OCT 6 1947

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 93—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1947, TO FEBRUARY 24, 1947
(PAGES 1 TO 1410)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1947

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Eightieth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, the Secretary, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following

PRAYER

Lord of the nations and of the passing years, summoned as servants of the people, we come in a crucial and creative day. First of all, we would bow our hearts in reverential silence in Thy searching presence, unto whom all hearts are open and from whom no secrets are hid. With burning issues affecting the very life of this dear land of hope and freedom and touching, too, the weal of the whole world, waiting to command our every power, with the expectant eyes of a cloud of witnesses upon this Chamber gazing from the invisible galleries of the past and the present, in this hallowed moment at the very top of the clean, white page of these national deliberations, we would write, "In the beginning, God," conscious, in very truth, that until we find Thee and art found of Thee, we begin at no beginning and come to no ending.

Grant to Thy servants here, to whom a great trust is committed, faith that dissolves all corroding cynicism, courage that scorns all compromise of principle, toil that refuses anything lower than one's best, as, on this solemn day, by high values and noble ideals, the course of the Congress is set.

We ask it in the name and for the sake of Him in whose face the final truth and beauty burns to birth and who taught us when we pray to say—let us all join together in the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

CREDENTIALS

The SECRETARY. The Chair will ask the clerk to read a statement.

The Chief Clerk (John C. Crockett) read as follows:

The present occupant of the chair, which he takes under direction of rule I, paragraph 2, lays before the Senate the credentials of the various Senators elected in November last for full and unexpired terms, including those of certain Senators elected and appointed for unexpired terms which ended at 12 o'clock noon today.

The above credentials, in most instances, follow the form suggested by the Senate in its resolution of January 4, 1934, and if there be no objection they will be placed on file and printed in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, I have no objection to the filing of the credentials, but I should like to make a motion.

The SECRETARY. If the Senator from Michigan will permit, the Chair will inquire if there is objection to the order which has been read.

There being no objection, the credentials of the respective Senators-elect were received, ordered to be placed on file, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 RAYMOND E. BALDWIN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for that portion of the unexpired term of former Senator Francis T. Maloney which follows midnight of November 5, 1946.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governor.

[SEAL] CHARLES J. PRESTIA,
Secretary.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 RAYMOND E. BALDWIN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governor.

[SEAL] CHARLES J. PRESTIA,
Secretary.

MISSISSIPPI EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 THEODORE GILMORE BILBO was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Fielding L. Wright, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson this 16th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

F. L. WRIGHT,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] WALKER WOOD,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 9th day of September 1946 OWEN BREWSTER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maine a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Horace Hildreth, and our seal hereto affixed at Augusta this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

HORACE HILDRETH,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] HAROLD I. GOSS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, November 25, 1946.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 JOHN W. BRICKER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Frank J. Lausche, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, Ohio, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] EDWARD J. HUMMEL,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 HUGH BUTLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Dwight Griswold, and our seal hereto affixed

at Lincoln, Nebr., this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA.

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

This is to certify that at a meeting of the State board of elections, held in its office on November 25, 1946, on an examination of the official abstract of votes on file in that office, it was ascertained and determined that at the general election, held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November 1946 for United States Senator, HARRY F. BYRD was duly elected United States Senator from Virginia for the term prescribed by law.

Witness the following official signatures and the seal of the office at Richmond this 25th day of November 1946.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
MATT G. ANDERSON,
Chairman.
[SEAL] MARVIN L. GRAY, *Secretary.*

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 HARRY P. CAIN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Washington a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Washington to be affixed at Olympia this 5th day of December A. D. 1946.

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor of Washington.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] RAY J. YEOMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 DENNIS CHAVEZ was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico as Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand, attested by the secretary of state and the seal of the State of New Mexico, this 12th day of December 1946.

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor of New Mexico.

Attest:
[SEAL] CECILIA TAFOYA CLEVELAND,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 TOM CONNALLY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Coke Stevenson, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this 29th day of November A. D. 1946.

COKE STEVENSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] CLAUDE ISBELL,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Frankfort, Ky., November 26, 1946.

PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES SENATE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Somerset, Ky., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the remainder of the term for which Hon. H. B. Chandler was originally elected, and a portion of which term was filled by Hon. William A. Stanfill on appointment of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Simeon Willis, and our seal hereunto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 25th day of November A. D. 1946.

SIMEON WILLIS,
Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 HENRY DWORSHAK, of Burley, Idaho, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term ending January 2, 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Arnold Williams, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise this 27th day of November A. D. 1946.

ARNOLD WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] IRA H. MASTERS,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 ZALES N. ECTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State, to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Sam C. Ford, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena this 12th day of December A. D. 1946.

SAM C. FORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF VERMONT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *Greetings:*

This is to certify that on the 1st day of November A. D. 1946 RALPH E. FLANDERS was duly appointed a Senator from the State of Vermont to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Warren R. Austin and to complete the term of the said Warren R. Austin ending at noon on January 3, A. D. 1947.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be hereunto affixed. Done in the executive chamber at Montpelier this 1st day of November A. D. 1946, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and seventieth.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HAROLD C. SYLVESTER,
Secretary of Civil and Military Affairs.

STATE OF VERMONT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946, RALPH E. FLANDERS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Mortimer R. Proctor, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] RAWSON C. MYRICK,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Leon, ss:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November A. D. 1946, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, M. F. Caldwell, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee this the 11th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] M. F. CALDWELL.
Attest:

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Albany.

I hereby certify that at a meeting of the State board of canvassers composed of the attorney general, two members of the State senate, and two members of the State assembly who canvassed the vote cast at the general election held in this State on the 5th day of November 1946, and whose original determination is on file in this office, IRVING M. IVES was, by the greatest number of votes cast at said election, duly elected United States Senator.

Witness my hand and seal of office at the city of Albany this 13th day of December 1946.

[SEAL] THOMAS J. CURRAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, Ind.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 WILLIAM E. JENNER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ralph E. Gates, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 12th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] RUE J. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 JAMES P. KEM was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Missouri a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United

States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Phil M. Donnelly, and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Jefferson, this 14th day of December 1946.

[SEAL] PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
WILSON BELL,
Secretary of State.
By P. F. WILLIS,
Chief Clerk.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, December 13, 1946.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 HARLEY M. KILGORE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Clarence W. Meadows, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WM. S. O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term ending the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Earl Warren, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, this 23d day of December A. D. 1946.

EARL WARREN,
Governor of California.
[SEAL] FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State of California.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Earl Warren, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, this 23d day of December A. D. 1946.

EARL WARREN,
Governor of California.
[SEAL] FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State of California.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 WILLIAM LANGER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Fred G. Aandahl, and our seal hereto affixed at Bismarck, this 5th day of December A. D. 1946.

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Maurice J. Tobin, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston, this 27th day of November A. D. 1946.

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] F. W. COOKE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that at a general election held in the State of Nevada on Tuesday, the 5th day of November 1946, GEORGE W. MALONE was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1947, having received the highest number of votes cast for said office at said election, as appears by the certificate of the duly constituted and qualified board of canvassers now on file in the office of the secretary of state at Carson City, Nev.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of state to be affixed at Carson City this 6th day of December A. D. 1946.

VAIL PITTMAN,
Lieutenant and Acting Governor.
By the Lieutenant and Acting Governor:
[SEAL] MALCOLM MCEACHIN,
Secretary of State.
By MURIEL LITTLEFIELD,
Deputy.

IN THE NAME AND BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

I, EDWARD MARTIN, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that at the election held on the 5th day of November 1946, EDWARD MARTIN, having received 1,853,458 votes, was duly elected to the office of United States Senator from the State of Pennsylvania for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at the city of Harrisburg, this 24th day of December in the year of our Lord 1946 and of the Commonwealth the one hundred seventy-first.

[SEAL] EDWARD MARTIN,
Governor.

By the Governor:
C. M. MORRISON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years commencing on the 3d day of January 1947.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 2d day of December A. D. 1946.

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 ERNEST W. MCFARLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Sidney P. Osborn, and our seal hereto affixed at Phoenix, Ariz., this 26th day of November A. D. 1946.

SIDNEY P. OSBORN,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] DAN E. GARVEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Providence.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 J. HOWARD MCGRATH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, John O. Pastore, and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R. I., this 10th day of December A. D. 1946.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 KENNETH D. MCKELLAR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Jim McCord, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 26th day of November A. D. 1946.

JIM MCCORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
Annapolis, Md.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 HERBERT R. O'CONOR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, and our seal hereto affixed at Annapolis, this 3d day of December A. D. 1946.

HERBERT R. O'CONOR.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD G. CHANEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WYOMING.

Election certificate

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Lester C. Hunt, and our seal hereto affixed, at Cheyenne this 10th day of December A. D. 1946.

LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] W. SCOTTY JACK,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
Executive Department.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 A. WILLIS ROBERTSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Virginia a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent Virginia in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 6 years, beginning November 6, 1946, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Hon. Carter Glass.

Given under my hand and under the lesser seal of the Commonwealth, at Richmond, this 6th day of December A. D. 1946 and in the one hundred and seventy-first year of the Commonwealth.

WILLIAM M. TUCK,
Governor of Virginia.

By the Governor:
JESSE W. DILLON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 JOHN SPARKMAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of Hon. John H. Bankhead, deceased.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery, this 14th day of November in the year of our Lord, 1946.

CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor of Alabama.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on November 5, 1946, H. ALEXANDER SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey a Senator from the said State to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

In testimony whereof the great seal of the State is hereunto affixed.

Witness the hand of His Excellency our Governor, Haydn Proctor, Acting Governor, President of the Senate, at Trenton this 3d day of December A. D. 1946.

HAYDN PROCTOR,
Acting Governor,
President of the Senate.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 EDWARD J. THYE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, EDWARD J. THYE, and our seal hereto affixed at the State Capitol in St. Paul this 30th day of November in the year of our Lord, 1946, and of the State the eighty-ninth.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MICHIGAN.

We, the undersigned, State canvassers, from an examination of the election returns received by the secretary of state, determine that at the general election held on the 5th day of November 1946 ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG was duly elected United States Senator for the term ending January 3, 1953.

In witness whereof we have hereto subscribed our names at Lansing this 4th day of December 1946.

HERMAN H. DIGNAN,
Secretary of State.
M. G. FIEGEL,
Deputy State Treasurer.
EUGENE B. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Board of State Canvassers.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Department of State, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of the certificate of determination of the Board of State Canvassers is a correct transcript of the original of such certificate of determination on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereto attached my signature and the great seal of the State, at Lansing, this 4th day of December 1946.

[SEAL] HERMAN H. DIGNAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 ARTHUR V. WATKINS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Acting Governor, E. E. Monson, and our seal hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, this 25th day of November in the year of our Lord 1946.

E. E. MONSON,
Acting Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK E. LEES,
Deputy Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 JOHN J. WILLIAMS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Walter W. Bacon, and our seal hereto affixed at Dover, this 20th day of November in the year of our Lord, 1946.

WALTER W. BACON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILLIAM J. STOREY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, November 25, 1946.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November 1946 KINGSLEY A. TAFT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term beginning on the 15th day of December 1946 and ending at noon on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Frank J. Lausche, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, Ohio, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. HUMMEL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, I wish to point out for the record that the service of KINGSLEY TAFT as Senator began on November 6, 1946, the day after his election. The portion of his credentials indicating that his unexpired term began on December 15, 1946, should be disregarded. It was apparently inserted because of a misapprehension as to the authority of the Ohio Legislature, by the enactment of Ohio General Code, section 4828–3, in 1914, to empower the Governor to make a temporary appointment to be effective beyond the date when the people filled the vacancy by election as the legislature directed. Under the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Ohio Legislature clearly had no such authority. This is also recognized in the Federal statutes (2 United States Code, section 36; 49 Statutes 22). The declarations of candidacy, the petitions of candidates, the primary ballots, the certificates of nomination, and the election ballots referred to the office to which Senator KINGSLEY TAFT was elected as "United States Senator (unexpired term)." There was nothing in or on any of them to indicate that the term began on any particular date.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

The SECRETARY. Will the Senator from Michigan permit the Chair to have another statement read?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The rules of the Senate provide no order of business for the opening day of the first session of a Congress. However, under the practice which has been followed for a long period of years, the next order of business will be the administration of the oath of office to the various Senators-elect, in groups of four, called in alphabetical order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, I object to that method of swearing in the Senators-elect, and I now move that the oath be administered to the able Senator-elect from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, whose credentials, in the usual form, have been received and filed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, if the Senator from Michigan will yield, may I ask him what purpose he has in departing from the traditional custom of the Senate?

Mr. FERGUSON. The purpose is to have Senator-elect ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG sworn in as the first Senator to take the oath at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, I ask for order, and that the occupants of the galleries be requested to be quiet. It is difficult to hear what is said.

The SECRETARY. The occupants of the galleries will maintain order. It is difficult for Senators to hear what is going on on the floor when there is talking in the galleries.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, with all due respect to the able Senator from Michigan, I object.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Michigan has submitted a motion.

Mr. OVERTON. I thought he had asked unanimous consent. It was difficult for me to hear.

Mr. FERGUSON. I submitted a motion.

Mr. OVERTON. I inquire if the motion is debatable.

The SECRETARY. The motion is debatable.

Mr. OVERTON. Whenever the Senator from Michigan yields the floor I shall ask for recognition.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator for a moment.

Mr. OVERTON. I say I am waiting until the Senator from Michigan yields the floor. I assume he wants to present his motion and the reasons for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have just stated the reason for the motion, which is that I desire Senator-elect ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, to be the first Member of the Senate to be sworn in at the beginning of this new Congress.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Michigan yield the floor?

Mr. FERGUSON. The motion is before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator from Michigan still retain the floor?

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. There seems to be some confusion, naturally so, among Senators, and to a greater extent among the public generally with respect to the method of swearing in Senators. From time immemorial it has been customary to call Senators-elect in alphabetical order in groups of four, but there is no rule on the subject; it has been a custom only. I recall a few years ago when Vice President Dawes required all 32 new Senators to stand up in a body and to be sworn at one time. He did it, I suppose, by unanimous consent or by order of the Chair in the absence of a rule.

Under the circumstances, the Senate has the parliamentary right to adopt any method that it may see fit in determining the order in which Senators shall be sworn in, and, in the absence of a rule, any Senator who is recognized can move that any Senator-elect be sworn in regardless of where his name would appear on the list. Therefore, the motion of the Senator from Michigan is in order, and, in the absence of a rule, and in spite of the custom which has prevailed merely by unanimous consent, any other Senator can arise and, if he is recognized, move that any Senator-elect be sworn in.

I felt that explanation ought to be made because we have proceeded from time immemorial by swearing in Senators-elect in groups of four in alphabetical order, but there is no rule on the subject in the Senate rules, and there is no rule which would prevent us from adopting any other method which we might see fit to adopt as to the order in which Senators-elect might be sworn in.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, I have made objection to swearing in Senators in groups of four in alphabetical order. I have no particular desire at the present moment to press the matter of swearing in the able Senator-elect from Michigan, except that I think in the administration of the oath the Senate should in each case adopt the same method, and that it should be on motion.

So I enter my objection to the swearing in of the new Senators in groups of four, and I withdraw the motion to swear in Senator-elect ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG at this moment, in order that we may ascertain whether we cannot adopt a method of swearing in the respective Senators.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Secretary, I present to the Senate the name of JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, recently elected Senator from the State of Wisconsin, and move that he be sworn in.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Wisconsin withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. WILEY. I withhold it.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If the order of recognition is left to the discretion of the Chair, will he recognize the sponsors of the various Senators in the alphabetical order of the names of the Senators-elect? If so, it is unnecessary that any other method be adopted.

The SECRETARY. If it is left to the discretion of the Chair, the Chair will ask the clerk to call the names of the Senators-elect in alphabetical order.

Mr. TAFT. Then the first name to be called will be that of the Senator-elect from Connecticut, Mr. BALDWIN, I take it.

The SECRETARY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is to say, they would be called one at a time, and not in groups?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

The SECRETARY. One at a time. Does the Senator from Wisconsin withdraw his motion?

Mr. WILEY. In accordance with the statement of the present majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], as to the right of any Senator, since there is no rule on the subject, to present his new colleague and request that he be sworn in, I have made such a motion. I think we should proceed in that manner, the Chair having recognized me for that purpose.

However, following the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, I shall withdraw the motion, though I think it is the proper way to proceed, and the best way to reach results.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Secretary, I gather, then, that the ruling of the present Presiding Officer affects the incoming Senator from Connecticut. Do I understand the ruling of the Secretary to be to the effect that it will now be proper for the Senator from Connecticut to escort the Senator-elect from Connecticut to the desk for the purpose of having the oath administered to him?

The SECRETARY. The Chair will request the clerk to call the first name on the list of Senators-elect.

The Chief Clerk called the name of RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, of Connecticut, and Mr. BALDWIN, escorted by Mr. MCMAHON, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the second name on the list.

The Chief Clerk called the name of THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, I send to the desk a resolution, to which I wish to address myself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the question before the Senate? Is there a motion pending?

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Idaho has sent to the desk a resolution to be read.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, as soon as the resolution is read, I desire to object to its consideration at the present moment.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 1), as follows:

Whereas the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, has conducted an investigation into the senatorial election in Mississippi in 1946, which investigation indicates that THEODORE G. BILBO may be guilty of violating the Constitution of the United States, the statutes of the United States, and his oath of office as a Senator of the United States in that he is alleged to have conspired to prevent citizens of the United States from exercising their constitutional rights to participate in the said election; and that he is alleged to have committed violations of Public Law 252, Seventy-sixth Congress, commonly known as the Hatch Act; and

Whereas the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program has completed an inquiry into certain transactions between THEODORE G. BILBO and various war contractors and has found officially that the

said BILBO, "in return for the aid he had given certain war contractors and others before Federal departments, solicited and received political contributions, accepted personal compensation, gifts, and services, and solicited and accepted substantial amounts of money for a personal charity administered solely by him" * * * and * * * "that by these transactions Senator BILBO misused his high office and violated certain Federal statutes"; and

Whereas the evidence adduced before the said committees indicates that the credentials for a seat in the Senate presented by the said THEODORE G. BILBO are tainted with fraud and corruption; and that the seating of the said BILBO would be contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate, dangerous to the perpetuation of free Government and the preservation of our constitutional liberties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the claim of the said THEODORE G. BILBO to a seat in the United States Senate is hereby referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration with instructions to grant such further hearing to the said THEODORE G. BILBO on the matters adduced before the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, and the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and to take such further evidence as shall be proper in the premises, and to report to the Senate at the earliest possible date; that until the coming in of the report of said committee, and until the final action of the Senate thereon, the said THEODORE G. BILBO be, and he is hereby, denied a seat in the United States Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Michigan will state his inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there a motion pending before the Senate to swear in Senator-elect BILBO? As I understand rule VI, it would require a motion, and such a motion would be the first question to be considered.

The SECRETARY. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho bears upon the seating or the credentials of the Senator-elect from Mississippi.

Mr. FERGUSON. My parliamentary inquiry is, Is there pending at the present time a motion to take up the credentials and to swear in Senator BILBO?

The SECRETARY. No motion is pending. The resolution of the Senator from Idaho is pending.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the resolution presented by the Senator from Idaho in order?

The SECRETARY. The Chair will ask the clerk to read rule VI.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

RULE VI

PRESENTATION OF CREDENTIALS

1. The presentation of the credentials of Senators-elect and other questions of privilege shall always be in order, except during the reading and correction of the Journal, while a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and all questions and motions arising or made upon the presentation of such credentials shall be proceeded with until disposed of.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Am I correct in understanding that the credentials of Senator BILBO have been presented?

The SECRETARY. They were presented and filed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the pending resolution take precedence over the swearing in of Senator BILBO?

The SECRETARY. The Chair must hold that under the rule it does. However, the resolution is subject to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit that we cannot hear any of the colloquy now being engaged in. Certainly the entire membership has the right to hear what is going on, and I respectfully ask that Senators raise their voices so that all the Members of the Senate may hear what is being said.

The SECRETARY. The point of order is well taken. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to discover what is before the Senate at the present time. I should like to know if it is the ruling of the Chair that the resolution of the Senator from Idaho is in order and is now before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. The Chair rules that the resolution is in order, and is subject to amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, I offer, as a substitute for the resolution, matter I send to the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Chair whether the Senator from Idaho has the floor, not having yielded to another Senator?

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Idaho has the floor. The Senator from Michigan propounded certain parliamentary inquiries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Making a parliamentary inquiry or asking a question is different from offering a substitute while the author of a pending resolution has the floor.

The SECRETARY. The Chair has not recognized the Senator from Michigan to offer a substitute.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, I wish to address myself to the resolution. I present it with a deep sense of its gravity and solemnity. While the Constitution gives to the Senate the power to pass upon the qualifications of its own Members, that power should be sparingly used. The people of each State have the right to choose their own representatives in Congress, and it would be extremely unwise for this body to set itself up as a self-righteous arbiter of the personality, the politics, or the morals of men who have been duly elected to office. I did not embark upon this course lightly but only after many weeks of deliberation and reflection. But it now appears that in rejecting Mr. BILBO we are merely rejecting a candidate until his election is proved to be the fair expression of the free will of those people.

I have frequently disagreed with the views of Mr. BILBO on the floor of this body and for that reason I have been doubly hesitant about taking this step. We do not have the right to reject any man because of his political views. That would be the negation of democracy.

If the people of Mississippi or any other State wish to elect to the Senate a man who advocates any belief extreme to the point of outraging great numbers of our citizens, that is their own business. They are perfectly free to do so and their representative is free to express their views in the Senate. In a Chamber devoted to free discussion, we can claim no right to censor the views of our colleagues. In a democracy based on the belief in the citizen's ability to govern himself, no legislative body may question the will of the electorate freely and fairly expressed. But intimidation and violence cannot masquerade as free speech; indeed they destroy the freedom of the electorate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. We cannot hear what is going on.

The SECRETARY. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point of order applies to the occupants of the galleries as well as to the Senate itself.

The SECRETARY. The Chair will ask the Sergeant at Arms to circulate about in the Chamber and to direct the doorkeepers to keep order. By reason of conversations which are going on it is difficult to hear the speaker.

The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, on July 26, 1946, I called to the attention of the Senate the inflammatory nature of the speeches which were being made in the Mississippi primary campaign by Senator BILBO. I read into the RECORD a United Press report which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 23, which reported that Senator BILBO had incited people in his State to use "any means" to prevent qualified voters from exercising their right to vote for candidates for the United States Senate. I urged immediate investigation since the elections at that time were only 2 weeks off. I pointed out that it was our duty to see "that no citizens will be deprived of their rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States." I further stated, "it therefore behooves us jealously to protect our democratic institutions, and to see that full observance is given everywhere to our precious constitutional

guaranties, many of which were enacted for the specific purpose of preventing racial discrimination at elections."

On July 1, 1946, I appeared by invitation before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and presented a brief citing the relevant provisions of the Constitution and statutes of the United States, and suggesting Senate action to prevent their violation in Mississippi. I urged the committee to conduct immediate field investigations in the State of Mississippi to collect evidence while it was still fresh. The committee referred my request to the Committee on Campaign Expenditures, which has since conducted field hearings, and has prepared two reports.

I am confident that all my colleagues are by this time informed of the nature of the charges against Mr. BILBO. It is reasonable to assume they have followed closely the press reports of the committee hearings. I am sure that they are familiar with the findings of the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1946, and the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

I am sure, too, that they are fully aware of the great interest which the country has shown in this case. Throughout the country citizens are watching today to see what action the Senate will take in this pressing matter.

Mr. Secretary, I do not exaggerate when I say that at this moment the honor and prestige of the Senate hang in the balance. To millions of Americans who have not previously evinced an interest in politics, today's action will alone determine whether this body is worthy of respect as the highest legislative body of a free people, or whether this body will fall into disrespect.

During the last few weeks I have driven through the Northwest, down the Pacific coast to Mexico, and across the country to Washington. Not once during that long auto tour have I been able to pick up a newspaper whose editorial page has not underlined these facts. I have not seen a magazine of current affairs which has not discussed the problem and expressed concern as to whether the Senate would have the courage to face this issue squarely. I have not heard a speaker of national reputation who has not speculated upon whether the code of the cloakroom would prove to be a higher law than the Constitution of the United States.

In short, Mr. Secretary, today it is not only Mr. BILBO who is on trial. Today it is the Senate itself which is on trial.

We, the Members of the Senate, are not only on trial collectively, we are on trial individually. For a statement was recently issued to the press asserting that if Mr. BILBO were refused his seat, he would expose the foibles of other Members of the Senate.

Mr. Secretary, I for one do not fear that threat of retaliation. The sound of the rattling skeleton in the closet does not intimidate me. I am sure that it does not intimidate my colleagues.

Our duty is made all the more plain because we were served with advance warning of Mr. BILBO's intention to subvert the electoral process. If we are to lend credence to reports appearing in the press at the time, he repeatedly declared his intent to keep qualified voters away from the polls. Repeatedly we read of it in the newspapers. As far back as July 1, 1946, I warned the Committee on Privileges and Elections as follows:

> If we cynically ignore the performance which the newspapers are now reporting, the prestige of this body will suffer a serious blow. The American people in every city in the country are reading these reports in the newspapers. They are observing that the United States Senate is completely unruffled and unperturbed. If we fail to take notice of these incidents without even raising an eyebrow we will lose the respect of men who love freedom. A great many of us have realized, albeit dimly, that various practices have been resorted to in some States to prevent citizens from voting. We have looked away from the fact that the Constitution and laws have become a dead letter in many places. In the press of our daily affairs we have ignored the mess but it is hard to ignore it any longer. We must take some action to protect our own integrity. We must take action to assure that every qualified citizen and voter will be permitted to cast his ballot for Federal officials in Mississippi next week and in every other State in the country. I ask your committee to give full force to the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

In that same speech I went on to say further:

> Gentlemen, this issue is one which, in the minds of millions of our citizens, tests the sincerity of our Senate. It is as important to the future of our Republic as any problem which has come before us this session. We cannot duck it, we cannot avoid it. It is before us. It was put before us, if the newspaper reports are correct, by one of our own Members, who saw fit to give us advance notice of a widespread plan to break Federal laws. He has allegedly named the time and place and pretty well described the details of the crimes to be committed. The threats are worthy of special credence because they were made in the context of a long history of similar crime. The election is tomorrow. If you act, you must act fast.

This ends my quotation from the speech I delivered on July 1, 1946.

Senators, the election day is now past. From the evidence so far made available it would appear that the crimes I then anticipated have now been perpetrated. While I decried the lack of vigorous action prior to the election, the fact that such action was not then taken only makes it more imperative that we act on the matter now.

While pondering the course of action I would take in this case, I read the debates of the Senate in the Vare and Smith cases. In reading the Smith debates which took place almost two decades ago, I was particularly impressed with the brilliant, statesmanlike and thoughtful words of the able constitutional lawyer who is now the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

At the time, the proponents of the candidate Smith tried to threaten the able and courageous Senators from the South with the possibility of retaliation if they voted against his seating. The able Senator replied in words which are worth repeating, because I feel that they still represent the sentiment of the best minds of the South. I quote:

> The doctrine has here been invoked that, perchance some Southern States have discriminated in their primary or election laws against a certain class of our citizens, that in some way we on this side of the aisle are estopped, especially those of us from the Southern States, to raise any question touching the qualification, election, or returns of any man who comes here from any State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Secretary, I wish to raise a point of order.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Idaho yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I invite attention to rule XXXIII of the Senate:

> No person shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while in session, except as follows:

Then there are listed the permissions for admission to the floor of the Senate. The last paragraph of the rule reads as follows:

> Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties. Clerks to Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate as such.

I point out that on this occasion I feel that the floor of the Senate has been turned into an auditorium. Many people have been seated on the floor of the Senate who have no right here under the rules of the Senate. I think it is an unfortunate precedent, and I think the Sergeant at Arms should be instructed to see that rule XXXIII is carried out to its fullest letter. The deliberations of this body in this solemn hour are of such great concern to the Nation that I do not think the work of individual Senators should be impaired by having on the floor individuals not connected with the work of the Senate, who are obviously, by conversation which is being carried on, making it impossible for us even to hear the Senator from Idaho, whose voice usually can be heard throughout the Chamber.

The SECRETARY. The point of order is sustained; and those who do not come within the provisions of the rule will please leave the Senate Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not hear the statement of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Secretary, I made the point of order in regard to the duty of the Sergeant at Arms to exclude from the Senate floor under rule XXXIII persons who are not entitled to be on the floor at this time. It is not the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to make it impossible, as has been suggested to me, for the wives of the new Senators to see them sworn in. However, I think it is the clear duty of the Sergeant at Arms to see to it that the wives and relatives of the new Senators be given preferential seating in the family gallery of

the Senate. I submit that if we start breaking down the precedents under rule XXXIII as is being done today, there will be no end to the confusion which will result in the future from this infringement upon the proper decorum of the Senate. The responsibility for protecting the rights of the Senate rests with the Sergeant at Arms once he is instructed to enforce any rule such as rule XXXIII. The rule was intended to protect the Senate from just the sort of confusion that prevails on the floor of the Senate at this very moment. Thus under a point of order I request that rule XXXIII be enforced.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, will the Chair have read the rule in question?

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to suggest that.

The legislative clerk (Emery L. Frazier) read as follows:

> No person shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while in session, except as follows:
>
> * * * * *
>
> Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties. Clerks to Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate as such.

The SECRETARY. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

The Senator from Idaho may proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, I was quoting from a speech delivered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I continue:

> I have no desire to get into two controversies at once, but that argument has about as much logic in it, of common sense in it, and of fairness in it, as the argument frequently advanced that because one comes from the South where certain amendments are alleged to have been nullified, he is estopped from saying that other amendments shall not be nullified. In my place I say now that whenever any Southern State, my own included, goes beyond the limitations of the Constitution, any person at interest is invited to take an appeal through all of the courts to the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the question.
>
> Why this effort to invoke this doctrine here? Why should Senators persist in the effort to frighten by threat the South every time they wish us to do wrong? Why do they not undertake to scare us when they wish us to do right?

Those were brave, intelligent, and courageous words. I quote still another passage, which is equally worthy of attention:

> More than that, I have not the slightest hesitancy in saying that when the time comes, as happily it will come, I believe, when every line of our law which seemingly gives offense to any right-thinking man or woman in this country may be written out of it, no section of this Nation will be happier than will the South itself.

Mr. Secretary, I believe that this statement of a great southern statesman, with whom I am proud to serve, represents the forward-looking attitude which characterizes the truly great men of the South. I am convinced that they will do their utmost according to their lights to try to effectuate the equality of man which the Declaration of Independence advocates and the Constitution demands. But I do not here argue for any improvement in that direction. That is not the issue here today. Today I do not argue in favor of a step forward; I argue against a step backward.

Let me detail briefly the evidence against Mr. BILBO. I shall consider first, because I believe it to be of first importance, the charge that Mr. BILBO conspired to and did prevent duly qualified citizens from voting because of their race or color, in direct violation of the Constitution.

The contemporary news reports amply illustrate the type of activity in which Mr. BILBO engaged. I concede that those newspaper reports were not made under oath. I regret very much that the Campaign Investigating Committee failed to call the newspaper reporters to the stand. The committee acted pursuant to a request from the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate the news reports which I placed before it. It called Mr. BILBO to deny the reports, but did not call the reporters to confirm them. In the special investigation which I suggest, however, there will be ample opportunity to hear the reporters involved.

Meanwhile, I, for one, am inclined to give great weight to their reports. I do this partly because some of them are known to me as men of the highest credibility and accuracy; and I do so because of the striking unanimity of all of the reports.

Let me read some of the statements Mr. BILBO made:

This is from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of June 23, 1946:

> LAUREL.—Citizens of Mississippi were again called on here Saturday by Senator THEO. G. BILBO "to resort to any means" to keep Negroes from the polls in the July 2 Democratic primary.
>
> "And if you don't know what that means, you are just not up on persuasive measures," said Senator BILBO as he completed a week of stump speaking in south Mississippi.

From the Jackson Daily News of May 30, 1946:

> TYLERTOWN.—Senator THEO. G. BILBO speaking here Wednesday afternoon in the interest of his candidacy for reelection, challenged the "qualifications" of Negroes to participate in a white Democratic primary, and laid the blame for "threatening racial strife in Mississippi to so-called southern liberals and socialistic, communistic political gangsters now attempting to undermine the white man's rule in the South."
>
> Senator BILBO insisted that "the Negro is not sufficiently advanced to meet the constitutional requirements for voting in Mississippi and therefore not qualified to participate in a white Democratic primary."

The Jackson (Miss.) Daily News on May 28, 1946, reported:

> Senator BILBO, holding forth on the porch of the pavilion, placed the responsibility for maintaining white supremacy in the hands of county officials.
>
> "The poll tax," he said, "has nothing to do with the Negro not voting in the State; the real thorn in their imaginary crown—placed there by the Negro lovers of the North—is section 244 of the State's constitution, which provides that before anyone can register he must be able to read, or explain after it is read to him or her, the provisions of this constitution.
>
> "The circuit clerks," he continued, "are under oath to protect the provisions of that constitution, and if there is a single man or woman serving in this important office who cannot think up questions enough to disqualify 'undesirables,' then write BILBO or any good lawyer and there are a hundred good questions which can be furnished."
>
> He told the campaign crowd it should support the officials and "use whatever means at your command to preserve and protect the custom in the Southern, white, Democratic primary."

Time magazine of July 1, 1946, contained this account:

> Three of his four opponents * * * were campaigning hard. But BILBO paid no heed. Instead he howled a warning, "The white people of Mississippi are sitting on a volcano. * * * We are faced with a Nation-wide campaign to integrate the nigger with the social life of this country. * * *
>
> "Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce is the greatest nigger-lover in the North—except Old Lady Eleanor Roosevelt. Yep; Old Lady Roosevelt is worse. * * * In Washington she forced our southern girls to use the stools and the toilets of damn syphilitic nigger women. * * *
>
> "I call on every red-blooded white man to use any means to keep the niggers away from the polls. If you don't understand what that means, you are just plain dumb."

An article by Harry Henderson and Sam Shaw in Collier's, July 6, 1946, quotes Mr. BILBO, as follows:

> The poll tax won't keep 'em from voting. What keeps 'em from voting is section 244 of the constitution of 1890 that Senator GEORGE wrote. It says that a man to register must be able to read and explain the constitution or explain the constitution when read to him. * * * And then Senator GEORGE wrote a constitution that damn few white men and no niggers at all can explain. * * *
>
> Why, the niggers are having meetings all over the State. We don't know what they're up to. They've had meetings in every county—meetings behind locked doors. Two policemen up at Jackson broke in on one of their meetings and do you know what they found? Northern niggers teaching them how to register and how to vote. * * *
>
> Mississippi is white. We got the right to keep it that way, and I care not what Tom Clark and Hugo Black say. * * * I'm calling on every red-blooded American who believes in the superiority and integrity of the white race to get out and see that no nigger votes. * * * And the best time to do it is the night before.

A United Press dispatch by Martha Coble, June 25, 1946, reads as follows:

> JACKSON, MISS.—Senator THEODORE G. BILBO today challenged the right of the Federal Government to tell Mississippi it must allow Negroes to vote in next Tuesday's Democratic primary.

Mr. Secretary, the unanimity of these press reports and the character of the reporters is not the only warranty of their authenticity. There is another very persuasive factor. That is the undeniable fact that these statements kept appearing, day after day, in the newspapers of Mississippi, and never once were denied or repudiated by Mr. BILBO. Indeed, I would be willing to go so far as to say that failure to deny, repudiate, correct, or attempt to rectify these reports would, under the circumstances, constitute a virtual adoption of the language quoted.

In a political campaign it is inconceivable—absolutely inconceivable—that

these press reports did not come to Mr. BILBO's attention. He knew that they were appearing everywhere, and he knew that among certain elements of the electorate he was profiting by their appearance. He knew, too, that the mere appearance of these statements in the newspapers would of itself intimidate thousands of other qualified voters, and would incite thousands of hoodlums. In order to prevent this it was clearly his duty to issue a denial if the statements were not true.

Did he issue a denial? Throughout the campaign he failed to do so. Indeed, he made no attempt whatever to deny the statements, until he appeared before a Senate investigating committee with his lawyer at his side. At late as August 3, 1946, he confirmed these news reports. In an interview on the Mutual Broadcasting System that night he participated in the following dialog:

Question. If you don't believe in lynch law, I wish you would explain in very simple terms to all of us what you meant by the statement that was several times attributed to you as having been made in campaign speeches down there, that the way to stop Negroes from voting was to start from the night before.

BILBO. I said the best time to keep a nigger away from a white primary in Mississippi was to see him the night before.

Question. Wasn't that in effect to intimidate any Negroes who might have differed with your interpretation of the law and to keep them from the polls?

BILBO. You can call it what you may.

Mr. Secretary, I respectfully submit that that radio confirmation far outweighs the self-serving last-minute denials that were issued to a committee of this Senate on advice of counsel.

In his defense, Mr. BILBO has stated that even if he left the word out his hearers always understood that he referred only to "legal" means. He also claims that he was misquoted and that he did in fact use the word "legal." The committee did not call the newspapermen who unanimously omitted the word "legal" from their quotations.

Mr. Secretary, let us examine the context of this language; let us consider the background of these speeches. Mr. BILBO has had a long history of exploiting racial antipathies. Race hatred has always been the favorite theme of his repertoire, and we here in the Senate have often listened to his peculiar anthropological theories. They have been appeals to the instincts of clash and conflict, appeals to the childlike distrust that men of one complexion have for those of another. Invariably, they were couched in a language of violence; and if these were his accents on the Senate floor, what can we assume to have been his speech upon the hustings?

When Mr. BILBO exhorted his followers to "use every means" to prevent Negroes from voting, he was not talking in a climate of calm, dispassionate deliberation. He spoke in an atmosphere redolent of the odors of hate, of burning flesh, of tar, of feathers, and of gunpowder. It was not the place for polite inferences or for thoughts that could remain pure and innocent in spite of the inflammatory language in which they were expressed. It was not a forum of academic discussion. The mere addition of one word would hardly change the purport of his harangue.

Is the white robe and hood the uniform of a debating society? Is it the costume of a discussion group? Or is it the mask of the Ku Klux Klan, a secret organization which has committed more crimes under cover of darkness than any other organization in the Nation's history, an organization which from its inception has been dedicated to the oppression of Negroes, to an attempt to reduce them to the status of animals, to the denial of their franchise by beatings, bloodshed, torture, mayhem, threats, coercion, and murder?

Mr. BILBO has taken the solemn midnight pledge of membership in this organization. He has signed his name in blood to its tenets. In a recent radio speech, he admitted membership in the Ku Klux Klan. I quote him:

I am a member of the Ku Klux Klan No. 40, called Bilbo, Bilbo Klan No. 40, Poplarville, Miss.

He said that he regarded his oath so conscientiously that "once a klansman, always a klansman."

All of these facts were known to the people of Mississippi. They knew BILBO to be a Klan member, and they knew that he was sympathetic to the aims and purposes of that organization. When he rose to emotional heights in demanding the exclusion of Negroes from the polling places, were they likely, then, to infer that he was referring, of course, only to "legal" methods? Would they be likely to take him seriously if he sandwiched in the word "legal"?

It is also argued in defense of Mr. BILBO that Negroes never were permitted to vote in the State of Mississippi. This, of course, is pure fiction. Negroes have not only voted in the State of Mississippi; they have even represented that State in this honored Chamber. In the post-reconstruction repression the vote was illegally taken away from Negro citizens.

The fact that the Senate might have previously ignored some violations of law does not excuse Mr. BILBO. No amount of acquiescence by this body can change a provision of the Constitution. No amount of acquiescence can wither the great fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to our Constitution. No amount of indifference can expunge the statutes which protect the civil rights of all our people. The dust of connivance can obscure, but it cannot tarnish, the bright gold of our free institutions.

But I do not now propose to brush that dust away. To my shame, I do not propose to vindicate these great constitutional provisions. I do not propose that this body should upon its own motion embark on a series of inquiries into elections held in all States, to determine whether the constitutional mandates are being observed.

In the Mississippi situation it was not I who brought the flagrant violations of law to public attention. It was Mr. BILBO who himself called our attention to these excesses.

For many years we have all known that there was a mess in our back yard. We knew that a stench was arising from the decadent, corrupt, and unlawful practices which were conducted at Federal elections in many States. We knew it; but in our smug and self-contented way we preferred to ignore it, for it is not pleasant to probe around in the muck. But it remained for Mr. BILBO to force us to see it and smell it; it remained for Mr. BILBO to rub our noses in it.

In the not distant past the Senate has debarred candidates for spending excessive sums of money on their campaigns. In the judgment of the Senate in the Newberry, Smith, and Vare cases, the expenditure of huge sums in effect resulted in coercion—it limited the free choice of voters. But if the expenditure of money limits the free choice of voters how much more is their choice limited by a threat to "see them the night before," to "use every means," yes; even "every lawful means" to keep them from voting, particularly when such incitements are addressed exclusively to "red-blooded" individuals?

The evidence brought before us by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program goes back much further than the recent election campaign. The Senate has now been informed by this committee that Mr. BILBO solicited campaign funds from war contractors whom he had aided, in what the committee says was a clear violation of the law of the land.

The Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program uses this language in summing up BILBO's acts in the 1942 Democratic primary in Mississippi and since:

The evidence presented to this committee clearly indicates that Senator BILBO improperly used his high office as United States Senator for his personal gain in his dealings with war contractors.

It is immaterial that many of the acts detailed by the war investigating committee were committed prior to the recent election.

These acts alone, connected with the senatorial primary campaign of Wall Doxey in Mississippi in 1942 would render Mr. BILBO morally unfit to be a United States Senator. They would show that he was morally unfit to be a United States Senator in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. The disqualifying character of these alleged acts is in no way condoned merely because they were not known to the Senate at an earlier date.

The evidence of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program does not conclude with the Mississippi Democratic primary 4 years ago. Rather there is evidence submitted that he has continued such practices.

Of these continuing acts the committee itself has this to say:

The committee considers Senator BILBO's acceptance of expensive gifts and donations of personal property and the acceptance of improvements to real estate, provided by contractors who have profited out of their work for the Government in the war effort, to be an illegal practice in violation of existing Federal statutes.

There is no qualification in that statement which is the studied conclusion of a committee of the Senate. Let me repeat, the committee says flatly that Mr.

BILBO's actions are "an illegal practice in violation of existing Federal statutes."

These findings are a solemn indictment. They are not the ill-considered nor hastily trumped-up allegations of irresponsible persons. They are a judgment against Mr. BILBO by a committee of United States Senators, members of a group which we like to call the greatest deliberative body in the world. Our action in the handling of this case will determine whether that title is a misnomer.

That is why it is not enough for us to say, "Yes, this BILBO matter needs looking into some time—but later." We cannot say, "We will not bother with this trivia now when the Congress is busy organizing itself." We cannot say, "We will give BILBO his seat now and one of these days we will get around to deciding whether we will keep him."

I suggest that the Committee on Rules and Administration be directed to weigh all the evidence, as the Senate itself must do, from the specific viewpoint of deciding whether or not Mr. BILBO is entitled to be seated. I do this because the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program was interested primarily in determining the effect of Mr. BILBO's alleged actions upon the war effort. Mr. BILBO should be given a full and fair hearing on the direct question of his right to hold office. That is why I ask for this additional committee action. But in no case—in the face of the evidence already before the Senate—should Mr. BILBO be seated as a Senator pending the outcome of this additional hearing.

What are the powers and duties of the Senate in the matter of determining the qualifications of its Members? The specific language of the Constitution, the intent of the founding fathers, the interpretations of Senate and constitutional law authorities, and the numerous precedents are all clear and convincing to the effect that the Senate has an unlimited power to judge the qualifications of its own Members.

Section 5, article I, provides:

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

Section 3 provides that no person shall be a representative unless he meets certain age, citizenship, and residential requirements. The language of section 3 is in the negative. The requirements of section 3 are not qualifications; they are disqualifications. In the Constitutional Convention, there was an attempt to set up affirmative qualifications. During the debate on that draft, which was later rejected, Mr. Dickinson, of Delaware, opposed the formulation because it would be held to be exclusive. He stated that he was "against any recitals of qualifications in the Constitution. It was impossible to make a complete one, and a partial one would, by implication, tie up the hands of the Legislature from supplying omissions."

Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, took the same view, saying: "Besides, a partial enumeration of cases will disable the Legislature from disqualifying odious and dangerous characters."

The intention of the founding fathers was clear. As expressed in the debates in the Constitutional Convention, and confirmed by the practices of the colonial legislatures and the acts of the first sessions of Congress, that intention was to give the Senate an untrammeled power to be the judge of the elections and qualifications of its own Members.

It has been contended from time to time that a Senator or Member of the other House is a representative of his State—a sort of ambassador to represent the State in the Legislature of the Union—and that if the credentials from his State are in good and proper form, they must be accepted. It may be said, first of all, that even ambassadors plenipotentiary are frequently rejected for being persona non grata. But fundamentally the ambassador argument is fallacious. A Senator is a national officer, a Senator of the United States, and not of his State. Judge Story, in his great work on the Constitution, says:

> They [the States] have just as much right, and no more, to prescribe new qualifications for a representative as they have for a President. Each is an officer of the Union, deriving his powers and qualifications from the Constitution, and neither created by, dependent upon, nor controllable by the States.
>
> These officers owe their existence and functions to the united voice of the whole, not a portion of the people.

Under this broad grant of power to judge elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members, what are the duties of the Senate?

It must be emphasized that Senators are officials of the United States Government and not of the States. They legislate not for the States alone but for all the people of the Union. The vote of a Senator affects every State in the Union as much as it does the State from which he is elected. His vote may mean peace or war, prosperity or depression, honest Government or public corruption, freedom or tyranny. Must the whole country suffer from the corruption of a part? Should not the United States protect itself against corruption in one of its parts?

In defense of its own integrity and the national welfare, what is the duty of the Senate under its power to judge elections? I say, and Senate history has many times confirmed it, that the Senate must insist that its Members be elected in full, fair, and free elections—in elections untainted by fraud or corruption or intimidation, whether perpetrated by money bribes or threats of physical violence. The Senate has many times declared that excessive campaign expenditures are grounds for disqualification. Why? Because excessive use of money holds the possibility, holds the threat and danger that the free choice of the voters may be impaired. How much more necessary, therefore, is it for the Senate to act against one who, by clear and damning evidence has been guilty not merely of the possibility of impairing a free choice by the citizenry but of actually and deliberately conspiring to prevent by force and violence the exercise of the constitutional right to vote.

How much more necessary therefore that the Senate protect itself against such a one when the evidence also shows that he has misused his high office and been guilty of a number of violations of Federal statutes, which are directed toward the protection of the electoral process and clean government.

It has been urged on occasion that the Senate should leave to the courts punishment for statutory crimes; that the proper procedure is to permit a Senator-elect to be seated and thereafter move to expel him. But Senate power is not so feeble, and Senate duty not so dilatory.

In my research into election contests, I found that the Senate has 29 times accepted the credentials of a Senator-elect and investigated the charges afterward; but 18 times the Senate has refused to seat the Senator-elect while the prima facie case was being investigated. The right of the Senate is clear—it may seat before investigating or investigate before seating. In this case, where a senatorial investigating committee has declared there is proof of corruption and disqualification, seating must be denied. The oath must not be administered to one who has deliberately and flagrantly flouted and mocked it.

I submit, Mr. Secretary, that that is more than the honor of this body can bear. It is now our clear duty to face the situation. It is our duty to say to Mr. BILBO: "If you have made public profession of your contempt for the Constitution, if you have boasted that the election laws are to be flagrantly violated in your State, if you have advised us publicly and frequently that you will subvert our democratic institutions, we can no longer ignore your actions. We must face the facts and perform our duty, distasteful as it may be. We must deny you a seat in this body."

In encouraging large numbers of people flagrantly to violate the law, BILBO violated his own oath to protect and defend the Constitution, the oath which he seeks to renew here today. What a mockery it would be if we should again permit him to perjure himself by swearing to support the Constitution which he has so openly conspired to violate. What a hypocritical and blasphemous gesture we would witness today, if Mr. BILBO were to stand in our midst and place his hand on the Holy Bible and swear fealty to democratic institutions, to free elections, to the rights of citizens. Or would Mr. BILBO prefer to save us that spectacle? Would he prefer to take his oath upon an expurgated version of the United States Constitution, one that did not say "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude"?

Mr. Secretary, I have frequently been informed that the problem of race relations in the South is a highly complex one, which required patience and good will. I am willing to accept that advice. I am willing to move as slowly as necessary.

I ask only one thing: That we do move forward; that we do not turn back the clock. And I will vigorously resist any attempt to move in the opposite direction, the direction of ill will.

Mr. BILBO has moved in that backward direction. He has toured the length and breadth of his State stirring up racial

hatred, inciting white to hate black and causing black to hate white. To whites who are themselves poor, ill-nourished, ill-clothed, and ill-educated, he does not offer prosperity, nourishment, clothing, food, and education. No; he offers to them the delicious sense of feeling superior to someone else, the cheap thrill of membership in a master race, the joy of kicking someone else around.

To those on the lowest rung of the ladder he does not offer a lift; he merely offers to create another rung, still lower, so that the progress of man will be a series of descending steps. This is the same sort of cheap thrill that was peddled in Germany by an ambitious house painter some 10 years ago. We know that his doctrines and his methods brought no good to his people or the people of the world. We know that they never can, because they go directly counter to the teachings of brotherly love, which alone can save us all in this atomic age.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, a point of order.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to make the point of order that the Senate rules require the Chair to admonish the occupants of the galleries that the galleries will be cleared if they indulge in applause.

The SECRETARY. The point of order is well taken. The galleries will be in order. If there are further demonstrations, either of approval or disapproval, the Chair will be inclined to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary——

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, I send to the desk and offer a substitute for the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, Senator-elect from the State of Mississippi, is hereby permitted to take the oath and to qualify as a Senator from the State of Mississippi without prejudice to the Senator-elect or to the right of the Senate to determine all issues respecting his right to a seat in the Senate.

The SECRETARY. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Ferguson
Baldwin	Capehart	Fulbright
Ball	Capper	George
Barkley	Donnell	Green
Bridges	Downey	Gurney
Brooks	Eastland	Hatch
Buck	Ellender	Hawkes
Hayden	Morse	Taylor
Hickenlooper	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	O'Daniel	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Pepper	Wagner
Lucas	Reed	Wherry
McCarran	Revercomb	White
McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.	Wiley
McMahon	Russell	Wilson
Maybank	Saltonstall	Young
Millikin	Stewart	
Moore	Taft	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The SECRETARY. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would have the effect of excluding Senator BILBO from the Senate. It would have the effect of excluding from a seat in the United States Senate one who comes here duly elected as a Senator by the people of his State, one who has presented his credentials showing his election, which credentials have been laid down by the Presiding Officer and ordered to be filed. There is no question as to Senator BILBO's nomination. There is no question as to his election. The only question involved in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho is, Shall the Senate exclude from a seat in the United States Senate, at the very threshold of the Senate, one who comes accredited from a sovereign State as a duly elected Senator from the State of Mississippi?

The argument back of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho is that the Senator-elect from Mississippi is guilty of such gross misconduct, of acts involving such a degree of moral turpitude, and has so demeaned himself as to be unworthy of a seat in the United States Senate.

It is not my purpose to discuss that phase of the question. It is not my purpose to state now whether I consider Senator BILBO worthy of a seat in the United States Senate. I desire to present for the consideration of the Senate a much more fundamental question than that. I am not speaking for Senator BILBO. I am not speaking for any individual. I am speaking for the rights of American citizens regardless of what States they come from; I am speaking for the rights of sovereign States of the Union. I am speaking for the Constitution of the United States. I shall base my argument upon the Constitution of the United States. I shall take my stand, furthermore, upon what I consider to be a fair, decent, and just course for the United States Senate to pursue.

Charges are made by the Senator from Idaho, without any proof submitted by him beyond his own ipse dixit. There are charges pending before the Senate which were filed by a Senate investigating committee which had no jurisdiction to inquire into the validity of the election of the Senator from Mississippi. There are charges filed by the Senate special committee investigating the national-defense program which deal with events which occurred not in respect to Senator BILBO's election, but which occurred a number of years ago. The proper time to consider whether a Senator is entitled to a seat is when a duly constituted committee, organized for the purpose of making such an investigation, has made the investigation and submitted a report thereon. That committee used to be the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Now, under the law, it is the Committee on Rules. That committee has made no inquiry and has submitted no report.

Here was a committee which was constituted for the purpose of ascertaining whether there had been violations of the law with respect to war contracts, whether there had been misconduct on the part of war contractors, whether there had been any undue influence exerted upon those in charge of the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments of the Government. The investigations were made for the purpose of protecting the Government against bribery and against corruption on the part of those designated to administer the law covering contracts dealing with the war.

There is another committee which has made a report, and this report is favorable to Senator BILBO. I say that the report of that committee is not one which should now be considered. It is not the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but it is a committee specially appointed with reference to expenditures in senatorial campaigns. While that report is favorable to the Senator-elect from Mississippi, at the same time it does not go, and it could not go, into the question of the validity of his election—into the question as to whether he is worthy of a seat in the United States Senate. The recommendations of that committee would be purely persuasive to the committee that has jurisdiction in such matters.

Now, here comes a man from a sovereign State of the Union, with his credentials, without there being any question as to their validity. He presents himself at the door of the Senate, and without any inquiry on the part of any regularly constituted committee of the Senate, under the Taylor resolution, he is to be barred from having a seat in the United States Senate.

My resolution, on the other hand, suggests that the Senator from Mississippi be allowed to take his seat and the oath be administered to him; that he be permitted to qualify without any prejudice to the right of the Senate to make inquiry either into the validity of his election or as to his fitness to occupy a seat in the United States Senate, and without any prejudice to the rights of the Senator-elect to appear in his own behalf in respect to any such matter.

Mr. Secretary, I should like to present this matter from a nonpartisan standpoint. It ought to be considered from a nonpartisan standpoint. I know it is said in the newspapers that the question is largely political. I hope it is not. I read a report contained in the daily press that the Republicans had met and had

unanimously determined to bar Senator BILBO from a seat in the United States Senate. I hope that information is not correct. I hope that on reflection the members of the new majority party—and I say that with some regret [laughter]—will come to another and a better conclusion.

I have heard Senators on this floor, both on this and on the other side of the aisle, speak very vigorously in support of antilynching bills which they are in the habit of preparing every now and then, especially during an election year, just before the election. Now what are we trying to do here today? Without giving Mr. BILBO a trial before a regularly constituted committee, without giving him an opportunity to appear in his own behalf and defend his cause before this august body, we are undertaking to drag him by the heels to the door of the Senate and lynch him. That is the effect of the Taylor resolution.

That is not only unfair, it is unconstitutional. The Constitution declares that each House of Congress "shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members." The Constitution declares what the qualifications of a Senator are. They relate to age, residence, and citizenship. He must be 30 years of age. He must be an inhabitant of the State from which he is elected. He must have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years preceding his election. Those are the qualifications which are prescribed by the Constitution. When the Constitution authorizes the United States Senate to pass upon the qualifications of its Members those qualifications are the qualifications declared by the Constitution itself.

I think I could bring that thought more clearly to the attention of the Senate if I were to give an illustration. Suppose the framers of the Constitution, instead of making the Members of the United States Senate the sole judges of the qualifications of its Members, should have delegated that authority to some other tribunal. Suppose it had vested authority, let us say, in the Supreme Court, and that the Constitution, after declaring what the qualifications of a Senator are, with respect to age, residence, and citizenship, should have declared that the United States Supreme Court shall be the sole judge of the qualifications of Members of the United States Senate. Would any Senator say that the United States Supreme Court could add any other qualification than those prescribed by the Constitution? Certainly not. And if the United States Supreme Court may not add any qualifications, how can we, as Senators, add any other qualification? At the present moment we are not sitting here as legislators making laws for our Nation. We are sitting here as a great judicial tribunal, such as the United States Supreme Court is, or should be. We cannot go beyond the authority vested in this judicial tribunal, which is to pass upon the qualifications of a Member with respect to his age, residence, and citizenship. I think there can be no escape from that conclusion.

The Senate is not without its remedy. If the credentials of a Senator-elect are proper and he is sworn in, if he is one who, in the judgment of his colleagues, is unworthy of a seat in this body, the Senate has the remedy of expulsion, an adequate remedy.

The question whether or not a Senator has been duly elected is a question which I think the framers of the Constitution very wisely lodged in a majority vote of the Senate. The question whether a Senator has the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution as to age, residence, and citizenship is, I think, a question that was very wisely left by the framers of the Constitution to a majority vote of the Senate. But when it comes to blasting a man's reputation, when it comes to declaring him guilty of gross moral turpitude, when it comes to declaring him wholly unworthy of representing a sovereign State whose people have sent him here as their representative, I believe that the framers of the Constitution very well vested that authority in a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate instead of a mere majority. That is the protection which a Senator has. That is the protection that the State which sent him here has. If we depart from that sound philosophy on the part of the framers of our Government, then we shall be involved in a vast amount of trouble.

The right to expel a Senator is unlimited. There is no limitation in the Constitution, such as is prescribed with respect to his right to take a seat. The Senate has the unqualified and unlimited power of expelling a Senator. There is no limitation as to causes for which he may be expelled. He may be expelled because in his early growth he robbed a watermelon patch, or because, as has been said on the floor of the Senate in times past, he has red hair, or because Senators do not like the way he walks, or the brand of cigars he smokes. The authority of the Senate is wholly unlimited in respect to expulsion, but it is limited with respect to a Senator being allowed to take his seat in the United States Senate.

Mr. Secretary, this is not the first time I have taken that position. I took that position in the Langer case. Senator LANGER was elected from the State of North Dakota. There was no question as to his credentials. He was permitted—as I hope and expect Senator BILBO will be permitted—to take the oath without prejudice. Senator LANGER was a Republican. I have been a Democrat all my life, but I advocated that Senator LANGER be permitted to retain his seat unless the Senate should resort to the remedy of expulsion and by a two-thirds vote deny him a seat. I fought vigorously in that battle. As I said at the time, I was not fighting for Senator LANGER. I was fighting for the principles of the Constitution under which I live, and which I have sworn to support.

I know the temptations of partisan politics, and I know that often we succumb to them. I remember that when I first came here in 1931 there was a contested election in the House of Representatives between a Democrat and a Republican. A yea-and-nay vote was called for. Every Democrat voted for the Democrat, and every Republican voted for the Republican. Of course, there could not have been that unanimity on the part of one party, and contrary unanimity on the part of the other party, unless each had been actuated by political considerations. I hope we can be free from such considerations today.

Since that time we have fought another great war. The people of this country have become more united than ever. The two great parties have worked together during the 4 years of that strife, and we have succeeded. We did not display partisanship in the conduct of the war; and I hope we have emerged from it a more united people.

I hope there will not be in this Congress a decision of a question purely on political considerations. I remember that in the Langer case the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made the identical argument which I have just made in support of the Constitution. If I can find what he said I should like to quote him, because the Senator from Ohio is justly recognized as a leader in the Republican Party, and what he said a few years ago on so grave a question should control him at the present hour. I believe that the Senator from Ohio is capable of rising to such an occasion as this. I do not believe that he, together with many other Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as many on this side, will be actuated by considerations other than those which they have heretofore expressed as their just and sound convictions, and that they will not change their convictions overnight because the pending case involves a Democrat from Mississippi rather than a Republican from North Dakota.

This is what the Senator from Ohio said in the Langer case:

> If the kind of thing for which we are asked to exclude Senator LANGER is a matter for a proper cause for exclusion, then it should be decided by a majority vote. If it is a proper matter for expulsion only, I think the decision should be by a two-thirds vote. * * * In my opinion, the word "qualifications" as here used refers to the qualifications contained in the Constitution itself, and does not authorize the House—

I assume that means the Senate—

> to impose any qualifications it sees fit to impose.

That was the declaration of the Senator from Ohio, an able lawyer and an able statesman. He declared that the qualifying provisions of the Constitution are controlling, and that we cannot consider any other.

I quote further from the Senator from Ohio:

> If the Senate can say that the absence of moral turpitude is a qualification, it can impose qualifications based on the morals, the religion or lack of religion, or the philosophical or political views of any person elected. This would be such a dangerous power that it certainly should not be implied unless entirely clear. The existence of such power would give to the majority of either House the ability to exclude those who disagreed with the opinions of the majority.

That is very clear; there is no doubt about that. Once we depart from the restrictive provisions of the Constitution, we have no limitations. Unhappily, in such event, a majority of the Senate can exclude any Senator-elect, either those who come to take their seats on the other

side of the aisle or those who come to sit on this side of the aisle. If one of them can be excluded, all of them can be excluded—for any reason on earth, even for the reason that they are Democrats.

If the Senate does not submit to the control of the organic law of our Nation, handed down by our forefathers, the Senate is under no control whatsoever. How can we escape that conclusion? Without such control we can say, "I do not like BILBO because he advocates white supremacy, so keep him out," or "I do not like BILBO because he said that the best time to keep the Negro from voting is to see him the night before, so exclude him," or "I do not like BILBO because he has stood up here and has argued against antilynching bills and anti-poll-tax bills, so put him out." We can do all those things the moment we depart from the restrictive clauses of the Constitution of our country.

So I am agreeing with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Not only do I agree with the Senator from Ohio, but I can refer to a number of other Senators, including the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I digress for a moment to offer him my congratulations that he has been elected majority leader. I have always entertained for the Senator from Maine the highest regard. I have confidence in his judgment. I remember that in the course of the Langer debate, when I was arguing the matter, the Senator from Maine interrupted me during a colloquy and sustained my position, if my memory serves me correctly, as I think it does. I do not think the able senior Senator from Maine is overnight going to change those convictions, formed during almost a lifetime of service and studious labor for his country.

Continuing with what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said:

> Atheists, perhaps Communists, might be excluded today, Socialists tomorrow, and Republicans or Democrats in good time. It may be said that this is a fantastic possibility, but it is a possibility which was foreseen by the founders of the Constitution. * * * It is my belief that section 5, article I (of the Constitution), was only intended to make each House the final judge as to whether a man was properly elected and whether he met the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution itself.

Those are the qualifications as to age, residence, and citizenship.

My conclusion is that under the circumstances alleged in the present case, the Senate has power only to expel Mr. BILBO. It enjoys the unhampered right of expulsion; I do not question it for a moment. We have the absolute right to expel Mr. BILBO after he takes his seat, even 5 minutes after that time. We do not even have to give him a hearing, if we do not wish to do so. But I say that after he has been sent here by the people of his State we ought to give him a hearing by the committee properly constituted for that purpose. I have not read the report submitted by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

I shall read no more. What the Senator from Ohio said is what many other Senators on the opposite side of the aisle said, and they voted that way.

Pursuing this thought further, I should like to read something which Mr. Madison said just during the adoption of the Constitution. I shall undertake to find it in the speech I made during the Langer case, and I am giving to the Bilbo case the same treatment that I gave to the Langer case. In the debates on the Constitution, Mr. Madison had this to say:

> The qualifications of elector and elected are fundamental articles in a republican form of government, and ought to be fixed by the Constitution.

He does not refer solely to the qualifications of electors, but he says, as well, "the qualifications of elected," and it is his view that both should be firmly entrenched in the Constitution.

> If the Legislature—

Said Mr. Madison—

> could regulate those of either—

And when he said "Legislature," he was referring to the National Legislature, the Congress of the United States—

> it can subvert the Constitution. A republic may be converted into an aristocracy or oligarchy as well by limiting the number capable of being elected as the number authorized to elect.

I wish to consider that thought expressed by Mr. Madison, and to say that it was followed by the framers of the Constitution. I hope the Senate will be patient with me for a moment. The point may be technical, but to my mind it is absolutely convincing. Clause 1 of section 3 of article I of the Constitution declares:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof.

Of course, today they are selected by popular vote.

On the matter of the right of a State to send whom it pleases to the Senate, we find that a State, through its legislature, and now through its people, could, with this clause standing alone, send to the Senate a boy of 12 or a man from an insane asylum, or anyone it please, because it was an unlimited authority vested by the Constitution in the various legislatures of the States.

Article I, section 2, declares:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In those two articles the framers of the Constitution prescribed the qualifications of the electors. When the Constitution was framed, the legislature alone could elect a Senator, and the electors of a congressional district could elect a Member of the House of Representatives when such electors had the qualifications of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. They were fixed. The qualifications of the electors were absolutely fixed, both as to United States Senators and as to Members of the House of Representatives. So the founders of the Constitution were careful to prescribe the qualifications of electors.

After that, there is in the Constitution the provision which declares that if vacancies occur, by resignation or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary appointment until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancy.

So there was another power of selection. There was the legislature; there were the qualified electors; and then in the case of temporary vacancies there was the power of the governor of the State to make a temporary appointment. There is no question as to the qualifications of the electors.

After prescribing the qualifications for electors as Madison said should be done, then the framers of the Constitution proceeded to impose qualifications on the elected. The qualifications are those I have already stated in reference to age, residence, and citizenship. So the work was done.

There was nothing left, then, to discretion. If a man is to be elected to the United States Senate he has to be selected by the qualified electors as prescribed by the amended Constitution, and if he is to take his seat in the United States Senate he should possess the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution.

There is no discretion on the part of the States with respect to the manner in which an election should be had, either of Senators or Representatives, and there is no discretion in the United States Senate as to whether a Senator who has been elected, and whose returns are here and are not questioned, should be permitted to qualify, because the qualifications are set forth clearly in the Constitution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has made it very clear that the questions involved in this case are exceedingly complicated; they cover constitutional questions and other questions, and I wonder if the Senator would be willing to have the pending business temporarily laid aside and have the other Senators-elect sworn in, those about whose right to be sworn in there is no question. Then we could proceed with the debate on the question whether Senator BILBO should be sworn in pending the determination of the case, or whether he should not be. The Senator says we are depriving the people of one State of the right to have a Senator sworn in. By denying this matter for today and tomorrow the Senator is depriving the people of States in which 35 Senators have been elected, whose election is unquestioned by anybody, of the right to have their representatives sworn in. I do not wish to delay the matter, but it seems to me that the proper procedure is to postpone temporarily the question of deciding whether or not Senator BILBO should be seated pending the determination of his case. It is a debatable and an important question. There have been precedents on both sides. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to postpone the decision until the Senate was organized, and, I would think, until the President's opening message was delivered to Congress on Monday. The Senator certainly

has shown that this is a complicated question, it is a case in which every Senator wishes to hear the arguments, and to determine the issue in accordance with what he thinks the law and the Constitution provide. It seems to me this matter should be temporarily put aside, and should remain the business of the Senate. Let it remain the business of the Senate except for necessary organizational procedures, and the hearing of the President's message on Monday.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, in answer to the Senator from Ohio, let me say that if I were to agree to what he suggests I might be suspected of gross partisan politics on behalf of the Republican side, because if that were done, then since there were many more new Republicans elected than there were Democrats elected, there would be a very large Republican majority, or at least a fair majority. There would be a shifting. I might take a different view if I were sure that there was no partisanship whatsoever lurking in the minds of Senators on the other side, and that they would determine this question from a purely nonpartisan standpoint, to which assurance I myself cannot yield, in view of the fact that the Republicans met in conference and unanimously decided to reject BILBO from the Senate at the very door of the Chamber. So I do not feel that I can yield to the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio.

On the other hand, let me ask the Senator from Ohio what difference it makes having BILBO sworn in? Let us organize the Senate. What difference does it make having BILBO in? He will have one vote. That is only one vote, and if the opposition delays this matter, they will have how many? The Senator from Ohio knows how many more.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield; but let me ask the Senator this question before he starts. There is only the question of Senator BILBO, and what is proposed? Senators do not wait for a proper hearing before a proper committee, and for a report. It is true BILBO would be given one vote, as against a number of votes on the other side, I do not know exactly how many. But by seating BILBO they would do what would be absolutely fair, they would give to a man from a State sent here as its ambassador the opportunity to defend his election by his constituents and by the people of his State, and the right to defend himself against the serious charges of moral turpitude which they propose to bring against him. Does not the Senator think that would be a fairer procedure?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is perhaps familiar with the precedents, which have usually provided—and certainly I would agree with them—that if a man is prevented from taking the oath, and is excluded from the Senate, he is nevertheless given an opportunity, as has been the practice in nearly every case I know of, to appear before the Senate and state his own case. I certainly would have no objection to that procedure, even if Senator BILBO is not seated.

Mr. OVERTON. He could not claim that as a matter of right.

Mr. TAFT. No; but as a matter of precedent it has frequently been done, and it is certainly nothing to which we would have any objection.

Mr. OVERTON. It was done in the Bankhead-Heflin case. That is about the only case I know of in which it was done.

Mr. TAFT. There were others. It was done also in the Smith case. Smith was given that opportunity.

Mr. OVERTON. That may be; I believe Smith was. Those are the only two cases I can recall in which it was done. There was some debate on that matter in the Heflin case, and considerable opposition. Finally the Senate yielded, and permitted Heflin to stand here and argue his own case. Of course, he did not have the right to vote or to engage in any colloquies. He could only rise and make a statement in his own behalf.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asked me what difference it would make. I do not know that personally it would make any difference to me in my final opinion, but there are plenty of authorities which take the position that charges such as those made against Senator BILBO by the War Investigating Committee go to the qualifications of a Senator, and therefore he may be barred by a majority vote in that kind of a case, whereas if he is once admitted, it will then take a two-thirds vote to oust him. There is a substantial issue involved in the question whether Senator BILBO shall be seated during the pendency of his case. I may not agree, but there are authorities which take the position I have stated, and that may well affect a sufficient number of votes to determine the Bilbo case.

Mr. OVERTON. It does not make any difference whether we act now, or 10 months from now, or 3 years from now, when an effort is made to bar him from the Senate on grounds other than age, residence, or citizenship, the only way it can be done is by expulsion.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator, but there are those who take the other position, and the ultimate determination of the case will depend on the votes of people who take that position. This question should be decided after adequate debate, and we should not hold up the organization of the Senate and the delivery of the President's message on the state of the Union by prolonging the debate now for several days to determine the question. I am only suggesting to the Senator that he agree temporarily to lay aside the pending matter and permit the other Senators-elect to be sworn in.

Incidentally——

Mr. OVERTON. I yielded for a question. Now let me say something.

Mr. TAFT. There is another question the Senator raised, if he will yield for an answer on that.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask the Senator to indulge me at that point.

Mr. TAFT. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it not true that any man charged with any serious offense in the United States of America is entitled to a fair and square hearing before a tribunal constituted for that purpose, to be accompanied by counsel, or to represent himself, to examine and cross-examine the witnesses, and to be confronted by the witnesses? Yet the Senator is asking me to let the Senate vote upon this question involving moral turpitude, upon the judgment of a committee that was never organized to make such an inquiry; and with all due respect to its members, let me say that I think it was extremely unfair that they did not give him or his counsel an opportunity to examine any of the witnesses or cross-examine the witnesses. That is wholly un-American, and I do not think the Senate would be worthy of its traditions and of the high place it has occupied in the estimate of the people of the United States and of the world if it should undertake to lynch a man by such a flagrant violation of all precedents as is suggested.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asked me a question. In the first place, there have been, I think, 19 cases in which men have been excluded from the Senate. In 10 of those 19 cases they have been barred at the door; in 9 cases they have been ejected after they were admitted.

In the House of Representatives even more have been barred at the door. The question is not one of lynching anybody. The question is a very simple one of whether or not Senator BILBO should be made a Member of the Senate, pending the determination of whether he has a right to be made a Member of the Senate. It has nothing to do with trials, or any of the other arguments made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. In most of the cases about which the Senator is talking, the Committee on Privileges and Elections had conducted hearings, the Senator-elect had appeared with his counsel, and witnesses, and had presented his case, and then, if a sufficiently strong case was made out against him by the report of the committee, he was barred from taking his seat; but that has not happened in this case.

In this instance two committees were involved. One of them, which had jurisdiction to inquire into expenditures in the campaign, made a favorable report. The other had no authority whatsoever to determine or to recommend to the Senate whether or not BILBO was properly elected, or whether he is entitled to a seat in the United States Senate. That committee comes here and makes a report, and on that report of an unauthorized committee, we are asked to bar BILBO from a seat in the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. As a matter of partisan politics, we are asked to bar Mr. BILBO from a seat in the Senate, and to let the majority on the other side be increased.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. The case of THEODORE G. BILBO is one that has been prejudged, and BILBO, foredoomed.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, let me say that he has frequently asked with regard to the political aspect of this matter. As I see it, there is no partisanship in this report. The report, which finds that Senator BILBO improperly used his high office as United States Senator for his personal gain, in dealings with war contractors, was a bipartisan

report signed by Democrats as well as Republicans.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say there was partisanship in that report. I said the committee had no authority.

Mr. TAFT. At the present moment the Senator is arguing against a resolution offered by a Democrat, not by a Republican, and so far as our action is concerned, as I suggested to the Senator, the question of whether or not Senator BILBO should be barred at the door is sufficiently important that it ought to be determined after proper debate, and therefore should be postponed until the organization of the Senate, and until the President's message is received.

It seems to me far better to permit 35 Senators whose right is unquestioned to take their seats, than to insist that they shall be held up, while the right of 1 Senator, which is questioned, and seriously questioned, is debated by the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator need not shake his gory locks at me. I did not bring up this issue at all. With the aid, I assume, of Senators on the other side, this resolution has been introduced by a Senator from our side of the aisle; but certainly it was not brought up by me. I am not keeping other Senators from being sworn in. I am not keeping their wives and the other members of their families, who are here, from seeing them sworn in. I know the families of the new Senators would like to see them sworn in. When I was first sworn in, I had my whole family here. I marched down the aisle; and in those days we had the morning frock coats, the tall silk hats, and all that, and it was a great event. I should be very glad to have the new Senators sworn in; but I am not stopping them. It is this fight against BILBO that is stopping it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from Ohio and his colleagues want to continue the fight against BILBO, they will have to continue it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking the Senator whether he will not permit this matter to be temporarily set aside.

Mr. OVERTON. No, I will not. That is final.

Mr. TAFT. Then, the Senator is preventing the organization of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. No, sir; I am not. I am fighting a resolution proposed by the Senator from Idaho and his aides on the Republican side.

Mr. WHERRY. No, we did not offer it.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that, but the Senators on the Republican side, or some of them, are back of it. At any rate, when the fight against permitting Mr. BILBO to take the oath is at an end, we can then consider the case on its merits.

Mr. Secretary, I did not want to speak at any length. I think I have spoken about as long as I care to speak at the present time. I began without any preparation whatsoever, and I have simply referred to certain constitutional provisions, the conclusions from which are inescapable.

I think the Senate should go on record as it did in the Langer case, which is the most recent one. It will be remembered that in the Langer case the Senator from North Dakota was charged with flagrant violations of law and of having done a great many other things that a man ought not to have done. But I stated in the Langer case I was not going to read the record. I did not read a word of the Langer record, and I do not propose to read the Bilbo hearings because we do not have the constitutional authority to dispute Mr. BILBO's right to a seat in the manner proposed.

That is all I have to say for the present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, the so-called action of the Republicans simply consisted in proposing the plan which I suggested to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CVERTON]. The resolution which we should like to see the Senate adopt is this:

> Whereas charges have been filed with the Senate by a committee and Members of the Senate challenging the right of THEODORE G. BILBO to be a Member of the Senate,
>
> *Resolved*, That the question of the prima facie right of THEODORE G. BILBO to be sworn in as a Senator from the State of Mississippi, as well as his final right to a seat as such Senator, shall be considered immediately at the opening of the business of this body on January 6, 1947, following the President's message to Congress, and until this body shall decide such question of his prima facie right to be sworn, the said THEODORE G. BILBO shall not be sworn in or be permitted to occupy a seat in this body.

In other words, we propose that the status quo as to Senator BILBO be continued until the question of changing it can be adequately debated.

That is the resolution we should like to see the Senate adopt. It seems to me that that is a reasonable thing to do. Senators on both sides of the aisle differ as to whether a man should be barred at the door or not. It is an important question, which heretofore has been argued in many cases in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives. As I said, in 10 cases men were barred at the door; in 9 cases they were admitted and subsequently expelled.

The House of Representatives has a much more definite record in favor of barring at the door. The precedents are numerous; but, as I said to the Senator from Louisiana, it is an important question, because it is possible that it may affect the percentage of votes required to pass on the charges made by the War Investigating Committee. It is not a question that ought merely to be waived. It ought to be debated, and I am not proposing to foreclose it. It is the Senator from Louisiana who is trying to foreclose the question by insisting that now, before we do anything, before we take any action, before 35 Senators are sworn in, we must seat Mr. BILBO.

The proper proceeding, it seems to me, is to suspend the proceedings for 2 days, say until Monday afternoon. It was suggested by someone that it ought to be 1 week longer, to give the Members an opportunity to look into the various records that have been made, and to become better informed as to the questions which may arise. That would be all right with me; but my proposal would be to take it up immediately after the President's message has been delivered.

I have read the report of the special committee investigating the national-defense program. The committee's report certainly raises a presumptive doubt. The other committee report is a 2-to-3 report, in which is raised the question whether statements made by Senator BILBO in the election actually void the election. I do not want to foreclose debate as to the wisdom of either report. I only say that those questions have been raised, and they ought to be determined, and they ought to be determined without prejudice, and, in my opinion, the moment we seat Senator BILBO the Senate does prejudice itself in determining the ultimate outcome of this case.

I cannot see any reasonable objection to postponing the question and debating the question. The Senator from Louisiana quoted from something I said in the Langer case. In that instance I took the position that in a moral-turpitude case it was necessary to secure a two-thirds vote to oust a Member from the Senate. I said also that I never again would vote to seat an individual where a serious contest was involved, because I thought the proceedings in that case, which dragged on for a year and a half, were a most unsatisfactory solution of the question.

It seems to me that if any individual's right to a seat is in question the proper thing to do is to keep him out until the Senate actually can determine the question involved.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senate today has the right to deny Senator BILBO entrance to the Senate for any reasons, why would it not have the right to declare his seat vacant for the same reasons next week or the week following?

Mr. TAFT. Only because of the use of the words to be found in the Constitution. I do not necessarily agree with the argument made by some in this connection, but the Constitution says, of course, that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," which is to be decided by a majority vote.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that.

Mr. TAFT. Whereas each House by a two-thirds vote may expel a Member.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the difference.

Mr. TAFT. So the argument is made by some that the rights of the Senate may be prejudiced by failure to act now.

Mr. GEORGE. But there is a difference between expulsion and the denial of the right to a seat. Expulsion usually and of necessity should relate to something which arises after an individual becomes a sitting Member of the Senate. That is the only sensible interpretation to give to it. But my question is very simple. If for any of the reasons that have been advanced and talked about, or that might even be imagined, the Senate today may deny Senator BILBO the right

to a seat in the Senate and to take his oath of office under the certificate duly issued by the authorities of his State, why could not the Senate subsequently, under the substitute resolution submitted providing for a proceeding without prejudice as to the rights of the Senate especially, act upon those same questions hereafter in passing upon whether the seat should be declared vacant, and the State of the applicant advised that his seat has been declared vacant, if that is the opinion of the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senate can probably do anything after a Senator is admitted that it could do before.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TAFT. But I am not at all sure that it can do it by the same percentage of votes. That is the question.

Mr. GEORGE. In my mind there is no doubt about that. I have already taken my position here that the language of the Constitution relates to something more than the mere age of a Senator and his residence and the fact of citizenship for 9 years before he is elected to this body. It is bound to mean something more, because expulsion, properly considered, relates to something that occurs in the life of the Senator himself after he takes his seat here, or, at least, to something that was concealed when he entered this body. In such a case, the Constitution provides for a two-thirds vote. But I have no hesitancy in saying that if I were to vote to stop any Senator-elect at the door by reason of something that is already in existence, that occurred last year or the year before, or in the election, or at any time in the past, I would feel that I had a perfect right to declare his seat vacant when that issue reached the Senate.

It seems to me the fair thing to do would be not to force any Senator to prejudge this case on a record which we have not even had a chance to read or an opportunity to examine, and to let Senator BILBO, or any other Senator who comes here properly accredited by the authorities of his State, to take his seat, especially when the substitute resolution provides that he shall do so without prejudice to his rights or to the rights of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I can see, the words "without prejudice" have not the slightest effect. I think they make no difference at all.

The Senator is aware, however, that distinguished Senate authorities take the position that the word "qualifications" means only the qualifications with respect to age, residence, and citizenship, and does not refer in any way to the moral character of the particular individual.

Mr. GEORGE. I am aware of that, and, as a matter of fact, I have great respect for that opinion. But after a long study of the Constitution itself, and of the cases that have actually come here within the past 24 years, I have reached the conclusion that that constitutional provision means something more than the mere canvassing of the returns by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the Senator differs in that respect from the very distinguished Senator from Louisiana who has just taken exactly the opposite position. It only illustrates to my mind the fact that the questions involved are complicated and hard to understand, that they cut across parties, and that this question is of sufficient importance that it ought to be determined after adequate debate. In my opinion, Senator BILBO loses nothing by our proceeding to organize the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; he does lose something.

Mr. TAFT. It has been stated that there are more Republicans than Democrats in the Senate. Frankly, I do not think that the question is going to be determined on a partisan basis.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so either. I hope not at least.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that a greater question is involved here than the right of a man who comes from Vermont or Michigan or Mississippi or Ohio with credentials issued by the State government through the proper authorities of his State. His State has a right under the Constitution to have two representatives in this body, and it has the right to sit here in the person of one whom it has seen fit to elect and send here. That does not interfere with the right and power of the Senate to say, "Very well, we have examined into your character, into your conduct, and we find that you are guilty of such moral turpitude as to justify us in saying that your seat shall be declared vacant"; and we can do it without the slightest embarrassment. That being true, should we not respect the other fundamental provision of the Constitution which declares that every State shall have two representatives in this body, and that, except by its own consent, it can never be deprived of the right to have two representatives in the Senate of the United States? We can keep the spirit and the letter of the Constitution itself, which is much more fundamental than the decision of whether I or A or B or C has a right to come here and take a seat. We can keep the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and then proceed without the slightest embarrassment to make any inquiry into the election of the Senator or into his qualifications.

Mr. TAFT. I respect the opinion of the Senator from Georgia. The point is that others do not agree with him. The Senator from Louisiana is certainly going to claim—he probably claims now—that when Senator BILBO is seated he can be ousted only on the moral-turpitude charge, and by a two-thirds vote. So why do we not yield a substantial point in permitting Senator BILBO to be sworn in now? I do not want to pass on the question today, and I do not want to argue the question, because it is complicated as to whether he should be sworn or should not be sworn. But I say that it is a substantial question which involves constitutional difficulties and questions which should be properly argued, which Senators should have time to study. They cannot study them pending the organization of the Senate. The State of Mississippi is not injured by my request that this matter be temporarily laid aside while the organization of the Senate is completed, to be resumed and debated in full by the Senate later.

Mr. GEORGE. Suppose the question raised, on which the Senate were asked to exclude a Senator-elect—in this case to deny Senator BILBO a seat—were one which went to the very vitals of the social and political integrity of the State itself; would not the State have the right to say to us, "Why do you not respect the Constitution? Let our representative take his seat. Your rights will not be prejudiced. Thereafter you can expel him."

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] does not believe that we can ask any question regarding the qualifications of anyone who comes to the Senate, except as to his age, his place of birth, and his residence in the State from which he may be elected for the term provided under the Constitution. Therefore, of course, the Senator from Louisiana will never vote to exclude Senator BILBO or anyone else who may be lacking in the moral qualifications which the Senate of the United States thinks a man should possess.

The proposition is very simple. If a Senator-elect can be stopped at the door for the reasons now urged, no others being involved, his seat can be declared vacant next week or next year. It seems to me that beyond possibility of doubt that statement must be true.

I do not wish to pass on the merits of this case at this time. I have no judgment as to whether Senator BILBO should be allowed to retain his seat in this body, because I have not examined a single particle of the record, and I would never try anyone on mere newspaper statements as to what some witnesses said or did not say. I apprehend that no other Senator would care to do so either. I am sure that that statement is true as regards Senators on both sides of the aisle. I had thought that the majority of the Senate had reached the conclusion, from long experience and from a study of the precedents as well as the law, that the qualifications of which the Senate is the judge are much broader than the inhibitions, prohibitions, or negative requirements stated in the Constitution itself.

Let me say in all sincerity and all candor that when the Smith case arose I was a Member of this body. I believe that no other Member of the present Senate, with the exception of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who has not yet been permitted to take his sixth oath, was a Member of this body at that time.

The Smith case involved the question of fraud and corruption in the primary. I very well remember that it was practically undisputed that Colonel Smith himself had received $200,000 from the utility companies of the State of Illinois, or from at least one of them, at a time when he was chairman of the utilities commission of that State. The facts disclosed that approximately $350,000 was used in that election, very largely for his benefit. A large part of it was

contributed by the utility companies of the State.

Colonel Smith was given the right to be heard. He practically admitted the facts in that case. When Senator McKinley passed away, Colonel Smith already having been nominated, the Governor of the State appointed him, and he came here as an appointee of the Governor. We felt that inasmuch as we were already investigating his conduct which affected the validity of his election, and inasmuch as we had already gone into the case it would not be seemly or necessary to give him the privilege of taking the oath and occupying his seat.

Mr. TAFT. However, as a result of that action, which is substantially what I am suggesting in this case, the State of Illinois was deprived of a seat in the United States Senate, a procedure to which the Senator is now objecting.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator voted to bar Smith at the door.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I did. I voted to bar him because of fraud in the primary, because I took the same position then that I now hold, that the primary was an essential part of the election processes in the State, and that fraud in obtaining the nomination was just about as bad as fraud in obtaining the final election. But the Senate was already investigating Smith. The issue had already been raised when the Governor simply threw him into the face of the Senate and sent him here with his credentials. We stopped him at the door.

Mr. TAFT. But he was also stopped at the door with respect to the full term for which he had been elected.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. In the Smith case, Smith was barred for the full term for which he had been elected, and for which he bore the certificate of election of the Governor of Illinois.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite correct. We found that his election was tainted with fraud. I know that the Senator wishes to proceed in the proper way in this matter. In the Vare case this issue again arose. There was the question as to whether or not Mr. Vare should be permitted to take his seat. The question continued to arise in one form or another, until the case of Mr. Gould, from Maine, the State of the distinguished majority leader-elect. I hope the Senator from Maine can find the final vote in that case.

Mr. Gould came here, and at that time we made the most painstaking investigation of this very question. As I now recall the facts, in that election in Maine Mr. Gould was charged with having received a bribe a dozen years or more before. A master in chancery in one of the provinces in Canada had charged him with having received a bribe. On the basis of that record, he having been elected to the Senate, it was proposed by some very able Senators that he not be permitted to take the oath. We had made a conscientious study of the question in the Smith case and in the Vare case. We were trying to arrive at some decent rule which would give full effect to the constitutional provision that no State should be deprived of its right to be represented in the Senate on matters which vitally affect it in its organization and in its social and political life. So we decided that, although Mr. Gould was known to have been charged by an officer of the law in Canada with having received a bribe as one of the organizers of the railroad in Canada, in the solemn judgment of the court in that province, the thing to do was to allow Mr. Gould to take the oath of office and allow the case to proceed without prejudice, to be determined later on its merits.

The distinguished Senator from Montana, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, had the most pronounced views of any lawyer in this body that the Senate had the full right to inquire into the qualifications of Mr. Gould, after he had been sworn, as well as before he had been sworn. Mr. Gould's case was referred to the proper committee of the Senate. I was chairman of that committee at the time. At least I know that I was chairman of a subcommittee of that committee; and with a distinguished Member of this body, who is now an honored judge—Judge Sam Bratton, of the State of New Mexico, who is now on the tenth circuit, I believe—and with a Republican member of the committee, we heard the case of Mr. Gould. We reached the conclusion at that time that there was no reason shown to us why Mr. Gould's seat should be declared vacant.

Then there was the case of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I believe that by unanimous consent he was allowed to take the oath, the investigation to proceed forthwith, without prejudice to him or prejudice to the right of the Senate to determine whether or not prior conduct upon his part, just as in this case, would justify the Senate in declaring his seat vacant.

That, undoubtedly, is a rule that can always be safely followed without doing any violence to other provisions of our Constitution. It is a rule for which I have always pleaded, and I am pleading for it now. My position, of course, is well known to the Senator from Ohio. I think we have the right, if we wish, to stop one at the door if sufficient facts are in our possession; but I think it is far better to say, "We will have the same right after you come in, and we will let you take your oath, and we will let all the other provisions of the Constitution which we have sworn to uphold, as well as this particular provision, take full force and effect."

That would seem to me to be the way this matter should be handled. If it were handled in that way, I can see no reason why the oath of office might not be administered to all the Senators-elect present, and we could proceed with other business.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, it does not seem to me that the Senator's argument has any relation to the question we have before us. The question is whether we shall temporarily, in effect, lay aside the question of Mr. BILBO and other constitutional questions involved and proceed to the organization of the Senate, or whether we shall tie up the Senate for some days, at any rate, in discussing the question—and it ought to be discussed—and, because of the insistence that one State shall be represented, thereby, by that action, incidentally deprive 34 or 35 other States of representation in the Senate and deprive the country of the organization of the Senate, which is so necessary in order to proceed with the business which is before the Nation.

I make a very simple request. It is that the question of determining the prima facie right of the Senator-elect from Mississippi to a seat in the Senate be postponed until Monday. If I could get a unanimous-consent agreement that if Mr. BILBO is sworn in he can then be objected to on the charges of the War Investigating Committee, by a majority vote, I would not object to his being sworn in, but there can be no such agreement. There is a basic difference of opinion among Senators on this side of the aisle as well as Senators on the other side of the aisle on that question, so the question would not be foreclosed even by a unanimous-consent agreement, which cannot be obtained. So it seems to me that the thing to do is to set aside this matter temporarily.

Since unanimous consent for that is refused, I intend to move to lay the entire matter on the table. I shall then move, after the President's message is delivered on Monday, to take the matter up again and debate at that time the question of the prima facie right of the Senator-elect from Mississippi to be sworn.

We have had an adequate preliminary debate. In my own time the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has talked longer than I have talked. I therefore move that the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] together with the original resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] be laid on the table; and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SECRETARY. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Reed
Baldwin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	White
Fulbright	Murray	Wiley
George	Myers	Wilson
Green	O'Daniel	Young
Gurney	Overton	
Hatch	Pepper	

The SECRETARY. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. Secretary, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from West Virginia will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the motion that is pending is carried, does it lay on the table both the resolution of the Senator

from Idaho and the proposed substitute of the Senator from Louisiana?

The SECRETARY. It does.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the motion to lay on the table both the resolution and the proposed substitute be carried, what then will be the parliamentary status insofar as concerns other motions or unanimous-consent requests relative to the matter now before the Senate, regarding the seating of the Senator from Mississippi? Will other motions of a different nature be in order, or will further unanimous-consent requests be in order, assuming that the motion to lay on the table the resolution and amendment is carried?

The SECRETARY. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, they would be.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would be?

The SECRETARY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair.

The SECRETARY. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like the record to show that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Green	Saltonstall
Baldwin	Gurney	Taft
Ball	Hawkes	Taylor
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	McMahon	Tobey
Buck	Millikin	Tydings
Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
Capehart	Morse	Wherry
Capper	Myers	White
Donnell	Pepper	Wiley
Downey	Reed	Wilson
Ferguson	Revercomb	Young
Fulbright	Robertson, Wyo.	

NAYS—20

Barkley	Hoey	Murray
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
George	Lucas	Russell
Hatch	McCarran	Stewart
Hayden	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—2

Cordon Magnuson

So Mr. TAFT's motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, my colleague-elect from Maine, Mr. BREWSTER, is in the Chamber. His credentials are on file with the Secretary's office. They are in due and proper form. My colleague-elect is worthy, and I move that the oath of office be administered to him.

Mr. OVERTON. I move, as a substitute, that Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of the State of Mississippi, be permitted to take the oath and to qualify as a Senator from the State of Mississippi, forthwith.

Mr. TAFT. I move to lay on the table the substitute motion of the Senator from Lousiana.

The SECRETARY. The question is on the motion to lay on the table, and the motion is not debatable. [Putting the question.]

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, I inquire, is the motion of the Senator from Maine debatable?

The SECRETARY. The motion of the Senator from Maine is debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, the Senator from Lousiana has the floor and had made a motion. He cannot be taken off his feet in such cavalier fashion.

The SECRETARY. The vote has not yet been completed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Ohio was out of order because the Senator from Louisiana had made a motion and apparently had addressed himself to the motion. He had the floor.

The SECRETARY. The vote has not yet been completed.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry. Is not the status of the parliamentary situation as follows: The Senator from Maine moved that his colleague-elect be permitted to take the oath of office, and as a substitute for that the Senator from Louisiana moved that the Senator-elect from Mississippi, Mr. BILBO, be permitted to take the oath and the Senator from Ohio moved that that motion be laid on the table?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, the fact that a Senator makes a motion does not mean that he continues to hold the floor. He has to be recognized after the motion is made, as I understand. At the time the Senator from Lousiana made his motion I was recognized, and I made a motion to lay his motion on the table. It seems to me that should be disposed of.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, I had the floor, and I did not yield.

The SECRETARY. The motion of the Senator from Ohio was to lay on the table.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not yield for that.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the situation, I made the motion that my colleague be given the oath of office, and a motion was made to amend that motion. The Senator from Ohio moved to lay on the table the amendment proposed to my motion. That is not debatable.

The SECRETARY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Chair would like to make an observation. The Chair put the question on the motion of the Senator from Ohio. The vote was not completed. The Chair did not put the negative.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. That is not in order until the motion of the Senator from Ohio is disposed of.

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Did not the senior Senator from Louisiana have the floor when the Senator from Ohio made his motion to table, and is it not a fact that the Senator from Louisiana did not yield to him for that purpose? Can the Senator from Louisiana be taken off the floor in such manner?

The SECRETARY. The Chair assumed that the Senator from Louisiana had completed his remarks, and the Chair recognized the Senator from Ohio to make his motion. Those opposed to the motion of the Senator from Ohio will so indicate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SECRETARY. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order that Senators may have an intelligent conception of the parliamentary situation, I ask the Chair, What will be the effect of a vote to adopt the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana? Will the effect be to lay both the motion of the Senator from Louisiana as a substitute and the motion of the Senator from Maine on the table, or will the effect be only to lay on the table the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana?

The SECRETARY. The effect will be to lay on the table only the substitute of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. After the Senate shall have voted upon the motion to table made by the Senator from Ohio, the motion of the Senator from Maine will be debatable, will it not?

The SECRETARY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

The SECRETARY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I repeat the announcement heretofore made, that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Green	Revercomb
Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Taft
Brooks	Lucas	Taylor
Buck	McMahon	Tobey
Bushfield	Millikin	Tydings
Capehart	Moore	Wagner
Capper	Morse	Wherry
Donnell	Murray	White
Downey	Myers	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson
Fulbright	Reed	Young

NAYS—19

Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
George	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Maybank	
Hill	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—2

Cordon Magnuson

So Mr. TAFT's motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. OVERTON was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is the pending motion debatable?

The SECRETARY. It is.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I claim the floor to debate the motion.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, I take the floor as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Contributions. I was not named on that committee in the first instance. A resignation took place during the summer, and the Presiding Officer asked me to fill the place made vacant. I consented. As a member of that committee, I attended the hearings held in Jackson, Miss. Inasmuch as this case is now under discussion, and inasmuch as it will be thoroughly discussed before any vote is had, I think the record should be made as clear as possible. I send to the desk the resolution that was adopted by the Senate, under which the committee to which I have alluded operated. I ask that the resolution be read.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 224), as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1946, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) the extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of the United States Senator in 1946 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) the amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign, or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention, held in 1946, at which a candidate for United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) the use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates; and

(5) such other matters relating to the election of United States Senators in 1946, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee, under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

SEC. 4. The committee by majority vote may authorize any member of the committee, or any member of a duly authorized subcommittee, to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any member so authorized may hold public hearings, issue subpenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, administer oaths, and take testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee, or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate on the first day of the next regular session of the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, the resolution provides that the report of the committee shall be filed on the first day of the session succeeding the adoption of the resolution. The committee, of which I am a member, prepared its report. It has been printed. I send a copy of the report to the desk and ask that it be read.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, I object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, in order that I may read the report, and that some of those on the other side of the aisle may have the privilege of hearing what this report says, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Reed
Baldwin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	White
Fulbright	Murray	Wiley
George	Myers	Wilson
Green	O'Daniel	Young
Gurney	Overton	
Hatch	Pepper	

The SECRETARY. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for a question, or if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Secretary, from the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, I desire to file the report of the committee, as well as the minority views.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

The SECRETARY. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit an additional report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, as well as the testimony taken by the committee.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Michigan object to the request made by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I have no objection.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, if the Senator from Michigan will modify his request and ask that the report and the testimony be filed at the end of my remarks, I have no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask that that be done.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Secretary, does the Senator from Michigan want all the testimony printed in the RECORD?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not wish to have it printed in the RECORD, because we have copies for all Senators. But I wish to present the testimony to the Senate. Copies of the testimony as well as the report of the committee have been

distributed and are on the desks of all Senators.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the additional report submitted by the Senator from Michigan from the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, as well as the testimony taken before that committee, will be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has just filed the report of his committee and the minority views. I take it for granted they will not be printed in full in the RECORD. At a later time I shall read the majority report, which was concurred in by the three Members who signed the report.

I am glad to note in the Senate Chamber, to my left, a distinguished former Senator of the United States from my State. He was elected at the beginning of statehood in Oklahoma, 40 years ago. He served during two different periods in this body. Former Senator Thomas P. Gore was born in the State of Mississippi. It is unfortunate for the Senate and the country that he is not here in the capacity of a Senator, so he could discuss the pending issue, because he could give us first-hand information respecting the political sentiment that prevails in the great State of Mississippi.

To the left of Senator Gore is another distinguished former Senator from my State, Hon. Josh Lee.

Mr. Secretary, since this matter is to be thoroughly discussed, I think the background should be laid as thoroughly as possible, so that each Member of this body may vote with all the information that it is possible to obtain. Mississippi has a population of more than two million. The population of Mississippi is approximately one-half white and one-half colored. The last census shows that there are 31,000 more white people than colored people in the State.

As a member of the committee I interrogated the witnesses who came upon the witness stand. Approximately 90 colored witnesses appeared and testified. I did not ask each this question, but I asked a number this question: In what State were you born? That question was propounded to the colored witnesses. I found only one colored witness who testified that he had been born outside the State of Mississippi. Some of the white witnesses who testified stated that they had been born outside the State of Mississippi. The evidence taken at Jackson disclosed conclusively that a very large percentage of the population of that State, both white and black, were native-born, that is, born within the boundaries of the State of Mississippi. Some stated that more than 90 percent of the population of the State were born in Mississippi. Others hazarded the guess that even a larger percentage than 90 percent were native-born citizens of the State of Mississippi.

Mr. Secretary, Senators may draw their own conclusions. I shall give mine. The white citizens of Mississippi, men and women, are the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons, and daughters, granddaughters, and great-granddaughters of former slave owners of that State. The present population of Mississippi come from a stock of people who either owned slaves in Mississippi or were in sympathy with the slave-holding system in Mississippi.

The people of that great State cannot understand now, and they will not understand in the near future, how the Congress of the United States can dictate to them as to who shall be their representatives in this great body. This is not a question of whether or not Senator BILBO shall be seated in the Senate. The question is larger than that. This question places the State of Mississippi on trial. Not only is the State of Mississippi on trial, but every other State in the South is on trial. Not only is every State in the South on trial, but every State of this Union, north and south, east and west, is on trial. If we can dictate the terms and conditions under which the people of the State of Mississippi shall select their Senators, we can dictate the conditions under which every other Southern State selects their Senators; and if we can dictate the system under which the South selects its Senators, we can then dictate the terms and conditions under which the Northern States shall select their Senators.

I have before me an abstract of the primary-election laws of all the States of this Republic. I am not in agreement with the election laws of some of the States, but the issue here today is the forerunner of a universal mandatory primary-election law for each of the States of the Union.

In California a man may announce for Senator on the Republican ticket. The same man may announce for Senator on the Democratic ticket. The same man may announce for Senator on the Socialist ticket, and on the Prohibition ticket, if there be one. It is possible for one man to win the nomination on all the tickets that are presented on the ballot. Some of the other States can do the same thing.

I make this statement—and I think it can be verified by the citizens of Mississippi: It makes no difference who the candidates are in that State for Governor, for Senator, or for Representative; they share the same ideas with respect to the issue raised in connection with this question. Senator BILBO may have been undiplomatic. He may have been a little more positive than some of the other candidates. But I make the statement, upon my conviction, that no man in the State of Mississippi can be elected to this body unless he shares the viewpoint that we heard expressed by the white witnesses in 4 days of hearings in the city of Jackson, the capital of the State of Mississippi.

The people of Mississippi believe that the selection of officers should be made by the white people. I shall not discuss that issue. That is their belief. Never before, so I am advised, have the colored people undertaken to cast ballots in a white Democratic primary, or any Democratic primary, or any other primary in Mississippi. There is only one party in Mississippi, and that is the Democratic Party. There are two groups of opponents of the Democratic Party in Mississippi. One group is known as the Lily-White Republicans. It is a very small group, not numerous enough to make a party, not numerous enough to have candidates on the tickets in the various counties or in the congressional districts, or in the State at large. It is only large enough so that if the election should turn its way, there would be a group which could be drawn upon to fill the appointive offices in the State of Mississippi, such as United States marshals and deputies, district attorneys and deputies, and postmasters.

There is a second group in Mississippi in opposition to the Democratic Party. It is known as the Black-and-Tan group. It is made up, of course, of the colored people of that State. The second group is not sufficiently organized in Mississippi to form a party. It is not sufficiently numerous to have candidates on the county tickets, the city tickets, the congressional tickets, or the State ticket.

So there is but one political party in the State of Mississippi, at least for practical purposes. In Mississippi there is a conviction that a colored voter is a Republican voter. We did not interrogate all the witnesses on this question. We did ask some of the colored voters how they voted in the primary, because some of them voted. They refused to tell us. They said that their votes were private; and when they stated that their votes were private, the committee respected their wishes. We did not press the question.

Mr. Secretary, the opinion prevails among the white people of Mississippi that a colored man or a colored woman, if permitted to vote his views, will vote the Republican ticket. I think one or two of the witnesses testified that they were Democrats.

I made the statement a moment ago that this issue is not closed. It is to be discussed in this forum at some length. This issue lays a foundation for the introduction of a Nation-wide uniform primary-election system that will be in force in each of the States of this Nation. When that time comes, if it comes, and if it involves in any section violence or trouble, what may we expect to see in the future? We may expect to see Federal soldiers at the polling places, not only in the South, but throughout the entire United States.

Mr. Secretary, when our committee decided to go to Mississippi to hold hearings, one of the timid members of the committee suggested that we should employ bodyguards. He gave expression to the fear that he would not be safe in Mississippi investigating an election for which a candidate had been elected for the United States Senate. The other members of the committee did not take that suggestion seriously. We did not take any bodyguards to Mississippi. There was no trouble there. There was no more trouble in Mississippi than in any other State in the Nation. The hearing was entirely quiet and peaceful. There was no suggestion of any opposition to the hearing which was held in the Federal Court Building, in the city of Jackson, the capital of the State of Mississippi.

Not only does this case open up the possibility of a mandatory primary-elec-

tion law throughout the Nation; it opens up two more questions of vital import. I understand that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is about to introduce in this body a Nation-wide uniform marriage and divorce bill. Not only shall we have the opportunity of considering the advisability of having a uniform Nation-wide primary-election law for all the States, the same in each State, but we shall be going into the question of marriages and divorces. The laws thereon are not the same in all the States. In some of the States whites and blacks may marry. In such States there is no inhibition against their marriage. That situation does not obtain in the State of Oklahoma, and my State would not be agreeable to the enactment of that kind of legislation. In some of the States before a man and woman can be married they must subject themselves to a blood test a certain number of days before the performance of the ceremony.

If we should go to the extent of providing uniform laws governing marriage and requiring blood tests and all that sort of thing, it is within the province of the Congress to embark upon such a wide schedule of operations. This contest may be the forerunner of a new deal in our national affairs.

In some States divorce laws are different from the divorce laws in other States. I understand that in the District of Columbia there is only one ground that will justify the courts in issuing divorce decrees. In some States there is more than one ground upon which a divorce decree may be granted. In my State I think there are something like 10 grounds. Other States have even larger numbers of grounds for divorce.

I doubt if the States of the Nation are ready and willing at this time to consider uniform marriage and divorce laws. That is what this issue leads up to if the Senate takes the action which is now contemplated by those on the majority side of this body.

In order that the Senate may have an opportunity at least to know what the majority report contains, I propose to read that report into the RECORD. I refer to the report just filed by the chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946:

SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1946

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, submitted the following report (pursuant to S. Res. 224):

On September 19, 1946, there was filed with this committee a sworn complaint signed by T. B. Wilson and other residents of the State of Mississippi protesting the nomination and election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO. This complaint, together with the signatures appended thereto is as follows:

"To: The honorable Senate of the United States of America.

"Attention: Committee on Privileges and Elections. Committee on Campaign Expenditures.

"The undersigned hereby petition for the redress of the following grievances and respectfully show and allege:

"1. The signatories hereto are residents of the State of Mississippi and are duly qualified electors of the State of Mississippi.

"2. Whenever the term 'duly qualified Negro electors' is used, it shall mean Negro citizens of Mississippi who have duly qualified to register and vote in general or special elections for Federal, State, and local offices, including the office of United States Senator from Mississippi, and Negro citizens possessing the legal qualifications to register and vote in such elections.

"3. In the primary of the Democratic Party of Mississippi to select a candidate for the United States Senate for the term commencing January 1, 1947, and in which an election was held on July 2, 1946, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, the incumbent, obtained a bare majority of less than 4,000 votes, of the votes cast and officially counted, over his opponents and thereupon was certified, became, and is the candidate of the Democratic Party of Mississippi for the office of Senator of the United States from that State.

"4. By custom, tradition, and precedent, and because of the absence of an organized or effective party of opposition to the Democratic Party of Mississippi within that State, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO is assured of his reelection to the office of United States Senator from Mississippi and indeed will face no opposition candidate in the general election.

"5. During the aforesaid primary and up to and including July 2, 1946, the date of the election thereof, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO conducted an aggressive and ruthless campaign for his reelection to the office of United States Senator from Mississippi with the purpose, object, design, and calculation to effectively deprive and deny the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi of their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote and otherwise legally participate in the said primary election.

"6. Because, amongst other things, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO has been notorious in his hostility toward the Negro people and has exercised all his energies to keep the Negro people in a subordinate and servile status, and because he has become a symbol of oppression and reaction against the Negro people in the estimation of the people of the United States, and particularly in the estimation of the Negro people of the United States, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO had knowledge or reason to know that the overwhelming majority of duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, totaling approximately 500,000 persons, would vote in the said primary election in opposition and adversely to the candidacy of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, and it was the intention of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO to frustrate, suppress, stifle, and overcome the opposition of the duly qualified Negro electors to the candidacy of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO in the aforesaid primary, and thus effectively to deprive and deny these electors of their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote and otherwise legally participate in the said primary election.

"7. In order to accomplish and effectuate the aforesaid purpose, object, design, and calculation, and to carry out his intention, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO—

"(1) Engaged in and inspired systematic and continuous attacks upon the Negro race in general and upon the Negro population of Mississippi in particular, and especially against the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi; these attacks were accompanied by and took the form of vituperative, insulting, abusive, and slanderous statements, holding up the Negro race in general and the Negro population of Mississippi in particular, especially the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, to hatred, opprobrium, contempt, and ridicule;

"(2) Exhorted, agitated, and made inflammatory appeals to the passions and prejudices of the white population of Mississippi to foster, stimulate, inspire, create, and intensify a state of acute and aggravated tension between the white and Negro races in the State of Mississippi, and utilized and directed this acute and aggravated racial tension for narrow, selfish, and political purposes, to wit, to prevent and deny the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi from exercising or attempting to exercise their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote or otherwise lawfully participate in the said primary election; and

"(3) With willful intent, individually and in concert with others, advocated, counseled, inspired, encouraged, incited, aided, and abetted the white population of Mississippi to commit acts of violence and intimidation against the Negro population of Mississippi, and especially against the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, so as to discourage, frustrate, suppress, stifle, and overcome the desire and intention of the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi of exercising or attempting to exercise their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote or otherwise lawfully participate in said primary election.

"8. The conduct, acts, and statements of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and the acts of violence and intimidation against the Negro people of Mississippi, as described above, and accomplished as hereinafter set forth, were crimes against and violations of the criminal statutes and laws of the United States of America and the State of Mississippi.

"9. As a direct or proximate consequence of the conduct, acts, and statements of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, as above alleged, wholesale incidents of attacks by white residents of Mississippi upon Negro residents of Mississippi occurred throughout the State of Mississippi during the said primary campaign, including acts of violence and intimidation against duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi; these attacks and acts of violence and intimidation were willfully and wantonly perpetrated (a) by white residents of the State of Mississippi, acting individually or in furtherance of a conspiracy with others or with Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, to deprive and deny the qualified Negro electors of Mississippi of their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote or otherwise lawfully participate in the said primary election, and (b) by white public officials of the State of Mississippi, acting under color of law, with like willfulness, wantonness, intent, and purpose.

"10. As a result of the foregoing the Negro people of Mississippi, especially the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, were subjected to a campaign and reign of terror during the said primary election; and the Negro people of Mississippi, especially the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, were placed in a state of fear, terror, coercion, and duress to the extent that the overwhelming majority of the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi were discouraged, frustrated, suppressed, stifled, fettered, and overcome in exercising or attempting to exercise their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote, or to vote if already registered, or to otherwise lawfully participate in the said primary election; and under the circumstances, such fear, terror, coercion, and duress, followed by the action or inaction above described, were reasonable and reasonably justified."

I am reading from the charges filed before the committee, upon which the committee acted, upon which the committee went to Mississippi and held hearings, and upon which this committee report is predicated. I shall continue to read from the charges. I now read from charge No. 11 against Senator BILBO:

11. By reason of the foregoing and as a direct or proximate consequence of the successful accomplishment and effectuation of the purpose, object, design, and calculation

of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, and the successful carrying out of his intention, as aforesaid, the election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO as the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate from Mississippi was and is illegal, void, and contrary to law, and such election was and is tainted and permeated with fraud, duress, and illegality. The said election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO was not free or unfettered, but, on the contrary, was achieved by force and violence and the use of criminal, extralegal, and illegal tactics and in wanton disrespect and disregard and in derogation of the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States under the United States Constitution, particularly the fifteenth amendment thereof, and of the laws of the United States in such cases made and provided, and of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as in violation of the laws and statutes of the State of Mississippi.

12. Except for the fraud, duress, illegality, force, and violence, as above alleged, the overwhelming majority of the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi would have voted in opposition and adversely to the said candidacy of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and their votes would have materially affected the result of the said primary election and would have resulted in the defeat of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, or, at least, would have resulted in the failure or inability of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO in securing a majority of the votes cast and officially counted in said primary election, thus necessitating a run-off, which, in all reasonable probability, would have resulted in the defeat of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

13. By his conduct, acts, and words, and by reason of the foregoing, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO—

(a) Has violated his oath of office of United States Senator to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its laws;

(b) Cannot reasonably be relied upon in the future to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its laws;

(c) Cannot reasonably be relied upon in the future to honor the oath of office required to be made by United States Senators to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its laws; and——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Was it disclosed during the course of the hearings who was the author of these charges? It was not any Mississippi lawyer, because they do not plead in such voluminous language and indulge in such extreme repetition of words as we find contained in this document. It seems to me it must have been prepared by some lawyer far away from Mississippi, or a number of lawyers. Was the evidence clear as to that?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; the evidence was unmistakably clear that these charges were inspired and prepared by the representatives and attorneys of an organization known as the Civil Rights Congress, of the city of New York and the State of New York.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand, then, about the form of the pleadings.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I was reading of the charges made by citizens of New York City and New York State against the seating of Senator BILBO as a Senator from the State of Mississippi. I think I was down to subdivision (d), and I continue the reading:

(d) Has advocated, counseled, inspired, encouraged, incited, aided, and abetted in the violation of the laws of the United States and the State of Mississippi; and

(e) Has exhibited a crass, wanton, and shocking disrespect and disregard for the constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities of United States citizens to exercise their political franchise to vote in elections for public offices; and

(f) Has demonstrated a cynical contempt for the orderly processes of government; and

(g) Has endangered and undermined the foundations of orderly and democratic government; and

(h) Has subscribed and subscribes to principles, ideas, and philosophies of government which are alien, repugnant, and inimical to the principles, ideas, and philosophies upon which the Government of the United States and the States of the Union are founded; and

(i) Has fostered, stimulated, inspired, and encouraged conflict, division, and disunity amongst the American people by pitting race against race, religion against religion, and nationality groups against other nationality groups; and

(j) Has brought the august and honorable United States Senate into contempt, ridicule, and disrepute; and

(k) Has been and now is a member of the Ku Klux Klan, a secret, conspiratorial, and illegal organization with past connections with known enemies of the United States of America, to wit, the German-American Bund, and has subscribed and still subscribes to the principles and actions of the said Ku Klux Klan, which has committed acts of lynching, near-lynching, assaults and batteries, false and unlawful detentions, and other crimes of violence and intimidation; and

(l) Has demonstrated his unfitness to hold the honorable position of a United States Senator.

14. Annexed hereto and made part of this petition, marked "Exhibit 1," and in substantiation and documentation of the allegations of this petition, are excerpts of statements, speeches, and writings of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO made during the aforesaid primary campaign.

15. Annexed hereto and made part of this petition, marked "Exhibit 2," and in substantiation and documentation of the allegations of this petition, is a photostatic copy of a radio interview between Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and certain newspapermen, held on August 9, 1946, over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. system on Meet the Press program.

16. Annexed hereto and made part of this petition, marked "Exhibit 3," and in further substantiation and documentation of the allegations of this petition, are photostatic copies of statements of Negro residents of Mississippi, indicating instances and describing occurrences of acts of violence and intimidation by white residents of Mississippi, including white public officials of the State of Mississippi, acting under color of law, against Negro residents of Mississippi and showing the acts of violence and intimidation practiced against the Negro residents of Mississippi, including the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi and showing further the fraud and illegality practiced against the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi. The originals of these statements are in the possession and files of the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., which directed, supervised, and participated in the collection of these statements. Other and additional statements showing and describing similar occurrences against other duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi are in the possession and file of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

Wherefore, the undersigned respectfully petition and request:

(1) The appropriate Senate committee or committees to conduct a full, fair, and fearless investigation into the allegations of this petition and the charges contained therein; and

(2) In connection with such investigation to hold public hearings in and throughout the State of Mississippi and in Washington, D. C., wherein witnesses shall be summoned to testify and give evidence under oath, and such other evidence, including the taking of depositions, as is material, relevant, and pertinent be incorporated in the record; and

(3) Upon the basis of the allegations of this petition and the charges contained therein and the documentary evidence submitted herewith, and any further evidence which may be disclosed as a result of the aforesaid investigation and hearings, the appropriate Senate committee or committees having jurisdiction over the matters herein set forth report and recommend to the Senate of the United States that Senator THEODORE G. BILBO be impeached and removed from his seat as the United States Senator from Mississippi and that the election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO as the Democratic nominee for the office of United States Senator from Mississippi be declared null and void, contrary to law, and tainted with fraud, duress, illegality, force, and violence, and that a new election be held for such office; and

(4) The Senate of the United States impeach Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and remove him from his office as United States Senator from Mississippi and declare his election as the Democratic nominee for the office of United States Senator from Mississippi to be null and void, contrary to law, and tainted with fraud, duress, illegality, force, and violence, and deny to Senator THEODORE G. BILBO any and all privileges, rights, and immunities which he may possess by virtue of being elected United States Senator from the State of Mississippi for the term commencing January 1, 1947, and also deny Senator THEODORE G. BILBO the right to subscribe to the oath of office for such new term as United States Senator from Mississippi and otherwise to refuse to seat Senator THEODORE G. BILBO as the United States Senator from Mississippi for such new term.

Dated: State of Mississippi, September 1946.

Following that are printed the names of the persons who are presumed to have signed this petition. I ask that those names be printed as a part of the petition, at this point.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The names referred to are as follows:

Louis C. Wilcher, Arthur Hicks, Rev. James Young, Julia Mae Hicks, R. S. Lyells, D. T. Hall, Rev. M. H. Bailey, M. A. Dixon, Stevelle Adams, Ozella Cox, John M. Bates, T. B. Wilson, A. J. Noel, M. J. Lyells, James A. Moore, Jr., Guy Cox, Percy Greene, W. A. Bender, Rev. F. W. Lee, W. R. Wrenn, Joseph A. Smith, Mrs. L. W. Alford.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I further ask unanimous consent that that portion of page No. 5 which gives the names of persons who say they have read the petition and have signed their names as concurring in the statements made in the petition, be printed at this point, without being read.

The SECRETARY. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Hinds:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the county and State aforesaid, the within-named Louis C. Wilchan, Arthur Hick, Rev. James Young, Julia Mae Hicks, R. S. Lyells, D. T. Hall, Rev. M. H. Bailey, M. A. Dixon, Stevelle Adams, Ozella Cox, John M. Bates, T. B. Wilson, A. J. Noel, M. J. Lyells, James A. Moore, Jr., Guy Cox, Percy Greene, W. A. Bender, Rev. F. W. Lee, W. R. Wrenn, each and all of whom, after being by me first duly sworn, stated on oath that the matters and things set out in the foregoing petition are true to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 10th day of September 1946.

VELMA E. WILSON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 21, 1949.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Pike:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the county and State aforesaid, the within-named Joseph A. Smith, Mrs. L. W. Alford, each and all of whom, after being by me first duly sworn, stated on oath that the matters and things set out in the foregoing petition are true to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 12th day of September 1946.

[SEAL] MARGARET SMITH,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 16, 1948.

James Rundles, Robert Cornelius, Herman Pickett, James Beal, Jr., Roosevelt Terry, Albert Cooper, James Cornelius, Stanley C. White, A. B. Stewart, Norman Haymer, Earl F. Hoyt, Lunford Lane, John D. Pruitt, Jr., Daniel Magee, Robert Hudson, Kermit W. Bryant, Cleophas Murphy, Ocie Lee Simms, Sampson Cleveland, Willie Blackhart, Lee M. Jones, Arthur J. Barlow, J. P. Dawson, J. C. Wilson, John L. Henry, Floyd Lloy, Wilson Idlebird, Thomas Knox, Willie Terry, John B. Terry, Glover Moore, John Henry.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Hinds:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the county and State aforesaid, the within-named James Rundles, Robert Cornelius, Roosevelt Terry, Stanley C. White, Earl H. Hoey, Daniel Magee, Cleophus Murphy, Willie Black Lark, James P. Dawson, Floyd L. Coy, Willie Terry, John Henry, Herman Pickett, Albert Cooper, A. B. Stewart, Linford Lane, Robert Hudson, Osie Lee Simms, Lee M. Jones, J. C. Wilson, Wilson Idlebird, John B. Terry, James Blake, James Cornelius, Norman Haymer, John D. Pruitt, Jr., Kermit W. Bryant, Sampson Cleveland, Tom J. Borden, John L. Henry, Thomas Knox, Glover Moore, each and all of whom, after being by me first duly sworn, stated on oath that the matters and things set out in the foregoing petition are true to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 13th day of September 1946.

[SEAL] VELMA E. WILSON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 21, 1949.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary——

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Reed
Baldwin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	White
Fulbright	Murray	Wiley
George	Myers	Wilson
Green	O'Daniel	Young
Gurney	Overton	
Hatch	Pepper	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is unavoidably detained.

The SECRETARY. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, I have just read that portion of the report which embraces charges filed against the seating of Senator BILBO, and it was these charges that induced the committee to go to Mississippi to hold hearings. The entire committee went, and it held hearings in the Federal courtroom in Jackson, Miss. We had long sessions, held during 4 days, and after the scheduled witnesses had appeared and testified under oath, no one else was denied. Every colored person who wanted to be heard was heard at length. Every white person who wanted to be heard was heard at length. After the list of witnesses had been exhausted, those that were subpenaed and those that came voluntarily, the committee met and proceeded to formulate its report.

I am now reading the conclusions of the majority of the committee:

Upon receipt of this complaint, three committee investigators were sent to Mississippi, where for 6 weeks a preliminary investigation into the matters alleged in the complaint was conducted, culminating in the submission to the committee on October 31, 1946, of a 33-page report, together with numerous exhibits, affidavits, and statements of witnesses interviewed by them. In light of this report this committee on November 16, 1946, unanimously voted that public hearings into the matters covered by the complaint be held in Mississippi, these hearings taking place at Jackson, Miss., from December 2 to December 5, 1946. The record of the hearings has been ordered printed as a Senate document, together with certain exhibits and the basic complaint. No complaint respecting campaign expenditures on the part of any candidate from Mississippi has been made to this committee and the matter of campaign expenditures was in no manner at issue in the investigation of Senator BILBO's campaign.

I should like to observe that this report was printed and filed only this afternoon. The Members of this body have had no chance to read it. It has not been available. Since I started to read the report the Senate has been in constant disorder; apparently but few Members are paying any attention to the subject of the charges made against Senator BILBO, and few Senators are paying any attention to the findings of the majority of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wish to point out that the matter now before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] to have the oath of office administered to his colleague, Mr. BREWSTER. So Senators have a perfect right to disregard the wholly irrelevant remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, in this great forum any Senator has the right to rise and make any statement he sees fit to make. The Senator from Ohio has just exercised that privilege.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, I have the floor, and I am discussing a question at issue before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to point out that the Senator was complaining that Senators were not listening to him. My answer to that is that the Senator is talking on wholly irrelevant matters which are not before the Senate at the time, and therefore Senators have a perfect right not to listen to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The country has an opinion different from that expressed by the Senator from Ohio, as will be evidenced by the newspapers tomorrow morning. There is only one issue before the Senate, and that is the seating of the Senator-elect from the State of Mississippi. Senators may inject other matters and motions from time to time as they see fit, but they cannot get away from the fundamental issue, and that is whether Mr. BILBO shall be sworn in as a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. In effect, the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, has postponed that question for 3 days, until next Monday. Therefore, the matter now discussed by the Senator from Oklahoma is not before the Senate at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I challenge the statement of the Senator from Ohio. The Bilbo issue has not been either postponed or settled.

I continue to read:

At the request of counsel to Senator BILBO, the investigators' report of October 31, 1946, together with the exhibits appended thereto was made a part of the record and has been considered by the committee in arriving at the conclusions expressed in this report.

During the course of the hearings, 102 witnesses testified before the committee, 34 of

whom were white and 68 colored. Eighty-four of the witnesses were volunteers or subpenaed by the committee and 18 were called at the request of Senator BILBO. All of the witnesses called at the request of Senator BILBO were white and many of them did not support his candidacy.

By way of background, it is apparent from the record that previous to the July 2 primary, Negroes have not participated in Democratic primaries in Mississippi for 56 years for the reason that the Democratic primary in Mississippi had been accepted under the law as the white man's primary by Negroes and whites. However, in April 1944, the Supreme Court, in the case of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649), invalidated a resolution of a State Democratic convention in Texas, which purported to limit the participation in the primary in that State to white citizens. The effect of this decision upon the Negro citizens of Mississippi remained largely quiescent until the spring of 1946, at which time, due to the influence and intervention of certain outside of the State organizations, attempts were made to organize the Negroes and urge them to go to the polls and participate in the July 2 Democratic primary. These attempts were further facilitated by the passage in April 1946 by the Mississippi State Legislature of an act exempting all veterans without reference to whether they were colored or white, from the payment of a poll tax for the 1944–45 period if they were in the armed services. The combination of these elements, together with agitation by certain radio commentators and correspondents from outside of the State, and the return to Mississippi of large numbers of Negro veterans, contributed to a situation which was shown by the record to have prevailed in Mississippi, in which great interest in this primary was exhibited on the part of both whites and Negroes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not want the Senator to yield to me for a question. I really have been trying to hear what the Senator from Oklahoma is reading. Sitting even as close as I am to the Senator it is impossible, due to the confusion which exists in the Senate Chamber, to understand what the Senator is reading. May we have order, Mr. Secretary?

The SECRETARY. The Senate will please be in order. Senators wishing to converse will kindly retire to the cloak room.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, I continue to read:

Evidence presented to the committee showed that Senator BILBO felt that the combination of these outside interests and intervention in the internal affairs of the State of Mississippi was inimical to the welfare of its citizens, and in consequence of that he alined himself with the great majority of the white citizenry of Mississippi in an effort in his campaign to overcome this outside influence and to confine the results in the primary to the will of the qualified electorate of Mississippi. If Senator BILBO made extreme statements in this campaign, it is felt that these must be considered in light of this outside interference and in the heat of a campaign in which known hostility of certain elements of the press and radio, whom he was convinced were opposed to the best interests of the State of Mississippi existed, and which were openly and avowedly out to get him.

Evidence presented to the committee from both Negroes and whites was practically unanimous to the effect that it is "common knowledge" that the Democratic primary in Mississippi was confined to whites and that Negroes had theretofore never participated therein. The testimony of the principal complainant, T. B. Wilson, on this point was as follows (record, p. 21):

"Mr. WILSON. * * * We have had no opportunity to vote in the Democratic primary prior to this year, prior to the time at least that the Supreme Court decision was handed down in the Texas case, and our people were indifferent about registering all the time because of that fact. They knew that they were refused all years past and said, 'This is a white Democratic primary, and you cannot vote in it.' There are numbers, hundreds of our people, right in Hinds County, that were indifferent, were disinterested in even registering and paying a poll tax because of that fact. They said, 'What is the use of throwing away that $2 when we can't vote? There is no other place to vote in Mississippi but the Democratic primaries, only in the general elections, which don't mean anything; and since we can't vote in the primaries, I don't care to throw away my $2 poll tax.'"

Let me interpolate that Hinds County is the county in which is located the capital of Mississippi, the city of Jackson.

I continue reading from the report:

On this same subject, Rabbi Stanley R. Brav, of Vicksburg, Miss., testified as follows (record, p. 92):

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, this situation really exists throughout the State among the white people, does it not, as a whole, that is, that they don't feel that the colored people should vote in the same primary elections as they vote?

"Mr. BRAV. Well, I don't know how the folks feel throughout this State. I have heard many people say that.

"The CHAIRMAN. But it is just common knowledge that that is true, especially in the Southern States, is it not?

"Mr. BRAV. There is a good bit of feeling in that direction."

A typical Negro witness, Meredith Lewis, of McComb, Miss., testified as follows (record, p. 323):

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, is it not true that it is common knowledge in the South, particularly in Mississippi, that the white people have been trying to keep the colored people from voting in their primaries?

"Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is common knowledge, is it not?

"Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. And is it not true that no matter who would have run, whether it was Senator Bilbo or Tom Smith or Bill Smith, the same results would have occurred, that is, that the white people as a whole would have made every effort to keep the colored people from voting in that primary?

"Mr. LEWIS. Well, I don't know, sir, because before, you see, they didn't ask all those questions.

"The CHAIRMAN. I am not talking about your registration. I am talking about the sentiment in Mississippi as to the white people trying to maintain the primary ballot for themselves and not let the colored people participate in it. Is it not true that that condition has prevailed?

"Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir; it has prevailed."

The testimony of the election officials who were heard before the committee, specifically the circuit clerks, in whose hands under the Mississippi law lay the responsibility for administration of the electoral machinery as applied to voters, uniformly testified that the discrimination against the Negro, if any, which they practiced, came from their deep-seated traditional conviction that the Negro has no place in the Democratic primary and that nothing that they did was attributable in any manner to the speeches or statements of Senator BILBO in his campaign. The testimony of Clifford R. Field, of Natchez, Miss., was very clear on this point (record, p. 430):

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, to be truthful about it, you made it a little harder for the colored to register than the whites, isn't that true?

"Mr. FIELD. That is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. Isn't it a fact that it is common knowledge throughout the State of Mississippi—in fact, throughout the South—that the white people have been striving to keep the primary elections to themselves without interference by the colored people?

"Mr. FIELD. I think so; yes, sir. I think it is common knowledge, and I just believe it is.

"The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, isn't it that which prompted you to take the steps you did?

"Mr. FIELD. I expect that is right."

* * * * *

(Record, p. 432:)

"Did you hear or read about any statements that were made by Senator BILBO during his campaign speeches respecting the fact that he didn't want the colored people to vote? You heard many of these statements?

"Mr. FIELD. Yes, sir; I heard them. I heard the ones over the radio.

"The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell the committee what it is that you heard?

"Mr. FIELD. Just about what they said here this morning, that he was advising them—I don't remember just how it was put now. I would hate to make a mistake about it.

"The CHAIRMAN. What effect, if any, did his statements have in causing you not to register colored people, or giving a lesser chance to the colored to register than the whites?

"Mr. FIELD. It didn't change me one bit.

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, irrespective of what Senator BILBO said, you would have followed the same course as you did?

"Mr. FIELD. Yes, sir; because as you brought out there a little while ago, it is generally accepted in Mississippi that the white primary is for the white people.

"The CHAIRMAN. And that is the reason why you took the steps that you did, and you were not at all influenced by Senator BILBO's statements?

"Mr. FIELD. That is right."

Wendell R. Holmes, circuit clerk in Magnolia, Miss., testified on this point as follows (record, p. 389):

"The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that it is almost common knowledge in the State of Mississippi, and in many of the Southern States, that the white people have consistently attempted to prevent colored people from voting in the primary elections?

"Mr. HOLMES. That is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. And with that knowledge on your part, don't you think that whether or not Senator BILBO had been the candidate, or anybody else, that the white people would have taken the same position?

"Mr. HOLMES. Regardless of who was running.

"The CHAIRMAN. What effect do you think the statements attributed to Senator BILBO had?

"Mr. HOLMES. None whatever, none at all.

"The CHAIRMAN. What effect did they have on you in attempting to discourage registration of colored people?

"Mr. HOLMES. None at all. I followed the custom that had been in existence from the time I started in the circuit clerk's office in 1932, and his speeches didn't have any effect at all on me."

Bearing on the custom and tradition as existing in the State of Mississippi, the record indicates that but an extremely small portion of the white and colored of the State popula-

tion are not native-born (about three-tenths of 1 percent) and from that it follows that the custom and tradition with regard to white Democratic primaries is inbred and ingrained into the great majority of Mississippi citizenry. A majority of the committee are of the opinion that the record clearly shows that irrespective of what Senator BILBO actually said in his campaign oratory, the disqualification of and prevention of the Negro from registering or voting would have been the same, since that is uniformly the attitude of the native white Mississippi citizenry.

Two statements which Senator BILBO was alleged to have made in the course of his campaign were (exhibit 1):

"(1) 'I call on every red-blooded white man to use any means to keep the niggers away from the polls. If you don't understand what that means you are just plain dumb.'

"(2) '* * * I'm calling on every red-blooded American who believes in the superiority and integrity of the white race to get out and see that no nigger votes. * * * And the best time to do it is the night before.'"

Witness after witness was questioned about these statements and as to their intended effect and actual effect upon the electorate and upon election officials. Senator BILBO was asked to explain these alleged statements. He admitted to frequent repetition of the phrase about "seeing them the night before the election" but denied that he intended that those following his admonitions give other than friendly advice to Negroes the night before the election. It is significant that not one witness testified that he had been "seen the night before the election" nor was there any evidence of any violence connected with "seeing Negroes the night before the election." On the record we can only conclude that Senator BILBO's intention as well as the effect of his words was the giving of friendly advice to Negroes.

As to the allegation that Senator BILBO urged use of "any means" to prevent Negroes from voting, Senator BILBO categorically denied ever making such a statement. At the hearing he insisted he always used the adjective "lawful" means. In the transcript of the radio speech which he made the night before the election, he used the adjective "lawful." Several witnesses who heard Senator BILBO's speeches also recollected that he used the adjective "lawful." On the record of conflicting accounts, the majority conclude that he used the word "lawful" and that if on some occasions he neglected to use the adjective as alleged by some witnesses, it was due to a slip of the tongue. This conclusion is further supported by a report of an interview between Senator BILBO and some reporters of the press as included in the record, page 787, which interview occurred on August 9, 1946, and in which Senator BILBO spoke of this point as follows:

"SPIVAK. Do you believe, when you speak as you did in your primary, you are upholding the fifteenth amendment?

"BILBO. I certainly was. There was nothing in violation of that provision of the Constitution in anything that I said; and I said further that it was the duty of every white Democrat in Mississippi to resort to every means within the law to keep the Negro from voting in our primary, because they were not qualified to vote."

While the record shows that in some respects Senator BILBO's campaign oratory was crude and in poor taste as viewed by some, it is our opinion that these statements cannot and should not be reasonably construed as indicative of moral turpitude or as unconstitutional and illegal. Mississippi politics have always been heated, and the type of campaign oratory used by Senator BILBO conforms to the custom prevalent in Mississippi for many years and to the wishes of the white citizenry of Mississippi regarding their candidate's position as evdenced by the returns in the primary, in which Senator BILBO led his nearest opponent by nearly 40,000 votes. We consider it a highly dangerous precedent for the Senate of the United States to criticize one of its Members for conforming to the pattern desired by the electorate in his particular State, in order to obtain the nomination, merely for the reason that that pattern may not happen to be that espoused in many of the other States.

The testimony of two of the so-called leaders of the Negroes in Mississippi, T. B. Wilson, president of the Mississippi Progressive Voters' League, and Percy Green, editor of the State's leading Negro newspaper, the Jackson Advocate, showed that they did all that they could to get the Negroes to come to the polls and yet that in Hinds County, in spite of their efforts, only 414 out of 55,000 registered and only 195 out of the 414 voted. The record shows further that there was no trouble in Hinds County in Negroes registering or voting, and that in spite of that fact and the efforts of these leaders, a very small number of Negroes even went so far as to register to vote. Percy Green testified to an editorial carried on the front page of his paper and in the New Orleans Times Picayune and the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which invited and requested the Negroes to put down all show of force and arms and go to the polls and vote; and yet, in spite of that fact and the fact that no one in Hinds County was seen the night before or otherwise troubled, very few Negroes showed enough interest to even make the attempt to register to vote. T. B. Wilson's testimony in this respect was as follows (record, p. 13):

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any duly qualified elector in Hinds County who presented himself to vote on July 2 and who was refused the right to vote?

"Mr. WILSON. I don't know. I don't recall anybody who was refused the right to vote, only those challenges.

"The CHAIRMAN. So that, so far as you know, all of the colored people in Hinds County who were duly qualified and who presented themselves to vote, did vote?

"Mr. WILSON. Did vote; that is right."

Wilson testified that while the ground work for the complaint upon which the investigation was based was initiated by the Progressive Voters' League, that the complaint itself was prepared by a lawyer for the Civil Rights Congress of New York and that assistance in preparing the complaint was furnished by the Civil Rights Congress.

Senator BILBO consistently maintained before the committee that under the law of Mississippi the Democratic primary was confined to whites. He pointed out that in 1890 the Mississippi Constitution was amended to provide for an educational qualification in connection with registration which had proved to be a stumbling block to the Negroes' efforts to register for more than 50 years. He explained that even if registered, he believed that under the law (sec. 3129 of the Mississippi Code) the Negroes as a group were incapable of bona fide intending to support the party nominee and of showing the election officials in their respective cases that they had been in accord with the party holding the primary within the two preceding years. Section 3129 of the Mississippi Code provides:

"No person shall be eligible to participate in any primary election unless he intends to support the nominations in which he participates, has been in accord with the party holding such primary within the two preceding years, and is not excluded from such primary by any regulation of the State executive committee of the party holding such primary."

Bearing upon this point, the majority of the committee is of the opinion that the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Smith* v. *Allwright* does not of itself invalidate Mississippi statutes until they are specifically at issue before the Supreme Court in appropriate proceedings, and that under section 3129 of the Mississippi Code it was open to Senator BILBO to maintain, and to the election officials in Mississippi to sustain, this statute by administratively interpreting it to constitute the primary confined to whites. This appears to us to be sound for two reasons: (1) That the inconsistency and hence improbability of the would-be Negro voter affirming his intention to support the party's nominee in the case of a party openly advocating white supremacy is apparent; (2) that in the case of established affiliation with the party holding the primary within the two preceding years, it is administratively feasible that the burden of proof in that regard be upon the voter, and unless he is able to prove to the election officials that he has been in accord with the party holding the primary within the two preceding years, his vote can be rejected. On this basis we feel that custom and tradition are entitled to consideration in interpreting the meaning of the words used in the statute; and in light of this custom and tradition showing that election officials had for many years confined the primary to whites, we feel we cannot say that under the law of Mississippi it is not a white primary, and from this we cannot condemn Senator BILBO for having in his campaign endeavored to protect what he felt to be the true meaning of the law of Mississippi.

Many Negroes testified as to fear of registering or voting, and associated this by opinions only with statements alleged to have been made by Senator BILBO during the course of his campaign. On this record we are unable to conclude that the failure of Negroes to participate was due to remarks made by Senator BILBO. Such a conclusion would be a mere speculation. In our opinion there are many other factors, such as (1) general belief among the white population and election officials (irrespective of statements made by Senator BILBO) that the primary was exclusively for whites; (2) Negroes, being probable Republicans, did not, therefore, qualify to participate in the Democratic primary; and (3) failure to participate was at least in part due to the lethargy of a group which had had little political experience hitherto. The record shows further that Perry Howard, Negro national Republican committeeman from Mississippi, in an article published in Mississippi papers 2 or 3 days before the primary, urged Negroes not to go to the polls on July 2 but to be prepared to remain qualified as Republicans and to go in 1948 to elect a Republican President.

I now quote from the statement just alluded to:

"PERRY HOWARD STATEMENT REDUCED NEGRO VOTE

"A statement attributed to Perry Howard, Negro national Republican committeeman from Mississippi, appearing in a local daily some 2 or 3 days before election day, is charged with having greatly reduced the number of Negro voters in the July 2 Democratic primary, in which Negroes voted for the first time in 70 years.

"The Howard statement urged Negroes not to go to the polls on July 2 but to be prepared to go to the polls in 1948 to elect a Republican President of the United States.

"Already fearful and apprehensive, many Negroes made the Howard statement their excuse and stayed away from the polls on election day."

Witnesses called by Senator BILBO uniformly testified that in their opinion Senator BILBO in his campaign had nothing to do with any difficulties that the Negroes may have had in the July 2 primary; but that, on the contrary, Senator BILBO had been earnest in his efforts in Mississippi to maintain peaceful relations and to protect the Negro citizens of the State of Mississippi. Many of these witnesses were not supporters of

Senator BILBO and were not in agreement with him on political issues. Yet, in spite of that fact, their testimony was very clear in developing the point that what happened in the Mississippi primary happened because of traditional antipathy to the Negro voting in the Democratic primary on the part of the whites and not because of anything Senator BILBO might have said in his campaign for nomination.

We further note that the record shows and that several witnesses testified that the July 2 primary, while a tense election, was very peaceful, there was very little violence (but 5 cases were discovered by the committee's investigators in 22 counties, and that in none of these cases was Senator BILBO, or any of his statements responsible on the basis of any evidence submitted to the committee). Several of the violence cases were shown not to have been connected with the election but to have exemplified the usual difficulties attendant on an election day whether in Mississippi or any other State.

CONCLUSION

The majority of the committee feel that there is no evidence in the record connecting Senator BILBO with any illegality or impropriety other than perhaps in certain cases departure from ordinarily accepted good taste as some view it or with any of the alleged discrimination or denial to the Negro in Mississippi of the right to register or vote. We are of the opinion that the record demonstrates conclusively that any difficulties experienced by the Negro in his attempts to register and vote in the July 2 primary in Mississippi resulted from the traditional feeling between whites and Negroes and their ideas of the law in that State as regards participation by Negroes in Democratic primaries, and it would have been the same irrespective of who the candidates might have been. And we further feel that nothing that Senator BILBO actually said was responsible in any way for any illegality shown in the evidence presented to the committee to have taken place in the Mississippi registration or voting.

We find that the law in Mississippi, as administratively and traditionally interpreted by the local election officials, constituted a white primary and that Senator BILBO, in realization and understanding of this fact, did nothing further than earnestly and sincerely seek to uphold Mississippi law, custom, and tradition. Considerable of the more vituperative remarks uttered by Senator BILBO in his campaign we deem to be justifiably directed at the attempted and unwarranted interference with the internal affairs of the State of Mississippi by outside agitators, seeking not to benefit the Negroes but merely to further their own selfish political ends.

RECOMMENDATION

The majority of the committee do find that THEODORE G. BILBO, duly accredited Senator-elect from the State of Mississippi, is entitled to his seat in the Senate from the State of Mississippi; that his renomination and reelection was proper and legal and expresses the will of the qualified electorate of the State of Mississippi; and we do recommend that Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO be seated in the Eighteenth Congress of the United States.

This report is signed by the chairman of the committee, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, by myself, and by Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina.

Mr. Secretary, I am advised that it is the desire to take a recess, and if that is so, I shall yield the floor for that purpose.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker, and that John Andrews, a citizen of the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Clerk of the House of the Eightieth Congress.

The message announced that a committee of three members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, and transmitted the resolution of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, late a Senator from the State of Florida.

The message further communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session of the two Houses in the Hall of the House of Representatives, on Monday, January 6, 1947, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President may be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEATH OF SENATOR ANDREWS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, I understand the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] have resolutions they desire to present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Secretary, I am willing to defer offering the resolution until a later time, if it is not in accord with the rule. I desire to make some comment about the death of my late colleague and to offer a resolution. Does the Senator from Maine desire that I wait until a little later?

Mr. WHITE. I think this is an appropriate time, if a resolution is to be offered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Secretary, on the 18th of September last the then senior Senator from Florida, Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, passed away. In his passing the Senate lost one of its most faithful, dutiful, and beloved Members, the State of Florida its senior Senator, and America a great Senator and citizen.

Senator ANDREWS, in his 69 years, had had a rare career of honor in his native State of Florida. He was born in Florida, like his ancestors ahead of him for over a century. He was educated in the Florida public schools, and held diplomas from the Florida Normal School and the University of Florida.

He was a captain in the Florida National Guard, and, ever a patriot, indicated his patriotism further by volunteering for Spanish-American War service and by applying for service in World War I.

As a young man, Senator ANDREWS was secretary of the Florida State Senate. Afterward he took up the career of the practice of law in the State and Federal courts.

His first judicial honor came in his own native section of Florida when he was judge of the criminal court in west Florida, in Walton County, in 1910 and 1911. Thereafter he moved into the executive branch of the government, and became assistant attorney general of Florida, a position which he held for 7 years, from 1912 to 1919.

Senator ANDREWS then became a circuit judge of Florida, and, I may add, by the unanimous expression of the bar of another section of the State from that in which he was living, because of the distinguished service he had rendered his State in 7 years as assistant attorney general.

In 1929 he was chosen a commissioner of the Florida State Supreme Court, and served until 1932. That choice was not a political choice, but the recognition of Senator ANDREWS' judicial excellence by the Supreme Court of Florida itself. It was a time when the legal docket of that court was in arrears, when the court was authorized by the legislature to select three of the outstanding members of the Florida bar who would be willing patriotically to give their services to the assistance of the highest court. The court fittingly called upon Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS, and he rendered further distinguished service upon the circuit court of the State.

Senator ANDREWS was president of the Florida State Bar Association in the years 1921 and 1922, and was also a member of the American, Florida State, and Orange County bar associations. In 1927 he was a member of the State House of Representatives from Orange County.

He was a member of the Rotary Club, of the Masonic fraternity, of the University of Florida Alumni Association, the Pi Kappa Alpha Fraternity, and of the legal fraternity, Phi Delta Phi.

Senator ANDREWS was elected, as was I, on the 3d of November 1936, to the United States Senate, and became immediately Florida's senior Senator. I believe I can say without contradiction that in the 10 years of Senator ANDREWS' service in this body there was no Member looked upon with greater tenderness, none respected more, none loved better, or regarded with warmer esteem, than the senior Senator from Florida, of whom I have the honor to speak.

Senator ANDREWS was a kindly man—firm and brave in his convictions—but

gentle in his touch, always thoughtful and considerate of other people in all walks of life.

So, Mr. Secretary, our former beloved colleague came to the end of his career after having served with distinction in the three principal departments of the Government, in the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments of his State or the National Government.

His career was crowned with a happy personal life. With his devoted and ever-gracious wife he saw his children grow up to recognition and distinction around him. He enjoyed their fellowship and their family association. And when finally the end itself came to him, the finger of death touched his brow only gently, and he slept away in the early hours of the morning of the 18th of September 1946.

Mr. Secretary, I know that our hearts are heavy, but that we are sustained by the sweet memories of Senator ANDREWS' noble and generous life, and that our prayers, our sympathy and understanding go out to his mourning family and his bereaved people.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution pertaining to Senator ANDREWS, which I send to the desk.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, is this a resolution to recess?

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, no; it is a resolution announcing to the Senate of the death of Senator ANDREWS, and informing the House of Representatives.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 2) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, late a Senator from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Secretary, I believe it would be appropriate for me at the conclusion of other matters which may be brought up to move that the Senate recess out of respect to the memory of Senator ANDREWS.

DEATH OF SENATOR BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, it becomes my painful duty to advise the Senate of the death of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina, JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY, which occurred at his home in Raleigh, N. C., on Sunday morning, December 15, 1946. Senator BAILEY had been ill for several months, but his health had greatly improved in recent weeks and he was preparing to resume his duties in the Senate upon the assembling of the Eightieth Congress. The summons came suddenly, but found him ready. He was 73 years of age.

For 16 years Senator BAILEY represented North Carolina in this body, and served the people of his State and the Nation with singular devotion to the public interest and with credit and distinction to himself. There was never any question as to where he stood upon any public matter. He never dodged and he never ducked. No matter how hot the issue or how controversial the cause, he met it squarely and faced it unafraid. The record of his service here sustains the best traditions of the Senate and adds lustre to the annals of this historic Chamber.

Senator BAILEY possessed many attributes of greatness. He was able, resourceful, versatile, courageous, and loyal.

In his young manhood he achieved great distinction as editor of the Biblical Recorder, the organ of the Baptist denomination in North Carolina; later he became a brilliant lawyer and established a lucrative practice. In a public capacity he served as United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Eastern District of North Carolina and became an outstanding political leader. For nearly a half century he was the masterful advocate of many humanitarian, educational, political, and religious causes and was an orator of superior gifts and graces and a speaker of rare force and effectiveness. He was elected to the Senate in 1931, and through the intervening years was an active participant in the Senate debates, and exerted wide influence in shaping legislation, having served for several years as chairman of the important Commerce Committee, and rendered effective service on various other Senate committees. He was a resourceful leader in many Senate fights, and made many memorable addresses upon vitally important matters pending in the Senate. His masterful argument against the measure to reorganize the Supreme Court was accounted one of the great addresses made in this body during this century.

Senator BAILEY was loyal to the very core of his being. Loyal to his friends, loyal to his family, loyal to his church, loyal to his State and country, and loyal to his God. And he believed in a great God. He would not worship at the shrine of a small deity—he would bow before no little god. His God was omnipotent, having all power, omniscient, knowing all things, and omnipresent, being everywhere, and able to bless and save to the uttermost.

Having known Senator BAILEY it is easier to read with understanding and faith the majestic first chapter of Genesis as it unfolds in stately passages the successive stages of creation, culminating in the making of man in the image of God, and stamping him with His own divine personality and giving him dominion over all created things.

Thomas Carlyle in writing of Robert Burns gave this standard by which a man might be appraised: "What the man did to the world and what the world did to the man." Senator BAILEY gave to the world an example of exalted living, of unselfish public service, of courage and daring, of faith and vision. The world responded by honoring him with high public position, according him universal respect and esteem, and crowning him with the plaudits of his beloved fellow citizens of the commonwealth he served so well. The world could not break his spirit nor shatter his faith.

When General Lafayette visited Washington after we had won the War of the Revolution, Chief Pushmatahaw, a famous Indian warrior, and the man described by Gen. Andrew Jackson as "the greatest and bravest Indian I ever knew," journeyed from his far-western nation to Washington to visit General Lafayette, and while in this Capital City, fell desperately ill. This beloved Indian chief, realizing his serious condition and that his death was imminent, called to his bedside his tribesmen and said to them: "When you return to our nation the braves will ask you, where is Chief Pushmatahaw, and you will say: 'He is no more.' And the news of his passing will be as the noise of the falling of a mighty oak in the stillness of the forest."

On April 9, 1946, in his office in this Capitol, Senator BAILEY was stricken, but after weeks of illness he recovered sufficiently to return to his beloved North Carolina, and under her inviting skies he had greatly improved and had completed all of his plans to return to Washington and to the Senate for the opening session of this Congress, but on December 14, 1946, he suffered another attack and he died on the following day. The news of his passing was as the noise of the falling of a mighty oak in the stillness of the forest in the great Commonwealth of North Carolina, that gave him birth and nourished, honored, and loved him until the end. The whole State mourns his death.

In the power of immortal verse Wordsworth fittingly describes Senator BAILEY in these lines from the Happy Warrior:

'Tis he whose law is reason; who depends
Upon that law as on the best of friends;
Whence, in a state where men are tempted still
To evil for a guard against worse ill,
And what in quality or act is best
Doth seldom on a right foundation rest.
He labors good on good to fix, and owes
To virtue every triumph that he knows:

Who, if he rise to station of command,
Rises by open means; and there will stand
On honorable terms, or else retire,
And in himself possess his own desire:

Who comprehends his trust, and to the same
Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
For wealth, or honors, or for worldly state;
Whom they must follow; on whose head must fall,
Like showers of manna, if they come at all:

Whose powers shed round him in the common strife,
Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad, for humankind,
Is happy as a lover; and attired
With sudden brightness like a man inspired;
And, through the heat of conflict, keeps the law
In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw;
Or if an unexpected call succeed,
Come when it will, is equal to the need:

He who, though thus endued as with a sense
And faculty for storm and turbulence,
Is yet a soul whose master-bias leans
To home-felt pleasures and to gentle scenes;
Sweet images! which, wheresoe'er he be,
Are at his heart; and such fidelity
It is his darling passion to approve;
More brave for this, that he hath much to love:

* * * * *

Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
Forever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead, unprofitable name,
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And, while the mortal mist is gathering, draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven's applause:
This is the happy warrior; this is he
That every man in arms should wish to be.

Our beloved and departed colleague so lived that he could with Byron tell "Death, that omnipotent tyrant, to his everlasting face, that he possesses no sting, and challenge his sleepless handmaiden the grave, to dare proclaim a victory."

Mr. Secretary, I send forward a resolution, and ask for its adoption.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 3) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHITE's motion that the oath of office be administered to the Senator-elect from Maine, Mr. BREWSTER.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, I inquire if the Senator from Maine is about to make a motion?

Mr. WHITE. I was about to make a motion to recess.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that under the circumstances now existing the only thing, so far as those who wish to organize the Senate without Mr. BILBO are concerned, is to recess at this time until tomorrow and have a session tomorrow afternoon. If by that time those who are blocking the organization of the Senate have not changed their minds, I think we should meet Monday morning, Monday afternoon, Monday evening, and continuously next week until this question is settled.

Resort to a filibuster in such an important matter, for such a wholly inconsequential purpose, namely, to prevent the temporary postponement of this question until the Senate can organize itself, is so unjustifiable that it seems to me that if those who are conducting the filibuster, who are preventing the swearing in of 35 Senators from other States, are not willing to change their minds, they are going to face a complete change in the rules of the Senate. They are going to face a change which will bring about a majority cloture on all questions, and I think that will have the full support of the country.

We have shown today that two-thirds of the Senate desire that the Senate be organized without Mr. BILBO, and that the question of his prima facie right to a seat be considered immediately after that organization; yet, in spite of that, a few desire to thwart the will of the entire Senate.

We cannot begin a session subject to that kind of threat for all measures that we may propose, and I believe very strongly that the only course for us to pursue is to see this thing through. I think Senators ought to have an opportunity to think it over for a day or two. Incidentally, the end of the week is not a good time in which to break a filibuster by simply staying in session. I hope the majority of the Senate will agree that beginning Monday morning the Senate should remain in session until the Senate is organized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, I had in mind to make some comment on the pending situation. I desire to emphasize the fact that I am not only not participating in any filibuster, but that I distinctly disapprove of filibusters generally. I have never participated in one. And while I cannot predict what action I might take over the long future during which I expect to remain a Member of this body, I have never sympathized with filibusters, and do not now sympathize with them, and if this is one that we are entering into I do not sympathize with it and will not participate in it.

I recognize the constitutional right of any State to be represented in the Senate by a full representation. I recognize the constitutional right of any Senator who has been chosen by a State to present his credentials to the Senate as a preliminary to his admission to the body. But there is an equal if not a paramount right, in my judgment, in the Senate itself, under the Constitution, to determine whether any man shall enter the Senate or whether he shall remain here after he has entered it, and if I were called on at this moment to express my opinion as to which of those constitutional rights is paramount to the other I would say that the right of the Senate itself, representing the whole country, under the Constitution, to determine the qualifications of a Senator is paramount to the right of any man to claim admission to the Senate if question is raised as to his qualifications.

I deplore anything that lowers the estimate of the American people of the Senate of the United States. We frequently refer to the Senate as the last palladium of our liberties and of public discussion, the forum of free speech. We are in a critical juncture in the history of our country and in the history of the world. I do not believe the American people are in a mood to condone any form of frivolity in the Senate, any resort to technicalities on either side that would thwart their will, or present the Senate of the United States in a ridiculous attitude before the people. I am very profound in that conviction, regardless of the politics of the situation, and I am convinced in my own mind that there ought not to be any partisanship in this body in determining whether a man is qualified for admission into the Senate. In this particular situation I doubt whether either political party can gain any political advantage out of it, no matter what may happen.

Therefore, I have regretted and deplored, and now regret and deplore, any effort on the part of anyone here to obtain any partisan advantage out of this situation, if there is any such motive in the mind of any Senator, and I do not accuse any Senator of having such a motive. The questions involved are far above partisanship. They are far above political considerations. They involve the integrity of the United States Senate. They involve the integrity of the legislative process. They involve the estimate of the world of ourselves as a legislative body, and involve not only our standing among our people, but world opinion respecting the validity of our action, as I see it. It is for that reason that at this juncture, as we are about to recess, I raise my voice against any effort to obtain temporary or permanent partisan political advantage.

I have not announced how I am going to vote on the right of the Senator from Mississippi to be seated. I have stated that I felt that Senators ought to have an opportunity to read the hearings, embracing some 700 pages, which have just been printed today and have been laid on our desks. I spent a considerable portion of last night reading the report of the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, which had just been made available yesterday. I want to read the evidence. I want to be fair to the Senator from Mississippi and fair to the Senate and fair to the country and to the State of Mississippi in determining how I shall vote. Whatever my ultimate determination may be—I am speaking now as an individual Senator and not as occupying any position of honor or trust here—whatever my ultimate vote may be, I shall be willing to abide the political or other consequences which ensue by reason of that vote, and if I were not willing to do so I ought not to be sitting here myself.

I hope that Senators on both sides of the Chamber will divest themselves of anything that is petty or that gives the appearance of being petty, either from a political or personal standpoint, in determining the right of the Senator-elect from Mississippi, the right of the State of Mississippi, and the right of the United States and of the people of the United States, to have this question passed upon on its merits.

I hope I can divest myself of any prejudice or of any personal favoritism of any kind or description. I hope that we may be able to devise some process by which the Senate can preserve itself from the contempt and condemnation of the American people if we are required to spend a week here or longer in determining whether the Senate of the United States as a whole shall be able to function, or whether our entire legislative process shall be held at naught and nullified while determining whether one man shall be allowed to sit in the Senate.

I hope that we may think this matter over seriously and solemnly. It is a solemn moment in the history of the United States. I hope that after the recess until tomorrow we may come back here prepared to do whatever big thing is necessary in order that the Senate may extricate itself from an unhappy situation, but at the same time preserve all the rights guaranteed under the Con-

stitution to the Senate itself and to the State involved in this controversy.

Mr. Secretary, I felt that I ought to make these remarks, which are wholly nonpartisan, and having been the victim of a great many filibusters heretofore in the Senate against legislation which I favored, I might say to the Senator from Ohio that, as he may recall, I have from time to time advocated that the Senate be permitted to decide by a majority vote what its rules should be, and should be permitted to decide the condition under which it might arrive at a point where a vote could be taken on any pending legislation. When I am confronted with that proposition in the way of an amendment to the rules I am quite sure my vote will not be inconsistent with the attitude which I have always assumed here with regard to the right of the Senate to govern itself by a majority vote.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. May I just say a brief word first?

Mr. Secretary, it is but a few moments ago that we heard two memorial addresses in honor of former Members of the Senate who brought to us during their long service distinction and honor.

I would much like to have this session close in the mood and in the spirit and in the terms of memorial rather than in words of controversy, and unless the Senator insists on it I should like now in that spirit to move that the Senate recess.

Mr. MAYBANK. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the two deceased Senators, I move that the Senate now stand in recess——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator withhold his motion for a minute or two? I should like to make a brief comment on the motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield for one statement?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was so greatly impressed with the statements of the distinguished future majority leader and my good minority leader that there is little that I can add, except this: I went to Mississippi, not at my request, but because I was appointed as a member of the committee. At the proper time I desire to lay before the Senate what I believe to be the facts which the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] presented to the public of the United States last week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I very much appreciate the courtesy of the Senator, because, as I understand the rules, his motion to recess would not be debatable and hence I would not have the privilege of making a very brief comment on the motion except for his courtesy in withholding the motion for a moment.

Speaking for myself, my comment is this: I think the greatest respect we could pay to the memory of the two distinguished Senators who have been called from us by death since we last met would be for the Senate to remain in session for as many hours and days as necessary to reestablish the integrity of the Senate in the esteem of American public opinion. I think we have made a sorry spectacle here today. Again, we have seen a demonstration of rule by minority, preventing putting into effect the majority wish of the Senate. Once again we have seen used a type of dilatory tactics which defeats the will of the Senate, against which tactics I spoke on more than one occasion during the Seventy-ninth Congress. I serve notice that in this session of Congress I shall continue to fight the filibuster technique. To that end I have on my desk a resolution which seeks to modify and amend both rule III and rule XXII of the Senate.

Let me say to the majority leader that in my judgment until those rules are amended in a manner that will make it impossible to conduct a filibuster against the wishes of a majority in the Senate, democratic government in America will be imperiled. I think this body has today made it perfectly clear that such a danger exists. As one Member of the Senate I shall continue to press for the establishment of rules of the Senate which will prevent rule by minority, which once again today has prevailed in the Senate. It is a deplorable situation which will be aided if the motion to recess is agreed to.

Let me say for the RECORD that I shall vote against the motion to recess, because I do not believe that a motion to recess at this time is the appropriate way under the circumstances of paying proper respect to the two Senators who have passed away since we last met. Let us first have an organized Senate before we recess in solemn respect for the memory of our deceased brethren.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I fail to understand why two speeches on this subject should give rise to all the commotion which has been caused in the Senate. In part, I fail to understand why they should have provoked threats on the part of the Senator from Ohio to put the minority in a strait-jacket by adopting new rules in reference to filibusters.

What has been presented here is a challenge to the right of a State to send to the Senate a Senator of its own choice, elected in a campaign in which all the charges which have now been presented in the report made by the Committee To Investigate War Contracts have been brought. Those charges were made and thoroughly aired, and the people of the State of Mississippi repudiated them and sent Senator BILBO here to represent them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not have the floor. Let me complete one thought.

When this representative of the State of Mississippi came to the door of the Senate, speeches were made by two Senators who believe in the Constitution of the United States and in the rights of the sovereign States. They do not believe, as has been suggested by our minority leader, that the rights of the sovereign States can be overridden by the United States Senate. I am not one who subscribes to such a theory as that. I come from a State which has always stood for States' rights. I stand now, as I have always stood, for the rights of the sovereign States of the Union, and particularly their right to send to the Senate representatives of their own choice, subject to the constitutional provisions as to qualifications and expulsion. But because two speeches are made against an attack, made not by us but by those who are opposed to the Senator-elect from Mississippi, we are charged with filibustering and not paying proper respect to the two Senators who have passed to the Great Beyond.

Mr. Secretary, if those two Senators were present today they would stand side by side with JOHN OVERTON, ELMER THOMAS, and WALTER GEORGE, who have spoken on this subject; and their voices would not be feeble.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, what impressed me about the threat of the Senator from Ohio was the fact that the first speech which was made was a speech of great length delivered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who is the left-wing leader of the oust-Bilbo forces. He occupied considerable time reading a long prepared speech. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who represents the right wing of that body, made a speech which occupied a considerable time. He held the floor for some time. Yet those on the other side take the position that no Senator who feels differently about the question has the right even so much as to open his mouth.

As I have said, the first speech that was made was a speech at great length by the Senator from Idaho. Then another speech was made, and the Senator from Ohio took the floor and made a speech. Then when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who happen not to agree with the position of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Ohio, presume to speak, it is immediately charged that there is a filibuster. They are guilty of lèse-majesté. They have expressed a different opinion from that held by the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Ohio. The statement will go out all over the country that there has been a great wicked filibuster in the Senate. I have not been in the Chamber all day, but during the time I have been present as much time was taken by the two Senators who are opposing BILBO as was taken by those who undertook to support him.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, on my time the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] spoke longer than I spoke.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unfortunately I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. He made a very interesting speech; and I believe the Senate thought that the debate was ample.

The question of a filibuster arises because of the fact that the question of Senator BILBO was, by a vote of the

Senate, put over until Monday. Now, with wholly irrelevant talk, Senators are objecting to the swearing in of the next Senator on the list, and all other Senators, because the Senate has decided some question with respect to BILBO in a way which certain Senators do not like. That is the filibuster. The whole argument of the Senator from Oklahoma was entirely irrelevant to the issue. The issue was whether the Senator-elect from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the other 35 Senators-elect, who are ready to be sworn in, should be sworn. In order to prevent that course, an obvious filibuster is now being conducted. The Senator from Oklahoma began by asking that the entire report of his committee be read by the clerk, after having had the resolution read. He then discussed the Bilbo case at length, which the Senate had already settled, simply in order to delay and prevent the organization of the Senate. If that is not a filibuster, I do not know what a filibuster is.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to know at what juncture of the proceedings the Bilbo matter was put over until Monday. I have been present in the Chamber every time there has been a quorum call or a vote; and if there has been any formal action of the Senate putting the Bilbo matter over until Monday, it was while I was absent from the Chamber. I regret that I had a luncheon engagement and did not hear the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. He is always edifying whether I agree with him or not. I should have liked to have heard him. However, I think it is certainly unfair to make a charge and a threat of this nature, in view of the fact that practically as much time was taken by those who presented the case of the "anti-Bilboites" as was taken by those who are "pro-Bilbo."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. I inquire whether any decision has been reached in reference to the Bilbo case, either to carry it over until Monday, or to permit him to take the oath?

Mr. RUSSELL. The decision was in the mind of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. After certain motions and resolutions had been tabled, it was moved that the Senator-elect from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] be permitted to take the oath. That is now the pending question. We have proceeded with debate on that motion. There has been no formal motion that the Bilbo matter be postponed until Monday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, as I understand the situation, it is this: I made a motion providing for the swearing in of the Senator-elect from Maine. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the motion, substituting the name of Mr. BILBO for the name of Mr. BREWSTER. That amendment was laid on the table. What is now left is the original motion that I made, that Mr. BREWSTER be permitted to take the oath.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct; but there has been no decision of the Senate that BILBO cannot be sworn in; and there is no resolution to postpone the case until next Monday. That may have originated in the mind of the Senator from Ohio. He said he wanted it done; but he is not the whole Senate, whatever he may be in the near future.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary——

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Louisiana made a motion that Senator BILBO be permitted to take the oath. I moved to lay that motion on the table, and I explained that it was not intended to be a permanent disposition of the question, but merely a postponement of it until the Senate chose to take it from the table. I stated that I myself would move to take it from the table on Monday after the President's speech. On the basis of that statement the Senate voted by a two-thirds vote to lay the Bilbo matter on the table—to lay BILBO on the table, one might say—until the Senate was organized. That was the purpose of the motion. It was so understood; and on that basis there was approximately a two-thirds vote. When we came to the question of the organization of the Senate by swearing in other Senators, a filibuster was undertaken to prevent the swearing in of the other Senators and the organization of the Senate. It was perfectly obvious that that was its purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. TAFT. The purpose was not to discuss the question of whether Senator-elect BREWSTER should be sworn, not to discuss the question as to the other Senators, but to try to protest against the action already taken by the Senate in postponing the swearing in of Senator BILBO.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary——

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator from Maine yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHITE. I rose to make the motion that the Senate take a recess. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary——

The SECRETARY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. HATCH, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I merely rose to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. HATCH. When a Senator is on his feet seeking recognition, he is entitled to be recognized. Mr. Secretary, I sought recognition as a Senator of the United States. I was entitled to recognition. The only purpose for which I rose was to ask as a parliamentary question whether there had been a decision that the Bilbo matter should be laid over until Monday or any other definite time. If there has been, I have not been advised of it. I propound that parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that the Senator from New Mexico was denied any privilege by the occupant of the chair.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no; certainly not.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine had the floor and had moved to recess. He yielded to various Senators, and then decided that if he were ever to get a vote on his motion he should not yield to any other Senator. The Senator from Maine declined to yield further, in order that there might be a vote on his motion.

Mr. HATCH. If I said anything at all that was disrespectful or in any way against the Senator from Maine, I withdraw it.

Mr. WHITE. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that on no occasion has he ever spoken unkindly or disrespectfully.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. HATCH. I believe I still have the floor. I was not showing any disrespect to the present occupant of the chair; but I think that when a Senator is on his feet seeking recognition he ought to be recognized. I still have not had an answer to my question. The parliamentary inquiry was, Was there a decision at any time during the debate today to lay the Bilbo matter over until Monday or sometime next week?

The SECRETARY. There has been no definite action of the Senate to postpone it until Monday.

Mr. HATCH. There has been no definite action of the Senate on that question?

The SECRETARY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Then the Senator from Ohio, in his kind advice to the Senate, to the Nation, and to the world, in which he said that we had postponed action until Monday, was entirely in error. I mean no reflection upon the Senator from Ohio. I am merely trying to straighten out the parliamentary situation. As I recall, the pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine to have the oath of office administered to his colleague.

The SECRETARY. That is the pending question.

Mr. HATCH. There has been no disposal of the Bilbo matter?

The SECRETARY. No.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Chair. My inquiry has been answered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a disposition of the motion to swear in Senator BILBO when the motion is placed on the table? Is not that a disposition of the matter under rule VI?

The SECRETARY. Not for a definite time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not for a definite time; but for the time being that is a disposition, under rule VI, is it not?

The SECRETARY. Temporarily so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary——

The SECRETARY. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I feel very much as the senior Senator from New Mexico feels. I realize that when a Senator rises to his feet he ought to be recognized.

I merely wished to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio one question. He always charges filibuster. I have been on this committee. There has been no filibustering on my part. I want the people of the country to know the exact situation which my colleagues the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma and the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana found.

I dislike to hear the continual talk that goes out over the radio that we are going to filibuster, before we can hear one word of truth as to what happened, or before we can make a single report, except the majority report, which was filed after the minority views were first filed. It will be my business—and certainly it should be agreeable to the junior Senator from Louisiana—to make certain that every word of the testimony and every word of what happened in Mississippi is made known to the people of the United States. After all, Mississippi is a sovereign State, and the people of Mississippi should be heard from.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the regular order.

The SECRETARY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Baldwin	Hawkes	Reed
Ball	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Gurney	Overton	

The SECRETARY. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. On the pending question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has requested recognition. He wishes to speak on the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. A while ago it was generally agreed that the Senate would take a recess until tomorrow. When the Senator from Maine made his motion, I think there was some confusion and misunderstanding. I have a feeling that if the Senate had really understood the situation it would have voted to take a recess, instead of voting against taking a recess. Personally, I should like to see the motion renewed in a moment of calm, to see what the wishes of the Senate are about it. I do not think we are going to get anything done here tonight. Unless the Senator from Maine wishes to renew the motion, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, I myself am willing to move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, I have no desire to make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then will the Senator yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators requested the yeas and nays; the yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Capper	Lucas	Russell
Downey	McCarran	Saltonstall
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McMahon	Taft
Fulbright	Maybank	Taylor
Hatch	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Hawkes	Myers	White
Hill	Overton	Wilson
Hoey	Pepper	

NAYS—18

Baldwin	Donnell	Morse
Ball	Ferguson	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Green	Tobey
Brooks	Gurney	Wherry
Buck	Hickenlooper	Wiley
Capehart	Moore	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Bushfield	Magnuson	Tydings
Cordon	Murray	Wagner
George	O'Daniel	
Hayden	Thomas, Utah	

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, January 4, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1947

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

The Chaplain of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following

PRAYER

Infinite and merciful Father, from whom cometh all wisdom, goodness, and power, we would unite our spirits in the ministry of worship. We pray Thee to endow us with faith in that Providence which heretofore has shaped the destiny of our Republic. O enable us to realize deeply the sanctity of our mission and understand that the measure of our power is the measure of our Christian virtues: "Except the Lord build the house they labor in vain who build it." Blessed is he who can look serenely back, who works wisely in the present, and who realizes that his new opportunity is in the forthcoming year, the threshold of whose temple we have now crossed. With the past revealed and facing the future, may we remember that we have been elevated to a great position of authority and responsibility, taking no counsel of fear but smiting the forces of anti-God which threaten the foundations of human rights. Therefore, by act and example, let our work flame forth over our country and the world, for the security and peace of all peoples.

Lord God, be Thou with our President, our retiring Speaker, and all who will serve us in the year to come. Let Thy divine impulse abide with us each day. In the name of the world's Saviour we pray.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

The DOORKEEPER. Representatives-elect: This is the day fixed by the Constitution for the meeting of the Eightieth Congress. Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the Eightieth Congress have been received by the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin	Hobbs	Manasco
Grant	Rains	Battle
Andrews	Jarman	

ARIZONA

Harless	Murdock

ARKANSAS

Gathings	Cravens	Norrell
Mills	Hays	Harris
Trimble		

CALIFORNIA

Lea	Gearhart	Bradley
Engle	Elliott	Holifield
Johnson	Bramblett	Hinshaw
Havenner	Nixon	Sheppard
Welch	Poulson	Phillips
Miller	McDonough	Fletcher
Allen	Jackson	
Anderson	King	

COLORADO

Carroll	Chenoweth	Rockwell
Hill		

CONNECTICUT

Miller	Foote	Patterson
Seely-Brown	Lodge	Sadlak

DELAWARE

Boggs

FLORIDA

Peterson	Sikes	Hendricks
Price	Smathers	Rogers

GEORGIA

Preston	Davis	Wheeler
Cox	Vinson	Wood
Pace	Lanham	Brown
Camp		

IDAHO

Goff Sanborn

ILLINOIS

Dawson	Church	McMillen
Vail	Reed	Simpson
Busbey	Mason	Howell
Gorski	Allen	Price
Sabath	Johnson	Vursell
O'Brien	Chiperfield	Clippinger
Owens	Dirksen	Bishop
Gordon	Arends	Stratton
Twyman	Jenison	

INDIANA

Madden	Harness	Wilson
Halleck	Johnson	Springer
Grant	Landis	
Gillie	Mitchell	

IOWA

Martin	LeCompte	Jensen
Talle	Cunningham	Hoeven
Gwynne	Dolliver	

KANSAS

Cole	Meyer	Hope
Scrivner	Rees	Smith

KENTUCKY

Gregory	Chelf	Meade
Clements	Spence	Bates
Morton	Chapman	Robsion

LOUISIANA

Hébert	Brooks	Larsade
Boggs	Passman	Allen

MAINE

Hale	Smith	Fellows

MARYLAND

Miller	D'Alesandro	Sasscer
Meade	Fallon	Beall

MASSACHUSETTS

Heselton	Bates	Kennedy
Clason	Lane	McCormack
Philbin	Goodwin	Wigglesworth
Donohue	Gifford	Martin
Rogers	Herter	

MICHIGAN

Sadowski	Wolcott	Coffin
Michener	Crawford	Youngblood
Shafer	Engel	Dingell
Hoffman	Woodruff	Lesinski
Jonkman	Bradley	Dondero
Blackney	Bennett	

MINNESOTA

Andresen, August H.	Devitt	Andersen, H. Carl
O'Hara	Judd	Blatnik
MacKinnon	Knutson	Hagen

MISSISSIPPI

Rankin	Abernethy	Colmer
Whitten	Winstead	Williams
Whittington		

MISSOURI

Arnold	Bennett	Bakewell
Schwabe	Short	Ploeser
Cole	Banta	Karsten
Bell	Cannon	
Reeves	Zimmerman	

MONTANA

Mansfield D'Ewart

NEBRASKA

Curtis	Stefan	Miller
Buffett		

NEVADA

Russell

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow Cotton

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton	Case	Sundstrom
Hand	Thomas	Kean
Auchincloss	Canfield	Norton
Mathews	Towe	Hart
Eaton	Hartley	

NEW MEXICO

Fernandez Lusk

NEW YORK

Macy	Buck	Byrne
Hall, Leonard W.	Coudert	Taylor
Latham	Marcantonio	Kilburn
McMahon	Klein	Fuller
Ross	Bloom	Riehlman
Nodar	Javits	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Delaney	Powell	Taber
Pfeifer	Lynch	Cole
Keogh	Rabin	Keating
Somers	Buckley	Wadsworth
Heffernan	Potts	Andrews
Rooney	Gwinn	Elsaesser
O'Toole	Gamble	Butler
Rayfiel	St. George	Reed
Celler	LeFevre	
	Kearney	

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner	Folger	Doughton
Kerr	Durham	Jones
Barden	Clark	Bulwinkle
Cooley	Deane	Redden

NORTH DAKOTA

Lemke Robertson

OHIO

Elston	Ramey	McGregor
Hess	Jenkins	Lewis
Burke	Brehm	Kirwan
Jones	Vorys	Feighan
Clevenger	Weichel	Crosser
McCowen	Huber	Bolton
Brown	Griffiths	Bender
Smith	Carson	

OKLAHOMA

Schwabe	Johnson	Peden
Stigler	Monroney	Rizley
Albert	Morris	

OREGON

Norblad	Angell	Ellsworth
Stockman		

PENNSYLVANIA

Gallagher	Fenton	Morgan
McGarvey	Muhlenberg	Graham
Scott, Hardie	Gillette	Tibbott
Maloney	Rich	Kelley
Sarbacher	McConnell	Kearns
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Simpson	McDowell
Chadwick	Kunkel	Corbett
Gerlach	Gavin	Fulton
Dague	Walter	Eberharter
Scoblick	Gross	Buchanan
Jenkins	Van Zandt	
	Crow	

RHODE ISLAND

Forand Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers	Dorn	Richards
Riley	Bryson	McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mundt Case

TENNESSEE

Phillips	Evins	Murray
Jennings	Priest	Cooper
Kefauver	Courtney	Davis
Gore		

TEXAS

Patman	Thomas	West
Combs	Mansfield	Thomason
Beckworth	Johnson	Burleson
Rayburn	Poage	Worley
Wilson	Lucas	Mahon
Teague	Gossett	Kilday
Pickett	Lyle	Fisher

UTAH

Granger Dawson

VERMONT

Plumley

VIRGINIA

Bland	Drewry	Harrison
Hardy	Stanley	Smith
Gary	Almond	Flannagan

WASHINGTON

Jones	Norman	Horan
Jackson	Holmes	Tollefson

WEST VIRGINIA

Love	Rohrbough	Kee
Snyder	Ellis	Hedrick

WISCONSIN

Smith	Kersten	Byrnes
Stevenson	Keefe	Hull
Brophy	Murray	O'Konski

WYOMING

Barrett

The DOORKEEPER. The roll call discloses the presence of 429 Members. A quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will state that credentials, regular in form, have been filed showing the election of the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska and of the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii. The Doorkeeper has also received a certificate showing the appointment by the Governor of Puerto Rico of the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN as Resident Commissioner to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Jesús T. Piñero.

Since the regular election of Representatives to the Eightieth Congress, two changes have occurred, as a result of which two vacancies now exist: In the Second Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin occasioned by the death of the late Honorable Robert K. Henry, and in the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Alabama by the resignation of the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The DOORKEEPER. The next business in order is the election of a Speaker of the House, and nominations are now in order.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Doorkeeper, by direction and authority of the Republican conference, representing a majority of the membership of the House of Representatives, I have the honor to place in nomination for Speaker of the House of Representatives during the continuance of the Eightieth Congress Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. FORAND. By direction of the Democratic caucus, I nominate as candidate for Speaker, Representative-elect Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

The DOORKEEPER. Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, and Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Doorkeeper will appoint the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

MARTIN of Massachusetts

Allen, Calif.	Gillette	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Mitchell
Andersen, H. Carl	Goff	Morton
	Goodwin	Muhlenberg
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Mundt
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
	Griffiths	Nixon
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	Nodar
Angell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norblad
Arends	Gwynne, Iowa	Norman
Arnold	Hagen	O'Hara
Auchincloss	Hale	O'Konski
Bakewell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Owens
		Patterson
Banta	Hall, Leonard W.	Phillips, Calif.
Barrett		Phillips, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Ploeser
Beall	Hand	Plumley
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Potts
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Poulson
Bennett, Mo.	Herter	Ramey
Bishop	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Hill	Rees
Bolton	Hinshaw	Reeves
Bradley, Calif.	Hoeven	Rich
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman	Riehlman
Bramblett	Holmes	Rizley
Brehm	Hope	Robertson
Brophy	Horan	Robsion
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Rockwell
Buck	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	Rohrbough
Burke	Javits	Ross
Busbey	Jenison	Russell
Butler	Jenkins, Ohio	Sadlak
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins, Pa.	St. George
Canfield	Jennings	Sanborn
Carson	Jensen	Sarbacher
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Calif.	Schwabe, Mo.
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Chadwick	Johnson, Ind.	Scoblik
Chenoweth	Jones, Ohio	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	Jones, Wash.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Church	Jonkman	Scrivner
Clason	Judd	Seely-Brown
Clevenger	Kean	Shafer
Clippinger	Kearney	Short
Coffin	Kearns	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Maine
Corbett	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Cotton	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Kunkel	Snyder
Crawford	Landis	Springer
Crow	Latham	Stefan
Cunningham	LeCompte	Stevenson
Curtis	LeFevre	Stockman
Dague	Lemke	Stratton
Dawson, Utah	Lewis	Sundstrom
Devitt	Lodge	Taber
D'Ewart	Love	Talle
Dirksen	McConnell	Taylor
Dolliver	McCowen	Thomas, N. J.
Dondero	McDonough	Tibbott
Eaton	McDowell	Tollefson
Ellis	McGarvey	Towe
Ellsworth	McGregor	Twyman
Elsaesser	McMahon	Vail
Elston	McMillen, Ill.	Van Zandt
Engel, Mich.	MacKinnon	Vorys
Fellows	Macy	Vursell
Fenton	Maloney	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Foote	Mason	Welch
Fuller	Mathews	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Meade, Ky.	Wilson, Ind.
Gallagher	Merrow	Wolcott
Gamble	Meyer	Wolverton
Gavin	Michener	Woodruff
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Youngblood
Gerlach	Miller, Md.	
Gifford		

RAYBURN

Abernethy	Bland	Buckley
Albert	Blatnik	Bulwinkle
Allen, La.	Bloom	Burleson
Almond	Boggs, La.	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Bonner	Camp
Barden	Boykin	Cannon
Bates, Ky.	Brooks	Carroll
Battle	Brown, Ga.	Celler
Beckworth	Bryson	Chapman
Bell	Buchanan	Chelf
Clark	Hedrick	O'Toole
Clements	Heffernan	Pace
Colmer	Hendricks	Passman
Combs	Hobbs	Patman
Cooley	Holifield	Peden
Cooper	Huber	Peterson
Courtney	Jackson, Wash.	Pfeifer
Cox	Jarman	Philbin
Cravens	Johnson, Okla.	Pickett
Crosser	Johnson, Tex.	Poage
D'Alesandro	Jones, N. C.	Powell
Davis, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Price, Fla.
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Price, Ill.
Deane	Kelley	Priest
Delaney	Kennedy	Rabin
Dingell	Keogh	Rains
Donohue	Kerr	Rankin
Dorn	Kilday	Rayfiel
Doughton	King	Redden
Drewry	Kirwan	Richards
Durham	Klein	Riley
Eberharter	Lane	Rivers
Elliott	Lanham	Rogers, Fla.
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Rooney
Evins	Lea	Sabath
Fallon	Lesinski	Sadowski
Feighan	Lucas	Sasscer
Fernandez	Lusk	Sheppard
Fisher	Lyle	Sikes
Flannagan	Lynch	Smathers
Fogarty	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Folger	McMillan, S. C.	Somers
Forand	Madden	Spence
Gary	Mahon	Stanley
Gathings	Manasco	Stigler
Gordon	Mansfield, Mont.	Teague
Gore		Thomas, Tex.
Gorski	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomason
Gossett	Marcantonio	Trimble
Granger	Meade, Md.	Vinson
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Gregory	Mills	West
Hardy	Monroney	Wheeler
Harless, Ariz.	Morgan	Whittington
Harris	Morris	Williams
Harrison	Murdock	Wilson, Tex.
Hart	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Havenner	Norrell	Wood
Hays	Norton	Worley
Hébert	O'Brien	Zimmerman

The DOORKEEPER. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 426, of which the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., has received 244; and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN 182. Therefore the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Eightieth Congress.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] will please escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

Mr. RAYBURN. Members of the House of Representatives, we have come to the opening of the Eightieth Congress. During all of these years the House of Representatives has deserved, and in my opinion has had, the respect of the thinking people of our country. It has been so because the people have sent men and women here of high character, of great patriotism, and splendid intelligence.

Throughout the history of the Congress, in the House of Representatives, 44 men have served as Speaker. Today we are inaugurating the forty-fifth. During the occupancy of this high position by these 44 men all of them have been men of high character, great patriotism, and absolute fairness.

Today I have the high privilege and the great personal pleasure, if it had to come, of presenting to you your Speaker, my friend, your friend, the friend of mankind, a man of unquestioned character, of demonstrated ability, with a great, fine heart and with fairness; and I predict for him a career such that history will record him as one of the great Presiding Officers who has occupied this position.

JOE MARTIN, you are undertaking an arduous and onerous task. Sometimes you may think it is a thankless one, but on the whole you will find that these men and women are mighty fine folks to deal with. I wish you well and congratulate you upon the high honor which has been conferred upon you. And now I introduce to you your Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, in assuming the duties of Speaker of this House of Representatives, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues for having bestowed this signal honor upon me.

No man could fail to be deeply touched by the great honor and privilege of being the Speaker of this historic and august body. No man could fail to have a deep sense of responsibility in assuming the duties of the Speakership because of the tremendous problems which beset our country and our times.

I pay warm tribute to the honorable and able gentleman from Texas whom I succeed to the chair, and who so generously and graciously presented me to the House.

Colleagues, the Eightieth Congress comes into existence in a time when most of the world lies crushed, broken, and in waste from the ravages of the most terrible war mankind has ever experienced.

Orderly government has, to a great extent, lost control in many countries.

Millions of men and women—and little children—are still displaced far from their native homes; they are still hungry; they are still dazed by the enormity of the horrible disaster which has wrecked their lives, laid waste their native lands, left them without homes, and, in many cases, bereft of loved ones.

Those millions of war-stricken peoples turn to the beacon of freedom and security, which, thank God, still burns brightly in the United States of America—sending its gleams of hope to the furthermost points of the world. If the torch of freedom and progress in the United States should flicker out, the world would be left in darkness. Therefore, for the sake of the world—of civilization—for the sake of those millions who have been crushed under the juggernaut of war—for the sake of our own future—we must keep the torch of freedom and progress alight in America.

So help us God, it is not going to flicker out.

Here at home we face grave and pressing problems. The debt into which this Nation has been plunged is of such magnitude it cannot be paid off in more than a century. Our people are bowed down under a burden of taxation which is well-nigh intolerable.

Strikes, industrial disagreements, scarcity of raw materials and machinery, and a large remnant of governmental controls still hamper production.

In this time and in the face of these momentous problems, the Republicans do not gloat over a victory won. We Republicans are conscious of our responsibilities as we seek the cooperation of every man and woman in this Nation to help pull our beloved country out of the economic bogs into which mistaken policies and two wars on two oceans have plunged us.

I say to you, my colleagues, with deep sincerity, that, for the constructive accomplishment of good government, I hope to see a degree of cooperation between the Members on both sides of the aisle, and between this and the other branch of the Congress, which will be unsurpassed in the history of our Nation.

This cooperation is requisite if we are to accomplish successfully the painful readjustments from war conditions of deficit spending, waste, and the don't-count-the-cost policy. Those readjustments must be made in every field of our domestic economy—agriculture, labor, small business, big business, and by all the citizens.

These readjustments facing us call for hard work, endurance, patience, and, above all else, honest, earnest, sustained cooperation between all classes, sections, and individuals in the Nation.

No one group or class of the people, no section of the country, can long profit at the expense of the rest. Economic and social organization must, like freedom, be based upon equal justice to endure. Whenever that balanced justice is disturbed, it must be restored through proper readjustment, however painful that readjustment may be.

We simply must get back to the sound philosophy that the Government does not support the people; the people must support the Government.

Past events and present conditions prove conclusively that whenever the people surrender their liberties to a government by men for too long a time disaster results.

No disaster can overtake America without all the citizens suffering the consequences. We know that through painful experience.

The Government's control over the private affairs of the citizens must be ended, and the people's control over their Government must be fully restored as soon as practicable.

To exercise wise and efficient control over their Government and their governors, the people must be frankly told the facts about their Government, its policies, and its operations. Truth, honesty, and sincere administration in government—administration for the common good and not for partisan advantage or private gain—will keep America great, free, prosperous, and powerful.

There is no room in America for those who would destroy America. All true Americans love and are loyal to our constitutional system and the Bill of Rights. The very essence of all that makes life worth living is expressed in the Bill of Rights.

There is no room in the Government of the United States for any who prefer the communistic system, or any other form of absolutism, to our American system. Those who do not believe in the way of life which has made us the greatest nation of all time should not be permitted to occupy positions of trust or power in the American Government. They should be—they must be—removed.

Our American concept of government rests upon the idea of a dominant Congress. Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government and their governors. This Nation can remain free only through a strong, vigorous Congress, a Congress determined to face firmly its responsibilities, and a Congress which will protect the liberties of the people and not delegate its fundamental powers either to the Executive or to arrogant bureaucrats.

We must make secure those principles of freedom, of government, and of progress for which our heroic men and women have through our history laid down their lives or borne wounds. The ideals they so nobly fought for we must maintain. Those of us privileged to live for our country must see to it that those who have died or suffered for American ideals have not sacrificed in vain.

Religious liberty, the rights of free speech, of free assembly, of free press, must be held inviolate. They are the safeguards against any dangerous drift away from our constitutional representative system of government into some form of political monopoly. On the other hand, freedom of speech, of assembly, and of press does not, and must not be permitted to, mean that enemies of this country and of our people, conspiring to overthrow by violence our governmental, economic, and social system, shall have license so to conspire under the protection of the Constitution.

Once again history has clearly demonstrated that only under a government of laws, and not under a government by men, can any people long remain free and go forward to a better life. The people, given the truth, possess an intuitive wisdom and sense of justice greater than that of any governmental bureaucracy. The history of America has proved that so.

In false information and propaganda, designed to mislead the people, lie the seeds of national destruction.

We cannot—we simply cannot—allow any forces outside or inside this Nation to destroy our American way, either by force of arms, or by keeping alive conflicts between classes within our own country.

Before we can help the rest of the world effectively, we must regain a basis of full production, full opportunity for jobs, and lower prices in a free American economy.

No sound economist can deny, or does deny, that competition is a better regulator of prices and quality than all the governmental bureaus and departmental regulations which could be organized or devised.

Price levels mean nothing if people cannot get fuel to warm them, food to sustain them, homes to shelter them, and fabrics to clothe them.

Wage increases can mean nothing if they are to be offset by weeks of idleness in strikes, and by such increased costs and prices as will rob the wage earners and the salaried people, the farmers, and the fixed-income people alike of purchasing power through a reduced exchange value of the dollar.

We must find a formula and a basis upon which disagreements between labor and management can be settled justly and effectively without stoppage of production. Such a basis and formula can never be found until both sides are ready to shoulder their fair share of responsibility for contracts; to cooperate in achieving increased production, lower prices, and fair profits, without decreasing wages or lengthening work hours.

Such a basis and formula for progress and plenty can never be found unless production is kept going while labor-management disagreements are being settled. To this great pressing problem we must give our immediate attention.

The only persons in America who could hope for a failure of cooperation between labor and management, who could hope for a failure of production and continued skyrocketing of prices, who could hope for continued controversies between great organizations of labor unions, or between unions themselves, with picket lines, silent factories, and paralyzed production, are those Communists or Fascists—and there is not a nickel's worth of difference between them—who would like to overturn this grand constitutional system of ours in favor of some form of tyrannical dictatorship under which they could loot the Nation.

Those who would have the people of this Nation believe America is ready to go to seed and wither on the vine simply close their eyes to the plain facts of accomplishments.

In 3 years, free labor, free agriculture, free industry, and free citizens, cooperating with each other, surpassed 40 years of war preparations in Japan, 20 years of war preparations in Italy, 20 years in Russia, and 12 years in Germany.

In 3 years we were fighting an offensive war and were on the road to victory. We helped our allies with millions of men and billions of dollars in machines and supplies of war in the Atlantic conflict, while we fought another war in the Pacific practically unaided, and almost single-handed, and won them both. No informed person now even pretends America's part in the great struggle was any less than decisive.

An America which can achieve that miracle in war can accomplish even greater miracles in peace. Our trouble, if we fail, will not be because we cannot. It will be because we will not.

We can attain full production, lower prices, and prosperity in this Nation. We can know a prosperity greater than we ever knew before. We can achieve miracles of new comforts, new outlets for our inventive genius and our unparalleled capacity for mass production.

One of the most important problems directly related to increased production and lower prices is taxation. A decrease in taxes can be made possible only through, and must be accompanied by, extensive economies in government.

It is not the intention of the Republicans in the Congress blindly and wildly to slash here and there. The best evidence of that is the study committees we

have had at work for 2 years and more, preparing for the time when we should be charged, as we now are charged by the Nation, with the responsibility of putting this country back on the American rails of progress. Our studies have shown Government costs can be reduced, and we intend to reduce them.

High taxes have long been recognized as an obstacle to business expansion. We intend to reduce tax rates wherever and as promptly as it is feasible to do so. We have given that promise to the American people, and we intend that it shall be fulfilled.

We must, after 17 long years, balance the Budget, commence paying off the national debt, reduce taxes to free the money of the individual for achieving a higher national standard of living, provide the incentive for business expansion which will create more jobs, more wages, more Federal revenue, and at the same time adjust prices and quality on a sound basis.

In our foreign affairs there is danger the war-stricken nations may be led to rely too much on the United States and try too little to help themselves.

We all recognize that while we desire to do our full share in helping the rest of the world, we must avoid the danger of so depleting and weakening ourselves as to be dragged down with them, instead of being able to help them lift themselves up with us. Only a strong, sound, solvent, free America can help rescue the world.

Never in the history of the world, however, has there been a greater opportunity for any nation to lead other bewildered and confused peoples toward the path of freedom and Christianity as is offered us now.

The greatest influence for good, for freedom, for spiritual, cultural, social, and economic progress on the rest of the world will be found in how we, in America, solve our problems.

We must face up to the challenge of this high purpose to save ourselves, and to help save the rest of the world from despotism, economic chaos, social confusion, and final utter destruction of all that makes life worth while.

I am deeply convinced if America is to be saved and put back on the high road to spiritual, cultural, social, and material progress it must be done by ourselves, and ourselves alone.

We must cooperate as citizens in the common good.

We must recognize the desperate necessity for the people to close ranks and fight for the right.

We, therefore, call upon every liberty-loving man and woman in this Nation, regardless of race, color, creed, or party, to cooperate with us in an honest effort to save this blessed country of ours from ruin and destruction by internal economic suicide.

We call upon every section and every class of good Americans to stand with us for an adequate, efficient national defense, while we endeavor to persuade the rest of the world to adopt a practical formula for disarmament and the outlawing of war.

We must set our faces sternly against any trend toward any weakening of religious liberty and influence in our civilization, or any sacrilegious creed of godlessness. We must stand firm and unyielding against any doctrine which would seek to persuade the people to cast their high ideals and their reverence for God aside, and embark upon a materialism which would substitute the state for the Deity.

The Declaration of Independence was founded upon faith in God. The Constitution was builded upon it. The pillars of our liberty and progress rest upon it.

We want and hope for the cooperation of the Democrats of the House of Representatives and of all other branches of the Government, of all classes, and all citizens, to the end that we may meet the task successfully.

God give us the strength and the wisdom, the will and the faith to go forward to meet and solve these problems, and save for ourselves and posterity all that our forebears so nobly sacrificed to provide for us.

The Chair will ask his distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] to administer the oath of office.

Mr. KNUTSON then administered the oath of office to Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Some years ago the old custom of having each delegation come to the well and take the oath of office was subrogated, and there was substituted instead the precedent that all Members should rise in their places and take the oath of office at the same time. The Chair thinks the latter precedent is much more convenient and much more practical. The Chair, therefore, asks each Member—and each Delegate-elect to the Eightieth Congress—to rise in his place that the Speaker may administer to them the oath of office.

The Members and Delegates-elect rose, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

SELECTION OF MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, has been selected majority leader of the House.

SELECTION OF MINORITY LEADER

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as minority leader the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 1), which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That John Andrews, of the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That M. L. Meletio, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Frank W. Collier, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the substitute resolution, as follows:

Substitute resolution offered by Mr. FORAND, of Rhode Island:

"*Resolved*, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

"That W. Moseley Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

"That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the original resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF THE OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. John Andrews, Mr. William F. Russell, Mr. M. L. Meletio, Mr. Frank W. Collier, and Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., appeared at the bar of the House, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Speaker.

NOTIFICATION OF SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, has been elected Speaker; and John Andrews, a citizen of the State of Massachusetts, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF SPEAKER AND CLERK

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, Speaker, and John Andrews, a citizen of the State of Massachusetts, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, with the following amendments included therein as a part thereof, to wit:

Rule V, clause 2, strike out "Committee on Accounts" and insert "Committee on House Administration."

Rule XIII, clause 2, strike out "clause 45 of rule XI" and insert "clause 2 (a) of rule XI."

Rule XXXIII, clause 1, strike out "the Resident Commissioner of the United States from Puerto Rico, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands" and insert "the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico."

Rule XLII, strike out "Committee on Accounts." and insert "Committee on House Administration."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which just has been read embodies all of the rules of the Seventy-ninth Congress, together with all of the applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It is needless for me to remind the Members of this House that the American people have given full approbation to the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act. The Republican conference, recognizing such approbation, has directed me to offer this resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EIGHTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the eighth quarterly report covering the operations of UNRRA and expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress on a cumulative basis as of June 30, 1946.

Since my last report, the Congress has appropriated the remaining funds pledged by this Government as its second contribution to UNRRA. Out of the total of $2,700,000,000 appropriated by this Government for the relief and rehabilitation of peoples in Europe and Asia, shipments from the United States have totaled 9,140,614 long tons with a value of $1,154,072,000 as of June 30, 1946. On the same date world shipments were 12,766,975 long tons with a value of $1,707,149,000. Tonnage from the United States thus amounts to approximately 71.6 percent and the value of United States shipments to approximately 68 percent of the total.

On August 5, 1946, the 48 member nations of UNRRA held their Fifth Council Session at Geneva, Switzerland. One of the decisions taken was that UNRRA could extend the date for making shipments to Europe out of available resources beyond the date of December 31, 1946, and to the Far East beyond March 31, 1947. The Congress is familiar with the delays which made it impossible for UNRRA to complete its shipments before these terminal dates. The extension of time will apply primarily to industrial and agricultural rehabilitation items, to the repair of essential facilities, and to provide a substitute for the draft animals decimated by the enemy. The bulk of food in the country programs, however, will be shipped by the end of the calendar year.

It was also recommended at the Fifth Council Session that immediate steps be taken under the direction of the United Nations Assembly to determine the need which will still exist in 1947. Measures have been inaugurated on this problem.

The Congress and the people of the United States may be proud of the contribution they have made to the rehabilitation of devastated countries through UNRRA, but we must also realize that the job has not been completed. It is essential that we look ahead to the relief requirements which will confront war-devastated areas in the coming year. At this time crops all over Europe are being harvested and, if weather conditions continue to be favorable, food reserves should be more adequate than in the past year. Nevertheless, despite prodigious efforts by the peoples of the liberated countries, agricultural production will still fall greatly below the prewar levels.

Here in the United States, we must continue our endeavors to conserve our food resources. Crops in the United States give promise of large yields, but the world food situation will be critical. Many countries will be forced to import food in excess of normal imports because full production has not yet been achieved. Prudence in the consumption of world food supplies is necessary.

The United States is aware of the fact that it may be necessary to find various methods of affording further assistance to some countries in 1947. To this end various agencies of this Government are completing plans so that proper solutions can be effected.

Having been largely successful in averting world tragedy during the most difficult period after the war, it would be doubly tragic if we were not prepared to meet the less difficult task ahead. We must be ready with workable plans which will enable the war-devastated countries to face the future with confidence and success.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 25, 1946.*

NINTH QUARTERLY REPORT COVERING OPERATIONS OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

DECEMBER 26, 1946.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a message from the President of the United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk at 4:30 p. m., December 23, 1946.

Very truly yours,

H. NEWLIN MEGILL,
Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the ninth quarterly report covering the operations of UNRRA and the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress for this purpose.

During the quarter under review the United States completed its contribution of $2,700,000,000 to the work of UNRRA, a figure which represents 2 percent of our national income and 72 percent of the total resources of UNRRA. Estimated shipments from the United States during the quarter of 3,596,517 tons were valued at approximately $284,915,000 and represented approximately 77 percent and 71 percent, respectively, of UNRRA's total shipments for the quarter. Through the quarter under review total UNRRA shipments were approximately 16,723,342 tons valued at approximately

$2,045,035,000, of which the United States provided 12,221,488 tons (73 percent) valued at approximately $1,438,987,000 (70 percent).

An important matter to which I should like to call the particular attention of the Congress is that concerned with the resolutions passed at the Fifth Council Session of UNRRA in Geneva last August. The several resolutions express the views of the Council at that time with respect to the problem of fully liquidating the UNRRA organization and with the disposition of its assets.

These matters were also scheduled for further discussion at the Sixth Council Session convened in Washington on December 10, 1946.

The United Nations are actively discussing the care of displaced persons after UNRRA ceases its operations. Further discussion by the United Nations is concerned with the problem of post-UNRRA relief in 1947 for those countries which may not, even after UNRRA completes its great work, be able to take care of their own needs. UNRRA deliveries of relief and rehabilitation supplies in 1947 may well amount to $750,000,000 and it is therefore unlikely that more than a few of the liberated areas will require further free assistance. The proposal of the State Department is that the spot problems of urgent relief needs in 1947 be met by each supplying government entering into arrangements directly with those requiring assistance and that the Secretariat of the United Nations be used as a central point for exchanging and pooling information on the part of all member governments. With this approach to the problem of relief in 1947 I am in full accord.

With the next report to the Congress it will be possible to provide a clearer picture of the plans for the liquidation of UNRRA and the provision of post-UNRRA relief needs in 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 23, 1946.*

TWENTY-THIRD REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

DECEMBER 27, 1946.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a message from the President of the United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk at 11:45 a. m., December 27, 1946.

Very truly yours,
H. NEWLIN MEGILL,
Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith to the Congress the twenty-third report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

Lend-lease operations since VJ-day have been limited largely to negotiating final settlement agreements and to certain other liquidation activities. The principal liquidation activity has related to the substantial quantities of lend-lease supplies which were in inventory or procurement in the United States at the time that direct lend-lease aid was terminated. Steps were taken immediately to sell to lend-lease countries the supplies which had been procured or contracted for on their behalf. Such sales agreements were entered into with 13 countries, the total amount aggregating almost $1,200,000,000. Most of these supplies have already been shipped and the remainder will be transferred to the recipient countries as rapidly as possible. This report discusses the terms and provisions of the sales agreements.

In the period covered by this report, agreements on final settlement for lend-lease and reciprocal aid have been signed with the Governments of France, Belgium, Turkey, Australia, New Zealand, and India. Detailed accounts of these agreements are contained in this report. The first settlement agreement was negotiated with the United Kingdom and was discussed in the twenty-second report.

Final settlements have been signed with countries which received 70 percent of total lend-lease aid. Countries with which agreements remain to be negotiated include the U. S. S. R., China, Greece, The Netherlands, Norway, and the Union of South Africa. Preliminary discussions concerning settlements are now in progress with several of these countries.

In the negotiation of the settlements the objective has been to carry out the provisions of Article VII of the Master Lend-Lease Agreements with various countries, which provide that "* * * the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations." Viewed in the light of the objectives of the Lend-Lease Act and the Master Agreements, I believe that the settlements which have been worked out not only are highly satisfactory to the United States in the financial sense but also serve the long-range interests of this country by providing one of the foundations of economic stability in the post-war world.

Although the value of lend-lease can never be satisfactorily measured in monetary terms, I think it should be noted that return to the United States from lend-lease through September 30, 1946, exceeded 10 billion dollars, including reverse lend-lease aid, cash payments for goods and services furnished under lend-lease, payment made or to be made under the final settlement agreements, and the sale of supplies in inventory or procurement.

Negotiation of the remainder of the final lend-lease settlements, fiscal activities in connection with the payments due under the various agreements, and the recording and reporting of fiscal operations are the principal continuing lend-lease functions.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 27, 1946.*

(Filed December 27, 1946, with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as provided in section 5-b of the Lend-Lease Act.)

PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL SHRINES PARK COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 3, 1947.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House of Representatives that subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress and pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 711 and the order of the House of August 2, 1946, empowering the Speaker to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House, I did, as Speaker of the Seventy-ninth Congress, on September 6, 1946, appoint Hon. Michael J. Bradley as a member of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission.

Respectfully,

SAM RAYBURN.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 3, 1947.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House of Representatives that subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress and pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 645 and the order of the House of August 2, 1946, empowering the Speaker to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House, I did, as Speaker of the Seventy-ninth Congress, on August 24, 1946, designate Hon. PERCY PRIEST as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures vice Hon. Emmet O'Neal, resigned; on August 24, 1946, appoint Hon. OREN HARRIS as a member of the committee vice Hon. Emmet O'Neal, resigned; and, on September 7, 1946, appoint Hon. FRANK FELLOWS as a member of the committee vice Hon. LEO ALLEN, resigned.

Respectfully,

SAM RAYBURN.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 3, 1947.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House of Representatives that subsequent to

the sine die adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Select Committee to Investigate the Disposition of Surplus Property, authorized by House Resolution 385, Seventy-ninth Congress, reported to and filed with me as Speaker a statement of facts concerning the willful and deliberate refusal of Benjamin F. Fields to produce certain books, records, documents, memoranda, and papers which had been duly subpenaed before the said select committee of the House, and I, as Speaker of the Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to the mandatory provisions of Public Resolution 123, Seventy-fifth Congress, certified to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the statement of facts concerning the said Benjamin F. Fields on September 6, 1946.

Respectfully,

SAM RAYBURN.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

REFERENCE OF BILLS INTRODUCED TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it will be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference inasmuch as the rules which were adopted today have changed the jurisdiction of many committees heretofore in existence. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible today but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all of them that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so Members may be aware of the difficulties that immediately present themselves.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the House has assembled, and that the House is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, has notified the President that the House is organized.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON JANUARY 6, 1947

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution (H. Con. Res. 1), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 6th day of January 1947, at 1 p. m. for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] to make a statement.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was called by States I was unavoidably detained. I did not therefore answer the roll call. When the oath was administered to the Members en masse I was present and took the oath of office.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to be recorded and thereby duly enrolled as a Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. The statement will stand and be printed.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION TO FLOOR OF THE HOUSE ON MONDAY, JANUARY 6

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement after consultation with the majority and minority leaders and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of appearances by the President of the United States at joint sessions of the Congress. With the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on Monday next the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

THE LATE HONORABLE SOUTH TRIMBLE

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives from the Sixty-second to the Sixty-fifth Congress and from the Seventy-second to the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 8), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. BARRY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 9), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BARRY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT K. HENRY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE CHARLES O. ANDREWS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 12), which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, a Senator of the United States from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE JOSIAH W. BAILEY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 11), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, a Senator of the United States from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our deceased Members, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 6, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Cargoes, Inc., for the period from January 1, 1944, to March 31, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts, and title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, authorizing payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued report entitled, "Industrial Electric Power in the United States, 1939–46"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued report entitled, "Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants, 1945"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the text of the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as required by paragraph (e) of that section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on the receipts, expenditures, and results of cooperative agricultural extension work for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the bimonthly report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation small business activities during the period June 1 through July 31, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11. A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the ninth quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

12. A letter from the Vice Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a fourth supplemental report with respect to chemical plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

13. A letter from the Director of Contract Settlement, transmitting the eighth quarterly report of the Office of Contract Settlement covering the period April 1 to June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

14. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission, entitled "Wholesale Baking Industry, Part 11—Costs, prices, and profits of the wholesale baking industry"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

15. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the bimonthly report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation small business activities during the period August 1 through September 30, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

16. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of the operations of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of the close of business June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

17. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting fifth annual report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

18. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from July 1 through September 30, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

19. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

20. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the thirteenth annual report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting the fourth annual report of the National Housing Agency for the calendar year 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

22. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

23. A letter from the Commissioner, National Housing Agency, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting the thirteenth annual report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration for the period July 1, 1944, through June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the complete annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

25. A letter from the Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting the eighth quarterly report, called the Second Year of Peace (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

26. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting three statements constituting a report on the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the third report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

28. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting, in accordance with section 24 of the Surplus Property Act, the progress report for the third quarter of 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

29. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

30. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of its official proceedings for the year ended December 31, 1945, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of the Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

31. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

32. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report filed pursuant to House Resolution 38, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the wartime accounting practices of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report filed pursuant to House Resolution 38, Seventy-ninth Congress, sale of ships to United States Lines and Grace Lines, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report filed pursuant to House Resolution 38, Seventy-ninth Congress, tax liability of subsidized ship operators on wartime earnings (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report filed pursuant to House Resolution 38, Seventy-ninth Congress, activities of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Investigating Committee during 1946 (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on the Public Lands. Report filed pursuant to House Resolution 96, Seventy-ninth Congress, study of the problems in connection with public lands of the United States, the tax problems connected with the acquisition of such lands, and burdens upon local units by reason of the use of large tracts of public lands for public use; with amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 1. A bill to reduce individual income-tax payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by providing optional cash payment of terminal leave bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit future applicants to elect to be compensated for terminal leave in cash in lieu of bonds, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 4. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5. A bill to protect honorably discharged veterans in their rights to join or refrain from joining labor and other organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8. A bill to amend and revise an act approved July 5, 1935, entitled "An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 9. A bill to authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed or to be constructed wholly or partially with Federal funds in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10. A bill relating to the taxation by State and local taxing units of certain real property sold by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11. A bill making appropriations for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 12. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for payment of benefits with respect to the month in which an annuitant or pensioner dies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 13. A bill approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 14. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 15. A bill to establish a Commission on Taxation in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 16. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 17. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 18. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 19. A bill to extend the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain veterans discharged or relieved from active service prior to December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 20. A bill to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 21. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the financing of certain aeronautical developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 22. A bill relating to the furnishing of transportation and housing facilities for the immediate family of members of the armed forces on duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 23. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to widows of veterans and to wives of certain totally and permanently disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 24. A bill to provide that postmasters shall be reimbursed for certain incidental expenses of third- and fourth-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 25. A bill to provide a pension for certain physically handicapped veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 26. A bill granting pensions to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the World War equivalent to pensions granted to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 27. A bill excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 28. A bill to provide annuities for persons who have served as President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 29. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 30. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States on a permanent basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 31. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 32. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 33. A bill to give veterans first priority in the sale or transfer of surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 34. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 35. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of certain aliens who have lawfully entered the United States upon visitors' permits and are refugees from or unable to return to their country of origin by reason of the emergency created by the existing war in Europe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 36. A bill to make available to certain European nationalities having small quotas the unused parts of the quotas of other European nationalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 37. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of 250,000 displaced persons and refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 38. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924 so as to provide for the admission to the United States of displaced persons and refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 39. A bill to provide adequate compensation for dependents of agents and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 40. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 41. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 42. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 43. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 44. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for return of amounts deducted from compensation in all cases of separation from positions within the purview of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 45. A bill to authorize the naturalization of parents of veterans without regard to certain requirements of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 46. A bill providing for the issuance of documentary evidence of United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 47. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 48. A bill to remove certain discriminations against Government employees in the payment of overtime compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 50. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 51. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 52. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 53. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 54. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 55. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 56. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 57. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 58. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 59. A bill to establish the Office of Power Administration for the coordinated administration of all Federal functions pertaining to the generation, distribution, and sale of electricity and the regulation of electric utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 60. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code relating to employees' trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 61. A bill to amend the Banking Act of 1876, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 62. A bill to fix the personal exemption and credit for dependents for purposes of income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 63. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a comparable price for wool, a comparable price for lambs, and to provide support price for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 64. A bill to establish the Territory of Guam, to provide for the government thereof, and to confer United States citizenship upon certain of the inhabitants thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 65. A bill to extend unexpired patents for periods equal to the length of time such patents shall have been in force during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 66. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 67. A bill to make certain legally adopted children eligible for child's insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 68. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 69. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 70. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 71. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 72. A bill to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 73. A bill to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 74. A bill to abolish the War Damage Corporation and to provide for the refund of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 75. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 76. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 77. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 78. A bill to remove the maximum placed on the amount a veteran enrolled in a training program may receive as a subsistence allowance in addition to compensation for productive labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 79. A bill to provide for erecting a monument or memorial to Albert Abraham Michelson upon the grounds of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 80. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 81. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 82. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 83. A bill to repeal an act granting certain public lands situated in Mono County, in the State of California, to the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 84. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 85. A bill to prevent interference with interstate or foreign commerce and to prevent interference with public utilities serving communities engaged in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 86. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to diminish unemployment, to establish a national policy for assuring continuing employment in a free competitive economy, and to protect the right to work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 87. A bill to make certain labor practices and boycotts unlawful; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 88. A bill to amend section 134 of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 89. A bill to amend sections 203 (52 Stat. 1060), 207 (b) (52 Stat. 1063), and 216 (b) (52 Stat. 1069) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 90. A bill to protect the public welfare when injuriously affected by strikes in public utilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 91. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 92. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 93. A bill to amend section 28 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 94. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 95. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 96. A bill to amend Revised Statutes, section 876, as amended, relating to issuance of subpenas in civil cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 97. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 98. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal, and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 99. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 100. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 101. A bill to provide for the termination of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 102. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 103. A bill authorizing and adopting the improvement of East River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 104. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 105. A bill granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 106. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 107. A bill for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 108. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 109. A bill relating to the war tax rate on retail sale of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 110. A bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 111. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 112. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 113. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 114. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 115. A bill providing for an additional naval academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 116. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 117. A bill to amend section 6 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide settlement and compensation entirely in cash; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 118. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 119. A bill to prevent the disposition as surplus property, without further authority from Congress, of certain plants which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 120. A bill to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 121. A bill to repeal the Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 122. A bill to protect the right of individuals to work by prohibiting certain practices in the field of labor relations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 123. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 124. A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents in the case of persons who serve in the land or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 125. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 126. A bill to provide for the assignment after the war of certain patent rights of the United States to the servicemen who made the inventions and discoveries patented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 127. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 128. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 129. A bill relating to the performance by Federal judges of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 130. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain commissioned naval air navigators; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 131. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 132. A bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 133. A bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education or on-the-job training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 134. A bill to provide support for basic commodities, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 135. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 136. A bill to amend section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 137. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 138. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 100 or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 139. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 140. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 141. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable on and after March 15, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 142. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 143. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 144. A bill to repeal the act of August 8, 1946, Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 145. A bill to repeal limitations on payments of subsistence allowance to veterans in training programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 146. A bill to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 147. A bill making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 148. A bill to provide a temporary increase in the tax on gasoline sold in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 149. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 150. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital at Taft, Okla., for Negro veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 151. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 152. A bill to establish a Department of Civil Aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 153. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 154. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 155. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act and other acts to permit the allocation of Federal funds to the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of publicly owned toll bridges or toll roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 156. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds in order to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 157. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 158. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption from $500 to $1,250 and the exemption for dependents from $500 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 159. A bill repealing certain taxes with respect to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 160. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and

compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 161. A bill to increase the subsistence allowances to veterans receiving education or training pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 162. A bill to provide, in the case of wage and salary payments made in contravention of the Stabilization Act of 1942, that the lawful portion of such payments shall be allowed as costs or expenses of the employer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 163. A bill to provide for vacancy in office of both President and Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 164. A bill to extend the benefits of title III of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation all amounts received by members of the armed forces as compensation for military or naval service performed during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 166. A bill to prevent the lapse of reemployment rights of veterans when the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, becomes inoperative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 167. A bill to increase to $250 and $300 the ceiling in relation to subsistence allowances established by Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 168. A bill to provide for disregarding small amounts of compensation for labor performed by persons eligible for old-age assistance in determining need for such assistance under title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 169. A bill to amend provisions of the Social Security Act and related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to coverage of employees engaged in processing and packing of dried fruits and dried vegetables and certain other commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 170. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 171. A bill to provide annuities for certain survivors of civilian officials and employees who were engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 172. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 173. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 174. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 175. A bill to confer upon the Governor of Alaska the power to pardon and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against laws of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 176. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 177. A bill to authorize appropriations for roads and trails and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Office of Indian Affairs in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 178. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1927, entitled "An act to prescribe certain of the qualifications of voters in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 179. A bill to forbid the appointment of any person but a resident of the Territory of Alaska to the office of Governor of said Territory; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 180. A bill to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to aid in the financing and facilitating of exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and any of its Territories or insular possessions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 181. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 182. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relative to the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 183. A bill to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 184. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 185. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 186. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 187. A bill to amend Public Law [illegible]4, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 188. A bill to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 189. A bill to increase the compensation of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 190. A bill to extinguish the Indian title to lands in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 191. A bill to extend the Federal Aid and Highway Acts to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 192. A bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 193. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 194. A bill to provide that judges of the district court for the Territory of Alaska shall hereafter be appointed to hold their offices during good behavior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 196. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 197. A bill to transfer part of block 90 and the school building thereon of Petersburg Townsite, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 198. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1936, to provide increased retirement benefits for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 199. A bill to provide for procurements without advertising; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 200. A bill to reestablish the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to recreate the offices of the members of said Board, and to transfer functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration from the National Housing Agency to said Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 201. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 202. A bill to amend section 16 of an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2017); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 203. A bill to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 204. A bill to amend the act relating to manifests in Alaskan and insular trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 205. A bill to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakahtla Indians of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 206. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska, the forty-ninth State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 207. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting and receiving certain stolen dogs in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 208. A bill prescribing certain offenses relating to the keeping, injuring, and destroying of dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 209. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the Board of Education of the Superior-Bay Mills Township Rural Agricultural High School, Brimley, Mich., in the construction of public school facilities to be available to Indian children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 210. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 211. A bill making it a felony to make bets on the outcome of sporting contests in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 212. A bill to prohibit mixed boxing bouts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 213. A bill to prohibit professional boxing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 214. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 215. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 216. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 217. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 218. A bill to authorize payment of death gratuity on account of death in active service of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 219. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 220. A bill to establish a United States Commission for the Promotion of Physical Fitness and making an appropriation for such Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 221. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 222. A bill to provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 223. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 224. A bill to grant free postage to veterans, soldiers, sailors, or marines, while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care, in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 225. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 226. A bill to repeal the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942 (except secs. 8 and 9 thereof), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 227. A bill authorizing the appointment of X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 228. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 229. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 230. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 231. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 232. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 233. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to provide a further exemption from maximum hour provisions, statute of limitation pertaining to commencement of suits, and rules of evidence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 234. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 235. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 236. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 237. A bill to provide compensation in cash for accrued leave granted by the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 238. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 239. A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 240. A bill to repeal the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942 (except secs. 8 and 9 thereof), as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 241. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 242. A bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 243. A bill to provide for the erection of headstones for certain members of the armed forces buried outside the United States, lost at sea, or reported missing in the performance of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 244. A bill relating to credit for service rendered in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps by members of the Women's Army Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 245. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 246. A bill to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 247. A bill to repeal section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 248. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 249. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 250. A bill to amend title III, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 251. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 252. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 253. A bill to authorize the acceptance by Federal agencies of a certification from the records of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as to place and date of birth of a veteran; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 254. A bill to authorize the Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Federal Security Agency to encourage, foster, and assist in the development, establishment, and maintenance of special services and facilities for handicapped persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 255. A bill to provide a commission to supervise the construction of a chapel, to be constructed for religious worship, and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 256. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time at post offices and banks, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 257. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to abolish tontine charges on amounts deducted from compensation of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 258. A bill to increase the monthly family allowances paid under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 259. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 260. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 261. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 262. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 263. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmail-

able, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 264. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 265. A bill to remove the monthly maximum placed on the income of veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 266. A bill to prevent interference with interstate and foreign commerce by sympathy or jurisdictional strikes or by boycotts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 267. A bill to prevent interference with interstate and foreign commerce by irresponsible acts of labor organizations and employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 268. A bill to prevent work stoppages in industries vital to the public health or safety and public utilities whose rates are fixed by some governmental agency, and to provide a method for settling labor disputes in them; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 269. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 270. A bill to increase the minimum wage rate under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to 65 cents an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 271. A bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 272. A bill to provide additional compensation for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 273. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians," approved April 10, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 274. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 275. A bill relating to the pay of stevedores, checkers, and dock clerks employed by the Department of War in the New York Port of Embarkation during the national emergency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 276. A bill to grant certain servicemen and veterans the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 277. A bill to provide gold-star medals for widows and parents of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 278. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 279. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States after the termination of hostilities in the present war and beginning of demobilization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 280. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 281. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 282. A bill to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 283. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 284. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 285. A bill to provide a method of relieving the existing acute housing shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 286. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 287. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 288. A bill to amend paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended by Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress, to remove the specific ceiling on subsistence allowance provided in the act of August 8, 1946; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 289. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the purchase price of automobiles or other conveyances purchased by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 290. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 291. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 292. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 293. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 294. A bill to provide adjusted-service compensation for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 295. A bill to authorize the payment of pension to certain widows and children of World War I and World War II veterans whose annual income exceeds $1,000 but does not exceed $2,500; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 296. A bill to make the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code granting percentage depletion with respect to fluorspar permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 297. A bill to exempt certain earned income of persons 65 years of age or over from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 298. A bill to grant pensions to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 299. A bill to repeal existing provisions of law relating to price control and rent control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 300. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 301. A bill to provide orderly procedures in collective bargaining, additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 302. A bill to provide on a basis for the settlement of industrial disputes vitally affecting the national health, security, or economy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 303. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of breakwater at Criehaven, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 304. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Round Pond Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works

H. R. 305. A bill to authorize lump-sum payments to the heirs or estates of Air Corps Reserve flying officers killed while on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 306. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Army Reserve Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 307. A bill to create an official ribbon to be known as the Army Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 308. A bill to increase the monthly rate of service pension payable to certain widows or remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 309. A bill for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Maine; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 311. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the Washington aqueduct pumping station to the Falls Church water-supply system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 312. A bill to amend section 702 of title 34 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 313. A bill to amend section 905 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 314. A bill to further amend the act approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 315. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 316. A bill making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 317. A bill to further amend section 239 of the Judicial Code, and to provide for certificates of questions by the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in customs cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 318. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 319. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of World War II, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 320. A bill to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 321. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 322. A bill to prevent the mutilation, desecration, or use of the flag for advertising purposes, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 323. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 2000, subchapter A, chapter 15, title 26, of the Internal Revenue Code, known as the luxury tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 324. A bill to authorize a special investigation, examination, and complete audit of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 325. A bill to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 448. A bill for the relief of the city of Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution prohibiting War Assets Administration from disposing of certain pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil until 6 months after final report and recommendations of the Federal Power Commission in its docket No. G–580 have been submitted to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution providing for the consideration of treaties by Congress in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution requesting the President to declare November 10, 1947, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to establish the Peace Division of the Department of State with an Assistant Secretary of State for Peace at the head thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Grand Rapids, Kent County, Mich., as the Lamoreaux Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a First Vice President, a Second Vice President, and a Third Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to treaty ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11, 1947, as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of suitable living accommodations for rental to Members and employees of Congress and their families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the selection of the successors of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress who become unable to perform their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday of October of each year as Grandmother's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution proposing establishment of appropriate international machinery for control and reduction of armaments and weapons of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that members

of the United States delegation to all future peace conferences advocate and urge the adoption of freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press by the delegates from all the nations assembled; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the action of the Government of Yugoslavia in imprisoning Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac and in other persecutions of Roman Catholics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution creating a joint select committee to study and recommend legislation concerning labor relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution for the creation of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to direct the President to take the necessary action to prohibit the exportation of more than 2 percent of all durable goods produced, processed, or sold under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and/or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to declare December 7, 1946, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in, and as the date of the termination of, the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. Res. 13. Resolution for the relief of Camille R. Neagle, wife of Elmer F. Neagle; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 14. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate the effect of cartels on commerce with foreign nations and among the several States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 15. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a study with respect to the holding and disposition of alien property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to study means of preventing strikes in public utilities, hospitals, and processing and distribution of essential foods and fuel; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Res. 17. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to provide for a report and question period at which heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to appear and answer questions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 18. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. Res. 19. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the operation of the program for the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. Res. 20. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the service, operations, and administration of commercial air-transport companies in the United States and of their regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 21. Resolution to continue the Special Committee To Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 22. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the operation of the program for the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 23. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the operation of the program for the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 24. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate rules and regulations of the various departments and independent agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the decree of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in re James B. Dunn; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 26. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 25; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. Res. 27. Resolution creating a select committee to make an investigation and study of the operation of the Army court-martial system, with special reference to the Litchfield trials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 28. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation of the economic and political foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 29. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 28; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 30. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for three chaplains instead of the present one; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 31. Resolution to direct the Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate Fascist activities in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Res. 32. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the operation of the program for the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. Res. 33. Resolution creating a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 34. Resolution creating a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 35. Resolution authorizing and directing a study and investigation of all Federal agencies dealing with labor matters, particularly labor disputes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 326. A bill for the relief of Wilma E. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 327. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 328. A bill for the relief of James I. Parsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 329. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 330. A bill for the relief of J. P. Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 331. A bill for the relief of Mike Clipper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 332. A bill for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 333. A bill for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 334. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 335. A bill for the relief of Samuel Valente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 336. A bill for the relief of Constantinos S. Christodulu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 337. A bill for the relief of Simos Mouzithras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 338. A bill for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 339. A bill for the relief of Nander (Nathaniel) Frieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 340. A bill for the relief of Moszes and Anna Helman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 341. A bill for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 342. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 343. A bill for the relief of Isidore Greenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 344. A bill for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 345. A bill for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 346. A bill for the relief of Maryan Cybulski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 347. A bill for the relief of A. T. Steele and J. C. Corbitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 348. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 349. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 350. A bill for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 351. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary B. Buckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 352. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Molly Poindexter, dependent mother of George Poindexter, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 354. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 355. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 356. A bill for the relief of Mid-South Airways Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 357. A bill for the relief of Tsuta Matsumoto, alias Tsuta Kubo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 358. A bill for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 359. A bill for the relief of Chryssostomos Dalengas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 360. A bill for the relief of Early O. Hardin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 361. A bill for the relief of Hattie Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 362. A bill for the relief of Everett William Flake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 363. A bill for the relief of Athan Peter Brakoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 364. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Broniewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 365. A bill for the relief of John F. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 366. A bill for the relief of William E. Koerting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 367. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Louise Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 368. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 369. A bill for the relief of Ralph I. Stose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 370. A bill for the relief of George H. Hines, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 371. A bill for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 372. A bill for the relief of Herschel W. Carlisle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 373. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Gehringer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 374. A bill for the relief of Miss Sylvia D'Arpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 375. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Smolowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 376. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Troth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 377. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 378. A bill for the relief of Ira S. Bushey & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 379. A bill for the relief of Kuo Yu Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 380. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 381. A bill for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 382. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amelia O. Finley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Rainger, Diane Rosser and Roberta Rosser, W. H. Baker, and Mrs. Katherine D. Wert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 385. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 386. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 387. A bill for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 388. A bill for the relief of Bert Harrington, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 389. A bill for the relief of dependents of Carl B. Sanborn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 390. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Walter See; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 391. A bill for the relief of Dominick Angelone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 392. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Antonio Saraco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 393. A bill for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 394. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Hendry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 395. A bill for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 396. A bill for the relief of Quan Dong Gee, alias Auan Yew Moon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 397. A bill for the relief of Kao Yu Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 398. A bill for the relief of Daniele or Daniel Fiore, alias Donald Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 399. A bill for the relief of Mario Generazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 400. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 401. A bill for the relief of Nicola Piccirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 402. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mortatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 403. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 404. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Tracey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 405. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 406. A bill for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 407. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 408. A bill for the relief of Lawson Ashby, Mrs. Ora Ashby, and Lawson Ashby, the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor, Darrel Ashby, a minor, Kenneth Ashby, a minor, and Vernon Ashby, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 409. A bill for the relief of Patrick James O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 410. A bill for the relief of Charles Albert Goetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 411. A bill for the relief of Pedro Garcia Casanova or Melzuiades Rojas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 412. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Santos Valente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 413. A bill for the relief of John Damacus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 414. A bill for the relief of Hristos Paulos Divitaris, alias Christ D. Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 415. A bill for the relief of Alvada Hirst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 416. A bill for the relief of William Edward Samek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 417. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stefan Wloszczewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 418. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Sulkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 419. A bill for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 420. A bill for the relief of Esther Ringel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 421. A bill for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 422. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 423. A bill for the relief of the estates of Mary Louise Laine, Joan C. Laine, Constance Laine, Arline Laine, and of the legal guardian of Rita Laine, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 424. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Naka Matsukata Rawsthorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 425. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Fiorentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 426. A bill for the relief of Manuel Amorin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 427. A bill for the relief of Abilio Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 428. A bill for the relief of Charles N. Bemis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYFIEL:

H. R. 429. A bill for the relief of Stavros N. Karavolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Jones and Miss Mildred Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 431. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Hospital, of Richland County, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 432. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Kaye Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 433. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 434. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Rich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 435. A bill for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 436. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 437. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 438. A bill to extend Letters Patent No. 1,734,445; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 439. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 440. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Alexandre Jose Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 441. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 442. A bill for the relief of Second Lt. Ephraim D. Yates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 443. A bill for the relief of Francisco Cozzolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 444. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 445. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Ante Jacob Roncevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 446. A bill for the relief of R. H. Padgett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 447. A bill for the relief of Joseph and Sara Rosalie Sliwowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Provincial Board of Davao, Philippines, expressing the board's gratitude to the United States for the grant of independence to the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Constituent Assembly of Brazil, paying homage to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Constituent Assembly of the Italian Republic, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to a just and honorable peace for Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Provincial Board of Bulacan, Philippines, expressing gratitude to the United States for the grant of independence to the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Panama, expressing the aspiration that Italy be granted generous peace terms which will permit the strengthening of its present democratic form of government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 6932 or a measure comparable in purpose and objective and containing due and adequate consideration for the right of each State to recommend and engage in research on marketing and distributing problems of local and State-wide significance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the House of Deputies of the Argentine Nation, tendering wishes for peace and reciprocal friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the South Deep Red Baptist Church, of Tilman County, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of laws to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2. Also, petition of the Los Angeles County division of the League of California Cities, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to relieving the housing shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3. Also, petition of the United States Army Mothers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a qualified United States Army mother being included in world-peace deliberations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4. Also, petition of Blissville Post, No. 727, of the American Legion, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a protest to any further shipments of relief supplies to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5. Also, petition of the American Fisheries Society, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the early ratification of the convention for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries; also to provide Federal aid to the States in programs of fish restoration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6. Also, petition of American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service in the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7. Also, petition of Mrs. Frances Reuter, petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to the Air Corps versus Frances Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8. Also, petition of Francis J. Reuter petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the Air Corps versus Francis J. Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9. Also, petition of Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Bernalillo County, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to forbidding the allotment of all grains and sugar to breweries and distilleries during the acute food shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10. Also, petition of Woodson W. Holst, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11. Also, petition of citizens of the United States of America and of Albuquerque, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to forbidding the use of sugar, sirups, and grain to brewers and distillers during the present food shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

12. Also, petition of several Greek organizations, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to injustice done to the Greeks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

13. Also, petition of United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their being opposed to any and all repressive and discriminatory action or legislation against anyone because of race, color, creed, or nationality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

14. Also, petition of the Association of the Veterans of the Revolution of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the United States to fulfill their pledge for Philippine rehabilitation and reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

15. Also, petition of the chairman, Fellowship for Social Justice, All Souls (Unitarian) Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House Concurrent Resolution 89; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. Also, petition of Robert Edward Edmondson, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

17. Also, petition of Francis Reuter, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to civil-service rating; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their first quarterly report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports filed up to and including December 20, 1946.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name_____

Business address_____

INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1)_____

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2)_____

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3)_____

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4)_____

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5)_____

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6)_____

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7)_____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name_____

Business address_____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1)_____

(2) To whom paid:

(2)_____

(3) For what purposes:

(3)_____

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4)_____

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5)_____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Addis, Rhoena I., 418 Federal Securities Building, Lincoln 8, Nebr. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Field employee, Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Permanently employed since May 16, 1939. (4) $35 weekly. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) $30 weekly allowance for traveling expenses only. (7) Traveling, hotels, meals.

Akeson, Virgil, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, suite 1299, 222 West Adams, Chicago, Ill. (2) Membership of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $265 per month before deductions. (5) International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (6) No per diem allowed, only actual expenditures. (7) Transportation, telephone, and telegraph.

Albers, Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend Clubs of America, affiliated with the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Until the enactment of the proposed legislation into law. (4) Twenty-five percent of all revenue derived from all sources to the national organization from the State of Florida. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (6) Salary and expenses all included in 25-percent commission. (7) Travel expenses, organization work, legislative work.

Alifas, Nels Peter, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, also the International Association of Machinists. (2) Government employees who are members of District No. 44, I. A. of M., and organized labor represented by the I. A. of M. (3) Present term expires December 31, 1947. (4) $8,000 per year as chief executive of District No. 44, part of whose duties is to support or oppose legislation of interest to membership. (5) District No. 44, I. A. of M. legislative work assignment by I. A. of M. is without compensation. (6) No actual limit set on legitimate expenditures, but personal legislative expenses usually about $10 per month and transportation. (7) Transportation between office and Capitol; extra meals incident to work and observing amenities with associates.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) Mississippi Valley Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,200 per year (see attached statement [2]). (5) Mississippi Valley Association. (6) Actual expenditures reimbursed. (7) Travel, subsistence, miscellaneous incidentals.

American Nurses' Association, Inc.,[1] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Acts on behalf of its membership consisting of 180,000 graduate, registered nurses. (2) In the interest of its membership. (3) The term for which the American Nurses' Association is organized is perpetual. (4) No special funds are collected for a specific purpose such as legislation. Dues, 75 cents per capita, are paid into the general treasury of the association. Legislative activities account for a small percentage (2.3 percent in 1944; 3.4 percent in 1945). (5) All expenditures of association (including overhead expenses) met through dues of membership (75 cents per capita). (6) See item 4. (7) Communications to constituent State nurses' associations: telephone, telegraph, letters, printing and mimeographing, legal advice, travel expenses of witnesses (officers or members of association).

[1] Notified by Clerk that registration is by individuals only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.

Avent, I. M., Wacker Hotel, 111 West Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Twenty-five percent of financial contributions of members of State going to support of national organizations. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) Expenses are absorbed in drawing account of $100 per week balanced off from 25 percent of gross income from State contributions. (7) None.

Babcock, Charles E., Vienna, Va. (route 3, box 415). (1) National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, a corporation organized not for profit, under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 3025-29 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 32, Pa. (2) In the interest of the national council, State councils, and subordinate councils (or lodges) of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America. (3) For the national council term of 2 years. The national council of the junior order meets biennially. I am chairman of the national legislative committee of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics. (4) I receive no salary whatever. An expense allowance of $50 a month is granted me by the national board of officers of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; and covers my expenses in going to and returning from Washington, postage and incidental items. (5) Expenses paid by the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Philadelphia, Pa. (6) Allowance $50 a month, see above. (7) Travel, hotel expenses, postage, telegrams, and incidental expenses.

Baldwin and Mermey,[1] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (2) Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (3) To March 31, 1947. (4) Retainer of $1,000 per month. (5) Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (6) Reimbursement at cost for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Mimeographing, printing, postage, telephone, telegraph, and traveling.

Barber, Hartman, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C., temporarily stationed at brotherhood headquarters, room 701, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2. Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,836 per year. (5) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (6) No definite amount. (7) Postage, taxi and streetcar fare, telephoning; traveling expenses when away from headquarters such as hotel, train fare, baggage, pullman, and meals.

Barnett, Arthur R., 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $11,000 per annum as secretary, assistant treasurer, and director of research. I estimate that not over 15 percent of my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of the act. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) No specific amount. See (7) below. (7) All traveling and incidental expenses.

Bassett, Earl C., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Permanent employee. Assistant to the national legislative representative. (4) Annual salary of $7,309 for all services rendered to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) Reimbursement of transportation expenses. (7) Transportation expenses.

[1] Notified by Clerk that registration is by individuals only.

Berenson, Anna, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich., (2) Members of the UAW-CIO and on behalf of all working people. (3) Indefinite. (4) $70 weekly plus personal and travel expenses. (Registrant covers duties as a general Washington housing representative for functions which include representation of union and its members before Government agencies, service on special labor and housing committees, distribution of information to union members on Government activities, laws and regulations, as well as presentation of union views to Members of Congress and congressional committees.) (5) UAW-CIO. (6) For subsistence: $5 per day in Washington, $7 per day while traveling; also, actual travel costs. (7) Personal and travel expenses: Food, tips, cabs, hotel, travel costs, etc. (These expenses include nonlegislative work as well as legislative work.)

Bivins, Emma Carr, 1719 Riggs Place, Washington 9, D. C. (1) National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) $4,600 annually ($4,300 for 1946, for salary was raised July 1, 1946); $600 annually, expenses. (5) National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. (6) $600 annually for expenses. (7) Transportation, postage, telephone and telegraph, stenographic assistance, office supplies, periodicals.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) In the interest of the National Association of Manufacturers. (3) The registrant has been continuously employed since November 1945. (4) The registrant is paid at the rate of $18,000 per year. (5) The registration is paid exclusively by the National Association of Manufacturers. (6) The registrant is furnished an office, secretarial, telephone, and telegraph service but has no fixed allowance for expenses. Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed on itemized monthly reports. (7) Expenses in connection with meals, entertainment, taxicabs, meetings, and travel out of Washington.

Boorde, Thomas E. (executive and legislative secretary), room 23, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) General Welfare Federation of America, Inc., room 23, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) Of public welfare, particularly in behalf of old-age pensions. (3) Until successor is elected. (4) $14.99 per month in addition to expenses. (5) Treasurer of the General Welfare Federation of America, Inc. (6) $12 per month in addition to other items of expense. (7) Travel, hotel bills, auto expenses such as parking, gas, etc., phone and telegraph.

Bouslog, Harriet, 930 F Street NW., room 800, Washington 4, D. C. (1) International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 604 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Labor, particularly organized labor and longshoremen, warehousemen, and sugar workers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $28 per week (one-third of weekly salary, maximum of one-third of time spent in legislative work when Congress is in session). (5) International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. (6) $5 per week (estimate). (7) Phones and taxies only.

Boyle, James J., 410 Hill Building, Seventeenth and Eye Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The United Public Health League, room 2004, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) The State medical associations

that are members of the United Public Health League. (3) Annual. (4) $833.33 monthly. (5) The United Public Health League, San Francisco, Calif. (6) Actual expenses: approximately $3,500 yearly. (7) Travel and such necessary expense. Washington office expense; conference expenses.

Boyle, Samuel E., 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) The Reformed Presbyterian Church, Synod of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., care of J. S. Tibby, Synod clerk and treasurer. (2) The Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (3) Until October 1947. (4) A salary of $2,500 per year. (5) The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America. (6) Travel, clerical, stationery, and such expenses only as are incurred in actual assignments connected with this work. No definite sum has been fixed. See No. 7 for details. (7) Railway, bus, taxi, or streetcar fares; 5 cents per mile if driving; stationery and postage costs, clerical help as needed, hotel rooms, meals while on trips, telephone and telegram expenses.

Brown,[2] Andrew H., 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (2) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (3) As long as may be necessary in any year. (4) $700, which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (6) Any amount required but no set sum, limited, however, to purposes stated in (7). (7) Traveling and subsistence when out of town.

Brown, Earle Palmer, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Public Relations Department, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Real Estate Boards and its members throughout the United States. (3) Since October 14, 1946. (4) Will receive $2,600 per annum—this is a half-time occupation. (5) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specified amount, reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in connection with duties. (7) Travel, hotel bills, telephone, and similar expenses in connection with duties.

Carter, Jack, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) (a) Personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (b) veterans of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the entire population of the United States in matters of national security. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,000 per annum. (5) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (6) No stated sum. To be reimbursed, upon claim, for luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in connection with official duties, out of a small budget appropriated for such purpose. (7) Luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in course of official duties.

Chamblin, Jr., Walter, 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York City; a nonprofit membership corporation under New York law organized by firms engaged in manufacturing. (2) In the interest of the National Association of Manufacturers, which was organized in 1895 to promote the industrial interests of the United States in fostering trade, business, and finance. (3) The registrant has been continuously employed since February 1938. (4) The registrant is paid at the rate of $25,000 per year to direct the National Association of Manufacturers, Washington office, which includes substantial duties and activities that are not covered by this act. (5) The registrant is paid exclusively by the National Association of Manufacturers. (6) The registrant is furnished an office, secretarial, telephone, and telegraph service, but no fixed expense allowance. Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed on itemized semimonthly reports. (7) The holding of meetings, meals, entertainment, taxies, travel out of Washington for both activities covered and not covered by this act. No quarterly report filed for quarter ended October 10, since registrant engaged in no activities covered by act during such quarter.

Chinberg, Mrs. Frances E., Little Falls, Minn. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) One year. (4) $25 per week, plus necessary expenses. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) All necessary expenses needed. (7) Board, room, and traveling expense.

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (2) National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (3) Secretary-treasurer, National Women's Trade Union League, elective office, by convention. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. As secretary-treasurer my duties are much more predominantly administrative than legislative. However, during the time Congress is in session I do assist in activities to further our legislative program. Coordinator of league's entire program. (4) $4,000 annual salary as secretary-treasurer. (5) National Women's Trade Union League of America. (6) No expense account. Occasional taxi fares. (7) None, except occasional taxi fares.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, 222 West Adams, Chicago, Ill. (2) Membership of International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (3) Indefinite. (4) A salary of $3,900 per annum. (5) International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (6) No per diem expense while in Washington—only taxicab fares, car fares, etc. While away from Washington, $6 per diem plus transportation. (7) Transportation, telephone, and telegraph.

Compton, Ralph T., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Association of Manufacturers. (2) National Association of Manufacturers. (3) Continuously since April 1941. (4) At the rate of $15,000 annually. (5) National Association of Manufacturers. (6) Office and secretarial, telephone and telegraph services, etc., are supplied by employer. Employer reimburses registrant for actual expenses incurred, pursuant to monthly itemized expense account. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, entertainment, incidentals, etc., incurred in the course of the employment. None filed for quarter ending October 10, 1946, as registrant has not engaged in legislative activities during this period.

Cone, D. C., room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 4849 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Chicago, Ill., as vice president, and sometimes perform the duties as national legislative representative. My principal duties include the handling and progressing of grievances as well as negotiation of agreements covering wages and working conditions and other activities of a labor organization, all of which is in no way either directly or indirectly connected with legislation. (3) Elected by National Convention of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America for 2-year term and until successor is elected, commencing October 1, 1944, and reelected for an additional 2-year term, effective October 1, 1946. (4) $5,250 per annum. Compensation covers all service rendered, whether directly connected with labor activities or legislation or both. A very small percentage of my time is given to legislative work. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America. (6) No expenses are allowed while at Washington. Actual expenses are allowed when away from Washington in connection with organization matters that have nothing whatever to do with legislative work. (7) Office expense for rent, part-time secretary, and other incidentals are approximately $140 per month. This amount covers all expenses, including the greater portion of my work, which is in no way either directly or indirectly connected with legislation.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building. (3) Elected at triennial convention of organization in 1942 for 3-year term; next convention will be held March 10, 1947. (4) $893.90 per month in wages, with office rent and stenographer's wages paid by Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. (6) No personal expenses paid while at Washington, except office rental and stenographer's office assistance. (7) Hotel room, meals, baggage, train fare, pullman berth while on assignments away from Washington handling work assigned from headquarters offices at Cleveland, Ohio.

Corlett, Spencer D.,[2] 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (2) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (3) As long as may be necessary in any year. (4) $400, which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (6) Any amount required, but no set sum, limited, however, to purposes stated in (7). (7) Traveling, and subsistence when out of town.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations. (2) Working men and women of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,820 per year, plus personal expenses while away from home. (5) United Steelworkers of America. (6) Personal expense amounting to $10 per day while away from home plus railroad or bus fare. (7) Personal expense, such as hotel, food, cabs, etc.

Cuneo, John C., post office box 1054, Modesto, Calif. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (3) Has been continuous since 1938. (4) Approximately $60 per week. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

d'Avila, Sarah H., 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (2) [Blank.] (3) Since November 1944. (4) $3,500 yearly. (5) The National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax. (6) Reimbursement for traveling expenses, if any. (7) Essential travel expense.

Dawdy, Della J., Route 4, Rogers, Ark. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) 60 years old and older, blind, disabled youth. (3) The third calendar quarter ending September 30, 1946. (4) 50 percent commission on new business. Total for the quarter, $62.31. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (6) None. (7) None.

Disbrow, Walter L., 930 F Street NW., rooms 411–413, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

of Navy Yards, Arsenals and Naval Stations, 930 F Street NW., rooms 411-413, Washington 4, D. C. (2) Membership of Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees. (3) To January 1, 1948. (4) $4,800 per annum. (5) Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of Navy Yards, Arsenals and Naval Stations. (6) Actual expenses approximately $1,000 per year. (7) Transportation, postage, and incidentals.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (2) Committee for Constitutional Government. (3) Indefinite. (4) $200 per month. (5) Committee for Constitutional Government. (6) $50 per month. (7) Postage, telephone service, incidental office supplies.

Dougherty, John E., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (3) Full-time employment, consisting of various phases of the business of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which concerns legislation. (4) $7,052.88 per annum, which is paid for all of the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. (5) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (6) Amount actually and necessarily expended in behalf of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., in connection with entire employment, only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred on business of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., including that part which concerns legislation.

Doyle, E. L., room 311, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. (3) To August 31, 1949 (unless revoked). (4) Annual salary, $8,600. (5) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. (6) Actual expense. (7) Actual traveling and office expense.

DuBois, Ben, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (2) Independent Bankers Association. (3) Employed on a yearly basis. (4) $5,000 per year. (5) Independent Bankers Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel and sustenance and incidentals thereto.

Eaton,[2] Edna L., 607 Boylston Street, room 36, Boston, Mass. (1) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) $75 weekly. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Included in weekly salary. (7) [Blank.]

Edelman, John W., 1031 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Textile Workers Union of America (CIO), 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (2) Membership of the Textile Workers Union of America and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $5,200 annual salary covering duties as general Washington representative for functions which include representation of union and its members before Government agencies and national organizations whose headquarters are in Washington, D. C.; serving on special labor committees such as OPA Labor Policy Committee and Housing Committee of CIO; distribution of information to union members on Government activities, laws, and regulations; presentation of union views on legislative matters to Members of Congress and congressional committees; plus cab fare and occasional luncheon expense in Washington; travel, hotel, and food expense while away from Washington on union matters. (5) Textile Workers Union of America. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, telephone when away from Washington; cab fare and occasional luncheon entertainment when in Washington.

Elliott,[3] John Doyle, 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (1) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (3) Steadily employed. (4) $60 per week prior to October 1946; $90 per week for the weeks ending October 5, 12 and 19, 1946, etc. (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) $30 per week prior to October 1946. Expenses to be paid from income received, as per paragraph 4, above, beginning with the week ending October 5, 1946. (7) Mileage, train, bus fares, etc.; meals when on the road, hotel, etc., when on the road; office rent and operation costs.

Ellis,[3] Clyde T., executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1711 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1711 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 9, D. C. (2) National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and its members; Rural Electric Cooperative Corporations, Public Utility Districts and Public Power Districts. (3) Indefinite. (4) $12,000 annually, salary. (5) National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. (6) No fixed amount but they are nominal, consisting principally of travel. (7) Travel and incidentals actually expended.

Fries,[3] Amos A., major general, United States Army, retired, 702 Albee Building, Fifteenth and G Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Friends of the Public Schools of America, Inc., 20 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., a strictly nonprofit organization. (2) He appears and works for the Friends of the Public Schools of America as editor of their bulletin, Friends of the Public Schools (monthly publication), and director of the southern-western region (really general manager of all the business of the organization). (3) Duration of employment indefinite. Have been steadily employed as above since April 1, 1938. (4) Annual salary of $2,480 ($206.67 monthly) and nothing more. (5) Paid by the organization regularly each month. (6) Actual travel expenses when such is incurred, but none have been incurred in the last 6 years. (7) Fare in public conveyances including sleeping car, meals and hotel expenses, if any.

Farnham, Diana, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO, 1860 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Membership of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO. (3) Indefinite. (4) $55 per week plus $3 per diem while away from home. (5) United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO. (6) Per diem of $3 while away from home, plus expenses for office rent, telephone, telegraph, stationery, transportation, and other normal office operating expenses. (7) Office operating expenses such as rent, telephone, telegraph, stationery, and personal expenses such as hotels, railroad and bus fares, streetcar and cab fare.

Farrington, Charles J., 804 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,500 per annum. (5) National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Fenning, Karl, Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Ralph D. Pittman, Bowen Building, Washington D. C. (2) Ralph D. Pittman. (3) Not determined. (4) $75 per day. (5) Ralph D. Pittman. (6) Not determined. (7) Traveling, printing, etc., if incurred.

Fernbach, Frank, 902-A Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) On behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, I am working in cooperation with the Committee for the Extension of Labor Education for the passage of a bill to establish a Labor Extension Service Division in the United States Department of Labor. (3) I have been assigned to this activity for 6 months. (4) I am paid $341.67 monthly. (5) United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (6) $10 per diem when out of Pittsburgh. (7) In addition to the per diem actual travel costs are allowed.

Ferris, Muriel, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (2) League of Women Voters. I am not employed principally to influence legislation; such activities are secondary to my principal occupation of informing league members on legislative matters. (3) Since August 20, 1945. (4) $4,050 annually. (5) League of Women Voters of the United States. (6) Average of about $10 per month. (7) Carfare to and from the Capitol and travel.

Fisher, Lewis H., Kellogg Building, 1416 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) National Association of Retired Federal Employees, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Received $150 in November 1946 and $3,333.33 as a retainer and to cover all expenses incident to employment with Canal Construction Service Committee. Future uncertain. (5) National Association of Retired Federal Employees, and Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone. (6) Not specified. (7) Unknown.

Ford, Mrs. J. A. (Mary Ann Ford), 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (1) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 450 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill., now moved to 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., Washington, Legislative Bureau. (3) Indefinite. (4) Amounts to $4,160 a year. (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Limited. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from my own home.

Foreman, Clark, 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Southern Conference for Human Welfare, 808 Perdido Street, New Orleans, La. (2) Southern Conference for Human Welfare. (3) Indefinite. (4) $8,000 a year. (5) Southern Conference for Human Welfare. (6) Maximum of $2,000 a year plus actual travel expenses. (7) Entertainment expenses and actual travel expenses.

Fort, J. Carter, 929 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C. For statement of the character of registrant's employment see rider A[4] attached. (2) The Association of American Railroads and its member roads. For further information see rider A. (3) Continuing. (4) Registrant's services for the association cover a wide field, including appearances before the courts, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other administrative tribunals, the preparation of legal opinions, etc., and, as a relative small part, the presentation of views to Congress on matters affecting transportation. For all such services, he receives annual compensation of $40,000 from the association which is not allocated as between the different services rendered. For further information see rider A. (5) Association of American Railroads. (6) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expense incident to the performance of his duties, such as traveling expenses, including hotel bills, taxicab fares, etc. (7) See answer to (6).

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Franklin, Leslie S., box 184, route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) The National Tax Relief Coalition, box 184, route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (2) For taxpayers of State and Nation. In the interest of Nation-wide tax reform and economy. Educational in effort. (3) Continuous from year to year. (4) $1,500 per year, or $125 per month. (5) The National Tax Relief Coalition. (6) Approximately $2,500 per year. (7) Printing, postage, clerical, transportation, hotel, food, and general office expense.

Franklin, Leslie S., box 184, route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) The Coalition of Free Enterprise, box 2693, Greensboro, N. C. (2) For anyone who believes in free enterprise. To enjoy life, liberty, and property. To reassert and reiterate the doctrine of local State sovereignty. (3) Continuous, year to year. (4) No salary; no compensation. (5) None. (6) This organization is not yet completed; no expenses have been provided; no contributions have been made and no moneys expended. (7) When organization is complete this information will be furnished.

Fuller, George M., 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Lumber Manufacturers Association. (3) Permanent. (4) $6,000 for this activity (per annum). (5) National Lumber Manufacturers Association. (6) No specific limitation. (7) Necessary travel and personal expenses reimbursed.

Gehman, Richard B., Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) Americans United for World Government, Inc., 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. Hired by Ulric Bell; no longer in employ of group. (2) Above. (3) From April 22 to present. (4) $5,200 per year. (5) See (1), J. A. Migel, treasurer. (6) Amount necessary for expenses as they arise. (7) Travel, hotel, operating expenses.

General Federation of Women's Clubs,[3] 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The General Federation is not employed, but its principal income is from member dues. (2) The General Federation is active in uniting the women's clubs throughout the world for the purpose of mutual benefit, and for the promotion of their common interest in education, philanthropy, public welfare, moral values, civics, and fine arts. (3) The General Federation has been organized since 1890. Its broad purpose is as stated in question 2 above. (4) The annual dues are 15 cents per member. (5) Membership. (6) See quarterly report. (7) See quarterly report.

George, Leo E., room 610, Bond Building, Fourteenth Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Federation of Post Office Clerks, room 610, Bond Building, Fourteenth Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. (3) Elected for term from August 25, 1946, to August 28, 1948. (4) $10,000 per annum, which includes pay for duties as an executive officer of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, not in connection with legislation. (5) National Federation of Post Office Clerks. (6) All actual necessary expenses. (7) Telephone, postage, stationery, secretarial, office space, etc.

Glodowski, Agnes, general delivery, Mitchell, S. Dak. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (3) Indefinite. Have worked since 1942. (4) Received $25 per week until July 15; $40 per week thereafter. (5) Townsend national headquarters. (6) It varies. It was $360.23 for the past quarter. (7) Travel and all living expenses.

Gordon,[2] H. Truman, D. D., 2257 East Washington Avenue, Madison 4, Wis. (1) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) My work is lecturing and organizing of American citizens in support of Federal retirement and disability insurance legislation, sponsored by Dr. Francis E. Townsend and the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) I have been in this work, with Dr. Townsend's organization, continuously since the month of May 1935, and intend to work in the best interests of enactment of this type of legislation until we secure passage of a satisfactory bill by the Congress. (4) Of all moneys sent in from organized Townsend clubs in Wisconsin for club membership cards and in the way of donations and/or contributions in support of this work, the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., is to pay me a commission of 25 percent (for the present). (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio, is to send me the above-mentioned commission earnings. (6) As abovementioned, the 25-percent commission on funds I produce from Townsend clubs in the State of Wisconsin includes both any personal compensation I am to receive as well as expenses. In other words, I pay my own traveling expenses out of commissions to be received. (7) Traveling expenses on the road as usual, hotel rooms, meals, and all maintenance of automobile used in the work, as well as such form letters or bulletins I may send to Townsend clubs in the State.

Gorman,[2] W. H., 129 Allegheny Street, Clifton Forge, Va. (1) International Association of Machinists, District No. 66, Machinists Building, Ninth and Mount Vernon, Washington, D. C., H. W. Brown, international president. (2) General chairman, International Association of Machinists, District No. 66; representing railroad employees. (3) Elected for a 2-year period at a time. (4) Carried on salary by the organization as representative, receives no extra compensation when called in on legislative work. (5) International Association of Machinists, District No. 66. (6) $9 per day. (7) Hotel and lodging, including meals, taxi fare, and pullman transportation.

Green, Abner, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York 10, N. Y. (1) American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York 10, N. Y. (2) American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (3) Since 1935. (4) $60 a week. (5) American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (6) Traveling expenses only between New York City and Washington, D. C. (7) [Blank.]

Gruver, E. B., 14 South Spruce Street, Lewistown, Pa. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend Organization. (3) Full employment. (4) Under a new arrangement, I am to receive 25 percent of all income the Townsend Organization receives from the State of Pennsylvania, or 25 percent of all money paid into our national headquarters by Pennsylvania clubs. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) The above commission includes salary and expense. I do not know the exact amount I will receive. (7) [Blank.]

Haddock, Hoyt S., room 800, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) CIO Maritime Committee, 930 F Street NW., room 800, Washington 4, D. C. (2) Merchant seamen, longshoremen, and fishermen. (3) Indefinite. (4) $50 quarterly salary. (Since lobbying occupies a minor part of time this is an estimate.) $5 quarterly expenses estimated. (5) CIO Maritime Committee. (6) Whatever is incurred in way of expenses. (7) Those necessary to the work such as telephone, transportation, food, etc.

Hallbeck, E. C., room 610, Bond Building, Fourteenth Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Federation of Post Office Clerks, room 610, Bond Building, Fourteenth Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. (3) Elected for term from August 25, 1946, to August 28, 1948. (4) $8,000 per annum, which includes pay for duties as an executive officer of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks not in connection with legislation. (5) National Federation of Post Office Clerks. (6) All actual necessary expenses. (7) Telephone, postage, stationery, secretarial, office space, etc.

Hanson,[2] Lawrence V., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (2) The home-building industry and in particular the members of the National Association of Home Builders of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $625 per month salary. (5) National Association of Home Builders of the United States. (6) No stated amount. Reimbursement for actual money expended for type of items listed below. (7) Transportation, meals, telephone calls, and other miscellaneous small items.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Oil Workers International Union, CIO. (2) Working men and women of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,900 per year plus personal expenses while away from home. This amount covers duties as a general Washington representative for functions which include representation of the Oil Workers Union and its members before Government agencies, service on special labor committees, distribution of information to union members on Government activities, laws, and regulations, as well as presentation of union views to Members of Congress and congressional committees. (5) Oil Workers International Union, CIO. (6) Personal expense amounting to $3.30 per day while away from home plus railroad or bus fare. (7) Personal expense such as hotel, food, cabs, etc.

Haren, Herbert F., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $5,000 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and on company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 6, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense, Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Since October 4, 1945. (4) $4,300 salary per annum. (5)

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[3] Registration filed with the Secretary only.

The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (6) Average of $20 per month for incidental expenses and actual travel expense. (7) Travel and such items as taxi fare, meals, phone calls.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, Ninth Street and Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Labor. (2) Membership of the American Federation of Labor. (3) Steadily. (4) $7,280 per year. (5) American Federation of Labor. (6) Average of $25 per month. (7) Taxicab and phone.

Hitchner, Lea S., 285 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Agricultural Insecticide and Fungicide Association. (2) Agricultural Insecticide and Fungicide Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day. (5) Agricultural Insecticide and Fungicide Association. (6) All expenses. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, and all other expenses.

Hollister, R. F., 802 Failing Building, Portland 4, Oreg. (1) Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District. (2) Members of Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District. (3) On a calendar-year basis. (4) $7,200 per year as salary. (5) Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District. (6) Actual traveling expense, plus telephone and telegraph expense. (7) Travel, telephone and telegraph, and any other out-of-pocket expense.

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago 9, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kodiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (2) P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago 9, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kodiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (3) The employment is of indefinite duration. See answer to question (4). (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered. (5) P. E. Harris & Co.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; New England Fish Co.; Kodiak Fisheries Co.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc. (6) Additional expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expenses and telephone and telegraph expenses.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Ill. (2) American Library Association, representing libraries in the United States. (3) October 1, 1945–October 1, 1949. (4) $7,500 per annum. Not more than one-third time devoted to legislative activity. (5) American Library Association. (6) Refund of actual expenses. Not more than one-third applicable to legislative activity. (7) Travel expenses to library meetings, postage, telephone, office supplies, printing, etc.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) United Mine Workers of America and its members. (3) Annual. (4) Annual salary of $7,500 payable semimonthly and an allowance of $6 per day for personal living expenses. (5) Affiant is paid by the United Mine Workers of America. (6) Answered in (4) above. (7) Answered in (4) above.

Hudson, Minor, 1624 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, 1624 H Street, NW., Washington 6, D. C. (Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the District of Columbia, is an association of Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.) (2) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services. (3) Employed on an annual basis beginning January 15, 1946. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services. (6) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services provides complete office facilities for operation of the affairs of the association and pays complete traveling expenses for employees traveling on association business, such as visiting local chapters. No expense account is authorized or paid for any other purposes. (7) General expenses incident to operating national headquarters of a national organization including office rent, telephone, secretarial help, and ordinary office expenses.

Hurd, Roy Clifford, 23 Belmont Avenue, Richardson Park, Wilmington, Del. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Indefinite. Work on a part-time basis only. (4) 25 percent of the income of Delaware. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) All moneys received by me are used for expenses. (7) All expenses.

Hushing, W. C., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) Labor. (3) Until fired, resigned, retired, or dead. (4) $140 per week. (5) American Federation of Labor. (6) As submitted for actual expense. (7) Taxies, messengers, phones when not at office, and other incidentals.

James,[2] Elmer J., route 3, box 595, Portland 6, Oreg. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Been employed 13 months. Do not know how much longer I will work. (4) $100 per month salary, $15 or less per week. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Not to exceed $15 per week. (7) Traveling expenses.

Johnson,[2] Carroll E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Have been for 12 years, don't know how much longer. (4) $60 per week. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) $30 weekly the limit. (7) Hotel, food, and traveling expenses.

Johnson, Lee F., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Public Housing Conference, Inc., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) In the interest of local, State, and Federal aid for slum-clearance public housing for the lowest, income groups, strengthening national housing policies to provide homes through private channels for families of middle income. (3) Annual. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) National Public Housing Conference, Inc. (6) None in Washington. Only actual expenses while traveling. (7) Travel, food, lodging.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (2) Order of Railway Conductors of America, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, as national legislative representative, and as a vice president engaged in organization representation activities, including the handling and progressing of grievances, wage movements, and other activities of a labor organization in no matter, either directly or indirectly, connected with legislation. (3) Elected by Grand Division of Order of Railway Conductors of America, for a 4-year term and until successor is elected and qualified, commencing August 1, 1941, and reelected for an additional 4-year term effective August 1, 1946. (4) $6,500 per annum until November 1, 1946, thereafter $8,500 per annum. Compensation covers all services rendered, whether directly connected with labor activities or legislation, or both. (5) Order of Railway Conductors of America. (6) When away from headquarters $6 per day at hotel and $3.75 per day en route, plus transportation expense until November 1, 1946, and thereafter not exceeding $8 per day at hotel and $5 per day en route. (7) Order of Railway Conductors pays office rent of $52 per month and a secretary's salary of $150 per month.

Jones, Harry H., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (2) American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. I am employed in the capacity of manager of the Washington office, American Institute of Laundering, in the interest of the laundry industry and the members thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,600 per year. (5) American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (6) Indefinite. Estimated not to exceed $5,000 per annum. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, committee meeting expenses, gratuities, etc.

Jones, J. M., 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) National Wool Growers Association, 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City 1, Utah. (2) Sheep industry of the United States. (3) Calendar-year basis. (4) $6,000 per year (total compensation regardless of whether work is legislative or not, and a large portion of work is with Government agencies). (5) National Wool Growers Association. (6) All expenses while in Washington (see exhibit II, p. 3). (7) Transportation to and from home; hotel room and meals; entertainment of guests, telephone and telegraph; taxi fares, etc., miscellaneous.

Kamm, Albert G., 86 Cedar Street, Hartford, Conn. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Senior citizens, totally incapacitated and the blind, mothers with dependent children. The Townsend National Recovery Plan. (3) Full time up to September 30, 1946. (4) $35 weekly. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) $30 weekly. (7) Travel, hotel meals, postage.

Keehn, Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (2) Legislative Committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches. (3) Employed on annual basis. (4) $4,000 per year, plus 10-percent cost of living increase. (5) Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches. (6) Itemized account to be rendered to Council for Social Action each month. (7) Travel, food, telephone, etc., connected with work.

Ketchum, Omar B., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) (a) Personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (b) veterans of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the entire population of the United States in matters of national security. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,500 per annum. (5) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (6) No stated sum. To be reimbursed, upon claim, for luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in connection with official duties, out of a small budget appropriated for such purpose. (7) Luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in course of official duties.

King, Joseph T., 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW, Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

(3) Annual. (4) $6,000 annually. (5) National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. (6) Actual. (7) Travel, business luncheons, cab fares, dinner when working overtime.

King, Williford I., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (2) Same as above. (3) Since July 9, 1945. (4) $150 per week. (5) The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. (6) Only actual expenses incurred for benefit of the committee; total since July 9, 1945, probably does not exceed $100. (7) See above.

Knowles, Miles H., and Dean, Allen, acting as copartners, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Non-Basic Steel Coordinating Committee. (2) Members of the Non-Basic Steel Coordinating Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,000 per month. (5) Non-Basic Steel Coordinating Committee. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, postage, printing, travel, periodicals.

Lamb, Robert K., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) United Steel Workers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (2) Members of the United Steel Workers of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $8,000 per year, business expenses in Washington and personal and travel expenses away from home. (5) United Steel Workers of America. (6) Business expenses in Washington such as cabs; living expenses away from Washington up to $10 per day; transportation. (7) Transportation, hotel, food, etc.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., 1624 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services (Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the District of Columbia, is an association of reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard), 1624 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Reserve officers of the naval services. (3) Employed on an annual basis beginning May 4, 1946. (4) $3,000 per annum. (5) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services. (6) Reserve Officers of the Naval Services provides complete office facilities for operation of the affairs of the association and pays complete traveling expenses for employees traveling on association business such as visiting local chapters. No expense account is authorized or paid for any other purposes. (7) General expenses incident to operating national headquarters of a national organization, including office rent, telephone, secretarial help, and ordinary office expenses.

Lawrence, John V., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) American Trucking Associations, Inc. (see exhibit A[4]). (3) Continuing since 1933; full time. (4) (See exhibit A.[4]) (5) American Trucking Associations, Inc. (6) No specific amount. (7) Only out-of-pocket expense such as taxi fare and other transportation; hotel bills when out of town.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Medical Association. (2) American Medical Association, Council on Medical Service. (3) Annual. (4) $15,000 annually and $5,000 set aside annually as a retirement fund. (5) American Medical Association. (6) Up to $2,400 per year. (7) Travel expenses: Railway, air, taxi, and hotel.

Leach, R. W., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (1) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (2) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (3) Indefinite. (4) $12,000 per annum for his personal services in attempting to influence Federal legislation. (5) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (6) All expenses paid directly by Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (7) All business, travel, entertaining, and other expenses relating to performance of job.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) United States Cuban Sugar Council, 136 Front Street, New York 5, N. Y. (2) United States Cuban Sugar Council. (3) Since January 1, 1946. (4) Fee of $15,000 a year; plus reimbursement of annual salary of $8,000 of secretary of United States Cuban Sugar Council, who is provided and paid by the registrant firm; plus out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of council. (5) United States Cuban Sugar Council, 136 Front Street, New York 5, N. Y. (6) No budgeted sum except for salary of council's secretary. Out-of-pocket expenses naturally vary with kind and extent of activities on behalf of council. (7) Routine items of out-of-pocket expenses such as travel, postage, addressing and mailing, telephone and telegraph, clipping service subscription, messenger service, and similar incidental expenses.

Leonard, Richard T., 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (2) Members of the UAW-CIO and on behalf of all working people. (3) September 1947. (4) $269.24 biweekly plus personal and travel expenses. (Registrant performs work other than legislative which is included in biweekly salary and expenses.) (5) UAW-CIO. (6) For living expenses incident to his work $6 per day while in Detroit, $7 per day while traveling; also actual travel costs. (7) Personal and travel expenses—food, tips, cabs, hotel, travel costs, etc. (These expenses include nonlegislative work as well as legislative work.)

Levine, Seth, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) CIO Maritime Committee, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) The membership of the seven unions affiliated to the committee, National Maritime Union, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, American Communications Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10.50 weekly. (One-tenth of salary of $105 per week. Prorated 10 percent to legislative activities and 90 percent to research activity. Holds position of research consultant to the committee and spends nearly all of his time on research work.) (5) CIO Maritime Committee. (6) Whatever is incurred. (7) Taxis, telephones, and publications.

Linquist, Earl G., general delivery, Topeka, Kans. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Commission. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (6) None. (7) All.

Louchheim, Joseph H., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 402 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 annually. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (6) Travel and actual living expenses when away from New York City. (7) Actual living expenses only—maximum $7 per day.

Lyon, A. E. (executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association), 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (2) Railway Labor Executives' Association, consisting of the chief executive officers of 19 national and international railway labor organizations. Major portion of work is not related to legislation. (3) Have been engaged in duties of executive secretary of association since May 1, 1945. Am elected to position for a term of 3 years. (4) Salary at the rate of $9,000 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Railway Labor Executives' Association. (6) Actual expenses which average about $50 per month. This includes reimbursement of personal travel expenses while away from Washington headquarters. (7) Incidental personal expenses, such as cab fare in Washington and reimbursement of personal expenses at other points.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (3) Elected every 4 years by a convention of the subordinate lodges of the order. (4) $7,000 per year salary. (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (6) All necessary expenses. (7) Expenses of secretary, office rent, supplies, and other necessary items.

McCarthy, Frank J., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (3) Full-time employment, consisting of various phases of the business of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which concerns legislation. (4) $14,790 per annum, which is paid for all of the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. (5) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (6) Amount actually and necessarily expended in behalf of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., in connection with entire employment, only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred on business of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., including that part which concerns legislation.

Macleay, Lachlan, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (2) Mississippi Valley Association. (3) Indefinite. (See attached statement.[4]) (4) $15,000 per annum. (See attached statement.[4]) (5) Mississippi Valley Association. (6) Actual expenditures. (7) Travel; including transportation and subsistence; miscellaneous incidentals.

McDonald, Earl L., Cheney, Wash. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (2) All of the people, especially elderly. (3) Indefinite. (4) No definite amount, commission. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

MacDonald, Verne, 1109 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of Small Business, Inc., San Mateo, Calif. (2) Small business. (3) Indefinite. (4) $250 per month to partnership, MacDonald & Narodich. (5) National Federation of Small Business, Inc. (6) Telephone. (7) Some traveling expense may be incurred.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., Sterling, Kans. (1) Christian Amendment Movement, 918 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (2) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) September 1, 1948. (4) $2,500 salary. (5) Christian Amendment Movement. (6) No definite amount. (7) Traveling, board and room while away from home.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 I Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Taxpayers of the United States of America. (2) Taxpayers of the United States of America. (3) Decades past and hope for decades to come. (4) No set fee. I take what I get. (5) The Taxpayers of the United States of America. (6) No set fee. (7) No detail expense account.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

McGrath, Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National St. Lawrence Project Conference. (2) Members of National St. Lawrence Project Conference. (3) Indefinite. (4) One hundred dollars per day for work necessarily performed on behalf of such conference. (5) By said conference, the funds for which are derived from sustaining memberships and voluntary contributions. (6) Unspecified. (7) General office expense, including rent, stenographic help, telephone, telegraph, supplies, etc., traveling and incidental expenses.

Mackenzie,[2] James, 6108 Northeast Eighth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio, (2) Same. (3) Month to month. (4) $75 a week. (5) Above. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

McLaughlin, Robert E., Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Amvets (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) To promote proper care and assistance for veterans of World War II, consistent with the best interests of the country. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,500 per annum. Legislative duties part time. (5) National headquarters, Amvets (American Veterans of World War II). (6) See (7). (7) Actual transportation expenses.

McLaurin, Joseph H., 837 Investment Building. (1) United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) In the interest of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association and its members. (3) For 1 year. (4) Since August 2, 1946, J. H. McLaurin has done nothing for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress, and he has not received any pay or consideration for such purpose. He is paid a salary as president and chairman of the board of the association, and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such officer to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be considered to be pay or consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (6) See answer to (4). In addition, J. H. McLaurin has not received any payment for expenses and is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense, if and when actually incurred in attempting to influence legislation, will be paid by him, subject to reimbursement by the association, and reported as required by law. (7) See answer to (6). Expenses may actually be incurred for travel, hotels, meals, taxies, tips, and entertainment in attempting to influence legislation.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center Station, Boston 24, Mass. (1) National Association of Postal Supervisors, having been elected last May as national president. (2) The members of this association, who are supervisors employed in the field service of the Post Office Department. (3) Term expires in September 1948. (4) Nothing. (5) No pay involved. (6) No set amount. (7) Only actual expenses for transportation, for hotel and subsistence, and the loss of post-office salary when absent from post-office duties attending hearings before Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

Mack, James Edward, 1731 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (after October 12, 1946, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue). (1) National Home and Property Owners Foundation, 1731 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Home and Property Owners Foundation and the thousands of members of the foundation throughout the United States who are home owners, owners of other real property or interested in private ownership of property. (3) Indefinite. (4) $5,000 a year. (5) National Home and Property Owners Foundation. (6) No specified amount, to be reimbursed upon claim for legitimate out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi, telephone, lunch, printing, and similar expense.

Manly, Milo A., 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (2) National Council for a Permanent FEPC. (See attached statement.) (3) Unknown. (4) $75 per week. (5) National Council for a Permanent FEPC. (6) Not yet determined. (7) None.

Mark, James, Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) United Mine Workers of America and its members. (3) Annual. (4) Annual salary of $7,000, payable semimonthly, and an allowance of $6 per day for personal living expenses. (5) Affiant is paid by the United Mine Workers of America. (6) Answered in (4) above. (7) Answered in (4) above.

Marsh, Benjamin C., room 31, 810 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) People's Lobby, Inc., room 31, 810 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) People's Lobby, Inc. (3) I have been employed by the People's Lobby, Inc., since 1928 (it was incorporated in October 1931), and am hired by the year, being elected at our annual meeting in January. (4) I am paid $150 a month. (5) People's Lobby, Inc. (6) I do not have any expense account, but am reimbursed by the People's Lobby, Inc., for expenses incurred in its work. (7) Travel.

Marshall, Katharine Lee, 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) United States section of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, United States section. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,400 per annum (salary). (5) United States section of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. (6) Amounts covering expenses listed under (7). (7) Travel and living expenses incurred while attending meetings and conferences of WILPF and of similar organizations.

Mechem, Frank L., 603 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. (1) P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago, 9, Ill. New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash. Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash. Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (2) P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago 9, Ill. New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash. Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash. Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (3) The employment is of indefinite duration. See answer to question (4). (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $200 a day for each day of legal services rendered. (5) P. E. Harris & Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby, New England Fish Co., Kadiak Fisheries Co., Pacific American Fisheries, Inc. (6) Additional expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expenses and telephone and telegraph expenses.

Miles,[2] Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $15,000 per annum, although not more than one-fourth is paid for the "principal purpose" of influencing legislation as defined in section 307. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

Miller, Martin H., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Indefinite; elected by conventions of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, held quadrennially. (4) Annual salary of $12,180, for all services rendered to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen (6) Reimbursement of usual and ordinary office expenses. (7) Office supplies, telephone, telegrams, transportation, office postage, and express.

Miskimins,[2] S. A., 103 Pendleton Street, Independence, Mo. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) I devote my time to the education of our citizens in regards to the need of broad social security to preserve free enterprise and protect the dignity of the whole of our people. (3) Indefinite. (4) I get 25 percent on all donations made to the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., from the State of Missouri. (5) Commission checks are paid to me by Townsend National Recovery Plan. These commission checks are of various amounts. (6) No amount is allowed for expenses. I pay the expense that I have while traveling about the State out of the amount of the commissions received. (7) The usual expense incurred when traveling.

Mock,[2] Hugo, 10 East Fortieth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. This is a trade association. (2) Toilet Goods Association, Inc. The employment is regular yearly employment as counsel to the association and not specifically in connection with legislation. (3) Since 1935. (4) At the present time $7,500 yearly. (5) Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Only expenses for out-of-town travel.

Mollin, F. E., 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo. (1) American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo. (2) American National Live Stock Association. (3) Am hired by the year as executive secretary and Washington work is only a minor part of my normal yearly duties. (4) Annual salary, $9,900 per year. In several recent years have had a bonus of $500 in addition. (5) American National Live Stock Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Mooney,[2] William W., 414–415 Eagle Building, Spokane 8, Wash. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (3) Indefinite. (4) Has been receiving $50 per week, less social security and all other taxes that are deductible. But since October 1 am working on a commission basis, determined at end of each month. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) When duties are confined to the State of Washington, the maximum expense allowance is $30 per week. On special occasions I am called to other States. Then all expense is paid, even if it runs over the $30 per week. This happened during the month of August, as I was called to Illinois and Ohio,

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

then back to Washington again. Prior to October 1, a maximum of $30 per week for travel expense when out of resident city. Since October 1 this expense will be included in the commission received. No other expense allowed. (7) Travel, hotel, and other incidentals while out of resident city.

Murray, Donald, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) United Public Workers of America, CIO, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) In the interest of the members of the United Public Workers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $4,000 per year, about one-fourth of which is payment for his work as a legislative representative. At least three-quarters of his time is devoted to supervising work of union organizers and to negotiating with Federal, State, and city governmental agencies. (5) United Public Workers of America, CIO. (6) Expenses actually incurred. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, purchase of publications. If he is required to travel away from Washington, hotel expenses are paid.

Nagel,[2] Jacob, 238 First Street SE., Washington 3, D. C., legislative representative. (1) National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees, 238 First Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (2) National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees. (3) Twelve months per year. From October 1945 until change is made by convention. (4) Legislative representative, secretary-treasurer, editor receives the sum of $4,000 per year. (5) National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees. (6) Actual. (7) All expenses incurred by legislation.

Narodick, Daniel M., 1109 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of Small Business, Inc., San Mateo, Calif. (2) Small business. (3) Indefinite. (4) $250 per month. (5) National Federation of Small Business, Inc. (6) Telephone. (7) Some traveling expenses may be incurred.

Neel, Samuel E., 705 Chandler Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (2) Same as above. (3) Indefinite—retained as Washington counsel until August 31, 1947, and such further period as may be later agreed upon. (4) Retainer of $850 per month. (5) Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (6) None except as below. (7) Those actual travel expenses incurred while traveling outside of Washington on business for the Mortgage Bankers Association of America.

Nielsen, Mrs. Marcia K., 1710 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) Americans United for World Government. (3) I entered the employ of Americans United for World Government March 1946 and am still employed by same organization. (4) $40 per week. (5) Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Nixon,[2] Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York 22, N. Y. (2) The members of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, their families, and neighbors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $80 per week for all work in Washington office, which includes much activity other than legislative. (5) United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $10 per week for all work in Washington, of which legislative activity is only a fraction. On occasion of visits into the field, rarely for legislative purposes, actual expenses of travel, food, and hotel are covered. (7) Transportation and other incidental expenses in Washington.

Norgord, Christian P., 135 Washington Avenue, Albany 6, N. Y. (1) Robert F. Sellar, president, the American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y. (2) On behalf of legislation affecting the welfare of children and the inhumane cruel treatment of animals. (3) During the entire year 1946–47. (4) $100 per month retainer fee plus $10 per working day. Total amount not to exceed $300 per month. (5) By the American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y. (6) All expenses incurred in course of daily services but amount not to exceed average of $10 a day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, etc.

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $10,000 per year. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual, necessary expenditures approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

Oliver, John P., 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) $600 per month. (5) Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (6) Reimbursed for personal travel expenses. (7) Personal travel expenses.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America. (2) Members of the organization. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,640 a year, plus personal expenses while away from home. (5) United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America. (6) Personal expense amounting to $10 per day while away from home plus railroad, plane, or bus fare. (7) Personal expense such as hotel, food, cabs, etc.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, 654 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. (1) Volunteer worker. (2) Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. (6) Expenses New York to Washington, D. C. (7) Railroad fare, hotel accommodations, meals.

Packard, Fred Mallery, 1214 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Mr. William P. Wharton, president, National Parks Association, 1214 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Parks Association, a nonprofit, voluntary organization of persons interested in the preservation of national parks areas. (3) Since September 1946. (4) $3,500 per year. (5) National Parks Association. (6) Actual expenses, but no specific amount assigned. (7) Travel and incidental expenses.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $7,000 per year. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures, approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

Patterson, Chat, room 201 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Veterans' Committee, Inc., 1860 Broadway, New York City. (2) Above organization. (3) At will. (4) $6,500 per annum. (5) American Veterans' Committee, Inc., 1860 Broadway, New York City. (6) Variable. (7) Taxis, occasional lunch.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The Realtors' Washington Committee, and, through it, the members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards throughout the United States. (3) One week. (4) $6,000 a year. (5) Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specified amount, to be reimbursed upon claim for legitimate out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

Pendleton, Norman W., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) As national lecturer for the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Month by month. (4) $92 per week. (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Actual traveling expenses when away from home in San Francisco, Calif. (7) Travel, hotel, meals.

Perry,[2] Leslie S., 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (2) National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (3) Continuous since October 8, 1942. (4) Salary, $3,600 per annum. (5) National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (6) No stated amount. Expense reimbursed as incurred (see below). (7) Taxi, newspapers, magazines, and the like.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Earle Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York 3, N. Y. (2) The membership of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,420 per year plus personal expenses while away from home. (5) Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. (6) Actual amounts spent in carrying on duties of the job. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, taxis, telephone.

Pope & Ballard, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Pope, Ballard & Loos, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Inland Steel Co., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Inland Steel Co., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (3) Indefinite—see statement attached. (4) See statement[4] attached. (5) Inland Steel Co. (6) Indefinite—see statement attached. (7) See statement[4] attached.

Pratt, Edith C., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (2) Members of the United Steelworkers of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,240 per year; business expenses in Washington; travel and living expenses away from Washington. (5) United Steelworkers of America. (6) Business expenses in Washington such as cabs; living expenses away from Washington up to $10 per day; transportation. (7) Transportation, hotel, food, etc.

Pratt, Foster J., room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL., 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL. (3) Elected at convention for 2 years as president whose duties are the administrative and executive head of the organization which include lobbying as a minor duty. (4) As president he receives a salary of $600 per month minus withholding and social-security taxes. (5) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL. (6) None for lobbying purposes. (7) None for lobbying purposes.

Pullen, Donald D., 1010 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.
[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

(2) Townsend plan. (3) Permanent. (4) 25 percent of income from State. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (6) None. Comes out of 25-percent income. (7) To pay his own expenses out of 25 percent for meals, mileage, hotels, secretarial work, office expenses, etc.

Purves, Edmund R., 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) The American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Architectural profession. (3) Permanent. (4) Yearly salary of $10,000 for general duties as director of public and professional relations. Presenting point of view of profession with respect to proposed legislation is incidental only to principal activities. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) None, except for petty-cash items. (7) None, except as noted in (6) above.

Read, James M., 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (2) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (3) Since March 1946. (4) $4,000 annually. (5) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. Actual expenditures since August 2, 1946, were $147.98. This is a larger sum than usual, due to the greater visitation of Friends yearly meetings, more of which are held in August than any other month. Field work is an integral part of the activities of our committee. (7) Railroad and other transportation, together with lodging and meals when on field trips or committee business, telephone calls, taxis. Field trips are for keeping members of Society of Friends aware of developments in legislation and national policy, participation in conferences, forums and institutes, and meetings of the executive and general committees.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Credit Union National Association, post office box 431, Madison 1, Wis. (2) Credit Union National Association. (3) Permanent. (4) Annual salary, $4,900, which includes pay for field, organization, and education work. (5) Credit Union National Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Rice, Roland, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. See exhibit A.[4] (2) American Trucking Associations, Inc. See exhibit A.[4] (3) Registrant has been employed continuously by the same employer since 1935. (4) See exhibit A.[4] (5) American Trucking Associations, Inc. (6) No specific amount, but only actual amounts expended. (7) Such necessary expenses as transportation, taxi fares; hotel bills when out of town.

Richter, Irving, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (2) Members of the UAW-CIO and on behalf of all working people. (3) Indefinite. (4) $80 weekly plus personal and travel expenses. (Registrant performs work other than legislative which is included in weekly salary and expenses.) (5) UAW-CIO. (6) For subsistence; $5 per day in Washington; $6.50 per day while traveling; also actual travel costs. (7) Personal and travel expenses, food, tips, cabs, hotel, travel cost, etc. (These expenses include nonlegislative work as well as legislative work.)

Riddell, Charles Edward, 3887 Rodman Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Manufacturers' Representatives' Association, Inc. (nonprofit), 3887 Rodman Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the association and its membership. (3) Two years from January 1, 1947. (4) Nothing. (5) No one pays him; the work is without compensation. (6) A nominal sum, as bills are rendered for office expenses and advertising. (7) Office expense and advertising.

Riley, George D., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor. (3) Elected by council delegates every year to serve as operations director. Duties are administration of operating force which include lobbying as a minor phase. (4) As operations director receives a monthly salary ($500) minus withholding tax and social-security tax. (5) Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor. (6) None for lobbying purposes. (7) None for lobbying purposes.

Rising, E. W., 710 Atlantic Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Western Beet Growers Association, post-office box 742, Great Falls, Mont.; water-conservation conference, continuing committee, 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Western Beet Growers Association; water-conservation conference, continuing committee. (3) Continuous, but subject to termination on notice by either party. (4) Western Beet Growers Association, $30 per day for actual time spent; water-conservation conference, continuing committee, no salary. (5) Secretary-treasurer, Western Beet Growers Association, post-office box 742, Great Falls, Mont., for work done for said association; water-conservation conference, continuing committee, no salary. (6) Actual cash expenditures; no fixed amounts. (7) All expenses, including travel, living, office, stenographic, printing, postage, when actually engaged on work for Western Beet Growers. Same for water-conservation conference, continuing committee, except no allowance for living expenses.

Robb, George Mackay, 942 Church Lane, Yeadon, Pa. (1) The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) In the interest of the Christian Amendment Movement, the principal sponsor of which is the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. (3) Until October 1, 1947. (4) A salary of $2,500 per year. (5) The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. (6) No definite sum. Certain expenses are allowed as listed in No. 7, below, providing they are incurred in the actual work of the Christian Amendment Movement. (7) Railway, bus, streetcar, and taxi fare; 5 cents per mile when driving auto; postage, stationery, hotel room, meals, telephone, and telegrams.

Roemer,[2] Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York 22, N. Y. (2) The members of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, their families and neighbors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $70 per week for all work in Washington office, including legislative work and nonlegislative work with Government agencies. (5) United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $10 per week for expenses in connection with all work, much of which is nonlegislative work described above. On trips into the field, actual expenses of travel, food, and hotel are covered. (7) Transportation and other incidental expenses in Washington.

Rose, Mary E., post-office box 176, Cumberland, Md. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) National insurance for the aged, disabled, and mothers with dependent children. (3) I do not know. (4) I receive a commission. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (6) It is included in my commission. It would just be impossible to tell. During the last quarter I turned in $64.09, the other was my own money I used. (7) If I got any it would be for traveling such as bus or train, meals and hotel and taxi.

Rowe, Roland H., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) In the interest of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association and its members. (3) For 1 year or until the next annual convention of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association. (4) Since August 2, 1946, R. H. Rowe has done nothing for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress, and he has not received any pay or consideration for such purpose. He is paid a salary as vice president and secretary and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such officer to influence legislation by Congress, an allocable part of his salary may be considered to be pay or consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) The United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (6) See answer to (4). In addition R. H. Rowe has not received any payment for expenses and is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense if and when actually incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him, subject to reimbursement by the association, and reported as required by law. (7) See answer to (6). Expenses may actually be incurred for travel, hotels, meals, taxis, tips, and entertainment in attempting to influence legislation.

Rumely, Edward A., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (2) Same as above. (3) Since February 1937. (4) $208 per week plus commissions. (5) Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. (6) $96.50 per week. (7) Cost of luncheons and group meetings for conferences, extensive travel, incidental expenses arising out of work for the organization.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington 11, D. C. (1) Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance & Bartenders International League of America, A. F. of L. (2) Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance & Bartenders International League of America, A. F. of L. (3) Yearly, 1946–47. (4) $7,200 yearly. (5) Hotel and Restaurant Employees Alliance & Bartenders International League of America, A. F. of L., 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (6) $5 per day in Washington, D. C.; $11 outside Washington, D. C. (1) Telegrams.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 1307 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America, CIO, 1505 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Working men and women of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,600 per year plus personal expenses while away from home; this amount covers my duties as Washington representative. These duties include representing my union and its members before Government agencies, supplying information to union members on legislation, Government regulations, and activities. I also represent the views of my union to congressional committees and Members of Congress. (5) Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America. (6) Personal expense amounting to $2 per day while in Washington; personal expense of $6 per day plus railroad, plane, or bus fare while traveling. (7) Personal expense, such as hotel, food, cabs, etc.

Schaffner, Franklin J., Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) Americans United for World Government, Inc., 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. Hired by Ulric Bell, no longer in employ of group. (2) Above. (3) From May 20, 1946, to present. (4) $5,200 per year. (5) See (1). J. A. Migel, treasurer. (6) Amount necessary for expenses as they arise. (7) Travel, hotel, operating expenses.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

Scott, John R., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, national headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) (a) Personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (b) veterans of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the entire population of the United States in matters of national security. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,500 per annum. (5) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, national headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (6) No stated sum. To be reimbursed, upon claim, for luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares, in connection with official duties, out of a small budget appropriated for such purpose. (7) Luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in course of official duties.

Scott, Orland A., secretary, American Pension Committee, Inc., 420 North Capitol Street, Washington 1, D. C. (1) American Pension Committee, Inc., 420 North Capitol Street, Washington 1, D. C. (2) American Pension Committee, Inc., 420 North Capitol Street, Washington 1, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) Effective October 3, 1946, $75 per week. (5) American Pension Committee, Inc., 420 North Capitol Street, Washington 1, D. C. (6) Effective October 3, 1946, not to exceed $50 per week, when in Washington, D. C. Full travel expenses and hotel and meals out of city. (7) Hotel, meals, and travel.

Shandros, Geraldine, 5 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Persons employed in the communications industry and American working men and women, generally. (3) Indefinite. (4) $43 per week, plus expenses. Since no more than half time is spent on legislative work under the terms of the act, only about $25 is properly attributable to salary on account of activities covered by the act. (5) American Communications Association, CIO. (6) Expenses actually incurred. (7) Travel expenses, hotel expenses, and miscellaneous expenses incurred.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Retail Credit Association, 218 Shell Building, St. Louis, Mo. (2) In the interest of the National Retail Credit Association. (3) Until May 31, 1947. (4) $375 monthly, but this includes allowance of $25 per month for stenographer account. Rent and other office expenses are paid by registrant from retainer. (5) National Retail Credit Association. (6) Stenographer (full time) salary absorbed from retainer by registrant, other than allowance of $25 per month specified in question 4. (7) Association allows an expense account in part for telephones, and pays for information releases, travel expense, luncheons, taxis, etc.

Smart, Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington 2, D. C. (1) National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (2) National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (3) Appointed for 1 year. Have been employed since July 1940. (4) $2,400 per year ($200 per month). (5) National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. (6) Amount varies, dependent on whether stationery has to be replaced and how many telephone calls, and so forth. Averages from $25 to $45 per month. (7) Office supplies, postage, telephone, telegrams, mimeographing when necessary, typewriter repairs, subscriptions to one newspaper, bulletins, periodicals, railroad fare and hotel expenses on rare occasions when necessary. Christmas gifts to employees of building.

Smeltzer,[2] C. W., 408 Wesley Temple Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) I do organizing of clubs for my employer. (3) I have been employed as State organizer since July 1944. (4) $40 per week with expense allowance of $30 per week until October 1, 1946. Now on drawing account on commission basis. Amount indefinite. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (6) Was allowed $30 week maximum. Since October 1, 1946, I pay my own expenses out of my commission. (7) Hotel, restaurant, and transportation.

Smith, Marillyn Coan, 1710 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) Americans United for World Government. (3) January 3, 1945, I entered the employ of Americans United for World Government. (4) I received $35 per week from January 1945 until June 1945; at that time I was given a raise to $40 per week; in May 1946 I was raised to $47 per week, which is my present salary. (5) Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Smith, Purcell L., 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies. (3) Three years from August 1945. (4) Salary of $65,000 per annum as president of the association. On the basis of the activities of the association to date, I estimate that not over 25 percent of my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of the act. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) No specific amount. See (7) below. (7) All traveling and incidental expenses.

Snow, William S., room 514, Rupley Building, 815 King Street, Alexandria. (1) American Fisheries Association Cooperative, Rupley Building, Alexandria, Va.; California Fish Canners Association, Ferry Building, Terminal Island, Calif.; California Sardine Products Institute, 255 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.; National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Fisheries Association Cooperative, California Fish Canners Association, California Sardine Products Institute, National Renderers Association. (3) Yearly basis. (4) American Fisheries Association Cooperative, approximately $8,000 a year; California Fish Canners Association, $1,500 a year; California Sardine Products Institute, $1,000 a year; National Renderers Association, $1,200 a year. (5) American Fisheries Association Cooperative, California Fish Canners Association, California Sardine Products Institute, National Renderers Association. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (2) The Realtors' Washington Committee, and, through it, the members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards throughout the United States. (3) Two years with the Realtors' Washington Committee. (4) $10,000 a year. (5) Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specified amount, to be reimbursed for legitimate out-of-pocket expense. (7) Travel, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

Speek, Mrs. Frances Valiant, American Association of University Women, national headquarters, 1634 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Association of University Women, national headquarters, 1634 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) American Association of University Women (national organization). (3) On an annual-salary basis. Have been with the association since 1929, but in varying capacities, often not connected with legislative work. (4) Annual salary, $4,080. (Possibly slightly over half of this is for duties in connection with legislative work.) (5) American Association of University Women, national headquarters. (6) Reimbursement for occasional expenses, such as 25 cents for carfare (perhaps twice a year), notary fees for any papers that have to be signed (such as the present papers). (7) See above under (6).

Stein,[2] Margaret I., 402 Sixth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y., 402 Sixth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,000 annually. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (6) Travel and actual living expenses when away from Washington, D. C. (7) Actual living expenses only, maximum $7 per day.

Stengle, Charles I., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Of Government employees. (3) Permanent for last 12 years. (4) $5,750 per annum. (5) American Federation of Government Employees. (6) Taxi fare only. (7) Taxi fare only.

Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan,[2] 711 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. (1) Alaska Transportation Co., pier 58, Seattle 1, Wash., for which the above reporting law firm is general counsel. Most of their legal work is done by Messrs. John Ambler and Albert E. Stephan. (2) Alaska Transportation Co. (3) Annual. (4) $250 per month retainer for general legal work, plus fees for additional work, including legislative problems, computed primarily on per diem basis of $75 to $100 for work done in their law offices and $125 for work requiring absence from their offices. (5) Firm is paid by Alaska Transportation Co. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Typical expenses are printing of briefs, transportation, hotel and meal expenses, postage, telegrams.

Stewart, Charles T., 1727 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Public relations department, National Association of Real Estate Boards (half time). (2) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (3) Since July 1, 1946. (4) $6,000 per year (half time). (5) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specific amount; reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in connection with duties. (7) Travel, hotel bills, meals, telephone, and similar expenses in connection with duties.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Public relations department, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (half time). (2) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (3) Since May 27, 1946. (4) $3,250 per annum (half time). (5) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specified amount; reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in connection with duties. (7) Travel, hotel bills, meals, telephone, and similar expenses in connection with duties.

Stone,[2] Margaret F., 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Women's Trade Union League of America, Elisabeth Christman, secretary-treasurer, 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (2) National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (3) Staff member of National Women's Trade Union League on an annual basis (half time). As legislative chairman I am charged with carrying out the legislative program of the National Women's Trade Union League of America, which concerns itself with labor legislation for social betterment, and legislation aimed at strengthening international cooperation and the maintenance of world peace. The National Women's Trade Union League is a member of the women's joint congressional committee through which it cooperates with other women's organizations in legislative activities. Articles prepared by me on current legislative issues appear from time to time in Life and Labor Bulletin, official monthly publication of the league. When Congress

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

is not in session I am occupied with other aspects of the League's program. (4) $1,500 per year for half time. (5) National Women's Trade Union League of America. (6) No expense account. Occasional taxi fares. (7) None, except occasional taxi fares.

Storch, Theodore Roosevelt, public relations consultant, 44 Court Street, Brooklyn 2, N. Y. (1) Theodore Roosevelt Storch Associates, 44 Court Street, Brooklyn 2, N. Y., Federal Surplus Products Co., 44 Court Street, Brooklyn 2, N. Y. (2) Appears as public relations counsel, veterans' rights, war surplus goods. (3) Permanent (4) No fees set at present. (5) By above companies. (6) No definite amount at present. (7) Transportation, hotels, business conferences, and professional services as consultant.

Sturrock, J. E., general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, 607-609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Texas Water Conservation Association, 607-609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (2) Texas Water Conservation Association. (3) General manager's position, in accordance with bylaws of the Texas Water Conservation Association, is an elective position. The general manager is elected each year by members of the association, and his term of office is for the period of 1 year. (4) $6,000 per annum and all necessary travel expenses. (5) Texas Water Conservation Association. (6) All necessary travel expenses average $2,500 per annum. (7) Travel expenses include traveling and hotel accommodations, entertainment, telephone service, meals, tips, taxi fares.

Sullivan, Francis M., assistant director, National Legislative Committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would elimnate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,200 per year. (5) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (6) Average of $20 per month. (7) Carfare and luncheons.

Sutlive, Carey R., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Association of Manufacturers. (2) National Association of Manufacturers. (3) Continuously since April 1943. (4) At the rate of $8,000 annually. (5) National Association of Manufacturers. (6) Office and secretarial, telephone and telegraph services, etc., are supplied by employer. Employer reimburses registrant for actual expenses incurred, pursuant to monthly itemized expense account. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, entertainment, incidentals, etc., incurred in the course of employment.

Taylor, Col. John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Since September 7, 1919. (4) $10,000 salary per annum. (5) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (6) Reimbursed for actual traveling expense and incidental expenses of about $30 monthly. (7) Travel and such items as taxi fare, meals, phone calls.

Thompson,[2] Alexander N., 1 Thomas Circle, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Raphael S. Soussi, post office box 168, 13 Rue de la Poste, Alexandria, Egypt. (2) Raphael S. Soussi, post office box 168, 13 Rue de la Poste, Alexandria, Egypt. (3) Since November 1945. (4) Commission basis. (5) Raphael S. Soussi. (6) Approximately $500 yearly. (7) Travel and incidental.

Tinney, William H., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (3) Full-time employment, consisting of various phases of the business of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which concerns legislation. (4) $5,842.88 per annum, which is paid for all of the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. (5) The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (6) Amount actually and necessarily expended in behalf of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., in connection with entire employment, only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred on business of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., including that part which concerns legislation.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $5,000. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

Townsend, Dr. F. E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) The Townsend Plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $7,800 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and/or company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Townsend, George W., Franklin, Nebr. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (3) Indefinite. (4) $25 per week (salary). (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) Mileage at the rate of 5 cents per mile and hotel bills. (7) Mileage, travel expenses, and food and lodging.

Townsend, R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) The Townsend Plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $5,200 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and/or company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Tucker,[2] John F. P., 819 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Union for Democratic Action. (2) Membership and affiliates of Union for Democratic Action. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,279.60 per annum. Lobbying is but a small portion of our activity. Consequently only a small pro rata portion of this salary would be covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Union for Democratic Action. (6) $10 per week plus travel (see note under (4)). (7) Lunches, carfares, purchase of publications.

Rothkirch,[3] Dr. Eduard von, 411 Times Annex, Minneapolis 1, Minn. (1) Central European Research Foundation, 411 Times Annex., Minneapolis 1, Minn. (2) Legislation or treaties affecting central Europe. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1 per year. (5) Central European Research Foundation. (6) Actual expenses not to exceed $500 per session of Congress. (7) Taxis, lunches, information material.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo 4, Ohio. (1) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (2) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (3) Pleasure of employer. (4) Amount variable; to be determined by services rendered. (5) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (6) Actual. (7) Travel, hotel, telephone, telegraph, and certain office expenses and supplies, and proper and necessary entertainment expenses.

Waterfield, Maynard H., 2844 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Citizens National Committee, Inc., 2844 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (2) Citizens National Committee, Inc. (3) Since September 1945. (4) $6,000 annually and minor expenses. (5) Citizens National Committee, Inc. (6) Depends on actual expenses incurred. (7) Taxis, occasional lunches, etc.

Waybur,[2] Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York 22, N. Y. (2) The members of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, their families and neighbors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $80 per week for all work in Washington office, including legislative work and nonlegislative work with Government agencies. (5) United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $10 per week for expenses in connection with all work, much of which is nonlegislative work described above. On trips into the field, actual expenses of travel, food, and hotel are covered. (7) Transportation and other incidental expenses in Washington.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) District No. 44, International Association of Machinists. (2) Government employees who are members of District No. 44, I. A. of M., and organized labor represented by the I. A. of M. (3) Present term expires December 31, 1947. (4) $4,000 per year as secretary-treasurer, and assistant to the district president, part of whose duties is to support or oppose legislation of interest to

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

membership. (5) District No. 44, I. A. of M. (6) No actual limit set on legitimate expenditures, but legislative expenses usually about $10 or $15 per month for transportation. (7) Transportation between office and Capitol; extra meals incident to work and observing amenities with associates.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Rivers and Harbors Congress. (3) Employment began in 1932; indefinite. (4) Salary, $4,940 per annum. (5) National Rivers and Harbors Congress. (6) No specified amount. (7) Necessary office, traveling, and personal expenses.

Werkau, Carlton W., 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Federation of Telephone Workers. (2) National Federation of Telephone Workers. (3) June 1947. (4) $9,000 per annum. (5) National Federation of Telephone Workers. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Taxis, occasional lunch, telephone, telegraph.

Wetterman, Charles W., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) $75 per week. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) On trips made outside of Cleveland I am allowed expenses for hotel, meals, and 5 cents per mile for travel expenses. (7) Same as above.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Building Products Institute, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Building Products Institute. (3) Month to month, beginning October 16, 1946. (4) $500 monthly. (5) Building Products Institute. (6) All cash advanced for Building Products Institute. (7) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses.

Wilmeth, James L., national secretary, national council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025–29 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, a corporation organized not for profit, under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. (2) In the interest of the national council, State councils, and subordinate councils or lodges of the Junior Order United American Mechanics. (3) I have been employed as national secretary since June 19, 1923, to the present time with stated compensation which does not include any salary or compensation for representing our fraternity before congressional committees. (4) I receive no salary whatever for any legislative work done in Washington along the lines of the restriction of immigration, deportation, and naturalization of aliens. My work in Washington is incidental to my regular employment as national secretary. (5) No salary is to be paid me whatever for legislative work or representing our fraternity at hearings before congressional committees. (6) No fixed amount is paid for expenses; whatever is incurred as railroad fare and hotel expenses in going to and returning from Washington is allowed. (7) Only travel expenses, no per diem or salary whatever.

Williamson, C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) California State Chamber of Commerce. The undersigned registers under Public Law 601, although he is not exclusively or even primarily employed to support or oppose legislation. His duties include reporting to the California State Chamber of Commerce activities and happenings in all of the Government departments which may be of interest to members of the California State Chamber of Commerce, and to industry and agriculture in California. He registers because at times he does communicate to Members of Congress the views of the chamber on pending legislation. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 annually. (5) California State Chamber of Commerce. (6) Allowance of $150 a month. (7) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses incident to carrying on the duties set forth in paragraph 2.

Williamson, John C., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) (a) Personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (b) veterans of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the entire population of the United States in matters of national security. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,500 per annum. (5) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (6) No stated sum. To be reimbursed, upon claim, for luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in connection with official duties, out of a small budget appropriated for such purpose. (7) Luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in course of official duties.

Wilson, E. Raymond, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (2) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (3) Since October 1943. (4) $5,000 annually. (5) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. Actual expenditures since August 2, 1946, were $73.10. (7) Railroad and other transportation together with lodging and meals when on field trips or committee business, telephone calls, taxis. Field trips are for keeping members of Society of Friends aware of developments in legislation and national policy, participation in conferences, forums and institutes, and meetings of the executive and general committees.

Wilson,[2] Glen S., 1008 Willow Street, Austin, Tex. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend Plan. (3) Annual. (4) 50 percent commission from State income. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) None. Must pay his own. (7) Must pay his own.

Wojtasik, Joseph, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) 25-percent commission of all the income derived from the Townsend organization in the State of Ohio, starting October 1, 1946. (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Expenses included in 25-percent commission. (7) Traveling, meals, hotel, stationery, postage, telephone, telegram, literature, deputies, speakers, and other promotional expenses too numerous to mention.

Woodson, George, Roosevelt Hotel, Lansing 15, Mich. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. Zone 5. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (3) Until further notice. (4) 25-percent commission on all gross receipts after September 30. I received a salary before September 30. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) None. (7) None.

Worley, Harry F., 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington 15, D. C. (1) National Customs Service Association, Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service and of the Federal Civil Service. (3) Elected for 2 years. (4) $2,500 per annum; part-time job. (5) National Customs Service Association. (6) No expense account. (See No. 7.) (7) Reimbursed for travel, office supplies, and postage.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.; 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 804 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (2) Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 804 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (3) Until December 31, 1948. (4) $1,000 per month, beginning January 1, 1947. (5) Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 804 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (6) No specific amount. (7) Actual expenses for traveling and for telephone and telegraph.

Young, Donald A.,[2] Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 51) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Addis, Rhoena I., 418 Federal Securities Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) Salary, 13 weeks, $455, less $54.60 withholding tax, $4.55 social-security tax; net, $395.85. Expenses, $239.05. (2) To undersigned. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend national recovery plan. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

Akeson, Virgil, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $795; expenses, $15. (2) Taxicab operators and Capital Transit Co. (3) Transportation. (4) The Union, organ of International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to labor and the general American public as well as national peace and security and general prosperity. Oppose any legislation detrimental to foregoing aims.

Albers, Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla. (1) $50 salary per week and approximately $50 per week expense allowance, covering field work in the Middle West and in the State of Florida. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Supporting the Townsend national recovery plan, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress as H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Alifas, Nels Peter, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Receipts $5,883.07, expenditures $9,111.08, in operation of District No. 44, I. A. of M., for all purposes. No separate fund set aside for lobbying. Believe less than 25 percent of expenditures used to support or oppose legislation. (2) Taxi drivers, $26.30; operators of eating and refreshment places, $30; National Publishing Co.; Post Office Department; Western Union; stationery supply companies; rent; salary of officers and employees; traveling expenses; etc. (3) Lobbying, organizing, keeping membership posted, paying for clerical work, preparing briefs on legislation and grievance, time spent in appearing before wage and grievance boards of departments. (4) The Federal Machinist (a monthly periodical published for information of membership covering activities of the organization) of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

The American Nurses' Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None during last quarter. (2) See answer, question 1. (3) See item No. 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing the membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) None at present or during past quarter.

Avent, I. M., Wacker Hotel, 111 West Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Employed August 18, 1946. Salary at $40 per week; 3 cents per mile for travel expense. Total for quarter not to exceed $250. (2) (No particular individual.) Expense for goods and services, hotel, food, laundry and cleaning, gasoline, oil and tires, etc. (3) Self-maintenance. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) Enactment of Townsend plan bills, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Barber, Hartman, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (temporarily located at room 701, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio). (1) Attached[4] will be found report of all expenses incurred by the undersigned in the performance of my duties as the general representative of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees for the calendar quarter July to September, inclusive. There was no expense incurred subsequent to September 7, because after that date I was stationed at Grand Lodge headquarters, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) See statement.[4] (3) See statement.[4] (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Bassett, Earl C., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total salary received $1,827.25. No part of salary expended for the purpose of this act. Total amount of expenses incurred and expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Berenson, Anna, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $980; expenses, $816. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News and Union News Service. (5) All housing and related legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting housing bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing housing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Bivins, Emma Carr, 1719 Riggs Place NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Salary from National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., $1,150. Expenses from National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, $150, total, $1,300. (2) Salary and expenses paid to Emma Carr Bivins, 1719 Riggs Place NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Services as director of legislation and Washington representative (expenses of director of legislation include transportation, postage, telephone, and telegraph, stenographic assistance, office supplies, periodicals). (4) Independent Woman, monthly magazine of National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., Federation Highlights, monthly bulletin of the organization. (5) Legislation "looking toward the establishment through scientific or other proper methods of conditions which assure to women, and to men as well, the fullest possible opportunity and reward for the development of whatever capacities they may possess." From Handbook of Federation Procedures.

Bouslog, Harriet, 930 F Street NW., room 800, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, $85. Expenses, $15. (2) Taxi drivers, phone companies. (3) Taxis and phone calls. (4) The Dispatcher, semimonthly publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO News. (5) Support legislation in the interest of longshoremen, warehousemen, and sugar workers particularly, and generally legislation in interest of sound international relations, domestic policy, social security, and health and oppose antilabor legislation.

Brown, Earle Palmer, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None—employment started after quarter ended. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $7.80. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Transportation. (4) VFW National News, foreign service (VFW monthly periodical.) (5) Legislation affecting (a) veterans and their dependents; (b) personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the national security.

Chinberg,[5] Frances E., Little Falls, Minn. (1) Salary and expenses. (2) Myself. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) None. (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $975; expenses, $324.79. (This expense money included expenses while away from Washington and while engaged in other general labor organizational work, of which a small portion was legislative.) (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) To defray personal expenses on transportation and hotel accommodations. (4) The Union, organ of International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to labor and the general American public as well as national peace and security and general prosperity. Oppose any legislation detrimental to foregoing aims.

Cone, D. C., room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) January 1946 annual compensation, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, covering all service rendered including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $2,681.70 as wages, $200.01 as office rental, $488.64 as office assistant wages. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental, $488.64 to Helen Corbett for stenographer and office assistance. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and/or legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railroad employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $1,205, received expense $1,228.95. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cuneo, John C., P. O. box 1054, Modesto, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

D'Avila, Sarah H., 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Salary $120 (since August 2, 1946). (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Dawdy, Della J., route 4, Rogers, Ark. (1) Received 50 percent commission on new business. Total $62.31. (2) Della J. Dawdy. (3) To promote national insurance, the aged, the blind, the disabled, and youth. (4) The Townsend National Weekly, announcing district and club meetings. (5) To support H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of Navy Yards, Arsenals, and Naval Stations, 930 F Street NW., room 411-413, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Expense account: August 1946, $64.52; September 1946, $57.60. Salary for August and September 1946, $678.80 or $339.40 per month. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) Quarterly Retirement News Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $600 salary and $150 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and others (as to the $150 of expense allowance). (3) Telephone service, postage stamps, incidental office expenses. (4) None. (5) The registrant does not support or oppose any proposed legislation but is employed as a correspondent to furnish information bearing on legislative proposals concerning the Constitution of the United States.

Doyle, E. L., room 311, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary paid me as brotherhood representative. No money expended in connection with legislative activities. Personal travel expense and office expense paid by brotherhood. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Railway Journal. (5) That directly and indirectly affecting labor.

Eaton, Edna L., 607 Boylston Street, room 36, Boston, Mass. (1) None. (2) No payments made. (3) No payments made. (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan bills.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 salary; $413.76 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $70 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Elliott, John Doyle, 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (1) Salary from June 30, 1946, to October 19, 1946, inclusive, $1,050; expenses reimbursed to me, same period; traveling expenses, $467; rent for office at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y., September and October, 1946, $200. (2) Rent for office at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y., to H. H. Solomon, 2336 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y., $200. (3) For rent of office at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (4) None. (5) Legislation embodying the principles of the Townsend national recovery plan bills, H. R. 2229 and 2230, of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Ellis,[6] Clyde T., executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1711 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Salary (3 months), $3,000; expense accounts (3 months), $1,058.80; total, $4,058.80. (2) Self for salary and expenses including reimbursements for meals, hotels, taxis, transportation, and tips, $3,779.45; to Ameri-

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

can Airlines for transportation, $279.35; total, $4,058.80. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of directors' meeting, etc. (4) Rural Electrification magazine, Illinois REA News. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts; and legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts.

Farnham, Diana, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $607.75; received expenses, $651.44. (2) George's Radio Co. (office rent), Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., stationers, railroads, cab drivers, and Capital Transit Co. (3) Office and travel expenses. (4) CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Ferris, Muriel, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received $168.75, salary every 2 weeks; received and expended, carfare to and from the Capitol and travel; average of about $10 per month. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government Action, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1946.

Ford, Mrs. J. A. (Mary Ann Ford), 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No report available at this time due to the fact that I do not (have not) keep any record of my personal account and records from national headquarters not available at this time due to the fact they are moving from Chicago to Cleveland, Ohio, and cannot be obtained until settled. (2) No record available at time of filing. (3) No record available at time of filing. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. (H. R. 2229, H. R. 2230, numbers of bills in Seventy-ninth Congress.)

Foreman, Clark, 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) $1,333.32 (salary). (2) Public carriers, hotels, and restaurants ($210.18 to be reimbursed from expense allowance). (3) Actual travel and food (to be reimbursed). (4) New Republic, Southern Patriot, and Life magazine. (5) All legislation to increase the suffrage and improve economic, health, and educational conditions in the South.

The National Tax Relief Coalition, box 184, route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Contributions received July, August, September, calender quarter, $1,345. (2) Answer attached.[4] (3) Answer attached.[4] (4) None. (5) General tax relief and reform.

Fries,[5] Amos A., major general, United States Army, retired, 702 Albee Building, Fifteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenditures (checks drawn), $498.67, $616.67, $535.67, $250.71, $3.76, $333, $335, $335, $85, $85, $85, $11.75, $1.20, $7.30, $5.75, $11.41, $12.12. Receipts: subscription to Bulletin (50 cents a year), $16.50; donation from Supreme Council Scottish Rite Masons, Southern Jurisdiction, $5,000. (2) (a) Employees ($1,651.01); (b) taxes ($254.47); (c) stamps and postage ($1,003); (d) Wotan Theatre Corp. ($255); (e) miscellaneous items ($26); (f) C. and P. ($23.53). (3) (a) Management, editorial, and secretarial work; (b) social security, unemployment compensation tax, and income taxes; (c) mailing monthly Bulletin and other postage; (d) rent; (e) office supplies and subscription to magazines; (f) telephone and telegrams. (4) None except regular monthly issue of the Bulletin, Friends of the Public Schools of America. (5) To support (incidentally only) any legislation deemed beneficial to the public schools throughout the United States and to oppose such as believed opposed to the best interest of the public schools in accordance with circulars printed in May 1938, and which remain unchanged to date. 2 copies of circular attached.

Gehman, Richard B., Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) See Form A for this organization. (2) See Form A for this organization. (3) See Form A for this organization. (4) None. Interview published in Chicago Tribune on August 6 and 8, 1946. (5) None specific at the moment.

General Federation of Women's Clubs,[5] 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See quarterly report attached to Form A and made a part of this questionnaire.[4] (2) See quarterly report attached to Form A.[4] (3) See quarterly report attached to Form A.[4] (4) The General Federation Clubwoman. (5) The General Federation is not "employed" to support or oppose any legislation. As an organization the General Federation endorses or supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body. See pamphlet, Resolutions, attached.[4]

George, Leo E., room 610, Bond Building, Fourteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) —. (4) Federation News Service and Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service, and to improve hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Glodowski, Agnes, general delivery, Mitchell, S. Dak. (1) Total salary, $450; total expense account, $360.63. (2) This was all received from Townsend national headquarters. Nothing was expended by me to get others to work. (3) Money paid me was for organizational work in connection with Townsend movement. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) Townsend bills, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Gruver, E. B., 14 South Spruce Street, Lewistown, Pa. (1) In carrying on my work. Regular salary of $50 per week, less withholding tax. An expense allowance up to $30 per week for mileage, meals, and hotel bills while away from home. (2) No money was paid to anyone except the actual expense of traveling throughout the State of Illinois where I was located up to October 1, 1946. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) To support bills in the Seventy-ninth Congress known as H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Haddock, Hoyt S., room 800, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $50 salary. (Since lobbying occupies a minor part of time this is an estimate.) $5 expenses (estimated). (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, telephone company, taxis, etc. (3) General expenses and salary. (4) Pilot, ACA News, the Marine Engineer, the Fisherman, the Dispatcher, the Voice, if others, do not remember. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the welfare of merchant seamen, longshoremen, and fishermen. Oppose legislation opposed to their interests.

Hallbeck, E. C., room 610, Bond Building, Fourteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) Federation News Service and Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service and to improve hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the Postal Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $975. Expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Hanson,[6] Lawrence V., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, August and September at $625 per month. $1,250; expenses as per attached statement A, $495.40; total, $1,745.40. (2) See attached statement A.[4] (3) See attached statement A.[4] (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. (5) All legislation affecting the home building industry.

Haren, Herbert F., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Approximately $1,250. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank]. (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $179.16 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $84.78 reimbursement for travel expense during July 1946; $21.55 incidental expenses for months of July and August 1946. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $84.78 reimbursement for travel expense to Indianapolis, Ind., and return to Washington, D. C.; $21.55 incidental expenses for months of July and August 1946, taxi, car fare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense, Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural developments; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.
[5] Filed with the Secretary only.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, Ninth Street and Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Taxi cab and phone averaging $25 per month. (2) As above. (3) As above. (4) American Federationist. (5) Legislation affecting organized labor.

Hitchner, Lea S., 285 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Two trips to Washington, carfare $66, hotel $55, incidental expenses, meals, transportation, etc., $45. (2) Railroad, hotel, taxi, meals, and incidental expenses. (3) Expenses incurred in discussing with House Agricultural Committee and Department of Agriculture proposed insecticide legislation. (4) AIF News, March 1946, article on Federal act; April 1946, article on Federal act by Dr. Smith and an editorial on the same subject; May 1946, editorial on Federal act, mention of Federal act in Rye meeting report; July-August 1946, story on food and drug mentions Federal act; September 1946, editorial on Federal act, story on seed trade conference mentions Federal act; May 1946, agricultural chemicals. (5) Agriculutural Insecticide and Fungicide Act.

Hollister, R. F., 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received for period of July, August, and September 1946, $2,441.47. Expended, $641.47. (2) Traveling expenses. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salaries, received $1,250; travel, paid $194.97; janitor, paid $16.50; telephone and telegraph, paid $35.72; equipment, paid $100. (2) Betty Diggs, 1709 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., $16.50; Washington Refrigeration Co., Washington, D. C., $100; transportation companies and hotels, $194.97; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and postage, $35.72. (3) Operation of office. Not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) None. (5) None.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Since August 2, 1946, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,250 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $342—a total of $1,592. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Hudson, Minor, 1624 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary of $2,500 received during 3-month period ending September 30, 1945: used only for personal living expenses. (2) Minor Hudson. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve officers of the naval services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve officers of the naval services may decide to support or oppose.

Hurd, Roy Clifford, 23 Belmont Avenue, Richardson Park, Wilmington, Del. (1) $100 to $200. I am employed on a part-time basis; receive 25 percent of the moneys received in Delaware and use same for expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) In support of the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, national legislative committee, AFL, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $1,820. Expenses for July 1946, $34; August, $14; September, $27; total for 3 months, $75. (2) Taxi drivers, telephone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals at Senate or House restaurant. (3) As shown in (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

James, Elmer J., route box 595, Portland 6, Oreg. (1) $300 salary, $105 expense money; total $405. (2) Elmer J. James. (3) Deputy organizer for the Townsend National Recovery Plan for Oregon. (4) None. (5) In support of the Townsend National Recovery Plan.

Johnson,[5] Carroll E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) None except my weekly salary and quoted expense. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) January 1946, annual compensation of $6,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Kamm, Albert G., 86 Cedar Street, Hartford, Conn. Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Senior citizens, totally incapacitated, the blind, and the mothers with dependent children. The Townsend National Recovery Plan. (2) Full time, up to September 30, 1946. (3) $35 per week, and expense allowance of $30 per week. (4) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., $30 weekly. (5) Travel, hotel, meals, postage.

Keehn, Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. $1,033.32 salary, $358.03 expense. (2) Money paid to self for salary and expense. (3) To cover living expenses and special expenses allowable within expense account. (4) Washington Report, Social Action. (5) See attached material.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars. 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $46.85 expended for transportation and lunches in connection with legislative activities. Money obtained from employer upon claim for reimbursement. (2) Taxicab operators and various restaurants and lunchrooms. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal lunch requirements. (4) VFW National News, Foreign Service (VFW monthly periodical). (5) Legislation affecting (a) veterans and their dependents; (b) personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the national security.

King,[5] Joseph T., 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $1,000 salary and $30.20 expenses. (2) Expenses paid to cab drivers and restaurants. (3) Taxi fares for travel on official business. Business luncheons and meals when working nights or Sundays. (4) National Affairs Report. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage and hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King, Willford I., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I have received $150 per week salary during the quarter. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) Wake Up America, August 19, 1946; the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of July 25, 1946. To what extent various papers may have quoted me, I do not know. (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Lamb, Robert K., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $2,000 salary, $865.08 expenses. (2) To hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel away from Washington. (4) Steel Labor, CIO News. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO. Oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., 1624 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary of $841.40 received during 3-month period ending September 30, 1945, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve officers of the naval services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve officers of the naval services may decide to support or oppose.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW. (1) Salary, $3,750. Travel refund, none. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxicabs, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Travel, subsistence. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the action of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Leach, R. W., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (1) None (all expenses paid by employer). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Advisor. (5) Social security and related legislation.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Received $6,704.12; expended $6,509.12. (2) See appended statement I.[4] (3) See appended statement I.[4] (4) See appended statement II.[4] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

Leonard, Richard T., 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,615.44; expenses, $1,178.88. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) For living expenses incident to his work and travel expenses. (4) UAW-CIO publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Levine, Seth, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $140 (one-tenth of quarterly salary of $1,260; 90 percent of time being spent on research work, plus $14 expenses). (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, American Communications Association News, National Maritime Union Pilot, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Dispatcher, IFAWA Fisherman, the American Marine Engineer, Marine Cooks and Stewards Voice, and CIO Maritime Committee Washington Newsletter. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers, and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Linquist, Earl G., Topeka, Kans. (1) From October 1, 1946, $85. (2) Earl G. Linquist. (3) Field employee. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) Townsend plan.

Louchheim, Joseph H., Committee for the Nation's Health, New York 19, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5)

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

National health insurance (Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill).

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary at rate of $9,000 per year. No money expended in connection with legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and to railway labor in particular.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary as vice president-national legislative representative of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, $1,750; personal expenses, $553.94; miscellaneous expenses, $437.98. (2) (a) To Mr. Jonas A. McBride; (b) printing and supplies—to miscellaneous printing concerns, rent to Labor. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Macleay, Lachlan, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) Expense accounts during quarter ending September 30, 1946. (2) Various railroads, air lines, bus lines, hotels, etc., as indicated on attached statement. (Some travel by personal automobile.) (3) Travel, hotel, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) As indicated on attached statement.[4]

McDonald,[5] Earl L., Cheney, Wash. (1) To October 1, salary and expense for travel and hotel, meals when traveling were allowed. Salary after deductions $374.90; expense $163.40; total received $537.30. (2) Earl L. McDonald. (3) Salary and expense. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, the Townsend plan.

MacDonald, Verne, 1109 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None expended. No expense account except telephone in office. (2) Daniel M. Nawdict and Verne MacDonald, attorneys. Partners, $750 received as salary last quarter. (3) To aid in editing Mandate and to advise federation on Washington matters. To advise Congress on small business. (4) The Mandate, a publication of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc. (5) Any legislation which small business feels is to the advantage of small business and the Nation as a whole.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 I Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Approximately $150. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To expend as I see fit which fitness I consider the taxpayers' (Nation's) welfare. (4) "Cause to be published" for fee, none. Submitted for legislative support, innumerable. (5) It's my aim to run the gamut of congressional legislation.

McGrath, Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for services, $52.13 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for petty cash expenses. (2) United States Post Office, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union, restaurants. (3) Postage, telephone, telegraph, and meals. (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project.

Mackenzie, James, 6108 NE. Eighth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. (1) $75 a week. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center Station, Boston 24, Mass. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation involving salaries, retirement, and working conditions affecting members of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, who are employed as supervisors in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mack, James Edward, 1731 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since August 2, 1946, and up to October 1, 1946, I have received: (1) The proportionate part of my salary as reported, plus (2) $68.39, being the amount of expenses incurred by me. My expenditures have been only the said amount. (2) (a) The Public Printer, $41.76. (b) Pennsylvania Railroad and others, $26.63. (3) (a) Copies of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (b) Travel. (4) The Property Owner—regular publication of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

Manly, Milo A., 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received $3,675.65; expended $3.508.77. (2) Miscellaneous expenses. (3) Salary, rent, etc. (4) None. (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Mark, James, Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Since August 2, 1946, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,166.64 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $342; a total of $1,508.64. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Marsh, Benjamin C., executive secretary, People's Lobby, Inc., room 31, 810 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total receipts, with largest contribution $50, $2,069.31. Salaries and wages, $938.85; printing, $633.55; postage, $385.10; travel, $19.75; incidentals, $83.08; rent, $165; withholding and social-security taxes, $143.66; supplies, $26.13, equals $2,408.62. (2) Salaries and wages, Benjamin C. Marsh, Arline Ryan, Eleanor Hagerman, Walter Clyde; printing, Graphic Arts Press; postage, United States Post Office; rent, J. B. Stein; taxes, collector internal revenue, Baltimore, Md.; supplies, A. B. Dick, and Addressograph Multigraph Corp.; travel, B. C. Marsh. (3) Salaries and wages for editorial, publicity, and clerical work; others for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) Have sent and distributed material to hundreds of papers, magazines, etc., but have not caused any to be published; it was intelligence on their part. (5) Support attached program, and oppose that against it.

Marshall, Katherine Lee, 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Support: Tydings's resolution (S. 219), antipoll tax, antilynchings, permanent FEPC legislation. Oppose: Extension of peacetime conscription, universal military training, policy on other issues still being formulated.

Miller, Martin H., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total salary received, $3,060. No part of salary expended for purposes of this act. Total amount of expenses incurred and expended, $410.62. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $72.29; Western Union, $216.02; United States Post Office, $48.32; Woodhouse Stationery Co., $29.75; Library of Congress, $13; Underwood Typewriter Co., $3.22; Collector of Taxes, D. C., $6.12; taxicabs, $21.90. (3) Telephone calls (local and long distance); telegrams; postage and envelopes; office supplies; photographs; typewriter repairs; taxes on office furniture; transportation. (4) None. (5) H. R. 32 opposed; H. R. 2536 opposed; H. R. 1362 supported; H. R. 7 supported; H. R. 142 supported; H. R. 4908 opposed; H. R. 5180 supported; H. R. 4761 supported; H. R. 6578 opposed; H. R. 6042 opposed, amendments; S. 1349 supported; S. 1537 supported.

Miskimins,[5] S. A., 103 Pendleton Street, Independence, Mo. (1) Total money received covering August, September, October, $751.34. Total expended for meals, hotel, lodgings, mileage, general travel expenses, $279.33. (2) Mr. S. A. Miskimins, by Townsend National Recovery Plan, organization. (3) For service as State representative of the Townsend National Recovery Plan in the State of Missouri. (4) None. (5) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.

Mollin, F. E., 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo. (1) None for lobbying purposes during the preceding quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Our official publication, the American Cattle Producer. Releases issued from this office are frequently published in whole or in part by other agricultural journals but not at our request. (5) No activity during preceding quarter. Last previous activity on OPA extension bill.

Mooney, William W., 414–415 Eagle Building, Spokane 8, Wash. (1) Salary, $650, less social security and other pay-roll taxes. Expense allowance, $531 for travel, hotel, and other incidentals while out of resident city, on organization business. (2) William W. Mooney. (3) Salary for personal and family use. The $531 for travel expenses for myself only while out of resident city. (4) Articles are mailed in at times to be printed in the Townsend National Weekly, located at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, bills known as H. R. 2229, and H. R. 2230, and Senate bill S. 690, in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Murray, Donald, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, $999.99; travel and hotel expenses, $500.94. Only $11.11 (1 day's salary) out of the above amounts was for legislative work, the preparation of a legislative report. Remainder of money covered time when I was on an organizing assignment for the union, totally unconnected with legislative duties. (2) Public carriers, hotels, telegraph and telephone companies, taxi drivers, and United States post offices. (3) Transportation, hotel accommodations, phone calls, telegrams, and stamps. (4) The Public Record (official publication of the United Public Workers of America, CIO). (5) No legislative work done during past quarter except preparation of a legislative report for publication as above. Will support legislation beneficial to public employees; oppose any harmful to them.

Nagel,[6] Jacob, legislative representative, 238 First Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Total moneys received and expended for legislation for the quarter from July 1 to September 30, 1946, was $37.01. (2) Cab fares, entertainment, dinners, etc.; business establishments. (3) Entertainment, cab fares, dinners, etc. (4) The Postal Mechanic magazine (for postal employees only). (5) We do not oppose any legislation, only such as would be detrimental to Government post-office employees. I support only postal legislation which is presented by the organization, insofar as salaries and retirement are concerned.

Narodick, Daniel M., 1109 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None expended; no expense account except telephone now in office. $750 received as salary during last quarter. (2) Daniel M. Narodick and Verne MacDonald, attorneys and partners. (3) To aid in editing Mandate and to advise federation on matters in Washington; to advise Congress on small-business opinions. (4) The Mandate, a publication of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc. (5) Any legislation which small business feels is to the advantage of small business and the Nation as a whole.

National Association of Electric Cos. (officers and principal employees are listed in

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

exhibit A[4] hereto), 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) (Ended September 30, 1946): See exhibit B[4] hereto for report of money so expended and received. (2) See exhibit B[4] hereto. (3) See exhibit B[4] hereto. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but see preamble to articles of association attached hereto as exhibit D.[4] For reservation by the association in filing Forms A, B, and C, see exhibit C[4] hereto.

Neel, Samuel E., 705 Chandler Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) From July 1 to October 1, 1946, received $850 per month; total $2,550. Expended, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Washington Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; letter to members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage-banking industry.

Nielsen, Marcia K., 1710 1 Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) As indicated on Registration Form B (filed with Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House), I have received no additional money from Americans United for World Government other than my weekly salary ($40). (2) I have paid out money to no one. (3) See 2. (4) None. (5) During the preceding quarter (July–September), Americans United for World Government supported the passage of S. 1717 and Senate Resolution 196. Americans United for World Government opposed no legislation during this period.

Nixon,[5] Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work in Washington. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives

Oliver, John P., 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) August 1946, $443.04; September 1946, $600. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, and so forth. (3) Living expenses for self and family. Taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development and execution of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $840; received expenses, $860. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and traveling. (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Opposed legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Patterson, Chat, American Veterans Committee, room 201, Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at rate of $6,500 per annum. Approximately $50 expenses. (2) Chat Patterson. (3) To implement veterans, national and international platforms of AVC. (See attached reprints.) (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting veterans, national and international platforms of AVC.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None (employment commenced after close of quarter). (2) No one. (3) No. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Pendleton, Norman W., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) For quarter ending September 30, 1946, $146.49. (2) Norman W. Pendleton. (3) Travel, hotel, meals. (4) None. (5) The Townsend old-age Federal insurance (pensions) bills.

Perry,[6] Leslie S., 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) See attached account of all moneys received and expended by undersigned in connection with operation of Washington office. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social-welfare legislation.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Earle Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,145; expenses, $341.42. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) The Advance (official publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers) and the CIO News. (5) To support all legislation favorable to the welfare of the people and oppose legislation that is detrimental.

Pratt, Edith C., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $810 salary, $568.05 expenses. (2) To hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) For personal expenses and travel away from Washington. (4) CIO News. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steel Workers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO. Oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Pratt, Foster J., room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) As president he receives a monthly salary ($600) minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL; Weekly Federal News Letter and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news, including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pullen, Donald D., 1010 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) Received $50 per week salary and approximately $30 per week expenses. (2) None. (3) [Blank]. (4) Townsend National Weekly and Denver Post. (5) Townsend plan.

Purves, Edmund R., 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None within scope of Public Law 601. (2) None within scope of Public Law 601. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Read, James M., 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Salary, including taxes withheld: $666.68 (August 2, October 9, 1946). Travel expenses: $147.98. (2) Travel: Carfare, $96.35; room, $6; meals, $21.75; telephone, $12.78; taxis, etc., $11.10. (3) Travel is to attend yearly meetings, conferences of friends and interested groups and committee meetings, interpreting developments in national and international policy, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited list of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization, foreign relief, aid for refugees; support also of rights of conscience; opposition to conscription.

Richter, Irving, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,040. Expenses: $1,123.92. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News, various UAW-CIO local papers, Wisconsin CIO, Minnesota CIO, Labor Journal, Ammunition, Scope, and other CIO publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Riley,[5] George D., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary of $500 minus withholding tax and social-security tax, expended for personal living expenses. (2) George D. Riley. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of Government Employees Council, AFL—lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers, International Union publications, Weekly Council Bulletin for the dissemination of organization news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Rising, E. W., 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C. (1) From Water Conservation Conference, continuing committee, $300; from Western Beet Growers Association, to be reported under Lobbying Act, none. (2) E. W. Rising. (3) For part of office rent, total rate of $56 month, $45; for part salary stenographer at rate of $250 per month, $150; Railway Express Co., express on printed matter, $27.59; to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., pro rata of exchange service, $17.41; to pro rata of air-line trip to Portland, Oreg., and return, $25; to stamps, stationery, and miscellaneous office expenses, $35. (4) None since effective date of act. (5) Legislation affecting water rights established under State law and development and control of natural resources. Legislation affecting domestic sugar-beet growers.

Roemer,[5] Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $875; expenses, $132.78. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work in Washington. (4) UE News and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rose, Mary E., post office box 176, Cumberland, Md. (1) I received $350.34 for salary and expenses. As we are nonpartisan there was not any used for political purposes. It was used in the interest of the cause. (2) Mary E. Rose, post office box 176. (3) For my own personal use for expenses such as travel, hotel, and meals. (4) None other than local newspaper for announcements of meetings and a report after meetings. (5) The Townsend bills, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Von Rothkirch,[6] Eduard, Times Annex, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) No money was received or expended during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Midwest Bulletin. (5) All legislation and treaties affecting central Europe.

Rumely, Edward A., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) I received only my salary and expenses as reported on Form B. (The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A.) (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue press releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. The committee has placed newspaper advertising as reported on Form A. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue on legislation where they think a constitutional principle is involved.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington 11, D. C. (1) None received for legislative work; none expended. (2) No. (3) No. (4) None. (5) None at present.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 1307 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $900. Received expenses $682.10. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and FTA News. (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Schaffner, Franklin J., Americans United for World Government, 1860 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) See Form A for this organization. (2) See Form A for this organization. (3) See Form A for this organization. (4) None. (5) None specific at moment.

Scott, Orland A., secretary, American Pension Committee, Inc., 420 North Capitol Street, Washington 1, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) The Comet, a weekly Washington Pension Report. (5) Legislation in behalf of old-age pensions.

Shandros, Geraldine, 5 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $75 salary (in the past 3 months, a relatively small portion of time has been spent in legislative work). There have been no expenses during this period. (2) [Blank]. (3) Salary. (4) ACA News, CIO News. (5) All legislation favorable to workers in the communications industry and to American working men and women generally.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) From August 2 to September 30, 1946, $750 received from National Retail Credit Association. (2) Eleanor Krueger, stenographer; rent, Colorado Building; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; printing, $17; stamps, $17.38; trips, $16; telephone, $30; rent, $12.50; stenographer, $200; total, $292.88 expended. See attached letter. (3) See same previous question. (4) Credit World. (5) The only pending legislation in which we are interested is H. R. 454, garnishment of salaries of Federal employees, and H. R. 2647, reduction of first-class postage. We are also interested in possible legislation affecting regulation W of the Federal Reserve Board.

Smart, (Miss) Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington 2, D. C. (1) $81.44. (2) Western Union, $15.30; postage, $21.85; subscription, Current Business, $2; notary fees, $1.50; Washington Times-Herald, $1.30; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $20.99; Royal Typewriter Co. for repairs to typewriter, $18.50. (3) Stamps, notary fees, phone service and calls, telegrams and messenger service, subscriptions, repairs to typewriter. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smeltzer, C. W., 408 Wesley Temple Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Transportation, $260.80; hotel, $27.75; meals, $76.61. Our clubs maintain a small State office at about $25 per week. (2) Filling stations, hotels, restaurants. (3) Transportation, room, meals. (4) None that I recall that were paid. I believe one announcement was published in the Star-Journal. (5) To support Townsend national recovery plan bill.

Smith, Hilda W., 902–A Twentieth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,599.96; travel, $21.28. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self and travel in line of duty. (4) Leaflet, A Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor. (5) H. R. 7108, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

Smith, Marillyn Coan, 1710 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) As indicated in my registration filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House (Form B) I have received from Americans United for World Government no money outside of my weekly salary. I have therefore no expenditures to report. (2) I have paid money to no one. (3) Answered in question 2. (4) I have written lead stories and articles for the legislative bulletin published by Americans United for World Government. From January 1945 until May 1946, this bulletin was called Capitol Hill Views the World; since that date it has been known as the Washington Bulletin. (5) In the preceding quarter, Americans United for World Government supported the passage by the Congress of S. 1717 and Senate Resolution 196. During this period Americans United for World Government opposed no legislation.

Snow, William S., room 514, Rupley Building, 815 King Street, Alexandria, Va. (1) American Fisheries Association Cooperative, $510.47; California Fish Canners Association, $375; California Sardine Products Institute, $500; National Renderers Association, $300. (2) William S. Snow. (3) Fee and retainer. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting fisheries industry and rendering industry.

Snyder, Calvin K., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) All expenses. (2) For expenses. (3) For expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Speek, Frances Valiant, American Association of University Women, National Headquarters, 1634 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received in salary for the calendar quarter: $1,020 (possibly slightly over half of this was for duties in connection with legislative work). (2) None of the money received by me was paid to anyone in connection with legislative work. (3) None. See under 2. (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women. Quarterly. AAUW general director's letter. Issued three or four times a year. Sent to leaders in the American Association of University Women. (5) See attached list as printed in the fall 1946 AAUW Journal, stating in full the legislation supported and opposed.[4]

Stein, Margaret I. Committee for the Nation's Health, 402 Sixth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance (Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill).

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; expended, $248.67. (2) Salary and expenses. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) Attached list[4] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) August 2–September 30, 1946. Salary, $541.68; expenses, $44.89. (2) Salary and expenses. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) Attached list[4] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Storch,[5] Theodore Roosevelt, public relations consultant, 44 Court Street, Brooklyn 2, N. Y. (1) None at present. (2) No one at present. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Veterans' rights, war surplus goods.

Sturrock, J. E., general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, 607–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Travel expenses for July, August, and September, 1946, $284.67. (2) Various railroad, air line and taxi companies and hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of the water resources of Texas through existing State and Federal agencies. To oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., assistant director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $600 per month, as salary, less withholding and social security taxes. $17.85 for expenses during month of June 1946 for carfare and luncheons. $9.40 for expenses during month of July 1946 for carfare and luncheons. (No expenses during August 1946). (2) Francis M. Sullivan, assistant director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Salary and incidental expenses. (4) The American Legion Magazine, 1 Park Avenue, New York City, the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations, and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Col. John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $417.77 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $320.82, reimbursement for travel expense during July and August 1946; $11.42, incidental expenses for month of July 1946. (2) Col. John Thomas Taylor. (3) $320.82 reimbursement for travel expense to Minneapolis and St. Cloud, Minn., and return to Washington, D. C.; and to Indianapolis, New Orleans, and Gulfport, and return to District of Columbia; $11.42 incidental expenses for July 1946—carfare, luncheons. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Secretary only.

children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Townsend, Dr. F. E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Approximately $1,625. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend, George W., Franklin, Nebr. (1) $300 salary. (2) None paid out. No expense account. (3) None. No expense account. (4) None. (5) Townsend national-recovery plan.

Townsend,[5] R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Approximately $1,300. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Waterfield, Maynard H., 2844 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; taxicab fares, $51.30. (2) Maynard H. Waterfield. (3) Salary, $1,500; incidental expenses, $51.30. (4) Round Washington, weekly publication; Washington Close-Up, monthly publication; Research Reports, occasional publication. (5) Mr. Waterfield is employed by Citizens National Committee, Inc., for legislative research purposes, not to influence legislation.

Waybur,[5] Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work in Washington. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Receipts, $5,883.07; expenditures, $9,111.08 in operation of district No. 44, I. A. of M., for all purposes. No separate fund set aside for lobbying. Believe less than 25 percent of expenditures used to support or oppose legislation. (2) Taxi drivers, approximately $30; operators of eating and refreshment places, $35 (approximately); National Publishing Co.; Post Office Department; Western Union; stationery supply companies; rent; salary of officers and employees; traveling expenses, etc. (3) Lobbying, organizing, keeping membership posted, paying for clerical work, preparing briefs on legislation and grievance time spent in appearing before wage and grievance boards of departments. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $26.60. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Transportation. (4) VFW National News, Foreign Service (VFW monthly periodical). (5) Legislation affecting (a) veterans and their dependents; (b) personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the national security.

Wilson, E. Raymond, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Salary, including taxes withheld, $833.32 (August 2–October 9, 1946). Travel expenses: $73.10 (August 1–October 9, 1946). (2) Travel: carfare, $25.54; room, $11.25; meals, $4.66; telephone, $11.90; taxis, etc., $19.75. (3) Travel is to attend yearly meetings, conferences of Friends and interested groups and committee meetings interpreting developments in national and international policy, and for other committee business. (4) We send a news letter to a limited list of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization, foreign relief, aid for refugees; support also of rights of conscience; opposition to conscription. See appended statement on policy issued by our committee.

Wilson, Glen S., 1008 Willow Street, Austin, Tex. (1) $50 per week, plus 5 cents per mile for traveling expenses, plus hotel expenses while out of town. (This prevailed up to October 1, 1946.) Starting October 1 will be working on 50-percent commission. (2) Glen S. Wilson. (3) Organization work. (4) None. (5) Townsend plan.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received for salary, $911.10, and expenses, $667.58. Expended $385.15. (2) Postmaster, Washington, D. C.; Barry-Pate Motor Co., John A. Reilly, treasurer; Hamilton National Bank; National Reclamation Association; registration committee, Propeller Club of the United States, Joseph W. Stewart, clerk; Treasurer of the United States; Sara E. Barnett; various individuals. (3) For miscellaneous office, personal and traveling expenses. (4) The Waterways Journal. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Wetterman, Charles W., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) In the past 13 weeks I have received $900 salary and $386.09 expenses, a total of $1,286.09. (2) Charles W. Wetterman. (3) Salary as an employee and travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Support Townsend bills H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230.

Wojtasik,[5] Joseph, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Prior to October 1, 1946, I received $25 per week plus traveling, meals, and hotel expenses. (2) Paid none. (3) No purpose involved. (4) Did not spend any money for above-mentioned. (5) In support of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, known as the Townsend bill.

Woodson, George, Roosevelt Hotel, Lansing 15, Mich. (1) I received a salary until September 30; total $525.85 after taxes. I received an expense account, total $656.77, which was spent in the regular way—meals, hotel, telegrams, and travel expense. (2) I paid no money to individuals for anything. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2229 (Townsend bill).

Worley, Harry F., 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington 15, D. C. (1) I receive salary and reimbursement for travel, postage, office supplies, and incidental expenses. (2) See No. 1. (3) See No. 1. (4) Customs Service News, published by National Customs Service Association. (5) He supports any legislation which will benefit officers and employees of the Federal Government and opposes any legislation which is against their interests.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.; 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since August 10, 1946 (the effective date of Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) the only amount received has been $450 as reimbursement for traveling expenses. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6225.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1947

(Legislative day of Friday, January 3, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Secretary, Leslie L. Biffle, resumed the chair.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art love and light and life, Thou knowest all the way by which we have come, and the pathway our feet are now treading, and the unbeaten track before us. Our times are in Thy hands. We would not ask to see life's distant scenes.

Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice and from the ugly sins of disposition that doth so easily beset us. Lift us above the mud and scum of mere things into the holiness of Thy beauty so that even the common tasks and the trivial round may be edged with crimson and gold. Lead us this day in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things which matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. May the awesome responsibilities of this high hill but clothe these chosen representatives of the Nation in the garments of humility, as befits our partial knowledge and our imperfect judgments seeing as but through a glass darkly. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in his seat today.

SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

The Secretary laid before the Senate the credentials of SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, appointed by the Governor of the State of Florida on September 25, 1946, a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ended January 2, 1947, caused by the death of Hon. Charles O. Andrews, which were ordered to be filed and printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on September 18, 1946, Hon. Charles O. Andrews, the then incumbent United States Senator from the State of Florida, died, thereby creating a vacancy in said office which it became my duty to fill pursuant to the applicable provisions of the law; that there being a question as to the method to be followed in filling such vacancy in accordance with my constitutional duty as Governor of Florida, I requested of the Supreme Court of Florida an advisory opinion which was delivered to me by the justices of the Supreme Court of Florida on the 24th day of September A. D. 1946, in which it was found and determined that it was my duty to fill said vacancy by appointment for the unexpired term of the said late Charles O. Andrews, said term to extend from the date of appointment to the

3d day of January A. D. 1947; that pursuant to said authority, I issued to SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND on the 25th day of September A. D. 1946 a commission as United States Senator to represent the State of Florida in the Senate of the United States until the 3d day of January A. D. 1947; that some question has arisen or might arise as to the regularity of said commission and in order that the true intent thereof may be effectuated and any irregularities that may exist may be cured and all questions regarding the validity of said appointment placed in repose, I, Millard F. Caldwell, the Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby appoint SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the 3d day of January A. D. 1947.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Millard F. Caldwell, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 5th day of November A. D. 1946 and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-first year.

M. F. CALDWELL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF FLORIDA.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the powers vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Florida, I, Millard F. Caldwell, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the 3d day of January A. D. 1947.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Millard F. Caldwell, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 25th day of September A. D. 1946 and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-first year.

M. F. CALDWELL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

The Secretary laid before the Senate the credentials of WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, appointed by the Governor of the State of North Carolina on December 18, 1946, a Senator from that State to represent the State until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Hon. Joseph W. Bailey, is filled by election, as provided by law, which were placed on file and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of North Carolina, I. R. Gregg Cherry, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Josiah W. Bailey, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, R. Gregg Cherry, and our seal hereto affixed at Raleigh, this 18th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1946.

R. GREGG CHERRY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON

The Secretary laid before the Senate the credentials of HARRY P. CAIN, appointed by the Governor of the State of Washington on December 26, 1946, a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ended January 2, 1947, caused by the resignation of Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, which, together with an accompanying letter from the Governor of the State of Washington, were placed on file and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, December 26, 1946.

SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In pursuance of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Washington, I am enclosing herewith certificate of appointment of HARRY P. CAIN as Senator from the State of Washington to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Hugh B. Mitchell.

Sincerely yours,

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor of Washington.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Washington, I, Mon C. Wallgren, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint HARRY P. CAIN a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States, filling the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of Hugh B. Mitchell, until his successor shall be duly qualified to office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed at Olympia this 26th day of December 1946.

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor of Washington.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ROY J. YEOMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I inquire of the Chair what is the business before the Senate?

The SECRETARY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] that the oath of office be administered to the Senator-elect from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] upon which question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary, at the risk of being charged with engaging in a filibuster, I desire to take a few moments of the time of the Senate this morning to discuss some questions presented by the matter now being considered which to me are far more important than the rights of any individual in this Chamber or outside the Chamber.

It was just asked, What is the question before the Senate? The Chair stated that the question was on the motion of the Senator from Maine that his colleague-elect be permitted to take the oath of office. It is not my intention to discuss that question. All of us know that that is not the question before the Senate. There was but one question before us all day yesterday, as, perhaps, there will be all day today and tomorrow and perhaps on and on. That question is, Shall the Senator-elect from Mississippi be permitted to take the oath of office and be seated as a Member of this body? It may be disguised or camouflaged, but that is the real question, and it is the only issue. To that for a little while I would direct my remarks.

I said that I thought there was involved in these proceedings something far more important than the rights of any individual, a question which transcends the right of the Senator from Mississippi to take the oath of office. There is involved a question of fundamental justice and fairness, of right dealing and proper procedure in the Senate of the United States. After all, the issue which is now presented is a simple one. The credentials of the Senator-elect from Mississippi have been filed; they have not been questioned; they are in due and regular form. Under any normal procedure and in ordinary circumstances the Senator-elect from Mississippi would have walked down the aisle yesterday morning, as he started to do, and would have had the oath of office administered to him. But normal procedure was not followed. When his name was called objection was made, that he be denied the right to take the oath of office which is administered to every other Member of this body. There was a simple objection, save for the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] which did contain charges and specifications. So far as the record now stands there is no charge against the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that the record is clear that yesterday there was offered in evidence, that is there was sent to the desk and it was asked that it be printed in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings of the Senate a copy of the report of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. At the same time there was filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Senate a copy of the testimony. So we had yesterday in the Senate and within the conscience of each Senator, because the material was placed upon his desk, a copy of the report of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and a copy of the testimony taken at the hearings of the special committee. That testimony was taken after notice to Senator BILBO. He was present with his counsel. He had an opportunity to ask, and did ask, questions, and he had no other witnesses to present. The record of the report of the committee clearly indicates that fact. So I——

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Michigan will pardon me, I did not yield to him to make a speech. I am sure he will go into the matter thoroughly in his own time, and, in fact, I had expected to discuss the very matter which he has just now raised. I have not overlooked the filing of the report of the Special Committee To Investigate the National

Defense Program. I shall give that report every bit of weight which it is entitled to receive. When I say the "weight which it is entitled to receive," I mean exactly that, for it has no standing in this body as coming from a committee authorized to file charges or make complaints against individual Senators.

I repeat what I said, that there is now no charge against the Senator from Mississippi. True, there is a report from the special committee, and so far as I know it may be absolutely correct in every detail; true, the newspapers have been full of comment for weeks and months; true, idle gossip as to the Senator from Mississippi has spread over the Nation; but since when, I ask, has the Senate of the United States proceeded to try one of its Members or one who is eligible to membership in this body upon gossip, upon rumor, or upon unfounded, unauthorized, and unwarranted committee reports?

I said that fundamental issues are involved. In all considerations of justice, in all jurisprudence, no matter what the tribunal may be, one of the most fundamental issues is that every person accused of crime, or of wrongdoing of any kind, shall have the right to have the charges against him set forth formally, specifically, and certainly. No man anywhere should ever be brought to the bar of justice without knowing with what he is charged. So fundamental is that principle that it alone should deny the position of those who seek to bar the Senator-elect from Mississippi at the door of this body without filing a charge against him, and without taking evidence on such charge.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the record will show that prior to the hearing by the Special Committee To Investigate the War Program Senator BILBO was furnished a memorandum containing the charges that were to be taken up at that hearing and that is set forth in the record.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary, I have the highest regard and respect in the world for the integrity, the ability, and the judicial training of the Senator from Michigan. I served with him on the committee, and I think we were in almost complete accord on every matter that ever came before us; but I am dumfounded to hear a Member of this body say that a memorandum which has been filed with a committee is sufficient upon which to try a man as to his fitness to be a Member of this body.

A graver charge cannot be brought against a man than that he is unfit, that he is unworthy, to sit here with us. I am saying nothing about his guilt or innocence. For the moment I am not concerned about that. I do not care how guilty he may be; he may be base and degraded to the lowest possible depth; but, notwithstanding that, fundamental principles of justice demand and require that the charges against him be filed in regular order, and that he be afforded an opportunity to be heard upon exact and specific charges. I said it was a simple issue. It is simple, so simple that I cannot see how any person can deny or dispute the fundamental principle of American justice to which I have adverted. In the position I took yesterday, and in the position I take today, I support, as the Senator from Louisiana said he did yesterday, not merely the Constitution, but fundamental principles of justice, which must not be denied to any human being anywhere; most of all, in the Senate of the United States.

I do not want to be technical. I do not ask that all the forms and niceties of indictments and informations be followed. I do not require that every "t" be crossed and every "i" dotted; but I demand that substantial charges be made, and that the next step also be followed—that after charges are made, the accused be given a hearing upon the specific charges.

I realize that a hearing was held and that the Senator from Mississippi was accorded the right to appear and to testify; but in giving him that right he was denied another fundamental right of American justice, without which no man can have a fair hearing and a fair trial. He was not permitted, either in person or by counsel, to cross-examine the witnesses who appeared and testified against him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. HATCH. For the benefit of the Senator from Iowa, let me say that I am now referring to the hearing by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the Special Campaign Investigating Committee, the Senator from Mississippi was afforded the opportunity, through himself or his counsel, to submit any and every question to be asked witnesses who appeared against him, and to my certain knowledge, with the exception of the last two or three witnesses, whose testimony I did not hear, every question submitted by the Senator from Mississippi through his counsel or on his own request was asked of each witness who appeared against him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand the Senator from New Mexico is referring to the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. HATCH. I referred to the hearing.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to say that prior to the hearing, as shown by the record, it was agreed between the committee and Senator BILBO and his counsel, Forrest Jackson, that they should be permitted to ask questions. They submitted many questions, and in each case the identical question was asked of the witnesses, so that he had an opportunity to cross-examine each and every witness produced at the open hearing.

If the able Senator from New Mexico will examine the report and the committee hearing, he will find that to be the fact.

Mr. HATCH. I repeat the statement as to my high regard for the Senator from Michigan, for his legal knowledge, for his training, and for his essential fairness; but, if submitting questions to be asked through a committee member is an exhaustion of the right of cross-examination, the Senator has an entirely different concept of the right of cross-examination from mine, and from any interpretation of it that has ever been applied in any court of justice in this land. The right to cross-examine was not met by the steps which were taken and the gratuitous permission which was given to write out a question and submit it to a committee member, to let him in turn propound it to the witness. Most of us are lawyers and most of us have had experience in cross-examining witnesses, and we know how vital it is to have the right and the power to ask questions, to follow them up, in order to develop points we are trying to elucidate, or to impeach the witness himself who is testifying. No, the Senator-elect from Mississippi has not been accorded the right to cross-examine witnesses.

Mr. Secretary, even if he has been accorded that right, full justice has not yet been done, for I return to the original proposition that a charge should be filed and a hearing should be had on the charge, or upon the charges, whatever they may be, alone. In the hearing of such charges the Senator should have the right to examine the witnesess, to present testimony of his own, to cross-examine, and to be given some measure of the simple justice that is accorded to the lowest criminal in this land. Oh, I am not asking for those further safeguards and protections: the presumption of innocence; that evidence must be sufficient to convince beyond a reasonable doubt. I am not asking for the application of any extreme, unusual principles. I am asking only for fairness—for ordinary justice.

I am going to be fair with the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which has made its report. I think that report might be taken as the basis of a formal charge against the Senator-elect from Mississippi. But, as yet, I have heard no one say, "This is the charge; we are trying him upon these particular matters, and are going to exclude others."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. We are not proposing to try Senator BILBO in any sense. We merely ask that the disputed question whether he be sworn in pending the termination of the so-called trial be postponed until the Senate be organized and that the swearing in of the other 35 Senators be not held up. There is no disposition at this time to try Senator BILBO or any of the facts connected with his particular case.

Mr. HATCH. No; there is no disposition to try him now, for in the minds of the majority he has already been tried, he has already been found guilty, and they would now impose the sentence of excluding him from the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that one committee, an arm of this body, by a committee report, has set forth an indictment which alleges that Senator BILBO's credentials are not subject to be accepted—I forget the exact language of the report of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program—amounting, if you please, in the Senator's own language, to a formal indictment and charge against this man.

I submit to the Senator that in any State in this land, when a grand jury indicts, it is not the trial, but, nevertheless, the accused is placed under the pains and penalty of an appearance bond, and his liberties are restrained until that indictment has been resolved, either by conviction or acquittal, or some other method. I submit to the Senator that there is exactly the same parallel here. An indictment has been made by a formal body of the Senate. We are merely asking that pending the hearing upon that indictment certain restraints accepted in any court of the land be imposed upon this man who is formally charged by a solemnly and duly constituted arm of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I think we are making progress. It is now made certain and clear that these are the charges; that this is the indictment. Very well, I am certain the Senator from Mississippi will be glad to know now for the first time with what he is specifically charged, and upon what charges he is either now or hereafter going to be tried. I take it that he may also assume, since the Senator from Iowa has drawn the parallel of the criminal case, that the evidence against him will be confined to the charges that are made in the committee report, and that he may prepare his defense in accordance with those charges, and shall not have to defend against anything else.

It was further said that a man charged by indictment is required to give an appearance bond. Yes; he is required to give an appearance bond in order to secure his attendance at the trial, and that is all. Sometimes in graver cases his liberty is taken away from him because the necessity of protecting society is such that it is required. That is the basis of criminal law. Do Senators anticipate there is any danger of the Senator from Mississippi not being present to take his oath of office?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I made the statement respecting the indictment and the appearance bond to illustrate the fact that restraint is automatically, under a free system of justice, placed upon one who is formally charged by an arm of justice with the commission of a crime, prior to the adjudication of the charge. The question of restraint is the question of holding in abeyance until the decision by a lawfully constituted adjudicating body can be reached.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. With respect to the thought just suggested, what is the restraint? The restraint is merely that the individual give bond for his appearance. That is the restraint, and the American citizen is still a free American citizen. He has the right to come into the court of justice; he has the right to go to the ballot box and vote. He has the right to deal and traffic in the merchandise of the country. He has a right to attend not only tribunals of justice but sessions of legislative bodies. He is a free American citizen and he is presumed to be innocent until he has been found guilty. That is the restraint. But the restraint is not such a restraint as now proposed, and that is to condemn a man without, as the Senator has very correctly said, any charges having been preferred against him, and by the action of a committee that is as destitute of authority as an egg is of hair.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the able Senator from Louisiana. He has taken some of the words out of my mouth. Not the last ones; I had not thought of that comparison.

But, Mr. Secretary, I am so deadly in earnest about the proper, the fair, the right, and the just procedure that I say if a comparison is going to be made with a criminal case, then I shall demand that those making the comparison go on further and indulge this man with the same presumption of innocence that they would grant to one charged with murder or any other heinous offense. But no, they will not do that. They say to Mr. BILBO, "Stop. Stop now." It was even reported in the newspapers that "We can stop him at the door. We can stop him at the bar. We can stop him any place if we have the votes."

I trust that report is untrue. I trust that at no time will it ever be said that in this body any party in power will stop someone from taking the oath merely because it has the votes to stop him. That sentiment derives from power and power alone. It is a denial of justice. It is a condemnation of the innocent. It is in derogation of every fundamental right of America and her citizens.

Mr. Secretary, I had not intended to take any time at all. I merely wanted to make clear that in voting yesterday and in voting today I am not supporting the Senator-elect from Mississippi; I am not dealing with his guilt or with his innocence.

At the proper time, when he has had his hearing, when he has been accorded the fair treatment he is entitled to have, when the proper committee has reported to this body, then the Senate should act on his case. I say frankly, if the statements made in the report of the committee are true, and if they are sustained, I shall as unhesitatingly vote to exclude him from this Chamber as I now demand without hesitation that he be accorded and given his fair, decent, right and just deserts in this body. That fundamental justice which I urge today can only be meted out now by letting the Senator from Mississippi go down to the bar, raise his hand, and take his oath, and remain as a Senator until the charges have been made, the evidence has been taken, the decision as to his guilt has been rendered by this body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Secretary, I desire to associate myself with the statement just made by the Senator from New Mexico. I completely concur in it. He has stated my position on the vote of yesterday, and he has stated my position on the votes which are to come in the future on this question. He has stated my position more eloquently than I myself could have stated it; and I wish to concur and associate myself in all he has said on the subject.

The question before us is as simple as it could be. The question is whether we are to give the accused an opportunity to stand here and contend against his accusers on an equal basis. The question is whether he is to be given his fair day in court. That is all I ask that he be given. After that, unless there are some explanations of some of the accusations, I shall not hesitate to vote, if the evidence justifies it, that he is not qualified to sit in the Senate.

All the questions which have been raised were before the Senate when Senator BILBO was a Member of this body. He could have been expelled during the previous session if he were guilty of those things. We did not have to wait until the next election. The Senate knew about them. The Senate heard Senator BILBO make the statements which he made, and they were not challenged by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator contend that the Senate had knowledge of the facts obtained by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which facts are set forth in the report and the printed hearings now on the desks of Senators?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know how much knowledge the Senate has today of any facts concerning Senator BILBO. I do not know of any knowledge that anyone has of those facts. But certainly the things which are supposed to have happened occurred while Senator BILBO was a Member of this body.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that Senator BILBO has been a Member of this body for 12 years. Senators have been associated with him. They have known his position on all questions. If the Senate had wanted to expel him, it could have attempted to expel him before.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In fairness, the RECORD should show that I do not believe that the Senate had knowledge of what is contained in the testimony and the report of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which testimony and report are now officially a part of the records of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I have previously stated, I do not know how much knowledge the Senate now has; but does the Senator wish to give Senator BILBO the opportunity of standing before his accusers, with the same rights which the accusers have, or does he wish to place Senator BILBO in an inferior position so that he cannot reply to the accusations which are made against him by Members of the Senate? Is the Senator afraid of Senator BILBO? Does he wish to bar him at the door and place him in an inferior position? It seems to me that no other conclusion can be reached. Senator BILBO would gain no rights by taking the oath of office at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MCMAHON addressed the Chair.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan. He was first on his feet.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that a question has been directed to the Senator from Michigan, and I am very glad to answer it.

As I see the question before the Senate, it is this: Senator BILBO would have the right to be sworn in if there were no evidence before the committee to rebut that right, if there were no evidence bringing to the attention of the Senate the facts now before the Senate, which disqualify him from becoming a Senator. He should have a fair trial, but he should not ask to come into the Senate and change the rule. Many Senators will contend that the minute he becomes a Member of the Senate by taking the oath, a two-thirds vote will be required to oust him from the Senate. I do not agree with that view, but I know that it is held by many Senators. The rights of Senators should not be interfered with. Senator BILBO should not be permitted to change his status and become a Member of the Senate, when a two-thirds vote would be required to expel him.

Some Senators will contend that section 3 of article I of the Constitution requires only three things in the nature of qualifications, namely, that a man be 30 years of age, that he shall have been for 9 years a citizen of the United States, and that he be a resident of the State which sends him to the Senate. It is said that those are the only qualifications. I do not agree with that view. There is an absolute mandate that no man may become a Senator who does not have those qualifications; but when we turn to section 5 of article I of the Constitution, we find that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members. The Constitution uses the word "judge." The Senate is the judge of the qualifications of its Members.

That is the question which faces us. We are the judges. We have the right to determine the qualifications of Members of this body. The evidence now before Senators should lead them to the conclusion that there is such a stain on his record and such a disqualification of Senator BILBO to become a United States Senator that he should not be sworn in.

I wish to cite a few lines which Daniel Webster quoted in this body, because I think they are pertinent. They come from a member of Parliament. Under these conditions it would be absurd to say that the oath must be administered, to be followed by a hearing—the evidence already having been gathered—and then an expulsion. That would seem to be a rather ridiculous performance. The irrational character of such a proceeding is pictured by an old member of Parliament whose verse is more expressive than poetical.

The following was quoted by Mr. Webster:

> I hear a lion in the lobby roar!
> Say, Mr. Speaker, shall we shut the door
> And keep him out, or shall we let him in
> And see if we can get him out again?

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The SECRETARY. The occupants of the galleries will maintain order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Secretary, I consider the statement of the Senator from Michigan only a flimsy excuse.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall speak later upon this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I believe the Senator is afraid to face Senator BILBO on equal terms in the Senate on the question involved. The statement that some Senators may believe this, and other Senators may believe something else, is only a flimsy, inconsequential excuse, and an attempt to evade the real issue which is before us. As I previously stated, Senator BILBO can gain nothing by taking the oath of office.

Mr. OVERTON and Mr. MCMAHON addressed the Chair.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, I think the argument just advanced by the Senator from Michigan is one of the most illogical arguments I have heard presented in a case which is replete with illogical arguments. The Senator admits that if BILBO were sworn he could not be excluded except by compulsion, requiring a two-thirds vote. So, in order to circumvent a provision of our Constitution, he says, "Expel him before he gets into the Chamber."

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MCMAHON. The Senator from Colorado stated that Senator BILBO would gain nothing by taking his seat. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my contention. Senator BILBO is either qualified or he is not qualified; and taking the oath of office does not qualify him to sit here if the Senate decides by a majority vote that he is not qualified and cannot sit here.

Mr. MCMAHON. But during the interim the Senator will admit that his name would be called on roll calls and he would have the right to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, and that is the very privilege which the Senator from Colorado extended to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] when charges were made against him.

Mr. MCMAHON. We might run into such a situation as that which the Senate encountered in the Newberry case. Senator Newberry had voted perhaps 150 times, and on some of the questions on which he voted decided vital issues of our times, because some of his votes were cast with reference to the League of Nations. After he had cast 150 votes Mr. Newberry was expelled from the Senate. Ab initio he had no right to cast a vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Newberry was not expelled from the Senate.

Mr. MCMAHON. I accept the correction of the Senator from Georgia. When he knew that a sufficient number of Senators had been elected to expel him, rather than fight the case for 2 years more and remain until the end of his term, knowing the fate that awaited him, he resigned immediately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is unreasonable to think that Senator BILBO, by himself, can stall off consideration of his fate. It rests with the majority of the Senate to decide how they want to proceed. I recall that consideration of Senator LANGER'S case by the Senate required more than a year, which I thought was an extremely long time in which to investigate his case; but the majority of the Senate, as is clearly to be perceived by the so-called test vote taken yesterday, cannot be depended upon to defend Senator BILBO or anyone else unless he has an incontestable case. So it is foolish to talk about letting this man take his seat for fear that we will not be able to get him out, and that the whole country is going to rack and ruin because of his vote. That is perfectly silly in view of the huge majority which the majority party has at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Constitution provide that every State is entitled to be represented by two Senators?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It does. Of course, the effect of this proceeding is to deprive the State of that representation. That is the substance of what it really does. But the point I wish to make clear is that the whole controversy revolves around one point, and that is whether the accused is to have an equal right with his accusers to stand up in this body, a body in which he has held membership for 12 years; whether he is to have the same right as his accusers in answering the accusations against him. That is the whole thing. Nothing else is involved.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Secretary, I think everyone in the Senate knows of the personal relationship between Senator BILBO and myself. Regardless of what that relationship is, he is entitled to justice and the State of Mississippi is entitled to have its constitutional rights recognized by the United States Senate.

Senator BILBO was fairly elected to the United States Senate. He was elected in an election in which there was no fraud

and no coercion. Two committees of the Senate have investigated him. One of those committees had jurisdiction of the subject matter and the power to make definite recommendations to the Senate. The report of that committee exonerated him of wrongdoing, in that it held that the statements made in the campaign did not deprive citizens of their constitutional right to vote. The other committee is the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

It has been charged that he has personally profited from dealings with contractors. These charges, if true, are a reflection not only upon him, but a reflection upon the State of Mississippi and her people. He is entitled and the State is entitled to have an investigation, and a trial, made by a properly constituted committee of the Senate, with full supervision of the subject matter and with the power and the duty to make definite recommendations to this body. The Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, with all deference, had no such authority; and, in addition, that committee did not attempt in its report to make definite recommendations to this body. That is a right to which every man who presents himself to the bar of the Senate is entitled. It is a right to which the State of Mississippi is entitled. Credentials in proper order—and Senator BILBO's credentials are in proper order—prima facie give him a right to a seat in this body.

The Constitution provides that the State of Mississippi is entitled to two Senators on the floor of the Senate to represent the State at all times. This proceeding will deprive Mississippi of that right, and will deprive one who has been elected of the right of trial by a proper committee with authority to make recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think that on the pending motion the Senator from Maine is entitled to a seat without waiting? The issue before the Senate is whether or not we shall swear in a Senator whose seat is uncontested.

Mr. EASTLAND. I disagree with the Senator. The real issue before the Senate is whether or not Senator BILBO should be seated. The Senator well knows that and the Senate well knows it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. The question is whether or not Senator BILBO shall hold a seat in the Senate while the issue is being determined. There is no disposition not to give the Senator a perfectly square deal. Whether he stays in the Senate or not has nothing to do with the square deal he receives.

Mr. EASTLAND. A trial by whom?

Mr. TAFT. By a duly constituted committee of the Senate for that purpose. That is a question to be determined later. The only question now is whether the Senator shall be sworn in.

Mr. EASTLAND. Just a moment. The Senator from Ohio says whether or not he shall be given a trial by a duly constituted committee is a question to be determined later?

Mr. TAFT. No matter what action is taken now the Senator will be given a complete trial on all charges, I suppose, before the Rules Committee. That is the proper committee to determine it. There is no disposition not to give him a square deal. We have the narrow question, Shall a man charged with heinous crimes be sworn in pending a determination of the question whether he shall be a Senator of the United States? That question has been decided in different ways by the Senate. In 10 cases the Senate decided that certain Senators should not be seated; in 9 cases that they should be seated.

As I see it, the Senator is objecting because he thinks the Senate is going to decide against his view of the matter. The Senator is insisting that the Senate be not organized, that none of the other Senators be sworn in, until, through a species of forced action we are compelled to adopt the Senator's view as to whether a Senator shall be sworn in pending the determination of the question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is certainly wrong. I am not arguing as to the credentials of any Senator. All I say is that Mr. BILBO's credentials are in proper order and he is entitled to be seated, and then that he be investigated by a proper committee with the power and duty to make definite recommendations to this body.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's position is that the status quo of the Senate be maintained until the whole question can be tried. The Senator insists as a condition of the organization of the Senate, the condition of giving 35 States the complete representation to which they are entitled, that we change that status quo and accept one view on a very disputed question, and seat Senator BILBO and have him sworn in as a Senator. The Senate ought to have the right to decide that question. The effect of the procedure preventing the swearing in of the other Senators is to deny the Senate the right to have a majority determine what it is going to do on a question which certainly is controversial and on which people can take either side.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator well knows that during that time the State of Mississippi would be deprived of its constitutional right of being represented by two Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The State of Mississippi has no right to be represented by two Senators if one of them has not the qualifications of a Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. But he was elected without fraud, and his credentials are in order. I am not saying that there should not be a trial. I think there should be a trial by a proper body; but I do not think he should be excluded except on the report of a committee that would have the power to make definite recommendations.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that if Mr. BILBO is sworn in, he becomes a duly qualified Senator in every respect. I wish to know whether in those circumstances he would be entitled to participate in the trial—I call it a trial, for want of a better word—and would be privileged not only to speak in his own behalf but to vote in his own behalf. Is that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. Frankly, I do not know about voting in his behalf, and I do not desire to debate that point. But certainly he would be entitled to speak in his own behalf.

Mr. WHITE. That question was preliminary to my real question. If he is admitted and takes the oath of office, does he not then have every title which every other Member has to his seat and to his position as a Senator of the United States; and would he not, on the conclusion of the hearings, regardless of whether he participated in the hearings, be privileged to vote on his own case?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am just reminded that there is somewhere a prohibition against having any Senator participate in any proceeding in which he has an interest.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, there is no constitutional provision to that effect, as I recall.

Mr. HATCH. There is a rule or something of the sort.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is in the records of the Senate a case in which a Senator was permitted to be sworn in notwithstanding the fact that a question was raised as to whether he was entitled to be seated; and he became a Member of the Senate. When the question was finally voted upon, he voted in his own behalf, and his vote decided the question in his behalf in the Senate, and he was seated. Subsequently a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which he had been retained. The fact that he voted for himself on the previous vote evidently influenced some Senators when they voted again; and although he voted for himself a second time, nevertheless he was denied a seat in the Senate, largely, I think, because he had exercised the right to vote for himself on the first occasion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I am concerned, I certainly shall join in a motion, supported by all the precedents, to permit Mr. BILBO to speak in his own behalf to any reasonable extent. Of course, if he becomes a Member of the Senate he may speak in his own behalf here all day, and every day; and I do not think we are required to give him that privilege to that extent.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think his physical condition would permit that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we should try to make the issue clear, as it stands today. The debate is taking place upon a motion to administer the oath to Senator-elect OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine.

Therefore, by this debate we are not permitted to organize the Senate and to swear in 35 Senators, because some of the Senators—and I think the RECORD of yesterday showed conclusively that it was merely some of them—insist that we shall swear in the Senators in alphabetical order, because the next name after that of Senator BALDWIN would be that of Senator BILBO, and that unless we surrender to that demand and swear in Senator BILBO next, the Senate cannot organize itself. To my mind, that is the question presented to the Senate today.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Secretary, I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

The fact is that Senator BILBO's name is not now before us, because the motion was tabled, and not because of any act of his supporters.

As the Senator from New Mexico so well stated, every man is presumed innocent until proved guilty by a court of competent jurisdiction. I do not think anyone would state that this committee had proper jurisdiction. As I have stated, the committee did not even make definite recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. In just a moment I shall be through.

Senator BILBO is entitled to that right. His credentials are in order. He is entitled to be seated, and then the proper committee should investigate the case, should give him his rights, and the Senate should take action.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply wished to ask a question, namely, whether the Senator from Mississippi contends, in connection with the last part of his remarks, that the Senate cannot act upon facts that have not been proved in a case in court or upon which a man has not been convicted in a court. The Senator from Mississippi does not mean to infer that; does he?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Mississippi meant was that every man who presents himself to the bar of the Senate, before he is prevented from taking his seat, should have the right of trial by a committee with jurisdiction over the subject matter and with the power to make definite recommendations in the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Secretary, there appears to be precedent in the Senate, in the Smith case, from Illinois.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Secretary, I yielded for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In answer to the Senator's statement that the States are entitled to complete representation in the Senate I should like to ask him whether it has occurred to him that one of the grandest States in the Union, possessing some of the richest historic traditions and having made to America contributions of inestimable value is completely without representation in the Senate of the United States today. I refer to the great State of Virginia. The tactics of discussing here at length on this floor a matter which is not even before the Senate at this time is preventing that magnificent State from any representation at all in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Secretary, there is no filibuster in progress, but the present condition is something that is not of our making.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Mississippi has been saying that Senator BILBO should be entitled to a fair trial by a duly constituted committee. That is exactly what the resolution I presented calls for, namely, that the matter be referred to a committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. That resolution has been tabled; and it was tabled, in part, by the vote of the Senator from Idaho. He himself voted against his own resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. It will be brought up again on Monday.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suppose the Senator from Idaho will vote against it again on Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Secretary, a few minutes after the Senate convened yesterday I entertained the hope that the majority in the Senate would at least afford a Senator-elect the opportunity to take his oath of office without attempting to bar him at the door. As has been stated during the debate this morning, there are on file in the Senate today the credentials of a Senator-elect from the great State of Mississippi. I have been a Member of this body for the past 10 years, during that time when, in a lawful and regular manner, charges have been preferred against a Senator-elect the method employed has been to permit him to be sworn in without prejudice, so that he would be given an opportunity to defend himself.

The course now being followed is not one against BILBO; it is a slap at the sovereign State of Mississippi. Today that great State is entitled to be represented in the Senate by two Senators, but on yesterday, when I noticed the gestapo methods which were sought to be employed by the majority party in seating new Senators, by starting at the bottom, the last letter of the alphabet, instead of the first, I realized that they would not accede to the request which I hoped would be complied with, namely, that Senator BILBO be sworn in without prejudice.

Oh, it is said Senators on the other side want to give Senator BILBO a fair trial. The fair trial some of them want to give him is to slit his throat from ear to ear. How can he expect a fair trial?

I quote from a newspaper article which appeared in the Evening Star under date of December 30 which gives some of the reasons why. This is a quotation from my distinguished friend the Senator-elect from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. The headline is:

BREWSTER backs move to bar BILBO at door when Senate meets.

The article proceeds:

Senator BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, announced today he is joining Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, in a demand that Republicans attempt to bar Senator BILBO, Democrat, of Mississippi, at the door when the Senate convenes Friday.

"The country—

This is Senator BREWSTER talking—

"The country expects us to act now on BILBO," Senator BREWSTER declared. "We ought to try to stop him at the door. If the Democrats want to filibuster and prevent the organization of the Senate, that is their responsibility."

Speaking for myself, I accept that challenge.

I shall now read from an editorial from the Washington Post, in its issue of January 3, entitled "Report on BILBO." I shall not read all the editorial, but only that part which I think is pertinent to the issue I am now discussing.

The paragraph preceding the one I will read refers to certain actions which may be taken by the Department of Justice. I quote:

But before the Department takes action he must be ejected from a privilege which is not his due—membership in the Senate of the United States. We believe that Senator BILBO is disqualified for membership in the Senate on the ground that he was not validly elected to it as well as on the ground of moral turpitude. Perhaps it does not much matter on which ground he is challenged and ejected. But we cannot help feeling that Senator TAFT'S statement on the subject was ill-considered and unfortunate—if he meant it to apply to final determination of the Bilbo case.

I now quote the language of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] which is referred to in the editorial:

You can stop him at the door any way you want to if you have the majority vote—

Senator TAFT was quoted as declaring Wednesday.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I quote further:

You can do it on any grounds you want to, or even without giving any grounds. All you need are the votes.

There is no man in the Senate I admire more than I do the Senator from Ohio. I do not know that he made that statement; I do not know what thought he had in the back of his head, when he made it, if he did make it, but if he desires now to explain it, he may have the opportunity.

I read further from the editorial:

This seems to us a pernicious doctrine susceptible of perilous abuse by intemperate majorities. Men who have a prima facie claim, as has Senator BILBO, to a seat in the Senate ought not to be denied it on anything less than compelling evidence of election frauds or of gross moral unfitness. In the case of Senator BILBO, exclusion or expulsion should be solidly based on the evidence which so clearly and abundantly warrants such action.

Mr. Secretary, of what are the Republicans afraid? What are they insisting on at this time? Are they hesitating because of the fact that permitting BILBO to be sworn in will entitle him to one vote when they themselves would have 15 or 16 new Members in the Senate? As was said by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], Senator BILBO should by all means be permitted to take the oath, and then if charges are made legally,

refer them to the proper committee, and let the committee give the accused the opportunity to defend himself. Under present conditions, and in view of the manner and method in which the press of the Nation has dealt with this case, many people throughout the country have been misguided, not by virtue of evidence properly adduced, but by reports, many of which were tainted reports.

To recur to the question of a "fair trial," I read yesterday an article emanating from Walter Winchell, in which he said it was rumored that the distinguished Senator from Michigan was "after BILBO's scalp," and that he would impeach him. The acts complained of took place in 1945, while Senator BILBO was a Member of the Senate. I ask, Why was it, if the special committee, or any members of it, were in possession of such evidence, they did not then and there perform their duty by bringing charges against BILBO and placing him on trial? No; they did not do that. They waited until the election.

Let us be perfectly frank. "Bilboism" was preached all over the New England States and all over the Northern States during the last campaign. I heard many speeches over the radio condemning "Bilboism." What is "Bilboism"?

Senator BILBO has been one of the few Senators on this floor to speak his mind. He is a man who has the courage of his convictions. He has led the fight, on many occasions, against the antilynching bill. I helped him, as did many other southerners. If he is to be condemned for that, so am I; for I helped him, as did the others.

When he opposed the antilynching bill, he of course trampled on the toes of many colored people throughout the North. Today there are in the North a few small, miserable groups, here and there, who pretend to be trying to help the Negroes of the South, when as a matter of fact, what they are trying to do is to help themselves.

It is a known fact that in the North there are eight pivotal States that have so many colored people in them that, as the colored vote goes, so goes an election. I contended on the floor of the Senate, during the filibuster against the antilynching, poll tax, and other measures, that that situation was the real issue behind those bills.

Evidence was adduced here to show that no other crime in the annals of criminology had been wiped out so quickly as the crime of lynching. From a high of over 300 we had in the last 3 or 4 years a low of 1 or 2 lynchings within the country; and yet, in the face of the decrease, there are these little groups here and there preying on other groups, to foster legislation of this kind, in order to carry out the views of the smaller groups. I have no doubt in my mind that it is because of Senator BILBO's fight and because of his attitude on that issue that the press of the Nation and various misled groups throughout the Nation have been "after his scalp," as it were.

When the poll-tax bill was discussed before the Senate, Senator BILBO always spearheaded the movement to defeat the bill. I was with him, although my State levies no poll taxes. I felt that the proper way to eliminate the poll tax was through the State legislatures. That was my position, that was Senator BILBO's position, and that was the position of most of the Senators who fought that bill. In opposing that bill Senator BILBO of course incurred the enmity of certain subversive groups throughout the country, many of which are preying on a large segment of our southern population, the Negroes. We have in the South 76 percent of all the colored people of the United States, and yet the North has been trying to tell us what to do about them. Senator BILBO, by his attitude toward that bill, has of course aroused the animosity of many people, of many groups, and those groups are today behind the effort that is being put forth to deny him his seat in the Senate.

Senator BILBO spearheaded the move to kill another bill, the so-called FEPC bill. I was with him in that move, which brought about a lively fight on the Senate floor. I am sure that Senator BILBO's attitude respecting that bill, the valiant fight he put up in his endeavor to kill the bill, has made many groups throughout the country very angry, including, I am sure, some of his colleagues in the Senate. I am satisfied that those groups are today behind the movement to deny Senator BILBO his seat in the Senate. I have no doubt about that. I am sure that many Senators have been visited in the past and have been visited recently by many leaders of those groups, who have demanded that Senator BILBO be thrown out of the Senate, and who have threatened what they will do if he is not thrown out.

A committee was organized in the city of New York with which I am sure all Senators are familiar, the Civil Rights Congress, which issued a great deal of literature dealing with Senator BILBO. That committee was called the Oust BILBO Committee. In other words, before the man was given a trial, before he was given an opportunity to appear before the Senate and defend himself, it was the desire of the members of that committee that he be thrown out of the Senate. I am told there are some good men on that committee. How they permit themselves to be misled by termites who are eating from the inside, who are misleading the members of the committee, I simply cannot understand.

I have no doubt that that group, as well as many other groups scattered throughout this broad land of ours, are behind this movement to stop BILBO, and why? I say to the Members of the Senate, that these groups are behind this movement, not because of the man himself, not because of what he has done and with what he has been charged by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, but because of the views Senator BILBO holds. These minority groups have been after his scalp because they are of the impression that he has been in their way in the Senate. I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that when the pressure vultures have picked clean the bones of Senator BILBO their insatiable appetite for blood will not be satisfied until they find another victim or victims of the same standing, men who might think as Senator BILBO does. Who might such victims be? One might be my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. One might be my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. One might be myself, because I entertain the same views. I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that I am firm in my convictions, and, so far as I am concerned, I propose to speak on the issues involved as I think about them, and as I have spoken in the past. If I have to be a martyr to the cause, I shall be, and I shall be happy in the realization that I have done my duty to my God and to my country.

I have tried to point out the attitude of Senator BILBO respecting the bill providing for the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Committee. As all Senators know, that bill had as its object the creation of a committee which could, without giving an employer the right to go into court, force the employment of a certain number of colored people, a certain number of Jews, a certain number of Christians, a certain number of Chinese, and so on. Senator BILBO opposed that measure.

Senator BILBO also opposed the bill providing for the establishment of a minimum wage, as that measure was first introduced. The minimum-wage bill, as it was first introduced, contained a clause which would create a bureau having full power to go into an employer's business, classify every job in that business, and then fix wages beginning at the point where Congress had left off. If the two bills, against which Senator BILBO and I and other Senators so violently fought, had been passed, we would have had one committee telling the employers of this Nation whom to employ, and an administrator telling them how much they should pay. Of course, we opposed those two measures, because, as I said on the Senate floor, if those bills had been passed we might as well hang crepe on the doors of enterprise. We opposed those measures. Of course, the groups which favored the two bills, and the other bills to which I have referred, are now after BILBO's scalp. They have joined with other groups in their efforts to bar BILBO from the Senate. That is what is back of this fight, and nothing else.

Does anyone wonder why so much attention has been paid in the last 4 or 5 years to whatever Senator BILBO did? Regardless of what he said in the Senate it was quoted. When it was disclosed that in a letter to a lady in New York he had addressed as "Dear Dago," reams of paper were utilized throughout the country to advertise that fact, to talk about and discuss it. Why? The reason why that was done was that for the past 4 or 5 years there has been a consistent effort made by many groups to build a case against Senator BILBO. The same groups participated to some extent in the Mississippi election. They are now knocking on the doors of the Senate insisting that Senator BILBO, although he has been duly elected, be denied his seat.

Mr. Secretary, why should the election of Senator BILBO have become so important all over the world? I returned from a world trip in August. I was abroad during the election in Mississippi. In newspapers in the Philippines, China, Egypt, Greece, and other countries I saw countless articles, and a large number of pictures of Senator BILBO addressing crowds in Mississippi. Why should that be? Why should so much interest be created in this man's election? Why should Life magazine, Time, and other publications have sent many editors and photographers to the State of Mississippi at great cost in order to follow the campaign of Senator BILBO? I should like to know the answer. There has been a concerted endeavor on the part of certain groups to start with BILBO, because they felt that he was the most vulnerable. As I stated a while ago, if they should succeed in throwing him out, other Members of the Senate who share his views had better look out.

Those groups are not fooling anyone. The same groups which for the past 4 years, have been fighting Senator BILBO and what he stands for are behind this movement. But instead of having the courage to come to the Senate and say, "Throw him out because of his views on the poll-tax bill," they have camouflaged the issue. They have wrapped it in a neat package and have labeled it, "Throw him out because he has accepted a Cadillac and a few pieces of furniture." Instead of having the courage to come before the Senate and say, "Throw Senator BILBO out because of his views on FEPC," what are they doing? They are saying, "Throw him out because he has illegally collected funds to build a church and parsonage." Instead of coming before the Senate and saying, "Throw him out because of his views on the antilynching bill," they are saying, "Throw him out because he accepted the offer of a contractor to paint his house." Instead of saying to the Senate, "Throw him out because of his views on the minimum-wage bill and other legislation against which he has fought," they are saying, "Throw him out because he engaged a contractor to build a lake and a swimming pool on his farm."

That is what is happening. These charges have been before the people of Mississippi for many years. They were discussed during the last campaign. They were known for 3 or 4 years. In fact, the record shows that many of them were known not long after the events are alleged to have occurred. With that knowledge, why were not efforts made then to oust him? The march is on to destroy southern traditions which are as deeply rooted as the giants of the forest. If Senator BILBO is toppled, we shall see what will happen to other Senators who hold the same views which he has the courage and the wisdom to entertain and express.

The pressure groups which are now advocating the causes which I have tried to define or explain, in reference to the poll tax, the FEPC, and other issues, will be back here. They will plague every Senator and every Member of the other House. I am not an old man, but in my lifetime I have seen many politicians cringe and cower like a belabored hound beneath his master's leash when confronted by groups asking that this or that be done, "else we will send you to political oblivion."

With such pressure groups permeating the Capitol at Washington ever since I have been here, I can really and truly say that I am fearful that representative government is at stake. The people of this Nation expect their representatives to use their God-given common sense and judgment in deciding the issues which come before them. They do not expect us to be intimidated by any group into doing the bidding of selfish pressure groups who look to themselves, who look through the big end of the telescope to find out where they come in, without in any manner evaluating the effect of their proposals upon other groups.

I am very hopeful that new Senators, as well as many older Senators, will give heed to what I have said because they will be plagued. For the good of our country, for the good of our citadel of democracy, I hope that all of us will follow our own inclinations, our own views, and use our good, common horse sense in deciding what should or should not be done.

I am somewhat disappointed. I have said it before, but it may not have hit the mark at the time. There has been in this country in the past 10 years or more a fight between the two great political parties to capture the colored vote, to capture votes of minorities. These groups are insatiable. We can satisfy them for a time, as the Democrats did for 14 years, but whenever we cease giving, or whenever things no longer happen as they expect, see what occurs at the polls.

In the recent campaign of Senator BILBO, as I tried to point out a while ago, brand-new tactics were employed, tactics which I believe were not resorted to in any other State.

As a rule, press representatives, photographers, and radiomen are about the only ones following a candidate around in a State, giving the other parts of the country the news of what is happening in the election which is going on in that State.

As I indicated a while ago, during the last campaign in Mississippi, Life magazine was represented by a score of photographers and many writers. Some of the largest newspapers in the country were represented. Stories were published about Senator BILBO, and I am sure that many of them were tinged with prejudice. Such stories were published throughout the country.

That, to my way of thinking, is what has caused many good people to take the attitude which they are now assuming against Senator BILBO. Senator BILBO's opponents have succeeded pretty well in advertising his election and in giving the people a great deal of misinformation which, in my humble opinion, is responsible for much of the effort which is now being exerted to throw the distinguished Senator-elect from Mississippi out of the Senate.

I am just as sure as that I am standing before the Senate today that during the campaign in the State of Mississippi, except for the outside influence that was brought to bear, BILBO might have had a hard time being reelected. BILBO has been Governor of his State for three terms; he has been Lieutenant Governor for one term; he has been in the Senate for 12 years. A man with such a long life in politics—I do not care where he comes from—is bound to have many political enemies within his State.

Long before the election last July I was told by some very prominent citizens of the State of Mississippi that they thought they had BILBO this time. But lo and behold, when outside influence began to come into Mississippi, when Walter Winchell and the great Drew Pearson began to write about BILBO; when Time magazine sent its representatives there; when they advocated the defeat of BILBO; when they began to talk about giving the colored people the vote, and all that, the people of Mississippi simply became angry and sent BILBO back to us. That is what happened. If it had not been for the outside influence and the resentment that the people of Mississippi felt because of such outside influence, BILBO might have had a great deal of trouble, because, as I have said, a man so long in politics is bound to have many political enemies.

I dislike to say it—I may be all wrong, and I hope I am—but the same groups will be knocking at the doors of the Eightieth Congress from the time the Senate is organized until 2 years from now. Watch them. They will be back. I am warning Senators. They had better do their bidding, else they may suffer at their hands.

The great Republican Party is now in power, and I was hopeful that it would make a good start. For many years it has been criticizing what the Democrats have done. The Republican Party should go after big game, and quit shooting sparrows. Republican Senators have said on many occasions that this, that, or the other ought to be done. Let them go to it, and God bless them.

I cannot help but express disappointment in many of my colleagues across the aisle who are insisting on the course which they are now pursuing. I hope that before this debate is over they will change their minds.

This morning I received a letter in the mail which I think is quite appropriate, and I should like to read it. Strange as it seems, this letter discusses some of the points which I have been attempting to make. I am not acquainted with the membership of the association from which the letter comes, but it is organized under an act of Congress of July 14, 1933, and it is the Allied Veterans' Political Association of America. I presume that every Member of the Senate has received a letter like the one I hold in my hand, because it is addressed to the Members of the United States Senate, and is dated at New York City, December 31, 1946. It reads as follows:

THE ALLIED VETERANS POLITICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
December 31, 1946.

Re Senator BILBO.

To the Members of the United States Senate:

Who rules America? Is Congress already yielding allegiance to the purse strings of

communism? Is communism so strongly entrenched in the high places of this land that he who refuses to serve them must be eliminated? Why should communism seek to unseat Senator BILBO? For the past several years BILBO has been an outstanding opponent of communism. His name is high on the must-eliminate list of communism. To attack and oust BILBO is to silence other Senators and to make them amenable to direct control—to intimidate them. The Communists organized a purge during the recent political campaign. The purpose of that purge, overtly conducted in the CIO and PAC groups, was to defeat those politicians and others who were outspoken against communism. BILBO was not defeated. Public records disclose that CIO and PAC groups did not oppose any Member of Congress who had not openly voiced antagonism against the Communist Party.

On December 26, 1945, a letter was mailed to every Member of the Congress, and to other public officials. Headed "An appeal to the conscience of the House of Representatives,' the letter described the policy of the American Veterans Committee to control the veterans and play upon their emotions by inciting racial and religious antagonisms. Their method was that used by subversive and Communist groups—seeming championship of disaffected minority groups. This letter stated: "We know how absurd the appeals of religious and racial prejudices may be, but we also know (from sad experience) the actual crimes that have been the direct result of such appeals. The AVC alleges to fight the cause of persecuted groups. They build their power on the blind faith and loyalty of weaklings. Once convinced of AVC sincerity, these poor, misguided, but sincere, people follow those who appear to be fighting their battles for them. We cannot censure them. But, gentlemen of the Congress, this same blind faith and loyal support—no matter how sincerely intended, can create a very serious political crisis—a crisis that now bids fair to become the most destructive in our whole national history. They are organized and directed by a group of highly intelligent, experienced, and wealthy leaders—toward a well-planned objective. It is only when you and I, who know better, who are aware of the spurious nature of their cogent and specious pretense; it is only when you and I lose our heads and play cheap and dirty politics, when we forsake sincerity of purpose and the welfare of all the people, that we play right into their hands. We then find ourselves amidst strange bedfellows. God and Stalin or Satan cannot bed together. The gentlemen of Congress are familiar with the methods used by the Communists.

It is needless to cite the case of Senator THEODORE BILBO, of Mississippi—a sincere, loyal, and fine southern gentleman. Senator BILBO had spoken upon a subject which is of a very controversial nature; a subject to which he had given a great deal of close attention and real study. He had every right to express his opinion of that subject. Yet, communism crucifies him for doing so. While I do not necessarily subscribe to his opinions, my organization will fight to the limit for his right to express that opinion. In doing so, he stepped on the corns of certain groups—for the subject was one commonly used by Communists as a ready means of augmenting its power and membership. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, thousands of letters, highly inflammatory in nature, postmarked from every State in the Union, flooded the office of Senator BILBO. Those letters subjected BILBO to every conceivable form of vile anathema and vilification. He was criticized, cursed, and called unprintably filthy names. His secretary, Edward Terry, prepared replies to them, and, in righteous indignation, BILBO signed and permitted a few well-justified letters to go to remote sections of the Nation; to widely separated localities. However, we are now confronted by all of these letters, all assembled obviously, by one hand; all viciously used by that hand to re-create Senator BILBO as the persecutor of racial minorities. BILBO was goaded into a situation, and it is now being used as a cross to crucify him. Behind this whole campaign stands the sinister force of the Communist Party. You are being made party to their conspiracy. What they are now doing to Senator BILBO, they can and they will do to you. The Communists want to control our Government. They will stop at nothing to seize that control. Part of that control is vested in you. You, yourself, may be their next victim. Even your most cautious defenses will be as futile as those of BILBO, and avail you nothing in your trial.

Proof of what was then written to Congress is amply shown in the parade of events before your Senate committee investigating the BILBO case. There, Ed Terry, the confidential secretary of Senator BILBO, boldly admits that, on September 15, 1945, he accepted from a wealthy Communist leader (Simon Liberfeld) $15,000 in cash, to be used by him for the purpose of defeating in the election, his own employer. He was promised an additional $10,000. Observe, in this bribe, a tacit agreement to provide for Terry's own business future. Terry has revealed that the Communists are destroying BILBO, presumably to replace him with their henchman. You, the Senate, are duty bound to exhaustively investigate those other sums of money necessarily given to Terry to bribe him to effect BILBO's defeat. The Senate should ascertain just how many months prior to September 1945, this bribe taking was going on. Was Terry the immediate agent and cause of the widespread issuance of those inflammatory letters? Were the replies thereto, admittedly written by him and signed by BILBO, actually invented by Terry for use as part of this Communist scheme to disgrace BILBO and destroy him? This is the very crux and the essence of the entire investigation. Terry definitely links communism with the smear campaign against BILBO; it discloses the perpetrators of the cause of this investigation.

BILBO has submitted an acceptable explanation of every other fact involved in the inquiry.

Every Member of the Congress knows all too well—a secretary can make or break a Senator. A secretary has complete control of all correspondence. It is impossible for any Senator to read every letter arriving at, or emanating from, his office. That task is necessarily the function of the secretarial staff. Naturally, Senators must sign documents placed before them by a secretary—a person in whom he must have absolute confidence and faith—and usually with none or cursory scanning. Hence—when a secretary is bribed by the Communist Party to frame a Senator—that Senator is almost inevitably trapped. This procedure is merely one of the lesser phases of the familiar Communist procedure—boring from within with traitors.

The Senate should also investigate the other secretaries of Senators—and, for that matter, try to discover how many Senators are themselves involved in this Communist attempt to overthrow our Government by a policy of quietly permeating all subordinate channels. Have the Communists already acquired complete domination of a majority of our leaders themselves?

Show me a Senator who is not guilty of taking care of his constituents—and I will show you a legislator who will never be reelected to serve a second term. A legislator must first of all protect our Nation—and then fulfill the necessary obligations of his office to his constituents—by personal favors as well as by securing that legislation deemed requisite for local need, or of benefit to constituents directly. This is the commonly accepted procedure for perpetuating every legislator in office. You do it. Why blame BILBO then?

I have delineated an organized Communist attempt to oust BILBO. Does the Senate know of the exact word-for-word resolution urging impeaching of BILBO, simultaneously presented to the major veteran organizations all over America? Why identical? Why spontaneous—if not emanating from the same Communist source? A few veteran groups passed that resolution. It was presented in New York City and passed by some American Legion posts—but New York County threw it out as Communist inspiration—largely because of my analysis and opposition. Did these resolutions emanate from the same hand that dictated the inflammatory letters about BILBO? Was that hand Terry's? Through the 6-year war period, I was chairman of the American Legion Subversive Activities—un-American committee—in a strategic position to know the actual workings of the Communist-controlled groups in directing their slur-and-smear propaganda against Senator BILBO, as well as others. I knew what happened. Being a sociologist and a successful politician for many years—I could interpret it, too.

I sincerely maintain that Senator BILBO is an honest and upright legislator who in the main, has shown a much more discerning, long-range vision than most politicians. BILBO has shown no anti-Semetic, or anti-this or that—racial group tendencies. Nor has he ever shown any enmity for the Negro. His attitude is much like the sincere and far-seeing parent who is evading indulgence and pampering of every whim of his child in a very real effort to build for that child, a bright and promising future. Millions of our citizens agree with BILBO as to what constitutes Negro welfare. Curiously enough, the highest type Negro also agrees with BILBO's theories. Give the Negro the fullest opportunity for self-expression, educate and develop the best in his race to his optimum capacity, and allow them to live their own lives in their own way. BILBO, as does almost every white man, objects to 100 percent acceptance of the Negro into participation in private family lives and affairs. Many whites honestly believe in intermarriage with Negroes—but only if it is the other fellow whose sister or daughter intermarries. Invariably, the white or Negro girl who marries into the opposite race is an outcast in both races. Because of the unseen forces begot by group misuse and abuse of the championship of the rights of suffering minority groups, most people are reluctant to honestly express their views. In their hearts, they agree with BILBO; for social security, they tactfully conform and give lip service. There are many persons, as in New York City, who have never before been for or against any racial group. A New York mayor made the whites Negro-conscious and stirred up hatred for Negroes. That mayor imported the Negro for his ballot and put him on relief. Landlords, with houses tenanted by Negroes, found that courts would neither require the tenants to pay rent nor evict them. To avoid a complete loss of property, landlords razed their dwellings—and set up a housing shortage. Citizens are daily assaulted, robbed, and killed by Negro criminals, with the police turning an unseeing back knowing that to protect the citizen would be to lose their own jobs.

Forcing the Negro on the white is not building up a Negro future. You cannot teach, train, educate, guide, and develop the Negro by passing laws. BILBO is a keen, analytical student of sociology. He knows history. He is an authority on the race problem. BILBO has urged that the future of the Negro be assured by sane, sound, educational policies. He does not seek to nurture the spoiled and pampered brat. As a politician,

he differs from that mayor of New York who cultivated the Negro to achieve certain personal political objectives. He does not want to protect the Negro in crime and injustice, nor train him to a life of cancerous social growth. BILBO has never refused the Negro the right to vote. If a State has set up socially acceptable conditions to which the Negro voter must conform if he is to vote, then that Negro must obey the law. Every voter has to conform to legal safeguards on the ballot. If Mississippi has set up certain regulations for declaring a change in party allegiance, then the Negro must conform to those regulations if he is to change his party.

The Republican Party has secured control of the Congress on probation. If they use that power to unseat BILBO, they will make a grievious and irreparable mistake. In effect, they are confirming the Democratic accusation of Republican complicity with communism. They are driving at one of the most fundamental of our constitutional rights—freedom of expression, freedom from fear, and freedom to think, feel, and act as God guides us to do. We can ill afford an American Stalin to pattern and to punctuate our thinking, feeling, and doing. The people of Mississippi elected BILBO. They like him. What right have we to dictate to the good people of Mississippi who is to represent them? If the thinking of a man as highly cultured, educated, and experienced as BILBO—whose extraordinary intelligence and political acumen has never been challenged—is not approved by subversive, minority groups, then it behooves the Senate to examine into the activities of those groups who persecute BILBO. Focus the spotlight of investigation on the persecutors—there is bribery and corruption there.

The critics of BILBO know little, and care less about the real racial needs of any minority group. They are not students, economists, sociologists. They are pandering to racial bigotry because it is a ready weapon to crucify BILBO, whose honestly expounded opinions chanced to be contrary to acceptance by certain small but active groups. His utterance was publicized, misquoted, and misinterpreted to serve as a flame to incite racial antagonisms. Then, with the cooperation of the racial bigots as a basis, Communists seek to eliminate BILBO by bribery and conspiracy. Terry seems to be well versed in these political machinations. He has placed himself in much the same category as a former New York mayor who rode to power on imported Negro votes. Then, in the flowering of political success, that mayor abandoned the Negroes to join another more fruitful issue. We are told that Terry now has a million-dollar credit with which to embark on housing construction. Was that million dollar credit authenticated by the same Communist who bribed him with an initial $15,000 to initiate BILBO's political downfall? One suspects $8,000 clerks who get millionaire credit. Is this million-dollar credit Terry's pay off? Is it the 30 pieces of silver?

It is certainly not the duty of the Senate, in its official investigation of allegations made against Senator BILBO, to fritter about on a witch hunt. But it is their plain duty to thoroughly investigate every pertinent factor developed in the investigation.

Terry, his admitted $15,000 bribe, his offer of additional funds, his succession to a vast money credit for entry into a highly paid construction activity—his sudden success and financial power after quitting a minor and low-wage position—all of this is very pertinent data. Every power of the Senate; every agency of our Government, should be called upon to explore the latent possibilities of criminal conspiracy lying therein.

Who is responsible for the demand that BILBO be subjected to the humiliation of an investigation by the Senate? Why was he denied the privilege of facing his accusors? What is the purpose of the Senate in clothing in silence the identities of those who are immediately responsible for an investigation of BILBO?

We think that Ed Terry can supply the answer to a lot of these questions. He should be compelled to do so. The person who gave Terry his $15,000—and unquestionably, many additional thousands of dollars to induce Terry to betray BILBO—that man did not come to Terry unknown and unsolicited. He was introduced to Terry by a mutual friend, and then only after Terry had been "sounded out" and expressed willingness to sell out. Terry should be forced to disclose all he knows about these persons who were instrumental in his betrayal of his employer. Those persons knew Terry—his weak points, his ability and willingness to "deliver." They knew how to approach him; how to lay the ground work and how to effect liaison between Terry and their own principles. No trustful, confidential secretary can be easily bribed or influenced unless some of his personal friends are "in on the take." Who were Terry's confederates in this conspiracy?

The United States Senate—through you, gentlemen—is itself on trial. It is up to the Senate to clean its own skirt of the contamination of communism—or to confess its firm allegiance to (and control by) communism. Every sincere and honest legislator who now investigates BILBO, is himself face to face with the same elimination policies by the same Communist Party power. What happens to BILBO, gentlemen, can happen to you.

America should not easily forget the bitter lesson learned in the downfall of Germany; the betrayal of France, Austria, and Poland. The conquest of these nations was not an overnight achievement by external forces alone. That conquest was the result of a long, patient, tedious, and insidious infiltration through the power of those "on the inside." The first conquest was that of the political leadership of the country. The first victory was betrayal by those who held places of power and trust—just such a place as you now hold. America faces that same insidious infiltration and domination at this moment. The Congress is an immediate objective. It is for the Congress to determine just how far and how successful this domination from without is to progress. It is for the Congress to decide when and how it is to end.

Who now rules America? In your investigation of Senator BILBO, you are answering this very pertinent question. The Senate is on trial as well as Senator BILBO.

President Roosevelt was accused of fraternizing with the Communists. Even intimidated newspapers both covertly and overtly describe Communist Party infiltration and control in Washington. It was because of the bureaucratic control of the Democratic Party, their Communistic alliances—that I, and many like me, organized reform groups. I incorporated the New Jersey State Democrats, and advocated the defeat of the Democratic Party so that a complete party purge would be effected. We must eliminate the Communists from American government and American political parties. But no citizen worthy of his American heritage expects the Republican Party to continue as the instrument to effect the objectives of the Communist Party. Your conduct in investigating BILBO is your declaration of purpose as to your stand on communism. My organization stands for the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, without discrimination between race, creed, or color.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL W. SILVERMAN,
National President.

Mr. Secretary, I am hopeful that that letter will be read by many Senators who do not at this time adorn the Senate by their presence. I believe the letter expresses good logic, and that in a measure it demonstrates what I was trying to point out to the Senate before I began to read it, namely, that there are in America today groups which have the ability to obtain as members some of the leading figures in America. Many such persons not only permit their names to be used on the committee letterheads but they furnished a considerable amount of the funds which make the machinery of such organizations operate. Nevertheless, many such organizations are operated by a species of termites who bore from the inside and who have been at work in this country for many years. They are now at work on many of the Members of this august body. Believe me when I say that if Senators do not support and further the principles and measures which some such organizations are now advocating and fostering, the organizations will make every attempt at their command to purge such Senators at the next election.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator if he will yield, subject to the distinct understanding that he will not lose the floor thereby, in order that the junior Senator from Oregon may make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under those conditions, I gladly yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the present Chairman pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to call to the chair, relieving him from duty in the chair, any Member of the Senate, for such period of time as he desires, subject to the condition that the Chairman pro tempore will keep himself within the precincts of the Senate, available to retake the chair at any time when any Member of the Senate requests that he do so, or take the chair at his own desire whenever he cares to. That is my unanimous-consent request.

I think it only fair that our Chairman pro tempore should be extended this courtesy, and it is not clear from the rules whether or not he can call a Senator to the chair. I do not think we should engage in any debate as to whether he can or cannot without unanimous consent. I think this courtesy should be extended to him. I think the request is a fair one, and I hope the Senate will unanimously join me in it.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor on the understanding that he would not lose the floor by yielding to me.

Mr. WHITE. On the understanding that it will not change the parliamentary situation or affect any question now pending, I am very glad to join with the Senator from Oregon in the request. I hope it will be granted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield under the same conditions.

Mr. HATCH. I have just entered the Chamber, and I heard a unanimous-

consent request being proposed. I think I am in complete accord with it, but should there not be a quorum called?

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

Mr. WHITE. I see no necessity for it, but I should have no objection.

Mr. HATCH. May not the unanimous-consent agreement be stated again? I did not hear all of it.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon will restate the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. The unanimous-consent request is that the Chairman pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to call upon any Senator to take the chair and relieve him of his duty of presiding over the Senate for such period of time as he desires, subject to the condition and understanding that he will keep himself within the precincts of the Senate in order that he may be available to retake the chair at any time upon the request of any Member of the Senate; and with the further understanding that my unanimous-consent request, if granted, will not displace any business now pending before the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Secretary, I do not desire to suggest the absence of a quorum. I am in accord with the request.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Secretary, I happened to be chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946. The purpose of that committee is to investigate expenditures of all Senators during the recent campaign. Such a process has been going on for many years. Our committee has been fairly active since we organized last July. We have received a few complaints, some of them minor in character. We proceeded to investigate all complaints received by us which were worthy of being considered. Senate Resolution 224, pursuant to which the special committee was appointed, authorized the committee during the campaign to investigate any charges made against any Senator by any person interested within a State or by any citizen. The powers given the committee are very broad. Among the charges which were thrown into our laps was one over which the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program had taken jurisdiction, particularly with reference to the $25,000 contribution that was made to Senator BILBO for conducting a campaign.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to ask the Senator if he would object to my suggesting the absence of a quorum without prejudice to his right to the floor? I notice very few Senators are present.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refuse to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Senators may come into the Chamber in response to the roll call, but they may go out immediately thereafter, so it will not make any difference. I do not suppose many Senators are interested in what is now going on. Probably many of them are not anxious to know the facts. Of course, it may take a little time to give the facts to the Senate, and Senators will have ample opportunity to listen to me.

Mr. President, the form of the resolution providing for the appointment of this committee is about the same as that of resolutions which have been submitted in the Senate many times in the past. The resolution begins as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1946, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) the extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of the United States Senator in 1946 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) the amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign, or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention, held in 1946, at which a candidate for United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) the use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates; and

(5) such other matters relating to the election of United States Senators in 1946, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

I read the first section of the resolution to point out what the authority was. When the charge was made before our committee that Senator BILBO had received $25,000 back in 1942 for an election which was then in progress—that of Senator Wall Doxey—we placed the matter before our general counsel and he advised us that we had no jurisdiction to investigate those charges because they did not pertain to the campaign in which Senator BILBO was nominated; and therefore our committee saw fit not to proceed with any investigation of that subject.

As to our authority, as I indicated, the charges could be preferred not only by an opponent of the Senator, but by any citizen of the State who had anything to offer that would show corruption, fraud, or any violation of the laws referred to in the resolution. As I shall attempt to point out in a moment when I reach the charges which were preferred against Senator BILBO, it will become apparent that those charges did not involve the expenditure of money. The sole issue in the charges, as I conceive it, was whether or not Senator BILBO, by the use of force or in any other manner, intimidated the colored people of his State and thereby prevented them from registering or voting during the election of 1946. That was the sole issue which our committee had before it.

The authority to which I referred is contained in section 2 of the resolution, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee, under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

The resolution contains other sections which are not pertinent at the moment. They refer to an appropriation to be made to carry on the work of the committee.

As I indicated a while ago, the sole purpose of this committee, created by the Senate, was to investigate the campaign of any Senator whose election was held last year; and, of course, the resolution affected the election of every Senator-elect who is ready to take the oath of office. I am glad to inform the Senate that there have been relatively few complaints, and I doubt if any more will be filed than have heretofore been filed.

Mr. President, a moment ago I referred to the charges which were preferred against Senator BILBO. I ask the close attention of Senators to the charges, so that they can determine for themselves that the charges do not involve any fraud or any act on the part of Senator BILBO with respect to any money spent by him or, as I interpret it, any activity on his part during this campaign.

What is the origin of these charges and this long petition, which occupies a little more than five pages of closely printed matter? Was the petition drawn by citizens of Mississippi who felt themselves injured? No. It was drawn by and under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, of New York. The Civil Rights Congress has expressed itself in no uncertain terms as desirous of forming a committee within its ranks to throw BILBO out of the Senate. I charge that the Civil Rights Congress is loaded with

termites—men and women who are boring from within, and who are now attacking the citadel of our democracy. This petition was composed and entirely written, I charge, by the Civil Rights Congress; and the citizens of Mississippi had no more to do with it than had my distinguished colleague. The record shows that it was fostered by a branch of the NAACP and some kind of a league headed by T. B. Wilson; but when the committee itself called upon the citizens of Mississippi who had signed that petition, there was not one who knew of his own knowledge any of the facts stated in it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is familiar with the pleading of southern attorneys in Louisiana and in Mississippi. This petition was evidently drawn up by some attorneys-at-law. By reason of its redundancy and repetition, its lavish use of synonyms, is there any question at all that the pleading was not drawn up by any lawyer from Mississippi or Louisiana, without going any further?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it. The record itself shows the fact.

Mr. OVERTON. But one does not need to go beyond the petition itself?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

Mr. OVERTON. I never in my life saw such a profligate use of synonyms. It would be useless to read them; Senators can do that for themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. The petition was drawn by an attorney representing the Civil Rights Congress. I cannot recall his name at this time. He was present at the hearings, and, just before the hearings were had, he left the State of Mississippi. I was informed that he got hold of a number of witnesses and had them appear before our committee. I say to the Senate that every witness submitted by him or by anyone else was heard, and every opportunity was given to every Senator on the committee to ask questions.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 10 years. I have served on many committees and subcommittees, and never have I been a member of a committee in which there has been such a fine attendance. Every member of the committee was present every day we sat, except that for a short period one member was absent. There were seldom less than four out of the five members present. Every Senator was given ample opportunity to ask questions to his heart's content, and after the committee concluded, we turned the questioning over to our attorneys, and they interrogated the witnesses with the utmost latitude.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ELLENDER. Just a moment. Thereafter, by consent, we permitted Senator BILBO to ask as many questions as he desired. The attorney for Senator BILBO prepared written questions, and those questions were propounded by me, and every opportunity was given the witnesses to answer them.

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator ever known a case involving an election where the contestee did not have the right to examine witnesses either in person or through his counsel?

Mr. ELLENDER. I never have. To be frank about it, our committee discussed that matter, and we concluded that the best policy to pursue was to give the right to Senator BILBO to ask questions through the chairman. If we had not done that, we could have refused the same opportunity to the proponents of the petition. They had two or three attorneys there. We felt that that was the best way to handle the matter.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I wish to ask the Senator if he was referring to organizations in New York which became involved in the Bilbo matter. The Senator has doubtless read in the press that some charges had been made with respect to the election to the House of Representatives of a member of the American Labor Party, in the State of New York. It was charged that a Republican who was interested in the congressional election had been murdered because of his activities on election day. It was called murder in New York. It would be lynching if it had happened in Louisiana.

It was charged that there had been numerous violations of the law with respect to contributions to the campaign made by the individual involved.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, in the recent senatorial and congressional campaigns, endeavored to frighten the electors of the country with the idea that the radicals or the extreme left wing element wanted to take over the Government of the United States; that there was infiltration by the Communists into positions of power, and that only the election of a Republican Congress would save the country.

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of Senator BILBO, I think everyone will agree that his name is certainly anathema No. 1 to all the Communists in the United States; and yet in this drive to oust radicalism and to preserve the country against communism, we find the No. 1 anathema of the Communists the subject of a violent controversy in the Senate, while, so far as I am advised, a representative of the Communist Party in the House of Representatives, where the Republicans also control, was not even asked to stand aside when he presented himself to take the oath of office.

I ask the Senator if he does not think there is such a thing as infiltration by left-wingers and that they have a way of transposing themselves very easily from one side of the aisle to the other.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to criticize the action of my good friends at the other end of the Capitol. Of course, that is their business, and I am not at all familiar with the Marcantonio case, which I suppose is what the Senator refers to. I do not follow the newspaper reports, but it may be that a great deal of the talk which the newspaper articles generated was somewhat exaggerated. I do not know, but I believe that Mr. MARCANTONIO should certainly have been sworn in by the House of Representatives; and if any charges have been made or are to be made against him, I certainly believe he should have his day in court. I wish to take off my hat right now to the Members of the House of Representatives, for notwithstanding all of the grave charges which have been made against Mr. MARCANTONIO, the House of Representatives has permitted him, as I understand, to take his seat in the House. I do not know what will happen to him. If the charges warrant ouster, I know that the Members of the House of Representatives will do their duty.

Mr. MAYBANK rose.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he issued subpenaes for all persons who were suggested as being witnesses against Mr. BILBO, regardless of whether they were recommended by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or regardless of whoever may have recommended them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who was present, that full opportunity was given to every witness who desired to be heard. For the first day we tried to get the witnesses to come voluntarily. Many came. Some refused to come, because they desired to be subpenaed. As soon as we found that out, we held a conference, at which we decided that if we were to get the witnesses who knew something about the matter or who could help in the case, we should subpena them. Thereupon, we gave instructions to our attorney to draw up the proper subpenaes; and I, as chairman of the committee, signed the subpenaes and had them served throughout the State of Mississippi.

Let me say a word in further answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator. He will recall that every day when we recessed or adjourned from the morning until the afternoon or from the afternoon until the next morning, the chairman of the committee rose and asked whether there were present any other witnesses who desired to be heard. I wish to say also that for at least 2 weeks, or, in fact, from the time when we determined the date and hour at which we were to hold hearings in the State of Mississippi, I instructed our counsel, who went to Mississippi and publicized the fact, to invite every man, woman, and child in Mississippi who knew anything about these charges to come forward and testify. We even went so far as to say to them that if they came before us, we would protect them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that on all occasions the courthouse was rather overcrowded; and is it not also a fact, as the Senator from Louisiana has stated, that when he called for the witnesses to come forward, many, both colored and white, came forward?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. We elicited from them every bit of evidence which they had to offer, and we gave to all witnesses very ample opportunity to give to the committee whatever they knew about the case.

Mr. MAYBANK. In addition to that, is it not true that some of the witnesses who were subpenaed were delayed because of the distance they had to travel, and in their cases the committee postponed the time for their appearance, in order to suit their convenience?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. President, I do not think it really is necessary for us to say anything further on that subject, because I am confident that my two distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who served with distinction on that committee, know that we made every effort to hear all the evidence in substantiation of the charges.

As I have said, the charges are long and somewhat complicated. I believe that many good lawyers probably could have drafted them in about two paragraphs. However, the persons who drafted the charges wished to be certain to have them cover everything. In other words, I cannot help but feel that they themselves thought they had a rather bad case, and it was their desire to cover every possible point.

I wish to say to the Senate that our committee diligently investigated this matter. Today we have before the Senate our report, and I propose to read it after a while.

Mr. President, what is this petition? As I have said, it was drafted, not by a citizen of Mississippi but by an organization which I again charge to have within itself a lot of termites who are boring from within. Today that organization is composed of people who, as I have said heretofore, have belonged to various groups throughout the United States. How they are able to induce fine citizens of New York, fine citizens of Pennsylvania, and fine citizens of other States of the Union to put up money to help them out is simply beyond my comprehension. Some of these days they will wake up and will find out, and I hope that happens before it is too late.

Mr. President, just listen to this petition. I hope all Members of the Senate listen to it:

To the honorable Senate of the United States of America:

(Attention Committee on Privileges and Elections, Committee on Campaign Expenditures.)

The undersigned hereby petition for the redress of the following grievances and respectfully show and allege—

Mr. President, I repeat that I hope all Senators will follow the reading of this petition. The Members of the Senate will notice that there is not a word in it about unlawful expenditures or anything of the kind. As I interpret the petition, it is based solely on the charge of intimidation, and so forth, of the Negro citizens in Mississippi.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Louisiana does not mean to imply by that statement, does he, that his committee would not have jurisdiction to go into any matter outside of campaign expenditures? His committee did have jurisdiction to go into other things, in addition to actual campaign expenditures, did it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I explained a moment ago, our powers were very broad. But our powers had to be confined to the election which was held in 1946.

I stated a while ago that the $25,000 contribution charge which the Senator's committee investigated was submitted to us, we submitted it to our attorneys, and we were told by our attorneys that our committee had no jurisdiction of that because it referred to an election which took place in 1942, and had absolutely nothing to do with the election of Senator BILBO in July 1946.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. For a question. Does the Senator desire to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; on that very issue. I have a copy of a letter dated October 8, 1946, in which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, sent to Senator James M. Mead a copy of the charges, which letter was mailed to him by former Representative Ross Collins. The Senator from Rhode Island sent a copy also to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on October 8.

If the Senator will yield long enough I should like to put into the RECORD a copy of the letter received from the Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and also state that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program referred certain letters to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of which I am a member. Being a member of both committees, I happen to have personal knowledge of these facts, and, as I understand, those matters were referred to the special committee of which the able Senator from Louisiana was the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so indicated a moment ago. I stated that we had considered the matter, and at the time some of us felt that we might have to investigate, but before proceeding we decided to have our committee counsel pass judgment on the question, as we did as to every other charge made, and our committee counsel advised us that since the charge referred to expenditures or matters which related to another election, or which related to 1942, and had no connection with the 1946 election, under the resolution giving us the power to investigate we could not go into the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that does explain the matter. As I have tried to demonstrate, these two committees worked together in such a way as would not conflict with the jurisdiction of each other. But the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program certainly had jurisdiction, and when it is stated on the floor of the Senate that we are interlopers, I think that is absurd. We were working under jurisdiction properly provided; we had had this matter referred to us by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and we took jurisdiction after we heard from them. For that reason I should like to offer these matters for the RECORD at this point.

While I am on the floor, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to lose the floor, and I yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yesterday I asked permission to put into the official RECORD of the Senate the report of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, and through some mistake of some kind, either in what I had said or in the understanding of what I had said, it was not included in the official RECORD. I now ask that the report by printed in the RECORD, together with the correspondence to which I have heretofore referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan asks that certain papers be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. KILGORE, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted the following additional report:

TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN SENATOR THEODORE G. BILBO AND VARIOUS WAR CONTRACTORS

Introduction

Allegations were made to the committee that Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi, had received certain sums of money and had accepted personal property and improvements to real estate owned by him from a number of contractors performing construction work for the United States Government in connection with the national defense program.

Upon instructions from the committee, a preliminary investigation was conducted as to these allegations. After presentation of the results of this preliminary investigation to the committee, on November 18, 1946, the committee decided to proceed with a full investigation. The chairman appointed a subcommittee consisting of Senator James M. Mead (Democrat, New York) as chairman and Senator James M. Tunnell (Democrat, Delaware), and Senator Homer Ferguson (Republican, Michigan), to conduct the inquiry. This subcommittee held executive hearings, and on November 23, 1946, announced that it would commence public hearings on Thursday, December 12, 1946.

At Senator BILBO's request, the committee notified him of the nature of the allegations as then known to the committee and advised that it would be willing to subpena, at committee expense, any witnesses suggested by him after the committee had satisfied itself that such witnesses would be able to present first-hand information as to the matters before the committee. Prior to the hearing, no request was made by Senator BILBO that the committee produce any witnesses other than those subpenaed on the committee's own motion, which were stated by Senator BILBO's attorney, Mr. Forrest Jackson, to be all of the

witnesses known to Senator BILBO or Mr. Jackson having knowledge of the matters under investigation.

The subcommittee convened on December 12, 1946, and remained in continuous session until December 19, 1946, hearing 44 witnesses and taking 564 pages of testimony and receiving 126 documentary exhibits. These exhibits, as well as the testimony which has been transcribed, are available for examination.

Senator BILBO was at all times present during the conduct of these proceedings, together with his counsel, Mr. Forrest Jackson, and he testified under oath.

The committee made plain that its investigation was confined to the examination of Senator BILBO's relations with war contractors. The committee did not concern itself with his controversies with any racial or religious minority groups, nor was it concerned with the propriety of the conduct of his recent election campaign, which has been the subject of an investigation by the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946. The committee, of course, took notice that Senator BILBO's alleged conduct in connection with war contractors might have a bearing upon his fitness to serve as a Senator, but sought to confine itself, to the extent that it was possible, to the examination of his relation to national defense contracts.

During the course of the proceedings certain matters developed in the testimony not directly related to war contracts, but which had a bearing upon the credibility and interest of witnesses, including Senator BILBO himself. The committee explored these matters to the extent it considered appropriate, and in some cases did so at the request of Senator BILBO.

Summary of findings

The evidence before the committee is clear and undisputed that Senator BILBO assisted certain contractors in obtaining contracts for the construction of national defense installations in the State of Mississippi. Among these contracts were the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts for the construction of the Camp Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss., by the M. T. Reed Construction Co., at a cost of $2,639,983.84; the construction of the cantonment at Key Field, Meridian, Miss., by a joint venture consisting of A. B. Friend, Volz Construction Co., Rock City Construction Co., and Flint-Jordan Construction Co., at a cost of $1,731,129.75; and the construction of the aviation mechanics training school, known as Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss., by a joint venture consisting of the J. A. Jones Construction Co., B. L. Knost, and a copartnership of Newton & Glenn, at a cost of $13,967,005.15. A list of the War Department contracts involved in this case is set forth as appendix I.

The committee finds no impropriety in Senator BILBO's assisting his constituents in obtaining and performing war contracts. The impropriety of Senator BILBO's actions consists in the acceptance of gifts, services, and political contributions from these same contractors whom he had aided. The committee is unable to accept the theory that Senator BILBO's aid to those dealing in Government contracts and the benefits he received were unrelated.

Testimony and documentary evidence before the committee indicates that during the war period Senator BILBO received substantial benefits from war contractors. He accepted as gifts a Cadillac sedan, valued at $1,906.67, and house furnishings valued at $500 or more. He also allowed war contractors to improve his estate at Poplarville, Miss., by constructing an artificial lake and island, a swimming pool, and by painting his home. The total cost of the foregoing improvements was at least $6,658.40. The contractors billed Senator BILBO for these services. However, Senator BILBO has not made any payments for these improvements, other than an alleged $200 on the painting bill, since the services were rendered in 1941 and 1942, nor have the contractors made any efforts to collect. The committee is convinced from the testimony and the circumstances that the benefits conferred on Senator BILBO as improvements to his real estate, which Senator BILBO and these war contractors now seek to treat as an indebtedness now payable by Senator BILBO, were not bona fide transactions in the ordinary course of business, but, on the other hand, were an attempted subterfuge to conceal the donation of funds in payment for services rendered to them by Senator BILBO. Also during the war period, Senator BILBO allowed Michael T. Morrissey, a war contractor, to incur a loss of $48,043.28 in the operation of Senator BILBO's Mississippi farm lands.

In the summer and fall of 1942, Senator BILBO received the sum of $30,000 from three war contractors. These funds were said to have been used by an "informal" committee, of which Senator BILBO was a member, in the 1942 political compaign of Wall Doxey, for the United States Senate in the Mississippi Democratic primary. The donation and solicitation of political contributions from Government contractors while they are negotiating or performing such contracts is prohibited by a Federal criminal statute (title 18, sec. 61–m–1, U. S. C.).

In some instances, the war contractors in making political contributions and in making improvements on Senator BILBO's estate, sought to charge the cost of such contributions and services as an expense on their books. Twenty thousand dollars of the F. T. Newton political contribution of $25,000 was originally charged directly to war contracts on the books of Newton & Glenn. These entries were changed on their books only after disallowance either by their own auditors or by Government agents. Five thousand dollars of this $25,000 was never located on the contractors' books.

Between February 24, 1943, and August 27, 1945, Senator BILBO also collected from many persons, including war contractors, contributions amounting to at least $27,501.51 for the building of a church parsonage on land owned by Senator BILBO. At least $7,300 of the foregoing total was collected from war contractors who had been aided by Senator BILBO. The title to this parsonage still remains in Senator BILBO, although the parsonage was substantially completed over 2 years ago. None of the war contractors contributing to the above-stated total of $7,300 were residents of Poplarville, Miss., near which the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage are located; nor were they members of that church. The construction of this parsonage was a personal philanthropic enterprise of Senator BILBO's. It was improper for him to utilize the aid he had given these war contractors as a means of inducing them to contribute substantial amounts to his personal charities, administered solely by him.

The evidence presented to this committee clearly indicates that Senator BILBO improperly used his high office as United States Senator for his personal gain in his dealings with war contractors.

Detailed discussion of facts

In discussing the evidence produced in the committee's public hearings, it is helpful to consider the various transactions involved in this investigation in four separate categories, as follows:

1. Sums of money received by Senator BILBO from war contractors, stated to have been used in the 1942 Mississippi senatorial campaign.

2. Gratuities or benefits received by Senator BILBO from war contractors.

3. Funds paid by war contractors to Senator BILBO for the construction of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage.

4. Other matters not directly related to war contracts.

1. Sums of Money Received by Senator BILBO From War Contractors, Stated To Have Been Used in the 1942 Mississippi Senatorial Campaign

Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, died on June 22, 1941. His term of office expired in January 1943. For the unexpired portion of his term, Wall Doxey, present Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, was among the candidates. Senator BILBO and some of his friends, including Forrest Jackson, Robert Gandy, and A. B. Friend, aided Wall Doxey in this campaign and collected funds for campaign expenses. Wall Doxey was elected in the 1941 Democratic primary to the Senate to serve for the unexpired term of Senator Harrison.

In Mississippi, there were two Democratic primary elections in 1942. The first of these was held on August 25. The two candidates receiving the highest votes in this first primary then became the candidates in the second or run-off Democratic primary, which in 1942 was held on September 15. In the first Democratic primary in 1942, there were five candidates: Senator James O. Eastland, Wall Doxey, Ross A. Collins, Roland Wall, and Douglas Smith. Senator Doxey and Senator Eastland, being the two highest candidates in the first primary, became the candidates in the second, or run-off primary.

On June 12, 1942, B. L. Knost, a member of the joint venture of Newton & Glenn, a partnership, B. L. Knost, and the J. A. Jones Construction Co. on the $13,000,000 contract for the construction of Keesler Field at Biloxi, Miss., gave Senator BILBO $5,000. This $5,000 was stated, both by Senator BILBO and by B. L. Knost, to be a contribution to the campaign of Wall Doxey, then a candidate for election to the United States Senate in the first Democratic primary. The discussion preceding the delivery of this $5,000 occurred at a dinner at the home of B. L. Knost, at which Senator BILBO and Michael Morrissey, a subcontractor on the above-mentioned contract, were present. Senator BILBO testified that he told Mr. Knost at this dinner meeting that they needed money for Wall Doxey's campaign, and, as a result, Mr. Knost gave him the check for $5,000, one-half of which he was to pay from his funds and one-half of which he was to pay from Michael Morrissey's funds, both Morrissey and Knost being engaged in a joint venture on work for the Government. The testimony is clear that this money was solicited by Senator BILBO within the meaning of section 61–m–1 of title 18, United States Code.

In a letter dated September 3, 1942, A. B. Friend advised Mr. F. T. Newton, who was then at Greenville, Miss., that Senator BILBO wanted Newton to meet him at the Royal Hotel, Jackson, Miss., on September 7. A copy of this letter is set forth as appendix II. On September 7, 1942, Newton attended a political rally at Jackson, Miss. This rally was said to be held for the purpose of stimulating interest in and collecting funds for Wall Doxey's campaign. Senator BILBO was one of the speakers at the meeting.

After the meeting, on September 7, 1942, F. T. Newton of the firm of Newton & Glenn, one of the members of the coventure mentioned above, delivered to Senator BILBO four checks drawn by Newton, and made payable to Senator BILBO on four different banks, totaling $25,000. This money was a contribution to the second Mississippi Democratic primary campaign for the election of Wall Doxey to the United States Senate.

The Newton and Knost donations were contributed to the "informal" committee for the election of Wall Doxey in the 1942 United States senatorial campaign, which committee consisted of Senator Theodore G. Bilbo, Forrest Jackson, Robert Gandy, and A. B. Friend. The testimony discloses that no account of receipts and expenditures of this informal committee were ever filed with the State of Mississippi. It was contended by Forrest Jackson, attorney for Senator BILBO, that the

law did not require the so-called informal committee to make a report of receipts and expenditures in the campaign.

No complete accounting of the receipts and expenditures was maintained. Robert Gandy, however, one of the members of the committee, maintained a book of accounts of moneys received by him personally and his expenditure of those funds. Mr. Gandy's account book was received in evidence. This account book included funds received and disbursements made in both the 1941 and 1942 campaigns. This book did not disclose the receipt of the $25,000 from F. T. Newton. This account book does show the receipt of $5,000 from B. L. Knost in June 1942 but indicates that this $5,000 check payable to Senator BILBO was merely a loan to the campaign fund. Mr. Gandy could not recall why he made the notation in his account book to the effect that this $5,000 check was a loan. Both Senator BILBO and Mr. Knost testified that they considered this $5,000 check to be an outright contribution to Wall Doxey's campaign.

The testimony of the other members of the committee, as well as Mr. Gandy, discloses that funds in addition to those contained in Mr. Gandy's account were received and disbursed by the other members of the committee, but none of them was able to state at the hearing any amount received by him individually, aside from Mr. Gandy, nor the total amount received and disbursed by the entire group.

Wall Doxey had a campaign committee under the direction of his campaign manager, Mr. Lee D. Hall. This committee filed an accounting of its receipts and expenditures and presented a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements in our public hearings.

The record clearly shows that Wall Doxey had no knowledge of the collection of $25,000 from F. T. Newton for his 1942 campaign. He first learned of this contribution in October 1942, after the campaign was over.

Under these circumstances, it is impossible for the committee to ascertain whether or not all of the funds collected for the Doxey campaign were expended for this purpose. It was testified by some of the witnesses that a part of the funds were used to enlist the support of two of the defeated candidates in the first primary; namely, Roland Wall and Ross A. Collins. It was explained that it was a custom in Mississippi politics to pay the operating deficits of defeated candidates in the first primary to enlist the support of the defeated candidate and his organization in behalf of a particular candidate in the second or run-off primary. As previously stated, this 1942 run-off was a contest between Senator EASTLAND and Wall Doxey.

Mr. Roland Wall testified that he entered into an agreement with the informal committee to support Doxey in the second primary in consideration of the payment to him of $8,000, the amount of his operating deficit. He also testified that he received out of this amount approximately $6,000 and that he considered the balance of $2,000 still owing to him.

With respect to Ross Collins, it was stated by Senator Bilbo, Forrest Jackson, and Robert Gandy that at a meeting with Ross Collins after his defeat in the first primary at Collins' suite in the Robert E. Lee Hotel in Jackson, Miss., Collins designated Cecil Travis to arrange for the payment of funds for the support of Wall Doxey by the Collins organization, and that subsequently arrangements were made with Travis to enlist the aid of the Collins organization for the sum of $11,000, which was paid to Travis.

Collins, supported by his secretary, Lura Harrison, denied that any such agreement was made and denied that any deficit existed. Collins denied that Travis had been authorized by him to enter into any such arrangement for the support of Wall Doxey by the Collins forces, and, on the contrary, he, Collins, had stated publicly, as well as individually, to his supporters that they were at liberty to support whatever candidate they pleased in the second primary. Collins' position on this subject is supported by Travis, as well as by two other witnesses to the conference, Charles Snow and George Butler.

Cecil Travis admitted receiving $11,000, but stated that it was not for the payment of the Collins' operating deficit, but for expenditures in Wall Doxey's campaign in the second primary, computed on the basis of $100 each for the organizations in the 82 counties of Mississippi, plus $3,000 for the operation of State headquarters. Travis states that he delivered the $11,000 to Phil Kimball, who Travis stated delivered it to the various county organizations. Kimball is dead.

Aside from the book of accounts kept by Robert Gandy and the records of the checks which were paid, very little documentary evidence exists from which it can be ascertained precisely who were the contributors or what amounts were received in contributions by the so-called informal committee. Likewise, it is not possible to determine the amounts expended, and to whom these funds were paid, and for what purpose. For the most part, the funds were handled in cash without a record being made.

The committee is, therefore, unable to find with certainty whether or not the funds received from war contractors and others were, in fact, completely expended for the Wall Doxey campaign.

It is, however, clear that at least $30,000 of the funds received by Senator BILBO for the informal committee were paid by war contractors. This fact makes pertinent a Federal statute passed July 19, 1940, designed to prohibit Government contractors from contributing to political campaigns. Senator BILBO, although only a member of a four-man committee, in his own words was a good "collector" of campaign funds, and on his own admissions and testimony the committee concludes that he solicited the $5,000 from B. L. Knost and the $25,000 from F. T. Newton.

Title 18, section 61–m–1, of the United States Code, provides as follows:

"61–m–1. Contracts with United States; contributions by contractors prohibited: (a) No person or firm entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, either for the rendition of personal services or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, shall, during the period of negotiation for, or performance under such contract or furnishing of material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly, or indirectly, make any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promise expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use; nor shall any person knowingly solicit any such contribution from any such person or firm, for any such purpose during any such period. Any person who violates the provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit any action which is prohibited by any provision of law in force on the date this section takes effect (July 19, 1940, ch. 640, sec. 5, 54 Stat. 772)."

The purpose of this statute was to remove, or at least minimize, one source of corruption in politics. It was precisely this sort of activity in connection with the national defense program that the Senate created this committee to investigate and expose.

The committee has had occasion to consider this statute previously. It has been impressed upon the committee that the statute is limited in its application to those who contribute funds and those who knowingly solicit funds, but is silent as to those who knowingly accept or receive such illegal contributions. The committee considers this an important loophole in the law and calls the existence of this defect to the attention of the Senate.

2. Gratuities or Benefits Received by Senator Bilbo From War Contractors

The evidence establishes that Senator BILBO has received from war contractors benefits of value which are set forth as follows:

Date	Name of war contractors	Nature of benefit	Minimum value	Maximum value
1941	M. T. Reed	Painting Dream House No. 1	$1,790.79	$1,790.79
Do	M. T. Morrissey	Artificial lake and island	3,672.91	34,500.00
Dec. 24, 1941	do	Cadillac sedan	1,906.67	1,906.67
Dec. 25, 1941	Several contractors and others	Furnishings for Dream House No. 2	500.00	1,000.00
April 1942	John R. Junkin	Swimming pool	1,194.70	1,500.00
1942–45	M. T. Morrissey	Operation of Bilbo's farm property	48,023.98	48,023.98
Total			57,089.05	88,721.44

Senator BILBO has admitted the receipt of a Cadillac car and furniture for Dream House No. 2 as Christmas gifts. The remainder of the foregoing benefits, with the exception of the operating loss of approximately $48,000 expended by Michael T. Morrissey in his operation of Senator BILBO's farm for 4 years, were all stated by Senator BILBO to be items which he owes. All of the foregoing benefits were conferred prior to January 1943, at which time Senator BILBO filed with the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans a financial statement in connection with a rearrangement of his loan with that bank, in which he failed to mention any of the foregoing items as debts owed by him.

For the excavation of the 15-acre lake surrounding the island on which Dream House No. 2 is built, Contractor Michael T. Morrissey submitted a bill for $3,672.91. Morrissey testified that this did not include any charge for the use of his construction equipment; that if he had charged Senator BILBO at the same rate he charged the Government, there would have been an additional charge of $5,500, or a total of approximately $9,000 for this work.

Col. John L. Person, of the Corps of United States Army Engineers, testified that the fair cost, without a profit, for excavating work of the character done by Morrissey would be 20 cents per cubic yard, and, with a profit included, 22 to 23 cents per cubic yard. Morrissey testified that in creating the 15-acre lake he moved from 150,000 to 165,000 cubic yards of earth. Computed on the basis of the figures given by the Corps of Engineers and Morrissey's testimony, the value of the excavation work to create the lake would have run from $34,500 to $37,950.

For pouring the concrete for the swimming pool on Senator BILBO's estate in April 1942, the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., sent a bill to Senator BILBO for $1,194.70. This bill was marked "Paid in full—St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc.," when it was mailed to Senator

BILBO. Mr. John R. Junkin, president of the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., testified that if a profit on this work were included in the bill it would have run about $1,500. Mr. Junkin testified that regardless of the fact that the bill was marked "Paid in full," he did not consider the bill paid, but merely that it had been transferred from the account of the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., a corporation, to the personal account of himself and his brother, sole owners of the corporation. Senator BILBO has paid nothing on this bill, nor has the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., nor Mr. Junkin, made any effort to collect it.

Although the books of the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., reflect that this pool was paid for in cash by Senator BILBO on May 28, 1942, the corporation listed the cost of this pool as a gift in its 1942 Federal income-tax return. This deduction was subsequently disallowed by income-tax agents in 1946. Mr. Junkin testified that the swimming pool was listed as a gift on his corporate tax return as the result of a bookkeeper's error. At the time Mr. Junkin worked on the swimming pool for Senator BILBO, his corporation was working on a half-million-dollar Government contract at Keesler Field.

In the spring of 1941 Mr. M. T. Reed, a war contractor, painted Senator BILBO's Dream House No. 1 and sent him a bill for $1,790.79. Both Mr. Reed and Senator BILBO claim that this is a debt which Senator BILBO owes, and Reed testified that he has made no effort to collect it. However, Senator BILBO testified that this year he sent Mr. Reed 400 pounds of pecans from his farm for which he credited $200 against the painting bill.

Mr. Reed testified that he wrote off this account as a bad debt in 1941 and sought to take advantage of it in connection with his Federal income-tax return. However, this deduction was subsequently disallowed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Senator BILBO testified that the statute of limitations in Mississippi outlawed debts on open accounts, such as those for the lake, swimming pool, and paint job after 3 years. Three years has run since all of the foregoing items were furnished and the debts are therefore uncollectible by law. Senator BILBO testified that notwithstanding this perfect legal defense to any action brought by these war contractors to collect the alleged indebtedness, it was not his practice to take advantage of that defense, and that he would pay these debts some time when he was able.

In addition to the foregoing improvements on Senator BILBO's estate, he also, at Christmas time in 1941, received a new Cadillac sedan as a Christmas present from Michael T. Morrissey. This automobile was purchased by Morrissey at a cost of $1,906.67 and is said by Morrissey, and admitted by Senator BILBO, to be an outright gift.

Also at Christmas in 1941, certain household furnishings for use in Dream House No. 2 were presented to Senator BILBO by several friends, including B. L. Knost, F. T. Newton, and John R. Junkin, who were war contractors. Edward P. Terry, who purchased these furnishings, estimated their value at approximately $1,000. He testified that the contributions he collected were insufficient to pay the cost of the furniture and that he, together with Robert Gandy, borrowed $500 from the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., of Jackson, Miss., on December 23, 1941, for the purpose of defraying the balance of the cost of the furniture. On July 29, 1942, this $500 note was paid by M. T. Reed, a war contractor, who was advised that the money was originally borrowed by Terry and Gandy for the benefit of Senator BILBO. Reed has never sought to recover this $500, nor has Senator BILBO acknowledged it as a debt.

From 1942 through 1945, Michael T. Morrissey, under an agreement with Senator BILBO, operated Senator BILBO's farm properties under an oral agreement whereby Morrissey was to pay all operating expenses and in the event the farm operation showed a profit he was to split this profit 50–50 with Senator BILBO and in case the operation showed a loss, Morrissey was to absorb all losses. Morrissey's records reflect that during this 4-year period, he lost a total of $48,023.48 in this operation.

This farm arrangement seems to be extremely unusual. The farm accounts show the expenditures to be extremely high in view of the amount of income received. Morrissey testified that he took advantage of these losses in his income-tax returns with the effect that approximately 80 percent of the losses were, in effect, paid by the Government, since he was in the 80-percent income-tax bracket.

The committee has been unable to ascertain the exact extent of the benefit to Senator BILBO arising from this farm operation. Taxes approximating $1,000 a year were paid by Morrissey for 3 years and were included in his operating losses. Substantial amounts were expended on fertilizer. Pay rolls appear to be excessive in view of the income from sales. For example, in the year 1943 the total income from the sale of produce was $7,267.83, together with $3,351.08 received as AAA conservation benefits paid by the Federal Government. The total gross income for 1943 was $10,627.91. In this same year, the pay roll was $10,777, exceeding the total gross income by over $100. A much more detailed examination of the farm books and records, as well as witnesses, would be required to ascertain accurately the benefit received by Senator BILBO from these extensive losses by Michael T. Morrissey under an oral agreement which, in itself, does not savor of the usual business transaction.

Under the circumstances, the committee is not convinced by the explanation that the foregoing benefits received by Senator BILBO from various war contractors were either pure Christmas gifts or ordinary business transactions, as Senator BILBO now claims. The explanations now offered, in the judgment of the committee, do not ring true, in the light of the conduct of the parties in the years intervening between the receipt of the benefits and the time of the committee's hearing. The committee considers the claims now made as a mere subterfuge manufactured for the occasion of this committee's hearing.

The committee considers Senator BILBO's acceptance of expensive gifts and donations of personal property and the acceptance of improvements to real estate, provided by contractors who have profited out of their work for the Government in the war effort, to be an illegal practice in violation of existing Federal statutes.

3. Funds Paid to Senator BILBO for the Construction of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and Parsonage

Senator BILBO lives near Poplarville, Miss., where he owns a large tract of land. He is a member of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church, the church property adjoining his property. Since 1942 Senator BILBO has solicited funds which he stated were for the construction of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage. These solicitations were made both orally and in letters. Included among the persons solicited were a number of war contractors.

On February 24, 1943, Senator BILBO opened a special bank account at the Bank of Commerce, Poplarville, Miss., in which he deposited donations received for this parsonage. He had sole authority to draw on this church fund and was the only person who drew on this account. The evidence indicates that he refused to allow church officials to have access to the fund or information concerning it. From February 24, 1943, to August 27, 1945, Senator BILBO deposited $27,501.51 in this account. As of August 15, 1946, he had withdrawn all but $1,285.38. There is no evidence that he used this fund for anything other than the construction of the parsonage and minor repairs to the church; however, from available books and records it is not possible to determine what disposition was made of all of these funds. Construction of the parsonage was begun in 1943 and was substantially completed 2 years ago. This parsonage is built on property owned by Senator BILBO which is adjacent to the church property. It is a brick veneer structure with eight bedrooms and five baths.

The property upon which the parsonage is located is part of a tract of land which Senator BILBO had previously mortgaged to the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans and the Bank of Commerce, Poplarville, Miss. On December 11, 1946, the Federal land bank released the parsonage property consisting of about 4 acres from its first mortgage securing Senator BILBO's indebtedness and on November 19, 1946, the Bank of Commerce released the parsonage property which had been part of the security for Senator BILBO's loan from that bank.

The bank records reflect that at least $7,300 of the parsonage fund collected by Senator BILBO was obtained from war contractors whom he had assisted. It is not possible from available records to determine whether an additional part of the contributions to this fund were also made by war contractors. However, none of the war contractors who are known to have contributed the $7,300 to the parsonage fund are residents of Poplarville, Miss., or members of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church.

Rev. D. Wade Smith became pastor of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church on October 22, 1944. He testified before the committee that the parsonage at that time was practically completed, but that he did not move into it. In fact, the parsonage has never been occupied. Reverend Smith and some of the church members sought to have the parsonage completed, since there was relatively little work to be done, but were unsuccessful. In the fall of 1945 Reverend Smith built his own house some 2 miles from the church and, according to his testimony, it has been only in the last 6 weeks that any substantial amount of work has been done on the parsonage during the entire period that he has been the pastor of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church.

During the period of the committee's investigation certain steps have been taken by Senator BILBO, such as the afore-mentioned release of the mortgages on the parsonage property and the preparation of a deed, and Reverend Smith testified that he now expects to move into the parsonage on January 1, 1947, and that formal dedication of the parsonage and the church is being planned for April 27, 1947.

The committee has no evidence that the funds collected for this parsonage by Senator BILBO have been used for any other purpose.

Although Senator BILBO was a member of the finance committee and the building committee of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church, he had sole control of the funds which he collected for the parsonage and exclusive title to the property on which it was built. The construction of this parsonage was a personal, philanthropic enterprise of Senator BILBO. It was improper for him to utilize the aid he had given these war contractors as a means of inducing them to contribute substantial amounts to his personal charities, administered solely by him.

4. Other Matters Not Directly Related to War Contracts

(a) The Shushan note: Preliminary information received by the committee indicated that a $3,000 note owed by Senator BILBO to Abraham L. Shushan, of New Orleans, La., was expected to be paid off by war contractors. This information was received from Edward P. Terry, former secretary to Senator BILBO.

On July 21, 1938, Abraham L. Shushan, of New Orleans, La., lent Senator BILBO $3,000 for which he took a note signed by Senator BILBO and endorsed by Grant Stewart, of New Hebron, Miss. This loan to Senator BILBO was for the purpose of helping to settle his financial obligations to his recently divorced wife. Subsequently in January 1939 Senator BILBO contacted J. P. Wenchel, chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in an attempt to get the Government to accept an offer in compromise of $40,000 to settle an $80,000 tax liability of Shushan's. The Bureau refused to settle and eventually collected in full.

The testimony concerning Shushan's demands for repayment of this note is in conflict. Some of the witnesses testified that in 1940 Shushan, who was then under prison sentence in connection with a Federal mail fraud violation, or his representatives, had indicated that if the note was not promptly paid by Senator BILBO, it would be turned over to Hugh White, who was then a candidate against Senator BILBO in the senatorial race of 1940. Mr. Edward P. Terry testified that Senator BILBO told him that Shushan never intended to be paid back if BILBO was successful in assisting Shushan in his pending difficulties with the Federal Government. Shushan denied both of these statements.

This $3,000 note was paid on July 15, 1940. The funds for its payment were supplied as follows:

$750 from Forrest Jackson, attorney at law, Jackson, Miss.

$750 from Robert Newton, president, Bank of Commerce, Poplarville, Miss.

$750 from Grant Stewart, merchant, New Hebron, Miss.

$750 from Edward P. Terry.

Senator BILBO paid Grant Stewart the $750 which Stewart had advanced and Forrest Jackson paid Edward P. Terry the amount which Terry had advanced. Stewart is now dead.

Forrest Jackson, although not a war contractor, did participate in the premium for binder insurance on Keesler Field through his law firm, which received a total of approximately $900, which Jackson split 50–50 with his partner. Jackson's law firm also represented A. B. Friend, Volz Construction Co., Rock City Construction Co., and Flint-Jordan Construction Co. in connection with their contract for the construction of Key Field at Meridian, Miss.

Both Robert Newton and Jackson testified that they had made no effort to collect from Senator BILBO the money which they had paid on his note to A. L. Shushan, and Senator BILBO has paid them nothing on this account.

(b) The narcotics charge: Wholly aside from the matter of war contracts, a matter was injected into the proceedings by the witness, Edward P. Terry, which, out of justice to those involved in the charge, the committee was required to explore.

This charge, in substance, was that in the summer of 1945, Senator BILBO received from one John A. Carr, an aged drug addict of Natchez, Miss., through Dr. A. J. Podesta, of Vicksburg, Miss., the sum of $1,500, and that Senator BILBO interceded with Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, to obtain the consent of the Bureau of Narcotics to the sale of 2 grains of morphine daily to Mr. Carr by Dr. J. G. Logan, of Natchez, Miss.

Senator BILBO testified that at the request of Dr. Podesta, who was his close friend and personal physician, he presented the facts of this narcotic matter to Mr. Anslinger. However, Senator BILBO denied that he received any money either for himself or for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church from Dr. Podesta, or any other person in connection with this case.

Mr. Anslinger testified that he called at Senator BILBO's office on October 11, 1945, read a letter to Senator BILBO from Dr. Podesta and certificates by Dr. Podesta and Dr. Logan attached to the letter. On the basis of those documents Mr. Anslinger concluded that the request made of him was justified, and on that date wrote a letter to Dr. Logan stating that the Bureau of Narcotics had no objection to the sale of 2 grains of morphine daily to Mr. Carr.

From the testimony of Mr. Anslinger, it would appear that not only from his examination of the doctors' certificates which he read in Senator BILBO's office, but also from an independent investigation by an agent of the Bureau of Narcotics, the request of Mr. Carr was wholly justified and would have been granted without the intercession of Senator BILBO.

The testimony of disinterested witnesses who had interviewed Dr. Podesta, one an agent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and one an investigator for this committee, corroborated the testimony given by Mr. Terry to the effect that Carr, through Dr. Podesta, had paid at least $1,000 to Senator BILBO.

Dr. Podesta told two special agents of the Internal Revenue Bureau who interviewed him jointly on April 30, 1946, and told an investigator of this committee on October 18, 1946, that in the summer of 1945 he had received from Mr. Carr the sum of $1,000, which he (Podesta) paid to Senator BILBO at the Walthall Hotel in Jackson, Miss. Dr. Podesta told these agents that in a conversation with Mr. Carr he (Podesta) had mentioned that Carr might pay the funds to Senator BILBO as a contribution to the Juniper Grove Baptist Church parsonage fund. The two internal revenue agents interviewed Mr. Carr on May 1, 1946. Carr stated to them that he did not consider the money paid to Senator BILBO as a contribution to the Juniper Grove Baptist Church parsonage fund, but as a payment to Senator BILBO for services rendered.

On December 20, 1946, Dr. Podesta was reinterviewed by an investigator of this committee and at that time he furnished a notarized statement to the investigator setting forth his recollection of the facts in this case. In his statement, which is set forth as appendix III, Dr. Podesta said that after the Bureau of Narcotics had granted permission to prescribe narcotics for Mr. Carr, Carr called upon Dr. Podesta and told him he wanted to do something for Senator BILBO. According to Dr. Podesta, he told Carr that Senator BILBO was endeavoring to complete the church and parsonage of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church. Mr. Carr then gave Dr. Podesta $1,000 to be given to Senator BILBO for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church fund. Dr. Podesta states that a day or two later he met Senator BILBO at the Royal Hotel in Jackson, Miss., and gave him the ten $100 bills which had been turned over to him by Mr. Carr. At that time Dr. Podesta told Senator BILBO that the $1,000 was for the church fund.

Mr. John A. Carr was also interviewed by a committee investigator at Natchez, Miss., on December 22, 1946, and executed a statement in his own handwriting concerning this matter. This statement is set forth as appendix IV. Mr. Carr in this statement says that 3 or 4 weeks after Dr. Logan had received permission from the Bureau of Narcotics to administer narcotics to him he, Carr, called upon Dr. Podesta to thank him for what he had done. At that time Mr. Carr said he gave Dr. Podesta ten $100 bills for Senator BILBO's church fund.

In a written statement dated December 22, 1946, Dr. J. G. Logan, of Natchez, advised the committee investigator that in August 1945 he gave Mr. Carr a statement as to his physical condition and need for a small amount of narcotics. Dr. Logan further stated that in October 1945 he received a letter from the Bureau of Narcotics granting him permission to prescribe morphine for Mr. Carr. Dr. Logan says he has no knowledge concerning any financial transactions in connection with this narcotics matter. A copy of Dr. Logan's statement is set forth as appendix V.

The bank statement for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church special fund by THEODORE G. BILBO discloses that the deposits for the year 1945, and up to August 22, 1946, were as follows:

Jan. 8, 1945	$50
May 10, 1945	200
Aug. 27, 1945	2,000
Do	100

The committee possesses a photostatic copy of a deposit slip evidencing the $2,000 deposit on August 27, 1945, showing that it is composed of the following items:

Michael T. Morrissey	$500
R. D. Sanders, of Jackson, Miss	1,000
A. B. Friend	500

Senator BILBO testified that all contributions for the church and parsonage were deposited in the above-mentioned special account in the Poplarville Bank of Commerce.

It is difficult for the committee to express an opinion on this charge. Although it has no direct bearing upon the awarding or administration of war contracts, this collateral episode, having been injected into the committee's proceedings, had to be explored at once because of the possible unfair implications and inferences resulting from the receipt of this testimony in public hearing, not only as to the integrity of Mr. Anslinger and the Bureau of Narcotics but as to Senator BILBO himself. For this reason, the committee proceeded promptly to obtain the facts, which, in part, had already come to its attention during the preliminary investigation, and ascertained that the charge concerning this conduct on the part of Senator BILBO was supported by information presented to the committee. Having obtained these facts, the committee feels obligated to call them to the attention of the Senate.

* * * * *

This report has been approved by the following Senators: Harley M. Kilgore, West Virginia; James M. Mead, New York; Owen Brewster, Maine; Joseph H. Ball, Minnesota; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; and William F. Knowland, California.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, does not approve the report.

Senator James M. Tunnell, Delaware, does not approve or disapprove the report, inasmuch as he was not present at all of the committee hearings on this matter and has not reviewed the testimony taken at the hearings. He takes no action on the further ground that he will not be a Member of the Senate when possible final action is taken concerning Senator BILBO's conduct.

Senator Frank P. Briggs, of Missouri, who was not a member of the subcommittee, does not approve or disapprove, as he heard none of the testimony.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Corps of Engineers, contract data—Prime contracts and subcontracts

Contract date	Name and address of contractor	Contract No.	Job	Original contract amount	Negotiations starting date	Owner, partnership, or corporation	Starting date	Completion or acceptance date	Final payment date	Total paid
7/28/41	F. T. Newton, Hattiesburg, Miss.	W-569-eng-2615, ERA No. 49.	Rental of bandsaw	[1] $25.00	[2]	Individual	7/1/41	5/9/42	12/8/42	$31.67
5/24/43	do	W-569-eng-5071	Greenville, Miss., Army Airfield, construction of buildings.	30,171.62	[3] 5/19/43	do	[4]	10/8/43	7/10/45	29,252.48
5/24/43	do	W-569-eng-5072	Construction of one all-purpose recreation building, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	30,433.32	5/19/43	do	5/24/43	9/15/43	7/10/45	29,803.40
5/24/43	do	W-569-eng-5074	Construction of one all-purpose recreation building and conversion of facilities for WAAC company, Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss.	39,168.43	5/15/43	do	5/25/43	10/9/43	7/10/45	41,410.90
6/13/41	J. A. Jones Construction Co., Charlotte, N. C., and Newton, Glenn & Knost, Hattiesburg, Miss.	W-569-eng-2615	Construction of aviation mechanics training school, Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss.	[5] 11,748,620.00 [6] 265,000.00	[3] 6/11/41	Corporation, partnership, individual	6/13/41	4/11/42	7/15/43	13,967,005.15
1/23/42	Newton, Glenn & Knost, Hattiesburg, Miss.	W-1106-eng-5614	Additional construction, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	122,861.80	1/13/42	Individual	4/1/42	8/27/42	6/27/44	144,365.88
3/27/42	Newton & Glenn, Hattiesburg, Miss.	W-612-eng-779	Camp Campbell, Tenn., construction of mobilization buildings.	1,813,999.00	No record.	Partnership	4/—/42	1/—/43	3/—/43	1,332,418.52
5/26/42	do	W-1106-eng-5875	Greenville, Miss., Army Airfield, additions and improvements to utilities, construction of buildings, etc.	736,361.26	[3] 5/26/42	do	6/—/42	11/2/42	7/31/43	830,584.12
8/5/42	do	W-569-eng-4194	Laurel, Miss., Army Air Base, housing facilities.	653,018.54	[3] 8/1/42	do	8/—/42	8/4/43	5/16/45	906,057.52
8/10/42	Felix T. Newton and Frank S. Glenn, Hattiesburg, Miss.	W-1106-eng-6143	Rohwer Relocation Center, Desha County, Ark., construction of 34 buildings.	505,000.00	No record.	Joint contractors and coadventurers.	8/11/42	3/31/43	6/1/43	521,045.95
	Total, Newton and associates.									17,801,975.59
4/28/42	B. L. Knost, Pass Christian, Miss	W-1106-eng-5830	Construction of service roads, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	37,145.30	4/27/42	Individual	5/4/42	6/17/42	7/29/42	33,256.94
5/9/42	do	W-1106-eng-5850	Construction of ordnance storage facilities, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	80,240.75	5/9/42	do	5/9/42	8/26/42	7/15/43	78,038.55
5/27/42	do	W-1106-eng-5876	Temporary buildings and utilities, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	1,088,990.49	5/27/42	do	5/27/42	2/2/43	7/15/43	1,223,206.47
7/16/42	do	W-1106-eng-6006	Construction engineering shop, dental clinic, etc., Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	195,567.00	7/16/42	do	7/20/42	5/26/43	8/16/43	221,234.04
12/21/42	do	W-569-eng-4628	Construction Air Corps squadron hangar, Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss.	39,500.00	12/15/42	do	12/23/42	5/15/43	8/7/45	43,213.42
1/19/43	do	W-569-eng-4711	Subdepot facilities, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	37,779.25	1/18/43	do	1/21/43	8/7/43	12/10/43	50,512.76
1/13/43	do	W-569-eng-4693	Construction commissary building, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	20,894.18	1/11/43	do	1/15/43	5/31/43	8/18/43	29,341.09
2/27/43	do	W-569-eng-4826	Additional temporary construction, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	192,774.10	2/25/43	do	2/27/43	1/15/44	8/7/44	267,823.00
4/16/43	do	W-569-eng-4956	Construction of 8 officers' quarters and 3 lavatories, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	33,795.50	4/15/43	do	4/20/43	7/16/43	9/24/43	33,950.05
4/24/43	do	W-569-eng-4980	Greenville, Miss., Army Airfield, erection of structures.	4,257.72	[3] 4/22/43	do	[4]	6/1/43	8/16/43	3,977.73
8/12/43	do	W-569-eng-5283	Range facilities, Gulfport and Keesler Fields, Miss.	212,032.20	7/30/43	do	8/27/43	3/2/44	4/1/44	231,123.18
3/21/41	B. L. Knost Co., Pass Christian, Miss.	W-1106-eng-5253, Sub. No. 27.	Installation of steam distribution system, Meridian Air Corps project, Meridian, Miss. (Key Field).	82,589.00	[7]	do	6/11/41	1/3/42	1/28/42	88,806.10
7/29/42	Morrissey & Knost, Vicksburg, Miss.	W-1106-eng-6066	Construction of perimeter taxiways, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	122,909.15	7/28/42	Individual and individual.	8/3/42	12/12/42	5/15/43	107,548.98
9/30/42	do	W-1106-eng-6383	Construct outfall sewer and extension to sewage collection system, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	56,200.50	9/29/42	do	10/3/42	11/14/42	1/23/43	51,635.75
1/1/43	do	W-569-eng-4672	Paving and drainage, additional post roads, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	22,481.00	12/26/42	do	1/5/43	5/1/43	8/13/43	24,463.50
	Total (Knost and associates).									2,487,831.56
2/20/41	Mike T. Morrissey, Vicksburg, Miss.	W-1106-eng-5151 Sub. No. 10 (ERA).	Rental of construction equipment.	[10]	[7]	Individual	4/1/41	5/10/41	7/7/41	2,047.50
3/1/41	do	W-1106-eng-5151 Sub. No. 20 (ERA).	do	[10]	[7]	do	4/1/41	4/19/41	6/5/41	2,807.25
3/15/41	do	W-1106-eng-5151 Sub. No. 28 (ERA).	do	[10]	[7]	do	4/2/41	4/28/41	6/5/41	513.00
4/8/41	do	W-1106-eng-5253 Sub. No. 20 (ERA).	do	[10]	[7]	do	4/8/41	8/13/41	9/20/41	10,599.89
5/7/41	do	W-1106-eng-5253 Sub. No. 19 (ERA).	do	[10]	[7]	do	6/1/41	6/24/41	8/7/41	3,120.00
5/21/41	do	W-1106-eng-5253 Sub. No. 21 (ERA).	do	[10]	[7]	do	6/1/41	6/18/41	8/11/41	2,412.00
6/23/41	do	W-569-eng-2615 ERA No. 3.	Rental of saddle horses	[11]	[7]	do	6/1/41	8/12/41	11/8/41	460.00
6/23/41	do	W-569-eng-2615 ERA No. 4.	Rental of construction equipment.	[10]	[7]	do	7/1/41	2/16/42	2/16/42	3,181.06

Footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers, contract data—Prime contracts and subcontracts—Continued

Contract date	Name and address of contractor	Contract No.	Job	Original contract amount	Negotiations starting date	Owner, partnership, or corporation	Starting date	Completion or acceptance date	Final payment date	Total paid
6/23/41	Mike T. Morrissey, Vicksburg, Miss.	W-569-eng-2615 ERA No. 5.	Rental of construction equipment.	(10)	(2)	Individual	6/1/41	12/15/41	2/18/42	$96,765.21
7/1/42	do	W-1106-eng-5972	Rental of equipment at Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	(12)	7/1/42	do	7/2/42	8/5/42	9/12/42	1,928.00
7/8/41	do	W-1106-eng-5253 Sub. No. 28 (ERA).	Rental of construction equipment.	(10)	(2)	do	7/8/41	8/13/41	9/20/41	8,919.66
8/5/41	do	W-569-eng-2615 ERA No. 46.	do	(10)	(2)	do	8/1/41	2/28/42	3/20/42	18,576.30
	Total, Morrissey									151,270.87
6/28/43	Roy V. Doughty, Columbus, Miss.	W-569-eng-5196	Floodlights at Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss.	$603.50	6/21/43	Individual	7/5/43	9/1/43	8/20/43	559.72
3/21/41	Alfred B. Friend, Volz Construction Co., Rock City Construction Co., Flint-Jordan Construction Co., Jackson, Miss.	W-1106-eng-5253	Construction of cantonment, Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	1,515,000.00 [6] 63,175.00	[3] 3/11/41	Individual, copartners, individual.	4/3/41	8/15/41	11/10/41	1,731,129.75
5/10/43	Glenn & Hamilton, Hattiesburg, Miss.	W-659-eng-5059	Greenville, Miss., Army airfield—addition to AAF warehouse building.	31,223.85	[3] 5/17/43	Partnership	(4)	8/23/43	11/1/43	31,196.16
1/10/41	M. T. Reed Construction Co., Belzoni, Miss.	W-1106-eng-5151	Construction of Camp Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss. (fixed fee).	1,459,710.00 62,000.00	[9] 12/31/40	do	2/3/41	6/25/41	1/11/43	2,639,983.84
2/22/45	do	W-01-076-eng-951.	Construction of additional facilities, Mississippi Ordnance Plant, Flora, Miss.	831,996.00 [6] 23,160.00	2/21/45	do	3/6/45	9/4/45	8/30/46	1,083,449.06
	Total, Reed Construction Co.									3,723,432.90
3/20/42	Mississippi Plumbing & Heating Co., Meridian, Miss.	W-1106-eng-5779	Plumbing at Key Field, Meridian, Miss.	4,965.00	3/20/42	Partnership	3/20/42	3/31/42	5/14/42	4,965.00
	Grand total									25,932,361.55

[1] Per month.
[2] Dates negotiations started not available as subcontracts negotiated by prime contractors.
[3] Date of opening of bids.
[4] Complete information not available.
[5] Date of request for authority to award.
[6] Fixed fee.
[7] Date of contract.
[8] Date of request for authority to negotiate.
[9] Date of quotation from contractor.
[10] Various unit prices.
[11] $1.25 per day each.
[12] $6 and $8 per hour.

APPENDIX II

SEPTEMBER 3, 1942.

Hon. F. T. NEWTON,
Care of Greenville Hotel,
Greenville, Miss.

DEAR FELIX: Senator BILBO called me from Washington last night and asked me to get in touch with you and ask you to meet with us next Monday afternoon, September 7.

Senator will be here in the Royal or down at the Edwards and will be very much disappointed if you are unable to see him at that time.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely your friend,

A. B. FRIEND,
Room 300, Royal Hotel.

APPENDIX III

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1946.

I, Dr. A. J. Podesta, make the following voluntary statement to Joseph M. Mannix, member of the general counsel staff of the United States Senate War Investigating Committee. This statement is made by me voluntarily and without any threats or promises.

I have known John C. Carr all my life. I was born and reared in Natchez and went to high school with his two brothers in Natchez, Miss.

From my records, which I am using to refresh my memory, I have had the following professional contact with Jack Carr:

On August 8, 1944, Jack visited me in Vicksburg for examination and treatment. My examination on August 8, 1944, showed that he was suffering from multiple neuritis and arthritis. He was given by me at this time vitamin B tablets and darthernol. He returned to my office in Vicksburg August 20, 1944, at which time I prescribed the same treatment.

On April 16, 1945, he returned to my office for treatment. The diagnosis at that time was arthritis, cardiac hypertrophy, and chronic morphinism. He was sent to the Vicksburg Infirmary April 1945. At the infirmary he was treated for arthritis and neuritis and, at his request, he was given a reduction treatment from morphine, which the chart at the Vicksburg Infirmary will bear out.

On April 22, 1945, according to my office records, he returned to my office April 22, 1945, at which time he was given a prescription of vitamin B 10 milligrams salicynal and gell tabs, 50,000 units vitamin D to the capsule.

Subsequently, Carr was treated at the infirmary and his next visit to my office was June 25, 1945. At this time he was given a prescription of vitamin B_1, 1 cubic centimeter daily hypodermically, 100 milligrams to the cubic centimeter.

On October 8, 1945, I treated him in my office for coryza—head cold—he was given a cough sirup.

I have not treated Carr at any other time except 1921 and 1922 when he came to my office at Natchez and, to the best of my knowledge, he was suffering from arthritis and neuritis.

Carr, by his statement to me and to the best of my knowledge, had made several attempts in institutions to break the narcotic habit, twice that I know of personally, when I treated him at the Vicksburg Infirmary. He claimed that after each of these treatments that he took, that in a short time the arthritis and neuritis pains returned and that he suffered from shortness of breath. After the first time I had him in the Vicksburg Infirmary he was given the reduction treatment for the morphine habit, of which he had taken only small doses. He, on returning to me, stated that the arthritis and neuritis pains were so severe that he tried to relieve them by drinking alcoholic intoxicants. He was admitted by the Vicksburg Infirmary again for treatment on ——— for acute alcoholism. I suggested to him to allow me to give him the reduction treatment again for this narcotic habit but he said he could not take it as he was suffering too much and he left the institution. Some time later he came to me and asked me if it was possible for him to get a Government permit to procure enough morphine to relieve his suffering. I told him that I was under the impression that if he could get two or three licensed physicians to certify that he needed a certain amount I thought the Narcotic Division would grant this permit. When he returned he told me that the doctors who had treated him for years were either dead or in the Army. He said there was one doctor in Natchez, who had treated him, who had agreed to give him the certificate. He later brought the doctor's certificate to me and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the doctor certified that due to arthritis and neuritis and the cardiac condition, and, I think, an asthmatic condition that he, the doctor, felt that this man should have morphine to relieve his suffering and the condition of his health, and I concurred in that opinion. And also taking into consideration the man's age, the length of time in this condition, his numerous attempts to overcome the morphine habit, and the small amount he asked for daily, I felt I was justified in certifying, with the doctor in Natchez, that he should have this small amount daily. I asked him how much it would take for him to keep himself comfortable and he replied 2 or 3 grains. A small amount like this for an addict of 45 years' duration was out of the ordinary.

Mr. Carr asked me if it was possible, through my influence, to get Senator BILBO to expedite

the getting of this permit for him. I told him I would be very glad to take the matter up with Senator BILBO and ask the Senator to do what he could in his behalf. Later I contacted the Senator's office for Jack Carr. I am not sure but I believe I contacted Ed Terry.

When Carr returned to Vicksburg and told me he had gotten his permit, and said that he wanted to do something for Senator BILBO, and asked me what he could do, I told him that Senator BILBO was endeavoring to complete the church and parsonage at his home, and Carr gave me $1,000 to give to Senator BILBO for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage.

A day or so later I heard that Senator BILBO was in Jackson. I drove to Jackson, went to the Royal Hotel, went up to his room, where there were two or three other men in the room with him, whose names I do not know. Those present were strangers to me. I had the money ($1,000) in an envelope in 10 $100 bills. I put the envelope either on the bed or the dresser and said to the Senator here is something I was given for the church funds and I left the room. To the best of my knowledge and belief the Senator left the next morning for his home in Poplarville or for Washington, D. C.

I wish to state there was no money arrangement made with Carr at any time by me, that Carr voluntarily came up and asked me if he could do something for Senator BILBO for the assistance the Senator had given him in securing the permit.

I received only $1,000 from Carr. I never did tell Terry that I received any money, especially $1,500, from Jack Carr or anyone.

My intention in the beginning was to help Carr, to relieve him from some of his suffering, and to get him a permit where he could go to a reputable physician in Natchez and get 2 grains of morphine a day that Dr. Logan and I felt that he needed to maintain his health and comfort.

I did not inform Senator BILBO who gave me the $1,000 for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage fund because the men in the room were strangers. To the best of my knowledge and belief, I have not informed Senator BILBO, to this day, who gave this money to me for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage.

To my knowledge, I remember when Senator BILBO sent letters of appeal for his church to his friends in Vicksburg. I collected some of this money. However, I do not remember the names at this minute of those people who gave me small donations which I sent to the Senator in Washington by mail.

Mr. Ed Terry was a patient in the Vicksburg infirmary for X-rays, electrocardiogram, and some other diagnosis tests. He later was in my home 5 or 6 days resting up. I, at no time, told Ed Terry that I received any money, especially $1,500, from Jack Carr or anyone else in Natchez.

As to the time I gave the money to Senator BILBO, I am not certain but I do know that Jack Carr came to me in Vicksburg and told me that he had received a permit from the Government for 2 grains of morphine per day. I kept the money in my safe for a couple of days and then I learned that the Senator was in Jackson so I made a trip to Jackson and delivered the contribution to him.

I have read the foregoing statement and it contains a true statement of facts to the best of my knowledge and recollection.

Dr. A. J. PODESTA, M. D.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of December 1946.

[SEAL] JOS. J. GERACHE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires December 7, 1947.

The foregoing is a true and accurate transcription from my notes.

RENA E. BROWN,
Public Stenographer.

APPENDIX IV

The following statement was obtained from John A. Carr, of Natchez, Miss., on December 22, 1946, by Joseph M. Mannix, investigator for the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. This was executed in longhand by Mr. Carr:

"I am 63 years of age; have been user of drugs for 35 years at least, during which time I have taken cures a number of times, twice at Cavington, La., Youngs Sanatorium, once in New Orleans, once in Jackson State Hospital pay ward, twice in Vicksburg, treatment by Dr. A. J. Podesta. After each time my trouble with short-breathing arthritis and other troubles coming back so I could not stand it. I left hospital on second treatment, but later came back asking if something could not be done for me. Dr. Podesta stated he thought the law was if I could get two or more physicians that had treated me give me a letter stating my condition he would try and help me. I got a letter from Dr. Logan, of Natchez, who had treated me a number of times.

"I then went back to Vicksburg showing Dr. Podesta the letter, and he promised to help me. I came back to Natchez, and some time later Dr. Logan told me he had received a permit to treat me. I was glad to hear it as I could not dress myself unassisted. Some 3 or 4 weeks after I received the permit I went back to Vicksburg to let Dr. Podesta see how I was getting along and to thank him for the great favor he had done for me and what I could do to show my gratitude for what he done, and I of my own free will suggested I make a donation to the Juniper Grove Baptist Church. Knowing from reading about it that Senator BILBO was interested in building it, I, of my own free will, wrapped up a thousand dollars in cash from my pocket (10 one-hundred bills and gave it to Dr. Podesta for a donation to this church) I don't know Senator BILBO only by sight. I never had any conversation with him in regards to money about anything before or after any permit being issued me.

"I was born and raised in Natchez. It was not my life's saving I gave, as I was in cafe (Gem) for 27 years and some many years were very good years. Also had one-third interest with two brothers in laundry business, but in later years my health got so bad I decided to quit.

"I am no rich man at present, but I have paid income taxes in the past, and will pay one this year 1946.

"I live within my means, but I have always paid my way as anyone in Natchez will say for me.

"I am a personal friend of Dr. Podesta, both born and raised in Natchez. Went to school together, he in grades below me. He has never charged me for any services due to friendship. This is why he taken special interest in me.

"JNO. A. CARR.

"NATCHEZ, MISS., *December 22.*

"No one has contacted me in regards this matter lately."

APPENDIX V

NATCHEZ, MISS. *December 22, 1946.*

Mr. JOSEPH M. MANNIX,
Investigator for United States Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program:

Mr. John Carr is a man approximately 65 years of age but older in senility. I have been acquainted with him for about 20 years and have treated him professionally for the past 5 or 6 years.

His physical condition is poor. He suffers from a severe bronchial condition, arterial hypertension, myocardial weakness, and a very severe type of recurrent arthritis. He has been an addict for years. He has made numerous attempts at treatment at various places for said addiction, all of which were unsuccessful due to his physical weakness.

In August 1945, Mr. Carr requested that I give him a statement as to his physical condition as he wanted to try to get permission for a small amount of narcotic sufficient to keep him on his feet. I gave Mr. Carr this statement. In October 1945, a letter from the Bureau of Narcotics was received stating that sufficient evidence had been submitted indicating a medical need of morphine for Mr. Carr and that the Bureau had no objection to same being prescribed for him. Since that time, I have given Mr. Carr weekly prescriptions for morphine.

I am not sufficiently acquainted with Mr. Carr's financial affairs to give an estimate of his financial condition. As far as I know, he has always paid his obligations.

As to a questioned exchange of money supposedly to have taken place about this time, I have no knowledge whatsoever.

J. G. LOGAN, M. D.

OCTOBER 21, 1946.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your communication of October 8, 1946, addressed to Senator Mead, wherein you transmitted a copy of the communication which was sent to you by former Representative Ross Collins, of Mississippi.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE MEADER,
Chief Counsel.

OCTOBER 21, 1946.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your communication of October 8, 1946, addressed to Senator Mead, wherein you transmitted a copy of the communication which was sent to you by former Representative Ross Collins, of Mississippi.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE MEADER,
Chief Counsel.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES
AND ELECTIONS,
October 8, 1946.

Senator JAMES M. MEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MEAD: The enclosed copy of a letter I have addressed to Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, is self-explanatory, as is the copy of the letter addressed to me by former Representative Ross Collins, of Mississippi.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

[Enclosures (2).]

OCTOBER 8, 1946.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The enclosed copy of a letter addressed to me by former Representative Ross Collins, of Mississippi, is self-explanatory and, I believe, will be of interest to you and your committee.

Please note the last paragraph of Mr. Collins' letter in which he suggests that your committee investigate the charges in question.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 5, 1946.*

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on Privileges and Elections, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: On June 28, 1946, I wrote the following letter to you:

"As you probably know, I am a candidate for the United States Senate from Mississippi in the current Democratic primary election, the first primary of which will be held on July 2, 1946. One of my opponents in this race is the incumbent, THEODORE G. BILBO.

"On May 27 of this year I publicly charged that BILBO, while a Member of the United States Senate in the year 1942, accepted from the war contracting firm of Newton & Glenn, then located in Hattiesburg, Miss., four checks, made payable to THEODORE G. BILBO, in the entire amount of $25,000. One of these checks, in the amount of $5,000, in photostatic form, was in my possession at the time the charge was made. The back of this check showed the endorsement of THEODORE G. BILBO and one Robert Gandy. I publicly called on BILBO to explain the nature of this transaction with this firm of war contractors to the people of Mississippi.

"From May 27 to June 27 BILBO refused to make any public explanation. Last night, on the eve of the first primary election, in a speech at Jackson, Miss., widely reported today in the press, he made what is purported to be an answer to this $25,000 question.

"BILBO admitted that he received the four checks from Newton & Glenn. He stated that he endorsed them. He said that the money was a voluntary contribution to the campaign fund of Hon. Wall Doxey, who was then in the United States Senate and a candidate for election to the full term. He said further that the money was turned over to a committee of which Robert Gandy was the chairman and that this committee handled the disposition of the funds.

"There were four candidates in this 1942 race for the United States Senate. James O. Eastland, the successful contestant, Wall Doxey, who entered the second primary with Senator Eastland, Roland Wall, eliminated in the first primary and myself, eliminated in the first primary by a small margin. The first primary was held on August 25, 1942.

"Senator BILBO was an open and active supporter of Wall Doxey in the senatorial race. Mr. Doxey's State campaign manager was Lee Hall, of Columbia, Miss. As required by our Mississippi Corrupt Practices Act of 1935, Mr. Doxey filed with the secretary of state of Mississippi the required report of his contributions and expenditures during this campaign. These reports show contributions of only $4,543 and expenditures of $10,088. Shortly after I made the public charges relative to the $25,000 there was some intimation that the money might have gone to Wall Doxey's campaign fund. Mr. Doxey was interviewed in Washington by the Commercial Appeal, Washington Bureau, and on June 1, 1946, a dispatch was released quoting Doxey as saying he never saw the checks, never heard anything about them until recently, and that the money was not put into his campaign fund. It is my information that Lee Hall, Mr. Doxey's State campaign manager in this primary, takes the same position.

"Last night BILBO, in addition to saying that this $25,000 went into Wall Doxey's 1942 campaign fund, made charges that involve my personal honor and integrity. He charged that there was a deficit in my campaign expenses in the 1942 primary and that approximately $14,000 of this $25,000 was given to me to take care of my campaign deficits. This is a lie out of the whole cloth. No one gave me, or anyone else with my knowledge, one dime to cover a campaign deficit or for any other purpose, nor was such a matter discussed. There were no deficits in my campaign. On the day of the first primary all of my expenses had been paid and I owed nothing. The reports that were made by me, as required by law, correctly reflect my contributions and expenditures. Further, I was then a Member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi. Immediately after the first primary I returned to Washington to resume my duties and took absolutely no interest in the runoff. My staff was free to support the candidate of their choice and most of them elected to support JAMES O. EASTLAND. I did not attempt to advise them one way or another.

"It is my personal conviction that BILBO did not use one dime of this $25,000 in behalf of the candidacy of Wall Doxey in 1942. But since he is now and was then a Member of the United States Senate, and makes public admission of having flagrantly violated the laws of both our State and Federal Governments, and since my own integrity is involved in this matter, I think it is only fair for me to demand that your committee, which is vested with jurisdiction over such matters, make a full and complete and immediate investigation as to the disposition and use of this $25,000.

"Yours very truly,

"ROSS A. COLLINS.

"P. S.—Of further interest in this matter is the fact that the books of F. T. Newton, one of the members of the former firm of Newton & Glenn, now in bankruptcy in the United States District Court of Hattiesburg, Miss., carry as a doubtful account $20,000 charged to THEODORE G. BILBO. I do not know whether this $20,000 is inclusive or exclusive of the $25,000 that BILBO admits having received."

1. The letter states that the records of a bankruptcy court case at Hattiesburg, Miss., show that BILBO was paid in September 1942 by Newton & Glenn, defense building contractors, the sum of $25,000.

2. That BILEO admitted receiving this money in September 1942 and that he—BILBO—was not then a candidate for public office.

3. That Senator Doxey and his campaign manager, Mr. Lee Hall, when interviewed, stated that the money was not used or expended by them in Mr. Doxey's campaign for the Senate.

4. That the same bankruptcy proceedings carry as a doubtful account $20,000 charged to THEODORE G. BILBO and I do not know—and only investigation will disclose—whether the $20,000 is inclusive or exclusive of the $25,000 which BILBO admits having received.

5. My letter states that it is my opinion that the money paid to BILBO was not used in behalf of Mr. Doxey's 1942 candidacy for the Senate. Hence, the matter is one of public record and an investigation of the record will disclose all of the information that I have and perhaps more, and since the Mead committee is a committee set up to investigate the national defense program and is a well-staffed committee with an ample force of investigators and attorneys, and since Newton & Glenn were defense building contractors and this company paid to a United States Senator a large amount of the company's assets upon which the company must have made a profit, it seems to me that the records of the bankruptcy proceedings should be carefully scrutinized by the Mead committee so that the record facts as they exist may be revealed.

Very truly yours,

ROSS A. COLLINS.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I heard the debate this morning, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] asserted, as I recall, that no charges against Senator BILBO are pending before the Senate. I myself doubt that the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program had any jurisdiction of this matter; that is, so far as using it as a basis for stopping a Senator at the door.

I grant that the hearings, and all the matters contained in them, can form the basis of a charge to be preferred in the future, and referred to the proper committee, which in this case, after reorganization takes place, will be the Rules and Administration Committee. As a matter of fact, that committee will be clothed hereafter with full power to do the very thing the committee of which I am chairman did during the last senatorial campaign.

I repeat, I can see no foundation at all for the Senate of the United States using the investigation and the charges which were sent by the Senator from Rhode Island to the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program as a basis for ousting one of our former colleagues.

Mr. President, I was reading the charge which was preferred against Senator BILBO, and although some of it was read yesterday, I desire to read most of it again, merely to show the nature of it, and what the committee itself has investigated. I read:

The undersigned hereby petition for the redress of the following grievances and respectfully show and allege:

1. The signatories hereto are residents of the State of Mississippi and are duly qualified electors of the State of Mississippi.

2. Whenever the term "duly qualified Negro electors" is used, it shall mean Negro citizens of Mississippi who have duly qualified to register and vote in general or special elections for Federal, State, and local offices, including the office of United States Senator from Mississippi, and Negro citizens possessing the legal qualifications to register and vote in such elections.

3. In the primary of the Democratic Party of Mississippi to select a candidate for the United States Senate for the term commencing January 1, 1947, and in which an election was held on July 2, 1946, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, the incumbent, obtained a bare majority of less than 4,000 votes, of the votes cast and officially counted, over his opponents and thereupon was certified, became, and is the candidate of the Democratic Party of Mississippi for the office of Senator of the United States from that State.

4. By custom, tradition, and precedent, and because of the absence of an organized or effective party of opposition to the Democratic Party of Mississippi within that State, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO is assured of his reelection to the office of United States Senator from Mississippi and, indeed, will face no opposition candidate in the general election.

5. During the aforesaid primary and up to and including July 2, 1946, the date of the election thereof, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO conducted an aggressive and ruthless campaign for his reelection to the office of United States Senator from Mississippi with the purpose, object, design, and calculation to effectively deprive and deny the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi of their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote and otherwise legally participate in the said primary election.

6. Because, amongst other things, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO has been notorious in his hostility toward the Negro people and has exercised all his energies to keep the Negro people in a subordinate and servile status, and because he has become a symbol of oppression and reaction against the Negro people in the estimation of the people of the United States, and particularly in the estimation of the Negro people of the United States, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO had knowledge or reason to know that the overwhelming majority of duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, totaling approximately 500,000 persons, would vote in the said primary election in opposition and adversely to the candidacy of Senator THEODORE G.

BILBO; and it was the intention of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO to frustrate, suppress, stifle, and overcome the opposition of the duly qualified Negro electors to the candidacy of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO in the aforesaid primary, and thus effectively to deprive and deny these electors of their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote and otherwise legally participate in the said primary election.

7. In order to accomplish and effectuate the aforesaid purpose, object, design, and calculation, and to carry out his intention, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO—

(1) Engaged in and inspired systematic and continuous attacks upon the Negro race in general and upon the Negro population of Mississippi in particular, and especially against the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi; these attacks were accompanied by and took the form of vituperative, insulting, abusive, and slanderous statements, holding up the Negro race in general and the Negro population of Mississippi in particular, especially the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, to hatred, opprobrium, contempt, and ridicule.

(2) Exhorted, agitated, and made inflammatory appeals to the passions and prejudices of the white population of Mississippi to foster, stimulate, inspire, create, and intensify a state of acute and aggravated tension between the white and Negro races in the State of Mississippi, and utilized and directed this acute and aggravated racial tension for narrow, selfish, and political purposes, to wit, to prevent and deny the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi from exercising or attempting to exercise their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote or otherwise lawfully participate in the said primary election; and

(3) With willful intent, individually and in concert with others, advocated, counseled, inspired, encouraged, incited, aided, and abetted the white population of Mississippi to commit acts of violence and intimidation against the Negro population of Mississippi, and especially against the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, so as to discourage, frustrate, suppress, stifle, and overcome the desire and intention of the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi of exercising or attempting to exercise their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote or otherwise lawfully participate in said primary election.

8. The conduct, acts, and statements of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and the acts of violence and intimidation against the Negro people of Mississippi, as described above, and accomplished as hereinafter set forth, were crimes against and violations of the criminal statutes and laws of the United States of America and the State of Mississippi.

9. As a direct or proximate consequence of the conduct, acts, and statements of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, as above alleged, wholesale incidents of attacks by white residents of Mississippi upon Negro residents of Mississippi occurred throughout the State of Mississippi during the said primary campaign, including acts of violence and intimidation against duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi; these attacks and acts of violence and intimidation were willfully and wantonly perpetrated (*a*) by white residents of the State of Mississippi, acting individually or in furtherance of a conspiracy with others or with Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, to deprive and deny the qualified Negro electors of Mississippi of their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote or otherwise lawfully participate in the said primary election, and (*b*) by white public officials of the State of Mississippi, acting under color of law, with like willfulness, wantonness, intent, and purpose.

10. As a result of the foregoing the Negro people of Mississippi, especially the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, were subjected to a campaign and reign of terror during the said primary election; and the Negro people of Mississippi, especially the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi, were placed in a state of fear, terror, coercion, and duress to the extent that the overwhelming majority of the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi were discouraged, frustrated, suppressed, stifled, fettered, and overcome in exercising or attempting to exercise their constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities to register and vote, or to vote if already registered, or to otherwise lawfully participate in the said primary election; and under the circumstances, such fear, terror, coercion, and duress, followed by the action or inaction above described, were reasonable and reasonably justified.

11. By reason of the foregoing, and as a direct or proximate consequence of the successful accomplishment and effectuation of the purpose, object, design, and calculation of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, and the successful carrying out of his intention as aforesaid, the election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO as the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate from Mississippi was and is illegal, void, and contrary to law, and such election was and is tainted and permeated with fraud, duress, and illegality. The said election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO was not free or unfettered, but, on the contrary, was achieved by force and violence and the use of criminal, extralegal, and illegal tactics and in wanton disrespect and disregard and in derogation of the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States under the United States Constitution, particularly the fifteenth amendment thereof, and of the laws of the United States in such cases made and provided, and of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as in violation of the laws and statutes of the State of Mississippi.

12. Except for the fraud, duress, illegality, force, and violence, as above alleged, the overwhelming majority of the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi would have voted in opposition and adversely to the said candidacy of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and their votes would have materially affected the result of the said primary election and would have resulted in the defeat of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, or, at least, would have resulted in the failure or inability of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO in securing a majority of the votes cast and officially counted in said primary election, thus necessitating a run-off, which, in all reasonable probability, would have resulted in the defeat of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

13. By his conduct, acts, and words, and by reason of the foregoing, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO—

(a) Has violated his oath of office of United States Senator to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its laws;

(b) Cannot reasonably be relied upon in the future to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its laws; and

(c) Cannot reasonably be relied upon in the future to honor the oath of office required to be made by United States Senators to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its laws; and

(d) Has advocated, counseled, inspired, encouraged, incited, aided, and abetted in the violation of the laws of the United States and the State of Mississippi; and

(e) Has exhibited a crass, wanton, and shocking disrespect and disregard for the constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States citizens to exercise their political franchise to vote in elections for public offices; and

(f) Has demonstrated a cynical contempt for the orderly processes of government; and

(g) Has endangered and undermined the foundations of orderly and democratic government; and

(h) Has subscribed and subscribes to principles, ideas, and philosophies of government which are alien, repugnant, and inimical to the principles, ideas, and philosophies upon which the Government of the United States and the States of the Union are founded; and

(i) Has fostered, stimulated, inspired, and encouraged conflict, division, and disunity amongst the American people by pitting race against race, religion against religion, and nationality groups against other nationality groups; and

(j) Has brought the august and honorable United States Senate into contempt, ridicule, and disrepute; and

(k) Has been and now is a member of the Ku Klux Klan, a secret, conspiratorial, and illegal organization with past connections with known enemies of the United States of America, to wit: the German-American Bund, and has subscribed and still subscribes to the principles and actions of the said Ku Klux Klan, which has committed acts of lynching, near-lynching, assaults and batteries, false and unlawful detentions, and other crimes of violence and intimidation; and

(l) Has demonstrated his unfitness to hold the honorable position of a United States Senator.

14. Annexed hereto and made part of this petition, marked "Exhibit 1," and in substantiation and documentation of the allegations of this petition, are excerpts of statements, speeches, and writings of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO made during the aforesaid primary campaign.

15. Annexed hereto and made part of this petition, marked "Exhibit 2," and in substantiation and documentation of the allegations of this petition, is a photostatic copy of a radio interview between Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and certain newspapermen, held on August 9, 1946, over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Meet-the-Press program.

16. Annexed hereto and made part of this petition, marked "Exhibit 3," and in further substantiation and documentation of the allegations of this petition, are photostatic copies of statements of Negro residents of Mississippi, indicating instances and describing occurrences of acts of violence and intimidation by white residents of Mississippi, including white public officials of the State of Mississippi, acting under color of law, against Negro residents of Mississippi and showing the acts of violence and intimidation practiced against the Negro residents of Mississippi, including the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi and showing further the fraud and illegality practiced against the duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi. The originals of these statements are in the possession and files of the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., which directed, supervised, and participated in the collection of these statements.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the last sentence I read, which is strictly in accord with the statement made by me a while ago. The language I just read is as follows:

The originals of these statements are in the possession and files of the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., which directed, supervised, and participated in the collection of these statements.

I continue to read:

Other and additional statements showing and describing similar occurrences against other duly qualified Negro electors of Mississippi are in the possession and file of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

Wherefore the undersigned respectfully petition and request:

(1) The appropriate Senate committee or committees to conduct a full, fair, and fearless investigation into the allegations of this

petition and the charges contained therein; and

(2) In connection with such investigation to hold public hearings in and throughout the State of Mississippi and in Washington, D. C., wherein witnesses shall be summoned to testify and give evidence under oath, and such other evidence, including the taking of depositions, as is material, relevant, and pertinent be incorporated in the record; and

(3) Upon the basis of the allegations of this petition and the charges contained therein and the documentary evidence submitted herewith, and any further evidence which may be disclosed as a result of the aforesaid investigation and hearings, the appropriate Senate committee or committees having jurisdiction over the matters herein set forth, report and recommend to the Senate of the United States that Senator THEODORE G. BILBO be impeached and removed from his seat as the United States Senator from Mississippi and that the election of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO as the Democratic nominee for the office of United States Senator from Mississippi be declared null and void, contrary to law, and tainted with fraud, duress, illegality, force, and violence, and that a new election be held for such office; and

(4) The Senate of the United States impeach Senator THEODORE G. BILBO and remove him from his office as United States Senator from Mississippi and declare his election as the Democratic nominee for the office of United States Senator from Mississippi to be null and void, contrary to law, and tainted with fraud, duress, illegality, force, and violence, and deny to Senator THEODORE G. BILBO any and all privileges, rights, and immunities which he may possess by virtue of being elected United States Senator from the State of Mississippi for the term commencing January 1, 1947, and also deny Senator THEODORE G. BILBO the right to subscribe to the oath of office for such new term as United States Senator from Mississippi and otherwise to refuse to seat Senator THEODORE G. BILBO as the United States Senator from Mississippi for such new term.

Dated: State of Mississippi, September 1946.

Louis C. Wilcher, Arthur Hicks, Rev. James Young, Julia Mae Hicks, R. S. Lyells, D. T. Hall, Rev. M. H. Bailey, M. A. Dixon, Stevelle Adams, Ozella Cox, John M. Bates, T. B. Wilson, A. J. Noel, M. J. Lyells, James A. Moore, Jr., Guy Cox, Percy Greene, W. A. Bender, Rev. F. W. Lee, W. R. Wrenn, Joseph A. Smith, Mrs. L. W. Alford.

Then follow affidavits taken by the various signers of the petition. As I indicated a while ago, this petition was signed allegedly by Mississippians, but I believe the record will disclose that no one of the signers of the petition was acquainted with any of the charges that were preferred in the petition. They signed on information and belief.

As the petition itself shows, the data which formed the basis of it were prepared by the Civil Rights Congress, of New York. That organization sent its agents scouring throughout the State of Mississippi, and all the affidavits, all the charges, and all the information that was dug up or found by the members of that organization or persons sent to represent them was furnished to the committee, and we in turn then started our work. We sent investigators to Mississippi to comb the State in an effort to find out what it was all about.

I continue reading from the report of the committee. This is one of the affidavits:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Hinds:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the county and State aforesaid, the within-named Louis C. Wilchan, Arthur Hick, Rev. James Young, Julia Mae Hicks, R. S. Lyells, D. T. Hall, Rev. M. H. Bailey, M. A. Dixon, Stevelle Adams, Ozella Cox, John M. Bates, T. B. Wilson, A. J. Noel, M. J. Lyells, James A. Moore, Jr., Guy Cox, Percy Greene, W. A. Bender, Rev. F. W. Lee, W. R. Wrenn, each and all of whom, after being by me first duly sworn, stated on oath that the matters and things set out in the foregoing petition are true to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 10th day of September 1946.

VELMA E. WILSON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 21, 1949.

I read another affidavit:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Pike:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the county and State aforesaid, the within-named Joseph A. Smith, Mrs. L. W. Alford, each and all of whom, after being by me first duly sworn, stated on oath that the matters and things set out in the foregoing petition are true to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 12th day of September 1946.

[SEAL] MARGARET SMITH,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 16, 1948.

Then follows another affidavit:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Hinds:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the county and State aforesaid, the within-named James Rundles, Robert Cornelius, Roosevelt Terry, Stanley C. White, Earl H. Hoey, Daniel Magee, Cleophus Murphy, Willie Black Lark, Jonas P. Dawson, Floyd L. Coy, Willie Terry, John Henry, Herman Pickett, Albert Cooper, A. B. Stewart, Linford Lane, Robert Hudson, Osie Simms, Leo M. Jones, J. C. Wilson, Wilson Idlebird, John B. Terry, James Blake, James Cornelius, Norman Haymer, John D. Pruitt, Jr., Kermit W. Bryant, Sampson Cleveland, Tom J. Borden, John L. Henry, Thomas Knox, Glover Moore, each and all of whom, after being by me first duly sworn, stated on oath that the matters and things set out in the foregoing petition are true to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 13th day of September 1946.

[SEAL] VELMA E. WILSON,
Notary Public.

My Commission expires August 21, 1949.

James Rundles, Robert Cornelius, Herman Pickett, James Beal, Jr., Roosevelt Terry, Albert Cooper, James Cornelius, Stanley C. White, A. B. Stewart, Norman Haymer, Earl F. Hoyt, Lunford Lane, John D. Pruitt, Jr., Daniel Magee, Robert Hudson, Kermit W. Bryant, Cleophas Murphy, Ocie Lee Simms, Sampson Cleveland, Willie Blackhart, Lee M. Jones, Arthur J. Barlow, J. P. Dawson, J. C. Wilson, John L. Henry, Floyd Lloy, Wilson Idlebird, Thomas Knox, Willie Terry, John B. Terry, Glover Moore, John Henry.

Mr. President, as I indicated a while ago, I have read this petition for the purpose of attempting to advise the Senate what the charges were. There is not one single, solitary line in the petition respecting any charge of fraud, or any charge as to funds spent during the campaign. The petitioners have based their case solely on the ground that Senator BILBO, by word of mouth and otherwise, intimidated Negro voters of Mississippi to such an extent that it is said that by virtue of that fact his election is tainted with fraud and duress, and that he should be denied his seat in the Senate.

In the course of this debate I propose to acquaint the Senate with much of the evidence which our committee obtained in the State of Mississippi, and is contained in these four volumes. I am sure that the Senate will be impressed with the manner and method in which the committee discharged its duty and with the effort put forth by each and every member of the committee to go to the bottom of these charges and to obtain every bit of information which could in any manner affect the election of the Senator from Mississippi.

I shall, in the course of this debate, make known to the Senators what proof was adduced, the manner and method of obtaining it, and the extent to which we endeavored to go to the bottom of all the charges.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not his opinion that the laws of Mississippi were complied with in the election, and that while the committee made a thorough investigation of the charges, nevertheless it went to Mississippi not only to investigate Senator BILBO, but to investigate the degree of compliance with the laws of the sovereign State of Mississippi. In the general election there was no opposition whatsoever to Senator BILBO. In the primary, in addition to others who had suggested to the colored people that they refrain from voting the colored leaders themselves had told them not to vote because if they did they would in a sense be disenfranchised for 2 years. In 1948 there will be a Presidential election and if they had voted this year they would be forced to vote the Democratic ticket in 1948. Perry Howard, the colored Republican leader in Mississippi, had also requested them not to vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to say to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina that he has rather anticipated me, because I intend to go into this matter very thoroughly.

As I shall show during the course of this debate, Perry Howard, the Republican national committeeman of Mississippi, published notices in certain newspapers in the State of Mississippi advocating that the colored voters of Mississippi keep away from the polls on July 2. To my way of thinking, that had some effect. I dare say it had more effect than anything that Senator BILBO

ever dreamed of saying. As I shall show during the course of this debate, the statements of Senator BILBO had no effect in keeping the voters away from the polls in Mississippi. On the contrary, I think the record will show that in some instances it stimulated many of the voters to accept the challenge of Senator BILBO.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to make certain that the Senator from Louisiana and I understand the record in the same way. It shows that the Republican national committeeman and other colored leaders asked the colored people not to vote, so that they would not be bound to vote the Democratic ticket in the future. When the Senator said July 2 he meant the primary election. They were asked not to vote in the primaries, so that they would be free to vote the Republican ticket in the years to come.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is exactly the reason, as I understand it.

After the committee received the petition, which was sworn to by 30 citizens of the State of Mississippi, we submitted it to our counsel. Counsel looked over it thoroughly and felt that there were sufficient allegations made to justify an investigation. We immediately employed three competent investigators. I, as chairman, invited all my colleagues on that committee, as the Senator from South Carolina knows, to help me obtain the best investigators who could possibly be obtained. We obtained the services of a crackerjack investigator from Iowa, the State from which my distinguished colleague, Senator HICKENLOOPER, comes. That investigator is a very competent man. He went to Mississippi with two others. Those who investigated spent 6 weeks in the State of Mississippi. They covered the whole State and went through practically every county in search of evidence in support of the allegations contained in this petition. Those investigators were aided, I believe, by the group which had previously made an investigation; and they were furnished affidavits and the names and addresses of such persons who could give information which would substantiate the charges which had been preferred against Senator BILBO. After 6 weeks of strenuous effort, the investigators made a report to the committee. That report I now hold in my hand. The written report itself, which I expect to read for the benefit of the Senate, contains 13 pages, and it is accompanied by quite a number of exhibits. Possibly for lack of time I shall not read all the exhibits, but I shall refer to a few of them.

This report was made by the investigators, as I have said, after spending 6 weeks of strenuous work in Mississippi. It reads as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., *October 31, 1946.*

This preliminary survey and report is predicated upon a complaint dated September 16, 1946 (exhibit A), received by the committee from Mr. T. B. Wilson, 1087 Lynch Street, Jackson, Miss., president of the Mississippi Progressive Voters League, that Senator THEODORE G. BILBO's July Democratic nomination was tainted with fraud, duress, and illegality. The complaint in question, which bears the signatures of 24 Negroes to the petition, as well as photostatic copies of 24 affidavits, demands an investigation with a view to having Senator BILBO denied his seat in the United States Senate on the grounds that his nomination was secured by force and violence, and the use of criminal extra-legal and illegal tactics, which prevented Negroes from participating in the party primary. The original of this complaint is in the possession and files of the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., which directed, supervised, and participated in the collection of the statements contained in the complaint, while other and additional statements are in the possession and files of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

Pursuant to instructions received from the committee, the undersigned proceeded to Jackson, Miss.: Messrs. H. B. Kiley and F. T. Kelly—

Two good Irishmen—

arriving on September 24, 1946, and Mr. Roy A. Moon on October 2.

Although the minimum of cooperation was to be expected on an investigation of this nature, involving as it did, among other things, traditional deep-rooted racial issues, we did not anticipate a situation practically approximating a total lack of cooperation with which we were actually confronted. Difficulty was experienced in obtaining office space, equipment, supplies, keys, post-office box, and a safe depositary for documents, etc., and our tireless efforts to obtain local secretarial help were fruitless. As a result, we were compelled to take statements from Negro witnesses in longhand at source, wherever they could be located, who for obvious reasons, in many cases, did not deem it prudent to cooperate; also, upon instructions from the committee, in order to avoid possible repercussions in the form of allegations that Negroes had been induced to make statements by the offer of a trip to Jackson, the State capital, and a per diem fee of $3—perfectly legal—no out-of-town witnesses were requested to appear at our office.

On the day of our arrival in Jackson, Senator BILBO took office space in room 512 of the Federal Building, making it necessary for potential Negro witnesses to pass his office en route to our office in room 538. Very few witnesses actually came to our office in the Federal Building, after the appearance of an article in the press entitled "BILBO Makes It Easy for Senate Probers" (exhibit B), whose caption we definitely believe was a misnomer.

Wherever possible, persons mentioned in the complaint were sought out, interviewed, and statements were taken, if procurable. We were in almost daily contact with Mr. T. B. Wilson, president of the Mississippi Voters League, the complainant—

Mr. President, I desire to say that it is my purpose to read to the Senate, after a while, most of the testimony of Mr. T. B. Wilson. I believe that after a reading of the testimony of T. B. Wilson it will be found that the majority report reflects conditions in the State of Mississippi during the election of July 2.

I continue to read from the written report of the investigators:

We were in almost daily contact with Mr. T. B. Wilson, president of the Mississippi Voters' League, the complainant, and through him received a wealth of valuable information, leads, etc. From these initial leads, as well as from other sources, we believe we were able to branch out and cover the State in such a manner as to make our investigation a fairly good cross section of conditions existing prior to and during the July 2 Democratic primary, especially with regard to the difficulty of the Negroes in registering and voting.

According to the 1940 census, there were 1,106,327 whites and 1,074,578 Negroes residing in Mississippi, and in some counties the ratio is nearly 3 to 1 in the Negroes favor. Approximately 200,000 Mississippians served in the armed forces in the last war, about equally divided between both races. No accurate figures on illiteracy are obtainable.

Attached to this report, as exhibit C, is a copy of the official election returns for United States Senator from the State of Mississippi of the primary held on July 2, 1946, to which we have added the total votes cast by counties, as well as the white and colored population by counties, on the basis of the 1940 census returns.

During the course of this investigation interviews were had and statements were taken from legal residents of the following 22 counties, representing a fairly good widespread geographical coverage, in half of which official primary voting statistics are given by color.

In the county of Adams, white population 10,344; colored population 16,885; total registration 3,371; Negro registration 147; Negroes who voted, none.

Claiborne County. White population 3,411; colored 9,398. Total registration and voting not given.

Copiah County. Whites, 16,107; colored, 17,863. Total registration and voting not given.

Forrest County. 23,963 whites. 10,935 colored. Registered and voting not given.

Grenada County. 7,934 whites; 11,113 colored. Registration and voting not given.

Hancock County. 8,955 whites; 2,351 colored. Total registration and voting not accounted for.

Harrison County. 40,742 whites; colored, 10,046. Total registration, 11,000. Negroes registered, 340. Voting, 12.

Hinds County. White population, 51,826; colored population, 55,445. Total registration, 27,386. Negro registration, 414. Negroes voting, 195.

While I am discussing Hinds County, I desire to make a few remarks respecting that county in particular. Hinds County happens to be the county in Mississippi where the great city of Jackson, the capital of the State, is located. In that city there was a colored resident by the name of T. B. Wilson, who was president of the Mississippi Progressive Voters' League, an organization which had been formed by him and others of his race in early 1945 for the express purpose of educating the colored people of that county to vote and to register.

Wilson testified—his testimony is in the record, and I shall read it after awhile—that no effort was made to prevent colored people from registering and that no effort was made to prevent colored people from voting. He said that as a matter of fact in a few instances where a few colored people had been refused the right to register he advised them to go back to the registrar, that he accompanied some of them, and that these men were registered. He said the registrar had asked these applicants to go back home and learn a little more about their Government, and said that if they could answer the questions he would register them. But Wilson testified in no uncertain terms, on more than one occasion, that so far as he knew every colored man and woman who presented himself or herself at the registra-

tion office to be registered was registered, and everyone who presented himself or herself to vote on July 2 did vote.

There was no violence of any kind, and, as I have said, with all the effort put forth by T. B. Wilson, with all the effort put forth by a colored man by the name of Green, who was editor of the Jackson News, a colored newspaper, and, who said that for 7 years he had been attempting to educate the colored people of Mississippi to register and to vote—with all that effort, out of a total population of 55,000 colored people, only 414 registered, and only 195 voted. There was no sign of violence whatever in Hinds County. Yet we were confronted with the allegation that the statements of Mr. BILBO, the language he used, and all that, prevented the colored people from voting and registering in the State of Mississippi.

I am stating this in advance for the benefit of the Senate. I know Senators are listening, and I am going to read to them after a while the testimony of T. B. Wilson.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to remind the Senator that by the term registration, as it is so often used, he means registering in the party.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the Mississippi law, as I understand it, I believe the record shows, it is not necessary to declare a party affiliation, but the person comes before the registrar and all he need do in order to register is to sign an oath. Then there is another portion of the registration law which states that when he comes to vote he can be challenged unless it can be shown that he did support the party for 2 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. And one of the reasons why a larger number have been registered and a smaller number have voted, was not because of racial trouble, but because they had to take an oath to support the Democratic Party for two further years. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. The evidence on that point is a little bit conflicting. What I think the Senator has in mind is in respect to the voting.

Mr. MAYBANK. Voting is what I referred to.

Mr. ELLENDER. There were quite a number of colored people who presented themselves for voting and who were challenged because of the fact that they did not declare, or, for some reason, could not declare whether or not they had supported the party for 2 years.

I may say further to the distinguished Senator that, as he will remember, the evidence shows that the July 2 primary was the first primary in the State of Mississippi in which any serious effort was made by the colored people of Mississippi to participate in a Democratic primary election.

Mr. MAYBANK. They have participated in the general elections?

Mr. ELLENDER. They have participated, no doubt, in general elections.

Mr. MAYBANK. Aside from colored people, there were white witnesses present who said they had voted in the primary?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. They also said they had taken the oath to uphold the laws of Mississippi, and to support the nominee in the general election?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. They said, however, that they had not done so?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not a question, therefore, affecting only colored people?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, no.

Mr. MAYBANK. It affects white people, as well. There is a continual reference to the colored people. There were white witnesses present, as the Senator knows, representing several different churches in Mississippi.

Mr. ELLENDER. We had several white witnesses who had voted, and who acknowledged that they had voted in the primary election, July 2. They had also voted in the general election, November 5. They claimed they had unwittingly violated the law of Mississippi by not supporting BILBO, because every Democrat who voted in the primary on July 2, whether for BILBO or for someone else, and who chose to vote in the general election November 5, was obligated under the law of Mississippi to support and vote for the Democratic nominee. Many of them violated that provision of the law.

Before I began to comment on the vote in Hinds County, I was reading, at page 4, from the report of the three investigators that were sent by the committee to the State of Mississippi. As I indicated a while ago, Hinds County, with a white population of 51,826, and a colored population of 55,445, shows a total registration of 27,386, of whom only 414 were colored; 195 voting.

Jackson County shows a white population of 16,214; colored, 4,160.

Jones County, a white population of 35,061; colored, 14,088. In Jackson and Jones Counties the total registration is not shown.

Lauderdale, with a population of 35,435 white, 22,810 colored, shows a total registration of 12,000, of whom 188 were colored. Twenty-seven colored persons voted.

Leflore County shows a white population of 14,394; colored, 38,970, with a total registration of 4,345, of whom 26 were colored. No colored person voted.

Lincoln County showed a white population of 17,833; colored, 9,672; total registration and vote not accounted for.

Madison County, white population, 8,787; colored, 28,711; total registration and vote not accounted for.

Marshall County, white population, 7,556; colored population, 17,965; total registration 2,370; Negro registration 17; voting, 5.

Newton County, total white population, 15,528; colored population, 8,418; registration and voting record not available.

Pearl River, white population, 14,973; colored, 4,152; registration and voting data not given.

Pike County, white population 19,291; colored population, 15,710; total registration, 4,501; Negro registration 19; voting, none.

Rankin County, white population 13,260; colored population, 14,670; total registration and voting record not available.

Sunflower County, white population 17,465; colored, 43,477. That is but one county, with a ratio of almost 3 to 1 in favor of the colored. Total registration 7,715; Negroes registered, 35; voting, none.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Sunflower County happens to be my home county. I know intimately all about the county, and I know that there was no coercion or intimidation of any kind in that county. Was there before the committee proof that any Negro had been refused registration in Sunflower County?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot answer directly the Senator's question, but as I recall there were a few such cases from the delta section. Whether that was in Sunflower County or in some other county in that section, I cannot tell, at the moment. There were probably 10 or 15 persons who applied for registration, of whom several were refused, because of their inability to answer questions propounded; others were registered. Whether they were in Sunflower County I cannot say.

Mr. EASTLAND. They were turned down simply because they were not qualified electors; is that not true?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the testimony, I would say, of the registrar; but quite a few questions were asked which were probably beyond the purview of the Mississippi law. As a matter of fact, some registrars stated—at least one that I remember in particular—that he made it a little hard for the colored people to register.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was an isolated instance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that was one instance. He said that that practice had been in effect in the State of Mississippi for many years. I do not have to tell the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi that since the State of Mississippi got rid of the carpetbaggers in the old days the white citizens there drafted a new constitution in 1890, or amended the existing constitution, so as to have control in that State of its political destiny.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to say to the Senator right there that what the Senator said is absolutely true.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is true of every Southern State.

Mr. EASTLAND. And we are going to see that it remains true; we are going to maintain that situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe other Southern States are going to follow the same pattern.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are going to maintain that situation against all enemies, both domestic and foreign.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Every effort is now being made to do so. The situation has been maintained in the past. I am very hopeful that at some time in the near future we can have a more enlightened citizenry which will be qualified to

vote. But it will take a considerable time to educate many individuals in Mississippi. Just stop to think of the conditions which exist in some counties I have mentioned, where the colored population tops the white population in some instances by more than three to one. If the colored people were to be permitted to vote in those counties it would mean——

Mr. EASTLAND. Racial domination in those counties.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is absolutely no question about that. That is something which the South has been fighting against, as I have said, since carpetbag days, and I presume the South will continue in its efforts against such domination.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Louisiana realizes that the mental level of those people renders them incapable of suffrage.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that. That is one of the principal reasons why suffrage is not permitted. The Senator will remember that in the New England States it took almost 250 years to get rid of witchcraft. We still have what amounts practically to voodooism among the colored people in Louisiana. There is no question about that.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. Secretary, I ask unanimous consent, following my remarks, that the statement of Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, before the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program on December 19, 1946, be printed in the RECORD, together with his response to the report concerning alleged transactions between him and various war contractors.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BILBO, OF MISSISSIPPI, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM ON DECEMBER 19, 1946

DECEMBER 19, 1946.

Gentlemen of the committee, this hearing has been in progress for 7 days, and I am bold to state, as a Senator of the United States and as an attorney at law able to evaluate evidence, that all that the witnesses have been able to establish is that I am a very poor man and heavily involved in debt, and that I received during all the periods that the investigation has covered but two Christmas gifts, one an automobile and the other living-room furniture consisting of a sofa, three floor lamps, and two table lamps.

The evidence shows conclusively that every assistance or service rendered to me, all of which I am under obligations to repay, was given voluntarily and without any solicitation on my part, with the possible exception of the money that I borrowed to make a property settlement with my ex-wife. I hold the legal title to considerable property, as the evidence shows, but today I own only 120 acres with one house that is free of all encumbrances whatsoever.

I want the committee to understand as they have uncovered all of my private affairs that throughout my life I have operated upon the advice of a very successful old friend of mine who told me when I was a young man that if I ever expected to have anything for my old age I must buy and buy and buy real estate and buy it on credit and then work like h—— the rest of my life to pay for it. This I have done which accounts, in part, for my heavy indebtedness.

Beginning in 1912 when I bought my first home of 160 acres at Poplarville, Miss., which was bought on credit, I have from time to time bought land and built houses until today I own about 3,300 acres of land with about 20 tenant houses in addition to my dream house. In 1917 I borrowed money from the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans and at one time my debts to the Federal land bank amounted to over $23,000, but I have been able to keep my payments current and I have reduced this indebtedness to about $13,000 and I have renegotiated this loan so that my annual payments are now only about $1,200 a year.

I borrowed my first money from the Bank of Commerce, of Poplarville, in 1912 and in my first race for the State senate I increased that debt and today I owe this bank only about $9,500. I have received salaries as Governor of my State for 8 years and as United States Senator for 12 years which were more than enough to pay these two banks all I owed, but instead of paying them I have paid the banks interest at a reasonable rate of interest and used the balance of funds that I collected as a public official in my law practice, and in the sale of timber and other property, in the purchase of more lands, and for the improvement of same.

My plan of operation and management was moving along fairly well until 1938 when I made a property settlement with my ex-wife and had to borrow $21,750 for alimony. At that time I had practically no money at all except the meager savings from my salary as United States Senator which you, gentlemen, know is a very small amount after you pay all necessary expenses and demands that are made upon a Senator to maintain two homes.

I borrowed every dollar of the $21,750 and made a cash settlement with my ex-wife on the 22d of July 1938. No one thought that I would be able to meet this large payment in a period of hard times, but in one week I called upon seven friends and every one responded but one and I raised $22,000. Another friend sent me $3,000 that I did not need and I returned it the next day after the settlement of the divorce. My tug-of-war since then has been to pay this $22,000 and at the same time keep up my other payments, always including taxes and insurance and to continue the development and improvement of my property. I have kept satisfied the Bank of Commerce of Poplarville and the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans and, while I have incurred other debts as I have struggled to pay the $22,000 borrowed in payment of alimony, they have been largely with my life-long friends who are willing to wait until I have worked out of my financial difficulties.

I have never taken advantage of the bankrupt law, notwithstanding I had a partner in the drugstore business at Wiggins, Miss., that took involuntary bankruptcy in my absence and without my knowledge or consent and I assumed the entire indebtedness of the business after the partnership was declared a bankrupt and paid it out by the month during the 4 years that I was Governor of Mississippi the first time. My friends and those who know me know that while I may be delayed in paying what I owe that I finally arrive with the cash.

This hearing is reprehensible to me because there is involved in it a suggestion that as United States Senator I have tried to profit because of my official position as United States Senator. I am not censuring my colleagues, who have been called upon with a list of absurd charges, because you are doing just what I would do if I was in your position. The charges have been made by irresponsible parties and it becomes your duty to investigate and find out the truth and I have tried in every way to help the committee find out the truth. With the possible exception of two after the hearing started, I have not requested to be subpenaed a witness in this case because I was willing to make out my defense by those who were summoned by the committee who were supposed to have first-hand information about all the facts and alleged charges.

I think it is fit and proper before I undertake to discuss the alleged charges that I be permitted in all fairness to discuss and evaluate the two men who are more responsible than anyone else for bringing these false charges to the attention of the Senate committee, and these two men are Ross A. Collins, who filed with the Committee on Elections and Privileges by letter the original charges during the recent senatorial campaign in Mississippi, and my erstwhile secretary, Ed Terry, who has been so free with his wild, hazy, vicious, and traitorous hallucinations.

But before I take up these two gentlemen for discussion I think it is fair to the committee to know that there are two groups in America that have sponsored and waged for many months a foolish and unjustifiable campaign to unseat me as United States Senator.

On November 27, 1946, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People issued a statement for release on November 29, 1946, from New York City. This release was just before a hearing of the Ellender committee at Jackson, Miss., which started on the 2d day of December. The first and second paragraphs of this statement read as follows:

"NEW YORK.—According to an unimpeachable southern source, professional race-baiters, backing Senator THEODORE BILBO's fight to retain his seat in the upper House, were nervously anticipating introduction of a heretofore closely guarded brief, prepared by NAACP legal counsel, assisted by powerful liberals with years of top-level Washington experience. This brief is expected to provide a sensational legal basis for the expulsion of the violently anti-Negro, anti-Semitic Mississippi demagog, when the hearings get under way in Mississippi on Monday. Attorney Charles H. Houston, of Washington, D. C., will represent the NAACP during the hearings.

"Attorney Houston, in Washington today, declared that it would probably require special permission from the special committee in charge of the hearings before the lethal brief, which he considers a most comprehensive one in terms of legal and other pressing elements, can be presented. In his opinion, the NAACP brief will provide the most practical basis for the Senate's right to act in the unseating of BILBO. Mr. Houston is expected to remain in Mississippi at least 1 week and perhaps 2. In addition to the brief, he will carry a substantial amount of photostatic material which he expects to aid materially in the action."

Now, the committee at Jackson, Miss., very properly permitted this "closely guarded brief" which was expected to provide a "sensational legal basis" for my expulsion to be introduced and made a part of the record of that hearing. The title of this brief is "The Case Against Bilboism," prepared by Charles M. LaFollette on October 21, 1946. You will understand that Mr. LaFollette is a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Indiana and was defeated for the Senate in the Republican primary by Senator JENNER.

I want to call this committee's and the country's attention to a statement on page 40 of this much heralded piece of rotten literature, "I want to point out that presently there are two groups now acting in campaigns to eliminate Senator BILBO. One of them is an all-Negro group, which is headed by a man about whom I think it is fair to say that most recognized Negro leaders in America believe can be justly charged with expediency on the basis of past performance. The other

group includes Communist Party members and quite a few other people who have been closely identified with Communist-front activities."

Without any reflection on this committee or any intimation that the committee is influenced or controlled by these two groups I do want you to know that all the pressure through press and radio that has sponsored the campaign against me stems from these two groups. These same groups are behind the now famous "Oust Bilbo" organization by these same influences in New York. A copy of their announcement and letters I will introduce a little later in this statement.

These two groups care nothing about whether I received an automobile or incurred an indebtedness of $3,667.90 for building a lake that I had planned for 12 years or more, or anything else involved in this investigation. They want BILBO destroyed and unseated because of my convictions and ideologies which are opposed to the great objectives of the all-out Negro groups and Communist groups of America.

These groups know that I have not been guilty of violating my oath as United States Senator by inciting violence against the Negroes down in Mississippi. They know that I did not do any more than Perry Howard, the Negro national committeeman of the Republican Party from Mississippi, who urged and pleaded with the Mississippi Negroes not to attempt to vote in Mississippi's recent Democratic primaries. They know that I am not guilty of any acts involving moral turpitude. They know I have kept the record straight but they would unseat me because of my views and convictions on racial issues, all because I have been rather active and militant in insisting upon my convictions. They are not willing for me to enjoy freedom of speech as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Now, since Mr. Collins made the first charge and has made himself rather conspicuous at this hearing with his inability "to take it on the chin," let us review some of his record that will account for his action in this behalf. Practically every charge that this committee has investigated is contained in a four-page campaign document which was printed by the hundreds of thousands and broadcast throughout Mississippi in the recent primary election. Regardless of what Collins says, practically all of the matter contained in his campaign circular was furnished by the Judas Iscariot who had been my secretary since January 1939. In this circular which I have read and analyzed I find at least 25 separate, distinct, contemptible, pusillanimous, and limicolous lies. After studying and analyzing the statements of this circular all these false charges were discussed day and night on the stump and on the radio before all the people of Mississippi, and then voted upon by the people of Mississippi. And, notwithstanding the fact that Ross Collins had been the attorney general of Mississippi for 8 years, ran for Governor in 1919 (being defeated and running fourth in the race), and made the race for the United States Senate three times before the recent campaign, which made four times for the Senate, and notwithstanding the further fact that he was Congressman from his home town and district for 20 years, when the votes were counted the 2d day of July he ran a poor third. He received less than 10 percent of the 191,806 votes cast, his vote being only 18,875. He received less than 100 votes in 22 of Mississippi's 82 counties; he received less than 200 votes but over 100 in 28 counties; he received less than 300 but over 200 in 16 counties. He did not carry a single county in the State, nor did he lead in any one county of the State. He lost his home county of Lauderdale and got less than 20 percent of the total vote in that county. I, BILBO, received in his home county 3,013, while Collins only received 1,137. My majority over Collins in his home county was 1,876. Even Mr. Ellis received 1,305 to Collins' 1,137—even Ellis' majority was 168 over Collins in his own home county. To show you how complete his condemnation and repudiation was in his old home district that he represented 20 years in the Congress, where he was born and reared and known, there were 10 counties and the vote was as follows:

The vote on July 2, 1946, in Ross Collins' old congressional district

	Bilbo	Ellis	Collins	Total
Clarke	1,131	310	193	1,757
Jasper	1,157	547	328	2,208
Kemper	733	355	216	1,443
Lauderdale	3,013	1,305	1,137	5,865
Leake	1,005	887	340	2,664
Neshoba	1,436	1,305	806	3,885
Newton	1,171	887	404	2,696
Scott	980	960	384	2,462
Simpson	1,442	726	201	2,633
Smith	1,428	972	262	2,955
Total	13,496	8,254	4,271	28,568

Because of Collins' campaign of lies and misrepresentations in making the charges upon which I am now being tried, and others, he has been the most thoroughly, completely, and everlastingly condemned, damned, and repudiated man in the history of the State. The people of Mississippi have already been appraised of all his charges involved in this hearing and they were all discussed fully and completely with the worst possible construction placed upon every charge which resulted in the defeat of Mr. Collins and my exoneration from these charges was complete by the people of Mississippi in my reelection in the first primary by a majority of 3,834 over 4 opponents in a campaign in which there was polled 191,806 votes.

With such a smashing and lambasting condemnation it is surprising that this man would have the gall and audacity to ever appear as a witness in any hearing and most certainly he is in bad grace when he makes a grandstand play, as demonstrated before this committee, in making claims to the protection of his good name and reputation. If the good white people of Mississippi, men and women, had given me such a beating at the polls I would seek the thickest jungles in the hinterlands and hide in its density and darkness until the resurrection morn.

Now, the other star witness in this case, the modern Benedict Arnold, by the name of Edward P. Terry, I do not know whether to pity or blame, because I sometimes think that he has a mental illness of imaginary grandeur and impossible hallucinations. I am sure you noticed from the newspapers the other day while witnesses were here on the stand proving beyond all doubt that he had stolen or embezzled $3,750 from Wall Doxey's campaign, that he was down at Quitman, Miss., waiting to hear from a New York bank where he was trying to borrow more than a million dollars. And again he says he has wrecked his health working so hard for me and he had increased my financial resources. When I hired this man upon the death of my secretary, at which time he was working for the Farm Security Administration at Little Rock, Ark., where I had secured him a job to come to Washington and become my secretary, I had never heard one word against him. On the surface he was congenial, affable, and pleasant, and I would like to say for the record that there has never been a cross word between us during the 7 years he was in my office except one little incident. But it now develops that almost from the time he entered my office he started his wild chase after ill-gotten gain.

I did not know until after he had left my employment on January 15, 1946, that he ended his career as a banker by wrecking a bank in Calhoun County, his home county, where a grand jury indicted him six times, four for embezzlement and two for fraudulent loans. I understand that by making payments and manipulations he was never tried on these charges.

One of the most horrible things that he committed against me was to open a bank account in the Jackson State National Bank in my name, telling the banker that it was my account and no one could draw the money out except himself, as agent, and BILBO as the principal. When deposits to this account started coming in, the bank called on him for a signature card with my name. Of course, he knew he could not approach me because I would then discover his treachery but, when the bank called on him for a signature card with my name, he sent the bank a facsimile copy of my name to be pasted on the signature card. He placed seven or eight thousand dollars in this account and I never knew anything about it until about the 2d day of December of this year, although the account was opened in 1939. He drew all the funds out of this account except about $200. The bank recently discovered that I knew nothing about the account because I have never written the bank, called the bank, had never been in the bank, had never sent a deposit or written a check on the account. He made all the deposits and wrote all the checks. He was all the time attempting to secure money any way he could from people who were doing business through my office. I trusted him as much as I ever trusted any man on earth and never suspected him until I learned of a telegram he had supposedly sent to one of my constituents, telling him that if he would send him $200 or $300 he would give him the relief that my constituent was asking at my hand.

When he left my office there were 42 files that are known to be missing. I learned later through two reliable witnesses that these files were in Ross Collins' campaign headquarters. However, I am convinced that he took these files more to protect himself than to use them in Ross Collins' campaign. I discovered that he was doing business through my office and in my name with people in Chicago, New York, Dallas, and other places and he was so anxious to deceive the people that he was dealing with, that in many cases he made his secretary use the initials of my personal secretary without her knowledge or consent.

In 1941 he arranged for a Christmas present for me at Jackson, Miss., consisting of one sofa, three chairs, three floor lamps, and two table lamps to be placed in the living room of my island house, which, by the way, is the only furniture in this house that I did not buy myself, and, by the way, the house is completely furnished. He inveigled one of my friends to sign a note with him at the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co. for $500 to pay for this Christmas present, and then he proceeded to collect from my friends who were lined up as donors in this Christmas present and put this money in his pocket and later persuaded M. T. Reed, of Belzoni, to pay the note.

This poor man went absolutely wild in his mad desire for money and is now testifying against the man who paid him the second best salary on Capitol Hill, and put his wife on the pay roll, paying her over $8,000, in a desire to help him pay the expenses of keeping his daughter in school. There is absolutely no limit of his betrayal. He even accepted $15,000 which he deposited in the bank at Jackson, Miss., stating that he had got this money from some parties in the north and that the money was to be used in getting Governor Bailey into the race for the United States Senate against me in 1946, this being done while he was still my secretary and he and his wife both on my pay

roll. Yesterday you gentlemen of the committee heard his sordid tale of unfaithfulness. His conduct has been so shocking until it is almost unbelievable and incomprehensible, and yet he testifies at this hearing and expects the committee and the public to believe what he says. It always did hurt me to the heart to be disappointed in friends or an associate, and this is one of the greatest disappointments of my life. Again I say I do not know whether to pity him or blame him. I can only commit him to a just God and to my countrymen, whose duty it is for the sake of the public good to mete out justice.

In this case to date and, I repeat, as a lawyer, the evidence has shown only one thing, and that is that I was given a Cadillac car Christmas, 1941, and a few pieces of living-room furniture. I am sure no man or woman will censure me for accepting these presents from real friends. These were presents and highly appreciated gifts, and I am sure that ninety-nine out of every hundred men and women in the country would have gladly accepted such from real friends when they came without any strings or obligations whatsoever. In fact, as to the car, it has been a custom, not only in Mississippi but throughout the country, to make presents to citizens who have been honored by their people. In my State I remember that I received a Willys-Knight automobile when I was elected Governor in 1916. Governor Russell, who succeeded me, received an automobile from his friends; Governor Whitfield likewise received an automobile when he was elected. When I was elected as Governor the second time, my staff and friends not only gave me an automobile but they gave my wife one. Governor Conner received an automobile and a nice home at Jackson from his staff and friends. Governor White, I understand, did not receive a car because he was a wealthy man. Governor Johnson received a $4,000 silver service and an automobile and a fine riding horse on his election. Governor Bailey received an automobile, a $3,750 silver service, and a $5,000 war bond. Senator Harrison, when elected last time, was presented with a beautiful automobile. So do not blame me for accepting a Cadillac when I was elected to the Senate for a second term. It is just an old southern custom—in other words, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone." Furthermore, I understand that our last and present Presidents received automobiles as gifts.

And now, before we take up the charges, let me make one observation about one witness, Mrs. Virginia Simmerman, executive secretary to Senator EASTLAND. This poor woman, in her venomous hate, stated that I had fired her after working for me for 6 years because her father refused to make me a loan when I was raising $21,750 to make a property settlement with my ex-wife. It is hardly necessary for me to answer her absurd statement after this committee heard her testify and heard her so completely destroyed as a witness by Colonel Thomas Rhodes, another Mississippian. I am sure the committee now understands why I dismissed her. Her statement about the reason for my dismissal of her could not be true because I received my divorce in 1938 and she remained in my office for 2 years thereafter. I am too much of a southern gentleman to express myself fully about this witness, but I will say, as she demonstrated in her testimony, that she is thoroughly undependable. Her father did lend me $500 on my alimony, and I repaid him, and I have here my letter to him and his reply. As a witness, she is most certainly "a blank cartridge."

Now let us take up the charges one at a time and see just what this investigation shows the facts to be. With reference to the specific charges that you have heretofore advised me you would consider, I most respectfully submit for your consideration the following complete answer and response.

On November 23, 1946, in answer to my wire of November 22, 1946, I was advised by your chief counsel that your honorable subcommittee would hold public hearings on allegations that I had engaged in certain transactions with certain war contractors which were listed. In my wire of November 22, 1946, I had requested that you advise me (1) the nature of the charges against me, (2) the names of my accusers, and (3) whether or not such accusers had sworn to any of these charges.

The response by chief counsel for the committee listed certain specific allegations but failed to name my accusers or to advise whether such accusers had sworn to the allegations made.

Therefore I wired you again on November 29, 1946, thanking you for giving me the nature and cause of the allegations and again requesting the names of my accusers to which your chief counsel again replied that the names of my accusers would not be made known to me but graciously tendering me every power of this honorable subcommittee to have any witnesses I might desire here to testify, providing I would submit the names of such witnesses and the nature of the evidence that such witnesses were capable of producing. I was further advised by your chief counsel that "after such preliminary investigations as to the nature of the evidence such witnesses are capable of producing" you would "determine whether to call them or not."

The charges which you advised me would be investigated were specified as follows:

1. That I assisted various contractors in obtaining cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts for the construction of Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss.; Key Field, Meridian, Miss.; and Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss.

2. That I received $26,200 from F. T. Newton, of the Newton-Glenn Construction Co.

3. That I received $6,200 from B. L. Knost, of the Morrissey-Knost Construction Co.

4. That I received $6,000 from Mike T. Morrissey; that without cost to me he built a lake on my premises; that he gave me a Cadillac automobile; that he made certain improvements on my farm while operating it, which operation caused a total loss of approximately $48,000.

5. That furniture purchased for Dream House No. 2 was paid for by war contractors.

6. That I received funds from various persons and deposited them in an account called Juniper Grove Baptist Church, Special Fund by THEODORE G. BILBO, in the Bank of Commerce, Poplarville, Miss., on which account I alone could draw and which money was principally to build a residence owned by me.

7. That a note for $3,000 which I owed to A. L. Shushan was paid by individuals who later were reimbursed by war contractors.

8. That certain of my personal expenses incurred in my office in Washington, D. C., were eventually defrayed by war contractors.

9. That a swimming pool was constructed on my premises without charge to me by St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc.

With your indulgence and permission, I shall take up each of these and give in addition to the testimony you have already heard explanatory of the actual facts my answer not only to the charges but to the very serious implications and insinuations that naturally follow.

1

"That I assisted various contractors in obtaining cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts for the construction of Jackson Army Air Base, Jackson, Miss.; Key Field, Meridian, Miss.; and Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss."

To this charge I plead guilty and if I am to be condemned for being loyal to the constituents that it is my happy privilege to represent as United States Senator, then by the same token every worth-while Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the National Congress, must likewise bear the burden of such condemnation.

In urging upon those in charge of the construction of facilities for the national defense and prosecution of World War II, the use of Mississippians on projects and construction work in Mississippi, I have done no more than has been done by practically all of my colleagues in the Senate and by nearly every Member of the House of Representatives, in urging consideration of constituents.

Indeed, that which I did was in accord completely with the general policy established by the War and Navy Departments in every State as shown by the undisputed evidence in this record from high-ranking officers who were charged with the responsibility of the construction program.

Jackson Army air base

In this instance, I recommended several responsible and qualified Mississippians for this work. Among them was M. T. Reed Construction Co., which satisfactorily completed the work in full accord with the desires of the War Department. I deny that I did not recommend this concern as testified by my former secretary.

This concern received from the War Department through Under Secretary Judge Patterson, the first commendation to a construction contractor for excellency in the history of the Department.

As to whether my recommendation of this and other concerns in any way influenced the War Department in awarding them a contract, you may judge from what General Robins and General Sturgis told this committee.

But during the hearings it was inferred that I may have caused the transfer of jurisdiction over construction from Mobile, Ala., to Vicksburg, Miss. Suppose I did (which General Robins denied); yet the testimony of at least three generals demonstrates that it was for the best interests of the national defense program and the Government so to have done, because

A. Vicksburg is only 42 miles from the site of the Jackson Army Air Base and Mobile is 200 miles away.

B. Vicksburg district office of engineers was better organized and equipped to supervise construction than Mobile.

C. Vicksburg was the more logical office to supervise construction from every viewpoint consistent with speed, economy, and efficiency.

Key Field, Meridian, Miss.

Here the War Department again says that my suggestions of contractors may not have been of any great weight. Nevertheless, the job was done satisfactorily by a combination of Mississippi and Tennessee contractors without any question but that it was up to every requirement of the War Department.

True, one of the associated contractors was my good friend and former campaign manager, A. B. Friend, of Sardis, Miss., who received as his compensation a gross of about $5,000 on a project involving $1,731,129.75.

The innuendo was advanced that Mr. Friend was not qualified to perform the work. War Department scrutiny determined otherwise; results obtained on the job deny the insinuation; and the background of Mr. Friend as to ability, training, and experience is a matter already abundantly in this record.

Bernie Friend is a great organizer, an excellent engineer, and a high-toned Christian gentleman, whose services have been sought by governmental agencies and municipal organizations for many years. I ought to know his ability because he has successfully managed two of my campaigns for United States Senator.

Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss.

The policy of using local contractors was made by the War Department. It was applied in every State. I recommended my constituents, J. A. Jones Construction Co.

of Hattiesburg, Miss., and Charlotte, N. C., who did, according to the undisputed evidence in this record, over $177,000,000, not counting Oak Ridge, in national defense work, and all most satisfactorily completed.

Newton-Glenn-Knost are three Mississippians, my friends and constituents, who were able to obtain a favorable agreement with Mr. Edwin L. Jones of the J. A. Jones Construction Co. and who satisfactorily completed national defense projects in Arkansas, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi.

It was intimated that I was responsible for the change by the War Department from a bid basis contract to a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract on this project. The undisputed evidence, however, is that such change was required by Army Air Forces objectives to speed up greatly needed construction and by instructions from the Commander in Chief to pledge all appropriations immediately for the war effort. My efforts in that regard were surely, therefore, in complete harmony with high authority and necessity.

2

"That I received $26,200 from F. T. Newton of the Newton-Glenn Construction Co."

This charge is made up of two items: One for $25,000 and one for $1,200.

As to the $25,000 item

When Senator Wall Doxey offered for reelection for a full term after serving only 15 months of the unexpired term of the late Senator Pat Harrison from Mississippi, I was deeply interested in the success of his campaign in the primaries for his nomination by the Democratic Party.

I was active in his interest in the first primary in which he was opposed by Ross A. Collins, then Congressman from the Fifth District of Mississippi; by Roland Wall, former WPA director of Mississippi; by Senator James O. Eastland; and by Douglas Smith, of Jackson.

Senator Doxey and Senator EASTLAND were the two high candidates and were in the run-off or second primary, having eliminated Ross Collins, Roland Wall, and Douglas Smith. Between the first and second primaries the friends of both Senator Doxey and Senator EASTLAND were anxious to gain as much support as possible from the forces of the defeated candidates and there was a considerable round of conferences and discussions looking to the accomplishment of success of this desire.

In the first primary there was set up wholly independent of the regular Doxey campaign organization of which Hon. Lee D. Hall, of Columbia, Miss., was campaign manager, a group or committee in which Bernie Friend, Robert Gandy, Forrest B. Jackson, and I, together with others, were quite active. This latter group had its offices in a series of three rooms in the Royal Hotel in Jackson, Miss.

The regular Doxey campaign headquarters was about three blocks west on Capitol Street in the same city, which is the State capital.

At the Royal Hotel, the group had Bernie Friend as a full-time manager with a battery of stenographers, clerks, field men and such personnel as was deemed necessary to carry on the work incident to making speaking engagements distributing literature, contacting local political leaders and doing those things usually and customarily done by friends of a favorite candidate.

This practice was not out of the ordinary but as shown by the testimony in this record was followed by the other candidates for nomination.

To carry on this work and to assist the Doxey campaign in its efforts, it was necessary to have funds. To get the money, letters were sent out, meetings were held and on September 7, 1942, a general rally and pep meeting was held in Jackson. To this meeting Doxey friends from every one of the 82 counties in the State were invited and urged to attend. An appeal for campaign contributions was made at the meeting.

You will observe from the testimony of Mr. Hall that some funds were donated to the regular Doxey campaign headquarters through Mr. Hall after this rally was held. Some donations were made to the group operating from the Royal Hotel, among them a contribution from F. T. Newton of Newton & Glenn of $25,000 in four checks payable to me, which I endorsed over to Robert Gandy who cashed them.

Mr. Gandy brought the money back to the Royal Hotel rooms from which we were working and turned the money over to me as a member of the informal committee or group.

Previous to this, and I believe on Saturday, August 29, 1942, after a series of telephone conversations and conferences with various friends of Ross Collins and friends of Wall Doxey, a meeting was arranged at Collins' suite at the Robert E. Lee Hotel, which is situated about three blocks from the Royal Hotel, in Jackson, one block east and two blocks north.

Robert Gandy, Forrest Jackson, and I went to the Collins suite, and there met Collins, George Butler, Charlie Snow, and Cecil Travis, who were apparently awaiting our arrival. This suite was composed of a living room, bedroom, and bath. Those whom I have named were the only ones present in the suite, and all remained until Gandy, Jackson, and I left at the conclusion of the conference, except that Robert Gandy and Ross Collins went into the bedroom of the suite for a talk about Collins' statement to the press, as will be hereafter related.

After exchanging greetings and having Collins complain about my activities in the first primary for Wall Doxey, I suggested to Collins that he should come on and support or help us elect Wall Doxey to a full term in the Senate.

The matter of Collins' statement to the press came up for discussion. My recollection is that he said that he, Collins, had already prepared a statement. I asked him what was in it. He replied to the effect that he had never submitted any political statement to me and he never would, but said that Bob Gandy was friendly to both and that both of us had confidence in Gandy. He then suggested that he, Collins, and Gandy go into the bedroom of the suite and that Gandy could read what Collins had prepared for release to the press and advise me whether it was satisfactory. He and Gandy went into the bedroom of the suite and shortly returned when Gandy stated that the press release prepared by Collins was satisfactory, which was accepted by me.

Collins then said that he was returning to Washington, where the Congress was in session, and that he would not be openly or personally active in the second primary and that he had released his supporters and friends to vote as each pleased in such primary.

He said, however, that he understood that Cecil Travis and other leaders of his were going to support Wall Doxey and that Travis felt or believed that he could get the field men to work for Doxey in the second primary. Travis agreed that such statement was correct.

Ross Collins then said that as to all other matters and arrangements we could work that out with Travis who was thoroughly familiar with everything and we left, that is Robert Gandy, Forrest Jackson, and I left for the Royal Hotel.

Later that day or on Monday, Robert Gandy told me and Forrest Jackson that it would take $11,000 to be paid to Travis for the Collins campaign set-up. It was my understanding that this covered a deficit. This understanding came from Robert Gandy and Forrest Jackson, who had also talked to Roland Wall about his deficit and who was coming with the Wall Doxey supporters in the second primary.

Robert Gandy and Forrest Jackson reported to me and possibly others of our group that they had agreed to pay Roland Wall $7,500 for his deficit and some miscellaneous accounts that amounted to something over $500, or a total finally of about $8,000 to Roland Wall.

To meet these amounts and other expenditures of the group for the second primary, money was required. Various loans were obtained and various payments were made, some to Cecil Travis for the amount agreed with him; some to Roland Wall on his requirement; some on telephones, printing, stenographers' salaries, and other campaign expenses.

To repay these amounts borrowed and finish meeting commitments and other campaign expenses, it was necessary to get contributions and the rally or pep meeting was held in the interest of Wall Doxey on September 7, 1942, in Jackson, as above stated.

After the rally, several contributions were made, some to Lee Hall and some direct to me. Among the latter were the checks for $25,000 from F. T. Newton. He said that he wanted me to spend it for Wall Doxey's campaign and to do the most good and I carried out his request.

As soon as the checks were given me by Newton I called for Forrest Jackson but he was away and I finally located Robert Gandy on the next day, or September 8, 1942, endorsed the checks, and he went for the money, returning the proceeds of the checks or drafts as they appear to be. I took charge of the money and began spending it for Wall Doxey's campaign. I did the same with other contributions that had come to our group but the Newton $25,000 was by far the largest amount that we received.

That day I recall giving some of the money to A. B. Friend to pay his office workers and for printing bills and other items. Some county workers came in and I gave them some money to use for automobiles to get voters to the polls. Some money I gave to Robert Gandy either that day or the following day or so. That afternoon Forrest Jackson came in and I gave him about $10,000 to pay off a note for $7,500 borrowed from Hattiesburg and $2,500 borrowed from the Deposit Guaranty Bank at Jackson.

Then the entire amount of the contributions was expended by me and the group for the Doxey campaign, including enough to pay Cecil Travis the $11,000 for the Collins set-up and $8,000 for the Roland Wall set-up. All of the time, the campaign headquarters of Wall Doxey both the State-wide organization and several of the county workers from out over the State were asking us for funds and we put out as long as the money lasted and then spent more than we had.

To show you what I mean, let me tell you what occurred at the last of the campaign. Robert Gandy and Forrest Jackson, with A. B. Friend, had borrowed around $15,000 from the banks. We had paid back $10,000 but still owed $5,000. We had agreed to hold up enough money contributed to pay off this note and we tried to do it, despite the continual calls and needs for funds to meet the opposition.

On Monday before the primary of September 15, 1942, we gave Forrest Jackson approximately $2,000 to carry to Meridian, Laurel, Gulfport, and Biloxi to arrange for the transportation of war workers to their home precincts to vote. Monday night at 11 o'clock Forrest was at the Markham Hotel in Gulfport where we called him by telephone to tell him that we had spent into our reserve fund until altogether we had only about $2,000 remaining. We asked what to do about holding up to pay the note or on the note. There were several folks in our rooms then from out in the State requesting funds to pay for transporting voters and there were field workers to pay and other expenses to be paid. Forrest said "Shoot the works." We did and all the money was spent and those

boys, Robert, Bernie, and Forrest are still holding the bag on the $5,000 note, it has been paid down to $1,000. You will find it in the bank records that Bill Mounger, president of the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., left with the committee.

So the $25,000 was spent and I did not get a dollar or a penny of it.

As to the $1,200

That was a personal loan by F. T. Newton to me and has been repaid—not a cent of it is owing.

The facts are that I borrowed the money and at the time gave Newton 12 drafts on my personal bank account at First National Bank of Hattiesburg. These were each for $100 to be presented over a period of 12 months to the bank for payment. Newton did not present them to the bank monthly as I had requested him and after several months had passed and I found he was not presenting them I called on him to do so. Then I paid all of them off—I believe $300 one time, $500 another, and finally $400, and thus the debt was liquidated and the $1,200 loan was repaid and Newton returned the drafts to me. And here they are [exhibits].

3

"That I received $6,200 from B. L. Knost, of Morrisey-Knost Construction Co."

As to the $5,000 item

B. L. Knost made a check payable to me for $5,000 as a contribution to the Wall Doxey campaign in 1942. I endorsed the check to Robert Gandy. He cashed it and spent the money for campaign purposes, as shown by his testimony and accounting for funds which he personally handled in that campaign.

In June 1942 I was in Mississippi and on my way to Washington I saw Bernie Knost in Meridian, had a meal with him, and he asked me how Wall Doxey's campaign for reelection was going. I told him Wall was having some campaign expenses that needed to be met, and he and Mike Morrisey, who was there, said they would give $2,500 each to the campaign to help out. Bernie Knost gave me his check for $5,000 and I called Robert Gandy to come over to Meridian, since he was handling all of the funds at that time. He came over. I endorsed the check over to Robert Gandy and left for Washington. Mr. Gandy has accounted for this amount of which I got not one cent and never had any of that money in my hands—the check just passed through my hands to Mr. Gandy.

As to the $1,200

In November 1941 I needed some money and borrowed $1,200 from B. L. Knost. I gave him 12 drafts for $100 each drawn on the First National Bank of Hattiesburg, dated monthly over a period of 12 months. Like the Newton draft they bore no interest—in other words we just swapped checks. Mr. Knost did not present his drafts, although I called on him to do so. I have paid him $750 and owe him a balance of $450 which I intend to and will pay. This is purely an indebtedness, and I have had several of them in my time.

4

"That I received $6,000 from Mike T. Morrissey; that without cost to me, he built a lake on my premises; that he gave me a Cadillac automobile; that he made certain improvements on my farm while operating it, which operation caused a total loss of approximately $48,000."

I'll break these down into items for convenience and clarity.

The $6,000 is made up of two notes—one for $5,000 and one for $1,000, both secured by mortgage on about 1,100 acres of land in the Gum Pond place, which I have sold under contract for $26,000 to be concluded as soon as abstracts can be prepared and title approved. I will be required to liquidate the $6,000 mortgage debt to transfer good fee simple unencumbered title. This indebtedness and some of my others can be paid when the sale is finally concluded. This item and charge is therefore "much ado about nothing" for it soon is "gone with the wind."

Here are the original notes now renewed [exhibits].

The lake

The lake is a 15-acre pond when the full water level is reached, and Morrissey charged me for it as shown by letter of February 19, 1942, mailed then, enclosing statement of December 1, 1941, already exhibited in evidence here. The cost of the lake was $3,671.92, which I owe and which I intend to pay when funds are available. With the sale of the Gum Pond place referred to just above, I can pay off several of these debts which I owe. I have never denied or failed ultimately to pay an honest debt. I may be slow but I am sure to pay. I always arrive.

New Cadillac car

Yes; Mike Morrissey gave me the new Cadillac car for a Christmas present in December 1941. This is the third car that has been given me by my friends; one when I was Governor of Mississippi the first time, another when I was Governor the second time—and they also gave my then wife a Cadillac, all as pointed out hereinabove.

There are very good precedents for automobiles to be given to public officials and without any criticism or insinuation that thereby anything illegal or immoral was done.

I therefore deny that there was any wrong on my part in accepting the automobile as a Christmas present from my real friend since 1923.

Farm improvements

I made a contract of rental of my farm with 2 tractors, 1 truck, farm tools and equipment, 6 farm wagons, 75 head of cattle, 50 head of hogs, 2 saddle horses, 13 mules, a drove of ducks, a drove of turkeys, a flock of guineas, a flock of geese, and a flock of chickens. Morrissey was to pay taxes and give me one-half of the profits, if any.

The farm includes a pear orchard, a pecan grove, and a tung-nut grove. When it came back to me at the end of the 4-year period I had 1 tractor, no truck, 1 wagon, few farm tools or equipment, 30 cows, no hogs, 1 horse, 2 mules, 1 drake, 1 gobbler, 1 guinea, 1 gander, and 1 white rooster—and 1 year of taxes had not been paid and I paid these taxes of about $1,100 and will apply it against my debt to Morrissey. I received no profits and my pears, pecans, and tung nuts were all sold by Morrissey. Mike Morrissey made no payment improvements on the property except terracing the land and made no repairs to any improvements there during the 4 years. He kept his superintendent in my home without any rent and rented out my tenant homes, and he stayed there himself for long periods of time. The Triple A paid for the terracing he did which could have been done whether he had the property or not.

Now tell me what profit did I make out of that deal even though Mr. Morrissey lost $48,000 in the transaction as reflected by his income taxes? Where am I to be condemned or censured for anything in this transaction and what connection has it with the national defense program?

5

"That furniture purchased for Dream House No. 2 was paid for by war contractors."

This is absolutely untrue and I specifically deny the charges and the insinuations contained in such allegations. I hold in my hand a Christmas card purporting to be signed by the following: Robert Gandy, W. M. Mounger, F. T. Newton, Edward Terry, Willie Terry, Martha Terry, Leland Speed, Bernie Knost, Ed Gatlin, Junkin.

I now offer this as an exhibit. I am now informed that some of those whose names appear on this card paid from $50 to $75 each to Edward P. Terry, my former secretary, and he practically admits it by his own testimony, and that he took similar amounts from other friends not here listed sufficient to more than pay for the $500 worth of furniture, to wit, one sofa, three chairs, three floor lamps, and two table lamps, but Terry did not pay the note signed by him and endorsed by Robert Gandy at the Deposit Guaranty Bank in Jackson with the money which Terry collected from my friends. He evidently put the money in his pocket or in the special account at the Jackson State National Bank, which account I had never heard of until a few days before the hearing at Jackson, Miss., on December 2, 1946. Then Terry got my good friend, Maurice Reed, to pay this note at the bank and had Reed make the check to "Terry & Co." when there was no such concern in existence.

With the exception noted before the furniture in Dream House No. 2, or Dream House, "Junior," was bought and paid for by me. Most of it came from Sears, Roebuck & Co. and I paid for it on the installment plan.

This house is a California-type rambling bungalow to be used as a study or library. The house has a living room, two bedrooms with bath, dining room, kitchen, luncheonette, and three porches. On one of the porches there is, in connection with a large rock chimney, a barbecue pit.

This house is completely furnished, including tables and chairs for the three porches. The furniture that was sent as a Christmas present by Ed Terry and the friends referred to above forms only a small portion of the furniture of the living room in this house. I have two mounted deerhide rugs in the living room that cost me about $85. The living room also contains another sofa and several other chairs that were transferred from Dream House No. 1.

I purchased a Cold-Spot refrigerator on December 24, 1941, from the Hattiesburg store of Sears, Roebuck & Co., also on the installment plan, which cost me $190. I bought some additional furniture, bathroom fixtures, kitchen fixtures, and venetian blinds from Sears, Roebuck. In the luncheonette is one table and benches, a counter and shelves. The crockery or glassware was given me by Mr. J. W. Daniels, Jr., of Hattiesburg, Miss., who was not a war contractor at any time.

As soon as the island was completed I had my old friends, Smith & Norwood, who have been my architects for 25 years, to prepare plans and specifications for the construction of the study or lodge on the island. I constructed this house myself with the assistance of Mr. Tom Massingale, of Hattiesburg, and under his direction and the direction of the architects the work was carried on, and it was my pleasure to be present part of the time.

In securing the materials for this house I wrecked a four-room residence on some property that I owned at Poplarville. This was a nice little home, ceiled with beaded ceiling, weather boarded, and with two fireplaces. I placed all the brick and lumber on the island to begin construction of the Dream House No. 2. I bought the cement, hardware, and most of the other lumber for the house from Trenton Supply Co., amounting to about $2,000, as has been testified by the manager of the Trenton Supply Co., for all of which I paid on the installment plan.

I purchased the columns and outside timbers, which were heart cypress, from Mr. G. H. Williams, of Picayune, Miss., and hauled it to the island on my farm truck. These timbers cost me close onto $100. I bought the flooring from the Nachary Builders Supply Co., of New Orleans, La., for $722.50, paying $222.50 cash and the balance in five monthly installments. This was a plastic tile floor.

The trusses in the large room in this house were given to me by some friends of mine who owned a sawmill at Gulfport, Miss. These four trusses were put together with bolts and this is the only place I could find

the timbers of sufficient dimensions from which to cut the trusses. This sawmill was owned by Baxter, Wheat, Cue, and Gex, four good friends of mine, and they refused to accept any pay for these special timbers—they were not war contractors. Of course this was a small item.

6

"That a note for $3,000 which I owed to A. L. Shushan was paid by individuals who later were reimbursed by war contractors."

No war contractor paid a dime on this note nor reimbursed, so far as I am able to find, any individual who paid and retired the note. Here is the way Shushan became involved in this $3,000 loan. Mr. Grant Stewart, a wholesale merchant of New Hebron, Miss., was one of the seven men that I selected when I started out to raise the $21,750 to pay alimony to my ex-wife. He was the first man I called upon. He told me that he did not have the money because he had just bought out his two partners and paid them $7,500 in cash. I told him I knew that but I knew that he had sources from which he could get me $3,000. He hesitated a moment and said, "Yes, I know where I can get the money," and he assured me that he would be at my home for luncheon on July 21, 1938, and he pleasantly reminded me of the fact that he was very fond of chicken pie. At 11 o'clock on the morning of July 21 he arrived at my home and delivered the $3,000. He did not tell me where he had got the money, but shortly after he called me and said he wanted me to meet Mr. Shushan at Pearl River, La., which I did, and it was then I learned that he had borrowed the money from Shushan. After a conference with Mr. Shushan, which lasted only about 5 minutes, we separated and the next time I saw him he was in Washington and he asked me to carry him down to talk to Mr. Winchell in regard to his civil suit involving his income taxes. I did it both because I appreciated what he had done for me through Mr. Grant Stewart, although I did not know at the time, and for the further reason that he was a constituent of mine, having a branch wholesale business in Jackson, Miss. I would have rendered him the same service if he had never loaned Grant Stewart a cent and you will remember in his testimony he insisted that he made the loan on Grant Stewart's account and not on mine.

The testimony before this committee about the payment of this loan took place in my absence, but I believe that it is a true story of how the note was paid to Mr. Shushan.

After this settlement I paid Mr. Stewart on the 3d of July 1941 the $750 that he contributed in the payment of the note to Mr. Shushan and here is a canceled check for the $750.

I am informed that Mr. Forrest Jackson refunded Mr. Terry the $750 that he was to contribute in the agreed settlement; however, as a matter of fact, my information is Mr. Terry paid only $500 at the time and Mr. Stewart advanced him the other $250 of the $750 that he was to pay. My information has always been that Mr. Jackson paid Mr. Terry his $500 and sent the $250 that Stewart advanced to Terry direct to Mr. Stewart.

I still owe on this alimony nightmare Mr. Jackson $1,500 and the president of my bank, Bob Newton, $750. In due time I will get to them. So you will see, gentlemen, that there was no war contractor connected in the remotest degree with the Shushan note and its payment, notwithstanding Drew Pearson.

7

"That certain of my personal expenses incurred in my office at Washington, D. C., were eventually defrayed by war contractors."

This charge I deny. I have heard the witnesses here testify that from time to time several of them on the insistence and request of my erstwhile secretary, Ed Terry, had advanced to Mr. Terry what he represented to be payment of telephone, telegram, and printing accounts. During the time that Mr. Terry was in my office he used long-distance telephone and telegrams to great extent to carry on his personal contacts in various States as well as the State of Mississippi. Many of these telegrams that he sent were not such as would come within the purview of official business for a United States Senator. All of the telephone bills had to be paid as a personal expense. It now appears that some of them were paid by my friends, but this was without my knowledge, acquiescence, or consent. I have never personally requested anyone to take care of any of my personal expenses whether he was a war contractor or a personal friend and constituent. It is a notable fact that every employee in my office can verify that Mr. Terry, while he had almost absolute control of the management of the office and dealing with my constituents, never brought to my attention any of these telephone bills and neither did he ever file any of these bills in the office. They are all gone.

As to printing bills there may have been some special matters that I had printed which could not be printed at public expense on which some of my friends, through Mr. Terry, volunteered contributions; especially is this true in the publication of various and sundry speeches that I made on the floor of the Senate.

Surely I am not to be condemned or denied my seat because of anything disclosed with reference to this particular charge, or any of the others as for that matter; especially is this true when the miserable, sordid, and treacherous record of an unfaithful secretary has been so thoroughly exposed in this hearing.

8

"That a swimming pool was constructed on my premises without charge to me by the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc."

The St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., is owned by my very good friends, John H. Junkin and his brother, William Junkin, of Natchez, Miss. They have both been my personal and political friends for many years and this company has been in existence for a half century, having been originally organized by the father of these two fine men. They are most certainly not what you would call "war contractors." They were selling to the Army engineers and Government contractors mixed concrete for which they had obtained their contract by reason of the fact that they were low bidders to the Mobile district office for the Keesler Field job.

I had prepared the swimming pool in question by constructing the forms, putting in the reenforcing steel and had the sand and gravel on the ground and most of the cement, and I had already provided a second-hand mixer to prepare mixed concrete to pour in the forms and around the reenforcing steel, when Mr. Junkin, an expert at the job, came to visit me. He offered to do the work for me at a figure which I considered reasonable. He sent up a mixing machine and his employees and workmen. They took my sand, my gravel, my cement with the exception of about 100 sacks that he furnished me at 60 cents a sack, and never at any time did it occur to me that he was doing it as a gift, and when he delayed sending me the bill I took the matter up with him and asked for the bill.

True the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., has never made any effort to collect the account nor has the obligation been canceled. They only transferred the account from the St. Catherine Gravel Co. to the personal accounts of the two owners. I consider it a just obligation and I propose to pay them for the part of the work they did on the swimming pool, which is not finished by any means. I have recently bought a carload of sand and a carload of gravel that is stacked on my yard beside the pool to finish the concrete work. I have the light poles and the underground leaded wiring stored in my barn and the piping on the ground to finish the job. I attempted to do it some time ago but the best price I could get on the tile was $1,400. I thought this was excessive and today the pool is about half finished and it has never been used by anyone. I am still "doing my swimming" in Wolf River which is 4 miles from my dream house.

9

"That I received funds from various persons and deposited them in an account called 'Juniper Grove Baptist Church, Special Fund by THEO. G. BILBO,' in the Bank of Commerce, Poplarville, Miss., on which account I alone could draw and which was principally to build a residence owned by me."

I deny, resent, and detest the vile implications of this reprehensible charge. Every cent that I have ever received for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church fund, which included funds collected to build the church building and funds collected to build the parsonage and to fence and beautify the grounds, has been spent on this worthy project except the balance of the funds now on deposit in the special fund account in the Bank of Commerce at Poplarville, Miss.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I trust you will be patient with me while I give you the real picture of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church program of improvement. My sainted father led in the organization of the first church house on this sacred spot in 1856. The first house was a log house, there being no sawmills nor lumber available in this wild and unsettled section of Mississippi at this time. This log church house was a one-room house and it was built before my father built his first home in that year and he secured permission from the then small church to permit him to live in it until he had finished his home, which is about 1,500 feet from the present church site.

The first sawmill in that section was a water sawmill with a saw that went up and down and the only power to operate it was falling water from a small creek 4 miles away at the Odoms homestead. The log house was removed and a plank house was built with 12-inch planks and batting, uncelled and hand-made benches.

As the country developed, a steam sawmill came along with a planer, and beaded ceiling was available. The old plank church was torn down and a modern, up-to-date church was erected; that is, modern for that day and generation.

When I became Governor of Mississippi for a second term and became the owner of my father's old homestead, I dreamed of building a befitting memorial to my father's name and at the same time benefiting the community—first the best and prettiest church house and pastor's home of any country church project of the entire South; then I proposed to build on the spot of my father's old house, which he erected in 1856 and in which I was born and our family was reared, the best and prettiest home in Mississippi.

I employed a young architect by the name of Vinson Smith and told him of my dream, and after 3 or 4 years of drawing plans and changing plans I had him to make out a bill of materials both for the church and for my home, and I commenced a long struggle to gather together the material to build these two structures. The church gave me carte blanche authority to tear down the weatherboarded and celled wooden church building, and I laid the foundation of the church and my home on the same day.

My community is a poor community. There is only one member of the church that has any wealth at all, and at that time he was not a member of the church. I commenced to collect funds in 1928 from anybody and everybody, at home and abroad, to help carry out my dream of this beautiful church, with all that goes with it. In my

first drive I was able to get far enough along with the church so we could use it, but it was far from completed.

The church membership never had anything to do with the building of it and had nothing to say about the plans. It was all left up to me, and while I had collected and spent about $20,000 in the original effort I am safe in saying that the whole community had at that time less than $800 in it.

After I became Senator I inaugurated a new campaign to get the money to finish the church, build the pastor's home, a garage, laundry, servant's house, chicken house, and the barn, to be surrounded with a beautiful colonial fence. I have no apologies to offer anyone in my strenuous efforts to collect enough funds to finish this job.

The first thing I did when I became the owner of the property was to deed the church two additional acres to enlarge the cemetery and the church grounds, my father having deeded 2 acres before then for the church and cemetery. There has been read into this record a copy of one of the many thousands of letters that I have mailed out. The letters I sent out were to bankers, lawyers, doctors, merchants, contractors, and people generally of every faith, and I have received funds from Methodists, Baptists, Catholics, Jews, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, saints, and sinners. I was chairman of the finance committee and the building committee. The church members as such did not ask or participate in any of my plans and the members of the church that worked on the job were paid like any outsider was. The special fund of the church, which was under my control because I had collected every dollar of it and for which I felt that I was trustee and responsible for the proper expenditure, had nothing to do with the other committees of the church proper. Mine was an outside operation but was for a definite religious purpose. The people who contributed this money had faith in me and believed that the money would be spent honestly and I resent more than everything else connected with the campaign that Ross Collins made against me and with the insinuations in press and over the radio that I would touch a dollar of money that was given and dedicated to the cause of the Christian religion. Gentlemen of the committee, it was a sacred fund and I want you and the world to know that if I ever forget the teachings of my sainted father and want to get money wrongfully I would never start by stealing from the church.

There was no difference in the money contributed so far as the church and the pastor's home and the fence around the premises were concerned. It was a common fund for the entire project and the first few thousands I received I used in finishing the church; in fact, I finished the church before I commenced the work on the pastor's home. I had a very good reason for maintaining control of the funds and I think my church community understood that there was no one connected with the deacons who controlled the church that knew just what my dream was nor were they experienced in building.

It is true that the pastor's home and all the buildings that go with the project outside of the church and the church house itself were constructed on land which I owned, or rather, held the legal title. I knew and my church knew that these buildings were being erected upon my land and that the Bank of Commerce and the Federal land bank had mortgages on this land but I knew that at any time I wanted to get a release from these banks I could do it. The church did not undertake to interfere with me or exercise any control over what I was doing while I was building and finishing the church proper. I had announced that I would not deed the pastor's home and buildings to the deacons of the church until I had finished and furnished the home. I did not want anyone to change the plans or "butcher up" the job.

When I was stricken with an illness in 1944 and was rushed to Mayo's Clinic at Rochester, Minn., I knew the operation that I had to undergo was a dangerous operation and there was a chance of my dying in this operation. I was in a hospital at Vicksburg, Miss., when it was decided to send me to Mayo's and against the advice of my physician I returned to Poplarville, sent for my lawyer, and he dictated the deed. I called for the chancery clerk and placed the deed in his hand and instructed him that in case of my death to turn this deed over to the deacons of the church. At the same time I made my will, a copy of which I have here in my pocket, in which I set up a memorial commission of fine and high-class men of the State—my friends—to carry on after I was dead. I gave them the authority and the instructions to sell all my property except my dream house which I knew would release the mortgage from the church property which I had deeded.

During the war I tried while I was here in Washington to get the men with whom I had contracts to finish the pastor's home and then I called on Brother Smith, who had become pastor, and asked him to assist me in getting the contractors back on the job. The electrical job was under contract with Mr. Smith; the plumbing was under contract with Mr. Bennett; the painting was under contract with a Mr. Parker. The plumber got sick and went to the hospital. The electrician's father became very ill and he had to stay at his bedside for almost a year. The job has been rushed as rapidly as it was possible under the circumstances. Material because of war conditions became hard to get, almost impossible to get. I deny that at any time I ever said or had thought of delaying the job to keep the present pastor from occupancy. It made no difference to me whom the people called as pastor. The money I had and the work I was doing was for the Lord and not for some individual. It was for the community in which I was born and reared and I resent more than I am able to express all the dirty insinuations that have been made by the politicians and my enemies that I was not cooperating and doing my best to finish one of the dreams of my life.

I have enough money in the bank to finish the job and I have every assurance that it will be finished by the 1st of January or before. In fact in consultation with the pastor and the church we have set April 27, 1947, as the day upon which the dedication of the church and pastor's home will be had, at which time the entire church understands I am to make the formal delivery to the deacons of the church of the title and all that goes with it to the church; but, however, the chancery clerk of Pearl River County holds in his hands now a corrected deed and the two banks have released their mortgages on the lands upon which the pastor's home and other buildings are located.

If my pastor, my deacons, and my church membership are satisfied and happy over the way I have handled the funds that my thousands of friends have contributed to the realization of this great dream, then pray tell me why and how anybody on earth could object.

Now, gentlemen, I have answered as fully as time would permit the charges enumerated in the statement given to my attorney, Mr. Jackson, by your Mr. Meader. Many statements have been made that I would like to discuss, but it would take too long to list and itemize the many things that I would like to discuss. However, before concluding, I do want to make special mention of one fact that has been developed in this hearing, and to my mind it is the most horrible thing in the case, and that is the story of my secretary, Ed Terry, secretly opening an account—secretly as far as I am concerned—in the Jackson State National Bank, in which he listed me as principal and himself as agent, and hypocritically telling the banker that they were authorized to pay out money from this special account by check that I might write on the account. He went so far as to state that the money belonged to me, yet when the bank called on him for a signature card he faked and sent a facsimile of my signature; and a second time the bank called on him to send the signature card which he has never to this good hour done. Now he says this was my account, and he told the banker I had a right to draw the money out, but I never knew until about the first of this month that such an account was in existence when Mr. Quinn showed me the correspondence in reference to this mysterious account in his bank. The records show that $6,000 or $7,000 were placed in this account, and $4,000 or $5,000 were placed there after March of 1940. All the deposits after this date, he said, were my money that he had collected for my campaign of 1940. Now the records show that this money was drawn out by Mr. Terry's checks in amounts varying from $10 to $800. No one knows but Mr. Terry where this money went, because neither my campaign manager, nor I, nor anyone connected with my campaign in 1940 ever received a dollar of this money or knew anything about it so far as I have ever been able to ascertain. Surely none of this money was used for Mr. Terry's expenses in 1940, because he traveled with me on my speaking tour, and I paid all expenses with campaign funds that I received. And the astounding fact is that he has claimed about $1,800 of the money that he expended in this campaign and has called on my friends to pay this money, $1,100 of which was paid to him by my attorney, Mr. Jackson, as shown by exhibit in this case.

Of course, you understand that Mr. Terry was at that time my private secretary and was, according to my information, the second best paid man on Capitol Hill, and he drew his salary straight through during the campaign, and yet he charged my campaign with $1,800 expenses and spent $5,000 or $6,000 of my money or money that he says he collected for my campaign, but unfortunately for the poor, miserable creature, the records show that a large portion of this money was drawn out after my election and there is still $200 in the account.

In his wild and reckless lying statements as a witness on yesterday he told the story of a doctor that had collected $1,500 from a drug addict and said the doctor told him that he, the doctor, had turned this money over to me. It is a lie out of the whole cloth and I want the world to know it. We have asked that the doctor be brought before the committee and permitted to tell the committee the truth about this dirty, contemptible fabrication.

This statement would not be complete without a reference to the greatest act of betrayal of trust, faith, loyalty, and confidence as admitted by my ex-secretary, Ed Terry, on the stand yesterday when he told the story of accepting on a sick bed, while he and his wife were both on my pay roll, several months before he resigned, $15,000 and the promise of $10,000 more, or a total of $25,000, from a Jewish Russian immigrant and one of the leading Communists within the United States, to be used in putting the late Governor Bailey of my State, or anyone else that he could find that would make the race, into the race for the United States [Senate] against me in the campaign of 1946.

He admits that he received this money in September 1945, and held the money until the month of July of this year and drew it out of the bank at Jackson in cash and that he in person delivered it to the Communist leader, Liberman, in New York City or in

Washington. Upon investigation it was shown that this Russian Jew died in January 1946, and then when the committee pressed him for a statement of what he really did with the money he refused to answer, and for this he was cited for contempt, but he had already committed perjury when he first said he delivered the money in person to Liberman.

Christ had his Judas Iscariot; Caesar had his Brutus; George Washington had his Benedict Arnold, but I claim to have had the greatest traitor of them all in my trusted secretary, Ed Terry.

Now, gentlemen, I want to thank you sincerely for your very gracious and kind consideration in being patient with me in making this statement, and now I will be glad to try to answer any questions that you may have in mind to submit to me.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
January 2, 1947.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Again, I request your indulgence and ask that you read the attached response to the report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The committee report in many respects is based on misconceptions or misunderstandings of the full purport of the evidence. My response points out the inaccuracies in the references to the testimony and demonstrates the erroneous conclusions reached in the report on both evidence and applicable law.

Please do not judge me until you have read and carefully considered the report, the response, and the transcript of the evidence (which should soon be in your hands in printed form). Upon the real facts I have confidence that you will reach a righteous decision, when and if you may be called upon to act in any matter affecting my right to continue to represent and serve the people of Mississippi who have three times elected me their United States Senator.

The people of your State want you to represent them, just as my people want me. I am sure you will not permit partisan prejudice or pressure groups to distort your sense of justice, although you may sharply disagree with my ideologies and views on many subjects. You may never have agreed with a word that I have said, but, like Voltaire, I am sure you will defend my right to say every word.

With continued appreciation, I am,
Sincerely yours,

THEO. G. BILBO.

P. S.—Since dictating the attached letter, my attention has been called to a letter purporting to have been signed by the chairman of the special committee. I must call your attention to the second paragraph of this letter which goes further in making charges than the report itself and, certainly, beyond the facts contained in the record of testimony before the subcommittee.

The letter charges:

1. That I solicited political contributions from war contractors and others whom I had aided before Federal departments.

My answer: This is wholly untrue and not supported by evidence.

2. That I accepted personal compensation.

My answer: This is totally untrue. The record shows not one dime of compensation paid to me by any person for services rendered except my salary as a United States Senator. I owe some debts to those who have trusted me but no personal compensation has been received by me.

3. That I accepted gifts.

My answer: The only true statement or charge. These were two Christmas presents—a few pieces of furniture and an automobile.

4. That I accepted services.

My answer: This charge is absolutely untrue and not substantiated by the evidence or any proper conclusions to be drawn from the entire record.

5. That I solicited and accepted substantial amounts of money for a personal charity administered solely by me.

My answer: This is an absurdity and positively untrue. I have collected funds since 1928 for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church as the building and finance committeeman of that religious organization, and have spent every dime I have collected and some of my own personal funds toward and upon this worthy project. As the custodian of the trust funds thus collected I have administered the trust to the entire satisfaction of the church, my pastor, my brethren, and sisters in that church, and the contributors who have assisted.

Please read the evidence on all of the charges before making any decision. I certainly have no objection to submitting the record and testimony in this case to the Department of Justice.

T. G. B.

JANUARY 2, 1947.

RESPONSE TO REPORT CONCERNING ALLEGED TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN SENATOR THEODORE G. BILBO AND VARIOUS WAR CONTRACTORS

INTRODUCTION

This is response on behalf of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO to the report filed by a majority of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program on its investigation of charges made against him.

Despite the fact that the subcommittee heard 44 witnesses, took 564 pages of transcribed testimony and received 126 exhibits in open hearings, yet the majority report in its effort to justify its criticism and in some instances condemnation of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, bases many of its findings and conclusions largely on the disclosures of (1) a politically discredited bitter political enemy of Senator BILBO or (2) of a self-confessed perjurer and contemptuous traitorous former secretary of Senator BILBO.

The record of the testimony reveals a complete explanation of every transaction by Senator BILBO with full corroboration by witnesses whose veracity is wholly unassailed and unimpeached and who appear to be above reproach in every respect as to honesty and integrity.

Every charge that Senator BILBO had received money and had accepted personal property and improvements to real estate from war contractors was first tried before the bar of public opinion in a bitterly contested political primary in Mississippi this past summer. Senator BILBO was acquitted by the people of Mississippi in no uncertain terms by being renominated over four distinguished opponents by a clear majority of 3,834 votes. In the general election he was elected for a third term as United States Senator without opposition.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

True, Senator BILBO was diligent in his efforts to serve his constituents, some of whom were personal or political friends of many years, and to have them receive favorable consideration for contracts in the war effort and defense program but in many cases these contracts here involved were awarded on competitive-bid basis wherein Senator BILBO's influence and interest could have been of little aid or benefit to anyone.

The majority report finds no impropriety in Senator BILBO's efforts to assist any contractor but indeed if there be any impropriety then most Senators and Congressmen would likewise be condemned because all of them were, and should have been, active for their constituents whom they have the high honor to represent in the Congress.

As to political contributions the record discloses without dispute that Senator BILBO received no contributions for his own personal political benefit but that all such contributions were made for the benefit of his then colleague in the United States Senate. In no instance was there any solicitation by Senator BILBO of a single contribution for any political purpose which fact the majority seems to have overlooked wholly in their zeal.

The two gifts and the alleged services found by the majority to have been received by Senator BILBO over the entire period investigated were wholly unrelated to any interest manifested or alleged aid given by Senator BILBO to any so-called war contractor. It was only incidental that for the time being some of those who participated in presenting these small items—old personal and political friends—were so-called war contractors.

There are at least four apparent, outstanding, incomplete or erroneous statements of fact in the majority report. These are:

1. The record conclusively shows that Senator BILBO did not in any instance solicit any contribution from any person or firm connected with the war effort for any political purpose. Great effort was made by rigorous cross-examination of witnesses to obtain an admission of such solicitation. Nevertheless, without any evidence to support it, the conclusion of solicitation is stated in the majority report.

2. There was a payment by Senator BILBO of $1,141.35 for taxes that Morrissey should have paid which was credited on Senator BILBO's debt to Morrissey. This item is wholly overlooked in the majority report.

3. No mention of the fact is made in the majority report that 7 of the 10 donors of the $500 furniture item at Christmas 1941 were not in any sense war contractors and that the three so-called war contractors gave not to exceed a total of $150 on this Christmas gift.

4. The equitable title, as shown by deeds, will, and other transactions, including other statements in evidence in the record here, as well as evidence from the president of the Bank of Commerce, Robert M. Newton, and the representative of the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, H. H. McLeod, to the land on which the Juniper Grove Baptist Church parsonage was built, was in the deacons of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church. Neither Senator BILBO nor either bank could have divested the church authorities of this title and the use of the entire property, including church, cemetery, and parsonage, regardless of in whose name the bare legal title may have been held. This was a fact, as shown by the evidence, that was well known to everyone who could possibly have any interest in the subject, but it, too, is entirely overlooked in the majority report regardless of the undisputed evidence.

Could it not be that other conclusions reached may be likewise on a total misconception of the true facts disclosed by the evidence in the hearing?

So far as the evidence discloses the work done on the artificial lake and island, the swimming pool, and the painting of the house for Senator BILBO, were actual bona fide business transactions, contracted in the ordinary course of business. There was no subterfuge to conceal these transactions. They appeared at large on the records of the contracting parties, statements of indebtedness were presented and requests for payments were sent to Senator BILBO by those to whom he owed the indebtedness.

The so-called loss in the operation of the farm by Michael T. Morrissey, whose contracts were all awarded on competitive-bid basis, was something over which Senator BILBO had absolutely no control. Morrissey had his own farm managers, employed his own labor, made his own expenditures, kept all of the records and the losses were set up on his books which were subject to, and inspected by, agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The donation of $30,000 from F. T. Newton, B. L. Knost, and Michael T. Morrissey to the

1942 political campaign of Wall Doxey for the United States Senate in the Mississippi Democratic primary were in no sense solicited as political contributions from Government contractors by Senator BILBO. In both instances the checks were payable to Senator BILBO; he endorsed the checks and turned them over to Robert Gandy to cash them and through him and others acting with him, the expenditures were made.

With reference to the $5,000 donated by Knost and Morrissey, Senator BILBO did not handle a single penny of the money. The cashing of the check for $5,000 and the entire expenditure were made by Robert Gandy and the items of the expenditure were supported by an account which was received in evidence by the subcommittee.

As to the $25,000 item, the four checks totaling the amount were made payable to Senator BILBO, were endorsed by him and turned over to Robert Gandy, who obtained the cash therefor and delivered the cash to the so-called informal committee of which Senator BILBO was acting as a member. The expenditure of this $25,000 was fully and completely explained and accounted for by Senator BILBO, Robert Gandy, Forrest Jackson, A. B. Friend, Roland Wall, and Cecil Travis. In fact, this committee expended more than the $25,000 and at the conclusion of the campaign three of the members of the committee, not including Senator BILBO, were indebted for money obtained from the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., of Jackson, Miss., in the sum of $5,000, which has been repaid by them down to a balance of $1,000 at the date of the hearings.

True, donations and solicitations of political contributions from Government contractors while they are negotiating or performing such contracts is prohibited by title 18, section 61–M–1, United States Code, but as heretofore pointed out there is not one scintilla of evidence in this record that Senator BILBO violated this law by soliciting a penny by way of political contributions from any Government contractor.

In receiving the checks from so-called war contractors Senator BILBO had the right to presume that the gentlemen making the contributions were not law violators and, indeed, he is justified in that presumption since, although 4 years have passed since such contributions were made and the facts with reference thereto have been notorious throughout Mississippi, yet the Department of Justice and no Federal agency or other authority has made any attempt to prosecute any alleged violations of this statute by either or any of the parties in question.

Reference is made in the majority report that F. T. Newton attempted to charge the amount of the contribution as expenses on his books of account. May we point out that Senator BILBO could in no sense be charged with the bookkeeping accounts of Mr. Newton or anyone else and indeed the auditors of Mr. Newton without any suggestion from the Internal Revenue Department changed the entries to show the true facts.

Senator BILBO is also criticized by the majority report for collecting from many persons contributions for the building of Juniper Grove Baptist Church and the parsonage. It is asserted that at least $7,300 of the total collected was from war contractors who had been aided by Senator BILBO. Let us point out that contributions for religious and charitable purposes are recognized as a wholesome public policy because in every internal revenue act that the Congress has enacted provision has been made in recognition of the right of every person to make such contributions and to have the same deducted in their income-tax returns. Reference is made to the fact that the so-called war contractors contributing to this worthy project were not residents of Poplarville, Miss., nor members of that church. The record discloses that of the total amount collected and expended by Senator BILBO since 1928 when this project first began only a small amount has been contributed by residents of the community or members of the church. It is a church in a poor rural community.

For at least 18 years no question was raised as to the propriety of Senator BILBO receiving contributions as a member of the building and finance committee of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church for the building of the church and parsonage. Everyone has recognized the propriety of his action and hundreds of people from all over Mississippi and in some instances outside of the State have contributed so that this community might have an outstanding country church project. We can see no impropriety in that which Senator BILBO did in connection with the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage. Indeed the majority finds that there was no personal gain to Senator BILBO from the Juniper Grove Baptist Church parsonage donations but that all of the donations went to this project.

We conclude, therefore, that the true evidence presented to the committee clearly indicates that Senator BILBO was guilty of no impropriety as a United States Senator and that he did not in any instance use his high office for his personal gain in his dealings with war contractors or any other persons.

We shall discuss the evidence produced in the committee's public hearings under the same four separate categories used in the majority report:

1. Sums of money received by Senator Bilbo from war contractors used in the 1942 Mississippi senatorial campaign

Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, died on June 22, 1941. His term of office expired in January 1943. Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND was given the interim appointment by the Governor of Mississippi and thereafter a special election was called for the purpose of electing someone to fill the unexpired term of Senator Harrison. In this campaign Wall Doxey, then Congressman from the Second Mississippi Congressional District, was a candidate and he was opposed by Ross A. Collins, Congressman from the Fifth Mississippi Congressional District. Collins, who claims to have initiated this investigation, was defeated in that election and Wall Doxey became the junior United States Senator from Mississippi. Senator BILBO was politically friendly to Senator Doxey in that campaign and the friends of Senator Doxey in Mississippi continued a political organization since it was apparent that Senator Doxey would offer for reelection for the full term.

In 1942 Senator Doxey was again opposed by Ross A. Collins and also by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Roland Wall, and Douglas Smith. In the first primary held on August 25, 1942, Senator Doxey and Senator EASTLAND were the high candidates of the five and were in the second or run-off Democratic primary held on September 15, 1942.

Robert Gandy with others in Mississippi was attempting to finance the preprimary efforts on behalf of Senator Doxey for reelection. On June 12, 1942, B. L. Knost and Michael T. Morrissey were at dinner in the home of Mr. Knost with Senator BILBO. The testimony shows without dispute that Knost and Morrissey inquired of Senator BILBO as to the progress being made with the campaign of Senator Doxey for reelection; that Senator BILBO advised them that funds according to his information were coming in rather slowly. Thereupon Knost and Morrissey voluntarily offered to contribute without solicitation from Senator BILBO $2,500 each to the campaign funds of Senator Doxey. The check was made by B. L. Knost on his personal account, not out of war-contract funds, payable to Senator BILBO. Senator BILBO endorsed the check and delivered it to Robert Gandy. Robert Gandy in turn cashed the check at the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., in Jackson, Miss., and Robert Gandy thereupon disbursed for expenses in connection with the precampaign expenditures for Senator Doxey the total of $5,000. Senator BILBO did not receive one penny of the proceeds of this check for $5,000. He did not pay out any of the money so received. All of it was expended by Robert Gandy who gave a complete accounting therefor to the subcommittee.

At the time, B. L. Knost drew this check on his personal account, he was associated in a joint venture with J. A. Jones Construction Co. and Newton & Glenn on the Keesler Field project at Biloxi, Miss. Michael T. Morrissey had been the successful bidder for renting dirt-moving equipment, of which he was the owner, to the Corps of Engineers, at Mobile, Ala., and the contractors on the Keesler Field project.

There is nothing in the record to justify the conclusion that this money was solicited by Senator BILBO within the meaning, purport, or intent of section 61–M–1 of title 18, United States Code. To the contrary Mr. Knost and Senator BILBO both swore positively that there was no solicitation by Senator BILBO but that the contribution was voluntarily made on the part of Knost and Morrissey from their personal funds because of their friendship for and great interest in the success of Senator Doxey.

On or about September 3, 1942, A. B. Friend, who was devoting a large portion of his time in connection with other friends of Senator Doxey in the primary campaign, talked with Senator BILBO, who was then in Washington. In the course of the conversation it was suggested that there be a political rally of outstanding citizens of Mississippi interested in Senator Doxey's election, which rally was held on September 7, 1942. A. B. Friend sent out letters to approximately 500 citizens of Mississippi requesting their attendance at this rally to be held on September 7. One of these 500 letters was sent to F. T. Newton and a copy of the letter is set forth as appendix 2 in the majority report. The purpose of the rally was to stimulate interest in and incidentally to collect funds necessary for the expenses of Wall Doxey's campaign. At this meeting on September 7 several speeches were made to the approximately 300 people there gathered. These 300 people came from practically every county in Mississippi, and there are 82 counties in the State. After this meeting on September 7, 1942, a number of contributions were made to the regular Wall Doxey campaign organization situated about three blocks west of the Royal Hotel, Jackson. There were also some contributions made to the informal group that had headquarters in the Royal Hotel. Among these contributions were four checks totaling $25,000 drawn by F. T. Newton on the firm account of Newton & Glenn who happened to be members of the coadventure engaged in the construction of Keesler Field at Biloxi. The checks were not drawn on the coadventure account or accounts but were drawn on and from the personal funds of the copartnership composed of Newton & Glenn. The testimony is without dispute that there was no solicitation by Senator BILBO from F. T. Newton of this contribution and there was nothing on the checks or in the entire transaction to indicate that the funds were coming from a war contractor as such.

These four checks were endorsed by Senator BILBO and delivered to Robert Gandy, who likewise endorsed them, and Gandy received the cash therefor from the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co. and delivered the cash back to Forrest Jackson, Robert Gandy, A. B. Friend, and Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, who were acting as individuals in an informal committee interested in the success of Wall Doxey's campaign for nomination in the Democratic primary.

All of the members of this informal committee testified positively and without contradiction that the $25,000 and other contributions were received and were disbursed by them in the interest of Senator Doxey's

campaign with the final results that Gandy, Jackson, and Friend were personally indebted to the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., of Jackson, in the sum of $5,000 besides other accounts that made up a deficit of their activities, in the interest of Senator Doxey's campaign. Their testimony is corroborated by Cecil Travis and by Roland Wall. Travis acknowledged that he received $11,000 of money from the informal group and Roland Wall acknowledged that he received slightly in excess of $8,000 from the same group; $7,500 of the contributions received on September 7 were used to repay a loan that Forrest Jackson and Robert Gandy had obtained from the First National Bank of Hattiesburg for use in the Wall Doxey campaign and $2,500 of the common fund were used to repay a note at the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., the proceeds of which had likewise been expended in the Wall Doxey campaign.

No account of the receipts and disbursements by the group at the Royal Hotel interested in the election of Senator Doxey was kept nor was there any report filed with any officer of the State of Mississippi, there being no law requiring the keeping of any such records or the making of any such reports in a primary election in Mississippi. However, Robert Gandy did maintain and presented for the consideration of this committee a personal record of the amounts which he personally received and expended. Mr. Gandy did not personally expend the $25,000 received from F. T. Newton. This amount with other contributions received on September 7 went into a common fund and from this common fund some amounts were delivered to Mr. Gandy which he entered as receiving and from these receipts he showed his disbursements and his account, exhibited in evidence, shows that he personally concluded with a deficit.

While it is true that there was a notation by Mr. Gandy in his personal account that the $5,000 Knost check was a loan, he explained in detail that this notation had no significance and that he did not pay the $5,000 back either to Senator BILBO or to Mr. Knost. Gandy considered the $5,000 by his actions as a contribution. Senator BILBO and Mr. Knost both testified that this $5,000 was a contribution to Wall Doxey's campaign.

The only possible criticism of Senator BILBO is that he permitted these checks for political campaign contributions, both the $25,000 and the $5,000 to be made payable to him, and yet the fact in and of itself demonstrates that there was no effort at concealment or subterfuge and further indicates to the right-thinking person that there was no idea of wrongdoing in connection with these contributions. If Senator BILBO had wanted to hide, cover up, or prevent anyone from knowing all about these contributions, he could have easily arranged it otherwise than to have the checks payable to him.

Senator Doxey had a regular official campaign manager, Mr. Lee D. Hall, of Columbia, Miss. Mr. Hall filed an accounting of receipts and disbursements, and there was offered in evidence by Mr. Hall a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements. Senator Doxey had no knowledge of many of the items collected in his behalf and did not know that F. T. Newton had contributed the $25,000 toward his campaign until after the campaign was over. He first learned of it from Edward P. Terry, former secretary to Senator BILBO. He next learned of it from Senator BILBO. He had the knowledge confirmed by F. T. Newton on October 9, 1942. The total expenditures were explained to him by Robert Gandy shortly after October 9, 1942.

The record therefore discloses that all of the funds collected for the Doxey campaign were expended in the interest of that campaign and in addition there was a deficit since the expenditures exceeded the total contributions. The testimony shows that on the night before the primary of September 15, 1942, Senator BILBO called Forrest Jackson who was then at the Markham Hotel in Gulfport, Miss., and advised Jackson that there was only $2,000 left in the common fund and there were the outstanding $5,000 note at the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co. and other items of expense that would necessarily have to be paid. Senator BILBO asked Jackson what should be done under the circumstances and Jackson requested Senator BILBO to use the $2,000 for the legitimate campaign expenses, using the expression "shoot the works," which Senator BILBO did and thereby all of the common fund of the informal group was expended and the deficit occurred.

With reference to "operating deficits" in political campaigns in Mississippi, the record discloses that there is nothing unusual about these deficits occurring and indeed we may assume that it is common knowledge that many political campaigns wind up with substantial deficits. There is no indication of impropriety in paying off such deficits, indeed common honesty requires the payment of honest indebtedness regardless of how it may arise. The settlement of "operating deficits" of defeated candidates has been practiced in Mississippi politics according to this record for many years without criticism by anyone. We therefore conclude that there was nothing improper in the payment to Roland Wall and to Cecil Travis of the amounts they acknowledged to have received.

While there was little documentary evidence from which it can be ascertained precisely the names of contributors, the amounts received, or the amounts expended yet there is positive evidence as hereinabove delineated demonstrating that all of the money received by the so-called informal committee was expended in the interest of the Wall Doxey campaign. The gentlemen who received and disbursed the funds stated positively that all of the money received was disbursed for the campaign and that $5,000 and some current accounts in addition thereto remained over and above to be paid after all of the contributions had been expended. This evidence is undisputed and these witnesses are unimpeached and their honesty and integrity have not been questioned by any witnesses or other evidence in this record. We therefore conclude that it has been shown with certainty that all of the funds received from war contractors and others were in fact completely expended for the Wall Doxey campaign and that no individual wrongfully profited one penny from such contributions.

Under the facts disclosed by this record we cannot see any pertinency of the Federal statute, passed July 19, 1940, title 18, section 61–M–1, of the United States Code, to any disclosure of the action of Senator BILBO in the political campaign for the election of Senator Doxey in 1942. Senator BILBO did not admit but, to the contrary, denied that he solicited $5,000 from B. L. Knost or $25,000 from F. T. Newton or any other amount from any so-called war contractor. (See testimony of B. L. Knost, Monday, December 16, 1946.) Here is the record:

"Senator FERGUSON. Can't you give more of what took place there when you gave $2,500 and Morrissey $2,500 and you gave the check?

"Mr. KNOST. Can't I give you more of what, sir?

"Senator FERGUSON. More of the details of what took place. Didn't Senator BILBO ask you for a donation for the campaign?

"Mr. KNOST. No, sir.

"Senator FERGUSON. Didn't he ask Morrissey?

"Mr. KNOST. No, sir."

(See testimony of F. T. Newton.)

Here is the record:

"Mr. MEADER. Mr. Newton, why did you make these checks out to Senator BILBO?

"Mr. NEWTON. Because I wanted them properly spent.

"Mr. MEADER. And he also was the one who asked you for the money, wasn't he?

"Mr. NEWTON. No, sir.

"Mr. MEADER. Who did ask you for the money?

"Mr. NEWTON. There didn't anybody ask me direct.

"Mr. MEADER. How did he ask you?

"Mr. NEWTON. They had this meeting there, this political meeting.

"Mr. MEADER. You said before that had nothing to do with your giving the money.

"Mr. NEWTON. They said they needed money.

"Mr. MEADER. But you said that wasn't the reason you gave it.

"Mr. NEWTON. It wasn't. My reason for giving it was a personal reason, and the personal reason was because I had lost a job up here that we had already been told we had.

"Mr. MEADER. And nobody asked you about giving a donation or urged you to give a donation before you made it?

"Mr. NEWTON. No, sir. I wasn't singled out; I wasn't asked for one dime personally."

2. Gratuities or benefits received by Senator Bilbo from war contractors

Our analysis of the majority report and of its discussion of alleged gratuities and benefits will follow the order used in that report.

Senator BILBO received a Cadillac car as a Christmas gift, which from the undisputed evidence is a custom which has prevailed in Mississippi and perhaps elsewhere for many years in that many high public officials have been given automobiles and other valuable gifts by their admirers and friends. It appears that the gentleman who presented this Christmas gift is a man of considerable wealth, engaged in many diverse activities; that he has been a personal and political friend of Senator BILBO for more than 20 years; that before this gift was presented, Morrissey, the donor, asked Ed P. Terry, then secretary to Senator BILBO, as to the propriety of the gift and was advised by Terry that it was entirely proper. There was no secret about the gift. It was well known throughout Mississippi and the people had this matter presented to them in Senator BILBO's recent campaign for reelection, and by their overwhelming vote determined that there was no impropriety in his accepting the Cadillac car.

With reference to the furniture for Dream House No. 2, consisting of a sofa, three chairs, three floor lamps, and two table lamps, of the total value of $500, they were purchased by Edward P. Terry, then secretary to Senator BILBO, and Robert Gandy, another old-time friend, and were presented as a Christmas gift with a card containing 10 names of supposed friends, including three so-called war contractors. Terry and Gandy bought the furniture from R. E. Kennington Co. at Jackson, Miss., went to the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co. at Jackson, borrowed $500 on their joint note and paid cash from the proceeds of the loan for the furniture. Terry attached the card containing the names of the 10 purported donors. Subsequently Terry collected various amounts from individuals throughout Mississippi, representing that the donations were to be used for the repayment of the amount expended for the furniture. The note remained unpaid until Terry requested M. T. Reed to pay the note for him at the Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co. Reed complied with Terry's request.

The remaining items in the majority report are items of indebtedness with the exception of the $48,023.98, operating losses while Michael T. Morrissey was operating the Bilbo farm consisting of approximately 3,300 acres, with all improvements, farm machinery, livestock, and equipment.

In January 1943 Senator BILBO rearranged his existing loan with the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, which was not a new loan or increase of pending loan, but was solely to change the terms of the loan. At this time he signed a financial statement prepared by the local secretary of the farm-loan association. The association secretary at the

time advised Senator BILBO that it was only necessary to show the items of indebtedness which the secretary of the association had written on the blank financal statement. Therefore this purported financial statement did not include the total indebtedness of Senator BILBO.

Morrissey used some equipment which he owned and which had, up to that time, not been engaged in any war contract to build a dam for a 15-acre lake, surrounding an island on which Dream House No. 2 was built by Senator BILBO. Morrissey had agreed with Senator BILBO on Morrissey's own offer and proposition to do this work for actual cost of labor and fuel necessary to operate his equipment. In turn, Senator BILBO permitted Morrissey to occupy the residence of Senator BILBO during the few weeks necessary to perform the work. After the work was completed Morrissey submitted a bill or statement showing an indebtedness from Senator BILBO to him of $3,672.91. On this account Senator BILBO is entitled to a credit of $1,141.35, the amount of taxes paid by Senator BILBO in August 1945, which taxes Morrissey was under contract to pay, as will be discussed under the farm-rental agreement later in this statement. While Morrissey testified that he was of opinion that he had moved from 150,000 to 165,000 cubic yards of earth, A. B. Friend, the engineer, who had actually surveyed the lake site, including the earthen dam, stated that Morrissey's estimate was excessive. Col. John L. Person, of the Corps of United States Army engineers, looked at a picture taken some years after the project was completed and after the lake had partially filled with water and from such observation of a photograph he estimated the value of the excavation work would have run from $34,500 to $37,950. Colonel Person admitted, however, that for a proper estimate to have been made it would be necessary for him to have surveyed the site in question and to have made cross sections of the earth actually removed. Regardless of any estimate the actual cost to Senator BILBO was $3,672.91, and he has made payment on this indebtedness of $1,141.35 by the credit above-mentioned, and Senator BILBO states that he still considers it a debt and will pay Morrissey in full when funds are available.

Senator BILBO about April 1942 was engaged in attempting to build a swimming pool on hi property near Poplarville. Mr. John R. Junkin, president of the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., a business that has been in successful operation for approximately 50 years, all of the capital stock of which is owned by John R. Junkin and his brother William Junkin, used a mixing machine with sand and gravel and most of the cement furnished by Senator BILBO in mixing concrete to be poured into forms which Senator BILBO had personally constructed. Mr. Junkin and his brother have for many years been close personal and political friends of Senator BILBO. Mr. Junkin testified without dispute that he instructed his bookkeeper to enter the item of $1,194.70, the actual cost of the work done by employees of St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., on the swimming pool in the books of the corporation as a charge to the personal accounts of John R. Junkin and William Junkin and that a bill be sent to Senator BILBO for the amount. A bill was sent marked "paid in full" by the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc. Some time later Mr. Junkin discovered the error, called the matter to the attention of the income tax agents of the Internal Revenue Bureau; the entries were corrected and Mr. Junkin and his brother paid the corporation income taxes on the item as income. Mr. Junkin stated and Senator BILBO corroborated the statement that the indebtedness of $1,194.70 was still due by Senator BILBO to John R. Junkin and William Junkin individually but that neither had made any effort to collect it, depending upon the belief that Senator BILBO would ultimately pay the account.

At the time this work was performed the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., had a contract which they had obtained on a competitive bid from the War Department and the contractors constructing Keesler Field to furnish mixed concrete at a fixed price per cubic yard. The record shows that Senator BILBO had absolutely nothing to do with the obtaining of this contract for the St. Catherine Gravel Co., Inc., but that the contract was obtained upon the basis of the best bid offered for the concrete to be furnished.

M. T. Reed, copartner of M. T. Reed Construction Co., offered to paint Dream House No. 1 for Senator BILBO at a price of cost of labor and materials plus 10-percent overhead plus 10-percent profit. This offer was accepted by Senator BILBO, the contract was thereupon entered into, and the work was performed. A statement of the account was sent to Senator BILBO, which was acknowledged by him. Since that time Senator BILBO has delivered to Mr. Reed 400 pounds of paper-shell pecans for which $200 has been credited against the paint bill. Both Mr. Reed and Senator BILBO stated that the balance of this account is still owing and that it will be paid. True, Mr. Reed attempted to show this as a bad debt for income-tax purposes in 1941 but his effort was disallowed and it stands as an accounts receivable on the records of Mr. Reed.

With reference to the statute of limitations in Mississippi on open accounts it is our understanding that to claim this statute is a matter of personal privilege to a debtor. Senator BILBO stated positively that he had never in his lifetime pleaded and would not plead any statute of limitations on an honest debt nor had he ever taken advantage of the National Bankruptcy Act. In addition it might be stated that Senator BILBO has acknowledged in writing the receipt of the statements and the indebtedness represented by such statements in most of these cases, in which event the statute of limitations in Mississippi is 6 years and therefore none of such debts are yet barred by any statute.

The matter of the gift of the new Cadillac sedan as a Christmas present at Christmas 1941 has already been discussed in this report. This is likewise true with reference to the $500 of household furnishings delivered to Dream House No. 2. It might be pointed out, however, that there is no indebtedness in connection with this transaction from Senator BILBO to M. T. Reed. The indebtedness would be from Edward P. Terry and Robert Gandy, the comakers of the note, to M. T. Reed. Senator BILBO received the furniture as a Christmas gift. There could be no indebtedness of Senator BILBO in this type of transaction.

For the 4-year period, 1942 through 1945, Morrissey and Senator BILBO had an agreement under which Senator BILBO let all of his farm properties, consisting of approximately 3,300 acres in Pearl River County, Miss., to Morrissey. The agreement was that Morrissey was to pay all operating expenses and ad valorem taxes assessed against the property. Senator BILBO delivered to Morrissey one truck, six farm wagons, two tractors, livestock, poultry, farming tools and equipment—in fact everything going with a farm operation. In addition there was a large pecan grove, a pear orchard and tungnut grove. It was agreed that whatever profit there should be in the transaction this would be divided equally between Senator BILBO and Morrissey but Morrissey was to absorb any loss. The record discloses a total loss, as shown by Morrissey's income-tax returns of $48,023.48 for income-tax purposes. Morrissey further testified that there was nothing unusual about the loss and gave as illustration that on another farm operation which he had at the same time he lost $65,000 in 1 year, paying after such losses in excess of $150,000 in income taxes from all of his varied operations and investments.

Senator BILBO testified that there was no benefit to him arising from this farm operation except Morrissey paid 3 years' taxes and was supposed to have paid the fourth year but Senator BILBO discovered that his property was about to be sold for taxes in August 1946 because Morrissey had overlooked the paying of the taxes. Senator BILBO paid $1,141.35 ad valorem taxes and credited this amount against the indebtedness to Morrissey for the lake and island construction job, which was agreeable to Morrissey. To illustrate his testimony of no benefits to him or his property, Senator BILBO stated without dispute that Morrissey returned the property to him, including livestock and equipment, in a much worse condition, consequently reduced in amount and greatly depleted in value, than it was when delivered to Morrissey. No permanent improvements were made by Morrissey during the 4 years except some terracing of pasture and farm lands under the AAA program of the Federal Government which could have been done regardless of whether Morrissey had been in charge of the property or not. Morrissey was paid by the AAA authorities for the terracing work and this item was reported as a part of the receipts from the operation of the farm. There is nothing unusual about this method of operation. The entire tenant and sharecropper system works largely on the same basis in the South.

There is no evidence that justifies any conclusion that the statements of Senator BILBO with reference to these various items of debt, corroborated by the others involved, were not in accord with the exact claim of Senator BILBO. The evidence does not justify any conclusion that the evidence given by Senator BILBO and the corroborating testimony is a mere "subterfuge manufactured for the occasion of this committee hearing."

Again we point out that all of these various items were fully discussed in a hotly contested political campaign in which Senator BILBO was opposed by four distinguished Mississippians and the people of Mississippi, after hearing all the charges put in their worst light, together with any and all implications that might be drawn therefrom, returned Senator BILBO for a third term in the United States Senate by a clear majority of 3,834 over these 4 opponents in the first primary.

We submit that there is no evidence to justify the conclusion that Senator BILBO has been guilty of any illegal practice in any instance in violation of existing Federal statutes.

3. Funds paid to Senator Bilbo for the construction of Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage

Senator BILBO is a member in good standing of Juniper Grove Baptist Church. This church was established by Senator BILBO's father and others in that community in 1856. The first two acres of land were donated by Senator BILBO's father to the church and thereafter there have been constructed on this and adjoining lands four houses of worship, including the present structure. The church is just in front and across the road from Senator BILBO's home. The church plant or project consists of a brick two-story, basement and balcony, colonial type structure, with 19 Sunday school rooms and two auditoriums. To the south of the church building is the cemetery or burial ground, the land for which was likewise donated by Senator BILBO's father. To the original gifts of land Senator BILBO has personally given two additional acres several years ago. And adjoining this land to the south and just north of a public highway there is approximately two acres on which the church parsonage has been constructed but has not yet been fully completed. The parsonage por-

tion of the property includes a dwelling house, a barn, a servant's house, a laundry, a two-way garage, and a chicken house. The entire property is surrounded by a colonial fence constructed of cypress.

The record discloses without dispute that Senator BILBO is a duly elected member of the building and finance committee of this church, his election appearing on the minutes of the church congregation and exhibited in evidence. In 1944 when Senator BILBO was quite ill and it became necessary for him to go to Mayo's Clinic at Rochester for a serious operation, he delivered a deed to the chancery clerk or recorder of deeds of Pearl River County, Miss., in which the parsonage acreage is located, deeding to the deacons of the church full and complete title to the property on which the parsonage is situated, with the understanding that if he should die this deed should be delivered to the deacons and at the same time he executed his last will and testament and set up a commission with instructions and powers to sell his additional property to pay off any indebtedness on the parsonage and enlarged cemetery lands which would free it from any record or legal encumbrances that were at the time held by the Bank of Commerce and the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans. Subsequently, Senator BILBO delivered corrective deed to the said chancery clerk in which the legal description of the lands in question were more completely stated.

Since 1928 when Senator BILBO was then Governor of Mississippi, in his second term as such, he has been engaged in collecting funds for the building of this church, cemetery, and parsonage project and has at all times stated to the world at large by letter and otherwise that the funds were being expended for a religious purpose in the construction of a country church plant to administer to the religious needs of a very poor inland community. It is apparent from this record that of all the funds collected for this worthy project only a very small amount has been contributed by the membership of the church or by residents of the immediate community. The plant is now practically completed and the parsonage will be occupied by the pastor of the church in a few days and there will be a complete dedication, which involves the certification that all debts are paid, on April 27, 1947, the date having already been fixed.

The mortgages heretofore on the lands in question have all been released. The Bank of Commerce and the Federal land bank and all the people of Mississippi have been advised of the condition of the title and all have recognized that the funds collected were trust funds; that the equitable title to the property was vested by reason of the fiduciary relationship existing under the laws of Mississippi in the church authorities regardless of where the bare legal title may be.

We can find no material difference between this type of philanthropic enterprise and other outstanding ones, in which we might mention the Warm Springs Foundation, including the March of Dimes.

We conclude therefore that on this record there was no impropriety for Senator BILBO to request contributions to the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage, administered by him under the law of Mississippi and under the rules and practices of the Baptist faith. Senator BILBO has done no more than thousands of other religious, educational, charitable, and political organizations and individuals have done in soliciting funds from the general public. The pastors, the deacons, and the membership of the Juniper Grove Baptist Church, and all contributors have at all times been happy and completely satisfied in the way in which Senator BILBO has handled these funds since 1928 in the building of this memorial church project and instead of censuring he should be commended.

4. Other matters not directly related to war contracts

A. The Shushan Note

The record disclosed that on or about July 21, 1938, Senator BILBO received from Grant Stewart, a merchant of New Hebron, Miss., the sum of $3,000 to be used by Senator BILBO as a part of a cash alimony settlement of $21,750, which was a property settlement by Senator BILBO with his ex-wife. Some days prior thereto Senator BILBO had requested Mr. Stewart to lend him the money. Mr. Stewart stated he did not have the funds personally but would obtain them and bring them to Senator BILBO's home at noon on the day before the divorce matter was to be concluded. Accordingly Mr. Stewart brought the money. Some time later Mr. Stewart advised Senator BILBO that he had borrowed the money from Abraham L. Shushan, a dry-goods merchant of Jackson, Miss., and New Orleans, La., and that Mr. Shushan wanted a note for the amount of $3,000. Senator BILBO and Grant Stewart gave their note to Abraham L. Shushan, dated July 21, 1938, for the sum of $3,000. Mr. Shushan insisted in his testimony that he made the loan entirely on the credit of and to Grant Stewart—not knowing Senator BILBO, but knowing Grant Stewart.

In 1940 Shushan began efforts to collect the note in question from Grant Stewart and was continually pressing Stewart for payment as shown by the letters exhibited in evidence by Mr. Shushan. In 1939 Senator BILBO had contacted the Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in an effort to assist in having the Bureau settle a civil suit on an income-tax liability of Mr. Shushan. The Bureau eventually collected most of the claimed liability.

In 1940, at the time Shushan was attempting to collect the note from Grant Stewart, Edward P. Terry contacted Robert M. Newton, Forrest Jackson, and Grant Stewart advising that Shushan was going to give some publicity to the note transaction that might prove embarrassing to Senator BILBO in his senatorial campaign and in his efforts as a speaker for the National Democratic Committee in certain doubtful States. The note was paid by Grant Stewart to Abraham L. Shushan.

In July or August 1940, the record being in dispute on the exact date, Robert Newton, president of the Bank of Commerce, of Poplarville, Miss.; Edward P. Terry, then secretary to Senator BILBO; Grant Stewart, one of the original comakers of the note; and Forrest Jackson, attorney of Jackson, Miss., Stewart, Newton, and Jackson having been for many years close personal and political friends of Senator BILBO, each paid $750 to Grant Stewart for the purpose of paying the Shushan indebtedness. Subsequently Senator BILBO paid Grant Stewart $750 and Forrest Jackson paid Edward P. Terry the amount he had advanced by giving a check for $500 to Terry and a check of $250 to Grant Stewart, it appearing that there was some arrangement between Stewart and Terry with reference to the $250 amount. Forrest Jackson was not a war contractor. Robert Newton was not a war contractor. Grant Stewart was not a war contractor. Terry was at that time Senator BILBO's secretary. Forrest Jackson in 1942, by arrangement with the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., of Baltimore, Md., through its general agents, Robinson & Julienee, of Jackson, Miss., brokered the insurance binder on the Key Field contract, for which he and his law firm received approximately $900, of which amount Jackson received $445 gross. Jackson's law firm was attorney for the Volx Construction Co., Rock City Construction Co., A. B. Friend, and Flynt-Jordan Construction Co. during the time that these associated contractors were engaged in the construction of Key Field at Meridian, Miss., in 1942. Neither Robert Newton or Forrest Jackson have made any efforts to collect from Senator BILBO the money paid on his note to Grant Stewart, who in turn paid Abraham L. Shushan. Senator BILBO testified, however, that he still owed these gentlemen for the amount they had paid to Grant Stewart and Edward P. Terry. There is nothing in this transaction for which there can be either criticism or condemnation, and it has absolutely no connection with the war effort.

B. The Narcotics Charge

As stated by the majority report, this matter is wholly aside from any connection with war contracts. It was a matter, however, that was developed in an investigation conducted by agents of the Internal Revenue Bureau in April 1946, which records were made available to this committee and again in October 1946, Investigator Lane, of the committee, made an investigation for the committee of the matters involved. Both of these investigations were upon information furnished by Edward P. Terry, ex-secretary of Senator BILBO.

In the course of the hearings when Terry was being interrogated with reference to the sum of $15,000 in cash which he had deposited in the Jackson State National Bank at Jackson, Miss., on September 8, 1945, and which he had withdrawn in cash from that institution in July 1946, and after the reelection of Senator BILBO for the third term, Terry stated that at the time he made the $15,000 deposit, and in order to fix the time in his own mind he recalled that he had had a conversation with Dr. A. J. Podesta, of Vicksburg, Miss., and that Dr. Podesta told him that he, Podesta, had given Senator BILBO $1,500 which John Carr, of Natchez, had given to Dr. Podesta for Senator BILBO in appreciation for services rendered by Senator BILBO in connection with the Narcotics Bureau. The service was that Carr, a drug addict of 35 or 40 years, was in need of the maximum amount of morphine that could be given by a reputable physician's prescription. It was at this time that Terry stated that he had received the $15,000 from Simon Liberman, of New York, for the purpose of getting some candidate to oppose Senator BILBO in his race for reelection, Terry and his wife at the time being employed in Senator BILBO's office. On being questioned as to what had become of the $15,000 after Terry had stated that he was unable to obtain a candidate in opposition to Senator BILBO that he thought could defeat Senator BILBO he stated he had paid the money back to Mr. Liberman after the July 1946 withdrawal from the bank at Jackson. When faced with the proposition that Simon Liberman had died on January 5, 1946, and that he was therefore guilty of perjury, Terry refused to further answer questions of the committee, and the committee gave instructions that Terry be cited for contempt of the Senate. Therefore, the entire basis for the charge and the intimation comes from a confessed perjurer and one who is presently under charge of contempt of the Senate, and we do not believe his testimony is worthy of any credence.

The facts developed from the investigation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, by the investigation of Mr. Lane for the committee, by the affidavits of John Carr, Dr. J. G. Logan, and Dr. A. J. Podesta, including Senator BILBO, are briefly as follows:

Carr, a drug addict, through Dr. J. G. Logan, of Natchez, Miss., and Dr. A. J. Podesta, of Vicksburg, Miss., desired to obtain the maximum morphine permitted to be administered under the rules and regulations of the Bureau of Narcotics. Drs. Podesta and Logan gave appropriate certificates certifying to Mr. Carr's need for the drug. Senator BILBO presented these affidavits to Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics in Washington. Mr. Anslinger testified that there

was nothing unusual or out of the ordinary about this practice; that he went to Senator BILBO's office, saw the affidavits of Drs. Logan and Podesta, and on October 11, 1945, wrote to Dr. Logan advising Dr. Logan that there was no objection to prescribing up to 2 grains of morphine daily for Mr. Carr; that an independent investigation was made that fully justified the affidavits of Drs. Logan and Podesta and that Carr was entitled to have prescribed the amount of narcotic indicated. Some time later Mr. Anslinger heard from an investigator of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that Senator BILBO had been paid $1,500 for the services rendered to Mr. Carr. The committee then sent another investigator, Mr. Mannix, to obtain statements in affidavit form from Dr. A. J. Podesta, Dr. J. G. Logan, and John A. Carr. Dr. Logan's affidavit was that he knew nothing about any financial transaction between Mr. Carr, Dr. Podesta, or Senator BILBO. John A. Carr gave his affidavit that some weeks after he had been told by Dr. Logan that he had permission to prescribe the narcotic for Carr from the Bureau of Narcotics, that he, Carr, went to Vicksburg to see Dr. Podesta and told Dr. Podesta of the fact that the Bureau of Narcotics had given him the relief he desired. Mr. Carr then said to Dr. Podesta that he wanted to do something for Senator BILBO. There was some discussion with reference to the making of a donation to the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage fund in which Senator BILBO's interest was well known. Carr thereupon took from his pocketpurse ten $100 bills, or $1,000, and delivered it to Dr. Podesta to be given to Senator BILBO for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage fund as a token of his appreciation for the services that had been rendered by Senator BILBO to him. Carr stated that he was a man of considerable business activity in past years and that it was untrue as had been stated that he had given Dr. Podesta his life's savings.

Dr. Podesta's statement to the investigator is to the effect that some time after Mr. Anslinger had written to Dr. Logan, Mr. Carr came to his office and the conversation given by Carr was corroborated by him. That he took the thousand dollars, put it in an envelope, placed it in his safe in his office; that some time later he learned that Senator BILBO was in Jackson; that he went over late one afternoon and found Senator BILBO at the Royal Hotel where Senator BILBO always stopped when in Jackson; that he went up to Senator BILBO's room and there found a number of people, all strangers to Dr. Podesta, in the room with Senator BILBO and that his recollection was that Senator BILBO was shaving. Dr. Podesta was anxious to get back to his practice in Vicksburg, some 40 miles from Jackson, and states that he left the envelope on the dresser or some other place in the room, saying to Senator BILBO in the hearing of the others that here is a contribution obtained for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage fund from a good friend of yours or words to that effect, but that he did not tell Senator BILBO at that or any other time that the amount in the envelope was from John A. Carr. Carr stated that he was not closely acquainted with Senator BILBO and that he had never said anything to Senator BILBO about giving the money to Dr. Podesta.

Senator BILBO was interrogated about this matter after Terry had made his statement on the witness stand and Senator BILBO's bank accounts, both his personal and his Juniper Grove Baptist Church special fund were searched diligently and there was no evidence that Senator BILBO ever received the $1,000 in question or that he ever put it in any bank account. Senator BILBO states that he did not receive any money from John A. Carr through Dr. Podesta but that Dr. Podesta on numerous occasions did bring him donations made by friends of Dr. Podesta and of Senator BILBO as donations for the Juniper Grove Baptist Church and parsonage fund. Senator BILBO was not advised of Dr. Podesta's final statement or that of Dr. Logan or that of Mr. Carr when he testified in the hearing before the committee. His statement was, however, that he had not knowingly received any thousand dollars from Dr. Podesta or from John A. Carr for Juniper Grove Baptist Church fund.

Under this state of the record there is no evidence upon which there can be any suggestion of impropriety on the part of Senator BILBO.

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing analysis and response to the report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, we have sincerely attempted to stay in the record of the testimony adduced before the subcommittee in its open hearings.

We have known Senator BILBO intimately for the past 34 years. As his attorney and as his friend, we confidently submit on the whole record, laying aside partisanship and prejudice, there is nothing to justify criticism or condemnation.

His entire public and private life has been thoroughly investigated by several departments of the Government and by two committees of the United States Senate. There, of course, may be sharp differences of opinion as to the ideologies which Senator BILBO entertains, but if the Constitution and congressional precedents are to prevail, he is entitled to continue to represent the people of Mississippi, who have thrice elected him to the United States Senate, twice as governor of his State, once as lieutenant governor, and once as State senator.

Our sincere desire is that a correct interpretation of the record may prevail and that complete justice may be done in all fairness.

Respectfully,

FORREST B. JACKSON,
Attorney and friend of Senator Bilbo.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will gladly yield to the Senator from Kentucky if by yielding I do not lose the floor or any of the rights I now have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the Senator from the floor. I would not ask him to yield unless he could resume after I make the statement which I now propose to make.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Kentucky will obtain unanimous consent that I not lose the floor by yielding I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may yield to me without losing the floor, if after yielding he desires to continue to occupy it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

The SECRETARY. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Donnell	Hawkes
Baldwin	Downey	Hayden
Ball	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Ellender	Hill
Bridges	Ferguson	Hoey
Brooks	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	George	Johnston, S. C.
Bushfield	Green	Lucas
Capehart	Gurney	McCarran
Capper	Hatch	McClellan
McMahon	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
Magnuson	Reed	Tobey
Maybank	Revercomb	Tydings
Millikin	Robertson, Wyo.	Wagner
Moore	Russell	Wherry
Morse	Saltonstall	White
Murray	Stewart	Wiley
Myers	Taft	Wilson
O'Daniel	Taylor	Young
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] because of a death in his family.

The SECRETARY. Fifty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT AS TO CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR-ELECT FROM MISSISSIPPI, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, I am sure that all Senators and the country at large are anxious for the Senate to compose the situation which now confronts it and to proceed to an orderly organization of the Senate in order that it may function as a part of the legislative branch of the Government. The Senator-elect from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], whose credentials have been filed and lie on the desk for such action as the Senate may see fit to take, has, along with other Senators-elect, presented himself to be sworn in as a Senator from the State of Mississippi. The indications are that in deciding the matter finally the Senate would be involved in controversial debate, the determination of which is indefinite, regardless of the merits of the controversy. I think I may say it is the wish of all Senators, without regard to politics, to reach at once some disposition of the matter which will not interfere with the orderly procedure of the Senate in its legislative duties.

The Senator-elect from Mississippi has been a Member of this body for 12 years. Whatever anyone may think of the Senator-elect or the policies which he advocates, or his suitability as a Member of the Senate, I think it is fair to say that no one would regard him as not having the courage to defend himself and his policies wherever defense may be called upon or required.

The Senator-elect from Mississippi is an ill man. Following the adjournment of the Congress on the 2d day of last August, Mr. BILBO went to the Naval Hospital at Bethesda for observation and for a check-up. He had an infection in the mouth which the physicians at the Naval Medical Center pronounced as cancer. It was decided, and in that conclusion Dr. Calver, who, as we all know, is the official physician assigned by the Navy Department to the Congress, concurred, that an immediate operation was necessary in the interest of the health of the then Senator from Mississippi. He went to New Orleans and on the 31st day of August, Dr. Alton Oschner, one of the outstanding surgeons of the South, who came originally from Wisconsin, and was at one time connected with the Mayo Institute at Rochester, Minn., performed an operation on the mouth of the Senator from Mississippi, in which a considerable portion of the lower jaw was removed, and

there the diagnosis of cancer was confirmed by Dr. Oschner.

Since that time developments in the health of the Senator-elect from Mississippi have required that another operation be performed. Dr. Oschner desired to perform that operation on the 26th of December last. Senator BILBO insisted that he could not undergo the operation then because it would require him to be in the hospital at a time when his seat in the Senate was being questioned and asked that the operation be postponed until such time as he could return, after disposition in the Senate of the question involving his right to a seat.

The Senator-elect from Mississippi has advised me that he is compelled, in the interest of his health—and it may be in the interest of his life—to return immediately to New Orleans in order that the operation which Dr. Oschner desired to perform on the 26th of December, involving the removal of a larger portion of the lower jaw, two glands in the throat of the Senator-elect, and possibly a malignant growth in his cheek, may be completed at the earliest possible date. The Senator-elect from Mississippi desires to return to New Orleans for that operation at once, and he is planning to leave the city either tonight or tomorrow for that purpose.

I may add that the Senator-elect from Mississippi came to me this morning to inform me of this situation, and I said to him what I think any Senator, or any friend or acquaintance would say, namely, that the preservation of a man's life is more important to him than a seat in the United States Senate or any other body. I think we would all agree that that is true.

After consultation this morning over the telephone with Dr. Oschner, and in confirmation of what I have said, Dr. Calver has sent to the Presiding Officer of the Senate a statement which I ask to have read.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1947.

PRESIDING OFFICER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Report on physical condition of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

DEAR SIR: After the completion of his primary campaign, Senator BILBO reported to my office with a badly ulcerated mouth. He was sent to the medical center for study and his condition was diagnosed as cancer. He was referred to Dr. Alton Oschner, of New Orleans, for consultation and indicated treatment. Dr. Oschner removed a mass of tissue from the Senator's mouth with the hope that all the cancerous growth had been destroyed.

During his convalescence, the Senator developed an infection in the jawbone at the site of the operation. One small sliver of dead bone was removed. There is another large one still in the wound with an apparent extension of the infection. This dead bone should be removed immediately and other enlarged glands be investigated for an extension of the cancerous growth without delay.

I consulted with Dr. Oschner by telephone this morning and he concurs in this recommendation and advises me that the convalescence from the operation will take approximately 2 months.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE W. CALVER.

Mr. BARKLEY. In conversation with Dr. Calver this morning he advised me that following this operation a minimum of 6 weeks, and probably 2 months, will be required before the Senator-elect from Mississippi may be able to return to Washington. That, of course, would be governed by circumstances and by the rate of recovery from the operation.

In view of this situation, and after consultation with Members on both sides of the Chamber, including friends of the Senator-elect from Mississippi and the Senator-elect himself, I ask unanimous consent that the credentials of the Senator-elect from Mississippi, Mr. THEODORE G. BILBO, lie on the table without prejudice and without action until such time as he is able to return, in view of his physical condition, and to be here when they shall later be taken up, or until such time as the Senate itself may order them to be taken up for consideration; that all other Senators-elect who are entitled to take the oath of office be permitted immediately to be sworn in in groups of four, except that the Senator-elect from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator-elect from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who are in the first group of four—the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] already having been sworn in, and the Senator-elect from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], stepping aside under this unanimous-consent agreement—be sworn in as a group; and that following that, the other Senators-elect be allowed to take the oath of office immediately in groups of four, alphabetically.

I also ask that the certificate of the Senator-elect from Mississippi lie on the table without prejudice and without action until such time as the official physician assigned to the Congress, Dr. Calver, certifies that he is able to return here, under the unanimous-consent request, or until such time as the Senate itself may take action.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, the Senator from Kentucky has consulted me regarding this agreement. I have consulted other Senators on this side of the aisle, and I think I may say that there is unanimous approval of the agreement which he proposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Secretary, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yesterday, and again today, I suggested that perhaps I would read into the RECORD the complete hearings before the special committee which was sent to Mississippi. Being a member of that committee, I embrace this opportunity to ask Senators to take the trouble to read the hearings. They are quite extensive. They will be printed. I will not ask that they be printed in the RECORD, but I hope that every Senator will have the opportunity of reading the hearings, so that Senators may familiarize themselves not only with the laws of Mississippi, but with the work which the committee did in Mississippi in connection with the hearings.

The SECRETARY. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, the Senator-elect from Ohio, Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, is in the Chamber. His credentials have been filed, and I ask that he be sworn at this time, together with the Senator-elect from Maine.

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Maine withdraw his motion?

Mr. WHITE. The motion that I made yesterday, that the Senator-elect from Maine be sworn, is still before the Senate. In view of the arrangement just entered into, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that motion.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Secretary, I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the names of Senators-elect, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. BRICKER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WHITE and Mr. TAFT, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. CHAVEZ.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WHERRY Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. HATCH, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ECTON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. MURRAY, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. IVES, and Mr. JENNER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. AIKEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. CAPEHART, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, and MR. LANGER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. DONNELL, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. YOUNG, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. MCCARTHY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. WILEY, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. O'CONOR.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. TYDINGS, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. SPARKMAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. HILL, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. THYE, Mr. UMSTEAD, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BALL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. BUCK, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Secretary.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Secretary, I understand the swearing in of Senators-elect has been concluded. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SECRETARY. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bricker	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Sparkman
Cain	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent because of a death in his family.

The SECRETARY. Ninety-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Brien McMahon and Raymond E. Baldwin.

Delaware.—C. Douglass Buck and John J. Williams.

Florida.—Claude Pepper and Spessard L. Holland.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Glen H. Taylor and Henry C. Dworshak.

Illinois.—Scott W. Lucas and C. Wayland Brooks.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—George A. Wilson and Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Kansas.—Arthur Capper and Clyde M. Reed.

Kentucky.—Alben W. Barkley and John Sherman Cooper.

Louisiana.—John H. Overton and Allen J. Ellender.

Maine.—Wallace H. White, Jr., and Owen Brewster.

Maryland.—Millard E. Tydings and Herbert R. O'Conor.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Michigan.—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

Minnesota.—Joseph H. Ball and Edward J. Thye.

Mississippi.— ——— ——— James O. Eastland.

Missouri.—Forrest C. Donnell and James P. Kem.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—Albert W. Hawkes and H. Alexander Smith.

New Mexico.—Carl A. Hatch and Dennis Chavez.

New York.—Robert F. Wagner and Irving M. Ives.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and William B. Umstead.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

Oklahoma.—Elmer Thomas and E. H. Moore.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne L. Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Francis J. Myers and Edward Martin.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and J. Howard McGrath.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Chan Gurney and Harlan J. Bushfield.

Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and Tom Stewart.

Texas.—Tom Connally and W. Lee O'Daniel.

Utah.—Elbert D. Thomas and Arthur V. Watkins.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Harry P. Cain.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Chapman Revercomb.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Edward V. Robertson.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHITE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 4), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The SECRETARY. The Chair appoints the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as the committee to wait upon the President under the resolution just agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 5), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. WHERRY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. WHITE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 7), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890 on the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, by direction of the conference of the minority, I move that the name of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, Senator from Tennessee, be substituted for the name of Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. Secretary, since there has been a change in the political complexion of the Senate, and in view of the fact that our Republican friends have selected one of the best of their number to preside over the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] be withdrawn, and that the Senator from Michigan be given the unanimous endorsement of the Senate for election as its presiding officer. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Secretary, notwithstanding the uncertainty involved in the result of the vote about to be taken, but at the urgent request of the Senator from Tennessee, I withdraw my amendment.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn, and the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine is unanimously agreed to.

The Chair designates the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to escort the newly elected President pro tempore to the chair.

Thereupon, Mr. VANDENBERG, escorted by Mr. MCKELLAR, advanced to the desk, and the oath was administered to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I am deeply grateful to my friends on both sides of the aisle for their generous consideration, and I shall undertake to the best of my ability to justify their confidence and faith.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BRIDGES submitted a resolution (S. Res. 8), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the minority, I move that the name of Leslie L. Biffle be substituted for that of Carl A. Loeffler.

The amendment was rejected.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair designates the retiring Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Biffle, to escort the newly elected Secretary to the desk to be sworn in.

Mr. Loeffler, escorted by Mr. Biffle, advanced to the desk and the oath was administered to him.

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. BRIDGES submitted a resolution (S. Res. 9), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Edward F. McGinnis, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the minority, I move to substitute the name of Hon. Wall Doxey for that of Mr. Edward F. McGinnis.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will observe that I am taking advantage of the first opportunity I have had to be initiated into the duties of minority leader of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair takes note of that fact, and also notes that the distinguished Senator has changed his disguise for the purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, apropos of the Chair's remarks, more or less ex cathedra, with regard to my addition, hirsutically speaking, I wish merely to say that on the 5th of November the people of this country voted for a change, and I have given them one worth while.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 10), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret most sincerely that I find it my duty to raise any question about the election of a Chaplain of this body. During all my service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, so far as I can now recall, there has never been any question of partisanship in the selection of a Chaplain.

When I came to the House of Representatives, Dr. Couden, blind Chaplain of the House, had been Chaplain for many years, and he was retained as long as he wished to remain, and I think was then retired upon pension by the House of Representatives. Following him, Dr. James Shera Montgomery was elected, and has been the Chaplain of the House of Representatives ever since, and has been reelected to that position notwithstanding the change in the political complexion of the House.

When the Democrats came into control of the Senate in 1932 Dr. Zé Barney T. Phillips, who was the pastor of Epiphany Episcopal Church in Washington, had been the Chaplain of the Senate since 1927, when he was elected by the Republican majority of the Senate as the Chaplain, and, as I recall, without any partisan division. Dr. Phillips remained as Chaplain of the Senate from 1927 until his death on May 10, 1942, a period of 15 years. He remained the Chaplain of the Senate notwithstanding there had been a change in the political control of the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not know the politics of Dr. Marshall, whose name has been presented. Neither do I know the politics of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, who has been Chaplain of the Senate now for 4 years. I never asked him his politics. I was never interested in knowing whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. He was chosen 4 years ago as the Chaplain of the Senate.

To me it seems peculiarly unfortunate, in view of the previous record of the Senate and the House in regard to the chaplaincy, which ought to be above politics, and to be based upon a man's qualifications—and I am not saying anything about the qualifications of the gentleman who has been nominated—that Dr. Harris should be denied reelection because of a change in the political complexion of the Senate. Dr. Harris has been a very faithful Chaplain of the Senate. He has been Chaplain during a very critical period, the war period, in which he has performed his duties acceptably. He has been Chaplain during a period in which the Senate required that every session be opened with prayer, regardless of whether it was after an adjournment or recess, whereas previous to that, under the custom of the Senate to recess frequently for weeks at a time, the Chaplain was not required to appear except when there was an adjournment of the Senate.

Dr. Harris is one of the outstanding divines, not only of Washington but of the country. He has been an exchange pastor between this country and other countries. His prayers, which have been published by order of the Senate, have been appreciated, I think, by the religious people generally throughout the country. It seems to me unfortunate that he should be denied reelection because of a change in the political complexion of the Senate.

Therefore, I feel it my duty, in the interest of justice, to move that his name be substituted in the resolution for that of Rev. Peter Marshall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on the majority of the Senate falls the duty of making recommendations for filling the various offices of the Senate. The majority has a special committee on personnel, a small committee, which reports to the majority conference as a whole. That committee, after consideration, felt that, since the Republican Party was returning to the control of the Senate after a long period, no mistake would be made in the selection of a Chaplain if we turned to the pastor of the church of Abraham Lincoln, the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. We thought that would be fitting and appropriate.

Dr. Marshall, whom we have nominated, is a sincere, devout, able, conscientious, spiritual man. He was not a candidate for the position and in no way sought it. Like the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I do not know Dr. Marshall's politics. He has never been one of those privileged gentlemen who could vote, because for many years he has resided in the District of Columbia, where he has had no vote.

Our presentation of Dr. Marshall's name is in no way a reflection on the standing or the fine service rendered by Dr. Harris. The Senate could change its Chaplain every year, and has changed Chaplains from time to time in its history. Personally, I think it would be well to have a rotation, so that different Chaplains representing different religious denominations could serve in the office of Chaplain of the Senate. Dr. Marshall, whom I think many Senators on both sides know and have heard, is an able speaker and a great religious leader.

I say that the matter was presented to the conference without his being in any way a candidate or indicating his acceptance of this call until after his name had been adopted by the Republican conference.

I hate to see the office of Chaplain of this body in any way enter into a political discussion, because I think it is absolutely unnecessary, and I think for our good and the good of the country, that the nomination, as presented by the majority, should go forward in the regular way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, just a word. I recognize the power which lies in the majority to make the selection. I

regret that it seems to be that a deviation has been made from the unbroken rule here as far as I can recall, in regard to this particular office. I might say that, notwithstanding the power which exists in the majority to do this thing, I think it should be said in good faith that they are setting us a very poor example for the time when we resume control of the Senate 2 years from now.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I seem to remember that Dr. Harris was selected as a candidate in the Democratic caucus about 2 or 3 years ago. Am I not correct in that statement? I remember there was a contest in the Democratic caucus, and Dr. Harris was selected.

Mr. BARKLEY. There occurred the death of Dr. Phillips, who had been retained as Chaplain from 1932 to 1942, although he had been previously selected by the Republican caucus, so there was a vacancy in the chaplainship. We did not make any change. We continued him in the office of Chaplain for 10 years. He died, and we had to select someone else, and we selected Dr. Harris.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied in my own mind that if Dr. Marshall had for one moment known that there would have been any contest relative to his selection as Chaplain of the Senate he never would have permitted his name to have been put before the Senate of the United States.

I wish to say that Dr. Marshall is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. He was born at Coalbridge, Scotland, studied engineering, and for 6 years was employed in the steel-mill tubes in Scotland.

In 1927 he determined to study for the ministry, and, leaving his native land, he came to the United States. For a time he worked in New Jersey, moved on to Birmingham, Ala., to obtain employment on the Birmingham News, and then moved to Decatur, Ga., to enter Columbia Theological Seminary. He graduated from the seminary in 1931. Dr. Marshall held two pastorates in Georgia, the second being at Atlanta Westminster Presbyterian Church, where his reputation as a speaker and theologian expanded rapidly. At that time he applied for citizenship in the United States, and he later became a citizen.

He was at Westminster Church in Atlanta when called in 1937 to the pulpit of historic New York Avenue Presbyterian Church here in Washington.

Dr. Marshall told me that he had not voted in any election. So no one can charge even a political basis. That is impossible.

From a religious point of view, I regret that there should be any controversy over this matter. I know that Dr. Marshall is a devout man. He is one of the outstanding ministers not only of Washington but of the United States. I say to the Senate that this man, if elected Chaplain of the United States Senate, will add dignity and reverence to this body. He can fill the shoes of anyone who has been Chaplain during the long history of the United States Senate. By what we propose to do there is no reflection upon Dr. Harris. If I had known when I submitted this resolution that it would have been interpreted in the light it has been, I would certainly have said more than I said when I submitted it.

I like Dr. Harris very much indeed. I have enjoyed his prayers as much as has any other Senator; and I think I can say that I have heard as many of his prayers as any other Senator has heard. I do not wish for a moment to have our present action considered as any reflection upon Dr. Harris. I have the highest regard for him. I know I speak the sentiments of every Senator when I say that he is beloved by the membership of the Senate. I was told by the personnel committee that they wanted a nomination for the chaplaincy, and I offered the name of Dr. Marshall. I have been a member of his church for four years. As a member of his church, and one who knows him, I wish to say that he is not only an outstanding minister, but a very devout person. I regret exceedingly that another name has been submitted for this office. I appeal to Senators on this side of the aisle as well as to Senators on the other side of the aisle. I ask the minority leader to withdraw his amendment, and that this body declare the unanimous vote of the Senate in favor of Dr. Marshall to be Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure that everything that has been said about Dr. Marshall is true. I am sure that he must be a wonderful man, a great preacher, and a fine spiritual leader. But I must say that I was astounded yesterday morning when I picked up the Washington Post and saw that the majority conference had agreed to bring to an end the services of Dr. Harris.

I remember, as a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives, that when the Democrats came into power in the House in 1931 no question was raised by any Democrat about the continuation of the services as Chaplain of the House of Dr. James Shera Montgomery. As the distinguished minority leader has said, when the Democrats came into power in the Senate there was no question about the continuation of the services as Chaplain of the Senate of the late lamented Dr. ZeBarney Phillips. So far as I know, it has been the custom, practice, and precedent of the Senate and of the House to continue Chaplains in the service irrespective of which party might be in power. As the distinguished minority leader has well said, the Senate has never had a Chaplain in all its history who has carried so heavy a burden as has Dr. Harris. He was here during the strenuous days of the war. He came here shortly after we changed the rules of the Senate so as to provide for prayer by the Chaplain at the beginning of every calendar day, rather than at the beginning of every legislative day. He has delivered more than 500 prayers in this body for the Senate of the United States. It is known among men that his prayers are appreciated throughout the country. He came to the Senate day after day only to pray, only to bring us beautiful and moving prayers, prayers of great power, great inspiration, and great light. He came to the Senate only as a servant of God.

I for one sorely regret to see him now turned out of the Senate without any warning and without notice. The first notice that Dr. Harris had, according to my understanding, was when he read yesterday morning's newspaper. If there is one fundamental tenet of the American creed it is the absolute separation of church and state, the separation of politics and religion; the fundamental conviction that the politician's reach shall not touch the sacred vestments of the ministry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Alabama to say that the first time that Dr. Harris knew that he was not to be the Chaplain of the Senate was when he read it in the newspaper?

Mr. HILL. That is my understanding. He might have heard some rumor about it before, but it is my understanding that his first knowledge that he was not to continue, under all the practices and precedents of the Senate, as the Chaplain of this body, was when he read the story in yesterday morning's newspaper. It came without warning, without consideration, and without any notice, that his services in this body had been decreed to be ended by the Republican majority.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I speak with a great deal of sincerity because I am very fond of Dr. Harris. Has it been the custom at any time to elect a Chaplain of the Senate according to political faith, or political party?

Mr. HILL. Not to my knowledge. In the 20-odd years I have been in the Congress of the United States, no question of the Chaplain's politics or his political faith has ever been raised. I have cited, as the minority leader has cited, precedents and practices to show that there has never been any question raised about politics or political faith. When I, as a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives, voted to continue as Chaplain of the House of Representatives the Rev. James Shera Montgomery, it never occurred to me to ask whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. I did not care. The idea of politics never entered my mind. I knew that in the first instance he had been elected by Republicans, but I did not think that any question of politics should enter into the election of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not finished.

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HATCH. Despite the denials which have been made, and despite the fine assertions which have been made, is it not perfectly clear from the record that is written here today that partisan politics is this day depriving Dr. Harris of his place as Chaplain of the Senate, and supplanting him by someone else?

Mr. HILL. Certainly the action today will be viewed by the people throughout the country as action to throw out of the Senate one of the great spiritual leaders, one of the great preachers in the great Methodist Church.

Mr. President, I deplore the action which is proposed. I think it is most unfortunate for the Senate and for the country. I think it is a sad day in the history of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the remarks of the Senator from Alabama and of the Senator from New Mexico are absolutely uncalled for, unjustified, and unfair. There is absolutely no politics involved in this question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If we are to enter into a political debate, there are certain things to be said, and I shall not hesitate to say them; but I hope to keep this discussion on a very high level.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have before me a list of the Chaplains in the United States Senate from April 25, 1789, up to the present date. Contained in that list are some renowned and eminent men. I am putting this discussion on a positive basis. I paid a high tribute to Dr. Harris. Instead of accusing anybody on the other side of any ulterior motive, I made a positive case for a great man, a great religious leader, and I ask that it be decided on a positive issue, not by playing partisan politics with the chaplaincy of the Senate.

I ask that a list of all the former Chaplains of the Senate be inserted in the RECORD, together with their denominations, the dates of changes and appointments, and the salaries paid them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Chaplains of the U. S. Senate, Apr. 25, 1789, to Aug. 2, 1946

Chaplains	Denomination	Date of appointment
Rt. Rev. Bishop Samuel Provost.	Episcopalian	Apr. 25, 1789
Rt. Rev. Bishop William Shite.	do	Oct. 24, 1791
Rt. Rev. Bishop John Thomas Claggett.	do	Nov. 27, 1800
Rev. Dr. E. Gantt	do	Dec. 9, 1801
Rev. A. T. McCormick	do	Nov. 11, 1807
Rev. R. Elliott	Presbyterian	Nov. 10, 1808
Rev. M. Wilmer	Episcopalian	May 24, 1809
Rev. Ob. B. Brown	Baptist	Dec. 5, 1809
Rev. Walter D. Addison	Episcopalian	Dec. 12, 1810
Rev. J. Breckenridge, D. D.	Presbyterian	Dec. 8, 1815
Rev. Jesse Lee	Methodist	Sept. 27, 1814
Rev. J. Glendie	Presbyterian	Dec. 18, 1815
Rev. S. E. Dwight	Congregationalist	Dec. 16, 1816
Rev. W. Hawley	Episcopalian	Dec. 9, 1817
Rev. John Clark	Presbyterian	Nov. 19, 1818
Rev. Reuben Post	do	Dec. 9, 1819
Rev. William Ryland	Methodist	Nov. 17, 1820
Rt. Rev. C. P. McIlvaine, D.D.	Episcopalian	Dec. 9, 1822
Rev. W. Staughton	Baptist	Dec. 10, 1823
Rt. Rev. C. P. McIlvaine, D. D.	Episcopalian	Dec. 14, 1824
Rev. W. Staughton	Baptist	Dec. 12, 1825
Rev. W. Ryland	Methodist	Dec. 8, 1826
Rev. H. V. D. Johns, D. D.	Episcopalian	Dec. 15, 1829
Rev. J. P. Durbin, D. D.	Methodist	Dec. 19, 1831
Rev. C. C. Pise	Roman Catholic.	Dec. 11, 1832
Rev. T. W. Hatch	Episcopalian	Dec. 10, 1833
Rev. E. T. Higbee	do	Dec. 23, 1835
Rev. Mr. Goodman	Not known	Dec. 28, 1836
Rev. Henry Slicer	Methodist	Sept. 11, 1837
Rev. G. Cookman	do	Dec. 31, 1839
Rev. S. Tuston, D. D.	Presbyterian	June 12, 1841
Rev. Henry Slicer	Methodist	Dec. 16, 1846
Rev. C. M. Butler, D. D.	Episcopalian	Jan. 9, 1850
Rev. Henry Slicer	Methodist	Dec. 7, 1853
Rev. Henry C. Dean	do	Dec. 4, 1855
Rev. Stephen P. Hill	Baptist	Dec. 8, 1856
Rev P. C. Gurley, D. D.	Presbyterian	Dec. 15, 1859
Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D.	do	Dec. 10, 1861
Rev. Dr. Thomas Bowman.	Methodist	May 11, 1864
Rev. Dr. E. H. Gray	Baptist	Mar. 9, 1865
Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman	Methodist	Mar. 8, 1869
Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D.	Presbyterian	Dec. 8, 1873
Dr. J. J. Bullock	do	Mar. 24, 1879
Dr. E. DeWitt Huntley	Methodist	Dec. 18, 1883
Dr. John G. Butler	Lutheran	Mar 13, 1886
Dr. W. H. Milburn*[1]	Methodist	Apr 6, 1893
Rev. F. J. Prettyman	do	Nov. 1902
Dr. Edward Everett Hale.	Unitarian	Dec. 14, 1903
Dr. U. G. B. Pierce	do	June 18, 1909
Rev. F. J. Prettyman	Methodist	March 1913
Rev. J. J. Muir	Baptist	Jan. 21, 1921
Rev. Ze Barney Phillips	Episcopalian	Dec. 5, 1927
Dr. Frederick Brown Harris.	Methodist	Oct. 10, 1942

*Blind.

[1] See biography, National Cyclopedia Am. Biog., p. 137.

NOTE.—The 35th Cong. discontinued the usage of electing Chaplains and extended an invitation to the clergy of the District of Columbia to alternate in opening the daily sessions by prayer, and in preaching on the Sabbath, which they continued to do until the 36th Cong., but the 37th Cong. returned to the old practice.

TOTAL NUMBER TO DATE BY DENOMINATIONS

Episcopalian	15
Methodist	16
Presbyterian	10
Baptist	6
Unitarian	2
Lutheran	1
Roman Catholic	1
Congregationalist	1

SALARIES OF CHAPLAINS OF THE U. S. SENATE

(Before 1870 appropriations of varying amounts were made for salaries as the need of payments arose)

	Per annum
December 1870	$900
July 1, 1904	1,000
July 1, 1909	1,200
July 1, 1924	1,520
July 1, 1929, to date	1,680

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has referred to what the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from New Mexico have said as unfair. The Senator happens to come from New England, glorious New England, as we are wont to say. In the language of the Concord philosopher, let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire—

What you are cries out so loudly that I cannot hear what you say.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was agreed to.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. WHITE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 11), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 12), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the minority of the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS. The secretary for the majority, the secretary for the minority, and the Sergeant at Arms are all present, and I ask that they be sworn in now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that they take no additional oath.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHITE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 13), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WHITE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 14), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHITE and Mr. BARKLEY advanced in the center aisle, and Mr. WHITE said:

Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Secretary under the resolution adopted earlier today to act in conjunction with a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President that the Congress is assembled and ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, has performed its duty. The President conveys his felicitations to this body and advises that he will address the House and Senate in joint session on Monday at 1 o'clock p. m.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 6th day of January 1947, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to say a further word about the resolution. It provides for meeting at 1 o'clock. It seems to me that in accordance with long precedent there should be no business of a legislative character transacted until the President has sent his message or delivered his message to the Congress in joint session. I express the very earnest hope that neither this afternoon nor on Monday, prior to the delivery of the message, will any Senator offer any bill or resolution for the consideration of this body. I think the Senator from Kentucky, whose experience is much longer than mine, and whose knowledge is much greater than mine, will concur in what I have just said as to the practice of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am happy to do so. It has been the custom of the Senate, out of courtesy to the President, not to introduce bills or resolutions until he has communicated with the Congress on the state of the Union; and I agree to the suggestion of the Senator.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BARRY, OF NEW YORK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

House Resolution 9

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *January 3, 1947.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BARRY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY, OF WISCONSIN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

House Resolution 10

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *January 3, 1947.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 16) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GALLAGHER, OF MINNESOTA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

House Resolution 8

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *January 3, 1947.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 17) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of what has been said as to the joint meeting of the two Houses at 1 o'clock on Monday next, and in view of the further fact that no business is expected to be transacted until the President's message has been delivered, I see no reason for meeting earlier than 12:30 on Monday. Unless there is some other business to be transacted at this time, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12:30 p. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 6, 1947, at 12:30 p. m.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, if ever we needed Thy wisdom and Thy guidance, it is now—as the Congress begins a new session, standing upon the threshold of a new year, fraught with so many dangerous opportunities. We pray that Thou wilt bless these men chosen by the people of this Nation, for Thou knowest them, their needs, their motives, their hopes, and their fears. Lord Jesus, put Thine arm around them to give them strength, and speak to them to give them wisdom greater than their own. May they hear Thy voice, and seek Thy guidance. May they remember that Thou art concerned about what is said and done here, and may they have clear conscience before Thee, that they need fear no man. Bless each of us according to our deepest need, and use us for Thy glory, we humbly ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

GUY CORDON, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 3, and Saturday, January 4, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Wagner
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent, and that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] are detained on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in accordance with previous action of the Senate and House of Representatives under House Concurrent Resolution No. 1, the Senate is to meet with the House at 1 o'clock to hear the message of the President of the United States. It has been suggested to me that the House would

appreciate it if Members of the Senate presented themselves at the entrance to the House Chamber at a quarter to one. I think, therefore, that we should immediately proceed to the House.

Let me add that at the conclusion of the joint meeting the Senate will reassemble in its Chamber, and I hope there will be adequate opportunity for the transaction of morning business, and in particular for the election of the committees of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say for the minority that we shall be ready to report our committee assignments, which, according to custom, are brought to the attention of the Senate simultaneously with the majority assignments, so that the committees may be complete.

Following that, as I understand, we are to have a morning hour so that bills and joint resolutions may be introduced and other routine business transacted.

Mr. WHITE. Yes. Let me add that the report of the majority will be presented by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who served as chairman of the Committee on Committees, which recommended the majority appointments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to be sure that the membership of the Senate understands the arrangements. We are departing forthwith for the joint meeting of the two Houses. Immediately upon the adjournment of the joint meeting the Senate will reassemble in its Chamber for the transaction of business.

The Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint meeting with the House to receive a message from the President of the United States. The Senate will stand in recess pending its return from the joint meeting.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler), its Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the annual message of the President of the United States.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(The annual message of the President of the United States this day delivered by him to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress appears at p. 135 of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 2 o'clock p. m., and, the recess having expired, was called to order by the President pro tempore.

STANDING COMMITTEES AND ASSIGNMENTS THERETO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair inquires whether the majority and minority leaders wish to submit their committee lists before the Senate proceeds with the morning hour.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood that both the majority and minority lists were prepared, and that Senators were ready to offer them. I understood the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would present the majority list.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair wish that both lists be read simultaneously so as to show the complete membership of each committee as it is called?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it would be preferable if both lists were presented together, and the full list of each committee announced.

Mr. BARKLEY. I present the minority list, by direction of the Democratic steering committee.

Thereupon the Chief Clerk read the list of committees and the assignments thereto, as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Capper (chairman), Aiken, Bushfield, Wilson, Young, Kem, Thye, Thomas of Oklahoma, Ellender, Lucas, Stewart, Hoey, Pepper.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Bridges (chairman), Gurney, Brooks, Reed, Ball, Ferguson, Wherry, Cordon, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Dworshak, McKellar, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tydings, Russell, McCarran, Overton, O'Mahoney, Green.

On Armed Services: Messrs. Gurney (chairman), Bridges, Robertson of Wyoming, Wilson, Saltonstall, Morse, Baldwin, Tydings, Russell, Byrd, Murray, Hill, Kilgore.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Tobey (chairman), Buck, Capehart, Flanders, Cain, Bricker, McCarthy, Wagner, Maybank, Taylor, Fulbright, Robertson of Virginia, Sparkman.

On Civil Service: Messrs. Langer (chairman), Buck, Flanders, Baldwin, Thye, Williams, Ecton, Chavez, McKellar, O'Daniel, Johnston of South Carolina, Umstead, O'Conor.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. Buck (chairman), Capper, Ball, Flanders, Cooper, Cain, Kem, ———, Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Sparkman, Umstead, McGrath.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. Aiken (chairman), Ferguson, Hickenlooper, Bricker, Thye, McCarthy, Ives, McClellan, Eastland, Hoey, Taylor, Robertson of Virginia, O'Conor.

On Finance: Messrs. Millikin (chairman), Taft, Butler, Brewster, Bushfield, Hawkes, Martin, George, Barkley, Connally, Byrd, Johnson of Colorado, Lucas.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Vandenberg (chairman), Capper, White, Wiley, Smith, Hickenlooper, Lodge, Jr., Connally, George, Wagner, Thomas of Utah, Barkley, Hatch.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Messrs. White (chairman), Tobey, Reed, Brewster, Hawkes, Moore, Capehart, Johnson of Colorado, Stewart, McFarland, Magnuson, Myers, McMahon.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Wiley (chairman), Langer, Ferguson, Revercomb, Moore, Donnell, Cooper, McCarran, Kilgore, Eastland, Myers, Fulbright, McGrath.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Messrs. Taft (chairman), Aiken, Ball, Smith, Morse, Donnell, Jenner, Ives, Thomas of Utah, Murray, Pepper, Ellender, Hill.

On Public Lands: Messrs. Butler (chairman), Millikin, Robertson of Wyoming, Cordon, Dworshak, Ecton, Malone, Watkins, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Downey, McFarland, Magnuson.

On Public Works: Messrs. Revercomb (chairman), Cooper, Cain, Martin, Watkins, Williams, Malone, Overton, ———, Chavez, Downey, O'Daniel, McClellan.

On Rules and Administration: Messrs. Brooks (chairman), Wherry, Hickenlooper, Knowland, Lodge, Jr., Jenner, Bricker, Ives, Hayden, Green, Maybank, McMahon, Holland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the resolution is voted upon, I should like to ask a question or two and make some comment with respect to one or two phases of the committee assignments, with particular reference to the mathematical ratio.

Under the Reorganization Act, no Senator is permitted to enjoy membership on more than two committees, except that in the case of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments the majority members of those two committees may serve on two other committees.

The passage of the act undoubtedly created some confusion and difficulty in working out the mathematical proportions, somewhat different from the method heretofore adopted. Heretofore it has been customary, as a matter of courtesy on both sides, for the majority and minority leaders to confer in advance and agree upon a proportion of membership on the various committees, and the membership has always followed a mathematical ratio, depending upon the relative number of Senators on the respective sides, except in a case where some Member of the majority or minority had been on a committee for a long time and it was not desired that he be displaced, in which event he would be allowed to retain his position, even though it did disturb the mathematical ratio, with the understanding that the next vacancy that took place on the committee would go to the side which had yielded in order that a given member might not be displaced from the committee. In the main, that has been the only deviation from the mathematical ratio and proportion method.

I realize that the minority, having 45 Members, can have only 90 committee assignments, and that the majority can add to the committee assignments of members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments two other assignments each, so that they would have 3, subject, of course, to the requirement of the law that a committee shall not be composed of exceeding 13 members in all cases, except the Committee on Appropriations, which may be composed of 21 members.

In the distribution of committee assignments it seems that the majority conference selected the Appropriations Committee on which to deviate from the mathematical proportion and ratio by assigning to itself 12 Members, and to

the minority, 9 Members. On Public Lands, Rules, and Labor and Public Welfare, the majority decided, without consulting any Member of the minority—which, of course, was not required, but which has always been done—upon a ratio of 8 to 5. So, in the case of the Appropriations Committee the majority comes forward with a ratio of 12 to 9, and in the case of Public Lands, Labor, and Public Welfare, and Rules and Administration with a ratio of 8 to 5. Under the law and under the arrangement the minority would be entitled to 90 positions. There are, in other words, 14 committees consisting of 13 members, making a total of 182 assignments and one committee, Appropriations, with 21 members, making a total of 203 committee assignments under the Reorganization Act. Forty-five minority Members, each being entitled to 2, would make 90, which would leave 113 places for the majority, 51 majority Members, allowed 2 assignments each, would make 102 places, leaving what might be called 11 "floating" assignments for other Members of the majority; because if we of the minority get our 90, of course we are not entitled to any more in the total of the membership of the committees.

I cannot understand why it was that the majority picked out the Appropriations Committee, which has heretofore been governed by the numerical ratio, subject to the deviations which I have mentioned; the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Public Lands, as the four committees of the Senate on which there is to be a disproportionate allowance between the two sides of the Chamber.

I recognize the fact that the Appropriations Committee is one of the most important committees of the Senate, yet I do not see why it should take priority over other committees in the application of this disproportionate mathematical ratio.

It has made it necessary, as we think, to displace on that committee the fair proportion of minority representation.

There is on the minority side a little more than 46 percent of the membership of the Senate, but in the aggregate of committee appointments we have only about 43 percent.

We feel that the ratio on the Appropriations Committee should have been 11 to 10 instead of 12 to 9, and that if there were any disproportion to be brought about by giving the majority more than its numerical ratio on any committee, the Committee on Appropriations should not have been one of those, and also that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should not have been one of the committees in which a ratio of 8 to 5 was established. We cannot understand why that committee was selected for this disproportionate ratio, unless there was a fear that at some time or other a Republican might vote with the Democrats and thereby upset the majority's plan. I do not know whether that is the reason, but in my own mind it is the only one I can imagine. I may be mistaken about that, but I recognize that it is the practical explanation of this unfair distribution of the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which I am sure is to be one of the important legislative committees at this session of the Congress.

In respect to the Committee on Public Lands, I grant that as a rule only Members from the Western States, the States where there are remaining public lands, are particularly interested in that committee. While it is not one of the outstanding legislative committees of the Senate, the proportion of 8 to 5 in the Committee on Public Lands gives to the majority a larger proportion than it is entitled to in dealing with the important subject of public lands, in which all western Senators, regardless of party, are interested.

So, granting that some members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may be placed on two other committees—not all of them, but enough of them to make up the total number of committee assignments—I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, or the majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], why these four committees, among all the committees of the Senate, were chosen for assignment of a larger number of Members of the majority than the numerical ratio would allow to be assigned?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, page 10, paragraph 4, of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, provides, "Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; * * *." That is the first sentence of the paragraph. There are two exceptions, but the paragraph limits the minority party, on the 15 committees, to two committees for each Senator. In the case of 11 committees the ratio of 7 to 6 has been fixed. That will give the minority party 66 seats. In the case of three committees the ratio has been fixed at 8 to 5, which will give the minority party 15 additional seats, and in the case of one committee, the Appropriations Committee, the ratio of 12 to 9 has been provided, which will give the minority party another 9; making a total of 90 seats, which, with their membership of 45, is the total number of seats to which they are entitled under the act.

The Republican Conference felt it was entirely within its province to select the four committees on which it was necessary to increase the ratio from 7 to 6 to 8 to 5, in three cases, and from 12 to 9 rather than 11 to 10 in the case of the Appropriations Committee.

As the distinguished minority leader has said, the Republican majority is entitled to 113 seats on committees. I will say that I think the majority leader's suggestion as to why some committees were given a different proportion of membership is possibly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator means the "minority" leader. Please get my present situation straight.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am so accustomed to refer to the Senator from Kentucky as the majority leader——

Mr. BARKLEY. I know how it is, and I will say that it is also a little difficult for me to adjust myself to the new situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The reason why the Public Lands Committee was chosen as one on which there should be a larger Republican representation I think is self-evident. We have five new Republican Senators from the public-land States: The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. It is natural that each of those Senators should take as his first preference for membership on a committee, the Public Lands Committee which has merged in itself five committees previously in existence, that is to say, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Mines and Mining, and the Committee on Indian Affairs. We felt it important that the Public Lands Committee should have an adequate representation, in membership, of Republicans from the West. We felt that the Committee on Rules and Administration was definitely an important one, and that we needed as strong a representation as possible on that committee. As I have said, we felt that the choice was entirely up to the Republican Party. I rest my presentation of the case on that statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the frankness of the Senator from Wyoming. I am not contending, and I am sure the Senator will recall that I did not contend that we are entitled to more than 90 places on behalf of the minority. The law which the Congress passed gives the majority, whichever side it may be, an advantage with respect to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; yet I cannot help but deplore the fact that among the entire list of 15 committees the majority conference decided there should be a disproportionate ratio on the Appropriations Committee, the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. It seems to me that other committees might have been selected to take care of all the majority Members without what to me and to some of the other Senators on this side appears to be an unfair distribution on these three important committees of the Senate. I realize that we have no authority to change the situation, but I wanted to call attention to the fact that in the selection of these committees to be given the preference I speak of, there is an appearance—it may be a surface indication, but there is an appearance—that three of the most important committees have been selected on which to give the majority a larger membership than they are really entitled to under a fair consideration of committee division.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to say a very brief word in reply to only one of the comments made by the Senator from Kentucky. I appreciate that it has been true, as he said, that the representatives of the two sides have usually met and agreed upon a ratio, and have applied that ratio in the apportionment of committee places as between the two parties, and we have adhered to that ratio, except in special and particular circumstances. I would not want the Senator from Kentucky to think, I would not want any Member of the minority party to think that in such part as I had in working out these assignments I had gone ahead in ruthless disregard of past precedents or in disregard of whatever might be fair so far as the representation of the two parties on the committees of the Senate is concerned.

It is true that while I was chairman of the committee on committees I did much spadework, as it might be called, in making up the assignments to these committees, and although I did not sit down with the Senator from Kentucky and agree upon a ratio, I had put into the hands of a representative of the minority a complete proposed breakdown as suggested by the majority party. That was in the hands of a representative of the minority, and I thought a designated representative in whom both sides had complete confidence. It must have been put in the hands of that representative at least a month before the final working out of this apportionment.

I repeat I do not want anyone on the minority side to think I did not make an effort to confer with the minority or with their representatives, and to work out what seemed fair under the limitations of the statute under which we were operating.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to add that a few years ago, when the Democratic majority was composed of 75 Members, and the Republicans had only 17 Members in the Senate, the former minority leader, Mr. McNary, and I, representing our two sides, always conferred in advance before there was any ratio settlement, so that there would be no complaint that both sides had not been consulted. It was perfectly easy to figure out the mathematical ratio. Since the Senator from Maine has been minority leader we have done the same thing. We have always conferred about this matter in the past.

I have no knowledge of what the Senator has just said, that about a month ago someone on the minority side was brought into the picture. I never knew anything about that. I think probably it is true that discussions were had with reference to this matter. I am not contending that we are entitled to any more memberships on committees than we are receiving, but I think it might have been possible for us to have urged upon the majority, if we had been given that opportunity in time, that some other committees, in one or two cases, be chosen for the disproportionate representation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what I do not like is the implication that we have been in any way unfair or partisan in this matter. Under the statute as it now exists there is no choice as to the ultimate result in the membership of the committees. That is to say there are, as I see it, 11 committees on which the membership is 7 to 6, as between the Republicans and Democrats, 3 committees on which the membership is 8 to 5, and 1 committee on which the membership is 12 to 9. Or, to put it in another way, on 11 of the 15 committees we have a majority of only 1 member; on the other 4 committees we must have a majority of 3 members. That is the only possible way to comply with the La Follette-Monroney Act. The only question is whether on any of those four committees there should be a majority of three instead of a majority of one. I respectfully submit that that question can only be determined by the majority and should be determined by the majority.

It is not true either in the House or the Senate when the membership of the two parties has been very close that we have always followed a percentage agreement. In the House there have been frequent occasions when the majority party has placed on the main committees a sufficient number of members to give the majority a clear control. There are many reasons why that is needed. I think it rather unfortunate that by reason of the fact that the committees add up to an odd number, 15, we cannot have a majority of 2 on each. That probably would have been a fairer distribution. But, as a matter of fact, in 1917, when in the Senate there were 53 Democrats and 42 Republicans, which is about the closest division of membership we have ever had, the Democrats placed 12 of their Members on the Appropriations Committee, while the Republicans had only 8. In other words, the Democrats claimed a 60 percent representation on the committee, although the Democratic representation in the Senate itself was less than 60 percent.

So, also in 1919, when the Republicans had a majority of only one in the Senate, they maintained a majority of two Members on the Appropriations Committee, two on the Committee on the Judiciary, three on the Committee on Foreign Relations Committee, and three on the Committee on Finance.

There are many reasons why, when a party has the responsibility for a program, it is inconvenient and dangerous to have a majority of only one Member on a committee. A Senator may be sick. He may be unable for other reasons to attend committee meetings. There may be many reasons why Senators may have a legitimate and conscientious difference of opinion with Members of their own party upon committees. There are many reasons why, if we are to control the Senate, we need more than a majority of one on committees. I think we have been perfectly reasonable, and I cannot see why any party in the majority, under the circumstances of the particular law, should not choose the four most important committees on which to have a majority of three, in order that it might have clear control of those committees under all circumstances. I think that is perfectly legitimate legislative procedure. I feel perfectly confident that the Democrats would have done the same thing under the circumstances. I do not believe it can be truthfully said that we have been in any way unfair.

Heretofore the apportionment has been entirely a matter of agreement. Under the new law the apportionment is fixed. There is no alternative to having four committees with disproportionate representation, and it seems to me that we must reasonably ask that we have the privilege of selecting the four committees.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a table showing the assignments on the more important committees since 1917, and the ratio of representation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Date membership to standing committees named	Committee	Republicans	Democrats	Senate membership
Mar. 12, 1917	Finance	7	10	42 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	7	10	53 Democrats.
	Judiciary	8	10	1 other party.
	Appropriations	8	12	
May 28, 1919	Finance	10	7	48 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	10	7	47 Democrats.
	Judiciary	10	8	1 other party.
	Appropriations	11	9	
	Attempts made in Senate by motions and amendments to change the ratio between Republicans and Democrats were defeated.			
May 27, 1920	A resolution was agreed to in the Senate, submitted by Mr. Knox, chairman of the Rules Committee, and agreed to after its being reported from the Rules Committee, changing the numbers in the membership of the standing committees for the beginning of the 67th Cong., for example, Finance, 15; Foreign Relations, 15; Judiciary, 15; Appropriations, 15.			
Apr. 13, 1921	At the beginning of the 67th Cong., Mr. Brandegee submitted a resolution which changed the numbers in the membership of the standing committees as fixed by the resolution agreed to May 27, 1920. Attempts were made in the Senate to change this resolution by motions and amendments, but these were defeated. The numbers for the following committees were fixed in the resolution as agreed to by the Senate: Finance, 16; Foreign Relations, 16; Judiciary, 16; Appropriations, 16. Assignments were then made in this ratio:			
	Finance	10	6	59 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	10	6	37 Democrats.
	Judiciary	10	6	
	Appropriations	10	6	

Date membership to standing committees named	Committee	Republicans	Democrats	Senate membership
Mar. 9, 1933	Finance	7	13	36 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	[2]9	(2)	59 Democrats.
	Judiciary	7	(3)	1 other party.
	Appropriations	9	14	
Jan. 7, 1935	Finance	6	15	25 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	[1]7	(4)	69 Democrats.
	Judiciary	5	(5)	2 other parties.
	Appropriations	8	16	
Jan. 8, 1937	Finance	5	(4)	17 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	[1]7	16	75 Democrats.
	Judiciary	4	14	4 other parties.
	Appropriations	5	19	
Jan. 10, 1939	Finance	6	15	23 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	[1]7	16	69 Democrats.
	Judiciary	5	13	4 other parties.
	Appropriations	7	17	
Jan. 21, 1941	Finance	7	14	28 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	[6]7	16	66 Democrats.
	Judiciary	6	12	2 other parties.
	Appropriations	7	16	
Jan. 14, 1943	Finance	9	12	37 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	8	15	58 Democrats.
	Judiciary	7	11	1 other party.
	Appropriations	9	16	
Jan. 10, 1945	Finance	9	12	39 Republicans.
	Foreign Relations	9	14	56 Democrats.
	Judiciary	7	11	1 other party.
	Appropriations	9	16	

Mr. La Follette, Jr., first appointed to the Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations on Jan. 7, 1935, was carried in the list of Republican assignments through and including the list of Jan. 10, 1945.

[1] Mr. Shipstead included.
[2] 13 and 1 vacancy
[3] 10 and 1 vacancy.
[4] 15 and 1 vacancy.
[5] 11 and 2 vacancies.
[6] Mr. Shipstead from this time on was included in the Republican assignments and not separately as Farm-Labor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, there is a slight correction to be made in the minority representation on two of the committees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. On further investigation I do not believe it can be corrected. I should like to suggest to the minority leader that we defer the selection of our places on the committees until this matter can be cleared up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not like to defer the election of all minority Members until a new situation arising between two Senators can be cleared up.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make an explanation. There is no argument between the two Senators. It seems to me that there has been a mistake on the part of the committee. I expressly requested that I remain on the Committee on Public Lands, on which I already have a high seniority position. I also wish to remain on the Labor Committee. I expressly asked to be relieved from service on the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the understanding that I was to have assignments on the two committees which I have named, to which I am entitled by reason of my seniority. There is no question between the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself on this matter, so far as the Committee on Public Lands is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the situation which has arisen since the steering committee made these selections, in the hope that we may iron out the difficulty during the afternoon, I am compelled to withdraw the minority list. I do not know whether that should be done with respect to all committees, but, inasmuch as some change may be required, I ask that the minority list be temporarily withdrawn.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that that may be done without interfering with the adoption of the majority report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to interfere with that part of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky withdraws the minority list. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. Without objection, the language of the resolution will be amended to indicate that the list represents the majority membership, and not the full membership of the committees. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, with the resolving clause reading as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority members of the standing committees of the Senate for the Eightieth Congress.

ORDER OF BUSINESS IN MORNING HOUR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to make a statement regarding the order of business in the morning hour.

A new Congress is starting. We are all familiar with the embarrassment and difficulties which have arisen in years past in connection with interruptions to the orderly process of the morning hour. The orderly procedure during the morning hour is disturbed when Senators disregard the order in which business is scheduled under the rules, and when the morning hour is interrupted by speeches which are not in order at that time under the rules.

The matter is largely in the hands of Senators themselves. The Chair certainly has no disposition to be technical in interrupting Senators who may claim attention during the morning hour; but the Chair asks, in the spirit of cooperation, that the Senate undertake to meet an objective which the Chair is certain is very clearly advisable in the opinion of those of us who have been Members of the Senate for some time. That objective is that the morning hour be conducted with regularity and without interruption.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Chair for that announcement in advance. As the Chair and other Senators know, for years I have sought to have the rules pertaining to the morning hour observed meticulously. I have been one of those—and still am—who contend that it is the duty of the Chair to enforce the rule, whether or not any Senator makes a point of order that the rule is being violated. In my judgment that is especially true in conducting business in the morning hour. The Chair has before him the order of procedure. It is sometimes embarrassing, and has frequently been embarrassing to me, to object to speeches being made during the morning hour. In my capacity as majority leader during the past several years I have frequently called attention to the rule and have asked the cooperation of Senators; but I still believe that it is the primary duty of the Chair to enforce the rule. The Chair can do so without embarrassment. I hope Senators will cooperate with the Chair. I commend the Chair for the very wise announcement which he has made before we again get into the habit of violating the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to express my complete approval of the statement made by the Chair, and my desire and intention to cooperate with the Chair in such ways as I can in the effort he is making.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to submit an amendment to the rules of the Senate relating to——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will temporarily subside until we reach that order of business, we can proceed in the spirit of the colloquy which has just occurred.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I believe that the announcement just made by the Chair answers the question which I was about to propound. I had been seeking recognition, thinking that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] was the question about to be put. I wished to make a few remarks on that resolution, but the Chair is proceeding with the morning hour, and I shall defer my remarks.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Usually during the morning hour speeches and other matters are offered for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD. At what point in the morning hour should such requests be made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is nothing in the rules on the subject. It is entirely a matter of unanimous consent. As a matter of procedure, the Chair would prefer to consider such requests under the head of petitions and memorials.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, that is the first order of business following matters laid down by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a series of bills, but before sending them to the desk I wish to make a few brief comments on several of them. First, permit me to say that I think the President in his message today demonstrated very clearly that he can rise above partisan politics and act on behalf of the interests of the country as he sees those interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Would the Senator be willing to submit his bills and be recognized to make a statement at the conclusion of the morning hour?

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask, Mr. President, if it is proper for me to make brief explanatory remarks at the time I introduce these bills because I prefer to do it that way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that a brief explanatory remark is within the spirit of the rule which we are trying to follow.

Mr. MORSE. Then, suppose that the junior Senator from Oregon defer introducing his bills until we finish with the morning hour and then when I am recognized I can take whatever time I need to comment upon my bills. I feel that a few comments are necessary by way of explanation of several of my bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA ELECTION CONTEST

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Tom Sweeney, contesting the right of Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE to a seat in the Senate of the United States because of alleged errors, irregularities, illegalities, and fraud in the general election in West Virginia on November 5, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATOR FROM MARYLAND ELECTION CONTEST

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of D. John Markey, of Walkersville, Md., contesting the right of Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR to a seat in the Senate because of alleged errors and irregularities in the general election on November 5, 1946, in Maryland, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA ELECTION CONTEST

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Lester S. Parsons, contesting the right of Hon. HARRY F. BYRD to a seat in the Senate from the State of Virginia for the term beginning January 3, 1947, based on a provision in the constitution of the State of Virginia requiring the laying of a poll tax against its citizens, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, for the period ended September 30, 1946, with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

FURTHERANCE OF DEMOCRACY IN ITALIAN PEACE TERMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Panama, expressing its aspiration that Italy be granted generous peace terms that will strengthen its democratic form of government, with accompanying papers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting copies of resolutions adopted by the Provincial Board of Bulacan, P. I., and the Provincial Board of Davao, P. I., respectively, expressing gratitude for the grant of independence to the Philippines, with accompanying papers; ordered to lie on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1945, with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Finance.

PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized report of transactions for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund, for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TAKING OF TRIAL PIECES OF COINS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to take of trial pieces of coins, to authorize a decrease in the number of silver coins required by statute to be selected for trial (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

USE OF COAST GUARD RADIO STATIONS FOR COMMERCIAL MESSAGES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the use of Coast Guard radio stations for commercial messages (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STANDARD OF INGOTS AND WEIGHT OF SILVER COINS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RELIEF OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS OF CERTAIN LIABILITY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of War, as president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

TRANSPORTATION OF WAR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation to and from their places of employment of personnel attached to or employed by the War Department, including personnel employed by private plants engaged in manufacture of war material, necessary to the effective prosecution of the war, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to said act (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 190 aliens whose deportation was suspended for more than 6 months by the

Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ON CERTAIN CERTIFICATES INCIDENT TO THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Two letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating that no certificates were issued or revoked but that one revocation of a certificate was amended by the Administrator of the Civilian Production Administration during the period May 1 to August 31, 1946, and a report covering the period September 1 to December 31, 1946, respectively, as to the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, requisite to the prosecution of the war by any person or persons for which no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON USE OF PENALTY MAIL PRIVILEGE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of the penalty mail privilege for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, MAIL CARRYING AND HANDLING

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the cost of carrying and handling the several classes of mail matter and of performing the special services for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

TRAVEL EXPENSES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND POSTAL SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the proposed transfer to the fish and reptile department of the Milwaukee, Wis., Public Museum of a naval vessel suitable in collecting specimens in the Gulf of Mexico (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE BY AND TO NAVAL VESSELS

Two letters from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by the Secretary of the Navy during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, for damage caused by vessels of the Navy and the Coast Guard or for towage or salvage services, and a report on the settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of claims for damage caused to naval vessels during the same fiscal year, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TRANSPORTATION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation to and from their places of employment of personnel attached to or employed by Naval Establishments and Navy contractors necessary to the effective prosecution of the war for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy on duty involving flying, by rank and age groups, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6 months ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing credits, disbursements, and the balances on hand in the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

LAWS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Five letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Legislative Assembly, Virgin Islands, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix and Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative statement of financial condition of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as of June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

MALCOMB G. DICKEY

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mr. Malcomb G. Dickey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the receipts and expenditures and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CLARENCE NORFLEET

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Clarence Norfleet (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the calendar year 1946 of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL-REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural-rehabilitation projects to June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Secretary of the Senate for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AUDIT REPORTS OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION, AND CARGOES, INC.

Two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, and a report on the audit of Cargoes, Inc., for the period January 1, 1944, to March 31, 1945, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a report on the audit of the financial transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, together with a copy of a statement of the acting manager of the said Corporation and a copy of the General Accounting Office comment thereon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the calendar year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL CEILINGS AND REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A communication from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his determinations of personnel ceilings for the various departments and agencies of the Government for the quarter ended September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

Estimates of personnel requirements, transmitted, pursuant to law, by the United States Civil Service Commission and the National Mediation Board, respectively, for the quarter ending March 31, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WHOLESALE BAKING INDUSTRY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of studies by the Commission on the Wholesale Baking Industry, Part II, Costs, Prices, and Profits (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ELECTRIC POWER CAPACITY AND PRODUCTION

Two letters from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of studies of the Commission on Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants, 1945, and Industrial Electric Power in the United States, 1939–46, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Agency for the calendar year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JAMES E. CULBRETH

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of James E. Culbreth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of surplus property, for the quarter ended September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS CHEMICAL PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Vice Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a fourth supplemental report on the disposal of surplus chemical plants and facilities, relating to synthetic ammonia plants (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that agency, for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

A letter from the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the operations of that agency for the quarter ended September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DEFERRED FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS

Two letters from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of registrants deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, on July 1, 1946, and on October 1, 1946, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MERCHANT SHIP SALES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the said Commission's activities and transactions for the period July 1 to September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Director of the Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that agency for the quarter ended September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the activities of that agency for the quarter ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

APRIL AND MAY REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Two letters from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the activities and expenditures of that corporation for the months of April and May 1946, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON SMALL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Two letters from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on that Corporation's small business activities for the periods June 1 to July 31, 1946, and August 1 to September 30, 1946, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND OIL COMPANIES IN OPERATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of agreements between the Navy Department and various oil companies for development and operation of lands of the United States and sale and purchase of petroleum produced for the Navy's account from unit operation, within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, since January 7, 1946, under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1938, as amended by the act of June 17, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CERTAIN WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment, made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, including the findings of the Commission with respect to the administration of the program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the said Court for the year ended November 30, 1946, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

W. J. KING v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 152, agreed to May 20, 1943, and section 151 of the Judicial Code, a certified copy of the findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion rendered by the said Court in the case of *W. J. King* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary Treasurer of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth annual report of that Commission for the year ended December 1, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FINANCES OF AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of that organization covering the period January 1 to October 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE, HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission's activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its proceedings and financial and statistical data of the several public utilities, for the year ended December 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON HEALTH AND EDUCATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Senator PEPPER, transmitting two copies of his final report as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Education, dated July 31, 1946, to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Seventy-ninth Congress, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1946, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

SEPTEMBER 3, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of July 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen, 1434 Saratoga Avenue NE.; District of Columbia government; annual salary, $3,970.

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Chairman.*

SEPTEMBER 3, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen, 1434 Saratoga Avenue NE.; District of Columbia government; annual salary, $3,970.

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Chairman.*

—

OCTOBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen, 1434 Saratoga Avenue NE.; District of Columbia government; annual salary, $3,970.

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Chairman.*

—

NOVEMBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen, 1434 Saratoga Avenue NE.; District of Columbia government; annual salary, $3,970.

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Chairman.*

—

DECEMBER 2, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen, 1434 Saratoga Avenue NE.; District of Columbia government; annual salary, $3,970.

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
August 3, 1946.

Mr. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: I transmit herewith the list of employees of the Senate Small Business Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. The Senate Small Business Committee, however, is reimbursing the agencies who have loaned these employees.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

AUGUST 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of July 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes, 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department; annual salary, $8,179.50.

Stella J. Groeper, 1127 Branch Avenue SE.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer, 2515 Wisconsin Avenue, NW.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $3,899.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

SEPTEMBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes, 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department; annual salary, $8,179.50.

Stella J. Groeper, 1127 Branch Avenue SE.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer, 2515 Wisconsin Avenue, NW.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $3,899.

Thomas E. Street, 2736 Porter Street NW.; Agriculture Department (July 8 to Aug. 3); annual salary, $5,905.20.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
October 1, 1946.

Hon. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: I transmit herewith the list of employees of the Senate Small Business Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. The Senate Small Business Committee, however, is reimbursing the agencies who have loaned these employees.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

OCTOBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes, 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department; annual salary, $8,179.50.

Stella J. Groeper, 1127 Branch Avenue SE.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer, 2515 Wisconsin Avenue, NW.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $3,899.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
November 5, 1946.

Mr. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: I transmit herewith the list of employees of the Senate Small Business Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. The Senate Small Business Committee, however, is reimbursing the agencies who have loaned these employees.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

NOVEMBER 4, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes, 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department; annual salary, $9,975.

Stella J. Groeper, 1127 Branch Avenue SE.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer, 2515 Wisconsin Avenue, NW.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $3,899.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
December 3, 1946.

Mr. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: I transmit herewith the list of employees of the Senate Small Business Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. The Senate Small Business Committee, however, is reimbursing the agencies who have loaned these employees.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

DECEMBER 2, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes, 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department; annual salary, $9,975.

Stella J. Groeper, 1127 Branch Avenue SE.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer, 2515 Wisconsin Avenue, NW.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $3,899.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
January 2, 1947.

Mr. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: I transmit herewith the list of employees of the Senate Small Business Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. The Senate Small Business Committee, however, is reimbursing the agencies who have loaned these employees.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

—

JANUARY 2, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes, 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department; annual salary, $9,975.

Stella J. Groeper, 1127 Branch Avenue SE.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer, 2515 Wisconsin Avenue, NW.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; annual salary, $3,899.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE

SEPTEMBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter F. Connell, 4634 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

Frank D. Byrne, 510 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $7,341.60.

Paul F. Morrison, 1205 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $5,403.60.

JAS. M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

—

OCTOBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter F. Connell, 4634 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

Frank D. Byrne, 510 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $7,341.60.

Paul F. Morrison, 1205 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $5,403.60.

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

—

NOVEMBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter F. Connell, 4634 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

Frank D. Byrne, 510 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $7,341.60.

Paul F. Morrison, 1205 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $5,403.60.

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

—

DECEMBER 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter F. Connell, 4634 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

Frank D. Byrne, 510 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $7,341.60.

Paul F. Morrison, 1205 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $5,403.60.

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
LANDS AND SURVEYS,
August 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of July, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum).

CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman.
STEWART A. HATCH,
Clerk.

—

AUGUST 1, 1946.

To: Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From: Senator PAT MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee to Investigate Administration and Use of Public Lands.

The following persons have been assigned by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to assist with the work of the above-named subcommittee:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12; basic salary, $5,000 per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF–5, basic salary, $2,000 per annum.

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
LANDS AND SURVEYS,
October 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the months of August and September, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum).

CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman.
STEWART A. HATCH,
Clerk.

—

OCTOBER 1, 1946.

To: Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From: Senator PAT MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee on the Administration and Use of Public Lands.

The following persons have been assigned by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to assist with the work of the above-named subcommittee:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12; basic salary, $5,000 per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF–5; basic salary, $2,000 per annum.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the inundation of State Highways 77 and 192 by the waters impounded by Prado Dam in Riverside County, Calif., and remedial legislation in connection with this and similar situations

"Whereas State Highway Route 77 comprises the inland route between the cities of Los Angeles and San Diego via Pomona and Temecula; and

"Whereas State Highway Route 192 runs from State Highway Route 77 to Upland in San Bernardino County and connects the State highway system within said county with said inland route between Los Angeles and San Diego; and

"Whereas the United States of America, acting through the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, has caused to be constructed a flood-control project known as the Prado Dam in the Santa Ana River; and

"Whereas the operation of Prado flood control project subjects portions of State highways 77 and 192 lying near the juncture thereof, in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, to periodic inundation and renders such portions unusable for considerable periods at a time and destroys their value and usability as a part of the State highway system and causes great inconvenience to many thousands of people residing in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange Counties, and other adjacent areas in the State of California; and

"Whereas pursuant to State law requiring the State department of public works to maintain any traversable route between the termini of, and approximately on, any route included in the State highway system, said department took over the roads in question from Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, respectively, in 1931 and 1933, and said roads have at all times since been under the full possession and control of said department as State highways and at State expense; and

"Whereas the legislature by section 24 of the Streets and Highways Code has defined "State highway" to be any highway that is maintained as a State highway pursuant to legislative authorization and has since the year 1925 considered, dealt with, and appropriated funds for the maintenance of such traversable highways as State highways; and

"Whereas the District Court of the United States, Southern District of California, Central Division, has rendered a decision affecting said highways, which decision appears to have the effect on technical grounds of relieving the United States of its obligation to relocate said highways or to reimburse the State of California for the relocation thereof; and

"Whereas said highways, routes 77 and 192, within said Prado flood-control project, have, in fact, been treated as State highways, maintained as such, and considered as such by all parties concerned, including the State of California and said counties and Federal engineers; and

"Whereas unless the United States assumes its obligation in the premises, the State of California is faced with an expenditure that may exceed a million dollars for relocation of said highways which have been rendered unusable by the construction of said Prado Dam by the United States, which expenditure, as a matter of policy and of justice, the State of California should not be called upon to bear, particularly in view of the fact that the

Federal flood-control policy contemplates and the law provides that the United States shall bear all of the cost of the lands, easements, flowage rights, and highway, railway, and utility relocation involved in the construction of such a flood-control project (sec. 701c–1, title 33, U. S. Code); and

"Whereas the United States of America should be far above any action which even remotely resembles an attempt to avoid on technical grounds an obligation to one of its constituent States to save it harmless from any damage caused to its highways by reason of flood-control works under a statute which contemplates that the entire expense and burden shall be borne by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary:

"1. To provide for the relocation of those portions of State highways 77 and 192 of the State of California which are within said Prado flood-control basin below the elevation of said Prado Dam in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, Calif., or to provide for the reimbursement of the State of California for the cost of such relocation; and

"2. To provide specifically by law that, whenever, because of the construction of works for flood control, it becomes necessary to relocate a road or highway the United States will relocate said road or highway or will reimburse the State or local agency for such relocation in accordance with the express policy heretofore enunciated by Congress in the Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, and June 28, 1938; and

"3. That such legislation further provide that proper and adequate arrangements for such relocation of public highways be made by the United States prior to commencement of construction of any such flood-control works; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from California; and be it further

"Resolved, That nothing in this resolution contained shall be deemed to have altered the meaning or effect of any statute of the State of California relating to highways, and any and all such statutes shall be deemed to have the same meaning and effect as they had prior to the adoption of this resolution."

A petition of sundry citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation empowering the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to forbid the allotment of all grains and sugar to breweries and distilleries during the acute food shortage throughout the world; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Nebraska Engineering Society, requesting that proper public officials make it possible for educational institutions to obtain needed equipment, apparatus, and tools at the cost of packing and shipping; (b) to establish a schedule of sales so that at least 30 days may lapse between the time of notification and date of sale, and (c) to make it possible to offer lots of materials of a suitable size for purchase on a nonspeculative basis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent inflation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the South Bend, Ind., Chapter No. 100, Supreme Lodge, Order of Ahepa, relating to the return of Northern Epirus to Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mrs. Ophelia Thomas Bell, of Chicago, Ill., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the relief of the Ex-Soldiers Investment Industrial Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, president, veterans of the Philippine Revolution, Manila, P. I., relating to the so-called Bell bill concerning the economic structure of the Philippines; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the members of the American Veterans of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., requesting that immediate steps be taken to process the families and relatives of American soldiers of Japanese ancestry and families and relatives of their friends and acquaintances residing in the Territory of Hawaii and on the continental United States and make it possible for them to return to America to join their families and relatives residing in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Emergency Antilynch Committee, Mount Vernon, N. Y., praying for the enactment of antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of San Francisco (Calif.) praying for the enactment of legislation further restricting immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of Rev. William S. Smith and sundry other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A petition from the teachers of the Salinas (P. R.) high school, praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Mariano Villaronga to be Commissioner of Education for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

The memorial of L. L. Limber, of Franklin (Pa.) remonstrating against portal-to-portal pay to industrial workers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Southern Governors' Conference, at Miami, Fla., favoring immediate hospitalization for Negro veterans in the 13 Southern States requiring such facilities for Negro patients, and that the Veterans' Administration consider such hospital as the Oklahoma Charity Hospital, which can be obtained from Oklahoma; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the directors and commissioners of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Southern Governors' Conference at Miami, Fla., requesting the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to direct the Veterans' Administration Committee on Waivers to cancel all claims for the refund of overpayment subsistence allowance made to World War II veterans taking training under Public Laws 346 and 679 whose annual salaries for the period August 1, 1946–December 1, 1946, were not in excess of $3,000, exclusive of subsistence allowance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from Josefina Rincon Marrero, Secretary of the Capital, San Juan (P. R.), transmitting a resolution adopted by the Administrative Board of San Juan (P. R.), expressing appreciation of the government and the people of Puerto Rico on the appointment of Jesús T. Piñero as Governor of Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

SENATOR FROM MISSISSIPPI—MEMORIAL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from Mrs. Vera Forbes, president of the Oak Leaf Art and Charity Club, of Topeka, Kans., asking that Senator-elect BILBO be barred from admission to the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *December 27, 1946.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Oak Leaf Art and Charity Club, of Topeka, Kans., affiliated with the National Association of Colored Women's Club, is asking your support and urging you to vote to oust Senator BILBO.

Mrs. VERA FORBES,
President.

OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL LICENSE FOR SALE OF LIQUOR IN DRY STATES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Men's Brotherhood of the First Friends Church, of Emporia, Kans., urging me to oppose the issuing of Federal licenses to sell liquor in dry States. I agree with the First Friends Church that they are justified in protesting against the Government's licensing the sale of liquor in a State like Kansas, which has for years had a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPORIA, KANS., *December 24, 1946.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: At a meeting of the Men's Brotherhood of the First Friends Church, of Emporia, Kans., held this month, it was decided to send you the following request:

That you use your influence against issuing of Federal license to sell any liquor in dry States. It was the opinion of all present that this practice was unfair to us who want our State to be dry.

Thanking you for your consideration of this important matter, we are,

Yours very truly,

MEN'S BROTHERHOOD OF THE FIRST FRIENDS CHURCH, OF EMPORIA, KANS.,
By GERALD W. JONES, *Secretary.*

A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "A Republican Program" delivered by him on January 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER DEDICATING A PLAQUE IN MEMORY OF JOSEPH MEDILL PATTERSON

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before members of the New York Daily News Chapel of Typographical Union No. 6, on September 9, 1946, dedicating a plaque to the memory of the late Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT WILSON'S PROPHECY—ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Wilson's Prophecy Will Be Realized," delivered by Hon. Josephus Daniels, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unan-

imous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2. A bill to provide for the use of 10 percent of the receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3. A bill to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 4. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

S. 5. A bill to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United States;

S. 6. A bill to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, business and distribution, and transportation; and

S. 7. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 8. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; and

S. 9. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 10. A bill providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations, trade associations, and labor organizations engaged in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 11. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 12. A bill to provide for Senate ratification of foreign-trade agreements; and

S. 13. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 14. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 15. A bill to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath;

S. 16. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts;

S. 17. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each district court of the United States, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes;

S. 18. A bill to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts, and for other purposes;

S. 19. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

S. 20. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases;

S. 21. A bill to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States;

S. 22. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926;

S. 23. A bill to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes;

S. 24. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys;

S. 25. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters;

S. 26. A bill to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape; and

S. 27. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 28. A bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the director and associate director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 29. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 30. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act;

S. 32. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases", approved June 25, 1910, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 33. A bill relating to the management and administration of national forest grazing lands;

S. 34. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934, as amended;

S. 35. A bill to establish a National Natural Resources Policy; to create a Natural Resources Council; to provide for a Natural Resources Inventory; and for other purposes;

S. 36. A bill to cancel authority under the act of June 23, 1936, for the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.;

S. 37. A bill to repeal an act which withdrew certain public lands of the United States in the State of California from settlement; and

S. 38. A bill to revoke certain orders withdrawing and reserving public lands in the State of Utah; and

S. 39. A bill authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to make payment to school districts as compensation for education of children of Federal employees residing on federally owned property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 40. A bill to provide for the payment of a lump sum to the State of Nevada in lieu of taxes at Davis Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 41. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 42. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 43. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 44. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; and

S. 45. A bill to authorize a payment to the widow and minor children of the late Commander Howard W. Gilmore, United States Navy, as a token of the appreciation of the people of the United States for his heroic sacrifice of his life; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 46. A bill to supplement the national transportation policy and to aid in achieving such policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 47. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 48. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 49. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 50. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 51. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government;

S. 52. A bill relating to the dismissal of indictments, information, or complaints in criminal cases by the Attorney General or the United States attorney; and

S. 53. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 54. A bill relating to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 55. A bill to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to improve the procedures of collective bargaining, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 56. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 57. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 58. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 59. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 60. A bill to rescind any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation

Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 61. A bill to require that revenues of the United States be covered into the Treasury, that the expenditures of Government agencies be made only from funds appropriated by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 62. A bill to terminate the Civilian Production Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 63. A bill to terminate the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 64. A bill granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 65. A bill relating to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 66. A bill to make the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws inapplicable to lands in the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 67. A bill to provide for the erection and maintenance on the island of Guam of a memorial to the members of the American armed forces who were killed in the Pacific area during World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 68. A bill to reimburse farmers for loss of bonus on sale of 1945 crops; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Benolken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 70, to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S 71. A bill to prohibit the closed shop in industries affecting commerce; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced S. 72, to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE introduced S. 73, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE also introduced S. 74, to amend title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the naturalization of persons who have served with the armed forces of the United States in overseas theaters, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE also introduced S. 75, to amend the definition of vessels of the United States and officers so as to include within the term "officers" chief radiotelegraph operator and assistant radiotelegraph operator, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE also introduced S. 76, to provide continuation of workmen's compensation in certain cases subject to the act of February 15, 1934, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE also introduced S. 77, to provide eligibility for retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, in the case of certain employees of the United States Employment Service with less than 5 years of service as Federal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE also introduced S. 78, to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Two Mile Creek, Oreg., for the purpose of determining what action should be taken to control floods of such creek and to make it adequately drain the area through which it flows, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees; ordered to lie on the table.

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced S. J. Res. 6, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to refrain from canceling applications for potassium or magnesium permits or leases in the State of Utah now pending before the Department of Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to provide for the incorporation and registration of labor organizations and to impose certain responsibilities upon such organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MORSE introduced S. J. Res. 9, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the succession to the Presidency, and the election of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and the time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain as to the Presidential election and succession. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so, whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where, after election, the President-elect or Vice President-elect, or both, die, decline to serve, or fail to qualify.

(5) How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined.

(6) Whether or not provision should be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, including provision for selecting an individual to execute such office in cases where by reason of removal, death, resignation, or inability there is no individual upon whom the powers and duties of such office would otherwise automatically devolve.

(7) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President.

(8) Whether or not there should be any limitation on the number of terms a person may serve as President.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, including drafts of legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than May 1, 1947, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other

assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Disbursements to pay the expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the administration of martial law in the Territory of Hawaii subsequent to December 7, 1941, including suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, peonage, involuntary servitude, other infringement of constitutional rights of civilians, and other abuses or alleged abuses in connection therewith.

Such committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy, both within the United States and abroad, and of the prisons, jails, and other places of incarceration or confinement of Army and Navy prisoners with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of the operation of such systems and places of incarceration or confinement; (2) the question of whether variations in such systems or in the administration and application thereof, in different areas or theaters of operations, with respect to review procedure or otherwise, constitutes or has constituted denial of due process or of equal protection of law in violation or derogation of the Constitution of the United States; (3) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (4) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (5) the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts martial are desirable and proper; and (6) any desirable improvements in or modifications of such court-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date not later than December 15, 1946, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], I submit a resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) submitted by Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. WILSON) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of 12 Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Eighteth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, is hereby terminated.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIF.

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21); which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the terms and conditions of contracts offered by the Department of the Interior for the disposition of the water resources of the Central Valley project of California, including, but not limited to, (a) the basis of the water rights claimed by said Department; (b) the character of the water rights offered by the Department to water users' organizations; (c) the control asserted or possessed by the Department with respect to both surface and underground waters; (d) the collection and application of taxes, assessments, and other revenues; (e) the provisions for limitation of acreage in single ownerships which may be served under said contracts; (f) the specific legal authority for said contracts and the several provisions thereof; (g) any other factors relating to the proper utilization and disposition of the water resources of the Central Valley project, and the policies of the Department of the Interior with reference thereto.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable concerning additional legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STUDY AND SURVEY OF THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WILSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Eightieth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to

take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deeems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILSON also submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, as agreed to October 8, 1940 (providing for study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as agreed to January 25, 1943, and continued by Senate Resolution 28, Seventy-ninth Congress, is hereby further continued in full force and effect during the Eightieth Congress.

SEC. 2. That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by Senate Resolution 28, Seventy-ninth Congress, is hereby fixed at $.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That subdivision 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

In the first sentence of said subdivision, after the words "If at anytime", insert a comma and the words "notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate,"; and, in the next line, strike out the words "pending measure" and in lieu thereof insert "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business".

In the third sentence of said subdivision, strike out the word "two-thirds" and insert in place thereof the word "majority"; and, in the same line, strike out the word "measure" and insert in lieu thereof the words "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business".

In the second line of the fourth sentence, strike out the words "pending measure" and in lieu thereof insert "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business", so that, as amended, subdivision 2 of rule XXII will read: "If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer shall be decided without debate."

INVESTIGATION OF CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEEAN

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 87, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to April 24, 1945 (providing for an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the disposal of the Government's interest in the Nashville Tennesseean), is hereby continued during the Eightieth Congress, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $7,500.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES O. ANDREWS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Charles O. Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY PURCHASED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HAWKES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury in cooperation with all agencies of the Federal Government concerned shall report to the Congress with respect to any real property (including property acquired for, or for use in connection with, fortifications, coast defenses, military camps, cantonments, proving grounds, airfields, training areas, training schools, bomb-testing areas, plants and manufacturing areas, research facilities and grounds, and all other related or similar activities) which has been or shall have been acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, by or on behalf of the United States for any purpose or purposes related to the present emergency since June 30, 1939.

The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to include in this report—

(1) The area and assessed valuation of all such real property and the improvements thereon at the time of acquisition by or on behalf of the United States;

(2) The tax classification of such property at the time of its acquisition by the United States;

(3) The present status of such property and the amount of such property intended to be permanently retained by or on behalf of the United States in a tax-exempt status;

(4) The amount of such property now idle, the amount of such property now being held in stand-by capacity, and the steps being taken to return such property now idle to taxable status or taxable ownership as soon as possible;

(5) The steps, if any, which have been taken or which are to be taken for the disposition of that portion of the property not intended to be permanently retained and for the return of such property to taxable ownership.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit this report to the Congress not later than July 1, 1947.

INVESTIGATION OF FIELD OF LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of the field of labor relations, including but not limited to—

(1) The administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to labor relations;

(2) Measures for improving relations between labor and management, for improving collective-bargaining procedures and practices, and for minimizing or eliminating work stoppages due to labor disputes;

(3) Measures to protect the public interest and welfare against the effects of work stoppages due to labor disputes in essential industries;

(4) Measures concerning the health and safety of employees engaged in industries that are essentially hazardous;

(5) The feasibility and desirability of a uniform voluntary system of welfare funds for the benefit of ill, disabled, or aged employees;

(6) The feasibility and desirability of guaranteed annual wage plans;

(7) The organization and administration of labor unions, with particular reference to the accounting for and control of union funds, the free election of union officers by the membership, and the degree to which union activities are controlled by and in accordance with the views of the membership;

(8) The effect upon labor relations of the concentration of power in the hands of particular individuals identified with management or labor;

(9) The methods and practices followed in establishing or determining collective-bargaining units and the desirability of changing such methods and practices; and

(10) Measures for bringing about and preserving equality in the bargaining positions of management and labor.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production

of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], I submit a resolution amending rule XXII of the Senate, relating to filibusters, which would change the present rule, which provides for a two-thirds majority, so as to require a majority of the full membership of the Senate, and which would also add the words "or motion" after the word "measure" in the provision relating to cloture.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended to read as follows:

"If at any time a motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure or motion is signed by 16 Senators, and Senator signing such motion shall upon a request for recognition be recognized by the Chair for the purpose of presenting such motion to the Senate, and when such motion is so presented to the Senate the presiding officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate, then said measure or motion shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further resolutions, morning business is closed; and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

ANTIMONOPOLY PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I feel that there are times when it is particularly desirable for a Senator to explain a bill upon its introduction. I take it that the Chair is now giving me an opportunity to make a brief explanation of two or three bills which I should like to introduce at this time.

First, I feel, in view of the President's very statesmanlike address, in which, according to my belief, at least, he rose above partisan politics to what he considered the welfare of the Nation, that the Republican majority in Congress should meet him on the same plane. I am confident that those of us in the Republican majority will do that very thing. Hence I think it is fitting that I introduce at this time a bill which I introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress and which I at that time labeled the antimonopoly bill of 1947. I think the President is to be particularly complimented for the blows he struck in his speech today against those elements in this country which, by means of concentration of economic and business power in the hands of a privileged few, are, in my judgment, seriously threatening the perpetuation of a private property economy in this country. I feel that controlling monopolies is clearly a nonpartisan issue and one in which I hope the Republican and Democratic Parties will join together in the coming year to the end that we shall do something which will be really effective in checking monopolistic practices for the first time since the Clayton and Sherman Acts were passed.

As I said in a speech on the floor of the Senate when I introduced the bill last year, although both parties have paid lip service to every antitrust and antimonopoly drive, the record is perfectly clear that neither party in our history has really done anything very effective in preventing the serious monopolistic concentration of economic power and wealth which today threatens the free enterprise economy of America.

When I introduced my antimonopoly bill on July 26, 1946, I spoke at some length on the need for the bill. At this time I wish to read a few short excerpts from that speech as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 26, 1946:

Mr. President, the most neglected economic problem in American life today is the problem of monopoly and monopolistic practices. While the Federal Government has long been aware of the need for effective action on this problem, it has done little but sit idly by while monopoly has increased its power over American life and created a dire threat to the continuation of our private-property system. What little the Government has done in recent years to combat monopoly has usually been half-hearted, inconsistent, and ill-considered.

Yet the great majority of the American people have a deep-seated antipathy for monopoly and monopolistic practices. Businessmen in particular know that the only hope of the continued existence of our private-property system is the maintenance of competitive private enterprise. They know that further growth of monopoly power or monopolistic practices is the greatest threat to our present economic system. This viewpoint is shared by American agriculture, which has long been suffering the effects of the monopolistic practices of the railroads and the manufacturers of farm machinery. It is shared by American labor, which has too often been forced out on strike by monopolistic companies which are in such a strong economic position that they have little or nothing to lose by a prolonged period of inactivity.

In recent years the campaign platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties have outlined a strong position against monopoly. In 1936, for example, the Republican platform made the following statement:

"A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It menaces and, if continued, will utterly destroy constitutional government and the liberty of the citizen.

"We favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal laws against monopolies and trusts and their officials, and we demand the enactment of such additional legislation as is necessary to make it impossible for private monopoly to exist in the United States."

The Democratic platform statement set forth the following antimonopoly plank:

"Monopolies and the concentration of economic power, the creation of Republican rule and privilege, continue to be the master of the producer, the exploiter of the consumer, and the enemy of the independent operator. This is a problem challenging the unceasing effort of untrammeled public officials in every branch of the Government. We pledge vigorously and fearlessly to enforce the criminal and civil provisions of the existing antitrust laws, and to the extent that their effectiveness has been weakened by new corporate devices or judicial construction, we propose by law to restore their efficacy in stamping out monopolistic practices and the concentration of economic power."

Mr. President, one might think that with such apparent agreement between the two major parties, the path to effective action would have been short and easy, and that immediately following the 1936 election, a vigorous antimonopoly program would have been developed. After the election, however, practically all that happened was that a new committee was set up to study the problem—the Temporary National Economic Committee.

The hearings, reports, and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, under the brilliant leadership of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], represent a landmark in the history of congressional investigations. Nevertheless, the recommendations of the TNEC were ignored by the Congress. Two years of intensive work yielded 31 volumes of hearings and 43 monographs, but resulted in nothing but inaction on the part of the Congress in attempting to deal with the monopoly problem.

During the war, in the interests of expediting war production, Government turned to big business, and ignored for the most part the antitrust laws. As a result of receiving the bulk of the new war plants and of war contracts for both production and research, monopolistic enterprises emerged from the war stronger than ever before in the history of our country.

As soon as the war was over, the monopoly problem won official recognition in the first Presidential message to Congress on the state of the Union. In his message of January 14, 1946, President Truman told the Congress that we must have a coordinated over-all antimonopoly policy. The President stated that we must have such a policy—but he did not propose such a policy. To my knowledge, neither he nor any other official of the Administration has yet mapped out such a policy.

However, the Government's activities since the end of the war have had a very definite effect upon the concentration of economic power—the effect of accelerating the trend toward increased concentration. I am referring specifically to what has happened in the disposal of Government-owned war plants. For example, more than one-third of all Government war plants have been disposed of to 22 companies, all of which are among the largest in the United States. Two-thirds of all these plants have gone to a group of big companies who represent only four-tenths of 1 percent of all the manufacturing enterprises in the country.

On July 14, 1946, the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], presented to the Senate a report entitled "Economic Concentration and World War II." This report summarized all the available statistics on the growing concentration of economic power that took place during World War II. It pointed out that in 1939 firms with over 1,000 employees accounted for 36 percent of the total pay roll for all American trade and industry; by 1943 this figure had risen to 53 percent. It was pointed out that by the end of 1945 the rate of mergers and acquisitions, particularly in manufacturing industries, was higher than at any time in the previous decade and a half.

The report from which I have quoted was prepared for the Senate Small Business Committee by the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which has now been transferred to the Department of Commerce. It is interesting to note that in submitting this report the SWPC recommended no specific program for doing anything about the concentration of economic power.

Mr. President, we have had too much empty talk on this vital matter.

The time has come for action.

The time has come for all true believers in economic and political freedom to join together behind a specific legislative program designed to cope with the entire problem of monopoly and monopolistic practices.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a new measure entitled "The Antimonopoly Act of 1947." This measure represents the first comprehensive antimonopoly measure to be submitted to the Congress since the Sherman antitrust law was enacted in the last days of the nineteenth century.

Mr. President, I reintroduce this bill not only on behalf of myself but also on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. A reading of the bill will show that it covers in detail the points which the President made in the antimonopoly section of his address of today. In fact, the speech which I delivered on this bill in the Senate on July 26, 1946, discusses in detail the serious situation of monopolistic control of the economy of this country which the President so ably decried in his message today.

Hence I am very pleased to send to the desk for reintroduction the antimonopoly bill of 1947 as I proposed it in the last session of Congress. We intend to offer certain revisions of this bill from time to time as we make further study of this vital problem. However, we think it important that the proper committee proceed at this time on this bill.

The bill (S. 72) to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. YOUNG), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. MORSE. I also, Mr. President, introduce a bill which proposes to create an independent Federal mediation, conciliation, and arbitration tribunal. It will be found, as I explained to a conference of Republicans the other day, that it is very similar to title I of the Ball-Taft-Smith labor bill. It limits itself, however, to title I of that bill. It has this very important and, I think, vital difference from the Ball-Taft-Smith bill in that it proposes that any mediation, conciliation, and arbitration tribunal which may be set up by the Federal Government shall be independent of the Department of Labor. That principle of complete separation from the Department of Labor was contained in the substitute for the Case bill which some of us proposed at the last session of Congress. Incidentally, this proposal to make the Board independent of the Department of Labor received a majority vote in the Committee on Education and Labor. I think the record will show that at that time some of those who now favor the Ball-Taft-Smith bill voted with us for the establishment of an independent tribunal. I know of no change that has occurred since the introduction of the bill of last year that would now justify the setting up of such a tribunal within the Department of Labor. I do not want the Department of Labor to have even bookkeeping jurisdiction over such a Board. I am for a Federal mediation, conciliation, and arbitration tribunal. I hope we can reach a common ground of understanding on it. At least I hope we can eliminate the area of disagreement which now exists between and among some of us as to this very important labor reform. However, I wish to say that in my judgment there is no more reason for setting up such a tribunal within the Department of Labor than there is for setting it up within the Department of Commerce or any other agency of government. I think that it is very important that we make clear to the business interests of the country and to the public generally, as well as to labor, that if we are to make a fair approach to the peaceful settlement of labor disputes, we must have a tribunal in which all parties have complete confidence. Industry, labor, and the public wish to know that the tribunal which is to render the decisions and provide the mediation, conciliation, and arbitration services does not even have to labor under the suspicion that it is partisan in its point of view. I wish to point out again, as I did last year before the Committee on Education and Labor, that any such tribunal set up in the Department of Labor necessarily in the minds of many people, and I think rightly so, will be considered a partisan tribunal. Many people will look upon it as a child of that division of the executive branch of Government one duty of which is, as I see it, to be a partisan advocate of the best but selfish interests of labor. Hence I do not desire to vote for setting up of such a tribunal within the Department of Labor. I wish to see it independent of the Department of Labor in all respects. I wish to see it take on those quasi-judicial characteristics which I think are so essential if we are going to have the voluntary principles of collective bargaining, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration work effectively through such a tribunal.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think there have been some changes in the policies of the Department of Labor, since we last considered this situation or problem, which more than ever justify an independent mediation, arbitration, and conciliation tribunal. Therefore I hope that in the consideration of the Ball-Taft-Smith proposal and the one which I now offer, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will make an investigation into the operation and policies of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor as well as other divisions of the Department of Labor. I am very desirous of knowing first hand what some of the administrative and hiring policies of the Conciliation Service are. I wish to know something more about the actual record of that division than just to read a statistical report on what it claims it is accomplishing. I wish to know to what extent it is true that some fine public servants of unquestioned ability have been removed from the Conciliation Service staff in order that those responsible for the selection of personnel of that Service could put on the roll some of their personal selectees, many of whom formerly were on the staff of the War Labor Board. It has been alleged to me that some very able conciliators not protected by civil service have been displaced in the Conciliation Service by men who are in no way better qualified to do the work. It is charged that a group of career men taken from the War Labor Board have received favored treatment. I think that the matter needs to be gone into when we consider this whole question as to where and under what jurisdiction we shall place the work and the duties of any proposed conciliation, mediation, and arbitration tribunal such as is proposed in the Ball-Taft-Smith bill. I think that conciliators, even though they do not have civil-service status, should not be fired simply because the officials in the Department of Labor seem to have a preference for some of the staff members of the War Labor Board. I shall be glad to discuss this matter in more detail when it reaches the committee for consideration.

Let me make perfectly clear that not only do I have no opposition to the objective of title I of the Ball-Taft-Smith bill, save and except its provision that the tribunal shall be a part of the Department of Labor, but I shall again work on the committee for the establishment of a Federal tribunal which has assigned to it the duties and objectives of title I of the Ball-Taft-Smith bill.

The bill (S. 73) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I next introduce and send to the desk a bill in regard to the benefits to accrue to those who served this Government in the war, but who were not naturalized citizens at the time. It is a reintroduction of a previous bill.

The bill (S. 74) to amend title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the naturalization of persons who have served with the armed forces of the United States in overseas theaters, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RADIOTELEGRAPH OPERATORS IN THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MORSE. I also send to the desk and introduce a bill on interstate commerce.

The bill (S. 75) to amend the definition of vessels of the United States and officers so as to include within the term "officers" chief radiotelegraph operator and assistant radiotelegraph operator, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONTINUATION OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MORSE. I also send to the desk and introduce a bill to provide for the continuation of workmen's compensation in certain cases, subject to the act of February 15, 1934.

The bill (S. 76) to provide continuation of workmen's compensation in certain cases subject to the act of February 15, 1934, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MORSE. I also introduce and send to the desk a bill to provide eligibility for retirement under the Civil Service Act of May 29, 1930, in the case of certain employees of the United States Employment Service with less than 5 years of service as Federal employees.

The bill (S. 77) to provide eligibility for retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, in the case of certain employees of the United States Employment Service with less than 5 years of service as Federal employees, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF TWO MILE CREEK, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. I also introduce and send to the desk a bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Two Mile Creek, Oreg., for the purpose of determining what action should be taken to control floods on such creek.

The bill (S. 78) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Two Mile Creek, Oreg., for the purpose of determining what action should be taken to control floods of such creek and to make it adequately drain the area through which it flows, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERMS OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

Mr. MORSE. I also send to the desk and introduce a joint resolution which deals with an amendment to the Constitution. It is a reintroduction of a joint resolution which I introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States. In substance it limits any President to two terms, in whole or in part.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS BY SENATORS ON SOURCES OF INCOME

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also introduce and send to the desk two resolutions which I think are very important. They relate to a bill which I introduced for myself and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. Not only in the light of happenings while we were in session during the Seventy-ninth Congress, but also in light of happenings since the adjournment of that Congress, we owe to the people of the country the duty of giving serious consideration to these resolutions. I refer to my resolutions which would require that the members of the Senate file with the Secretary of the Senate a complete statement of their income and the sources of such income, because I think we need to adopt such a rule of the Senate in order to demonstrate to the people of the United States what I am satisfied is the fact, namely, that the overwhelming majority of the Members, practically without exception, do not engage in questionable financial transactions. Nevertheless from time to time there are exceptions in that some public officials do not always live up to their public trust. In any human institution we find exceptions and therefore I think we should surround the Senate and provide the people of the country with such a protection from misconduct on the part of Senators as I offer in these resolutions. We must all agree that those who do engage in questionable financial transactions disqualify themselves for service in the Senate. I think the record of such matters should be an open book. Hence I renew the measure which I introduced in the last session of Congress to provide for the requirement that our income and the sources of our income be filed with the Secretary of the Senate subject to public knowledge and information. I do not propose this as a discrimination against the wealthy. However, I think the public is entitled also to study and analyze our voting records against the background of our economic interests.

The resolution (S. Res. 31) submitted by Mr. MORSE was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate are hereby amended by adding the following new rule:

"RULE NO. XLI

"Every Member of the United States Senate shall, not later than 30 days following the date of agreement to this resolution, and on the 2d day of January of each year thereafter, file with the Secretary of the Senate a report containing a full and complete statement of—

"(1) The amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and

"(2) All dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year."

SEC. 2. As used in this resolution—

(1) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) submitted by Mr. MORSE was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That every Member of the United States Senate shall, not later than 30 days following the date of agreement to this resolution, and on the 2d day of January of each year thereafter, file with the Secretary of the Senate a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates, and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and

(2) all dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year.

SEC. 2. As used in this resolution—

(1) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEMS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MORSE. On behalf of myself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I submit a resolution to the effect that a special committee to be composed of seven Senators, four from the Committee on Armed Services and three from the Senate Judiciary Committee, shall carry out what I endeavored so strenuously during the Seventy-ninth Congress to have that Congress do, namely, conduct a thorough investigation into the courts-martial system of the Army and the Navy, including its penalties, its incarceration places, and its methods of penal treatment.

The resolution (S. Res. 34), submitted by Mr. MORSE for himself and Mr. YOUNG, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee to be composed of seven Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, four from the Committee on Armed Services and three from the Senate Judiciary Committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the courts-martial systems of the Army and Navy, and of the prisons, jails, and places of incarceration of Army and Navy prisoners with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of

the operation of such systems and places of incarceration; (2) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (3) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (4) the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts martial are desirable and proper; and (5) any desirable improvements in or modifications of courts-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

AMENDMENT OF RULE GIVING PRIORITY TO PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF CLOTURE MOTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], I submit a resolution which might be interpreted as a companion resolution to that previously offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] dealing with the filibuster practice of the Senate. However, my resolution differs in one important respect from his in that my resolution also seeks to amend and modify rule III of the Senate. I think this has to be done before we can ever have an effective antifilibuster rule in the Senate. I also propose to amend rule XXII of the Senate, in that I provide for a majority vote on the adoption of a cloture petition signed by 16 Members of the Senate, with the understanding that after the adoption of such a petition any Member of the Senate may be allowed 3 hours to discuss the issue pending before the Senate. Further he may be privileged to farm out any or all of his 3-hour allotment to other Senators. The important point is that my resolution does fix a terminal date for the ending of debate in the Senate, which is so essential if we are to guarantee majority rule at all times in the Senate of the United States.

The resolution (S. Res. 32), submitted by Mr. MORSE on behalf of himself and Mr. TAYLOR, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE III

"COMMENCEMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS

"1. The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, and any mistake made in the entries corrected. The reading of the Journal shall not be suspended unless by unanimous consent; and when any motion shall be made to amend or correct the same, it shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of, except that it shall be displaced by the action of the Presiding Officer in submitting to the Senate for an aye-and-nay vote any question under rule XXII. If the question submitted under rule XXII is decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, the motion to amend or correct the Journal shall remain displaced until the measure which becomes the unfinished business under rule XXII is disposed of.

"2. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn."

SEC. 2. That part of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture (as shown on p. 28 of the Senate Manual, 1945) is amended to read as follows:

"If at any time a motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is signed by 16 Senators, any Senator signing such motion shall upon a request for recognition be recognized by the Chair for the purpose of presenting such motion to the Senate, and when such motion is so presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter each Senator shall be entitled to speak in his own right on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same for an aggregate period of not more than 3 hours. Any Senator may yield to any other Senator the unexpired portion, or any part thereof, of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded, in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III, the reading of the Journal of the preceding day shall be dispensed with on days when the Senate is proceeding under the provisions of this paragraph.

"In any case in which a motion is filed under the provisions of this paragraph while a motion is pending under rule III to amend or correct the Journal of a preceding day, the term 'pending measure,' as used in the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, shall mean the measure which would be the pending measure if the Journal of all preceding days were approved."

TERMINATION OF PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I introduced a bill which I believe would end the portal-to-portal pay controversy. The title of the bill reads "To exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes."

It has become completely obvious in the last few weeks that it is absolutely urgent that the Congress promptly enact legislation which will preserve the very foundations of American industry by relieving it of the many billion dollars of portal-to-portal pay suits which have recently been filed. It is up to the Congress, I believe, definitively to indicate to the Supreme Court Congress' intent in this matter in order that the Court might find proper legal ground for reversing the stand which it has taken heretofore, which has resulted in the disastrous suits, amounting now to billions.

My bill is divided into three sections.

The first section is intended effectively to bar all pending so-called portal-to-portal cases which have been recently instituted in the courts, based upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the Mt. Clemens case.

Section 2 is self-explanatory. It provides simply that employers who, in good faith, find themselves liable under the act to the harsh penalties properly intended for malefactors, will hereafter be permitted a fairer deal by being relieved of liability for punitive damages.

The third section of the bill is intended to permit in proper cases the compromise and settlement out of court of wage claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act in amounts less than provided by the act. I believe that this is necessary in view of the 1942 decision (*Rigopoulos et al.* v. *Kervan*, 47 Fed. Supp. 576) in which the court stated that the act forbids compromise settlements in amounts less than provided by the act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 70) to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'work week' shall include only the time during which an employee is engaged in productive work, unless such time is compensable in pursuance of an agreement between an employer and his employee or employees or is considered compensable working time according to established custom in the industry or part thereof involved; and hereafter no action for the recovery of wages, penalties, or other damages (actual, liquidated, or exemplary) shall be instituted or continued under this act in any court by reason of any time spent by such employee in other than productive work."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 16 (b) of such act is hereby amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma and adding the following: "*Provided, however*, That any employer, who shows by a preponderance of the evidence that any error made by him with respect to payment of wages for time worked or with respect to his coverage under this act was a bona fide error made in good faith, shall not be liable to the employee or employees for liquidated damages."

SEC. 3. Section 16 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit an employee from giving his employer a valid release of his rights to liquidated damages accrued under this act against such employer in consideration of receiving any payment of liquidated damages in an amount less than that provided by this act."

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution which I introduced a few moments ago be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (h) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—

(1) The positions and funds allocated on January 1, 1947, to the chairman of any standing committee of the Senate existing on such date shall be continued through January 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by such chairman; except that in the case of any such chairman who has died or was not reelected, committee employees shall be continued on the pay rolls of the Senate through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate, and such employees shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Senate shall prescribe.

(2) Clerks and other employees of any Senator who was a Member of the Senate on January 1, 1947, but who was not a chairman of any standing committee existing on January 1, 1947, and who was not reelected, shall be continued on the rolls of the Senate through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate; and such employees shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Senate shall prescribe.

(3) The appropriations for the compensation of employees of Senators and of committee employees of standing committees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available for the compensation of employees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) The proviso under the caption "Senate" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, approved August 8, 1946, is hereby repealed, effective as of August 8, 1946.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like briefly to explain the proposed joint resolution for just a moment, and then to have it acted upon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HATCH Did the Senator indicate he would ask that it be considered at this time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Perhaps I should suggest the absence of a quorum, if that is to be done. I do not know whether there is any objection or not.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think there is. I conferred with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations, and they have no objection. I shall explain the joint resolution, and if the Senator then thinks there would be objection, I shall not press it.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Reorganization Act provided for carrying on the staffs of all existing committees until January 31, 1947. Shortly after that act was passed, a supplemental appropriation bill was enacted which provided "that positions and funds now allocated to any Senator or to any standing-committee chairman shall be continued until March 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by the Senator or the chairman."

The effect of this proviso would be to continue on the pay roll of the Senate until March 31, 1947, all committee employees of existing standing committees, and all employees of individual Senators in office on August 8, 1946, unless otherwise directed by the chairmen of such committees or the individual Senator, as the case might be. This would merely mean at this stage that the staffs of all the old committees, even though the committees were not in existence, would continue to March 31, 1947, the staff of the Committee on Appropriations would continue to June 30, 1947, and the staffs of individual Senators who had been defeated or who had died would continue to March 31, 1947.

The financial clerk of the Senate indicates that the appropriations heretofore made will not stand the load of the new committee staffs and the old committee staffs. Of course, it is not efficient to continue the staffs of Senators who are deceased or who have been defeated, or the staffs of committees which are no longer in existence. In many cases the chairmen are no longer Members of the Senate.

The joint resolution would put the matter back on the Reorganization Act basis. It is a more liberal provision than has ever existed before, because it would continue everyone to January 31, it would give the new committees time to reorganize, and the members of the old staffs an opportunity to look for new jobs. The only bad feature about it is that it would give the staffs of Senators who are not here, either because they were defeated or because of death, no place to hang their hats, so to speak, in the meantime, and no duties to perform.

Mr. President, this is merely an efficiency measure, an economy measure, and I am sure it is perfectly sound. However, I do not desire to have anyone think there is any attempt to put anything over, and I should much rather have it referred to a committee, if there is any objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would make it possible for the people of the District of Columbia to participate with their fellow Americans in the government of our country. The resolution differs from that introduced by me in the Seventy-ninth Congress only so far as it includes an explanatory preamble as a basis for the action sought.

The amendment which is proposed to be added to the Constitution of the United States is identical with that introduced in the last Congress, and reads as follows:

ARTICLE —

The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.

This proposal is an enabling provision to be added to the Constitution which will permit the application, in the case of the people of the District of Columbia, of the fundamental principles of our form of government. I hold that all Americans, wherever they reside in our country, should possess the right and privilege of participating in the legislation of the Nation through legislators of their own choosing. I also hold that all such Americans are justly entitled to participate through their duly chosen electors in the election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

I should like to reiterate what I said on January 10, 1945, in introducing the similar joint resolution.

With the single exception of those Americans permanently residing in the District of Columbia, the way is open for all to participate. However, the peculiar situation as regards the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia is that the Congress, which under the Constitution has the broad power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of the government, lacks the power to correct this fundamental defect. The people of the District of Columbia labor under serious handicap and humiliation through being denied the exercise of these fundamental American rights.

The rank injustice to these fellow Americans residing in the District of Columbia is pointedly emphasized by the plight of the fighting men from the District of Columbia in the late war. In the last Presidential election they continued voteless while their comrades-in-arms from the States were permitted to vote by absentee ballot. I called the attention of the Senate, while the soldier vote bill was under consideration, to the fact that "fighting side by side with the men from your State and mine are the fighting men from the voteless and unrepresented District of Columbia. They are the men who volunteered or were drafted, just like the boys from your State and mine. They are in the thick of the fight in all theaters of the war. They are shedding their blood and giving their all for their country and its

democratic institutions, in which they do not fully share."

In this connection I should like to quote from an election day statement published in The Washington Star, which showed that the District of Columbia had contributed to the armed forces in World War II more men and women than each of 14 States:

Complete figures are still unavailable covering the service of the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia in the armed forces in World War II. To the Army the District contributed a total of 68,401 men and women, to the Navy personnel 24,881, to the Marine Corps 3,800 and to the Coast Guard 1,320. This makes an estimated grand total of 98,402 men and women from the District of Columbia in all branches of the service. This was greater than any of 14 States: Maine, 92,071; Rhode Island, 84,597; Utah, 69,324; New Mexico, 60,478; Arizona, 59,633; Montana, 58,665; South Dakota, 57,686; North Dakota, 56,985; Idaho, 56,982; New Hampshire, 52,356; Vermont, 35,019; Delaware, 30,688; Wyoming, 28,520, and Nevada, 16,334. The number of those from the District of Columbia exceeded the combined number furnished by Vermont, Delaware, and Wyoming.

The District contributed to the Marine Corps more men and women than any of 15 States: Nebraska, Maine, Montana, Utah, Rhode Island, Idaho, Arizona, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Dakota, North Dakota, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada. The number of those from the District exceeded the combined number furnished by Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada.

The most complete figures available regarding casualties among those serving from the District are for service in the Army. A War Department release of June 27, 1946, gave a consolidated list of Army dead and missing in World War II, disclosing that the District of Columbia, where 3,029 failed to return, had the highest rate of dead and missing, with 5.05 percent. Among the States, Maryland, with 2.20 percent, had the lowest rate. Of the Virginians who went into the Army, 3.02 percent failed to return. For the Nation as a whole the dead and missing rate was 2.98 percent.

Mr. President, enactment of this amendment would not in the slightest detract from the power of Congress over the Federal District. It would, however, so broaden the power of Congress as to enable it to correct this grievous wrong, action for which the District citizens have for half a century petitioned the Congress.

The amendment would merely empower Congress to provide national representation for the permanent residents of the District of Columbia, leaving the details of such representation to be worked out by the Congress. Full power is given to Congress either to withdraw or modify the form of such representation as may be provided by subsequent legislation.

These people of the District of Columbia, I am qualified to testify, are fine, patriotic, public-spirited Americans. They are the equals of the best among those in the States who sent us here to Congress. It has always been a source of mortification and shame when I reflect that in actual practice these fine Americans are politically only the subjects of the United States, and by no means the political equals of the citizens of the States. It is a condition that is absolutely wrong and does not make sense. Under the law they are recognized fully as the equals of the people in the States, so far as bearing all the burdens of American citizenship which fall alike on all citizens of the Republic are concerned. While they are denied the vote and representation in the councils of our Nation, they are required to pay national taxes, and to fight, bleed and die in the service of their country.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR VANDENBERG AND SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like personally to congratulate the President pro tempore the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I know that not only his party, which is of course my party, but the country, has confidence in him, and that he will carry on in the finest traditions of the Senate.

I also wish to express my appreciation to his distinguished predecessor as President pro tempore the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who so graciously withdrew his nomination, and moved the unanimous election of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the position he now occupies. That gesture omens well for future cooperation of Senators on both sides of the aisle in vital matters.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it had been my intention to discuss very briefly the resolution that is pending. Is it expected to proceed with that resolution now? I will ask the majority leader if he proposes to go ahead with the resolution on committees.

Mr. WHITE. It has been agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the matter to which I desired to address my remarks has already been agreed to, I see no use in delaying the Senate longer.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I know, there is no other business immediately pending, to be brought before the Senate. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion for a moment?

Mr. WHITE. I withhold it.

Mr. MURRAY. Is my understanding correct that a report on the minority membership of the committees is to be submitted this afternoon? I understand it is being prepared and it is the intention to have it acted on this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, that is all so indefinite, and I think the understanding was so general that we would adjourn this afternoon that I must insist upon my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 8, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of mankind, we praise Thee that Thou dost stoop to our needs and art a shield when temptation is nigh. Make plain and open for us the royal pathway of truth, never forsaking it for expediency or compromise. Clothed with the insignia of a great office, forbid that we should be untrue to our best selves. Build in the citizens of our country, with its commerce, its schools, its homes, the golden rules of the blessed beatitudes of our Master. Be unto all of us, O God, more than a clause in a creed; bless us with a personal relationship that assures us that Thou art all-loving and all-wise as well as all-mighty.

Bless our chosen Speaker, the leaders and Members, and keep all minds free from worry and all hearts free from hate. As we look into the folds of the future help us to heed these immortal words:

"Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll!
Leave thy low-vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea!"

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 3, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on January 6, 1947, at 1 p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 2

JANUARY 3, 1947.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, late a Senator from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 3

JANUARY 3, 1947.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 4

JANUARY 4 (LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 3), 1947.

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Pursuant to the above resolution, the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WHITE and Mr. BARKLEY members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 5

JANUARY 4 (LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 3), 1947.

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 14

JANUARY 4 (LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 3), 1947.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Carl A. Loeffler, of Pennsylvania, as Secretary of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 15

JANUARY 4 (LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 3), 1947.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Senate Resolution 16

JANUARY 4 (LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 3), 1947.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Senate Resolution 17

JANUARY 4 (LEGISLATIVE DAY OF JANUARY 3), 1947.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may declare a recess at any time during the day subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints the following members of the committee to conduct the President of the United States into the Chamber: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

At 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure and high privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress of the United States: It looks as though a good many of you have moved over to the left since I was here last. [Laughter and applause.]

I come before you today to report on the state of the Union and, in the words of the Constitution, to recommend such measures as I judge necessary and expedient.

I come also to welcome you as you take up your duties and to discuss with you the manner in which you and I should fulfill our obligations to the American people during the next 2 years.

The power to mold the future of this Nation lies in our hands—yours and mine, joined together.

If in this year, and in the next, we can find the right course to take as each issue arises, and if, in spite of all difficulties, we have the courage and the resolution to take that course, then we shall achieve a state of well-being for our people without precedent in history. And if we continue to work with the other nations of the world earnestly, patiently, and wisely, we can—granting a will for peace on the part of our neighbors—make a lasting peace for the world.

But, if we are to realize these ends, the Congress and the President, during the next 2 years, must work together. It is not unusual in our history that the majority of the Congress represents a party in opposition to the President's party. I am the twentieth President of the United States who, at some time during his term of office, has found his own party to be in the minority in one or both Houses of the Congress.

I realize that on some matters the Congress and the President may have honest differences of opinion. Partisan differences, however, did not cause material disagreements as to the conduct of the war. Nor, in the conduct of our international relations, during and since the war, have such partisan differences been material.

On some domestic issues we may, and probably shall, disagree. That in itself is not to be feared. It is inherent in our form of government. But there are ways of disagreeing; men who differ can still work together sincerely for the common good. We shall be risking the Nation's safety and destroying our opportunities for progress if we do not settle any disagreements in this spirit, without thought of partisan advantage.

GENERAL DOMESTIC ECONOMY

As the year 1947 begins, the state of our national economy presents great opportunities for all. We have virtually full employment. Our national production of goods and services is 50 percent higher than in any year prior to the war emergency. The national income in 1946 was higher than in any peacetime year. Our food production is greater than it has ever been. During the last 5 years,

our productive facilities have been expanded in almost every field. The American standard of living is higher now than ever before, and when the housing shortage can be overcome, it will be even higher.

During the past few months we have removed at a rapid rate the emergency controls that the Federal Government had to exercise during the war. The remaining controls will be retained only so long as they are needed to protect the public. Private enterprise must be given the greatest possible freedom to continue the expansion of our economy. [Applause.]

In my proclamation of December 31, 1946, I announced the termination of hostilities. This automatically ended certain temporary legislation and certain Executive powers.

Two groups of temporary laws still remain: The first are those which by congressional mandate are to last during the emergency; the second are those which are to continue until the termination of the war.

I shall submit to the Congress recommendations for the repeal of certain of the statutes which by their terms continue for the duration of the emergency. I shall at the same time recommend that others within this classification be extended until the state of war has been ended by treaty or by legislative action. As to those statutes which continue until the state of war has been terminated, I urge that the Congress promptly consider each statute individually, and repeal such emergency legislation where advisable.

Now that nearly all wartime controls have been removed the operation of our industrial system depends to a greater extent on the decisions of businessmen, farmers, and workers. These decisions must be wisely made with genuine concern for the public welfare. The welfare of businessmen, farmers, and workers depends upon the economic well-being of those who buy their products.

An important present source of danger to our economy is the possibility that prices might be raised to such an extent that the consuming public could not purchase the tremendous volume of goods and services which will be produced in 1947.

We all know that recent price increases have denied to many of our workers much of the value of recent wage increases. Farmers have found that a large part of their increased income has been absorbed by increased prices. While some of our people have received raises in income which exceed price increases the great majority have not. Those persons who live on modest fixed incomes—retired persons living on pensions, for example, and workers whose incomes are relatively inflexible, such as teachers and other civil servants—have suffered hardship.

In the effort to bring about a sound and equitable price structure each group of our population has its own responsibilities.

It is up to industry not only to hold the line on existing prices but to make reductions whenever profits justify such action.

It is up to labor to refrain from pressing for unjustified wage increases that will force increases in the price level.

And it is up to Government to do everything in its power to encourage high-volume production, for that is what makes possible good wages, low prices, and reasonable profits.

In a few days there will be submitted to the Congress the economic report of the President, and also the Budget message. Those messages will contain many recommendations. Today I shall outline five major economic policies which I believe the Government should pursue during 1947. These policies are designed to meet our immediate needs and, at the same time, to provide for the long-range welfare of our free-enterprise system:

First. Promotion of greater harmony between labor and management.

Second. Restriction of monopoly and unfair business practices; assistance to small business; and the promotion of the free competitive system of private enterprise.

Third. Continuation of an aggressive program of home construction.

Fourth. The balancing of the budget in the next fiscal year, [applause] and the achieving of a substantial surplus to be applied to the reduction of the public debt.

Fifth. Protection of a fair level of return to farmers in postwar agriculture.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The year just past—like the year after the First World War—was marred by labor-management strife.

Despite this outbreak of economic warfare in 1946, we are today producing goods and services in record volume. Nevertheless, it is essential to improve the methods for reaching agreement between labor and management and to reduce the number of strikes and lock-outs.

We must not, however, adopt punitive legislation. We must not, in order to punish a few labor leaders, pass vindictive laws which will restrict the proper rights of the rank and file of labor. We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

We must remember, in reviewing the record of disputes in 1946, that management shares with labor the responsibility for failure to reach agreements which would have averted strikes. For that reason, we must realize that industrial peace cannot be achieved merely by laws directed against labor unions.

During the last decade and a half, we have established a national labor policy in this country based upon free collective bargaining as the process for determining wages and working conditions.

This is still the national policy.

It should continue to be the national policy. [Applause.]

But as yet, not all of us have learned what it means to bargain freely and fairly. Nor have all of us learned to carry the mutual responsibilities that accompany the right to bargain. There have been abuses and harmful practices which limit the effectiveness of our system of collective bargaining. Furthermore, we have lacked sufficient governmental machinery to aid labor and management in resolving differences.

Certain labor-management problems need attention at once and certain others, by reason of their complexity, need exhaustive investigation and study.

We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.

In the light of these considerations, I propose to you and urge your cooperation in effecting the following four-point program to reduce industrial strife:

Point No. 1 is the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices.

First, under this point, are jurisdictional strikes. [Applause.] In such strikes the public and the employer are innocent bystanders who are injured by a collision between rival unions. This type of dispute hurts production, industry, and the public—and labor itself. I consider jurisdictional strikes indefensible.

The National Labor Relations Act provides procedures for determining which union represents the employees of a particular employer. In some jurisdictional disputes, however, minority unions strike to compel employers to deal with them despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union. Strikes to compel an employer to violate the law are inexcusable. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable.

Another form of interunion disagreement is the jurisdictional strike involving the question of which labor union is entitled to perform a particular task. When rival unions are unable to settle such disputes themselves, provision must be made for peaceful and binding determination of the issues.

A second unjustifiable practice is the secondary boycott, when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act.

Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions, as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

A third practice that should be corrected is the use of economic force, by either labor or management, to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts.

Collective bargaining agreements, like other contracts, should be faithfully adhered to by both parties. [Applause.] In the most enlightened union-management relationships, disputes over the interpretation of contract terms are set-

tled peacefully by negotiation or arbitration. Legislation should be enacted to provide machinery whereby unsettled disputes concerning the interpretation of an existing agreement may be referred by either party to final and binding arbitration.

Point No. 2 is the extension of the facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting collective bargaining.

One of our difficulties in avoiding labor strife arises from a lack of order in the collective-bargaining process. The parties often do not have a clear understanding of their responsibility for settling disputes through their own negotiations. We constantly see instances where labor or management resorts to economic force without exhausting the possibilities for agreement through the bargaining process. Neither the parties nor the Government have a definite yardstick for determining when and how Government assistance should be invoked. There is need for integrated governmental machinery to provide the successive steps of mediation, voluntary arbitration, and—ultimately in appropriate cases—ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and the reporting of them to the public. Such machinery would facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes.

Point No. 3 is the broadening of our program of social legislation to alleviate the causes of workers' insecurity.

On June 11, 1946, in my message vetoing the Case bill, I made a comprehensive statement of my views concerning labor-management relations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor relations, but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society. In this connection, for example, the Congress should consider the extension and broadening of our social-security system, better housing, a comprehensive national-health program, and provision for a fair, minimum wage.

Point No. 4 is the appointment of a Temporary Joint Commission to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relations.

I recommend that the Congress provide for the appointment of a Temporary Joint Commission to undertake this broad study.

The President, the Congress, and management and labor have a continuing responsibility to cooperate in seeking and finding the solution of these problems. I, therefore, recommend that the Commission be composed as follows: Twelve to be chosen by the Congress from the members of both parties in the House and the Senate, and eight representing the public, management and labor, to be appointed by the President.

The Commission should be charged with investigating and making recommendations upon certain major subjects, among others:

First. The special and unique problem of Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest. In particular, the Commission should examine into the question of how to settle or prevent such strikes without endangering our general democratic freedoms.

Upon a proper solution of this problem may depend the whole industrial future of the United States. The paralyzing effects of a Nation-wide strike in such industries as transportation, coal, oil, steel, or communications can result in national disaster. We have been able to avoid such disaster, in recent years, only by the use of extraordinary war powers. All those powers will soon be gone. In their place there must be created an adequate system and effective machinery in these vital fields. The problem will require careful study and a bold approach, but an approach consistent with the preservation of the rights of our people. The need is pressing. The Commission should give this its earliest attention.

Second. The best methods and procedures for carrying out the collective bargaining process. This should include the responsibilities of labor and management to negotiate freely and fairly with each other, and to refrain from strikes or lock-outs until all possibilities of negotiation have been exhausted.

Third. The underlying causes of labor-management disputes.

Some of the subjects presented here for investigation involve long-range study. Others can be considered immediately by the Commission and its recommendations can be submitted to the Congress in the near future.

I recommend that this Commission make its first report, including specific legislative recommendations, not later than March 15, 1947.

RESTRICTION OF MONOPOLY, AND PROMOTION OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The second major policy I desire to lay before you has to do with the growing concentration of economic power and the threat to free competition in private enterprise. In 1941 the Temporary National Economic Committee completed a comprehensive investigation into the workings of the national economy. The Committee's study showed that, despite half a century of anti-trust-law enforcement, one of the gravest threats to our welfare lay in the increasing concentration of power in the hands of a small number of giant organizations.

During this war, this long-standing tendency toward economic concentration was accelerated. As a consequence, we now find that to a greater extent than ever before, whole industries are dominated by one or a few large organizations which can restrict production in the interest of higher profits and thus reduce employment and purchasing power.

In an effort to assure full opportunity and free competition to business we will vigorously enforce the antitrust laws. [Applause.] There is much the Congress can do to cooperate and assist in this program.

To strengthen and enforce the laws that regulate business practices is not enough. Enforcement must be supplemented by positive measures of aid to new enterprises. Government assistance, research programs, and credit powers should be designed and used to promote the growth of new firms and new industries. Assistance to small business is particularly important at this time when thousands of veterans who are potential business and industrial leaders are beginning their careers.

We should also give special attention to the decentralization of industry and the development of areas that are now under-industrialized.

HOUSING

The third major policy is also of great importance to the national economy—an aggressive program to encourage home construction. The first Federal program to relieve the veterans' housing shortage was announced in February 1946. In 1946 1,000,000 family housing units have been put under construction and more than 665,000 units have already been completed. The rate of expansion in construction has broken all records.

In the coming year the number of dwelling units built will approach, if not surpass, the top construction year of 1926. The primary responsibility to deliver housing at reasonable prices that veterans can afford rests with private industry and labor. The Government will continue to expedite the flow of key building materials, to limit nonresidential construction, and to give financial support where it will do the most good. Measures to stimulate rental housing and new types of housing construction will receive special emphasis.

To reach our long-range goal of adequate housing for all our people, comprehensive housing legislation is urgently required, similar to the nonpartisan bill passed by the Senate last year. At a minimum, such legislation should open the way for rebuilding the blighted areas of our cities and should establish positive incentives for the investment of billions of dollars of private capital in large-scale rental housing projects. It should provide for the improvement of housing in rural areas and for the construction, over a 4-year period, of half a million units of public low-rental housing. It should authorize a single peacetime Federal housing agency to assure efficient use of our resources on the vast housing front.

FISCAL AFFAIRS

The fourth major policy has to do with balancing the Budget. In a prosperous period such as the present one, the Budget of the Federal Government should be balanced. Prudent management of public finance requires that we begin the process of reducing the debt. The Budget which I shall submit to you this week has a small margin of surplus. In the Budget message, I am making recommendations which, if accepted, will result in a substantially larger surplus which should be applied to debt retirement. One of these recommendations is that the Congress take early action to continue throughout the next fiscal year the war excise-tax rates which, under the present law, will expire on June 30, 1947.

Expenditures relating to the war are still high. Considerable sums are required to alleviate world famine and suffering. Aid to veterans will continue at a peak level. The world situation is

such that large military expenditures are required. Interest on the public debt and certain other costs are irreducible. For these reasons I have had to practice stringent economy in preparing the Budget; and I hope that the Congress will cooperate in this program of economy. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURE

The fifth major policy has to do with the welfare of our farm population.

Production of food reached record heights in 1946. Much of our tremendous grain crop can readily be sold abroad and thus will become no threat in our domestic markets. But in the next few years American agriculture can face the same dangers it did after World War I. In the early twenties the Nation failed to maintain outlets for the new productive capacity of our agricultural plant. It failed to provide means to protect the farmer while he adjusted his acreage to peacetime demands.

The result we all remember too well. Farm production stayed up while demand and prices fell, in contrast with industry where prices stayed up and output declined. Farm surpluses piled up, and disaster followed.

We must make sure of meeting the problems which we failed to meet after the First World War. Present laws give considerable stability to farm prices for 1947 and 1948, and these 2 years must be utilized to maintain and develop markets for our great productive power.

The purpose of these laws was to permit an orderly transition from war to peace. The Government plan of support prices was not designed to absorb, at great cost, the unlimited surpluses of a highly productive agriculture.

We must not wait until the guaranties expire to set the stage for permanent farm welfare.

The farmer is entitled to a fair income.

Ways can be found to utilize his new skills and better practices, to expand his markets at home and abroad, and to carry out the objectives of a balanced pattern of peacetime production without either undue sacrifice by farm people or undue expense to the Government.

HEALTH AND GENERAL WELFARE

Of all our national resources, none is of more basic value than the health of our people. Over a year ago I presented to the Congress my views on a national-health program. The Congress acted on several of the recommendations in this program—mental health, the health of mothers and children, and hospital construction. I urge this Congress to complete the work begun last year and to enact the most important recommendation of the program—to provide adequate medical care to all who need it, not as charity but on the basis of payments made by the beneficiaries of the program.

One administrative change would help greatly to further our national program in the fields of health, education, and welfare. I again recommend the establishment of a well-integrated Department of Welfare.

VETERANS

Fourteen million World War II servicemen have returned to civilian life. The great majority have found their places as citizens of their communities and their Nation. It is a tribute to the fiber of our servicemen and to the flexibility of our economy that these adjustments have been made so rapidly and so successfully.

More than 2,000,000 of these veterans are attending schools or acquiring job skills through the financial assistance of the Federal Government. Thousands of sick and wounded veterans are daily receiving the best of medical and hospital care. Half a million have obtained loans, with Government guaranties, to purchase homes or farms or to embark upon new businesses. Compensation is being paid in almost 2,000,000 cases for disabilities or death. More than 3,000,000 are continuing to maintain their low-cost national service life insurance policies. Almost 7,000,000 veterans have been aided by unemployment and self-employment allowances.

Exclusive of mustering-out payments and terminal-leave pay, the program for veterans of all wars is costing over $7,000,000,000 a year—one-fifth of our total Federal budget. This is the most far-reaching and complete veterans' program ever conceived by any nation.

Except for minor adjustments, I believe that our program of benefits for veterans is now complete. In the long run, the success of the program will not be measured by the number of veterans obtaining financial aid or by the number of dollars we spend. History will judge us not by the money we spend, but by the further contribution we enable our veterans to make to their country. In considering any additional legislation, that must be our criterion.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We have recently witnessed in this country numerous attacks upon the constitutional rights of individual citizens as a result of racial and religious bigotry. Substantial segments of our people have been prevented from exercising fully their right to participate in the election of public officials, both locally and nationally. Freedom to engage in lawful callings has been denied.

The will to fight these crimes should be in the heart of every one of us.

For the Federal Government that fight is now being carried on by the Department of Justice to the full extent of the powers that have been conferred upon it. While the Constitution withholds from the Federal Government the major task of preserving the peace in the several States, I am not convinced that present legislation reaches the limit of Federal power to protect the civil rights of its citizens.

I have, therefore, by Executive order, established the President's Committee on Civil Rights to study and report on the whole problem of federally secured civil rights, with a view to making recommendations to the Congress.

NATURAL RESOURCES

In our responsibility to promote the general welfare of the people, we have always to consider the natural resources of our country. They are the foundation of our life. In the development of the great river systems of America there is the major opportunity of our generation to contribute to the increase of the national wealth. This program is already well along; it should be pushed with full vigor. [Applause.]

I must advise the Congress that we are rapidly becoming a "have not" nation as to many of our minerals. The economic progress and the security of our country depend upon an expanding return of mineral discovery and upon improved methods of recovery. The Federal Government must do its part to meet this need.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Progress in reaching our domestic goals is closely related to our conduct of foreign affairs. All that I have said about maintaining a sound and prosperous economy and improving the welfare of our people has greater meaning because of the world leadership of the United States. What we do, or fail to do, at home affects not only ourselves but millions throughout the world. If we are to fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves and to other people, we must make sure that the United States is sound economically, socially, and politically. Only then will we be able to help bring about the elements of peace in other countries—political stability, economic advancement, and social progress.

Peace treaties for Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary have finally been prepared. Following the signing of these treaties next month in Paris, they will be submitted to the Senate for ratification. This Government does not regard the treaties as completely satisfactory. Whatever their defects, however, I am convinced that they are as good as we can hope to obtain by agreement among the principal wartime Allies. Further dispute and delay would gravely jeopardize political stability in the countries concerned for many years.

During the long months of debate on these treaties, we have made it clear to all nations that the United States will not consent to settlements at the expense of principles we regard as vital to a just and enduring peace. We have made it equally clear that we will not retreat to isolationism. [Applause.] Our policies will be the same during the forthcoming negotiations in Moscow on the German and Austrian treaties, and during future conferences on the Japanese treaty.

The delay in arriving at the first peace settlements is due partly to the difficulty of reaching agreement with the Soviet Union on the terms of settlement. Whatever differences there may have been between us and the Soviet Union, however, should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the basic interests of both nations lie in the early making of a peace under which the peoples of all countries may return, as free men and women, to the esssential tasks of production and reconstruction. The major concern of each of us should be the promotion of collective security, not the advancement of individual security.

Our policy toward the Soviet Union is guided by the same principles which determine our policies toward all nations. We seek only to uphold the principles of international justice which have been

embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

We must now get on with the peace settlements. The occupying powers should recognize the independence of Austria and withdraw their troops. The Germans and the Japanese cannot be left in doubt and fear as to their future; they must know their national boundaries, their resources, and what reparations they must pay. Without trying to manage their internal affairs, we can insure that those countries do not rearm.

INTERNATIONAL RELIEF AND DISPLACED PERSONS

The United States can be proud of its part in caring for peoples reduced to want by the ravages of war, and in aiding nations to restore their national economies. We have shipped more supplies to the hungry peoples of the world since the end of the war than all other countries combined. [Applause.]

However, insofar as admitting displaced persons is concerned, I do not feel that the United States has done its part. Only about 5,000 of them have entered this country since May 1946. The fact is that the executive agencies are now doing all that is reasonably possible under the limitation of existing law and established quotas. Congressional assistance in the form of new legislation is needed. I urge the Congress to turn its attention to this world problem, in an effort to find ways whereby we can fulfill our responsibilities to these thousands of homeless and suffering refugees of all faiths.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

World economic cooperation is essential to world political cooperation. We have made a good start on economic cooperation through the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Export-Import Bank. We must now take other steps for the reconstruction of world trade and we should continue to strive for an international trade system as free from obstructions as possible.

ATOMIC ENERGY

The United States has taken the lead in the endeavor to put atomic energy under effective international control. We seek no monopoly for ourselves or for any group of nations. We ask only that there be safeguards sufficient to insure that no nation will be able to use this power for military purposes. So long as all governments are not agreed on means of international control of atomic energy, the shadow of fear will obscure the bright prospects for the peaceful use of this enormous power.

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the Commission established under that law is assuming full jurisdiction over our domestic atomic energy enterprise. The program of the Commission will, of course, be worked out in close collaboration with the military services in conformity with the wish of the Congress, but it is my fervent hope that the military significance of atomic energy will steadily decline. We look to the Commission to foster the development of atomic energy for industrial use and scientific and medical research. In the vigorous and effective development of peaceful uses of atomic energy rests our hope that this new force may ultimately be turned into a blessing for all nations.

MILITARY POLICY

In 1946 the Army and Navy completed the demobilization of their wartime forces. They are now maintaining the forces which we need for national defense and to fulfill our international obligations.

We live in a world in which strength on the part of peace-loving nations is still the greatest deterrent to aggression. World stability can be destroyed when nations with great responsibilities neglect to maintain the means of discharging those responsibilities.

This is an age when unforeseen attack could come with unprecedented speed. We must be strong enough to defeat, and thus to forestall any such attack. In our steady progress toward a more rational world order, the need for large armed forces is progressively declining; but the stabilizing force of American military strength must not be weakened until our hopes are fully realized. When a system of collective security under the United Nations has been established, we shall be willing to lead in collective disarmament, but, until such a system becomes a reality, we must not again allow our weakness to invite attack. [Applause.]

For these reasons, we need well-equipped, well-trained armed forces and we must be able to mobilize rapidly our resources in men and material for our own defense, should the need arise.

The Army will be reduced to 1,070,000 officers and men by July 1, 1947. Half of the Army will be used for occupation duties abroad and most of the remainder will be employed at home in the support of these overseas forces.

The Navy is supporting the occupation troops in Europe and in the Far East. Its fundamental mission—to support our national interests wherever required—is unchanged. The Navy, including the Marine Corps, will average 571,000 officers and men during the fiscal year 1948.

We are encountering serious difficulties in maintaining our forces at even these reduced levels. Occupation troops are barely sufficient to carry out the duties which our foreign policy requires. Our forces at home are at a point where further reduction is impracticable. We should like an Army and a Navy composed entirely of long-term volunteers, but in spite of liberal inducements the basic needs of the Army are not now being met by voluntary enlistments.

The War Department has advised me that it is unable to make an accurate forecast at the present time as to whether it will be possible to maintain the strength of the Army by relying exclusively on volunteers. The situation will be much clearer in a few weeks, when the results of the campaign for volunteers are known. The War Department will make its recommendation as to the need for the extension of Selective Service in sufficient time to enable the Congress to take action prior to the expiration of the present law on March 31. The responsibility for maintaining our armed forces at the strength necessary for our national safety rests with the Congress.

The development of a trained citizen reserve is also vital to our national security. This can best be accomplished through universal training. I have appointed an Advisory Commission on Universal Training to study the various plans for a training program and I expect that the recommendations of the Commission will be of benefit to the Congress and to me in reaching decisions on this problem.

The cost of the military establishment is substantial. There is one certain way by which we can cut costs and at the same time enhance our national security. That is by the establishment of a single Department of National Defense. I shall communicate with the Congress in the near future with reference to the establishment of a single Department of National Defense.

National security does not consist only of an army, a navy, and an air force. It rests on a much broader base. It depends on a sound economy of prices and wages, on a prosperous agriculture, on satisfied and productive workers, on a competitive private enterprise free from monopolistic repression, on continued industrial harmony and production, on civil liberties and human freedoms—on all the forces which create in our men and women a strong moral fiber and spiritual stamina.

But we have a higher duty and a greater responsibility than the attainment of national security. Our goal is collective security for all mankind.

If we can work in a spirit of understanding and mutual respect, we can fulfill this solemn obligation which rests upon us.

The spirit of the American people can set the course of world history. If we maintain and strengthen our cherished ideals, and if we share our great bounty with war-stricken people over the world, then the faith of our citizens in freedom and democracy will spread over the whole earth and free men everywhere will share our devotion to these ideals.

Let us have the will and the patience to do this job together.

May the Lord strengthen us in our faith.

May He give us wisdom to lead the peoples of the world in His ways of peace. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President of the

United States be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I deem it appropriate that it be said by someone belonging to the minority that the present occupant of the chair comes to the high position which he holds possessed of the confidence and the good will of the country and his colleagues here in the House. That his services will redound to his own credit and to the public good, his high character, his fine sense of justice and fair play, his patience and his tolerance, his industry and his understanding, give complete assurance.

This House in naming its Speaker bestows the highest honor within its power; and that this honor in the instant case will be worn worthily, old friends of the recipient who have labored with him many years proudly pledge their word. Just a few days ago the gentleman was leader of a faction; today he is the captain of the hosts, all united, let us hope, in the common intent and purpose of serving with undivided loyalty this our common country.

Mr. Speaker, as the now presiding officer of this House, you succeed a wise, a noble, and a good man.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates the splendid remarks of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this day is memorable for many reasons. It is particularly memorable for one very outstanding reason, and this is that it is the sixty-fifth birthday of our great friend, our able colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The other day when the gentleman from Texas introduced the gentleman from Massachusetts as his successor to the Speakership, he said that if we had to have a Republican Speaker, he was mighty glad that it was JOE MARTIN. I think that we can say for Mr. RAYBURN that there must be a minority leader and we, in turn, are happy that it is SAM RAYBURN. He served illustriously and well as Speaker of this great body. He was always fair and square in his dealings with all of us. He was considerate and helpful; yes, helpful to the newest Member as well as the oldest; always honorable, and possessed of a balanced, good judgment; an able speaker, and a man of complete integrity whose word was always good.

We, in this House, undertake a momentous session. We have just heard the President speak of our responsibility in molding the affairs of our country. We have heard the Speaker speak of cooperation between the Executive and the legislative branch.

I think that SAM RAYBURN on his side and I on my side join in expressing to the President our firm intention to cooperate for the welfare of our beloved country. I am quite sure that with the minority under the leadership of our colleague, Mr. RAYBURN, who today celebrates the sixty-fifth anniversary of his birth—and incidentally, he might even desire that we say it was the thirty-fifth, but at any rate, it is the sixty-fifth—we enter upon this great task which lies before us assured that in cooperation among us and with the Executive we shall find the right answers for the welfare of our country.

I am sure that I project faithfully the feelings of all the Members on this side of the aisle, as well as those of the minority, when I pay earnest tribute to the great service which the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, has rendered the Republic in this Chamber during the last 35 years. In committee, on the floor, in the chair of the Speaker, he has been studious, faithful in his defense of the Constitution, gentle of manner and ever cordial and genial in his relations with all of his colleagues, regardless of party, and unmindful of differences of opinion expressed in legislative debate.

In that respect he has been not only a servant but a living symbol of the one best hope of mankind—the conviction that a society of free people is equipped by Providence to govern itself through representative bodies such as the Congress of the United States.

A son of Texas, he has brought to his tasks here the rugged qualities of heart and mind which characterize the entire history of that great State. As Texas is big on the map of the United States, so is our good friend the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, big in his thinking, in his generous sentiments for the public welfare, in his easy and genial moods of cooperation and sincere friendship.

As a Member who was only a boy of 12 years when the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, began his notable career in Congress, I count it a high privilege indeed to stand before this great body to pay tribute to a man who thus has served so nobly to protect, defend, and preserve the Republic.

May he be with us on many future birthday anniversaries, and may his lot among us reflect always the high place he has won in the regard, esteem, and affection of us all.

THE LATE DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of Hon. Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., which occurred in Richmond, Va., on Friday, December 27, 1946, after a brief illness. He represented the Third District of Virginia in the Congress from November 2, 1937, until February 15, 1945, when he resigned to become executive director and general counsel of the Life Insurance Association of America.

During his service in the House he was a member of the Judiciary Committee. His outstanding ability and sound judgment were quickly recognized by his colleagues and his sincerity of purpose and fidelity to duty won their confidence and respect.

Most of his life was spent in the public service. Having served his country as a naval aviator in World War I, he was called to active duty by the Navy in World War II, and sent to England on a special mission. He served his city, State, and Nation with great distinction in various capacities over a long period of years and his loss will be keenly felt.

We attended college together, and it was my privilege to succeed him in the Congress. He was a true and loyal friend, and I prized his friendship very highly. I know that his former colleagues in the House share with me a feeling of deep sorrow over his untimely passing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances. Two of these extensions will exceed the limit, one by $140 and the other by $200, but I ask that they be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts on the portal-to-portal controversy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. DONDERO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a magazine article and an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Attorney General of the United States in reference to oil compacts.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one from the Chicago Sun and one from the New York Times.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, after 14 years of frustration in our attempts to rid the people of bureaucracy and Government regimentation, we Republicans have been returned to Congress as the majority party by an overwhelming vote of the people.

Let none of us who have been elected and reelected to the Eightieth Congress think for one moment that it was due to our own superior personalities that we were given such large majorities by the people.

The fact is the American people became dissatisfied, discouraged, and disgusted with regimentation and tyrannical dictation by power-drunk bureaucrats and political leaders who in late years came into control in America but who refused to recognize the true American ideals.

It is our obligation as newly elected Members of Congress not to allow ourselves and our country to be taken over by certain elements in America who have no real interest in Americans; who have no respect for the principles of free enterprise and true democracy. It is our duty as duly elected Members of the Congress of the United States of America to wipe out restriction upon our free economy and to eradicate regimentation of free American industry and private enterprise. The obligation is ours, and the decision whether we shall be a free or a shackled people must be made now.

Americans fear the infiltration of subversive elements into our Government, in any and all its departments, whether it be in the executive, the legislative, or the judicial.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of our Federal Bureau of Investigation, knew what he was talking about when, at the national convention of the American Legion this fall, he startled the Nation out of its lethargy, stating that during the past 5 years communism has made its deepest inroads in our American Government; that the divide-and-conquer tactics of Hitler are employed with greater skill today by American Communists with their boring-from-within tactics; that the Communist influence has projected itself into some newspapers, magazines, books, over the radio, on the screen, and in some schools and colleges; and that the ultimate aim of communism is the destruction of American freedom and liberty. Mr. Hoover made those terrific assertions only after years of investigation into the machinations of subversive elements in this country.

We who constitute the Eightieth Congress must not permit these elements to get control in America; otherwise the cherished liberty and freedom guaranteed to us by our Constitution will become but a memory.

Let us therefore stand united, Republicans and Democrats—Americans all—ever ready from this very moment to combat at every turn the elements that oppose our American ideals and transgress our American traditions. We must be ever watchful to stamp out those influences that operate under false and deceptive cloaks and banners to undermine our own true Americanism.

There is a national and an international conspiracy by foreign elements who worship foreign ideologies to divide our people, to bring about a disregard for our American representative form of government, and to conquer this Nation.

We must not allow foreign ideologies to triumph in this country. The American people have given us a mandate as their chosen representatives to revive the cherished principles of freedom and true democracy set forth by our founding fathers in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States of America, those American patriots who ordained and established the Constitution in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

And so let us forget petty partisanship and petty politics. Let us think only of America. Let us be American always. This is our responsibility to the American people who elected us; this is our opportunity.

WINDFALLS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938—LEGISLATION TO PREVENT ECONOMIC RUIN AND "SHAKE-DOWN" LAW SUITS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1938 the Congress declared:

That the existence, in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers (1) causes commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States; (2) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; (3) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce; (4) leads to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and (5) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

Congress further declared it:

To be the policy of sections 201–219 of this title, through the exercise by Congress of its powers to regulate commerce among the several States, to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate the conditions above referred to in such industries without substantially curtailing employment or earning power.

Commerce as used in this act was defined to mean "trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or from any State to any place outside thereof."

To effectuate its policy the Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the pertinent provisions of which are hereinafter quoted.

MINIMUM WAGES

The act provided that every employer subject to its provisions "shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" a minimum wage. (29 U. S. Code, sec. 206.)

MAXIMUM HOURS

Section 207 declared that:

No employer shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce,

for a workweek longer than 40 hours.

PENALTIES—CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY

To force compliance with the terms of sections 206, 207, section 216, reading as follows, was incorporated:

Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of section 215 of this title shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both. No person shall be imprisoned under this subsection except for an offense committed after the conviction of such person for a prior offense under this subsection.

(b) Any employer who violates the provisions of section 206 or section 207 of this title shall be liable to the employee or employees affected in the amount of their unpaid minimum wages, or their unpaid overtime compensation, as the case may be, and in an addditional equal amount as liquidated damages. Action to recover such liability may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated, or such employee or employees may designate an agent or representative to maintain such action for and in behalf of all employees similarly situated. The court in such action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, allow a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid by the defendant, and costs of the action. (June 25, 1938, ch. 676, sec. 16, 52 Stat. 1069.)

The United States Supreme Court said that one purpose of the act was to reduce the hours of work and spread employment by applying financial pressure upon the employer. (*Murray* v. *Noblesville Milling Co.* (131 Fed. (2d), 470). Certiorari denied, 63 S. Ct. 832.)

Until John L. Lewis raised the question of portal-to-portal pay in the coal mines and was sustained by the United States Supreme Court in *Tennessee Coal, Iron & R. Co.* v. *Muscoda Local* (321 U. S. 590, 63 S. Ct. 698, 88 L. Ed. 849, 152 ALR 1014), decided March 27, 1944; *Jewell Ridge Corp.* v. *Local No. 6167, NMWA* (325 U. S. 161, 65 S. Ct. 1063, 89 L. Ed. 1534), decided May 7, 1945, there was little, if any, effort made to collect compensation for overtime which had not been spent in productive work. Even then legal action to recover for unpaid overtime spent in going to or preparing for productive work did not become epidemic.

June 10, 1946, the United States Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Murphy, Mr. Justice Burton, and Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissenting, handed down its decision in *Anderson* v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.* (66 S. Ct. 1187).

Across the country almost with the rapidity of a prairie fire swept a wave of suits brought principally by CIO unions seeking more than $2,000,000,000 in payment for overtime not spent in productive work.

The question here at issue is (a) whether the Congress may now amend the National Fair Labor Standards Act so as to limit recovery for unpaid compensation for overtime to overtime which was actually spent in productive work.

(b) Require such suits to be brought within 1 year of the time when the action accrues, and

(c) Limit such suits to those brought after the enactment of the proposed amendments.

The first two amendments attached hereto are designed to accomplish the first purpose; the third to bring about the second and third results.

A brief statement of the facts found and the law construed in the Anderson case, insofar as they shed light upon the proposal to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in such manner so as to end this drive to recover billions never expected to be paid by employers—never thought due by employees—may be of interest.

The suit was brought by Steve Anderson and six fellow employees and their local union under section 216 of the act on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated.

The purpose was to collect pay and a half doubled at the regular rate of pay for the overtime spent by the employees on company property, figured from the hour when they checked in at the time clock to the time when they actually went to work or the blowing of the work whistle.

A discussion of all the facts found by the court or of all the rules of construction laid down bearing upon the liability of the employer for unpaid overtime and the amount of such liability under section 207 of the act is unnecessary for the present purpose.

It is sufficient to say that the employees at the pottery company punched a time clock—probably near the entrance of the plant—at, for example, 6:46 a. m. and 12:46 p. m., but did not actually begin productive work until the whistle blew at 7 a. m. and 1 p. m.

The case was in the first instance referred to a master, who found that the actual productive work did not begin before the whistle blew, except in a few instances, which were counterbalanced by occasions when work began after the scheduled hours or ended before the scheduled hours or ended before the scheduled cessation of productive work.

The Supreme Court agreed with this finding. It further held that the employees did not prove that they were engaged in work for the employer from the moment when they punched in at the time clock to the moment when they punched out, but that they were required to be ready for work at their benches at the scheduled starting times.

The employees were given 14-minute periods in which to punch the time clock, walk to the places of work, and prepare for productive labor, but there was no requirement that the employee check in or be on the premises at any particular time during the 14-minute interval.

The Court further held that the time clock did not show the time during which the employees were compelled to be on the premises or at any prescribed place of work and thus could not form the sole basis of determining the statutory workweek.

But the Court further said:

The employees did prove, however, that it was necessary for them to be on the premises for some time prior and subsequent to the scheduled working hours. The employer required them to punch in, walk to their work benches, and perform preliminary duties during the 14-minute periods preceding productive work; the same activities in reverse occurred in the 14-minute periods subsequent to the completion of productive work. Since the statutory workweek includes all time during which an employee is necessarily required to be on the employer's premises, on duty or at a prescribed workplace, the time spent in these activities must be accorded appropriate compensation.

No claim is here made, though, as to the time spent in waiting to punch the time clocks and we need not explore that aspect of the situation. * * * But the time necessarily spent by the employees in walking to work on the employer's premises, following the punching of the time clocks, was working time within the scope of section 7 (a). * * * Such time was under the complete control of the employer, being dependent solely upon the physical arrangements which the employer made in the factory. Those arrangements in this case compelled the employees to spend an estimated 2 to 12 minutes daily, if not more, in walking on the premises. Without such walking on the part of the employees the productive aims of the employer could not have been achieved. The employees' convenience and necessity, moreover, bore no relation whatever to this walking time; they walked on the employer's premises only because they were compelled to do so by the necessities of the employer's business. In that respect the walking time differed vitally from the time spent in traveling from workers' homes to the factory. * * *

It follows that the time spent in walking to work on the employer's premises, after the time clocks were punched, involved "physical or mental exertion (whether burdensome or not) controlled or required by the employer and pursued necessarily and primarily for the benefit of the employer and his business." * * * Work of that character must be included in the statutory workweek and compensated accordingly, regardless of contrary custom or contract.

But under the conditions prevalent in respondent's plant, compensable working time was limited to the minimum time necessarily spent in walking at an ordinary rate along the most direct route from time clock to workbench. Many employees took roundabout journeys and stopped off en route for purely personal reasons. It would be unfair and impractical to compensate them for doing that which they were not required to do. Especially is this so in view of the fact that precise calculation of the minimum walking time is easily obtainable in the ordinary situation. * * *

The employees proved, in addition, that they pursued certain preliminary activities after arriving at their places of work, such as putting on aprons and overalls, removing shirts, taping or greasing arms, putting on finger cots, preparing the equipment for productive work, turning on switches for lights and machinery, opening windows, and assembling and sharpening tools. These activities are clearly work falling within the definition enunciated and applied in the Tennessee Coal and Jewell Ridge cases. They involve exertion of a physical nature, controlled or required by the employer and pursued necessarily and primarily for the employer's benefit. They are performed solely on the employer's premises and are a necessary prerequisite to productive work. There is nothing in such activities that partakes only of the personal convenience or needs of the employees. Hence they constitute work that must be accorded appropriate compensation under the statute. (66 S. Ct. 1187, 1194-1195.)

The Court sent the case back to the lower court for a "determination of the amount of walking time involved and the amount of preliminary activities performed, giving due consideration to the de minimis doctrine and calculating the resulting damages under the act."

A careful reading of the decision of the district court (60 F. Supp. 146), of the decision of the circuit court of appeals (149 Fed. (2d) 461), and of the Supreme Court's decision (66 S. Ct. 1187) will show that the door has been opened to a multiplicity of suits involving the payment of billions of dollars which the employer had no reason to expect he would be required to pay; which the employees never expected to receive or to which they never thought they were entitled.

The decision, as some previous decisions on labor legislation which placed added burdens on industry, lays down a rule which ignores the usual practice and custom which previously prevailed and which were taken into consideration when collective-bargaining contracts fixing hours and wages were negotiated.

It is obvious that, if the employer is to be required to pay, if the employee is to receive, compensation for time spent for other than productive work, that fact should be known and considered when the parties enter into contracts of employment.

It is axiomatic that wages must be paid out of sales and the price at which things are to be sold must be based upon the total amount of the wage which is usually a large part of the cost. Any other procedure is unfair to both employee and employer.

The unfortunate situation now confronting employers the country over is an invitation to unscrupulous lawyers and racketeering labor leaders to not only make demands sustainable under the Supreme Court decision of June 10, 1946, and those in the portal-to-portal cases, but to make demands which are unjustified even under that decision, and thus force employers to either pay some sum in compromise or meet the burdensome and sometimes unsustainable expense of costly lawsuits. The law as written, the decisions as announced, open the door to unscrupulous blackmailers, and to lawyers more interested in fees than in justice for their clients.

The manner in which some unions are using and abusing a law enacted by Congress to advance the interests of all employees by spreading employment, lessening their hours of work and increasing compensation, and the recent decisions of the courts herein cited, is shown by an ad printed in the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, on the 21st day of December 1946. In blackfaced type appears this caption:

DO YOU WANT YOUR BACK PAY?

The ad continues:

If you have worked in a shop engaged in interstate commerce any time in the years 1940 to the present, you are entitled to back pay, which may run into hundreds of dollars.

You are in interstate commerce if you are engaged in the manufacture or distribution of goods across a State line.

But, you must file a claim.

The UER and MWA, Local 931, will maintain office hours to midnight tonight to assist you regardless of your affiliation or nonaffiliation in filing your claim. No charge for this service.

The UER and MWA, Local 931, Norman E. Hardy, President; Harold Anderson, New Products, Chairman; Jack Anderson, Remington-Rand, Chairman; Fred Constant, Rosback, Chairman; Kelly Cutler, G. & M. Brass, Chairman; William Gertz, St. Joe Machines, Chairman; Robert Garland, Pier Equipment, Chairman; Eileen Hall, Masters Planter, Chairman; Elwood Taylor, Consumers Dairy, Chairman; Guy L. Shindeldecker, Viloco, Chairman; Carl Layman, Covel Mfg. Co., Chairman; Robert Wycoff, Kaywood, Chairman; George Ball, Nineteen Hundred, Chairman.

The point is this—note the misstatement in the first paragraph which I quote again:

If you have worked in a shop engaged in interstate commerce any time in the years 1940 to the present, you are entitled to back pay, which may run into hundreds of dollars.

Obviously, the fact that one has worked in a shop engaged in interstate commerce from any time in the year 1940 to the present does not of itself entitle him to back pay.

An employee may or may not be entitled to back pay under the act depending upon many circumstances usually varying in every case.

That ad is an invitation to employees who may or who may not be entitled to back pay, who even though entitled to back pay under the technical construction of the act, may or may not desire to sue an employer, to start a lawsuit.

That ad holds out to all employees in that locality the suggestion that they may obtain hundreds of dollars by suing their employers and that advice relating to such a suit will cost them nothing.

The men signing that ad are inviting the employees to start lawsuits against those who over the years have brought factories to the cities, given employment. Surely, if the employees, themselves, do not feel aggrieved, why should others encourage litigation, create bad feeling and perhaps bring action which will kill the industry?

A WORKWEEK

The Fair Labor Standards Act does not define a workweek nor is it probable that Congress, when the Act was passed, ever contemplated or anticipated any such unfortunate situation as now confronts American industry and, indirectly, the Nation.

Without delay, in order to protect our national economy, the Fair Labor Standards Act should be amended to—

(a) Define the term "workweek";

(b) Limit the workweek to time actually spent in productive work;

(c) Limit the time within which suits to recover for the payment of the minimum wage or unpaid overtime should be brought; and

(d) Limit all punishment and liability imposed upon an employer to that which accrues after the passage of these amendments.

To accomplish that purpose, the three amendments attached hereto have been offered.

The proposal will undoubtedly be met by the argument that a statute cannot be given retroactive effect; that employees have a vested right in the recovery authorized by section 216, Twenty-ninth United States Code, and that any amendment prohibiting the exercise of that right is in violation of the fifth amendment.

Such argument, however, is not sound.

There can, in the nature of things, be no vested right in an existing law which precludes its change or repeal. (11 American Jurisprudence, sec. 372, 6 R. C. L., sec. 296.)

American Jurisprudence cites, among others, the cases of *Truax* v. *Corrigan* (257 U. S. 312), Arizona Employers' Liability Cases—*Arizona Copper Co.* v. *Hammer* (250 U. S. 400), *Middleton* v. *Texas Power & L. Co.* (249 U. S. 152), *New York C. R. Co.* v. *White* (243 U. S. 188), *Chicago & A. R. Co.* v. *Tranbarger* (238 U. S. 67), Second Employers' Liability Cases—*Mondou* v. *New York, N. H. & H. R. Co.* (223 U. S. 1), *Louisville & N. R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467), *Meriwether* v. *Garrett* (102 U. S. 472).

There can be no vested right in the continued existence of a statute or rule of the common law which precludes its change or repeal. (16 C. J. Se., sec. 223.)

Also citing many cases.

The question here involved, that is, as to whether the Fair Labor Standards Act can be so amended as to prevent the filing of additional suits or the prosecution of suits already filed under section 216 would seem to have been decided in the affirmative by the Supreme Court of the United States, when, on May 22, 1944, in *National Carloading Corp.* v. *Phoenix-El Paso Express* (64 U. S. Sup. Ct. Rep. 1156), it denied certiorari to review a decision of the Supreme Court of Texas.

The Supreme Court of Texas, in 1943—*National Carloading Corp.* v. *Phoenix-El Paso Express* (176 Southwestern Reporter 564)—had before it a case where a motor carrier sought to recover from a freight forwarder certain charges which had not been made.

Section 217 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, 1935 (49 U. S. Code, 317 (b)) provided that no common carrier by motor vehicle shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for transportation than the rates, and so forth.

In this case, a lesser charge had been made and the plaintiff sought to recover the difference between the lesser charge and the published rate.

But section 419 of part 4 (49 U. S. Code, sec. 1019), enacted subsequently—May 16, 1942—provided that—

No person shall be subject to any punishment or liability under the provisions of this chapter and chapter 1, 8, and 12 of this title, on account of any act done or omitted to be done prior to the effective date of this chapter.

In deciding the case, the Texas court, among other things, said—pages 567–568:

We think the court of civil appeals was correct in its conclusion that the quoted section from the 1942 amendment is a complete bar to the recovery of the plaintiff. As above stated, plaintiff's suit is predicated upon section 217 (b) which made it obligatory upon the plaintiff to collect from defendant the full legal tariffs in effect at the time of the shipments, which would mean that the plaintiff should have collected 85 cents per hundred pounds unless the defendant was entitled under the Motor Carrier Act to file tariffs and participate in joint rates with plaintiff on the basis of 45 cents per hundredweight from El Paso to Phoenix. Therefore, the suit of the plaintiff is not based upon a contract or agreement but arises by reason of special statutory authority.

It is generally conceded that a right of action given by a statute may be taken away at any time, even after it has accrued and proceedings have been commenced to enforce it.

The Court further said—page 569:

The courts are generally agreed that rights of action based upon purely statutory grounds may be abolished by the legislature even after they have accrued.

The Court also said—pages 569–570:

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, in overruling this (a similar) contention, in delivering the opinion of the Court said:

"This argument is in the teeth of another established principle. Contracts, however express, cannot fetter the constitutional authority of the Congress. Contracts may create rights of property, but when contracts deal with a subject matter which lies within the control of the Congress, they have a congenital infirmity. Parties cannot remove their transactions from the reach of dominant constitutional power by making contracts about them. See *Hudson County Water Co.* v. *McCarter* (209 U. S. 349, 357, 28 S. Ct. 529, 52 L. Ed. 828 (832), 14 Ann. Cas. 560)."

We think it therefore becomes evident that the plaintiff does not possess such a vested right as to come within the inhibition of the fifth amendment. Such a right must be something more than a mere expectation based upon an anticipated continuance of the existing law. It must have become a title, legal or equitable, to the present or future enjoyment of property, or to the present or future enforcement of a demand, or a legal exemption from the demand of another. If, before rights become vested in particular individuals, the convenience of the State induces amendment or repeal of the laws upon which they are based, these individuals are left without any remedy at law to enforce their claims; and if final relief has not been granted before the repeal goes into effect, it cannot be granted thereafter, even if a judgment has been entered and the cause is pending upon appeal. The general rule is that when such law is repealed without a saving clause, it is considered, except as to transactions past and closed, as though it had never existed.

This decision of the Texas Supreme Court has the sanction of the United States Supreme Court, as certiorari was denied on May 22, 1944, 64 United States Supreme Court Reports 1156.

An examination of the authorities would seem to leave no room for doubt that there is no vested right in a remedy given by law which precludes its change or repeal; that the Congress cannot by statute deprive itself of its constitutional jurisdiction to legislate; that what the Congress by legislation gives, it may, until the gift has been reduced to possession, by legislation take away.

To relieve an intolerable situation, to prevent national economic disaster, to prevent racketeering, the following amendments should be adopted by the Congress at an early date:

A bill to amend sections 203 (52 Stat. 1060), 207 (b) (52 Stat. 1063), and 216 (b) (52 Stat. 1069) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 of title 29 of the United States Code (52 Stat. 1060), the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, be amended by adding the following subdivision:

"(n) Workweek means time spent in productive work, but does not include time going to or from work, changing clothing, putting on aprons or overalls, taping or greasing arms, putting on finger cots, preparing equipment for productive work, turning on switches for light or machinery, opening windows or assembling or sharpening tools, or time spent in preparation for work or which is not time actually consumed in productive work: *Provided, however,* That maintenance workers shall be entitled to compensation for the time actually consumed

in and about their regular and customary work."

SEC. 2. That subsection (b) of section 207 of said title 29, United States Code (52 Stat. 1063), be amended by adding the following subdivision:

"(4) No employer shall be deemed to have violated subsection (a) by employing any employee for a workweek in excess of that specified in said subsection without paying the compensation for overtime employment prescribed therein, unless such employee has actually been employed in productive work: *Provided*, That in computing the number of hours of a workweek there shall not be included any time as productive work, or work for which payment is to be made, which lapsed between the time when the employee entered the place of employment or punched a time clock and the time the employee began productive work, or which was used in any manner other than when the employee was actually engaged in productive work: *Provided further*, That maintenance workers shall be entitled to compensation for the time actually consumed in and about their regular and customary work."

SEC. 3. That subsection (b) of section 216 of said title 29, United States Code (52 Stat. 1069), be amended by striking out said subsection (b) and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Any employer who violates the provisions of section 206 or section 207 of this title shall be liable to the employee or employees affected in the amount of their unpaid minimum wages or their unpaid overtime compensation, as the case may be: *Provided, however*, That no employer shall be liable for, nor shall any employee or any person bringing suit for or in his behalf be entitled to recover for, any unpaid overtime compensation unless the one bringing such suit shall establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the unpaid overtime compensation is due because of time actually spent by the employee in productive work and not for time spent in going to or from the scene of productive work or in preparing therefor. Action to recover such liability may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated, or such employee or employees may designate in writing an agent or representative to maintain such action for and in behalf of all employees similarly situated: *Provided, however*, That no such action shall be brought or maintained unless the same be filed in a court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year of the date when such action accrues: *Provided further*, That no person shall be subject to any punishment or any liability under the provisions of sections 206, 207, and 216, title 29, United States Code (the same being secs. 6, 7, and 16 of Public Law 718, 75th Cong., 3d sess.), on account of any act done or omitted to be done, payment made or omitted to be made, or time worked, in connection with minimum wages or maximum hours or penalties as defined or imposed by said sections 206, 207, and 216, prior to the effective date of these amendments to said act. The court in such action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, allow a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid by the defendant and costs of the action."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include part of a magazine article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence to attend a funeral.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article from the Cleveland News.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address that he made.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE POLISH SITUATION

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years I have been calling to the attention of the House, with what may have seemed monotonous insistence, the dangerous implications of the Polish situation. On January 17, 1945, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to note the date, almost 2 years to the day from the so-called Polish elections, I expressed this doubt:

> Recent utterances of responsible statesmen, both here and abroad, particularly with respect to the future of Poland, have left our people bewildered, disheartened, and confused. They are bewildered, disheartened, and confused because to them it has appeared that the ideals for which their boys are fighting are in serious danger of being compromised. They are disturbed by the signs that the Allied leaders find it expedient to yield to necessity, that they find it to their best interests to sacrifice ideals to so-called practical necessity.

Several times since I have asked on the floor of the House that our State Department take more positive action in defense of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements entered into by the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia in behalf of free and unfettered elections in Poland.

As far back as February 12, 1946, I pointed a finger in the direction in which Polish events were moving. I quote from my address to the House on the joint anniversary of Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko:

> On this two hundredth birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko we Americans are enjoying the independence for which he so fiercely fought. One may question whether his own native land is enjoying the independence which he vainly fought to gain for it during his eventful life. True, Poland is now free and independent, but disquieting stories of political murders and Communist terrorism continue to leak out of that devastated land. Such is our American debt to Poland, the land of our benefactor's birth, that I strongly urge that we, as a nation, continue to exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland. Under various international agreements, we are committed to guarantee free and unfettered elections in the liberated lands. I strongly urge that our State Department follow up Secretary Byrnes' remonstrances on the terrorism existing in Poland, and throw the great weight of America behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

The terrorism to which I referred and against which Secretary Byrnes remonstrated, continued, and our State Department failed at the very time when strong representations might have stopped it. The United States did not throw its great weight behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

The terrorism practiced by the Communist-dominated Warsaw regime continued. On May 3, the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Third of May Constitution of Poland, I renewed my warnings. On that date I said:

> Tragically, however, it has not brought to the Polish people the blessings which our great document has brought to us. Even today, when Poland theoretically and according to the Potsdam agreements has a free and independent government of its own, the people of Poland, according to the few reports that filter out of that ravaged land, still do not enjoy the blessings of democracy.
>
> It would be easy for me to commemorate Polish Constitution Day by giving fulsome praise to the great Polish people for their centuries-long fight for political and religious freedom. It would be easy to count over the exploits of Polish heroes, both at home and abroad, but I feel that such words would be small comfort to the Polish people themselves in their present predicament. The greatest testimony of my esteem and the greatest contribution to their cause must, I feel, lie along other lines. I wish to make that contribution and express that esteem by calling the attention of the House to a current situation in which the future of Poland's true interests is deeply involved. * * *
>
> Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to developments which have already occurred and which seem to cast grave doubts upon the good faith of the regime which we propose to further strengthen by our loans and credits. I feel that I am serving the real interests of the Polish people by pointing an emphatic finger at these developments. Four days after Mr. Lange's letter, which apparently reassured our State Department and others who opposed the loan, there appeared a dispatch in the New York Times to which little attention has been paid. This dispatch from Warsaw revealed that Stanis-

law Mikolajczyk and his Peasant Party went into open opposition and abstained from the vote of confidence when this year's budget was approved. The Peasant Party declared that the whole present session of the National Council has been utilized for an attack and a campaign of calumny against our party.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that this was the party which was taken into the government at the insistence of the United States to broaden its base by the addition of democratic elements not dominated by Soviet Russia.

The Peasant Party further charged the security police with unlawful arrests and detention and seizure of property, alleging, also, that their action endangered the liberty of citizens.

It is evident to me, Mr. Speaker, and should be to all the Members of the House, that the developments taking place now in Poland should be watched most carefully. What will it avail to have so-called free and unfettered elections in the fall if no one opposed to Soviet domination remains to vote? The pattern is evident. It has been followed many times before. The opposition is removed by all the various means which the Soviets know so well how to use. Then elections are held and the vote is announced as nearly unanimous. * * * If our Government is serious in its desire to see that free and unfettered elections are really held and proposes to use this loan as a means of insuring this objective, then there is one thing that must be done, and be done immediately. Our State Department should demand an investigation of the charges made by the Peasant Party and demand further that the Allied press enjoy full freedom at once to report to the world upon developments in Poland. This is the time—before the elections—which is all-important. The whole character of those elections is being determined now. If the Warsaw regime is sincere in giving its assurances in return for the loan, then it should not object to the fullest investigations of the Polish situation from this date to the holding of the elections.

I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the American press indeed enjoyed full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Poland. Apparently it is enjoying that full freedom. That very fact should be the undoing of the present tyrannical regime; because reports from American press representatives show clearly that what I foretold during the past two years has, in fact, happened. The so-called free and unfettered elections will not take place. With unmitigated effrontery, the Warsaw regime, set up by the Allied Powers, has made such elections impossible. I need only quote in support of this statement, the dispatch written from Warsaw on January 2 by Sidney Gruson, the New York Times correspondent.

I hope the House will note the significant headline used by the Times. I quote:

ELECTION IN POLAND IS RIGGED BY FORCE—BANNING OF OPPOSITION LEADERS AND TERROR AMONG FOLLOWERS HELD TO PRECLUDE JUSTICE

(By Sydney Gruson)

WARSAW, January 2.—Mass arrests of members of the Polish Opposition Party (PSL), intimidation of anyone and everyone who might be unwilling to accept Communist leadership and the ban on the candidacy of some opposition leaders have reached such a point that voting on January 19 will be meaningless.

There is no other conclusion to be reached. It is obvious that the events of the last 6 weeks, no matter what happens on January 19, have precluded the possibility of obtaining anything like a free expression of the people's will.

The Communist leadership is prepared to crush Vice Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk's opposition, once and for all. Continued at its present pace, the unbridled terror let loose in the country, of which Mr. Mikolajczyk gave additional details today, may obviate the need for faking the ballot count, such as is generally believed to have occurred during the referendum last July.

DISSIDENT SOCIALIST BANNED

Terror and intimidation are not new. Now the authorities have begun on the candidates. The national electoral commission tonight voted 6 to 1 to remove Anthoni Zdanowski from the combined Socialist-Peasant list in Warsaw and Lodz, asserting that the prewar secretary of the Polish trade-unions had connections with the underground and as a Socialist leader had not been active enough against the Germans during the occupation.

M. Zdanowski is a member of the small dissident Socialist group led by Zygmund Zulowski, which has filed combined lists with the Peasants in five districts. These lists have been either partly of completely banned in two of the five districts. The electoral commission has also decided to ban Peasant Leaders Kazimirz Baginski, Stanislaw Mierzwa, and Stanislaw Kotek because they are in jail on charges of subversive activities.

After talking with government officials and neutral diplomats here, it is obvious also that Poland's leaders have decided to act this way partly because they feel certain that neither the United States nor Britain will withdraw recognition after the elections. The faint hints of such a possibility in recent British and American notes do not impress the men charged with running Poland's internal affairs.

The Communist paper Glos Luda pointed up the determination here to make the elections the last word in establishing the "democratic bloc's" authority by asserting that already 70 percent of the people entitled to vote in Silesia have signed up for the bloc.

"The democratic bloc must not be just victorious," Glos Luda said. "Its victory must be overwhelming to deliver the final blow to the allied forces of legal, half-legal and illegal reaction."

Mr. Mikolajczyk, at a press conference, gave another few instances of how this overwhelming victory is being assured. First of all, he reported, 104 PSL candidates are under arrest and the national electoral commission has rejected party appeal for their release "because it is a matter for the security authorities."

M. Mikolajczyk also reported the finding of the mutilated body of a candidate, Jan Malejko, in a field near his home in the district of Bydgoszcz. Although M. Mikolajczyk said there was no proof as to who had committed the murder, he left no question about his belief by telling that M. Malejko had been threatened by the security police unless he agreed to withdraw his candidacy. He was taken from his home one night by three men describing themselves as militiamen.

The rest of Mr. Mikolajczyk's talk to the press was what by now has become an old story: Arrests, disruption of Peasant party meetings, striking Peasant party supporters from voting lists, maltreatment of those detained and hindering of Peasants' district organizations.

"There was no peace for the peasants of Poland during the Christmas holidays," the Peasant party's daily communiqué said sadly.

TERROR ON BOTH SIDES

Government spokesmen categorically deny every charge of terror and intimidation made by M. Mikolajczyk. But the denials do not stand up against the personal observation of foreign correspondents here and reports from a majority of the diplomatic missions in Warsaw.

The Government has made much of the terror used by the underground. It is considerable. More than 20 of the bloc parties' election officials have already been murdered and 8 Communist workers were recently killed and mutilated on the highway near Warsaw in a particularly revolting crime.

The Gazeta Ludowa has so far failed to report the murder of the workmen and the Government press has charged that silence on the part of the Peasant press implies support of such action. M. Mikolajczyk today again condemned any kind of political violence, which his paper denounced editorially yesterday.

"Censorship has never allowed us to publish the news of the murders of our members," he said. "Must we repeat our condemnation in every case?"

Censorship has cracked down hard on the Gazeta Ludowa recently. It has blue-penciled every reference to arrests or intimidation and has given the newspaper's editors a nightmare of work refilling as much as three-quarters of the front page of a single edition. The paper is not allowed to appear with blank spaces denoting censorship.

There is still time, Mr. Speaker, for our State Department to redeem itself. Until now it has let the Polish situation slide along. As a matter of fact, the British have done far more in the way of remonstrance to vindicate the Yalta and Potsdam agreements than have we. It is time that we assumed our share of the burden which we willingly accepted.

There is still time, I say again, for our Government to exert every force at its disposal to ensure that the elections to be held on January 19 are actually free and unfettered. This will, I admit, necessitate immediate action, but such action is imperative if the smaller nations throughout the world are to have any confidence at all in the promises and pledges of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a radio address and in the other to include another address.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. NELSON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I announce the sudden death at his home in Columbia, Mo., on the day before the Congress assembled, of Hon. William L. Nelson who served in this body for 18 years.

He was a member of two of the important committees of the House, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Rules, and left his imprint on vital legislation enacted by this body.

He had previously served as a member of the General Assembly of Missouri; as assistant secretary of agriculture for Missouri; was the author of numerous publications; and was one of the outstanding citizens of his State.

His wide circle of friends here in the House will learn with regret of his passing.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I learn of the passing of my predecessor, William L. Nelson. I knew him as my Congressman for 18 years and admired his untiring efforts. He built a reputation for hard work and diligent attention to the duties of his office. He gave of himself in faithful public service both in and out of Congress during the most productive years of his life.

I am sure that next to his devotion for his immediate family, his service in this body was his chief interest in life. He was beloved by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and his memory will be cherished, especially by the older Members of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include part of a statement by Gen. Peyton C. Marsh and an editorial from the Washington Post.

THE LATE HONORABLE SOUTH TRIMBLE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, South Trimble, for 36 years the only nominee of the Democratic Party for Clerk of the House of Representatives, died at the age of 82 during our absence from Washington. He had for 24 years successfully fulfilled the arduous duties of his office with distinction. Mr. Trimble served his country throughout his life with outstanding ability and devotion. Venerable and beloved, his splendid public service endeared him to every Member of every Congress with whom he served. We have lost an able administrative assistant. I have lost a friend.

Mr. Trimble was born in Kentucky in April 1864. He exemplified the highest traits of the Kentucky gentleman. He grew younger with the passing years in his love for his native State. His fidelity to his friends—and they were innumerable—made him the object of affection. He never avoided political conflict, fighting hard, but clean, and leaving no bitterness. His kindness of heart and generosity of spirit gave him the understanding of the wise protagonist, able to smile in victory and defeat.

South Trimble was above all an American, possessed of the highest ideals, a man of learning, scholarly, courteous, and distinguished. He carved for himself a name among the great names who have served in the House of Representatives. He discharged every duty of his office efficiently, and with fidelity and honor.

Mr. Trimble witnessed many dramatic events on Capitol Hill. None, however, equaled his experience as speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives in 1900. In that year the Kentucky gubernatorial election was so closely contested that the legislature designated Mr. Trimble to pick from a bowl containing many slips of paper the names of three men who would investigate the election and decide the outcome. Mr. Trimble drew the names of three judges sponsored by his own, the Democratic, party. The Democratic Governor was elected, but was assassinated as he was about to take the oath of office. Mr. Trimble led a group of legislators to the death bed of the Democratic candidate, William Goebels, and enabled him to take oath of office immediately before he died. This historic incident had many repercussions in our national life. The name of South Trimble became a household word throughout Kentucky. In that year he was elected to Congress and served as a Member of the House until 1906, when he decided not to seek reelection.

Little can be added to what has previously been said on the floor of the House to South Trimble in salutation and congratulation while he was alive. Capitol Hill has lost a sage counselor and adviser on all congressional and governmental matters. We all will miss South Trimble.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

33. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

34. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending March 31, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

35. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report submitted under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Law 338, Seventy-ninth Congress (to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes), covering the period July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

36. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report and appendix for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

37. A letter from the Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of the selective-service registrants of inductible age occupationally deferred by the local boards of the System as of October 1, 1946, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

38. A letter from the Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of the selective-service registrants of inductible age occupationally deferred by the local boards of the System as of July 1, 1946, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

39. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act, for the quarter ending September 30, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

40. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on several authorized investigations for flood control; to the Committee on House Administration.

41. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946; the number of pieces procured during the fiscal year 1946; the estimated mailings and the estimated costs, by departments and agencies, for the fiscal years 1945 and 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

42. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

43. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

44. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

45. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

46. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of the audit report of the financial transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the period July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943; together with a copy of the statement of the acting manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, filed by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture under date of May 9, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

47. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in compliance with Public Law 301, report of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

48. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting Navy Department report for the fiscal year 1946, in compliance with Public Law 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Law 338, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

49. A letter from the War Assets Administrator, transmitting a supplemental report on Government-owned pipe lines; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

50. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 190 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

51. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a recommendation for legislation regarding pay and promotions of certain postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

52. A letter from the Acting President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the Commission's request for personnel for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

53. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a coastal mine sweeper or other vessel of generally similar type suitable for use in collecting specimens in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

54. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all claims settled by the Navy Department in accordance with the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726, 46 U. S. C. 797), and the act of December 5, 1945 (Public Law 246, 79th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting one copy each of all agreements and all purchases and condemnation proceedings entered into under authority of the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1253), as amended by the act approved June 17, 1944, Public Law No. 343, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

56. A letter from the Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress; to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of all War Department contracts in excess of $150,000 undertaken during the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

58. A letter from the Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on House Administration.

59. A letter from the Governor, Government of the Virgin Islands of the United States, transmitting three copies of a resolution passed by the legislative assembly of the Virgin Islands urging the restoration in the Virgin Islands of the United States of the Soil Conservation Service and the Farm Security Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

60. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Clarence Norfleet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

61. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the use of Coast Guard radio stations for commercial messages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

64. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to taking trial pieces of coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

65. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Malcomb G. Dickey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

67. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

68. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1946, including a full and complete report of receipts and disbursements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

69. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the nineteenth annual report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 12); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

70. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission's report of December 21, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

71. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the thirtieth annual report of the United States Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

72. A letter from the Chief Clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 30, 1946, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

73. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the thirty-second annual report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

74. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from various departments and independent establishments; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

75. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1946, for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

76. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

77. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report covering activities under the Federal aid in wildlife restoration fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

78. A letter from the director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1946; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

79. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 13); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

80. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting comparative statement of financial condition for the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as of June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

81. A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1943; to the Committee on Public Lands.

82. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

83. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the amount of moneys credited to a special helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

84. A letter from the director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the twenty-eighth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held at San Francisco, Calif., September 30 to October 4, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 449. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 450. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 451. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 452. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 453. A bill to amend Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 454. A bill to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn sold by producers between January 1, 1946, and April 18, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 455. A bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 456. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 457. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 458. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 459. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to agricultural fairs and pay features conducted as part thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 460. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of death-pension benefits to widows and children of World War Veterans under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 461. A bill to provide for flood-control work on the Wabash River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 462. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 463. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, with respect to farmer-debtor relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 464. A bill to provide for the admission of certain displaced persons to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 465. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 466. A bill relating to the admission into the United States, as nonquota immigrants, of certain individuals who have served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 467. A bill to terminate certain wartime excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 468. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 469. A bill to amend section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for the refund of income taxes paid for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, by persons who die while serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 470. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 471. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 472. A bill to extend certain benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to husbands and widowers of insured wives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 473. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide old-age insurance benefits for husbands and survivors' insurance benefits for widowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 474. A bill to permit extension of insurance of Federal Housing Administration loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 475. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; to the Committee on Education and Labor

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 476. A bill to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered wartime service in the United States merchant marine, and to provide aid for their families; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 477. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the determination of employment time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 478. A bill to regulate and control the operation of foreign agencies acting within the United States or its Territories and dependencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 479. A bill relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 480. A bill to amend section 25 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 481. A bill to create a commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 482. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit future applicants to elect to be compensated for terminal leave in cash in lieu of bonds, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 483. A bill to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 484. A bill to extend the period of time during which veterans of World War II may participate in the education benefits provided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 485. A bill to amend Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, to provide increased pension for orphans of deceased World War veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 486. A bill to provide follow-up outpatient medical treatment for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 487. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 488. A bill to repeal subsistence allowance ceilings and limitations for on-the-job training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 489. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 490. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States Commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 491. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 493. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22–3204 D. C. Code 1940 ed.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 494. A bill to reorganize the system of parole of prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 495. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 496. A bill to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 497. A bill to transfer the probation system for the District of Columbia to the probation system for United States courts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 498. A bill to protect the public security by providing for the scientific determination of needs of children who become a public charge; to provide individualization of treatment in their own or other homes or institutions; to provide the integration of services; to provide for continuity of service and records; and to extend the authority of the Board of Public Welfare in the interest of conserving family life; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 499. A bill to integrate the penal and correctional system of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 500. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 501. A bill to amend section 22 (b) and section 25 (b) (1) of title 26 of the Internal Revenue Code by granting additional exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 502. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 503. A bill to create a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 504. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 505. A bill to prohibit the transportation of certain inflammable textile fabrics in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 506. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 507. A bill relating to the payment for grave markers and headstones which the Secretary of War is authorized to furnish; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 508. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 509. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 510. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers and former officers of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 511. A bill to provide that retired personnel of the Regular Army called into active military service under the provisions of the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940, shall be restored to active duty with the rank held by them on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 512. A bill to grant to veterans of the present war a temporary exclusion from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 513. A bill to provide acreage allotments and marketing quotas of tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 514. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 515. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 516. A bill to provide a larger Federal contribution for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 517. A bill to authorize the designation of retired justices for service on the Supreme Court of the United States when necessary to obtain a quorum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 518. A bill to create a Board to be known as the National Symphony Orchestra Trust Fund Board, to define the duties of said Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 519. A bill to provide for the admission to practice before all Federal courts, departments, and agencies of veterans who have been admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States or the highest court of any State, district, or Territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 520. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an annuity for total and permanent disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 521. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 522. A bill to provide for the erection of a World War II memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 523. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a special Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 524. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 525. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a special Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 526. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 527. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for war-veteran patients in United States veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 528. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall have the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 529. A bill to extend the time for filing certain applications for insurance payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 530. A bill to limit the purposes for which loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank of Washington to foreign governments and persons in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 531. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 532. A bill to provide for the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 533. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption from $500 to $1,000 and the exemption for dependents from $500 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 534. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 535. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce port district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 536. A bill to require common carriers by railroad to install reflectors on railroad cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 537. A bill to repeal the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 538. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for refunds of deductions from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of certain temporary employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 539. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 540. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 541. A bill to provide a more equitable program of old-age assistance by amending section 2 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 542. A bill to provide a more equitable program of old-age assistance by amending section 3 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 543. A bill authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Thirty-second Division; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 544. A bill to establish import quotas with respect to cheese of various types or kinds and grades; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 652. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Laban P. Hilton, in recognition of his valor in saving from drowning eight of his fellow citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 653. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ebersbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 654. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans and to regional agricultural credit corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution providing for the payment of a 30-cent bonus per bushel on all wheat and corn harvested and sold between June 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution relating to Public Law No. 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and providing for the refund of all penalty taxes collected and for the cancellation of all uncollected penalty taxes on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for making available to the Veterans' Administration, for distribution to veterans' hospitals, undeliverable magazines and other periodicals held by the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to provide for the incorporation and registration of labor organizations and to impose certain responsibilities upon such organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution providing for payments for the purpose of equalizing, as between the different regions or Territories of the United States, freight charges for the transportation of defense materials during the existing emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICH:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress during February 1947, to ask God's divine guidance in the deliberations and actions of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to study the mining and distribution of coal; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 36. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. Res. 37. Resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the operation of the program for the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 38. Resolution requesting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish the House of Representatives information with respect to materials in the possession of the War and Navy Departments suitable for use in relieving the housing shortage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps to alleviate the shortage of buildings and office space in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the inundation of State Highways 77 and 192 by the waters impounded by Prado Dam in Riverside County, Calif., and remedial legislation in connection with this and similar situations; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 545. A bill for the relief of George Elly Vasu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 546. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo or James Bologna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 547. A bill for the relief of Michael Pirog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 548. A bill for the relief of Orlando Poraale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 549. A bill for the relief of Maj. Edward A. Zaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 550. A bill for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 551. A bill for the relief of Teruko Nagai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 552. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francis J. O'Driscoll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 553. A bill for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 554. A bill for the relief of Jon Ovezea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 555. A bill for the relief of Edna Rita Saffron Fidone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 556. A bill for the relief of Raimundo Fernandez (Rodigues); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 557. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Armand Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 558. A bill for the relief of Francesco Garuffi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 560. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 561. A bill for the relief of W. S. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 562. A bill for the relief of Mordko David Jurkiewicz, alias Max York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 563. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel W. Macdonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 564. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 565. A bill for the relief of C. C. Land; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 566. A bill for the relief of Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 567. A bill for the relief of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 568. A bill for the relief of John D. Panoushis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 569. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 570. A bill for the relief of Henry Shoichi Higashio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 571. A bill for the relief of W. Garland Lillard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

18. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Protestant Council of the City of New York, supporting the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

19. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frederick W. Collins, M. D., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

20. Also, petition of student council, Juilliard School of Music, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of amendments to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to effectuate an upward revision of the subsistence payments under these laws to adequately meet the high cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

21. Also, petition of the City Council, City of Biddeford, Maine, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to advocating the improvement of the waterways and anchorages at Biddeford Pool and Wood Island Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

22. Also, petition of Wisconsin State Council of Machinists, I. A. of M., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

23. Also, petition of American Veterans Committee of the Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to processing of families and relatives of American soldiers of Japanese ancestry residing in the Territory of Hawaii, and making it possible for them to return to America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

24. Also, petition of the Independent Voters League of Boise, Idaho, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Congress to pass legislation to purchase all outstanding patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

25. Also, petition of several citizens, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passing a law for the relief of the Ex-Soldiers Investment Industrial Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of mercies, we thank Thee that the mind of a good God is on the affairs of human life; in all our contacts we beseech Thee to resolve discords into flawless harmony. Our greatest values will be realized when self is lost in true devotion to the welfare of all people. Save us from ourselves that the treasures of golden opportunities may not be lost or neglected. O freely endow us with radiant faith, compelling courage, and loyalty to the highest conceptions of personal conduct.

Bless richly our newsmen who serve the public so efficiently; be with all clerks and reporters who are so faithful in the discharge of their duties. Comfort the homes among us which bear the silent story of affliction; do Thou be unto them as a shadow of a great rock in a weary land, sustained by Thy presence and comforted by Thy love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint reso-

lution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES ON APPROPRIATIONS AND WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 39) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Appropriations: John Taber (chairman), New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; Francis Case, South Dakota; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Noble J. Johnson, Indiana; Robert F. Jones, Ohio; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walter C. Ploeser, Missouri; Harve Tibbott, Pennsylvania; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma.

Ways and Means: Harold Knutson (chairman), Minnesota; Daniel A. Reed, New York; Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Bertrand W. Gearhart, California; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by me before the Joint Army and Navy Board created pursuant to House Resolution 529 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, of which I was the author, with reference to a second bay crossing from San Francisco to Bay Farm Island on the easterly side of San Francisco Bay; also to include a supplemental statement submitted by me to the same Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the winter issue of Dixie Business by Lt. James A. Reilly entitled "Atlanta Depot's Automotive School Trained 50,000 for Global War on Wheels."

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Chicago Tribune on the state of the Union.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it in order for Members to request time for special orders today?

The SPEAKER. Such a request would be in order.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes following the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special order just granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include short resolutions by the Ringgold County (Iowa) Carriers' Association.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the services conducted by the Washington Federation of Churches upon the first day of the Congress just prior to the opening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable Robert E. Frear, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include excerpts.

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Bar Association Journal.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include certain newspaper articles relative to the death of Judge W. B. Bowling, a former Member of this House.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, including a speech by J. Edgar Hoover on communism in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor at this time to discuss a matter about which millions of our people are deeply concerned, and about which a great many statements, requests, letters, and inquiries are coming to Washington. It pertains to the domestic supply of sugar, and particularly as it relates to household consumers.

We have to bear in mind, as legislators, that the present sugar program of the administration and of the Congress and of the Government generally has been running since about 1934; as a matter of fact, we could date it back of that a little if we wanted to, but as far as legislation is concerned we may place it about 1934. Since then, and since the inception of the reciprocal trade-agreements programs we have had four successive reductions in the tariff on sugar which comes into the United States.

Some of you may have forgotten or overlooked the fact that the tariff duties applied in two ways. Cuba, operating under the reciprocal trade-agreement program, enjoyed one duty and offshore areas—that is, foreign countries other than Cuba—had to pay a higher duty under the historical tariff assessments of this Government. So both the foreign duties other than Cuba have been reduced and also the Cuban duties.

If you can imagine yourself as an investor in sugar properties, and I refer particularly to raw-sugar mills such as you find in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and the beet-sugar mills such as you find in some 16 or 17 of our States—I do not refer to the seacoast refineries which are no more than laundry machines for the purpose of washing the molasses out of raw sugars—if you are an investor in sugar mills which produce raw sugar located on the continent of the United States you would be concerned about the reduction in the tariff duties on raw sugar coming into the United States because that raw sugar would directly compete with the raw sugar which is produced in the beet fields and the sugar-cane fields of this country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I know the gentleman from Michigan has made a thorough study of this sugar situation. What is going to be the result in the not distant future so far as the American people securing the amount of sugar that they need without being regulated as to the amount they can use?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I shall tell you about that particular phase of it later. Let me go on now for a moment.

With four successive reductions in the duty on sugar within a few years, as an investor you would naturally be concerned about your present investment and you would not be too anxious to put further additional funds in an expansion of a business which the administration had at least indicated it expected to retire from operation in the United States. So in the last 12 or 15 years we have had no expansion of consequence in the productive facilities of sugar, but we have had a great expansion in two other things, namely, population and the monetary power to buy sugar and try to satisfy a sweet tooth, if you please.

In addition to that general set-up I have just stated, we have the domestic sugar industry which consists of the beet and cane industries here on the continent plus the Hawaiian sugar industry, plus the Puerto Rican and the Virgin Islands sugar industry. Those

are areas under the American flag where citizens of the United States live. Cuba is a foreign country; the Philippines is a foreign country; so neither of those areas is included within the domestic sugar industry. They simply cannot be. But always remember that Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are the same to this Congress as are the beet fields of the various States and the cane fields of Louisiana, Florida, and Texas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman, I think, will recall that when the Philippine trade bill was passed in the last Congress we did then, with the binding effect of a treaty, give to the Philippine Islands for a long period of time the same portion of our domestic sugar market that they had been enjoying.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is true, I believe.

Mr. CURTIS. That is putting a further obstacle in the way of extension of sugar production in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to these reductions in duties, there is imposed on the sugar industry marketing quotas. That is, the whole market of the United States was allocated a certain percentage to Cuba, a certain percentage to the Philippines, a certain percentage to the domestic beet-sugar industry and the sugarcane industry, and so on down the line. That tended to further restrict the production of sugar and to further restrict the expansion of productive facilities on sugar to the market allocation, rather than depending on competition.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. If we give the domestic producers, meaning the producers who are American citizens in this country and in those offshore areas, a chance to operate, expand, and profit, are we capable of producing all the sugar we need in this country?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you ever establish a certain definite policy and lay it down cold-blooded so that the investor would know what to depend upon, and what you were going to do, of course, you could produce the sugar we need, which is for domestic use and exports of sweets, say 9,000,000 tons of sugar per annum. Of course, in such a plan you will largely care for Cuba. In 1946 about 5,450,000 tons, in round figures, were allocated for consumption, and therefore you were short of supply. Now we are going to continue short on sugar for some time to come, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we must not overlook this fact when we are trying to develop our own sugar industry, that during 1938–39 we paid the sugar industry in this country $49,000,000 for not raising sugar, and then we came along about 1941 and we started to pay the sugar industry $58,000,000 for raising sugar. Now we want to establish a policy in this country, if we are going to protect the sugar industry, so that we will not have to reach down into the Treasury and take out $58,000,000 for subsidies. We want to be careful from now on, because the responsibility is yours and mine.

Further, may I call your attention to the fact that we are about $259,000,000,000 in the red. The President said yesterday we are going to balance the budget. That is the first time in 15 years that I have heard anybody down in the White House say he was going to do it. Now we want to help him do that very thing, but at the same time we want to help the sugar industry of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is not this also a thing that has affected the supply of sugar? The price of sugar has been held down, as everyone knows, by OPA. Naturally, the price of sugar beets and sugarcane was held down to such a degree that it was not profitable to raise sugar beets and sugarcane, or as profitable as it was to raise other crops. Consequently we have not had the added production of sugarcane and sugar beets as we have of other products, and hence we have had a small crop, and because of that we have no sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Three or four things have happened: A reduction in the tariff duty, the establishment of your marketing quotas, and the initiation of price control which damped down the production of sugar, because other competitive crops could be more profitably grown. Further, we have entered into some twelve or fifteen basic international agreements since January 1940, which impose upon us more or less the responsibility to share with the other nations of the earth such sugar as we do get. Now how can we give the housewives of this country the sugar they want?

Mr. JENSEN. In order to get production of sugar we must have the price of sugar raised; is that not a fact?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, you are going to have to do some other things, too.

Mr. JENSEN. But that is one of the things.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; that is certainly one of them. What we have to do as a Congress, if we want to answer the prayers of the housewives for sugar, is to start to put into operation those things which permit sugar to be produced. This is because we have certainly had a sufficient number of lessons to teach us that we cannot legislate foodstuffs into the kitchens of this country. It has got to be produced. Here you have a shortage of sugar throughout the whole world. It is a world shortage, and I do not mean maybe. There is no fooling about it.

What can we do? Let your price go up until producers come back into the field. That is number one. Unless you do that by the planting time this spring you do not get the sugar beets and the sugarcane planted for next fall's harvesting. That is the reason I am making this statement today. This is something that runs with the seasons. If you go until June next before you make any changes, then figure 18 months before you get the increased quantity of sugar. What do I mean by an increased quantity of sugar? I mean what these housewives want. I do not mean 5 pounds next year, I mean to fix it so that the farmer's wife and the city wife can go to the grocery store and buy the sugar they want when they get ready to buy it. That is what they want. They are not going to fuss about whether they pay 7 cents a pound or 12 cents a pound. They want the sugar, so as to put the cookies in the lunch basket that the kiddies take to school; meet their canning and other requirements as in years past. That is what they are after, and it is up to this Congress to do something about that. It is a big program, and we might as well get started on it as quickly as possible.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman speaks about the shortage of sugar and how housewives need the sugar. They surely needed sugar during the Christmas holidays to make the cakes and cookies.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They need it now, too.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman no doubt has read ads in the New York Journal of Commerce by importers of sugar like John M. Schlein, who advertised all the sugar that the housewives or anybody else wanted, in hundred-pound sacks, shipped anywhere in the world except the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. That is due to the marketing quota and the restrictions.

Mr. STEVENSON. Could the gentleman explain how that could happen?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You have rationing of sugar in the United States under the OPA. You can have your pocket full of money but you have to have a sugar stamp to get some. That fellow cannot import 100-pound bags and sell freely to you just now because you have to have stamps to get the 100 pounds of sugar. That is what you are up against.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I can tell the gentleman how he can get sugar; in the black market.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Many of us are very deeply interested in this subject and very much interested in what the gentleman has to say about it. There is one

inquiry I should like to make. As I understand the gentleman, he is in favor of a situation whereby the housewives and those who need the sugar will be able to secure the sugar. The gentleman mentioned also that even if it got up to 12 cents a pound they would not be able to get the sugar. Suppose sugar got to an unusually high price, would not that indicate there was a scarcity? If there was a scarcity, how would that indicate they could get the sugar?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If it goes to 12 or 15 or 50 cents a pound, that in itself does not indicate a scarcity, because you have got just what the market offers, and no more. There is a world scarcity of sugar now. Higher free prices would bring forth production and the scarcity would vanish as it has on meats and other food items.

So, we should rid ourselves of sugar price controls, sugar-marketing quotas, positively and permanently establishing a minimum tariff of $1.50 per 100 pounds of sugar against Cuba and get back to the expansion of sugar production under the American flag. All this if we want an ample supply of sugar.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all my colleagues on this side of the aisle will be very much gratified at the announcement I am privileged to make, and I am certain also that all of his friends on the other side of the aisle will be glad also. I have finally prevailed upon my old friend and coworker, JOHN McCORMACK, to accept the place of whip of the minority. For 6 years he and I have been coworkers in the leadership of the House. Since the majority passed to the other side and my colleagues on this side have imposed upon me the duty of the leadership, I am proud that I will have him as my consultant and coworker in the leadership of the minority, as I have had in the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY SUITS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the filing of many suits for alleged overtime compensation—popularly known as portal-to-portal pay—has focused the attention of the country on a problem which should have the immediate attention of the Congress.

The amounts claimed in actions already begun run into billions of dollars. In view of the number of employees now subject to certain Federal statutes, the final amount may reach fantastic proportions and do serious damage to our entire economic structure.

Certain laws are being interpreted and enforced without regard to long-standing practices and customs in the particular industry—heretofore considered to be a part of every agreement of employment. In some cases this is being done in spite of specific agreement to the contrary and, as a result, the entire philosophy of collective bargaining is being jeopardized. These new regulations are given a retroactive application in spite of good faith attempts to comply with the then existing regulations and practices. The failure of Congress to enact proper statutes of limitation permits the litigation of claims arising many years in the past and covering transactions about which satisfactory evidence is no longer available.

These suits call for the payment of amounts equal to three times the regular hourly wage, plus attorney fees and costs. Some employers, unable to pay the amounts claimed, may be forced into bankruptcy. The uncertainties, the protracted litigation will seriously retard production at a time when maximum production is greatly needed. The flow of interstate commerce will be retarded. In the long run, the results will be detrimental to all.

Employees are learning that the wages to which they are entitled depend, not upon bargains made with their employers, but upon fortuitous and unexpected circumstances. Definitions of worktime, left by Congress largely to employer and employee, are being drawn within the orbit of administrative regulation and court decision.

The Government too has a stake in these suits. Some of the judgments obtained will be proper charges against the National Treasury under wartime cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. It was learned last year in the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee that additional billions may thus be added to the cost of the war.

This problem received consideration in the last Congress. On March 28, 1945, I introduced H. R. 2788, a bill to provide a statute of limitation in certain cases. On October 22, 1945, this bill was reported favorably by that committee with certain amendments. Thereafter the bill passed both the House and Senate in slightly different forms but failed of final enactment.

Today I am introducing another bill to deal with this problem. Important features of the proposed legislation are as follows:

First. Hereafter the actions covered by the bill must be commenced within 1 year after the cause of action accrued.

Second. Causes of action accrued prior to the effective date of the act, and not barred by any applicable statute of limitations, may be commenced within 90 days after such effective date. Recovery under any cause of action which has already accrued would be limited to 1 year.

Third. No recovery would be permitted for any period during which the employer was complying with the law as then interpreted and enforced by the enforcement authorities.

Fourth. In the absence of fraud or duress, a settlement or release of a claim or cause of action would be a defense to the suit.

Fifth. The court may include as part of the judgment an attorney fee which shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount recovered and in no event in excess of $5,000.

Sixth. The burden of proof shall rest upon the party maintaining such action and the failure of the defendant to produce records, not required by published regulations authorized by statute, shall give rise to no prejudicial inference affecting liability or the measure or extent of damages.

Seventh. Jurisdiction is withdrawn from the courts to pass on these claims except under the conditions specified, or to nullify employment contracts already performed by giving retroactive effect to decisions such as the portal-to-portal decisions, or to award liquidated damages except where the violation of law was willful.

Eighth. This act would apply to all such acts or causes of action arising under or pursuant to section 2 of the act of June 30, as amended—the Public Contracts Act (41 U. S. C. 36); section 16 (b) of the act of June 25, 1948—the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U. S. C. 216 (b)); and section 3 (b) of the act of August 30, 1935, as amended—the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C. 276 (a) (2)). Any parts of said acts inconsistent with any provision of this act are to such extent repealed.

This bill would not interfere with the power of the Federal Government to enforce provisions of the law by proceedings for injunctions or by criminal prosecution. It is not designed to aid the willful violator. Its purpose is to prevent the chaos which now threatens us because of interpretations which would nullify and remake transactions long since completed. It would remove many uncertainties now plaguing both employer and employee. It would foster and protect interstate commerce. It would protect the Public Treasury from the serious drain of this new form of windfall.

At some future date, there will no doubt be opportunity to discuss the constitutional questions involved. Permit me at this time to invite attention to the following general propositions:

First. Congress has the power and the duty to regulate interstate commerce and matters affecting such commerce. In exercising this power, Congress should act in the interest of all. All contracts which have been or will be made are subject to this broad power.

Second. Congress has power to regulate the jurisdiction of the courts. No person has a vested property right in a Federal statute or in any right of action or remedy under such statute. Just as Congress may repeal any law, it may modify the remedies provided and direct the courts to apply the remedies under the conditions laid down by the Congress. It lies within its power to determine whether, in the application of penalties or liabilities provided by statute, decisions of the courts should be given retroactive or merely prospective effect.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement. I have noticed some writers have suggested that this problem of portal-to-portal pay

might be reached by taking away the jurisdiction of the courts to hear such cases. If I understand the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, his remedy varies from that, in that it would provide that proof that the employer had followed the law and regulations as required by the Government would constitute a defense to the suit.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. I do not think it would be advisable to take away all jurisdiction of the courts to hear questions under the Fair Labor Standards Act, because there are certain violations for which suit should be maintained.

The general purpose of this bill is to lay down the conditions under which the court may entertain jurisdiction, and under which the court may render judgment. It would protect the employer in three general classes of cases. First, he would be protected where his conduct had been in accord with regulations existing at the time.

Second, where his conduct had been in accord with a collective-bargaining agreement in operation at that time.

And, third, where his conduct had been in accord with the established custom and practices of the industry at the time.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe the gentleman's proposal is sound.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I recall very clearly, Mr. Speaker, the bill that was introduced and later passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress concerning this very subject. The events which have taken place in the courts since that time have justified some of the apprehensions that were expressed during the course of the debate on that bill.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether he has considered the constitutional question of whether the legislation he has now introduced in any way violates the constitutional provisions relating to the sanctity of contracts and the obligation of contracts? Has the gentleman given that any thought or consideration, and has he any comment to make on it?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Yes; I have given it considerable thought, but it would be a rather long subject to make a detailed explanation of right now.

The general philosophy I have in mind is this—and there is precedent for it: Congress has the right to regulate interstate commerce. That is a power to which all contracts are subject.

The constitutional provision which it may be claimed this law violates is the due process clause that property cannot be taken without due process of law. Let me cite to the gentleman the well-known gold cases, where Congress in its authority to regulate money and fix the value thereof was held to have the right to interfere with contracts made long before the law was passed. We did substantially the same thing when we passed the insurance bill during the last session, where in effect we gave a moratorium of 2 years on the bringing of certain suits which had then accrued under the antitrust laws. I believe we are on sound constitutional grounds in this approach.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. This is a very vexatious but important question in which I am greatly interested. Was there anything in the message on yesterday precommending that attention be paid to this matter?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I do not recall anything.

Mr. GIFFORD. I simply suggest that I do not know how much legislation might be approved if passed.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Not being a prophet I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION As I understand the gentleman, one of his proposals is to uphold and protect the sanctity of contracts

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION. And his second proposition is to protect the citizen where he has followed the law and regulations issued under the direction of an act of Congress.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, how disappointing must be the President's speech on the state of the Union to the millions who are looking forward to a better day as a result of the recent election. Hardly a word of encouragement did he offer for the solution of the very pressing problem of strikes and their accompaniments. The President recommends some slight relief such as the prevention of jurisdictional strikes. He says the secondary boycott is an unjustifiable practice "when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act." Then he adds:

> Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions, as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence.

For the first time, so far as I know, the political forces in control of the Federal Government make it a policy to sanction and uphold boycotts.

About the only remedy the President suggests for alleviating strikes is more political intervention in the relations between employers and employees. Political intervention in this field is responsible for much the greater portion of the falsely called labor-management strife. To cure this situation the President proposes to apply more of the same noxious substance which caused the trouble, more political machinery and meddling.

Not one word did he say about the billions of dollars' worth of property that is being destroyed by the policy of the political machine in control of the Government in sanctioning and encouraging strikes.

How depressing all this must be to the wage-earners, both unionized and nonunionized, as well as the public, for each and all of these groups must bear the evil consequences of this antisocial policy. Who but the working people and the poor were the first to suffer from the coal strike and the last to be benefited by its discontinuance?

There is in the President's speech the same kind of promise to balance the budget that has characterized Presidential protestations in the last 14 years relating to this matter. In one breath the President says the budget will be balanced and that there will even be a small surplus to apply on the Federal debt. In the next breath he launches into the advocacy of further and extensive socialization of the economy, in the fields of medicine, housing, agriculture, and industry in general, involving projected costs running into many many billions.

The President is also silent about the giant bureaucracy that is eating out the substance of the working people who actually produce the necessaries of life and which is tearing down the whole fabric of free enterprise and dragging this Nation of ours into the mire of communism.

Apparently the President sees nothing significant in the upheaval that took place in the recent election.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the subject of the statehood of Hawaii.

ELECTRICAL RECORDING OF VOTES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution that provides for the electrical recording of the votes taken in the House. We have

heard much recently about reforms in the operation of Congress and how the general public are looking forward to the improvements that are to follow the so-called streamlining of Congress. To me it seems a pity that we are about to leave the job only about half done.

In the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, the roll was called 789 times. I believe you will all agree with me that a minimum of 20 minutes was consumed on each roll call and perhaps 30 minutes would be more nearly correct. But let us put it at the minimum. This means that 263 hours were used by Members of the House in the last 4 years, yes, 32 days and 7 hours—that is 8-hour days—or 6 weeks and 2 days—that is 5-day weeks—have been consumed doing nothing but calling of the roll. If you multiply this by 435 Members you would really have some lost man-hours.

Besides the wasting of the time, there is an angle that is far more important and that is the lack of time given by Members of Congress to the business of enacting laws, which should be our real job. As we all know, the respect of the people of the country is given a terrible nose dive when they come to the gallery of the House for a visit.

It is hard to convince the people when only a few Members are on the floor that the majority of the House Members are not sadly neglecting their duty. With the votes being recorded electrically, we all would be on hand when we were needed, and the general public would have their confidence and respect increased for the highest lawmaking body of our land. I hope every Member of this House will insist on my resolution getting a hearing in order that we may work out a better procedure which will reflect credit on this body and result in better laws being enacted.

A DEFENSE OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the attack made on President Truman's message by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

I heard the President's message. On the whole it was splendid. There were things in it with which I probably did not agree; but on the whole it was excellent.

Let me remind the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] that this is the Congress of the United States. It is our duty to pass legislation to correct whatever evils may prevail. That legislation is sent to the other end of the Avenue for the President's approval or disapproval, and even if he disapproves it we have the right to pass it over his veto.

The gentleman from Ohio called the President to task for not doing something about strikes. I want to say to him that Harry Truman, as President of the United States, stopped the recent coal strike and prevented John L. Lewis from freezing the American people into submission.

President Truman's popularity has increased tremendously within the last few weeks.

There are many things about Harry Truman that commend him to the average American.

In the first place, he is a real American himself. He embraces no foreign ideology. He speaks our language.

Then, too, with the exception of Warren G. Harding, he is the first President of the United States since McKinley who ever served a single day in either House of Congress. Therefore, he knows how to deal with individual Members of the House and Senate.

Again, he is a Christian gentleman; a man whose heart is in the right place; and he is not too egotistical to change his mind when convinced that he is wrong.

He has courage, and he manifested that courage just before the Christmas holidays when this brazen attempt was made to force a coal strike on the American people, just as he manifested his courage on the battlefield during the First World War.

He has kept the common touch better than any other man who ever served as President, in my opinion, since the War Between the States. If you doubt that, go down and talk to him or watch him in his contacts with others.

I am not agreeing with President Truman on everything, and he knows it. When we get together we sometimes have a friendly quarrel about the things on which we disagree. But he is always willing to hear the other side.

I agree with what the gentleman from Ohio says about communism. There is not a man in America who is more willing to drive communism from American soil than I am. But Harry Truman is not a Communist. He has no sympathy with communism in America.

We have a tremendous task before us to pull this country together and to get it back on the beam, so to speak, to promote the happiness and prosperity of the American people and to protect our country, as George Washington said, against the insidious wiles of those elements who come pretending to be our friends and who have their hands out for something they want us to give them.

We have a tremendous task, and I for one am willing to give President Truman the benefit of the doubt. I believe as we go along even my distinguished friend from Ohio will agree that Harry Truman is doing his best to restore America to her proper place in world affairs and to promote the peace, the happiness, and the prosperity of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman take what I said as an attack on Harry Truman or as a criticism of his speech?

Mr. RANKIN. I took it as an attack on his message, and I thought it was premature, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio.

I have taken more abuse, and I am taking more abuse now, from the un-American elements through this country than any other man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States, because I have dared to stand for what I conceived to be American principles.

I have no apology for defending my country, as best I could, against the subversive elements throughout the land. Any man who thinks more of his political life, or of his personal security, than he does of his country in times like these has no business in the Congress of the United States.

Whether other Members agree with me or not, I propose to follow that policy which in my opinion will best serve this great Republic and bring to the American people the greatest measure of peace, happiness, and prosperity throughout the years to come; and I believe that Harry Truman feels just as I do on the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

HON. THOMAS E. DEWEY

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, since we have begun this early discussing Presidential candidates for 1948, I feel that it is not untimely for me to rise in the House today to discuss other possibilities. I believe Harry Truman will be a candidate for President in 1948 on the Democratic ticket. I believe the Republican Party will also have a candidate for President in 1948. Up in New York State we have an excellent man. The Governor of New York State just won by one of the largest pluralities accorded anybody who ever ran for a State-wide office. It is my frank opinion that Mr. Dewey's vote-getting ability will put him in good stead in the Presidential year 1948. I feel it is accurate to say that his chances of becoming President are the best of any man in the country as of the present time. So while we are discussing Presidential possibilities, and I assume the gentleman from Missisippi was referring to Mr. Truman as a possible candidate for reelection, I think it is fair to mention our governor up in New York State.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know whether or not President Truman will be a candidate for President in 1948, but I was speaking of him as President of the United States, with the grave responsibilities he now bears.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Nevertheless, this is the year 1947, and we would be barren of serious thinking if we did not at this moment here in the Congress and throughout the country, begin to think about who is going to be our next President.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, the gentleman recalls that we produced his Governor in Michigan.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is very true, and I think it is a timely remark. I thank the gentleman for it.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, let me suggest to my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] that a candidate for President who starts out running this early usually runs to a "cold trail" even before the nomination period.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. To my knowledge, the Governor of New York has made no reference to any interest in becoming a Presidential candidate. I think I recall that he has even indicated in the public press that he is not a candidate. I have simply taken it upon myself at a time when Presidential candidates are being discussed, and I believe it is both my duty and my prerogative to mention the name of a distinguished possibility. Governor Dewey certainly is Presidential material. Personally, I believe he is just as sure of being the next President as it is certain that we are here in this Chamber at this moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended for 5 minutes, if he so desires and if there is no objection on the part of those who may have special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. Speaking of vote-getting ability, there was evidence throughout the country on November 5 of the ability of certain candidates to get votes. Many of the Members of this House showed they had this proclivity. Many of my friends on the Republican side established all-time-record majorities. They showed that the people in their districts were solidly behind them and that they were candidates of whom the people could be proud. They were interested in the rights of the people and the primary objectives of good government. There were many candidates throughout the country who did that. Yet, I know of no man who ran for public office, whether it was for the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States or for the governorship of any State, who did a better job of piling up convincing pluralities than did our own Governor.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. As a Democrat, I would be the last one to say that Mr. Dewey is absolutely devoid of accomplishments. As a Texas Democrat, I am willing to concede that Mr. Dewey has accomplished some great things in his life. In fact, his greatest accomplishment is that he married a Texas girl, which is not an easy thing to do for the average Republican.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I imagine his statement is absolutely accurate. But I will say I believe the sun is rising for the Republican Party. I believe the opportunities for good government and for embarking on a program of progress and good will and raising the standards of living for the American people are in sight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SNYDER, for the balance of the week, on account of death in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 8, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

85. A letter from the adjutant general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the journal of the proceedings of the Eightieth National Encampment, held at Indianapolis, Ind., August 25 to 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 2); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

86. A letter from the quartermaster general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the Forty-eighth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 4 to 8, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

87. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Works Agency for fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 572. A bill authorizing appropriation for rehabilitating the oyster beds destroyed by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 573. A bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 574. A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 575. A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code, section 25 (b) (1); paragraphs 400 and 1622 (c) (1); and other necessary sections, charts, tables, or other data which might be inconsistent with the following amended exemptions providing for an increase in the income-tax exemption bracket of single persons to $2,500 on their yearly gross income and for an increase in the income-tax exemption bracket of married persons to $5,000 on their yearly gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 576. A bill to amend the Articles of War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 577. A bill to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 578. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 579. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 580. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 581. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 582. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 so as to guarantee to persons after their period of military service certain rights with respect to employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 583. A bill relating to the disposition of mineral rights to any land acquired by any Federal land bank or by the Land Bank Commissioner through the foreclosure of any mortgage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 584. A bill to define the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 585. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain patents which expired during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 586. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to daughters of veterans of the War of 1812; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 587. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 588. A bill to provide for the coverage of barbiturates under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 589. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers

for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 590. A bill to repeal that part of section 4, Public Law 761, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, authorizing construction of the Osceola Dam on the Osage River in Missouri; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 591. A bill to authorize an appropriation to Mount Ida, Ark., for sewer-construction purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 592. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 593. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 594. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $50 to $75 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 595. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 596. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 597. A bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 598. A bill to exempt from the Federal amusement tax all admissions charged to fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 599. A bill declaring Kenduskeag stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 600. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the use of private vehicles for official travel; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 601. A bill to prohibit the transportation of certain highly inflammable textile fabrics in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 602. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 603. A bill to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 604. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 605. A bill to establish a Department of National Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 606. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 607. A bill to provide for the sale of certain submarginal lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 608. A bill to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 609. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Norfork Dam in Baxter County, Ark., as Lake John Morrow; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 610. A bill to limit the purposes for which loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank of Washington to foreign governments and persons in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 611. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to extend the time within which veterans may apply for the loan benefits approved by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 612. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 613. A bill to define "work" or "workweek" as referred to in the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the events; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to refrain from canceling applications for potassium or magnesium permits or leases in the State of Utah now pending before the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate Federal Government competition with private business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. Res. 40. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 614. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of *John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted)*, v. *The United States*, No. 34450; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 615. A bill for the relief of Albert August Friess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 616. A bill for the relief of Jakob Clue, also known as Jacob Klueh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 617. A bill for the relief of James Harry Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Fred O. Donohue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 619. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 620. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 621. A bill for the relief of Vera Frances Elicker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 622. A bill for the relief of M. F. Diller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 623. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 624. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sorotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 625. A bill for the relief of (1) William R. Dohnt, administrator of all and singular, the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Margaret E. Dohnt, deceased; (2) Joseph A. Hauser, individually and as guardian of Florence Hauser, an infant of the age of 19 years; (3) Richard Adams, Sr., individually and as guardian of Richard Adams, Jr., an infant of the age of 16 years; (4) William Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of William Joseph Novotny, an infant of the age of 18 years; (5) William P. Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of Bernadette Novotny, an infant of the age of 20 years; (6) Grace Swiadek, individually and as guardian of Stanley Swiadek, an infant of the age of 18 years; and (7) Joseph F. Krotz, Sr., individually and as guardian of Joseph F. Krotz, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 626. A bill for the relief of Rustom Bana, Adi Russi Bana, Nasli Russi Bana, and Narie Russi Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 627. A bill for the relief of Robert Cathcart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 628. A bill for the relief of Marvin Clements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 629. A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 630. A bill for the relief of P. W. Woodyard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Maryland:

H. R. 631. A bill for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 632. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ambrosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 634. A bill for the relief of George Lutley Sclater-Booth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 635. A bill for the relief of Carey Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of Knox Lumber Sales Co., Thomson, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Marvin Pettus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 638. A bill for the relief of Alois Schanner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 639. A bill for the relief of Tsung Tsai Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 640. A bill for the relief of Harley Shores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 641. A bill for the relief of L. A. Holcombe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 642. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 643. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 644. A bill for the relief of Chiyokichi Y. Koga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 645. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Colburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 646. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 647. A bill for the relief of Felice Di Prospero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H R. 649. A bill for the relief of Antonio Belaustegui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

26. Mr. VAN ZANDT presented a petition by Fifty-fourth District, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, State Council of Pennsylvania, in protest against the enactment of legislation that would modify immigration laws and permit thousands of displaced persons from Europe to enter the United States at a time when thousands of American war veterans and other American citizens are unable to find homes or positions to support themselves and their families, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father of our souls, grant to the Members and the officers of this body a sacred moment of quiet ere they take up the duties of the day. Turn their thoughts to Thee, and open their hearts to Thy Spirit, that they may have wisdom in their decisions, understanding in their thinking, love in their attitudes, and mercy in their judgments.

Let them not think, when this prayer is said, that their dependence upon Thee is over, and forget Thy counsels for the rest of the day.

Rather from these moments of heart-searching may there come such a sweetness of disposition that all may know that Thou art in this place. From this holy interlude may there flow light and joy and power that will remain with them until night shall bring Thy whispered benediction, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

So help us all this day, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 6, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to express my deep regret at the resignation of Secretary Byrnes. It was my privilege to serve with him in the Senate and to work with him very closely on the Committee on Appropriations and the Special Committee on Unemployment Relief, where I developed the greatest admiration for his remarkable intellectual powers. I am sorry on personal grounds that his health is not so good as we would all like it to be, and I hope that the well-earned rest to which he looks forward will restore him completely. It is a great pity that the country should lose his unique knowledge of foreign affairs, his sure understanding of American opinion, and the intelligence, courage, and idealism with which he carried forward his great task. I wish for him all possible health and happiness.

If we have to lose Secretary Byrnes, it is good to see that he is being replaced by a man of such high quality as General Marshall. It was my privilege to see a great deal of General Marshall's work at first hand when I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and subsequently during the war. He combines the traits of a great soldier and statesman. I look forward to working with him and pledge him my cooperation.

ASSIGNMENT OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the day of the last session it was necessary for me to withdraw the nominations of minority members of the standing committees because of a slight mistake made by the steering committee which made it necessary to rearrange three or four names. The list has now been completed, and I move that the Senate confirm the selection of the list, which I send to the desk, of the minority members of the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to have the list read?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be well to read it; it will not take long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The list will be read.

The list of the committee assignments of Senators of the minority was read, as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Thomas of Oklahoma, Ellender, Lucas, Stewart, Hoey, Pepper.

On Appropriations: Messrs. McKellar, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tydings, Russell, McCarran, Overton, O'Mahoney, Green.

On Armed Services: Messrs. Tydings, Russell, Byrd, Hill, Kilgore, Maybank.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Wagner, Maybank, Taylor, Fulbright, Robertson of Virginia, Sparkman.

On Civil Service: Messrs. Chavez, McKellar, O'Daniel, Johnston of South Carolina, Umstead, O'Conor.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. ———, Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Sparkman, Umstead, McGrath.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. McClellan, Eastland, Hoey, Taylor, Robertson of Virginia, O'Conor.

On Finance: Messrs. George, Barkley, Connally, Byrd, Johnson of Colorado, Lucas.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Connally, George, Wagner, Thomas of Utah, Barkley, Hatch.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Messrs. Johnson of Colorado, Stewart, McFarland, Magnuson, Myers, McMahon.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. McCarran, Kilgore, Eastland, Magnuson, Fulbright, McGrath.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Messrs. Thomas of Utah, Murray, Pepper, Ellender, Hill.

On Public Lands: Messrs. Hatch, O'Mahoney, Murray, Downey, McFarland.

On Public Works: Messrs. Overton, ———, Chavez, Downey, O'Daniel, McClellan.

On Rules and Administration: Messrs. Hayden, Green, McMahon, Myers, Holland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to confirm the minority appointments to the Senate committees.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I assume that the morning business is now in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. WHITE. Pending the transaction of morning business, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR] are attending the inaugural ceremonies of Gov. William Preston Lane, Jr., of Maryland, being held today at Annapolis, Md.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is detained on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RESIGNATION OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES AND NOMINATION OF GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before we proceed with the morning hour, as in executive session I ask that the nomination of the new Secretary of State be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Marshall, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the nomination is before the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I deeply regret the sudden resignation of Secretary of State Byrnes. If his health requires this release from his heavy and difficult public burdens, he has richly earned the right to retire with all the honors that a grateful country can bestow upon him. But it can only be with a sense of deepest national loss that his country greets his departure.

Secretary Byrnes has been an able, efficient, courageous Secretary of State in the finest American tradition. He has relentlessly defended American ideals in crises where they required his indomitable loyalties. Those of us who have been privileged to work with him in the white heat of international contacts on the diplomatic front can testify, out of our hearts, to the patience, the firmness, the genius, the vision, and the faith which he has dedicated to these tasks. He has maintained the dignity, the honor, and the rights of the United States. He has made a magnificent contribution to the welfare of his country and to the peace of a better world. I salute him with affection and respect. I hail him as a very great American.

General Marshall will be welcomed by his countrymen as Secretary Byrnes' successor. He will bring to his assignment a stout heart, a shining integrity, a rich experience, and a lifetime of dedication to his country. He has always had the total confidence of Congress, as well as that of all his military and civilian colleagues, at home and abroad.

Now, Mr. President, since this sudden and unusual interruption in the State Department's personnel undoubtedly is causing speculation all around the world, I think it is highly important that the Senate of the United States, continuing to pursue what has been an effective bipartisan foreign policy, should make it perfectly clear immediately that there is no interruption to this unity by the episode to which I refer.

The majority of the Senate has determined by a rule that all nominations hereafter, regardless of what position or what personnel may be involved, shall always go to committee. I am prepared to recognize that procedure, although it would be inconceivable to me that it were necessary under the present circumstances.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am asking that the nomination of General Marshall be referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon, such consent being required by the new La Follette act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection to the request, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before I take my seat I should like to ask the members of the new Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to gather at 12:30 o'clock in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has already voiced not only his own sentiments but those of the Senate, and, I believe, the feeling of the country, in expressing his regret that Secretary of State Byrnes has felt it necessary to retire from the high and responsible position which he has occupied with such distinction and in which he has rendered such illustrious service.

Mr. President, Secretary Byrnes has had a most unusual career. Coming to the House of Representatives when a very young man, he served there for a number of years in the responsible position of member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Later he was elected to the United States Senate. Senators know with what efficiency and with what rare ability he performed the responsible duties which devolved on him as a Member of this body.

Subsequently he was appointed by the President a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, from which position he resigned to become Economic Stabilizer, and to fill other responsible positions in the executive department of the Government. When Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. retired as Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes was chosen by the President to succeed him. The duties of Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State were of transcendent importance and most difficult. At times the discouragement which faced him and all of us was so great that it appeared as though it would be impossible to write the treaties with Italy and other satellite nations which were finally consummated. Along with others, it was my pleasure and honor to serve with and to be associated with him in London, Paris, and New York in these delicate negotiations and in connection with the work of the United Nations. The Secretary of State showed rare skill and magnificent ability. Of course, he represented the views and interests of the people of the United States, which he presented forcefully and aggressively. He was marvelously successful in bringing about the negotiation and drafting of treaties which were in large measure entirely satisfactory to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, when one like Secretary Byrnes leaves the public service there is a great loss, not only to the service itself but to the people of the United States. It is particularly unfortunate at this time, when we are only halfway through the making of the peace treaties, that we should lose the Secretary, who has had such a marvelous experience, who, by reason of his background, was so well fitted to meet the tasks which will face us with respect to the treaties with Germany, with Japan, and with Austria.

Mr. President, Secretary Byrnes leaves behind him a great record. The people of the United States will send to him in his retirement expression of their high admiration, their affection, and their deep personal regard.

I have been associated with Secretary Byrnes almost 30 years. I served with him in the House of Representatives. I served with him here in the Senate, and served with him, as I have already suggested, on some diplomatic missions. He will leave in the annals of his country an illustrious and shining record of high duties nobly, honorably, and courageously performed, of great personal ability, of devotion to the public welfare, and of patriotic approach to all the questions with which he dealt.

Mr. President, General Marshall, a man of fine character and of great military distinction, is highly regarded by the country and by the Senate of the United States; but, in view of the fact that his nomination has already been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall reserve any further comment respecting him at this time.

I strike hands with Secretary Byrnes on his departure, and wish for him restored health, renewed strength, and all the good things that a grateful Republic and a beneficent Creator may bestow upon him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to join in the words of commendation which have been expressed with respect to Secretary Byrnes. I say that, notwithstanding the fact that I have not always believed that the policy enunciated or followed by the Government of the United States during the tenure of Secretary Byrnes was the best policy to serve the peace and to promote the well-being and the security of the United States and the world. However, I know of no man who could have threaded his way through the difficult labyrinthian passages of the recent past better than has Secretary of State Byrnes. He is a man of rare ability, of exceptional tact and capacity, a man who is as much the master of the legislative processes and the field of negotiation as any man of whom I have knowledge. He is a great patriot, a man deeply rooted in the soil and in the traditions of this country, a man truly wedded to democratic sentiment and spirit; and he has withal laid a strong foundation for the peace and security of mankind.

I reluctantly see him depart from his high office. I think it is most fitting that Time magazine has just extolled Secretary Byrnes and honored him by placing him on the cover of that magazine as "the man of the year."

I am one of those who also regret his passing into private life. I am not at all sure that Secretary Byrnes will remain in private life, however. He has always been called upon by his country and his President in a moment of need and great crisis, and I am sure that if his Government requires his further services as a public servant he will respond to the call. Secretary Byrnes goes into temporary retirement carrying with him not only the gratitude of the country but the affectionate good wishes of an innumerable host of friends.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 181.)

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 183.)

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 183.)

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER PROPERTY REQUISITIONING ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 183.)

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and Directors of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, its thirteenth annual report, fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REFERENCE OF REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that in accordance with law, certain quarterly reports on the operations of UNRRA and on lend-lease operations have been filed with the Secretary of the Senate since the adjournment of the Senate on August 2 last.

Without objection, such reports will be taken from the files and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 8, 1947.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me make inquiry of the Chair. Just as I was entering the Chamber I heard the Chair announce that the Economic Report of the President had been referred. Let me inquire to what committee the report was referred?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, created by the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this report and the President's message of the other day made reference to the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, which was filed with the Senate in March of 1941, I desire, first of all, under the order of the introduction of bills, to introduce a bill amending the Clayton Act. It was one of the recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and it is one of the recommendations of the Economic Report of the President. I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which is the committee which has jurisdiction over the antitrust laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 104) to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPRINTING OF FINAL REPORT OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the final report of the TNEC is one of the documents of that Committee which has had a very wide circulation throughout the United States. The Superintendent of Documents advises me that the general public has purchased more of the hearings, monographs, and reports of that Committee than those of any other committee in the entire history of the Congress of the United States. The general public has paid approximately $80,000 for these various documents. The supply of the final report of the Committee, which has been in demand ever since it was filed in 1941, has now been almost completely exhausted. The Superintendent of Documents advised me this morning that approximately 4,600 copies were printed—there have been two printings—and that there now remain only about 30 copies in that office. The Senate document room advised me this morning that the demand has been so great that there are left less than 20 copies of the report.

I feel that in the circumstances this report should be reprinted. As originally published it contained not only the report itself, but the verbatim testimony submitted by those who made recommendations for inclusion in the report. I am making this public reference to the report in order to call the attention of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I think will now have jurisdiction over all matters of printing, to the public demand for the document. I feel that because of the reference in the President's message on the state of the Union, and because of the reference contained in the economic report of the President which was submitted today, there will be considerable public demand for the report. I shall at a later day offer a resolution for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration for the reprinting of this document.

Mr. President, without taking the time of the Senate to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by me to the press today, with respect to the economic report of the President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S PROGRAM TO SAVE PRIVATE PROPERTY

In his message on the state of the Union on Monday and again today in the Economic Report, President Truman has laid down a policy for the preservation of the capitalistic system. There is nothing sensational about it, nothing even dramatic, but unless it is followed it will become increasingly difficult to stem the drift toward big government.

Authoritarianism is just around the corner unless the people of America take immediate and positive action to maintain free competitive enterprise. It should be noted that the President refers not to "free enterprise," but to "free competitive enterprise." Unless competition is maintained in business, economic concentration in a few big units will continue and this will end only in the Government taking over.

CAPITALISTS PUT ON NOTICE

President Truman has put the capitalists on notice. Unless they cooperate with him to maintain competition they will be playing the game of those who are consciously working for totalitarianism in government.

The economic report is notable in that it calls attention to the fact that public works alone will not solve the problem of unemployment in a crisis. "In the event of severe unemployment," he says, referring to public works, "they cannot be generated in sufficient volume to avoid supplementation by other means." This was proved during the depression. A free enterprise system cannot stand upon the foundation of "made work" whether that "made work" is permanent like the PWA projects of the depression or more or less temporary like the projects of the Works Projects Administration. A free enterprise system which means nothing unless it means the institution of private property for individuals rather than for government or for collective corporate groups can be preserved only by maintaining a high level of purchasing power among the masses of the people by keeping the door of opportunity open to all individuals who desire to engage in business and by preventing the continued absorption of industrial productive and commercial activity by a few giant corporations.

PROHIBITION OF MERGERS

To accomplish this objective the President endorses the recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee for the amendment of the Clayton Act to make the prohibition against monopolistic mergers effective, to enforce the existing antitrust laws, and to encourage small business by giving to small businessmen through the Department of Commerce the "information on markets and technical and commercial facts" which are now available only to big business which has the resources to maintain staffs of high-pressure economists and lobbyists in Washington.

Of equal importance is the President's summons to business to reduce prices wherever possible and his declaration for the maintenance of a high level of Government revenue so that the public debt may be paid.

DANGER OF CUTTING GOVERNMENT REVENUE

We cannot have good business unless prices are such as to encourage sales. A good market is the essential basis of prosperity. The businesses which increase prices are jeopardizing their own prosperity. A reduction of revenue while the national debt remains at its present high peak ($260,000,000,000) would cut the foundations from under the capitalistic system because such a policy would threaten the stability of Government bonds. Tax reduction now would mean the substitution of Government I O U's for Government bonds and would destroy the savings of millions who, during the war, as the President's report points out, saved between 25 and 30 percent of their income. The rate of saving began to fall in 1945 with the peace, and now is only about 10 percent of the income of the people—a rate similar to that in 1939.

This striking falling off of income is a danger signal which no businessman can afford to overlook. It is a danger signal which should warn every Member of Congress that the President's economic program should be carried out.

The economic report of the President transmitted to Congress today should be required reading in every college and high school of the United States. Every bank and every business house should give it prayerful attention free from all preconceived political notions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to an inquiry by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], let me say that I have not asked that this report be made a Senate document now, but I intend to offer a resolution to that effect to go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had in mind that perhaps the report should be made a Senate document, but I defer the request for the present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Joint Resolution 8

"A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt a national housing policy providing for effective cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to meet the current critical housing emergency, and to adopt immediate measures to facilitate the successful operation of State and local emergency housing programs

"Be it resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to adopt a national housing policy for the current critical housing emergency which will provide effective cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments in this field, and eliminate all unrealistic regulations.

"2. The Congress of the United States is further memorialized to adopt all possible measures to facilitate the successful operation of State and local emergency housing programs, including the granting of opportunities to State and local governments equal to those given to the Federal Public Housing Authority with respect to priorities for building materials and supplies.

"3. The Congress of the United States is further memorialized to take thorough and immediate action for the complete Nationwide eradication of black markets of all kinds in building materials and supplies, to the end that all emergency housing programs may operate with maximum effectiveness.

"4. The Congress of the United States is further memorialized to take immediate action for the complete review and revision of Federal policies and regulations which have hampered the construction of dwelling accommodations by private enterprise, to the end that private enterprise may be enabled to construct housing as speedily as possible.

"5. The secretary of state is directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress of the United States.

"6. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"A true copy:

"LLOYD B. MARSH,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
"SENATE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,
"Sacramento, Calif.

"To Whom It May Concern:

"This is to certify that the Senate of the State of California on July 24, 1946, adopted the following resolution:

"'Whereas the Congress of the United States has now before it for consideration H. R. 6932 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, which has for its objective the providing for further research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to improve and facilitate the marketing and distribution of agricultural products; and

"'Whereas a scientific approach to the problems of marketing, transportation, and distribution of agricultural products through research, study, experimentation, and cooperation among Federal and State agencies, farm organizations, and private industry is of inestimable value to the achieving of a prosperous agriculture, and this scientific approach will be promoted by said bill; and

"'Whereas efficient farm production and the current problems of improved packaging, refrigeration, transportation, marketing, and distribution require coordination and correlation between official agencies of the Federal and State governments for the benefit of producers, handlers, and consumers, as envisaged by said bill: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California,* That it urgently represents to the Congress of the United States that the passage of H. R. 6932 is a matter of prime importance, and it hereby memorializes the Congress to enact said bill or a measure comparable in purpose and objective and containing due and adequate consideration for the right of each State to recommend and engage in research on marketing and distribution problems of local and State-wide significance; and be it further

"'*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.'

"J. A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Petitions of sundry citizens of Bernalillo County and Albuquerque, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the allotment of grains and sugar to distilleries and breweries during the food shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by members of the Second Annual State Convention of AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, Newark, N. J., favoring legislation providing for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey convention of AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, Newark, N. J., favoring the consolidation of the Army, Navy, and air forces into a single department of national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from M. Franklin Greenstreet, of Independence, Mo., relating to the overhaul of the financial system of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the eleventh annual convention of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America,

San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by the Tennessee Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, Chattanooga, Tenn., and the Florida Association of Architects of the American Institute of Architects, Petersburg, Fla., favoring the removal of all restrictive measures pertaining to the construction industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Architects League of Northern New Jersey, Hackensack, N. J., relating to housing projects for veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Boston City Council, of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Taft-Ellender public housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from Kae Sales Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring extension of Public Law No. 603, as amended, and Executive Order 9665, authorizing RFC to purchase surplus property with priority under section 18E of the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the eleventh annual convention of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the so-called excess-profits tax refund law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the eleventh annual convention of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against any and all inflated taxes which would tend to take money away from labor and give it to industry; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at its thirty-sixth annual meeting at St. Paul, Minn., recommending that the Governments of the United States and Canada ratify as soon as possible the convention for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries, signed at Washington on April 2, 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Margaret M. Jackson, of Kansas City, Mo., embodying a resolution adopted by the United States Army Mothers, in Emporia, Kans., requesting that a qualified United States Army mother be included in the world peace deliberations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram from Evan Howell, Representative in Congress, Twenty-first Illinois District; O. Logan Giffin, State senator, forty-fifth senatorial district; and John W. Kapp, mayor, all of Springfield, Ill., embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held in Springfield, Ill., relative to the return of Northern Epirus to Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American Fisheries Society at St. Paul, Minn., favoring the prompt ratification of the convention for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Catholic War Veterans, New York City, N. Y., favoring that the United States be permanently represented at the Vatican State by an official with the rank of ambassador; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Blissville Post, No. 727, the American Legion, Woodside, N. Y., protesting against any further shipments of relief supplies to Yugoslavia until full and complete satisfaction is received by the United States for the shooting down of American fliers by the Yugoslavs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American Fisheries Society at St. Paul, Minn., favoring Federal aid to fish restoration and management; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Robert J. Des Roches, Loyola University, New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of House bill 2346, the so-called merchant seamen's war service act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Clifford G. English, of Washington, D. C., praying for an amendment to the Constitution to relieve the distress of the people and the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lester Giffen, executive chairman of the Wendover Development Association, Wendover, Utah, praying that Wendover, Utah, be annexed to Nevada or made the Territory of Wendover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolution adopted by the eleventh annual convention of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the enactment of legislation which would discriminate against any race, color, creed, or nationality, and favoring the enactment of fair employment practice legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two letters from Mrs. Ada B. Thompson, of Washington, D. C., praying for compensation for inventions and discoveries alleged to have been made by her for the benefit of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Bar Association of Dallas, Tex., relating to the policy of the Veterans' Administration concerning the restoration of qualified lawyer veterans to eligibility for on-the-job training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Justo Pastor Lozada, president of the Federation of Employees of the Insular Government, relating to the price of sugar and other staple commodities in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted by a group of working citizens of Aquadilla, P. R., requesting a grant of land by the United States to the Puerto Rican workingmen who cooperated in the national defense program; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Resolutions adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Jacksonville, Fla., and the governing and advisory boards of the Associated General Contractors of America, at Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the Executive order dated August 2, 1946, curtailing the expenditures of funds by the Congress for flood control, river and harbor improvement for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Portsmouth, Ohio, requesting the President to abrogate his curtailment order of August 2, 1946, and release the funds appropriated by the legislative branch of the Federal Government insofar as it relates to the flood protection program now in process in the city of Portsmouth, Ohio, and throughout the Ohio Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

A petition signed by 5,133 residents of the District of Columbia, requesting that Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO be not assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. M. L. Hodges, of Benton, Ky., praying that Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO be permitted to take his seat in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the membership of Local No. 685, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), Kokomo, Ind., protesting against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi, in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi, in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the XXIII convention of the Czechoslovak Society of America, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO of Mississippi; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the members of Lloyd Spetz Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Bismarck, N. Dak., remonstrating against the holding of office in the United States Senate by any person who is a member of the Ku Klux Klan; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Maurice Eugene Clark, of New Orleans, La., relating to the present system in cases of write-in candidates for Federal office; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Antonio Figueroa, president, Rotary Club of Rio Piedras, P. R., expressing appreciation for the appointment of Jesús T. Piñero as Governor of Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Lions Club of San Juan, P. R., expressing appreciation for the appointment of Jesús T. Piñero as Governor of Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

THE LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from O. G. Colwell, president of the Preferred Fire Insurance Co., Topeka, Kans., urging that the Congress enact legislation which will be fair to both sides so far as the labor problem is concerned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PREFERRED FIRE INSURANCE CO.,
Topeka, Kans., December 13, 1946.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The coal strike has molded popular opinion out here into a very strong desire for drastic regulation of labor unions; making them responsible in the same manner the employer is held responsible.

We hope you will use your best efforts to secure legislation which will be fair to both sides and protect the people from hardships brought upon them by any one organization.

Yours very truly,

O. G. COLWELL,
President.

FREEDOM AND SECURITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on juvenile delinquency entitled "Building for Tomorrow," written by him and published in the December 1946 issue of the Baptist Leader, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM AND SECURITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Freedom and Security," written by him and published in the Baltimore Sun of January 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARTER GLASS—MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorial address on the late Carter Glass, delivered by Representative J. LINDSAY ALMOND, Jr., at the Virginia State Democratic Convention in Richmond, Va., on September 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DURABLE-GOODS INDUSTRY—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Big Year Expected in Heavy Industry," written by Hartley W. Barclay and published in the New York Times of January 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NEW PRESIDENT'S UNEQUALED OPPORTUNITY: AMERICA UNLIMITED—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New President's Unequaled Opportunity: America Unlimited," published in the Detroit Free Press of November 24, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW UNITED STATES FOOD SAVED THE WORLD—ARTICLE BY WALLACE R. DUEL

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How United States Food Saved the World," written by Wallace R. Duel and published in the Chicago Daily News of November 15, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR BOOMS AND BUSTS—ADDRESS BY JUDGE HAROLD C. KESSINGER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "War Booms and Busts," delivered by Judge Harold C. Kessinger before the annual convention of the New Jersey Association of Schools of Business, on October 26, 1946, at Newark, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNCOMMON MAN—ARTICLE BY L. WARD BANNISTER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Here's a Cheer for the Uncommon Man," written by L. Ward Bannister and published in the Denver Post of September 19, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before we proceed further with the morning hour, because I have to attend the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee at 12:30, and I have a meeting with the Attorney General at 1 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to introduce certain measures and submit certain resolutions at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDY OF EMERGENCY AND WARTIME LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, first I submit a resolution authorizing and directing all standing committees of the Senate to make a full and complete study of all existing temporary and permanent emergency and wartime legislation falling within their respective jurisdictions.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 35) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That each standing committee of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of all existing temporary and permanent emergency and wartime legislation (including legislation which terminates on or after a proclamation proclaiming the cessation of hostilities) which falls within the jurisdiction of the respective standing committees. Each such committee is further authorized and directed to make such recommendations with respect to such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Committee on the Judiciary not later than February 15, 1947.

Resolved further, That upon receipt of such recommendations the Committee on the Judiciary shall review and correlate them, and not later than March 5, 1947, shall submit such recommendations to the Senate as it may deem advisable.

Mr. WILEY. In connection with the resolution just submitted by me, I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a report entitled "Termination of War Controls," which I made to the Republican conference on December 30, 1946.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTROLS

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose of this report

It is a pleasure to present to my colleagues this report in fulfillment of the assignment to me by the Republican steering committee. The assignment requested my study into the subject of possible termination of war controls by general resolution.

I have prepared the following analysis, based upon research covering as many phases of the problem as I could touch upon. In the course of my inquiry I utilized data from private and governmental sources including the resources of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. In addition, I consulted the report on this same subject made by Representative LEWIS, Republican, of Ohio, to Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts, and the report of the House Postwar Planning Committee. Finally, I consulted every member of the President's Cabinet, together with the Veterans' Administration. I requested of the Cabinet Secretaries and the Veterans' Administration a statement as to which emergency and war powers lay within their jurisdiction, which war powers they regarded as feasible of termination now and why, and which they regarded as preferably not terminated now and when might they be so terminated.

Most of these 11 officers have replied to me. In each case, the official listed the emergency and wartime powers within his jurisdiction but stated that his recommendations as to which should be terminated and when had been submitted to the President for the Chief Executive's review. Thereafter, I wrote to the President, asking for his recommendations, but I have received no reply to date. I may emphasize at this point that I believe this subject is so important that it must be considered and handled in as nonpartisan a manner as possible.

2. History of termination of World War I

I should like to present now a very brief history of the termination of the statutes of the first world conflict, as prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I quote from this Division's report:

"Considerable confusion was created by the armistice of November 11, 1918, and the message to Congress on that day, in which the President, after outlining the terms of the armistice, stated: 'The war thus comes to an end; for having accepted these terms of armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 56, pt. 11, p. 11538). As evidence of this confusion we call attention to the court litigation which commenced, for example in *U. S.* v. *Hicks* (1919, 256 F. 707), and *Commercial Cable Co.* v. *Burleson* (1919, 255 F. 99).

"On April 1, 1920, there was introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327, 66th Cong.) declaring the state of war at an end. After favorable legislative consideration, this bill was vetoed on May 27, 1920 (H. Doc. 799, 66th Cong.), by President Wilson because he objected, among other things, to terminating the war merely by repealing the joint resolutions of war of April 6, 1917 (Germany, 40 Stat. 1), and December 7, 1917 (Austria, 40 Stat. 429). This resolution was one of approximately thirty bills introduced in the Sixty-fifth, Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses providing for the study of wartime legislation (S. J. Res. 119, 65th Cong.), the repeal of specific wartime laws, or the repeal of the joint resolutions of April 6 and December 7, 1917.

"A study prepared in February 1920 by the Legislative Reference Service, which was printed as a Senate committee print by the Committee on the Judiciary, indicates that the problem at that time was far less complex than the present one confronting Congress.

"On December 6, 1920, Representative Volstead introduced House Joint Resolution 382, which declared that certain acts, joint resolutions, and proclamations should be construed as if the war had ended and the emergency had expired (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 60, pt. 1, p. 11). After prolonged consideration, this joint resolution was passed and approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1359). In the meantime, the President had been active in terminating war programs by Executive order.

"The joint resolution of July 2, 1921 (42 Stat. 105), declared the state of war with Germany and Austria at an end. This was followed by the proclamation of the Treaty of Peace with Germany on November 14, 1921 (42 Stat. 1939)."

3. Problems in terminating war and emergency controls by general resolution

The basic problem in terminating war and emergency controls by general resolution is that it would affect several hundreds of laws of varying complexity and importance. They may be divided broadly into five categories, as follows:

1. Legislation limited to definite termination dates;

2. Legislation predicated upon the limited emergency proclaimed by the President September 8, 1939 (54 Stat. 2643);

3. Legislation predicated upon the unlimited emergency proclaimed by the President May 27, 1941 (55 Stat. 1647);

4. Legislation predicated upon the cessation of hostilities; and

5. Legislation predicated upon the end of the war.

Many of these statutes have already been terminated. We may expect that others will be ended rapidly in the normal course of events by the Chief Executive. However, there is a large body of laws which lie within the field of policy differences as to when they should be terminated and it is these which provide the fundamental basis of our problem.

4. Fundamental Republican position

As a last note before I submit my recommendations, may I state what I construe to be the Republican position on the matter of terminating war controls, especially those which affect the health of our domestic economy. It has been the position of our party,

as I see it, that all emergency and wartime controls be terminated at the earliest possible date, that all powers delegated to the Chief Executive during the emergency and war conditions, which are normally inherent within the legislative branch, should be returned to the legislative branch, that the unrestrained tendency to multiply a bureaucratic empire through emergency and war powers should be vigorously curbed, and that the bureaucracy should itself be cut.

This, as I interpret it, is the Republican position, and it is a position which, as you so well know, has been endorsed by the overwhelming mandate of the American people expressed at the polls on November 5, 1946.

But the Republican Party is also pledged to terminate war controls in an orderly manner, one which will not create chaos, and, moreover, to terminate them in such a way that they will not render our Nation helpless in the event of any domestic or foreign emergency.

These, then, are the general bases of the Republican position in my opinion.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Basic recommendation

My basic recommendation is that we do not terminate war and emergency controls by general resolution at this time.

2. Reasons for basic recommendation

The following are my reasons for opposing a general resolution at this time terminating all emergency and wartime statutes:

(A) The First Reason—Continued National Emergency

I need hardly point out to my colleagues that, although the shooting war is over, war emergencies remain. In the international sphere, we are still fighting a war of ideas. The world continues in a turbulent state, economically as well as politically. On the home front, we are still in a domestic crisis. We have shortages that should have been avoided. There has been widespread lack of production due to strikes and restrictive Government regulations. If we were to close our eyes to these international and domestic emergencies and deprive our Government of such tenuous powers as it already has, for example, in the domestic field relating to strike control, we might find that we are losing the kind of enduring peace, for which 300,000 of our heroic men gave their lives.

It is still easier to get into a war than to get out of a war. War does not make for peace. It leaves a bitter legacy of problems which exist for years and years. It is foolhardy to deny these problems and dangerous to assume that the mere end of shooting returns us to the peaceful world of pre-1939. We are living in a different age today. With the advent of the atomic age, many of the emergency and wartime statutes continue to be essential, at least in some degree. We must be adequate to our responsibilities in the atomic age.

(B) The Second Reason—Varied and Complex Nature of Wartime Statutes

If we were, by general resolution, at this time to terminate all of the statutes, we would in one sweep wipe out legislation of a great complexity and touching every conceivable subject handled by Congress—the Armed Forces, international trade, agriculture, public lands and natural resources, labor controls, and so on. Each of these fields can only be handled by the appropriate congressional committee, looking separately and exhaustively into the problems unique to each field.

If we were to act upon a general resolution terminating hostilities and all war and emergency controls without exception, and if that resolution were referred simply to a single committee, for example, the Judiciary Committee, its members would find themselves hopelessly inadequate to the task of reviewing all of the varied pieces of legislation, and finding whether or not they continued to be necessary.

(C) The Third Reason—Chaotic Effects Resulting From Over-All Repeal

I have stated there are many important pieces of legislation which must be thoroughly studied, and only after the most exhaustive study, should it be determined whether to retain, amend, or repeal them.

It should be borne in mind that the greatest number of wartime-control statutes, which have a direct impact on business operations, are those which have a specific termination date fixed in the statute itself and such laws will expire on the date fixed unless reenacted or earlier terminated by the Congress, or in some instances, by the President. They are, in no way, dependent upon the declaration of the end of the war, of hostilities, or other condition of emergency, except to the extent that the existence of a state of war lends validity to the exercise of such controls.

I call to your attention a few instances of the chaotic effect of abrupt termination of hostilities and of war and emergency statutes:

1. Specific termination dates

The Emergency Price Control Act would terminate on June 30, 1947. Likewise, the Stabilization Act would terminate on the same date unless earlier terminated by Congress or the President. The Second War Powers Act would terminate on March 31, 1947. They contain authority for:

(a) Rationing.
(b) Priorities on delivery of materials.
(c) Allocation of materials.
(d) Motor carriers transportation preference.
(e) Inventory controls.
(f) Allocation of the use of rubber-borne equipment.
(g) Allocation of food and food facilities.
(h) Acquisition of real property.

The Selective Training and Service Act would terminate on March 31, 1947. Section 9 of the Selective Service Act, as amended by section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act, authorizes the Government to seize and operate plants, mines, or facilities where there is an interruption or a threatened interruption to work as a result of a labor dispute.

The act of July 2, 1940, granting authority to regulate exports of articles, technical data, materials, or supplies, has the fixed termination date of June 30, 1947.

The War Mobilization and Reconversion Act terminates June 30, 1947.

2. End of the war or within a fixed time thereafter

Over 125 statutes would terminate with the official end of the war or within a fixed period thereafter of anywhere from 3 months to 6 years.

Titles 1 and 2 of the First War Powers Act which, generally speaking, have to do with the internal operation of the Government during wartime, and do not impose controls upon our civilian economy, remain in force during the present war and for 6 months thereafter. Under title 1, the President is authorized to reorganize and consolidate the functions of the executive bureaus and agencies, including the Army and Navy. Under title 2, the President is empowered to authorize any department of government to enter into contracts without regard to provisions of law regulating the making, performance, amendment, etc., of such contracts. Army officials have stated that a declaration ending the war would mean that the Army would have but 6 months to return to the United States all troops now abroad in occupied countries and elsewhere, except those in the Regular Army.

3. End of hostilities or within a fixed time thereafter

Within this category are found the War Labor Disputes Act and the Surplus Property Act. The latter act provides for the disposal of all Government surplus property 3 years after the date of cessation of hostilities. Here we also find the act of July 12, 1943, which provides that leases of silver entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury must be terminated within 6 months after hostilities cease. Much of this silver is being used by the War Department in the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge.

4. Emergency statutes and permanent law

There are permanent laws, like Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, the Interstate Commerce Commission Act, giving the Commission authority to establish railroad transportation priorities, and the act of June 3, 1916, empowering the President to seize plants, and others which are permanent law but they only go into operation during wartime or periods of emergency.

5. Tax statutes

There are 25 or 30 provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which are effective during the war, hostilities, or the emergencies, and usually have a fixed period following the termination thereof. These statutes have close relationship to the Government's tax program and require the consideration of technical and specialized subjects.

6. Agriculture

The legislation on the books relating to American agriculture requires earnest consideration. Were we arbitrarily to wipe out price supports, we might well find before long the farmers having the same experience that they had during the twenties and thirties. This must not happen. We are all aware of the illustrious war performance of the American farmers, the vast amount of foodstuffs produced to feed our country and the world, despite the lack of machinery, of farm labor, and of adequate Government encouragement. The farmers are one class who have never struck. They are the backbone of America. A prosperous America depends upon their continued prosperity.

3. Suggestions for Republican action

What, then, are my specific recommendations? I recommend the following:

(a) That immediately upon the opening of the Eightieth Congress there be enacted a Senate resolution stating it to be the sense of the Senate (1) that there be a review of all existing temporary and permanent emergency and wartime legislation by each subject-matter committee of the Senate, including the Senate Appropriations Committee, as to matters coming within their respective jurisdictions; and (2) that such committees, not later than February 15, 1947, send to the Senate Judiciary Committee a report based on their review, presenting their recommendations for amendment, repeal, consolidation, and other revision of permanent and temporary emergency and wartime laws within their respective jurisdictions. (This matter, both as to policy and mechanics of operation, might be handled similarly in the House.)

(b) That the policy of each of the committees in reviewing these statutes and making their recommendations should be as follows:

1. To recommend the repeal of all temporary and permanent emergency and wartime statutes which are found to be obsolete, the continuance of which is inadvisable or unnecessary at present or in the foreseeable future. Particular stress should be placed on eliminating from the statute books laws whose repeal might result in: (a) Savings to the Federal Government, (b) reassumption by Congress of its former power delegated to the Chief Executive, (c) reassumption by private enterprise of its initiative rather than

reliance on the Federal Government, (d) reassumption by State governments of powers and controls normally within their jurisdictions.

2. To recommend such new permanent legislation as may be necessary to cope with any foreseeable emergency or war, domestic or foreign. Such new permanent legislation should provide appropriate checks and limitations to forestall the possibility of arbitrary and despotic acts by a dictator-minded Chief Executive.

(c) That upon receipt of the recommendations submitted to it by the respective committees above referred to, the Senate Judiciary Committee shall proceed to review and correlate them in the light of the overall national welfare; and that, not later than March 5, 1947, the Judiciary Committee shall prepare an appropriate resolution to be submitted for Senate action.

It should be noted again that major statutes such as the Selective Training and Service Act and the Second War Powers Act expire automatically on March 31, 1947, unless renewed. The wisdom of Congress may therefore require relatively prompter consideration of these statutes.

C. EXHIBIT

At my request, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared a booklet listing the provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of the war and/or emergency. This listing has been made to correspond with the subject-matter assignments of the standing committees of Congress established by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Thus, if my recommendation is followed and the statutes are siphoned into the respective committees, this booklet should facilitate the committees' review by outlining the specific laws before each of them.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 5

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, also in connection with the resolution just submitted by me I ask that there be printed as a Senate document a report setting forth the provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of hostilities, the war, and emergency. The report was prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It has relation to the resolution which I have just submitted.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. WILEY. I resubmit a resolution stating that "It is the sense of the Senate that any international agreement relating to the use, development, or control of atomic energy, entered into by a representative of the United States, is not valid and binding upon this country unless it is ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate as a formal treaty."

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 36) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that any international agreement relating to the use, development or control of atomic energy, entered into by a representative of the United States, is not valid and binding upon this country unless it is ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate as a formal treaty.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I reintroduce a bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Peace.

The bill (S. 79) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Peace, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PROTECTION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce companion legislation to that introduced by Representative GEARHART, of California, to prevent desecration of the American flag. I believe that the Republican Eightieth Congress must, and will, enact such legislation at an early date. In doing so it will contribute a shining star to its record and will fill the sorry gap resulting from the omission of this vital legislation by all previous 79 Congresses. I believe that passage of this legislation is necessary on these grounds:

First. As a pointed illustration to every American youth and American adult of the respect and veneration with which the Congress holds Old Glory. These sentiments must, of course, be shared by every American, young and old.

Second. As a belated tribute to 300,000 Americans who died in the Second World War in protecting the Stars and Stripes and to those of our gallant men and women who have died in all previous wars in defense of Old Glory. The emblem which was raised on Mount Surabachi and on countless alien battlefields must not be allowed to be bespattered and trampled in the dust by anti-American groups in our midst.

Third. As a very real contribution to the defense of the American birthright. Red Fascists and other subversives have always used our flag as a primary target for their hate and venom because they recognize that if they can besmirch the symbol of the American constitutional system they will have gone a long way in undermining the Republic. Passage of this legislation will be a bar to their insidious efforts.

Fourth. As a reminder to every foreign nation of the respect with which our Congress and our people hold our national emblem. We cannot expect foreign respect of the American flag unless we, ourselves, show such respect and buttress such respect by appropriate legislation which will protect Old Glory.

The bill (S. 80) to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. WILEY. I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 11, 1947, as General Casimir Pulaski Memorial Day.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF PRESIDENTIAL TENURE

Mr. WILEY. I am reintroducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution limiting Presidential tenure to two terms.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit a resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to object, but we were proceeding under the order petitions and memorials, and it seems to me that we should wait until later for the presentation of resolutions.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Ohio in his suggestion regarding procedure. We have branched off into other matters. We have not started auspiciously. During the past several days no attention has been paid to the rule. If we are not to observe this rule, we might as well start abolishing the other rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 79, to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Peace, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 80, to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

S. 81. A bill to assist the States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by providing funds to be used for supplementing teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 82. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 83. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn; and

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 85. A bill to provide support for basic commodities, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 86. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 87. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim

of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; and

S. 88. A bill for the relief of Knox Lumber Sales Co., Thomson, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 89. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hal S. Martin; and

S. 90. A bill for the relief of J. H. Kerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 91. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 92. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 93. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place or places in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 94. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 95. A bill to terminate price and rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 96. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census); to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 97. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans whose deaths are not due to service-connected disabilities or diseases; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 98. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936, as amended, by eliminating the provision that the judge of the district court of the northern and southern districts of West Virginia shall succeed to the office of district judge of the northern district of West Virginia upon a vacancy in the latter office; and

S. 99. A bill for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 100. A bill to provide for requiring compliance with safety regulations in coal mines; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 101, to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. PEPPER) introduced Senate bill 102, to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide for the redemption prior to maturity of bonds issued under such act; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 103. A bill to provide support for wool, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 by including wool as a commodity to which orders under such act are applicable, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to fix wool standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 104 to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 105. A bill to make unlawful any contract or agreement making membership or nonmembership in a labor organization a condition of employment, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 106. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 107. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; and

S. 108. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 109. A bill to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn sold by producers between January 1, 1946, and April 18, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 110. A bill to amend section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, with respect to the pooling and division of certain revenues of carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 112. A bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended; and

S. 113. A bill to provide for payment of extra compensation for work performed by customs employees on Sundays and holidays during the period between September 29, 1931, and June 2, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 114. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate bill 115, to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 116. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Jones and Miss Mildred Wells; and

S. 117. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 118. A bill to guarantee honorably discharged veterans their right to work regardless of whether they are members or nonmembers of any labor organization; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 119. A bill making unlawful the use of force or violence, or threats thereof, to prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 120. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 121. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 122. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 123. A bill prohibiting labor organizations from making contracts or engaging in combinations or conspiracies in restraint of commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. 124. A bill to repeal the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced S. J. Res. 10, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced S. J. Res. 11, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced S. J. Res. 12, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) introduced S. J. Res. 13, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution authorizing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to provide for collecting and publishing the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce a bill to be known as the Industrial Safety Act. The purpose of the bill is to assist the several States in establishing and maintaining safe working conditions in industry and in promoting the observance of safety precautions and rules by employers and employees in industry. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill (S. 101) to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the prepa-

ration, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REDEMPTION OF BONDS ISSUED UNDER ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide for the redemption prior to maturity of bonds issued under such act. The bill would give the boys the right to receive cash in place of the bonds.

The bill (S. 102) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide for the redemption prior to maturity of bonds issued under such act, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. PEPPER), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the regular morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is proceeding under the order of the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

PRESIDENTIAL TERMS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution. I wish to explain that I desired to offer it in the regular order. Because of the fact that I have observed the regular order, I wish to have it receive a number to correspond with the numbers of the joint resolutions which were introduced out of order, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELECTION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATES TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I reintroduce a bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions. I received a letter from John P. Mullen, a prominent attorney of Washington, who comments favorably on this proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 115) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter presented by Mr. CAPPER in connection with the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 2, 1947.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I do indeed believe that our primary bill for the District of Columbia should become a much needed law early in the Eightieth Congress. Accordingly, I am transmitting to you that which in the Seventy-ninth Congress was S. 242 to be, if you please, again introduced in its precise form.

Now is the time for a real attempt to give to the Nation's Capital some semblance of suffrage. And, at the same time, obviate the possibility of any self-anointed local political chieftain again parading off to the next party conventions his hand-picked delegates who, to quote from a local editorial, "no more represent the people of the District of Columbia than a cat represents a mouse."

Thus it is clear that such a law is vitally needed. For, after all, does not primary mean the first step in any process?

With best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN P. MULLEN.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a few moments ago I rose to introduce a joint resolution, but it was suggested that I wait until that order was reached. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. LODGE] and myself I now introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski Memorial Day. My colleague and I are much interested in this joint resolution and hope the committee to which it is referred will take prompt and favorable action upon it. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1947, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of General Casimir Pulaski.

CATHERINE M. FLYNN

Mr. BALDWIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Catherine M. Flynn, the sum of $1,002.29, as compensation for services performed by her in the office of Senator-elect RAYMOND E. BALDWIN during the period November 6 to December 26, 1946.

INVESTIGATION OF MILITARY DISCIPLINE AND JUSTICE

Mr. KILGORE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 38), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of military discipline and military justice, with particular attention to the Lichfield trials.

The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That that part of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture (as shown on page 28 of the Senate Manual) is amended to read as follows:

"If a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate (1) upon a motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, or (2) upon any pending question, is presented to the Senate at any time after 10 calendar days have elapsed since such debate has begun, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, then such measure shall be deemed to be the unfinished business.

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure, then such measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of. Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

RELATION OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES TO NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued until the end of the Eightieth Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $: *Provided*, That hereafter the committee authorized under such resolution shall consist of three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, three members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and three members of the Committee on Public Lands, to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendations of the respective chairmen of such committees, and two Members of the Senate to be selected and appointed by the President of the Senate.

NUMBER OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with a view to ascertaining (1) the number of officers and employees on the rolls of each department, independent establishment, or agency of the Government (including Government-owned or controlled corporations); (2) whether the number of officers and employees on the rolls of each such department, establishment, agency, or corporation is adequate to enable it efficiently to perform its functions; and (3) whether the number of officers and employees on the rolls of any such department, establishment, agency, or corporation can be reduced without impairing its ability efficiently to perform its functions. The committee shall make a report (a copy of which shall be delivered to the Committee on Appropriations) to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

OPERATION OF CAFETERIAS IN GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the management and operation by corporations or associations of cafeterias established in Government buildings for the use and convenience of Government employees, with a view to ascertaining whether the present system and methods of operation of such cafeterias are in the best interests of the Government and its employees, or whether such interests would be better served by direct governmental operation of such cafeterias; and to report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CLASSIFICATION AND RATES OF POSTAGE AND MAIL MATTER

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to all matters relating to the classification of mailable matter, including rates of postage applicable to the various classes of mailable matter, limits of weights of mailable matter of the various classes, zones for postal-rate purposes, and matters affecting the volume of mailable matter of any of such classes, with a view to ascertaining whether a revision of such classifications, rates, limits, or zones is necessary or desirable in order to promote the service to the public or to insure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO SPECIAL AND SELECT OR JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That paragraph (o) (1) (A) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any resolution proposing to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a special or select joint committee, shall not be referred to any other standing committee of the Senate but shall be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration of all phases thereof, including the substantive matter."

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941; Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 20, 1943; Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944; Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to August 23, 1944; and Senate Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program); is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress.

SHORTAGE OF COAL CARS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit a resolution providing for an inquiry and investigation into the shortage of coal cars in certain of the coal-mining areas, and I think it is in order that I make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, for the past several months there has been a shortage of cars for the transportation of coal from the mines to the market. The result has been a reduction of production and a lessening of work and employment in the mines. It is a very serious thing when the production of coal and the employment of those producing coal are intermittently interrupted. I submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred as requested.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with the request made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], that his resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I think that is the appropriate committee to which the resolution should be referred. However, in the past there has been a tendency for some Members of the Senate to introduce bills or resolutions and request that they be referred to particular committees. In view of the fact that we have reorganized the Senate, serious question may arise at times as to the committees to which measures should be referred. So it seems to me that with reference to bills that are introduced, Senators should ask that they be appropriately referred, and then the Parliamentarian and the Presiding Officer should determine where such bills should go.

What I have said is more in the nature of a suggestion than a parliamentary inquiry. I am satisfied that the Senator's resolution should go to the committee which he has suggested; but I raise the point that he made the request that the resolution go to a particular committee, rather than that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The point raised by the Senator from Illinois is well taken. Under the Reorganization Act the type of legislation which will go to any particular committee is clearly defined; but it is within the province of the Presiding Officer to decide as to the legislative committee which is to have jurisdiction. It may be proper for a Senator to suggest to which committee a bill introduced by him should go, but the final reference is not in the province of the Member introducing it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am indebted to the Chair for that explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, however, a Senator might get from the Senate permission to have a measure referred to some other committee than that designated by the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. Anything can be done in this body by unanimous consent, the rules to the contrary notwithstanding. However, I know, Mr. President, that in the past resolutions which have been submitted and bills which have been introduced have sometimes been referred to the wrong committees merely because the Senators who submitted the resolutions or introduced the bills made specific request regarding the reference to committee. I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time in view of the fact that so many of the committees have been consolidated. It seems to me that the Parliamentarian and the Chair should exercise their rights more than ever before in seeing to it that resolutions and bills are appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to emphasize the remarks and point made by the Senator from Illinois. As the Senator who is now in the Chair and other Senators know, I have for a long time protested against a sort of obiter dictum ruling by a former Vice President to the effect that he would refer any measure to the committee to which the author of the measure wished it to go. It seemed to me at the time that it was a mere remark, not a ruling. The rules in regard to the jurisdiction of committees of the Senate have been more or less vague, but in the reorganization bill and in respect to the consolidation of committees an effort has been made to define more clearly the jurisdiction of committees and the types of legislation which shall be referred to them.

As we are starting out now under the new dispensation, I think the point which has been made in a good one, and I think the suggested procedure is something which we should try to observe and enforce. I hope that whoever is in the chair will undertake to have measures appropriately referred, that is to say, to the committees intended to have jurisdiction over the subject matter, regardless of the requests of authors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia—and as the Chair understands, no point has been made regarding it by the Senator from Illinois—is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and is properly referred to that committee. But the reference should be made by the Presiding Officer, not by the Senator submitting the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the matter of the introduction of bills and other measures. I hope that from the start, from this day on, there will not be reference of measures on the basis of personal or unanimous-consent requests. As Senators have stated, we have undertaken to define the jurisdiction of committees. I hope that in all cases that system will govern the references, and that no personal requests will play any part in the determination of the committees to which measures are referred.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, with respect to the resolution which the Senator from West Virginia just submitted, which has precipitated this discussion, mention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was made only because it was the view of the author of the resolution that that committee was the appropriate one to receive the resolution. I understand that no point has been made that it is not the appropriate committee.

I heartily concur in the view which has been expressed, namely, that bills and resolutions should certainly be referred to the appropriate committees. In this instance, mention of the specific committee was made only because I thought there could be no debate or question as to the fact that the requested reference was the appropriate one.

The resolution (S. Res. 44) submitted by Mr. REVERCOMB was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the adequacy of the supply of railroad coal cars in the West Virginia coal-mining areas and with respect to the reasons for any inadequacy of such supply.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

EFFECT ON SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE OF EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I was very much surprised to read in the public press a statement by Col. C. C. Hanson, secretary of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, in which he stated that he had filed a brief with the State Department in opposition to the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries. That statement was heralded over the United States—and I am informed over the world—as a great reversal in the traditional attitude of the South on this question. I know that through tearing down trade barriers a great benefit will accrue to southern agriculture, and I was amazed that the commissioners of agriculture of the Southern States should take such a position. I immediately wrote the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Mississippi. He sent the following telegram to Colonel Hanson:

DECEMBER 30, 1946.

Mr. C. C. HANSON,
Secretary, Southern Commissioners,
Raleigh Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Cannot concur in program in opposition negotiating extension reciprocal trade agreements. This question has not been presented or acted upon by southern commissioners at any legally called meeting attended by me since 1940. Suggest poll association membership before any further activities on this question.

SI CORLEY, *Commissioner.*

Mr. President, it appears to me from Mr. Corley's telegram that Colonel Hanson had not polled the southern commissioners of agriculture and had no authority from them to speak in their behalf.

Further, I read a letter which I received from Mr. Corley, the Mississsippi commissioner of agriculture, dated December 31, 1946:

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Your letter of December 24 arrived during our long Christmas holiday. Upon opening it yesterday I tried to call you at Ruleville but was informed you were en route to Washington.

I am enclosing a copy of telegram I sent Colonel Hanson giving my position on the reciprocal trade treaty. I also called Commissioner Harry D. Wilson and Colonel Hanson and found I was right in that this question has not been discussed at any meeting since I entered this office.

I particularly invite the attention of the Senate and the country to that statement. I repeat it:

I also called Commissioner Harry D. Wilson and Colonel Hanson and found I was right in that this question has not been discussed at any meeting since I entered this office. I told Colonel Hanson that my position was the same as that of the Mississippi Farm Bureau and other agricultural leaders of Mississippi

and that I propose to join them in favoring the continuation of trade agreements with the request that agricultural products be given a little more favorable position in the treaty than they have in the past.

I certainly appreciate your calling my attention to this matter, as I had not noted Hanson's release in the paper, and from the article I received this morning, which appeared in the New York Times, was to the effect that the 13 commissioners had opposed any reciprocal agreement.

Again thanking you for the information on this matter and wishing you a most prosperous and successful New Year, I am

Sincerely yours,

SI CORLEY, *Commissioner.*

So, Mr. President, it appears that a brief was filed by Colonel Hanson in an attempt to change the entire policy of the South on these questions. It also appears that he had not consulted a single commissioner of agriculture and spoke merely his own views for what they might be worth.

In this regard I should like to read a statement given to the public press by Mr. Joe N. Poole, commissioner of agriculture industries in the State of Alabama. The statement was made in a telegram which he sent to the President of the United States on December 27. The telegram reads as follows:

The brief filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information by C. C. Hanson protesting against the proposal to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with certain countries in behalf of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture does not represent my views with reference to reciprocal trade agreements, the AAA program, the Bankhead farm bills, and other agricultural legislation mentioned. Mr. Hanson had no authority to speak for me either as an individual or as commissioner of agriculture for Alabama. In my opinion, Mr. Hanson's brief would be supported by only a small minority, if any, of the farm people of Alabama.

I think he speaks the sentiments of the farmers of the whole South when he says that Colonel Hanson would be supported by only a very small minority, if any, of those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits.

I read further from Commissioner Poole's statement:

It is my opinion that the farm people of Alabama, in general, support the principles of reciprocal trade agreements, as it has been long recognized that our protective policies have worked undue hardships on agricultural producers.

That statement is sound, and will apply not only to the farm population of Alabama but, in my humble judgment, to the farm population of every other section of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator from Maine will let me finish reading this telegram, I shall be glad to yield.

I read further:

We do believe, however, that in administering the trade-agreements program, equitable treatment in adjusting trade barriers must be given to agricultural products. It is my sincere opinion that the brief presented by Mr. Hanson is inconsistent with the best interests economically of the United States and the world and is certainly a serious blow against achieving a permanent peace.

The telegram is signed by Joe N. Poole, commissioner of agriculture and industries of the State of Alabama.

Mr. President, I say that 99 percent of the people of the South concur in the statement of Commissioner Poole.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not wish to precipitate a discussion of reciprocal trade agreements or tariffs, but in view of the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, I think it would be appropriate to know at this point whether or not the Senator contemplates giving up the quota and quantitative restrictions on our importation of cotton, which restrictions are alien to the reciprocal trade agreements and to the current policies of the Government.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is certainly fundamental economics that American cotton must compete with world cotton on a price and quality basis.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the Senator's statement; but, under the quota system American cotton enjoys a protection that practically no other American product enjoys. We do not object to that, believing in protection, but we wonder whether the South would share the benefits with us in other fields.

Mr. EASTLAND. Regardless of whether it is a southern product or a northern product, the whole prosperity and future of the country depend upon the destruction of trade barriers; and I do not think that the selfish interests of anyone should interfere with such a great program.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. VANDENBERG. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations; which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably and unanimously the nomination of George C. Marshall, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of State. I desire to make a brief explanatory statement in connection with the report.

The committee feels very keenly that we must not establish the practice of confirming nominations without complete hearing and investigation. The committee wishes me to state that the action now proposed is not in any way to be considered a precedent in respect to the procedure ordinarily to be followed in the consideration of nominations. However, the committee feels that it is highly essential that the voice of the Senate, unanimously, if possible, should notify the world immediately this afternoon that unity still prevails in respect to this situation.

I present the unanimous report of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Marshall, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gen. George C. Marshall to be Secretary of State?

The nomination was unanimously confirmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, at the time the OPA ceilings on cattle were removed, the livestock producers of the West were much concerned. The border had been closed for some months, perhaps a year, because of foot-and-mouth disease among the cattle in Mexico.

I cannot overestimate the devastating effect in any country of the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in cattle, and every possible precaution should be taken to prevent any such outbreak in the United States. This particularly applies to the West, where the cattle have been kept singularly free from diseases of all kinds.

The Mexican border has been closed again on account of a recurrence of the foot-and-mouth disease among the cattle herds in Mexico.

Not so very long ago a number of Brazilian bulls were admitted to this country, and some found their way to the Rocky Mountain States. The danger that these bulls are possibly carriers of the foot-and-mouth disease is one that cannot be overestimated. They are a great hazard when alive, and they can be a greater hazard when dead if not properly buried or cremated. I have also been advised that some 900 head of Mexican cattle were brought into Montana during the recent holiday season.

I mention this in the hope that the Department of Agriculture will take no-

tice and see that prompt action is taken to survey the whole situation of cattle that have been or may be imported from Mexico and South America.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Benefits to Farm Homes and the Nation From the St. Lawrence Project," by Fred J. Freestone, which was prepared for the Power Authority of the State of New York.

I also ask to have printed excerpts from the annual message of Governor Thomas E. Dewey to the Legislature of the State of New York, submitted this morning, which refers to the same subject, namely, the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEFITS TO FARM HOMES AND THE NATION FROM THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

(By Fred J. Freestone)

On June 13, 1946, the United States Senate received a report adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations recommending passage of Joint Resolution 104 to authorize construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

As recommended by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and favorably reported by the Senate committee, the pending plan provides for development of the St. Lawrence River for power and navigation purposes. The greater part of the new work required to complete the project will be carried out in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, a 48-mile stretch on New York State's boundary with the Province of Ontario.

The St. Lawrence River is New York State's principal undeveloped resource of low-cost hydroelectric power. Even with its present outmoded canals and locks, it is a going concern as one of the busiest navigable waterways now in operation in this country. In the war years annual commerce, carried in more than 5,000 separate cargoes which passed through the St. Lawrence in a single season, rose above 10,000,000 tons.

SHORTAGE OF FACILITIES DURING THE WAR

All over the United States during World War II rail transportation was taxed beyond its capacity. Greatly expanded hydroelectric power plants, public and private, and new installations for steam power generated from coal and oil were required for war production.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey took office at Albany in the midst of the war in January 1943. Since Pearl Harbor, New York farms had been suffering from shortages of feed for cattle and poultry, shortages of lumber, coal, oil, gasoline, trucks, farm machinery, and other equipment and supplies desperately needed to sustain full production.

With characteristic vigor and tenacity, Governor Dewey grappled with the wartime problems which confronted New York agriculture. Much needed equipment in short supply could not then be obtained under the operation of wartime controls at Washington. Nevertheless, emergency measures were initiated by the State government, seasonal farm labor was recruited, bottlenecks in transportation were attacked, and every aid was given to assist New York State farmers in their critical job of food production. By the end of the war, in the face of unprecedented difficulties, New York State had achieved a record production, surpassing normal levels in many important food items.

AGRICULTURE A LEADING INDUSTRY IN NEW YORK STATE

Few people outside its borders realize that New York State, which leads the Nation in manufactures, is outranked in the value of its farm production by only five or six other States. There are today more than 150,000 farm homes in New York State, supporting a farm population of over 700,000. This exceeds the farm population of all the New England States combined. It is greater than the farm population of such predominantly agricultural States as Nebraska, Kansas, North or South Dakota, or any one of the States of the mountain section or the Pacific coast.

In the production of milk, butter, cheese, poultry, eggs, market vegetables, noncitrus fruits, and many other essential foods for human consumption, New York State is among the leaders throughout the Nation.

The importance of agriculture as one of the basic industries of New York State has been recognized by Governor Dewey, both in the emergency program initiated during the war and in long-range measures recommended by the Governor for postwar development. In a message to the legislature January 3, 1945, as in other public statements, the Governor urged prompt development of the St. Lawrence and emphasized the value and benefit of its low-cost hydroelectric energy to producers and consumers throughout the area.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER NEEDED BY NEW YORK FARMS

No one familiar with farming operations in this State will dispute the conclusion that New York farmers will greatly benefit from the St. Lawrence development.

Dairy farming, poultry raising, and the production of fruits and vegetables are peculiarly adapted to the use of electrical energy at low rates in electrical equipment and appliances, including deep-freezing and other refrigerating equipment, milking machines, milk coolers, driers, brooders, and many others. In addition, there is a great pent-up demand for washing machines, vacuum cleaners, refrigerators, electric stoves, and other appliances in the modern farm homes of New York State.

In recent years encouraging progress has been made in New York State in extending electric service to the farms and in introducing promotional rates to permit wider use of electrical energy and electrical appliances at lower cost to the consumer.

In its annual report, February 15, 1945, the public service commission stated that at the end of 1944 electric service was being furnished to 123,000 New York State farms over 42,500 miles of rural lines. This represented an increase in the number of New York State farms with central station electric service of more than 184 percent since 1929, when only 43,300 farms had such service.

Further progress in reducing the spread in the costs paid for electrical energy in New York State, as compared with the low-cost hydroelectric power areas, is necessary if New York farms and industries are to compete on an equal footing in our domestic and foreign trade.

ALL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY WILL GAIN BENEFITS FROM PROJECT

Development of St. Lawrence power will increase by 1,100,000 horsepower, or less than one-fifth the present power capacity of the State, and cannot, therefore, displace or absorb the markets of existing utilities.

It will stimulate new business and create new industry for New York State to develop its low-cost hydroelectric resources instead of relying exclusively upon more expensive steam power to meet the normal growth in the demand for electric energy. All business and industry will gain from this development in New York State, including the utilities and their security holders.

COST SMALL IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECTS

Authorized postwar river projects approved by Congress since 1944 up to the end of the last session include improvement of the Missouri River, for power, navigation, irrigation, and flood control, at a cost of $800,000,000; the first stage in improvement of the Arkansas River, at an ultimate cost of $450,000,000; and new dams on the Columbia River, where Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have already been completed, to expand the Columbia River development for power, navigation, and irrigation to a cost of more than $750,000,000.

Net cost of completing the development of the St. Lawrence River, estimated at $212,000,000, is therefore small in comparison with other projects already approved by Congress.

BENEFITS OF ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT ESTABLISHED AT PUBLIC HEARINGS

Endorsements of the project were received at the Senate hearings from the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers Union, and from rural electric cooperatives and other farm organizations in every section of the country.

The committee followed the recommendation of Governor Dewey and included in the St. Lawrence resolution, as favorably reported to the Senate, 14 to 8, the Federal-State accord provisions which protect New York's rights in the power development. Under these provisions, New York State will take over the ownership and operation of the power project to be built near Massena on a self-liquidating basis. Governor Dewey had insisted upon such provisions in his exchange of telegrams with President Truman in September 1945, when certain Washington officials sought to Federalize the power development.

If the question is decided upon the facts and upon the tests applied to other river developments in other parts of the country, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be approved by the new Congress. Its tremendous benefits to agriculture, manufactures, and to every section of the State of New York as well as to the Nation have been established beyond dispute in engineering reports and surveys, economic studies, and the public record of the congressional hearings.

EXCERPTS FROM ANNUAL MESSAGE OF GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY TO THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, JANUARY 8, 1947

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Once again the matter of the development of the St. Lawrence for the benefit of the people of this and neighboring States will be before the Federal Congress.

For many years I have held the view and advocated that the development of hydroelectric power from that great natural resource should go forward. During these years the proposal for the development of hydroelectric power and the seaway has steadily gained strength and supporters.

During the war the electric-power production of the State was stretched to its maximum. We would have been unable to meet any greater demand than was then put upon our system. The trend over the years for great electric consumption is upward. We are reaching capacity even for normal times.

It has also been forcibly borne in upon us more than once that the dependence of so much of our electric-power production on coal makes clearer the need for alternative sources for electric-power production. Moreover, the great cost of replacement of capital equipment and of expanding capital equipment in the electric-power field

threatens to terminate or even reverse the uniformly decreasing cost of electricity to the consumers of this State in the future. A partial solution to all these needs is provided by utilizing to the full the waterpower of the State for the production of hydroelectric power.

I am firmly convinced that in this course of action there lies additional prosperity for all the people of the State. The Empire State is going forward and in the future it can use all the railroad facilities, all the transportation facilities, all the waterways, and all the sources of power available to it or lying at its threshold.

SENATOR FROM MISSISSIPPI

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator about to make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. WHITE. I was about to do so, but first I intended to make a brief statement.

Mr. HATCH. Before the Senator makes a motion to adjourn, I should like to make a very brief statement.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Senate today, but in connection with the matter which was discussed Saturday, and especially concerning my own position, I wish to add a statement, now that the immediate rush and emergency seem to have passed.

I wish to stress again what I tried to emphasize on Saturday, the importance of the maintenance and preservation of certain fundamental rights, which in reality are more important perhaps to the Senate than to the individual who is accused. So I am taking the liberty now, during this time when there is no need for immediate action, to make a suggestion. I make it only as a suggestion, because I think the procedure should be adopted upon the initiation of others.

My suggestion is that in connection with the charges against the Senator-elect from Mississippi, now, or very shortly, the report of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which seems to be the basis for the charges, be referred to the proper committee, which, under the new organization, I understand will be the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that that committee take the report, together with the report of the Committee on Campaign Expenditures, the minority views, and such other information as may properly come before it, and that the committee prefer formal and specific charges against the Senator-elect from Mississippi.

In my opinion it is of vast importance that charges be so prepared and filed, and that they be transmitted to the Senator-elect from Mississippi as quickly as possible, notwithstanding the condition of his health, in order that he may have full knowledge of the charges against him, and may prepare whatever defense he may care to submit. After that has been done and after the Senator-elect from Mississippi has returned to the Senate, as I am sure every Member of this body hopes he will, he should be accorded by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of whose jurisdiction there can be no doubt and no question, a full hearing upon the charges filed; witnesses should be brought to testify, and he should have the privilege of confronting them in person and of cross-examining them fully and, furthermore, he should, of course, be accorded the privilege of producing in his own behalf whatever witnesses or whatever evidence he might care to submit.

I suggest that after those full and orderly steps have been taken before the committee, the committee then report to the Senate its findings, and that we act then upon the ultimate question, which we must and should determine upon competent charge and competent evidence, namely, the actual guilt or innocence of the man.

When that has been done, Mr. President, I say again for myself—and I think I say for every other Member of the Senate, regardless of the side of the Chamber on which he may sit—that without politics, without partisanship, we may then vote upon the only question involved, which is whether he is guilty, and if guilty, whether his guilt has been established in accordance with fundamental American principles of right, privilege, and justice.

For myself, Mr. President, and for many others I know that if it is established that this man, or for that matter any other Member of this body, has prostituted the high office of Senator of the United States, by using it for his own personal gain or profit, that he has illegally conspired against any segment of the country, no matter what the race, or against any citizen, the judgment and verdict of the Senate will be one of guilty; but it is more important I think that the guilt be established, if there be guilt, according to correct rules of procedure than it is that he be denied a seat in this body.

Mr. President, I urge that such procedure as I have outlined be substantially followed. I am not trying to dictate the procedure, I am merely making the suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I understand the Senator from New Mexico to ask unanimous consent that an order be entered regarding this matter?

Mr. HATCH. I did not. I was merely making a suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that such course would be inconsistent with the order entered last Saturday with reference to this entire procedure, for the reason that it was requested and ordered that the credentials of the Senator-elect from Mississippi lie on the table. That carried with it the idea that the entire proceeding, including hearings before the two committees, remain in status quo until such time as the Senator-elect could return, or until the Senate itself decided to take up the matter.

To follow the course suggested by the Senator from New Mexico would make it necessary probably for the Committee on Rules and Administration to proceed, or at least make it possible for that committee to proceed prior to the time indicated in the order of Saturday, which was, until such time as the Senator-elect from Mississippi could return; and while I appreciate the desire for prompt consideration of the matter, under the order entered Saturday I doubt very much whether the committee should proceed in the absence of the Senator-elect. I fear that under the suggestion they might feel some obligation to do so. I think that possibility should be considered before we enter on the course suggested.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Maine yield further?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I stated in the beginning, I was only making a suggestion. I think that the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky is entirely appropriate, but I think it would be most unfortunate if, in the event the committee desired to follow the course I have suggested, it could not prepare the charge, and at least submit them to the Senator-elect, so that he or his counsel, during the interim, could be preparing his defense.

Of course, the situation mentioned as an obstacle could be obviated by a unanimous-consent agreement or by other action of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no other business to come immediately before the Senate, but before moving an adjournment I should like to make a brief statement as to the policy of the majority with respect to sessions of the Senate for some 2 or 3 months.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to inquire whether or not it is the plan and purpose of the Senate to meet on Friday of this week.

Mr. WHITE. That matter will be covered in the statement I am about to make.

Mr. REVERCOMB. My only purpose in propounding the question is that under an engagement previously made I shall have to be absent Friday, and I wish to have permission to be absent on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection leave of absence is granted the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think all Senators recognize perfectly well that the legislative process divides itself into two principal phases. One is that with which committees are primarily concerned, covering the introduction of proposed legislation, its reference to appropriate committees, hearings by the committees, the laborious task of draftsmanship following the hearings, and the ultimate reporting of the legislation by the committees to the Senate. That is what I call the first phase, and it is one of the principal phases of the legislative process. The other phase involves consideration and subsequent action upon the floor.

A great deal of difficulty has been encountered in arranging hearings of committees in such a way as to avoid conflict with the sessions of the Senate, to preclude so far as possible any collision between the sessions of committees and the

sessions of the main body of the Senate itself. In the report of the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, in the consideration of what should be done to improve the efficiency of the legislative body, one of the proposals was in these terms:

> We respectfully suggest experimentation by the leadership of the two Houses in dividing the workweek, reserving 3 days for morning and afternoon hearings by committees, possibly with evening sessions on these days, and 3 days for sessions in the Chambers for legislative work. Sessions in the Chambers could be held either on three consecutive days or could alternate with days reserved for committee meetings.

That recognized the difficulty and suggested a method to minimize the conflict which we have experienced so many times between floor obligations and committee obligations. When the reorganization bill was introduced it embodied substantially the language of the report of the special committee. Section 246 of the bill as introduced in this body by Senator La Follette provided as follows:

> It is the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the leadership of the respective Houses experiment with schedules for meetings of the two Houses so as to determine whether the business of the Congress may be more efficiently transacted by providing for alternate days for Chamber sessions and committee meetings, or by providing for three full days for committee meetings and three full days for sessions in the Chambers, or by providing some other schedule, including night sessions.

Those two provisions, one in the bill as introduced, and one in the report of the special committee, indicate the thought of that committee that some provision should be made so that committees might hold their hearings undisturbed, if I may use that word, by calls from the Senate floor, and so that the Senate might deliberately consider legislation once it had been reported, without constant interruptions to obtain quorums on the floor.

With these recommendations in mind, the steering committee of the majority gave some consideration last week as to what our attitude should be toward committee sessions, and we adopted the second proposition or proposal that there should be alternate days of sessions of committees and sessions of the Senate. I was authorized to say to the Senate that it would be the policy of the majority party for a couple of months or so, to a date somewhat indefinite, to move that there be sessions of the full Senate on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and that on the days between, various committees of the Senate might meet to perform their functions and discharge their responsibilities by considering proposed legislation, by having hearings, and by drafting the proposals upon which they agree.

I have in mind that there are coming ahead of us some days of unusual significance to all Members. I should want in the case of the anniversary of Lincoln's birth to depart somewhat from this program of having Senate sessions Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and permit the largest possible opportunity for Members on this side to go to their homes or elsewhere, and make their customary, and I think proper, speeches on Lincoln's Birthday. Some provision perhaps should be made for Washington's Birthday.

I have it in mind that the minority usually have either a Jackson Day or a Jefferson Day dinner, and that might suggest to certain of its members the desirability of a special dispensation with respect to Senate sessions on those occasions. But subject to those limited exceptions, I wanted to advise the Senate that under the authority of the majority steering committee I shall move that sessions adjourn from Monday to Wednesday and then from Wednesday to Friday until we have proved either the futility of the plan or until we are ready to adopt it more or less permanently.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The suggestion offered by the Senator from Maine was discussed in the last Congress with respect to some plan by which we could concentrate senatorial work free from committee work. Various suggestions were discussed, but none of them was ever adopted. We have been in the habit heretofore, until legislation became ready for consideration, of having what we call 3-day adjournments. I take it for granted that this program would obviate the 3-day adjournments.

Mr. WHITE. To a very large extent; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would take the place of the 3-day adjournments which we have heretofore taken during periods when legislation was not pressing. It seems to me the plan is worth trying, and it may be possible to work it out for the entire session, although I would not be willing to consent to it for longer than, say, a couple of months to see how it works.

So far as Lincoln Day absenteeism is concerned, we have no objection to any deviation from this program that would permit our friends to get back to Lincoln. There was a suggestion made here the other day that Senators on the other side of the aisle wanted to get back to Lincoln, and I am all for it. I want the Republican Party to get back to Lincoln.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the closer the party gets back to Lincoln the nearer it will come to Jefferson.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I simply wish to say that the Senator from Kentucky has just now "beat me to the punch."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think there will be no difficulty about arranging for Washington's Birthday and for Lincoln's Birthday. So far as Jackson is concerned, the Democrats have always celebrated Jackson Day on the 8th day of January, today, which is the day of the Battle of New Orleans.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator from Kentucky is celebrating it now.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have made no special arrangement for celebrating Jackson Day, except that I am to address a Democratic club in Baltimore on Saturday night at a Jackson Day banquet, to which I am happy to invite all my Republican friends.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator would have a highly intelligent audience if we accepted.

Mr. BARKLEY. But in April I think it is planned to have a number of Jefferson Day celebrations throughout the country, and I am sure that Jefferson and Lincoln and Washington and Jackson will all be maintained upon an equal footing with respect to the work of the Senate and the convenience of individual Senators.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wanted to say for the benefit of my friend the Senator from Kentucky that I hope his statement, which I shall designate as exhibit A, is evidence that the great party to which he belongs, of which he has been majority leader in the Senate for so many years, and so successfully, will be bound to return to the principles and teachings and tenets of Thomas Jefferson. When that day comes it will be a great day for this country.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that we have never departed from them, because Jefferson was the outstanding liberal of his day, and we have always adhered to the liberal policies which were advocated by the original liberal, Thomas Jefferson, which were not altogether dissimilar to the liberality of the founder of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely desire to say that, as I understand, while the Senate will meet Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, there is nothing to prevent committee meetings being held in the mornings of those days before 12 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Ohio is correct in that statement.

Mr. TAFT. But the idea was that on Tuesdays and Thursdays the committee chairmen can arrange for all day hearings, knowing that the committees can sit and hold hearings for the whole day, and thus accomplish three times what can be accomplished if there is only an hour or so in the morning to be given to committee hearings before the Senate meets. There is no reason, however, why such meetings could not be supplemented on the days when the Senate meets, so long as the committees do not meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. WHITE. If I may say another word, Mr. President, I think we all recognize that this plan is experimental. We may feel after we have lived under it for a while that it has so much of merit that we can adopt it permanently, or it may be that we shall discard it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may offer the suggestion to the Senator from Ohio that except when committees were holding continuous hearings day after day, Tuesdays and Thursdays have been generally

the customary days for meetings of committees to take place.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, while we are discussing the greater efficiency of our body and its functioning, I should like some consideration to be given to the Senate having a regular lunch hour. I know that in many cases Senators are away from the floor when important matters are being discussed, and we must hurry away from our meals, perhaps to answer a call for a quorum, perhaps two or three times during the meal, which is probably not the best thing for one's health. Ofttimes a Senator or Senators will be discussing an important matter, and nearly all the Senators will take advantage of such a time to do downstairs and try to have their lunch, which means that we are not giving to such matter the consideration and the attendance it deserves.

Mr. President, I simply ask consideration of the suggestion that the Senate meet earlier in the morning, 10:30, or perhaps 11 o'clock, and, let us say, continue until 1 o'clock, and then perhaps have a lunch hour from 1 o'clock to 2 o'clock, or perhaps meet at 10 o'clock and continue in session until 1 o'clock, and then take a recess until 2 o'clock, and come back at 2 o'clock and continue in session until time for adjournment arrives. I suggest we not have any committee meetings on the days when we have sessions of the Senate.

I want to commend the majority leader and his associates for what they are doing with respect to the procedure of the Senate. I think what they have proposed is very wholesome and salutary. I wished, however, to submit my suggestion in respect to the procedure.

I desire to make another suggestion. It may be due to the lack of acuteness of our hearing or to the bad acoustics of this Chamber, but frequently it is impossible to hear what our colleagues say. I remember when I first came to the Senate I heard a Senator on this side of the Chamber, in referring to another Senator, say, "The Senator has been here 8 years, during the time I have been here, and I have never yet heard a word he has said." Frequently, because of the poor acoustics in the Chamber, we simply do not hear what our fellow Senators are saying. I hope attention may be given to improvement of the acoustics of the Chamber. Perhaps the study which was previously initiated is being continued.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under the leadership of the late Senator Andrews of Florida complete plans have been made for the renovation of the Senate Chamber. In preparing those plans the best acoustical experts of the United States were consulted. However, they have a very difficult problem. As Senators know, the Chamber will be entirely changed. The skylight will be removed. There will be a low flat dome instead of the present skylight, and we hope it may provide very much better acoustical qualities. I believe that the specifications are practically completed. The work is expected to be done this summer when the Senate adjourns. But there are no plans for improving the acoustics during this session, except to speak louder.

Mr. PEPPER. I am proud of the association of my late colleague, Florida's distinguished Senator, with this project. It was very close to his heart. I hope the plans will proceed with all possible dispatch. Meanwhile, I hope the able majority leader and the others of us individually will try to speak louder, and encourage our colleagues to speak sufficiently loud so that at least what may be said will be heard, whether it is regarded or not.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, both suggestions of the able Senator from Florida are worthy of consideration, and I have no doubt they will be in the minds of Senators as we proceed during this period of experimentation.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate on Friday of this week, and on Monday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Wednesday, January 8, 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George C. Marshall, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of State.

Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, to be the United States representative on the Commission of Investigation established by the Security Council of the United Nations on December 19, 1946, to ascertain the facts relating to alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Francis Bowes Sayre, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

The following-named persons to the commissions to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Isador Lubin, of the District of Columbia, to be the United States member of the Economic and Employment Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be the United States member of the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

Philip M. Hauser, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be the United States member of the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

Miss Dorothy Kenyon, of New York, to be the United States member of the Commission on Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be the United States member of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the United States member of the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service staff officers of the classes indicated, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICERS OF CLASS 6

James E. Callahan, of Massachusetts.
Duncan M. White, of North Carolina.
John R. Wood, of Florida.

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICERS OF CLASS 7

Neal D. Borum, of Tennessee.
Sabin J. Dalferes, of Louisiana.
Paul M. Dutko, of the District of Columbia.
Ellis A. Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Victor H. Loftus, of California.
Camden L. McLain, of Virginia.
Clay Merrell, of Arkansas.
Henry O. Ramsey, of South Dakota.
Marc L. Severe, of Iowa.
Charles H. Stephan, of New York.

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICERS OF CLASS 8

Charles W. Allen, of Wyoming.
Edward S. Benet, of Texas.
Frederick A. Bohne, of New York.
George L. Brist, of Iowa.
Albert S. Browne, of Missouri.
F. Willard Calder, of Florida.

Harold Carlson, of Illinois.
Herbert W. Carlson, of Massachusetts.
John J. Coyle, of New York.
Laurence J. Daymont, of New York.
Joseph R. Evans, of Colorado.
Cyrus B. Follmer, of Pennsylvania.
Charles M. Gerrity, of Pennsylvania.
Culver E. Gicden, of Texas.
Carl O. Hawthorne, of Missouri.
Bernard F. Heiler, of Massachusetts.
Wendell S. Howard, of Florida.
Julius C. Jensen, of Wyoming.
Stanley R. Lawson, of New York.
William R. Lynch, of Kansas.
Samuel A. McIlhenny, Jr., of Texas.
George C. Minor, of West Virginia.
H. Claremont Moses, of New York.
Eugene W. Nabel, of Rhode Island.
Arthur G. Parsloe, of Georgia.
Raymond Phelan, of Arizona.
James C. Powell, Jr., of Texas.
Arthur J. Romero, of California.
Miss Agnes E. Schneider, of Pennsylvania.
Paul C. Seddicum, of the District of Columbia.
Warren C. Stewart, of Maryland.
Hugh H. Teller, of Michigan.
Hernan C. Vogenitz, of Ohio.
Joseph F. Walker, of Illinois.
Leslie A. Weisenburg, of Illinois.
Stephen C. Worster, of Maine.
Casimir T. Zawadzki, of New York.
Ben Zweig, of Arizona.

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICERS OF CLASS 9

John R. Barry, of Massachusetts.
Adam Beaumont, of Maine.
Horace C. de Baca, of New Mexico.
Henry T. Dwyer, of Rhode Island.
Earl W. Eaton, of Illinois.
J. Stanford Edwards, of New York.
Fred H. Houck, of the District of Columbia.
Robert L. Hunter, of South Dakota.
Russell B. Jordan, of Wyoming.
Chester H. Kimrey, of Oklahoma.
Henry G. Krausse, of Texas.
Francis A. Lane, of Missouri.
Nelson P. Meeks, of New York.
Augustus Ostertag, of Pennsylvania.
Harry K. Pangburn, of Texas.
Carroll C. Parry, of Missouri.
George R. Phelan, of California.
Frithjof C. Sigmond, of Oregon.
Jones R. Trowbridge, of Georgia.
Lawrence W. von Hellens, of Washington.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate pursuant to the act of February 23, 1931, as amended. In accordance with section 1102 (a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, effective November 13, 1946, these persons were transferred to the new class 6 established by that act:

Stuart Blow, of North Carolina.
William L. Brewster, of Texas.
Lawrence N. Chamberlin, of Pennsylvania.
Martin P. Detels, Jr., of New York.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
Martin F. Herz, of New York.
C. H. Walter Howe, of New Jersey.
Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.
Edward V. Lindberg, of New York.
William A. McFadden, of New Jersey.
Charles P. McVicker, Jr., of New Jersey.
Robert Behymer Moody, of California.
Warren S. Moore, Jr., of Illinois.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr., of Maryland.
William N. Stokes, of New York.
Oliver L. Troxel, Jr., of Colorado.
Robert E. Whedbee, of Kansas.
William A. Wieland, of New York.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of Michigan.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Robert M. Berry, of Massachusetts.
Gardner C. Carpenter, of California.
William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
Glenn R. McCarty, Jr., of Iowa.
James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.
Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.
G. Alonzo Stanford, of Michigan.
Robert W. Weise, Jr., of Minnesota.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

W. Stratton Anderson, Jr., of Illinois.
Russell W. Benton, of New York.
William O. Boswell, of Pennsylvania.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.
Jack B. Neathery, of Texas.
Robert W. Rinden, of Iowa.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
Robert C. Strong, of Wisconsin.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James M. Gilchrist, Jr., of Illinois.
Boies C. Hart, Jr., of Connecticut.
George D. Henderson, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Raleigh A. Gibson, of Illinois.
Clarence E. Macy, of Colorado.
Marshall M. Vance, of Ohio.

Robert M. Carr, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate pursuant to the act of February 23, 1931, as amended. In accordance with section 1102 (a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, effective November 13, 1946, Mr. Carr was transferred to the new class 3 established by that act.

Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Douglas W. McGregor, of Texas, to be the Assistant to the Attorney General. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, vice Hon. James C. Wilson, retired.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Richmond B. Keech, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

George Morris Fay, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

J. Ellis Mundy, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James R. Wright, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas. (Mr. Wright is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 25, 1946.)

Edward M. Ranson, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

M. Frank Hammond, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas. (Mr. Hammond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 3, 1946.)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Archibald L. M. Wiggins, of South Carolina, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of O. Max Gardner.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

William Chapman Foster, of New York, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Under Secretary of Commerce.

Adrian S. Fisher, of Tennessee, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

John Nicholas Brown, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

NATIONAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR

Raymond Michael Foley, of Michigan, to be National Housing Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

HOUSING EXPEDITER

Frank Creedon, of Massachusetts, to be Housing Expediter, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Dillard B. Lasseter, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

John D. Goodloe, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1946, to be effective January 17, 1947 (vice George E. Allen, resigned).

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Frances Perkins, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate (vice Lucille F. McMillin, resigned).

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Carroll Miller, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1953. (Reappointment.)

Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1949 (vice Claude R. Porter).

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Clarence M. Young, of California, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John O'Dea, of the District of Columbia, to be people's counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

PUERTO RICO

Mariano Villaronga of Puerto Rico to be Commissioner of Education for Puerto Rico, terminating recess appointment, vice José M. Gallardo.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Oren E. Long of Hawaii to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, terminating recess appointment, vice Gerald Robert Corbett.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

George Tinsley Garnett for appointment as Administrative Officer, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of Administrative Officer, national headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

Col. Harris P. Ralston for appointment as deputy State director of Selective Service for Illinois, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of deputy State director of Selective Service will be at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

Lt. Col. Harold M. Hayes for appointment as State director of Selective Service for Maine, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of Selective Service will be at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

Lt. Col. John B. Elliott for appointment as deputy State director of Selective Service for Tennessee under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of deputy State director of Selective Service will be at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

Lt. Col. Charles M. Toynbee for appointment as deputy State director of Selective Service for Washington, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of deputy State director of Selective Service will be at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

Maj. Bentley Courtenay for appointment as State director of Selective Service for Wisconsin, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of Selective Service will be at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Herbert E. Arnold, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, to fill an existing vacancy.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

S. Scott Beck, Jr., of Maryland, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., to fill an existing vacancy. (Mr. Beck is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

To be Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer with the rank of captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

John H. Peters,* September 1, 1946.
George C. Mattison,* October 1, 1946.
Kenneth T. Adams,* October 1, 1946.
Frederic L. Peacock, January 1, 1947.
Ray L. Schoppe, January 1, 1947.

To be Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

Oliver S. Reading,* September 1, 1946.
Francis L. Gallen,* October 1, 1946.
Cornelius D. Meaney,* October 1, 1946.
John A. Bond, January 1, 1947.
Augustus P. Ratti, January 1, 1947.

To be Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

Charles A. Schanck,* September 1, 1946.
Joseph P. Lushene,* October 1, 1946.
Curtis LeFever,* October 1, 1946.
Henry O. Fortin, January 1, 1947.
Edwin C. Baum, January 1, 1947.

To be Junior Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer with rank of lieutenant (j. g.) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

Miller J. Tonkel, June 28, 1946.
Robert H. Brown, August 8, 1946.
George E. Russell, jr., August 8, 1946.
Norman E. Taylor, October 16, 1946.
William E. Randall, December 13, 1946.

To be Aide with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

Lewis V. Evans III, September 1, 1946.
Allen L. Powell, September 1, 1946.

(NOTE.—The officers marked with an asterisk now hold recess commissions in the same grades as shown.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons:
John R. Heller, Jr.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr.

The following-named candidates for appointments and promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

David B. Scott to be senior assistant dental surgeon, effective November 18, 1946.

Engla J. Anderson to be assistant dietitian, effective date of oath of office.

Ruth E. Corcoran to be junior assistant dietitian, effective date of oath of office.

Senior surgeons to be medical directors, effective dates indicated:
Calvin C. Applewhite, October 1, 1946.
Frank V. Meriwether, October 1, 1946.
Roy E. Bodet, October 1, 1946.
Walter G. Nelson, October 1, 1946.
Albert E. Russell, October 22, 1946.
Ralph D. Lillie, October 25, 1946.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons, effective dates indicated:
William Hendon Gordon, November 1, 1946.
Albert T. Morrison, February 1, 1947.

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons, effective dates indicated:
Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1946.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1946.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1946.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1946.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1946.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1946.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1946.
Roger E. Heering, December 3, 1946.
Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1946.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1946.
John W. Cronin, January 1, 1947.
Edgar W. Moreland, January 1, 1947.
Jonathan B. Peebles, January 1, 1947.
Havelock F. Fraser, January 1, 1947.

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated:
Albert N. Sarwold, July 1, 1943.
Ardell B. Colyar, November 9, 1946.
Isaac M. Zigler, January 1, 1947.
J. Howard Beard, Jr., January 1, 1947.

Senior assistant dental surgeon to be dental surgeon, effective date indicated:
Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1946.

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective dates indicated:
Earl C. Hewitt, July 10, 1946.
Ceril S. Scheppegrell, July 11, 1946.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated:
Franz J. Maier, January 6, 1945.
Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1946.

Assistant sanitary engineers to be senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated:
Roscoe H. Goeke, February 8, 1946.
Chris A. Hansen, June 28, 1946.
Richard J. Hammerstrom, August 8, 1946.
John R. Thoman, February 15, 1947.

Victor H. Vogel, senior surgeon, to be temporary medical director, effective date of assumption of duties.

Senior surgeon to be temporary medical director, effective date indicated:
Ralph B. Snavely, October 21, 1946.

Surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, effective dates indicated:
Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1946.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1946.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1946.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1946.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1946.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1946.
John E. Dunn, December 1, 1946.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1946.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1946.
Robert J. Anderson, December 3, 1946.
Havelock F. Fraser, January 1, 1947.
Edgar W. Moreland, January 1, 1947.
Jonathan B. Peebles, January 1, 1947.

Senior assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, effective dates indicated:
David E. Price, October 21, 1946.
Paul W. Lucas, October 16, 1946.
Daniel MacKillop, October 16, 1946.
William J. McAnally, Jr., November 20, 1946.
Harry Leaffer, November 4, 1946.
Nunzio J. Carrozzo, January 1, 1947.
W. Clark Cooper, January 1, 1947.
Clarence Kooiker, January 1, 1947.
Roy Hertz, January 1, 1947.
Harold J. Magnuson, January 1, 1947.
Charles C. Shepard, January 1, 1947.
Llewellyn E. Kling, January 1, 1947.
Wayne W. Carpenter, January 1, 1947.
Timothy J. Haley, January 1, 1947.
Linden E. Johnson, January 1, 1947.
Samuel C. Ingraham, January 1, 1947.
Russell I. Pierce, January 1, 1947.
Donald J. Birmingham, January 1, 1947.
Leonard M. Schuman, January 1, 1947.
Robert T. Potter, January 1, 1947.
Roland K. Iverson, January 1, 1947.

Assistant surgeons to be temporary senior assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated:
J. Howard Beard, Jr., July 12, 1946.
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr., January 1, 1947.
Robert L. Morrison, January 1, 1947
Dean W. Geheber, January 1, 1947.

Dental surgeon to be temporary senior dental surgeon, effective date indicated:
Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1946.

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be temporary dental surgeons, effective dates indicated:
Joseph G. Yount, August 27, 1946.
Ceril S. Scheppegrell, October 16, 1946.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be temporary sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated:
Russell W. Hart, June 27, 1946.
Paul C. Henderson, June 27, 1946.
Malcolm C. Hope, October 21, 1946.
James G. Terrill, Jr., November 25, 1946.
Richard T. Page, January 1, 1947.

John S. Wiley, January 1, 1947.
August T. Rossano, January 1, 1947.

Assistant sanitary engineers to be temporary senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated:

Chris A. Hansen, June 27, 1946.
Arthur H. Neill, July 11, 1946.

Pharmacist to be temporary senior pharmacist, effective date indicated:

Thomas A. Foster, November 16, 1946.

Senior assistant scientists to be temporary scientists, effective dates indicated:

Clyde M. Berry, January 1, 1947.
Lewis J. Cralley, January 1, 1947.

Nurse officers to be temporary senior nurse officers, effective dates indicated:

Rosalie I. Peterson, November 27, 1946.
Florence H. Callahan, December 1, 1946.
Mary D. Forbes, December 2, 1946.
Marion Ferguson, December 6, 1946.
Mary E. Corcoran, December 18, 1946.
Lily C. Hagerman, January 1, 1947.
Rosemary McCann, January 11, 1947.

Senior assistant nurse officers to be temporary nurse officers, effective dates indicated:

Elsie T. Berdan, November 13, 1946.
Esther A. Garrison, November 7, 1946.
M. Constance Long, November 6, 1946.
Ruth L. Johnson, November 7, 1946.
Zella Bryant, November 1, 1946.

Jane E. Taylor, senior assistant nurse officer, to be temporary nurse officer, effective date of oath of office in the Regular Corps.

Assistant nurse officers to be temporary senior assistant nurse officers, effective dates indicated:

Gladys M. Ray, December 15, 1946.
Loretta C. Parsons, January 1, 1947.
Ruth Henton, January 1, 1947.
Jeanette E. Westlake, January 1, 1947.
Loretta M. Schroll, January 12, 1947.
Madge M. Neill, January 18, 1947.
Gladys C. Guydes, January 19, 1947.
Rose G. Ernsberger, January 20, 1947.
Edna L. Easterday, January 22, 1947.
Josephine T. Lamb, January 22, 1947.
Lucile B. Ross, January 25, 1947.
Mary Raprich, January 27, 1947.
Amy L. Cawley, January 1, 1947.
Viola E. Householder, January 1, 1947.
Edith M. Hettema, January 1, 1947.
Edith K. Davenport, January 1, 1947.
Lena V. Boothe, January 1, 1947.

Assistant dietitian to be temporary senior assistant dietitian, effective date indicated:

Myrtle M. Morris, January 1, 1947.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Robert Sprague Beightler, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Donald Hilary Connolly (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Sidney Parker Spalding (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Wallace Harry Graham (first lieutenant, Medical Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and arm or service specified, with dates of rank determined by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.):

TO BE MAJORS

(Promotion list)

Foote, Donald C., QMC, [redacted]
Van Sickler, Donald R., AGD, [redacted]
Nelli, Humbert O., Ord., [redacted]
Young, Charles C., JAG, [redacted]
Saunders, William L., CE, [redacted]
Wise, George S., QMC, [redacted]
Miller, Edward C., Inf., [redacted]
Feinberg, Philip, Fin., [redacted]
Balke, Frank T., Inf., [redacted]
Marshall, Arthur L., QMC, [redacted]
Stanley, Leslie W., AGD, [redacted]
Lindsay, Wallace W., SC, [redacted]
Marcy, Alfred R., SC, [redacted]
Rouillard, Chester F., FA, [redacted]
Buell, George B., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Schultz, Marion H., CAC, [redacted]
Rund, Henry M., AGD, [redacted]
Forney, Donald M., Fin., [redacted]
Adams, Lawrence W., CAC, [redacted]
Hahn, Thomas M., SC, [redacted]
Campbell, Jack P., CE, [redacted]
Morris, Joseph A., AC, [redacted]
Hanna, Fred S., FA, [redacted]
Duckworth, Joseph B., AC, [redacted]
Todd, Harold E., CAC, [redacted]
Sheldon, Clifford A., JAG, [redacted]
Kemman Lawrence H., Inf., [redacted]
Ready William D., AC, [redacted]
Breedlove, Clarence H., CWS, [redacted]
Willing, Alexander M., QMC, [redacted]
Zartman, Paul A., AC, [redacted]
Hazlett, Howard, FA, [redacted]
Connor, Robert T., CAC, [redacted]
Weir, George M., AGD, [redacted]
Hollidge, Melvin S., AC, [redacted]
Finks, Jack E., QMC, [redacted]
Moore, George G., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Curtin, Raymond G., Ord., [redacted]
Cash, James H., Inf., [redacted]
Bryant, Burnell V., Inf., [redacted]
Holm, Clifford P., CWS, [redacted]
Hosterman, Frank H., Inf., [redacted]
Lewis, William, Jr., AC, [redacted]
Wolfe, George G., AGD, [redacted]
Wright, Robert N., QMC, [redacted]
Fraser, James W., AGD, [redacted]
Gardner, Edgar W., AC, [redacted]
Titus, George F., Inf., [redacted]

TO BE CAPTAINS

McLane, Alton O., SC, [redacted]
Roy, Mark J., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Henry F., Inf., [redacted]
Cardwell, Eugene F., CAC, [redacted]
Kuhfeld, Albert M., JAG, [redacted]
Kelly, Samuel G., Inf., [redacted]
Boardman, Thomas G., Inf., [redacted]
Farr, Charles D., AC, [redacted]
McAnsh, Andrew T., Inf., [redacted]
McMillion, Willie C., AGD, [redacted]
Selby, Arthur L., Inf., [redacted]
Boerem, Richard D., FA, [redacted]
Cechmanek, George, AC, [redacted]
Lassek, Marshall G., QMC, [redacted]
Cocanougher, Eugene H., Inf., [redacted]
Wolf, Samuel S., QMC, [redacted]
Sledge, Marvin, AC, [redacted]
Nelson, Andrew C., Fin., [redacted]
McCall, Clarence J., AC, [redacted]
McDuffee, Ray W., AC, [redacted]
Eley, Frederick W., JAG, [redacted]
Bye, Charles C., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Reed, Robert M., QMC, [redacted]
Zalesky, Richard C., FA, [redacted]
Maxfield, Ralph D., FA, [redacted]
Knapp, Ernest C., CAC, [redacted]
Gahan, Theodore P., CWS, [redacted]
Kallis, Stephen A., CAC, [redacted]
Reiff, Stanley G., CE, [redacted]
Nolan, James L., JAG, [redacted]
Millet, Stephen J., Ord., [redacted]
Voorhis, Nicholas R., JAG, [redacted]
Ammons, Benjamin T., Inf., [redacted]
Murray, Walter H., CAC, [redacted]
Kingsbury, William C., AC, [redacted]
Howard, John F., QMC, [redacted]
Batton, Wyatt G., FA, [redacted]
Scarle, Victor C., CWS, [redacted]
Hall, Earl W., QMC, [redacted]
Kell, Elmer A., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Stokes, John H., QMC, [redacted]
Keane, William M., FA, [redacted]
Smith, Fred C., FA, [redacted]
Middlebrooks, R. R., Inf., [redacted]
Stephens, Roy A., Inf., [redacted]
Monaham, John C., SC, [redacted]
Valle, Calixto C., CWS, [redacted]
Hughes, Donald K., FA, [redacted]
Dayhuff, Charles H., Jr., Cav., [redacted]
Miller, Richard S., QMC, [redacted]
Pidgeon, Arthur R., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Nichols, Earle B., Inf., [redacted]
Barry, Charles J., Jr., AGD, [redacted]
Newman, Harold H., AGD, [redacted]
Babcock, John F., CWS, [redacted]
Black, Arthur H., AGD, [redacted]
Fiedler, Arthur A., CAC, [redacted]
Ritts, James H., Inf., [redacted]
Dundas Donald S., JAG, [redacted]
McCaw, Robert H., JAG, [redacted]
Hazlehurst, Max W., JAG, [redacted]
Gibbons, Donald F., Cav., [redacted]
Taylor, George W., Ord., [redacted]
Newcomb, Ralph E., Fin., [redacted]
Toro, Edward E., AC, [redacted]
Whitneybell, T. H., AC, [redacted]
Janes, Clinton W., SC, [redacted]
King, Hall, FA, [redacted]
Hart, Richard V., QMC, [redacted]
Burns, Paul, FA, [redacted]
Tomlinson, R. H., Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Levie, Howard S., JAG, [redacted]
Keasey, Charles R., Cav., [redacted]
Greene, Fred W., QMC, [redacted]
Coleman, Walter L., AGD, [redacted]
Luther, William A., Inf., [redacted]
Rodman, Frazer W., Ord., [redacted]
McNary, Charles H., Inf., [redacted]
Grant, Edward J., Inf., [redacted]
Gealta, Cecil G., Fin., [redacted]
Shewbridge, E. C., Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Patterson, Franklin R., QMC, [redacted]
Edge, Wilmer A., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Clark, Albert J., JAG, [redacted]
Curren, William F., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Kelleher, Gerald C., Inf., [redacted]
Eales, John I. H., Inf., [redacted]
Markley, Harrison M., Inf., [redacted]
Mathewson, David A., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Painter, Brookman R., SC, [redacted]
Higgins, Elmer R., SC, [redacted]
Johnson, William G., FA, [redacted]
Grenelle, Edwin W., Inf., [redacted]
Squires, Monas N., Inf., [redacted]
Smith, Dana E., AGD, [redacted]
Hornsey, William C., AC, [redacted]
O'Neil, Larry J., Inf., [redacted]
Saenz, Ralph, Inf., [redacted]
Wert, Jack E., QMC, [redacted]
Roelofs, Thomas B., Inf., [redacted]
Keyes, Lewis H., Inf., [redacted]
Hoff, Stuart S., SC, [redacted]
Ford, Robert L., QMC, [redacted]
Riley, John R., Inf., [redacted]
Rasor, Sam J., Inf., [redacted]
De Vaney, Carl N., CAC, [redacted]
Fee, Francis R., QMC, [redacted]
Seymour, Willard R., QMC, [redacted]
True, Gerald F., Fin., [redacted]
Campbell, Clark G., Inf., [redacted]
Ford, Howard G., Inf., [redacted]
Harvey, Oliver C., QMC, [redacted]
Gardner, Robin B., FA, [redacted]
Moody, George K., FA, [redacted]
Baumgartner, Philo M., FA, [redacted]
Cooper, Robert N., Fin., [redacted]
Melody, Philip B., QMC, [redacted]
Davids, John L., FA, [redacted]
Barnett, Norman P., Inf., [redacted]
Stevenson, Frank E., CE, [redacted]
Hotmann, William A., AC, [redacted]
Willoughby, Jesse D., Inf., [redacted]
Dixon, Dale D., Inf., [redacted]
Carberry, Francis P., Inf., [redacted]
Burke, Carl V., CWS, [redacted]
Hunter, Thomas B., CE, [redacted]
Mickel, George E., JAG, [redacted]
Sanders, Wilton L., Inf., [redacted]
Jordan, Herbert A., Inf., [redacted]
Pocock, William S., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Prokop, John J., Jr., Cav., [redacted]
Whitehouse, Hayden B., FA, [redacted]
Johnson, Elmer, Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Clist, Angus S., Fin., [redacted]
Brooks, John E., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Dow, Joy, Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Anderson, Truett C., QMC, [redacted]
Austin, Edward L., FA, [redacted]
MacEachern, George A., Inf., [redacted]
Ritchie, Paul J., Inf., [redacted]

Garretson, Henry M., QMC,
Tryon, Merlin O., Inf.,
Ward, John L., Fin.,
McFeely, Horace F., QMC,
Bowman, James W., CAC,
Carey, Fay E. J., Ord.,
Holman, Robert E., Inf.,
Stevens, Douglas, CWS,
Townsend, William B., QMC,
Flewelling, John D., SC,
Mueller, Alvin J. H., Jr., AC,
Rosso, Frank P., SC,
Higley, Howard C., QMC,
Cupello, Albert R., FA,
Minecci, Joseph P., Inf.,
Hudgins, Ernest C., Jr., Inf.,
Dunloy, Deane A., SC,
Markey, Lawrence B., Fin.,
Sanford, Henry R., CWS,
Britten, John W., Inf.,
Barton, Douglas C., Fin.,
Luthi, Irvin L., QMC,
Pollock, Rolla D., SC,
Harvey, Murray L., Inf.,
Corwin, Charles D., QMC,
Hill, James F., Inf.,
Blackwell, David S., AC,
Curtis, Donald M., FA,
Alford, John C., QMC,
Colwell, Russell M., QMC,
Von Tungeln, H. A., AC,
Kayko, Wilson H., Inf.,
Randall, Frank J., Inf.,
Keist, Benjamin F., Inf.,
Gowdey, Hodges C., QMC,

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Doran, Roy E., Inf.,
Preston, Marshall C., QMC,
Black, Asa C., FA, 304811
Coffin, Ralph B., CAC,
Steidtmann, Carl A., Ord.,
Scott, Marvin R., Jr., QMC,
Barkman, William E., CAC,
Hines, John D., QMC,
Williams, Donald B., CE,
Williams, Sam S., CE,
Lyman, Harry E., Fin.,
Jensen, Carl C., Inf.,
Miller, Norbert C., SC,
Fairfax, Virgil F., CWS,
Donoho, Thomas B., CE,
Vincent, Edward J., Cav.,
Simpson, Oliver T., Jr., Fin.,
Thetford, James A., CE,
Scordas, Paul H., Ord.,
Eister, William D., CE,
Davies, Albert C., Inf.,
Sell, Russell B., Ord.,
Lambert, Harry F., FA,
Sacerdote, Sydney E., CAC,
Brown, Charles P., Jr., Inf.,
O'Rourke, Peter J., FA,
Greiner, Robert E., FA,
Pierce, Samuel, Jr., Inf.,
Keating, Frank W., Inf.,
Beaty, Harold E., CE,
Clark, Francis M., FA,
Bednarek, Frank, QMC,
MacGrain, Donald, CAC,
Stiefel, Arthur A., Fin.,
Wishart, Henry H., Ord.,
Holmberg, Donald W., CAC,
Gross, Leslie M., CE,
Gray, Walter A., CE,
Van Buskirk, Arthur B., QMC,
Lawton, Elmore G., CE,
Newbury, Alvin L., FA,
Huston, Robert M., CAC,
Richards, Harris T., CAC,
Du Bose, Robert L., CE,
Zimmerman, John S., FA,
Hirsch, Allan S., FA,
Robinson, John S., CAC,
Barker, Stockbridge H., QMC,
Gardner, Paul E., CE,
Schwane, Henry H., AC,
Koreman, Edward H., Fin.,
Daniel, Roy E., Jr., CAC,
Carter, Sam, Inf.,
Schiltz, Howard F., Ord.,
Owens, Owen W., FA,
Brown, Paul J., Inf.,
Bridges, Walter M., AC,
Willey, Wilford L., Inf.,
Leverette, William L., AC,
Ketcham, Edward P., Jr., QMC,
Briggs, Merritt W., CWS,
Pridgen, Claude L., Jr., FA,
Van Court, Lloyd P., CAC,
Williams, Walter H., Inf.,
Archer, Norman R., CE,
Wilson, Paul F., FA,
Michaels, Charles E., Ord.,
Bowers, William S., FA,
Perry, Fred E., Inf.,
Reagan, Bruce W., CE,
Boswell, Charles B., Inf.,
Finley, William H., Fin.,
Wilson, Lawrence M., Inf.,
Vandenberg, Robert E., Inf.,
Daugherty, Glen E., CAC,
Hollis, Charles H., Inf.,
Colley, Martin H., Inf.,
Swett, Daniel H., Inf.,
Whitaker, Narce, AC,
Jackson, Robert J., CE,
Hassett, Burrell C., Jr., FA,
Tate, Nicholas L., CE,
Skillman, Charles S., CE,
Cosgrove, Sherman D., Inf.,
Browne, Harvey S., 3d, CAC,
Waldecker, Charles D., Fin.,
McComsey, Robert M., AC,
Rohr, Urban E., Inf.,
Baum, John W., CE,
Dawson, George P., Jr., QMC,
Holst, John B., AC,
Campbell, Murdoch W., AC,
Young, Ross, Inf.,
Ross, William A., QMC,
Druhe, Hubert K., AC,
Schulze, Herbert O., AC,
Werngren, Martin S., Ord.,
Lear, Frank L., QMC.,
Cannon, Charles C., CE,
Morton, George C., Inf.,
Wasson, Frank J., Jr., Ord.,
Ottinger, Charles F., CAC,
Price, Hayden J., Fin.,
Heinrich, Charles T., CAC,
McBee, Marshall G., FA,
Ruffner, C. H., Jr., Ord.,
Parker, John M., Fin.,
Walton, Victor E., AC,
Murray, Charles E., AC,
Inabinet, C. J., Jr., AC,
Oneill, James L., AC,
Dawson, Clifford H., Inf.,
Thybony, William W., QMC,
McElhenny, William S., Inf.,
Davis, Duane D., SC,
Payne, Dolford F., AC,
Hooper, Thomas F., Inf.,
Simon, Howard H., Fin.,
Brown, Earl J., QMC,
Tudor, Ralph N., SC,
Wintermute, Ira F., AC,
Legare, Ben W., Inf.,
Martin, James G., Inf.,
Polley, James D., 3d, Ord.,
Harris, Glynn L., CE,
Marshall, Charles S., AC,
Ball, Thomas F., Inf.,
Jacobson, James L., AC,
Ansley, John M., CE,
Adams, Lewis R., Inf.,
Dietrich, Carl F., SC,
Zipf, Karl A., Fin.,
Schafer, Robert W., CAC,
Buford, Lanier D., Inf.,
Yates, Edison E., CAC,
Jones, Robert H., AC,
Thomas, Jay P., AC,
Converse, Peter V., Inf.,
Ellers, Conway L., CAC,
McCartney, Robert W., CAC,
Duckwall, Richard L., CAC,
Neumann, Richard T., FA,
Troescher, Edward C., FA,
Sharp, Felix C., Jr., CAC,
Felton, Donald C., Cav.,
Daniel, Joe R., CE,
Liedike, Ray R., CE,
Harris, Joe L., CE,
Miles, Joe D., AC,
Simmons, Vernon N., Jr., SC,
Landers, Herbert H., Jr., CAC,
Franson, Paul O., Jr., CAC,
Standish, Albert C., CAC,
Jacobson, Alden D., Inf.,
Cox, Edward L., Jr., AC,
Farrell, Frederick B., AC,
Cronin, Eugene S., QMC,
Van-de-Voort, Leo D., Inf.,
Halper, Maurice J., Fin.,
Aronson, Richard W., QMC,
Schintz, Thomas A., QMC,
Tuley, James G., AC,
Rush, Donald L., Fin.,
Barr, Sam L., AC,
Black, Shirley N., Fin.,
Lovelace, Richard M., FA,
Rudd, Robert J., AC,
Frost, Jack W., AC,
Woods, Durward A., AC,
Dunn, William R., AC,
McNamara, Donald G., CWS,
Ervin, Davis F., AC,
Phipps, Charles H., Jr., SC,
Montgomery, Douglas M., AC,
Feyereisen, Paul A., SC,
McKinney, Joseph E., Ord.,
Kiley, Leo A., Jr., Ord.,
Cross, James C., Inf.,
Gibbs, William W., CE,
Frazier, William H., Jr., Inc.,
Roth, Robert C., Inf.,
McGregor, Edward W., Inf.,
Sullivan, William G., Inf.,
Peabody, Herbert G., Inf.,
Creek, Roy E., Inf.,
Dalrymple, Robert C., Inf.,
Woodward, Joseph G., CAC,
Quirey, William O., CAC,
Cross, Adelbert D., AC,
Biddlecome, Bruce D., AC,
Muir, Robert P., CAC,
Lassiter, Olbert F., AC,
McGraw, Robert E., Inf.,
Moran, Edward E., SC,
Heil, George J., Jr., Inf.,
Daugherty, Jean H., AC,
Nolan, Hubert L., Ord.,
Carpenter, Irvin F., Inf.,
Nold, Ewell K., Jr., AC,
Copley, William M., Jr., SC,
Boswell, Irving W., AC,
Robinson, William C., Inf.,
Flegeal, Foster F., Inf.,
Grimsley, Ralph J., FA,
Brown, Jack M., Inf.,
Ford, John T., AC,
Bunte, Donald W., Fin.,
Jacobsen, Otto F., AC,
Harrison, Robert C., AC,
Bass, Koy M., Jr., Inf.,
Arntz, John P., Inf.,
Foss, Erling J., SC,
Fite, Calvin W., Jr., AC,
Chrietzberg, James, Jr., CAC,
Fulmer, Richard P., CAC,
Ramsey, Woodrow W., AC,
Carpenter, Woodward B., AC,
Flynn, Ralph M., CAC,
Howe, Robert M., Inf.,
Maness, Lewis E., CE,
Davis, Oscar E., Inf.,
Adams, Nathan J., FA,
Williams, Floyd D., FA,
Gillett, Richard L., AC,
Eigenmann, John C., FA,
Wild, Edward W., CAC,
Doan, Oliver C., AC,
Sykes, Robert B., Jr., AC,
Marland, James R., Inf.,
Kemp, Harry M., Inf.,
Lennox, Weston M., Ord.,
Sorenson, John M., AC,
Howell, Walter E., QMC,
Romans, Warren L., CAC,
Miller, William C., AC,
Tringali, Joseph A., CAC,
Howard, Charles E., CAC,
McIntyre, Clarence E., AC,
Stevenson, Ralph L., AC,

Shingler, H. I., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Snipes, Gilmer L., AC, [redacted]
Cummings, Claude H., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Bird, Clement W., AC, [redacted]
Phillips, Herbert L., AC, [redacted]
Wilson, James A., CAC, [redacted]
Brown, John H., AC, [redacted]
Howell, Henry R., Jr., Cav., [redacted]
Gaustad, John M., Inf., [redacted]
Sanders, Harry G., Cav., [redacted]
Silliman, Clifford R., CE, [redacted]
McCabe, William J., Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Gudith, Roy E., AC, [redacted]
Whitesell, Willis J., Ord., [redacted]
Rogers, Richard E., QMC, [redacted]
Royce, Ralph S., AC, [redacted]
MacDonald, Robert J., Cav., [redacted]
Wingfield, Oren C., Inf., [redacted]
Ryan, Thomas S., AC, [redacted]
Beaton, James L., FA, [redacted]
Aitken, John, Jr., AC, [redacted]
McAdams, Samuel C., QMC, [redacted]
Cronin, Harold J., AC, [redacted]
Evans, Thomas H., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Benson, Walter R., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Owens, Elmer G., Inf., [redacted]
Buchanan, Stephen C., CAC, [redacted]
Bickerstaff, Curtis E., AC, [redacted]
Binnell, Francis E., AC, [redacted]
Bower, Deward E., AC, [redacted]
Siegismund, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Hartsock, Kenneth J., AC, [redacted]
Click, Ralph M., FA, [redacted]
Trussell, John B. B., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Hill, James H., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Chavis, Thomas N., CAC, [redacted]
Eckert, Kenneth R., FA, [redacted]
Buckwalter, John S., CAC, [redacted]
Brinson, Sheldon S., AC, [redacted]
Crumley, James P., AC, [redacted]
Nading, William D., AC, [redacted]
Griffith, Ole C., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Adams, Richard E, Inf., [redacted]
Babbs, John B., Ord., [redacted]
Gipson, Charles H., AC, [redacted]
Putnam, George W., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Krueger, Herbert W., CAC, [redacted]
Cunliffe, Richard K., AC, [redacted]
Husemoller, Kenneth E., Inf., [redacted]
Lynch, Clyde M., AC, [redacted]
Flesner, Eugene E., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Clement F., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Gordon, James L., CAC, [redacted]
De Voe, Robert C, AC, [redacted]
Stevens, George R., 3d, Inf., [redacted]
Ervin, John W., FA, [redacted]
Reynolds, Harold K., Inf., [redacted]
Borman, Robert C., AC, [redacted]
Beers, Robert L., Ord., [redacted]
Nolan, John A., AC, [redacted]
Woodruff, Harold D., Cav., [redacted]
Klingenhagen, John L., Inf., [redacted]
York, William B., FA, [redacted]
Dowell, Richard W., SC, [redacted]
Kilzer, James E., Inf., [redacted]
Abernathy, J. R., Jr., Cav., [redacted]
Howe, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Adams, Orville G., AC, [redacted]
Duncan, Herbert L., QMC, [redacted]
Newberry, Robert H., Inf., [redacted]
Spratt, James L., Inf., [redacted]
Edington, Leonard E., AC, [redacted]
Weniger, Robert L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Gardner, Ralph V., CAC, [redacted]
Pallo, John, CAC, [redacted]
Langland, Lawrence Q., Inf., [redacted]
Kerr, Kenneth J., AC, [redacted]
Leenerts, Gordon J., AC, [redacted]
Bollard, John A., FA, [redacted]
Cunningham, John L., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Del Zoppo, Roger A., FA, [redacted]
Tucker, James R., AC, [redacted]
Delbridge, Thomas C., Ord., [redacted]
Fromme, Robert J., Ord., [redacted]
McMurry, George B., AC, [redacted]
Schlamersdorf, O. E., Fin., [redacted]
Ruff, George F., Ord., [redacted]
Pletcher, Gaylord L., AC, [redacted]
De Angelis, Anthony J., SC, [redacted]
Lovell, Herbert R., QMC, [redacted]
Cleaveland, Arthur B., AC, [redacted]
Morris, James M., AC, [redacted]
Yorston, Alfred, Jr., Cav., [redacted]
Kauffman, Eldeen H., QMC, [redacted]
Boyle, Harry F., QMC, [redacted]
Binford, Lloyd T., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Hazel, Charles E., Inf., [redacted]
Orwat, Norman S., AC, [redacted]
Owen, Arthur W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Anderson, John F., AC, [redacted]
Bryant, Ernest D., AC, [redacted]
Jackson, Joseph J., FA, [redacted]
Marsh, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Tillery, George G., CAC, [redacted]
Black, Joseph E., Ord., [redacted]
Bzdek, Beverly M., Inf., [redacted]
Duvall, Clifford P., FA, [redacted]
Wiselogle, Candler R., Inf., [redacted]
Hofmann, Thomas C., AC, [redacted]
Harkness, Orlo V., Inf., [redacted]
Henderson, Chester T., QMC, [redacted]
Marks, William L., FA [redacted]
Fritts, Billy E., QMC, [redacted]
Zell, Lucian T., 2d, AC, [redacted]
Willems, Raleigh C., AC, [redacted]
Henderson, Tony S., FA, [redacted]
Wuest, Charles H., FA, [redacted]
Alagna, Antonito F., AC, [redacted]
Bailey, Lawrence O., AC, [redacted]
McKenzie, Byron E., AC, [redacted]
Johns, Howard G., AC, [redacted]
Baltes, Paul A., Cav., [redacted]
Rountree, Malcolm S., AC, [redacted]
Kenney, Paul H., AC, [redacted]
Carter, Frank M., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Kettler, William H., AC, [redacted]
Tiessen, Charles F., Inf., [redacted]
Bach, John V., AC, [redacted]
McClain, Howard P., QMC, [redacted]
McLean, Edward R., AC, [redacted]
Davis, George A., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Vaughan, Haywood C., Inf., [redacted]
Ottaway, Harold E., AC, [redacted]
Howell, Sylvanus T., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Armstrong, G. V., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Kennedy, Arthur H., Inf., [redacted]
Bennett, Eddie L., Inf., [redacted]
Good, Marvin H., AC, [redacted]
Cunningham, Hubert S., Inf., [redacted]
Cole, Charles B., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Tyson, Houston C., AC, [redacted]
Gauvin, Francis R., AC, [redacted]
Marshall, Winton W., AC, [redacted]
Pruett, Lloyd O., CAC, [redacted]
Souleyret, Kenneth, AC, [redacted]
Bass, Roy H., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Council, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Cook, Charles E., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Summerall, Robert E., Inf., [redacted]
Collins, William C., AC, [redacted]
Williams, James A., Ord., [redacted]
Belue, Fred W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Drum, Vernon B., Inf., [redacted]
Bussells, Chatham P., AC, [redacted]
Smith, James B., AC, [redacted]
Butler, Farley P., Fin., [redacted]
Lindley, Charles C., AC, [redacted]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Lowell, Charles L., AC, [redacted]
Sheppard, Byron E., CAC, [redacted]
Curry, Jack A., QMC, [redacted]
Seidel, Richard L., CE, [redacted]
Smith, James D., AC, [redacted]
Waldner, Stanley C., FA, [redacted]
Grosshuesch, Leroy V., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Paul R., AC, [redacted]
Bolyard, John W., Inf., [redacted]
Tabor, Raleigh E., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Cowart, Robert P., CE, [redacted]
Stephens, Joseph W., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Fowler, Walter M., AC, [redacted]
Blair, Warren A., Inf., [redacted]
MacDonald, John P., QMC, [redacted]
Phelps, William G., Inf., [redacted]
Lema, Henry R., Inf., [redacted]
Sweers, Peter C., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Burch, Nolan E., Inf., [redacted]
Alger, Leroy, Inf., [redacted]
Luckey, William J., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Riffle, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Gill, Robert E., Inf., [redacted]
Denman, John L., Inf., [redacted]
Suther, Fred L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Adams, Donald E., FA, [redacted]
Watson, Francis M., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Mercer, Oliver L., Inf., [redacted]
Lukosky, Eugene R., FA, [redacted]
Walker, Robert B., Inf., [redacted]
Dollar, Fred W., QMC, [redacted]
Livers, George M., AC, [redacted]
Fikes, Maurice G., AC, [redacted]
Unger, Edward C., AC, [redacted]
Walsh, Edward M., Jr., AC, [redacted]
LaCagnin, Leonard J., AC, [redacted]
Trimble, George L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Calkins, Radford C., AC, [redacted]
Remmele, Frank M., AC, [redacted]
Chenault, Charles J., AC, [redacted]
Zimmermann, Hugo, QMC, [redacted]
Galentine, Paul G., Jr., CE, [redacted]
Priest, Royce W., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Irvin D., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Kipp, Eugene H., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Claybaugh, K. Wayne, AC, [redacted]
Mann, Gerald E., AC, [redacted]
Neu, John J., Inf., [redacted]
Shea, Robert B., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Robert M., Ord., [redacted]
Atkins, James L., Inf., [redacted]
Peters, Marvin L. W., Inf., [redacted]
Lozito, Francis C., CWS, [redacted]
Corbin, Zane E., AC, [redacted]
Dix, Roy A., CAC, [redacted]
Graham, Harold B., AC, [redacted]
Brashears, James R., Jr., Ord, [redacted]
Smith, Jeffrey G., Inf., [redacted]
Ives, Charles G., Inf., [redacted]
Taylor, Roy M., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Hilburn, John E., Inf., [redacted]
Burnet, Frederick R., CE, [redacted]
Vaughn, James C., Cav., [redacted]
Michels, William N., Inf., [redacted]
Baker, Ellis C., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Nixon, Floyd G., Inf., [redacted]
Anderson, Edward P., QMC, [redacted]
Silver, Benjamin S., Inf., [redacted]
Humphrey, David B., Inf., [redacted]
Ring, Joseph J., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Powers, James F., SC, [redacted]
Hughes, Orville R., Inf., [redacted]
Cross, Richard E., FA, [redacted]
Gunnell, Rex C., FA, [redacted]
Robertson, James P., QMC, [redacted]
Rasmussen, Kenneth W., Cav., [redacted]
McDonald, Thomas J., Ord., [redacted]
Berry, George R., Inf., [redacted]
Fleming, Dale R., CAC, [redacted]
Freakley, Edwin M., Inf., [redacted]
Sidfrid, Leroy O., Inf., [redacted]
Devine, James E., CWS, [redacted]
Clark, Charles R., CE, [redacted]
Davis, Loren E., Inf., [redacted]
Kissinger, Harold A., SC, [redacted]
Dickson, H. F., 2d, Inf., [redacted]
Creel, Buckner M., 3d, Inf., [redacted]
Baum, Samuel, AC, [redacted]
Smith, Ellsworth F., CE, [redacted]
Gagne, James V., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Coker, Morgan B., Ord., [redacted]
Dansby, Cecil G., Inf., [redacted]
Wetmore, Ray S., AC, [redacted]
Middleton, Troy H., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Whisner, William T., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Fowlkes, William B., Inf., [redacted]
Bartlett, Harry M., Inf., [redacted]
Brown, Lee R., Inf., [redacted]
Osborn, Arthur L., AC, [redacted]
Weyant, Wallace W., CAC, [redacted]
Stanley, Richard E., Cav., [redacted]
Webel, James B., Inf., [redacted]
Furman, Hezekiah W. C., CAC, [redacted]
Armstrong, William P., AC, [redacted]
Hartman, Durell B., Inf., [redacted]
Bush, James M., Inf., [redacted]
Habakangas, Wilbert E., Inf., [redacted]
Hintz, Kenneth R., Inf., [redacted]
Fischer, Kenneth P., CAC, [redacted]
Shutts, Bion Q., Inf., [redacted]
Sowards, Melvin J., Inf., [redacted]
Blanton, Walter P., Inf., [redacted]
Siegrist, Robert H., Inf., [redacted]
Switzer, John W., Inf., [redacted]
Kamp, Walter B., Inf., [redacted]
Webb, James E., AC, [redacted]
Dewey, Hobart E., FA, [redacted]
Davis, John L., 3d, Inf., [redacted]

Shupe, Bennie A., AC, [redacted]
Kitts, Alfred R., FA, [redacted]
MacKinnon, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Wolff, Herbert E., Inf., [redacted]
Benton, James R., Inf., [redacted]

TO BE MAJORS

(Nonpromotion list)

Hinman, Elmer O., DC, [redacted]
Blanton, Franklin S., PhC, [redacted]
Witherspoon, Glenn J., Ch., [redacted]
Maxwell, William P., Ch., [redacted]
May, Erwin T., Ch., [redacted]
Phillips, Albert D., MC, [redacted]
Marteney, Charles W., Ch., [redacted]
Schindler, John A., MC, [redacted]
Brownton, Sheldon S., MC, [redacted]
Sharp, William B., Ch., [redacted]
Czerwinski, Anthony, MC, [redacted]
Uram, Michael A., DC, [redacted]
Walthers, Walter J., DC, [redacted]
Darrah, John R., MC, [redacted]
Ferris, Donald L., MC, [redacted]
Parks, Harold D., MC, [redacted]
Henderson, Benedict A., Ch., [redacted]
Hoey, Patrick H., MC, [redacted]
Mosley, Gaines, PhC, [redacted]
Fedor, Ernest J., DC, [redacted]

TO BE CAPTAINS

Kregel, Herman J., Ch., [redacted]
Knauf, George M., MC, [redacted]
Kojac, George H., MC, [redacted]
Ervin, Lindsay J., MC, [redacted]
McLane, Robert A., Jr., MC, [redacted]
Nuernberger, Robert E., MC, [redacted]
Vollertsen, Arthur H., DC, [redacted]
Batcheldor, George D., VC, [redacted]
Smith, Max L., MC, [redacted]
Snyder, Harry G., DC, [redacted]
Zieger, Karl O., DC, [redacted]
Wheelin, Thomas J., VC, [redacted]
Lockwood, Mulford C., VC, [redacted]
Rogers, Roger P., DC, [redacted]
Jordan, John E., DC, [redacted]
Naylor, Duncan N., Ch, [redacted]
Yergin, Harry I., DC, [redacted]
Campbell, John L., DC, [redacted]
Read, Robert N., PhC, [redacted]
Berry, Floyd L., PhC, [redacted]
Lord, Frank G., PhC, [redacted]
Trexler, Carl E., PhC, [redacted]
Bishop, Vincil C., VC, [redacted]
Crofut, Vincent E., DC, [redacted]
English, Burt W., VC, [redacted]
Weir, Roy I., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Prior, Bradley W., MC, [redacted]
Pugnier, Vincent A., DC, [redacted]
Kinney, Joe R., PhC, [redacted]
Hamrick, William H., PhC, [redacted]
Shutt, William F., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Mosgrove, Richard L., DC, [redacted]
Abbott, William L., VC, [redacted]
Chorpenning, Frank W., PhC, [redacted]
Luker, Charles T., VC, [redacted]
Bock, James L. E., DC, [redacted]
Kerns, Robert L., VC, [redacted]
Laird, Glover W., VC, [redacted]
Zurcher, John J., 3d, PhC, [redacted]

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Olson, Clarence T., PhC, [redacted]
Love, William D., DC, [redacted]
Monroe, Willis, PhC, [redacted]
Olson, Morris V., PhC, [redacted]
Rattan, Volney H., PhC, [redacted]
Coker, Richard J., PhC, [redacted]
Gaynor, John E., DC, [redacted]
Stewart, Thomas B., PhC, [redacted]
Powell, Harry C., PhC, [redacted]
DeSautels, Francis O., PhC, [redacted]
Neurauter, Lloyd J., VC, [redacted]
Coleman, John J., PhC, [redacted]
Brown, Byron W., PhC, [redacted]
Rixey, Charles O., MC, [redacted]
Forester, Samuel G., VC, [redacted]
Greer, Richard S., PhC, [redacted]
Gaines, Sidney, PhC, [redacted]
Hazelrigs, James A., PhC, [redacted]
Fugitt, William K., PhC, [redacted]
Munson, Jack W., PhC, [redacted]
Smith, Robert L., PhC, [redacted]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Wells, Frederick M., PhC, [redacted]
Phifer, James H., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Cooper, Nathan, PhC, [redacted]
Lansche, Robert L., PhC, [redacted]
Bunger, Egbert V., PhC, [redacted]
Evans, John M., PhC, [redacted]
Anding, Marvin E., PhC, [redacted]
McCoy, Wayne E., PhC, [redacted]

Calvin Ervin Glidewell, graduate of the United States Military Academy, class of June 1946, for appointment as second lieutenant of infantry in the Regular Army of the United States, with rank from June 4, 1946, under the provisions of sections 23 and 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM 22 AUGUST 1946

Col. Edward C. Gillette, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE PROFESSOR OF MILITARY TOPOGRAPHY AND GRAPHICS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM 19 DECEMBER 1946

Col. Lawrence E. Schick (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, Vice Col. Roger G. Alexander, Dean of the Academic Board.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Vice Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Paul F. Lee, United States Navy, to be chief of naval research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

Rear Adm. Clifford A. Swanson, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

The following officers of the Navy to the ranks and grades indicated:

To be admirals in the Navy for temporary service:

Marc A. Mitscher
Richard L. Conolly

To be vice admirals in the Navy for temporary service:

Edward L. Cochrane
John L. McCrea
Ross T McIntire, Medical Corps.

To be rear admirals in the Navy for temporary service:

John H. Carson	George C. Crawford
Robert P. McConnell	Frederick I. Entwistle
Ernest E. Herrmann	William D. Johnson
Ernest H. von Heimburg	Charles R. Brown
	John M. Hoskins
Eliot H. Bryant	Joseph W. Fowler
John R. Redman	Thomas P. Wynkoop
James H. Foskett	Louis Dreller
Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter	David H. Clark
	Paul F. Lee
Francis P. Old	Evander W. Sylvester
Charles C. Hartman	Paul B. Nibecker
Wendell G. Switzer	Henry R. Oster
William L. Rees	Theodore C. Lonnquest
Heber H. McLean	
John A. Snackenberg	Charles A. Nicholson II
Richard H. Cruzen	

Rear admirals, Medical Corps:

Morton D. Willcutts	John C. Adams
Clarence J. Brown	Carlton L. Andrus
Arthur H. Dearing	William J. C. Agnew
Paul M. Albright	

Rear admirals, Supply Corps:

William V. Fox
John E. Wood

To be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as indicated:

Rear Adm. William S. Parsons, United States Navy, while serving as Director of Atomic Defense, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Rear Adm. Herbert L. Pugh, Medical Corps, United States Navy, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as indicated and during any assignment commensurate with the rank of commodore or until reporting for other permanent duty:

Commodore Albert T. Sprague, Jr., United States Navy, while serving as Deputy Commandant of Armed Forces Staff College.

Commodore Wilbur E. Kellum, Medical Corps, United States Navy, while serving on the staff (medical) of the Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet.

Commodore James W. Boundy, Supply Corps, United States Navy, while serving as special assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Commodore Ernest M. Eller, United States Navy, while serving as Director of Public Information, Navy Department.

Commodore Richard P. Glass, United States Navy, while serving as Director of Civil Relations, Navy Department.

Commodore Charles T. Dickeman, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, while serving as Superintendent Civil Engineer, Areas IV and V.

Vice Adm. Sherwoode A. Taffinder, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Wednesday, January 8, 1947:

SECRETARY OF STATE

George C. Marshall, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, the Lord of life and light, as we pray at Thy altar, hear Thy children. This day is for us; let us not make our hours vague, difficult, or unprofitable. So touch the impulses of our souls that we may justly claim the glorious right to live and to win the approval of a good name, which is the richest achievement of all human aspirations. It is not just what we do that constitutes the best benefactions to our fellow citizens, but how we make our way through the entanglements of daily experiences. We pray Thee to make us calm and courageous, keeping the faith, never allowing our sense of righteousness to become weak or vitiated. Always help us to appreciate that nothing of great worth can be accomplished with half a mind, a faint heart, or with a lame endeavor. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THIRTEENTH REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

JANUARY 7, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the Thirteenth Report of the Attorney General, covering the period from May 1 through August 31, 1946, submitted pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was received in this office on September 17, 1946.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FOURTEENTH REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

JANUARY 7, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the Fourteenth Report of the Attorney General, covering the period from September 1 through December 31, 1946, submitted pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was received in this office on January 6.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EIGHTEENTH QUARTERLY REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

JANUARY 7, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith Eighteenth Quarterly Report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1946, which was received in this office on November 20, 1946.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

JANUARY 7, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the report of the activities and expenditures of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, covering the months of April and May 1946, submitted pursuant to section 201 B, title II of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, which was received in this office on October 8, 1946.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1947.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my economic report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the sixty-third annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1947.*

THE LATE HONORABLE BENJAMIN IRVING TAYLOR AND THE LATE HONORABLE BENJAMIN LEWIS FAIRCHILD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death, since our last meeting, of two former Members who were residents of the Twenty-eighth District of New York—the Honorable Benjamin Irving Taylor and the Honorable Benjamin Lewis Fairchild.

Ben Taylor served the people of the then Twenty-fifth New York District as a Member of the Democratic Party from 1912 to 1914, which was but one interlude in the 40 years as a public servant of this descendant of Alexander Hamilton and the chief archer and military adviser to William the Conquerer. Mr. Taylor's first elective office following his graduation from Columbia University and practice of the law was as supervisor for the town of Harrison in 1905. Serving 8 years in this post and having won for himself recognition throughout New York State as an expert on town law and administration, Supervisor Taylor came to Congress in 1914 and, following this term, retired as an officeholder to return to the practice of the law until 1922, when he was again elected supervisor for Harrison. Altogether, he served 15 terms in Westchester County administration as supervisor and chairman of the county board. During his incumbency, the town of Harrison won the reputation as the most efficiently governed municipality in the State. It has been well said that Harrison is a monument and memorial to Ben Taylor's zeal, foresight, and development. He was lovingly known as "Mr. Harrison" by grateful constituents and neighbors.

In 1929 Supervisor Taylor left the Democratic ranks and formally declared himself a Republican, drawing his support for elective office from friends in both political parties and continuing his fine service to the county and the township which marked his long career. He retired and did not seek reelection last year due to ill health.

Benjamin L. Fairchild, who resided in and developed Pelham Manor in Westchester County, was a member of the World War I Congress representing the Twenty-fourth New York District. He was returned to the House in 1921 to serve until 1927 but he originally came to Congress in 1895 as the Representative of the then Sixteenth Congressional District of New York. Mr. Fairchild was a Republican.

The son of a veteran of the Civil War, Mr. Fairchild was brought to Washington as a child where his father was recuperating from war wounds. At 14 he worked as a draftsman in the Patent Office and later was a clerk in the Treasury Department. In 1883 he was graduated from Columbian University, now George Washington University.

His introduction nearly two decades ago of an amendment to the Constitution providing that no President should serve more than two terms is indicative that he was far ahead of his time, a progressive and far-sighted legislator.

THE LATE HON. CHARLES H. MARTIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of a former Member of this House, Hon. Charles H. Martin, whose death occurred at his home in Portland, Oreg., on September 22, 1946. General Martin served in the House of Representatives from March 4, 1931, to January 3, 1935, representing the Third Congressional District of Oregon, which I now have the honor to represent. General Martin was one of Oregon's most outstanding citizens, having served his State and Nation in many capacities with great distinction. He was appointed to West Point after receiving his primary education in Carmi, Ill., and at Ewing College. After being commissioned a second lieutenant in 1887, he was assigned to duty at Vancouver Barracks, Washington Territory. He became a major in 1910 and saw service as a lieutenant colonel on the Mexican border in 1915–17. At the outbreak of World War I he became a colonel and later brigadier general.

General Martin, on his retirement from active military service, took up his residence in Portland and took an active interest in public and civic affairs, being subsequently elected as a Representative to Congress from the Portland, Oreg., district, where he served with distinction and credit not only to himself but to his

State. Subsequently the people of Oregon called him to the Governor's chair, where his administration was characterized by a forthright program for the development of the great resources of the State of Oregon. Through a long and distinguished career, both in the military service and private life, General Martin endeared himself to the people of Oregon and to all with whom he came in contact. His passing was an occasion of deep regret to all of his many friends and associates.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on January 15, following the legislative program of that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today following any other special orders that may already have been entered for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions regarding the veterans.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include newspaper items.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a set of resolutions of the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a portion of a communication from the railway commission of Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the rehabilitation committee of the American Legion, Department of Connecticut.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered at the annual convention of the Inland Empire Waterways Association at Portland, Oreg., last October by Dr. Wilson Compton, president of Washington State College.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an item from the Arizona Farmer.

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. COMBS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained permission to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds by approximately one-half page the limitation set by the Joint Committee on Printing, and that it will cost $150. Notwithstanding the excess I ask that it may be extended.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances: in the first to include an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on August 12, 1946; in the second to include a sermon delivered by the president of St. John's University in Brooklyn recently; in the third to include a letter which he received from the committee chairman of the Navy Day celebration held at Borough Hall, Brooklyn, N. Y.; and in the fourth to include an editorial and an article which appeared in the New York Times on January 6, 1947.

THE HONORABLE JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that practically every Member—I will say every Member—of this House received the news of the necessity for the resignation of Secretary of State Byrnes with deep regret, just as I did; deep regret not only that the President, this country—yes, the world—must be denied the valuable service of this great statesman at this crucial moment, a man who will undoubtedly go down in history as one of the great Secretaries of State of all time, but deep regret also of the reason for his resignation, his health. I am thoroughly convinced that had Secretary of State Byrnes not felt it absolutely necessary that he resign for that reason he would not have done so. I am equally convinced that the President would not have accepted his resignation on any other condition.

Mr. Speaker, since it has been necessary for him to resign, I am sure that the entire membership of the House joins me in expressing the very sincere hope that now that he will be relieved of the strenuous duties he has so very ably performed and the great pressure which has been upon him every single minute since he entered upon the tenure of his office, with the rest to which he is so justly entitled his health will greatly improve and that he may remain with us for many, many years and afford the President and the country the benefit of his valuable advice as one of our great elder statesmen.

Since it is necessary for Secretary of State Byrnes to go, however, I consider that the country and the world are fortunate indeed in having such a man as General Marshall to take over the reins, a man who is so highly regarded by both the civilian and the military population, not only of this country but throughout the world, a man whose name commands respect in military, diplomatic, and civilian life wherever the sun shines.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's table and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes on the resignation of my constituent, James F. Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, may I thank the gentleman from Alabama for the generous remarks he has made about the outstanding services of South Carolina's most distinguished citizen. Secretary Byrnes was not only South Carolina's number one citizen but he ranks as statesman and citizen number two of the Nation. In addition to that his name must be placed in the front rank of the citizens and statesmen of the world. No man ever appointed to the office of Secretary of State has grasped the duties of that office more quickly, worked more untiringly, nor enunciated its policies more clearly, ably, and firmly than has Mr. Byrnes.

No man went into that office at a more critical time; no man, no secretary, met more obstacles on the diplomatic front of the world; no man accomplished more in the same length of time. Many were this man's accomplishments in the legislative, judicial, and executive field; but his greatest monument will be the foundation of the house of international understanding and cooperation which he so carefully and firmly laid.

We who admired Jimmie Byrnes and were proud to call him friend know that he would not have stepped down from that exalted position if it had not been for good, patriotic reasons. We know that he would not have stepped out had he not known that the man who would succeed him was possessed of preeminent qualification for the position, and a man who would carry on his policies.

I congratulate the President on his selection of General Marshall for this arduous task. He is a great soldier, a great diplomat, and a great American.

MINORITY MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 41) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Louis Ludlow, Indiana; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Joe Hendricks, Florida; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Maryland; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE BUTTER MARKET SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days the press has carried the story of the butter market in New York City. The January 5 edition of the New York Times says:

was a "battle of giants" in the market. When the league determined to hold up the price, large dealers bought "spot" contracts for more than a million pounds on the Chicago market and dumped them on the New York market, trade sources said.

The formula or timetable for using butter prices as part of the process of arriving at fluid milk prices under the milk marketing acts, has always placed butter in a position of receiving the wrath of the would-be price reducers. In fact, before the war, fluid milk was bringing the producer as much as $3.23 per hundredweight in the milkshed when milk sold for butter was bringing less than $1 per hundredweight. Twenty-nine percent of the milk might have been benefited, but 71 percent had to pay the fiddler.

There are, however, two other very important points brought out by this recent episode in the butter market.

One is—just exactly how does it happen that the milk producers represented by the Dairyman's League are to be threatened with violation of the Commodity Act for supporting a price for their products, when evidently the dealer can with impunity try to break the market without fear, without intimidation, and without threat of a term in the jailhouse?

I do not know whether or not the Commodity Act was violated, but any fair-minded person knows that if it is a violation to strengthen the market, it should be a violation for the dealers to dump the million pounds on the market to break the market. Or, in other words, is the speculator to be heralded as a great public benefactor for breaking a market, but the producer whose labor, toil, and sweat went into producing his product is to be intimidated, publicized, and threatened? If the Commodity Act works this way, it had better be amended, and that at once.

And point No. 2, I wonder how they are going to explain the market manipulations and bucket-shop operations of governmental agencies—one after the other. The Government-subsidized DPMA has, in fact, for years been buying and selling butter. Have they rigged the prices down or up? If the DPMA has not been indicted, is it because the price of butter has been rigged downward? The avowed purpose of the DPMA was to stabilize butter prices. How could they stabilize the butter market if they did not support the market by purchases that would maintain or increase the price? Can the DPMA operate with governmental sanction but the Dairyman's League face legal obstacles for performing a similar service to the producers? And what about the wartime rye market manipulations?

Are we to believe then that speculators can legally rig a market down without fear of the law, and that Government agencies can strengthen or weaken a market and all is well, while if a group of New York farmers try to maintain their market they are to be sued, fined, threatened, and jailed?

This whole market for agricultural products must be viewed in the light of the law in regard to the Steagall amendment. The law, if followed, will compel purchases or loans to support or maintain farm prices. Will the Commodity Act be used to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from following the provisions of the Steagall amendment?

Let us have the answers and let us have them now.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act, No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1947.*

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER PROPERTY REQUISITIONING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from April 16, 1946, through June 30, 1946.

HARRY S TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1947.*

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1947.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and includue an article recently written by George Fielding Eliot.

GOV. EARL WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor the gentleman from

Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] informed the House that there are two very fine candidates for President in 1948. I cannot let this opportunity pass without reminding you that the State of California has an excellent Presidential candidate also in its Gov. Earl Warren, who succeeded in being reelected in the June primaries of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in a State where a million and a half people from all other States in the Union have come to live within the past 4 years. We believe he is possessed of all the qualifications necessary. He is the only Californian governor reelected to succeed himself with the exception of the late Honorable Senator Hiram Johnson. I just want to say, "Watch the Golden State in '48."

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 3 minutes, so that I may have 18 minutes in all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARTITION FOR PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that at the next Cabinet meeting on Thursday the British Government will announce the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states. If true, and determination is at the sticking point, these are happy tidings. If the partition is equitable and just and permits of proper growth and peaceable development by Jew and Arab in the Middle East, partition should be accepted by all.

Great Britain now has the glorious opportunity to bring peace to the Middle East, to redeem in some measure the pledges she made when she became the mandatory power for Palestine. Palestine is presently a besieged country; acts of terror have destroyed all semblance of stability. Acts of reprisal have been visited by British soldiers upon the innocent in the desire for bloodthirsty revenge.

The Arabs will not yield to the demands for a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. The Jews will continue to resist any and all efforts to keep them a minority people without national sovereignty in the Holy Land. Thousands of displaced Jews face another despairing winter in DP camps which are padlocked by British policy in Palestine. A solution does exist which moderates of all three entities—the Jews, the Arabs, and the British—will find acceptable, practicable, and closest to any legal, ethical, and moral justification that can be reached in this chaotic, strife-torn world. The solution lies in the partition of Palestine into a Jewish state and an Arab state with each in control of and fully responsible for the economic, political, and social development of their own spheres.

By and large there are relatively few who do not deplore the terroristic activities of the two underground organizations in Palestine, the Stern and the Irgum Zvai Leumi groups. The Haganah, which is the defense group of Palestine, is attempting to exert every influence in Palestine to stop these unauthorized bombings and killings. Happily, word reaches us this morning that a truce on violence has been declared, awaiting the London Conference. The Jewish Agency for Palestine has brought its influence to bear to halt these incidents. But before a cure can be effected, the cause must be determined. We must remember the frustration, the bewilderment, the despair in the hearts and minds of the Palestinian Jew. We must keep in mind all the promises and pledges that were made by Britain to the Jews only to be broken. We must remember that in 1939 when Jews were frantically trying to escape from the scourge of Hitler, Britain closed the doors of Palestine and shut off the main avenue of escape, thus condemning to death thousands upon thousands of innocent Jews. We must remember that for a very brief period when the Labor government came into power, the hopes of the Jews flared up again. They had every reason to believe that the Labor Party, which had pledged itself since 1922 to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, would now recognize the legal and moral obligations of Britain. Instead, they found in the Labor government an implacable, inflexible opposition to their most cherished aims. Jews who sought to gain a new life, new dignity in Palestine, who, indeed, had no place else to go, were placed behind barbed wire on the island of Cyprus. Although Bevin had promised to carry out the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine if a unanimous report were rendered, the recommendations of this committee were cast aside by Britain, Labor Britain at that. The Jews in Palestine, heavy with the knowledge that 6,000,000 of their brethren had perished, had once again to watch the survivors crowded into camps without hope of knitting together the broken strands of their broken lives.

Here is Palestine, which the Jews had brought to life again by reclamation of its desert soil, by the building of cities, by the inauguration of industries, by the introduction into the Middle East of the arts, sciences, and medicine; here was Palestine, making ready to receive the dispossessed and defenseless, and the government which had professed to be its friend these many years had turned coat. It is little wonder, then, that human endurance had been stretched to the breaking point. Despair brought terror.

Now, the opportunity arises for Britain to act with honor, to gain for herself the good will of the world and to gain for herself stanch allies in the Middle East. Should an equitable partition of Palestine result, peace, prosperity, and stability would flow into the Middle East. How many times does Britain have to learn the same lesson again? India, Ireland, our own American Colonies have shown Britain the folly of suppression without attempting to remove the cause of disorder and defiance. I think the British publication, the Manchester Guardian, put it most forcefully:

> The British Government seems happily convinced that what it is doing in Palestine is right. If Jewish refugees from Europe have to be shipped off to Cyprus it is unfortunate, but since they had no business to go to Palestine in the first place, it is not the fault of the British Government. If some of them in their desperation jump into the sea and try to swim ashore, they must be hauled out again. It only proves what obstinate, exasperating people these Jews are. If one or two get killed in the process it is too bad. We are a humane nation and do not like causing unnecessary suffering, but, of course, law and order must come first. And so it goes on. Having once persuaded ourselves what we are doing is morally justified, we can, with typical Anglo-Saxon complacency, carry out a policy which would shock us very much indeed if it were carried out by anyone else.

In partitioning Palestine into Arab and Jewish states, each would assume full responsibility for the conduct of its affairs; both would achieve self-government with all its concomitant duties, privileges, and obligations. The tensions would cease between the two peoples, the fear having been removed that one would dominate the other. There would be no danger or threat of one group dispossessing the other. The energies that are now directed toward political friction would be bent to peaceable pursuits in building the Middle East, raising its standards of living, developing its irrigation projects; in erecting schools, houses, and business enterprises; in farming; in short, in carrying forward a program of progress in the Middle East. The Palestine Arab would find political and social expression in his own state, as would the Palestine Jew. The acts of outlaw gangs that are creating so much havoc would cease. There would be other work to do, happy, fruitful, constructive work, for both the Arabs and the Jews, each attempting to develop a state of which each can be rightfully proud.

The Jews of Palestine would gain a voice in the United Nations. The Jews in the displaced persons' camps would be brought into the Jewish state with rejoicing as welcome and contributing citizens thereof. Jewish homelessness would cease to agitate the world. Partition means dignity and self-determination for both the Arabs and the Jews, and it means for Britain the friendship of the Middle East, an external line of defense, since by treaty and trade agreements she can gain bases and entry if she fears attack. Certainly a turbulent Middle East will avail Britain very little in any military conflict. Witness Burma. Britain should consider this well. In enlightened self-interest, she can only tighten her ties with the Middle East by loosening them.

The boundaries can so be fixed in Palestine as to create a viable state in an adequate portion for the Jews and a viable adequate portion for the Arabs. Those areas now closely populated by the Jews should be retained by the Jews. Upper Galilee, eastern and western Galilee should be included, making possible large scale irrigation projects which would benefit all of Palestine and not only the Jewish portion thereof. The

seacoast region from Haifa down to Gaza, now heavily settled by Jews should likewise be included, but not the port of Jaffa. The Negev area, which is the southern triangular part of Palestine, should likewise be included in the Jewish area. This is completely desert area which has no population to speak of. The Jews of Palestine could redeem this land as they have other portions.

The central part of Palestine which is now heavily populated by the Arabs should be given to the Arab state. Care should be taken to provide the Arabs with access to the Mediterranean. It might well be feasible for the Arab state to be joined with Transjordania which was originally a portion of Palestine. Iraq would greatly benefit thereby as well since through such amalgam, Iraq could gain an opening to the Mediterranean.

These are merely suggestions as to how Palestine may equitably be partitioned. These are not rigid lines to be laid down, but they do constitute a working plan and a concrete approach. Naturally, under any agreement reached, the Holy places of all three major religions in the Holy Land should be placed under international authority.

It is imperative that Britain recognize the necessity for partition. Decidedly we cannot overlook the importance of achieving peace in the Middle East if we are bent on world peace. The deadlock in the Middle East must be broken.

Self-government for the Jews and self-government for the Arabs with each controlling its domestic and foreign policies, including immigration, peace in the Middle East, development in the Middle East of a progressive civilization, the lifting of a burden from Britain and the redemption of her pledge, the rescue and rehabilitation of Jewish refugees now languishing in DP camps, all these are spelled out by a workable partition of Palestine.

In reviewing both the Jewish and Arab case, we must keep in mind that the historical connection of Jewry with the Holy Land has never been broken and that connection has been recognized internationally by 53 nations including the United States. Both the Balfour Declaration and the mandate guaranteed a national homeland to the Jews in Palestine. Palestine was once a Jewish state; it has never in history been an Arab one. Palestine was conquered by the Arabs in the seventh century and became a province of the caliphs, but it never had a significant political role. In 1517 it was conquered by the Turks and until after World War I it remained a province of the Ottoman Empire governed by a Turkish administration. Therefore, in discussing sovereignty of Arabs and Jews, it has never been a question of restoring sovereignty to the Palestine Arab which he never had. The Arabs now have independent monarchies in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Egypt, Iraq, and Trans-Jordan and two republics in Syria and Lebanon. The Arabian territory consists of 1,288,954 square miles for a population of no more than 14,000,000. All this was made possible for Arabia by the Allied victory in the First World War. The only exception in the territory that was granted independence was the 10,000 square miles of Palestine which was specifically excluded so as to make possible the establishment of a Jewish national home therein.

The Arab world, therefore, cannot complain with any justification that a partition of Palestine which would give the Jews a viable state in a portion thereof would be unfair. The Jews, who can go nowhere in the world save Palestine, have the promise of the world, a legally sanctioned right. If the Jews of Palestine accept a reasonable partition, the Arab world in a spirit of mutual cooperation, for the sake of the whole population of the Middle East, for social, economic, and political welfare of their people, for the sweet name of peace, must alike accept a fair partition.

Again, I say, this is Britain's chance. Let her seize this opportunity to act with honor, with justice, and with conscience and at the coming conference make partial amends for the suffering of the Jewish people, make adjustment for the sake of the impoverished Arab people by consenting to a feasible, practical plan of partition for Palestine. Certainly the legal precedent already exists in the case of Trans-Jordan, which, though once a part of the Palestine mandate, has now been granted independence as a sovereign state.

There is none so blind as he who will not see. Surely, surely, this time Britain will see the light.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman approve of the act of the Jews recently when they kidnaped and whipped a British officer?

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I do not. I deplore all terrorism, whether it is on the part of the British or on the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I sought to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the majority and minority Supreme Court opinions on the portal-to-portal case, which exceeded the cost somewhat, as I am informed by the Public Printer. I believe the cost is justified, however, and I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the allowable cost the extension may be permitted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

TIME TO PASS THE SPINACH

INTRODUCTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Selective Service System appeared before the Appropriations Committee in June of 1946 a chance remark by one of the officials of Selective Service induced me to ask a number of questions concerning the findings of the Selective Service System with respect to the physical well-being of young men who had been examined for military service and who for one reason and another were rejected. The matter seems of such moment that I requested an assembly of the findings of Selective Service in order that they might be carefully examined and evaluated. These findings were compiled and completed in December of 1946 and reveal some astonishing facts.

A BRIEF SUMMARY

By way of a brief summary let me point out from these findings that by August 1, 1945, about seventeen and one-third million men between the ages of 18 and 37 had been examined for military service. Manifestly this group can be considered as the robust segment of our male population and now for some bad news. Out of this number about five and one-quarter million were rejected. Think of it! More than 30 out of every 100 young men in this age bracket from 18 to 37 were examined for military duty and then rejected. As one drops down into the ripe old age bracket of 34 to 37 as indicated in the attached table more than 48 out of 100 were rejected. It makes one pause and think of what the poet once asked under the rhetorical question, "Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?"

SOME ODDITIES

It is a bit odd that 43 out of every 100 young Tarheels from the State of North Carolina should be rejected compared with only 25 out of every 100 from the plains of Kansas. It is difficult to account for the fact that there were but 23 rejects out of every 100 in New Jersey compared with 44 out of 100 in the palmetto State of South Carolina or why should so rugged a jurisdiction as Maine account for 30 rejects out of every 100 examined compared to a State like Florida where the enervating climate accounted for 35 out of every 100.

AND WHY

Take a look at table No. 3. There you will find the whole challenging story. Out of every 1,000 examined more than 119 had eye defects. Despite the fact that as a nation we use $40,000,000 worth of tooth paste, tooth powder, tooth brushes, mouth washes, and whatnot every year, 116 out of every 1,000 young men exhibited defective teeth. Our per capita consumption of shoes exceeds by far that of any other nation on earth, including health shoes, arch supports, bunion pads, custom-built shoes, and whatnot. In fact we use 400,000,000 pairs of shoes annually and yet 90 out of 1,000 young men examined had defects of the feet. Now notice the cardiovascular cases. As you well know these are included in the common appellation of heart disease. More than 57 out of every 1,000 young men had defective tickers. Who says that heart disease belongs to old age?

TAKE IT BY STATES

The break-down by States in table 3 is especially revealing. Consider the staggering number of young men in whom there was found mental defects.

Alabama seems to lead the list with 133 per 1,000. Virginia shows 106 per 1,000, Michigan 60 per 1,000, and New Hampshire 93 per 1,000. Now consider VD. To be sure VE-day and VJ-day have come and gone but VD-day is still here. In the District of Columbia—the Nation's capital—more than 102 out of every 1,000 who were examined for military service revealed syphilis. In Florida the syphilis rate was more than 142 out of every 1,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Please let me pursue this one step further.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman that he is doing an injustice to the white people of those Southern States by not calling attention to the real facts. Now, if the gentleman will break that down by races he will present a different picture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is all broken down.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, but the gentleman has not said so in his speech so far.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman raises a fair point there, and I shall insert tables which will break the whole thing down by States so that everybody can see. Unfortunately, with the limitation of time, as the gentleman knows, it becomes impossible to set out all these States.

NOT A PRETTY PICTURE

Well there it is fresh from the files of the Selective Service System and it is not a very pretty picture—more than five and one-fourth million young Americans in the very prime of life so defective either physically or mentally that they could not be used for military service. And what shall be said of the millions over the age of 37 who, according to the age ratios which are set out in table No. 1, must necessarily show an even greater proportion of defects? If that segment of our male population over age 37 could have been examined it would have presented a truly shocking picture if the ratios hold good. All these people are a part of our population. They are here with us. They are alive. They will carry on for many years with defective eyes, with bad teeth, with heart disease, with troublesome feet, and the rest of these ailments—these young men who could not be used for military service. Do we propose to embalm these figures and to say in our most casual and complacent manner, "Well, of course, it is too bad but then—that's just one of those things," or do we propose to do something about it?

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We hear so much of national defense. In this new Congress billions will be appropriated for equipment, research, matériel, weapons, battleships, and what not, but what are they all worth without manpower that is physically and mentally effective? Human beings are the first line of defense and the problems disclosed by the findings of the Selective Service System cry out in a loud voice for immediate and vigorous attention.

HERE ARE THE DATA

I am appending the full report of the Selective Service System dated December 13, 1946, which was forwarded over the signature of Director Lewis B. Hershey:

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRANTS DURING WORLD WAR II

Introduction: The statistical information contained herein concerns (a) rejection rates and (b) causes of rejection of Selective Service registrants. In some cases data are available for the period 1940 to the summer of 1945, in other cases for only part of this period. The information comes from tabulations of the results of physical examinations conducted by Selective Service local board physicians and by the physicians at the Armed Forces Induction Stations. The tabulations were produced for such administrative purposes as estimating manpower availability, recommending changes in physical examination policy or standards, and bringing greater uniformity in examining procedure.

Rejection rates (1940–45): Rejection rates for men 18 through 37 years of age who had been examined by August 1, 1945, are given in table 1. By that date an estimated 17,384,700 men of these ages had been examined and 5,249,200 were still classified by Selective Service local boards as unfit for military service. This represents a 30-percent rejection rate.

As expected, the rejection rate increased with the age of the men examined. Those under 26 years of age had a rejection rate of 23 percent, whereas the rejection rate of those 34 through 37 years of age was 49 percent (table 1).

Rejection rates by States are shown in table 2. They are based on the same data as is table 1 and represent the number of men 18–37 years of age on August 1, 1945, who had been examined and either found acceptable, or rejected. Rejection rates range from 23.0 percent in New Jersey to 44.2 percent in South Carolina. Less than half of the States had rejection rates above the national average of 30.2 percent.

Defects of examined men: At the end of each examination a physician summarized the men's defects on a special part of the examination form. Tabulations derived from these summaries provide the basis for determining how many men per 1,000 examined had eye defects or hernias or any other defect. Table 3 shows this information for the five most frequently recorded defects for the continental United States and for each State. It should be pointed out, however, that these defects are not always serious enough to warrant rejection. Furthermore, some physicians may have summarized defects more completely than others.

The total frequency of defects among all examined registrants for the period 1940–43 was 1,105.7 per 1,000 men, or an average of 1.1 defects per man. The five defects most frequently recorded in the continental United States were: Eyes, 119.6 per 1,000 examined; teeth, 116.1; feet, 90.1; musculoskeletal, 87.5; and cardiovascular defects, 57.5. Rates per 1,000 men examined ranged from 729.8 in Kansas to 2,453.4 in Vermont.

Principal causes of rejections: A third important consideration is the main cause for each man's rejection. Such information is available for three time periods: the peacetime period 1940–41, the early war period 1942–43, and the year 1944 in the later war period. Some of the differences between these periods are due to the different average ages of the men examined, to the varying proportion of men who were being resubmitted for induction, and, of most importance, to changes in physical standards for induction. For example, teeth and eye defects which were principal causes for rejection in 1941 were not in 1943 and succeeding years. These comparisons are shown in table 4, which gives the ten principal causes for rejection at local boards and induction stations for each of these time periods.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted and rejected* [1]

Age group	Estimated total physically examined [2]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to physically examined
All ages	17,384,700	12,135,500	5,249,200	30.2
18 to 25	8,392,300	6,484,800	1,907,500	22.7
26 to 29	3,996,800	2,821,400	1,175,400	29.4
30 to 33	2,781,500	1,689,100	1,092,400	39.3
34 to 37	2,214,100	1,140,200	1,073,900	48.5

[1] Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants.

[2] Includes registrant enlistees and inductees and nonregistrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by States* [1]

State	Estimated total examined [2]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to examined
United States continental	17,384,700	12,135,500	5,249,200	30.2
Alabama	401,300	241,800	159,500	39.7
Arizona	68,500	46,600	21,900	32.0
Arkansas	276,600	168,400	108,200	39.1
California	908,200	672,800	235,400	25.9
Colorado	141,100	95,600	45,500	32.2
Connecticut	233,400	173,500	59,900	25.7
Delaware	36,800	25,800	11,000	29.9
District of Columbia	124,700	83,300	41,400	33.2
Florida	269,400	174,200	95,200	35.3
Georgia	450,400	260,500	189,900	42.2
Idaho	64,000	47,700	16,300	25.5
Illinois	1,002,800	742,500	260,300	26.0
Indiana	433,900	308,800	125,100	28.8
Iowa	285,000	214,600	70,400	24.7
Kansas	205,100	156,100	49,000	23.9
Kentucky	389,600	249,000	140,600	36.1
Louisiana	338,100	214,100	124,000	36.7
Maine	101,800	71,300	30,500	30.0
Maryland	266,200	184,400	81,800	30.7
Massachusetts	524,800	385,000	139,800	26.6
Michigan	709,500	495,900	213,600	30.1
Minnesota	337,800	248,800	89,000	26.3
Mississippi	300,500	190,500	110,000	36.6
Missouri	477,300	323,500	153,800	32.2
Montana	70,000	50,200	19,800	28.3
Nebraska	143,600	104,800	38,800	27.0
Nevada	16,500	12,500	4,000	24.2
New Hampshire	59,500	41,100	18,400	30.9
New Jersey	540,400	416,200	124,200	23.0
New Mexico	71,000	47,700	23,300	32.8
New York	1,731,100	1,264,000	467,100	27.0
North Carolina	530,800	303,200	227,600	42.9
North Dakota	75,400	54,500	20,900	27.7
Ohio	910,700	667,700	243,000	26.7
Oklahoma	289,200	196,800	92,400	32.0
Oregon	132,000	98,100	33,900	25.7
Pennsylvania	1,310,900	974,100	336,800	25.7
Rhode Island	92,800	68,100	24,700	26.6
South Carolina	291,600	162,700	128,900	44.2
South Dakota	71,800	53,100	18,700	26.0
Tennessee	418,400	271,300	147,100	35.2
Texas	894,300	607,900	286,400	32.0
Utah	67,900	52,200	15,700	23.1
Vermont	42,700	28,200	14,500	34.0
Virginia	407,000	261,400	145,600	35.8
Washington	210,100	152,300	57,800	27.5
West Virginia	275,900	185,700	90,200	32.7
Wisconsin	354,700	264,800	89,900	25.3
Wyoming	29,600	22,200	7,400	25.0

[1] Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants.

[2] Includes registrant enlistees, inductees, and nonregistrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

TABLE 3.—*The 5 most frequently recorded defects of registrants 18–38 years of age physically examined through Selective Service, by States, November 1940–December 1943* [1]

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

	Rate per 1,000 examined
Total defects	1,105.7
Eyes	119.6
Teeth	116.1
Feet	90.1
Musculoskeletal	87.5
Cardiovascular	57.5

ALABAMA

Total defects	933.8
Mental deficiency	133.5
Eyes	98.6
Musculoskeletal	84.2
Syphilis	67.5
Feet	64.2

ARIZONA

Total defects	1,260.7
Eyes	144.8
Feet	106.3
Musculoskeletal	87.1
Nose	77.1
Throat	75.4

ARKANSAS

Total defects	915.3
Mental deficiency	106.2
Musculoskeletal	72.6
Eyes	72.5
Mental diseases	71.7
Cardiovascular	67.2

CALIFORNIA

Total defects	1,045.6
Eyes	111.0
Musculoskeletal	87.4
Feet	79.9
Teeth	79.9
Cardiovascular	62.5

COLORADO

Total defects	1,005.4
Eyes	109.9
Musculoskeletal	106.1
Feet	86.6
Cardiovascular	63.6
Mental disease	62.6

CONNECTICUT

Total defects	1,150.5
Eyes	172.8
Teeth	163.8
Feet	112.9
Musculoskeletal	73.1
Mental disease	59.7

DELAWARE

Total defects	1,624.6
Teeth	278.2
Eyes	155.6
Feet	143.9
Mental disease	110.5
Musculoskeletal	100.1

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Total defects	1,335.2
Eyes	129.8
Syphilis	102.9
Feet	101.3
Throat	86.5
Mouth and gums	80.7

FLORIDA

Total defects	1,034.9
Syphilis	142.1
Eyes	85.3
Mental deficiency [2]	84.9
Musculoskeletal	82.1
Feet	78.4

Footnotes at end of table.

GEORGIA

	Rate per 1,000 examined
Total defects	884.0
Mental deficiency [2]	108.9
Syphilis	74.4
Eyes	64.2
Musculoskeletal	62.1
Feet	60.8

IDAHO

Total defects	948.8
Musculoskeletal	94.5
Eyes	93.6
Teeth	87.4
Feet	86.5
Hernia	63.7

ILLINOIS

Total defects	888.4
Eyes	103.1
Teeth	77.1
Musculoskeletal	75.1
Feet	66.9
Mental disease	56.7

INDIANA

Total defects	906.3
Eyes	105.2
Musculoskeletal	75.7
Teeth	70.4
Mental disease	58.2
Cardiovascular	51.5

IOWA

Total defects	1,541.0
Eyes	193.3
Teeth	190.0
Feet	186.2
Musculoskeletal	147.2
Nose	134.7

KANSAS

Total defects	729.8
Musculoskeletal	73.7
Feet	70.7
Eyes	68.9
Mouth and gums	56.6
Cardiovascular	46.7

KENTUCKY

Total defects	1,034.0
Mental deficiency [2]	90.1
Eyes	78.9
Musculoskeletal	73.7
Mental disease	73.4
Teeth	61.8

LOUISIANA

Total defects	1,174.1
Mental deficiency [2]	155.9
Syphilis	98.4
Feet	84.3
Teeth	79.3
Musculoskeletal	77.2

MAINE

Total defects	1,738.3
Teeth	452.2
Eyes	277.4
Musculoskeletal	109.8
Nose	72.7
Feet	71.0

MARYLAND

Total defects	1,372.1
Eyes	146.4
Feet	114.2
Musculoskeletal	101.0
Teeth	94.2
Mental disease	75.7

MASSACHUSETTS

Total defects	1,930.2
Teeth	458.1
Eyes	334.5
Feet	167.2
Musculoskeletal	102.1
Mental disease	79.1

MICHIGAN

Total defects	967.2
Eyes	99.2
Teeth	91.6
Feet	74.7
Musculoskeletal	73.8
Mental disease	59.7

Footnotes at end of table.

MINNESOTA

	Rate per 1,000 examined
Total defects	1,179.7
Teeth	159.3
Eyes	115.7
Musculoskeletal	115.5
Feet	95.5
Nose	75.7

MISSISSIPPI

Total defects	984.2
Mental deficiency	125.4
Feet	113.2
Syphilis	107.5
Musculoskeletal	75.3
Eyes	69.9

MISSOURI

Total defects	837.8
Eyes	76.1
Musculoskeletal	75.2
Feet	59.4
Teeth	59.2
Mouth and gums	49.6

MONTANA

Total defects	1,051.0
Eyes	145.7
Musculoskeletal	119.8
Teeth	98.4
Feet	78.4
Cardiovascular	57.8

NEBRASKA

Total defects	1,380.8
Feet	215.8
Eyes	121.1
Musculoskeletal	117.1
Teeth	100.2
Nose	88.7

NEVADA

Total defects	903.6
Musculoskeletal	104.7
Eyes	91.9
Hernia	65.2
Cardiovascular	61.3
Teeth	60.4

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Total defects	1,584.7
Teeth	373.0
Eyes	154.6
Musculoskeletal	110.4
Mental disease	93.3
Cardiovascular	69.8

NEW JERSEY

Total defects	1,004.0
Teeth	123.9
Eyes	114.9
Feet	90.6
Musculoskeletal	66.3
Mental disease	57.6

NEW MEXICO

Total defects	1,084.1
Eyes	98.5
Mental deficiency [2]	89.5
Musculoskeletal	84.6
Feet	65.5
Ears	52.2

NEW YORK CITY

Total defects	1,471.2
Teeth	290.3
Eyes	206.4
Feet	125.2
Musculoskeletal	90.8
Cardiovascular	77.0

NEW YORK (EXCLUDING NEW YORK CITY)

Total defects	1,209.6
Teeth	178.2
Eyes	128.5
Feet	89.1
Musculoskeletal	85.6
Genitalia	75.4

NORTH CAROLINA

Total defects	1,157.3
Musculoskeletal	126.5
Feet	123.1
Mental deficiency [2]	116.5
Eyes	78.6
Cardiovascular	63.9

Footnotes at end of table.

	Rate per 1,000 examined
NORTH DAKOTA	
Total defects	1,124.3
Eyes	117.5
Musculoskeletal	110.6
Teeth	99.7
Cardiovascular	70.0
Hernia	67.2
OHIO	
Total defects	999.6
Eyes	114.4
Teeth	94.7
Musculoskeletal	73.2
Feet	65.9
Cardiovascular	48.3
OKLAHOMA	
Total defects	1,456.0
Eyes	152.2
Feet	137.2
Musculoskeletal	125.2
Mental disease	92.9
Genitalia	84.0
OREGON	
Total defects	832.7
Musculoskeletal	99.0
Eyes	91.5
Teeth	71.9
Feet	61.9
Cardiovascular	48.7
PENNSYLVANIA	
Total defects	1,079.7
Teeth	142.1
Eyes	119.5
Feet	88.2
Musculoskeletal	85.6
Cardiovascular	71.9
RHODE ISLAND	
Total defects	1,302.7
Eyes	206.9
Teeth	167.7
Feet	119.0
Musculoskeletal	88.8
Cardiovascular	87.1
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Total defects	1,401.3
Eyes	167.3
Feet	163.0
Mental deficiency [2]	153.7
Musculoskeletal	113.0
Teeth	83.8
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Total defects	1,231.8
Eyes	159.4
Feet	163.6
Musculoskeletal	107.1
Teeth	95.0
Nose	75.6
TENNESSEE	
Total defects	1,145.1
Eyes	103.6
Musculoskeletal	103.5
Feet	101.8
Teeth	96.4
Mental deficiency [2]	80.4
TEXAS	
Total defects	833.8
Mental deficiency [2]	88.5
Musculoskeletal	73.6
Eyes	73.2
Syphilis	64.6
Feet	60.1
UTAH	
Total defects	936.4
Feet	100.7
Musculoskeletal	85.8
Eyes	81.2
Cardiovascular	78.6
Teeth	72.8
VERMONT	
Total defects	2,453.4
Teeth	383.9
Musculoskeletal	276.7
Feet	252.5
Eyes	224.5
Nose	171.5

Footnotes at end of table.

	Rate per 1,000 examined
VIRGINIA	
Total defects	1,059.5
Mental deficiency [2]	106.3
Musculoskeletal	86.6
Feet	76.5
Eyes	70.7
Cardiovascular	66.0
WASHINGTON	
Total defects	766.1
Eyes	101.0
Musculoskeletal	92.0
Teeth	68.8
Feet	55.0
Cardiovascular	44.0
WEST VIRGINIA	
Total defects	1,088.3
Eyes	125.7
Musculoskeletal	115.5
Teeth	82.1
Feet	70.7
Mental disease	62.3
WISCONSIN	
Total defects	925.9
Eyes	93.4
Teeth	86.7
Musculoskeletal	84.1
Feet	70.0
Hernia	60.0
WYOMING	
Total defects	792.6
Eyes	91.8
Musculoskeletal	86.2
Teeth	67.1
Feet	58.5
Hernia	52.3

[1] Based on a 10-percent sample of first examinations recorded on DSS Form 220, Reports of Physical Examination, for November 1940–September 1941, and approximately 7 percent of those recorded on DSS Form 221, Reports of Physical Examination and Induction, for April 1940–December 1943. Reports for registrants examined and deferred for other than physical and mental reasons are excluded from this sample.

[2] Includes registrants recorded as educationally deficient prior to June 1, 1943, and as failing to meet the minimum intelligence standards after that date. Also includes morons, imbeciles, idiots, and those with unspecified mental deficiencies.

TABLE 4.—*Percent distribution of principal causes for rejection at local board and induction station, for selected periods*

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, ALL RACES

NOVEMBER 1940 TO SEPTEMBER 1940 [1]

Principal cause for rejection	Percent of total rejections
Total	100.0
Teeth	16.5
Eyes	11.7
Mental and nervous	10.4
Cardiovascular	10.0
Musculoskeletal	8.9
Hernia	5.9
Venereal	5.9
Ear, nose, and throat	5.5
Tuberculosis and lungs	3.8
Educational deficiency	3.8
Other	17.6

APRIL 1942 TO MARCH 1943 [2]

Principal cause for rejection	Percent of total rejections
Total	100.0
Mental disease	12.5
Syphilis	9.4
Musculoskeletal	9.3
Cardiovascular	8.8
Eyes	7.8
Hernia	7.8
Educational deficiency	7.7
Neurological	5.5
Ears	5.0
Tuberculosis	3.7
Other	22.5

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—*Percent distribution of principal causes for rejection at local board and induction station, for selected periods*—Con.

JANUARY 1944 TO DECEMBER 1944 [3]

Principal cause for rejection	Percent of total rejections
Total	100.0
Mental disease	25.8
Intelligence tests [4]	12.8
Musculoskeletal	8.8
Cardiovascular	8.0
Hernia	4.9
Ears	4.4
Neurological	4.1
Eyes	4.0
Tuberculosis	3.4
Mental deficiency [5]	2.6
Other	20.2

[1] From an analysis of reports of physical examination from 21 selected States. (Medical Statistics Bulletin No. 2.)

[2] Based on a sample of DSS Forms 221 received at National Headquarters, April 1942 to March 1943. (Medical Statistics Bulletin No. 3.)

[3] Based on a 20-percent sample of DSS Form 221, Reports of Physical Examination and Induction, for registrants inducted or rejected during 1944. (Medical Statistics Bulletin No. 4.)

[4] Registrants rejected for failure to meet the minimum intelligence standards.

[5] Includes morons, imbeciles, idiots, and mental deficiency not specified as to type or degree.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because of the fact that we do not have a lot of work planned since it is necessary for the leaders to make committee assignments so that we can get the wheels running for the best interests of our country.

May I take this occasion to wish for the Republican Party, for the Democratic Party, for the Speaker, and for all those associated with us in public office, a happy, happy New Year. May we be able to assume the responsibilities that are going to be ours during the Eightieth Congress.

I wish to speak to you for a few minutes in reference to labor-management relations and our Government. This has been a very ticklish question in the last few years for a great many Members of Congress, because many Members have been too prone to think of the things that are said on the floor of the House that are going to mean votes for us, rather than say the things that we believe in or that are for the best interests of our country.

Looking over the membership of the House, and thinking of the votes of many Members of the last Congress, I see that a lot of them who voted differently than I did are not here today. I would be very foolish if I said I was sorry that they are not here in Congress, because I am not. I think we have to come to a conclusion as to what is the best thing for America and then do it. Let the chips fall where they may. I am glad the people of this

country left back home those Members who were not reelected, because the people have come to a realization that we must work, earn, and save if we are going to make America a greater Nation and keep America safe. We must stop boondoggling and pussyfooting like the New Deal has been doing.

The vote in November shows that the American people are sick and tired of trying to have every person get a living off the Government without doing anything to earn it.

I can remember very well when we discussed the Wagner Act. When that act was passed there were five reasons, as I stated on the floor, why it was good for labor or why labor wanted it, but there was not one reason why management would want that act. For that reason, I thought it was a poor bill and would create more strikes in the country in the future than we had had in the past.

I will never forget my good friend, Billy Connery, who was then in charge of the bill, and who has now gone to his reward. I think Billy meant exactly what he said, that it would help, aid, and assist in curbing strikes, but the fact of the matter is that we have had many more strikes since the act was enacted than before. I am glad to see that my observation at that time was correct. Now the act should be changed.

Let me show you how many man-days have been lost since 1936. In that year we lost 789,000 man-days; in 1937, 1,861,000; in 1938, 688,000; in 1939, 1,171,000; in 1940, 577,000; in 1941, 2,363,000; in 1942, 840,000; in 1943, 1,981,000; in 1944, 2,116,000; and in 1945, 3,467,000. I do not have the figures for 1946, but there were a great many more in that year than in any year previous to that time. So the Wagner Act and the support of the Administration gave us trouble and vexation between labor and management.

Now it is up to you and me to change the act giving management and labor the same rights—the same consideration and a 50–50 break; no more and no less.

It has been observed that there are people in labor unions who do not like the conditions we have been working under in the last few years. I insert in the RECORD at this point for the information of the House and the general public the results of the R. C. Dunn Survey, of Greenwich, Conn., which specializes in the field and which reviewed the Gallup polls of union members in 1945, which showed as follows:

Fifty-four percent against closed shop; 39 percent for.

Fifty-eight percent against union contributions to campaign funds; 24 percent for.

SEVENTY PERCENT FOR "COOLING" PERIOD

Seventy percent for cooling-off period and fact-finding to help avoid strike.

Seventy-one percent for making unions financially accountable.

Sixty-four percent for law prohibiting strikes in war plants; 26 percent against.

Forty-nine percent for law to stop "featherbedding"; 26 percent against.

Summing up, a Gallup poll in 1945 stated: "The practices and policies of labor unions by no means meet the approval of the majority of American workers, or even of labor-union members themselves."

It would seem that facts such as these would impress Members of Congress more deeply than either the accusation that they are out to "break the unions" or that any really restrictive law will dangerously promote communism. If either the President or the Republicans let stuff like that affect them, they will deserve little, indeed, from the country.

You can see therefore that the membership of the unions do not agree with the things that the union heads themselves are doing.

Today I received a letter from one of my constituents who is a laboring man. He writes me as follows:

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICH: I am what is commonly called a workingman, being employed as a machinist in a local industry.

Last November I voted for you to represent me in the United States Congress. As that Representative I desire that you vote for the following:

1. The repeal of the Wagner labor law.

2. The open shop, or the right of a man to work when, where, and for whom he pleases without interference from or being forced to pay to a labor union a fee for the privilege of working.

3. The abolition of the picket line, including protection for those who desire to work.

4. Equal responsibility for unions and management, including financial reports by the unions.

5. The abolition of labor monopolies.

6. A secret ballot by all union members before a strike can be called.

7. To make it unlawful for a union member to intimidate his fellow worker.

8. The right to sue a labor union for damages.

9. Corrective legislation on portal-to-portal pay.

10. Corrective labor laws in general.

I am very tired of the way labor unions have abused the special privilege they have enjoyed.

They are the changes some laborers want.

In the same mail today I received a letter from one of the big manufacturers in my district, who by the way, has been a good Jeffersonian Democrat. He writes me as follows:

The new Congress, a Republican Congress, is about to convene, and I am happy as an American to cast my vote of confidence for the work which it is about to undertake.

I note with considerable satisfaction that consideration of possible revision to the Wagner Act is high on the agenda, and I look to this Congress to create the balance between management and labor which is so long overdue. It is unthinkable that a law can long continue which permits one individual to attain such a position of power that he can defy his Government, bring the wheels of industry to a halt at a time when full production is so essential, throw hundreds of thousands of our producers out of work, and, generally, bring the greatest producing country in the world to a stand-still.

I, therefore, urge you most earnestly to support such legislation as will correct the above conditions, for it is my firm conviction that if such conditions are permitted to continue much longer the American way of life, of which we are so proud, must soon come to an end.

Very truly yours.

I realize that much can be said about this legislation. Proposed legislation will be presented to you as Members of the Congress, and I believe it behooves every one of us to give our very best attention to these matters so that we will not do anything to labor that is going to be a set-back. At the same time they must be responsible. Contracts must be kept by both employee and employer.

The closed shop should be outlawed. The portal-to-portal pay is a great farce made law by the courts, and it was not the intent of our founding fathers that anybody but the Congress should write the laws—certainly not the courts. This must be changed. We must think wisely, act judiciously, and be not afraid to do that which will benefit all—not minorities, but the country as a whole.

We must make labor just as accountable as we require management to be, because any law that is right and just will give every man his just dues. We want to do that which will aid and assist in building up our country. I do not want to tear down labor. I am an employer of labor. I want to help labor. I want to see that they are given the best working conditions possible; that they are given every advantage possible. I want to help them, because no man can run a business without labor. We are as inseparable as if we were to try to operate our plant without machines.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point some data from a booklet prepared by the manufacturers of this country, as well as an advertisement that was placed in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Monday, December 16, by the Tool Owners Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. In concluding my remarks I want to place in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from a little booklet which came to my desk, Let's Build America. Industry's Recommendation to the Eightieth Congress; by the Congress of American Industry. I insert their summation with which I agree in the 10 points enumerated with the exception of point No. 7, a cut of 20 percent in taxes. If we knew that our income will be greater than our outgo I would agree with that point.

IN SUMMATION

Here are industry's recommendations of action that can be taken by the Eightieth Congress during 1947 to encourage sustained prosperity for America:

1. The special privileges now granted to strikers by our labor laws should be withheld when strikes are called or conducted improperly.

2. The Federal Government should not intervene in strikes beyond the point of providing conciliators.

3. Compulsory union membership should be forbidden by law.

4. Monopolistic wage conspiracies should be outlawed.

5. The budget should be balanced, and a start made on debt retirement.

6. Federal expenditures should be cut drastically—enough to permit—

7. A 1947 cut in personal income taxes of 20 percent and—

8. Reductions and reforms in business taxes for 1948.

9. A declaration of the end of hostilities should be made as soon as needed labor legislation has been enacted.

10. Remaining wartime controls and emergency powers should be terminated as rapidly and completely as possible.

Also I insert from an advertisement appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Monday, December 16, from the Tool Owners Union, their platform for progress in the revision of laws:

PLATFORM FOR PROGRESS

I. REVISION OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS TO ASSURE GENUINE FREE BARGAINING

It is clear that American progress cannot be resumed until Federal laws dealing with labor unions have been changed. Tool Owners Union will petition Congress for these constructive changes; every citizen is invited to join TOU in that petition: (Use coupon below).

A. Freedom to work—no closed shop: All workers must be protected in their human right of free bargaining with the right at all times to choose between (a) bargaining individually without membership in a labor union and (b) bargaining collectively as a labor union member.

B. Equal responsibility—no special privilege for unions: Labor unions and business must be made equal before the law, equally responsible for failure to fulfill their contracts, and for violation of the law.

C. No fake bargaining by coercion: Means must be provided for business management and labor unions to freely and thoroughly bargain, and to assure that no lock-out, work interruption, or strike vote shall be undertaken until after genuine collective bargaining has failed.

D. No industry-wide monopoly: Bargaining must be at the plant level. No labor union should call a strike or work interruption until it is voted by a majority of eligible union members in the specific plant, mine, or facility affected. This assures the right of union members to control their leaders by referendum vote; it safeguards the right to strike and the right not to strike until the union members realize and consciously accept the full effect of the strike upon themselves, upon their fellow workers in other plants, and upon the general public.

These changes mean fair play; equality before the law and freedom of bargaining are as American as baked beans and baseball. Join with Tool Owners Union in petitioning Congress to make these changes now.

"You are a tool owner if you are 1 of 6,000,000 elderly, retired workers living on your savings; 1 of 13,000,000 women largely dependent on annuities and insurance; 1 of 16,000,000 farmers and small business and professional men; 1 of 41,000,000 ordinary life insurance owners; 1 of 45,000,000 savings bank depositors; 1 of 8,000,000 owners of corporate securities."

Not counting duplications there are 50,000,000 thrifty tool owners whose self-denial makes possible the tools that are the very foundation of our national strength and material welfare. If you are one of these and a citizen you are eligible to Tool Owners Union.

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the whole country was shocked this morning when it learned that the Honorable James F. Byrnes had resigned as Secretary of State in President Truman's Cabinet. I know, too, that all patriotic Americans deeply regret that his health has necessitated this action on his part. Few, if any, men who have occupied that exalted position have ever been confronted with more harassing or momentous problems. It is, therefore, no wonder that even his stalwart constitution weakened under the tremendous strain that was his. The task assigned him of bringing order out of international chaos following the capitulation of the Axis Powers indeed approached the superhuman. But grateful Americans everywhere will always remember that it was the cool judgment, the resolute will, and the magnificent courage of Secretary Byrnes that resulted in the splendid progress that has been made in converting a dream of universal peace into an international parliament of nations to preserve that peace and cause the cessation of barbaric warfare among men.

This splendid South Carolinian can now well retire after years of outstanding service as a legislator, administrator, jurist, and exceptionally able statesman to enjoy the peace of his own body and mind that he so richly deserves. The prayers of the Christian people of the world will be his for a speedy physical recovery.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might say I think, too, the country applauds the President for the wisdom he showed in selecting the best brain that came out of the last war to succeed Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. COLMER. With that statement of my distinguished colleague I have no argument. I think the President's selection was indeed a splendid one, as the successor to this great man who is now resigning from that office.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of Secretary of State Byrnes' resignation, which came to us at nightfall yesterday, was not a surprise to those who were intimately acquainted with the distinguished Secretary. It has been more or less generally known for many months that Secretary Byrnes desired to be relieved from his multitudinous duties. By reason of the unprecedented tasks and tremendous responsibilities incumbent upon him through the long war years when he served as Director of Economic Stabilization and Director of War Mobilization, and then as the eminent spokesman of our Nation in the councils of a troubled and complicated postwar world, Secretary Byrnes had drawn too heavily upon his physical strength. It was inevitable that he must be relieved. To be sure, we are never quite ready to accept unpleasant announcements and had continued to hope that Secretary Byrnes would be able to carry on much longer.

There is little that I can say to the membership of this House concerning the life and character of one of its former members, then Representative Byrnes, who later became Senator Byrnes and still later Justice Byrnes. Seldom in our country's history has one of her sons possessed necessary outstanding qualifications to permit him to serve with such distinction in all three branches of the Government. This great South Carolinian overcame many difficulties and handicaps. It was his to be born in a proud but humble home. The father of Secretary Byrnes died before the birth of his distinguished son. The divine hand of Providence, however, gave the Secretary a saintly mother, endowed with more than the usual amount of wisdom and courage. By plying her needle, she was able to support not only her own son, but also her nephew, the Honorable Frank Hogan, who became the president of the American Bar.

Secretary Byrnes, or "Jimmy" as he is still affectionately called by his host of friends, never lost the common touch. He was able to move among the scholars and diplomats of the world and retain his personal knowledge and friendship with the toiling masses. Surely the example and life of such a one as Secretary Byrnes should be inspiring to the youth of the day. This is an example of where the son of the very poorest man may aspire to and ultimately attain the highest places in life.

While the retirement of Secretary Byrnes is to be regretted, we are exceedingly proud that the President, in his great wisdom, has chosen Gen. George C. Marshall to become Secretary of State. As evidence of General Marshall's greatness, although he was not a graduate of West Point, he became Chief of Staff, an accomplishment seldom attained. General Marshall was advanced by President Roosevelt over a number of higher-ranking officers, by reason of his outstanding qualifications. I have been told that General Marshall, while a student at Virginia Military Institute, studied and sought to emulate our own great southern general, Thomas Jonathan Jackson, recognized as one of the greatest military strategists of all time.

We shall miss Secretary Byrnes. Let us hope that by returning to his native State he may regain needed physical strength to carry on for many years to come. I am proud that he is a resident of my congressional district.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as one man who served with Jim Byrnes in this House for many years, I join in the tributes that have been paid him. I am also delighted that he is succeeded by General Marshall.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that today is one of the most important anniversaries in the history of America. One hundred and thirty-two years ago today Andrew Jackson, with his invincible band of volunteers, met the British Army at New Orleans and, as Sergeant S. Prentiss, a former Member of this House, has said, he taught the newly fledged American eagle to match its talons with the lion's strength, and raised America for the first time to the dignity of a world power.

We must maintain for our country her rightful position of leadership among the nations of the earth, if our civilization is to endure.

I am tired of seeing my country undermined at home and insulted abroad; and I believe if there is one man under the American flag who will call the hand of that element so dealing with the United States it is Gen. George C. Marshall.

For that reason I am delighted that he has been appointed to this exalted position. I am sure he will follow the advice of George Washington and "Put only Americans on guard."

THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging speeches ever made on the floor of this House was that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a few moments ago. In my opinion, it would be a salutary and wholesome thing if the President of the United States would now call a national health conference here in Washington to begin a real war on the bugs that have beset not only the youth of America but all mankind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time for the purpose of complimenting the President of the United States upon his appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall as Secretary of State. I deeply regret the necessity of the resignation of James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, from this position in the Cabinet. He has done a magnificent job in handling the foreign affairs of this Nation and, no doubt, when history sums up the events of his life in future years it will give a foremost place in this summary to his genius which has contributed so much in the last few years in constructing events for permanent world peace.

In the tragic events leading up to the recent world war and during the long and tortuous years of this war, it was my privilege and high honor to work with Gen. George Marshall, who served as Chief of Staff of our armies. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I know of his transcendent ability as an organizer and his brilliance as a leader. General Marshall has the complete confidence of the peoples of the nations of the earth. What is more important, in my mind, is that he has the complete confidence of the people of the United States.

In handling the new task which has been assigned to him, General Marshall carries with him his genius as an organizer and a vast storehouse of experience in world affairs. No Member of Congress who has known and worked with General Marshall will doubt his sincerity of effort, his tenacity of purpose in the face of obstacles, and his devotion to his country. The President is certainly to be commended upon his fine judgment in selecting General Marshall.

JUSTICE FOR OUR TEACHERS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I read in the public press yesterday where the chairman-designate of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], has indicated that we can very well get along with approximately a million fewer Federal employees. I believe that we can get along with a smaller number of Federal employees. Whether it is a million, a half-million, or a quarter of a million, I do not know. I trust, however, that the Congress will proceed in an orderly way to determine just where money can be saved and how we can get along with fewer employees. I also trust that when we cut people off the Federal pay roll those who remain will be paid well for their services. I believe in paying public employees well for doing a good job.

A class of citizens, public employees, underpaid throughout the land, are the people in the teaching profession. It is understandable that on occasion some of these people in the teaching profession look longingly toward Moscow and elsewhere when they are paid as niggardly salaries as they are everywhere in educational institutions, both in our public schools and institutions of higher learning. I do not know just how we here in the Congress can best approach the subject. I do not believe in the Federal Government having too much to do with our educational systems. I know our State legislatures are now in session. I trust that our legislatures will immediately proceed to raise teachers' salaries. There is a shortage of qualified teachers now, but the real hurt is going to last a long time because there are only 50 percent as many persons in teacher-training colleges now as before the war. During the war a large number of teachers sought more lucrative jobs and will never return.

We are neglecting the people in the teaching profession, and, if there is no other way out, if after the legislatures meet during the next 60 or 90 days and fail to take the action that is necessary, I trust that the Congress will make some effort to augment or to provide funds in those places where funds are not available so that our teachers might be well paid. Summarizing my remarks briefly, let us put it this way: For years, Government officials on every level of authority have persistently ignored the plight of our Nation's school teachers. They have been compelled to maintain themselves and their families on substandard salary scales on the theory that their calling in some mysterious way offered compensation in public respect and prestige adequate to their needs. Today hundreds of thousands are leaving the teaching profession. Too few new teachers in training are being attracted to fill the gaps. It is time for the lawmakers and fund disbursers of the country to recognize that praise and platitudes are not substitutes for food, clothing, and shelter. It is time for recognition of the fact that school teachers in our Republic must have good incomes to assure good teaching; that they must be honored through the public purse no less than from the public forum. We have constantly proclaimed the dependence of our Nation's future on the quality of instruction imparted to the citizens of tomorrow. We must act today if we are to make certain that the instruction offered meets the stringent tests of adequate preparation of our children to live in an atomic world.

THE RESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with real regret that I heard the news of the resignation of our able and faithful Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes. During the period in which he was in charge of our foreign relations, he has had to contend with some of the most difficult problems that this Nation has ever been confronted with. He has performed his many tasks in an outstanding manner, and the people of the United States are to be congratulated upon the fact that they had such a man as Jimmy Byrnes representing them in our postwar negotiations with other nations throughout the world.

It is to be sincerely hoped that his firm and just policy will be continued and the strides made under his leadership will be carried forward in the activities of his successor, the Honorable George C. Marshall. The President is to be commended for his appointment of General Marshall as our new Secretary of State. General Marshall is to be commended for the fine job he has performed in China and his understanding of the situation in that strife-torn country. For the past 13 months, as the President's special ambassador to China, he has exerted all his efforts to bring about

a sound understanding between the various factions in that country to the end that China might become united and in so doing be able to resume the place which had been prepared for her among the great nations of the world. That he was unsuccessful was due not to lack of striving on General Marshall's part but rather to a lack of understanding between the leaders of the Communist Party in China and certain elements within the Kuomintang itself. This was brought out quite clearly in the personal statement issued by General Marshall, and I believe that this frank exposition of facts, as he saw them, should serve as a guide to the American people in bettering their understanding about the complicated situation in China. General Marshall will bring to his new position a sound knowledge of diplomacy based on his experience as Chief of Staff during the war years and also on his most recent mission to the Far East.

I know that as always he will do the best possible job he can; that we will be well and capably represented in our negotiations with all foreign countries; and that he will carry on in the tradition of his predecessor, Jimmy Byrnes, to the end that a just and permanent peace will be made and that a new era of friendship will take place among all the nations of the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts and statements in each.

EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATION

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the judgment of our Congressman at Large, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], in regard to education. It is well known, and leading papers of the country have directed our attention to the fact, that $3 in this country are spent on cosmetics to every $1 that is spent on education. I think this is a situation that needs correction, and I am most happy that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has brought this matter to our attention. I trust this Congress will take the lead in giving all possible assistance to education. Thereby we will not only be doing our duty to our young people, but we will be insuring the continuance of our democratic form of government, which, we know, depends upon a well-informed citizenry.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLEMENTS, for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 9, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

88. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Julius Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority's thirteenth annual report covering the activities during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945, and ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

90. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the eighteenth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

91. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the thirteenth report of the Attorney General, covering the period from May 1, 1946, through August 31, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

92. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the fourteenth report of the Attorney General, covering the period from September 1, 1946, through December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

93. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the report of the activities and expenditures of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, covering the months of April and May 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 655. A bill exempting Central Valley projects of California from the land-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws and repealing all inconsistent provisions of prior acts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 656. A bill exempting Central Valley projects of California from the land-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws and repealing all inconsistent provisions of prior acts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 657. A bill for the purpose of renewing and increasing forage and improving watershed conditions on range lands, forests or Indian lands, or other public owned and controlled land of the United States; authorizing the sowing operations by airplane, machinery, or other means, for conducting experiments to improve methods of reseeding and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana (by request):

H. R. 658. A bill to provide for the adjustment of repayment contract, cancellation of irrigation charges, and amendment of certain provisions of the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 464), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and for other purposes, Flathead irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 659. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 660. A bill to provide additional compensation to veterans who have suffered the loss of limbs, or who are totally blind, as a result of military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exclusions from gross income for income-tax purposes in the case of persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 662. A bill to extend percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate to bentonite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 663. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 664. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 665. A bill to provide for participation by private lenders in certain loans made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 666. A bill to authorize the payment of premiums on national-service life insurance and United States Government life insurance at United States post offices; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 667. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 668. A bill to authorize the transfer without charge to the States, and political subdivisions thereof, of any interest of the United States in public works acquired under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 669. A bill to provide a method of paying subrogation claims arising out of insurance payments for damages sustained as the result of explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on June 17, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 670. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 671. A bill to prohibit utilization of the facilities of interstate or foreign commerce in connection with desertion or abandonment of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 672. A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the city of St. Petersburg, Fla., for museum purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 673. A bill to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 674. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 675. A bill to increase the monthly rate of pension payable to certain widows and former widows of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 676. A bill to provide appropriate pins for mothers whose children served in the armed forces during the time of war and

died as the result of such service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 677. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 678. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish funds for the purchase of an automobile by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 679. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims and in the United States district courts suits for payment for the infringement of patents infringed by or for the Government and for the use of inventions used by or for the Government, and for the better protection of the rights of inventors and owners of patents, and to stimulate the making of inventions useful to the Government and insure payment for the use thereof when used by or for the Government and its contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 680. A bill to amend section 4915, title 35, section 63, of the United States Code, as amended by section 72a of the code, and for the protection of inventors and owners of patents and applications for patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 681. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 682. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement after 25 years of service, irrespective of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 683. A bill to provide tax relief for income earned over a period of years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 684. A bill granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 685. A bill to make available to the States a portion of certain sums received by the United States under compensatory royalty agreements relating to lands acquired for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 686. A bill to incorporate the United War Mothers of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 687. A bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H R. 688. A bill for the erection of a public building at Lake City, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 689. A bill for the erection of a public building at Timmonsville, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 690. A bill for the erection of a public building at Florence, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H R. 691. A bill for the erection of a public building at Myrtle Beach, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 692. A bill for the erection of a public building at Loris, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 693. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 694. A bill to amend the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relating to maximum rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 695. A bill to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 696. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government employees who have attained the age of 60 years or who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to quiet titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution relating to Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and providing for the refund of all penalty taxes collected and for the cancellation of all uncollected penalty taxes on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution relating to assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and submit its report to the Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to terminate the emergency war powers of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution urging that representatives of religious organizations serve as advisers to the American delegation of the United Nations and to the American delegations at all peace conferences; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 42. Resolution providing for compensation for three special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective February 1, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt a national housing policy providing for effective cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to meet the current critical housing emergency, and to adopt immediate measures to facilitate the successful operation of State and local emergency housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMOND:

H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 698. A bill for the relief of Constantinos George Georgiades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 699. A bill for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Anthony Arancio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of Evangelos G. Pappadatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 702. A bill for the relief of Nandor (Nathaniel) Frieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 703. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 705. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 706. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 707. A bill for the relief of Rulon T. Hinckley and Arza A. Hinckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 708. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Paolone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 709. A bill to authorize cancellation of deportation in the case of Frank Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Fritz Halliquist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 711. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Andrej Belovescik, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 712. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Arnold Szeleczky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 713. A bill for the relief of Henry S. Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 714. A bill authorizing the President to bestow the decoration of the Purple Heart upon Thomas Anthony Deleo; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Louisa Russell Nipkow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 716. A bill for the relief of Manuel DeCaldas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 717. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Coelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 718. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 719. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Stalica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Michael O'Keefe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 721. A bill for the relief of James Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 722. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

27. By the SPEAKER: Petition of David J. Wilson, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the matter of the contest for the seat of WALTER K. GRANGER, Representative from the First Utah District; to the Committee on House Administration.

28. Also, petition of state commander, New Jersey Department, Amvets, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to unification of the armed forces; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

29. Also, petition of Rev. George B. Murphy, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to request for enactment of a new code or set of Articles of War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

30. Also, petition of C. Beauchamp, Bremerton, Wash., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requested legislation making it unlawful for a closed-shop agreement and also making picketing illegal; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

31. Also, petition of president, Brooklyn Chapter, the American Institute of Architects, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to removal of all remaining restrictive measures pertaining to the construction industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

32. Also, petition of Bernardo Santiago and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request to remove all controls over production, distribution, and rationing of sugar in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

33. Also, petition of White Eagle Society, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting refugees permission to enter the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, petition of the city of Boston, City Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring enactment of the so-called Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

35. Also, petition of Dame V. B. Evans, of Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to defining property in public domain and to legislate its proper use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

36. Also, petition of several people of Aguadilla, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting a tract of land to the applicants; to the Committee on Public Lands.

37. Also, petition of International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the prompt adoption of the proper and necessary implementing legislation by the Congress of the United States and Parliament of Canada of the convention for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

38. Also, petition of citizens of Iloilo, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of the Tydings indemnity system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

39. Also, petition of American Veterans Committee, New Jersey State Department, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuing the selective service training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy mercy need not be graven in stone, for it has been stamped forever on the wanderings of man. It has transcended time and space and embraces a multitude without number. Breath of our breathing, light of our gladness, be with us in our aims, our ambitions, and our dearest affections. Pardon us if we are miserly, forgive us if we are filled with pride, and spare us from becoming victims of an evil temper. Thou who canst bind up the hurt hearts and inspire with bright hopes those who are tossed on the maddened waves of life, be Thou our way, our beacon, and our rescue, for Thy goodness we never seek in vain. Lead us above the level of our own poor understanding into the paths where God's hand is upon us; then we shall know of the newer, richer, and deeper meaning of life. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dealing with the subject of flaxseed and linseed oil.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I come from Chicago, one of the great retail and wholesale centers of the United States. I desire to invite the attention of the House of Representatives to a situation which is developing as the result of the declaration of the termination of hostilities by the President of the United States. I refer to the extension of the Federal retail excise tax. The continuance of this full tax until July 1, 1947, will affect the retail trade adversely and relief should be granted. Because of the knowledge that this tax is to be lifted there will be a tendency on the part of a large number of people to hold off in making purchases if it operates to the extent which is contemplated. This will create a serious condition, not only in Chicago but in the other large retail centers of the country. A great number of people may be thrown out of employment and an injustice will be operating against a large number of establishments. I wish to bring to the attention of the House a few communications on this subject which I received and which I intend to send to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

I submit a letter from one of the large retail department stores in Chicago, which I hope will receive proper consideration:

MANDEL BROS.,
Chicago, Ill., January 6, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman TWYMAN: As president of a corporation engaged in operating a large department store and consequently selling merchandise subject to the Federal retail excise tax, I should like to call your attention to the already patent inequities occasioned by the recent announcement of a reduction in the tax rate.

It is my opinion, and that of many others with whom I have discussed the matter, that unless the proposed reduction in rate is effected immediately, both manufacturer and retailer will sustain a serious loss of business during the first half of this year. The customer is also penalized; one who has a definite and immediate need for such merchandise is forced to pay the current tax, while one who can afford to wait is benefited by the reduced tax. There are other reasons sustaining this opinion with which I will not burden you but which must appear obvious.

Your serious consideration of this problem, and early action to remove this inequitable situation, is respectfully urged.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEON MANDEL,
President, Mandel Bros., Inc.

I also quote the following paragraph from a letter from another Chicago company:

Therefore, we respectfully urge you to use your influence in relation to the House Ways and Means Committee and the corresponding Senate committee to begin as quickly as possible procedure to reduce the above-mentioned 20 percent taxes to 10 percent instead of waiting until July 1.

The foregoing paragraph contains the views of the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations. The full retention of the 20-percent Federal excise tax until July 1 will affect people in every walk of life.

(Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein a letter and a paragraph of another letter.)

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN W. BOEHNE, SR.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of the late Honorable John W. Boehne, Sr., who represented the old First District of the State of Indiana, now known as the Eighth District, which I have the honor to represent. Mr. Boehne served in the House of Representatives with distinction in the Sixty-first and Sixty-second Congresses during the administration of President Taft. I am sure my colleagues join me in revering the memory of Mr. Boehne, who died December 27, 1946, at the age of 90, and in extending sympathy to his family.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 43), which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR TAX RATES ON CERTAIN MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 6 I introduced H. R. 467, to terminate certain wartime excise-tax rates. Since that date I have learned through the medium of the Associated Press and the United Press that the genial gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has expressed himself in accord with my bill. Similar sentiments were expressed by several other gentlemen on that high committee of the House.

It is splendid to know that the gentleman from Minnesota who is so well versed in the tax structure of our country and who has the best interests of the country and its people at heart is so strongly in favor of my bill. I never doubted that the promises that the gentleman made that he would see to it that taxes were reduced would not be kept. I welcome his assistance, and I shall be very happy when he notifies me that he will give me a speedy hearing on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 44), which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Ways and Means: Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Milton H. West, Texas; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; A. Sidney Camp, Georgia; Walter A. Lynch, New York; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania.

Rules: Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; J. Bayard Clark, North Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, according to yesterday's newspapers, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, speaking on sugar at Chicago, said:

We are already getting a large share of the world's supplies.

Only two other countries, the United Kingdom and Canada, have as much sugar per capita as we have. Most countries have a great deal less sugar, less of other sweetening, and less of other food as well.

Remember that our country, as an important member of the International Emergency Food Council, was allowed to buy the whole crop of Cuban sugar at a fair price without other countries bidding against us.

The Cuban crop represents a major portion of the world's sugar available for export.

The countries that trusted us to act as sole buyer have a right to expect that the crop will be handled as a pool which they can share, as they did in the war years.

Our integrity is at stake.

This brings to mind the controversy of last October when Howard R. Tolley, formerly of the United States Department of Agriculture, now Director of the Division of Economics and Statistics of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, announced a program for sharing our sugar supply with other nations for years to come. It was not advanced as a famine-relief program, but as a plan to raise the normal consumption of sugar in other countries at the expense and through the sacrifice of the people of the United States.

Specifically, Tolley proposed that by the year 1950 the total American supply of sugar and syrup should be depressed by 12.6 percent under the total prewar consumption. And this despite the fact that our population in 1950 is expected to be 13,500,000 more than in 1940.

The Tolley plan will keep us on the wartime basis of sugar scarcity for years after the peace. At that time, in October, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson flatly denied that Mr. Tolley's plan represented the views of the Department of Agriculture. Has Secretary Anderson changed his mind? Or was the announcement of the Tolley plan made in the famous New Deal technique of announcing a certain program as a trial balloon and immediately publicly repudiating it to assuage the blow, while it was secretly being put in operation?

The American people have no objection to sharing a portion of the sugar from their accustomed areas of supply with nations in desperate need. But the housewives should not be obliged to forego their needed supply of sugar for the carrying out of the plans of the international "do-gooders" under the Tolley program; nor should such a plan be carried out with secrecy against the interest of the American sugar users.

It is now well known that the administration sugar control agencies deliberately sabotaged production of sugar during the years 1943, 1944, and 1945 to perpetuate their control through the resulting scarcity. They should not be permitted to further perpetuate their power by deliberate maldistribution while production in our supply areas is finally catching up with consumption.

Nor should the American housewife be cheated out of her sugar by false propaganda creating unwarranted sympathy for the European housewife. According to reliable statistics, while the consumption per capita in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada is 78.1 pounds, there are some countries in Europe with per capita consumption as high as 89.6 pounds and 84.4 pounds. Moreover, in the United States two thirds of the per capita consumption, or 53.1 pounds, is absorbed by commercial users. In European countries commercial consumption is negligible. So that in such countries as Switzerland with 60.6 pounds per capita, Holland with 53.1 pounds per capita, Czechoslovakia with 63.7 pounds per capita, and so forth, the bulk of the sugar goes to the housewives instead of only one-third of it, as in the United States.

This explains why people returning from Europe report abundance of sugar for household purposes in those countries. The American housewife is left holding the bag while European housewives get the sugar. It is high time that this misplaced sympathy racket be exposed.

Congress should make an immediate investigation of sugar production and distribution maladministration, and secure a fair deal for the American housewife.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES M. BORCHERS

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCMILLEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of Charles M. Borchers at Decatur, Ill., late in December 1946. He represented the Nineteenth Congressional District of Illinois in the Sixty-third Congress. He was twice mayor of Decatur, where he practiced law for 50 years. His rugged honesty and ability was a credit to the bar, and his constant response to civic duty is a lasting contribution to his community and country.

STOCKHOLDERS FREQUENTLY OUTNUMBER EMPLOYEES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, there have been many deliberate attempts, both on this floor and elsewhere, to picture our great industrial enterprises as soulless, bodiless, voteless "nebulisms."

The truth is, of course, that these corporations are the cooperative instrumentality of flesh-and-blood citizens who, as the owning stockholders, frequently outnumber the employees.

From the list of our 50 largest manufacturing corporations, I am appending the names of a dozen in which number of stockholders exceed number of employees—in one case by more than 5 to 1.

	Stockholders	Employees
General Electric Co	234,732	167,212
American Tobacco Co	74,039	10,740
Republic Steel Co	62,912	59,712
International Paper Co	26,800	22,677
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co	61,000	15,000
American Can Co	34,000	23,400
National Dairy Products Corp	66,636	36,698
Radio Corp. of America	228,502	38,435
American Car & Foundry Co	14,437	7,495
Borden Co	49,174	27,258
American Rolling Mill Co	42,872	21,957
Procter & Gamble Co	44,987	14,535

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, January 13, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day, on the subject of legislation relating to lifting the ceilings on the job-training program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances and in each to include excerpts.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to extend my remarks and include an address by Dr. Wilson Compton, President of Washington State College. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limitation set under rule 10; that it will take 2⅓ pages and cost $140. Notwithstanding this, I ask consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on rice.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a bill.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum on sugar.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL BUREAUCRATIC ENCROACHMENT OF ST. LOUIS AIRPORT

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the story I have to tell today is one of arrogance and official usurpation against the interest of the people. It is the story of bureaucratic officiousness running rampant. It is the case of a Government corporation in particular, and other departments and bureaus, abusing the interest and privileges of the people of the State of Missouri and the city of St. Louis. These acts, which I am about to relate, threaten to destroy the logical and great air center of St. Louis because of the abuse of wartime privileges extended by the city to the Federal Government. Patriotism in this case has been repaid by usurpation.

The city of St. Louis with only the purpose of winning the war in mind—and without thought of compensation either then or in the future—gave, loaned, and leased for the emergency, large areas of its airport property to various branches of the armed forces. The development of these areas, and the use of the airport, have not only worked a great hardship and expense upon the city of St. Louis, but have made it necessary for the city to alter its airport plans in such a way that it became necessary for the citizens to vote an additional fund of $14,397,000 for this development. The operation of these federally held properties have encroached upon the airport and threatened its very existence. Even though the war is over, the Federal Government, through its various agencies, shows either a reluctance or refusal to return or release these properties. As a result, the city of St. Louis, which holds the promise of one of the world's greatest air centers, is now so badly handicapped it cannot move forward. Until the activities of the Federal Government can be removed from its airport, the airport ownership and operation cannot be successful. The extension of wartime controls, which have now become usurpation, are working viciously against the commercial operation and expansion.

The agencies to which I refer are the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in particular, War Assets Administration, and the Army and Navy. These Government authorities used the only commercial airport belonging to the city of St. Louis. They added their own special facilities, and after the close of war activities, reversing the Federal policy elsewhere, they have retained their hold on the city's commercial facilities under their war leases.

The city is now confronted with the lack of control of its own airport. A brief description begins with the so-called Curtiss-Wright plant. It stands on leased ground of the St. Louis Airport, and together with the associated area of activity around the plant, completely dominates the entire north side of our airport.

The naval training station, together with its associated area of activity, usurps the southern sector of our air field. An Army lease of hangar and area, which was leased for $1 a year, takes over the activities of the entire southern half of the western side of our airport. The Lambert-St. Louis Airport is literally squeezed in between these activities and cannot expand without a tremendous outlay of money.

Now, if St. Louis is to gain its proper place as one of the major airports of the world, it must have required facilities such as hangars, repair shops, and so forth, now occupied by Army and Navy, as well as the high bay area of the Curtiss-Wright plant. Airplanes must be housed and the big commercial planes of today served. The minute these facilities are available, St. Louis becomes the originating and terminating point of transcontinental flights. This program is now delayed by Federal bureaucracy.

The city is ready to spend and expand and to build, but it is dangerous to do so without the definite assurance that it will have use and control of its own airport.

Various city officials, citizens, and I, have spent months in an attempt to arrive at an equitable solution with the Government. The dilatory, and in some cases, arrogant tactics, which have been used to counter every activity on the part of the city, amount to a national scandal.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on this Federal "merry-go-round" before and it is not a new experience—but it is a bitter one. Over the years, we have allowed bureaucracy to grow so arrogant that it threatens the very existence of community activity and authority.

In 1940, the city of St. Louis leased 48.8 acres on the St. Louis-Lambert Airport to the Curtiss-Wright Corp., with the understanding that the Defense Plant Corporation would finance a plant thereon in which airplanes would be manufactured for the United States Army.

The city made no attempt to get a fair rental, but leased this ground for a nominal amount. They also gave the free use of the airfield, and this use included the testing of airplanes used in the plant. The city required very few restrictions, but it did include in the lease a provision that if anything other than airplanes or airplane parts were manufactured that the right to use the airfield would be canceled.

The city also included in the lease a proviso that in the event the Government wished to install a tenant, which was not a department of the Government, that the city should have the veto power and control of such tenancy. We did not know at that time, and we do not know now, any other way to control our airport, unless we have control of this all-important site.

The RFC, which now holds title to this plant for the United States Navy, has not only moved a tenant into the property illegally and virtually rent free, but also boastfully repudiates the city's legal rights. That is just one part of the case of the city of St. Louis against the usurpation by the Federal Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to confirm what the gentleman has to say about the cluttering up of the St. Louis airport by these Government buildings. I think it was in 1942 that the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents was called upon to go to St. Louis to investigate an accident that almost resulted in death on account of the construction of this Curtiss-Wright plant on the land occupied by the airport and set up off the land. The runways are in some measure surrounded by buildings. It is a dangerous situation, and I believe for the safety of the people flying in and out of St. Louis certainly these buildings directly on the airport proper might well be removed. Certainly, if the Government has them there, they might well take those steps.

Mr. PLOESER. I appreciate what my distinguished colleague from California has said, and I know that he is thoroughly informed because of his great work on that special committee. They investigated these air accidents a few years ago. I want to say that the situation has caused us to turn our entire airport plans around and require, many, many more acres of ground.

In 1941, the city transferred to the Navy Department a piece of ground on this airport site, opposite the Curtiss-Wright site, amounting to 21.5 acres. For this, the city received a token payment of only $50. The commercial value of this lease, on an earning basis of its prominence and importance to the airport, would easily be the valuation of $1,000,000. The purpose of this concession to the Navy was to enable the Navy to build and operate a naval air-training station, and then in addition the city graciously allowed the Navy the free and unrestricted use of the city's then existing airfield for the training of Navy pilots.

In 1942, the city leased the southwest corner of the airport—a tract of 8.4 acres—to the Army for a rental of $1 a year. There is a big city hangar on this site, which was used by the Army for the repairing and housing of planes, and as a depot for ATC planes. The Army encroached upon the airfield proper for at least double the rented area for all the various Air Forces functions, including testing and installation of bomber turrets.

The city of St. Louis made other arrangements of this type in cooperating with the war effort. For example, they leased the enclosed roof of the terminal building to the Army at a rental of 20 cents per year. In all its dealings with the Federal Government, the city was motivated only by the desire to contribute to the country's defense, without thought of profit or even compensation. The city turned over large strategic areas of its airport to the Federal Government.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from St. Louis, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. The question of facilities at the Lambert-St. Louis Airport is a nonpartisan matter. I am just as interested in this matter as my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

At the present time St. Louis has only one major airport and unless something is done to alleviate the situation that exists there the city will likely lose its place in the fast-moving development of aviation.

The city of St. Louis as a patriotic gesture, during the period of the war, turned three large areas of the airport over to the Government. Now that the war is over the city is justified in asking for the return of its airport facilities. The field is now practically surrounded by military and naval activity.

A survey of the whole situation was made recently by the Municipal Airport Commission. It submitted a report which outlines in detail the situation that exists at the field. A copy of the report reached me a few days ago and I am in accord with the general objectives it seeks to accomplish.

I am anxious to see the situation at Lambert Field corrected and also am anxious to protect the interests of the people of St. Louis. I am going to cooperate with the gentleman in his efforts to straighten the matter out.

Mr. PLOESER. I appreciate the gentleman's assistance, and he has been of assistance.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. The St. Louis newspapers are unanimous in their support of this movement. I would request that the gentleman ask permission to include at the conclusion of his remarks editorials from these newspapers.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say to the gentleman I appreciate what he has said and I do now ask unanimous consent that the editorials, which are now in the possession of my distinguished colleague from St. Louis the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], be extended at the conclusion of my remarks following the report of the airport commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the fact that 90.2 percent of the total number of commercial and military operations of the air field, from April 1, 1941, to November 1, 1946, were operations by military aircraft, is evidence of the city's all-out effort to be of assistance. In addition to the concessions, losses to the city's out-of-pocket maintenance expense, for the benefit of these Federal agencies, for 5 years, was $250,000 per year.

When I recall that many cities of the Nation were asked for facilities on their commercial airports, and the Army and Navy were told by them to go build their own airports, I feel ashamed that any department of the Federal Government should be guilty of the abuse now being handed out to St. Louis. I cannot help but recall that the Federal Government bought Floyd Bennett Field for New York for a reported $9,500,000 and added more than $6,000,000 dollars in improvements. After the war was over, the Government gave it back to the city of New York. I also cannot help but remember the Thunderbird Field in Arizona, where the Federal Government built and paid for an airport, and gave it to a private corporation after the war. Coming even closer home to St. Louis, I cannot help but recall that Douglas Field, 1,000 acres, bought and paid for by the Federal Government, was an outright gift to the city of Chicago.

Now, the city of St. Louis wants to own, maintain, and operate its own commercial airport, and to do this it must have these properties returned. It must remove the military operations from the field.

We have attempted, by the exercise of the utmost patience, to bring about amicable adjustment of these matters with the Army, Navy, WAA and with the RFC. Numerous meetings have been held in Washington and in St. Louis, consuming countless hours of city and Federal officials—and my time—attempting to bring about a solution without injury. While the Navy has shown a willingness to be on the job, and I cannot question that, there has been a reluctance on the part of the Navy to fully comprehend the injury to the city of St. Louis. So, they stand today in the position of one usurping the city's property. But, even where the Navy was willing to function to bring about results, we were always blocked by the total lack of responsibility of any statement from RFC. On several occasions, we thought that we had agreement, only to find that the very propositions made by RFC were to be denied, repudiated, and retracted within hours after their promises. We have been pushed from one agency to another on the vicious Washington "merry-go-round."

The Navy claims that they cannot complete action without the RFC; the RFC passes the buck back to the Navy. There have been conferences in which the very integrity of the city officials in St. Louis has been insulted.

The Army has now declared surplus their tract and their $1 a year lease, which they claim is valuable, and the WAA has it for sale.

Military use of the airport continues at the expense of the city of St. Louis, all because of the citiy's honest and patriotic effort to serve during wartime. We cannot justify such shabby treatment now. The arrogance of the RFC, the vacillation of the WAA, and the reluctance of the Navy to comprehend, added to the unreasonableness of the War Department's position, makes a sorry picture which is hindering air commerce and threatening the very air life of the city.

Now, we do not intend to go on and tolerate such actions. The city intends to fight with every weapon, and I intend to give my aid—within my power—to remove the military and bureaucratic domination. In respect to the 20-cent-a-year lease of the Army's enclosed top of the city's administration building, we are told, by the Army, that it has been transferred to CAA. Now that the emergency is over, it should rightfully be returned to the city.

We have an air-transportation crisis, and it has been created by the Federal

bureaucracy. Now we propose to bring that bureaucracy into accounting and defeat its dilatory actions and regain our rightful property.

We have not asked for any gifts such as have been enjoyed by other municipal beneficiaries, but we have asked—and we do demand—the return of that which is rightfully due the city of St. Louis.

On Tuesday, January 7, I transmitted a letter to the President of the United States, which I ask to have embodied at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1947.

MR. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It had been hoped that it would not be necessary to bring to your personal attention the difficult airport problem facing the city of St. Louis. In cooperation with members of the St. Louis Airport Commission; the present mayor, Hon. A. P. Kaufmann; and the former mayor and present postmaster, Hon. Bernard Dickman, I have attempted to bring about cooperation—and by cooperation—solution of the immediate St. Louis airport problems.

Due to useless delay brought about by deliberate procrastination and vacillation upon the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the War Assets Administration; and due to stubborn usurpation on the part of the Navy Department; and a ridiculous and unfair assumption of property rights on the part of the War Department, I am compelled to lay the case before you personally.

The report attached will shock your sense of justice, as it does mine.

Mr. President, action—immediate action—is so very important or else your State and mine suffers a continued injury, which cannot be anything but shameful in the eyes of all citizens of all States.

This report was made public in St. Louis today, and I propose to tell the House of Representatives, and from this moment on to use whatever means at my command to break these chains of bureaucratic arrogance and abuse.

It is within your power to direct that justice be done in this situation. For months we have tried reason, without success. Now, the city of St. Louis has the power of public opinion, which is sure to follow full exposure; or, legal action, which is likely to work injury to the Naval Establishment.

Your immediate action would be greatly valued.

Respectfully and with personal regard, I am

Sincerely yours.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, with this letter I enclosed a copy of the St. Louis Airport Commission's report entitled "The Crisis Created by Continuing Federal War Controls at Lambert-St. Louis Airport." This report reveals the amazing procedure, which all of us have been compelled to endure for the past months. As I told the President, it will shock the sense of justice of any person who reads it. Denials we can expect, but, likewise, full exposure of the circumstances can be expected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be necessary for me to ask for a full-dress investigation by this House of these activities. I do propose to use every means at my command to bring about immediate settlement of the city's equities. The city of St. Louis has been injured to the extent of $6,500,000 by these Federal agencies and, what is worse, it cannot proceed until they are eliminated from the airport.

Curiously enough, this money spent by the city in behalf of the Federal Government was not created by some mysterious Washington economic Houdini. It was hard cash paid by the taxpayers of St. Louis, and every day St. Louis fails to complete its necessary airport facilities additional tax penalties are being saddled upon the taxpayers of St. Louis by the Federal bureaucracies.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Representing the Eleventh Missouri Congressional District, which takes in a great part of the city of St. Louis, I wish to go on record as concurring in the position taken by my colleague from the adjoining district, the Twelfth Missouri Congressional District. I have read the recent report of the Municipal Airport Commission and cannot help but come to the conclusion that the development of air facilities and air activities at Lambert Field has been very seriously retarded and impeded by what I would call the vacillation, indecision, and cross purposes of representatives of various bureaus of the Federal Government. Not only has it retarded commercial activities of the St. Louis Airport but by reason of what I might call the disintegrated system of both commercial and military flying at this field, there definitely exists a serious hazard to both life and property. I therefore concur in the position of my colleague and hope and trust that the duly authorized representatives of the War Assets Administration, the RFC, and the Army and Navy promptly get together to find a solution to this problem in order that the city of St. Louis can proceed with its postwar air development without being subject to the whims and fancies of a few individuals in the Federal Government.

Mr. PLOESER. I appreciate what my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] has said, and what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] has said. I want this House to know, and the bureaus to know, that the three of us are together in this fight to the finish.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I understood the gentleman to say that the Army has declared as surplus the airfields and they are now turned over to the War Assets Administration?

Mr. PLOESER. We gave them this area of eight and a fraction acres, plus the hangars, for their use during the war, for a dollar a year. So now they are putting it on sale in the War Assets Administration, instead of giving it back to us directly.

Mr. RICH. They can make a grant to the city of St. Louis, if they so choose?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes, but you are probably familiar with the War Assets Administration. It is a very difficult thing to get them to do anything.

Mr. RICH. I know it is. You cannot tell anything about what they are doing. Let me ask the gentleman this question: If the authorities of St. Louis make a request from it, they can get that property, and they ought to turn it over to them, and the quicker they do it the better.

Mr. PLOESER. It is my understanding that on the last request they were told that this is a very valuable property—this dollar-a-year lease—and so they were going to sell it. Of course, we have a priority on the purchase of it, but we do not like the idea of buying back our own property.

Mr. RICH. What are the improvements on the property?

Mr. PLOESER. There are hangars and repair shops which St. Louis built.

Mr. RICH. How long was that lease to be in operation? During the war?

Mr. PLOESER. I think it has a few years to run.

Mr. RICH. During the war emergency?

Mr. PLOESER. When they came in they asked us for a lease, which they wrote, and we gave them anything they asked for, in order to get on with the war. Now, they used 90.2 percent of the field over all these years, and we paid for the maintenance for their services.

Mr. RICH. I am not interested in giving anything more to St. Louis than to any other city, but I think you people should make your application to them and see that you get treated right and that the city gets that back. If it is worth something to the city of St. Louis they should pay something to the United States Government for what it is worth.

Mr. PLOESER. The property belongs to the city of St. Louis. This I have said repeatedly. Furthermore, we do not propose paying the Federal Government for our own property.

Mr. RICH. What about the airport which the Navy owns? Why do they need that out there?

Mr. PLOESER. The Navy does not own an airport at this location.

Mr. RICH. Then they should get rid of it, because the Army and Navy are holding on to too many things that are costing the Government a lot of money and that are not necessary. The sooner we let the Army and Navy know that they should economize in the operation of those two branches, the better off the Government will be and the better off the Army and Navy will be, and we should see that they do that.

Mr. PLOESER. I thank the gentleman.

The charges made by the St. Louis Airport report are thoroughly documented, and I ask unanimous consent to have the report extended in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

THE CRISIS CREATED BY CONTINUING FEDERAL WAR CONTROLS AT LAMBERT-ST. LOUIS AIRPORT

I. DESCRIPTION OF CITY'S AIRPORT CRISIS

The city's plight

The city of St. Louis through its authorized officials presents the following account as to its airport situation.

The story of St. Louis' airport problems is the case of a city which, with only the purpose of winning the war and without a thought of compensation, either present or future, gave, loaned, and leased for the emergency, large areas of its airport property to the various branches of the armed forces. Now, as a result of the city's efforts, it finds itself facing the ruination of its airport and air transportation program because these various agencies of the Federal Government, even though the war is over, refuse to release these various properties, and wish to control these properties with all the rights and privileges accorded them in wartime and thereby control not only the present airport but the city's ultimate airport.

Federal agencies on city's airport

The situation at Lambert-St. Louis Airport presents a unique set of circumstances completely unprecedented throughout the country. Instead of building new airports at St. Louis or expanding old ones for the crucial war activities, as was done everywhere else, our Government used the only commercial airport belonging to the city of St. Louis, adding their own special facilities and after the close of war activities, reversing the Federal policy elsewhere, retained their hold on the city's commercial facilities under the war leases. Although the city of St. Louis has devoted much thought, effort, and planning to the development of this airport and has expended large sums of bond-issue money thereon for the purpose of providing main trunk air-line facilities for the citizens of St. Louis and environs.

Although the citizens of St. Louis have voted an additional $14,397,000, an amount entirely adequate for major airport facilities for the largest air transports, nevertheless the city, through no fault of its own, now finds itself seriously handicapped by reason of the necessity for excessive expenditures to remedy circumstances forced on it by Federal occupancy of the field in the past 5 years under war conditions.

A brief visual survey of the exact situation speaks for itself. Exhibit A discloses the area of Federal activity during the past 5 years and its effect on the airport.

Federal installations overwhelm airport

It is obvious that the Curtiss-Wright plant, together with its associated area of activity, completely dominates the whole north side of the field.

It is also apparent that the Navy training station, together with its associated area of activity, usurps the major portion of the southern sector of the field.

On the west the Army, through $1-a-year leases, has taken over and occupied the entire southern half of the west end of the airport, including paved areas owned and needed by the city.

Not only have these most valuable areas been removed from utilization by the city but a glance at the exhibit indicates that also the remaining choice areas on the original field are literally "squeezed" in between these Federal activities and irretrievably preempted from being used as alternate locations in the future development of the field. Only by tripling the size of the field to the east and by greatly increased outlay has satisfactory location been made of runways, taxiways, and terminal facilities, which under the original plans could have been so advantageously fitted into the original area.

Lambert Field only possible site

By far the greatest damage to the city of St. Louis as a result of the location of the Curtiss-Wright building on its present site is the fact that this building introduces hazards to, and usurps a portion of, Lambert Field, which field is absolutely irreplaceable and is the sole locality in which a major airport can now be developed by the city of St. Louis.

The city of St. Louis is in the unique situation of being completely surrounded by St. Louis County, yet being no part of the county. Citizens of St. Louis pay no county taxes, do not vote in the county, nor do they have any voice in county affairs.

The city derives its power to acquire land for airport purposes by virtue of a State statute which contains the proviso that "no airport or landing field shall be established or located in any county, city, or city under special charter in violation of any plan or master airport plan or zoning regulation restricting the location of any airport or landing field adopted by the planning commission of any county, city, or city under special charter." St. Louis County has a planning and zoning commission, which commission has adopted a master airport plan, and that plan assigns only two sites as being available for the construction of major airports, namely, Lambert Field and Columbia bottoms sites. In the past the city has made special application to the planning commission for approval of another site, but was denied such permission after extensive negotiations and hearings.

Columbia bottoms 6 to 10 years away

The city is now acquiring the Columbia bottoms site, but this project is some 6 to 10 years in the future, because of delays attendant upon condemnation procedure and because of the engineering difficulties in protecting the property against floods of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Therefore, it is self-evident that for the present and for some time to come Lambert Field is, in fact, the only site available to the city of St. Louis for a major airport.

St. Louis' position in jeopardy

The city of St. Louis now has available the ample funds voted by its citizens to develop airport facilities so that St. Louis can regain its position on the schedules of the main trunk air lines. In order for St. Louis to gain its proper place as one of the major airports of the country it must have the required facilities, such as hangars, repair shops, etc., where the air lines can house and service the big planes which will then use the St. Louis airport as an originating and terminating point of transcontinental flights. This would mean flights that originate and terminate in St. Louis at reasonable hours so the citizens of St. Louis will not have to proceed to the airport at such hours as midnight or 4 o'clock in the morning or to arrive at similarly inconvenient times, using planes which are not based in St. Louis, but stop over at St. Louis on their way between other metropolitan centers. Until St. Louis is the origination and termination of flights there is no certainty that even such service as it now has will be maintained when points of origination and termination have a normal commercial priority over intermediate stations.

The need for real air transportation service is urgent. If air cargo is to be devoloped, an air-cargo depot is needed right now. The citizens have voted the money. But the various Federal agencies are today, more than a full year since the cessation of fighting, continuing to insist upon retaining control of every facility offered by the city in its war effort. (See exhibit A.) The city, obviously, dares not proceed to spend additional large sums of the taxpayers' money until it has definite assurance that it will have the use and the control of its own airport.

City's airport position critical

The city is in critical and immediate need of facilities, both for passenger and cargo planes, as well as a cargo depot. The need is now all the more urgent, for while the city has spent months attempting to arrive at an equitable solution with the Federal Government, summer has gone and winter is here, and the air lines must of necessity have hangars in which their planes can be housed and serviced in winter weather. It is conceivable that, if St. Louis does not demonstrate quickly that it can supply these required facilities, the city might well be bypassed as a major air terminal by the main trunk air lines who are already well along in their postwar plans.

II. HOW DID CITY GET INTO THIS SITUATION AND WHY?

How and why did city permit this?

The foregoing shows clearly that St. Louis faces a crisis in its air-transportation situation because vital areas of its airport are in the hands of Federal agencies.

A natural and fair question is, "How did these Federal agencies get control of the vital areas of St. Louis' airport?" and "Why did St. Louis turn these vital areas over to these Federal agencies?"

These questions are answered herewith.

Curtiss-Wright building

In 1940 the city of St. Louis leased 46.8 acres of land in Lambert-St. Louis Airport to the Curtiss-Wright Corp. with the understanding that the Defense Plant Corporation would finance a plant thereon in which airplanes would be manufactured for the United States Army.

A lease was signed and later amended and transferred to the Defense Plant Corporation. This lease provided that the Government could have the use of the land for 25 years if it was needed, provided that the plant was used for Government purposes. The city made no attempt to get a fair rental for this property but leased it to the Government for a nominal amount. The city also gave the free use of the airfield, including the testing of airplanes made in the plant. The city required very few restrictions, but it did include in the lease a provision that if anything other than airplanes or airplane parts were manufactured that the right to use the airfield would be canceled.

The city also had the all-important clause inserted in the lease which provided that in the event the Government wished to install a tenant which was not a department of the Government, the city should have the veto power and control of such tenancy. The city did not know at that time and does not know at this time of any other way to control its airport without having control of this all-important site.

Navy training station

The city, in 1941, transferred to the Navy Department a 21.5-acre piece of its airport opposite to the Curtiss-Wright site. For this the city accepted a token payment of only $50; the commercial value of this lease on an earning basis of its prominence and importance to the city's airport would easily be on a valuation of $1,000,000. The purpose of this was to enable the Navy to build and operate a naval training station, and the city gave the Navy the free and unrestricted use of the city's then-existing airfield, the only restriction being that it was to be used for training Navy pilots.

The city takes great pride in the Navy's statement that more and better pilots came from this area than any comparable area in the United States—and, especially important, these were among the first pilots to reach the combat areas.

The Army's lease

The city also leased (W-782-Eng-107) to the Army on May 1, 1942, the southwest corner of the airport, an 8.404-acre tract, for a

token rent of $1.00 per year. The big city hangar on this site was used by the Army for the repairing and housing of planes and as a depot for Army Training Corps planes, and the Army encroached on the airfield proper to the extent of at least double the rented area for all the various air-forces functions, including testing and installation of bomber turrets.

Other concessions

The city of St. Louis made several other arrangements of this type in cooperating with the war effort. An example of this is the lease for the enclosed roof of the city's overcrowded Terminal Building, which is rented to the Army at a rental of 20 cents per year.

City's motives 100-percent patriotic

The foregoing makes it crystal clear that the city of St. Louis in all of its dealings with the Federal Government was motivated only by a desire to contribute all it could to its country's defense. Without thought of profit or even compensation, the city turned over large strategic areas of its airport to the Federal Government.

City paid operating expense of military airport

A factor of equal importance is that with these gifts the city let the Federal agencies take over control of the city's airport and in effect operated its airport for 5 years at the city's expense—$250,000 per year for 5 years—for the benefit of these agencies of the Federal Government. This is evident from the fact that 90.2 percent of the total number of commercial and military operations on the field from April 1, 1941, to November 1, 1946, were operations by military aircraft.

III. WHAT HAS CITY DONE TO RESOLVE ITS CRISIS?

Negotiations

The city has exercised the utmost patience and has assiduously followed every avenue of approach open to it to bring the matter to an equitable settlement as the following brief recounting plainly proves.

Meeting with Hon. John L. Sullivan, Admiral Salada, et al.

The Honorable W. C. PLOESER, Congressman from St. Louis, arranged for a meeting, and on Friday, May 24, 1946, Gen. Clifford W. Gaylord, chairman of the executive committee, St. Louis Airport Commission, Mayor Aloys P. Kaufmann, Hon. Milton M. Kinsey, president, Board of Public Service of St. Louis, proceeded to Washington and together with Congressman PLOESER met with the Navy's representatives in the office of the Honorable John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of Navy for Air. In addition to the Assistant Secretary of Navy for Air, other Navy representatives were present including Rear Admiral Salada, Bureau of Aeronautics, Rear Adm. R. E. Jennings, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Air, Rear Adm. T. B. McQuiston, Bureau of Yards and Docks, and Capt. H. R. Nieman, Jr.

The city's representatives explained the necessity for the city's obtaining title to the Curtiss-Wright facilities and Lambert-St. Louis airport. It was pointed out by the city's representatives that the present lease on these facilities as well as other leases, easements, etc., would need to be canceled in order for the city to have control of the airfield and reduce to a minimum all flying which was now conflicting so seriously with commercial activities. The city's representatives also set forth the city's urgent need for space in the highway area and for the Curtiss-Wright building so that large planes of the main trunk air lines which wished to operate turn-about flights from the Lambert-St. Louis airport could be serviced. It was pointed out at this meeting that urgent requests had been received from American, Eastern, and the Chicago and Southern Air Lines for facilities so that they could inaugurate new flights at St. Louis. The city's representatives advised the Navy that the city was willing to have McDonnell Aircraft Corp. continue to occupy space they actually needed in the Curtiss-Wright facilities, but it was agreed among all the conferees that McDonnell's present arrangement of his plant and equipment was inefficient and that he was occupying a great deal more space than was required.

In view of the urgency of the situation, the Navy agreed to send representatives to St. Louis early the next week to discuss the matter.

Captain Pihl in St. Louis

In accordance with arrangements made at the meeting on May 24, 1946, in Assistant Secretary Sullivan's office, Capt. P. E. Pihl and Lt. Jeffries Pace of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics called at the office of Milton M. Kinsey, president of the Board of Public Service on Tuesday, May 28, at which time Mr. Kinsey again outlined the city's immediate need for space in the highway area and its need to regain control of its airport.

On Wednesday, May 29, representatives of the city including Mr. James V. Frank of the law department, and Mr. Kinsey met with Captain Pihl, Commander Baldwin, Lieutenant Pace, of the Navy, Mr. McDonnell, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Drake, of McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and Mr. George Logan.

Captain Pihl set forth the Navy's position that Curtiss-Wright facilities were to be retained as one of the group of seven or eight reserve plants, and although he agreed that the underlying lease was given by the city on a patriotic basis, he doubted that the city's desire to secure title to the building was possible of accomplishment.

It was agreed that the city was in immediate and desperate need of space in the highway area and various plans were discussed for giving the city from 80,000 to 160,000 square feet of that area.

McDonnell's proposal vetoed by AAL

On Friday, May 31, Hon. Milton M. Kinsey, president, Board of Public Service, Col. James H. Howard, director of aeronautics in St. Louis, and Mr. Ken Crago, of American Airlines proceeded to Lambert Field and held a discussion with Mr. J. S. McDonnell and Mr. Drake, of McDonnell Aircraft Corp. At this meeting Mr. McDonnell submitted a plan whereby the city would receive 65,000 square feet of space in an irregular shape in which he stated five DC-4 could be accommodated if the air lines were willing to use dollies and jockey the planes into position with a tractor.

Mr. Crago immediately characterized this plan as wholly unsatisfactory to American Airlines, and Mr. McDonnell agreed to prepare another plan increasing the area to 85,000 square feet.

Admiral McQuiston in St. Louis

On Tuesday, June 4, 1946, a meeting was held at Lambert Field at which the following were present: Mayor Kaufman, General Gaylord, Milton M. Kinsey, and James H. Howard, representing the city; Rear Admiral McQuiston, Captain Nieman, Captain Lyons, Commander Cleave, and others representing the Navy. Admiral McQuiston opened the meeting by declaring that after a great deal of thought and since the meeting of May 24 and a careful examination of other fields in the vicinity of St. Louis, he had definitely decided that Lambert-St. Louis Airport was the only field which the Navy found satisfactory for the Naval Air Station. After this pronouncement, Admiral McQuiston stated that it was not the Navy's policy to permit their flights to interfere in any way with commercial aviation. He agreed that the city was entitled to be reimbursed by the Navy for the Navy's use of Lambert Field.

The city's representatives expressed grave doubt that the Navy could continue to utilize Lambert Field as their Naval Training Station and still not interfere with commercial aviation.

Meeting in Congressman Ploeser's office with Navy

On Wednesday, July 24, 1946, the Honorable WALTER C. PLOESER and Mr. Frank McGregor proceeded to Washington and Mr. PLOESER called to his office for a meeting at 10 a. m. Rear Adm. H. B. Salada and Capt. P. E. Pihl. At this meeting the city's representatives explained to the Navy's representatives the city's urgent need for space in the highway area and discussed the possibility of having the Curtiss-Wright facilities declared surplus.

The Navy's representatives reluctantly agreed that the city could have 140,000 square feet of the highway area but insisted that this should be on a temporary basis, preferably for 1 year. The city's representatives explained that this would be practically of no value to the city, because the air lines must of necessity be assured of permanent hangar space if they were to inaugurate "turn about" flights at the Lambert-St. Louis Airport. Furthermore, under present building conditions, it is extremely unlikely that hangar facilities could be constructed within a year. The Navy's representatives finally agreed that the city should have possession of the 140,000 square feet of the highway area for 3 years.

The Navy's representatives further stated that if the Navy Department wrote a letter to the War Assets Administration declaring the Curtiss-Wright facilities surplus, it would be necessary to include some restrictions which would provide that McDonnell Aircraft Corp. should continue to occupy the premises so long as the Navy desired, and that in the event of an emergency the entire facility would be turned over to the Navy upon 90 days' notice.

Meeting in Ploeser's office with Navy, RFC, and WAA

Following the meeting with the Navy's representatives earlier in the forenoon, another meeting was held in Congressman PLOESER'S office at 11:30 a. m., Wednesday, July 24, 1946. Those present were Hon. Walter C. Ploeser; Mr. L. A. Kelley, associate counsel, RFC; Mr. E. L. Bridges, Chief, Industrial Branch, Legal Division, WAA; Mr. W. O. Manley, Director, Airport Division, WAA; Mr. Patrick H. Clark, WAA; Lt. J. Jeffries Pace, Bureau of Aeronautics; Capt. P. E. Pihl, special assistant to Chief of Bureau of Aeronautics; and Frank McGregor.

Representatives of WAA stated that they did not believe they could accept a declaration of surplus which had restrictions such as those the Navy indicated they intended to include, and that in any event WAA would not classify the Curtis-Wright facilities as airport facilities and transfer title of them to the city.

Following these meetings, Frank McGregor remained in Washington for 10 days and held numerous meetings with members of the Navy, RFC, and WAA. As a result of all of these conferences, the Navy finally wrote a letter setting forth the conditions under which it would declare the Curtiss-Wright facilities surplus (see exhibit C), and WAA eventually agreed to accept such a declaration of surplus. WAA, however, insisted that the Curtiss-Wright facilities could not be given to the city as surplus facilities but would have to be purchased by the city as surplus industrial facilities.

WAA: Not airport facilities

War Assets stated that they felt their classification committee would so rule regardless of the fact that the highway area would be used for airplane housing and maintenance and regardless of the fact that it might be entirely separated by divisional wall from the rest of the building. It seemed that the classification committee would make a ruling to avoid the responsibility of ex-

plaining such rule to other cities not entirely in conformity but somewhat similarly situated.

Possible purchase from WAA

The city's representatives discussed with WAA the possibility of the city's buying the Curtiss-Wright facilities and WAA stated that the cost of constructing the facilities south of the Wabash tracks was approximately $9,500,000 and approximately $2,000,000 for facilities north of the tracks. WAA's first asking price of the facilities for negotiating purposes was $5,500,000 which they indicated they were willing to cut in half.

Mr. Kelley re city's damages

Meetings were held August 8 and 9, 1946, at St. Louis at which Mr. L. A. Kelley, associate counsel of RFC, Mr. Lee, St. Louis office of RFC, Captain Pihl, Captain Garton, and Lieutenant Pace of the Navy Department were present with representatives of the city including Hon. Walter C. Ploeser, Gen. C. W. Gaylord, Milton M. Kinsey, James Frank, and Frank McGregor. After prolonged discussion Mr. Kelley stated that if the city could show that it had suffered damages in a substantial amount, there was no law, no ruling, and no precedent to prevent the Board of RFC from renting to the city those parts of the Curtiss-Wright facilities the city needed at a nominal rental sufficient to cover RFC's dispersals for the maintenance of these parts of the facilities. The plan was that the city could in turn rent these facilities to the air lines at going rentals and thus liquidate some of the damages sustained because of the Federal installations on the city's airport.

A special meeting was held on August 9, 1946, with General Gaylord, Milton M. Kinsey, James Frank, L. A. Kelley, Mr. Lee, Lt. Pace, and Frank McGregor present. Mr. Kelley instructed and advised the city's counsel and other city representatives how to prepare the memorandum setting forth these damages.

The city prepared a memorandum in accordance with this advice from Mr. Kelley which showed that even a partial computation established damages at $3,540,000.

This memorandum was presented to RFC in its office in Washington on September 6, 1946, by Frank McGregor. During the 10 days the city's representative remained in Washington for the purpose, meetings were held with Mr. Kelley, Mr. Frank C. Ronan, Executive Director, Office of Defense Plants, RFC, and Mr. Alan Brown, Assistant Chief Counsel, Office of Defense Plants, RFC.

Mr. Kelley reverses himself

At these meetings Mr. Kelley reversed his position and stated that even though the city had suffered damages to the extent set forth in the memorandum, it was not the responsibility of RFC. The three gentlemen of RFC stated flatly that they would not recommend to the RFC Board that it proceed along the lines discussed so optimistically by Mr. Kelley at the meetings in St. Louis a short time earlier.

Mr. Kelley interprets underlying lease

Mr. Kelley further maintained, with the support of Messrs. Ronan and Brown, that while the provisions in the ground lease (Plancor 17A) were binding on the city as to all of the city's obligations thereunder, the provisions were invalid which provided that the tenant of the building must be approved by the city and would forfeit his right to use the airfield if he manufactured anything other than airplanes or airplane parts. These gentlemen said the latter two provisions were "bad law" and Mr. Kelley expressed himself as quite confident that in the event of a court action he could obtain the court's approval of his interpretation.

WAA indicates interest in $500,000 bid

On Friday, September 13, 1946, the city's representative, Frank McGregor, again called on Mr. E. L. Bridges, Chief, Industrial Bureau, Legal Division, WAA, to discuss the possibility of purchase of the Curtiss-Wright facilities from WAA, when declared surplus in accordance with the Navy letter referred to above. The Navy's expressed desire to keep these facilities as a "reserve plant" was discussed, and Mr. Bridges agreed that this restriction would definitely limit the number of possible purchasers and would drastically affect the sale price of the facilities. At the conclusion of the interview, Mr. Bridges agreed that if the Navy were to hold the facilities as a "reserve plant," WAA would consider a bid of $500,000, but if the Navy removed the "reserve" classification WAA would probably insist on $1,000,000.

First trip of mayor and others to Washington

On September 25, 1946, Hon. Walter C. Ploeser, Mayor A. P. Kaufmann, Postmaster B. F. Dickmann, and Gen. C. W. Gaylord, chairman of the executive committee of the airport commission, Frank McGregor, and Ray Raleigh proceeded to Washington. Two meetings were held with staff members of the RFC—Mr. Frank P. Ronan, Executive Director, Office of Defense Plants, RFC, and Mr. Lynas A. Kelley, Associate Counsel, Office of Defense Plants, RFC, Hon. Walter C. Ploeser and the city's representatives present. At these two meetings, on September 26 and 27, respectively, the RFC representatives presented several proposals, the final one of which proposed:

RFC proposition

RFC lease to the city of St. Louis the 140,000 square feet of highway area and the buildings north of the Wabash tracks for a period of 3 years, subject to examination in 3 years by the Navy to see if the lease could be extended beyond that period.

The city pay rent of $1 per year plus maintenance plus proportionate share of the taxes—probably about one-fifth. (There are no taxes on city-owned property.)

Elimination of the provision for a free airport, landing fees to be paid on a commercial basis by all parties using this airport—this to include Federal agencies.

The city's right to approve or disapprove the tenancy of the Curtiss-Wright buildings to be eliminated from lease, but some reasonable limitation be worked out as to the uses of the buildings.

Navy have the right to declare the property surplus at any time and city's lease would expire coincidental to this declaration of surplus by the Navy.

Meeting with Hon. John Snyder

Following the meeting in the office of Mr. Ronan on Friday, September 27, General Gaylord and Postmaster Dickmann had a meeting with Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, in his office. Mr. Snyder expressed great interest in the city's airport problem and suggested that the gentlemen discuss the matter with some members of the RFC Board, and said he would endeavor to arrange an appointment. Mr. Snyder telephoned immediately, and upon finding the several directors he telephoned out of town, suggested that he would make an appointment in the near future, at which time these gentlemen could be interviewed.

Second visit of mayor et al. to Washington

Consequently, on Tuesday, October 1, Mayor Kaufmann, Postmaster Dickmann, and General Gaylord proceeded to Washington and met with Mr. George S. Allen, Director of the RFC. Mr. Allen introduced them to Mr. Louis Bean, who was described by Mr. Allen as RFC's trouble-shooter, and Mr. Allen then assigned Mr. Bean to the job of helping the city's representatives get the airport situation settled to the city's satisfaction.

RFC's revised offer

Mr. Bean conducted the city's representatives to the office of Mr. L. A. Kelley, associate counsel, Office of Defense Plants, RFC, where, after some discussion, Mr. Kelley agreed that RFC would lease the city the highway area and the property north of the tracks for $1 per year, and that RFC would drop its demand that the city relinquish its authority to approve or disapprove any tenant in the Curtiss-Wright Building.

Mr. Kelley stated that RFC could give a lease to the city, but that it was subject to being terminated if at any time the Navy decided that it wished to surrender the premises. Under these circumstances, McDonnell Aircraft Corp. would move from the buildings, the Navy would declare the buildings surplus, and they would be transferred to WAA for disposal.

Mr. Kelley said, however, that the city could obtain an agreement from WAA at the time the lease for the building was made with RFC. This agreement could provide that WAA would agree to permit the city to retain possession of the premises until the termination date. Mr. Bean later advised the city's representatives that RFC could obtain this letter for the city from WAA.

Meeting at WAA

The city's representatives again communicated with the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder, who arranged a meeting for them with Major General Littlejohn, WAA Administrator and his deputies, Mr. Robertson and General O'Brien. However, neither of these two gentlemen attended the meeting and the city's representatives conferred in a conference room at the Railroad Retirement Building with Mr. Fuller, Acting Department Administrator, WAA; Mr. O. H. Beasley, Chief, General Manufacturing Branch Real Property, WAA; Mr. A. H. Green, attorney, Office of Real Property Disposal, Legal Division; and Mr. E. R. Heiberg, special assistant, Office of Field Service, WAA. The proposition of declaring the Curtiss-Wright building surplus and giving it to the city of St. Louis as airport facilities was discussed and vetoed by the WAA representatives.

WAA's selling price

The proposition of the city's buying the building was then discussed and Mr. Beasley said the Curtiss-Wright building south of the tracks cost over $9,000,000 and the building north of the tracks cost over $2,000,000 and the WAA put a valuation of $5,500,000 on it. He indicated that WAA would consider cutting the price at this time to $2,750,000 if the city wanted to buy the building. However, before the city's representatives left the building, Mr. Beasley withdrew even this figure.

Beasley's lecture on patriotism

During this discussion Mr. Beasley delivered a lecture on patriotism to Mayor Kaufmann and the other representatives of the city. The theme of Mr. Beasley's lecture was that the city of St. Louis should be willing to permit the installations of the Federal Government to continue to occupy, dominate and control Lambert-St. Louis Airport as a patriotic gesture. Mr. Beasley did not indicate any plan St. Louis might follow to provide a place and facilities for main trunk air lines to land their planes and have them garaged and serviced so that the city might regain its prewar position on the air schedules of the air lines. In fact Mr. Beasley did not indicate by word or action that he felt that St. Louis had any right to be on the national air-lines schedules at all.

WAA banking on Kelley's new attitude

The War Assets people gratuitously assured the city's representatives that they were sure Mr. Kelley would be successful in persuading the courts that his opinion was correct as to the invalidity of the city's veto power of a tenant in the Curtiss-Wright building. They stated that they had seen Mr. Kelley win a great many cases for the Federal Government. They were quite frank in stating that this greatly enhanced the

value of the buildings, and that they were relying on this opinion to substantially increase the amount of money the Federal Government expected to get for the buildings.

WAA demurs at assuring city possession of buildings

The city's representatives then inquired as to the possibility of receiving a letter from WAA assuring the city possession of the buildings for the full tenure of their lease in the event the facilities were declared surplus. Mr. Fuller stated that the WAA would be unable to advise RFC without all the facts, and also the Army and the Navy must both approve. He added that any decision made by WAA must be so made that it would be able to make like decisions for other cities.

RFC rescinds its offer

Before leaving Washington, the city's representatives communicated with Miss Kelley in Secretary Snyder's office and a meeting was arranged for the city's representatives with the top officials of the WAA for Monday, October 7. The date of this meeting was later changed to Thursday, October 10. On Monday, October 7, Mr. Bean telephoned Mayor Kaufmann in St. Louis and said that RFC had again reversed itself and had withdrawn its proposition of renting the city the space in the Curtiss-Wright facilities for $1, and further stated that RFC now declared that no lease of any kind could be made unless the city agreed to the elimination of the clause in the underlying ground lease which permits the city to approve or disapprove any tenant in the Curtiss-Wright building. In view of this, immediate plans for a further meeting were abandoned.

Federal agencies' shabby treatment of city's representatives

The foregoing recitation of the dodging, twisting, and turning of the Federal agencies in Washington is both illuminating and distressing. Their attempts to hide behind technicalities, their practice of submitting proposals and then repudiating them, and even their arrogant attempts to intimidate the representatives of St. Louis out of their legal rights as written in a contract are not, we submit, the accepted pattern of the way one echelon of a democratic government should treat another echelon of that same government. The machinations of these Federal agencies have been characterized as the Washington run-around. The history of St. Louis' honest efforts to assist these same agencies in time of war does not, we believe, justify such shabby treatment.

IV. HOW HAVE FEDERAL AGENCIES COOPERATED?

The attitude of the Federal agencies concerned and their effect on the city's postwar airport crisis do not make a pretty picture. There is no instance where one of these agencies has moved to assist the city in its efforts to extricate itself from the crisis which now confronts it.

It is a strange fact that these Federal agencies to whom the city practically gave its airport with all expenses paid for the duration of the war are prolonging and intensifying the city's postwar aviation crisis. Neither have these Federal agencies hesitated to seize upon any technicality nor even arrogantly violated the city's contractual rights in their determined efforts to continue to control the city's airport.

The Army's exit

Now let us look at the Federal Government's handling of the Curtiss-Wright building built by Defense Plant Corporation on land leased for a nominal fee to the Federal Government.

The Curtiss-Wright Co., continued to manufacture planes and parts in this building erected on the city's airport until the summer of 1945 when information was received that the Army, in curtailing its airplane production, was preparing to have these facilities declared surplus. The city moved at that time to have title to these facilities transferred to the city and received verbal assent from the War Assets Administration that in the absence of higher priority interference such transfer could be made of the property, as surplus airport facilities, to the city.

Navy moves McDonnell in Curtiss-Wright building

However, the Navy Department, exercising its higher priority, took over the Curtiss-Wright building on loan from the Army and in October 1945 the city received a letter from RFC, who was acting in behalf of the Navy, requesting approval of the tenancy of McDonnell Aircraft Corp., a company developing airplanes for the Navy Department. Although the city never gave this approval, as required by the ground lease, McDonnell Aircraft Corp. was moved into the building without the knowledge or consent of the city of St. Louis.

The McDonnell problem

The McDonnell Aircraft Corp. still occupies and controls all of the Curtiss-Wright building. The RFC installed the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. in the Curtiss-Wright building through the device of a letter of intent. The provisions of this letter gave McDonnell the right to occupy the premises and manufacture anything any Government agency requests even though the intent of the city's ground lease was to provide that only airplanes and airplane parts can be manufactured. McDonnell is thus spread out over the entire building which he obviously does not need, for his peak employment is 3,000 employees, while Curtiss-Wright, when it occupied the building, employed as many as 16,000 people.

The arrangement also contemplates McDonnell's free and unrestricted use of the city's airfield at any and all times.

According to a letter written to the city by RFC dated October 15, 1945, the rent charged to McDonnell for all this space and these privileges is $1 per year.

One of the agonizing factors of the city's position is the attitude that McDonnell has taken. The city approached the Navy Department and RFC with a suggestion that some of the surplus space not needed by McDonnell, including 140,000 square feet of the highway area, which the city needs so badly to house commercial air-line planes, be transferred to the city. Upon hearing this, Mr. McDonnell took the position that he and his company has been sold down the river and threatened that if the city did not cease "persecuting" him, he would move his plant to another city.

McDonnell's maneuvering re prefabricated housing in Curtiss-Wright building

And now McDonnell has developed a new project. Within the last 30 days, the McDonnell Corp. has expressed its intention of manufacturing prefabricated houses in the Curtiss-Wright building and has, in fact, carried on negotiations with the Federal Housing Administration to this end. McDonnell, in doing this, is relying, apparently, on the letter of intent given to it by RFC. High-ranking naval officers have assured the city's representatives that this letter of intent has all the force and competency of a formal contract or lease.

At the time McDonnell did this, there was available (and still is) ample unoccupied Federal Government-owned manufacturing space in the vicinity of St. Louis which McDonnell could easily have obtained if he seriously desired to manufacture prefabricated houses.

The explanation for McDonnell's maneuvering becomes apparent when it is realized that a directive from the Housing Administrator for McDonnell to manufacture prefabricated houses in the Curtiss-Wright building would at that time have been binding on the RFC and the Navy, and the letter of intent written by RFC to McDonnell gave him the right to manufacture anything required by any Federal Government agency.

This is contrary to the provisions of the underlying ground lease, but had the city protested, it is quite probable that it would have been put in the position of hindering the production of prefabricated houses in the face of the acute housing shortage that plagues the Nation.

Army's $1 lease

What of the tract with the big city hangar rented to the Army for $1 per year?

The United States engineers speaking for the War Department have indicated that the Army no longer needs this 8.4-acre tract and the big hangar which the city turned over to it at a token rental of $1 per year and is prepared to declare it surplus.

In dozens of similar cases all over the country, where the Federal Government had actually purchased the land and spent millions of dollars erecting runways and buildings on it, the properties have been declared surplus airport facilities and transferred to the cities free. Not so in the case of St. Louis even though the city owns the land and built all the facilities on the airport.

The city has been reliably informed that the United States engineers consider this $1-a-year lease a valuable property and is peddling it to other Government agencies.

RFC's attitude toward ground lease

RFC maintains an adamant position. In numerous meetings held between representatives of the city of St. Louis and RFC, RFC has maintained that it was completely within its rights in issuing its letter of intent turning over the Curtiss-Wright property with all the additional privileges conveyed to McDonnell in violation of the provisions of the underlying lease.

RFC further contends that the city has signed a lease renting land to the Federal Government for 25 years and that these provisions of the lease are valid and must be honored.

RFC on the other hand contends just as stanchly that the provisions in the lease which provide that no tenant should be moved into the building without the city's approval and the provision that nothing but airplanes and airplane parts can be manufactured in the building without loss of the privileges of the flying field are not valid and they aver that the Supreme Court will uphold RFC's contention.

In other words, it is RFC's contention that all provisions in the lease are valid which give rights to the top echelon, the Federal Government, but the provisions that give rights to the city of St. Louis, another echelon of our Government, are invalid.

RFC's tactics

RFC would appear to be so eager to save its face that it would be willing to use the power of the top echelon of the Federal Government to "bull through" the provisions of its letter of intent to McDonnell Aircraft Corp. at the expense of and in complete disregard of the rights of another echelon of our Government—the city of St. Louis—that it would risk a suit for damages from McDonnell.

In the event the city decides to avail itself of its legal remedies and evict McDonnell from the premises, since he is there without the city's approval in direct violation of the city's underlying ground lease, it would appear that RFC would be liable for damages to McDonnell for loss of the following privileges given McDonnell in the letter of intent:

1. Occupancy and control of the entire Curtiss-Wright building.

2. Free and unrestricted use of the city airfield at all times.

3. Manufacturing of any product needed by any Federal agency.

Navy's attitude

The Navy's attitude has progressed from a disinterest in the city's airport problems and a determination to keep for itself what the Navy had at Lambert-St. Louis Airport to one of reluctant acquiescence to the city's temporarily regaining certain parts of its airport now under the control of the Navy. On other parts the Navy has continued adamant in its determination to hold on.

Navy's concessions re Curtiss-Wright facilities

At the outset when negotiations were started the Navy told the city bluntly that the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. had been installed in the Curtiss-Wright facilities at $1 rent per year, and if the city wished to secure space in the building it should negotiate with McDonnell. This attitude on the part of Navy was not acceptable to the city in view of the fact that McDonnell had been illegally installed in the building by RFC at the request of the Navy without the consent or knowledge of the city in violation of the underlying ground lease which provides that no tenant other than a department of the Federal Government can be installed in the building unless the city had first approved the tenant.

Navy rewarding McDonnell at city's expense

The Navy's explanation for installing McDonnell at $1 per year was that McDonnell had done good experimental and development work for the Navy, and the Navy wished to reward McDonnell.

The melancholy truth from the city's point of view is that the Navy is rewarding McDonnell at the expense of the city, and in so doing is contributing to the strangling of the city's already partially suffocated aviation program.

St. Louis has no objection to the Navy's rewarding of McDonnell for past performances. The city does, however, object to the Navy's doing it at the expense of St. Louis' future in aviation.

The Navy has gradually and reluctantly made some temporary concessions. It has agreed to arrange for the city to have some 140,000 square feet in the highway area of the Curtiss-Wright building south of the Wabash railroad tracks and possession of the building north of those tracks. But there is a joker to the agreement to give the city 140,000 square feet of highway area—it is limited to 3 years, at which time the space must be turned back to the Navy.

City could be evicted on moment's notice

In the event the Navy decides to cancel its contract with McDonnell and declare the Curtiss-Wright facilities surplus, the city is to be evicted from both the highway area in the building south of the tracks as well as the building north of the Wabash Railroad tracks, unless the city can make some arrangement with WAA to stay awhile longer. The city's unhappy attempts to get some reasonable proposition from WAA have been described in the accounts of the meetings held between the city's representatives and those of WAA.

It can be seen in what a precarious situation the city would be placed when it is understood that the Navy has the right to cancel its contract with McDonnell at any time and declare the facilities surplus. Under this set-up, the city could well find itself dispossessed a month or even a day after it signed its agreement with the Navy or RFC as the Navy's agent.

We submit that this is a sleazy foundation on which to build an aviation program. How are main trunk air lines to be attracted to St. Louis if they are in danger of being evicted from the hangars in which their planes are to be housed and serviced on a moment's notice?

Navy's position re naval training station

The Navy's position remains unyielding regarding the 21.5 acres turned over to it by the city for $50 to be used as a naval training station. The only concession the Navy has made has been to promise that Navy pilots will not train on Lambert Field. That is, the planes will still be stationed at the air-training station, will take off from Lambert Field, and land there upon returning, often in large groups that usurp the landing field for long periods of time to the hazard, detriment, and delay of commercial main trunk air-line planes.

Obviously, this is no solution to the city's problem. The city must have its sole major airport free of military aircraft so that the major air-line planes can land safely and on schedule.

Further, the city needs the hangars now being used by the Navy. The Navy, however, insists that Lambert-St. Louis Airport is the only one in the St. Louis area that meets its requirements (see Admiral McQuiston's statement in report on meeting at the airport June 4, 1946), and the Navy has indicated that it fully intends to hold this tract of land, and, further, it plans to continue to use Lambert-St. Louis Airport.

Navy training and commercial aviation

The Navy still operates the naval training station it constructed on the 21½ acres transferred to it by the city for $50, and has not indicated by word or action any intention of returning this property to the city, even though the surrender of Japan came over a year ago. Astounding as it may be, the Navy gives every indication of planning to enlarge this station and of continuing to operate it indefinitely. The impossibility of such a plan is obvious.

The inconsistency of military air training and commercial flying at the same airfield need not be labored. It is evident on the face of it that they are innately incompatible. On the one hand we have piloting the commercial airplane a man with hundreds of flying hours indoctrinated with a supreme regard for safety. His one duty toward which every effort is concentrated is to avoid danger and land his passengers at their destination safely.

The military flyer, on the other hand, is far apart from this concept of flying. Surely, he wants to bring his plane back safely and walk away from each landing. However, he is and must of necessity be trained to be a daring flyer. If he is ever going to be a good military pilot, he must take chances that a commercial air-line's pilot would avoid assiduously.

There have been incidents of pilots from the naval training station who, in their youthful exuberance, have violated the laws governing flying and flown dangerously low over heavily populated areas, "buzzed" residents, homes, and so forth. These incidents, however, while detrimental to aviation in St. Louis, do not constitute the major problem. The Navy's statement that pilots will not practice at Lambert-St. Louis Airport, but will just take off there, practice elsewhere and land, and then proceed to their station does not solve the problem.

It is the fundamental difference between military and civilian commercial flying and the hazard that is created when the two are located at the same place that makes it imperative that the situation be rectified.

Increased traffic volume brings a separate and different problem not one whit less vital to the operation of St. Louis Airport. There are, in fact, two separate factors. First, as discussed above, the hazard inherent in the differences in equipment, operational practices, procedures, and attitudes deliberately acquired by training; and, second, control of the volume of traffic. Naturally, greater traffic congestion might markedly increase any element of hazard due to difference in equipment and operation. But an increase in the volume of traffic may also affect the hazard and the volume of military traffic is for all practical matters entirely outside the control of the airport authorities or CAA. This refers to instrument as well as contact flying. Thus, even assuming that the military will eventually submit to all CAA controls on all occasions in exact conformance to commercial flying and disregarding the weakness of CAA having to deal with military organizations and not directly and individually with the military personnel who unlike commercial pilots are unlicensed, we still have the volume problem since no other organization can so completely preempt the traffic lanes by sheer numbers.

Already many have expressed reluctance to fly on planes operating from Lambert-St. Louis Airport because of this jeopardy. In view of the considerable number of passengers carried by the large four-motored planes, it is not pleasant to contemplate the magnitude of the disaster that might result if one of these young Navy pilots were to crash his fast, "hot" plane into a big, slower, and much less maneuverable commercial plane prior to its landing or after the take-off from Lambert Field. Apart from the tragic loss of life in such an accident, the effect on the attitude of the flying public toward St. Louis Airport is incalculable.

The Navy has not paid 1 cent for the use of the city's airport.

Navy had city's only major airport blocked

To sum up, we see that the Navy has maneuvered so that it has the city's sole major airport blocked in on the north by the 48-acre Curtiss-Wright facilities and on the south by the 21.5-acre naval training station and, except for a period of 3 years when the city will be permitted to use part of the Curtiss-Wright building, the Navy plans to hold these blocks indefinitely in a total disregard of the ruinous consequences to St. Louis' air-transportation future.

Army engineers and city's land and hangar

The Army engineers have stated publicly that they no longer need the 8.4-acre tract and the big city hangar thereon leased to them by the city for $1 per year. However, they have categorically refused to return it to the city and are, in fact, now in the process of peddling this lease to other Government agencies as a "valuable property."

Army engineers in administration building

The Army engineers have advised the city, in an official communication in words more blunt than courteous, that they propose to transfer their 20-cents-per-year lease for the enclosed top of the city's administration building to another Federal agency—regardless of the fact that their emergency is over and they no longer need the space for which the city is entitled to use for the best interests of its citizens and to charge normal rentals if leased to others.

City's air in war crisis

When the top echelon of our Government faced the crisis of all-out war, the city of St. Louis rushed forward to help and turned over strategic areas of its airport for the duration of that crisis.

City now faces crisis

Now, as the direct result of its efforts to help win the war, the city faces a crisis in its air-transportation program. The crisis of war has been liquidated and the purpose for which the land was turned over has been achieved—the war has been won. But the top echelon takes no heed of the city's plight. No cognizance is taken of the spirit of patriotism and unselfishness that impelled the city to turn over vital areas of its airport for the duration. Every technicality is seized upon and these Federal agencies even violate

the city's rights, as set forth in the documents mutually signed.

City's motives impugned

The city is treated with the cold, evasive technique usually reserved for an anxious and none-too-scrupulous trader. Astonishing as it may be, the Federal agencies have impugned the city's motives and declared that "the city must have had some powerful and far-reaching motive of self-interest in turning these tracts over to the armed services of the United States."

Federal agencies return evil for good

In summarizing the effect the actions of the Federal Government are having upon the St. Louis aviation crisis we are forced to the conclusion that evil is being returned for good.

V. WHAT IS SOLUTION?

City demands restoration

The city of St. Louis now calls upon the Federal agencies involved to cease their high-jinks, abandon their dilatory and evasive tactics, and restore to the city its properties which were turned over by the city to these Federal agencies to help them wage war.

The city of St. Louis has been wearied by the lectures on patriotism delivered, on occasion, to the mayor and other representatives by the bureaucrats in Washington who, at the same time, were coldly interpreting the rules pertaining to the municipal airfield, the same as if it were a commercial enterprise, and seizing upon every possible technicality to maintain their throttling hold on the city's airport.

The people of St. Louis would like to know if "patriotism" requires that the expenses cannot be divided among all of the 140,000,000 people of the country, but must be saddled on the 1,000,000 people of St. Louis. Or has St. Louis been singled out as the one city which is to have all of the postwar patriotism for the whole nation?

St. Louis has amply demonstrated its patriotism by turning over its airport to the armed services for the duration of hostilities—the city paying for the operation of the airport during that time.

Federal Government's gifts to other cities

The city of St. Louis knows that all over this country the Federal Government has given airports worth millions of dollars to cities. These airports were constructed by agencies of the Federal Government and paid for out of Federal funds—the cities, in many cases, not having one penny invested in the airport.

In other cases the Federal Government bought airports from cities, used them during the war, spent millions of dollars improving these airports, and has now returned the airports to the cities absolutely free.

St. Louis demands modest

St. Louis' demands are modest, indeed, when compared to these millions of dollars worth of airport facilities given to other cities throughout the country by the Federal Government.

The city wants the land it loaned to the Federal Government, to help with the war, to be returned now that the war is over.

All agree war measure

It is time now to call a halt to the machinations and tricks of the bureaucrats and face the issues.

The prudent city fathers of St. Louis in normal peacetimes would not have signed these unilateral leases which give the Federal Government all of the safeguards, including a 30-day cancellation clause, while the city has no such protection. Obviously these were entered into as emergency wartime measures, and it was planned and expected that they would be canceled with the advent of victory and restoration made to the city.

Federal Government destroying St. Louis' air-transportation system

On the other hand, it is inconceivable that the higher echelon of Government would select strategic sites on the city's only airport, as these were selected, unless these echelons had in mind returning these properties to the city at the conclusion of the war. To assume that these Federal agencies plan to keep these sites in perpetuity would be to assume that they are recklessly unconcerned about the crisis in aviation faced by the city of St. Louis and could well be held accountable for destroying St. Louis as a main-trunk air-line terminal.

City has only one site—Government has many

It has been established earlier that the Lambert-St. Louis Airport is not alone the only airport which St. Louis has, capable of handling major air lines large planes, but that it is the only possible site available for years to come for a major airport.

We have, then, on one hand, St. Louis with only one possible airport which has been usurped so that St. Louis, which has already lost its preeminent place on the schedules of the major air lines is now in danger of being permanently bypassed by these main trunk air lines who are already well advanced in their postwar plans.

On the other hand, the Federal agencies who are at present "sitting tight" on these strategic and critical sites, have literally scores of locations from which to choose.

Obviously, in a democratic Government such as ours, one echelon of government cannot be permitted to frivolously and wantonly destroy a very important part of the transportation system of another echelon of the Government.

War purpose achieved

The purpose for which the city leased out the land on which the Curtiss-Wright facilities are built has been accomplished—airplanes were built in these facilities which helped to win the war. This land, with facilities built thereon, should be returned to the city of St. Louis. The city is entitled to have the land back, and for the Federal Government to destroy these buildings, which the city needs so desperately would be an act of pure vandalism.

McDonnell can remain in Curtiss-Wright building

The Navy Department and the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. need have no concern as to the latters' continued tenancy in the Curtiss-Wright building when title to that building is transferred to the city. The city is happy to have McDonnell continue to occupy that portion of the building needed by McDonnell on a legitimate basis whereby he pays a fair rental to the city for the space he occupies and fees for the privilege of using the city's airfield.

Navy should return land

The Navy should return the 21.5 acres which the city turned over to it for $50 so that the Navy might have a training station where fliers to fight the war could be trained. The hangars and other buildings constructed thereon by the city are needed right now by the city. There is no longer the slightest excuse for the Navy to usurp this essential part of the city's airport for the Navy has any number of other locations on which it can establish its training station without crippling some city's one and only major airport.

Army peddling lease

The Army engineers, the agency authorized to speak for the War Department, have already stated that the 8.4 acres on which is located the big city hangar, which they rented from the city for $1 per year, is no longer necessary to their program. The Army engineers are, in fact, peddling this lease as a valuable property to other Federal agencies. This, in itself, is a fact so scandalous that the only reason it has not created a tremendous reaction among the citizens is that the fact is not generally known. It is obvious that this property should be immediately returned to the city of St. Louis.

In returning the several tracts of the city's land, with the improvements constructed thereon, to the city, the Federal Government will not be "giving" anything to the citizens of St. Louis. The land was purchased by bond-issue money, voted and paid by the citizens of St. Louis.

The buildings were not constructed with some mysterious type of money created by the bureaucrats in Washington. They were built with money from the taxpayers, and the citizens of St. Louis have paid for them many times over.

They have served the purpose for which they were loaned to the Federal agencies and should now be returned to the city which needs them in order to solve its own present airport crisis.

VI. DAMAGES DUE CITY FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The effects of Federal Government installations on the physical lay-out and development of the airport

When the Federal Government has evacuated its various agencies from Lambert-St. Louis Airport and restored to the city the several tracts of land on which they are situated—as discussed earlier—then the city can start to fight its way back to the position to which it is entitled and which it held in air transportation before its airport was overwhelmed by the Federal agencies.

In order to get a picture of what has to be accomplished by the city to get back its rightful place in aviation, it is necessary to review the activities of these Federal agencies and assess the damage that has accrued to the airport as a direct result of these actions.

Curtiss-Wright damages

The construction of the Curtiss-Wright buildings on Lambert Field has resulted in an incalculable damage, because it constitutes a perpetual hazard to flying on the present runways and because the city must at great and increasing cost, presently of indeterminate extent, acquire new land, replan the development, and by resorting to engineering expediency, develop an airport equal to that which was originally assured.

City's airport usurped

The location of the Curtiss-Wright building, the Navy training station, and the Army's air station with their respective areas of activity extending out on the flying field have already so hemmed in and hampered the city's airport that the city's original development program has had to be permanently and drastically changed, forcing expansion onto new land, which has had to be acquired. The bare cost of this land, together with the additional expense of grading, draining, lighting, etc., is $2,590,000. This figure does not include the large additional work and expense which will be entailed, particularly in draining, but also in grading the usable part of the original airport to bring it to a mean level with the newly acquired section.

Damages due city for operation of airport for benefit of Federal agencies and additional construction costs

Thus, St. Louis not only has built its airport solely at its own expense, but now, after 6 years of Government occupancy and control—November 1, 1940, to November 1, 1946—during which the city expended over $1,500,000 to maintain and amortize this city property, it must ask its citizens to expend at least $2,590,000 more than they otherwise would for the essential development of their

airport, a total extra cost either spent to date or definitely determinable of $4,090,000.

Rentals due city

However, that is only a part of the damages suffered by the city. The Federal Government agencies who occupied (and insist on continuing to occupy) these strategic areas of the city's airport have either paid no rent to the city for the land occupied or have paid only a token rent and in no case was any pretense made of paying the city a fair rental for the land.

Damages due city for landing fees, physical damage to runways and abandonment of runways

Still other damages due the city from these Federal agencies include landing fees for military aircraft, physical damages to runways and the cost of abandonment of runways due to the Federal installations making certain runways unusable. These latter items amount to additional damages due the city in the amount of $2,424,210.21.

Total of $6,514,210.20 damages due city

Therefore, in addition to the incalculable damage caused to the city's airport program and its consequent retrogression in aviation, the city has actually suffered out-of-pocket cash damages to a total of $6,500,000 either spent to date or definitely determinable, all due entirely to the presence of the Federal installations and their Federal operation.

Details of damages on following pages

The damages as calculated by the city of St. Louis accounting and engineering departments are set forth on the following pages.

New airfield must be built

Exhibit B shows in black the official plan presently adopted for the expansion of the field and superimposed thereon in colors is an alternate lay-out for runways and terminal area which typifies what would have been adopted by the city had it been free to develop the field along original lines. The exhibit indicates clearly how drastically the original development has been modified due to the encroachment of Federal facilities.

With this visual picture of the pertinent facts in the record, it is now in order to establish by individual items the damages sustained by the city and the historical circumstances which occasioned them.

Summary of Damages

1. Additional land	$400,000.00
2. Additional grading	320,000.00
3. Additional drainage	235,000.00
4. Additional paving	1,300,000.00
5. Relocation of airport road	100,000.00
6. Relocation of gasoline pipeline	135,000.00
7. Additional electrical installations	50,000.00
8. Added maintenance	50,000.00
9. Rental due city for land used by Curtiss-Wright building tenants	662,884.00
10. Rental due on land and hangar occupied by naval air station	307,411.33
11. Fair rental from War Department	*164,473.22
12. Rental due on land occupied by Laister-Kaufmann and Brayton	42,634.33
13. Abandonment of runways	200,000.00
14. Physical damage to runways	250,000.00
15. Landing fees due from Army and Navy	796,807.33
16. City's cost of operating wartime airport	1,500,000.00
Total	6,514,210.21

Additional land

A discussion of each of the items of damage included in the preceding tabulation, together with an explanation of the method used in evaluating them follows.

Due to the existence of the Curtiss-Wright plant on city-owned property, thus making this property unavailable for expansion purposes, it was necessary to extend the airport into the territory eastwardly from Airport Road and to acquire the area bounded by Natural Bridge Road, Airport Road, Brown Road, and the present easterly property line. This area, which is shown on the attached sketch (exhibit B) comprises approximately 400 acres, and was purchased by the city at a cost averaging $1,000 per acre, or a total of $400,000.

Additional grading

Partly because of the additional area involved and partly because of the rough topography of this additional area, the spreading out of the runway pattern onto the area east of airport road will necessitate grading which would otherwise have been avoided. Detail and final grading plans have been prepared and a study of these indicates that approximately 1,400,000 cubic yards of grading will be necessary, however, 600,000 cubic yards of this can be utilized in other locations. Deducting this latter amount leaves 800,000 cubic yards directly attributable to the use of the area mentioned. Based on recent negotiations with contractors, it is our opinion that this grading will cost not less than 40 cents per cubic yard, or a total of $320,000.

Additional drainage

The city is now faced with the necessity for providing drainage on the additional 400 acres to be occupied. It is true that the drainage system for the entire field would be reduced in scope were it not for the added area, but to evaluate such an element would involve extensive calculations. The estimate, therefore, is confined only to the cost of drainage actually to be located east of airport road.

An analysis of the drainage and sewer plans, which are now in complete and final form, indicates that the elimination of this area would have saved the city approximately $235,000 in drainage construction on the new area alone. The drainage design for the original field would undoubtedly have effected a saving to the city of between two and three times this amount.

Additional paving

The adoption of a "spread out" runway pattern necessitated by the city's inability to make effective use of the land area already owned, will entail the construction of large additional quantities of concrete taxiways and runways.

A comparison between the officially adopted plan and the plan as shown on the attached sketch indicates that some 218,500 square yards of pavement have been added because of the location of the Curtiss-Wright building.

At prices now prevailing in St. Louis, as evidenced by recent contracts, this added pavement will cost in excess of $1,300,000.

Relocation of airport road

The present program requires the abandonment of Airport Road, which is a concrete paved highway owned and maintained by St. Louis County. Reference to exhibit B clearly indicates that this would have been unnecessary if a more compact runway pattern confined to the west of this road could have been adopted, as was originally intended.

The city is now engaged in negotiating with the St. Louis County Court for the abandonment of Airport Road, and, because of legal requirements, the city must stand the cost of providing a substitute route. The very minimum limit of such expense as measured by the investment in the present concrete pavement is $85,000.

In addition to the above, the removal of the concrete surface will be an added cost, as well as the additional right-of-way needed for the substitute road. Together these items, with associated expenses, will cost the city in excess of $15,000. The above makes a total in excess of $100,000.

Relocation of gasoline pipe lines

Parallel to and along the easterly side of Airport Road is a right-of-way easement on which the Shell Pipeline Corp. maintains a telephone line and two 10-inch pipe lines for the transportation of gasoline and other petroleum products between Oklahoma and Wood River, Ill.

Since the existence of the Curtiss-Wright building has made necessary the expansion of Lambert Field into the area east of Airport Road, the route of these pipe lines, as it now exists, would pass through the new terminal facilities, as well as under four of the new main runways. The Shell Co. is insisting that such a situation would be extremely hazardous, and that the pipe line be rerouted completely around the expanded air field. That company also maintains that the cost of such rerouting is a legal obligation of the city. Without admitting any obligations, there is a potential liability against the city for the cost of whatever measures may ultimately be decided upon.

Based on actual contractors' estimates, the cost of relocating this line will exceed $135,000.

Additional electrical installations

Due to the spread-out location of runways and taxiways, as well as to the additional area involved, the city will be required to install larger and longer electrical circuits, which, together with the added boundary, contact, warning, and range lights, are estimated to cost a minimum of $50,000.

Added maintenance

The added maintenance costs for pavements, electrical equipment, care of turf, fencing, and other items associated with the 400 acres east of Airport Road is estimated at $5,000 per year, or a total of $50,000 for a 10-year period, the minimum leasehold period.

Rental due city for land used by Curtiss-Wright building tenant

The 2,125,728 square feet of land occupied by the Curtiss-Wright building (Plancor 17A) constitutes a prize location as to all airport facilities, and in addition is located on the only available railroad. For several years space at Lambert Field has been at a premium and the area could have been rented for the past 5 years at an average of 5 cents per square foot, which is the rental now received for an adjoining area of considerably less value.

In addition to the 48.8 acres which it was entitled to use according to the terms of the lease, the tenant, without any authorization, appropriated 1,715,200 square feet as shown on exhibit A.

This land on the airport would be even more valuable than the Curtiss-Wright site. However, for the purposes of rendering this account, the rental is set at 5 cents per square foot, or $662,884 for 3,840,928 square feet.

Rental due for 2,125,728 square feet at 5 cents per square foot per year for 5⅝ years from Dec. 30, 1940, to Nov. 1, 1946 (48.8 acres) included in lease	$620,004
Rental due for 1,715,200 square feet at 5 cents per square foot per year for ½ year from April 1944 to November 1944, occupied without authorization	42,880
Total	662,884

Rental due on land and hangar occupied by naval air station

The Federal Government should pay a fair rental to the city of St. Louis for the land on which the naval air station is located as well as that area of the airfield used by the naval air station for parking

Navy planes without the consent of the city. (See exhibit A.)

The Navy has also fenced off a 30,000-square-foot tract of land west of the naval air station, the flying field which the Navy uses for parking automobiles by authority of a letter from Mr. Ray Schroeder dated January 1, 1945, and addressed to Commander Cleaves. The Navy has never paid 1 cent of rent for this space.

936,540 square feet (21.5 acres) included in the deed at 5 cents per square foot per year for 5⅔ years from Feb. 24, 1941, to Nov. 1, 1946	$265,353.00
728,000 square feet used on flying field for parking planes, without authorization, at 5 cents per square foot per year for 1½ years from October 1945 to Nov. 1, 1946	39,433.33
30,000 square feet used on flying field for parking automobiles at 5 cents per square foot per year for 1¾ years from February 1945 to Nov. 1, 1946	2,625.00
Total	307,411.33

Fair rental from War Department

The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has occupied 366,078 square feet (8.404 acres) for 4½ years, from May 1, 1942, to November 1, 1946, as authorized by lease (W-782-Eng-107), and, in addition, has occupied 649,600 square feet on the flying field as shown in exhibit A without authorization. They have also occupied for the same length of time the hangar built by the city on the property. Moderate rents would be 5 cents per square foot per year for the land and 30 cents per square foot per year for the hangar space.

Rental due for 366,078 square feet included in lease at 5 cents per square foot per year for 4½ years	$82,367.55
Rental due for 649,600 square feet land occupied without authorization at 5 cents per square foot per year for 1⅓ years from January 1944 to May 1945	43,306.67
Rental due for 28,740 square feet of hangar space at 30 cents per square foot per year, exclusive of ground rent, for 4½ years	38,799.00
Total	164,473.22

Rental due on land occupied by Laister-Kauffmann and Brayton

In addition to the area on the flying field appropriated by the Army, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation arranged for 372,800 square feet to be used on the field for parking planes; and in keeping with their methods of dealing with St. Louis at that time paid only a token rental for the space.

Laister-Kauffmann used this space from July to November 1944, and Brayton Flying Service, Inc., used it from June 1945 to March 1946. However, the land is fenced off, is still used to park planes, and to all intents and purposes is cut off from the airfield; and the city has had no use of the area from July 1944 to the present, a period of 2 years and 4 months.

Rental due on 372,800 square feet rented by RFC and used by Laister-Kauffmann and Brayton at 5 cents per square foot per year for 2⅓ years from July 1944 to Nov. 1, 1946	$43,493.33
Credit for cash received—$720 paid by Laister-Kauffmann and $139 paid by Brayton Flying Service	859.00
Balance due	42,634.33

Abandonment of runways

Because of the construction of the Curtiss-Wright buildings, the city was forced to abandon two runways which had been extensively used, and in which the city had a sizable investment. The loss of this investment entirely aside from the impairment in efficiency of the entire field has resulted in damages estimated at $200,000.

Physical damages to runways, etc.

Because of the use by aircraft originating at Curtiss-Wright, the Navy and other Federal sources, the city has sustained severe physical damage to its runways, taxiways, apron, and grass areas which have made necessary not only excessive maintenance, but also very heavy reconstruction of paved use cannot be allocated as to individual areas. Such damages occasioned by Federal source.

In addition the Navy, as well as the Army, has and still is, using large areas of city-owned land for the parking of aircraft. This use is without the consent of the city and without payment of any kind and results in loss of revenue, as well as actual out-of-pocket expense to the city. The physical damage alone is conservatively estimated at $250,000.

Landing fees due from the Army and Navy

Many branches of the Federal Government, particularly the Army and Navy, have used the Lambert-St. Louis Airport for a training field as well as other aviation purposes, and the military activities have, at times, been such that civilian flying at the field was suspended. Of the total 1,327,809 operations on the flying field by commercial and military aircraft during this period; 91.2 percent were made by military aircraft.

Commercial air lines which were compelled to adjust their schedules to the convenience of military have, of course, paid landing fees in accordance with their use of the field. The Federal agencies have paid nothing for their preemptive use of the field, and the city now calls upon the Federal Government to pay these fees on the same basis the commercial air lines have paid them.

During the years April 1, 1941, to November 1, 1946, the agencies of the Federal Government made 1,195,211 landings and take offs.

The commercial air lines pay on the basis of 66⅔ cents per operation. This equals $796,807.33 due from the Federal Government for the period from April 1, 1941, to November 1, 1946.

City's cost of operating wartime airport

During the 6 years, 1940-46, the city continued to operate the Lambert-St. Louis Airport at a cost of $250,000 per year. The city was, in effect, operating the airport for the benefit of Federal agencies, for these Federal agencies monopolized the airport to the extent of 90.1 percent of all operations.

Military aircraft had precedence over commercial airplanes, and the military did not hesitate to preempt the airfield to the exclusion of commercial aircraft for prolonged periods of time, running in length from a few hours to periods as long as 2 days, during which time all commercial aircraft were excluded from the use of the airfield.

In all fairness the Federal Government should reimburse the city for this $1,500,000 advanced by the city to operate what was literally a Federal airport, the operating expenses of which should have been paid by the Federal Government at that time.

Operation expense of Lambert-St. Louis Airport at $250,000 per year for 6 years, $1,500,000.

EXHIBIT A

[Map of Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport omitted from the RECORD.]

EXHIBIT B

[Drawings of runways, hangers, buildings, etc., of Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport omitted from the RECORD.]

EXHIBIT C

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS,
Washington, D. C.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Office of Defense Plants,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The basis on which the Navy Department would be willing to declare the facilities furnished under lease agreement, Plancor 17A, between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. for possible disposition by the War Assets Administration to the city of St. Louis has been requested.

As your Corporation is aware, the manufacturing plant constructed under the terms of the above-mentioned lease agreement is among those plants designated by the Air Coordinating Committee in its report to Congress dated October 29, 1945, to be set aside as stand-by facilities in the event of another national emergency. Furthermore this plant is presently occupied by a manufacturer engaged in the production of certain aircraft deemed essential to the Navy's aeronautical program. Consequently any surplus declaration that this Department might make must contain the following provisions:

(a) Any deed transferring title to the plant to any party or parties shall contain a stipulation that the property will be made available to the Navy Department within 120 days after receipt of a written notice by the Secretary of the Navy that the interests of national defense require the use of the plant by the Government;

(b) Any deed transferring title to other than a Government agency shall contain a stipulation that no structural alterations will be made without the consent of the Navy Department and that in the event of recapture by the Government the plant shall be restored to its original condition by the end of the hereinbefore-mentioned 120-day period, providing further that any restoration made necessary by an alteration approved by the Navy shall be made the subject of negotiations as to the possibility of reimbursement by the Government for such alterations;

(c) That the Navy Department will have the right to inspect any part of the property at reasonable times to see that it is adequately maintained and that the restrictions against alterations are complied with;

(d) That the Navy Department reserves for its use, or for the use of any party or parties it may designate, all of the floor space in the plant with the exception of 140,000 square feet of the high bay area and 227,500 square feet of other than high bay area located in that portion of the facilities furnished under Plancor 17A, which rest north of the railroad tracks, providing further that the apportionment of the accepted floor area will be made in such a manner as to prepare the manufacturing integrity of that area reserved for the Navy Department or its assignees.

It is to be further understood in the event of a surplus declaration made under the terms as hereinbefore outlined that your corporation shall forward to the War Assets Administration a letter reflecting this Department's desire that the final form of any proposed deed transferring title to the city of St. Louis, or any other party or parties, under such a declaration will be subject to the approval of the Navy Department in order that it may review the provisions relating to conditions in respect of national defense interests.

It is to be further understood that the proceeds from any disposition made under any such surplus declaration shall be credited in accordance with the applicable contracts between your corporation and the Navy Department.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
By ——— ———.

EXHIBIT D

LOAN AGENCY OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
St. Louis, Mo., October 15, 1945.

Hon. ALOYS P. KAUFMANN,
Mayor, City of St. Louis,
St. Louis, Mo.

Re Curtiss-Wright Corp., Plancor 17.

DEAR SIR: The land lease dated the 1st day of November 1940, entered into between the city of St. Louis and Curtiss-Wright Corp., covering certain lands located at Lambert Airfield, Robertson, Mo., provides in paragraph II that the lessee shall not assign, transfer, convey, or sublease to anyone, without lessor's written consent, except that such lease may be assigned to the United States of America or any agency or corporation thereof, and if so assigned may be reassigned and subleased to Curtiss-Wright. Such assignment was effected by Curtiss-Wright to Defense Plant Corporation, which was dissolved pursuant to Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved on June 30, 1945, effective July 1, 1945, and all of its functions, powers duties, and authority, together with its documents, books of account, records, assets and liabilities of every kind and nature were transferred to Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be performed, exercised, and administered by Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the same manner and to the same extent and effect as if originally vested in Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Sponsorship of the captioned Plancor has been transferred from the Army Air Forces to the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, and this Corporation is terminating the agreement of lease with Curtiss-Wright Corp., and proposes to enter into a new lease with McDonnell Aircraft Corp. for the production of Navy planes under such sponsorship.

In view of the provisions of paragraph II of the above-mentioned land lease, it will be necessary that this Corporation obtain the consent of the city of St. Louis to the proposed sublease of the premises to McDonnell Aircraft Corp. for the purpose herein stated, unless this Corporation or some other governmental agency is to use the premises pursuant to the terms of the original landlease and assignment thereof by Curtiss-Wright Corp.

The terms of the proposed sublease between this Corporation and McDonnell Aircraft have been agreed upon and provide, among other things, for:

1. Rental at the rate of $1 per year;

2. A termination of such sublease at the end of a 5-year period ending September 30, 1950, subject to earlier termination as hereinafter set forth;

3. A continuation of the occupancy by Curtiss-Wright Corp. of building 4A not later than December 31, 1945, buildings K and engineering addition not later than March 31, 1946, and that the use of building 4A by McDonnell Aircraft Corp. after December 31, 1945, shall be contingent upon the prior written consent of RFC, together with the right of RFC to remove the operation of the proposed lease agreement building 4A and that portion of the area north of the Wabash Railway tracks not reasonably necessary to the use of the remaining facilities occupied by McDonnell Aircraft Corp.

4. A termination of the proposed lease at any time upon 10 days notice by either party when substantial use by the McDonnell Aircraft of the site, buildings, and machinery shall be no longer required to enable McDonnell Aircraft Corp. to furnish the Government with products required by the Government.

5. A termination by RFC by notice in writing, with approval of the Navy Department noted thereon, in addition to the abovementioned right of termination in the event—

(a) All or substantially all of McDonnell's contracts with the Government at any time outstanding for the manufacture or furnishing of McDonnell's product or other products shall be terminated or canceled prior to completion, or

(b) The Government shall request priority with respect to the manufacture or furnishing of any product and McDonnell shall fail or refuse to give priority, or

(c) A receiver or trustee is appointed for McDonnell or its property, or McDonnell makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors, or McDonnell becomes insolvent, or a petition is filed by or against McDonnell Aircraft pursuant to any of the provisions of the United States Bankruptcy Act, or

(d) For any violation of any of the terms, conditions, and covenants of the proposed lease, and a failure to cure such violation within 30 days after notice.

6. A covenant by McDonnell Aircraft Corp. that it will not, without the prior written consent of RFC and the Navy Department, use the site, buildings, and machinery for any purpose except for the manufacture and furnishing of McDonnell Aircraft's product and other products for the Government.

7. A covenant that McDonnell Aircraft will not, without prior written consent of RFC and the approval of the Navy Department, sell, assign, or pledge the proposed lease, or any of its rights or obligations thereunder, or sublease or permit the use by others of any of the property covered by said proposed lease except that McDonnell Aircraft may lease or lend to others for the performance by McDonnell of its contracts with the Government such items of machinery as it may designate in writing to RFC.

In view of the fact that this corporation desires to continue its use and occupancy of the premises in question by making the same available to McDonnell under the terms of a proposed sublease, as hereinabove stated, it is requested that the city of St. Louis consent to such proposed sublease, and that such consent be made in the form of a modification of the land lease of November 1, 1940.

Yours very truly,
SIDNEY B. MCCLANAHAN,
Acting Agency Counsel.

(Copies to Mr. Milton M. Kinsey, president, board of public service, St. Louis, Mo.; Mr. George Stemmler, city counselor, St. Louis, Mo.)

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF ST. LOUIS, MO.,
September 19, 1946.

Mr. RAY W. RALEIGH,
c/o Gaylord Container Corp.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR RAY: As promised, I am pleased to enclose copy of letter from Sidney B. McClanahan, Acting Agency Counsel of the Loan Agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, regarding terms of a lease between the Defense Plant Corporation, the city, and Curtiss-Wright Corp.

I shall also be happy to follow your suggestion that in future copies be made of all letters which Mayor Kaufmann wishes General Gaylord to have an opportunity to read, so that you may retain them in your files.

Very truly yours,
FRED HUME, Jr.,
Secretary to the Mayor.

EXHIBIT E

THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS,
Law Department,
July 24, 1946.

Hon. A. P. KAUFMANN,
Mayor, City of St. Louis.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: You have requested my opinion as to whether there has been a breach of the covenants of a certain lease entered into on the 1st day of November 1940 between the city of St. Louis, as lessor, and Curtiss-Wright Corp., as lessee, covering certain land at Lambert-Municipal Airport.

The term of the lease is 25 years, with the right of renewal, by lessee, for an additional 25 years.

Paragraph 11 of the lease is as follows:

"Lessee stipulates and agrees not to assign, transfer, convey, sublet, or otherwise dispose of this lease, or of its right, title, or interest therein, to any other person, company, or corporation without the lessor's previous consent in writing, except that lessor hereby consents that lessee may assign, transfer, convey, sublet, or otherwise dispose of this lease or its right, title, or interest therein, to the United States of America, or any agency or corporate instrumentality thereof (and if so assigned may be reassigned and/or subleased to this lessee) or to a corporation wholly owned by lessee. This lease shall bind and inure to the benefit of all successors of the parties hereto and to the assigns of lessee as hereinabove limited."

Pursuant to the provisions of said paragraph 11, the lease was assigned by Curtiss-Wright Corp. to Defense Plant Corporation, an instrumentality of the United States.

On July 1, 1945, Defense Plant Corporation was dissolved by act of Congress and all of its assets, presumably including this lease, were transferred to Reconstruction Finance Corporation, another instrumentality of the United States.

So far, in my opinion, the transfers of interest in the lease were authorized under the provisions of the above-mentioned paragraph eleventh.

It now appears, however, that Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made a transfer of interest in the lease to McDonnell Aircraft Corp. We have never been advised, so far as I know, of the exact nature of this transfer, except as may be indicated in the letter to you, under date of October 15, 1945, from Mr. Sidney B. McClanahan, Acting Agency Counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. McClanahan's letter states, in part:

"In view of the provisions of paragraph 11 of the above-mentioned land lease, it will be necessary that this Corporation obtain the consent of the city of St. Louis to the proposed sublease of the premises to McDonnell Aircraft Corp. for the purpose herein stated, unless this Corporation or some other governmental agency is to use the premises pursuant to the terms of the original land lease and assignment thereof by Curtiss-Wright Corp."

Mr. McClanahan concludes his letter as follows:

"In view of the fact that this Corporation desires to continue its use and occupancy of the premises in question by making the same available to McDonnell under the terms of a proposed sublease, as hereinabove stated, it is requested that the city of St. Louis consent to such proposed sublease, and that such consent be made in the form of a modification of the land lease of November 1, 1940."

As you know, the city has consistently refused to consent to any transfer of interest in the lease to McDonnell Aircraft Corp., by way of sublease or otherwise. Notwithstanding such refusal, it has been established and has been conceded that McDonnell Aircraft Corp. is in possession of, and is making use of, the demised premises.

There has, therefore, in my opinion, been a clear breach of the covenants of the lease.

Respectfully submitted.
GEORGE L. STEMMLER,
City Counselor.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 8, 1947]

BREAKING THE LOG JAM

Two reports have now been issued by special committees of the Municipal Airport

Commission. Both reports are directly concerned with St. Louis' future as a national air center. Both propose specific courses of action. They deserve serious consideration, not only at the city hall but by every citizen who recognizes the importance of maintaining St. Louis' place in the air.

The report made public last week by the special committee named to investigate the causes of delay in the city's postwar aviation expansion program points the way to action which is essential in order to eliminate interdepartment conflicts and divided responsibility. The committee recommends that an airport agency be established to centralize authority and responsibility for the administration of municipal airports. Such an agency the committee urges, should be responsible to the people, should be tied into the city government by mayoralty appointment and financial accountability and should be authorized to hire the business and technical personnel necessary to manage the airports.

This step is consistent both with efficient government administration and the practices of private enterprise. Under the present setup the committee points out that aviation must compete for attention with all the other city affairs in each department and with each official concerned. Aviation was forced to wait its turn, with the result that vexatious delays have occurred and mistakes have been made.

A city airport authority with straight-line responsibility should help end the delays and confusion in St. Louis Airport program. It should also assure efficient and economical administration of the program in the future. The committee urges that the airport authority be created as quickly as possible and suggests that a Government research institute be asked to cooperate in working out the steps necessary to insure the legal competency of the authority. The city looks to Mayor Kaufmann to act promptly on this proposal.

The second report, made public yesterday by the special committee headed by Clifford W. Gaylord, vice chairman of the commission, suggests that it is time for a showdown with the Federal agencies which are usurping Lambert-St. Louis Field and hampering its development. The 143-page report presents a carefully documented indictment of the Federal practices which are retarding the expansion of Lambert Field and interfering with control of municipally owned facilities. It includes a bill of $6,514,210 for uncompensated services and damages.

Included in the fighting indictment are charges that:

The Navy by exercising a high priority over the $11,000,000 former Curtiss-Wright plant has deprived the city of facilities needed for servicing large planes. Such facilities are essential if St. Louis is to expand as a commercial air center

The Navy also usurps the major portion of the south side of the field with its naval training station and has taken over additional space for parking facilities. The Navy has not indicated any intention of abandoning its 21-acre site and the only concession it has made to the city is to agree that pilots will not be trained at the field.

The Army, for a rental of $1 a year, continues to occupy 8.4 acres of land at the field, with a city-owned hangar, and has encroached upon the field for 649,000 additional square feet of space.

It is amazing to discover that when the city sought to regain control of the field after the war its representatives were, in their own words, "given the Washington run-around." It is even more disturbing to contemplate the obvious results of the continuation of such high-handed tactics.

Obviously the city cannot proceed with its plans for the expansion of Lambert Field until St. Louis can be assured of full control of the field's facilities, and until the city knows what will be the final disposition of the Curtiss-Wright buildings, the naval training station, and the Army's quarters. It would be foolish for the city to construct new hangars for servicing planes if the Curtiss-Wright building with its high bay areas is to be made available It would be idle to plan for an air cargo depot until the city knows whether the other facilities will be vacated.

Other cities in this country have been the beneficiaries of large and expensive airports built by the Government during the war and turned over to those municipalities. St. Louis, on the other hand, is not only deprived of such Federal donations, but is now being penalized for its patriotism.

This city has been patient—perhaps too patient. It has vainly sought to settle the controversial matters privately with the Federal Government. This policy has failed. Now it is time for St. Louis to fight for its rights.

It is not a partisan fight, and there is no need that it become a partisan issue. To avoid any charge of partisanship, Mayor Kaufmann should name as the city's representatives in securing the return of Lambert Field to St. Louis and the payment of just Federal damages men of both political parties, representing neither the Democratic nor Republican Parties, but the people of St. Louis, who demand justice in this matter. To obviate any suggestion that a Republican city administration is "cracking down" on a Democratic administration, it might even be good policy to have the redress committee headed by a well-known Democrat.

[From St. Louis Star-Times of January 7, 1947]

WHOSE AIRPORT IS IT?

The news columns of today's paper summarize in considerable detail the report of a special committee of the municipal airport commission on the crisis created at Lambert Field by the refusal of Federal agencies to release land and other facilities loaned or leased for the war emergency.

Reading the report, one cannot escape the conclusion that the Army and Navy, the War Assets Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have assumed a dog-in-the-manger attitude which seriously interferes with development and use of the city s only major landing field. The appeals to patriotism to which Government spokesmen have resorted in defense of their desire to continue to dominate the field are out of date. It was patriotic of the city to make the airport available in wartime, but St. Louis is interested now in maximum use of the field for civil aviation and it cannot turn, as the Army and Navy can, to other sites. Lambert Field is going to be the only airport available to the city for several years and, goodness knows, it is none too big for commercial needs even if all Federal establishments and controls are removed.

The committee's criticism is based on months of futile negotiations with Federal agencies for an equitable restoration of the facilities to which St. Louis seems entitled. On the city's side is the fact that elsewhere the armed services have been willing to give municipalities millions of dollars' worth of airport improvements without argument.

If the generals and the admirals and the RFC directors will not listen to reason, the matter should be carried to the President himself. St. Louis deserves more than a slap in the face in return for more than $6,000,000 in out-of-pocket expense to provide aviation facilities in time of war.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 8, 1947]

USURPATION AT THE AIRPORT

The Federal Government should get off Lambert-St. Louis Field. The continued encroachment of Federal agencies has exhausted the city's patience, as the report of a committee of the airport commission shows. St. Louisans hope there can be a constructive settlement with Washington, but in any case the squeeze play must end. The airport is ours.

This is an astonishing story from the investigating committee. In some cities where the Federal Government was forced to build military airports it later made virtual gifts of them to the municipalities. In St. Louis, the city granted the Government rights to Lambert Field because of the war emergency, but now the Government wants to hold on. Has the city's patriotism backfired?

From 1940 to 1942 the city issued three leases of airport land to the Government. One was for construction of the Curtiss-Wright plant for the Army Another was for a naval training station. The third was for an Army air transport command depot. Charges for these leases were nominal—in the last case only $1 a year.

Now what? Now the Army engineers are said to want to peddle their rights to the depot to some other agency. The Navy is hanging on to its training station, although the city charges that naval flights are a hazard to our growing commercial operations. As for the Curtiss-Wright plant, there has been dickering and buck passing and legalistic mumbo-jumbo but the Government still holds on.

When the Army was through with that plant, the city hoped to take it over. It was on city ground; other cities had been given similar Federal projects. Moreover, the city charges that Federal use of Lambert Field has run up $6,514,210 in damages. Regardless of that figure, there has been no payment.

Instead, the Navy stepped in when the Army departed. It turned the plant over to McDonnell Aircraft Corp. for a dollar a year. So the city got busy. What the city wanted was the plant, or, at least, use of the highway area for sheltering and servicing big airline planes. This was necessary, the city felt, to permit air lines to begin major flights here, instead of regarding St. Louis as just a stopover.

The report describes months of a round-robin with Washington. The Navy thought it might declare the Curtiss-Wright property surplus, but the War Assets Administration rejected the Navy's terms. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting for the Navy, made offers of rental or lease, reversing itself each time. One WAA official lectured Mayor Kaufmann on patriotism. An RFC officer attacked the city's land lease because it gave the city the right to veto occupants of the plant. It was "bad law," he said, even though the Government had signed it. In short, it's all a fine bureaucratic mess.

Where will the city go from here? Possibly to court, possibly to further negotiations, possibly to top authority in Washington. Wherever it goes, the city administration has the support of the people, and should have the strong backing of its Members of Congress.

Yet the public will also hope for a rational agreement. The St. Louis area wishes to be hospitable to the military aviation services within reason. If Washington wants to establish its own air bases here it may do so, and it has the money to do so, without hobbling our only major airport.

As for the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., it is caught in the middle. The city accuses the

Navy of rewarding McDonnell at the city's expense. Since McDonnell is engaged in work which is a public service, some means should be found for permitting the company to continue, but not at the city's expense.

Meanwhile the dispute with Washington must not interfere with the city's airport planning. The dispute does not mean the "ruination" of our plans, as the committee suggests. It is a hindrance, but one of the main obstacles to expanding Lambert Field and developing new airports is administrative delay. The investigating committee virtually said so itself, in its first report last week. There should be no delay in carrying out the committee's proposal to give the city a responsible, undivided aviation authority.

But St. Louis has problems enough without those foisted upon us by assorted agencies in Washington. They have repaid hospitality with usurpation. That must end.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables and other material on the question of taxes. I have had an estimate from the Government Printer, and it exceeds the cost by $135. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding that fact, that the request be granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. DOMENGEAUX appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and insert some statistics and a copy of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

94. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 for the period beginning April 1, 1946, and ending December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

95. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a preliminary report showing the number of officers above the rank of major during the 6-month period June 1 to November 30, 1946, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during this period; to the Committee on Armed Services.

96. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation relative to trial insurance on tobacco and corn; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 724. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Bureau of Animal Industry quarantine station at Clifton, N. J., to the city of Clifton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 725. A bill providing for an Industrial Relations Act of 1947, to amend and supplement the National Labor Relations Act, to create a commission for the settlement of industrial disputes, to facilitate the free flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 726. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 727. A bill to repeal an act which withdrew certain public lands of the United States in the State of California from settlement; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 728. A bill to cancel authority under the act of June 23, 1936, for the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. R. 729. A bill to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 730. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act approved July 16, 1916, and acts amendatory thereto and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 731. A bill to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park, to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 732. A bill to provide for immigration into the United States of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH

H. R. 733. A bill relating to the unauthorized wearing of the discharge button awarded by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 734. A bill to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 735. A bill relating to the unauthorized wearing of the discharge button awarded by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 736. A bill to provide for the wearing of wound chevrons and war-service chevrons by members of the naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 737. A bill to terminate rationing in the case of sugar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 738. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 739. A bill to provide for the protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reductions in force in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 740. A bill to provide for increasing the amount of pensions paid to veterans of the war with Spain, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion, who are now blind or helpless, or so nearly blind or helpless as to require constant aid and attendance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 741. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon, acquired for military purposes, or for housing projects, national parks or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 742. A bill to provide disability and death compensation or pension in the case of members of the Enlisted Reserve of the Army who have received or are receiving training under the Army specialized training program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 743. A bill to authorize and direct the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River Dam and Reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of Doroteo Julian Echevarria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of B. E. Truitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 747. A bill for the relief of Claud Catheart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of T. L. Truitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 749. A bill for the relief of J. R. Mahon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 750. A bill for the relief of W. B. Lacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 751. A bill for the relief of W. W. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 752. A bill for the relief of G. W. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 753. A bill for the relief of J. M. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 754. A bill for the relief of F. T. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of J. W. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 756. A bill for the relief of Uta Bulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 757. A bill for the relief of Frances Monfort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 758. A bill for the relief of Jack Cebamanos Monfort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ekaterinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of William W. Maddox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anthony D. Chamberlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Dudley Tarver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pardo Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of Stanley S. Kutkowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Lorrayne E. Graus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 768. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vesta Meinn and Mrs. Edna Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 769. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of Norman Abbott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 771. A bill for the relief of Edwin R. Samsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, Thou hast promised to give us the Holy Spirit if we are willing to open our hearts and let Him in. Make us willing now that things of eternal significance may begin to happen here. We know deep down in our hearts that without Thy guidance we can do nothing, but with Thee we can do all things. Let us not be frightened by the problems that confront us, but rather give Thee thanks that Thou hast matched us with this hour. May we resolve, God helping us, to be part of the answer, and not part of the problem.

For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 8, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is detained on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CERTAIN DONATIONS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT RELATIVE TO TRIAL INSURANCE ON TOBACCO AND CORN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, relative to trial insurance on tobacco and corn (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

JULIUS STEIN, MANAGER, TULARE FARM LABOR SUPPLY CENTER

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of Julius Stein, manager, Tulare Farm Labor Supply Center, Linnell, Calif. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Comptroller General of the United States of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified by the United States Maritime Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED PIPE LINES

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on Government-owned pipe lines (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

THE BUDGET

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the President's Budget message for 1948. The letter of transmittal comprises 60 printed pages. The Chair suggests that it might be satisfactory to dispense with the reading of the communication and have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TOBEY. I might say with Shakespeare, "For this relief, much thanks."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, the course the Chair has suggested will be followed and the letter of transmittal and the Budget will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For letter of transmittal, see p. 237 of the House proceedings of today.)

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a resolution adopted by the

Thirteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation, composed of Governors' representatives from 48 States, in meeting at Washington, D. C., relating to increased participation by the States in the program of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Juneau (Alaska) Chamber of Commerce favoring the Executive order dated August 2, 1946, curtailing the expenditures of funds by the Congress for flood control, river and harbor improvement, for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition from Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, stating that the Alaska Development Board condemns and urges the rejection of the proposal of the Alaska Steamship Co. and Northland Transportation Co., dated November 19, 1946, covering interim operation of water carriers in the Alaska trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A memorial of certain citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

A resolution adopted by the Cardinal O'Connell Council, No. 2919, Knights of Columbus, assembled in regular meeting at the American Legion Hall, Chestnut Hill, Mass., relating to the trial and conviction of the Most Reverend Archbishop of Zagreb, Yugoslavia, Aloysius Stepinac; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

USE OF GRAIN IN MAKING WHISKY AND DISTILLED SPIRITS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received from Mrs. A. F. Goad, corresponding secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Augusta, Kans., a memorial against the increased use of grain for making whisky and distilled spirits. I ask unanimous consent to have this memorial from the women of Kansas printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, KANS., *November 19, 1946.*

Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Associated Press of October 21 carried this news item from Washington:

"The Agriculture Department announced tonight that the Nation's distilling industry will be granted about 16 percent more grain for making whisky and distilled spirits in October and subsequent months until further notice. It also granted brewers about 6 percent more grain."

This note is sent to you to raise vigorous protest against the above action.

In a world that is hungry, cold, and needy, the above action by a civilized Nation (even called a Christian Nation), is, to say the least, wasteful and disgraceful.

And, not only that, but it means ruined manhood and womanhood in our own Nation.

And sufficient grain is not available for stock feed and is at a prohibitive price.

As women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in session this afternoon we hereby register our opposition to this action and request that it be rescinded.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the action taken in the spring by a group of people, all of them living in Augusta or its near vicinity except two—a total of 205 people.

Yours truly,

Mrs. D. A. Zahn, President; Mrs. George Patton; Mrs. William A. Johnson; Mrs. Minnie Ralston; Mrs. William Olson; Mrs. George Snider; Mrs. F. S. Anderson; Mrs. John Luding; Mrs. C. C. Hooper; Mrs. C. E. Hanes; Mrs. A. Auer; Mrs. M. J. Cash; Mrs. C. B. Robb; Mrs. N. D. Smith; Mrs. Roy Skeels; Mrs. A. Holladay, Vice President; Mrs. A. F. Goad, Corresponding Secretary.

PROMOTION OF WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What We Must Do To Promote World Peace," delivered by him in the Salt Lake Tabernacle on Armistice Day, November 11, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROLE OF THE SENATE IN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Senate's Role in Foreign Policy," delivered by him before the Institute of World Affairs at Riverside, Calif., December 9, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOD'S LAW IN MODERN LIFE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FLANDERS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "God's Law in Modern Life," delivered by Senator FLANDERS on Laymen's Sunday, October 20, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTITUDE OF NATIONAL GRANGE ON AGRICULTURE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the action taken by the National Grange at its eightieth annual session at Portland, Oreg., in November, regarding agriculture, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SUGAR PROBLEM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Now It's Sugar," from the Washington Post of January 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILBO'S DRUMHEAD TRIAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD AND ARTICLE BY ZACHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "BILBO's Drumhead Trial," from the Boston Herald, and an article by Professor Zachariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS COMES BACK—ARTICLE BY FRED BRENCKMAN

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Comes Back," by Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange Monthly, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX REDUCTION—EDITORIAL BY C. F. BYRNS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one of the most important issues that will come before this Congress is that of tax reduction. There appeared in the Fort Smith (Ark.) Southwest American on January 6 an editorial by the editor, C. F. Byrns, which is a very able discussion of this problem. Mr. Byrns' logic and reasoning are so sound that the editorial will commend itself to the consideration of the Members of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

The No. 1 bill of the Republican majority in the House of Congress proposes to cut income taxes 20 percent on 1947 incomes.

The No. 1 job of the party now in power is to manage the financial affairs of the Government so that there will be enough money to provide an adequate defense, carry on the essential operations of Government, and cut down the national debt.

A cut in income taxes is popular. I'd love it, personally. So would you. But my personal feeling about my own tax bill is not the final consideration. I'd love it, too, if I had no income tax to pay—nor any other kind. But it would be disastrous for the country, and finally disastrous for me. The decision on a tax cut or no tax cut must be pitched on a broader plane than the individual's selfish desire to save some of his tax bill.

Right now, the people of this country have more cash income than they ever had before. Maybe not every one of them, but all of them together. The total national income for 1946 is officially reported at about 164 billions, slightly higher than in 1945. If we aren't going to make a sizable dent in the national debt now, we never will. If we aren't going to provide now for essential protection and development of our natural resources, with such things as flood control, navigation, and other programs of that sort, we never will.

If the Republicans can trim some of the waste out of Government expenses and get the budget down to a point where a tax cut is intelligent, then I'm all for it. But I'm not for it at the expense of the national defense, nor the orderly development of internal improvements, nor the essential services of government nor the reductions we should be making in these good times in the national debt.

At this moment, high taxes loom up as an important public complaint. But at this moment, we are better able to pay high taxes than we have ever been before. It is possible, although by no means certain, that we shall not see again in our lifetime a national income as large as it is now.

It seems to me a sound principle of taxation to get the money when the getting is easy and reduce the demands on the taxpayer when he has less to spend. Usually, we have operated in the other direction. When income is high and tax revenues are rising—as they have been in Arkansas and in the entire Nation in the past few years—people look at the big figures and cry out for tax reductions. At least they resist tax rises on the ground that they are not needed. When the income drops and tax revenues drop with it, cuts in taxes are resisted because the Government agencies need the money to carry on essential services, including the extra expenses caused by depression. In such circumstances Government has gone into debt.

The National Government has been on a deficit basis since the early thirties. The debt has mounted to a figure impossible for most of us to grasp—somewhere around $275,000,000,000. (What is a few billions, more or less?) There is a chance now to make some reduction in that debt. There is a great

popular cheer awaiting anybody who will cut taxes. The chances are the tax cut will win. But I keep wondering if it really makes sense.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE

JANUARY 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter F. Connell, 4632 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

Frank D. Byrne, 510 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $7,341.60.

Paul F. Morrison, 1205 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $5,403.80.

OWEN BREWSTER, *Chairman.*

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—ADDITIONAL REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, during the month of November 1946 Federal employment, both inside and outside the United States, dropped 111,006 from the October total of 2,441,473 to the November total of 2,330,467. Inside the United States employment dropped 101,475 from the October total of 2,125,469 to the November total of 2,023,994. Decreases in the War and Navy Departments totaled 40,325. Outside the United States employment dropped 9,531 from the October total of 316,004 to the November total of 306,473.

Largest increases occurred in the Veterans' Administration, which added 8,364 employees, to bring their total to 221,760, and the War Assets Administration, which added 1,599, to bring their total to 58,922. Largest decreases were in the War Department, which dropped 46,651; the Post Office Department, which dropped 37,345; the Labor Department, which, by following the direction of the Congress to return the United States Employment Service to the States, dropped 22,720; the Department of Agriculture, which dropped 6,516; the Navy Department, which dropped 3,456; the Office of Price Administration, which dropped 2,706; the Interior Department, which dropped 1,312; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which dropped 1,033.

The relief which the sorely pressed taxpayer might feel in reading such figures must be mitigated somewhat by two considerations which should be borne in mind. The first of these is that a portion of this decrease is found among seasonal and temporary employees, who quite possibly may be hired again at a later date. The second is that over-all employment, with the exception of the War and Navy Departments, is still considerably greater than it was on VJ-day. On August 31, 1945, Federal employment, excluding War and Navy but including that of 19 war agencies, stood at 1,117,456. On November 30, 1946, this same group of establishments totaled 1,296,397. In other words, the reductions which are now taking place are not reductions below our war-peak total; rather, they are merely decreases which still leave the Federal Government, excluding the War and Navy Departments, with 178,941 more employees than it needed to beat Germany and Japan.

I have heard the argument that certain agencies, forced to curtail their normal peacetime activities because of the war, now need additional employees to handle the backlog of work, and also that the war and its aftermath have given the agencies additional responsibilities requiring more employees. Accepting this, let us examine Federal employment as of December 1939. At that time there were 706,700 Federal employees within the United States, not including those in the War Department and Navy Department. As of November 30, 1946, there were 1,240,378 such employees within the United States and 56,019 overseas. Also, in December 1939 there were 222,136 civilian employees in the War and Navy Departments, while as of November 1946, there are 783,616 civilians in the War and Navy Departments, nor does this include 250,454 civilian War and Navy Department employees overseas. Certainly these figures offer convincing proof that our Government is still needlessly overmanned; that our country is still needlessly over-governed; that our taxpayers are still needlessly over burdened.

The new Congress, regardless of political affiliation, must not shirk the duty which the departments and agencies, by their failure to reduce to peacetime requirements, have forced upon it. At present the annual pay roll of the executive branch of the Government approximates $6,250,000,000. This is $1,500,000,000 more than the entire Government spent for all purposes in 1933. The executive branch now employs more people than all the State, city, and county governments of the entire 48 States. With the exception of school teachers this includes, beside the regular State and municipal authorities, all the policemen, firemen, and public-service employees of the entire Nation. I call upon the Congress to correct this evil. If we are ever to balance the budget, to reduce the national debt, we must do it now. And we cannot do it with 2,330,000 Federal employees.

I ask unanimous consent that an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH NOVEMBER 1946, AND A COMPARISON WITH OCTOBER 1946

(All figures compiled from reports signed by the heads of Federal establishments or their authorized representatives)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the continental United States during November decreased 101,475 from a total of 2,125,469 in October to 2,023,994 in November. Excluding the War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 61,150 from the October total of 1,301,528 to the November total of 1,240,378. The War Department within the United States decreased 37,017 from the October total of 492,162 to the November total of 455,145. The Navy Department inside the United States decreased 3,308 from the October figure of 331,779 to the November figure of 328,471. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 9,531 from the October total of 316,004 to the November total of 306,473. The majority of these employees are industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of the War and Navy Departments, there was an increase of 251 from the October figure of 55,768 to the November figure of 56,019.

The consolidated table presenting data with respect to personnel inside and outside continental United States shows a total decrease of 111,006 from the October total of 2,441,473 to the November total of 2,330,467. Excluding War and Navy Departments reductions of 50,107, there was a decrease of 60,899 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the October figure of 1,357,296 to the November figure of 1,296,397. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of November decreased 30,852 from the October total of 690,609 to the November total of 659,757. The War Department decreased 9,872 outside continental United States and decreased 18,111 inside the United States in the industrial group, making a total reduction of 27,983 employees. The Navy Department showed a decrease of 2,786 industrial employees. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include regular maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1946 and comparison with October*

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget	746	750	+4
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Agriculture Department	88,728	82,114	−6,614
Commerce Department	35,082	35,513	+431
Interior Department	45,213	44,188	−1,025
Justice Department	24,268	24,022	−246
Labor Department	30,288	7,629	−22,659
Post Office Department	494,244	456,894	−37,350
State Department	8,502	8,587	+85
Treasury Department	101,787	101,655	−132
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Defense Transportation	99	103	+4
Office of Price Administration	34,679	31,993	−2,686

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1946 and comparison with October*—Continued

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Emergency war agencies—Continued			
Office of Scientific Research and Development	259	212	−47
Office of War Mobilization	172	161	−11
Selective Service System	10,109	9,625	−484
Postwar agencies:			
Civilian Production Administration	4,278	4,333	+55
Council of Economic Advisers	17	26	+9
National Wage Stabilization Board	759	637	−122
Price Decontrol Board	20	15	−5
War Assets Administration	57,301	58,899	+1,598
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	2	4	+2
Civil Aeronautics Board	438	450	+12
Civil Service Commission	3,589	3,517	−72
Export-Import Bank of Washington	114	116	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,347	1,358	+11
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,181	1,178	−3
Federal Power Commission	778	793	+15
Federal Security Agency	30,658	30,671	+13
Federal Trade Commission	529	537	+
Federal Works Agency	23,874	24,035	+161
General Accounting Office	12,365	12,134	−231
Government Printing Office	7,115	8,001	+886
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,272	2,270	−2
Maritime Commission	13,453	12,952	−501
National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics	5,692	5,724	+32
National Archives	388	392	+4
National Capital Housing Authority	276	277	+1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	----------
National Gallery of Art	316	315	−1
National Housing Agency	19,081	19,148	+67
National Labor Relations Board	873	876	+3
National Mediation Board	101	102	+1
Panama Canal	428	417	−11
Railroad Retirement Board	2,114	2,287	+173
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	11,115	10,084	−1,031
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,206	1,207	+1
Smithsonian Institution	503	502	−1
Tariff Commission	222	225	+3
Tax Court	122	123	+1
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,897	13,284	+387
Veterans' Administration	211,911	220,026	+8,115
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,301,528	1,240,378	−73,234 +12,084
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−61,150
Navy Department	331,779	328,471	−3,308
War Department	492,162	455,145	−37,017
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,125,469	2,023,994	−113,559 +12,084
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−101,475

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November and comparison with October*

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Agriculture Department	1,383	1,481	+98
Commerce Department	2,343	2,327	−16
Interior Department	5,059	4,772	−287
Justice Department	618	609	−9
Labor Department	149	88	−61
Post Office Department	1,392	1,397	+5
State Department	13,633	14,202	+569
Treasury Department	654	641	−13
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Price Administration	395	375	−20
Selective Service System	163	91	−72
Postwar agencies:			
Civilian Production Administration	22	22	----------
War Assets Administration	22	23	+1
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	96	94	−2
Civil Aeronautics Board	11	10	−1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	----------
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1	2	+1
Federal Communications Commission	37	36	−1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	----------	2	+2
Federal Security Agency	668	698	+30
Federal Works Agency	299	295	−4
Maritime Commission	226	232	+6
National Housing Agency	47	49	+2
National Labor Relations Board	2	2	----------
Panama Canal	26,932	26,708	−224
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	118	116	−2
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	----------
Veterans' Administration	1,485	1,734	+249
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	55,768	56,019	+963 −712
Net increase, excluding War and Navy Departments			+251
War Department	207,679	198,045	−9,634
Navy Department	[1] 52,557	[2] 52,409	−148
Total, including War and Navy Departments	316,004	306,473	−10,494 +963
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments	----------	----------	−9,531

[1] As of Sept. 30, 1946.
[2] As of Oct. 31, 1946.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1946 and comparison with October*

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget	746	750	+4
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Agriculture Department	90,111	83,595	−6,516

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1946 and comparison with October*—Continued

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments)—Con.			
Commerce Department	37,425	37,840	+415
Interior Department	50,272	48,960	−1,312
Justice Department	24,886	24,631	−255
Labor Department	30,437	7,717	−22,720
Post Office Department	495,636	458,291	−37,345
State Department	22,135	22,789	+654
Treasury Department	102,441	102,296	−145
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Defense Transportation	99	103	+4
Office of Price Administration	35,074	32,368	−2,706
Office of Scientific Research and Development	259	212	−47
Office of War Mobilization	172	161	−11
Selective Service System	10,272	9,716	−556
Postwar agencies:			
Civilian Production Administration	4,300	4,355	+55
Council of Economic Advisers	17	26	+9
National Wage Stabilization Board	759	637	−122
Price Decontrol Board	20	15	−5
War Assets Administration	57,323	58,922	+1,599
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	98	98	----------
Civil Aeronautics Board	449	460	+11
Civil Service Commission	3,594	3,522	−72
Export-Import Bank of Washington	115	118	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,384	1,394	+10
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,181	1,180	−1
Federal Power Commission	778	793	+15
Federal Security Agency	31,326	31,369	+43
Federal Trade Commission	529	537	+8
Federal Works Agency	24,173	24,330	+157
General Accounting Office	12,365	12,134	−231
Government Printing Office	7,115	8,001	+886
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,272	2,270	−2
Maritime Commission	13,679	13,184	−495
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,692	5,724	+32
National Archives	388	392	+4
National Capital Housing Authority	276	277	+1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	----------
National Gallery of Art	316	315	−1
National Housing Agency	19,128	19,197	+69
National Labor Relations Board	875	878	+3
National Mediation Board	101	102	+1
Panama Canal	27,360	27,125	−235
Railroad Retirement Board	2,114	2,287	+173
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	11,233	10,200	−1,033
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,206	1,207	+1
Smithsonian Institution	511	510	−1
Tariff Commission	222	225	+3
Tax Court of the United States	122	123	+1
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,897	13,284	+387

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1946 and comparison with October*—Continued

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Independent agencies—Continued			
Veterans' Administration	213,396	221,760	+8,364
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,357,296	1,296,397	−73,811 +12,912
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−60,899
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	384,336	380,880	−3,456
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	492,162	455,145	−37,017
Outside continental United States	207,679	198,045	−9,634
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,441,473	2,330,467	−123,918 +12,912
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−111,006

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees*[1] *of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during November 1946 and comparison with October 1946*

Departments or agencies	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Commerce Department	1,179	1,009	−170
Interior Department	5,088	4,903	−185
State Department	241	252	+11
Treasury	5,690	5,684	−6
Independent agencies:			
National Housing Agency	17	17	
Panama Canal	2,675	2,689	+14
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,922	6,175	+253
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	20,812	20,729	−361 +278
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−83
Navy Department, inside and outside United States	266,580	263,794	−2,786
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	227,029	208,918	−18,111
Outside continental United States	176,188	166,316	−9,872
Total, including War and Navy Departments	690,609	659,757	−31,130 +278
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−30,852

[1] Industrial employees include unskilled, semiskilled and skilled, and supervisory employees on construction projects. Maintenance and custodial workers not included.

POLAND

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the United States, in a note delivered January 9 by Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane in Warsaw, warns Poland that "the continuation of the present policy of suppression, coercion, and intimidation as applied to political opposition in Poland constitutes a violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements."

The matter is of such significance that I ask that the full note of the Department be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the note was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have the honor to refer to the Embassy's notes of August 19 and November 22, 1946, regarding the Polish national elections, to which no reply has yet been received, and pursuant to instructions from my Government to inform Your Excellency, as a signatory of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, with particular regard to those sections of the two agreements which deal with the establishment of a government in Poland, through the instrumentality of free and unfettered elections, of my Government's continued concern over the pre-election activities of the Polish Provisional Government of national unity.

My Government is especially perturbed by the increasingly frequent reports of repressive measures which the Polish Provisional Government has seen fit to employ against those democratic elements in Poland which have not alined themselves with the bloc parties.

It is a source of regret to my Government that its previous efforts to call the attention of the Polish Provisional Government to its failure to perform its obligations under the agreements cited have not resulted in any change in the course which that Government has pursued in connection with pre-election political activities.

According to information reaching my Government from various authoritative sources, these repressive activities on the part of the provisional government have now increased in intensity to the point where, if they do not cease immediately, there is little likelihood that elections can be held in accordance with the terms of the Potsdam Agreement which call for free and unfettered elections "on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and put forward candidates."

SANCTITY OF PACTS AT ISSUE

It is the view of my Government that this matter involves the sanctity of international agreements, a principle upon which depends the establishment and maintenance of peace and the reign of justice under law.

The obligations with respect to the Polish elections which my Government assumed at Yalta and reiterated at Potsdam, together with the Soviet and British Governments, and the obligations subsequently assumed by the Polish Government and frequently reiterated, provide for the conduct of free and unfettered elections of the type and in the manner described above.

The fact that the subject matter of these agreements relates to elections in Poland is incidental. The essential fact is that they constitute an international agreement under which all four nations concerned have assumed obligations.

I need hardly say that my Government is interested only in seeing that the Polish people have the opportunity to participate in a free and unfettered election and that my Government does not regard the results of such an election as being a proper concern of anyone other than the Polish people themselves.

My Government would be failing in its duty if it did not again point out that the continuation of the present policy of suppression, coercion, and intimidation as applied to political opposition in Poland constitutes a violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

STUDY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS AND INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment the following resolutions:

S. Res. 20. A resolution appointing a special committee to study the problems of American small business; and

S. Res. 46. A resolution continuing the authority for the investigation of the national-defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in connection with the two resolutions just reported, I want to point a moral.

The new Committee on Rules and Administration met yesterday, organized, became a going concern, and appointed subcommittees. There is a Joint Committee on the Library, which, under the Reorganization Act, must consist of four Senators from the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and four members of the similar House committee. On the part of the Senate, Senators JENNER, IVES, GREEN, and HOLLAND were selected to serve on that joint committee.

On the Joint Committee on Printing the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] will serve with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself.

On the Smithsonian Institution Subcommittee the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was appointed, with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

On a revision of the Senate rules there was appointed a subcommittee consisting of Senators WHERRY, IVES, and HAYDEN.

With reference to rooms, anyone who is interested in that subject either in the Capitol or the Senate Office Building should consult the chairman of the committee, since no subcommittee was appointed.

On the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, Senators HICKENLOOPER, BRICKER, and MYERS were selected, and all of the members present very properly decided that the Committee on Rules should assume the jurisdiction conferred upon it by law to take over all activities in relation to contested elections.

It will be understood that the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures in the 1946 General Election, which continues in existence until the end of this month, was investigating the election in the State of Maryland. The Committee on Rules and Administration definitely determined that under the law that committee now had jurisdiction over all contested elections; that the committee would assert its jurisdiction and ask that the Maryland dispute be placed in its hands.

Then, toward the close of the meeting, much to the surprise of some of us, action was taken on the two resolutions which have been reported by the Senator from Illinois to create special committees of the Senate. They involve a very serious question of Senate policy. At the last session of Congress the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 became law. That act defines the jurisdiction of the 15 committees of the Senate. Now, at the beginning of the new Congress, there is a proposal to recreate the Committee on Small Business, and to continue the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. Those of us who knew nothing about the resolutions and did not expect them to come up at the committee meeting requested they go over for a day or two, so that we might give consideration to the major problem of whether or not the Senate should at this time attempt to wreck the system of jurisdiction that had been imposed upon its various standing committees.

However, our request was very courteously but very firmly denied, and the majority of the committee decided to report the two resolutions immediately; they have been reported, and are now on the calendar. They can come up for consideration by the Senate on next Monday or any day thereafter. Since a principle is involved, I deem it to be my duty to bring this situation to the attention of the Senate. The very grave and serious question is whether the Senate shall now proceed to violate both the letter and the spirit of the act to reorganize the legislative branch of the Government, which became a law last August.

I have served for a long time in Congress. I have observed the operations of special committees both in the Senate and in the House. Many, though not all of them, have performed useful public service; but I am reminded in that connection of a remark made by the late Senator Claude Swanson, of Virginia, who was conducting an investigation in the Senate at one time. He said that an investigating committee was entitled to continue to investigate so long as it could stay on the front page, and that, his particular committee having been mentioned that morning on the fourth page of the newspapers, he thought it was high time that the investigation come to an end.

Publicity has its advantages. Members of the Senate all remember that a common or garden variety of Senator from the State of Missouri was made the chairman of an investigating committee to look into the national defense program, and that as the result he became the candidate of his party for and was elected Vice President of the United States. I would be loath to say that any Senators now entertain Vice Presidential ambitions, but it is an old American custom to erect rods that may attract the lightning which is bound to strike somewhere.

I want to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that coming over from the last Congress there are now in existence, and will be until the end of this month, the following special committees: The Committee To Study and Survey Small Business Enterprises; the Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1946 General Elections; the Committee on Problems Relating to the Development, Use, and Control of Atomic Energy; the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program; the Committee on Petroleum Resources Within and Outside of the United States; the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; the Committee Investigating the Effects of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; the Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources; and the Committee To Investigate Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool.

Some of these special committees have been rendering very excellent service; for example, the Committee on Petroleum Resources Within and Outside of the United States and the Committee Investigating Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool. The work of both of those committees has been outstanding. If the Senate is now going to establish special committees, as is proposed in the two resolutions now on the calendar, then we must give serious consideration to the reestablishment of other special committees that were performing valuable functions.

I have inquired of the disbursing office and find that there are 14 subcommittees of regular standing committees which have money available for expenditures at the present time. That, of course, is the regular procedure that the Senate would follow under the existing rules. The nine special committees I have mentioned also have money that they can expend until the end of January. I ask unanimous consent to have the list of subcommittees placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEES OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry investigating the production and distribution of food and other allied products.

Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of obtaining and laying factual data and information before the committee for its consideration in the discharge of its functions.

Committee on Finance investigating old-age and survivors' insurance and all other aspects of social security.

Committee on Indian Affairs making a survey of Indian conditions.

Committee on Interstate Commerce investigating conditions of railroads in the hands of receivers because of insolvency proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act.

Committee on Interstate Commerce investigating international communications by wire and radio.

Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation investigating the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power.

Committee on the Judiciary investigating activities of Security and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department.

Committee on the Judiciary investigating the disposal of the Government's interest in the Nashville Tennesseean.

Committee on Military Affairs taking testimony concerning treatment accorded the population of the Philippines by the Japanese.

Committee on Military Affairs investigating war contracts.

Committee on Naval Affairs inspecting naval establishments in the Western Hemisphere.

Committee on Public Lands and Surveys investigating the administration of public lands.

Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs investigating economic conditions and war damage in the Philippines.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me repeat that by a unanimous vote the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has decided to take over the jurisdiction imposed upon it by law with respect to contested elections. That was the regular, and entirely proper, thing to do. But it was decidedly irregular for that same committee, after having demanded that jurisdiction be taken away from the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, and be deposited with it, to turn right around and report out two resolutions which create special committees. All I can say is that the jewel of consistency was not on exhibition in the Committee on Rules and Administration's showcase yesterday.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I should like to say that there is nothing new and there is no element of surprise connected with resolutions concerning the two committees mentioned in the resolutions reported by me. A distinction exists between the two committees and the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was absorbed by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There was a demand that the latter committee take over the functions the Committee on Privileges and Elections has always exercised when charges have been filed in election cases. We would have been derelict in our duty if we had not assumed that responsibility, and we did rightfully assume it.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. So far as continuing the two committees in question being a surprise, I will say that one of the committees has become such a household word in the Nation that most people still call the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the Truman committee, because of the distinguished President's work as a Senator on that committee. Congress appropriated $400,000,000,000 during the war, much of it behind the curtain of secrecy. Senators were not even privileged to ask questions on the record during those trying days. Much has been developed and disclosed by this committee under former Senator Truman, under former Senator Mead, and under the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and now all that is proposed to be done is to thrash the question out on the floor and determine whether we are now again going to pull the curtain over things that have been done and have been looked into.

The same thing is true of the Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. We do not ask for immediate consideration of the resolution affecting that committee. We think it is an important matter, and it will be thrashed out completely. The reason why I, as chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee,

entertained the proposals with respect to the two special committees was that I thought it was so vitally important that the people know whether we are now going to look behind the curtain and see what happened to the money Congress appropriated for war purposes, and continue to investigate contracts that have been exposed and discussed recently on the floor of the Senate, and whether attempts will be made to block us from looking further into the subject.

Mr. President, I ask that the matter go over until Monday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] suggested that the report made to the Senate by the committee of which the Senator from Illinois is the chairman lacks "the jewel of consistency." I suggest to the Senator that the exhibition of too much jewelry is vulgar.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to say that I agree with the point of view expressed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Let me point out to the able Senator from Illinois that when the Truman committee was appointed, which had to do with investigating the conduct of the war, there were two separate Senate committees dealing with this subject, one having to do with the Navy Department and the other having to do with the Army, and therefore it was not feasible to have these committees of the Senate, separate as they were, conduct an over-all investigation.

That situation does not apply now. We have just set up a Committee on Armed Services, and if I may say so without immodesty, being a humble member of it, there is no abler committee in this body than the Committee on Armed Services, headed by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is a member of that committee, and other Senators who are able and experienced are members of it. I can see no logic whatsoever in taking a function from this committee, on which we have lately conferred complete jurisdiction over the armed services, the conduct of war, and all things related thereto, and lodging it in the hands of a special committee of Senators who are not members of the Armed Services Committee, while at the same time taking the question of elections from a special committee, which was created by the Senate and which is halfway through its work, and transferring it to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from Arizona spoke of inconsistency. If that is consistent, then it is equally consistent that the Committee on Armed Services should look into all matters relating to the war. I am thoroughly in favor of the investigation in question. I will do nothing in the Armed Services Committee to block any investigation of matters relating to the conduct of the war. But that is the committee which should make the investigation. If Senators will look at the field of that committee's work, the scope of its activity, and consider the duties which are expressly outlined in the law which Congress recently passed, they will find that it is to consider all matters having to do with the conduct of the War Department and with the conduct of the Navy Department. That certainly means contracts to buy Army and Navy materials and other incidental matters. Here, as we start a new Congress, when we have recently passed a law reorganizing the Congress, the very first act of the Committee on Rules and Administration is to disorganize and attempt to reorganize the reorganized Congress all over again.

What is back of this movement? Does anyone question the ability, the standing, the knowledge, and the integrity of the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]? I do not think so. I do not think there is an abler, a more judicious, and more patriotic Senator in this whole body.

Who are the other members of the Committee on Armed Services? The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] are the Republican members and the Democratic members are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and myself. Certainly the Republican members of this committee are outstanding men, both the older Members of this body and those who, as newcomers here, have made reputations which have preceded them into this Chamber. What on earth are we about to do except to take from one of the great committees of this body one of the very functions for which it was created? Is that being done in the name of public service, or in the name of greater efficiency? Not at all. If any Member of this body should desire an investigation of any phase of World War II, whether it be in the Army or Navy, or in any related activity, if he should submit a resolution and it should be sent to the Committee on Armed Services, we would assist in having it adopted, and the chairman would appoint an able subcommittee to conduct the investigation.

From the public viewpoint, the principal part of the reorganization bill was the salary increase to $15,000. In my humble judgment most of us would have been red in the face had we voted for a salary increase without a reorganization of the Congress, which had become antiquated because it was an old organization with expanding special committees, which had reached the point where Members received notices to attend three or four committee meetings at the same time, and obviously could not attend them all. So we reorganized; and every Member of this body knows that one of the reasons why many Senators voted for the bill, in order to justify the over-all act, was that of efficiency, and the disposition and division of duties of the various committees, aside from the salary increase.

Now we have no sooner met than we say nothing about the $5,000 salary increase, but we proceed to go off in all directions at the same time, with numerous special committees, which in my judgment is a direct reflection upon the membership of the standing committees whose reasonable right and duty it is to make certain investigations. I certainly hope that when this question comes up for a vote the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] who honors the Committee on Armed Services by acting as its chairman, will insist on his rights. I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will sustain him, so that we may have the committees appointed by the Senate do the work of the Senate and the country, without having reflections continually cast upon the standing committees by having Senators who are for the most part unacquainted with many of the routine matters which come before such committees attempting to "barge" into their functions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to know, first, what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is proceeding in the morning hour under the head of reports of committees.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has there been any motion to consider the continuing resolutions concerned with the special investigating committees to which reference has been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No such motion has been made. The resolutions have been placed on the calendar.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to ask that the matter go over until Monday, in accordance with the understanding which was discussed in the Committee on Rules and Administration while I was present at the meeting yesterday. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. I did not make any special request that the resolutions go over until Monday. They will automatically go over until Monday. They must lie over. No request has been made for immediate consideration, in order that Senators may have ample time to study the resolutions and prepare their speeches accordingly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to equal the eloquence of the Senator from Maryland, or to reply at this time to the gentle aspersions of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who, I am sure, on further reflection, will not desire, even in his very gentle manner, to question the motives of Members of this body. When we descend to that level we depart from all legislative deliberation. The Senator from Arizona gently suggested the fate which awaited a former chairman of a special committee. We might as appropriately—and I eschew the suggestion—suggest that the heated oratory from the other side might properly be attributed to some very ulterior motives; but that I do not suggest.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator does it by innuendo, and I am sorry he does. I made it a point not to do so, even by innuendo.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was referring to the statement of the Senator from Arizona, and not to anything the Senator from Maryland said. However, I did refer to the eloquence which the Senator from Maryland always exhibits. I do not withdraw that reference. I am sure that is no reflection upon the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator object to my reference to possible candidates for Vice President?

Mr. BREWSTER. I stated that the suggestion of the Senator, in the very gentle and lovely manner which is always characteristic of him, and other considerations of that character, which we are quite accustomed to hear from columnists and commentators, really had no proper place in this debate. I am sure the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. HAYDEN. I stated that I was loath to believe that any Senator now entertains Vice Presidential ambitions.

Mr. BREWSTER. However, the mere fact that the suggestion was made is significant. I would be loath to believe that the decision upon the other side arose from fear that further delinquencies of the administration might be exposed. I would certainly be loath to believe that; so we are on an equal footing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I courteously point out to the Senator from Maine, who I feel has perhaps not given this matter his usual careful consideration, that in the report on the reorganization bill which I hold in my hand there are these two paragraphs, which I beg his leave to read to the Senate.

The first paragraph reads as follows:

A bill should be referred without regard to the author's service on any particular committee seeking jurisdiction when its subject matter does not normally lie in the defined province of that committee. In redefining the jurisdiction of committees, great care should be taken clearly to resolve existing conflicts by specifying which committee shall have jurisdiction.

The second paragraph—and I am taking only two paragraphs out of many, to show the philosophy of the bill—reads as follows:

Directing the regular standing committees to carry on this supervisory function appeals to your committee as a better method than the appointment of numerous select investigating committees when situations have grown so difficult as to arouse public demand for correction or special study. We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned.

It was that philosophy which remained clearly in my memory. It was expounded on this floor at the time the bill was passed and caused my earlier expression. It is that philosophy which I am sure impelled Members on both sides to give to the reorganization bill the standing which it had before the Congress and the country.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that the solicitude which has been expressed on the other side as to some possible infringement on the prerogatives of any Members on this side is duly appreciated.

It is interesting to note that this matter has already been discussed since reference of the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, in accordance with what had been deemed to be the policy that should be pursued by the majority. I am happy to assure the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that not only I, but the members of the special committee, would be most happy to meet with members of the Committee on Armed Services in order to clear away any possible misunderstanding either as to jurisdiction or scope, and to consider what should be done in the transitional period in which we now are.

I have been one of the strongest believers in reorganization, and in the proper staffing of the standing committees, in order that they may perform their functions; but I trust we shall all understand that reorganization cannot be accomplished in a day. Time will be required both to secure the staffs and to complete the organization which is requisite. It had been my assumption, from earlier discussions, that it was thought possible that not only in the completion of the work which has been hitherto carried on by the special investigating committee, but in winding it up with the staff which we now have, which was created under my predecessors, there might well be, at least temporarily, a continuance of the special committee. I think that is the only thing that is contemplated in any proposal for the extension of the work. I anticipate that on Monday, when this matter will be in order for discussion, there will be ample opportunity for the discussion which its importance merits.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have been very much alive to the possible controversy on the question which the resolution has brought forward. I have had numerous talks with committee members, which wound up this morning with a conversation with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who very graciously quickly agreed not to take up the matter today, but to meet with our committee and his committee on Monday. At that time I am sure we shall be able to talk over the whole question and we will then be in position to give our views to the Senate on Monday if the subject is to be taken up at that time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the presentation of a report debatable in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I make that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. Reports of committees are still in order.

INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES — REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and myself, I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 40, providing for the extension of the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources. It had been my expectation that that resolution would be referred, as these other two resolutions were referred, to the Committee on Rules and Administration; but I notice that it has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which I believe to be an erroneous reference. I should like to have unanimous consent, since there has been no action on the resolution, that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that the rule of the Senate up to this time has been that no special investigating committee could be created unless a resolution had been reported by the appropriate standing committee of the Senate and then referred to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The functions of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate have been absorbed by the Committee on Rules and Administration. When the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] introduced his resolution on Wednesday he asked unanimous consent to have it referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that is how that committee got it. In suggesting references, normally the Parliamentarian is perfectly right.

The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska reads as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (o) (1) (A) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any resolution proposing to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a special or select joint committee, shall not be referred to any other standing committee of the Senate but shall be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration of all phases thereof, including the substantive matter."

Until the Senate adopts such a rule, under the rule of the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma should be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. That is where it belongs. I object to its reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration until the Committee on Public Lands has considered it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the Reorganization Act bill, in the absence of a special committee dealing with small business, which of the standing committees would have jurisdiction of small business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that pending a change in the rules such as has been proposed, such a question would go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Chair will read from subparagraph (d) of section 102 of the Reorganization Act:

> Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
> 1. Banking and currency generally.
> 2. Financial aid to commerce and industry.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I can well understand that small-business legislation might properly go to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not a member of that committee nor a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; but I believe that under the Reorganization Act the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction of commerce generally. In view of the observation of the Chair, I respectfully submit that the Chair might consider the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that under the law the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is not given jurisdiction over commerce generally; it is given jurisdiction over interstate and foreign commerce generally.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to paragraph 7, on page 7, of the Reorganization Act, under the heading "Committee on the Judiciary." It provides that that committee shall have jurisdiction of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

I understand that the real purpose of the Small Business Committee is to assure protection of small business against restraints and monopolies. So I think that the question hinges upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to relieve the mind of the Senator from Arizona. A few moments ago he made reference to a prophecy as to the aspirations of men to the great positions of President and Vice President of the United States. In my judgment, so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, if any of our friends in the press gallery were bold enough to heave a stone on this side of the aisle, they could not fail to hit a man who is a candidate for President or Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In one of the local morning newspapers—I think on yesterday morning—there was an article which indicated that there were 48 candidates for Vice President or President on the other side of the aisle. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but it was worthy of a news story.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. While we are dealing with parliamentary inquiries—and there will probably be a number of them as a result of the Reorganization Act—I should like a ruling by the Chair upon the one I am about to make. I contemplate introducing legislation which will deal with portal-to-portal pay. I have in mind the definition of the workweek, the question of the statute of limitations, and other important matters that are involved in what seems to me to be probably the most urgent and important question which the Congress should first consider.

I base my parliamentary inquiry upon what happened the other day when I discovered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] had introduced Senate bill 49 to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, I think, properly so, after reading the contents of that measure.

On the same day the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] introduced Senate bill 70, to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes. For some unknown reason, that bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have given study to the substance and the objective of both bills; in my humble opinion they are the same.

I raise this question because I should like to have any measures on this subject which I may introduce referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Of course, that, again, is a matter which is in the hands of the Chair; but I invite the attention of the Senate to the Reorganization Act, page 8, of Public Law 601, which I hold in my hand, which states specifically that the question of wages and hours of labor is a matter to be considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I am satisfied that both measures to which I have referred deal with wages and hours, and all matters which are incidental and flow therefrom. It seems to me that now is the time to determine which of those committees is to have jurisdiction over the portal-to-portal pay question. I should like to know what the Chair will rule, so that I may be in a position either to follow the Chair's decision or to do something else, in the event that I introduce proposed legislation along this line.

The matter raises a very serious question. We should not have two committees handling this portal-to-portal issue. One bill is now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, headed by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Another bill on the same subject matter is before the Committee on the Judiciary, headed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The latter bill was introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin; and, as I understand, the able Senator from Wisconsin requested that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—the very thing, Mr. President, regarding which I made a point of order the other day, in connection with the question of the proper reference of bills to committees. I undertake to say that we cannot permit the persuasion of any individual Senator on the floor of the Senate to determine the committee to which a bill or other measure should be referred, and especially so now that we are operating under the terms of the Reorganization Act, which, in my opinion, takes away a great deal of discretionary power which heretofore has been given to the Chair in making decisions of this character. I think it is important to raise the point at this moment, and to determine where these measures should be referred.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we further find ourselves in the position that the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings, as I understand, on Wednesday of next week, on the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin and was referred to that committee. The bill I introduced was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 49, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, for the simple reason that, instead of having the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hold hearings on portal-to-portal bills and the Judiciary Committee hold hearings on such bills, I think it is only fair that my bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, so that the bill may be considered by that committee together with the other bill which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 49, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know what is the position of the Chair with respect to the reference of proposed legislation of this character, and whether it

is the position of the Chair that it should be referred to the Judiciary Committee or should be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That is the point I raised and which is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, each bill has to be judged on its own terms and its own provisions. The opinion of the present occupant of the chair is that a bill which relates to wages and hours primarily and on its face, should be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. However, the Chair would have to examine the Senator's bill before committing himself on that point.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I wholeheartedly concur in the opinion of the Chair with respect to the reference of such measures to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

In view of the ruling of the Chair, I shall make objection to the request that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 49, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I base my inquiry on my belief that under the new rules the Senate should be careful not to make any decision which might be used as a precedent hereafter. If the bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin and the bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana are similar in nature, how did it happen that one was referred to one committee and one to another committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. When I sent my bill to the desk, I asked that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I did not ask that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or to the Committee on the Judiciary, but I requested that it be referred to the appropriate committee. Later I found that the Chair had referred it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, again I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that although beginning next week hearings are to be commenced before the Judiciary Committee on a portal-to-portal bill, and although one such bill is before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and another bill on the subject is before the Committee on the Judiciary, nevertheless, today I have been denied the right to have my bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, so that both bills might be considered by that committee at the same time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Chair will permit me to make a suggestion for the benefit of the Chair, if it is of any benefit, I should like to say that if a bill is incorrectly assigned or referred to a committee, the fact that that committee proceeds to hold hearings on the bill does not give it jurisdiction over the bill, if the bill was incorrectly assigned.

I do not know whether the two bills are identical or similar. But if the two bills are similar, it is a bad beginning here to have one referred to one committee and one referred to another committee. I do not believe that either committee should obtain jurisdiction by providing for the holding of an early hearing. If either of the bills has been incorrectly referred, that mistake should be corrected before we proceed too far into the maze of parliamentary differences and into the mesh of confusion by having similar bills referred to different committees.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Both bills amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, without reading the text of the bills, it would seem that both of them should have been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Kentucky will suspend for a moment, the present occupant of the Chair is advised that the reason why the bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary was that he requested that that be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that raises the very question which has been a matter of great difficulty here in the past, and as to which I think the Senate as a whole and the Chair the other day announced ought not to be the rule which would control the reference of bills and other measures. In other words, I think Senators should refrain from undertaking to control the reference of measures to committees. I think that is the spirit of the new rules. I think that certainly is the spirit of the Senate. The Chair should not pay any attention to the personal request of any Senator, unless the request is that the bill be assigned or referred to the proper committee; and if it is to go to the proper committee, it should not be necessary for a Senator to request that it go there. It should go there under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair when the bill was referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. But I think a new ruling of the Chair should be used as a precedent hereafter in determining a matter that is of some importance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky will remember that I raised this very question one day earlier this week. I did so primarily because an individual Senator made a request from the floor that a bill which he was introducing be referred to a certain committee. In that case the Senator's request was a correct one, for the Chair did properly refer the bill to the committee to which the Senator requested that it be referred. But I know what has happened many times in the past when Senators were especially interested in particular bills which they wished to have referred to particular committees. Such requests have been made by Senators on both sides of the aisle, as the able Senator from Kentucky has said.

Under the Reorganization Act, if we are to start out by observing its spirit and letter, we cannot permit the practice to continue as we have in the past, for I undertake to say that the discretionary power which heretofore was lodged in the occupant of the chair has been taken away to a great extent, because in relation to each and every committee we can find, spelled out so that everyone can read, most of the information which it is necessary to have in order to determine exactly where a bill should be referred.

If we are to continue the practice we have followed in the past—and we have such a suggestion already—then we will have plenty of trouble in the Senate in connection with which committee should handle this or that measure, and the Senator who reaches the Chair first and says, "I want my bill referred to such and such committee," will determine the committee which will get the measure. That is wrong. Such a practice cannot be justified. Now is the time to stop it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we all know that the custom which has been referred to grew up before the Reorganization Act was passed. I contended all along, in spite of the fact that the Senate rules did not very clearly define the jurisdiction of committees, that the Chair should exercise his own judgment in determining to which committee a bill should go, and in a case where he had any doubt about it and consulted the Parliamentarian, that the Parliamentarian should consider the subject matter of the bill in determining what advice he should give the Chair, and not be governed by the request of an individual Senator.

Those of us who served in the House of Representatives know that the jurisdiction of committees there is rather sharply defined, and there is not any confusion over the subject. Sometimes the Speaker may be in some doubt as to what committee a bill should be referred and consults the parliamentary clerk of the House, but I know of no custom that ever existed in the House that a bill should be referred to a particular committee because the Member introducing it asked that it be so referred, and it is not customary in the House to make such a request.

In the Reorganization Act we made an effort more sharply to define the jurisdiction of the committees, in order to get away from the long-time confusion which has existed, in order to get away from a sort of obiter dicta, ex cathedra announcement by a Presiding Officer then occupying the chair that he would refer any bill on any subject to any committee as requested by the author, which was utterly unjustified, in my judgment, and at that time I took the position that it was.

All I am seeking to do is to have it understood that the Chair shall exercise his judgment as to the committee to which a bill should go, depending upon its substance, and that he should not be governed by the fact that there is a request by a Senator that it should go to a particular committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in keeping with the announcement by the President pro tempore at the beginning of the session relative to procedure during the morning hour, I submit to the Chair that the Senate is now out of order, that the regular order should be pursued. There is a time and a place when such motions as that we are considering should be made.

Inasmuch as we have entered upon this matter, I shall yield to the Senator from Indiana for a further statement, but I shall ask for the regular order after the Senator shall conclude. Then, if there is to be a discussion of any motion about proper reference of measures, we will take it up in the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] a question, if I may. I understand that hearings will start next week in the Committee on the Judiciary on the portal-to-portal bill.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me ask a further question. Will it be possible for that committee to consider Senate bill 49, a bill introduced by me, which has to do with the question of portal-to-portal pay, without having it referred to his committee?

Mr. WILEY. If I may, I should like to make a brief statement in the Senator's time. I have listened to all the lecturing this morning——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I must rise to a point of order. I ask that distinguished Senators withhold any further argument on the subject they have been discussing, and that we proceed with the morning hour. Then Senators can take their own time. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. Reports of committees are still in order.

Mr. WILEY. Is it in order to introduce bills?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WILEY introduced S. 125, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced S. 126, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced S. 127, to provide flexibility in the schedule of basic salaries of employees of Senators, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 128. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Joseph Christian Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Anastasios P. Ionnetos (known as Tom Panage Yanatos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 130. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to remove the time limitation on the filing of applications for benefits by persons who were discharged or released from active duty before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 131. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 132. A bill to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 133. A bill to prevent the use of certain monopolistic practices in collective bargaining, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 134. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 135. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 137. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 138. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 139. A bill to provide for the holding of special elections to fill vacancies caused by removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. TAFT) introduced S. 140, to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 141. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Army Reserve Medal;

S. 142. A bill to authorize lump-sum payments to the heirs or estates of Air Corps Reserve flying officers killed while on active duty; and

S. 143. A bill to create an official ribbon to be known as the Army Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 144. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 145. A bill to provide for the relief of Eric Seddon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 146. A bill authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the farmers' irrigation district, North Platte project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Presly Holliday, quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 148. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Meyers;

S. 149. A bill for the relief of Hans Hauser; and

S. 150. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Gottfried Schmidt-Ehrenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 151. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 152. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 153. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 154. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 155. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 156. A bill to permit retired officers of the armed forces to act as agents or attorneys for prosecuting claims against the United States; and

S. 157. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act defining the compensation of persons holding positions as deputy clerks and commissioners of United States district courts, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1938; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 158. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 159. A bill to repeal the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 160. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to overtime pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 161. A bill relating to the hours of employment, compensation, and conditions of employment of employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for such commerce or employed in the performance of any Government contract; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 162. A bill to amend sections 812 and 861 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow the deduction of the amounts of bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers to or for the use of veterans' organizations in determining the net estates of decedents subject to Federal estate taxes to the Committee on Finance.

S. 163. A bill to amend section 33 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Grand Rapids, Kent County, Mich., as the Lamoreaux Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB):

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to extend in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch the time during which disposition of such pipe lines is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any person from being elected President for consecutive terms in excess of two; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. KILGORE) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 22, to create a Temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 23, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to freedom to work, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO SENATE OFFICIAL REPORTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate, and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 125) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such subsection the following:

"For the purposes of this act, the Official Reporters of the Proceedings and Debates of the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government, and service heretofore or hereafter rendered as an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate or as a person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be service as an officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them until he gives notice in writing to the said Official Reporters of his desire to come within the purview of this act. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who is in service on the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after such date. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who enters the service subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of such entrance into the service. No provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall be applicable to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them."

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY to accompany the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. WILEY ON REPORTERS' RETIREMENT BILL

The purpose of this bill is to fill a needless omission in the Civil Service Retirement Act. Because of that omission, Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate do not now have the benefits of the retirement provisions of the act. It seems to me, therefore, simple justice that these able and faithful men and those who work for them should have the benefits of the act.

No Member of this distinguished body can long be here without recognizing the invaluable services that are performed for him by the Official Reporters. With patience, with care, and with complete respect for their task, the Official Reporters chronicle each single word and action in this Chamber, editing senatorial remarks with precision, making suggestions, and otherwise helping to make an adequate and complete report for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They deserve this amendment at the very minimum.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF WISCONSIN INTO THE UNION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 126) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State, there shall be coined not to exceed 100,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date of the year in which they are minted, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of a duly authorized representative of the State of Wisconsin, upon the payment by it of the par value of such coins. Such coins shall be issued in such numbers and at such times during the calendar year 1948 as shall be requested by such State of Wisconsin and may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds shall be used for the observance of the centennial as directed by the Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. WILEY

A COMMEMORATIVE COIN FOR WISCONSIN'S CENTENNIAL

The purpose and nature of this resolution are self-explanatory, and conform completely to legislation passed previously by Congress, for example, the measure passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress for coins commemorating Iowa's centennial.

The preparation of a special coin is but one of the ways by which I hope our Federal Government will appropriately recognize this noteworthy occasion in the life of the great Badger State. I have already written to Postmaster General Hannegan, urging immediate plans for the issuance of a special centennial stamp. I hope that by the prompt passage of the legislation which I am introducing, and the prompt preparation of the centennial stamp, we may lay the groundwork for the extensive plans that will be made by the appropriate authorities in Wisconsin for the commemoration of the centennial.

The importance of honoring and giving appropriate recognition to our States as entities and to our State governments cannot be underestimated in this day of centralization. Only by giving new dignity and prestige to the States can they be encouraged

to solve their local problems at the grassroots level. I call attention to the fact that a special coin was struck to commemorate the centennial of Wisconsin's territorial government, and I believe that measures such as this are of help in promoting the prestige of our States.

BASIC SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES OF SENATORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide flexibility in the schedule of basic salaries of employees of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 127) to provide flexibility in the schedule of basic salaries of employees of Senators, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the eighth paragraph under the heading "Clerical assistance to Senators" of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, approved July 1, 1946, is amended to read as follows:

"Senators may change the number of employees in their respective offices, and may rearrange the schedule of basic salaries of such employees, including administrative assistants, in multiples of $5 per month: *Provided*, That such changes and rearrangements shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices by law or Senate resolution: *Provided further*, That no salary, other than that of the administrative assistant, shall be fixed under this paragraph at a rate in excess of $5,040 per annum, and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $5,040 per annum: *Provided further*, That Senators, before the day on which they are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office of the Senate which thereafter shall pay such employees in accordance with such certifications. Any sum available for the salaries of administrative assistants to Senators shall be available for payment of salaries of clerks in the case of any Senator in an amount equal to the difference, if any, between the basic salary of the administrative assistant and $8,000."

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. WILEY ON ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT BILL

The purpose of this bill is to correct an inflexible feature in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1947. Under that act, each Senator was given an administrative assistant whose basic salary is not to exceed $8,000. Further, under that act, if an employee is hired to fill that position at less than the top basic salary of $8,000, the difference between his salary and the $8,000 figure cannot be made available for other office purposes of the Senator.

At the time this feature was enacted I pointed out that in many senatorial offices Senators did not feel that employees hired to be administrative assistants, however capable, should be begun at the top basic salary of $8,000. On the contrary, I know that many of my colleagues are planning to hire men or have already done so at lower figures, such as $6,000. Under such a present arrangement, the $2,000 that is left over cannot be used by the Senator for office purposes. I need not remind each Senator that that sum might be properly used for apportionment, if only in part, among other members of the Senator's staff. I definitely do not believe that simply because a Senator has been granted this $8,000 job he should use the $8,000 in full merely in order to use up the money. On the contrary, I have stated that we must husband our funds here as much as we want the downtown agencies to husband their funds rather than to spend them recklessly, but innumerable senatorial offices would be benefitted, I humbly believe, if my amendment is passed in that each Senator will have available such additional sums to cover deserving needs in his office.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, I introduce a bill to create an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security. At this time I desire only to observe that this bill is very similar to the one we introduced in the last Congress, known as S. 2503. I ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TEMPORARY LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to create a Temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations.

I am introducing the joint resolution in order to carry out, in part, the President's recommendation in his state-of-the-Union message wherein he requests Congress to appoint such a Commission to investigate "the entire field of labor-management relations."

Mr. President, I have for a long time felt, and I publicly so stated as far back as April of last year, that the most intelligent approach leading to the most equitable and lasting solution of the labor-relations problem lies in a thorough and expert investigation of the whole problem, including, as the President suggested, "the underlying causes of labor-management disputes." In June of last year I specifically recommended a Presidential commission along the lines of the one established by President Wilson, which under the very able chairmanship of the late Frank P. Walsh, of Missouri, carried out such an enlightening and valuable investigation.

Mr. President, the sponsors of the joint resolution are in complete agreement with the President that Congress together with representatives of management, labor, and the public can carry out a more valuable and comprehensive study of the problem of labor-management relations than Congress by itself, or management, labor, and the public by themselves. The joint resolution, therefore, calls for the appointment of six Senators by the President of the Senate, six Members of the House by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and eight members of management, labor, and the public by the President of the United States.

The joint resolution gives particular emphasis to "the special and unique problem of Nation-wide strikes in essential industries affecting the public interest." The Commission in determining the underlying causes of labor-management disputes would be charged with investigating union and employer policies and practices, economic and other factors. The methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process, Government policies, existing and proposed legislation, and measures designed to lessen or eliminate labor-management disputes would also be studied.

The Commission would also investigate the problem of the health and safety of workers and the feasibility of establishing welfare funds, as was suggested in the President's veto message on the Case bill last year.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to create a Temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. KILGORE) was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FREEDOM TO WORK

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, for several years I have sponsored in the Senate a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to restore to all citizens the freedom to work. At this time I send an identical joint resolution to the desk for proper reference, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to freedom to work, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"FREEDOM TO WORK

"SECTION 1. No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with or resignation from a labor union, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any corporation or individual or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude from employment members of a labor

union or persons who refuse to join a labor union, or because of resignation from a labor union; nor shall any person against his will be compelled to pay dues to any labor organization as a prerequisite to or condition of employment.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power and exercise it to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

TERMINATION OF PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, and offer it as a substitute for Senate bill 70, to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be appropriately referred.

Mr. HILL. Reserving the right to object, did I understand the Senator to ask unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Indiana to be offering an amendment as a substitute for a bill.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator from Indiana ask that the amendment be referred to a particular committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asked that it be referred to the committee which has before it the bill which his proposal is designed to amend.

Mr. CAPEHART. I asked unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, being the final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Document Room and 500 copies for the use of the House Document Room.

SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD BOXCARS

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas there is presently available to shippers of traffic requiring boxcars approximately 700,000 cars of that type; a need for 800,000 cars is indicated; the result is a severe stringency in the supply of such cars in all sections of the country with consequent damage to shippers unable to receive cars adequate to their need; and

Whereas the rate of building new cars of all types is governed by the availability of necessary materials which has been and now is far below the needs of the commerce of the country; and

Whereas there are persistent claims that allotment of critical materials for building of freight cars has been below a justifiable minimum; and

Whereas the insufficient supply of boxcars produces a constant tendency to dislocate, as between railroads and as between sections of the country, the cars that are available with damage to business generally; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has been given full powers to control the freight-car supply of the country (Interstate Commerce Act, sec. 1, pars. 13 to 17); and

Whereas it has been and is being vigorously asserted that the Interstate Commerce Commission has failed to use its power and authority to prevent or correct such dislocation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or any duly constituted subcommittee thereof, of the Senate is authorized and directed to make an early and thorough investigation on the following points and to make prompt report to the Senate together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable:

A. Whether the boxcar supply of the railroads has been and is now adequate;

B. Whether there has been an avoidable failure to make necessary material available for the building of new cars;

C. Whether material for building of freight cars for export from the United States of America has been provided and such cars exported to the detriment of business in this country;

D. Whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has fully carried out the duties and obligations imposed upon that agency of the Congress by the Interstate Commerce Act.

CHARLOTTE D. WORDEN

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 48), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Charlotte D. Worden, widow of Floyd Worden, late an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO GERMANENESS OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"GERMANENESS

"No amendment to any bill or resolution pending in the Senate which is not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in such bill or resolution shall be received or considered; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of any such bill or resolution be received or considered which does not directly relate thereto. All questions of germaneness or relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate."

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO VOTES ON CERTAIN MEASURES

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That paragraph (3) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to a quorum for standing committees) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any measure or recommendation reported from any such committee shall be accompanied by a report in writing, which shall be printed, and a record vote shall be taken on any such measure or recommendation and the names of those voting for and against the measure or recommendation shall be included in the committee report."

THE DOMESTIC SUGAR SUPPLY

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution pertaining to the sugar situation in the United States, and I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from a young housewife in my own home State of Connecticut pertaining to the sugar situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 51), submitted by Mr. BALDWIN, was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas there exists in certain parts of the United States a shortage in the supply of sugar; and

Whereas this shortage is causing distress and suffering to people who are unable to obtain sugar to meet their minimum requirements; and

Whereas there would seem to be ample productive capacity in the United States, coupled with available foreign sources, from which to obtain a supply of sugar more than sufficient to meet all our needs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the sources of our domestic sugar supply, the amount of our present inventories, the reasons for existing shortages in sugar, and possible measures for alleviating such shortages; and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

The letter presented by Mr. BALDWIN is as follows:

LITCHFIELD, CONN., *December 21, 1946.*

Senator BALDWIN,

State House, Hartford, Conn.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to tell you about our sugar problem. I am a housewife, and we live on a farm in Litchfield County. We have five children. That means I have much cooking to do. My greatest problem since sugar rationing began is how to feed my family without sugar. Substitutes do not take the place of this hard-to-get article. Before rationing I always used from 5 to 10 pounds each week. In canning season much more.

We have done without our canned fruits, jams, jellies, without sugar for our table much of the time, and the pies, cakes, cookies, doughnuts, puddings, and candy have been out of the question.

Now, the war has been over for some time. Reports are that Europe's sugar crop is nearly normal. We want much more sugar in our American homes, where we are trying to raise the future generation of this country.

This year we faced Thanksgiving without sugar; now Christmas and the New Year without sugar, and it's not fair, especially to the children.

Thank you for listening.

Very truly yours,

INEZ I. MAY.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth

Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small-business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, as continued and supplemented, is hereby increased by $7,754.

EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION OF SYNTHETIC FUELS ACT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill to amend the Synthetic Fuels Act by extending that act from 5 to 8 years and by increasing the authorization. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have just dictated for release to persons interested.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTENSION OF SYNTHETIC FUELS ACT AND DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PIPE LINES

Unless the O'Mahoney-Randolph Synthetic Fuels Act of April 5, 1944, is amended, it may be impossible for the United States Bureau of Mines to proceed effectively with the originally planned program to make gasoline and other fuels from coal. I have, therefore, today introduced a bill extending the effective period of the act from 5 to 8 years, and the appropriation authorization from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000.

When the law was originally passed, it was contemplated that coal hydrogenation plants to demonstrate the utilization of coal as a source of liquid fuel should be constructed in several parts of the country close to the Nation's large deposits of coal. Rising costs due to the war and the fact that a government ordnance plant at Louisiana, Mo., was originally made available to the Department of the Interior prevented the construction of any of these coal plants.

On September 26, 1946, however, the War Department withdrew the Missouri ordnance works because it was found that it would be needed for the emergency production of ammonia for fertilizers. This effectively put an end to the coal hydrogenation plant, except for the research work which has been carried on in the Bureau of Mines laboratories, because the Interior Department does not now have sufficient funds available to proceed with the original plan.

Meanwhile, the consumption of petroleum in the United States is exceeding expectations. The conversion from the use of coal to the use of oil in many industries is increasing, as, for example, on the railroads where Diesel engines in large numbers are now supplanting steam locomotives.

If such conversions continue the coal industry may be seriously impaired, and many areas of the United States which depend upon coal mining may suffer.

Another fact which indicates the necessity for the amendment I have offered is that foreign sources of petroleum now greatly exceed domestic resources. The United States is no longer the world's greatest petroleum reservoir as it has been for 75 years until the war, and a sound conservation policy would indicate that there should be no interruption of the Bureau of Mines' program as originally contemplated in the O'Mahoney-Randolph Act to make a complete commercial demonstration of the possibility of making liquid fuel from coal.

The plan has the endorsement of the petroleum industry. The Independent Petroleum Association of America, for example, in its suggestions for a national oil policy, recommended that "research activities should be expanded and intensified in all fields, including the development of petroleum products from natural gas, coal, shale, and other sources of synthetics."

Supplementing my measure to continue the synthetic fuels program, I have, in conjunction with Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, introduced a resolution to postpone for 90 days the sale of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines so that Congress may have an opportunity to study the effect of the disposition of these lines on all the fuel industries.

The report of the War Assets Administration recommends that the pipe lines be disposed of either for the transportation of petroleum or natural gas by sale to the purchaser "offering the greatest net return in dollars to the United States Government."

Personally, I have never believed that the greatest net return in dollars should be the only standard, and, as a matter of fact, the Surplus Property Act specifically set forth numerous other objectives which should guide the disposal of surplus property. Among these was the maintenance of competition, the encouragement of employment opportunities, and the avoidance of "dislocations of the domestic economy and of international economic relations." Moreover, it was specifically provided by Congress in the Surplus Property Act that "Government-owned transportation facilities and equipment" should be disposed of "in such manner as to promote an adequate and economical national transportation system."

The recently announced agreement among four large American companies operating in the Middle East for the distribution of Saudi-Arabian petroleum has given great concern to domestic petroleum producers in the United States lest it should mean a sharp increase of petroleum importations in such manner as to drive small producers out of business. It has been suggested, for example, that this agreement might lead to shifting the flow of Latin-American oil from its accustomed market in Europe to the United States.

The use of these pipe lines for gasoline was strenuously opposed at the joint hearings held in November 1945 by the Surplus Property Subcommitee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and the Special Senate Committee on Petroleum, by the railroads, the coal associations, and the mine workers. The hearings of the Senate Public Lands Committee on the original O'Mahoney-Randolph Synthetic Fuels Act developed the fact that natural gas is, next to crude petroleum, the best source of gasoline. The transportation of natural gas from the Southwest to the industrial areas of the East supplanting coal may be a very uneconomic use of a valuable natural resource when it is taken into account that the position of the United States as a producer of petroleum is deteriorating in comparison with the oil areas of the Eastern Hemisphere.

It would seem to me all of these subjects should be carefully examined by the appropriate congressional committees before the pipe lines are sold merely for cash without regard to the effect of such disposal upon the economic system of the country.

DISPOSAL OF LITTLE BIG INCH AND BIG INCH PIPE LINES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced two measures, one a joint resolution in which I acted on behalf of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and myself. The purpose of that joint resolution is to postpone for 90 days the disposal of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines in order that the appropriate committees of Congress may consider the many issues which are involved in that matter. According to its report, the War Assets Administration would dispose of these pipe lines merely for cash to the highest bidder, without giving consideration at all to many of the very important objectives set forth in the Surplus Property Act, among which are the maintenance of competition, the preservation of domestic and foreign economic relations, the promotion of employment, and so forth. There was also an objective set forth in the Surplus Property Act that transportation facilities built by the Government during the war should be disposed of in a manner calculated to promote the best interests of the country.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in connection with the initial reports submitted today from the reorganized Foreign Relations Committee I want to say a word for the RECORD regarding my predecessor in the chairmanship of this committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The "bipartisanism" in foreign affairs of which we hear so much had its primary start in Chairman CONNALLY's committee, where my able friend from Texas, as always, has been wholly generous and scrupulously fair in his dealings with all his committee colleagues, entirely without regard to partisan lines. Furthermore, he developed a high committee morale and a high degree of committee efficiency by constantly bringing before us the key men of this and other countries for informal but highly significant interchanges of opinion. I am sure I speak for the entire committee when I express our thanks to him for his able, friendly, and effective leadership during critical and difficult days.

I should like to add, Mr. President, that I have been privileged to serve with the distinguished Senator from Texas in the intimate contacts of many international conferences along the road which we hope may lead to international peace and security. In every instance he has put his country greatly in his debt. At the recent meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, for example, he faced an unusually heavy accumulation of burdens because he represented us on the commission which was dealing with most of the white-hot political problems with which the General Assembly was confronted. He was called to long, arduous, delicate, and difficult labors, and he met all of these situations with relentless fidelity and constant success. He has richly earned our universal thanks.

The turn of the wheel, Mr. President, now calls me to the chairmanship so long and so well administered by my distinguished and able friend from Texas. I could not let the occasion pass without this expression of my affection and respect, and of my earnest hope that a united, unpartisan, American foreign policy may be the sole and exclusive dedication of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the future as it has been in the past.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the eminent Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for his very kind and generous remarks. I shall not take the time of the Senate to make any extended remarks in reply, but I wish to say that I very greatly enjoyed my service as chairman of the Committee on Foreign

Relations, and I feel a profound sense of gratitude to all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their earnest cooperation and assistance. I am happy to have served with the Senator from Michigan, who has given such fine cooperation and made such an outstanding contribution in the various conferences in which we have taken part. I wish for him, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the high degree of success which I am confident he will attain, and I am sure he will have the support of the members of the committee in the same degree accorded me, if not greater.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this morning, all of us received a statement made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to the United States Senate, with reference to Federal civilian personnel.

For 6 years I have had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator from Virginia. Time and time again we have both loyally supported the proposition of reducing personnel in the departments and agencies that we felt had too many employees, and we have likewise joined in seeing to it that departments and agencies such as the Veterans' Administration received increases. Today I wish to thank the able, hard-working Senator from Virginia for again bringing this matter of Federal employment so forcibly to the attention of the Members of Congress and of the public at large by his release to the press.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the press release issued by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY SENATOR HARRY BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE WITH REFERENCE TO FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

During the month of November, 1946, Federal employment both inside and outside the United States dropped 111,006 from the October total of 2,441,473 to the November total of 2,330,467. Inside the United States employment dropped 101,475 from the October total of 2,125,469 to the November total of 2,023,994. Decreases in the War and Navy Departments totaled 40,325. Outside the United States employment dropped 9,531 from the October total of 316,004 to the November total of 306,473.

Largest increases occurred in the Veterans' Administration, which added 8,364 employees to bring their total to 221,760, and the War Assets Administration, which added 1,599 to bring their total to 58,922. Largest decreases were in the War Department, which dropped 46,651; the Post Office Department, which dropped 37,345; the Labor Department, which by following the direction of the Congress to return the United States Employment Service to the States, dropped 22,720; the Department of Agriculture, which dropped 6,516; the Navy Department which dropped 3,456; the Office of Price Administration, which dropped 2,706; the Interior Department, which dropped 1,312; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which dropped 1,033.

The relief which the sorely pressed taxpayer might feel in reading such figures must be mitigated somewhat by two considerations which should be borne in mind. The first of these is that a portion of this decrease is found among seasonal and temporary employees, who quite possibly may be hired again at a later date. The second is that over-all employment, with the exception of the War and Navy Departments, is still considerably greater than it was on VJ-day. On August 31, 1945, Federal employment, excluding War and Navy but including that of 19 war agencies, stood at 1,117,456. On November 30, 1946, this same group of establishments totaled 1,296,397. In other words, the reductions which are now taking place are not reductions below our war-peak total; rather they are merely decreases which still leave the Federal Government, excluding the War and Navy Departments, with 178,941 more employees than it needed to beat Germany and Japan.

I have heard the argument that certain agencies, forced to curtail their normal peacetime activities because of the war, now need additional employees to handle the backlog of work, and also that the war and its aftermath have given the agencies additional responsibilities requiring more employees. Accepting this, let us examine Federal employment as of December 1939. At that time there were 706,700 Federal employees within the United States, not including those in the War Department and Navy Department. As of November 30, 1946, there were 1,240,378 such employees within the United States and 56,019 overseas; also, in December 1939 there were 222,136 civilian employees in the War and Navy Departments, while, as of November 1946, there are 783,616 civilians in the War and Navy Departments; nor does this include 250,454 civilian War and Navy Department employees overseas. Certainly these figures offer convincing proof that our Government is still needlessly overmanned; that our country is still needlessly overgoverned; that our taxpayers are still needlessly overburdened.

The new Congress, regardless of political affiliation, must not shirk the duty which the departments and agencies, by their failure to reduce to peacetime requirements, have forced upon it. At present the annual pay roll of the executive branch of the Government approximates $6,125,000,000. This is $1,500,000,000 more than the entire Government spent for all purposes in 1933. The executive branch now employs more people than all the State, city, and county governments of the entire 48 States. With the exception of school teachers, this includes, beside the regular State and municipal authorities, all the policemen, firemen, and public-service employees of the entire Nation. I call upon the Congress to correct this evil. If we are ever to balance the budget—to reduce the national debt—we must do it now, and we can't do it with 2,330,000 Federal employees.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Civil Service, which consists of seven Republicans and six Democrats, has jurisdiction of "the status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement; also over the Federal Civil Service and the Postal Department generally." Immediately upon the convening of Congress we organized our committee as promptly as possible, and on Wednesday we introduced a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 41) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with a view to ascertaining (1) the number of officers and employees on the rolls of each department, independent establishment, or agency of the Government (including Government owned or controlled corporations); (2) whether the number of officers and employees on the rolls of each such department, establishment, agency, or corporation is adequate to enable it efficiently to perform its functions; and (3) whether the number of officers and employees on the rolls of any such department, establishment, agency, or corporation can be reduced without impairing its ability efficiently to perform its functions. The committee shall make a report (a copy of which shall be delivered to the Committee on Appropriations) to the Senate at the earliest practible date, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Virginia, will be glad to know that, as chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, I have already had conferences with the Civil Service Commission. A hearing has been set for Tuesday morning, at which time we shall take up one department which we believe has far too many employees, whose number we think we shall be able to reduce very materially.

Mr. President, this matter has been discussed with the other members of the Committee on Civil Service, and we plan to bring before the committee the head of every department and agency of our Government. Under the Reorganization Act we shall report our findings promptly to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It will be our earnest endeavor to consider each department as soon as we possibly can. If funds are needed to make a thorough investigation of excess employees all over the United States where these different departments operate, I take it the Senate will grant the necessary funds.

Immediately upon being appointed to the committee I discussed this matter with Mr. Hoover, of the Federal Bureau

of Investigation, and asked him for several investigators from that Bureau. I found, however, that it is not the policy of the Department of Justice, which has charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to assign men to investigative work for any department of the Federal Government. Therefore, I shall confer with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], ranking Democratic member of the committee, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], next ranking Democratic member, who is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in an endeavor to ascertain what investigations we shall need in order to rid the Government of excess employees, and to supplement those agencies which are understaffed.

So I wish to report to the Senate, so far as the release prepared by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is concerned, that the matter has already had and is having very careful attention by the Civil Service Committee of the Senate.

DISCHARGE OF WAR-VETERAN EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to call the attention of the Senate to the letters which at the direction of the majority have been sent out discharging from the employ of the United States Senate men who are war veterans. I agree that it is within the province of the majority to send out such letters, but I also feel that in the case of veterans discharges should be made in accordance with the intent of the law.

Those of us who were in service in World War I will remember the promise that we would be given back our jobs when we returned from the service. We well remember that that promise was not lived up to. In the case of the last World War the Congress of the United States, in its judgment, saw fit to correct what occurred after the First World War. Paragraph (a) and paragraph (c) of section 8 of the Selective Service Act provide that employees of the Government of the United States who are in service may not be discharged from their jobs within 1 year after return from war service, and provide for the reemployment of such veterans if they make application for their old jobs within 90 days after their discharge.

Mr. President, I call attention to paragraph (b) of section 8 of the act, as follows:

> In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes application for reemployment within 40 days—

That I understand has since been changed to 90 days—

> After he is relieved from such training and service—
>
> (A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, such person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

Subparagraph (B) applies to private employment.

I call attention to the last sentence of paragraph (c) of section 8, reading as follows:

> And shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

Mr. President, some of the Senate employees who now are being discharged went into the service from their jobs here in the Capitol and fought for their country. Nobody asked them then whether they were Democrats or Republicans. They helped defend this country in its hour of need. Some have married, some have children, and they came back to their jobs here, attempting to supplement their income so that they can pursue their education. Now they find that all the promises made them are negated by the very people who wrote the law. It is going to leave a very bitter taste. I regret very much if the majority is going to carry politics this far. I hope they will reconsider their action in discharging these men. What can we expect of private employers if the Congress of the United States sets such ah example?

REPLETION OF SALMON FISHERIES THROUGH COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate had pointed out to it the great work done by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in bringing about international cooperation. I am sure that if such men as the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas continue their work we may finally achieve the goal of international cooperation for which we all hope.

Today I wish to call to the Senate's attention a matter of international cooperation which has actually occurred between this country and Canada. The great salmon runs of Puget Sound, the salmon fisheries being one of our large industries, were badly depleted from 1913 on. The mighty Fraser River, which flows wholly in Canada, dumps most of the salmon into the Puget Sound area. The industry is a joint one between the two countries. It was found that certain obstructions in that river were the cause of the great depletion of the salmon runs since 1913. Representatives of the two countries immediately got together, held such conferences as were necessary, and appointed a joint commission, which made a thorough study of the matter. Funds were jointly appropriated and the great canyon known as Hells Gate, in the Fraser River, through which the water flows 110 feet deep during the spring season, was widened, and the salmon runs of Puget Sound are now repleted because of the cooperation between and the friendly attitude of the two countries in this international economic problem.

Mr. President, to illustrate what can be done when two countries put their heads together for the great benefit of both peoples, I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD an article entitled "The Dramatic Conquest of Hells Gate." The solution of this economic problem affecting the great salmon runs of Puget Sound was brought about by international cooperation between Canada and the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DRAMATIC CONQUEST OF HELLS GATE

(By Edward W. Allen)

Hells Gate—the conquering of the Hells Gate Canyon obstruction in the Fraser River, where at certain stages the ruthless sweep of turbid water completely frustrated the heroic efforts of struggling thousands of sockeye salmon to reach their spawning grounds to perpetuate their race—this marked a dramatic climax to the first 8-year epoch of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.

Two million dollars, half from Canada, half from the United States, were placed at the Commission's command to aid these salmon at Hells Gate and other places in the Fraser River system. The sum is substantial, but no more sought after, no more delicious, no more attractive food is to be found than canned up-river sockeye salmon. Dr. W. F. Thompson is world renowned for his work in the restoration of the Pacific coast halibut and is known to be ultraconservative in his statements, yet he computes that since 1911 (when rocks were dumped into the Fraser in the course of construction along the river and created disastrous obstructions to the salmon's ascent) the quantity of canned salmon which should have been but was not produced would, at recent OPA ceiling prices, have had a value of about half a billion dollars.

Some background knowledge is essential to an understanding of this, one of the greatest accomplishments in the history of fishery conservation.

Though it is of common knowledge to fishermen, many people do not know that Pacific coast salmon spawn in fresh-water lakes and streams, that the young spend some time in the fresh water, then go to sea until the spawning urge brings them back to the place of their birth, there to spawn and die.

About the time salmon approach fresh water on their spawning migration, they stop eating and deterioration sets in. Just before this process commences salmon have reached their greatest size, also the height of perfection in quality. It is then only that they should be caught. In the case of the sockeye salmon of British Columbia and the State of Washington, the usual period of a complete life cycle is 4 years.

Two facts, therefore, should be borne in mind. A sockeye will return to the stream where it was born; and in the Fraser this will ordinarily be in 4 years. It will be a part of a specific run of salmon, at a specific period of time, to a specific place.

A stream may have a run which enters the river in July. It may have another run which enters the river in September. Although runs overlap, these two runs to the same stream may be as independent as runs to different streams. Therefore to protect or build up a particular run to a particular stream in a particular year may be of no service to any other run to that stream, or to any other stream.

To illustrate one phase of the salmon problem in a different way: If a stream which has only one run each year is completely blocked off in any year, that stream will be barren every 4 years thereafter unless accidentally or artificially stocked. Even then it will require several 4-year periods before substantial production can be expected.

Another interesting feature as to the Fraser River sockeye, is that a particular spawning ground seems capable of producing a large run only every fourth year. The cycle of

1901, 1905, 1909, and 1913 had become known as the big years. The other years were "off" years.

The biggest pack of sockeye of all time was that of 1913, when almost 2,500,000 cases (a case being forty-eight 1-pound cans or the equivalent) were produced. In that year also the damage due to the dumping of rock into the river at Hells Gate Canyon reached its maximum. There has not been a big year since.

Attempts were made to remove the debris from the river, also to coordinate the fishery regulations on both sides of the boundary line, but it became recognized that only by joint international action could the once great sockeye industry be restored. In 1937 the present Commission was at last created.

The treaty confined the first 8 years' work of the Commission to investigation and the removal of obstructions. After that the Commission became charged with the additional function of regulation both for conservation purposes and to insure an approximately even division of the catch between the fishermen of the two Nations.

Investigation on a broad base was immediately undertaken. Eventually it centered upon Hells Gate as the outstanding culprit in obstructing restoration of the sockeye runs. It was found that the river had never been completely restored to its condition prior to the beginning of railroad construction. But it was also found that this rock canyon, even under natural conditions, had frequently taken heavy toll.

The entire upper Fraser River Basin, an area almost as large as the entire State of Oregon, debouches through this canyon, the gate of which at low water is only 110 feet wide. The river has the astounding normal seasonal variation in height at this point of 60 feet; in extreme years, 90 feet. It was definitely determined that at certain heights, particularly when the gage at the gate registered between 25 and 40 feet, that the river was practically impassable to salmon, that if such levels coincided with salmon runs and lasted long enough whole runs might be killed off, and that there was probably no run which had not suffered in some year or other.

Just as Dr. W. F. Thompson had been "borrowed" from the International Fisheries Commission to conduct the scientific investigation, so Milo C. Bell was now "borrowed" from the fisheries department of the State of Washington to grapple with the formidable task of conquering the Fraser. Mr. Bell, in consultation with Prof. C. W. Harris, of the University of Washington, and Prof. E. Pretious, of the University of British Columbia, and an able staff, built to scale on the University of Washington campus, a model of Hells Gate Canyon.

Experiments were conducted on this model resulting in the evolution of a wholly new design of structure for assisting the passage of fish up stream. The result was called a fishway and differs radically from the familiar ladder. Money and authorization were secured and, at a cost approaching a million dollars, a fishway was constructed on each side of Hells Gate. That on the northerly or right bank is a cement structure 220 feet long, 20 feet wide with vertical sides 45 feet high. It is divided lengthwise into 10 compartments separated from each other by vertical baffles rising the full height of the sides. These baffles are so designed as to break and spread the speed and drop of the water over the whole length of the structure instead of their being concentrated largely at one spot as on the natural river. The baffles are equally effective at any height of water in the fishway that is deep enough for fish.

The fishway on the left bank is similar to the other except that it is longer and that its upper end is narrower. Fishways of the same general character have also been built at Bridge River rapids farther up the Fraser. More, but smaller, fishways are under construction or in contemplation for several other places in the area where the passage of fish has been severely obstructed.

In 1941 water conditions at Hells Gate were so bad that a careful estimate indicated that the passage upstream of probably a million fish was absolutely blocked. In 1946 water conditions were believed to be as bad as in 1941, but the two fishways were in full operation and the bulk of the run passed through them, reaching the spawning grounds in excellent condition. However, on recommendation of its engineers, the Commission is extending its assistance to the fish to higher water levels than reached by the present fishways.

Much of the Commission's success is due to its exceptionally able experts—all of whom should be better known by those interested in fishery management. Dr. Thompson, Professors Harris and Pretious, and Chief Engineer Milo C. Bell have already been mentioned. The director is now B. M. Brennan, formerly director of the department of fisheries of the State of Washington, who resigned from the Commission to become its director. Dr. W. A. Clemens, as biological consultant, and Dr. H. C. Gunning, as geological consultant, have been generous in their assistance. The Commission feels very fortunate in having recently secured the services of Dr. Richard Van Cleve to head the biological staff. He was formerly with the International Fisheries Commission. At the time he accepted the Commission's invitation to become its chief biologist, he was chief of the bureau of marine fisheries of the California division of fish and game. All of these men have been ably assisted by competent and loyal members of the biological, engineering, and office staffs.

Under the treaty creating the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, its work is limited to the rehabilitation of the sockeye salmon of the Fraser River, but it is confidently believed that the accomplishments of the Commission in the broad fields of fishery biology and fishery engineering will prove to be of inestimable value to other fisheries throughout the world. Moreover, this Commission and the International Fisheries Commission in its field of halibut, have nobly illustrated how two friendly nations can cooperate in practical ways to their mutual advantage.

THE DOMESTIC SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] today asked and received unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a letter which apparently came from an irate housewife regarding the sugar situation. I appreciate that there is a scarcity of sugar, and I appreciate the concern with which all the people of the country view the situation respecting sugar. There is a great lack of sugar, but there are some justifiable reasons for the conditions which exist. The situation probably can be corrected and remedied to some extent. Probably many things can be done to increase the flow of sugar into this country and into other countries, but the reason for the situation and the facts behind it again involve matters of international politics and international cooperation and international agreement, so, for the benefit of many of us who probably are not so well versed as is the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and other Senators in the matter of foreign relations and as to certain commitments regarding this commodity so important not only to the United States but to the world at large, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Washington Post of this morning, which gives a remarkable analysis of the entire sugar situation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to suggest to the Senator from Washington that earlier today I had asked and received consent to have the editorial published in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well; Mr. President, I withdraw the request. I commend the Senator from New Mexico for feeling as I do respecting the contents of the editorial.

Mr. HATCH. It is an excellent editorial. I made no comment of my own at the time I offered it for the RECORD. I am very glad the Senator from Washington has spoken as he has.

REFERENCE OF BILLS RELATING TO PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine propose to move that the Senate adjourn?

Mr. WHITE. I am about to move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Maine withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. WHITE. I am very glad to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to make one observation for the RECORD regarding the colloquy which occurred earlier today respecting the reference of bills dealing with the portal-to-portal problem. The President pro tempore was in the chair at the time the reference was made on Wednesday last. He was not in the chair earlier today when the colloquy in question occurred because he was on the floor waiting to be recognized in his capacity as the senior Senator from Michigan.

The Chair wishes to make this comment: It seemed to the Chair that the first portal-to-portal bill, which was introduced by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], dealt almost exclusively with a legal remedy and with a statute which essentially involved a legal question rather than a public-welfare question, although it could be readily argued that both problems were intertwined and that either decision could have been justified. But it was because at that time the Chair thought the original bill predominantly involved a legalistic contemplation that it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Subsequent bills were referred automatically, without any particular consultation, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare because they in turn seemed to be dominated by the labor and public-welfare factor rather than the legalistic factor.

However, the net result is obviously an impasse which ought not be allowed to stand. The Chair will ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to confer on this subject so that we may have a unified program. The Chair respectfully suggests that it is not quite so easy, as was indicated in the debate, always to find

a clear-cut reference from the text of each bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate what the Chair has said. I understand what the Chair will be up against under the Reorganization Act, in connection with a number of bills which will be introduced. However, when I saw in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what had happened and realized that one measure dealing with portal-to-portal pay had been referred to one committee and another such measure had been referred to a different committee, I then took it upon myself to read both bills. I also conferred with two very good lawyers on this subject. I will say to the majority leader, who seems to be interested in this discussion, that I do not pretend to keep up with law as I once did. I have been more or less out of active practice for a long time. However, I did confer with two good lawyers to find out whether or not they believed that these bills ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary or to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I also conferred with the Parliamentarian, and I gained the very distinct impression from all three of those gentlemen that in their opinion this problem dealt with wages and hours, and under the Reorganization Act dealing with that question there could be little doubt that the measures should go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I mention these facts only in an attempt to initiate our proceedings under the Reorganization Act in an orderly fashion, so that we may not set an erroneous precedent on this question which may arise to plague us later.

With all due deference—and I am always reluctant to disagree with the able Senator who now occupies the chair because I have great respect for his ability and judgment on all matters—I merely pass this suggestion along for whatever it is worth. After due consideration and study I believe that this important measure ought to go to the committee which the Parliamentarian and good lawyers say should handle it, notwithstanding the fact that it may have been referred to the wrong committee in the beginning. I repeat that I do this with a full sense of the weight of responsibility which the Reorganization Act places upon the United States Senate. I am completely "sold" upon the Reorganization Act, and I wish to do what I can to contribute in my limited way toward seeing that we get started right under this act, rather than starting on a wrong course which may cause trouble later. That was my only purpose in raising the parliamentary issue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair not only believes the able Senator from Illinois was wholly justified in raising the point, but also that it was very important that it should be raised.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for those remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair adds this further indication of the difficulties involved in some of these situations: The title of the original bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was "A bill to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases." The title of the bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was "A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938." It was quite obvious that the latter belonged in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was not so obvious that the other bill belonged in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In the view of the Chair, it belonged in the Committee on the Judiciary. There is a mixed jurisdiction involved, and we must straighten it out.

Mr. LUCAS. I can readily understand how, under those two captions, the Chair, in casually looking over the bills, should refer one to one committee and the other to another. But I seriously contend, upon a careful examination of each bill, that they both pursue the same objective, and they both belong in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair agrees with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to read a portion of the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which bears directly upon this vital issue:

> The major objective or predominant character of a bill, in the opinion of the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House, should be controlling in determining the reference of bills. We recommend the exercise of more care in the reference of Senate bills. A bill should be referred without regard to the author's service on any particular committee seeking jurisdiction when its subject matter does not normally lie in the defined province of that committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am about to make a motion to adjourn until Monday, but I should like to make a brief statement before making the motion.

I feel that all Members of the Senate understand that in organizing a new Congress, creating committees, and introducing bills, as well as holding hearings before committees which ultimately report legislation to the Senate, there is an inevitable delay. I believe that at this time we are experiencing that which always happens at the opening of a new Congress. So far as I know, there is no further business immediately ready for Senate consideration. However, I am hopeful—and I think I may say I have the expectation—that in a very few days committees will be able to function, and proposed legislation will be before the Senate for consideration. I make that statement so that the country, as well as the Senate, may understand the situation which always confronts a new Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not enter into the colloquy this morning relative to special committees, or the value of reports. I believe that in time the question which has arisen will be ironed out.

I respectfully invite the attention of the Chair, as well as other Senators, to the fact that regardless of reports, and regardless of the interpretation of those who wrote the reports, the reorganization bill stands for itself. The idea has been advanced by some Senators that what is in the reports, which have been written by Senators who are interested in this, that, or the other interpretation, is important. Let me say that what is in the reports is not the law itself. As we study the law and make our own interpretations, these questions will be ironed out satisfactorily.

With reference to special committees, of course if a Senator wishes to adopt the language of a report as his own interpretation, he has a perfect right to do so. I am not questioning that right. But here we have the question of special committees. I agree that as the reorganization bill passed the Senate at the last session it provided that there should be no more special committees. When the bill reached the floor of the House, that provision was eliminated. As the bill was finally passed and became law it still provided that special committees might be created if the Senate so desired. Their creation is not against the Reorganization Act which was passed by the Congress.

It is still a debatable question. We might debate all day as to what the report on the reorganization bill means and what was the purpose of those who drafted the bill. But when we get down to brass tacks, reports are not laws. We must take the law as it now is and do the very best we can to refer bills to committees which have jurisdiction of the subject matters involved in such bills. When it comes to the question of special committees we must decide what the policy will be, not as a party, but as the Senate of the United States.

I think my position is clear. I have gone along with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] many times in opposing special committees that were hurriedly organized, even to the extent of withholding appropriations because we felt that such committees were unnecessary. If it is to be the policy of the Senate that no special committees shall be organized, certainly I shall be glad to go along with that policy.

I believe I have had as much experience in the past 4 years with special committees as has any other Member of the Senate. I am just as anxious to eliminate them as is any other Senator. On the other hand, if it is to be the policy of the majority Members of the Senate to continue to organize special committees which cut across standing committee lines, I think we should develop the policy.

While I am on my feet, I wish to mention the fact that one Senator said that small business committee matters should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A distinguished Senator who has been a member of the Committee on Rules for many years, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], said that such matters ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary. The ruling of the Chair was that if small business legislation were to be referred to a standing committee it should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I submit that there are special committees which cut across standing committee lines. When they do, and the Senate feels that they are sufficiently important, I think we should organize such special committees and refer all proper subject matters to them.

I am not laying down a policy; I am simply stating again, as I stated in the debate on the reorganization bill, that special committees should be created only when there is need for them. Because of that fact I have submitted a resolution to amend rule XXV, which provides for the very thing that has been commented upon by Senators, that a bill or a resolution shall first be referred to the standing committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter. Certainly we cannot have that rule and then give another committee power to judge whether or not an appropriation should be provided for a special committee. The resolution which I have offered proposing an amendment to rule XXV provides that where special committees are to be organized the Committee on Rules and Administration shall take jurisdiction of the subject matter, for the reason that that committee rises above the standing committee which has jurisdiction, and therefore it should consider not only the authorization for the special committee, but also the question of funds.

I hope that when the proposed amendment comes before us Senators will express their views, because I think this question is the meat of the whole situation. If we adopt the proposed amendment to the rule, it means that we may create special committees. If we do not, it means that the Senate will depart from the policy of the past of having special committees cutting across standing committee lines, and that we shall have no more special committees.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it seems apparent that a bill of which I was the parent, a bill relating to portal-to-portal pay, which I introduced a few days ago, has precipitated considerable discussion. I think we have had sufficient lecturing on the subject. The distinguished Senator who recently spoke called attention to the fact that men's minds differ as to the proper committees to which certain bills should be referred. This particular bill, as the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is a member of my committee, said, involves simply a legal question. If there is any committee in the Senate which has jurisdiction of a legal question it is the Committee on the Judiciary.

When I introduced the bill I called the attention of the Parliamentarian to the fact that it involved simply a legal question, and it was referred to my committee. Someone must make the decisions. It is not the function of individual Senators to do so; it is the function of the Chair. He receives his direction and guidance from the Parliamentarian.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], than whom there is no better lawyer in the Senate, agreed that our committee should have jurisdiction, and he agreed that the bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] should be referred to our committee.

We are not here to squabble over delays or methods which occasion delays. Rather, we are here to accelerate and expedite the work of the Senate. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is recognized as the proper committee to handle the over-all labor bill. There are various versions of it, including the so-called Ball-Taft bill, and other versions. The committee is going to work on that subject.

We recognize that one of the challenging issues before the American people today is the issue of whether or not the Supreme Court shall continue legislating, which it did in the Michigan case, which laid the basis for the portal-to-portal pay issue. We know that already suits involving approximately $3,000,000,000 have been commenced. That is a vital matter, because it affects not only individual industries but the whole economic structure of America. It is a reeducation, as some New Dealers would have it, which might make any future labor legislation unnecessary. If industry cannot provide jobs there will be no work.

So, Mr. President, I maintain that the President pro tempore, under the guiding hand of the Parliamentarian, exercised the proper function, and that he was correct. I have appointed a subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who has been requested by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to start hearings not later than Wednesday next, with reference to the vital and challenging subject of portal-to-portal pay.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were rereferred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following nominations:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations;

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, to be the United States representative on the Commission of Investigation established by the Security Council of the United Nations on December 19, 1946, to ascertain the facts relating to alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain;

S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

Sundry routine appointments in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

CONVENTION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND FRANCE RELATING TO TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, Eightieth Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on October 18, 1946, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on estates and inheritances, and for the purpose of modifying and supplementing certain provisions of the convention between the two Governments relating to income taxation signed at Paris on July 25, 1939. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The convention is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on October 18, 1946, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on estates and inheritances, and for the purpose of modifying and supplementing certain provisions of the convention between the two Governments relating to income taxation signed at Paris on July 25, 1939.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1947.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Convention of October 18, 1946, between the United States and France for the avoidance of double taxation.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 8, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, the convention between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on October 18, 1946, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on estates and inheritances, and for the purpose of modifying and supplementing certain provisions of the convention between the two Governments relating to income taxation signed at Paris on July 25, 1939.

The Department of State and the Treasury Department collaborated in the negotiation of the convention of October 18, 1946, which was formulated as a result of technical discussions between representatives of this Government and representatives of the French Government. A public announcement regarding the negotiations was made

by the Department of State, the announcement referring also to the fact that attention was given to certain current questions concerning the interpretation and administration of French taxes in their application to American nationals. The position of the French Government regarding such matters and regarding the application of certain provisions of the 1939 convention, pending the signature and coming into force of the proposed new convention, was made the subject of record in diplomatic notes, the texts of which were made public.

The new convention is in four parts, called titles. Title I (articles 1 to 6) contains substantive provisions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to the United States estate tax and the French tax on inheritances. As in the cases of the existing conventions on this subject with Canada and the United Kingdom, the convention with France extends in its application, insofar as the United States is concerned, only to estate taxes imposed by the Federal Government. The imposition and collection of inheritance or estate taxes by States or Territories of the United States or by the District of Columbia are not restricted by the convention. As to France, the convention is applicable to the tax on inheritances, which corresponds with the Federal estate tax in the United States.

Title II (article 7) contains six lettered subparagraphs, each of which involves some modification or supplementation of provisions of the convention of July 25, 1939, now in force between the two countries, relating to income taxation.

Title III (articles 8 to 15) contains provisions relating to mutual administrative assistance through the exchange of information and for the collection of taxes in certain cases, with a view to discouraging tax evasion. Pursuant to article 16, upon the coming into force of the convention, the provisions of title III would apply with respect to taxes on estates or inheritances and also with respect to income taxes, the corresponding provisions of the 1939 convention being for that purpose superseded and replaced.

Title IV (articles 16 to 19) contains provisions relating to the procedure for bringing the convention into force and the procedure for terminating the convention.

The provisions relating to taxes on estates or inheritances are similar, in substantial respects, to provisions in the existing convention of June 8, 1944, between the United States and Canada and the existing convention of April 16, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom relating to taxes on the estates of deceased persons. As in the case of the convention with Canada and the convention with the United Kingdom, double taxation is avoided principally by means of a credit. The country imposing the tax in the case of a deceased person who, at the time of death, was domiciled in that country (or was a citizen thereof if that country be the United States) allows a credit for the tax imposed by the other country with respect to property situated in such other country and included by both countries for the purpose of computing the tax. A further credit is provided in the event that each of the two countries determines that the decedent was domiciled in its territory at the time of death. Other important provisions in title I are those relating to rules of situs of property, exemptions, and a provision that the country which imposes the tax solely on the basis of property situated therein shall not take into account, for determining the amount or rate of tax, property situated outside its territory. As in the convention with the United Kingdom, but unlike the convention with Canada, title I of the new convention with France contains no provision for the exemption of real or immovable property situated outside the taxing country. However, under the laws of both the United States and France such property is now exempt from tax on the estate or inheritance. France also exempts corporeal movables (tangible personal property) situated outside France.

The provisions of the convention which modify or supplement the 1939 convention with France are designed primarily to take into consideration certain changes in the laws or practices of one or the other of the two countries in regard to income taxation. Article 7, which constitutes title II of the convention, contains specific amendments to the 1939 convention, as set forth in six lettered subparagraphs, summarized as follows:

(a) The reference to the French national tax on undistributed profits as being among the taxes to which the 1939 convention relates is eliminated, in as much as that tax has been abolished.

(b) The first sentence is designed to embody in the convention with France the principle of article IX of the income-tax convention between the United States and the United Kingdom. The second sentence, whereby the term "royalties" shall be deemed to include rentals in respect of motion picture films, is consistent with article VIII (3) of the convention between the United States and the United Kingdom.

(c) This amendment has the effect of making article 8 of the 1939 convention reciprocal and has its origin in the desire of the French Government to be free to subject to its schedular taxation its own nationals who are employed by the United States Government in France. Under the 1939 convention France waived taxation of such individuals, although the United States reserved its right to tax United States citizens employed by the French Government in the United States.

(d) The amendments here provided are designed to accomplish more adequately the object of avoidance from double taxation. Under the 1939 convention France, in effect, allows a credit against its securities tax for 12 percent of the amount of income from securities derived by taxpayers in France from United States sources. At the time of the conclusion of the 1939 convention the United States tax generally imposed was at the rate of 10 percent upon such income. Since that time the rate of such tax has increased to 30 percent in the case of nonresident aliens and even higher rates where the income exceeds $15,400. Under these circumstances, the 12-percent credit allowed by France became inadequate to avoid double taxation. In recognition of this fact the French Government has agreed to raise the credit to 25 percent of the income taxes, effective retroactively to January 1, 1945, with respect to the taxation of income acquired since that date on which the French tax has not been collected. The second part of the subparagraph (d) would make applicable to aliens resident in France, including United States citizens, technical changes made in article 114 of the French Code on Direct Taxation. These changes do not involve any real departure with respect to the taxation of United States citizens in Frances. Like other aliens in the same situation, a United States citizen resident but not domiciled in France will continue to be taxed, insofar as the French general income tax is concerned, upon a sum equal to five times the rental value of the residence or residences maintained by such citizen in France. This basis is deemed to be as favorable to the taxpayer as can be reasonably expected.

(e) The new article 17A here set forth will have the effect of permitting American business in France a further opportunity to obtain the benefits which were accorded by article 17 of the 1939 convention.

(f) This amendment merely changes the designations of the respective officials of the two countries who shall be deemed to be the "competent authority" or "competent authorities" for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the 1939 convention. In this respect, the 1939 convention is made consistent with the corresponding provisions in tax conventions of the United States with other countries.

Title III, relating to administrative cooperation, corresponds with title II of the 1939 convention and supersedes that title II insofar as the provisions of title III of the new convention may be applicable to income taxation. This is designed primarily to achieve uniformity, as far as possible, in the provisions for administrative cooperation in respect of both estate taxation and income taxation. The provisions of title III are substantially similar to provisions on the same subject in the tax conventions which have entered into force recently between the United States and Canada and the United Kingdom. There are the usual safeguards that the provisions do not impose upon either country the obligation to carry out measures contrary to the regulations and practice of either country or to supply information not procurable under its legislation, as well as other safeguards found in corresponding provisions of other tax conventions of the United States. The changes which are effected in relation to the 1939 convention are considered desirable in the interest of a more efficient fiscal cooperation between the revenue services of the two countries.

It is anticipated that in the course of consideration of the convention by the Senate the appropriate officials of the Treasury Department will be called upon to furnish, and will furnish, a more detailed statement with respect to the purpose and application of the substantive provisions of the convention, including those relating to exchange of information and assistance in collection.

Article 17 is similar to article XXII of the income-tax convention between the United States and the United Kingdom, in that it lays the basis for application of the convention to colonies, overseas territories, protectorates, or territories under mandate or trusteeship. Article 17 does not of itself extend the provisions of the convention to such colonies or other territories, but makes it possible, in the case of French colonies or other territories which have tax systems closely analogous to that existing in France, for the convention to be extended in its application without the necessity for entering into a separate convention covering each of the colonies or other territories. This, of course, will be possible only on the conditions specified in article 17. As pointed out in connection with the submission to the Senate of the income-tax convention with the United Kingdom, the United States revenue laws do not extend to overseas possessions, such as Puerto Rico. Such possessions will be free to elect, under article 17, to have the conventions with France extended in application to them, subject to the requirement for the giving of a notification to that effect by the United States Government to the French Government and the right of the latter to give notice that it does not accept such notification. Adequate provision is made also with respect to the termination of the convention as to any of the colonies or other territories to which it may have become applicable under article 17.

Article 18 provides for ratification and for the exchange of instruments of ratification and prescribes the effective dates of the convention. As to title I and other provisions of the convention applicable with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, the convention will enter into force on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable solely to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after that date. As to title II and other provisions of the convention applicable with respect to taxes on income, the convention will (except as otherwise provided for special purposes, as in articles 7 and 17) enter into force on the 1st day of January

following the exchange of instruments of ratification.

It is provided in article 19 that the convention shall remain in force for a minimum period of 5 years, but may be terminated by the giving of written notice by one of the contracting countries to the other contracting country, according to the procedure and with the effect specified in that article.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES F. BYRNES.

CONVENTION BETWEEN FRANCE AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ABOUT DOUBLE TAXATION AND FISCAL ASSISTANCE

The Government of the United States of America and the Provisional Government of the French Republic,

Desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on estates and inheritances, and for the purpose of modifying and supplementing certain provisions of the Convention between the two Governments relating to income taxation signed at Paris on July 25, 1939,

Have designated for this purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America: Mr. Jefferson Caffery, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in France,

The Provisional Government of the French Republic: Mr. Georges Bidault, President of the Provisional Government of the French Republic, Minister for Foreign Affairs who, after having exchanged their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

TITLE I. TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

Article 1

(1) The taxes which are the subject of this Title are:

(a) for the United States of America, the Federal estate tax, and

(b) for France, the tax on inheritances.

(2) This Title shall also be applicable to all other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either Contracting State after the signing of the present Convention, or imposed by the government of any territory to which the present Convention applies under Article 17.

(3) The present Convention is concluded with reference to United States and French law in force on the day of its signature. Accordingly, if these laws are appreciably modified the competent authorities of the two States will consult together for the purposes of adapting the provisions of the present Convention to such changes.

Article 2

(1) In this Title, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means only the States, the Territories of Alaska and of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "France", when used in a geographical sense, means only metropolitan France, excluding Algeria and the Colonies.

(c) The term "tax" means the French tax on inheritances or the Federal estate tax of the United States, as the context requires.

(2) In the application, by one of the Contracting States, of the provisions of this Title, any term which is not otherwise defined shall have, unless the context requires a different interpretation, the meaning which it has under the laws of that Contracting State relating to the taxes which are the subject of this Title.

Article 3

(1) For the purposes of this Title, the question whether a decedent was domiciled in the territory of one of the Contracting States at the time of his death shall be determined in conformity with the law in force in that territory.

(2) In the case of the death of a person domiciled in the territory of one of the Contracting States, the situs of any of the following property or property rights shall, for the purpose of the imposition of the tax and for the purpose of the credit provided for in Article 5, be determined exclusively in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Real property shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the land involved is located. Real property includes leases of such property, unless such leases are of eighteen years' duration or less, but excludes mortgages and other liens on such property as security. The question whether any other property or right in property constitutes real property shall be determined in accordance with the law of the place where the land involved is located.

(b) Corporeal movable property, except as hereinafter prescribed, as well as bank notes and any other kind of money which is legal tender at the place of issuance, shall be deemed to be situated where it is physically located at the time of the decedent's death.

(c) Ships and aircraft shall be deemed to be situated at the place of registration or documentation of the ship or aircraft.

(d) The good will of a business firm (including for the purposes of this subparagraph rights in a lease other than one deemed to be real property under the provisions of subparagraph (a) of this Article) or the good will attached to the practice of one of the liberal professions shall be deemed to be situated where the business is carried on or the profession is practiced.

(e) Patents, trade-marks and designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered.

(f) Copyrights and rights or licenses to use any copyrighted material, patent, trademark or design shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the rights arising therefrom are exercisable.

(g) Shares in a corporation (including shares held by a nominee for the benefit of the decedent) shall be deemed to be situated at the place in which, or under the laws of which, such corporation was created or organized.

(h) Bills of exchange and checks shall be deemed to be situated at the place of the drawee's residence, and negotiable promissory notes at the place of residence of the maker.

(i) All property other than hereinbefore mentioned shall be deemed to be situated in the State in which the deceased person was domiciled at the time of his death.

Article 4

The Contracting State which imposes tax in the case of a decedent who, at the time of his death, was not domiciled in its territory but was domiciled in the territory of the other Contracting State:

(a) shall allow every abatement, exemption, deduction, or credit, which would be applicable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled in its territory, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property, situated according to Article 3 in such State and subject to the tax of such State, bears to the value of the property which would have been subject to the tax of such State if the decedent had been domiciled in its territory; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this Article and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article 3 outside its territory in determining the amount or rate of tax.

However, the provisions of this Article shall not apply to the tax imposed by the United States in the case of a deceased citizen of the United States.

Article 5

(1) The Contracting State imposing tax in the case of a deceased person, who, at the time of his death, was domiciled in such State (or was a citizen thereof if such State is the United States), shall allow against its tax (as otherwise computed) a credit for the amount of the tax imposed by the other Contracting State with respect to property situated in the territory of such other Contracting State and included for tax purposes by both States, but the amount of credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed by the former State which is attributable to such property. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article.

(2) If the decedent is regarded by each of the Contracting States as being domiciled in its own territory, each State shall, in addition to the credit authorized by paragraph (1) of this Article, allow against its tax (as otherwise computed) a credit for the part of the tax imposed by the other State with respect to property included for tax purposes by both States and situated or deemed to be situated

(a) in the territory of both Contracting States, or

(b) outside of both territories.

The total of the credits authorized by this paragraph shall be equal to the amount of tax imposed with respect to such property by the State imposing the smaller tax, and shall be divided between the two States in proportion to the amount of tax imposed by each of the two Contracting States with respect to such property.

(3) For the purposes of this article, the amount of the tax of each Contracting State attributable to any designated property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable abatement, credit, remittance, diminution, or increase, as provided by its law, other than any credit authorized by this article.

Article 6

(1) Any claim for a credit or a refund of tax founded on the provisions of this Title shall be made within a period of five years from the date of the death of the decedent.

(2) Any such refund shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

TITLE II. TAX ON INCOMES

Article 7

The provisions of the convention and protocol between the United States of America and the French Republic signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, are hereby modified and supplemented as follows:

(a) In the enumeration of French taxes to which the convention of July 25, 1939, applies the reference to the national tax on undistributed profits which is set forth as number (3) in Article 1 (b) of Title I is eliminated as the tax has ceased to be imposed in France since January 1, 1941. The second paragraph of Article 15 of said convention is abrogated.

(b) For the purposes of Article 7 an individual resident of France deriving from sources within the United States rents from real property, or royalties in respect to mines, quarries, or other natural resources may elect for any taxable year to be subject to United States tax as if such resident were engaged in trade or business within the United States through a permanent establishment therein in such taxable year. For the purposes of Article 7 the term "royalties" as used in the second paragraph of such article shall, as to amounts paid on or after January 1, 1945, be deemed to include rentals in respect of motion picture films.

(c) Article 8 is amended by adding after the words "other State" in the first paragraph thereof the following:

"(other than citizens of such other State").

(d) (1) Article 14, B, a) is amended by striking out "12" and inserting in lieu thereof "25". This subparagraph shall be deemed to be effective as of January 1, 1945, with respect to the taxation of income acquired since that date on which the French tax has not been collected.

(2) The last paragraph of Article 14, B, b) is abrogated and replaced by the following provisions:

"However, the provisions of the first and second paragraphs of Article 114 of the French Code on direct taxation relative to the taxation of aliens domiciled or resident in France shall continue to be applied."

(e) By adding immediately after Article 17 the following new Article:

"Article 17A

"The American corporations affected by Article 17 of the Convention of July 25, 1939, which remain subject to the provisions of Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872, which were not placed under the special regime established by Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention for the avoidance of double taxation between the United States of America and France signed April 27, 1932, may, during a new period of six months from the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification of the present Convention, exercise with reference to past years the option provided in those two Articles under the conditions which they prescribe."

(f) Paragraph VIII of the Protocol is amended to read as follows:

"VIII.

"As used in this Convention, the term 'competent authority' or 'competent authorities' means, in the case of the United States of America the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or his duly authorized representative, and in the case of France the Chef du Service de la Coordination des Administrations Financieres or his duly authorized representative."

TITLE III. ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

Article 8

(1) With a view to a more effective imposition of the taxes referred to in Title I of the present Convention and in the Tax Convention of July 25, 1939, and to the prevention of fraud in the case of such taxes, the Contracting States agree that their competent authorities will exchange all the information which they possess or can procure under their respective laws that may be of use to the competent authorities for these purposes. The information transmitted under the provisions of this Convention by one of the Contracting States to the other Contracting State shall not be published, revealed or disclosed to any person except to the extent permitted under the laws of the latter State with respect to similar information.

(2) In no case shall the provisions of this Title relating to disclosure of information in particular cases or to mutual assistance in the collection of taxes be construed so as to impose upon either of the Contracting States the obligation to carry out administrative measures at variance with the regulations and practice of either Contracting State or to supply particulars which are not procurable under its own legislation or information which is of such nature that it would involve violation of an industrial, business, or trade secret or compromise its security.

(3) The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it. If, for any of the reasons set forth above, it is unable to comply with such request it shall inform as soon as possible the State making the application.

Article 9

(1) In conformity with the provisions of the preceding Article the competent authorities of the United States will transmit without request to the competent authorities of the French Republic:

(a) As regards any person, corporation or other entity having an address in France and deriving from sources within the United States rents, dividends, interest, royalties (including income from authors' rights), income from trusts, salaries, wages, bonuses, pensions, annuities, or other fixed or determinable periodical income, the name and address of such person, corporation or other entity as well as the amount of such income.

(b) As regards—

(A) a decedent who was a citizen of, or domiciled in, the United States, any information disclosed by United States estate tax records relative to property of such decedent situated in France; and

(B) a decedent domiciled in France, any information disclosed by United States estate tax records relative to property of such decedent situated in the United States.

(c) Any particulars which the competent authorities of the United States may obtain from banks, savings banks or other similar institutions concerning assets belonging to individuals whose addresses are in France or to French corporations or other entities, as well as information on the amount of payments of coupons from securities which are made to the account of these persons.

(d) Any particulars which the competent authorities of the United States may obtain from inventories in the case of property passing on death concerning debts contracted with individuals whose addresses are in France or French corporations or other entities.

(2) The information referred to in subparagraph (a) of paragraph (1) of this Article will be transmitted as soon as possible after December 31 of each year. The information referred to in subparagraphs (b), (c) and (d) of paragraph (1) of this Article will be transmitted as soon as practicable in the course of audit of estate tax cases.

Article 10

(1) In conformity with the provisions of Article 8, and independently of the enumeration below, the competent authorities of the French Republic will transmit spontaneously to the competent authorities of the United States information which they can obtain on the existence of property belonging to the estates of persons, domiciled at the moment of their death either in France or in the United States or of citizens of the United States, and which may be taxable under the estate tax laws of the United States.

(2) They will furnish in particular to these authorities:

(a) the copy of the transcript of the report of the opening of safety boxes or sections of safety boxes which were rented by the decedents or their spouses if these persons were domiciled in the United States or if they were citizens thereof;

(b) the copy of the transcript of the reports of the inventory of the content of sealed envelopes and locked boxes deposited by said persons with bankers, brokers or other persons receiving habitually deposits of this type;

(c) the copy of the lists of securities, cash or documents of evidences of value belonging to the estate of a person domiciled in the United States transmitted by corporations or companies, brokers, bankers, ministerial officers (notaries), business agents, custodians;

(d) the report of the opening of each individual or joint account opened with one of the persons designated under the preceding subparagraph and concerning one or more citizens of the United States.

(3) They will also furnish to these authorities:

(a) the name and address of each natural or juridical person having an address in the United States and drawing from sources situated in France income from immovables, dividends, interests, royalties, salaries, wages, bonuses, pensions, annuities, or other periodical (fixed or variable) incomes, accompanied by an indication for each of the said persons of the amount of this income;

(b) all information which they can obtain from banks, savings banks or other analogous institutions on assets belonging to persons who have an address in the United States or corporations or other United States juridical persons as well as information on the amount of payments of coupons from securities which are made to the account of these persons;

(c) all information which they can obtain from inventories at death concerning debts which are due to persons residing in the United States or corporations or other United States juridical persons.

(4) The information referred to in paragraph (2) and subparagraph (c) of paragraph (3) above will be transmitted as quickly as possible and as soon as it comes to the attention of the competent authorities of the French Republic; the information referred to under subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph (3), as quickly as possible in the first six months of each year.

Article 11

The competent authorities of each of the Contracting States shall be entitled to obtain from the competent authorities of the other Contracting State information concerning concrete cases affecting natural or juridical persons as far as the application of the taxes referred to under Title I of the present Convention and the taxes under the tax Convention signed July 25, 1939, is concerned.

Article 12

(1) The two Contracting States undertake to lend assistance and support to each other in the collection of the taxes to which the present Convention or the Convention of July 25, 1939, relates, together with interest, costs, and additions to the taxes and fines not being of a penal character according to the laws of the State requested, in the cases where the taxes are definitively due according to the laws of the State making the application.

(2) In the case of an application for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the Contracting States which have been finally determined will be accepted for enforcement by the State to which application is made and collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes.

(3) The application will be accompanied by such documents as are required by the laws of the State making the application, to establish that the taxes have been finally determined.

(4) If the revenue claim has not been finally determined, the State to which application is made will take such measures of conservancy (including measures with respect to transfer of property of nonresident aliens) as are authorized by its laws for the enforcement of its own taxes.

Article 13

(1) The competent authorities of the two Contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of the present Convention and the Convention of July 25, 1939. With respect to those provisions relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currencies, transfer of sums collected, minimum amounts subject to collection, payment of costs of collection, and related matters.

(2) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention or the Convention of July 25, 1939, or their relationship to Conventions between one of the Contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the Contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

Article 14

Any taxpayer who shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the Contracting States has resulted in double taxation in this case in respect of any of the taxes to which the present Convention, or the present Convention, or the Convention of July 25, 1939, relates, shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of each State may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

Article 15

As used in the present Convention, the term "competent authorities" means, in the case of United States of America, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or his duly authorized representative, and, in the case of the French Republic, the Chef du Service de la Coordination des Administrations Financières or his duly authorized representative.

TITLE IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 16

Upon the coming into force of the present Convention, the provisions of Articles 20 to 26, inclusive, constituting Title II, of the Convention between the United States of America and the French Republic, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, shall be superseded and replaced by the provisions of Articles 8 to 15, inclusive, constituting Title III, of the present Convention to the extent that such provisions may be applicable with respect to the taxes which are the subject of the Convention of July 25, 1939.

Article 17

(1) So long as the present Convention shall be in force, either of the Contracting States may, by written notification to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, declare its desire that the operation of either

(a) Title 1, and other provisions of the present Convention which may be applicable with respect to the taxes which are the subject of Title I, or

(b) the Convention of July 25, 1939, as modified and supplemented by the present Convention,

or both, shall extend to all or any of its colonies, overseas territories, protectorates, or territories under its mandate or trusteeship which impose taxes substantially similar to those which are the subject of Title I of the present Convention or which are the subject of the Convention of July 25, 1939, as the case may be.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention, or of the Convention of July 25, 1939, as modified and supplemented by the present Convention, with respect to which a notification is given in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article, shall apply to the territory or territories named in such notification,

(a) as to the taxes which are the subject of Title I of the present Convention: in the case of persons who die on or after the date or dates specified in the notification (it being understood that such date or dates shall be not less than sixty days from the date of the notification), or, if no date is specified in respect of any such territory, on or after the date of such notification, or,

(b) as to the taxes which are the subject of the Convention of July 25, 1939: on and after the first day of January following the date of the notification (it being understood that such first day of January shall be not less than sixty days from the date of the notification),

unless, before the date on which the provisions would otherwise be applicable to a particular territory, the Contracting State to which the notification is given shall have informed the other Contracting State, in writing through diplomatic channels, that it does not accept such notification in respect of that territory. In the absence of such an extension, the provisions which are the subject of the notification shall not apply to any such territory.

(3) At any time after the expiration of a period of one year from the effective date of an extension made by virtue of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article, either of the Contracting States may, by a written notice of termination given to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, terminate the application of the provisions to any of the territories of the former State to which such provisions have been extended; in which case,

(a) in so far as concerns estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after the date or dates specified in such notice (it being understood that such date or dates shall be not less than sixty days from the date of such notice), or, if no date is specified, on or after the sixtieth day after the date of such notice, or

(b) in so far as concerns the application of the Convention of July 25, 1939, as modified and supplemented by the present Convention, on and after the first day of January following the date of such notice (it being understood that such first day of January shall be not less than sixty days from the date of the notice),

the provisions, as the case may be, shall cease to be applicable to the territory or territories named in such notice; provided, however, that this shall not affect the continued application of such provisions to the United States, to France, or to any other territory to which such provisions apply and which is not named in the notice of termination.

(4) For the application of any of the provisions to any territory to which it is extended by the United States or by the French Republic, references to "United States" or, as the case may be, "France" or to the territory of one (or of the other) Contracting State, shall be construed to refer to the territory to which such provisions shall have been extended.

(5) For the purposes of the present Convention, Algeria shall be considered to be a French territory to which the provisions of this Article shall apply.

Article 18

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) The provisions of Title I, and the other provisions of the present Convention in so far as they may be applicable with respect to the taxes which are the subject of Title I, shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification, and shall be applicable solely to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after that date.

(3) The provisions of Title II, and the other provisions of the present Convention in so far as they may be applicable with respect to the taxes which are the subject of the Convention of July 25, 1939, and of Title II of the present Convention, shall, except as otherwise provided in the present Convention, enter into force on the first day of January following the exchange of instruments of ratification.

Article 19

(1) The present Convention shall remain in force for a minimum period of five years after the date of the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

(2) If, not less than six months before the expiration of such period of five years, neither of the Contracting States shall have given to the other Contracting State, through diplomatic channels, written notice of its intention to terminate the present Convention, the Convention shall remain in force after such period of five years until either of the Contracting States shall have given notice of such intention, in which event

(a) the provisions of Title I, and the other provisions of the present Convention in so far as they may be applicable with respect to the taxes which are the subject of Title I, shall not be effective as to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after the date (not being earlier than the sixtieth day after the date of the notice of termination) specified in such notice, or, if no date is specified, on or after the sixtieth day after the date of such notice; and

(b) the provisions of Title II, and the other provisions of the present Convention in so far as they may be applicable with respect to the taxes which are the subject of the Convention of July 25, 1939, and of Title II of the present Convention, shall not be effective on or after the first day of January following the expiration of a six-month period after the date of the notice of termination.

In testimony whereof the Plenipotentiaries above-named have signed the present Convention and affixed thereto their seals.

Done at Paris, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, this 18th of October 1946.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JEFFERSON CAFFERY.

For the Provisional Government of the French Republic:

BIDAULT.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 13, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Friday, January 10, 1947:

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, who was nominated January 8, 1947, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William C. Trimble, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

John Willard Carrigan, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John D. Clifford, Jr., of Maine, to be United States district judge for the district of Maine, vice Hon. John A. Peters, retired.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William D. Griffin, Covin, Ala., in place of A. J. Rainwater, transferred.

James H. Pittman, Crane Hill, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred W. McLaurine, Fitzpatrick, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Otis L. Headrick, Pyriton, Ala., in place of Eliza Sailors, retired.

Thomas S. Edwards, Remlap, Ala., in place of M. B. Gamel, failed to qualify.

Matthew J. Semrick, Saint Bernard, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Robert Thomas Coffman, Veto, Ala. Office made Presidential July 1, 1946.

Margaret C. Phillips, Wellington, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ALASKA

Lilly V. Clark, Nenana, Alaska, in place of A. E. Larson, resigned.

ARIZONA

William L. Conger, Ashfork, Ariz., in place of W. D. Washington, deceased.

Louis F. Skubitz, Avondale, Ariz., in place of E. C. E. Kinderman, deceased.

George S. Leopard, Goodyear, Ariz., in place of M. A. Jenner, resigned.

Wilfrid G. Humbert, Saint Michaels, Ariz., in place of A. G. Sippel, declined.

Esther Eshelman, Wellton, Ariz., in place of I. L. Spain, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Eugene S. Hunton, Hartford, Ark., in place of W. S. Sampson, Sr., deceased.

E. Penn Kimbrough, New Edinburg, Ark., in place of Finch McCulloch, resigned.

Rubye I. Bostick, Vanndale, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nannie Mae Smith, Winchester, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Mary F. Feehan, Alma, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth A. Rodgers, Camp Meeker, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

June R. Dolcini, Davis, Calif., in place of V. F. Dolcini, deceased.

Ethelyn M. Bushey, Desert Center, Calif., in place of F. G. Young, resigned.

Charles M. Tucker, Encino, Calif., in place of T. C. Gibson, resigned.

Bertha L. Groves, Farmington, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Juanita A. Dinkel, Georgetown, Calif., in place of L. J. Kiviaho, resigned.

Lydia M. Riley, Gilman Hot Springs, Calif., in place of M. J. S. Gilman, resigned.

Edward E. Enos, Niles, Calif., in place of E. E. Enos, resigned.

Joe A. Sheeley, Portola, Calif., in place of M. E. Vance, resigned.

Byron H. Johansen, San Jacinto, Calif., in place of D. G. Mang, resigned.

Mable Clara Galle, Sunset Beach, Calif., in place of E. F. Ivey, retired.

Otto C. Meeks, White Water, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Palmer A. Wells, Woodbridge, Calif., in place of E. M Burnett, resigned.

COLORADO

Agnes G. Smith, Branson, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Howard F. Wade, Cheraw, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Genevieve B. Bragg, Gilman, Colo., in place of M. L. Lewis, resigned.

Frances L. Larrabee, Henderson, Colo., in place of G. F. Frost, resigned.

John V. Twomey, Julesburg, Colo., in place of J. H. Parker, resigned.

Raymond D. Woolley, Meeker, Colo., in place of W. O. Ball, resigned.

William F. Luedke, Oak Creek, Colo., in place of W. D. McIntyre, resigned.

FLORIDA

Hattie Ferrell, Foley, Fla., in place of F. G. Brown, removed.

Louie C. Wadsworth, Live Oak, Fla., in place of Joe Hinely, removed.

GEORGIA

James C. Griffin, Georgetown, Ga., in place of M. C. Balkcom, removed.

J. Storey Ellington, Jefferson, Ga., in place of H. J. W. Kizer, removed.

Velna P. Pittman, Meigs, Ga., in place of D. A. Willis, transferred.

George T. Love, Jr., Morganton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

HAWAII

Eva R. Andrade, Haiku, T. H., in place of Julia Smythe, resigned.

Masayuki Shigemi, Kalaupapa, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Seichi Masumoto, Kukuihaele, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Kuulei Warren, Kurtistown, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Mary M. Viveiros, Laupahoehoe, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

IDAHO

Thomas W. Rogers, Glenns Ferry, Idaho, in place of H. H. Tate, removed.

William A. Jones, Moore, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Archie V. Lott, Weston, Idaho, in place of N. S. Hansen, retired.

ILLINOIS

James H. Randolph, Beason, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ted Bauer, Benton, Ill., in place of J. W. Williams, resigned.

Winifred Hughes, Broughton, Ill., in place of R. M. McElvain, resigned.

Charles H. Lawler, Cortland, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leland Adams, Dieterich, Ill., in place of R. L. Graham, resigned.

Joseph H. Pulcher, East Carondelet, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marvin Randall, Forsyth, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Oscar Hayward Holman, Geff, Ill., in place of P. P. Simmons, transferred.

Harry M. Ostrander, Harmon, Ill., in place of C. M. Ostrander, transferred.

Eva S. Hooe, Niantic, Ill., in place of S. H. Wheeler, deceased.

Guy E. Midget, Pittsburg, Ill., in place of A. M. Pulley, resigned.

Ray P. Callery, Princeville, Ill., in place of F. J. Hill, resigned.

Pauline M. Hutchison, Shirley, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

INDIANA

Charles W. Woods, Bowling Green, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hazel Runner, Cross Plains, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Charles E. Rodenberg, Pershing, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Margaret A. Horseman, Dublin, Ind., in place of G. A. Adrion, retired.

Fern Zimmerman, Fair Oaks, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Harold A. Merkling, Kendallville, Ind., in place of W. A. Maggert, retired.

Harold E. Collings, Kingsbury, Ind., in place of G. H. Collings, resigned.

Zula G. McBride, Mays, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Mabel E. Deel, Rockfield, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Paul Sittler, Silver Lake, Ind., in place of W. R. Meinert, transferred.

William C. Bunner, Springport, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IOWA

Anna Belle L. Nuckolls, Blanchard, Iowa, in place of J. E. Dean, removed.

Evelyn M. Chalus, Clare, Iowa, in place of C. J. Donahoe, resigned.

Marion W. Palmer, Clearfield, Iowa, in place of J. S. Walton, removed.

Ellowene Zinke, Hamlin, Iowa Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Stella P. Mulholland, Malvern, Iowa, in place of F. E. Mulholland, deceased.

Arnold L. Garnass, Manly, Iowa, in place of D. I. Peterson, resigned.

George C. Brauch, Marengo, Iowa, in place of R. P. Gilchrist, resigned.

Wilda Stephenson, Packwood, Iowa, in place of L. L. Lockhart, retired.

Don J. Meggers, Walker, Iowa, in place of J. F. Zimpfer, deceased.

KANSAS

Earle F. Hill, Altamont, Kans., in place of C. H. Kessler, transferred.

Dalton H. Muck, Beloit, Kans., in place of E. C. Carrico, transferred.

Van W. Brooks, Clayton, Kans., in place of V. H. Leichliter, resigned.

Nellie C. Lucas, Dearing, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Howard D. Meisel, Haviland, Kans., in place of H. R. Ellis, declined.

Ira B. Armstrong, Hiattville, Kans., in place of E. L. Long, retired.

Dale E. Merritt, Lebanon, Kans., in place of M. A. Nelson, resigned.

Elmer G. Jackson, Manhattan, Kans., in place of W. E. Moore, retired.

Ralph M. Plotner, McCracken, Kans., in place of E. W. Shiney, transferred.

Floyd A. Osborn, Riverton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lester R. Campbell, Rush Center, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William E. Matheny, Russell Springs, Kans., in place of Rollie David, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Edna T. Holman, Cerulean, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary R. Meredith, Mammoth Cave, Ky., in place of M. R. Meredith. Incumbent's commission expired Feb. 18, 1941.

Katie Lee Walker, Paint Lick, Ky., in place of R. J. Walker, deceased.

William O. Hopper, Willisburg, Ky., in place of Mary Crow, retired.

LOUISIANA

Murray B. McCarley, Baton Rouge, La., in place of R. L. Pettit, resigned.

Newton H. Nelson, Forest Hill, La., in place of E. P. Durio, declined.

Pearl H. Campbell, Pine Prairie, La., in place of Jesse Campbell, retired.

MAINE

Ellis H. Parlin, Machias, Maine, in place of J. A. McDonald, resigned.

Frank Scott, Wilton, Maine, in place of H. F. Wright, retired.

MARYLAND

Gertrude S. Chapman, Lanham, Md., in place of H. A. Wrenn, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Arthur G. Dodge, Charlton, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

MICHIGAN

Perry F. Frownfelder, Adrian, Mich., in place of H. I. Bourns, resigned.

Daniel Koert, Belmont, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Leo L. Corbett, Blissfield, Mich., in place of Edson Porter, retired.

Frank J. Brown, Camden, Mich., in place of C. A. May, transferred.

Clifford R. Osborne, Cedar Lake, Mich., in place of E C. Williams, retired.

Thomas St. Charles, East Jordan, Mich., in place of F. H. Crowell, removed.

Clark H. Thompson, Fenton, Mich., in place of D. E. Kelleher, resigned.

Robert H. Reid, Gregory, Mich., in place of G. H. Kuhn, transferred.

Hiram M. Terry, Leonard, Mich., in place of E. J. Porter, retired.

Marguerite D. Marsh, Mackinaw City, Mich., in place of G. J. Carlton, resigned.

Edith E. Osborn, Mecosta, Mich., in place of C. E. Osborn, resigned.

Fern A. Pierce, Oakley, Mich., in place of A. C. Hutt, resigned.

Nina I. Wall, Parma, Mich., in place of M. B. Hawes, resigned.

Emanuel W. Rupprecht, Reese, Mich., in place of M. M. Rupprecht, resigned.

Leona M. Caffrey, Waterford, Mich., in place of A. V. Jacober, retired.

Lloyd N. Hahn, Wequetonsing, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

MINNESOTA

Otto W. Anderberg, Grove City, Minn., in place of D. G. Sundahl, resigned.

Melvin R. Henrickson, Guthrie, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred P. Schroeder, Sauk Rapids, Minn., in place of T. G. Schaefer, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Earl B. Kisner, Bruce, Miss., in place of Pink Hardy, deceased.

Robert L. Gray, Corinth, Miss., in place of N. N. Northcross, deceased.

Albert L. Mills, Kossuth, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William C. Perry, Tchula, Miss., in place of L. E. Turnage, retired.

MISSOURI

Frank W. Wildehaber Beaufort, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elmer H. Temme, Leslie, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MONTANA

James E. Elgie, Brockton, Mont., in place of A. O. Lien, resigned.

John R. Johnson, Fairview, Mont., in place of W. L. Thompson, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Frank C. Diehl, Bassett, Nebr., in place of C. S. Carrell, resigned.

Mina M. Paulson, Bloomington, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irvin C. Conkel, Burr, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Troy Kenneth McCown, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel, transferred.

Charles Edmond Rock, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koshler, resigned.

L. Wayne Spainhourd, Thurston, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Virginia M. Dyer, North Hampton, N. H., in place of F. C. Leavitt, resigned.

Benning W. Noyes, Salem Depot, N. H., in place of D. E. Stevens, resigned.

Joseph E. Hurley, Wilton, N. H., in place of J. R. K. Kelley, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Bertha Applegate, Barnegat City, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Charles J. Winkelspecht, Delanco, N. J., in place of S. R. Hunt, removed.

Edith Fisler Bozarth, Elwood, N. J., in place of H. M. Milne, resigned.

Joseph E. Lyons, Vineland, N. J., in place of T. H. Hall, resigned.

Gilbert L. Morris, Wyckoff, N. J., in place of W. J. Morris, transferred.

NEW MEXICO

Clyda Morrow, House, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

NEW YORK

Catherine Damme, Atlantic Beach, N. Y., in place of W. H. French, resigned.

Clara H. Eggleston, Belleville, N. Y., in place of H. A. Williams, deceased.

Thomas F. Lyons, Brookhaven, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles J. O'Connell, Elmira, N. Y., in place of E. J. Reidy, deceased.

James W. Adriance, Fishkill, N. Y., in place of J. W. Jewell, deceased.

William J. Whitney, Greenwich, N. Y., in place of W. C. Sharp, retired.

Carl R. Gleason, Groton, N. Y., in place of John Hamill, Sr., deceased.

Leonard L. Lakin, Hancock, N. Y., in place of W. L. McGranaghan, deceased.

Edward S. Raynor, Islip, N. Y., in place of J. E. Downs, retired.

Helen Hubert, Islip Terrace, N. Y., in place of E. J. Bruger, transferred.

Doris K. Griesa, Kanona, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Harry J. French, Katonah, N. Y., in place of K. L. Hunn, resigned.

Curtis G. Andrews, Kirkwood, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alvin J. Jones, Marcy, N. Y., in place of W. A. Eggison, transferred.

Marie H. Saulsbury, Nineveh, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James F. Byrne, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. M. Bulger, deceased.

Peter Mazzei, Point Lookout, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Winifred D. Fisher, Rock Tavern, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Jessie M. Sweeney, Shortsville, N. Y., in place of M. F. Chambers, resigned.

John J. McDonnell, Southfields, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles M. Bogardus, South Westerlo, N. Y., in place of C. E. Winn, resigned.

Dorothy Woodward, Stony Creek, N. Y., in place of V. A. Rogers, resigned.

Joseph L. Phillips, Vails Gate, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Charles F. Partridge, West Nyack, N. Y., in place of Theresa Jaeger, resigned.

Mildred R. Lindsey, Westtown, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Exam A. Elliott, Barium Springs, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edgar William Bullard, Belmont, N. C., in place of W. M. Jefferson, deceased.

Clyde J. Smith, Bennett, N. C., in place of J. A. Purvis, retired.

Esther H. Bullock, Delco, N. C., in place of L. R. Hobbs, retired.

Beulah Johnson, Holly Springs, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Russell A. Parker, Middlesex N. C., in place of J. A. Barnes, deceased.

Samuel L. Sanderlin, Shawboro, N. C., in place of M. R. Bell, resigned.

Addie S. Winborne, Sims, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Herbert Maurice Brett, Winton, N. C., in place of A. T. Newsome, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

William A. Borderud, Davenport, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Nicholas G. Abel, Karlsruhe, N. Dak., in place of Dolores Bossert, resigned.

Alvin N. Anderson, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Daniel F. McMenamy, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Mealy, transferred.

Harold H. Neustel, Robinson, N. Dak., in place of O. B. Wells, resigned.

Alice C. Kelly, Rogers, N. Dak. Office become Presidential July 1, 1946.

Carl E. Lindsay, Souris, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Sletten, transferred.

Philip J. Thorne, Tuttle, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Hinkel, transferred.

Amanda J. Shaw, Wolford, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OHIO

Minerva S. Gray, Baybridge, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Ned Stiger, Bradner, Ohio, in place of W. L. Bryan, retired.

Esther Swerlein, Dola, Ohio, in place of W. G. Kahler, deceased.

Nonnie B. Irwin, Goshen, Ohio, Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Olive A. Ruble, Haydenville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William R. Hapner, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of E. V. Miller, resigned.

William Schroeder Warren, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary E. Vaughan, Jaite, Ohio, in place of Russell Jaite, resigned.

Howard R. Poole, Londonderry, Ohio, in place of H. R. Poole, resigned.

S. Albert Culbertson, New Athens, Ohio, in place of R. D. Huff, resigned.

Ruth E. Sherwood, Oregonia, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Howard B. Acker, Perry, Ohio, in place of M. C. Hickman, resigned.

Laura V. Tipton, The Plains, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marie L. Ruff, Thurman, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Alice Marguerite Corder, Trinway, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Glen M. Haas, Woodville, Ohio, in place of J. K. Faist, deceased.

J. Paul Orsborn, Zanesfield, Ohio, in place of F. V. Miller, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Elden R. Louthan, Chester, Okla., in place of D. E. Condreay, transferred.

OREGON

Bertha L. Proctor, Cove, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leona Alice Creson, Eastside, Oreg., in place of K. F. Prey, retired.

Chris W. Myers, Estacada, Oreg., in place of A. H. Fasel, retired.

Margaret A. Duvall, Hebo, Oreg., in place of F. E. Cross, resigned.

James H. Driscoll, Heppner, Oreg., in place of C. B. Cox, deceased.

Duane D. Hatcher, Hubbard, Oreg., in place of B. M. Brown, deceased.

Rilla M. Schaffer, Idanha, Oreg., in place of L. H. Haseman, resigned.

Gerald P. Connor, Jr., St. Paul, Oreg., in place of P. I. McDonald, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ida L. German, Andreas, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Thelma B. Kelley, Brier Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Margaret E. Dell, Broad Top, Pa., in place of W. F. Rinehart, retired.

Allen W. Kessler, Codorus, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Raymond R. Walker, Ford Cliff, Pa., in place of J. M. Walker, retired.

Rose H. Poll, Forest Park, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Mazie N. Fulton, Hanlin Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Sara M. Slight, Hartsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

William G. Phillips, Joffre, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ellen E. Malmberg, Kinzua, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gertrude M. Brown, Leckrone, Pa., in place of Catherine Duretsia, resigned.

Evalyn S. Gates, Mattawana, Pa., in place of G. J. Harshbarger, resigned.

Miles W. Miller, New Berlin, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jennie A. Evans, Orwin, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Arthur C. Gulick, Riverside, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jane M. Martin, St. Thomas, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Georgeanna Garbinsky, Smithmill, Pa., in place of Edward Copenhaver, removed.

William A. Bailey, Southwest, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Florence D. Porter, Spring Creek, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leon D. Kingsley, Townville, Pa., in place of L. L. Childs, deceased.

Eugene Patrick J. McMahon, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, declined.

Eleanor B. Burns, Wolfdale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PUERTO RICO

Dolores G. Sotomayor, Barceloneta, P. R., in place of J. R. Sotomayor, deceased.

Genoveva I. Miura, Hormigueros, P. R., in place of L. H. Diaz, resigned.

Blanca Rosa Gomez, Las Marias, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Peparada R. Roman, Toa Alta, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Loyd H. Johnson, Gramling, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Elden E. Arnold, Britton, S. Dak., in place of H. C. Hagen, transferred.

Otto Weller, Eureka, S. Dak. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Reuben H. Hubbart, Fedora, S. Dak Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Agnes I. Haarberg, Missionhill, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Archibald B. Elliott, Valley Springs, S. Dak., in place of O. P. Ronning, resigned.

TENNESSEE

John Hatcher Crowder, Fountain Head, Tenn., in place of Lizzie Roney, retired.

Myrtle Mae Atkinson, Grimsley, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Dorsie G. Bailey, Reagan, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Eliza Cooper, Rickman Tenn. Office because Presidential July 1, 1945.

Guilford J. Hutcheson, Ripley, Tenn., in place of J. H Morris, resigned.

TEXAS

Tobe Hahn, Beaumont, Tex., in place of Ogden Johnson, deceased.

Marvin E. Ezell, Bovina, Tex., in place of E. T. Caldwell, deceased.

Cecelia B. Phillips, Brazoria, Tex., in place of E. B. Hopkins, retired.

Richard A. Bowers, Caldwell, Tex., in place of G. R. Kocurek, removed.

Roland N. Allbright, Crockett, Tex., in place of K. H. Godsey, resigned.

Louise I. Lintelman, Crosby, Tex., in place of C. A. Fortner, retired.

Sam S. Devall, Hallettsville, Tex., in place of Joseph Kopecky, resigned.

Louis G. Harrell, Knott, Tex., in place of I. T. Smith, resigned.

Bonnie S. Langford, Mertens, Tex., in place of C. K. Langford, deceased.

Inez L. Mullins, Sanford, Tex., in place of C. T. Page, resigned.

Imogene J. Benton, Sunray, Tex., in place of T. B. Armstrong, resigned.

Ozella H. Sharp, Vanderbilt, Tex., in place of H. M. Rust, resigned.

VERMONT

Mildred D. Murphy, Center Rutland, Vt., in place of L. B. Loveland, retired.

VIRGINIA

Elmore P. Mudd, Alexandria, Va., in place of J. O. Lynch, deceased.

James A. Combs, Appalachia, Va., in place of S. S. Brooke, deceased.

William P. Heath, Esmont, Va., in place of E. P. Heath, deceased.

Louis H. Suddith, Jr., Highland Springs, Va., in place of W. D. R. Proffitt, retired.

Rollie N. Phillips, Indian Valley, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Essery B. Nuckles, Phoebus, Va., in place of J. P. Mugler, resigned.

George H. Blick, Rawlings, Va., in place of W. E. Henderson, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Ole C. Noste, Conway, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Ada E. Buchanan, Kahlotus, Wash., in place of A. G. Howton, resigned.

Ida B. Howell, Lakeside, Wash., in place of C. R. Dexter, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cora B. Dearth, Bens Run, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Henry F. Jackson, Clothier, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry Anderson, Dorothy, W. Va., in place of M. M. Linonsy, resigned.

Sylvia J. Lilly, Stotesbury, W. Va., in place of E. W. Williams, retired.

Martha L. Shrader, Switchback, W. Va., in place of J. H. Miller, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Edward H. Belz, Athens, Wis., in place of T. E. Wozniak, deceased.

Carolyn Stoxen, Bassett, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irvin W. Henze, Sr., Big Bend, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William George McCoy, Brookfield, Wis., in place of F. W. Plank, deceased.

Edna M. Reynolds, Cottage Grove, Wis., in place of S. C. Hanson, resigned.

John E. Thorpe, Darien, Wis., in place of M. A. Thorpe, deceased.

John F. Koin, Marengo, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Violet E. Place, Nelson, Wis., in place of H. F. Breutzman, transferred.

Gordon J. Hansen, Oregon, Wis., in place of C. A. E. Manion, removed.

Hansel E. Jacobson, Pigeon Falls, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Donald B. Prehn, Spencer, Wis., in place of Laurence Driscoll, removed.

Reuben Hein, Thiensville, Wis., in place of A. H. Hadler, removed.

Helen P. Ouellette, Townsend, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Ruth Mae Prosser, Winegar, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Through Thee, our Heavenly Father, we rise to the great realities of our existence and know ourselves as the sons of God. Thus the things of earth are seen in their true proportion. Do Thou keep us awake and alive to our possibilities for service to raise the whole ideal of the well-being of the Republic. I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God. In the blessed name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

JANUARY 8, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: During the interim between the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and the convening of the Eightieth Congress, the following reports were received and printed by the Clerk of the House:

House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress: Reconversion experience and current economic problems. Submitted by Mr. COLMER, from the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, pursuant to House Resolution 60. Filed December 12, 1946.

House Report No. 2730, Seventy-ninth Congress: Operation of national sales programs of surplus property by War Assets Administration. Submitted by Mr. Slaughter, from the Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property, pursuant to House Resolution 385. Filed September 30, 1946.

House Report No. 2731, Seventy-ninth Congress: Aid to the physically handicapped. Submitted by Mr. KELLEY, from the Subcommittee on Aid to Physically Handicapped, pursuant to House Resolution 45. Filed October 10, 1946.

House Report No. 2732, Seventy-ninth Congress: Report relative to investigation of circumstances with respect to disposition of the charges of espionage and the possession of documents stolen from secret Government files. Submitted by Judge HOBBS, from Subcommittee No. IV of the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to House Resolution 430. Filed October 23, 1946.

House Report No. 2733, Seventy-ninth Congress: Disposition of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch Lines. Submitted by Mr. Slaughter, from the Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property, pursuant to House Resolution 385. Filed December 16, 1946.

House Report No. 2734, Seventy-ninth Congress: Report on the system currently employed in the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of intelligence affecting the war potential of the United States. Submitted by Mr. May, from the Committee on Military Affairs, pursuant to House Resolution 20. Filed December 17, 1946.

House Report No. 2735, Seventy-ninth Congress: National transportation inquiry. Submitted by Mr. LEA, from the Special Subcommittee on Transportation, pursuant to House Resolution 318. Filed December 16, 1946.

House Report No. 2736, Seventy-ninth Congress: Petroleum investigation—petroleum supplies for military and civilian needs. Submitted by Mr. LEA, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 187. Filed December 30, 1946.

House Report No. 2737, Seventy-ninth Congress: Economic reconstruction in Europe. Submitted by Mr. COLMER, from the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, pursuant to House Resolution 60. Filed December 30, 1946.

House Report No. 2738, Seventy-ninth Congress: Report relative to investigation of disposition of surplus property. Submitted by Mr. Slaughter, from the Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property, pursuant to House Resolution 385. Filed December 31, 1946.

House Report No. 2739, Seventy-ninth Congress: Campaign expenditures. Submitted by Mr. PRIEST, from the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1946, pursuant to House Resolution 645. Filed December 31, 1946.

House Report No. 2740, Seventy-ninth Congress: Report relative to the study of the progress of the national war effort. Submitted by Mr. May, from the Committee on

Military Affairs, pursuant to House Resolution 20. Filed December 31, 1946.

House Report No. 2741, Seventy-ninth Congress: Investigations of the progress of the war effort. Submitted by Mr. VINSON, from the House Committee on Naval Affairs Investigating the Progress of the War Effort, pursuant to House Resolution 154. Filed January 2, 1947.

House Report No. 2742, Seventy-ninth Congress: Investigation of un-American activities and propaganda. Submitted by Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, pursuant to House Resolution 5. Filed January 2, 1947.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it would be a very great accommodation to the Members if they knew what might be the program for next week, if any?

Mr. HALLECK. I am in agreement with the gentleman from Texas as to the desirability of Members knowing something about what the program will be next week because it is to be hoped that committee assignments will shortly be announced.

There will be the matter of the organization of committees; and if other Members are in the same position I am, they would like to have a day or two to try to get caught up with their correspondence. It is hoped that our Committee on Committees can complete its labors and make its recommendations Monday morning. We then hope to be in position to have a conference Monday afternoon for approval of our committee assignments and that those committee assignments will be ready for presentation to the House on Tuesday. It is my idea for next week, there being no legislation yet, of course, to come before us, that we might meet Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, and then go over to the following Monday. I have discussed this with the minority leader and I understand it meets with his approval.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

BUDGET MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 19)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Budget for the fiscal year 1948. It includes recommendations for the entire Federal program.

Expenditures under existing and proposed legislation are estimated at 37.5 billion dollars and revenues under existing tax laws at 37.7 billion dollars, leaving a very slight margin of surplus.

I strongly recommend that the Congress take early action to continue throughout the fiscal year 1948 the war excise-tax rates, which, under the present law, will expire July 1, 1947. My declaration of the end of hostilities on December 31, 1946, was not issued in order to achieve tax reduction. I considered it essential that war excise-tax rates be retained, but I also considered it necessary to terminate the "state of hostilities" as soon as it became possible to do so.

I also recommend that the Congress increase postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the postal deficit.

These recommendations would reduce expenditures to 37.1 billion dollars and increase revenues to 38.9 billion dollars. We would then have a budget surplus of 1.8 billion dollars.

As long as business, employment, and national income continue high we should maintain tax revenues at levels that will not only meet current expenditures but also leave a surplus for retirement of the public debt. There is no justification now for tax reduction. At today's level of economic activity, our present revenue system will not yield so much in 1948 as in the current year. We shall no longer collect large sums from the excess-profits tax, and sales of surplus property will decline.

Revenue estimates are, of course, to a very large extent determined by the level of business activity. In this Budget, it has been assumed that, with minor fluctuations, business activity will average slightly higher than in the calendar year 1946. A recession in business would cause tax yields to drop. In addition, the cost of supporting agricultural prices and payments to unemployed veterans would increase. Should such a recession occur, it would be a temporary slump growing out of transition period difficulties and would call for no revision in our budget policy.

For the fiscal year 1947 it now appears that receipts will amount to 40.2 billion dollars and expenditures to 42.5 billion dollars. The 1-billion-dollar increase in expenditures over the August estimate occurred largely in veterans' programs. For example, many more veterans than had been expected decided to go to college or enroll for job training. We cannot regret this demand for education, but it illustrates the kind of uncertainty that cannot be eliminated in preparing our estimates.

The deficit for the current fiscal year would have been larger if executive action had not been taken to place expenditure ceilings on some activities and to hold them well below the amounts available under appropriations already made. The way the various departments and agencies of the Government, particularly the War and Navy Departments, have succeeded in cutting their expenditures is gratifying. Although public works could not be cut so deeply as anticipated in August without causing a wasteful stoppage of work already under way, we shall still show a substantial saving in this fiscal year for these programs.

This Budget meets our basic requirements for Federal programs at home and abroad for the fiscal year 1948. The Federal Government must not only fulfill its contractual obligations; it must also provide the services that are necessary for the welfare and the progress of the Nation. We have to carry our proper share of the expense of building world organization. We must make effective provision for national defense.

We have many other commitments, both international and domestic, that must be honored. In fact, a very large part of all our expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 will be required to meet commitments already made. The Budget is designed to meet these needs and to execute every program with strict economy.

The reconversion of wartime military and civilian services was far advanced during the calendar year 1946. Of 26 emergency war agencies in operation shortly before VJ-day, only 5 remain, and 3 of these are winding up their work. Two others—the War Assets Administration and the Office of Temporary Controls—have been added to help close out the war program. The 1948 Budget assumes a reduction of civilian employment in the Government as a whole to less than three-fifths of the wartime peak number—in addition to the heavy shrinkage of the armed forces.

The Government has been exerting every effort in the wake of the war demobilization to strengthen and make more efficient its internal organization and administrative methods. It is essential that citizens receive maximum service for their tax dollars, and the administration plans further intensive measures to improve the administrative practices, organization, and efficiency of the departments and agencies.

But the cost of peacetime services has risen strikingly as compared to these costs before the war. Prewar figures can no longer be used as a yardstick. Although Government wages have not been raised so much as private wages, the cost of supplies has risen in line with the cost of goods in private markets. Further, the population to be served has grown since 1939 by 10 million people, adding proportionately to the demand for many public services. Many normal maintenance items had to be postponed on account of the war, and cannot be further neglected. Normal services which were cut during the war have to be restored.

Let me now review the expenditure side of the Budget, taking first the large items which practically determine the size of the total.

1. Interest on the national debt will be 5 billion dollars. This is an obligation that must be met.

2. Refunds due under the tax laws are estimated at 2.1 billion dollars. These are fixed obligations under present law.

These two items total 7.1 billion dollars.

3. National defense is estimated at more than 11.2 billion dollars, almost all for the operating expenses of the Army and Navy. Though we expect the United Nations to move successfully toward world security, any cut in our present estimate for 1948 would immediately

weaken our international position. This large part of the Budget, in my judgment, represents a proper balance between security and economy.

The total so far is 18.3 billion dollars.

4. International affairs and finance will call for 3.5 billion dollars, a sharp reduction from the 6.4 billion dollars required in the fiscal year 1947. We still have contractual commitments to make good in connection with our loan agreement with the United Kingdom and under the reconstruction lending program of the Export-Import Bank. We must discharge our occupation responsibilities in Europe and the Far East. We must provide for war damage restoration in the Philippines and for the relief and resettlement of displaced people of Europe. We must continue to give relief to some other countries which are most urgently in need.

The work of the United Nations and the specialized organizations associated with it is of the highest importance. We must not fail in our support. The Department of State, for which increased appropriations are requested, must be prepared to carry an increasing load of work in the growing field of American foreign relations.

Our international affairs budget is important for peace, security, and our own prosperity. To reduce it would delay the restoration of a peaceful and prosperous world.

The total of these four items is 21.8 billion dollars.

5. Veterans' services and benefits will cost more than 7.3 billion dollars. This country has provided generously for the successful return of veterans to civilian life and for the care of the disabled. While the cost looms large in the Budget, much of it goes to provide education and rehabilitation which will add to our national strength and prosperity. The cost for veterans' education, pensions, and hospitals will increase in the fiscal year 1948; but if employment remains high, the unemployment payments should be smaller. Veterans' benefits under present law appear to be adequate.

These five items—interest, refunds, national defense, international affairs, and veterans—require expenditures of 29.2 billion dollars, or almost four-fifths of the total Budget.

6. Programs for regulation and improvement of the transportation and communications systems and for development of natural resources will amount to 2.6 billion dollars. The largest single item is 443 million dollars for the Atomic Energy Commission. Our major effort now must be to exploit to the full the peacetime uses of this great discovery.

About 1.2 billion dollars of the expenditures on these two programs is for public works construction, and much of the rest is for the promotion of our merchant marine and other aids to transportation.

The expenditure for the Federal-aid program for highways rests on the Federal Government's agreements with the States. Air transport will be seriously retarded unless new air-navigation facilities are promptly supplied. River basin development and harbor improvement cannot be neglected without impairing efficiency in private enterprise. Most of the public construction projects are already under way. A few additional projects, not yet started, have been provided for in 1947 appropriations.

Public construction in these and other fields contributes to the productive capacity and taxpaying ability of the country. The postponement of public works in good times and their expansion in hard times will make their contribution even greater. All postponable public works should be deferred at the present time. But the need to protect and improve our natural resources has become acute as a result of the war, and we must carry out the works included in this Budget if we are to avoid waste.

7. Our agricultural program will amount to 1.4 billion dollars. This includes the price supports guaranteed by law, the conservation of farm land, and our investments in rural electrification. In addition, the Department of Agriculture will continue its program to promote research in agriculture and better marketing methods.

This brings the total to 33.2 billion dollars.

8. The Budget programs for social welfare, health, and security, and for education and general research amount to 1.7 billion dollars. This total excludes unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors insurance, which are financed through trust-account operations that do not appear in Budget expenditures. It does include 481 million dollars in payments to the railroad retirement trust fund. More than half of the remaining expenditures is for aid to the aged and other dependent persons. The rest is largely for protection of public health, for crime control, and for grants to States for vocational education.

9. The Federal housing program is estimated at 539 million dollars. The bulk of the housing expenditures is for purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of guaranteed home loans to veterans and for continued operation of revenue-producing war housing in overcrowded communities.

Our social-security program and our education and housing programs can hardly be considered adequate. Improvements in these fields are seriously needed. Although this Budget does not contemplate major extensions in the next fiscal year, I recommend that the Congress lay the legislative ground work now for the needed improvements, including general health insurance and a long-range housing program.

The costs of social welfare, education, and housing bring the cumulative total above 35.4 billion dollars.

The remainder of the Budget totals 2.1 billion dollars. Nearly one-third is for war liquidation, including the overhead cost of disposing of surplus property. The rest is for services to business and labor through the Commerce Department and Labor Department, for general functions of the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the Executive Office of the President, and for many other items. These services, with a total cost of less than 5 percent of the Budget, are an indispensable part of the machinery of the Government.

The Budget total of expenditures thus comes to 37.5 billion dollars.

It has always been the Government's duty to provide whatever assistance is required to afford private enterprise a chance to prosper. In the nineteenth century a principal economic service of the Federal Government was the opening of the West. The Government acquired the territory, granted lands to settlers, gave military protection, and subsidized railroads and highways—thereby opening opportunities for the private initiative of the American people.

Today, our great new frontiers are in river-valley developments, in air transport, in new scientific discoveries, and in application of the new science and technology to human progress. These new frontiers can be developed only by the cooperation of Government and private enterprise.

Our expenditures on developmental projects are a good investment for the Government. They increase the productive power of the country and make for higher living standards. Directly or indirectly, the Government recovers the cost in the form of either service charges or increased revenue yields to the Treasury.

The Federal Government promotes improvements in agricultural methods. It provides many services to private enterprise that could not be organized except by Government. The Bureau of Standards, for example, furnishes basic scientific data. The Weather Bureau supplies information used by thousands of farmers and business concerns and has a rapidly developing field of work in aviation weather reporting. Maps and charts, as well as lighthouses, beacons, and other physical aids to navigation, are supplied by the Federal Government. Many kinds of statistical reports, required by American business, are also provided.

Since 1939, our complex system for the production of goods and services has grown so much that more services than ever are required from the Government. We cannot risk retarding our growth by lack of roads, electric power, air-navigation facilities, engineering data, maps, education, surveys of resources, weather reports, protection against disease, or any other necessary instrument of progress. There is a multitude of Government activities which the whole Nation takes for granted and on which our prosperity depends.

Let me now review briefly the appropriation side of the Budget.

This Budget recommends appropriations of 31.3 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1948 under existing and proposed legislation. It recommends that authority of 1.5 billion dollars be granted certain agencies to contract for services and supplies, such as aircraft and construction. Payments under such authority will be financed from appropriations to be made in subsequent years.

The expenditures for 1948 still reflect a portion of the cost of our tremendous war program for which appropriations were made in previous years. They also reflect certain large international commitments likewise previously authorized. These two factors in large measure explain why estimated expenditures for 1948 are so much more than the appropriations recommended for that year.

Existing appropriations available for obligation in 1948 and subsequent years are again under review. As these appropriations become unnecessary, their withdrawal will be recommended to the Congress.

The Federal Government, as shown by the size of its Budget, has far greater obligations than at any time before the war. Although the Budget reflects the urgent need for rigorous economy in the execution of every program, expenditures are inevitably large. The American people surely will not shirk their new responsibilities at home and abroad. They will supply the necessary funds to meet these responsibilities.

RECEIPTS

As previously indicated, I cannot recommend tax reduction. The responsibilities of the Federal Government cannot be fully met in the fiscal year 1948 at a lower cost than here indicated. Even if the cost were less it would be desirable in our present economic situation to maintain revenues in order to make a start toward the repayment of the national debt. At the present time, in my judgment, high taxes contribute to the welfare and security of the country.

Under the wartime tax system, millions of taxpayers with small incomes are called upon to pay high taxes. When the time comes for taxes to be reduced, these taxpayers will have a high priority among the claimants for tax relief.

I have recommended that the war excise-tax rates due to expire July 1, 1947, be continued. When the time comes for excise-tax revision, the Congress should review the entire group of excise taxes rather than concentrate attention on those that were imposed or increased during the war.

Our long-run tax program must be designed to maintain purchasing power and provide incentives for a high level of production.

In the corporation section of this message, legislation is recommended which will require return to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts of certain capital funds totaling 379 million dollars.

I also recommend that the Congress reconsider the extent to which fees should be charged for services rendered by the Federal Government. While it is not sound public policy to charge for all services of the Federal Government on a full-cost basis, and many services should be provided free, the Government should receive adequate compensation for certain services primarily of direct benefit to limited groups. For example, I believe that a reasonable share of the cost to the Federal Government for providing specialized transportation facilities, such as airways, should be recovered.

Budget receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Source	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948
Direct taxes on individuals	$19,008	$18,637	$19,120
Direct taxes on corporations	12,906	9,227	8,270
Excise taxes	6,696	7,283	6,118
Employment taxes	1,714	1,955	2,694
Customs	435	496	517
Miscellaneous receipts:			
Present law	3,480	3,987	2,620
Proposed legislation			379
Total receipts	44,239	41,585	39,717
Less net appropriation to old age and survivors insurance trust fund	1,201	1,355	1,987
Budget receipts	43,038	40,230	37,730
Proposed continuation of war excise rates (not included in Budget receipts)		37	1,130

Receipts from direct taxes on individuals are estimated to decrease from the fiscal year 1946 to 1947 because of the lower effective individual income-tax rates in the Revenue Act of 1945, and to increase from the fiscal year 1947 to 1948 because of higher incomes. Direct taxes on corporations decline in the fiscal year 1947 and further in 1948 largely because of repeal of the excess-profits tax.

The excise-tax estimates increase in 1947 because of increased consumer demand and increased production, and decline under present law in 1948 because of the expiration of the war-tax rates of the Revenue Act of 1943. The employment-tax estimates show increases in both fiscal years, due in 1947 mostly to larger pay rolls, and in 1948 mostly to increases in rates as provided by law. Miscellaneous receipts increase in 1947 over 1946 largely because of increased receipts from disposition of surplus property and decline in 1948 largely because of a decline in surplus-property receipts.

BORROWING AND THE PUBLIC DEBT

The public debt reached a peak last February at 279 billion dollars. During the remainder of the calendar year, the debt was reduced by over 20 billion dollars and stood near 259 billion dollars at the end of December. Most of the securities retired were held by banks. This reduction was accomplished by drawing down the Treasury cash balance to a level more in line with peacetime requirements.

We propose to continue the sale of savings bonds. The proceeds will be available to redeem marketable securities—particularly those held by the banking system. It is important that every citizen in a position to do so help to maintain a sound economic situation by purchasing and holding United States savings bonds.

The annual interest charge of about 5 billion dollars is less than 3 percent of our current national income. It is well within our capacity to pay, particularly if we keep up a high volume of national production. The best method of keeping down the burden of the debt is to maintain prosperity. A single year of depression can lay more burdens on the people than many years of gradual debt reduction can relieve.

Our debt-management policy is designed to hold interest rates at the present low level and to prevent undue fluctuations in the bond market. This policy has eased the financial problems of reconversion for both business and government. The stability of the Government bond market has been a major factor in the business confidence which has been of such value in achieving full production. Low-interest rates have also relieved the burden on the taxpayer. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve System will continue their effective control of interest rates.

EXPENDITURE PROGRAMS

In this year's Budget, expenditures are grouped under a new functional classification in order to present to the Congress and the people a clearer picture of the purposes for which Federal funds are spent. To facilitate comparison, figures for previous years are also given on the new basis. The new classification is described in detail in part IV of this Budget.

Budget expenditures by major programs

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
National defense	$45,012	$14,726	$11,256	$9,493
International affairs and finance	1,464	6,394	3,510	1,169
Veterans' services and benefits	4,414	7,601	7,343	7,009
Social welfare, health, and security	1,113	1,570	1,654	1,877
Housing and community facilities	−180	544	539	179
Education and general research	88	71	88	85
Agriculture and agricultural resources	752	1,117	1,381	824
Natural resources	257	728	1,101	779
Transportation and communication	824	905	1,530	1,196
Finance, commerce, and industry	30	83	426	116
Labor	104	124	118	118
General government	972	1,545	1,492	1,341
Interest on the public debt	4,748	4,950	5,000	5,000
Refunds of receipts	3,119	2,155	2,065	2,065
Reserve for contingencies		10	25	25
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis	997			
Total	63,714	42,523	37,528	31,276
From—				
General and special accounts	$65,019	$42,698	$36,699	$31,276
Corporation accounts	−1,305	−175	829	
Total	63,714	42,523	37,528	31,276

The Budget classifications and Budget totals reflect all transactions in the general and special accounts and the excess of expenditures over receipts of wholly owned Government corporations. For the first time, the net expenditures of wholly owned corporations are classified on a functional basis. The Budget totals do not include the operations of trust accounts. However, such transactions,

when significant, are discussed in connection with the various Budget programs.

National defense

Expenditures for "National defense" remain by far the largest category in the Budget. The cost of maintaining the military, air, and naval forces necessary in the fiscal year 1948 will be high. The present defense establishment requires larger forces, more complex mechanized equipment, more intensive use of equipment, and more extensive developmental activity than before the war.

However, in the fiscal year 1948 these expenditures will be but one-eighth of the outlays in the peak wartime fiscal year, 1945. This drastic cut reflects a corresponding reduction in the size of the armed forces. Outlays for munitions have been reduced even more.

Despite these reductions, our defense establishments will not have fallen to its ultimate peacetime level by the end of the fiscal year 1948. We still have large responsibilities arising out of the war. Military occupation in Europe and the Far East must continue. The lines of communication and supporting installations for the occupation forces must be maintained. Recruits must be trained as replacements.

The high cost of our defense establishments requires that the program be operated with the utmost efficiency. In the estimates for 1948 emphasis has been placed on eliminating as much duplication and overlapping in activities as is possible under present conditions. In my State of the Union Message I have again urged establishment of a single department of national defense. This is an important step in the search for economy and efficiency in organization and administration of the armed services.

I recently appointed an advisory commission to study the need for a universal training program. We still have available from the war much of the equipment and installations which will be needed for such a program. The program, after it has been worked out and approved, will still require considerable time to get under way. Estimates for it have, therefore, not been included in this Budget. Since plans are not complete for the training program, a small amount has been included in the Budget to cover the cost of induction machinery whenever provision is made for it.

National defense

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Military defense:				
Military	$24,846	$6,741	$6,658	$5,942
Atomic energy	430	179		
Naval defense	16,763	5,588	4,423	3,540
Terminal leave for enlisted personnel		1,900	250	
Activities supporting defense:				
Lend-lease (excluding War and Navy Departments):				
Treasury Department	$672	$333	$34	
Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration	1,045	411		
Agriculture Department	1,003	5		
Other	45	35		
Stock-piling of strategic and critical materials.				
Treasury Department		177	243	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation		−87	−210	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (other)	−53	−337	−121	
War Shipping Administration (other)	187	−250	−34	
Other	74	30	13	$10
Total	45,012	[a] 14,726	11,256	9,493
From—				
General and special accounts	$45,066	[a] $15,149	$11,587	$9,493
Corporation accounts	−53	−424	−331	
Total	45,012	[a] 14,726	11,256	9,493

[a] Excludes disbursements of approximately 1,500 million dollars for the War Department and 250 million dollars for the Navy Department which have appeared as Budget expenditures in previous years.

Expenditures: "National defense," as used in this Budget, is much less inclusive than the category used last year. For example, War Department expenditures of 645 million dollars in 1948 for supplies to and administration of occupied areas (other than Army pay, subsistence, and related items) are now in "International affairs and finance." Likewise, expenditures for the atomic energy activities of the Manhattan District project beginning January 1, 1947, when the Atomic Energy Commission took control, are shown in "Natural resources." For the fiscal year 1946 and the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1947 this program remains in "National defense."

The level of expenditures for "National defense" in 1947 would have been 1.7 billion dollars higher, and the reduction from 1947 to 1948 correspondingly greater, except for certain adjustments—1.5 billion dollars in War Department accounts and 250 million dollars in Navy accounts. Some funds withdrawn from the Treasury in 1946 and earlier years, and reported as expenditures at the time, were not used until 1947. Also some expenditures by the War Department in 1947 were offset by credits from funds which had accumulated in trust accounts during the war.

The expenditure estimate of 11.1 billion dollars in 1948 for the Army and Navy for military purposes reflects the reductions from the current fiscal year in the number of military personnel and in war-liquidation outlays—such as mustering-out payments (reduced by 370 million dollars), contract termination (700 million dollars), and surplus property handling. On the other side, the estimate reflects greater procurement in the fiscal year 1948, as war inventories cease to be available to supply current needs.

The estimated expenditures of 6.7 billion dollars for the War Department in the fiscal year 1948 include 132 million dollars for public works under supplemental legislation. The Navy expenditures of 4.4 billion dollars also include 77 million dollars for ship construction and public works under supplemental legislation. In both instances the objective is to return to the peacetime procedure of obtaining specific legislative authority for these programs.

Taken together, the War and Navy Department expenditures estimated for the fiscal year 1948 provide for an average military strength of 1,641,000 men and officers. Of this, Army strength is projected at 1,070,000 throughout the year; Navy and Marine strength will begin the year at 598,000 and average 571,000. These figures compare with an average strength in the fiscal year 1947 of 2,108,000. Pay, subsistence, travel, welfare, training, clothing, and medical expenditures for military personnel are estimated at 5.2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1948, as against 6.7 billion dollars in the current year. Average annual costs per man for these purposes—about 3,100 dollars in 1948—have increased markedly since VJ-day. Fully 45 percent of Army and Navy expenditures in 1948 are in this category.

Expenditures by the War and Navy Departments for all other military purposes are estimated at 5.9 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1948. This sum covers procurement, research and development, construction, operation and maintenance, and citizen-reserve activities. The estimates for 1948 contemplate proceeding with construction projects of highest priority at overseas bases and in the continental United States, and limiting procurement to those items essential for the current operation, maintenance, and training of the military forces, except for aircraft and limited quantities of newly developed items.

Effective defense under modern conditions requires us to push ahead in scientific and technological fields. Toward this end, expenditures for research and development by the Army and Navy are projected at 530 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948—slightly above their 1947 rate. Similarly, we must keep alive the knowledge of military skills among our citizens. To provide for an orderly

expansion of citizen-reserve organizations, expenditures of 308 million dollars are projected in 1948—about two-thirds more than the outlays in the current fiscal year when these programs are getting under way. The Reserve organizations of the Army will still be below planned strength at the end of 1948.

The bulk of the terminated Army and Navy contracts has already been settled, with creditable dispatch. For all agencies, total commitments canceled on 318,000 prime contracts exceed 65 billion dollars. After deducting credits due the Government, total payments to contractors under the entire program are estimated at about 6.5 billion dollars. Of this total, about three-fourths of a billion dollars remained for payment at the beginning of the fiscal year 1947. Most of this has now been paid in final settlements or in advances pending settlement.

Applications for terminal-leave payments to enlisted military personnel have been smaller than expected. It is now estimated that 1.9 billion dollars will be paid in 1947 and only 250 million dollars in 1948.

Lend-lease expenditures in the fiscal year 1947 from funds appropriated to the President are largely interappropriation adjustments and payments for articles procured and services rendered in previous years. In 1948 there will be very small expenditures—all for closing out the program.

Except for some military aid to China and minor items, lend-lease was terminated after VJ-day. Since then, lend-lease goods valued at over 1 billion dollars have been sold to foreign countries on a cash or credit basis. Much progress has been made in effecting settlements with the countries which received about 50 billion dollars of lend-lease aid and extended almost 8 billion dollars of reciprocal aid. Final settlements have now been negotiated with the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, France, Belgium, and Turkey, and discussions with the Netherlands, Norway, and the Union of South Africa are nearing completion.

The military program for stock piling of strategic materials has been reviewed carefully to minimize interference with business requirements. New stock piling is estimated at 90 million dollars in the fiscal year 1947 and 33 million dollars in 1948. In addition, excess metals and materials, amounting to 87 million dollars this year and 210 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948, will be transferred from Reconstruction Finance Corporation stocks to the Treasury military stock pile. Apart from stock piles transferred to the Treasury, the receipts of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in its war activities reflect largely the rental and disposal of excess war plants, together with the sale of metals, minerals, and other commodities to the public.

Appropriations: To finance the expenditure program outlined above, appropriations of 9.5 billion dollars and new contract authorizations of 541 million dollars will be necessary in the fiscal year 1948. These totals include 262 million dollars of supplemental appropriations and 91 million dollars of contract authorizations under legislation shortly to be submitted. The new appropriations needed in 1948 are about 2 billion dollars lower than the estimated expenditures, which include provision for payment of substantial amounts of unliquidated obligations of prior years.

International affairs and finance

The budget for our international program is designed to contribute to a peaceful world and a stable world economy. We have definite responsibilities to our wartime allies and in occupied countries. Our international lending program is an essential part of our efforts to achieve a world economy in which private trade will flourish.

The period when large-scale general relief is required for our allies is almost over. With the termination of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, there will remain, however, the urgent question of refugees and displaced persons. I urge the Congress to provide adequate support for the International Refugee Organization, now in process of being formed under the United Nations. It is also necessary that we provide a modest relief program for a few countries which are still in desperate straits. I recommend that the Congress speedily enact legislation to authorize these expenditures for which I am making provision in this Budget. In addition, I recommend that the Congress authorize participation in the World Health Organization and the proposed International Trade Organization and have included the small amounts needed for their support.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Reconstruction and stabilization:				
Subscriptions to International Fund and Bank	$159	$1,426		
Treasury loan to United Kingdom		1,500	$1,200	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to United Kingdom	−39	−39	−40	
Export-Import Bank loans	464	1,025	730	
Aid to China	120			
U. S. Commercial Company	−118	20		
Foreign relief:				
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	743	1,515	305	
War Department (occupied countries)		556	645	$725
Other	4	3		
Philippine-aid program	28	105	137	144
Membership in international organizations	2	15	18	18
Foreign relations:				
State Department	81	140	173	197
Other	20	12	15	9
Proposed legislation		116	326	76
Total	1,464	6,394	3,510	1,169

International affairs and finance—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
From—				
General and special accounts:				
Purchase of capital stock in Export-Import Bank	$674	$325		
Philippine-aid program	28	30	$137	$144
Other	1,129	5,283	2,683	1,025
Corporation accounts:				
Issuance of Export-Import Bank capital stock	−674	−325		
Export-Import bank loans	464	1,025	730	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to Philippines		75		
Other	−157	−19	−40	
Total	1,464	6,394	3,510	1,169

Expenditures: The sharp decline in total expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 is due chiefly to the fact that in 1947 we shall complete our payment to the International Monetary Fund and our basic cash subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Further liabilities to the International Bank will arise only if we are called upon, within the limits of our total subscription, to join with other countries in making good any defaults by borrowers from the Bank.

More than half of our expenditures in the international field in the fiscal year 1948 will be loans for reconstruction or trade expansion. Disbursements will be predominantly under existing commitments. By the end of the fiscal year 1948 we shall have discharged about three-fourths of our commitments under our loan agreement with Britain. Since the International Bank is now ready for business, new authorizations for reconstruction loans by the Export-Import Bank are being sharply curtailed. In the future, the Export-Import Bank will be primarily concerned with loans to finance United States trade and small developmental loans in which we have a special interest. Outlays by the Export-Import Bank in the fiscal years 1946 and 1947 have been financed to a considerable extent by the sale of capital stock to the Treasury. Since the Treasury subscription is now complete, future net outlays will be financed entirely by sale of notes to the Treasury.

The existing appropriation for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration expires at the end of the current fiscal year. Estimated expenditures in 1948 are entirely to wind up the program.

During the fiscal year 1948, the War Department will incur expenditures for administration and relief in Germany, Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus and for administration in Austria. We must continue to provide subsistence to prevent disease, hunger, and unrest, and to provide proper administration, if these lands are eventually to become democratic and self-supporting. Moreover, shipments of food and other supplies are required to maintain the working efficiency of the populations and to stimulate production. Resulting increases in exports from these areas will furnish a growing source of funds to pay for necessary imports and thus help eliminate the need for financial assistance.

The recent agreement for economic unification of the British and United States zones in Germany will increase exports from those zones and help to make them self-sufficient by the end of the calendar year 1949. All costs incurred for the support of the German economy are to be repaid out of future German exports as quickly as recovery permits.

An important contribution to the economic revival of the occupied areas is being made by Federal agencies, such as the U. S. Commercial Company, in temporarily financing exports from these areas. Net dollar proceeds are currently being used primarily to purchase raw materials and equipment needed for a further expansion of exports in order to hasten the time when the occupied areas will become fully self-supporting. To aid in this program, I urge that the Congress authorize the U. S. Commercial Company to continue operations beyond June 30, 1947, the present expiration date.

Aid for the Philippine Republic includes assistance in rebuilding its economy, payments to fulfill our pledge to compensate partially for war damage, and maintenance of training programs for Philippine citizens. The 1947 total includes a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan of 75 million dollars for aid in financing the current budget of the Republic.

Estimated expenditures of 18 million dollars for our membership in international organizations consist primarily of our share of the administrative budgets of the United Nations and its affiliated specialized organizations. In view of the immense tasks we have entrusted to the international organizations, this is a modest sum. Our contribution to the International Refugee Organization and funds for additional relief are included under proposed legislation.

Expenditures by the State Department are expected to increase in the fiscal year 1948. It is of utmost importance that the Department be equipped with sufficient funds and an adequate staff to make its maximum contribution to international peace. In 1948 there will be an increase of expenditures to carry on the improved Foreign Service program authorized under the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The Budget estimate for the Foreign Service buildings fund provides for the purchase of real property obtained by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner in lend-lease and surplus-property settlement agreements with other nations. Payment for these properties by the State Department increases miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury by a corresponding amount.

Appropriations: Appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 total 1,169 million dollars, mainly for the administration and relief of occupied countries and for various State Department programs. Funds for loans by the Export-Import Bank in the fiscal year 1948 will be obtained under its current borrowing authority. Advances to the United Kingdom will be made under the existing authorization. The appropriations total includes 11 million dollars of anticipated supplementals for the State Department and 76 million dollars for proposed legislation.

Veterans' services and benefits

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act provides education and training benefits, unemployment and self-employment allowances, and loan guarantees. National service life insurance is an additional tangible benefit. For those who suffered disabilities, the best of medical care is provided. Pension rates for disabled veterans and for dependents of veterans were increased by the last Congress. In addition to the veterans' program, our servicemen have been assisted in resuming civilian life by mustering-out payments and terminal-leave payments.

Since the main purpose of our veterans' program is to reestablish former servicemen in civilian life, we must carefully avoid types of assistance which would encourage, or unnecessarily prolong, dependence upon Government subsidy. Any other policy would not only put an intolerable burden upon the taxpayer, but would be a great disservice to veterans themselves.

Although some amendments to veterans' legislation may still be required, no major new programs of assistance appear necessary. The job is now primarily one of effective administration. The Veterans' Administration has made great progress in establishing machinery that will administer this comprehensive program with speed and equity.

Veterans' services and benefits

GENERAL AND SPECIAL ACCOUNTS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Readjustment benefits, Veterans' Administration	$1,350	$3,467	$3,462	$3,484
Pensions, Veterans' Administration	1,261	2,165	2,492	2,492
Insurance, Veterans' Administration	1,395	979	73	73

Veterans' services and benefits—Continued

GENERAL AND SPECIAL ACCOUNTS—continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Hospitals, other services, and administrative costs:				
Construction:				
Veterans' Administration	$27	$37	$84	$43
Federal Works Agency	----	40	50	25
War Department	----	37	290	----
Current expenses:				
Veterans' Administration	377	870	890	892
Federal Works Agency	3	6	1	----
War Department	----	----	1	1
Total	4,414	7,601	7,343	7,009

Expenditures: The readjustment benefits program as a whole will continue in 1948 at its present level, as reductions in unemployment allowances will be offset by increases in education and loan-guarantee expenditures. These estimates assume continuing prosperity and present legislation.

In the fiscal year 1947, almost 1,100,000 veterans, on the average, are drawing unemployment allowances and more than 200,000 are receiving self-employment allowances, at a time when total unemployment in the United States is less than 2,500,000. The turn-over on the allowance rolls has been rapid. Almost one-half of the 14,000,000 discharged from the services have already drawn unemployment or self-employment allowances. In recent months tightened administration and a more positive job-placement program by the employment service have contributed to a reduction in the numbers on the allowance rolls. In the fiscal year 1948 it is expected that about 900,000 veterans on the average will receive nearly one billion dollars in these allowances.

On the average 2,000,000 veterans are receiving education and training benefits in the fiscal year 1947. In 1948 possibly 2,100,000 will participate at a cost of over 2.3 billion dollars. We have had to meet an acute situation with respect to educational and housing facilities in universities, colleges, and schools throughout the country. In the fiscal year 1948 the Federal Works Agency will largely complete the conversion of war surplus facilities for educational purposes.

The number of trainees receiving on-the-job training has increased sharply to over 600,000. To guard against misuse of public funds, the Congress, in its last session, wisely provided limitations on subsistence allowances to veterans whose earnings exceed fixed monthly amounts and also clarified the standards to be used by the States in approving

training—establishments. Such limitations on subsistence allowances are essential to assure equity for veterans and taxpayers alike.

Amendments liberalizing the loan-guarantee program have brought a sharp increase in the number of loans guaranteed and in the average size of the guarantee. During the fiscal year 1947 new loans will be guaranteed for 750,000 veterans; in 1948 for possibly 1,000,000. Roughly, 90 percent of these loans are made to finance home purchases by veterans. Expenditures in 1948 will be somewhat higher than in 1947—just over 100 million dollars for payment of the first year's interest on the guaranteed portion of the loan and for losses which are still relatively small.

Pension payments to disabled veterans and to dependents of veterans rose sharply from 1946 to 1947, as claims arising in World War II were granted. The increase in 1947 expenditures also reflects the 20-percent rise in pension rates approved by the last session of the Congress. Estimated expenditures of 2.5 billion dollars for pensions in 1948 include about 150 million dollars for subsistence allowances to disabled trainees and students. An average of 3,150,000 individuals will receive pensions and compensation in 1948—50 percent more than in 1946. This program will continue to increase for years to come.

Expenditures for insurance, which are mostly transfers to the national service life insurance trust fund, will decline sharply in 1948 with a corresponding decline in the trust-fund accumulations. The total cost to the Government for servicemen's insurance in World War II will approach 3.7 billion dollars by the end of 1948 with small additional costs to come later.

Veterans' services and benefits

TRUST ACCOUNTS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$1,382	$974	$53
Premiums, interest, and other	1,085	641	653
Expenditures for benefits, refunds, and other (deduct)	340	298	371
Net accumulation	2,127	1,317	335

The most extensive hospital and domiciliary construction program in the history of this Nation is now under way. The construction of veterans' hospitals and domiciliary facilities now authorized and recommended for authorization aggregates 1 billion dollars. Such construction, chiefly under the direction of the Corps of Engineers, will continue to increase in the fiscal year 1948. Less than half of the total program, however, will be completed by the end of that year.

In the fiscal year 1948 the operating and general administration expenses for veterans' programs as a whole will be somewhat higher than in the present year, chiefly because of the expansion of hospital facilities and improvement of medical care.

General administrative expenses for programs other than hospital and medical care are estimated in 1948 at about the 1947 level. The number of veterans participating in the readjustment, pension, and insurance programs will be higher, but the work load will fall as the number of entrants drops off.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is carrying out a decentralization program aimed at attaining more effective administration through more direct contact with veterans in their communities.

Appropriations: For these veterans' programs, this Budget recommends appropriations of 7,009 million dollars and contract authorizations of 220 million dollars to cover obligations to be incurred in the fiscal year 1948.

Social welfare, health, and security

In spite of the achievements of the past 11 years in promoting the health, welfare, and social security of the American people, much remains to be done. Our present program affords but partial protection against the major causes of insecurity; large segments of the population are excluded from its benefits. We have not yet done enough to secure good health for the Nation.

The Federal Security Agency has recently been given broader jurisdiction over the social-welfare activities of the Government. As previously recommended, I favor creating a well integrated, yet flexible, Cabinet department of health, education, and social security to supersede this agency.

I hope that the studies already undertaken by congressional committees will result in the prompt expansion and integration of the present social-security system. There is, for example, serious need to correct inequalities between States in public assistance payments and to extend the scope of Federal aid to include general assistance programs. The temporary increase in Federal grants for public assistance enacted in the last session of Congress will expire December 31, 1947; the Congress should now consider permanent legislation in this field. The estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 include provision for such legislation.

The old-age and survivors insurance system at present leaves out 40 percent of those who earn their living. Even greater numbers are outside the unemployment compensation program. It is unjust to deny these agricultural workers, public employees, and other excluded groups the protection of social insurance. The system should be extended to cover them. At the same time, retirement benefits for the aged should be liberalized to reduce the necessity for piecing out insurance benefits with public-assistance payments.

Recent legislation for hospital construction, for increased activities in mental health, and for expanded maternal and child-health services are substantial achievements toward improving the substandard health level of a large part of the population. But the major problem of financing health care still persists. Therefore, I again urge the Congress to enact a health-insurance program which will make adequate medical care available to everyone and provide protection against the economic hardships of sickness. Such a program should be almost entirely self-financing through pay-roll contributions.

Social welfare, health, and security

GENERAL AND SPECIAL ACCOUNTS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Unemployment and accident compensation:				
Federal Security Agency	$75	$74	$72	$72
Railroad Retirement Board	13	14	15	13
Retirement and dependency insurance:				
Railroad Retirement Board	294	507	487	691
Federal Security Agency and other	24	4	4	4
Assistance to aged and other special groups	636	702	720	727
Promotion of public health:				
Federal Security Agency	169	158	164	198
Federal Works Agency, Interior and War Departments	10	12	17	15
Crime control and correction	78	81	85	75
Other	13	18	16	8
Proposed legislation			74	74
Total	1,113	1,570	1,654	1,877

Expenditures: A large part of the social-insurance program is financed through trust-account operations which are not included in Budget expenditures. Pay-roll taxes collected by the States to finance unemployment compensation are deposited directly in a Federal trust account. The proceeds of Federal pay-roll taxes to cover old-age and survivors insurance are deducted from the receipts side of the Budget and do not appear as Budget expenditures. For the railroad retirement system, however, the pay-roll tax receipts are included in net Budget receipts and the amounts transferred to the trust account appear in Budget expenditures. Similarly, the Government contribution to the Federal employees' retirement funds is a transfer included in Budget expenditures.

Social welfare, health, and security

TRUST ACCOUNTS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948
Unemployment trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Deposits by States	$1,010	$977	$1,124
Railroad unemployment taxes	116	129	114
Transfers from general and special accounts	10	9	9
Withdrawals (deduct):			
State benefit payments	1,128	800	700
Railroad unemployment benefit payments	17	36	49
Net accumulation	−9	279	498

Social welfare, health, and security—Con.

TRUST ACCOUNTS—continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Net appropriation from general fund receipts	$1,201	$1,355	$1,987
Benefit payments and administrative expenses (deduct)	321	436	543
Net accumulation	880	919	1,444
Railroad retirement account:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	292	502	481
Benefit payments (deduct)	152	198	270
Net accumulation	140	304	211
Federal employees' retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts (from general government)	247	223	246
Deductions from salaries and other income	280	228	182
Annuities and refunds paid (deduct)	266	244	168
Net accumulation	261	207	260

Trust fund withdrawals by the States to pay unemployment benefits depend not only on the number of unemployed in covered employment, but also on the rate of turn-over. Budget expenditures for unemployment and accident compensation are mainly Federal grants to the States for administrative expenses of unemployment compensation. With high employment, accumulations in the trust fund will continue and administrative expenses will remain low.

Withdrawals from the trust fund for old-age and survivors insurance will continue to increase over a long period. As the program matures, the number of beneficiaries and the average benefit will gradually rise. A large estimated increase in receipts of this fund in the fiscal year 1948 is based on the assumption that the employment tax will rise from the present 2-percent rate on employers and employees to 5 percent on January 1, 1948, in accordance with present law.

Estimates for Budget expenditures for retirement and dependency insurance reflect the action of the last Congress in broadening the Railroad Retirement Act by adding survivors insurance and liberalizing benefits. Employer and employee tax rates were increased, resulting in larger payments to the trust account. These payments, which vary according to the railroad-pay-roll level, are expected to continue high. The major part of administrative expenses for old-age and survivors insurance is now paid directly from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and is therefore not included in Budget expenditures after the fiscal year 1946; this change is responsible for a sharp drop in the Budget item for the Federal Security Agency for retirement and dependency insurance.

Federal payments for assistance to the aged and other special groups are expected to increase in the fiscal year 1948 because of a continuing long-term rise in benefit levels and case loads. A sharp rise in the expenditures in the fiscal year 1947 results from the higher public assistance benefits under temporary legislation and the inclusion of the school-lunch program in this category beginning this year.

Expenditures for promotion of public health are estimated slightly higher than in the current year. Although the total for the fiscal year 1948 includes expanded research and State-aid programs, including the Federal-State hospital program, these additions are largely offset by reductions of 24 million dollars owing to termination of the nurses' training program and of the maternity and infant-care program for families of servicemen.

Appropriations: For the fiscal year 1948 the Budget includes appropriations of 1,877 million dollars, of which 74 million dollars are for proposed legislation. The recommended appropriation for the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year 1948 exceeds the estimated expenditures to permit transfer to the trust account of taxes and income from 1947 and previous years; this transfer will take effect in the current fiscal year. The recommended appropriation for the hospital construction program is greater than the estimated expenditures because the program is just getting under way.

Housing and community facilities

I have urged the Congress to enact the essential features of the general housing bill which was passed by the Senate last year. The most urgent immediate requirements are for incentives and aids to private lenders and builders to provide lower cost housing, especially rental housing, for assistance to local communities in their programs for urban redevelopment and low-rent housing, and for a permanent agency to supervise the major housing activities of the Federal Government.

Housing and community facilities

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Aids to private housing:				
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	−$275	−$245	−$210	
Mortgage purchases (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	−45	233	443	
Premium payments (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	2	60		
Federal Housing Administration and other	−13	19	17	
Public housing programs:				
Veterans' reuse (Federal Public Housing Authority)	29	369	30	$8
War housing (Federal Public Housing Authority and other)	34	29	135	142
Low-rent and other (Federal Public Housing Authority)	14	−10	18	8

Housing and community facilities—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Other housing services: Housing Expediter, and Administrator, National Housing Agency	$3	$11	13	$12
Provision of community facilities:				
Federal Works Agency	28	53	35	4
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other	3	25	44	
Proposed legislation			14	5
Total	−180	544	539	179
From—				
General and special accounts	$158	$526	$225	$179
Corporation accounts	−337	18	314	
Total	−180	544	539	179

Expenditures: In our housing program we shall continue to rely primarily upon private housing construction. During the past year, with the assistance of many public and private agencies, we have succeeded in securing a rapid expansion in the supply of building materials available for construction of veterans' housing. With the increased materials flow now evident, emphasis in the coming year will be focused on a few key materials, on acceleration of programs for recruitment and training of labor, and on provision of ample financing facilities for builders and prefabricators, as well as veterans and other purchasers. Particular attention will be given to measures to expand construction of rental housing. Many of these operations to aid private housing construction are reflected in expenditures of the Office of Temporary Controls, the Department of Labor, the Veterans' Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as part of programs classified elsewhere.

The programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration involve relatively small net expenditures, but are of major importance in stimulating private construction. In the fiscal year 1948 the Federal Housing Administration expects to guarantee loans on 325,000 homes and apartments, most of them for new construction. During the same period savings and loan associations which are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System will make an estimated 300,000 loans for financing new homes.

From an expenditure standpoint, the chief aids to private housing in the fiscal year 1948 will be provided by Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchases of mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration. In the fiscal year 1948, purchases of veterans' home loans are expected to account for the great bulk of all mortgages purchased by the Re-

construction Finance Corporation. With the rapid rise in guaranteed loans to veterans (see "Veterans' services and benefits"), the Federal Government has recognized that its responsibility to the veterans can be realized only by assuring private financial institutions the same ready market for these obligations that they already possess for mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The lending institutions in turn have a responsibility to make sure that their loans will benefit the veterans and will not burden them with impossible future obligations.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds have also been employed to make premium payments to increase the supply of critically scarce building materials. In view of the rapid expansion in output and the decontrol of prices, it appears that these programs can be terminated before the close of the current fiscal year.

The repayment of Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans will taper off in 1948 as its outstanding loans shrink. With its profits in recent years, we can now safely predict that this Corporation—which refinanced the loans of more than a million distressed borrowers during the depression—will liquidate without any loss to the Federal Government.

Expenditures on public housing programs are now concentrated almost entirely on liquidation of war-housing activities and provision of emergency housing units for war veterans. Conversion of barracks and other types of temporary war structures—the largest expenditure item in 1947—will be substantially completed in the current year. Under this program an estimated 255,000 units are being provided for veterans and their families—more than half for veterans in educational institutions.

The continued housing shortage in many industrial areas has made it necessary for the Government to continue operating many temporary war-housing units longer than previously expected. More than half of these units are occupied by veterans and servicemen. Expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 for management and disposition of war housing show an apparent increase primarily because receipts from the program are now deposited in miscellaneous receipts, rather than credited against expenditures. Payments of 85 million dollars also are forecast to transfer previous net receipts from rentals and sales into the general receipts of the Treasury. If allowance is made for these transfers and nonrecurring net receipts of 64 million dollars in 1947 from liquidation of the Defense Homes Corporation, program expenditures for war housing will decline substantially in 1948 from 1947 levels.

Receipts from the low-rent housing program will temporarily exceed expenditures in the current fiscal year because of anticipated repayments of loans by local housing authorities. Annual contributions to local housing authorities required by previous contracts will rise gradually as wartime tenants are replaced by low-income occupants.

Expenditures of the Federal Works Agency for defense public works will be virtually completed in the fiscal year 1948. Disbursements to localities for detailed planning of local public works will be limited to previous commitments under existing legislation.

On the other hand, disbursements on Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to local agencies for construction of self-liquidating projects will be increased as materials become available to resume urgently needed work. To make sure that funds are adequate for these disbursements, I request that the present 100-million-dollar limitation on Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans for these purposes be increased to 125 million dollars.

Appropriations: Of the total of 179 million dollars in appropriations estimated for the fiscal year 1948, an estimated 150 million dollars will be from current rental and disposition receipts of the veterans' reuse and war housing programs. Most of the 1948 expenditures will be made from Corporation funds or from unexpended balances of previous appropriations.

Education and general research

Our generous provision for education under the veterans' program should not obscure the fact that the Federal Government has large responsibilities for the general improvement of educational opportunities throughout the country. Although the expenditure estimates for the coming fiscal year are limited to present programs, I have long been on record for basic legislation under which the Federal Government will supplement the resources of the States to assist them to equalize educational opportunities and achieve satisfactory educational standards.

The relationship of the Federal Government to higher education also demands serious consideration. The veterans' readjustment program, which compelled a rapid emergency expansion of facilities to meet immediate needs, has focused attention on this fundamental problem. A Presidential commission on higher education is studying the matter because of its great importance to the future of the Nation.

Many agencies of the Federal Government carry on research as a part of their regular programs. But we need a central agency to correlate and encourage the research activities of the country. While freedom of inquiry must be preserved, the Federal Government should accept responsibility for fostering the flow of scientific knowledge and developing scientific talent in our youth. To accomplish this, I recommend again that a National Science Foundation, or its equivalent, be established. The Scientific Research Board appointed in October 1946 is now making a study of the research program of the entire Federal Government in its relation to all other research activities planned or in progress. Its report will undoubtedly be of service in establishing a proper program for the new agency. It is assumed that no additional expenditures will be required during the fiscal year 1948.

Education and general research

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Promotion of education:				
Office of Education, Federal Security Agency	$27	$28	$35	$35
Federal Works Agency	----	4	3	----
Educational aid to special groups (except veterans):				
Bureau of Indian Affairs (Interior)	11	12	12	12
Other agencies	2	3	6	6
Library and museum services	6	8	17	18
General-purpose research:				
Office of Scientific Research and Development	34	4	----	----
Commerce Department	8	11	14	14
Other agencies	----	----	1	1
Total	88	71	88	85

Expenditures: Federal expenditures for promotion of education, apart from the veterans' education program, now consist almost entirely of vocational grants to States, support of land-grant colleges, and general administration of the Office of Education. The Federal Works Agency will complete during the fiscal year 1948 its expenditures for the maintenance and operation of schools in war-affected communities. Corresponding expenditures prior to the current fiscal year are classified in "Housing and community facilities."

In August 1946, the Congress increased the authorization for vocational education by 15 million dollars. It is not possible at this time, however, for the State and local governments to make firm commitments on the availability of matching funds for the development of new programs of vocational education or the expansion of existing programs. Therefore, although the estimates of appropriations and expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 include an anticipated supplemental appropriation under this authorization, it may be necessary to increase the amount on the basis of later information from State and local governments. Money for this purpose has been included in the reserve for contingencies.

Expenditures for educational aid to special groups include funds for education of Indians through the Department of the Interior and smaller amounts for assistance to the blind and the deaf and to Howard University through the Federal Security Agency. The major part

of the estimated increase in expenditures is for construction of four buildings at Howard University, for which Congress has already appropriated money for drawing plans. Their construction is made urgent by the pressure of enrollment upon all existing facilities.

The increase in expenditures for library and museum services is due chiefly to the general expansion of activities of the Library of Congress.

Research is inherent in many Federal programs and consequently the bulk of such expenditures is included in the specific programs to which the research relates. The principal items of continuing expenditure for those research programs which serve several purposes or are general in character are in the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Standards, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey—all within the Department of Commerce. Some expansion of these activities is contemplated in the estimates for the fiscal year 1948. The Office of Scientific Research and Development, which was devoted to research in support of the war effort, will be almost completely liquidated in the fiscal year 1947.

Appropriations: The total of appropriations for education and general research is 85 million dollars for the fiscal year 1948—3 million dollars less than the estimated expenditures. This total includes a tentative estimate of the amount which will be required under the new authorization for vocational education.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

Because of high consumer incomes in the United States and the continuing world shortage of many foods, the demand for farm products will doubtless remain strong throughout the fiscal year 1948. Agricultural production goals for the 1947 crop year, with a few exceptions, will call for another year of maximum output.

The demand for American farm products, however, cannot be counted upon to continue indefinitely at the present high level. Under present legislation the Department of Agriculture is required to support prices of most agricultural commodities until December 31, 1948.

We must design our agricultural policies to work toward a better balance of supply with demand and so avoid excessive expenditures for price support. We should facilitate the transfer of unnecessary farm labor and resources from agriculture to industrial and other pursuits. We shall need also to devise ways of supporting farm income which will retain export markets for wheat, cotton, and tobacco, and at the same time give the American consumer the benefit of increasing efficiency in farm production.

The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation expires on June 30, 1947. Since the Corporation now has a State charter, I am recommending that it be rechartered by act of Congress and that its present borrowing authority of 4,750 million dollars be renewed.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Loan and investment programs:				
Department of Agriculture:				
Price support, supply, and purchase programs (Commodity Credit Corporation)	−$1,329	−$79	$330	----
Other corporate transactions	−261	−73	−50	$23
Farmers' Home Administration	30	40	154	172
Rural Electrification Administration	11	12	25	31
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:				
Loans to Rural Electrification Administration	74	200	300	----
Other loans	−24	10	−17	----
Other financial aids:				
Department of Agriculture:				
Conservation and use	311	352	311	202
Exportation and domestic consumption	75	80	66	148
Sugar Act	54	52	53	55
Other	3	5	7	9
Food subsidies (Commodity Credit Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	1,634	325	6	----
Agricultural land and water resources	39	52	53	49
Development and improvement	134	139	142	135
Total	752	1,117	1,381	824
From—				
General and special accounts:				
Postwar price support	$500	----	----	----
Cancellation of notes of Commodity Credit Corporation	----	$921	$830	----
Other	535	661	773	$824
Corporation accounts:				
Postwar price support	−500	----	----	----
Cancellation of notes of Commodity Credit Corporation	----	−921	−830	----
Other	217	456	608	----
Total	752	1,117	1,381	824

Expenditures: By the fiscal year 1948 the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation will be limited almost entirely to price support for agricultural commodities. Reimbursements from lend-lease, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and foreign governments will be largely completed in the next 6 months. Liquidation of inventories is tapering off. For the present, the high level of farm prices has made price-support outlays unnecessary except for a few commodities such as potatoes and eggs.

In 1948, however, even with continued general prosperity, an estimated 330 million dollars will be spent to support agricultural prices. Larger outlays will be required should markets weaken seriously. In addition, loans by commercial banks guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation will probably be substantial. The present borrowing authority, if renewed, will be ample to support agricultural prices during the fiscal year 1948.

Receipts from other corporate transactions in the Department of Agriculture are expected to be lower in 1947 and 1948 than in 1946. In 1946 there were unusually large repayments to the farm credit agencies and large receipts in revolving funds of the Treasury from return of capital of mixed-ownership corporations. In view of the large repayments and refinancing of the loans of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, this Budget recommends that the Corporation's borrowing authority of 2 billion dollars be reduced to an amount more nearly commensurate with foreseeable needs. This recommendation should be considered when the Farm Credit Administration submits its report on the mortgage-loan programs of the Corporation and the Federal land banks.

The rural rehabilitation and farm-tenant programs, formerly under the Farm Security Administration, and the Crop and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration have been merged to form the new Farmers' Home Administration. This program shows an apparent increase in 1948, solely because of the changed method of financing required in the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946.

The increased estimates for Rural Electrification Administration loans will permit expansion of a program that is urgently needed by farmers but has been held back during the war years.

Commitments for payments to farmers under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation and use program for the 1947 crop year have already been made as provided by the 1947 appropriation act. Expenditures for this program, including administrative expenses, are estimated at 311 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948.

A year ago the Budget message recommended gradual reduction of these payments, and that recommendation is now renewed. More than 60 percent of the total payments go to about one-eighth of the Nation's farmers. Most of this money thus is being paid to farmers who, because of their strong position in American agriculture, would undoubtedly continue the best farm management

practices without the persuasion of a bonus from the Treasury.

We should shift our effort from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation and management, along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service. I therefore propose that the appropriation act limit the conservation and use program for the crop year 1948 to 200 million dollars instead of the 300-million-dollar program to which we are committed for the crop year 1947. This will not affect expenditures materially until the fiscal year 1949.

Expenditures to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of farm products are financed under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, by a permanent appropriation equal to 30 percent of customs receipts. In the fiscal year 1946 expenditures for the school-lunch program were financed by this appropriation. These have been transferred to "Social welfare, health, and security" in later years. The remaining expenditures in 1947 and 1948 are for export subsidies, diversion of surplus commodities to new uses, and purchase and distribution of surplus agricultural commodities to State welfare agencies. Addition of the cotton export subsidy program previously financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and other increases offset the transfer of the school-lunch program.

Almost all wartime food subsidy programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have now been discontinued. Subsidy payments from corporate funds in the fiscal year 1948 will be limited to sugar, which is expected to remain in short supply. In addition, payments to sugar growers in the United States under the Sugar Act program will remain at approximately the present level.

Expenditures for agricultural land and water resources, which include the Soil Conservation Service, upstream erosion and flood control, water conservation and utilization, and the submarginal land program, are estimated to increase slightly in 1948.

Expansion of agricultural research under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 will cost an additional 18 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948. The farm labor supply program will decrease by about 16 million dollars. Other general programs for the development and improvement of agriculture, such as the Extension Service, the scientific research agencies, and the staff agencies of the Department of Agriculture, will remain at about the present level. Thus, the programs in this category as a whole will increase by 3 million dollars.

Appropriations: To carry out our agricultural programs, I recommend that the Congress appropriate 824 million dollars for the fiscal year 1948. In addition, since not all of the permanent appropriation of section 32 funds will be required to subsidize exportation and domestic consumption of surplus agricultural commodities, the transfer of 100 million dollars to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program for conservation and use of agricultural land resources is recommended. In 1947, 42.5 million dollars of section 32 funds were so transferred. In view of the probable need for these funds after 1948 for surplus disposal programs, however, we cannot look forward to their continued annual use for the conservation and use program.

The operations of the various agricultural corporations and the agricultural programs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be financed out of corporate funds borrowed from the Treasury. It is estimated that 830 million dollars of notes owed the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation will be canceled in 1948 pursuant to the appraisal of the assets of the Corporation as of June 30, 1946. This cancellation of notes will be an expenditure under general and special accounts and a receipt under corporation accounts, and thus will have no net effect on Budget expenditures or on the appropriations recommended for 1948.

Natural resources

The natural-resources program has been increasing to fill some of the gaps arising from wartime deferments and depletions. The estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 represent a further expansion over the current year. They do not contemplate initiation of large new projects.

The harnessing of atomic energy was a war achievement, and it remains of major military significance. With the appointment of the Atomic Energy Commission last fall we have entered on a new phase of development. This Commission has assumed direction of the Manhattan Engineer District project. Our aim is to bring the benefits of atomic research to industry and medicine and to enrich standards of well-being.

In line with the shift in emphasis, the atomic-energy program, since December 31, 1946, is classified in "Natural resources." This transfer in the middle of the current fiscal year and the inclusion on a full-year basis in 1948 are major reasons for the increases in expenditures for resource development in both years.

Expenditures: In order to push forward basic research in development and use of atomic energy, I am recommending a program which will involve expenditures of 444 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948. This compares with total outlays of 385 million dollars in the current fiscal year, of which 179 million dollars are shown in "National defense."

Much of the productive future of this Nation lies in the effective development of our river basins. Under the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, this work will go forward in 1948 at a somewhat increased expenditure rate. The estimates provide for continuation of projects under way and starting those projects for which 1947 appropriations were made, but which have been temporarily deferred.

Natural resources not primarily agricultural

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Atomic energy:				
Atomic Energy Commission	.....	$201	$443	$250
Other agencies	.....	5	1	.....
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers (War)	$89	192	255	189
Bureau of Reclamation (Interior)	62	145	176	151
Bonneville and Southwestern Power Administrations (Interior)	9	20	27	23
Tennessee Valley Authority	5	36	47	27
International Boundary and Water Commission (State)	1	4	10	9
Other (Interior)	10	12	15	15
Forest resources:				
Forest Service (Agriculture)	40	53	53	54
Department of the Interior	3	3	3	3
Mineral resources:				
Department of the Interior	18	21	23	20
Navy Department	3	6	4	.....
Recreational use of resources (Interior)	5	15	19	13
Other resources (Interior)	12	17	24	26
Total	257	728	1,101	779
From—				
General and special accounts:				
Tennessee Valley Authority	$21	$33	$45	$27
Other	254	694	1,054	752
Corporation accounts:				
Tennessee Valley Authority	−16	3	2	.....
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−2	−2	.....	.....
Total	257	728	1,101	779

The only appropriations now recommended are for projects partly provided for in previous appropriation acts. A substantial portion of the expenditures is for multiple-purpose projects which, in addition to flood control, navigation, and irrigation benefits, will supply needed power for industry and agriculture.

Some expansion of transmission facilities is needed by the Bonneville Power Administration to market the hydroelectric power generated at certain of the Government's multiple-purpose dams. Receipts of 25 million dollars from the sale of power by this agency and the Southwestern Power Administration will be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury in the fiscal year 1948.

Expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority will increase in the fiscal year 1948 as work progresses on the two large dams provided for in the 1947 appropriations. By the end of 1948 construction of the major dams will be almost complete; thereafter, the principal activity

will be directed toward the effective utilization of local resources for industrial and agricultural improvement within the valley. The Tennessee Valley Authority finances its power operations and transmission facilities from its own revenues. The Authority will continue the practice started in the last fiscal year of making payments to the Treasury.

Expenditures by the International Boundary and Water Commission for the United States share of the construction of dams and other water improvements on the Rio Grande, in cooperation with the Mexican Government, will be expanded in 1948, pursuant to the 1944 treaty.

Among the other expenditures by the Department of the Interior for land and water resources in 1948, the major portion is for the use, protection, and improvement of the public lands which it manages. The estimated expenditures for 1948 for grazing activities contemplate restoration of the program to approximately the 1946 level. Appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 were cut to a level that does not permit adequate protection and conservation of these grazing resources. The Department of the Interior is investigating the feasibility of raising grazing fees to cover the operating costs of the Grazing Service and also service charges on the cost of capital improvements.

Because of critical needs for lumber, our forests, both public and private, must be administered to yield the maximum immediate supply without unduly impairing future timber resources. Expenditures for the Forest Service for the fiscal year 1948 provide for increased timber-sale administration and forest-fire control. These increases are offset by decreases in other phases of the work.

Our mineral resources have been seriously depleted during the war. Substitutes or new sources of supply must now be found. As part of our military program we are accumulating a strategic stock pile of critical materials from both domestic and foreign sources. To plan this program successfully and to assure adequate supplies for industrial and consumer use, it is essential that we have full information on our domestic resources. Consequently, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey will make small expansions in their mineral resource programs in 1948.

During the war the national park system has been maintained on virtually a custodial basis only. Increased expenditures are required in 1948 to provide the most needed improvements in roads, parkways, buildings and utilities, and for general administration and protection.

Other resource programs of the Department of the Interior will increase by 7 million dollars in 1948. General surveys and topographical mapping activities by the Geological Survey must be accelerated to provide basic data needed for natural resources programs and industrial development. Expenditures for conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources reflect a small increase in operating costs.

Some progress has been made in the development of Alaska, but only a beginning. Included in several of these programs are expenditures for the investigation and development of the natural resources of this vast area.

Appropriations: Appropriations of 779 million dollars for resource development in the fiscal year 1948 include an estimated supplemental of 4 million dollars for the Forest Service. The total is substantially below estimated expenditures for that year. Postponement of some of the public works projects for flood control and reclamation in the current year will leave available in 1948 substantial balances from earlier-year appropriations. Similarly, the curtailment of other resource development activities has resulted in some carry-over of appropriations for these programs. A smaller amount from 1948 appropriations will be available to finance expenditures in later years.

In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Budget recommendation includes contract authority in the amount of 250 million dollars in addition to the 250 million dollars of recommended appropriations. The appropriations to discharge obligations under this contract authority will be made in future years when the payments become due.

Transportation and communication

Six years of deferred maintenance and improvement must be made up before the basic postwar needs of motor and water transportation are met. The highway system, particularly, has fallen far behind the standards which should prevail under conditions of rapidly growing use. Urban congestion is again becoming a serious problem. Likewise, the enormous expansion of civil aviation since VJ-day has thrown an increasing burden upon inadequate airway and airport facilities. An expanded program is essential if undue hazards in the air are to be avoided and if the development of aviation is to continue without serious technical impediment. At the same time it is hoped to restore prewar service standards in the postal service. The enforcement of regulatory standards, particularly those designed for accident prevention in all types of transport, should be restored, at least to prewar levels.

Transportation and communications

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Promotion of the merchant marine (Maritime Commission)	$374	−$117	$204	$6
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:				
War Department	93	124	152	120
Coast Guard		168	157	149

Transportation and communications—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Provision of highways:				
Federal Works Agency	$77	$268	$393	$300
Other	13	33	35	33
Promotion of aviation:				
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	32	38	44	36
Commerce (Civil Aeronautics Administration)	62	92	149	152
Other	5	2		
Regulation of transportation	22	25	15	15
Other services to transportation:				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (railroad loans)	−43	−31	−3	
Other	17	19	21	22
Postal service (Post Office Department)	161	276	352	353
Regulation of communications (Federal Communications Commission), and other services to communications	11	7	9	9
Total	824	905	1,530	1,196
From—				
General and special accounts	$866	$936	$1,533	$1,196
Corporation accounts	−43	−31	−3	
Total	824	905	1,530	1,196

It is the policy of the Government to withdraw from ship operation as rapidly as possible and to dispose of vessels in a manner that will promote a large and effective merchant fleet under our flag. But, since private operators see little prospect of profit in the coastwise trade and much of the overseas traffic is regarded as temporary, Government operations have continued. The Maritime Commission reconversion program, the lay-up of vessels in the reserve fleet, and the preparation of war-built vessels for sale are under way.

Expenditures: The Maritime Commission, by its petition before the Interstate Commerce Commission, is attempting to obtain revision of the railroad rate structure in order to permit resumption of domestic shipping under private auspices. We must look to the domestic trade to provide the active core of our merchant fleet reserve, since we cannot hope to maintain in the foreign trade alone a merchant fleet adequate for the Nation's security. Because the long-run needs of foreign trade are not yet clear, the expenditure estimates contemplate only a moderate expansion in operating subsidies. Construction of new vessels is limited to those for which private purchasers are available and those essential to meet specialized needs for which war-built vessels cannot be adapted. I hope that the rate of ship disposition and

liquidation of Government operations can be expedited.

Under the War Department are two major functions relating to transportation—the Panama Canal and the rivers and harbors work of the Corps of Engineers. To make up deferred maintenance, to continue at a minimum rate river and harbor construction projects already under way, and to make a slow beginning on projects authorized under the 1947 appropriation it is necessary to expand the expenditures during the fiscal year 1948.

Other aids to navigation are those maintained and operated by the Coast Guard (in the Treasury Department). The large decrease in the fiscal year 1948 reflects the return to a normal program, the completion of previously deferred work during 1947 and early 1948, and some reduction in Coast Guard aviation. In the interest of reducing expenditures, the installation of the Loran system of radio navigation aid will be spread over a number of years.

Most Federal expenditures for highways are concentrated in the Federal-aid program under the Federal Works Agency. This is a matching program in which Federal expenditures depend upon the level of State activity within the authorized annual rate of 500 million dollars established for each of the first three postwar years by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. Materials shortages, contracting difficulties, and high costs have delayed this program, but the situation should ease by next year. Sums apportioned to the States, however, are available only for a year after the close of the fiscal year for which they are authorized, and the rate of expenditure has thus far been well below congressional authorizations. States are, therefore, under pressure to obligate these funds at once. As has been urged by many of the States, it is recommended that the Congress extend for one additional year the period during which these funds may be expended. Moderate increases for the Agriculture and Interior Departments are included to begin to overcome the long deferment of work on the forest roads and trails and Indian roads.

The sharp upward trend in expenditures by the Department of Commerce for civil aviation results from the rapid expansion of the industry. Inadequate facilities and services have caused serious congestion and a threat to air safety. The expansion and modernization of the airways system provided in these estimates is essential for the continued progress of the industry and could not be reduced without great risk.

As the rapid growth of aviation continues, I believe it is unwise to place the entire burden of expanding, improving, and maintaining the airways upon the general taxpayer. Instead, civil aviation should bear a reasonable share. The Department of Commerce is considering the feasibility of various methods to recover part of the expenses from the users.

Substantial expenditures for grants-in-aid to airports under the 1946 legislation are anticipated for the first time, increasing from 7 million dollars in the fiscal year 1947 to 50 million dollars in 1948. This will be channeled as far as possible into urgent work designed to relieve bottlenecks in air transport, but the apportionment formula will limit the discretion of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in scheduling first the most needed projects.

Unless legislative action is taken to revise postal rates, the Post Office deficit threatens to be the largest in history. Mail volume has expanded enormously, but current operating costs have increased even more rapidly. This is the chief cause of the deficit. Further temporary additions to expenditures result from the need to take up deferred maintenance and replace equipment. The Post Office Department is studying its operations with a view to introducing economies. I am instructing the Postmaster General to institute all operating economies consistent with reasonable service and to prepare a comprehensive recommendation for rate revision sufficient to wipe out the deficit.

Appropriations: Appropriations of 1,196 million dollars are included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1948 for "Transportation and communication," compared with estimated expenditures of 1,530 million dollars. Unobligated balances in Maritime Commission revolving funds are adequate for all expenditures with the exception of an appropriation of 6 million dollars recommended for the maritime training fund and aid to State marine schools. War Department and Federal Works Agency appropriations fall below expenditure estimates because of the deferral to 1948 of work for which appropriations were already made in 1947. The appropriations total includes 50 million dollars for the Civil Aeronautics Administration as an estimate of the appropriation request that will be made for the airport program as soon as the plans of the Agency are sufficiently matured. Contract authorizations of 500 million dollars are included for the Federal-aid postwar highway construction program.

Finance, commerce, and industry

By the end of the current fiscal year, almost all wartime controls of business will have ended. I recommend that the Congress extend the authority for rent control; price control on sugar and sirups, and rice; sugar rationing; export and import controls; priority and allocation controls on a few commodities still in extremely short supply; and a few other minimum controls which are indispensable for the time being.

Now that we are returning to a peacetime economy that depends for its success on private enterprise, the Government should resume and expand its services to business, including both financial and nonfinancial aids. In addition, free enterprise depends on positive Government action to preserve competition and control monopolies—proper functions that a democratic government must not neglect.

Finance, commerce, and industry

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Promotion or regulation of business:				
Office of Temporary Controls	$184	$133	$55	$52
Commerce Department	11	22	28	31
Others (Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, etc.)	15	15	13	13
Business loans and guarantees:				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to business	−111	−21	57	-------
Retirement of Smaller War Plants Corporation capital stock	-------	-------	100	-------
War damage insurance (War Damage Corporation)	−2	1	211	-------
Aids to private financial institutions (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	−72	−73	−55	-------
Control of private finance (Securities and Exchange Commission)	5	5	6	6
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	10	14
Total	30	83	426	116
From—				
General and special accounts	$216	$176	$112	$116
Corporation accounts	−185	−93	314	-------
Total	30	83	426	116

Expenditures: During the rest of this fiscal year, the Office of Temporary Controls will discontinue as rapidly as possible direct controls over business operations previously administered by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration. Although a few essential controls should be retained a little longer, these, too, will be terminated as soon as conditions permit.

Among the other regulatory agencies, Foreign Funds Control (Treasury) and Solid Fuels Administration (Interior) will also cease operations this year.

The peacetime regulatory agencies, however, must be strengthened from low levels justified during the war by the existence of other direct controls. This Budget, therefore, provides for the necessary increases in such essential agencies as the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Antitrust Division (Justice), and the Tariff Commission.

The Antitrust Division will concentrate its efforts on major violations of the antitrust laws. The Federal Trade Commission will increase its effectiveness by operating on an industry-wide basis, rather than through the slower procedure of individual complaints. It will also sponsor a larger number of industry conferences designed to locate and eliminate

unfair trade practices through cooperative action.

In the past year, we have made a fine start in building up the business service programs of the Department of Commerce from their low wartime levels. To provide necessary information for business, provision of funds is recommended for a census of manufactures, already authorized by law, and likewise for a census of business to be authorized by proposed legislation. No census has been taken in either area since 1939 and present information is badly out of date. A small but necessary increase in the business-service activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is also recommended. The Patent Office urgently needs increases in personnel to cope with the growing backlog of patent applications and to handle registrations under recent trade-mark legislation.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation estimates assume that repayment of outstanding wartime loans to business enterprises will continue in the fiscal year 1948, but at a slower rate. In its peacetime business-loan program, the Corporation has been authorizing about 1,000 loans a month, chiefly to small business. Ninety percent of them are in amounts of 100,000 dollars or less. The new program also emphasizes guarantees of private credit rather than direct Government loans. These guaranties will not require disbursements in any large amount unless there should be an economic recession. In this event the Reconstruction Finance Corporation stands ready to purchase the loans offered by participating banks.

Since January 1946 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been administering the loan and lease program of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Disbursements on previously authorized Smaller War Plants Corporation loans are nearly finished and outstanding loans are gradually being repaid. In the fiscal year 1948 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation plans to retire an estimated 100 million dollars in Smaller War Plants Corporation capital stock.

The War Damage Corporation, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary, which at its peak had a total of 140 billion dollars of war damage insurance in force, is also terminating its operations. By 1948 it will be in full liquidation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been directed to return to the Treasury the 210 million dollars of net profits from this operation.

The expenditures of 310 million dollars for retirement of Smaller War Plants Corporation capital and return of War Damage Corporation profits will be paid into miscellaneous receipts and thus have no net effect on the total Budget. With these transfer items eliminated, the net increase of expenditures under this function in 1948 is ?3 million dollars.

Federal and State bank supervisory authorities are making special efforts to encourage banks and insurance companies to complete repayment of their prewar obligations to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. By June 30, 1948, the outstanding volume of such loans and investments will be down to 100 million dollars out of a total of about 3.5 billion dollars disbursed since 1932.

With stock-market activity and new security issues far above wartime levels, the Securities and Exchange Commission requires additional funds to rebuild its depleted staff and thus provide more adequate protection for the millions of investors.

Appropriations: To finance the expenditures for these programs, estimated appropriations in the fiscal year 1948 of 116 million dollars include anticipated additional appropriations of 53 million dollars required by proposed extension of the existing authority of the Office of Temporary Controls and the authority of the Department of Commerce to control exports. They also include 14 million dollars for new censuses under proposed new legislation.

Labor

The facilities of the Federal Government for dealing with the welfare of labor and with labor-management disputes provide for the encouragement of collective bargaining, administration of laws and regulations to protect the working force, assistance to States in promoting employment opportunities, and gathering of basic labor information.

In my message on the State of the Union, I have asked that the machinery in the Department of Labor for facilitating collective bargaining and expediting the settlement of labor-management disputes be amplified and strengthened. I have included administrative funds for this purpose under proposed legislation.

I recommend also that the Congress authorize grants to States through the Department of Labor for programs fostering safe working conditions. The toll resulting from industrial hazards reduces the productive capacity of the labor force. The new program should be administered by State departments of labor under Federal standards. Funds for this purpose have likewise been included under proposed legislation.

Labor

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Mediation and regulation:				
Labor Department	$14	$11	$9	$9
National Labor Relations Board	4	5	8	8
Other	6	3	4	4
Training and placement:				
Public employment offices	71	80	78	78
Other	1	3	3	3
Labor information and statistics and general administration	8	12	14	14
Proposed legislation			3	3
Total	104	124	118	118

Expenditures: The National Labor Relations Board has an accumulation of unresolved cases awaiting action owing to the increased incidence of representation cases and unfair labor-practice cases and to the reduced appropriations available for the Board's work this year. Delay in settling such cases is in itself a cause of labor disturbance. Apart from the backlog of unsettled cases, the number of cases brought before the Board for settlement has increased. The program submitted in this Budget is designed to reduce the backlog and keep the Board more nearly current in handling cases. This should diminish the incidence of strike action by labor organizations which is encouraged by tardy handling of cases.

The public employment service system, although now composed of the coordinated employment office facilities of the several States, is still financed in full by the Federal Government. Expenditures for these offices for the fiscal year 1947 are estimated at 90 million dollars. This includes the increased cost of State operation and 11 million dollars of nonrecurring terminal-leave pay for Federal employees upon the return of the employment service to the States. It is my hope that the public employment service system will maintain the high standard of operations and the efficient procedures which have proved essential for facilitating the flow of workers to areas where they are needed.

I propose also increased expenditures for labor information and statistics to facilitate collective bargaining and meet the more important needs of labor, business, Government, and the general public for current data concerning employment, wages, prices, and the like.

Appropriations: For 1948 I recommend appropriations of 118 million dollars, including the amount for proposed legislation.

General government

The principal types of expenditures in "General government" are for (1) legislative and judicial activities, and executive management and control; (2) the Government payment toward civilian employees' retirement; (3) other services covered by appropriations which relate to more than one function; and (4) a few special programs necessitated by the war, such as disposal of surplus property, which do not logically belong in any other category.

Expenditures for these functions in the fiscal year 1948 are expected to decline only moderately from the comparable total for 1947, because they will still include a substantial amount for war liquidation. Such activities will account for more than one-third of all the expenditures in this category.

Expenditures: The work load of the Treasury Department remains at a high level. For example, in the Bureau of Internal Revenue tax returns for previous years remain to be audited, pending excess-profits-tax cases must be investigated and settled, special efforts are continuing to reduce tax evasion, and the number of tax returns to be reviewed is increasing as war veterans revert to civilian status. Further, with the resumption of foreign trade and passenger

travel and the designation of new airfields in the United States and Alaska as ports of entry, the staff requirements of the Bureau of Customs are above the level of 1946.

The Government payment toward the Federal civilian employees' general retirement system will be larger in the fiscal year 1948 than in the current year. About half of the increase reflects the advance in salary rates which took effect July 1, 1946, and was not covered in the appropriation for 1947. The remainder of the increase applies against previous liabilities of the Government to the retirement system.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency concerned	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Legislative functions	$23	$29	$29	$25
Judicial functions	13	17	17	18
Executive direction and management	8	7	7	7
Federal financial management:				
Treasury Department	350	257	261	365
General Accounting Office	38	41	37	37
Other	9	5	5	1
Government payment toward civilian employees' general retirement system	245	220	244	244
Other general government:				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−17	62	66	----
War Assets Administration	98	494	393	328
Federal Works Agency	61	79	81	70
Commerce Department	25	30	34	38
Justice Department	35	39	39	39
Interior Department	48	22	25	21
War Department civil functions—(cemeteries)	2	78	60	58
Other	33	66	94	91
Total	972	1,545	1,492	1,341
From—				
General and special accounts	$989	$1,483	$1,427	$1,341
Corporation accounts	−17	62	66	----
Total	972	1,545	1,492	1,341

The surplus property disposal program, under the War Assets Administration, is at its peak during the current fiscal year. Henceforth, it will be tapering off, but disposal will be relatively more difficult as Government stocks of scarce items are reduced and as civilian production increases. The statutory provisions governing the sale of surplus property which give preference to certain groups of purchasers have greatly complicated the disposal program, slowing down sales and augmenting administrative costs to such an extent that Congress might well reconsider these provisions. The expenditures of the War Assets Administration cover only part of the handling of surplus property; many other Federal agencies participate in this program. The proceeds from sales of surplus property are included in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The return of war dead from overseas is a civil function of the War Department which is just getting under way. The total cost of this program is estimated at 234 million dollars. Efforts will be made to complete this work in the next 2 years.

Public buildings construction programs of the Federal Works Agency will remain at a low level, but certain expenditures for repair and maintenance of buildings cannot be delayed. Together with expenses for current operation of the buildings, these constitute a sizable portion of "General government" expenditures.

Appropriations: The appropriation total of 1,341 million dollars for the fiscal year 1948 includes 75 million dollars for anticipated supplemental appropriations. The total is well below the estimated expenditures, mainly because the War Assets Administration will be paying obligations incurred against earlier appropriations.

Interest on the public debt

The volume of interest payments on the public debt reflects the magnitude and composition of the debt, as well as the level of interest rates. As long as prosperity permits, our objective should be a steady retirement in the outstanding debt. Interest rates will be kept at present low levels through continued cooperation between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System.

Interest on the public debt

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Treasury Department	$4,748	$4,950	$5,000	$5,000

The estimated increase of 50 million dollars in interest payments in 1948 over 1947 is due principally to (1) increased interest payments on the larger volume of special issues held by trust funds which pay relatively high rates; (2) increased accruals on savings bonds, owing to a large volume of bonds reaching higher accrual brackets; and (3) the change from semiannual to annual payment of interest on certificates of indebtedness, effective September 1, 1946. The net effect of these factors has been to increase interest costs in 1948, even though the debt has been declining since its peak on February 28, 1946.

Interest payments are made on the basis of a permanent appropriation. The amount shown under recommended appropriations is equal to the estimated expenditures.

Refunds of receipts

Tax refunds will be a large item in the Budget for some years to come, largely because of overpayment of individual income tax under the current payment system and settlement of the wartime income- and profits-tax liabilities of corporations. The overpayments made each year under the current payment system are in the main refunded during each immediately succeeding year. The refunds to corporations, attributable to wartime-tax liabilities, will be spread over the next several years because of the time required to effect final settlement in many cases where the various carry-back and other relief provisions are applicable. If the war excise-tax rates are continued, refunds in 1948 will be 123 million dollars lower.

Refunds of receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1948
	Actual, 1946	Estimate, 1947	Estimate, 1948	
Treasury Department	$3,119	$2,155	$2,065	$2,065

CIVIL PUBLIC WORKS

In the Budget, construction projects are listed in the programs which they serve. In total the expenditures for civil public works are estimated at 2.1 billion dollars in 1948 compared with 1.7 billion dollars in 1947. These are discussed in detail in part IV.

Federal public works provide capital assets from which the Nation derives benefits over a long period of time. During the past decade the responsibility of the Federal Government, both directly and through grants to the States, has increased. Public construction is essential to our veterans, natural resources, transportation, social welfare, and housing.

Construction programs have to be scheduled over a number of years. The work done in any one year is largely controlled by legislation and appropriations in prior years. For these reasons the program for 1948 is larger than that for 1947. While curtailment orders in August 1946 slowed down the program, they could not alter the trends already established by legislation.

The recommendations for the fiscal year 1948 for grant and loan programs allow those programs to continue at rates consistent with the authorizing legislation.

Direct Federal construction of long-term projects will be confined to those for which appropriations have already been made. Short-term projects such as provision of national-park facilities, forest roads and trails, and institutional facilities will be limited to those of an urgent character.

The Budget contemplates the construction at a conservative rate of all projects for flood control, navigation, and reclamation for which initial appropriations were made in prior years. It does not provide initial appropriations for any new projects under these three programs. Even so, expenditures will be greater in the fiscal year 1949 than in 1948.

This upward trend in public construction deserves careful consideration by the Congress.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

This Budget reflects the continuing decline in Federal civilian employment. Federal agencies have reduced their civilian personnel to 2,300,000—including those in the Territories and possessions and in foreign countries—from a wartime peak of 3,770,000 in June 1945. The Budget estimates contemplate further reductions.

Total civilian personnel of the War and Navy Departments is far below the wartime peak. Personnel in the emergency war agencies has been cut drastically except in the War Assets Administration, which is at the height of its work.

Three agencies—the Veterans' Administration, the Post Office, and the Treasury—together have almost as many employees as the 1939 total of 900,000 for the whole Federal Government. Personnel requirements of the Veterans' Administration are large because it must administer a great variety of programs for millions of veterans. The rise in the number of postal employees reflects the growth of the population and the even larger increase of business and industry. Increased employment in the Treasury results mainly from the greater complexity and coverage of the tax system and the wide distribution of public-debt ownership.

Total employment in all the other Government departments and agencies combined is lower than in June 1945 even though certain functions of emergency war agencies have been returned to the peacetime agencies from which they were transferred and other permanent functions have been added.

The personnel reductions were facilitated by the statutory limitations on personnel and provisions for detailed personnel ceiling determinations enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. When we began to convert to a peacetime basis and appropriations greatly exceeded expenditures, this legislation served a useful purpose. By the Legislative Reorganization Act the Congress has in effect decided that the extent of Federal activities, and hence personnel, should be determined by the usual appropriations process. The statutory limitations and personnel ceilings constitute a separate and possibly conflicting method of controlling the number of employees. The appropriations process, to my mind, is far preferable to the personnel ceilings and limitations, since these place undue emphasis upon the number of employees and put a premium on contractual arrangements and other measures to get the necessary work done without exceeding numerical limitations.

I therefore recommend the repeal of the statutory limitations on personnel and provisions for personnel ceiling determinations.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

With the termination of wartime programs, net expenditures of corporations in the fiscal year 1948 will be focused in a few major areas—chiefly purchase of veterans' housing mortgages, loans to finance rural electrification, price-support outlays for farm commodities, and disbursements on Export-Import Bank loans to foreign borrowers. These programs represent, in the main, capital items recoverable over a period of years. As long as high levels of business activity continue, disbursements in all other major areas will be held to low levels and will be partly or wholly offset by receipts.

In the fiscal year 1948 net expenditures from corporation accounts alone will amount to 829 million dollars, compared with net receipts of 175 million dollars in 1947. But if we take into account reduced payments by the Treasury to the corporations and increased repayment of capital funds to the Treasury by the corporations, net withdrawals from the Treasury for these programs will remain almost unchanged, despite the sharp shift in the methods of financing them. This is explained in detail in the summary narrative for part III.

At present certain wholly owned Government corporations have authority to issue obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the Federal Government. During the war the Treasury, because of its tremendous public debt operations, requested the corporations to obtain their funds directly from it rather than issue obligations on the market. I now recommend that the authority of Government corporations to issue guaranteed obligations to the public be repealed and that such agencies be authorized to obtain their funds solely by borrowing from the Secretary of the Treasury.

During the war, the Treasury has been advancing funds to the corporations at an interest rate of 1 percent. This low rate was based in part on the general level of interest rates in the market and in part on the fact that a large proportion of corporation activities—like subsidies and preclusive buying—was non-income-producing.

From now on most corporation programs will be revenue-producing. Accordingly, I recommend that corporations be required to reimburse the Treasury for the full cost to it of money advanced to the corporations. Interest paid on borrowings from the Treasury should be based upon the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States—now about 1.8 percent. Dividends should be paid on capital stock, if earned. While these changes in the amount of intragovernmental transactions will not affect the Budget deficit or surplus, they will cause the corporations' records to reflect more nearly the true costs of their operations.

I recommend that the statutory authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be extended beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1947. Such extension is assumed in the expenditure estimates in this Budget. The new charter to be submitted will provide for the repeal of all powers not required for peacetime activities. It will also provide for a reduction of 2.5 billion dollars in the Corporation's borrowing authority. With the receipts anticipated from liquidation of war activities the reduced authority should prove adequate.

I have already recommended extension of the authority of the U. S. Commercial Company and reduction in the borrowing authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

In this Budget, I am also recommending return of capital to the Treasury by certain mixed-ownership corporations. The Federal land banks will complete retirement of Government-owned capital stock during the fiscal year 1947. In the fiscal year 1948, it appears that they can repay the outstanding paid-in surplus of 37 million dollars. These transactions will return the land banks to the status of cooperative institutions owned by the farmers they serve. In addition, I recommend a further small retirement of the capital stock of the Federal home loan banks.

The Corporation Supplement to the 1947 Budget indicated that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could soon begin to retire its capital stock. The continuing rapid growth in the Corporation's resources and the exceptionally strong position of the insured banks now make it possible to propose a substantial amount of capital redemption in the fiscal year 1948. Accordingly, I recommend that the Congress authorize the Corporation to repay all of the 139 million dollars of capital furnished by the Federal Reserve System. Since the Reserve banks have already replaced these funds from earnings in recent years, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has proposed that the Congress at the same time authorize the payment to the Treasury of the 139 million dollars. I also recommend that the Congress authorize the Corporation to repay 100 million dollars of the 150 million dollars furnished by the Treasury Department.

By the close of the fiscal year 1948, after these repayments, the Corporation will still have capital surplus and reserves of about 1 billion dollars—the objective set several years ago.

The Board of Governors has made a further recommendation, in which I also concur, that the Congress repeal the existing, largely dormant, authority of the Federal Reserve banks to make direct loans to industry, releasing to the Treasury the funds reserved for this purpose. The gold increment fund now includes 112 million dollars reserved for such loans, and an added 28 million dollars has been advanced to the Federal Reserve banks. These sums will be transferred to miscellaneous receipts.

These transfers from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve banks, and the gold increment fund will add a total of 379 million dollars in miscellaneous receipts in the fiscal year 1948.

The Government Corporation Control Act requires that no wholly owned Government corporation not now possessing a Federal charter shall continue after June 30, 1948, unless reincorporated before that time by act of Congress. Of the 16 such corporations in operation when the act was approved, the following 6 are already in process of liquidation: Defense Homes Corporation, Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Inter-American Navigation Corporation, Institute of Inter-American Transportation, Prencinradio, and the U. S. Spruce Production Corporation.

This Budget recommends the liquidation of five other State-chartered corporations: Inter-American Educational Foundation, The RFC Mortgage Company, Rubber Development Corporation, Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, and the Warrior River Terminal Company. The residual functions of the Rubber Development Corporation and the program of The RFC Mortgage Company will be assumed by their parent corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Warrior River Terminal Company will be absorbed by the Inland Waterways Corporation, of which it is now a subsidiary.

This Budget also recommends that three nonfederally chartered corporations be reincorporated by act of Congress: Commodity Credit Corporation, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the Virgin Islands Company. The act establishing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States expires in June. It, therefore, needs early consideration.

Recommendations on the Panama Railroad Company and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs have necessarily been postponed. The Department of State is reviewing the program of the Institute and a recommendation regarding its future status will be forthcoming soon.

Activities of the Panama Railroad Company have become closely interwoven with those of the Panama Canal in the 42 years since the Government purchased this Company. While its major functions obviously must be continued, a careful reexamination and reappraisal of the respective roles of the Company and the Panama Canal are required. As soon as studies are completed, my recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress.

In addition to examination of the nonfederally chartered corporations, studies are under way, in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of the Government Corporation Control Act, regarding those corporations whose fiscal affairs could be handled more appropriately in the same manner as those of regular Federal agencies. These and future studies will be useful, not only in developing recommendations concerning specific corporations, but also in establishing a consistent pattern for use of Government corporations.

While the general role of the Government corporation has been accepted in the laws of this country for more than 30 years, the standards for use of this instrument are not fully developed and will be subject to many refinements. Experience indicates that the corporate form of organization is peculiarly adapted to the administration of governmental programs which are predominantly of a commercial character—those which are revenue-producing, are at least potentially self-sustaining, and involve a large number of business-type transactions with the public.

In their business operations such programs require greater flexibility than the customary type of appropriation budget ordinarily permits. As a rule the usefulness of a corporation lies in its ability to deal with the public in the manner employed by private business for similar work. Necessary controls are or can be provided under the Government Corporation Control Act. Further study may well indicate not only that some existing corporations ought to be converted into agencies, but also that some existing agencies might administer their programs more effectively if they had some or all of the attributes of corporations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The new legislation and the extension of existing legislation, proposed in this message, for which funds are required in the fiscal year 1948 are as follows:

	Estimated expenditures, 1948
I. Proposed new legislation:	
International affairs and finance:	
Contributions to the support of new international organizations	$75,718,000
Relief program for foreign countries	250,000,000
Social welfare, health, and security:	
Increase in public assistance benefits	73,500,000
Antibiotics control	242,000
Housing and community facilities:	
Long-range housing program	14,000,000
Transportation and communication:	
Upward revision in postal rates to meet the Post Office Department's operating deficit	−352,000,000
Finance, commerce, and industry:	
Census of business	10,150,000
Census of mineral industries	218,000
Labor:	
Grants to the States for programs fostering safe working conditions	1,300,000
Strengthened machinery for facilitating the settlement of industrial disputes	1,295,000
II. Proposed extensions of existing legislation:	
National defense:	
Interim universal training operation	10,250,000
Social welfare, health, and security:	
Continued benefits for United States civilians injured by enemy action	138,000
Finance, commerce, and industry:	
Extension of rent control, price control on sugar and sirups, and rice, sugar rationing, export and import controls, priority and allocation controls on a few commodities, and a few other minimum controls	47,610,700
III. Proposed extension of corporation authorty:	
U. S. Commercial Company: Extension beyond June 30, 1947.	
Commodity Credit Corporation: Extension beyond June 30, 1947.	
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Reduction of borrowing authority.	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Extension beyond June 30, 1947. Reduction of borrowing authority. Increase in the present limit on loans to States or local public authorities for construction purposes.	

In this message every effort has been made to present the Federal Budget program with as much clarity as its complexities permit. All citizens have an interest in the Budget. Both sides of the Budget touch their everyday lives. I consider it my duty to give them full information on what their Government proposes to do.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 3, 1947.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the message). Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that this message is a very long document and will take considerable time to read. I therefore ask unanimous consent that further reading of the message be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that we should read the communication from the President.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the message.)

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when our national security, or our internal security, or our way of life is challenged or is in jeopardy, the membership of the House of Representatives may be depended upon to put aside partisanship and cooperate for the public good.

There is abundant ground for that assertion in the annals of days gone by. In the words of Lord Byron, "The best prophet of the future is the past."

The people of the United States in their wisdom—or lack of wisdom—by their vote last November transferred the stewardship of the Nation and the control of the national legislative branch of the Government to the Republican Party. In our new status as the minority party of the House, the Democratic membership may be relied upon to support and aid in the enactment of measures which manifestly would promote the general welfare. That would be in keeping with the party's consistent record down through the years for initiating and enacting legislation of benefit to all the people.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, cooperation is not a one-sided thing. The head of our Government, a stanch Missouri Democrat, continues as President of all the people and a very large proportion of

our people continue by choice to be represented by Democratic Senators and Representatives. Those of us in the National Legislature have responsibilities to those who send us here. The President has a responsibility to all the people which our Republican friends must recognize.

Our stewardship for the last 14 years is replete with accomplishments in the interest of all the people. We point to them with a deep sense of satisfaction and it will be our purpose to preserve the structure we have built and to strengthen it and make additions to it in such ways as may point to further progress and national betterment.

We took over the conduct of the Government in 1933 when it was tottering on the edge of a precipice. We found chaos and we leave prosperity. We have preserved the American way of life. We found half our banks in bankruptcy and we are leaving the most stable banking system men have ever created. We found farm prices below the cost of production and leave them at the highest level in history. We found old age in destitution and leave it in comfort and security. We found labor unemployed and hopeless, and today jobs are going begging. We found America facing the greatest military menace in history and leave it the foremost Nation in the world.

We just listened, Mr. Speaker, to the President's Budget message. It is a forthright presentation of the Nation's financial status, actual and projected, so far as projection is practical at this time. It is a further evidence of the determination of the Democratic Party to bring the cost of government down to the lowest level consistent with outlays occasioned or required by law, contractual obligations, and expenditure objects which would be unwise from a public-spirited standpoint to ignore or defer at this time.

It is with a considerable sense of pride that we point to the rapid reduction in the rate of expenditure brought about by our party since the cessation of hostilities. Bear in mind that the Japanese war was going on but 17 months ago. The fiscal year which ended June 30, 1946, 6 months ago, was partly a war year. Despite this pressing situation, expenditures dropped in that year from a prior $100,000,000,000 ceiling to $65,000,000,000. This year the outlook is for a total of $42,500,000,000. For 1948, commencing July 1, the President projects a total of $37,500,000,000, which will be within the estimated receipts with a relatively small margin for debt retirement.

In his address to this body on the opening day of the session, our new Speaker said:

> We must, after 17 long years, balance the budget and commence paying off the national debt.

There is an implication there that the Republican Party is proposing to start something, which as a matter of fact, has already been started. Certainly there is no mention or commendation of the unprecedented accomplishments already achieved. That was, to say the least, hardly a premise on which to invite cooperation.

The party newly coming into power cannot hope to equal in this session of Congress, either in percentages or in total amounts reclaimed, the retrenchments and rescissions effected by the party in power in the last session.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that on this side of the aisle we will continue, as far as we are permitted, the retrenchment program which we promptly inaugurated upon the cessation of hostilities, and we will contribute every support to the further development of that program where it is evident that such course would be in the public interest.

Let me add that our past record would have been a better one had we had the kind of support we are being solicited now to give. I recall some very large savings that would have ensued had our friends on that side of the aisle, following our lead, refused funds for proposed construction of a number of naval ships that Bikini rendered obsolete; riding over the committee roughshod when we advocated deferment of undertaking the prosecution of a number of river and harbor projects; and other proposals for unwarranted expenditures.

When you have an economy objective, Members must subordinate local interest to national interest. You will not get anywhere unless you do, and if that policy had prevailed during the last session you would be confronted today with a smaller budget than is submitted by the President in the message just received.

However, it has been the policy of the Appropriations Committee from its inception to examine estimates of appropriations and to cut them wherever a cut seemed to be justified. You will find the Democratic members of the committee ready to continue that course. Manifestly the field for application of the knife is limited. Do not look at totals for agencies. If you examine their component parts, you can better understand the problem. Of course, you can cut indiscriminately to arrive at a predetermined ceiling either with the determination to hold to such reduced amounts or with the idea of providing supplemental amounts later.

I trust there will be no disposition to wink at any disregard of the antideficiency law. There is such a law, and it has teeth in it. Indiscriminate cuts, in view of that law, can prove disastrous.

We shall not be a party to that sort of retrenchment.

The immediate aim of our Republican brethren, we are told, is tax reduction. Last summer my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], announced on the floor here in a colloquy during the debate on the last appropriations bill that he would sponsor a 50-percent tax slash.

I notice now in the newspapers that he has come down a little. He has dropped from 50 percent to 20 percent, apparently.

Speaker MARTIN tells us, and I quote from his very notable address:

> We intend to reduce tax rates whenever and as promptly as it is feasible to do so. We have given that promise to the American people and we intend that it shall be fulfilled.

That sounds a little better; it is somewhat more reserved than some earlier utterances.

> We intend to reduce tax rates whenever and as promptly as it is feasible to do so.

That sounds much more statesmanlike, more prudent, although there is a world of latitude in that word "feasible."

Speaking as one Democrat, I am for reducing tax rates whenever and as promptly as such course would appear to be in the public interest. I shall need much persuasion, however, to support any move that would reduce the Federal income at this critical time. Our public debt is today above $259,000,000,000—such a debt as was never carried by any nation at any period in the history of the world. I am not one of those who believes that it should be passed on to generations a hundred years hence with the possibility of superimpostion thereon of many more billions of dollars.

Speaker MARTIN tells us:

> The debt into which this Nation has been plunged is of such magnitude that it cannot be paid off in more than a century.

That is a frightening statement, it is a disheartening statement; a statement fraught with implications which should alarm all thinking Americans. God grant that America may never again become involved in war; and God grant that America shall never again find herself in such dire financial stress as the Democrats found the Treasury when they completely assumed the reins of government in 1933.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. What assurances under the proposed program that has been announced here through the newspapers in the last few days is there that such a situation will not recur?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman ought also to include the fact that in 1930 we had only $4,426,000,000 in circulation. The last Treasury report I have is dated October 31, 1946. It shows that the amount of money in circulation at that time, instead of being $4,426,000,000, was $28,600,120,086. Therefore, when you talk about the national debt and compare it with the national debt in former years you should take into consideration the depreciation of the value of the dollar and the inflation of the currency as it now exists.

Mr. CANNON. The statement of the gentleman from Mississippi emphasizes the significance of the situation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman state the total amount of the rescission bills we passed during the last Congress?

Mr. CANNON. They were in excess of $64,000,000,000, an amount unprecedented in the annals of any American war.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask further, Is this practice of passing such rescission bills a new practice or has that been done earlier in our legislative history?

Mr. CANNON. It has not been done before to the amount or with the promptness with which we acted in the last Congress. After the last war a smaller amount was recaptured following the termination of hostilities. In this war we incorporated in the appropriation bills a provision that the Budget Bureau should submit periodically information upon which to base such rescissions, and promptly on the capitulation of the Japanese, members of our committee were called back and proceeded without the loss of time with a program which resulted in the salvaging of this unprecedented amount of $64,000,000,000. No committee could have proceeded with more celerity or more effectiveness.

It behooves us, therefore, to liquidate the present debt whenever and as promptly as the people's welfare will permit. I personally feel that the time is not opportune deliberately to lessen income and that it is in the Nation's interest to employ any surplus it may be practical to build up in the reduction of this enormous debt.

It cannot be repeated too often that the debt is costing us five billion annually in interest alone and that interest is at a remarkably low rate, the lowest rate at which Government expenditures of that character were ever funded. What will it be when large-scale refunding operations become necessary? Between January 1, 1950, and December 31, 1954, $38,880,000,000 of 2-percent bonds will mature.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will it be possible to refund that amount of money at 2 percent? The day is coming when replacement issues for maturing securities will have to be made sufficiently attractive to interest those who have funds to invest. We shall not be in a market influenced by victory drives and a national spirit of sacrifice for boys waging war in distant lands. It is entirely conceivable that replacement issues may have to be made tax-exempt, or marketed at a sufficiently attractive discount, in order that maturing obligations may be met. The potentialities are many and run to extremes disturbing to contemplate.

From whence comes the urge for an immediate tax reduction? Our people were never better circumstanced. The banks are surfeited with deposits. At the end of August $63,200,000,000 of interest-bearing public debt was owned by individuals. Wages are at top levels. Employment is at top levels. Business at present and prospectively has never been excelled in times of peace. Does not that all point to the wisdom of making as much inroad upon the public debt as existing sources of income may permit as long as such a healthy state of affairs obtains?

I submit that a contrary course is fraught with danger and should not be embarked upon until the potentialities pro and con have been thoroughly explored. This is not a political or a party question. It is a question of grave general national concern, not alone as regards the present but as regards many tomorrows.

So, I say to my Republican friends, we shall be glad to cooperate with you in the furtherance of programs and policies initiated by Democratic Chief Executives and Democratic Congresses, and to join with you in all economy measures which have firm foundations, and which in our judgment, will best promote the interests of the Republic and the people as a whole.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Wells relating to the coming Polish elections.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of November 30.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement appearing in the Financial Chronicle, of New York.

SERGEANT AT ARMS OFFICE ACCOUNTS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the House Members have received from Mr. Shotwell, senior investigator of the General Accounting Office, a statement similar to the one which I now hold before me, asking us to verify the accounts, or whatever we might owe to the Sergeant at Arms Office.

In discussing this form with the General Accounting Office I have made some suggestions with respect to the wording of the form. It is customary, of course, for a group of auditors to send to the creditors or debtors of a firm a figure which the creditor or debtor can verify. In this case no figure was submitted. So I think we, as Members of the House, can expedite the work and bring about the opening of the office much sooner if we will take our last statement received prior to January 3, 1947, and then add to that the January 3 credits of $833.33 and $208.33 and deduct such outstanding checks as we have, and then send the verified figure to the General Accounting Office without delay. That is one way to avoid the necessity of the General Accounting Office having to send us another statement. What they should have done, of course, was to give us a figure to work from, but on account of conditions prevailing, they did not do that. Now we have to build our own figure if we are to hurry the work along.

MEETING OF THE WAR VETERAN CONGRESSMEN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that on Monday next, at 10 o'clock in the morning, there will be a meeting held in this Chamber for the veterans of all wars who are Members of the House of Representatives at this time. It will cover those from the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II.

The purpose of this meeting is for the reactivation or reorganization of a veterans' group which has been organized in this House since World War I. May I say that this meeting, or any meetings which are held in the future, will be entirely nonpolitical, and they will be wholly social in character and for educational purposes. Recently—and I think it appeared in one of the papers last night—the press purported to claim that this was intended as a veterans' bloc. There is nothing of that kind or character intended. This will be a social organization entirely. This will not be a veterans' bloc in any respect.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am very glad the gentleman has made this statement, particularly with reference to the published stories about the formation of some sort of bloc. I am quite sure the last thing the gentleman from Indiana would have in mind would be that some pressure operation was contemplated.

Mr. SPRINGER. No pressure operation is contemplated, it will not be a veterans' bloc, and we will not operate as a bloc. It is entirely social in character and nature. Each veteran member will vote his own independent determination upon each measure presented.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that the Veterans' Association is already in existence. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is the chairman.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right. Major Bulwinkle is the present chairman of the veterans' group.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been in existence ever since the last war. It is nonpolitical, being purely social in its nature.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with what the gentleman has said. The meeting should be nonpartisan, and it should so organize as not to interfere with the normal functioning of House committees. To that extent, veterans have a common interest that we can serve by mutual education. I hope every veteran will attend the meeting Monday at 10 a. m.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct. Remember the time, Monday morning next, at 10 o'clock, in this chamber. All are invited.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. CURTIS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include Report of the Special Committee of the St. Louis Airport Commission.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. CURTIS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of January 7, 1947.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles on the subject of taxes.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Judge Prettyman.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Act commonly known as the Wagner Act has been in force since 1935. Under the interpretation of that act by the NLRB and the courts the causes of labor disputes have increased rather than diminished as have strikes, until over the country there has swept a wave of indignation and protest which can no longer be ignored by the Congress.

Not only have employers protested but the presidents of the three major labor organizations—Mr. Green, of the A. F. of L.; Mr. Murray, of the CIO; Mr. Lewis, formerly affiliated with the A. F. of L., then with the CIO, then with the United Mine Workers and now back again with the A. F. of L.—have all on occasion characterized the interpretation and the administration of the act as arbitrary and unfair, as tending to create labor unrest. The people now demand the repeal of the Wagner Act.

Those who understand labor's problems still believe in collective bargaining but they insist that the right of the unorganized workers, who far outnumber those who are organized, shall be protected.

They further insist that the rights of the public are paramount, cannot be destroyed in order to advance the interest of minority groups, without endangering the foundations of the Republic.

Hence, the bill today is introduced to repeal the Wagner Act and to enact equitable, basic legislation.

Permit me briefly to recite some of the reasons for the repeal of the Wagner Act, for the enactment of labor legislation and to clarify by question and answer some of the provisions of the bill. The abuses perpetrated, not by workers, employees, nor friends of labor but by racketeers who have taken advantage of the situation, who are injuring the causes of labor, and by a few politicians who hope through false promises to profit individually by assuming to act as spokesmen for labor, must be brought to an end.

What the bill which will be introduced on Monday attempts to do is to provide a remedy for lock-outs, slow-downs, work stoppages, and strikes which lessen production, disturb the economic structure, injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare.

The Labor Department reports that during the first 11 months of 1946, 107,475,000 man-days of productive work were lost through strikes, while during the preceding year strikes caused the loss of but 38,025,000 man-days. The Wagner law is not a remedy; it has not lessened labor disputes nor removed their causes. It has created and fostered an extra-legal tax-collecting—initiation fees and dues—agency.

Recently labor unions have filed lawsuits asking for the payment by employers to employees of something over $3,000,000,000 for so-called overtime spent, not in productive work, but in going to or from the place of employment or in preparation for productive work.

The demands are for billions of dollars which employers never expected to pay; which the employees never expected to be paid.

The suits grow out of judicial legislation promulgated by certain members of the United States Supreme Court; are inspired in many instances by racketeering labor leaders, unscrupulous lawyers and, no doubt in some cases by Communists who desire to wreck America.

A few of the demands presented may have been made by workers who have rendered services during overtime hours, for compensation to which they are justly entitled. Such actions are very few in number and the amounts involved are relatively small.

Differences of opinion involving questions of public policy which affect the national interest cannot be settled by legislation which is inequitable; which does not at least attempt to mete out justice to all.

Such differences of opinion, unless remedied by just legislation fairly interpreted by the courts, where the issues are vital and an inequitable solution may ruin one large segment of our population, may, as did the question of slavery, involve us in civil strife.

Permitting the issue to drift until such a result comes upon us is unthinkable. Labor disputes, with their attendant strikes, accompanied by the massed picket line, violence, destruction of property, and rioting, may, unless we now find the answer, ultimately involve us in civil war.

To remove the causes of labor disputes, to establish equality of bargaining power between employees and employers, the National Labor Relations Act—the Wagner Act—was passed in 1935. Unfortunately, that act made no effort to mete out equal justice to those required to bargain, to those compelled to work together. It carried no protection for the public.

Privileges without responsibility were given employees and labor organizations, while liabilities, penalties, and responsibility, together with a restriction on long-established customary industrial practices and procedure, were imposed upon employers.

While the act protected employees against employers, it gave individual employees no protection whatever against labor racketeers or their own officials.

The act was so unfair, its interpretation so one-sided, that not only did employers and the public complain, but, on occasion, President Green of the A. F. of L., Murray of the CIO, and Lewis of the United Mine Workers, bitterly condemned it and its administration.

The special privileges granted by the act were so abused, it was so erroneously interpreted, so maladministered that all too often the public health, safety, and welfare were imperiled.

Public sentiment, the public good, now demand the repeal of the National Labor Relations Act.

The security of the worker, the freedom and prosperity of the people, the

welfare of the Nation demand the enactment and enforcement of over-all basic labor legislation safeguarding the interests of the man who must work if he would eat, of the employer who must have a profit if he creates and holds open a job, of the citizen who is not a party to a labor dispute.

To accomplish those purposes, this bill is offered without pride of authorship—with the hope that it may be considered on its merits—and prove to be the much-needed, long-sought, remedy.

This is the first attempt to in one bill advance and protect the interests of all parties affected by labor disputes and strikes—the employee—the employer and the innocent citizen who all too often is trampled by the warring contestants.

The concept underlying this bill is one which has been long awaited in many quarters. It proceeds upon the theory that labor has grown up, and should no longer be permitted to continue as the "tough boy" of society, disregard the welfare of the public. Having grown up it should take its place as a responsible member of the American family, and like industry, assume responsibility, be kept within appropriate bounds.

This the bill accomplishes, by making employee and labor organizations equally responsible with industry and employers for the perpetration of any unfair labor practice. It makes both labor and industry amenable to the courts, which under the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts, virtually refused to impose any restraint upon the activities of labor, no matter how shocking to the conscience or detrimental to the public interest or to the interest of labor those activities may have been.

Under the bill, the Federal courts are empowered to make any order or judgment, either preliminary or final, which is necessary to promote industrial harmony, protect the public and to do justice in any particular case or controversy. Nuisance suits filed either by an employee, a labor organization, or by an employer, a wide-spread practice under the Wagner Act bitterly complained of by industry, are placed under a salutary restraint. The courts are authorized to award attorneys' fees as well as legal costs to the prevailing party in any controversy arising under the act. Nuisance suits would, therefore, subject their sponsors to the obligation of paying their intended victims' court costs and attorneys' fees.

The bill also provides that whenever a plaintiff has himself been guilty of an unfair labor practice related to the controversy, the court shall render judgment dismissing his complaint as such practice constitutes a complete defense. This provision will insure that either employee or employer invoking the jurisdiction of a court must come in with "clean hands."

The National Labor Relations Board created by the Wagner Act is abolished and a new Board is created which is designated as the National Labor Mediation Board. The section authorizing the creation of the Mediation Board provides that it should be composed of three members, the initial terms of whom shall be 2, 3, and 5 years. This will enable the President to designate one member whose term will expire in 1948 and two other members whose terms will expire in 1949 and 1951, respectively. The latter, it is anticipated, will be subject to special scrutiny by the Republican-dominated Senate.

The Board, in organizing its staff, is required by the act to select personnel who are not only American citizens but who will enable it to function in an impartial manner. This presumably would exclude all personnel who are decidedly "left or right of center" and those who are known as "pinkish" or "fellow travelers." This provision should prove to be a boon to industry as well as to those labor organizations which have striven with notably poor success to rid themselves of Communist domination.

The Mediation Board is given exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine controversies with respect to representatives for collective bargaining, to grant, withhold, or revoke certification of unions, to require by order the resumption of collective bargaining. Whenever it breaks down and a strike is threatened, the Board is directed to use its best endeavors in such instances to mediate industrial differences and promote harmonious relations between employees and employers.

Another area of exclusive jurisdiction which the bill gives the Mediation Board is one of outstanding importance to the Nation and its economy. We have witnessed the consequences of work stoppages in industries where harmony existed in employer-employee relations and which were brought about because of strikes called in other industries whose functioning was necessary to the continuance of activities in the former. We have also witnessed the paralyzing results to the Nation's economy of strikes in those industries which were directly connected with the public health, safety, and welfare of the people.

The bill authorizes the Mediation Board to keep a watchful eye on all segments of the industrial economy and to evaluate the effect of strikes upon any level of the economy. Whenever the Board finds that any threatened strike will be inimical to the public interest by involving the safety, health, or welfare of the people, either directly or indirectly, such as by causing a slowdown or a work stoppage in a public utility or a food-processing industry, a declaration of that fact may be made by order of the Board. Thereupon a strike in such industry must be deferred for a period of 6 months. The refusal of any employee to continue in his work in such an industry in the interim is an unfair labor practice and would justify the termination of his employment and the hiring of another worker to replace him at his post of duty.

The closed shop and the closed union are banned, as is all violence and intimidation in organizing employees, forming unions and collecting dues. Secondary strikes, sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes are illegal and anyone guilty of indulging in any prohibited activity is subject to criminal penalties as well as to civil liabilities.

The bill certainly emancipates the American worker and protects him from violence, coercion, and compulsion. It preserves his right to free speech, to strike, and it also guarantees to him the unconditional right to work.

The bill elevates labor to the dignity and stature of responsibility and provides a sound foundation for its healthy development as a functioning element of our Nation's structure.

The bill and the index to the bill read as follows:

A bill to repeal the National Labor Relations Act, approved July 5, 1935, and to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Mediation Board to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SECTION 1. Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

Experience has proved that abuse of the rights conferred upon employees and labor organizations by the National Labor Relations Act has at times injuriously affected the public health, safety, and welfare; encouraged defiance of lawful authority and threatened civil strife.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce, to eliminate the slowing down or cessation of activities which injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare, and to mitigate and eliminate those obstructions when they have occurred by furthering the development of friendly and mutually fair labor relations, by protecting the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by all workers and employers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or hiring or other mutual aid or protection.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy or receivers.

(b) The term "employer" means any person who employs more than 10 employees and includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(c) The term "employee" shall include any individual in the employ of any person including any whose work has ceased in consequence of any employer's unfair labor practice and who has not obtained other regular and substantially equivalent employment,

but shall not include any person employed as a foreman or in any other supervisory capacity, or any individual employed as an agricultural laborer or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual who has been discharged for lawful cause or whose work has ceased in violation of a valid contract or who, has been laid off for lack of work, inefficiency, misconduct, or other good cause.

(d) The term "any individual employed as an agricultural laborer" shall include any person engaged as an employee in farming in all its branches and, among other things, includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, eggs, baby chicks, and poults, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations when it is performed in connection with bona fide farming) performed by or for a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in connection with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to any processing plant, or to market or to carriers for transportation to market; and shall also include employees of establishments engaged in ginning or compressing of cotton, or canning or freezing during the harvesting season from their raw or natural state, or pasteurizing, or drying, or preparing in their raw or natural state, of any agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or making cheese or butter or any other dairy products, and such packing or handling or storing as is used in connection therewith or is incidental thereto, when such establishment is located (1) at a point where the major commodity used in such establishment is normally produced in commercial quantities within a radius of 50 miles thereof; and (2) within the general territory in any region of the United States where the farming district or districts are located from which such commodity is produced and within or in close proximity to any such farming district; or at such place in the general territory in proximity to such farming district, where such commodity is produced (but outside of any metropolitan industrial city) as is necessary to obtain reasonable, available, and adequate transportation, water power, or other required operating facilities; and (3) such establishment is engaged in the above operations on products produced from any farming district within the same general territory.

(e) The term "representatives" includes any individual or labor organization.

(f) The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee-representation committee or plan, formed and controlled by employees and in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with the employer of such employees concerning wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, grievances, labor disputes, or conditions of work.

(g) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

This act shall not apply to any person whose sales in commerce—as defined herein—during the calendar year preceding the date of filing a complaint or petition relating to that person were less than 50 percent of that person's total sales.

(h) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or substantially burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute substantially burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(i) The term "unfair labor practice" means any unfair labor practice listed in section 8.

(j) The term "labor dispute" includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure, or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, provided the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee.

(k) The phrase "collective bargaining" for the purposes of this act shall be understood to mean the meeting together, on written request of one of the disputants, on a reasonable number of occasions and for a reasonable length of time, the reasonableness of the number of meetings and the length of the negotiations to be determined by taking into consideration the views of the parties to the negotiations and the prospects of an agreement, of an employer and his employees, through accredited representatives voluntarily chosen by them, with the full and free opportunity for negotiating concerning the terms or conditions of employment.

(l) The term "National Labor Mediation Board" means the National Labor Mediation Board created by section 3 of this act.

(m) The term "old Board" means the National Labor Relations Board established under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, approved July 5, 1935.

NATIONAL LABOR MEDIATION BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a Board to be known as the National Labor Mediation Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after the date of the enactment of this act, for terms as follows: One for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, and one for a term of 5 years, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, and thereafter each member shall hold office for a term of 5 years from the expiration of the term of his predecessor, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board and may remove any member upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office but for no other cause.

(b) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(c) Upon the appointment and confirmation of the three original members of the Board and the designation of its Chairman, the old Board shall cease to exist.

(d) A vacancy on the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall at all times constitute a quorum. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the Board, however, shall be filled as promptly as possible.

(e) The Board shall appoint, without regard for the provisions of the civil-service laws, but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, an executive secretary and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and shall appoint such other employees with regard to existing laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, as it may, from time to time, find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated for by Congress: *Provided, however,* That the Board shall not appoint any person to any position who is not at the time of such appointment an American citizen, nor shall the Board appoint an executive secretary, attorney, examiner, regional director or employee who shall have been an employer of 10 or more persons or who shall have been on the pay roll or an officer of a labor organization or industrial association within a period of 2 years prior to the effective date of such an appointment: *Provided further,* That the Board may also employ such employees of the old Board as may be specifically selected by the Board. Any employees of the old Board so selected and employed may be transferred to and become employees of the Board with salaries under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but no employee so transferred shall acquire a permanent or civil-service status by such transfer.

(f) All records, papers, and property of the old Board shall become records, papers, and property of the Board, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the old Board shall become funds and appropriations available to be expended by the Board in the exercise of the powers, authority, and duties conferred on it by this act.

(g) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board, under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

(h) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members, or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, hold hearings necessary to its functions in any part of the United States; except that in holding hearings necessary to its functions or otherwise in exercising the powers conferred upon it by this act the Board shall not, directly or indirectly, by its employees or otherwise, act in any other than a completely impartial manner. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated service as may from time to time be necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided,* That persons or agencies so utilized shall be completely impartial.

(i) The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

SEC. 4. The Board shall have exclusive jurisdiction—

(a) To hear and determine any and all controversies affecting the representation of employees for collective bargaining;

(b) To grant or withhold certification of representatives of employees for collective bargaining, and to revoke certification of such representatives for cause or whenever otherwise necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act;

(c) To hold such hearings as may be necessary in the performance of its duties and the exercise of its authority upon due notice to all parties in interest therein;

(d) To require by subpena the attendance at such hearings of any and all persons and to require the production of such books, papers, and records as may be necessary for the discharge of its duties. Any witness summoned before the Board or to any hearing or proceeding before the Board shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of failure to comply with any subpena or in case of the contumacy of any witness appearing before the Board, the

Board may invoke the aid of any United States district court. Such court may thereupon order the witnesses to comply with the requirements of such subpena or to give evidence touching the matter in question as the case may be. Any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as in contempt thereof. No person shall be excused from attending or testifying nor from producing any book, paper, document, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no natural person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing as to which, in obedience to a subpena and under oath, he may so testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, but no person shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying;

(e) To prescribe the forms of petitions and other pleadings and to administer all oaths and affirmations incidental to the conduct of any proceeding or hearing within the jurisdiction of the Board;

(f) Upon the receipt of notice that any party to a labor dispute intends to engage in a strike affecting commerce, to require by order the parties to such labor dispute to resume collective bargaining under the supervision of the Board upon any and all matters in controversy between them and, in conformity with the provisions of this act, to mediate such differences and any others which may arise.

(g) The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That such rules and regulations shall not favor or discriminate against any party to any controversy to which this act is applicable, and shall be effective upon publication in the manner prescribed by law.

SEC. 5. The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all money it has disbursed.

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 6. Employees shall have the unqualified right to freely form, join, and be members of any labor organization; to refrain from forming, joining, and from membership in any labor organization; to bargain individually or collectively with their employer; and to engage in and pursue individual or concerted activities for their mutual aid, protection, or for any other lawful purpose.

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for any person—

(1) To threaten, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 6 hereof: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall abridge the freedom of speech or of the press;

(2) To dominate or interfere by threat, restraint, or coercion with the formation or administration of any labor organization or for any employer to contribute financial or other support to it: *Provided,* That nothing herein shall prohibit employers, individually or collectively, from furnishing housing, heating, lighting, and other facilities without charge for meetings relative to activities of such employees, provided no discrimination is exercised among their employees in offering such facilities: *Provided further,* That an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay: *And provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall prevent any employee or employees, of their own initiative, from discussing any problem of common interest with their employer; or any employer from discussing with any employee or employees any such subject if in connection therewith labor-practices prohibitions herein contained are observed.

(3) To refuse to resume collective bargaining or to participate in a mediation under the auspices of the Board, whenever ordered so to do by the Board;

(4) To deny to any employee or employer the benefits of any of the terms and conditions of any agreement touching wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of employment provided for in any agreement in existence at the time of the commencement of collective bargaining or during the pendency of any mediation required by the provisions of this act.

(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to violate any of the provisions of this act, or—

(1) By discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization;

(2) To discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act, unless such testimony be proved to be willfully false;

(3) To refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of this act;

(4) To deduct from the wages of employees any dues, fees, assessments, or other contribution payable to labor organizations, or to collect or to assist in the collection of any such dues, fees, assessments, or other contribution, unless such deductions have been voluntarily authorized in writing by the employee from whose wages such deductions are made;

(5) To fail or to refuse to comply with a subpena to testify or to produce books, papers, and records, issued by the Board.

(c) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employee to violate any of the provisions of this act, or—

(1) To interfere with, restrain, or coerce other employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 6 hereof;

(2) To threaten, intimidate, restrain by force or threat, or coerce any other employee, directly or indirectly, for the purpose and with the intent of compelling such employee (a) to join or to refrain from joining any labor organization; (b) to continue or to suspend or to cease his employment; or (c) for the purpose or with the intent of influencing or affecting his selection of representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining;

(3) To resort to or engage in, during the course of any labor dispute and in connection with such dispute, any act or practice which is a violation of any criminal law effective in the jurisdiction in which such act or practice occurs;

(4) To interfere by threat, intimidation, or force or threat of force, with the exercise of the right by any employee to continue at his work or to go to or from his place of employment;

(5) To strike in violation of a valid contract or agreement or in violation of the provisions of this act;

(6) To refuse to continue in the performance of the duties of his employment at any place of employment in commerce whenever the Board shall find that such refusal will seriously endanger the public health, safety, or welfare by bringing about a work stoppage or slow-down in any industry, the continued operation of which is essential to the public health, safety, and welfare: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall in any way impede or diminish the right of an employee to terminate such employment at any time;

(7) To fail or to refuse to comply with a subpena to testify or to produce books, papers, and records, issued by the Board.

(d) It shall not be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge or to refuse to reemploy any person who, under the terms of this act, is guilty of an unfair labor practice; nor shall it be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain with any organization which or employee who fails to recognize or be bound by the official certificate of collective bargaining representatives issued under section 9 hereof, or willfully violates the terms of a collective-bargaining contract.

(e) It shall not be considered an unfair labor practice for any person to fail to reach an agreement after bargaining for a reasonable period of time.

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, (1) by force, intimidation, by threat thereof, or otherwise corruptly (a) to influence or attempt to prevent the free exercise by an employee of any of the rights prescribed in section 6 hereof; (b) to require or compel an employee to refrain or desist from continuing in his employment; (c) to molest or interfere with the right of an employee to peacefully go to or from the place of his employment; (2) to engage in any sit-down strike or other form of strike involving the illegal seizure or occupation of property; (3) to picket any place of employment in commerce in any manner other than peaceful; (4) to prevent, impede, or deny ingress to and egress from any place of employment in commerce; (5) to injure or destroy any place of employment in commerce, or any property therein; (6) to prevent the delivery to or the movement from any place of employment in commerce of any materials, goods, or commodities in commerce; (7) to halt, delay, or impede the free movement in commerce of any materials, goods, or commodities, or to refuse to load, unload, pack, ship, process, or handle any materials, goods, or commodities in commerce by reason of their manufacture, processing, packing, handling, or shipment, in whole or in part, by persons who either are or are not members of any labor organization; (8) to engage or participate in any sympathy or jurisdictional strike affecting commerce.

(b) Any person violating any of the provisions of subdivision (a) hereof shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or to both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 9. (a) Whenever a petition shall be filed with the Board by an employer, a group of employees numbering or a labor organization representing at least 20 percent of those employed by an employer, in a plant unit, praying for an order affecting representation of employees, affecting the certification of any labor organization as bargaining agent of employees, affecting the type of unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining, or otherwise within the provisions of this act, the Board shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice to all parties having any interest therein, and shall, if appropriate to such proceeding, take within 10 days thereafter a secret ballot amongst all employees concerned therewith, affording adequate opportunity for all employees concerned to vote thereon, to determine the views of the majority, if any, with respect to the designation of representatives for collective bargaining, the type of unit most appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining, or otherwise to effectuate the purposes of this act.

(b) The form of the ballot shall be prescribed by the Board but the ballot shall in all cases clearly and fairly present the issue and the result of such election shall be certified by the election officials to the Board.

(c) All elections held under the provisions of this act shall be held under the direction of the local election board or boards of the election district or districts where the unit

appropriate for such election shall be located and shall be conducted in the same manner as is provided by the laws of the State where such election is held insofar as the same are applicable.

(d) Before the Board shall issue any order certifying representatives for collective bargaining, the labor organization or representatives seeking certification shall qualify by filing with the Board a sworn statement setting forth the following information, which shall be brought up to date at least annually and whenever during any year any substantial change occurs in any of the facts set forth in the statement: (1) The official name or title of the labor organization or collective-bargaining agency; (2) the date established; (3) a copy of the constitution or articles of organization and of any by-laws in effect; (4) the names of all officers of the organization, with the certification that each is an American citizen; (5) the official address or principal place of business of the organization; (6) the names and addresses of the individuals who will actually function in collective bargaining with the employer, the majority of whom shall be bona fide employees of that employer, with the certification that each is an American citizen, the Board to be notified of any changes in the identity of the individuals who will function thus and those changes to be in accordance with the foregoing provisions; (7) a statement that its members are a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit in which such representatives were chosen.

(e) Any person aggrieved by any final order of the Board may obtain a review of such order by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States, in the circuit wherein such person resides or transacts business or in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon all persons having any interest therein, and notice thereof shall be given to the Board. Thereafter, and within such time as may be required by rule or order of such court, the aggrieved party shall file in such court a transcript of the entire record of the proceedings before the Board, which record shall be certified by the Board, and shall include the petition, other pleadings, the testimony upon which the order complained of was entered, and the findings and the order of the Board. Upon such filing the court shall have jurisdiction to grant to any party to the proceeding such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper or otherwise necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying and enforcing as so modified or setting aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Board. The findings of the Board as to the facts, if supported by the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive.

(f) Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment: *Provided*, That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer.

PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

SEC. 10. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all other cases and controversies arising under the provisions of this act.

(b) Upon the filing in any district court of a complaint charging any person with the commission of any unfair labor practice, the court may make such temporary orders with or without bond as may effectuate the purposes of this act. The court, pursuant to such rules as may be prescribed hereunder, shall summarily require the joinder of issue on any such complaint, and, if possible within 10 days after the joinder of issue, shall hear the proofs and allegations of the parties and determine the matter or matters presented thereby. If after hearing the court shall be satisfied that any party to such action has engaged or is about to engage in any unfair labor practice the court shall make its findings of fact and shall render and cause to be served on such party a final order or judgment enjoining such party from such unfair labor practice, and requiring such affirmative action, including the payment of remedial severance pay, as will effectuate the purposes of this act and do justice in the cause. Such order or judgment may further require such party to report the extent to which he has complied with such order or judgment. If after hearing the court shall be of the opinion that no party to the action has engaged in or is about to engage in any unfair labor practice, then the court shall make findings of fact and render an order or judgment accordingly, dismissing the said complaint. As an incident to the rendition of judgment in any such action, the court shall award the prevailing party such reasonable attorney's fees as may be determined by the court, the costs allowable by law, and in addition may render judgment for such damages as may have been sustained by reason of the commission of any unfair labor practice.

(c) The commission of any unfair labor practice by or chargeable to the plaintiff in any such action, which the court shall find is related to the matter or matters in controversy therein, shall constitute a complete defense to such action.

(d) Except as hereinbefore provided, such actions shall be governed by the same rules, including rules of evidence, as may at any time be applicable in civil actions in the district courts. Any party to any such action shall have the same rights of appeal therein as are granted by statutes applicable in other civil actions in the district courts.

(e) For the purposes of this section, the term "district court" shall mean any district court of the United States, including the district courts of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, and the Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

(f) The President of the United States is authorized, upon request by the Chief Justice of the United States, to appoint from time to time, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, such additional district judges as may be necessitated by the enlarged jurisdiction conferred upon the district courts of the United States by the terms of this section.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

SEC. 11. Whenever any employer and his employees or their representatives, after having engaged in collective bargaining for a reasonable period of time, have been unable to agree on any matter affecting wages, rates of pay, terms, or conditions of employment, and in the opinion of any such person a controversy affecting commerce, or a labor dispute is likely to arise, or where because of such disagreement any party thereto has given notice to an employer that in the absence of the negotiation of an agreement any employee participating in such collective bargaining intends to engage in a strike which may affect commerce, notice of such fact shall forthwith be given to the Board in writing. Such notice shall contain a summary of the matters upon which such persons are in disagreement, as well as a summary of the matters upon which such persons are in agreement, and a copy of such notice shall be forthwith served upon any and all other parties who have participated in the collective bargaining. The Board shall thereupon, by order, require such parties to resume their bargaining upon any and all matters in controversy between them and shall use its best endeavors to mediate such differences as exist between the parties. If after a period of 30 days such controversy still exists, then it shall be lawful for the employees concerned therein to conduct a strike against such employer: *Provided, however*, That whenever the Board shall find that such threatened strike will seriously endanger the public health, safety, or welfare by bringing about a work stoppage or slow-down in any industry the continued operation of which is essential to the public health, safety, and welfare, it shall not be lawful for the employees concerned therein to conduct such strike until a period of 6 months has elapsed from the resumption of collective bargaining: *Provided further, however*, That nothing herein contained shall in any way impede or diminish the right of employees in such industries to individually or collectively terminate their employment therein at any time.

The wages, the rates of pay, the hours of employment, and other conditions of employment provided in the terms of any agreement between the parties to any labor dispute shall not be withheld, suspended, abated, lessened, or impaired during the period of collective bargaining or mediation provided for herein, or in any period during which it is unlawful for any employee to engage in a strike, notwithstanding the termination of any such agreement during the pendency of such negotiations or mediation.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 12. If any provision of this act shall conflict with any provision of any other statute of the United States the provisions of this act shall be controlling: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to modify, amend or repeal any provision of any act governing or providing for the adjustment of disputes between carriers and their employees: *Provided further*, That in any situation where the provisions of this act cannot be validly enforced the provisions of such other acts shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

The National Labor Act approved July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 449) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "National Labor Mediation Act."

INDEX TO BILL

Section 1. Findings and declaration of policy.
Section 2. Definitions.
Section 3. National Labor Mediation Board:
(a) Creation and composition.
(b) Salaries.
(c) Termination of old Board.
(d) Vacancies and quorum.
(e) Officers and employees.
(f) Provision for books, papers, property, and funds of old Board.
(g) Payment of expenses.
(h) Principal office, conduct of hearings throughout country.
(i) Official seal.
Section. 4. Jurisdiction of Board:
(a) To select representatives of employees for collective bargaining.
(b) To grant, withhold, or revoke certification of representative.
(c) To conduct hearings on notice.
(d) Summoning witnesses, documentary evidence, fees of witnesses, court aid in compelling production of evidence and attend-

ance of witnesses, privilege of witnesses, and immunity from prosecution.
(e) To prescribe forms of pleadings, to administer oaths and affirmations.
(f) To order resumption of collective bargaining.
(g) Rules and regulations.
Section 5. Annual report.
Section 6. Rights of employees.
Section 7 (a) Unfair labor practices by persons defined.
(b) Unfair labor practices by employers defined.
(c) Unfair labor practices by employees defined.
(d) Exceptions as to employers.
(e) Exceptions as to persons.
Section 8 (a) Offenses.
(b) Penalties.
Section 9 (a) Procedure for determination of type of unit and representative for collective bargaining.
(b) Form of ballot.
(c) Conduct of elections.
(d) Qualification of representative for collective bargaining.
(e) Review of final order of Board on petition to circuit court.
(f) Exclusive bargaining representative.
Section 10 (a) Jurisdiction of district courts as to unfair labor practices.
(b) Power of district courts, award of judgments, costs, reasonable attorney's fees.
(c) Defense to action.
(d) Rules governing action.
(e) Term "district court" defined.
(f) Authorization of President to appoint additional judges.
Section 11. Provision for mediation and resumption of collective bargaining.
Section 12. Conflict of laws.
Section 13. Separability clause.
Section 14. Citation of act.

Perhaps you have not listened to what has just been said; more probable is it that what has been said has not been clearly and concisely stated. If that be true, the fault is mine; so permit me to impose upon you further by asking a few questions and attempting to answer them myself.

Here are some of the questions and at least a partial answer to each:

ANSWERS TO SOME OF YOUR QUESTIONS AND WHERE IN THE BILL YOU WILL FIND THEM—THE NUMBERS AND LETTERS REFER TO SECTIONS AND SUBSECTIONS OF THE BILL

Question No. 1. What is the purpose of the bill?

Answer. To diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening interstate and foreign commerce, to protect the right to work and to protect the public health, safety, and welfare—section 1.

Question No. 2. How is that purpose to be accomplished?

Answer. (a) By the enactment of legislation which insures equal privileges to, imposes equal burdens upon, employees and employers; protects the right of the unorganized worker; guarantees that labor disputes shall not be permitted to injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare.

(b) By the creation of a National Labor Mediation Board—section 3 (a)—with authority to hear complaints, designate collective-bargaining agents—section 4 (a)—and compel mediation—section 4 (f).

Question No. 3. Are the rights of employees defined?

Answer. Yes. Under the bill—section 6—employees have the right to form and join or to refrain from forming and joining a labor organization; to bargain individually or collectively.

Question No. 4. Does the bill provide for an open shop, prevent the imposition of a closed shop?

Answer. Yes; under section 6 employees are given the right to join or not to join a labor organization. That prevents the imposition of a closed shop upon unwilling workers. Subsequent provisions of the bill, such as those contained in sections 7 and 8, guarantee an open shop unless, by collective bargaining, all the employees themselves desire a closed shop.

Question No. 5. Are employees, union members and nonunion members, protected from unfair labor practices by employers, pickets, and others?

Answer. Yes; the bill—section 7 (a)—states that it is an unfair labor practice for any person to engage in certain acts; to, first, threaten or coerce any individual from exercising freely the rights guaranteed by section 6; or, second, to interfere in any manner with any union activity; or, third, to refuse to resume collective bargaining or participate in mediation; or, fourth, to deny to either an employee or an employer the benefits of any contract touching wages, hours of employment, or working conditions.

Question No. 6. Does the bill prohibit discrimination by an employer against an employee?

Answer. Yes; section 7 (b) declares that it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to, first, discriminate in regard to employment; or, second, because he has filed complaint against the employer; third, to refuse to bargain collectively; or, fourth, to aid in any check-off unless the employee has given his consent in writing.

Question No. 7. Does the bill provide that certain acts performed by an employee shall be unfair labor practices?

Answer. Yes. The bill—section 7 (c)—declares it to be an unfair labor practice for an employee to—first, second, third, and fourth—in any manner, except by the use of free speech and peaceful picketing, interfere with the exercise of any of the rights guaranteed in section 6, or to in any manner interfere with the rights of an individual to join or not to join, to participate or not participate in union activities; or, fifth, to strike in violation of a contract or of the provisions of the act.

Question No. 8. Are any of the benefits of the act withheld from employees guilty of an unfair labor practice?

Answer. Yes; section 7 (d). An employer may discharge or refuse to reemploy an employee guilty of an unfair labor practice; may refuse to bargain with an organization or an employee who disregards the official representation certificate issued by the Board or willfully violates a contract.

Question No. 9. How long must collective bargaining continue?

Answer. Collective bargaining need not continue—section 7 (e)—until an agreement is reached. It need continue only for "a reasonable period of time," which by the Board shall be determined by taking into consideration the number of occasions upon which mediation meetings have been held, the length of time such meetings have continued, the views of the parties to the negotiation, and the prospect of an agreement. See definition of collective bargaining, section 2 (k).

Question No. 10. Does the bill impose criminal liability upon individuals who violate its provisions?

Answer. Yes; section 8. It declares that it shall be unlawful for any person, by force, intimidation, threat, or corruptly, to attempt to prevent the free exercise of any of the rights given by section 6; to compel an employee to quit his job or to interfere with him on his way to or from his job; to participate in a sit-down strike involving the illegal occupation of property; to picket otherwise than in a peaceful manner; to interfere with the movement of materials in commerce; to engage or participate in sympathy or jurisdictional strikes. The punishment inflicted—section 8 (b)—is imprisonment of not more than 1 year or a fine of $5,000, or both.

Question No. 11. Does the bill outlaw the closed shop, prevent violence, ban jurisdictional, sympathetic strikes and boycotts?

Answer. Yes. The application of this section—section 8—and of the remedies available under section 7 (d) and section 10 will tend to prevent intimidation, violence, jurisdictional, sympathetic strikes and boycotts; will ban the closed shop.

Question No. 12. How can an election to determine a bargaining representative be called?

Answer. Section 9 (a) provides that either the employer or 20 percent of the employees in a plant unit may by petition to the Board obtain an election to determine representatives for collective bargaining.

Question No. 13. Who holds the election and counts the ballots?

Answer. The local election board—section 9 (c)—the same Board which holds an election, counts the ballots, when a constable or a United States Senator is to be elected.

Question No. 14. Are there any restrictions which limit the right of a board to call an election?

Answer. Yes; section 9 (d). If a labor organization asks for such an election, it must file a sworn statement giving its official name, the date it was established, a copy of its constitution and bylaws, the names of its officers, accompanied by a statement that each is an American citizen, the official address of its organization, and the names and the addresses of the individuals who will act in collective bargaining with the employer. Such bargaining agents must be certified to be American citizens. There must also be a statement that the members of the union are a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit in which the representatives were chosen.

Question No. 15. Is there any relief from a final order made by the Board?

Answer. Yes; section 9 (e). By appeal to the United States circuit court of appeals.

Question No. 16. How can relief from or punishment of unfair labor practices be obtained?

Answer. By—section 10 (a, b)—filing with the United States district court a

petition setting forth the facts upon which the complaint is based, asking for appropriate relief. After hearing, that court may make such orders as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act and to do justice.

Question No. 17. Are there any special rules of procedure to be followed in such application?

Answer. No; except as provided in section 10. The rules of procedure applicable in civil action in the district courts, including the rules of evidence applied by those courts, shall obtain.

Question No. 18. Does the bill provide for a cooling-off period and for mediation?

Answer. Yes; section 11. After the parties have bargained for a reasonable length of time and have been unable to agree and a strike is threatened, a 30-day notice must be given before a strike can legally be called. If the threatened strike will seriously endanger the public health, safety, and welfare, there must be a waiting period of 6 months, though, in the meantime, the employees may, individually or collectively, terminate their employment at any time, but, if they do, they are out of a job.

Question No. 19. Does the bill ban strikes which injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare?

Answer. Yes. Section 11 provides that if the Board finds that any strike or threatened strike will seriously endanger the public health, safety, and welfare by either a sit-down or a work stoppage in any industry, the continued operation of which is essential to the public health, safety, and welfare, the employees shall not strike until the expiration of a 6-month period after notice thereof has been given. If they do strike, then their rights as employees cease and the employer may hire other workers without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. In effect, such procedure would deprive the striking employees of their benefits under the act and lessen strikes in public utilities.

Question No. 20. Does the bill seek to prevent picketing?

Answer. No; not lawful picketing.

Question No. 21. Does the act repeal or carry exemptions of any other act?

Answer. Yes; section 13. It repeals the National Labor Relations Act, but continues in force the act governing disputes between carriers and their employees.

Mr. Speaker, in closing these somewhat extended remarks which have trespassed upon your time and patience, let me offer the excuse that the subject is one which is deemed to be of the utmost importance. For more than 10 years, from the floor of this House and elsewhere, in my humble way, attention was called to the situation which from time to time has confronted us; which has steadily, and with ever-increasing speed, developed into what has now given every appearance of being an insistent demand which will not be denied; that the Congress act speedily and with the sole purpose of enacting labor legislation which will protect not only the right of collective bargaining, the right of organized workers, but as well, the rights of the unorganized worker and the paramount right of the public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. James H. Polhemus.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 13, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

97. A letter from the Administrator, United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, transmitting a report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor for the year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

98. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the Comptroller General of the United States of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

99. A letter from the chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

100. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

101. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

102. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649 (79th Cong. 2d sess.) approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

103. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize credit in the accounts of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 772. A bill to remove the monthly maximum placed on the income of veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 773. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 774. A bill to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 775. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 776. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 777. A bill to amend section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 778. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 779. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 780. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 781. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 782. A bill to extend the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain veterans discharged or relieved from active service prior to December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 783. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit future applicants to elect to be compensated for terminal leave in cash in lieu of bonds, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 784. A bill to provide compensation for sheriffs or other law-enforcement officers who transport mentally incompetent veterans to a Veterans' Administration hospital or home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 785. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 786. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers and former officers of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, and National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 787. A bill to provide a basis for the settlement of industrial disputes vitally affecting the national health, security, or economy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 788. A bill to provide for the admission on motion of certain merchant seamen to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 789. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for addition to the Fredericksburg National Cemetery; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 790. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 791. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Rehoboth-Assateague National Seashore in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 792. A bill to compensate Prince William County, Va., and York County, Va., for certain of their public roads and highways seized by the United States for the use of a permanent Marine Corps post at Quantico, Va., and a Navy mine depot at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 793. A bill to authorize the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare estimates and plans for improvement of certain river and harbor projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 794. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 795. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act approved July 16, 1916, and acts amendatory thereto and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 796. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEDEN:

H. R. 797. A bill to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 798. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 799. A bill to provide for lump-sum payment for certain Army and Navy nurses of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 800. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 801. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 802. A bill to provide equitable relief to contractors supplying dairy products to the armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 803. A bill to prohibit the exportation of sugar and to abolish sugar rationing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 804. A bill authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 805. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 806. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 807. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 808. A bill to permit certain postal employees who are war veterans to retire after 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. Res. 45. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate Old-Age Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 46. Resolution to amend the House Rules by striking out paragraph 17 of rule X and all of paragraph q of rule XI; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 809. A bill for the relief of J. T. Melson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 810. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of William A. Hallett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 813. A bill for the relief of J. Don Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 814. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 815. A bill for the relief of Ho Low Ping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Joe Valonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 817. A bill for the relief of Andres Quinones and Letty Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 818. A bill for the relief of Clinton Construction Co., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Arraes, also known as Jose M. Arrais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 820. A bill for the relief of Ruth Muzio (Mrs. Joseph Muzio) and to the legal guardian of Louis Muzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 822. A bill for the relief of Chin Ta Bin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of Shokichi Washimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of A. Boyd Puccinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 825. A bill for the relief of Benzo Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 826. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of the estates of Harold P. Stites and William A. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance funds of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 829. A bill for the relief of A. Boyd Puccinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 830. A bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 831. A bill for the relief of George Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 832. A bill for the relief of Yee On Wong, also known as Wong Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 833. A bill for the relief of Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 834. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stringer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 835. A bill for the relief of John Sheehy and Mrs. Anna Sheehy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einer Engen, and N. L. Gifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 839. A bill for the relief of Anthony M. Andrzejak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Jozef A. Jura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 841. A bill for the relief of Adrian Uriarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 842. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Stejden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Peter Pitcoff Atanasoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 844. A bill for the relief of Gustav Lukowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 845. A bill to reinstate John B. Day, a captain, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 846. A bill for relief of Mrs. Frances B. Bynum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of J. H. Karr and Mrs. J. H. Karr, doing business as Home Plumbing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 848. A bill for the relief of Loui Usry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 849. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of the parents of Dorothy White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of Winston Cann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 853. A bill for the relief of Leo Joseph Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 18 veterans of World War II, urging repeal of Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

41. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the town of Worthington, Mass., opposing unifying the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

42. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Thirteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of certain provisions of the International Labor Organization's constitution and commending them to the favorable consideration of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

43. Also, petition of Henry A. Alexander, Atlanta, Ga., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to protesting the seating of the 10 members of the Georgia delegation; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Save this moment, O Lord, from being merely a gesture to custom or convention, and make it a real experience for each one of us in this place, as we call upon Thee for guidance and for help.

We have felt Thee near and beside us in the exalted experience of worship in church; make us now to feel Thy nearness in the business of the day—the Unseen Delegate, present and voting. Vote through these men, we pray Thee, O Jesus, that what they say and what they do may be in accordance with Thy will for this land that we love so much.

Thou hast said: "When ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any." Give us the grace to lay aside all bitterness or resentment we may be nursing in our hearts, lest their acid eat into our peace and corrode our spirits.

Thou hast said: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Give us the grace today to think not of what we can get but of what we can give, that a new spirit may come into our work here, with a new vision and a new purpose, that Thou wilt delight to bless.

We ask these things in Thine own name and for Thy sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 10, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Holland	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Ives	Overton
Brewster	Jenner	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Knowland	Russell
Capehart	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Sparkman
Connally	McCarran	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Thye
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tydings
Flanders	Malone	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Millikin	White
Gurney	Moore	Wiley
Hatch	Morse	Williams
Hayden	Murray	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Myers	Young
Hill	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before proceeding with the morning hour the Chair wishes to rule finally upon the question of order which was raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at the last session of the Senate. The Senator raised an important point of order regarding the reference of certain bills to committees, as reported at page 218 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There was general discussion of the matter in the Senate, but without conclusive action. The Chair wishes to rule this morning on the point of order raised by the Senator from Illinois.

He pointed out that a bill dealing with the portal-to-portal problem, introduced by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], had been referred to the Judiciary Committee, while, on the same day, another bill, on the same subject, introduced by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senator from Illinois appropriately raised the question whether two bills on the same general subject should not go to the same committee.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana, S. 49, showed by its title that it proposed to "amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938," and it was automatically referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is the successor to the former Senate committee from which that act came.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin, S. 70, did not propose an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and its title invited no such implication. The bill raised the purely legal question as to the legal nature of the portal-to-portal problem and proposed a remedy confined exclusively to legal procedure. Unquestionably constitutional questions are involved. It did not occur then to the Chair—nor does it now—that such a bill should go anywhere else than to the Judiciary Committee, which would clearly appear to have jurisdiction, not only in the general nature of the case, but also in the definitions contained in the Reorganization Act. Furthermore, it is to be recalled that the so-called Gwynne bill, dealing with the statute of limitations on the same subject, was referred to the Judiciary Committee in the last session.

Upon further examination, it is entirely clear that the subject matter of both bills involves the same ultimate objective and both bills have a common theme which could put them in the purview of either committee. But it is equally clear that only one committee should have jurisdiction of the problem. It was for this reason that the Chair announced his purpose to confer with the chairmen of both committees to determine, as a practical proposition, which committee should take jurisdiction.

This has been done. The situation is as follows: The chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], believes that the bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin (S. 70) was properly referred to the Judiciary Committee; he further believes that the whole portal-to-portal problem may be properly handled, under the rules, by the Judiciary Committee; and he is favorable to this reference. Meanwhile, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], has appointed a subcommittee, headed by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], which will start public hearings on S. 70 next Wednesday morning; and the bill (S. 49) introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has been reintroduced as an amendment to

the Wiley bill (S. 70), and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, and the Chair understands that the Senator from Indiana will be the first witness before the Judiciary Committee next Wednesday.

The subject matter involved in these bills is of imminent importance to the country. The object of procedural rules is not to hamper but to facilitate the business of the Senate. Under the existing circumstances, since there is a mixed jurisdiction which permits reference to either of these two Senate committees, the Chair will refer any other current legislation on this subject to the Judiciary Committee unless directed otherwise by the Senate.

The Chair thanks the Senator from Illinois for having raised his point of order. The Chair agrees with him and with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that the spirit of the Reorganization Act puts new emphasis upon the importance of the appropriate reference of bills and resolutions to proper committees, and that this is the duty of the Presiding Officer without regard to any special requests for reference which may be made by the authors of such bills and resolutions.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILL TO TERMINATE PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES

Mr. DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement with respect to the proceedings before the subcommittee referred to in the statement just made by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, there have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary a bill, namely, S. 70, introduced by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on January 6, 1947, entitled "A bill to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes," and an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on January 10, 1947, as a substitute for S. 70, the offer of which amendment appears at page 223 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On January 10, 1947, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary appointed a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and myself, the scope of the duties of which subcommittee has been subsequently defined to be to consider and make recommendations with respect to said S. 70 and said amendment so offered as a substitute. The senior Senator from Wisconsin, who is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is ex-officio a member of the subcommittee. I was designated as chairman of the subcommittee.

I hereby give notice to the Senate that the subcommittee will begin hearings at the office of the Committee on the Judiciary, 424 Senate Office Building, on the morning of Wednesday, January 15, 1947, at 9:30 o'clock. The first witness scheduled to be heard by the subcommittee is the senior Senator from Indiana.

The hearings will be conducted as expeditiously as possible and consistent with thorough presentation. All persons desiring to appear should promptly communicate with the office of the Committee on the Judiciary. The subcommittee will, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 24 hours before hearing, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument.

This special notice to the Senate is given in view of the great importance of the questions involved in the subjects committed to the subcommittee for its consideration and recommendations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In line with our conversation had this morning in the Committee on the Judiciary, I understand that the Senator from Missouri, as chairman of the subcommittee, is making the statement to the Senate for the purpose of informing the Senate of the general scope of the hearings involved, because of the conflict over the subject matter of the bill. It is, is it not, the Senator's intention to emphasize in the hearings the legal aspects of this problem?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not think it advisable to limit the language used in the announcement which I have made. As stated:

> The scope of the duties of the subcommittee has been * * * defined to be to consider and make recommendations with respect to said S. 70 and said amendment so offered as a substitute.

I think that language speaks for itself, and I prefer not to interpose an interpretation, this being the action this morning taken by the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 295.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRODUCTION OF SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

FARM SECURITY AND SOIL CONSERVATION—ACTIVITIES IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting a letter from the Governor of the Virgin Islands, together with copies of a resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands requesting the restoration of the activities of the Farm Security Administration and the Soil Conservation Service in the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR, & RAILWAY CO.

A report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator, & Railway Co., for the calendar year 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN D. CLIFFORD, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MAINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 20, 1947, at 10:15 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John D. Clifford, Jr., of Maine, to be United States district judge for the district of Maine, vice Hon. John A. Peters, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RICHMOND B. KEECH TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 20, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Richmond B. Keech, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. He is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD M. CURRAN TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and

in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 20, 1947, at 10:45 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. He is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOE B. DOOLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 20, 1947, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, vice Hon. James C. Wilson, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], chairman; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]; and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR LYNN J. FRAZIER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to announce to the Senate the death of former Senator Lynn J. Frazier, of North Dakota.

Senator Frazier had a long and distinguished record of public service in North Dakota and in the Nation. He was three times elected governor of his State. For 18 years he represented the State of North Dakota in this body. He was a faithful, honest servant and truly represented the interests of the farmers, the laborers, and the small businessmen of the Nation.

Originally elected by the Non-Partisan League Republicans of our State, he refused their endorsement in June 1940. Had he accepted I am sure he would have been overwhelmingly reelected. He had the merited confidence of our people to a remarkable degree, and I am sure that many Senators here today who served with him join with citizens of North Dakota and all other sections of the Nation in sincere regret over his passing.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from North Dakota in respect to the passing of one of North Dakota's most distinguished citizens.

Lynn J. Frazier was one of our early pioneers who during his entire life took a leading part in the development and government of the State. For more than two decades he served with marked honor and credit in the highest offices the State could offer. His integrity and honesty of purpose were never questioned even by his bitterest political foes.

All North Dakota mourns the passing of Lynn J. Frazier, a worthy and faithful public servant.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to express my sorrow at the sad news which has just been given to the Senate by the Senators from North Dakota relating to the death of our former colleague, Senator Frazier.

USE OF GRAIN IN MANUFACTURE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Mrs. A. F. Goad, corresponding secretary of the Women's Organization, of Augusta, Kans., a petition to Congress to pass legislation that will prevent the use of grain in the manufacture of intoxicating liquor and for other nonessential purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the petition be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

To prevent the use of grain for nonessential purposes during the period of shortages, and enable America to make her maximum contribution to the food needs of her own country and the world, we the undersigned citizens of the State of Kansas petition the Congress of the United States to pass House Joint Resolution 325, and thereby take all grain away from the nonessential brewing and distilling industry.

THE FARMER'S ANGLE—STATEMENT BY HOMER AYRES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an able and convincing statement in support of a constructive program entitled "The Farmer's Angle," written by Homer Ayres, who is the farm relations director of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheat is not only the timber from which the staff of life is constructed; it is also a political ferment that starts operating either when people have too few of the golden berries or when, in the case of farmers, they are told they raise too many, and go bankrupt.

The price of wheat, as it relates to farm-operating cost in the Northwest, has been the yeast that touched off past farm revolts, and today this ferment is again liberated and at work.

Grain farmers, of course, know that in many places in the world people are starving for want of the wheat with which they are beginning to be plagued. Farmers are being told again that surpluses are piling up and the price will no doubt drop sadly. But inflation has skyrocketed farm living and operating costs. So there is an uneasy feeling again, and farmers take another look at their hole card and wonder if they can't do something about it.

This situation is what brought Fiorello H. LaGuardia to the Twin Cities recently in response to an invitation of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association on the occasion of its annual meeting. The GTA is a gigantic farmer-owned cooperative grain-marketing institution that handles around 40 percent of the total grain raised in the area. This year, as a monument to their steadfastness, they were able to dedicate a new million-dollar office building. The farmer members of this cooperative are proud of their achievements because they represent victories over their enemies, the grain speculators, who have waxed fat through the years on the farmers' sweat and toil. And the impact of these farmers on national politics, when they get in motion, should not be underestimated.

LaGuardia told the farmers: "We want no swivel-chair farmers or professional politicians or spokesmen for the ticker-tape boys to arbitrarily decide the destiny of the American farmers." And the farmers ate it up. He told the farmers that they needed the world food and agricultural organization as a reservoir of food that would not only stabilize farm prices but would also solve the hunger problem and promote world peace. The farmers heeded LaGuardia and will soon put a heat campaign on Congress to prevent the "ticker tapers" from scuttling FAO and reducing it to a mere fact-finding and statistical bureau.

The Little Flower also linked up the grain speculators with the "cookie pushers with striped pants" who operated the State Department.

There was much consternation in high places over the LaGuardia speech at this great farm gathering, and immediately one of the cold-water artists of the grain trade was rushed to the scene to proclaim that LaGuardia preached false doctrines to "make over our democratic system."

But these Farmers' Union farmers know that their interests are with people who need bread to eat and not with overfed millionaires. People who have been dejected because farmers at times become victims of reactionary big-business propaganda would have received a new lease on life if they had attended the LaGuardia-GTA meeting. Great things will come of it.

SIX WEEKS IN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Six Weeks in Europe," delivered by him in Oklahoma on October 22, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADVICE TO REPUBLICANS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Advice to the Republicans," written by Senator BARKLEY and published in the New York Times magazine of January 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Improving Administrative Justice: Hearings and Evidence; Scope of Judicial Re-

view," delivered by Senator McCARRAN on October 30, 1946, before the American Bar Association and published in the December 1946 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY ON CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "World's Most Important Publication," written by him and published in the December 1946 issue of the magazine Future, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER AT OPENING OF IOWA CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION IN THE CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the opening of the Iowa Centennial Exhibition in the Congressional Library on December 28, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PLAN FOR NATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. IRA C. EAKER

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Plan for National Security," delivered by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker before the Georgia Farm Bureau at Macon, Ga., on November 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION REALITIES IN THE MISSOURI BASIN—ADDRESS BY GOODRICH W. LINEWEAVER

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Reclamation Realities in the Missouri Basin, delivered by Goodrich W. Lineweaver on November 8, 1946, at Williston, N. Dak., before the North Dakota Reclamation Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ISSUE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Special Committee Issue," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which were referred the following resolutions, reported them each without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 41. Resolution to investigate certain matters relating to officers and employees of the Federal Government; and

S. Res. 42. Resolution to investigate the system of operating cafeterias in Government buildings.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 164, for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 166. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa; and

S. 168. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshi Yokoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BROOKS introduced Senate bill 169, to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term United States Government life insurance policies for another 5-year period, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 170. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in increasing the rate of salary payments to teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 171. A bill relating to the application of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to prisoners of war and others in the Philippines during the Japanese occupation; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 172. A bill to provide for a Commission to adjudicate claims of American nationals who were prisoners of war of Japan, for payment of its awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 173. A bill to authorize the protection of life and property, water conservation, and the comprehensive reclamation of land in the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico, by flood control, irrigation, sediment detention, drainage, and other activities; to provide for the financial rehabilitation of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District; to provide for the disposition of surplus electrical energy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 174. A bill to provide for reconditioning the vessel *Prowler* and returning such vessel to the Pomperaug Council of the Boy Scouts of America at Bridgeport, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 175. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 176. A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 177. A bill to amend the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, approved June 3, 1924, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to extend the services and operations of the Inland Waterways Corporation to Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 178. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide assistance to States in developing and maintaining dental health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 180. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act with respect to hours of work for barbers within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 181. A bill to authorize the appointment and retirement of Raymond E. Corson as a lieutenant commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 183. A bill authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Schubert;

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. A bill for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis.

S. 188. A bill for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino;

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Yasutaro Ikuta;

S. 194. A bill for the relief of the Elmore Cooperative Hatchery;

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins; and

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Lavatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 197. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a term of 4 years for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which is similar to one introduced last week in the House by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, to establish a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government. I ask for its reference to the appropriate committee.

The bill (S. 164) for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I should like to have inserted in full in the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute to read the few last paragraphs of the statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LODGE. I read from the statement:

This Commission will find the places where economies can be effected and the places where there is overlapping and duplication. It will list and define the functions of government.

Another important problem which must be solved is that of developing a steady flow of high-quality civil servants at the policy-making level. Without such personnel effective government is not possible.

There is a reason why popular representative government has endured in this country whereas it has disappeared in so many other nations of the earth. The reason is that in these other nations government for one cause or another ceased to be an effective instrument for translating into action the aims and the aspirations of the people. Our system of government will endure just as long as people can look to it with confidence that it is both responsive and effective. The prompt enactment of this bill is an essential first step toward the maintenance of truly popular government.

There being no objection, the statement submitted by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

In his introductory statement Congressman BROWN said that the purpose of the Commission would be to "make a thorough study and investigation of the services, activities, and functions of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch for the purpose of promoting economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business.

"The need for such a study and investigation should be apparent to all. The executive branch of the Federal Government has undergone fantastic growth in the last few decades. Thirty years ago the number of executive establishments of the rank of a bureau or equivalent is reported to have been 158. In 1932 the number had increased to 521. By 1944 the number had grown to 1,141. During this same period of time the number of civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government had increased at an amazing rate. In 1916 Federal workers numbered 438,057. In 1926, 528,542. In 1936, 824,259, and in 1946, 2,766,165.

"The legislative branch of our Government has already been streamlined and reorganized. The time has now come to take the first step toward reorganizing and streamlining the executive branch. While the President has had the authority under laws enacted in recent years to reorganize the executive department and its various subdivisions, nothing of real significance or benefit has been accomplished under that authority. Neither the President nor the Congress is now in position to make a comprehensive study and investigation, or to take the preliminary steps necessary to put the executive branch of the Government on an economical and efficient basis.

"I wish to point out that the duties conferred upon the Commission under my bill are solely to study and investigate present organization and methods of operation, and from the results of such study and investigation to submit findings and recommendations to the Congress as to what changes are necessary, in their opinion, to effectuate the policies set forth in the bill. The Congress has complete authority to accept or reject, in its discretion, any or all of the recommendations of the Commission.

"I also wish to emphasize the fact that the Commission will be completely bipartisan and truly representative. Included in its membership will be representatives of the Congress and of the President, as well as of the general public."

The Commission should consist of men of high-grade ability, great experience, and true vision. They will be required to make their report in January of 1949, so that their findings will be available to the Eighty-first Congress. The time to make such a study is now, just as the partisan composition of our Federal Government is in a state of flux.

This job requires a special commission because congressional committees have not the time to give to such work.

There has been no attempt to reorganize the Government since the end of hostilities. War leaves a lot of rubble and waste in the field of government, just as it does on the battlefield.

While this Commission in no way retards or affects the duty of the present Congress to make all possible economies now, it is, nevertheless, evident that further economies will be possible once all these facts are known. The tangle is now so thick that it is often hard to prune out the deadwood without chopping down the tree.

This Commission will find the places where economies can be effected and the places where there is overlapping and duplication. It will list and define the functions of government.

Another important problem which must be solved is that of developing a steady flow of high-quality civil servants at the policy-making level. Without such personnel effective government is not possible.

There is a reason why popular representative government has endured in this country, whereas it has disappeared in so many other nations of the earth. The reason is that in these other nations government, for one cause or another, ceased to be an effective instrument for translating into action the aims and the aspirations of the people. Our system of government will endure just as long as people can look to it with confidence that it is both responsive and effective. The prompt enactment of this bill is an essential first step toward the maintenance of truly popular government.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term United States Government life insurance policies for another 5-year period.

Five-year level-premium term policies were first authorized in 1926. Statutes providing for three renewals have since been enacted making a total of 20 years during which United States Government life insurance could be carried. The last of such renewal statutes was enacted in 1942. Such policies permit World War I veterans to keep up insurance policies, which, although of the lowest grade, having no cash-surrender or loan values, nevertheless provide a means for such veterans to maintain life insurance. As of the end of November 1946 there were 37,500 of such policies in force. The passage of this measure will enable such veterans who are physically and financially unable to obtain life insurance policies of higher grades to keep in force their low-level term policies on which they have paid premiums for 20 years.

The bill (S. 169) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term United States Government life insurance policies for another 5-year period, introduced by Mr. BROOKS, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end of title II thereof the following new section:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AND EFFICIENCY

"SEC. 246. (a) There is hereby created a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on Administrative Practices and Efficiency (hereinafter referred to as the 'committee').

"(b) The committee shall be composed of the Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

"(c) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as the case may be.

"(d) Vacancies in the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee.

"(e) The members of the committee shall serve without additional compensation for their services, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with the meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such time as the Congress is in session.

"(f) The committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

"(g) The committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of such professional, clerical, and other employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the committee, and all of such employees shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties to which they may be assigned: *Provided*, That the chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may, in their discretion, with the consent of a majority of their said committee, assign regular personnel from the professional staff and the clerical staff of their respective committee to duties related to the work of the Joint Committee on Administrative Practices and Efficiency herein created. Said personnel so assigned shall receive no additional compensation to that

paid them as members of the personnel staff of the regular Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Employees of the committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, or other records of any department or agency of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

"(h) No decision shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

"(i) The committee is authorized and empowered to conduct investigations and studies into the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any department or agency of the Government or any corporation owned by the Government or in which the Government has a financial interest. The committee shall receive and consider complaints relating to the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any such department, agency, or corporation. The committee is empowered upon resolutions adopted by either the Senate or the House of Representatives or upon complaint or upon its own initiative to make such investigations and studies under this subsection as in its judgment may be necessary to keep the Congress fully informed as to whether or not the laws of the United States are being properly and efficiently administered and as to whether or not additional legislation is necessary and appropriate to improve their administration. It shall be the duty of the committee to make such studies and investigations when directed by resolution of either House of Congress, or upon its own initiative.

"(j) The committee shall report to the Congress annually on or before the 1st of February and at such other times as it deems advisable the results of its investigations and studies and may make such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"(k) The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(l) Appropriations for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman."

PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect during the Eightieth Congress; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to December 31, 1947. The said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, $10,000, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND PRESENTATION OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking from subdivision (o) (2) thereof the following language:

"Such committee shall also have the duty of examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the Senate; and, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate."

Resolved further, That rule XIV of the Standing Rules be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after paragraph numbered 4 the following paragraph, to be numbered 5:

"5. The Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate."

Renumber paragraph numbered 5 of said rule as paragraph numbered 6.

SAFETY RECORD IN CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, undoubtedly all Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives will be interested in knowing what fatalities have come about by the augmentation of air transportation in America. I have in my hand a very short letter, of less than two pages, which came to me from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce bearing on that particular subject. I think the letter is so interesting that I ask unanimous consent to have it read at the desk, and that it together with its appendages, may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, January 10, 1947.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Knowing of your interest in everything connected with civil aviation, I am forwarding a copy of safety record of scheduled domestic and scheduled United States flag international air lines from 1939 through 1946.

I think you will be interested in the fact that for domestic and international services combined passenger fatalities per hundred million passenger miles flown, which is the best index of comparative safety, were the lowest in 1946 for any year on record.

The figure for 1946 was only 1.6 passenger fatalities per hundred million passenger-miles flown as compared to 2.31 in 1945.

For domestic operations alone, there were only 1.24 passenger fatalities per hundred million passenger-miles in 1946 as compared with 2.14 in 1945, an improvement of approximately 40 percent. This is over twice as safe as the 1945 record (1946 figures not yet available) for passenger automobiles of 2.9 deaths per hundred million passenger-miles.

I think you will also be interested in exhibit 2 which shows the trend of safety over 3-year periods from 1932 through 1946. A 3-year average is used so as to give a more representative statistical sample and eliminate the element of luck affecting the figures for any one period. You will note that the average for 1944 through 1946 was 1.67 passenger fatalities per hundred million passenger-miles—a 30-percent improvement over the previous 3 years. This is the greatest relative improvement accomplished in any 3-year period, except in 1938 through 1940, where the introduction of DC–3 resulted in a great jump over the previous record.

Comparison of the safety record of United States flag international operations with the international operators of other countries in 1946 indicates that the United States operations were several times safer.

These figures, of course, provide no reason for complacency as much remains to be done before air transport achieves the ultimate in safety, but the fact that 1946 was the best year on record so far, and that the improvement has been substantial and steady over 3-year periods, is certainly an important and encouraging fact with which I thought you should be acquainted.

I would be glad to explain these figures in detail to you in case you should be interested.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM A. M. BURDEN,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the appendages to the letter need not be read, but I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator will be complied with.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Domestic and international air-line safety record, 1939–46

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946, through Dec. 30
Domestic (including territorial):								
Number of fatal accidents	2	3	4	5	2	3	8	9
Airplane miles flown [1]	83, 396, 961	109, 922, 178	134, 447, 558	111, 406, 804	105, 199, 955	144, 239, 738	218, 189, 135	303, 900, 000
Plane miles to fatal accident	41, 698, 481	36, 640, 726	33, 611, 890	22, 281, 361	52, 599, 978	28, 847, 948	27, 273, 642	33, 766, 667
Passenger fatalities	9	35	35	55	22	48	76	[2] 75
Crew fatalities	3	10	9	16	8	10	12	22
Total passenger-miles [2]	765, 555, 435	1, 159, 661, 788	1, 508, 182, 779	1, 501, 674, 209	1, 669, 227, 104	2, 297, 782, 195	3, 554, 714, 828	6, 046, 000, 000
Passenger-miles to passenger fatality	84, 061, 715	33, 133, 194	43, 090, 937	27, 303, 167	75, 873, 959	47, 870, 462	46, 772, 564	80, 613, 333
Passenger fatalities per 100,000,000 passenger-miles flown	1. 19	3. 02	2. 32	3. 66	1. 32	2. 09	2. 14	1. 24
International:								
Number of fatal accidents	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	2
Airplane miles flown [1]	7, 579, 102	9, 595, 535	13, 763, 986	19, 086, 416	18, 457, 864	22, 272, 709	32, 630, 552	59, 000, 000
Plane miles to fatal accident	7, 579, 102	No fatality	13, 763, 986	No fatality	18, 457, 864	22, 272, 709	16, 315, 276	29, 500, 000
Passenger fatalities	10	0	2	0	10	17	17	[4] 40
Crew fatalities	4	0	0	0	4	0	10	12
Total passenger-miles [2]	75, 262, 807	105, 502, 271	168, 766, 447	248, 554, 476	257, 378, 451	318, 706, 620	467, 065, 137	1, 137, 000, 000
Passenger-miles to passenger fatality	7, 526, 281	No fatality	84, 383, 224	No fatality	25, 737, 845	18, 747, 448	27, 474, 420	28, 425, 000
Passenger fatalities per 100,000,000 passenger-miles flown	13. 29	0	1. 19	0	3. 89	5. 33	3. 64	3. 52
Domestic and international (combined):								
Number of fatal accidents	3	3	5	5	3	4	10	11
Airplane-miles flown [1]	90, 976, 063	119, 517, 713	148, 211, 544	130, 493, 220	123, 657, 819	166, 512, 447	250, 819, 687	362, 900, 000
Plane-miles to fatal accident	30, 325, 354	39, 839, 238	29, 642, 309	26, 098, 644	41, 219, 273	41, 628, 112	25, 081, 969	32, 990, 909
Passenger fatalities	19	35	37	55	32	65	93	[5] 115
Crew fatalities	7	10	9	16	12	10	22	34
Total passenger-miles [2]	840, 818, 242	1, 265, 164, 059	1, 676, 949, 226	1, 750, 228, 685	1, 926, 605, 555	2, 616, 488, 815	4, 021, 779, 965	7, 183, 000, 000
Passenger-miles to passenger fatality	44, 253, 592	36, 147, 516	45, 322, 952	31, 822, 339	60, 206, 424	40, 253, 674	43, 244, 946	62, 460, 000
Passenger fatalities per 100,000,000 passenger-miles flown	2. 26	2. 77	2. 21	3. 14	1. 66	2. 48	2. 31	1. 60

[1] Revenue 1946 figures estimated.
[2] Revenue and nonrevenue. 1946 figures estimated.
[3] Includes 3 infants in arms and 2 company employees.
[4] Includes 3 infants in arms and 3 children ages 3 to 11 years.
[5] Includes 6 infants in arms, 3 children ages 3 to 11 years, and 2 company employees.

Source: The above figures were developed by the CAA Aviation Statistics Division from records of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The 1946 figures are preliminary and subject to possible later revision.

Scheduled air-line accidents, domestic (including territorial)

	Passenger-miles	Passenger fatalities	Passenger fatalities per 100,000,000 passenger-miles	Percent improvement over previous period
1944–46 [1]	11, 898, 497, 023	199	1. 67	30
1941–43	4, 679, 084, 692	112	2. 39	14
1938–40	2, 489, 288, 443	69	2. 77	65
1935–37	1, 236, 496, 597	99	8. 01	10
1932–34	491, 546, 152	44	8. 95	

[1] 1946 through Dec. 30.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to ask one question of the Senator from Nevada, realizing his complete understanding of the subject of aviation, his interest in it, and the letter which has just been read. Is it not a fact that, as to the factors of safety in air travel, one of the best indexes is the attitude of the insurance companies toward risks flying in planes; and is it not further a fact that insurance companies have been even more lenient in considering these risks now, in the face of recent accidents, than heretofore?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I am so advised.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator would call that fairly expert testimony, would he not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

USE OF MONOPOLISTIC POWER AS WEAPON IN LABOR DISPUTES—REPORT BY SENATOR KINGSLEY TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my colleague from the time of the last election to the opening of the present session of Congress, Senator Kingsley Taft, while he was here, prepared a report on the question of protecting the public from the use of monopolistic power as a weapon in labor disputes, together with a proposed bill. I ask that the statement and the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF SENATOR KINGSLEY TAFT, OF OHIO, ON PROTECTING THE PUBLIC FROM USE OF MONOPOLISTIC POWER AS WEAPON IN LABOR DISPUTES

In preparing for the eventuality of a session during the 2 months that I have had the privilege of representing the State of Ohio in the United States Senate, it became apparent to me that the people of this Nation needed prompt and effective protection from the use of monopolistic power against them by labor organizations as a weapon in labor disputes. Other legislative proposals did not seem to recognize or deal with this particular problem.

For this reason I am submitting this report in the hope that it may be of some help in the preparation of effective legislation by the Eightieth Congress.

1. NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

The labor required to produce an essential commodity is just as necessary an element in the production of that commodity as the raw material required to produce it. Without that labor, the commodity cannot be produced, even though the raw material is available. It necessarily follows that monopolistic control of the labor required to produce the commodity may be as great a threat to the public as monopolistic control of the raw material required to produce it. Any legislative statement to the contrary simply ignores the facts.

If any property owner or combination of property owners should secure such a control of the supply of a commodity, normally a subject of interstate commerce, that they could keep it from going to market, that is, make it impossible for people to buy it—then we would say they had a monopoly.

Since enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890, such a monopoly has been unlawful and there are ample provisions in our laws which would enable the Government to prevent the group having the monopoly from either causing or threatening to cause disaster to the public by using their monopolistic power. The antitrust laws have been construed as not only providing against exercise of such monopolistic power, but also providing against its existence, even though it is not exercised. Even such monopolies in nonessentials are outlawed.

However, the antitrust laws during the past 30 years have been so amended that it is possible, without violating them, for a labor organization or a group of labor organizations not only to acquire the monopolistic power, which would enable them to cut off completely the supply of even an essential commodity or service, but also to exercise that power.

Unthinkable as it is, the Government will be powerless in peacetime to protect the people of the United States against the exercise by a labor organization, or combination of labor organizations, of power to cut off all or substantially all of the supply of labor required to provide an essential commodity or service, even though exercise of that power would threaten disaster to the American people.

This appears clear on consideration of the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C. 101, etc.) and certain sections of the Clayton Act (29 U. S. C. 52, and 15 U. S. C. 17) as construed by the Supreme Court of the United States in *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U. S. 219). As pointed out by that Court in *Allen Bradley Company* v. *Local Union No. 3*, decided last June (89 L. Ed. 1441): "* * * the desirability of such an exemption of labor unions is a question for the determination of Congress."

Whether the Government can even supply necessary protection to the public in wartime, through the device of Government seizure and operation of the industry involved, is now before the Supreme Court of the United States.

No individual or group should be allowed to have an absolute right to cause or threaten disaster to the people of this country. The exercise by labor organizations of power to cut off all or substantially all labor required to supply an essential commodity or service, can certainly cause or threaten such disaster. Such an exercise of power must always be prevented. Because of the resulting injury to the public, monopoly power, as a weapon in a labor dispute, should never be tolerated.

The recent coal crisis was a warning of the disaster which could result from a failure to prevent the exercise by labor organizations of monopolistic power to cut off all or substantially all labor necessary to supply an essential commodity. The increasing frequency of these warnings during the recent past emphasizes the prompt need for permanent legislation which will protect the public against the exercise of such monopolistic power.

2. OUTLINE OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The Government has encouraged the organization of labor in groups which have monopolistic power. To require the breaking up of those groups, as is done with business groups that have monopolistic power, would therefore be quite revolutionary. Furthermore, legislation preventing them from exercising their monopolistic power in all instances, rather than merely where such exercise would inflict severe injury on the public, would represent a serious interference with existing labor organizations and their activities. For these reasons, application of the restraint of trade section (sec. 1), or even of the monopoly section (sec. 2), of the Sherman Act, does not appear practicable. A practicable solution, and one which should arouse a minimum of opposition, would require an effective means of preventing the exercise of such monopolistic power where such exercise would cause or threaten disaster to the public. This would provide protection which the public must have with a minimum of inconvenience to labor organizations and their activities. The draft of a bill, attached hereto, is designed to provide this solution.

Section 1 (a) makes it unlawful to "so monopolize the labor of human beings, or otherwise induce them to refrain from working, as to prevent the supply of a commodity or service to such an extent that severe hardship is or will be inflicted on the public." This represents a limited adoption of the pattern of section 2 of the Sherman Act. The same penalties, by way of fine or imprisonment, are provided for as in that section.

Section 1 (b) defines "the public" to include what might be referred to as "outsiders"—that is, those who are not owners or employees of businesses involved in the labor dispute or merely interested as sellers of its products.

Sections 1 (c) and (d) contain appropriate definitions of the word "commerce" and of the words "person" and "persons."

Section 2 (a) contains provisions enabling the Government to secure court orders preventing or restraining violations of section 1. It is substantially identical to section 4 of the Sherman Act.

Section 2 (b) authorizes the court, where clearly necessary to protect the public from severe hardship, to direct employees to return to their posts of duty within a reasonable time. Provision is made for taking away rights of employees as such under the National Labor Relations Act or the Railway Labor Act where they willfully fail to comply with the court's direction. This method of enforcement is somewhat similarly provided for in sections 3 (d) and 10 (d) of the Case bill (H. R. 4908), section 12 (d), of the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill (S. 1171), and section 6 of the bill proposed by President Truman last May, as amended by the Senate (H. R. 6578).

Section 2 (c) is a provision for bringing in additional parties where necessary and is substantially the same as section 5 of the Sherman Act.

Section 2 (d) provides for the court retaining jurisdiction so that any final order may be revised from time to time where such revision appears to be proper. Similar provisions are usually included in final orders made by equity courts in Sherman Act cases.

Section 2 (e) is designed to make it clear that the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts are not to limit the power of the court under this act.

There would be little danger of unfair use of this legislation to break strikes, not involving, as a weapon, the use of monopoly power to threaten public disaster. In the first place, proceedings for enforcement could be instituted only by the Federal Government. Furthermore, the requirement of court action would provide an additional obstacle against its unfair use.

This legislation would not outlaw all industry-wide strikes because many of them would not inflict severe hardship on the public. For example, an industry-wide strike in the watch industry, unlike that in the coal industry, would not inflict severe hardship on the public. It also would not outlaw those strikes in essential industries which did not paralyze such a large portion of the industry as to inflict severe hardship on the public. For example, a strike involving even as much as 30 percent of the coal industry would probably leave available a sufficient supply of coal so as to avoid inflicting a severe hardship on the public. However, it would prevent a strike which would shut down a public utility that was the sole source of an essential service to a community. Such a shut-down might well be as disastrous in its effects as a strike of all of the firemen in a community.

It is difficult to comprehend why the latter effect of the bill should provide any valid argument against its enactment. In other words, the labor organizations using the strike weapon against such a public utility would have to use it, if at all, carefully, so as to cause mere inconvenience rather than extreme hardship on the public. This might be accomplished by a partial, rather than a general strike, against the employer.

3. OTHER LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS WILL NOT PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH APPROPRIATE PROTECTION

There are numerous proposals for labor legislation now under consideration. Those which might be considered as giving the public some protection against the exercise of monopolistic power by labor organizations may be classified under rather definite headings and will be hereafter discussed under those headings.

(a) Waiting periods

These are usually provided for in connection with mediation boards and fact-finding commissions. Such provisions are contained in the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill and the Case bill.

However, after the waiting period has expired, the public has no protection. These provisions may tend to discourage strikes, but give no protection against monopolistic strikes which come into existence despite the fact that they have been discouraged.

(b) Compulsory arbitration or labor courts

For the purpose of disposing of those controversies which threatened disaster to the public, provision was made in the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill for compulsory arbitration, and suggestions have also been made that labor courts be established. As pointed out by Senator BALL (the New York Times magazine, December 8, 1946) this "* * * would simply empower some man to render arbitrary judgments in disputes between other men. Such a concept is entirely foreign to our liberal system of equal justice, under law. Our courts do not decide cases on the basis of the judge's individual judgment. They apply to a particular dispute a general law defining the rights and duties of the parties and applying equally to all. * * * we would first have to define the court's jurisdiction in the law, deciding what are proper issues * * *. There is no general agreement in the country on either of these questions today, and it is questionable whether in the absence of such general acceptance it would be possible to write such definitions into a law and make it work. It is certain that even the attempt would require many months, probably years, of legislative effort."

Without discussing these proposals further, it is apparent that this Nation cannot wait for its necessary protection to be provided along these lines.

(c) Prohibition of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes

Such provisions were included in the Case bill. These provisions would have had no effect in preventing disaster to the public from continued exercise of monopolistic power by labor organizations, if either the railway strike of last May or the recent coal strike had continued. Where there is an industry-wide union covering substantially all of the workers in the industry or a union which includes substantially all of even one class of essential workers in a public utility, this remedy would not prevent the use by such labor organizations of monopolistic power to cause disaster to the public.

(d) Abolition or restriction of closed shop

This remedy might accomplish the same purposes in the end as the bill proposed in this report. However, it is believed that this remedy is just as revolutionary as would be a proposal to break up labor organizations having monopolistic power. It is highly controversial, and, even if it could, it would only accomplish the purpose, for which the bill attached to this report is recommended, after a considerable lapse of time.

(e) Government seizure of plants and draft of workers

Plant seizure was adopted as a wartime measure, while drafting of workers was at one time recommended by the President only as a temporary measure. Plant seizure has not been very effective even as a wartime measure since the end of hostilities, and it points toward totalitarianism. Drafting workers has never been suggested as a potential permanent solution of this problem.

(f) Application of the antitrust laws

It has been suggested that these be applied to prohibit simultaneous strikes against, or lock-outs by, two or more employers. In view of the encouragement given over a long period of years to combinations between labor organizations and such activities as industry-wide bargaining, it is believed that this remedy, while it might be effective, would represent too revolutionary a change.

A bill to protect the public from the use of monopolistic power as a weapon in labor disputes

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. (a) Every person who shall, individually or in combination or conspiracy with any other person or persons, so monopolize the labor of human beings, or otherwise induce them to refrain from working, as to prevent the supply in or for commerce of a commodity or service to such an extent that severe hardship is or will be inflicted on the public, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or by both said punishments in the discretion of the court.

(b) With regard to a particular commodity or service, "the public" means the persons who have an interest in the supply in or for commerce of such commodity or service, other than an interest in producing or furnishing it or in being employed to produce or furnish it.

(c) "Commerce" means trade or commerce among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the

United States and any State or Territory, or between any insular possessions or other places under the jurisdiction of the United States, or between any such possession or place and any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States.

(d) The words "person" or "persons" shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the Territories, the laws of any State or the laws of any foreign country.

SEC. 2. (a) The several district courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 1 and it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violators. Such proceedings may be by way of petition setting forth the case and praying that such violations may be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the party complained of shall have been duly notified of such petition the court shall proceed as soon as may be to the hearing and determination of the case; and pending such petition and before final decree, the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order as shall be deemed just in the premises.

(b) Where it clearly appears necessary in order to protect the public from severe hardship, the final order of the court enjoining or otherwise prohibiting such violations, or any temporary restraining order issued by the court pursuant to this section, may direct employees engaged in producing or furnishing such commodity or service in or for commerce to return to their posts of duty within a reasonable time to be specified therein, which reasonable time shall be not less than 3 days after the signing of said order. Any employee who willfully fails to return to work within the time so specified or who shall, after the time so specified and while such direction is still in effect, engage in any strike, slow-down or other concerted interruption of operations, shall not thereafter be regarded as an employee of his employer for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act or the Railway Labor Act, as amended, unless he is subsequently reemployed by his employer.

(c) Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under this section 2 may be pending that the ends of justice require that other parties shall be brought before the court, the court may permit them to intervene and become parties or may cause them to be summoned whether they reside in the district where the court is held or not; and subpenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

(d) The court making any final order hereunder shall retain jurisdiction of the cause for the purpose of revising it from time to time as shall be deemed just in the premises upon application of any party thereto.

(e) The power and jurisdiction provided for in this section shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, or by the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, one of the great addresses made in the late years on the general subject of the foreign relations of the United States and world affairs was delivered before the Cleveland Foreign Affairs Forum, at Cleveland, Ohio, on Saturday night last, by the distinguished President pro tempore of this body. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Cleveland Forum upon the powerful program it has produced from all quarters of the globe in a striking exchange of international opinion. This process of reciprocal candor is one of the major forces which can beat swords into plowshares on the anvils of mutual understanding and good will. Indeed, this is the supreme potentiality of the organized United Nations. War will remain at a heavy discount so long as international controversy stays in the council chamber and adversaries talk things out instead of shooting them out.

It was my good fortune to coin a phrase at the United Nations San Francisco Conference in 1945 which seems to survive. I prophesied that the General Assembly would become the town meeting of the world. In 1 year it has become exactly that. So long as the town meeting meets, reason is calculated to outweigh force. So long as this safety valve works, the world's boilers are not calculated to explode.

Peace with justice is the dearest aspiration at every hearthstone in the world. Here in your town meeting the voices of global hope have joined in this universal prayer. The voice of our own America must rise above them all, not only because our people deeply share this dedication, but particularly because time and events have given us the tremendous responsibility of a spiritual leadership which most of the world is eager to have us grasp and which we would desert at our own peril.

Tonight, according to your program, the United States replies to the world. So far as my little part in this symposium is concerned, this is too large an order to be filled in 30 minutes. Further, I must make it plain that I am not in a position to reply for the United States because the Constitution confides that prerogative exclusively to the President. The Senate merely advises and consents. Sometimes it doesn't even do that.

Fortunately, the Secretary of State is here to speak for the President. But, unfortunately, he is shortly leaving the public service by resignation. I say this with deep regret. Secretary Byrnes has been an able, efficient, courageous Secretary of State in the finest American tradition. He has relentlessly defended American ideals in crises where they required defense. He has made a great contribution to the welfare of this country and to the peace of the world. I salute him with affection and profound respect; and I hail him as a very great American.

General Marshall, who succeeds him, brings to his task a stout heart, a clear head, and a rich experience. He has always enjoyed the total confidence of Congress and of all his military and civilian colleagues at home and abroad. I wish him well in his great responsibility.

As a junior partner I have worked with Secretary Byrnes on what is called a "bipartisan foreign policy" in the United Nations and in planning European peace. It would be more significant to say we have sought a united American foreign policy so that, despite some inevitable dissidence at home, America could enjoy abroad the enhanced authority of a substantially united front. I dare to believe that, despite some distressing domestic interludes, it has borne rich fruits. In any event, partisan politics, for most of us, stopped at the water's edge. I hope they stay stopped—for the sake of America—regardless of what party is in power. This does not mean that we cannot have earnest, honest, even vehement domestic differences of opinion on foreign policy. It is no curb on free opinion or free speech. But it does mean that they should not root themselves in partisanship. We should ever strive to hammer out a permanent American foreign policy, in basic essentials, which serves all America and deserves the approval of all American-minded parties at all times.

The State Department and the Foreign Service themselves require broad-gaged reorganization to keep pace with America's unavoidable world responsibilities, and particularly to develop more long-range planning so that there need be less catch-as-catch-can improvisation and expediency. Our top representative in the United Nations should be a permanent Under Secretary of State.

But let me get back to that reply to the world. I assume the world chiefly wants to know whether America will persist in its attitudes toward collective peace and security. I cannot answer for others. I will answer for myself.

I believe the United States, in enlightened self-interest, will do everything within its power to sustain organized international defense against aggression; to promote democracy and human rights and fundamental freedoms; and, through international cooperation, to seek peace with justice in a free world of free men.

We plot no conquests. We shall neither condone nor appease the conquests of others. We ask nothing for ourselves except reciprocal fair play. The extent to which it develops will determine our final course. We are not interested in unity at any price. We shall aspire to standards which will rally others to match our zeals. We offer friendship to all. Our reply to the world is a challenge to match us in good works.

Mr. Chairman, these American attitudes will persist because they stem from reason and reality, and we are a practical people. We should remind ourselves, as well as our neighbors, from time to time, of certain facts in this connection lest we suffer in steadfastness what we lose in recollection.

Prior to December 1941 we were conscientiously divided, along lines of deep conviction, regarding our proper role in a world-at-war just as we were similarly divided 20 years before regarding our proper role in a world-at-peace. Pearl Harbor ended that debate. It brought a united country to far-flung battle lines where we swiftly mobilized the greatest fighting resources of all time. It did more. It released an evolution which drove most of us to the irresistible conclusion that world peace is indivisible. We learned that the oceans are no longer moats around our ramports. We learned that mass destruction is a progressive science which defies both time and space and reduces human flesh and blood to cruel impotence. Then we constributed the crowning proof ourselves. In the climax of this tragedy we ourselves devised the atom bomb—an appalling tribute to our illimitable genius—an equally appalling prophecy of civilization's suicide unless World War Three is stopped before it starts. This produced the inevitable conviction that the jungle code of war must be repealed for keeps.

Before the horrors of the conflict had even reached their maximum we brought our major allies together at Dumbarton Oaks to chart the most essential victory of all—a victory over war itself. Oh, yes, we had said these same things once before and they had turned to ashes on our lips. But there is no comparison in the provocation which was our immediate spur. From Dumbarton Oaks we went to San Francisco and at the symbolic Golden Gate the Charter of the United Nations was unanimously approved. From San

Francisco we went to Washington and the Senate spectacularly ratified the Charter with but two dissenting votes. We accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. From Washington we went to London and organized the first town meeting of the world. From London we came back to New York, where, in response to congressional invitation the United Nations launched its gigantic adventure on a site in the United States, which thus gives us the permanent peace capital of the world.

This record cannot be misread at home or abroad. We have embraced the United Nations as the heart and core of united, unpartisan American foreign policy. We shall be faithful to the letter and the spirit of these obligations. In my view, this will be true no matter what administration sits in Washington, and it will remain true to whatever extent the United Nations themselves are faithful to our common pledge. That, in general, Mr. Chairman, would be my over-all reply to the world.

But I make the reply with no illusions that now all's well. The United Nations is neither an automatic nor a perfect instrument. Like any other human institution, it will make mistakes. It must live and learn. It must grow from strength to strength. It must earn the ever-expanding confidence and fidelity of people everywhere. It must deserve to survive.

Meanwhile it is definitely beset by hazards. For example, the necessity for unanimity among the Five Great Powers is both strength and weakness to its arm. Strength, because these Great Powers when united are invincible. Weakness, because the excessive use of the veto, particularly in respect to the pacific settlement of disputes, can reduce the whole system to a mockery. It is much too early to talk about major surgery on the Charter itself. But I hope all the Great Powers will voluntarily join in a new procedural interpretation of the Charter to exempt all phases of pacific settlements from what, in such instances, makes of the veto a stultifying checkmate. I pose this as a test of international good faith.

There is another hazard. The organization is beset by fiscal dangers. In the enthusiastic eagerness with which it expands its nobly meditated efforts through specialized agencies, each with its own uncoordinated autonomy, it threatens accumulating, annual assessments which a majority of its member nations soon may be unable to fairly share. In such event, either the burden is concentrated on a few large states or the smaller states drop out. In the former case, the sovereign equality of member states will disappear. In the latter case, the United Nations will become a rich man's club and its greatest genius—universality of membership—will disappear. Stern fiscal control is indispensable—not penury but prudence.

But, Mr. Chairman, we must not be impatient. It took 5 years to take the world apart. It would not be surprising if it took at least that long to put it together again. The remarkable thing is that the United Nations has done so well so soon. Its Security Council has already peacefully tempered many critical situations which, in the absence of its mediation, invited serious implications. The recent dispatch of a committee of inquiry to the Greek border is the latest striking case in point. Meanwhile, its General Assembly has already initiated powerful movements for the common good—incomparably the greatest of which is an approach to mutual disarmament.

These things can be the beginnings of the greatest benediction of all time. They are worth every effort which men of good will can muster. And let's always remember this: The more imponderable the world's frictions may become, the greater the need to persevere in strengthening this one and only available agent of organized emancipation.

And this: If, one day, some aggressor leaves the United Nations, in order to be free of its restraints, the rest of the world has ready-made at hand the well-geared machinery for another, and immediate, grand alliance, swiftly and overwhelmingly to confront the offender. Would-be international assassins, if ever such there be, will not lightly chance such condign disaster.

I spoke of disarmament. No other peace factor is of such vitality; and none could better typify America's attitude toward peace and the world. We are prepared to disarm (1) to whatever extent other powers are dependably ready to make comparable, permanent, and effective renunciations; or (2) in whatever degree the United Nations and its cooperative military resources prove hereafter to offer a reliable substitute. It is our dearest dream. But we shall not dream ourselves into a nightmare. We shall not disarm alone. We shall not trust to the persuasion of our example. We tried that once before. We shall take no sweetness and light for granted in a world where there is still too much iron curtain. We shall not trust alone to fickle words. Too many words at Yalta and at Potsdam have been distorted out of all pretense of integrity. We shall not ignore reality. We do not intend to be at anybody's mercy; nor do we intend to emasculate our authority with those who may still think in terms of force. But we will joyfully match the utmost limits of mutual disarmament to which other Titans will dependably agree, if there be disciplines which guarantee against bad faith; and we will speed the day when such a boon shall deal war its deadliest blow. I repeat, however, that this cannot happen either in ambush or on a one-way street.

Our American proposals regarding atomic bombs illustrate my point. With an investment of $3,000,000,000 in this supreme destroyer of all time, and with a monopoly upon its sinister secret for some years to come, we offer not only to abandon our dominant advantage but also to join in outlawing its destructive use by anybody, any time, anywhere on earth. And what is our price? Just this—an effective system of continuous inspection and control which makes certain that no international brigand shall hereafter break faith with us and with the world. The price is simply protection against treachery. But it is a fixed price, Mr. Chairman, and the price must be paid. We ask nothing for ourselves. We ask everything for peace. I submit, sir, that never had there been a comparable example of national good will, nor one so thrillingly dramatizing the purpose of a great people to live and let live on a peaceful earth, if we are allowed to do so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I briefly touch upon another phase. The economic factors of the peace are of vital interest to the world—and us. Peace and economics are inseparably kin. Unfortunately this area of action is not so clear because the premises themselves are mixed in a clash of economic ideologies. But we shall not draw back from our essential responsibilities. For example, I am sure Congress will make a liberal relief appropriation—to be administered under American auspices in consultation with the United Nations—for the stricken postwar areas which are still war casualties, even though we never again contribute 72 percent of an international fund, as in UNRRA, which can be controlled and even exploited by others. This is said without prejudice to the great and humane achievements of UNRRA despite its handicaps. Again, reasonable rehabilitation credits are unavoidable if democratic stabilities are to be restored before it is too late. By way of another example, I believe we shall continue the device of reciprocal trade agreements, in one form or another, to release and expand mutual trade—an even greater need for us than for any other country because our vastly expanded national economy and employment require it. Whether this can continue on its present multilateral basis will depend somewhat upon the type of competition we confront from foreign state monopolies and from a growing habit abroad of making bilateral agreements for political as well as economic purposes. These habits could force us into defensive tactics which we would not voluntarily embrace. We shall fit our procedures to the necessities which are forced upon us. Certainly we intend to keep our own American industry and agriculture in sound, domestic health, and to protect our system of free enterprise. Anything less would be a calamity not only for us but for the Western World. But sane, healthy, mutual trade expansion is best for all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, my time runs out though I have touched only the outer rim of our mutual problems with the world. I conclude with a few swift overtones.

We have finished five treaties with ex-enemy European states. They passed in review before a peace conference of 21 nations in Paris. We are entitled to say that this broad consultation of all our battle allies was an achievement primarily due to American insistence. Here, again, is an unmistakable cue to our international disposition ever to recognize the rights of little states as well as big. Here also is a cue to what seems to be our improved relations with the Soviet Unions—as a result, I believe, of our present rugged policy of firm but friendly candor which I hope has permanently established the American doctrine that there are deadlines in our ideals from which we shall never again retreat. This is not truculence; it is the power of brave and naked truth. When we left Paris in September the Council of Foreign Ministers was deadlocked on more than 40 issues. When we left New York in December they were all amicably resolved. These five treaties are far from satisfactory in many aspects. But they bear no remote resemblance to the greater dissatisfactions which we have prevented, and they are a great advance toward reconstruction in a peaceful world.

Now we turn, after many weary months of urging, to peace plans for Austria and Germany. At long last, we shall come to grips with the heart of the European problem. All occupying powers should recognize the independence of Austria and withdraw their troops. In Germany, retarded by Russian and French refusals to fulfill the Potsdam requirement that the four zones of German occupation should operate as an economic unit, the German situation has suffered such economic deterioration as to threaten chaos and disaster. We have partially met this worsening crisis by unifying the American and British zones—with an invitation to the French and Russians to join us at their option. This is a hopeful pattern. Meanwhile the business of renewed, decentralized political autonomy—looking toward federated states which shall be the masters and not the servants of a new Berlin—makes encouraging progress in the American zone. But the pressing need is a plan for total peace—a plan which omits no possible precautions against recurrent Hitlerism, yet which offers some reward other than eternal degredation to new German states when they faithfully strive toward democratic self-redemption. The important thing for the world to know is that we intend to remain in occupation until this job is done. It is part of the war, if we are to preserve our victory.

Meanwhile, we face the intimate necessity of refreshing our indispensable pan-American solidarity. This comes close to home. It is historically basic in American foreign policy; and nothing has happened to lessen the importance of these good neighborly contacts. Quite the contrary. At San Francisco, 20 Latin-American Republics were unwilling to proceed with the United Nations Charter

until the validity of our historic regional arrangements were officially tied into the United Nations plan. This was specifically done in chapter VIII of the Charter. Thereupon, the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, as part of the agreed plan, promised "to invite the other American Republics to undertake in the near future the negotiation of a treaty which, as provided for in the Act of Chapultepec itself, would be consistent with the Charter of world organization and would support and strengthen that organization, while at the same time advancing the development of the historic system of inter-American cooperation."

That was on May 15, 1945. This is January 11, 1947. "In the near future" has not yet arrived. The Secretary said of the proposed conference that "it would be another important step in carrying forward the good-neighbor policy." If he was right—and I think he was—this long failure to hold the conference has had the opposite effect. I am well aware of the reasons for delay. I entirely sympathize with the anxiety to purge the Americas of their last vestige of nazism. But I think that, under a dozen solemn pan-American treaties to which we are a party, this is a multilateral decision which should always be made by all of us jointly and not influenced or dictated by us alone. In some aspects it can be said that we have been proceeding jointly. But I think it is past time to hold the Pan-American conference which we promised in 1945, and there to formally renew the joint New World authority which is the genius of our New World unity. There is too much evidence that we are drifting apart—and that a Communistic upsurge is moving in. We face no greater need than to restore the warmth of New World unity which reached an all-time high at San Francisco.

I devote a few parting sentences to the Far East, where General MacArthur is doing so magnificent a job in Tokyo that our daily headlines scarcely remind us that we are successfully liquidating the greatest single postwar task which fell to our primary responsibility, and where the young Philippine Republic arises as a monument, not only to its own vigorous self-development but also to our steadfast, anti-imperialistic American liberalism, which defies successful libel, either at home or abroad. But it is particularly China to which I dedicate this paragraph.

Here lies a vast and friendly republic, rich in wisdom, equally rich in its democratic promise for tomorrow, and historically fixed in the orbit of our good will. Since 1911, when Dr. Sun Yat-sen gave China her new vision, she has been struggling, against bitter odds, toward the light of a new day. While recognizing the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek, we have—through a year's mission headed by our distinguished General Marshall—been impartially urging that it produce unity with a rival armed party—the Chinese Communists. Under the determined leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, a national assembly has just produced a new constitution and the government has been reorganized with a coalition of non-Communist parties. We can hope that this Nanking charter, with its first great national election promised before next Christmas, will weld together a strong and competent China. It is my own view that our own far-eastern policy might well now shift its emphasis. While still recommending unity, it might well encourage those who have so heroically set their feet upon this road, and discourage those who make the road precarious. Our marines, having finished their task, are coming home. But there will never be a minute when China's destiny is not of acute concern to the United States and to a healthy world.

My fellow citizens, we face a new year in world affairs, with many gnawing problems still unsolved all round this turbulent globe. I have touched only a few which have special significance in respect to the topic of the evening. Peace is more difficult to win than was the war. Even we ourselves cannot yet claim convalescence. It is not strange if other lands, torn asunder by physical destruction, desperately rocked by disintegration, perhaps still ridden with alien troops and unwelcome overlords, perhaps unable to reerect their family shrines, reunite their families or even find decent subsistence for their families, perhaps unable to resist the subversive invasion of alien tyranny and terrorism—it is not strange if other lands are prey to a restlessness which stalks the earth and offers sanctuary to creeds of deliberate chaos and confusion. There is nothing but peril—for the United States of America—in neglecting our vigilant attention to these ugly facts. On the other hand, we have a right to clear ourselves with some very real encouragements. The greatest of these—and I end as I began—is the luminous fact that 55 nations are committed by solemn covenant to help each other keep the peace, to substitute law for force, and to strive toward the uplift and defense of human rights and justice and fundamental freedoms. The world has far to go before this pledge is a reliable reality. But the United Nations has raised this standard to which men of good will in every clime and under every flag can repair, and it has already sped us on this God-blessed way. America will do her full part.

CREATION OF WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE BYRNES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there also be printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, in Cleveland, Ohio on the same occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This coming of age anniversary of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs is of more than usual significance. Under the leadership of President Emeny of the Council, the community of Cleveland has come to regard world problems not as the affairs of far-distant countries, but as the affairs of the world of which the community of Cleveland is a part.

Twice in our generation the communities of America have learned that they are very much a part of the world when the world is at war. If we are to prevent war and build enduring peace, every community in America must realize that it is very much a part of the world when the world is at peace.

Our first task is to liquidate the war. We cannot think constructively about the building of lasting peace and about rising standards of life until we give the peoples of this world a chance to live again under conditions of peace. We cannot deal with the problems of a convalescing world until we get the patient off the operating table.

That is why President Truman and I at Potsdam 2 months after VE-day proposed to set up the Council of Foreign Ministers to start work upon the peace treaties as quickly as possible, wherever possible.

That is why we have persistently urged since last winter that deputies should be appointed to begin work upon the German and Austrian treaties.

BARS RETREAT TO ISOLATION

After every great war the victorious Allies have found it difficult to adjust their differences in the making the peace. At the very outset grave differences between the Allies did arise in the work of the Council of Foreign Ministers. But we refused to abandon the principles for which our country stands. And we served notice that we would not retreat to a policy of isolation.

We made it clear that, as anxious as we were to reduce the burden of occupation, America would not evade her responsibility. And we also made it clear that as long as our allies maintained troops in Germany and Austria, the United States would maintain its troops in those countries.

We were determined to do our part to bring peace to a war-weary world and we have not sought any excuse, however plausible, for shirking our responsibilities.

The treaties with Italy and the ex-satellite states, as they emerged from months of protracted negotiation and debate, are not perfect. But they are as good as we can hope to get by general agreement now or within a reasonable length of time.

The treaties mark a milestone on the return to conditions of peace. The fact that the Allies have been able to agree upon these five treaties does give hope that they will soon be able to agree upon a treaty with Austria. That will make possible the removal of occupation troops from all European countries except Germany, and will give to millions of people relief from the burdens of occupying armies.

FAVORABLE CONDITIONS SEEN

Agreement upon these treaties gives assurance, too, that the discussions of the German settlement will start under much more favorable conditions than seemed possible until last month.

During the year or more that these treaties were under discussion it was inevitable that the differences between the Allies should be emphasized, and at times exaggerated. On the other hand, during the war some of these differences were minimized and overlooked. But peace cannot be made by ignoring very real and basic differences and by pretending that they do not exist.

By recognizing and bringing out into the open our differences and honestly seeking means of reconciling them we have advanced and not retarded the cause of peace.

The discussions and debates in the Council of Foreign Ministers and in the Security Council during the past year caused a better understanding of our problems and contributed much to the substantial progress made at the recent assembly of the United Nations.

But we would never have made the progress that we did during the last year if the American people had not been united on a foreign policy.

For the past year our foreign policy has not been the policy of a political party, it has been the policy of the United States.

VANDENBERG'S HELP PRAISED

And I am sure my Democratic friend, Senator CONNALLY, would join me in saying that our bipartisan foreign policy was made possible only by the wholehearted and intelligent cooperation of my Republican friend, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG.

I would issue a word of caution against excessive optimism and excessive pessimism.

We must not let ourselves believe that peace can be made secure by any one treaty or series of treaties, or by any one resolution or series of resolutions. And we must not let ourselves believe that the struggle for peace is hopeless, because we cannot at once find ways and means of reconciling all our differences.

Nations, like individuals, differ as to what is right and just, and clashing appeals to reason may in the long run do more to avert a clash of arms than a lot of pious resolutions which conceal honest and serious disagreements.

Never before have the differences between nations been brought out into the open and so frankly discussed in public as they have during the past year in the Council of Foreign Ministers, the Security Council, and the General Assembly.

Of course, it is true that public discussion emphasizes differences. But without such public discussion the people of the world who want peace would not know and understand the differences which arise between nations and which threaten the peace.

Wars may start not because the people want war but because they want things that other people possess and will not give up without a fight. Full and frank discussion of such situations may avert armed conflict.

A NEVER-ENDING STRUGGLE

The struggle for peace is the struggle for law and justice. It is a never-ending struggle. Law and justice can be developed and applied only through living institutions capable of life and growth. And these institutions must be backed by sufficient force to protect nations which abide by the law against nations which violate the law.

If we are going to build a regime of law among nations, we must struggle to create a world in which no nation can arbitrarily impose its will upon any other nation. Neither the United States nor any other state should have the power to dominate the world.

The present power relationships of the great states preclude the domination of the world by any one of them. Those power relationships cannot be substantially altered by the unilateral action of any one state without profoundly disturbing the whole structure of the United Nations.

Therefore, if we are going to do our part to maintain peace under law, we must maintain, in relation to other states, the military strength necessary to discharge our obligations.

Force does not make right, but we must realize that in this imperfect world power as well as reason does affect international decisions.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY CITED

The great states are given special responsibility under the Charter because they have the military strength to maintain peace if they have the will to maintain peace. Their strength in relation to one another is such that no one of them can safely break the peace if the others stand united in defense of the Charter.

We have joined with our allies in the United Nations to put an end to war. We have covenanted not to use force except in defense of law. We shall keep that covenant.

As a great power and as a permanent member of the Security Council, we have a responsibility, veto or no veto, to see that other states do not use force except in defense of law. We must discharge that responsibility.

And we must realize that unless the great powers are not only prepared to observe the law but are prepared to act in defense of the law the United Nations cannot prevent war.

In a world in which people do differ as to what is right and wrong, we must strive to work out definite standards of conduct which all can accept. We must develop and build through the years a common law of nations.

History informs us that individuals abandoned private wars and gave up their arms only as they were protected by the common law of their tribes and their nations. So I believe that in the long run international peace depends upon our ability to develop a common law of nations which all nations can accept and which no nation can violate with impunity.

In the past, international law has concerned itself too much with the rules of war and too little with the rules of peace. I am more interested in ways and means to prevent war than in ways and means to conduct war.

COMMON LAW FOR ALL ASKED

Unless we are able to develop a common law of nations which provides definite and agreed standards of conduct such as those which govern decisions within the competence of the International Court of Justice and such as those which we hope may be agreed upon for the control of atomic energy, international problems between sovereign states must be worked out by agreement between sovereign states.

The United States has taken the lead in proposing the control and the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction under agreed rules of law.

These rules of law must carry clear and adequate safeguards to protect complying states from the hazards of violations and evasions. They must be sufficiently definite and explicit to prevent a state that violates the law from obstructing the prompt and effective enforcement of the law.

If a nation by solemn treaty agrees to a plan for the control of atomic weapons and agrees that a violation of that treaty shall be punished, it is difficult for me to understand why that nation cannot agree to waive the right to exercise the veto power should it be charged with violating its treaty obligation.

In 1821, while a Member of the House, I advocated that the President call a conference for the limitation of naval armaments.

Later the President did call such a conference. What happened thereafter influences my thinking today. While America scrapped battleships, Japan scrapped blueprints. America will not again make that mistake.

INSISTS AGREEMENTS BE KEPT

We have urged a general limitation of armaments, but we are not going to disarm while others remain armed. And we should make certain that all governments live up to their agreements to disarm.

We have urged priority for the control of atomic weapons because they are the most destructive of all weapons; because we have been at work on the proposal for more than 6 months; and because it presents concretely the issue of international inspection and control. We are convinced that if there can be agreement on that subject, there can be agreement on the control of other major weapons and a general reduction of armaments.

But international law in a friendly, peaceful world must rest upon something more than mere rules, something more than force and something more than fear. It must be made to rest upon the growth of a common fellowship, common interests, and common ideas among the peoples of this earth.

It was our fostering of a common fellowship that gave vitality to the good-neighbor policy in the Americas. It was a common fellowship which made the Act of Chapultepec possible.

We are eager to proceed with a negotiation of a mutual assistance treaty in accordance with the Act of Chapultepec at the projected Rio de Janeiro conference. But we do not wish to proceed without Argentina, and neither our Ambassador nor any official of the State Department is of the opinion that Argentina has yet complied with the commitments which she as well as the other American republics at Chapultepec agreed to carry out.

HOPES ARGENTINA WILL COMPLY

It is our earnest hope that before long there will be such reasonable and substantial compliance by Argentina with its obligations, that the American Republics, after consultation, will convene the Rio conference.

A common fellowship does not mean that nations must in all respects think alike or live alike. Inevitably, we will differ. But nations like individuals must respect and tolerate one another's differences.

Peace in this interdependent world must be something more than a truce between nations. To have peace, nations must learn to live and work together for their common good. We live in one world. The health of the body politic like the health of the human body depends upon the health of all its members.

We cannot whole-heartedly abandon the policy of political isolation unless we abandon the policy of economic isolation. We are not likely to be successful in our efforts to cooperate to prevent war, unless we are willing to cooperate to maintain freedom and well-being in a world at peace.

We must learn to cooperate so that the people of each country may exchange the products of their country easily and fairly with the people of other countries.

Although our general long-run purpose is to help raise the living standard, the immediate problem during the last 2 years in some areas has been to maintain life itself.

DISTRESS ABROAD STRESSED

Economic distress, starvation, and disease breed political unrest, tyranny, and agression. If we are sincere in our efforts to maintain peace, we must do our part to assist in the elimination of conditions which breed aggression and war.

If we want people to value freedom and respect law we must at least give them a fair chance to feed, clothe, and shelter themselves and their families.

The war has devastated many countries and disrupted their economics. UNRRA has helped these countries through their most critical period. Its authority is terminated but some countries through no fault of their own will require further relief to get upon their feet. And this we must not deny them.

Outright relief by us is necessary in some countries. But the countries in need and the extent of the need can be determined by the United States just as well as it could be determined by a committee composed of representatives of other governments.

A permanent place on the relief rolls is not the desire of those self-respecting nations which have fought for their freedom. But much of their productive capacity has been destroyed, and they have no working capital in the form of foreign exchange to start the flow of needed raw materials.

They do need loans to secure the raw materials, capital equipment, and tools necessary to rebuild and resume their ability to produce. The work of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and our own Export-Import Bank must continue to have our wholehearted support.

SCIENTIFIC AIDS EMPHASIZED

Despite the ravages and destruction of the war, the advance of science makes it possible for us and other nations to preserve and increase our living standards if we work together with other nations to produce what we and other nations want and need.

We must learn that prosperity like freedom must be shared, not on the basis of handouts, but on the basis of fair and honest exchange of the products of the labor of free men and free women.

We believe that there should be no unnecessary barriers to the free exchange of ideas and information among nations. But it is unrealistic to expect to have trade in ideas if we are unwilling to have trade in goods.

We must do our part to break down the artificial barriers to trade and commerce among nations. We must pursue vigorously our reciprocal trade policies which are designed to expand American trade and world trade because the world cannot buy from us if we are not willing to buy from the world.

We must pursue vigorously our proposed charter for the establishment of an international trade organization. That charter is designed to avoid economic warfare between nations and to insure equality of commercial opportunity for all nations, both large and small. We must avoid economic blocs if we wish to avoid political blocs.

After every great war there comes a period of disillusionment. Those who fight together expect too much from one another and are inclined to give too little to one another.

They forget that victory in war can only give the opportunity which would otherwise be denied, to live and work for the fruits of peace and freedom.

ADMITS DISCOURAGEMENTS

I admit that during the past year there were times when I was deeply discouraged. Our repeated efforts to achieve cooperation in a peaceful world seemed to be meeting only with constant rebuff. But we persisted in our efforts with patience and with firmness.

Today I am happy to say that I am more confident than at any time since VJ-day that we can achieve a just peace by cooperative effort if we persist "with firmness in the right as God gives us the power to see the right."

We have demonstrated our capacity in war. We must demonstrate our capacity in peace. If we do, our children and the children of men everywhere can inherit a peaceful world of expanding freedom and increased well-being.

To that goal freedom's past inspires us and freedom's future calls us.

LABOR COURTS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the February issue of the American magazine contains an able discussion of the proposal for labor courts as supported by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I ask unanimous consent to have it reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT LABOR COURTS?

(By United States Senator HOMER FERGUSON)

Four times within the past year our Nation has come perilously close to complete paralysis because certain of our industrial and labor captains could not settle their disputes peaceably.

During the steel strike, during the rail strike, and during two different coal strikes 140,000,000 Americans stood by helplessly as our magnificent industrial system began grinding to a stop.

The last coal strike marks the eighth time in 5 years that a private citizen has threatened to deprive his Nation of its major source of industrial power. During each of these eight times at least 25,000,000 American workers, aside from miners, have faced the prospect of unemployment.

Even more discouraging, we have seen, during these seemingly innumerable industrial crises, the spectacle of the President of our Nation trying to intervene to bring peace, only to be defied or abused for his efforts. As far as industrial disputes are concerned we are in a state of near-anarchy. Our Government, in this area, has lost its power to govern.

This situation has become intolerable. We cannot afford a national paralysis every few months, simply because labor and industrial managers cannot agree on a contract, or on the interpretation of one made by them.

As a former judge, it does not make sense to me that modern-day America should have to endure public brawling, even if the brawling is done by sovereign giants of capital and labor.

Labor disputes should be settled where all our other domestic disputes are settled—in court. When two private citizens, a landlord and a tenant, for example, fall into disagreement over the terms of a lease, they are not permitted to fight it out in the public streets. If they did, they would be jailed for disturbing the peace or for disorderly conduct. Instead, they take their problem to court. And when the judge pronounces the decision they abide by it. Justice has spoken.

Why are labor-management disputes any different from tenant-landlord disputes except that the issues are bigger, more people are involved, and the economic security of the Nation is endangered?

Basically, they are the same. The difference is in the handling of the issues. Industrial disputes are still settled on the basis of economic power. Which side can outstrangle the other in a showdown? And nowadays these strangle holds cover such wide areas that the public's neck is usually included.

The time has come to settle these disputes on the basis of justice instead of on the basis of strangle holds.

I think we should subject industrial disputes, along with all other disputes, to the legal discipline of a civilized society.

After talking with representatives of both labor and management and with representatives of both major political parties I have worked out a plan to set up a system of American labor courts.

These courts would parallel our regular Federal courts, and would judge every dispute on the basis of justice. All labor contracts affecting interstate commerce would be filed with these courts, and whenever disagreements arose concerning the terms set down the judges would help the parties arrive at a settlement.

If they failed to arrive at such a settlement the court would hold public hearing as in any other case, and then make a decision which would be binding on all parties to the contract. Furthermore, where basic industries or interstate public utilities were involved, and the parties were unable to reach an agreement on a contract to start with, the courts would resolve the matter and the decisions of the court would be final.

This amounts to compulsory arbitration in these basic industries. I see no other remedy when the Nation is faced with a monopoly, either of labor or of management, which can paralyze the industrial life of the country.

Such drastic penalties would be available to ensure enforcement that neither party would seriously consider defying the labor courts, just as today contestants never consider defying the decisions of any of our other courts.

I believe that such a system of labor courts offers a fair, sane, and sensible solution to one of the two big problems facing the Nation today: Recurrent industrial crises.

The other problem is to find a solution to the recurrent wars that afflict the world in which we live. When you consider it, the two problems are almost identical.

Wars, the nations of the world have decided, have become too expensive to tolerate any longer. The nations are moving now at Lake Success to set up a structure to outlaw wars. They have created the United Nations and the International Court of Justice. And they have created a forum and are building the machinery with which to solve future international issues on the basis of justice rather than on the slugging power of the nations involved.

The nations are making progress, and I hope and pray that they succeed. If they do, the world, under justice, can move on to peace and prosperity for all.

It took two horrible wars to convince the world that wars are outdated and must be outlawed. Similarly, it took the recent series of catastrophic strikes to convince the American public that strikes in basic industries are as outdated as wars, and must somehow be outlawed.

Strikes, like wars, have become too expensive. And just as innocent civilians are now the main victims of wars, they are the main victims of strikes.

Most people will grant that strikes once had their proper role in our economy, but that time is rapidly passing. Today, our economy is so intermeshed, and both unions and industries have grown so big, that a single strike can paralyze the Nation.

A strike in the steel industry (or a lockout by management) not only affects the steel workers and their families, but it also affects every one of the literally thousands of industries that use steel in their products, whether automobiles, toy trains, or fence posts.

And it no longer takes a big strike to paralyze a large section of our Nation. The more than 7,000,000 residents of New York City, for example, found that a strike of a mere 6,000 tugboat operators could, and did, bring them to their knees. They were put under virtual martial law as churches, schools, theaters, and business houses were instructed to close.

Or again, when truck drivers entering their city with food supplies went on strike, they were deprived of fresh vegetables, meats, fruits, and medicines. The trucking tie-up afflicted virtually every shop and business in the city and caused losses of business runnng literally into billions of dollars. Yet the dispute was between the trucks' drivers and owners.

We do not have to decide that either union leaders or industrialists are to "blame" for the series of strikes we have had to suffer in order to decide that we need a forum and machinery with which to settle labor disputes.

The blame rests on us as a whole for allowing unions and industries to exist in our midst as sovereign powers.

Given such sovereignty and such conflicting interests, strikes probably are inevitable, just as wars are inevitable when there are no laws that nations abide by. Both capital and labor want to get all they can, and, lacking restraints, will do so.

If recently labor has been more to blame than capital, it is because labor has come up to, if not surpassed, capital in the economic power it can wield in a show-down. For years capital was ruthless and domineering. It formed monopolies and it exploited labor. Since 1929, however, labor has been on the ascendant, and now has its own monopolies and its own domineering attitude among some of its leaders. It, too, has its lobbies, and powerful ones, in Washington.

Lacking any standard for judging issues except force, labor has become increasingly aggressive. Rival unions raid one another, and their leaders often compete with one another to see which can force the largest concessions from management. Every aggressive union leader who demonstrates that he can "get away with" a crippling strike which forces new concessions from management sets a precedent that rival leaders feel they must imitate, or perish. Some leaders demonstrate admirable restraint and awareness of their new responsibilities, but some do not.

I have heard it argued by those who oppose any change in the present "voluntary" system of handling strikes that everything will work out all right once we have an "aroused public interest." Frankly, I don't think that an aroused public interest fazes the Petrillos or the Bridgeses in the least.

Public opinion is aroused. In fact, it is close to the boiling point. Opinion is so aroused that it may force through punitive laws that may throttle labor so completely that capital will again have the upper hand.

But that is not the solution. We would start building toward the same economic war all over again. What we need is a sane program, fair to both sides, that will still give the long-suffering public a break, and let the country get on with its reconversion.

Lately I've been hearing a great many proposals to curb labor by prohibiting this or that. I hear, for example:

"Pass a law forbidding monopoly in labor."

"Pass a law prohibiting the closed shop."

"Pass a law outlawing secondary boycotts."

"Pass a law prohibiting coercion of individual workers by violence through mass picketing."

Some of these have merit, but if passed there would be no machinery with which to carry them out. Passing such laws will not get at the basic problem, which is to provide the machinery and a forum where disputes can be settled decisively short of conflict.

Such a machinery is available in the labor courts which I suggest.

The appealing thing about a court system, to me, is that it is simple, clear-cut, understandable—and, most of all, fair. It is neither antilabor nor antimanagement, but rather is pro-everybody. Our courts have long been admired as symbols of impartial justice, and I believe that the labor courts would soon likewise become such symbols.

The labor-court system, incidentally, has been tried in such countries as Australia, New Zealand, and France, and has worked out very well for all concerned.

Here, briefly, is how the labor-court system might work: There would be district labor courts, circuit courts of appeal, and finally a supreme court of labor. The judges would be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. They would receive up to $15,000 a year.

There would be three judges in each district court, five or seven in each circuit court of appeals, and nine in the supreme court. In all these, the lay judges would always outnumber the legal judges by one, because of the many questions of fact that would come before the labor courts. And in all cases they would be selected for their fair-mindedness.

Any representative of labor or management, whether he was a lawyer or not, could appear before this bar.

Unions and management would still negotiate their contracts by collective bargaining, just as they do today. If they can arrive at mutually agreeable contracts without help, fine. When they can't, they can call upon the judges to act as conciliators or arbitrators, or they can call in outside intermediaries.

The main thing is that they arrive at some agreement. It is hoped that all negotiators will be able to arrive at agreement, with the help of such machinery. But if a basic industry engaged in interstate commerce or an interstate public utility is involved, a contract must be reached. There can be no strikes in such industries. If the parties cannot agree on terms of the contract, then the courts will arbitrate, and the decisions of the court will be final.

What industries should be subject to such compulsory arbitration? I believe congressional hearings should be held to decide which ones to include. However, I believe that at least these eight should be included. Basic steel, coal, oil, gas (when crossing State lines), all maritime shipping, railroads, electric power, telephone and telegraph.

Perhaps eventually the court system will work out so well that the public will want all industries to come under this compulsory arbitration. The reason I make a division is that it might put too much of a load on the courts at the start to make them responsible for peace on the whole industrial front. So we should start where strikes have the most devastating effect on our economy.

However, once a contract is made, in whatever industry engaged in interstate commerce, it must be filed with the courts. And once it is filed, any future disputes about changing the contract or about its interpretation must be argued before the court. And the decision of the judges must be final.

Thus, if John L. Lewis became dissatisfied with his contract, as he did recently, he would have to establish before the courts that he had a legal right to cancel the contract. If the courts decided the contract could not be canceled without the operators' consent, that would be the end of it.

The enforcement provisions available to the courts would insure that! There would be no defiance—at least, not if he wanted to continue to be a labor leader.

Law without enforcement is a mockery. Any representative of labor or industry who defied the verdicts of the court would be prohibited from appearing before the courts in the future. He would have taken from him the right to negotiate any contracts. In short, he would be disbarred, just as a lawyer guilty of malpractice may be disbarred.

Furthermore, the courts would be empowered to levy heavy fines against corporations or unions that refused to abide by their decrees.

In order that undue hardship would not be inflicted on either side in a dispute, provision should be made that the courts be required to pass down decision within a few days of the time a case is filed with them. Speedy justice is essential.

To a lot of people, including industrialists and workingmen alike, one great appeal of the court system is that it would end the current flood of little pesky strikes arising from differing interpretations of contract.

I talked recently to a taxicab driver in my home town of Detroit who said he quit a higher-paying job with a big auto-making company because men in his department were continually being called out on strike. Perhaps a man would be discharged for shooting dice in the washroom. So out the whole department would go on strike until he was reinstated. These 3-day strikes added up.

If courts were available to rule on the justice of the discharge there would be no necessity for strikes.

Again, men are often called out on strike in a jurisdictional dispute with another union. Perhaps a steamfitters' union and a carpenters' union both feel they should fasten a certain pipe to a wall. Let the courts decide which, instead of the men sulking on strike.

There will be those who will say that the scheme is impracticable because no court composed of human beings is capable of arriving at just decisions involving such complex matters as arise in industrial disputes. I can say to this that during my 14 years on the bench I was required to reach decisions on all types of cases, including labor disputes—and found the latter no more difficult than many of the others.

Some labor people may be apprehensive of the proposal I have outlined because it interferes, as far as persons in basic industries are concerned, with their right to strike. They consider this right to strike as sacred. It should be if they hav no other means of getting a fair deal, as is true at present. But if they are assured of justice through the courts, they should be delighted to adopt this less expensive substitute, which will be their guarantee of economic security. Furthermore, this would not prevent any man or woman from quitting his or her job.

I shall have to acknowledge that the court set-up would take away some of the labor leader's glory in mapping strike strategy and in "talking tough" to management and to government. But he would have an even greater opportunity to serve his constituents constructively. The courts would give him a better forum than he now has for presenting his case to the public. His task would be to present the best possible case for his men to the courts. To my mind, there is no question that workers should organize and be represented by spokesmen of their own choosing—as management should represent the stockholders in the industry.

In a sense, the court structure would be an encouragement to unionism because the courts would not function except where the employees of a company had a spokesman empowered to represent their collective interests. Sanctity of contract through decisions of a labor court would enhance the security of both labor and industry and also protect the interests of the general public.

And management should like the court set-up if for no other reason than that it would permit its leaders to plan better for the future if they were assured that production would not be interrupted periodically by strikes.

I have a suspicion that if the labor-court plan is put into practice we shall see a great reduction in the bickering and feuding between capital and labor. They both will no longer need to have chips on their shoulders to protect their interests, because they will know that their rights are assured by the presence in the background of the labor courts.

Furthermore, both sides will know that if they have to state their case in a public forum before the court they will not raise issues unless they know they have a good case. And they will know, further, that they will not be able to becloud the issues by emotional appeals, as they often can now.

The great principle which has shaped America's growth for a century and a half is that of equal justice under law. I believe that if we are to fulfill our destiny as a people it is time we broaden application of the principle to include labor-management relations.

Let justice, and not power politics, reign in our workshops!

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that there are on the calendar two resolutions about which there has been some discussion heretofore. I further understand that on the call of the calendar on Monday, debate would be limited to 5 minutes. In the circumstances I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar today be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall speak today on a subject which I deem of very great importance in this epoch in the affairs of the Eightieth Congress. It has to do with the two resolutions which were reported by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] on last Friday; namely, Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20.

I realize, as I rise to speak, a consciousness that I am out of step, so to speak, with the majority of my party in what I am about to say. I aver that it is a delightful thing to be able to say, as was said of old, "How pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity"; but when unity is brought about at the expense of one's convictions, one has no recourse but to express his convictions for what influence they may generate.

This is an important occasion. I have written my views on Senate Resolution 46, so that there may be no possible misconception of the thoughts which I am about to express.

The Congress is organized under circumstances which more than ever turn

the attention of the country to our handiwork. The Congress is now in the majority control of the Republican Members. Furthermore, the Congress is meeting under the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Thus, both in terms of party and with respect to the legislative framework of its activities, the Eightieth Congress is meeting under new auspices.

The public at large and the Members of Congress themselves are keenly watching to see in what direction we will set our faces, and what goals we will seek to achieve.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was the sincere expression of the will of the people. For years, even for decades, Congress had been criticized for inefficiencies and for muddling and confusion. Congress was the butt of every cartoonist and of every maker of jests. This constant wearing away of the prestige of Congress was not healthy for the activities of its Members or for the country at large. To this confusion, this muddling, and this widespread criticism, Congress sought to put an end when it enacted the statute which became law on August 2, 1946.

All over the United States newspapers published editorials, columnists published articles, and radio commentators made statements praising Congress for the eneactment of this statute and for the introduction of true efficiency into the workings of Congress.

Among the greatest gains registered by this statute were the elimination of conditions that made for inefficiency, waste, and confusion. Above all, such conditions centered around the multiplicity of congressional committees, and the overlapping of their respective jurisdiction.

The bill for the reorganization of Congress was directed specifically to those unfortunate conditions.

In two widely publicized reports, the attention of Congress was specifically called to the effort to remove the inefficiencies and waste resulting from those conditions.

In Report No. 1011, dated March 4, 1946, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress dealt with the whole subject of congressional reorganization. The first and principal subject it discussed was the structure and operation of the congressional committees. The joint committee said to both Houses of Congress:

> Your committee believes that no adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first reorganizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous work load that present-day governmental problems place upon it.
>
> About 90 percent of all the work of the Congress on legislative matters is carried on in these committees. Most bills recommended by congressional committees become laws of the land and the content of legislation finally passed is largely determined in the committees.
>
> We feel that there is nothing sacrosanct in the present arrangement of our committees. A study of the committee system of both Houses reveals that since the First Congress the committees have undergone many realinements and changes as conditions demanded. As "the workshop of Congress" the committee structure, more than any other arm of the legislative branch, needs frequent modernization to bring its efficiency up to the requirements of the day.
>
> However, because of obvious difficulties attendant upon the reduction of standing committees, Congress for many years past has neglected to survey its over-all needs for a more effective system. New committees have been established to do particular jobs, but little attention has been paid to realinement of committees and their jurisdictions on an over-all basis.
>
> Congress can no longer afford the luxury and waste of manpower and time in maintaining a total of 33 standing committees of the Senate and 48 standing committees of the House. We recognize the difficulties inherent in simplifying this old system of 81 standing committees. We realize that loyalties to these present committees, certain perquisites of membership upon them, established seniority rights, and a desire to maintain these traditional rights make reorganization of our committee structure the No. 1 problem to be faced in any attempt to modernize and strengthen the Congress.
>
> Only by untangling the existing overlapping jurisdictional lines and merging standing committees which today have almost concurrent jurisdiction can present-day legislation be adequately handled. We have attempted in the following recommendation to merge closely related committees into one where their jurisdictions overlap or where they deal with similar subjects.

The report proposed a reduction of the number of committees and the clear specification of the respective jurisdiction of the various committees. The joint report then went on to say:

> Composed of the directly elected representatives of the people, Congress needs to improve its lines of communication, its relationships, its understanding of the departments. At present there is no regular machinery of cooperation between them, aside from inadequate informal conversations or correspondence or a full-dress investigation, by which the common problems of governmental policy can be surveyed.
>
> Vast powers are often necessarily delegated to governmental agencies. Sometimes the laws are not clear or specific and sometimes a problem defies specific legal description and adequate limitation. A clear and continuing understanding of the objectives and methods of the departments should be achieved.
>
> We feel that this oversight problem can be handled best by directing the regular standing committees of the Senate and House, which have such matters in their jurisdiction, to conduct a continuous review of the agencies administering laws originally reported by the committees. Frequent consultation with and reporting to the committees would greatly improve relationships between the executive and legislative branches.
>
> Directing the regular standing committees to carry on this supervisory function appeals to your committee as a better method than the appointment of numerous select investigating committees when situations have grown so difficult as to arouse public demand for correction or special study. We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned.
>
> Each of the reorganized standing committees should be given the power of subpena and should be authorized to undertake studies of matters within its jurisdiction either by full or subcommittee action (p. 6).

Subsequently, on May 31, 1946, the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, from the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress submitted a report, No. 1400. This also gave its first and primary attention to the number 1 problem involved in the reorganization of Congress, the reduction of the number of committees and the clear assignment of nonoverlapping jurisdiction to each committee. This report contained language showing that the work of the joint committee and the bill it prepared were the fruits of the assembled wisdom of—

> Members of Congress, political scientists, efficiency engineers, and students of government concerning the conditions that handicap Congress in the performance of its proper functions and suitable remedies.
>
> Since 1941 a series of independent surveys of the machinery and methods of our National Legislature have been made by public and private organizations. These surveys, including that by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, have reached substantially the same conclusions as to the defects in our legislative structure and operation and as to appropriate correctives. They are agreed that Congress today is neither organized nor equipped to perform adequately its main functions of determining policy, authorizing administrative organization and appropriations to carry out policy, and supervising execution of the resultant programs.
>
> Devised to handle the simpler tasks of an earlier day, our legislative machinery and procedures are by common consent no longer competent to cope satisfactorily with the grave and complex problems of the postwar world. They must be modernized if we are to avoid an imminent break-down of the legislative branch of the National Government.
>
> Cited as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, S. 2177 is designed to reconvert our inherited and outmoded congressional machinery to the needs of today. One group of provisions deals with strengthening the policy-determining function of Congress. Because of the volume and specialized character of the legislative business, Congress has logically delegated the initial work of policy making to standing committees of its Members. These committees have had a long and useful history, some of them dating back to the early days of the Republic. There have been several major and minor reorganizations of the congressional committee system through the years, as new problems have arisen and old ones have disappeared. The system has not been revamped to meet modern needs and conditions, however, since 1921. It is now in need of a complete overhaul to enable Congress to handle efficiently the expanding problems of the postwar world.
>
> Today there are more than twice as many standing committees in the Senate as there are principal provinces of public policy. Responsibility for legislative action is scattered among 33 little legislatures which go their own way at their own pace and cannot act in concert. Their jurisdictions are undefined in the Senate rules, and there are many committees functioning in the same problem areas. For example, three Senate committees deal with problems of commerce and industry, five deal with public land problems, and six with the rules and administration of the Senate. Furthermore, some committees are inactive and seldom or never meet.
>
> To remedy this crazy-quilt pattern, S. 2177 would replace our jerry-built committee structure with a simplified system of standing committees corresponding with the major areas of public policy and administration and having authority to hold joint hearings with the parallel committees of the House

of Representatives on matters of common interest. The correlation of the committee systems of the two Chambers with each other would facilitate joint action on specific measures by means of joint hearings. It would also increase the efficiency of the committee structure, facilitate closer liaison between the two Houses, and economize the time of busy legislators and administrators alike. And the coordination of the congressional committee system with the pattern of the administrative branch of the National Government would improve the performance by Congress of its legislative and supervisory functions, provide direct channels of communication and cooperation between the two branches, promote more harmonious and unified action in the development of public policies, and go a long way to bridge the gap between the legislative and executive branches of the Government (pp. 1–2).

The committee report then listed the proposed consolidation of the committees of Congress and substitution of a small number of standing committees. Following this list, the committee report states:

Moreover, the burden of committee work is especially onerous in the Senate. At present the combined membership of all the standing committees in the upper House is 481 and of the 11 major committees is 220. In addition, there are 10 special committees of the Senate, with a total membership of 87. Altogether, the 96 Senators of the Seventy-ninth Congress occupy 568 seats on its standing and special committees, an average of 6 seats per Senator. Nor are there any exclusive committees in the Senate as there are in the House, the members of which serve on no other committees. Today no Senator serves on less than 3 committees; and 1 sits on 10 committees, not counting the service on subcommittees, of which there are 67 in the Senate. In short, the committee work load of United States Senators today is too heavy to bear (p. 3).

The report went on to emphasize the fact that by establishing those standing committees and no others, jurisdictional disputes between them would be limited, if not eliminated. It stated:

S. 2177 would also define the jurisdiction of each reorganized committee so as to avoid jurisdictional disputes between them (p. 3).

The report went on to emphasize that the proposed efficient plan for a small number of standing committees would make unnecessary the rash of special investigating committees which had only helped to make the congressional machinery more cumbersome, at the same time that it interfered with, and thereby contributed inefficiency to the work of, the regular standing committees. The report said:

A third group of provisions in the bill is designed to strengthen congressional surveillance of the execution of the laws by the executive branch.

To remedy this situation, S. 2177 would authorize the standing committees of both Houses to exercise continuous surveillance of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their jurisdiction. Armed with the power of subpena and staffed with qualified specialists in their respective provinces of public affairs, these committees would conduct a continuous review of the activities of the agencies administering laws, originally reported by the legislative committees.

Under this arrangement, it will no longer be necessary to create special committees of investigation from time to time. Sporadic investigations of the conduct of public affairs in the past have often served a salutary purpose by exposing administrative incompetence or corruption and by improving the execution of the laws. But they have lacked continuity and have not provided the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information they have gathered. In cases where legislative action is indicated, standing committees find it necessary to do much of the work over again. S. 2177 proposed, therefore, to ban the use of special committees hereafter (p. 6).

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from New Hampshire is making an admirable statement of the aims of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It is indeed sweet music to my ears, after the time we spent on that committee. But I think it would be unfortunate not to emphasize at this place that in formulating its plan of reorganization the Organization Committee was not unmindful of the precedents set by Congress itself in regard to the supervision of the various departments by the standing committees.

As we all know, many statutory provisions, especially in various war acts, have called for the making of reports by the executive departments handling the affairs and procedures under such acts, but not a single one of them called for a report to a special committee. They called for reports to the regular standing committees.

Therefore, on the particular point to which the Senator from New Hampshire is now adverting, perhaps this simple statement by me may augment the fine argument of the Senator from New Hampshire that Congress itself laid down the precedent for action by standing committees.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the scholarly Senator from Utah for his contribution.

Mr. President, the report further explained that section 128 of the bill would require the standing committees of the Congress to make the necessary investigation of the activities of the executive branch of the Government, and to do so continuously. The report stated:

In effect, this section directs each standing committee of the Senate and the House to exercise continuous surveillance of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of laws within the jurisdiction of the respective committees (p. 20).

In fact, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so provided in section 136 of the statute, reading as follows:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government (pp. 23–24).

This statute has been spoken of throughout the United States as the streamlining-of-Congress statute. We are now meeting in the first session at which that streamlining will contribute efficiency. Yet, within 2 days after the new Members of the Senate were sworn in, there was submitted in the Senate a resolution providing for the continuation of the existence of a special committee whose life would otherwise expire at the end of this month. In other words, the resolutions, Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20, proposed an exception to the streamlining enacted by Congress last year.

Within a day after Senate Resolution 46 was introduced, it was considered briefly by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and action in favor of this first exception to the Legislative Reorganization Act was quickly taken by a majority of the committee. On the following day the committee favorably reported the resolution to the Senate.

Thus, within less than 4 days after the new Senate had been organized under the streamlining statute which for the first time introduced efficiency and economy into the operations of the Senate, an exception had been introduced and favorably reported to the Senate, an exception which necessarily would bring back into the Congress some of the old confusion, wastefulness, and inefficiency. Thus, within less than a week after the new Senate had organized for business under the statute designed to assure efficiency in the operations and activities of Congress, we were confronted with a program squarely contrary to that which last year was proposed to the Congress by the joint committee, and to the Senate by its own committee, and which we solemnly adopted by an overwhelming vote in this Chamber.

Every evil to which the Senate report pointed in this connection will be reintroduced as a result of the adoption of such resolutions as Senate Resolution 46 or Senate Resolution 20. It means the beginning of the creation of more committees. It means the reintroduction of overlapping jurisdiction and, thus, of confusion and of jurisdictional difficulty.

Senate Resolution 46 does not even try to minimize the evil it reintroduces, the very evil against which we specifically legislated a few months ago. Senate Resolution 46 does not even say that for any subject within the jurisdiction of the special committee with which it deals, no standing committee shall have the same or duplicating jurisdiction. On the contrary, Mr. President, Senate Resolution 46 not only increases the number of committees beyond those which Congress solemnly stated were sufficient for the work of the Senate, but it results in conferring on two separate committees of the Senate jurisdiction over subjects which are exactly the same for each of the two committees.

Senate Resolution 46 constitutes an even greater defiance of the Legislative Reorganization Act than would be involved by a resolution proposing to create a new special committee for a different purpose. When the Senate debated the

bill for legislative reorganization every Senator knew of the existence of the special committee known as the War Investigating Committee as well as the Small Business Committee. Every Senator knew that if it was intended that those committees should be continued as committees additional to those named in the bill, the fair and straightforward thing to do was to say so right in the bill. That was not done. That was not suggested. We thereafter legislated in full knowledge of the fact that we were not providing for a list of committees that included those special committees.

Had there been any reason to believe that those special committees were needed as additional committees, or also as ones which duplicate in part the jurisdiction of any one or many of the standing committees of the Senate, it would have been simple and frank to say so in the course of the debate and to ask that provision for that purpose be made in the statute. Even if there were any reasonable likelihood that such special committees would be needed, frankness and straightforwardness would have required a statement to that effect, not only in the course of the debate, but also in the bill itself.

I should like to refer to examples of the great body of testimony before the congressional joint committee, condemning the very type of evil which Senate Resolution 46 would reintroduce into the operations of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] said that it was archaic and grotesque to continue the conditions then prevailing in the operations of the Senate.

He referred to the confusion and overlapping in the jurisdiction of Senate committees. He said that special committees have been used to correct this condition, and then added:

> I do not think we can rely indefinitely on this creation of special committees.

He emphasized particularly the necessity of adequately staffing the standing committees, since without such staffing it becomes easier to seek the creation of special committees.

That staffing, I interpolate, was provided.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 addressed itself specifically to the problems of providing a substantial staff for each standing committee. The Senator from Maine told the joint committee considering this legislation of the grave dangers which will increasingly arise unless Congress adequately staffs its standing committees (hearings before joint committee, pursuant to H. Con. Res. 18, pp. 228–229).

The junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] testified before the joint committee; and among other criticisms of the existing conditions in the operations of the Senate, he specified the overlapping of committees—one of the evils against which the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was directed, and which Senate Resolution 46 and the companion resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], would revive. (Hearings before joint committee, p. 165.)

My colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], testified before the joint committee, particularly referring to the evil of a multiplicity of committees. I quote some of his remarks:

> My next recommendation, Mr. Chairman, would be a reduction of the committees of the House and Senate to a much lesser number than we have today, and again I do not pretend to advise the House.
>
> I do believe, however, that the 33 committees of the Senate could be cut down to a maximum of 12 or 14, and that could be done with more efficiency to the Senators and to the Senate, and in that way no Senator would have over 3 committees, and most of them would have only 2 (hearings of joint committee, p. 279).

At the hearings of the joint committee the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] expressed his agreement with the remarks made by the senior Senator from New Hampshire, as follows:

> If I may interrupt, I want to indicate my complete approval of what you are now saying. I know I took a hand at it at one time, and I know the chairman of the committee took a hand at it, and maybe among all of us we could work out something that would be sound in principle and might find acceptance (hearings, p. 279).

Other remarks of the senior Senator from New Hampshire were summarized by the joint committee, and I refer in particular to the summary statement of one of his recommendations, as follows:

> Abolish the use of special committees, except joint ones (hearings, p. 20).

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] testified before the joint committee, urging that all committee jurisdiction relating to the affairs of any department of the Government should be centralized in a single committee of the Senate—an expression of the admirable view directed against the overlapping, the confusion, the waste, and the inefficiency in the old committee system of the Senate, the reintroduction of which would be one of the consequences of the adoption of Senate Resolution 46 (hearings, pp. 19, 258–259).

There was an abundance of additional testimony on this subject before the special committee, submitted by many Members of Congress. I shall limit myself to referring to the testimony of one of the Members of the House who appeared before the joint committee, Representative WADSWORTH, of New York. He testified that some special committees had been established in the past because there were some subjects which had not yet been assigned to standing committees, and that the result was confusion. He further said that the reorganization legislation would put the power to investigate in the standing committees—and that is exactly what the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has done.

It has also assigned all the subject matters which might be investigated to the standing committees, so that there is now no gap for which any special committee is needed.

(For references to testimony of Representative WADSWORTH, see hearings, pp. 7–8, 96.)

I now turn to the record of proceedings in the Senate when the bill for legislative reorganization came before the Senate. In the course of the debates, there were numerous criticisms of the existing wasteful and inefficient committee system in the Senate. I shall mention only two instances from the debates—the criticism made by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Each of them specifically mentioned the evil of the duplication of authority resulting from the grant, to two committees, of the power to deal with the self-same subject. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6366, June 6, 1946.)

Two Senators raised the question with respect to the possible need at some future time of some special committee. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, who was in charge of the bill in the Senate, the following question:

> Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to state what his committee has in mind with respect to the following situation: Suppose an entirely unexpected subject were to arise, one which generally speaking, would not be considered as comprehended within the provinces of the committees established by the rule—as, for illustration, the matter of atomic energy or something else which came up ab initio, something we never had thought of. What is the Senator's idea, please, as to the committee to which such a subject of unexpected nature should be assigned? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6366, June 6, 1946.)
>
> * * * * *
>
> The point which was in my mind was whether there was adequate provision to take care of a very unexpected situation. Of course, I appreciate that the matter of atomic energy has already been covered. However, I was referring to that matter only as an illustration; it is easily possible that some other entirely unexpected situation which we cannot at this time foresee might arise within the next few years (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6366, June 6, 1946).

Similarly, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said:

> However, I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6395, June 6, 1946.)

The then senior Senator from Wisconsin said in answer:

> I grant that point, and have conceded it in the brief time we have been able to devote to the consideration of the bill today. I have conceded the point several times, but I have also contended that when an issue or a problem of similar magnitude arises, it will not be difficult to get the respective House which may be concerned, or both Houses, to suspend the rules. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6395, June 6, 1946.)

Thereafter, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied:

> I think our viewpoints are in substantial agreement.

Mr. President, the Senate was intent on getting rid of special committees. Beyond peradventure, the Senate was in favor of getting rid of special committees, and we passed the bill in that form by an impressive majority. The bill went to

the House of Representatives, and there that provision was stricken out. The bill came back to the Senate, and because of the pressure of time and the desire to have enacted some kind of legislation on the subject, the Senate surrendered on that point, and the provision was not in the final draft of the bill. But I now aver that it was the intent, it was the spirit, it was the purpose, of the Senate, as indicated by its own action, to do away with special committees.

The Senate passed the bill, including section 126, which sought to ban all special committees. As I have said, in the House this particular provision of the bill was dropped. The subject was explained by Representative MONRONEY, who was in charge of the bill in the House, when he was discussing the reason for the inclusion in the bill of a grant of subpena power to all standing committees. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, this was rather carefully considered by the House committee, and our set-up is considerably different from the set-up in the Senate. The Senate is plagued with a great many special committees. It is a rash that has broken out there which practically destroys the continuity and the power of the standing committees. In order to get away from that outbreak of special committees, the Senate wrote in this provision for subpena power by their standing committees. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10073, July 25, 1946.)

So, Mr. President, the reorganization legislation contemplated that the standing committees of the Senate should themselves conduct the investigations in matters germane to the work of such committees.

Finally, the legislation included provisions which made it unnecessary to establish special committees to take over any of the jurisdiction of any standing committee, for each standing committee was provided with a staff and with subpena power.

It was explained on the floor of the Senate by the then senior Senator from Wisconsin that the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, with respect to the committee system in the Senate and the House, remained a matter for any future action by the Senate and the House, respectively, so far as their own committees were concerned. The Senate can change the provisions of the act with respect to the standing committees in such manner as it may deem appropriate. The act merely constitutes so far as the Senate committees are concerned, the adoption of a rule by the Senate, subject to amendment by the Senate alone.

The original section in the bill banning special committees was proposed by the joint committee of the Senate and the House, and was adopted by the Senate, as I have heretofore said. By that action the Senate indicated its view on the subject of special committees. The Senate obviously had no need for insisting that the House should express a similar view with respect to its own committee situation. Since, as Representative MONRONEY stated on the floor of the House, the situation in the House was different, and since the Legislative Reorganization Act would fail of passage if the Senate insisted that the House should adopt a particular viewpoint with respect to its own committee situation, the Senate in the closing days of the session was agreeable to the passage of the bill without the section banning special committees for the two Houses.

However, the Senate had expressed its view, and this conformed to the view of every witness who had appeared before the joint committee on the subject of this legislation, and who had spoken on this point, including members of the Senate. The same view was expressed on the floor of the Senate.

Whether a specific ban against special committees be included in any legislative reorganization act or not, it will, of course, be in the power of the Senate or the House to take action for the creation of a special committee. But, as indicated by the questions put in the course of the debate by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the only time when this could conceivably be appropriate would be when "an entirely unexpected subject were to arise, one not comprehended within the provinces" of the standing committees—some "very unexpected situation which we cannot at this time foresee"—some extraordinary situations for which it might be necessary to establish a special joint committee of the Senate and the House.

Can it be said that any subject matter which the special committee provided for in Senate Resolution 46 wants to investigate was not foreseen or foreseeable? Can it be said that the possible need for the continuation of this special committee is a wholly unexpected matter which no one could have anticipated? The only thing which was not foreseeable was that an attempt would be made, at the very moment the reform legislation became effective, to undermine and begin the process of wrecking that legislation. The only thing that could not have been foreseen was that even before the legislation became effective, in the maneuvering for power in the Eightieth Congress that had not yet been begun, plans would be laid to whittle this reform statute down, to cut its scope, and to set effective precedents for its ultimate destruction.

I now come to another aspect of this problem, one that was mentioned by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] when Senate Resolution 46 was under discussion in the Senate on January 10, 1947. He referred to the fact that a salary increase was granted to Members of the Senate as part and parcel of the legislation which complied with the widespread popular demand for the intruduction of efficiency in the operations of the Senate. The increase in financial emoluments for Members of the Senate, provided in this streamlining legislation, is even greater than one would gather from the remarks of the senior Senator from Maryland. He referred to the subject only very briefly and, of course, did not mean to indicate that the Members of the Senate received only a $5,000 increase in salary. They received a great deal more than this. In the first place, $2,500 of the $5,000 is free from income tax. In the second place, highly valuable monetary remuneration, over and above the salary, was provided for in section 602 of this streamlining statute, which is the provision with respect to retirement pay for Members of Congress.

No matter how justified these provisions may be, it is only fair that we should face frankly the fact that these several provisions constitute a very large increase in the emoluments of Members of Congress.

No matter how justified it is to remunerate public officials who are going to do a much more efficient and competent job by reason of the streamlining provisions of the legislation, it is essential that we bear in mind what the senior Senator from Maryland so cogently and properly mentioned on the floor of the Senate last Friday. The streamlining, the elimination of waste and confusion, the introduction of efficiency, were put in the same bill with the increase in emoluments. It was entirely feasible to have separate legislation to deal with these subjects if it was not intended to recognize that they have a relation to each other.

But, as the Senator from Maryland indicated, it is now proposed, before Congress has had an opportunity to get underway at this session, and before we have had the opportunity to give effect to the streamlining provisions of this efficiency legislation, that we shall retrace our steps, throw overboard some of the efficiencies, and reintroduce some of the very confusion and waste which we obligated ourselves to eliminate. At the same time, however, no proposal is made to reduce to any extent whatever the increased emoluments granted to Members of the Senate in the streamlining, efficiency statute.

I am persuaded, Mr. President, that all Members of the Senate are sincere and honorable in dealing with the subject now under discussion. Yet, all of us are living in the light of intense publicity and we must make sure that not only shall our action conform to high standards, but that we shall give no reasonable person an opportunity to think or say the contrary. It has been said already that it would be fraud for Congress, while retaining the emoluments provided in the bill, to throw overboard some of the efficiency which made the reorganization law acceptable to the American public.

I do not think that the charge of fraud is justified in the sense that a charge would impute to any Member of the Senate an intention to obtain money under false pretences. But the consequence of the adoption of Senate Resolution 46 in its effect on the efficiency of Congress and on that which the public thought it was getting through the reorganization law, would be just as bad as if there had been fraud. In brief, the ill effect on the public interest and on the operations of Congress itself would be the equivalent of the ill effect which would have flowed from actual fraud.

More than three-fourths of the men now in the Senate were Members of the Senate when committees were created to study the necessary streamlining of Congress, when such committees reported on the evils which had to be eliminated, and

when legislation was enacted for the purpose of eliminating those evils—evils for whose reintroduction into the operations of Congress Senate Resolution 46 seeks to have the dubious honor of being the first harbinger.

It is well known that men do not enter the Senate simply for the monetary remuneration. They are impelled by a sense of service. It is also true that references were made to the fact, in the committee's report on the legislative-reorganization program, that power comes to Members of the Senate through the position of chairman of a committee, and that this is a highly valued perquisite even if considered solely in terms of the opportunity to perform service. It gives the chairman a staff and a forum and much else that is highly gratifying to a man whether his primary purpose be public service or any other consideration.

In the reports on the reorganization legislation, mention is made of the fact that the legislation, by reducing the number of chairmanships, would deprive some of the Members of Congress of such desirable positions. Nevertheless, the interests of efficiency and economy were plaeed high above those of personal satisfaction or aggrandizement.

Now, Senate Resolution 46 would embarrass the Senate by a reversal of this salutary trend. Again chairmanships would be created, additional to those provided for under the Legislative Reorganization Act. Again additional committee staffs would be authorized, additional to those provided for under the standing committees listed in the Legislative Reorganization Act. Again more forums for chairmen and other members would be provided additional to those set up under the efficiency and streamlining provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Once we start on this reverse trend we not only promote confusion, waste, and inefficiency, but we also provide occasions for logrolling and backscratching, and deals, in which great prizes of new committee chairmanships and the authorization of new staffs and great power are involved. It is not necessary to say or to assume or to think that that is the motive behind Senate Resolution 46. It is sufficient to recognize that the adoption of the resolution would set us upon a dire course in which the opportunity for men, if so motivated, would be greatly increased.

This leads me to the discussion of a much graver danger in the adoption of the pending resolutions for a continuation or creation of special committees. There is a serious danger that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 can be converted from an instrument of clean government to an instrument of machine politics. It is not necessary, at this precise moment and on this particular day in the history of the Eightieth Congress, to consider in a discussion of the pending resolutions whether in fact they have a present relation to the problem of machine politics. If the need for a consideration of that question should arise, I shall be glad to consider the advisability of exploring the present situation thoroughly. This is not, at the present moment, necessary because, regardless of the presence or absence of any machine politics at this particular moment, the adoption of the practice of creating special committees will set in process a method and a technique which I predict will readily be used in the interests of machine politics, sooner or later.

When I speak of machine politics, I am referring to the creation of a machine for the domination of the Senate by either a single person or a small oligarchy. It is one thing for such men to control the rank and file of the majority party—Republican or Democratic—whichever may happen to have the majority voice in the Senate. It is quite another thing for the leaders of the Senate to be the servants of the rank and file of the Senators of their respective parties.

The phenomenon of machine control of a legislative chamber is not impossible in our system. On the contrary, we have had some well-known instances, fortunately not continuous, in the lifetime of our own generation. People have not yet forgotten the fact that the House was controlled by a very small oligarchy, and to some extent by one man, in the first decade of this century. People have not yet forgotten that following the First World War there was something of the sort in the Senate.

At the present time the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has enhanced the value, to any individual or a small group desirous of getting a machine grip on the Senate, of creating special committees for the furtherance of their political machine purposes. One of the very virtues of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is that it has reduced the number of committees in the Senate, and thus has reduced the number of committee chairmanships in the Senate, the number of committees on which an individual Senator can sit, the number of committees in which a chairman and his committee members can share the control of the staff, and the number of forums which each Senator can have for his public and publicized participation in affairs. Last year there were 54 committees in the Senate. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, there are to be only 15 committees in the Senate.

This very change makes all the greater the boon which can be conferred on an individual Senator by letting him have a special committee and its chairmanship, or by getting on a special committee. These posts, being now in short supply for the persons who may desire such opportunity, are therefore more valuable in their eyes.

Take it from the point of view not only of the man who wants to be a chairman but of the individual Senator. Last year the average number of committee memberships of each Senator was six. This year, under the reform statute, each Senator, with a very few exceptions, is limited to two committee memberships. The creation of a special committee, and the appointment of a Senator even to an ordinary membership on such a committee, at once increases his committee memberships, his participation in the control and use of committee staff, and the forum for his public activities, by 50 percent.

Up to the time of the enactment of this reform statute, the creation of a special committee, the post of chairman of a special committee, and the ordinary membership on a special committee, were all relatively easier to obtain. Now that they have become scarce commodities, any person who can form a small oligarchy for capturing the control of the Senate has a great weapon at its command. So far as committee chairmanships and memberships are concerned, it is to a large extent the only weapon in the hands of such a small oligarchy. They cannot have anywhere the same power with respect to the chairmanship and membership of the standing committees that they can have with respect to a special committee. They can arrange not only to create a special committee, but they can also kill it. They can even revive a special committee, but as a new committee, for the purpose of transferring the chairmanship or other memberships of such a special committee from one person to another. In short, the opportunity to create special committees becomes an opportunity of dispensing political patronage of great value. The very fact that a special committee can be discontinued enables the dispensers of patronage to hold a club over the chairman and members of a special committee. In short, the resort to the creation of special committees, except in some highly extraordinary situation, means the resort to a spoils system for the control, through a machine, of the operations of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with the extremely able address being made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to remind him that he and I served together as members of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I should like to ask him if it is not a fact that the clerical assistants of the special committees far exceeded in number those of the regular committees, and that hundreds of thousands of dollars were appropriated for clerical hire for special committees? Furthermore, the special committees borrowed clerical help from the various departments of the Government, to the extent of additional hundreds of thousands of dollars. Today, the number of clerks serving the special committees is three times as great as the number of clerks allowed to regular committees by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. TOBEY. And may I add to the comment of the Senator from South Carolina that, with respect to the special committees which are now seeking to be revived, or extended, whichever term may be appropriate, one of the committees, with many clerks, sprawls over 13 rooms in the Senate Office Building, while some of us need a fourth room to

carry on legislative business. There is food for thought in the comment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, the spoils system should never be used on the Members of the Senate themselves. They are freely elected representatives of the people. They are here to act in accordance with the dictates of their consciences. I am sure that every Member of the Senate has that in his mind and heart. There is danger in enabling any person, or any small oligarchy, to bring pressure on any Member of the Senate in any future year, to fall in with the program or the purposes of a ruling machine.

We are all human and have the frailties of the human race. One of our frailties is that the nature and impact of proposals may not at times be too clear. Frequently the line between principle and expediency is not clearly marked. Thus, in many matters relating to legislation and the conduct of the legislative body there is a lack of clarity between that which is required by conscience and that which is insinuated by expediency. It is in those areas that the power of a machine to dispense patronage will tend to carry the day for the purposes of the machine.

We had better stick to clean politics, to reform legislation, to the efficiencies and economies introduced by the Legislative Reorganization Act. Instead, however, we find ourselves already in the undesirable position of being asked to create a dangerous precedent which may be useful, at one time or another, to any person or persons seeking to control the Senate through a machine operation. Under the law the present Senate was going to have 15 committee chairmanships. As things stand no boss or bosses, in the years ahead, would be likely to have in any ruling oligarchy which they might seek to set up, the cooperation of more than five or six of the chairmen of the standing committees, if indeed they could get that many; but if they can create two special committees they at once increase their group of powerful followers by one-third or more.

Here at the outset of our work in the present Congress we are being asked to create or extend two special committees. Obviously, the plans for those two special committees were made before this Congress was even organized, before most of the Senators had yet come to Washington. If this can be done before the Reorganization Act has taken effect, or at the very moment it takes effect, the process can be repeated in every Congress; indeed it can be repeated in the Eightieth Congress, so that additional special committees may be created as the purposes of any group seeking control may require.

Those who planned this unexpected and regrettable blow at the Reorganization Act did not even deem it necessary to permit the thorough consideration which the gravity of their proposal requires. Here is a proposal which runs directly counter to the purpose, the methods, and the whole basis and structure of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Such a proposal calls for hearings at which witnesses might testify and present for the consideration of the members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration the vital facts and principles which are involved. We all know that in hearings before the Joint Committee of Congress dealing with the Reorganization Act there were numerous witnesses from Congress, from the executive departments of the Government, from learned groups, from all manner of experts. Not a single one of them, not a single Member of the Senate or the House, was given the slightest opportunity to appear before the Senate committee considering these two extraordinary resolutions for the continuance and maintenance of special committees in the very face and in disregard of the new reform statute.

In order to achieve this reform it became necessary for the press, the radio, and the people of the United States to carry on a campaign for years. It became necessary for Congress to expend money for prolonged hearings. It became necessary for members of the joint committee to spend hours, days, and months of work. That was only a part of the cost and a part of the prerequisite and condition to being able to achieve sound legislation on this subject.

But when it comes to breaking down the reorganization legislation, no safeguards are provided, no inquiry of any substantial nature into the merits or demerits of the proposal is permitted in any committee hearing. It always takes a long time to create a good and fine structure. It can be destroyed in a moment. But that kind of atomic bomb is something from which the people and the Senate should be protected. Such protection could have been given to them by the few men who devised this scheme. Sound restraint would have led them to reject it. The protection could have been provided in the standing committee to which the Senate referred the two resolutions relating to the two special committees. Instead, those resolutions were rushed through the committee, not in the open, not where the public could see what was going on, and not with any opportunity for the public to be heard.

I do not mean to suggest that any impropriety was intended by any Member of Congress in the proceedings in the Committee on Rules and Administration. It could be that the nature of these two resolutions and their consequences were not fully comprehended or understood at the time the Committee on Rules and Administration met last Thursday. But that is one of the points I am making; that steps on the road to the cemetery where the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and its reforms are likely to be buried have been proposed without the realization that one of the probable consequences will be the burial of a portion of this reform measure at the very moment when it has first become alive, and the interment of further portions of it as time runs on.

Mr. President, the eyes of the people are on Congress. The eyes of the people are on a Congress which is now in the majority control of the Republicans. The eyes of the people are on a Congress which has, for the first time in decades, an opportunity to function with real efficiency. At such a moment it is not wise for the Republican Party, or for the Senate as a whole, to start the process of bringing back any unfortunate conditions, and in particular, unfortunate conditions already legislated out of existence.

In this beginning fortnight of the new, streamlined and Republican Congress, let us justify fully the expectations of the people, which we ourselves phrased for them, when we adopted for the operation of Congress the efficiencies and economies of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps I ought to say that I desire at this time to make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. There are on the Executive Calendar a number of nominations of high national interest. I felt that we could dispose of the Executive Calendar promptly, and act on these nominations at this time. I will say furthermore to the Senator from New Mexico that if we dispose speedily of the Executive Calendar I shall move the resumption of legislative session.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Maine that it was not my intention to occupy the floor for any length of time, not for more than 5 minutes at the most. I wanted to discuss a joint resolution which I introduced earlier today. I did not ask unanimous consent to make explanation of it at the time I introduced it during the morning hour because I consider that to be bad practice.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I can listen to the Senator from New Mexico for 5 minutes with pleasure, and with profit to myself.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Maine. I promise not to delay him long.

Mr. President, many months ago I made the statement publicly, and in several different places, that at the outset of this session of Congress I intended to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would give a 4-year term to Members of the House of Representatives, instead of the present term of 2 years. In keeping with my previously announced intention I have introduced that joint resolution today.

My reason for the proposal is not based upon a desire merely to lengthen the terms of Members of the House for their own benefit or gain. The amendment is offered for the purpose of curing what I believe to be a serious defect in the governmental structure, a defect which has cost the Nation much in times past.

Under the provisions of my proposed constitutional amendment Members of the House of Representatives would be elected for terms running concurrently with that of the President. Then if a change in the Government should take

place, the change could be reflected in both branches, executive and legislative.

At the time I made the original suggestion, the Democratic Party, my party, was in the majority in both branches, the legislative and the executive. No divided responsibility then existed, and there was no party division.

When the returns of the last election were received and I realized that the people had chosen a Republican House and Senate, thereby creating the very divided responsibility against which the amendment is aimed, I realized that proposing the amendment now might be considered as a party matter, as a rebellious attitude against the election result, or perhaps as "sour grapes." Hence my brief explanation that my intention was announced long ago, before anyone—even the most optimistic Republican—contemplated that both the Senate and the House would become Republican.

Mr. President, as I have said, the change from Democratic to Republican control of Congress has nothing to do with this proposal. My views are based upon the history of the country. The history of American politics as it concerns midterm elections is one of absorbing interest. Past administrations under such circumstances have conclusively proved that any good that may result from midterm elections of Members of the House is more than offset by the evils which in the past have always resulted when divided party responsibility between executive and legislative branches of government existed.

At some time in the future I hope to address the Senate on the history of midterm elections, but such is not my intention today. I realize full well that in the light of the election results of last November and the present Republican Party control of the legislative branch of government, now is not an opportune time to urge the adoption of the amendment which I propose. As a matter of fact, I myself choose to postpone action. I want sufficient time to elapse so that both branches of government, the legislative and the executive, can demonstrate whether political antagonism, which has always developed in the past under similar circumstances, will again occur. If such antagonism does not arise, if fine, fair attitudes are taken, such as that evidenced by the able address of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], it will probably mean that the amendment which I propose will not be seriously considered. Under such circumstances probably it should not be considered.

In the critical years in which we live, the most important thing for all officials in both branches of government is to devote all our energies and abilities to making democratic institutions effective. It is no time for political bickering and quarreling for the sake of party advantage. But if history does repeat itself, if sharp and bitter political antagonisms arise and stymie the Government and the country, that condition will operate to create strong support for the amendment which I propose, and in that event I shall urge its adoption. But today I have merely introduced the joint resolution and requested that it be referred to the appropriate committee, which has been done.

PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, inasmuch as my committee was brought into the discussion by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and comment was made with respect to the promptness with which Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46 were reported to the Senate, I take my full share of responsibility.

I wish to point out very definitely that one of the most difficult and heart-searching votes of my life was when I had to vote to send this country into war. I knew what would happen when war should ensue. I knew that thousands of men would be killed and thousands more would be wounded. I knew that great industries would have to be controlled; that it would be necessary to impose restrictions and restraints upon the American people; that an oligarchy such as that to which reference has been made would operate behind the curtain of secrecy. During the entire war I served on the War Department subcommittee, as well as the Navy Department subcommittee, of the Committee on Appropriations. At the beginning, when the appropriations were small we could obtain rather adequate information; but when requests for billions of dollars were made that was impossible. No Senator could ask an intelligent question about a request for a billion dollars when the request was presented quickly by the armed services. We had to take their word.

I contend that we shall probably find, as we did after the previous war, that some men enriched themselves; that some men were corrupt in their dealings; that many defective munitions were supplied to the young men who by our vote and our action were sent abroad to face death in the front lines.

The Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program is not new. If it were, there would have been long hearings before my committee, if my suggestion were followed. This is merely the continuation of a committee which I was glad to see formed, and which I have supported in every respect. The resolution provides for the continuation of the committee so that it may function in the same fine manner in which it has carried on in the past.

The same statement applies to the Small Business Committee. If it had not been for the Small Business Committee, acting as a forum in the Congress, in my judgment thousands of small businesses would have been trampled into the ground during the past few years. It was only in the forum of the Small Business Committee that small businessmen had an opportunity to present their cause against restrictions and against the consolidations of large industries which were necessary as a result of the war.

I contend that both committees should be continued. They are not new. There is nothing surprising about them; and their continuation would be in no way an attack upon the reorganization of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to deal at length with the problems involved in the resolution to continue the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, but I should like to deal with the suggestion that in some way there is bad faith or a violation of the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act in regard to special committees. How can the spirit of the act possibly prohibit the creation or continuation of special committees when we took out of the bill the prohibition of special committees? How can we violate the spirit of an act when we do not violate its terms? Not only do we not violate its terms, but the proposal to prohibit special committees was taken out of the bill when it was passed.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained this provision in section 126:

> No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

That proposal went to the House. The House, after debate, deleted it. They thought it was much too rigid. I think it was much too rigid. Whether I voted for the bill or not, there were many good things in it; but under that provision the very committee which framed the La Follette-Monroney Act could never have been created. It was a special joint committee. We had already created the Atomic Energy Committee, and we had the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. All such committees would have been prohibited by the sweeping provisions of this particular bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I am sure that the Senator has in mind that the motion to concur in the House amendments, one of them being to strike out section 126 of the Senate bill, was made by former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, himself.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. There were many things in the original La Follette-Monroney bill which were not retained in that bill by the Senate. When the House called attention to this particular provision, which would have been very difficult to handle, we concurred in the amendment of the House on the motion of Senator La Follette and struck the provision from the bill.

How can we have any spirit left after we have removed the actual provision? Moreover, the very fact that it was in the bill and was taken out by Congress is a final answer to the statement that there is any spirit left. It is conclusive evidence that the Congress did not propose to prohibit special committees. So how can we possibly be charged with bad faith in connection with the salary provision or any other provision in the act because we are not following some provision proposed by the Committee on Organization which provision was eliminated from the bill? It may be that one can point to inconsistencies of particular Senators who favored the original provi-

sion, but certainly there can be no charge that Congress is morally or in any other way bound to conform to the spirit of an act when the spirit was expressly taken out of the act by action of the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I can show the Senate how the spirit of the Reorganization Act has been violated in this instance. Under the rules of the Senate as they now exist, the creation of a special committee requires the submission of a resolution and the reference of the resolution to the committee of the Senate having jurisdiction of the subject matter. That was the way the Truman committee was originally created. A resolution to investigate expenditures in connection with national defense was introduced and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and from that committee was reported a resolution which resulted in the creation of the Truman committee. Then the resolution was referred to the Senate Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to provide money from time to time. In this instance, when the Brewster resolution and the Wherry resolution were submitted they should have been referred to the proper standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matters. Instead, by unanimous consent the Wherry resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Brewster resolution also bypassed the proper committee and went to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that committee has reported both resolutions. If the Committee on Armed Services had had an opportunity to look over the Brewster resolution, and the Committee on Banking and Currency had had an opportunity to look over the Wherry resolution, and had reported them to the Senate, that would have been in keeping with the letter and the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is talking about another point which has nothing to do with the La Follette-Monroney Act. All this argument is based on the assertion that we are violating the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act. If the Senator wants to say that we are violating the rules of the Senate, that is another question; and I am willing, when the resolution comes up, to postpone it so that the situation may be straightened out in that respect. I am concerned only with the assertion going out to the country that in some way, acting in bad faith after taking advantage of the benefits of the act, we are refusing to carry out the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act. We are not. In the La Follette-Monroney Act the Congress expressly refused to abolish special committees. It becomes a question of policy on which Senators may differ. I quite agree that there is a very good argument against special committees. I think there is a very good argument for many special committees. I believe that we should not extend the principle too far. I think the provision which was stricken from the bill went too far. I would favor a rule to send all such resolutions to the Rules and Administration Committee. I think that would provide more effective control. What has happened before is that the standing committee having jurisdiction has approved the resolution and sent it to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has felt that the matter of policy was settled and that the only question was that of money. We have divided the responsibility between the two committees, and consequently it has been pretty easy to have special committees established. I think it would be a better rule if we were to send all such proposals to the Committee on Rules and Administration and then require the approval and consent of the standing committee having jurisdiction before the matter is reported. I think there ought to be an over-all control by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I understand, in connection with this particular matter, that the question has been put up to the Committee on Armed Services and that what is finally presented will be completely satisfactory both to the standing committee and to the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, that question is not before us today.

Mr. HAYDEN. It should have gone to the Committee on Armed Services in the first place.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know the Senator desires to be accurate. There was no agreement in the Committee on Armed Services to any proposal at all. There was a discussion, and an effort was made to reach a meeting of minds; but both Democratic and Republican Senators on the committee reserved the right to oppose anything that was presented that would violate the standing committee rule.

Mr. TAFT. I trust that before the resolution comes before us there will be complete agreement. I think that any standing committee has a right to object to the creation of a special committee which will take jurisdiction from the standing committee. I was really concerned today only with pointing out what actually had happened, to show that there certainly is no spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act floating around in the air. The act is before us. I think in the next 2 or 3 months we may find that a number of amendments ought to be made, but I do not think that any change ought to be made until complete consideration is given.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct in stating that when the bill passed the Senate it carried a provision against the creation of any special or joint committee. The bill then went to the House, where that provision was eliminated. It came back to the Senate when we were on the verge of adjournment, and we almost had to accept the House amendment or get no legislation at all along that line. Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was operating almost at the point of a gun, in the sense that the bill had to be handled in the best way possible, and he yielded in regard to that and other House amendments in order that we might get some legislation. I do not believe that anyone has contended that the pending resolutions violate the La Follette-Monroney Act, but they violate the spirit in which the Senate acted when it considered the question originally and placed in the bill a prohibition against the creation of special committees.

Mr. TAFT. On the question as to the spirit, so far as the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program is concerned, I should like to read what Senator La Follette stated during the debate. He said this:

> It is my understanding of the language as it now stands that existing committees which may be continued beyond the end of this Congress would be permitted, if they were given additional funds and authority, to conclude their work; but the creation of such committees in the future is banned by the measure as it stands.

So, Mr. President, even if there were a spirit represented by the personal views of the distinguished Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, apparently he felt that if the committee's work were not concluded—and, after all, the work of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program is all one job; the committee has been doing it, and has not finished it—certainly its continuation would not violate even the spirit as set forth by Senator La Follette, so far as that particular committee is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make an observation or two on this question, in view of what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has just said. Under the rules with respect to the former Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, it was necessary for every committee requesting money to give to that committee a budget regarding the amount of money it needed for the year, along with an explanation of how the money was to be used. Last April the then Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, was chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. At that time it was difficult for his committee to work out an agenda so as to get a sufficient amount of money to continue its work through 1946. It was difficult to justify its continued existence. The then Senator from New York told the Senator from Illinois, in the presence of other members of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, that when 1946 was over his committee would be through. They would fold insofar as further investigations were concerned.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that this resolution does violate the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act. In order to ascertain whether anyone was interested in curtailing and finally abolishing special committees, all one has to do is

read the debate which occurred last year on the floor of the Senate. The RECORD is full of it, Mr. President. Even Senator La Follette satisfied the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, after a colloquy upon the matter, that special committees should go.

I respectfully submit that under the Constitution of the United States we in the Senate of the United States have the right to make our own rules. The La Follette committee recognized that when it made the report, for it proposed that certain sections of title I be enacted by the Congress:

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

In other words, we do not have to follow the Reorganization Act at all. The House makes its rules, and the Senate makes its rules. So far as the matter of following any part of the La Follette-Monroney Act is concerned, we in the Senate would not be compelled to do so under the Constitution of the United States. But when we review the debates on that subject which were held in this body, no one can gainsay that the Senate did not abolish special committees. I do not refer to what was said on the last day of the session, when practically every Member of the Senate had his bags packed, ready to go home. There was no time for debate or even a conference. Senator La Follette accepted the House version in order to get something. But I refer to what was said when this matter was debated at length. There we find statements and conclusions which will prove to every reasonable and prudent mind that the spirit of the Senate of the United States on special committees, as expressed at that time, certainly is being violated by these particular resolutions.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. I announce that if that motion is agreed to, upon the conclusion of the call of the Executive Calendar and the disposition of the matters on the calendar, I shall move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF DILLARD B. LASSETER—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on January 8 the nomination of Dillard B. Lasseter, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I point out that the reference should be changed from Banking and Currency to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the nomination, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

If there be no executive reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, to be the United States representative on the Commission of Investigation established by the Security Council of the United Nations on December 19, 1946, to ascertain the facts relating to alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, about a year ago I rose on the floor of the Senate and said that I intended to protest the confirmation of any further nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service unless the State of North Dakota was represented in that Service. Today we have before us 81 nominations. Eleven are the nominations of persons from the State of New York, and five are nominations of persons from the State of Missouri. I simply wish to register my protest against having the Senate confirm any of the nominations which are before it today, and I serve notice that until the State of North Dakota is represented at least once in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, after being a member of this Union for 57 years, I shall continue to protest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the other nominations on the calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of S. Pinkney Tuck, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, insofar as the nominations which have just been confirmed are concerned, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, inasmuch as the remainder of the nominations are for routine promotions in the career service, I ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agree to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES — INVESTIGATION OF COURTS-MARTIAL SYSTEMS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no other matter——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so as to permit me to make a brief comment on a measure?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago I submitted, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a resolution, which has been numbered Senate Resolution 34, calling for the appointment of a special committee, to be composed of four Senators from the Committee on Armed Services and three Senators from the Committee on the Judiciary, to conduct an investigation into the courts-martial systems of the Army and the Navy. Upon giving that matter further thought, I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think it is so important that we in the Eightieth Congress do not proceed to create new special committees that I should like to make a brief comment upon a substitute resolution, which I now ask unanimous consent to submit and to have substituted for Senate Resolution 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and will be substituted as requested, and will be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the courts-martial systems of the Army and Navy, and of the prisons, jails, and places of incarceration of Army and Navy prisoners with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of the operation of such systems and places of incarceration; (2) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (3) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (4) the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts-martial are desirable and proper; and (5) any desirable improvements in or modifications of courts-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof. The subcommittee shall report to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate today in favor of continuing certain special committees, I wish to say that in my opinion we are not confronted with a question of good faith, as to whether or not we are keeping faith with the spirit of the Reorganization Act. I am not concerned about that question because it is irrelevant to the real issue before us. It seems to me that we should be concerned with the issue of how best to carry on efficient operation of the business of the Senate of the United States. I certainly am willing to meet, in discussion and argument on that issue, those who desire to sustain the major premise that throughout the sessions of the Eightieth Congress, and of Congresses which will meet in the future, we can maintain maximum parliamentary efficiency in this body if we return to the system of multiple special committees, such as has characterized the Senate of the United States for years past.

We saw the abuses of that practice in the last session of the Congress. Time and time again we saw standing committees of the Senate unable to get a quorum because most of the members of standing committees found many of their busy days taken up with attending meetings of special committees.

I think the country has a right to have us strike out boldly now, at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, for an efficient Senate. I certainly look askance on what I deem to be a beginning movement to return us to a repetition of the errors of the past by continuing and creating many special committees. I think the procedure of having special committees should be so drastically hemmed in with restrictions and safeguards that only in cases of exceptional circumstances will it be possible to secure such a grant of special committee authority from the Senate. I think we should stop playing politics with special committees and give the people of the country an efficient and business-like parliamentary procedure, working through recognized standing committees and their subcommittees.

This practice of trying to satisfy pressure groups by appointing special committees should stop in the interest of good and efficient government. I note that today another resolution has been introduced calling for the appointment of another special committee. The other day I proposed a special committee to investigate courts martial, but in keeping with the spirit of the argument I now make, Mr. President, I offer a substitute resolution for Senate Resolution 34, because I think the time has come to stop the presentation of resolutions for the appointment of special committees.

As far as my proposed courts-martial investigation is concerned, I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary should also have an interest in the investigation of the courts-martial systems of the Army and the Navy. So far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to have the whole job assigned to either the Committee on the Judiciary or to the Armed Services Committee, but I do not think we need a special committee to do the job as I first proposed. Hence I am opposed to setting up a special committee to do that job, and therefore I offer my new resolution for the work to be done under one of the standing committees. Now, as to this issue of continuing special committees which were appointed by other Congresses, it may be that some committees now in existence should be allowed some time to complete their work, but I doubt if they should be allowed to start new investigations. I think the matter probably should be resolved by a reasonable compromise. However, I would suggest to those in the Senate who are so anxious to continue these special committees for one purpose or another that any compromise must include the termination date of such committees. I say that because I have a feeling that the votes are not here to continue all the special committees which certain groups in the Senate desire to continue for as long and for whatever purpose those groups have in mind. I shall be glad to consider any compromise proposed, but if I go along with a compromise then it must be so phrased that we will know definitely that the special committee is going out of existence at the termination of the investigation set for a certain date. Further, I want to know how much money the committee is going to be allowed to spend in the months ahead, and what its personnel is going to be. I understand there are some special committees with personnel staffs of 30 or more. I am in favor of economizing in the costs of government wherever we can without interfering with the efficient operation of the Government and without depriving the people of this country the service to which they are entitled. However, I think many of these special committees are wasteful of the taxpayers' dollars and duplicate the work of standing committees.

Hence I am not going along with continuing special committees just because some in my party want to make political capital out of investigations. I am not interested in a partisan approach to the problems of national welfare which confront us. I think we should bring to a close the work of these special committees very quickly.

I do not know what my view will be on the resolutions presented, to continue certain special committees for at least a time, but I do say that the burden of proof is clearly on those who desire to extend committees. I think the obligation rests on the Members of the Eightieth Congress to see to it that we do not go back to the errors of the past, and indulge again in the inefficient operation of the Senate that characterized it when there were in existence the many complex, duplicating, and multiple special committees of the Senate. If I were to list the reasons why I think special committees should be discontinued I would mention the following:

First. The jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to create a special committee is to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee.

Second. The standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpena power for this purpose. Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

Third. The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition, Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

Fourth. Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from downtown departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.

Fifth. Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden to, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate.

Sixth. Sporadic inquiries by select committees lack continuity and fail to provide the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information gathered. In cases where legislative action is indicated, standing committees find it necessary to do much of the work over again.

Seventh. Special investigations should be conducted by subcommittees of the reorganized standing committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter involved. Thus, for example, inquiries into the condition of small business might well be assigned to a standing subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Eighth. Modernization of the congressional committee structure, achieved by the Legislative Reorganization Act, was the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. To set up a series of special committees now would be a regressive step that might lead to the ultimate destruction of this fundamental reform.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon a question about the resolution submitted by him. Is he offering a resolution to amend a resolution he formerly submitted?

Mr. MORSE. I am substituting a substitute resolution for Senate Resolution 34. I asked unanimous consent for the privilege, and it was granted. It is a substitute resolution. It calls for an investigation of the courts-martial systems of the Army and Navy, said investigation to be conducted by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. To what committee was the first resolution referred?

Mr. MORSE. It called for a special committee, composed of four members from the Armed Services Committee and three from the Committee on the Judiciary. In effect what I did was to resubmit a resolution I presented in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I hope that my proposal for a substitute resolution shows that I can be convinced on the merits of a proposition and change my opinion accordingly. I am now of the opinion it would be a mistake to create another special committee, so I have offered a substitute resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his explanation. I understand the mechanics of the resolution now.

I now propound this parliamentary inquiry. To what committee will the substitute resolution be referred? As I understand, it is asking for a committee composed of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Or is it just the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. MORSE. Just the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg pardon. I understood the Senator to say he would be glad to have the resolution referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE. May I explain myself on that question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. The original resolution, Senate Resolution 34, called for a combined committee, made up of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Judiciary Committee. I do not care under what standing committee this investigation is conducted. If the Senate desires to change my resolution and have it conducted under the Judiciary Committee as a standing committee, that is all right with me, but I do not want it conducted under a special committee as called for by the wording of my resolution when I first introduced it.

Mr. WHERRY. Not under a special committee?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. GURNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Chair answer my inquiry as to the committee to which the first resolution was referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair it should go to the Committee on Armed Services, but the present occupant of the Chair recognizes that that is a debatable question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota was on his feet first. The Chair recognizes him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. GURNEY. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. I have only a brief statement to make.

I believe our new committee is going to be very close to the armed services, and therefore will be in very good position to proceed under such a resolution as has just been submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

I wish also to point out to the Senate that if the investigation were conducted by the Committee on Armed Services it would be unnecessary for the several departments of national defense to appear before other committees, and they might be able to present their views better to the committee to which they are used to come. I think my committee can handle this matter satisfactorily. Of course, if it does not, the Committee on the Judiciary could take the matter up at any time it desired.

SENATORS' INCOMES AND VOTING RECORDS, AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE, AND PREPARATION OF SENATE PRECEDENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit another resolution which combines certain other resolutions I have heretofore offered. It is submitted "in order to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States Senate and to enable the United States Senate more effectively to discharge its responsibilities under the Constitution."

The resolution covers the following heads:

Registration of amounts and sources of Senators' incomes;

Publication of Senators' voting records;

Control of Senate filibuster;

Open publication of Senate precedents.

The resolution (S. Res. 57), submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, In order to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States Senate and to enable the United States Senate more effectively to discharge its responsibilities under the Constitution—

REGISTRATION OF AMOUNTS AND SOURCES OF SENATORS' INCOMES

(a) That every Member of the United States Senate shall, not later than 30 days following the date of agreement to this resolution, and on the 2d day of January of each year thereafter, file with the Secretary of the Senate a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and

(2) all dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year.

(b) As used in this resolution—

(1) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

PUBLICATION OF SENATORS' VOTING RECORD

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of the present session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readability and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times.

CONTROL OF SENATE FILIBUSTER

SEC. 3. (a) That rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE III

"COMMENCEMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS

"1. The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, and any mistake made in the entries corrected. The reading of the Journal shall not be suspended unless by unanimous consent; and when any motion shall be made to amend or correct the same, it shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of, except that it shall be displaced by the action of the Presiding Officer in submitting to the Senate for an aye-and-nay vote any question under rule XXII. If the question submitted under rule XXII is decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, the motion to amend or correct the Journal shall remain displaced until the measure which becomes the unfinished business under rule XXII is disposed of.

"2. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn."

(b) That part of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture (as shown on page 28 of the Senate Manual, 1945) is amended to read as follows:

"If at any time a motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is signed by 16 Senators, any Senator signing such motion shall upon a request for recognition be recognized by the Chair for the purpose of presenting such motion to the Senate, and when such motion is so presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter each Senator shall be entitled to speak in his own right on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same for an aggregate period of not more than 3 hours. Any Senator may yield to any other Senator the unexpired portion, or any part thereof, of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III, the reading of the Journal of the preceding day shall be dispensed with on days when the Senate is proceeding under the provisions of this paragraph.

"In any case in which a motion is filed under the provisions of this paragraph while a motion is pending under rule III to amend or correct the Journal of a preceding day, the term 'pending measure,' as used in the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, shall mean the measure which would be the pending measure if the Journal of all preceding days were approved."

OPEN PUBLICATION OF SENATE PRECEDENTS

SEC. 4. That the Parliamentarian of the Senate be authorized and directed to prepare a complete and annotated digest, with a full index, of the precedents and the decisions on points of order in the Senate down to the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and that 1,000 copies be printed and bound for the use of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Chair to which committee the new resolution offered by the Senator from Oregon is referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This particular resolution, in the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understood it, it was a resolution authorizing a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last resolution offered by the Senator from Oregon is the one to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the ruling made on the ground that the Committee on Rules and Administration is more democratic than any other committee?

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Illinois, the two ranking members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, a suggestion which might be of some benefit in aiding Senators who are interested in a subject which is referred to a committee of which they are not members. For example, suppose a Senator wants to have an investigation of wool. He may not be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which in my judgment would be the committee properly to undertake such an investigation. Therefore he draws his resolution and it goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He feels, perhaps, that no member of that committee wants to look into the matter, which is of vital interest to his constituents and to himself. I suggest to the majority members of the Committee on Rules and Administration for their consideration that when a Senator asks for a special investigation of some matter and the request goes to a committee of which he himself is not a member, a rule be provided which will allow him, in connection with the special subject, to sit on the committee as an ex officio member, without vote, so that he may be the "advocate," so to speak, of the policy he deems adequate, and so that he may be present. He should not have a vote because he might be a Democrat, and that might make the membership of the committees even, or he might be a Republican, and that might make the vote overwhelmingly one way. But I think there is a real need to permit a Senator who wants an investigation of something to be, if he desires, ex officio, a member of the committee or subcommittee which has jurisdiction over a given resolution providing for a special investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for his remarks. I think they have merit, and they present the reason why I desired to get information on the particular resolution the Senator from Oregon seeks to amend.

I think there is some merit in the Rules Committee membership having some knowledge of what the standing committees are doing with resolutions referred to them, in cases in which there is no advocate on the particular committee of the resolution submitted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no business ready to be taken up at this time——

Mr. MURRAY rose.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

STUDY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MURRAY. I desire to address the Senate at this time in support of Resolution No. 20, offered by the very able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], providing for the establishment of a Special Senate Committee To Study the Problems of Small Business.

I shall not undertake to discuss the effect of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on the policy of the Senate in reference to the continuance of special committees, as that will be debated at length, I understand, by other Senators who are better prepared to discuss it.

I believe it would be unfortunate if the act precluded the continuance in some instances of effective committees for the aid and protection of small-business enterprises.

It has been my privilege in the past 6 years to serve as chairman of the present Small Business Committee. The life of that committee will expire at the end of this month, and the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska would set up a new committee of the same character, to the end that it might continue the program in aid of small business which the Senate had in mind in establishing the original committee.

The original committee was established in October 1940, pursuant to a resolution offered by me authorizing and directing a study and survey of the problems of small business enterprise and the securing of the necessary facts and information which might aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation in the interest of preserving independent small business enterprise in America.

Mr. President, the need for such a program has widespread recognition in the country. Notwithstanding the enormous contribution small business enterprise has made in the development of our economic system and the political democracy upon which it rests, it is a conceded fact that the great concentration of business and industry and the growth of monopoly during the last half century has created many difficult problems which are threatening the survival of small business.

In practically every industry in the country, a few powerful organizations dominate the field. They possess unequal advantages, such as easier access

to financing, more favorable interest rates, freight and power rates, and taxes. These special advantages and privileges render it difficult for small concerns to compete when the large concerns seek to grab the market.

Over the years, the impact of monopoly practices upon small business has caused the disappearance of thousands of small independent enterprises in manufacturing, wholesale, and retail trades. As a consequence of these conditions, thousands of small businessmen all over the country for a long time have been looking to the Congress for protection and relief.

These conditions were sufficient in 1940 to justify the Congress in singling out this issue and providing for its study and solution through the establishment of the Special Senate Committee on Small Business Problems.

Small businessmen brought their problem to the Senate Small Business Committee and to a similar committee which had been set up in the House of Representatives. The Senate committee immediately undertook a study of these problems. A committee staff was set up and hearings and studies were commenced. But in 1941, while the Congress was in the midst of its studies of the problems affecting small business, the war started, creating still more difficult problems in this field. So great was the life and death struggle of small independent business as the war-preparedness program got under way that the committee was diverted from investigation of long-range problems and was forced to take up the more immediate task of cushioning the shock of the war on small business.

When the war broke out in Europe, the War Department apparently had no conception of what was going to happen in this country. There was no program whatever for the utilization of small plants of the country in war production. Because of scarcity of materials, they were finding it impossible to remain in civilian production. Yet at first they were denied access to war contracts.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the very able Senator from Montana what legislation he considers to have been passed for the benefit of small business enterprises in the country through recommendations of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator inquires about legislation that was passed, I should answer by saying that we passed legislation, at the very commencement of the activities of the committee, to protect and relieve the automobile dealers of the Nation, who were affected by the action of the Government in stopping the production of automobiles, particularly pleasure cars.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Special Committee on Small Business sponsor that legislation?

Mr. MURRAY. The Small Business Committee sponsored that legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was it not the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. MURRAY. No. The bill went to the Committee on Banking and Currency, perhaps; but it was introduced by me, representing the Small Business Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did not the Banking and Currency Committee also hold hearings on it?

Mr. MURRAY. The Banking and Currency Committee also held hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. And they did not call witnesses?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then there was a duplication of effort?

Mr. MURRAY. I should not consider it a duplication, because the Small Business Committee had not held extensive hearings. They went into the matter in conference with representatives of the automobile dealers, and they introduced the bill because it was necessary to act promptly in the matter. Over 60,000 automobile dealers in the country were facing bankruptcy, unless speedy relief was accorded them.

Mr. MAYBANK. What I meant to ask the Senator was this: Did the Small Business Committee report favorably in its own name any legislation on this subject?

Mr. MURRAY. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Small Business Committee merely recommended certain legislation to the Banking and Currency Committee or to other committees?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And those other committees found it necessary to hold public hearings before reporting the legislation?

Mr. MURRAY. The Small Business Committee was not given the power and authority, itself, to report bills to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the resolution the Senator is discussing give it the power to act?

Mr. MURRAY. I have not studied the resolution, but my understanding is that it is in the same language as the other and follows the provisions of the original resolution, which set up the committee in 1940.

It was only through the active efforts of the Senate Small Business Committee that we finally brought about a recognition of the need of utilizing small manufacturing plants in war production. The committee performed an invaluable service in bringing about the mobilization of small manufacturing concerns in the war-production program and also in aiding other concerns unable to participate in war production to continue in civilian production.

From its very inception, the committee worked as a bipartisan committee entirely without political consideration or party advantage. It ignored political considerations and directed its activities earnestly to the preservation of the small independent business structure in our economy, which is the very foundation of American democracy.

I cannot take the time now to detail all the activities of the committee over the war period. At the commencement of the war, when the Government ordered stoppage of automobile production and froze the stocks of new cars in dealers' hands, a desperate situation was created for 60,000 automobile dealers throughout the country. With large plants and investments on their hands and their business disrupted by the Government orders, they faced bankruptcy. In desperation they appealed to our committee for help. Without delay the committee worked out a program to aid these dealers and other concerns affected by the regulations, rationing scarce articles and commodities in meeting the conditions confronting them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana, who has been the chairman of the so-called Small Business Committee during all the time since its inception——

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct, and I submitted the original resolution creating the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that because of the aid given small business by the committee during the war, contracts for war materials were given to small businessmen in every State of the Nation?

Mr. MURRAY. In every State in the Union; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator believe that the small businessmen throughout the country would have received such war contracts if it had not been for the committees of the Senate and House which served as vocal organs for small business?

Mr. MURRAY. If it had not been for such committees the small businessmen of the country would not have had the opportunity to receive such war contracts. By reason of the aid thus furnished, small businessmen sought to secure contracts and were able to secure them. They were not equipped with the machinery and the plants to take on some contracts, and it was necessary to secure financial aid for them. Others who could not secure war contracts, or who were unable to secure materials, were helped to continue in civilian production. So, small businessmen were helped in both ways.

Mr. WHERRY. It is asserted that the war is now over, that the war contracts have all been awarded, and that there will be no new war contracts. But I ask the distinguished Senator from Montana, the chairman of the so-called Small Business Committee, if it is not true that the small businessmen during the past 6 years have appeared before the Senate Small Business Committee and a similar committee of the House, because there was the place they could secure help in obtaining contracts, and in other ways? Does not the Senator further feel that until the standing committees of the Senate are properly organized, when perhaps other procedure shall be established, that the present Senate special committee should continue, at least during the present session, to be the advocate of the small businessmen, and to be the one committee where the small businessman can come, in

view of the fact that he has heretofore been taught to come for aid to that committee during the past 6 years?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska has stated the situation exactly. The small businessmen of the country had no other place to go except to this committee, and it was as the result of very great pressure on the part of the committee that we were finally able to induce the War Department and the Navy Department to recognize the need of giving contracts to the smaller business concerns.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Montana in his speech advance further reasons for the continuance of the committee at this time? I have reference to hearings which the distinguished Senator would like to conduct. It is my understanding, from conversations and conferences with the Senator, that there are some very important hearings which should be held, and that the distinguished Senator is waiting until the committee is reorganized in order that such hearings may be held.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee has heretofore done the preliminary work, has it not?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. We were ready to proceed with such hearings last month, but in view of the fact that Congress was in the process of reorganization, and that the new majority party was going to take charge, the hearings were delayed.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator further if it is not true that the country is under a considerable amount of regulation even now? At this time the question of priorities is still involved in many instances through different agencies of the Government. We still have controls; do we not? We still have priorities. There are contracts yet to be let by the Department of Agriculture and by other Government agencies which involve small businessmen. Is it not a fact that until that work is taken over by the standing committees, if standing committees are to do it, during the intervening period some committee such as the Small Business Committee should serve the small businessmen?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at that point will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In view of the fine record the Small Business Committee has made, as brought out by the questions just asked by the able Senator from Nebraska, I should like to ask him a question. As this is a nonpartisan proposition, and we are all interested in the promotion of small business, and because we do not want to change a committee which has been working on the subject, and based on all the other arguments that have been adduced to support the position of maintaining a small business committee, I should like to ask the able Senator if he would not be in favor of having the Senator from Montana continue as chairman of that committee, so we could make sure that the work he has inaugurated would be carried on?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am glad indeed to say to the Members of the Senate that I think the distinguished Senator from Montana has done an able job, just as the Senator from Maryland has done an able job in the committees of which he is a member. I should be glad to suggest, if it came to me to decide, that both Senators should be placed upon the Small Business Committee, to continue in the work of that committee, if they would like to be placed on the committee.

I think this is the time to call to the attention of those who are interested in continuing the work of special committees which cut across standing committee lines, that if such continuation can be shown to be justified, it should be done. The way to do it is to call attention to what the committees have done, and if a committee has given a good account of itself by reason of services well performed, I think the place to give such justification is here on the Senate floor, and I am doing so this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana again yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator from Nebraska has been not only generous but factual, and that is the best kind of generosity. But I know that we all simply ache and we all are most anxious in the most impartial way to see that the small businessman of this Republic not only receives a fair deal, but a little bit more than a fair deal, if we can give it to him, because we are not unmindful of the giant concerns which usurp all the prerogatives of ordinary commerce and movements in the channels of trade. Therefore, as we have had such eloquent testimony respecting the work the so-called Small Business Committee has done under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Montana, I think it would be a step backward, that we would be going back to the "horse and buggy" days, if it were not continued under his chairmanship, and——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Permit me to finish.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator if he will not yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason the Senator from Montana has been such an able chairman of the committee is that he had members of the then minority party working hard with him, and that they have endeavored in every way to assist the chairman in his efforts. I believe the chairman will tell the Senator from Maryland that the work of the committee has been done by a nonpartisan group. We honor the chairman for that.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the work has been done by a nonpartisan group, then I can conceive of no better way to continue the nonpartisan effort than for the able Senator from Montana to continue so that the small businessmen of the Republic will receive a square deal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to show the Senate that I am nonpartisan, I should like to have the committee continued, and I should like to have seven Republican Members on it, and five Democratic Senators on it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to say that during its entire life there were never any problems arising between the Democrats and the Republicans serving on that committee. I think that in practically every instance when we introduced a bill to correct unfortunate conditions in order to benefit small business the action of the committee was unanimous. It was so in connection with the bill which we brought forward to help the automobile dealers. It was true also when we set up the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I think in practically every case where the committees took action on any problem affecting small business we had the full cooperation of the Republican members of the committee. In fact, they were very helpful to us. We had some businessmen on that committee. One was the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who gave us considerable support in connection with the problems we had before the committee at different times. There is no problem with reference to politics so far as the committee is concerned. I think it has done an excellent job.

An act sponsored by the committee to relieve automobile dealers was Public Law 549, regulating the handling of certain articles and commodities rationed under the authority of the United States. Through this law we obtained relief not only for automobile dealers but for all wholesalers and retailers whose stocks and funds were frozen by war orders, providing also Government assistance in carrying their interest charges and regulating the disposal of their goods.

Closely related to the automobile dealers' problems at that time was the situation of the 300,000 independent tire dealers. By hearings, inquiries, correspondence, and otherwise, the committee was able to render valuable service to this section of our economy in the war period.

By enactment of a special resolution following our investigations in the automobile-servicing field alone some 300,000 independent businesses in the United States were not only saved from extinction but were provided with materials which enabled them to carry on all through the war effort supplying essential automotive parts and making repairs without which the civilian and military transportation of the Nation would have been greatly impaired.

When the bakery trade of the country was threatened with bankruptcy through the rationing of fats and oils, the committee held prompt hearings which resulted in immediate relief for that industry, preventing the bankruptcy of thousands of small bakeries and preventing great inconvenience to the public.

We secured passage of legislation creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which channeled war contracts into small business establishments, enabling many thousands of small business firms to make a remarkable contribution to our wartime accomplishments.

We prevailed upon the War and Navy Departments to set up special procedures for channeling Government contracts into small local firms. We policed the regulatory machinery set up by the control agencies, the War Production Board,

and the Office of Price Administration, breaking many a bottleneck, thereby obtaining relief for small business firms unable to maintain lobbies or representatives to plead their case at the Nation's Capital.

The plight of small retailers and wholesalers handling hosiery, dry goods, lumber, groceries, and general merchandise in the many thousands of stores over this broad land was early brought to our committee. We held hearings which resulted in maintaining their normal channels of trade, kept them in business, and enabled them to get a share of the necessarily scarce consumer goods. Small meat packers were the victims of regulations which unduly favored the big processors; and again we were asked to intercede, with the result that a substantial revision of subsidy payments and slaughtering quotas were made in their favor.

We took a most active part in framing the surplus property legislation, seeing to it that priorities were included which have made it possible for small business to obtain a fair share of surplus plants, goods, and equipment.

These are but illustrative of the many successful efforts made by the Senate Small Business Committee in behalf of the small business community. They were accomplished by means of the loyal and diligent work of the entire Democratic and Republican membership of the committee and its small, hard-working staff of experts. Practically every action which was taken was the result of unanimous agreement. The money costs of maintaining the committee during the 6 years of its life are an infinitesimal fraction of the actual money saved American business and the people of this country.

All of this wartime effort in behalf of independent small business accomplished one major purpose, namely, the survival and readiness of a healthy, awakened small business economy to participate in reconversion and peacetime activities. I shudder to think what the condition of independent American small business would have been had this effort not been so successful.

But the program which the Senate Small Business Committee was called upon to carry out has not been completed, namely, the investigation of the long-range problems of American small business. We have carried on studies of long-range problems to the extent that time allowed. By arrangement with the Smaller War Plants Corporation, a study of the effect of the war years on American business has been made. This was published as Economic Concentration and World War II, a 359-page document packed full of startling facts showing that despite all of the efforts made in behalf of independent competitive business, the war years saw such a concentration of economic power develop in the hands of a few industrial giants that today this constitutes the greatest single threat to the survival of the free enterprise system in the United States.

In a final report of my chairmanship of 6 years of effort of the Senate Small Business Committee, I later intend to present in some detail the bearing of big business concentration on the future of independent business.

I am prepared to offer more than 50 major recommendations intended to arrest the damaging growth of monopoly and thereby give independent business in the country a fair and equal chance to get under way, develop, and grow strong in a competitive situation, guaranteed under our Democratic system and its safeguarding institutions. Many of these recommendations are new, but long overdue. Others have been heretofore presented to the Congress and must be urged again and again until action results. The evils these remedies seek to correct have already gripped our economic system in what may well prove to be a death struggle.

In an article appearing in the Atlantic Monthly for January 1947, Joseph and Stewart Alsop said:

> But the sad fact is that "free enterprise" is as dead in Europe today and throughout the world except in the United States as the Holy Roman Empire.

I am not an alarmist. Nevertheless, I feel sure that anyone intelligently viewing the world scene today cannot fail to recognize that the situation requires immediate action. Already competitive private enterprise has been abolished in many major countries. Even before the war, three of the largest nations in Europe—Russia, Germany, and Italy—had abandoned it and other nations were threatening to follow their lead. Free competition is disappearing with alarming rapidity all over the world. It is so weakened in our own country by the tremendous growth of monopoly and concentration of wealth as to force President Truman to declare in his state of the Union message that this constitutes a major problem for immediate attention of the Congress.

Mr. President, imposing evidence of the value of the Senate Small Business Committee is found in the many hundreds of letters from individual businessmen and representative business associations and organizations which have come to me in recent weeks while the question of committee continuance has been pending.

I do not want to burden the RECORD with a long reading of these impressive testimonials to the accomplishments of the committee, but I want to mention one or two of them.

So effective has been our work in behalf of the many hundreds of small miners scattered over most Western States, for example, that their journal, Pay Dirt, in the December 1946 issue said, in part:

> We who are concerned with the problems of the mining industry are vitally interested in the fate of the Senate Small Business Committee. It would be a tremendous setback to United States mining, and especially to the small mines which some day will be our large ones, if the splendid work of its Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals becomes only a matter of record of what happened in the Seventy-ninth Congress. * * * Never before have the small mine operators had a congressional group to which they could present their problems and obtain prompt action.

I ask that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION IS NEEDED RIGHT NOW

It was almost a hurricane that swept the country on November 5. There is no question but that the voters expressed themselves as wanting something different from what they had. Now the problem which faces the new powers that be is to sort out the good from the bad—retain that which is beneficial to the country and discard that which is considered harmful. There are mighty few so narrow and bigoted who will not admit that some of what we had is good enough to retain and to amplify.

Small business in the country, for instance, is vitally interested in what the situation will be after the Senate reorganization as to Senator MURRAY's Committee on Small Business. While MURRAY, being a Democrat, probably would not be chairman, he could be a potent part of a similar committee. His leadership in recognizing and attempting to solve the problems of small business knew no party designation and it is doubtful if he even knew the political beliefs of those he was serving. That committee did a fine job and it is a work that the Republicans should retain and amplify.

We who are concerned with the problems of the mining industry are vitally interested in the fate of the Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals Industry, for, if the Senate Small Business Committee disappears from the picture, its subcommittees will likewise fade out. It would be a tremendous setback to United States mining—and especially to the small mines which some day will be our large ones—if the splendid work of that subcommittee becomes only a matter of record of what happened in the Seventy-ninth Congress and does not carry forward into the Eightieth Congress.

It would be quite in accordance with political tradition that the dominating party be given the leadership, but it would be a disaster to have the new leaders take the attitude that everything which the old leaders did was wrong and should be discarded. No such mandate was given the new leaders. If they are wise—and we hope they are—they will build on all that was helpful and tear down that which was leading us away from true democracy.

The mining industry will watch anxiously for signs that the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals Industry will have the opportunity to complete for us in the Eightieth Congress the unfinished or uncompleted business of the Seventy-ninth, and that the extensive research work which has been done will bear fruit later.

Never before have the small mine operators had a congressional group to which they could present their problems and obtain prompt action. Such action has been tremendously important because it came from a committee with congressional force sufficient to compel an autocratic bureaucrat to be civil and human with Mr. John Q. Public. Members of that congressional group could smooth out arrogance for they had the power to beat it down if it was not smoothed out.

The mining industry, both large and small operators, is interested in a continuance of the work of the Mining and Minerals Industry Subcommittee, and we should take it upon ourselves individually to inform the newly elected Members of the Eightieth Congress that here is a worth-while work in progress, and it should be given the opportunity to carry on.

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, did a good job for small business, and it was not because those he served were Democrats or Republicans. It was because they were small and needed congressional help. He did a good job because he built up a capable organization within his committee and sub-

committee, and that organization was serving industries and not political parties.

Let's let those in the Eightieth Congress know that here is a work that should be carried forward—congressional aid to small business and to small mine operators. There should, in fact, be a similar committee in the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. George C. Hatch, president of the New Council of American Small Business, telegraphed me on January 10, 1947, as follows:

New Council of American Business strongly feels that continuation of Senate Small Business Committee is absolutely essential to best interests of independent businessmen throughout America. The record of the committee thus far has shown imperative need of strengthening small business if system of private competitive enterprise is to endure. We urge that the work of the committee be extended and enlarged in scope by the new Congress.

The American Association of Small Business, with national headquarters in Washington, D. C., wrote me under date of January 10, 1947, over the signature of its president, Mr. Robert R. Hellyer:

I wish to put in your hands the attitude and convictions of the American Association of Small Business on the continuation of the Senate Small Business Committee * * *. The work of the Senate Small Business Committee, in its earnest endeavor constructively to solve the problems peculiar to small business, has attracted wide public attention * * *. Due to the fact that in the past there has been no organized effort on the part of small business to establish a national organization which could undertake to represent all classifications of small business before Senate committees, hundreds of small businessmen throughout the country found it necessary to journey to Washington to present their individual problems. Due to the sincerity with which the committee welcomed all petitioners, and because of the thoroughness with which such particular problems were examined in open hearings, the committees were enabled to get first-hand the frank views of hundreds of men in small business who otherwise never had been enabled successfully to present their problems.

Thus, small business was afforded opportunities, as full as the petitioners themselves desired, to submit their cases in a national forum. In many instances through public hearings and through the expert aid of its investigators and economists, businessmen were enabled intelligently and thoroughly to bring the economic plight of small business to the attention of their representatives in the national legislature * * *. We know of no other committee of the Congress whose functions so successfully have operated to reach the "grassroots" of industry and distribution throughout all sections of the country.

Mr. President, I regret that I find myself not in accord with many of my colleagues whose judgment I generally hold in high respect. Nevertheless, I am supporting the resolution of the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to establish a Senate Small Business Committee because I am convinced by my experience on the committee that such action is absolutely necessary if we are going to protect small business enterprise. I do not believe that a subcommittee of a general standing committee could do the job as effectively as could a special committee, and I believe that it is in the interest and welfare not only of the small businessmen but of the whole country that the Senate reorganize the Small Business Committee and permit it to go forward with its investigations and studies in an effort to support small business enterprise in America.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I thought the Senator was about to conclude his remarks, and I did not want to interrupt him if he had not about concluded.

I think probably the Senator can explain something that rather puzzles me. The Senator is or was the chairman of the Small Business Committee, which was created pursuant to a resolution which I presume he submitted?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I notice that the committee has terminated.

Mr. MURRAY. It will be terminated at the end of this month. It is still a live committee. A resolution was adopted which extended it until the end of January.

Mr. HATCH. I observe that the resolution which is now on our desks contains a specific provision in section 3 that the committee which was heretofore created is "terminated" by express action, while by the resolution another committee, a new one, is to be created and set up. Is there any difference in the powers? I am puzzled about the provisions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I might point out to the distinguished Senator that it was difficult, in view of the representation on the old committee of seven to five, to continue the committee, because the membership of the committee would now be in the ratio of six to five. The only Senator falling out was Senator Mead, of New York. The legislative counsel has already drafted the provisions of the original resolution, as amended from time to time, extending in full force the authority and powers of the committee as they have heretofore existed. After that was done it was suggested that we would have to terminate this committee as of some date. I should be glad, if the distinguished Senator from Montana would like to have me do so, to put into the resolution a provision that the committee as now constituted shall terminate on January 31, in keeping with the statute.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that was my intention.

Mr. WHERRY. It was in order to reconstitute the committee, with the representation to which it is entitled, that we had to terminate the old one; but we are asking the formation of the new one exactly under the provisions of the original resolution and the resolutions which have continued it from time to time. Section 3 of Senate Resolution 20 requires the termination of the old committee because of the representation feature. I should be glad now to amend section 3 so that the committee will be terminated as of January 31, 1947.

Mr. MURRAY. I will make that request when the resolution comes up.

Mr. HATCH. That part of the resolution seemed to me to be unusual, and I wondered if the purposes or the powers of the committee were being changed.

Mr. WHERRY. In no way whatever. The only reason for terminating the present committee was to reorganize it on a basis of representation of 7 to 5. I have talked with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and I think that will be agreed to, so far as the membership of the committee is concerned and so far as we are concerned.

Mr. MURRAY. I did not understand what the membership division would be.

Mr. WHERRY. The membership of the committee was originally five. Then it was increased to seven. I think Senate Resolution 66 increased the membership to 12. That was done by resolution. There were seven Democrats and five Republicans. That is the exact number provided in Senate Resolution 20, except that the representation, so far as parties are concerned, will be reversed.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of nothing further to come before the Senate this afternoon, and I therefore move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Monday, January 13, 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

Warren R. Austin, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mark Foster Ethridge, to be the United States representative on the Commission of Investigation established by the Security Council of the United Nations on December 19, 1946, to ascertain the facts relating to alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

O. Max Gardner, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

S. Pinkney Tuck, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt.

George Wadsworth, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq.

Lowell C. Pinkerton, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon.

J. Rives Childs, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Raleigh A. Gibson
Clarence E. Macy
Marshall M. Vance

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Joe D. Walstrom

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert M. Carr

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James E. Callahan
Duncan M. White
John R. Wood
Neal D. Borum
Sabin J. Dalferes
Paul M. Dutko
Ellis A. Johnson
Victor H. Loftus
Camden L. McLain
Clay Merrell
Henry O. Ramsey
Marc L. Severe
Charles H. Stephan
Charles W. Allen
Edward S. Benet
Frederick A. Bohne
George L. Brist
Albert S. Browne
F. Willard Calder
Harold Carlson
Herbert W. Carlson
John J. Coyle
Laurence J. Daymont
Joseph R. Evans
Cyrus B. Follmer
Charles M. Gerrity
Culver E. Gidden
Carl O. Hawthorne
Bernard F. Heller
Wendell S. Howard
Julius C. Jensen
Stanley R. Lawson
William R. Lynch
Samuel A. McIlhenny, Jr.
George C. Minor
H. Claremont Moses
Eugene W. Nabel
Arthur G. Parsloe
Raymond Phelan
James C. Powell, Jr.
Arthur J. Romero
Miss Agnes E. Schneider.
Paul C. Seddicum
Warren C. Stewart
Hugh H. Teller
Hernan C. Vogenitz
Joseph F. Walker
Leslie A. Weisenburg
Stephen C. Worster
Casimir T. Zawadzki
Ben Zweig
John R. Barry
Adam Beaumont
Horace C. de Baca
Henry T. Dwyer
Earl W. Eaton
J. Stanford Edwards
Fred H. Houck
Robert L. Hunter
Russell B. Jordan
Chester H. Kimrey
Henry G. Krausse
Francis A. Lane
Nelson P. Meeks
Augustus Ostertag
Harry K. Pangburn
Carroll C. Parry
George R. Phelan
Frithjof C. Sigmond
Jones R. Trowbridge
Lawrence W. von Hellens
W. Stratton Anderson, Jr.
Russell W. Benton
William O. Boswell
George Lewis Jones, Jr.
Douglas MacArthur 2d
Jack B. Neathery
Robert W. Rinden
M. Robert Rutherford
Robert C. Strong
Evan M. Wilson
James M. Gilchrist, Jr.
Boies C. Hart, Jr.
George D. Henderson

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Stuart Blow
William L. Brewster
Lawrence N. Chamberlin
Martin P. Detels, Jr.
L. Milner Dunn
Martin F. Herz
C. H. Walter Howe
Alexander C. Johnpoll
Edward V. Lindberg
William A. McFadden
Charles P. McVicker, Jr.
Robert Behymer Moody
Warren S. Moore, Jr.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr.
William N. Stokes
Oliver L. Troxel, Jr.
Robert E. Whedbee
William A. Wieland
Sam L. Yates, Jr.

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert M. Berry
Gardner C. Carpenter
William P. Hudson
Thomas D. Kingsley
Glenn R. McCarty, Jr.
James H. McFarland, Jr.
Randolph Roberts
G. Alonzo Stanford
Robert W. Weise, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Redeemer and our Lord, as we come to the throne of grace, we pray for a richer life in Thee. Fulfill in us the promise: Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. There is nothing more glorious than the knowledge of Thy truth, with its spiritual and moral application, which bids the weak be strong, the bad be good, the unjust be upright, and the unclean be pure. Wherever there is oppression, repression, and injustice, Thy holy arm make bare. Come Thou in wonderful evolution in the thoughts and spirits and lives of men, and let Thy divine impulse rest upon us, O Christ. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 10, 1946, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE LATE LYNN J. FRAZIER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty this morning to announce the passing of former United States Senator from North Dakota, Lynn J. Frazier.

The Senator was a graduate from Mayville Normal and the State university. While at the university I had the pleasure of playing with him on the same football team for 4 years. His fairness, honesty, and determination were respected by all the other players. No player ever found fault with any decision of Captain Frazier.

After graduation he followed agriculture, and became one of the successful farmers in Pembina County. Then in 1916, without his knowledge or consent, he was endorsed by the original Nonpartisan Leaguers as their candidate for Governor.

Known only in some parts of the State by those who knew and were acquainted with him in college, he became a formidable candidate overnight, and in the June primaries he was nominated as the Republican candidate by a large majority. He was elected in the general election of that year by a vote of over 4 to 1.

During his first term as Governor, the opposition had a majority in the State senate, and blocked most of the important progressive legislation that he sponsored. In the 1918 campaign, however, the issues were clear and clean-cut. The Governor was renominated and reelected by a large majority, and with him a two-thirds majority of his supporters in both the State house and senate.

During the 1919 session of the State legislature, the Bank of North Dakota—the only bank in the United States owned, operated, and controlled by the sovereign people of the State—was established. No one in the State would now be without this bank, although this legislation was bitterly opposed at the time.

In the same session the State mill and elevator was established, State hail insurance was rewritten and made workable, workmen's compensation—perhaps the most liberal up to that time in the Nation—State bonding of public officials and State insurance of public buildings were passed. These were a few of the many progressive laws sponsored by Governor Frazier.

It was but natural that to such program there was bitter opposition. But I may state that today there are few in the State—businessman, farmer, or laborer—who would change or abolish any of these institutions.

Governor Frazier realized that that which was for the best interest of the greatest number was best for all. He realized that there was a line between private industry and monopoly. He believed that there were some things that all the people—the State—could do better for all the people than a few monopolies.

Senator Frazier was honored and respected by all who knew him. Even his opponents knew that he was just, and that they could depend on him. Always brutually frank yet just to his enemies and friends alike.

Senator Frazier's earthly existence has ended. He has gone on that journey from which as yet none has returned. But the memory of Senator Frazier and his accomplishments will live and grow as the years go by. His accomplishments as Governor and as United States Senator has made the State of North Dakota, and the Nation, a better place to live in.

In the Senate he was coauthor of the Frazier-Lemke moratorium which has saved the homes of at least 250,000 farm families. He was coauthor of the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill that finally resulted in lowering the interest on Federal farm loans from 5 to 3½ percent. He was the coauthor of the cost-of-production bill—which is the only solution to the agricultural problem.

I know that those who know of his work will agree with me that Senator Frazier was a statesman—not a politician. We sympathize with his family and many friends.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DETROIT EXTENDS INVITATION FOR 1952 OLYMPIAD

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced into the House my first bill as a Member of the Congress of the United States. To the membership of this body my proposed measure is relatively unimportant, but to me and the civic and industrial leaders of Detroit it is a resolution of significant import. It provides that an invitation be extended to the International Olympic Committee which will meet in Stockholm, Sweden, in June of this year, to hold the 1952 Olympic games in the United States.

If the invitation is accepted, Detroit will be one of the leading contenders to be host to these games. A delegation of prominent and responsible Detroit men will be in Stockholm when the invitation is formally presented. Some of the active civic leaders in my home city have requested that I sponsor this concurrent resolution in the hope that the 1952 Olympiad may be brought to America's fourth city 5 years hence. Detroit is far to the forefront in staging affairs of such magnitude and entertaining royalty and representatives of all phases of business and society of foreign lands. It is also accustomed to taking its place as one of the great sport centers of the Nation. It has played host to world-series crowds in baseball; been the scene of the national hockey play-offs, and saw its professional football team triumph in the championship series in recent years. During World War II sporting events and other gatherings were curtailed while all Detroit literally rolled up its sleeves and went to work in the war effort to justify its designation as the arsenal of democracy. Now, in peacetime, it has another ambition—to, come 1952, earn the designation of the playground of all nations.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, there is transmitted herewith a report by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems with respect to the participation of the United States in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and in the International Monetary Fund to October 31, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1947.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of all other business and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of sugar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter from a constituent to Philip Murray, of the CIO, and also a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the adjutant general of the State of Iowa.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lewistown Journal and a biographical article from the Portland Sunday Telegram on the senior Senator from Maine.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table on sugar.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a speech delivered by Ted Malone of the American Broadcasting Co. on the opening session of the Eightieth Congress, and in the other an address delivered by the president of the National Teachers' Association in Chicago.

THE SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Britain apparently are tired of socialism and Government ownership of public utilities, because they are now distributing pamphlets throughout England which read as follows:

Leaflet No. 1:

The people of Britain who fought from 1939–45 for freedom from oppression.

Wot! No coal?

There are more civil servants than hewers of coal.

How about their changing jobs?

Leaflet No. 2:

The cotton market at Liverpool— * * * hub of the world's trade closed by official orders. Why? Because it was private enterprise! * * * so it simply had to go.

Leaflet No. 3:

When we're sitting around fireless grates let us remember that we own the mines!

Leaflet No. 4:

State doctor—

"Now just sit up in bed and sign here—and here—and here.

"And fill out this form.

"And get three neighbors to vouch for it.

"And remember the pains and penalties of perjury!

"Then I will look at your tongue."

Leaflet No. 5:

We voted left and—we got left.

Leaflet No. 6:

Every brick of the house we have not got has been zoned, rationed, allocated, prioritied, and planned. So perfect is the official scheme that every hod of mortar is certified under seal to be free from private profit and wholly devoted to national interest. How happy this makes us as we double up with our cheerful relatives.

Leaflet No. 7:

Our quids go down the drain.

Another deficit added to the debt, and our Government obligations (bonds) buy less and less of more and more of what we haven't got.

Leaflet No. 8:

When we are parked with relatives and the kids are hungry, it helps a bit to know—

We own the Bank of England.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE RICE FARMERS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am sending to the desk for introduction a resolution for the purpose of correcting present inequities as they pertain to a great class of our rural citizenship, the farmers whose money crop is rice.

Under the present control policies as administered by the executive branch of our Government, the rice farmers have not been treated fairly, and it is imperative that immediate action be taken. It would have been far better if this action had been taken long ago, and certainly when the Executive order removing certain other OPA controls was issued, the

rice farmer should then have been given adequate protection.

As I understand it, present controls are left on rice for the express purpose of implementing the Government's purchase program for overseas shipment. Thus, we find that our citizens' own Government is discriminating against them for the benefit of foreign peoples. It would be better to remove these price controls and, if the price should go slightly higher, let the tax burden be shared equally. As it now is, the rice farmer must forego a part of his profit and then pay an equal share of taxes for the purchase of this rice. This, in effect, causes the rice farmers and producers to pay twice for the price of rice to be sent to foreign nations. The rice farmers, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, are not financially able to carry this double taxation, and my resolution is introduced for the purpose of correcting this unfair situation and condition.

In my district in eastern Arkansas there are many fine men who earn food and clothing for their families through the cultivation and sale of rice. These men have been having a difficult time. They need every dollar they can earn. They were, it is true, given a recent increase of a dollar a barrel for rice, but this increase did little to assist them, and the increase in many cases did not raise the price to the levels prevailing before OPA controls were imposed. Thus, we find that this large group of agricultural workingmen, whose families rely on their earnings for food, clothing, and housing, have, by force of law, been prevented from sharing in the general rise of earnings. Rather, they have been forced to live on a level lower than even the prewar scale and have suffered increased costs and taxations.

It is well to be charitable to foreign nations. Charity is a characteristic of the Christian mind; but charity, Mr. Speaker, begins at home. In this case, the rice farmers ask you to be charitable enough to give them a fair deal. They ask that we remove the controls that penalize their wives and children to benefit certain favored foreign nations. I ask that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture in order that immediate action may be taken.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

RECENT AIR CRASHES AND THE CAB AND CAA

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is astounded to read the headlines of the morning papers telling of the crash of an Eastern air liner at Galax, Va., in which catastrophe 18 of her 19 passengers and crew members were killed.

The account of the crash in the newspapers indicates that this plane was at least 60 miles off course. This is absolutely inexcusable.

A few days ago we read another account, this time of the crash of an American air liner, bound from New York to Washington with a full passenger list. This plane had to return to New York and crash land on Jones' Beach. The facts in that case are these: That plane came down here with no alternate place to land, an inexcusable thing.

The appropriate committee of this House should forthwith start a very thorough investigation of these inexcusable crashes and killings of the American people. The American people are shocked and horrified. The American people are scared to death of flying. Those who want to ride on an airplane are afraid.

I believe the CAA should be thoroughly investigated, and I believe that the supreme court of the CAA, the CAB, should be investigated. The American people should know what is going on. There is something rotten in Denmark, there is something wrong with Eastern Air Lines, there is something wrong with American Airlines, there is something wrong with the whole doggone set-up, and something ought to be done about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

CHANGE IN SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 30 minutes granted me to address the House on Thursday be moved up to Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. And I wish to state that I intend to speak about the Budget, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday following the legislative program of the day and other special orders. I also wish to discuss certain aspects of the Budget on that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the GI bill of rights which would forbid payments by the Veterans' Administrator to schools which discriminate against veterans because of their race, religion, creed, or national origin.

A deplorable and shameful condition has been exposed in the American educational system which calls for immediate correction. Educational institutions which claim to be nonsectarian have denied their facilities to those veterans of World War II who belong to certain minority races or religions. Authoritative studies of admission practices of schools of higher learning made by the American Jewish Congress reveal that numerous veterans are unable to take advantage of the rights accorded them under the GI bill of rights because many schools have adopted a quota system limiting the number of Jews, Negroes, Catholics, and persons of Italian origin who may be admitted. The American Jewish Congress has conducted a comprehensive investigation into the admission practices of educational institutions. The statistical results compiled by this investigation, which conclusively demonstrate that discrimination against persons of particular races and religions prevails, have been widely accepted. The statistics of the American Jewish Congress have furnished the basis for an investigation by the City Council of the City of New York which resulted in a finding that discrimination on account of race, color, religion, and national origin exists and must be corrected by remedial legislation.

It is extremely regrettable that those who are returning from all parts of the world where they have been engaged in mortal combat to preserve democracy are confronted with the closed doors of educational institutions which practice discrimination. A GI who was not excluded from the hedgerows of Normandy or the beaches of Okinawa should not be excluded from the so-called educational institutions of our country. Discrimination by an educational institution against a veteran because of his color or religion strikes at the very heart of the democracy for which he fought. The American Government cannot and must not support those very practices for whose abolition we sacrificed the lives of thousands of our young men of all races, colors, and religions. The Government of the United States cannot and must not on the one hand grant them the opportunity to fight for the preservation of democracy and on the other, support denials of the opportunity to obtain higher education.

It is imperative that the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will empower the Veterans' Administrator to cease making further payments to educational institutions which, after attempts by conciliation and mediation, refuse to discontinue practices of discrimination against veterans belonging to certain minority races and religions. The amendment which I have introduced today may not eliminate this un-American practice, but it should at least stop these institutions from feeding at the public trough. There is no reason why the Government should subsidize un-American practices.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], who has just addressed the House in favor of denying the benefits of veterans' legislation to ex-servicemen in the South or anywhere else where they maintain separate schools, wonders why there is so much racial disturbance in this country.

You say anything about a Jew, and he will get up and whine to high heaven; yet he comes in and tries to disturb every school system in the United States, and especially in the Southern States, by attempting to deny to our veterans the benefits of the GI bill of rights because of our separate school systems.

By such agitation he is not doing the people of his own race any good, but is doing the Negroes of the country infinite harm—while trying to punish the white servicemen who fought this Nation's battles in time of war and are now trying to rehabilitate themselves with the assistance of a grateful Government.

You know, and he knows, that his bill cannot pass, but he wants to get some cheap publicity propaganda over.

He will probably get it tomorrow in the Communist Daily Worker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of communism in textbooks used and paid for by the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which she has been asked to introduce by the ABC, and also a report on the legislation.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include resolutions of the National Federation of the Blind.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the special orders for today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on postwar economic conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the same time on Thursday at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next after disposition of any matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I obtained unanimous consent to extend certain material in the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $570, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX ON RETIREMENT PAYMENTS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that this session of Congress should do something toward lowering existing income taxes. I feel, however, that some discretion should be used in the methods employed in order to accomplish these reductions.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a bill which I am about to introduce providing an exemption up to the amount of $1,440 on all retirement pensions, allowances, and annuity payments made by the Federal Government or any State or any political subdivision thereof. I am filing this bill because I believe there are in this country many former school teachers, firemen, policemen, and other public servants who are not able at this time to live properly on the amount of the annuities which they are receiving.

I hope that this bill will be given favorable consideration in committee and by the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY LAWSUITS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the press gives us the information that up to last Friday suits calling for the payment of over $4,000,000,000 have been filed ostensibly on behalf of employees against employers to recover for overtime work. Some folks refer to those suits as actions for portal-to-portal pay. Many wonder how it happens that suddenly all over this country there has broken out an epidemic of lawsuits for overtime pay. Just why it is that if millions of workers were entitled to pay for overtime for work done back in 1940 and subsequent years, the workers themselves either never knew of it or never thought of presenting their demands, of bringing suit. The very delay leads to the conclusion that many of the present suits are brought to collect something that the workers themselves did not think they were entitled to receive.

The query naturally suggested is: Is someone other than the workers back of these suits? Are those who advised and instigated them interested, not in overtime pay, but in the fees which might be collected, in obtaining for themselves, say, 20, 30, or 50 percent of the sums recovered?

Those who have been watching the situation realize that it is due to judicial legislation conceived and given birth over in the big marble palace known as the Supreme Court Building. It is quite evident there is a group over there which thinks that the Congress is either incompetent to legislate, has no inclination to legislate constructively, or does not know what it is about. So they are—I was about to say "sticking their noses into our business," but it would not be proper to refer to the Supreme Court in that way, hence the statement is not made. Let this be said: In their wisdom they tried to, in their polite way, "help us out." Now, this is not the first time they have tried that.

You will recall that some years ago—it was in June of 1934—the Congress passed what it thought was an antiracketeering law. Then you will recall that Dan Tobin's Teamsters Union in New York, and in fact all over this country, began to levy taxes, tribute on every truck that traveled the highway. We thought that was in violation of that statute, but the Supreme Court said "No." In substance, the Court said it was just a sort of playful union activity which the Congress intended to exempt from the practices prohibited by the law.

Far be it from me to criticize a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, but the then Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Stone, did say in his dissenting opinion—315 U. S., page 540—that the reasoning of the majority opinion, if valid—and permit me to quote—"would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime."

He further said—page 541:

> When the Antiracketeering Act was under consideration by Congress, no Member of Congress and no labor leader had the temerity to suggest that such payments, made only to secure immunity from violence and intentionally compelled by assault and battery, could be regarded as the payment of wages by a bona fide employer or that the compulsion of such payments is a legitimate object of a labor union, or was ever made so by any statute of the United States.

Four days after that decision was rendered an amendment was offered by me, striking out the so-called exception upon which the majority hung its opinion.

It took more than 2 years to force through the other body the Hobbs bill which redefined racketeering; which rendered of no effect the decision of the Supreme Court.

It is my hope that the disastrous effects which may follow the Supreme Court's more recent decision in the so-called pottery case may be prevented by the passage of remedial legislation which will leave that august Court no room for superficial—permit me to add, synthetic—reasoning.

In 1938 the Congress passed what is called the Fair Labor Standards Act, and insofar as this discussion is involved, it is but needful to refer to the provisions which fixed minimum wages at 40 cents an hour at the present time and 40 hours a week as the maximum workweek, Congress did not define either "work" or "workweek" as used in the act. But the Labor Department enforcing that law provided rules and regulations which were accepted by employees, by unions, by bargaining representatives of unions and by employers, and there grew up in industry and labor negotiations customs and methods of dealing with overtime and payment for overtime which were accepted and relied upon by all parties primarily interested in wages and hours.

Then along came what we call the portal-to-portal suits instituted to recover wages, instituted by the miners to recover pay for overtime, and we have now two decisions by the Supreme Court with dissenting opinions on the question of what is work and overtime in the coal mines. Those decisions were not so bad because undoubtedly some of the miners were entitled to pay for overtime.

Then we had this pottery case, so-called, up in Mount Clemens, Mich., which came up before Judge Picard in Detroit. I have always heretofore refrained from talking about any case which has not been finally settled. But this situation is something out of the ordinary, its results are so far-reaching that we cannot let it go on unchallenged, because if we do, under that decision of the United States Supreme Court, lawyers, unscrupulous lawyers, crooks, labor racketeers, are inducing and will continue to induce employees, who never had any idea of bringing a suit against an employer for overtime, to file claims in the hope that whether there was or is any justification for those suits, even though there is no foundation for nor hope of recovery, each has a nuisance value, and the employers will be compelled to either pay millions of dollars to avoid expensive lawsuits, to get out of hiring lawyers, and avoid the nuisance of spending their time in court fighting those suits. The Supreme Court, whatever may have been its intention, threw wide open the door to blackmail. And these suits as they are developing, are all too often nothing less than blackmail which is attempted to be levied, not by all employees, because some of these suits are justified, but, as just stated, by labor racketeers and unscrupulous lawyers who are seeking to take advantage of the situation, who are creating bad feeling between employees and their employers; the evil effects will continue for years.

When they started this pottery suit there was only $1,200 involved; that is all. The question was whether the employees should receive pay from the time they arrived at the place where they were going to work, the bench, the machine, and the time they started to work. The master in chancery to whom the case was referred found that the contentions of the employees that such time was work during that extra time and should be paid for as overtime were not sustained.

The master heard the witnesses, he was familiar with the facts, he found in favor of the pottery company on all issues of fact. Then the findings went to Judge Picard and he overruled the master. He also told the company that they would not only pay an attorney fee of $2,000, when the amount involved was only $1,200, but if the litigation was continued on they would have more attorneys' fees to pay.

Then an appeal was taken to the circuit court of appeals, and the circuit court of appeals agreed with the master and disagreed with and overruled the trial judge. Then the case went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court agreed with the master and with the appellate court as to the findings of fact.

Then what happened? Well, Mr. Justice Murphy—and I think four Justices—Justices Douglas, Reed, Rutledge, and Black agreed with him—thought he would do a little judicial legislation, and he added to the issues and said that one of the questions involved was whether from the time the men punched the time clock, which was 6:46 in the morning and 12:46 at noon, to the time they went to work when the whistle blew, which was 7 o'clock in the morning, 14 minutes later, and 1 o'clock in the afternoon, which was 14 minutes later, they should be paid for that time, and he said sure, if it took them that long to walk over to the place where they were to work, or they were about, as he characterized it, the company's business. He injected that issue.

Under the rules of the Federal court, Judge Picard should have sustained the findings of the master unless he found they were contrary to the evidence. Judge Picard practically admitted that the master had not erred in his decision as to the facts, but nevertheless he used an arbitrary formula of his own and found against the company.

Please do not forget that, in spite of the judge's decision, both the circuit court of appeals and the United States Supreme Court, as just stated, found that the master's findings were in accord with the facts.

And do not forget that the Supreme Court agreed with the circuit court of appeals and reversed Judge Picard. But then, strange as it may seem, sent the case back with instructions to the district judge to determine whether, on two counts, judgment should be found against the company, for the employees, and damages awarded. Neither of these two counts were in the original suit.

The Supreme Court opinion laid down a rule of its own and, it is my understanding, on issues which were not raised in the district court; that is, the trial judge was instructed to find as to how much the company owed for, let us call it, walking time and preliminary activities.

Under what theory, other than that it was at liberty to give us judicial legislation, the Supreme Court took upon itself the function of creating and passing upon new issues, instead of the issues sent to it from the lower court, it is difficult to decide.

Is it possible that the more recently appointed members of that Court are committed to the theory that it is within the province of the Court to decide what the law should be, rather than what it is; that, if, in its opinion, the Congress does not legislate in accordance with what the Court thinks to be for the country's interest, the Court should and will strike down the legislation of the Congress, substitute its own judgment of what is best for the country?

If that is to be the theory from this day on, then we should look into the philosophy—political and economic—of the members of the Court, in order that we may adopt legislation which will unmistakably give to the Court the opinion and views of the Congress, and leave no room for construction.

On that theory, permit me to ask who is Judge Murphy? What are his views as to the rights of organized labor, where there is a dispute between labor and management, and has the public any interest which is to be protected? Judge Murphy is not unknown. He was once Governor of the Philippine Islands. He was called back to the States by the President to become a candidate for Governor of Michigan, and with New Deal support he was elected. That was back in the New Deal days. He is the Governor who, when on the last day of December 1936, the goon squads from Ohio, Toledo, and as far south as Georgia, walked into Michigan and took possession of our factories and the streets of our cities and defied our courts and the court orders. He is the man who called out 3,700 members of the National Guard—to put property owners in possession of their property, to protect the citizen who was walking the streets—to end violence? Oh, no. He called them out and he told them to prevent bloodshed when the sheriff and the local peace officer wanted to enforce the law. He gave them to understand that the sheriff's orders, issued by the court, were not to be enforced. He left the sit-down strikers in possession of private property, of the streets of the cities. He and the troops who were subject to his orders permitted the goon squads to destroy private property, defy the police, and the orders of the courts.

Now he is the man who sits over there and who promulgated this judicial legislation. Under it these suits have started, and they will result, if they keep on, in putting many and many an industry out of business, in cutting off hundreds of thousands of jobs.

The point in all that is this: It is time that this Congress enact legislation to end these ruinous lawsuits. How can we do it? We define the term "work" used in the act. We redefine the workweek. We give the workweek the definition given it by the Labor Department, by the custom which has grown up throughout industry. They have gotten along all right heretofore—the employees, the labor unions, those who have bargained for industry with those who bargain for labor, as to hours and wages. Seldom was there a suit for overtime until Pottery decision came along. Now, if we redefine the workweek, if we redefine workweek in accordance with the custom and methods adopted and

used by labor and industry in accord with what Congress meant, much of the trouble will be over.

Do I hear someone say it cannot be done? Oh, yes; it can. The Congress gives and the Congress can take away. So the Supreme Court has said—*National Carloading Corp.* v. *Phoenix-El Paso Express* (176 S. W. Reporter 564. Certiorari denied May 22, 1944, 64 U. S. Sup. Ct. Rept. 1156), *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (251 U. S. 146); *Norman* v. *B. and O. R. R. Co.* (294 U. S. 240); *Treigle* v. *Acme Homestead Assn.* (297 U. S. 189).

The Congress has authority, if it wishes to exercise it, to deprive the district courts of jurisdiction to hear these suits—*Kline* v. *Burke Construction Co.* (260 U. S. 226). Also cases collected in *Seligman's, Inc.* v. *United States* (30 Fed. Supp. 895, at p. 900).

It also has power, if it wishes to do so, to enact so-called windfall legislation, which will make these sums which may be recovered if these suits which are filed now succeed, go not into the pockets of these lawyers and the racketeers but go into the United States Treasury as a windfall tax — *White Packing Co.* v. *Robertson* (89 Fed. (2d) 775), *United States* v. *Hudson* (299 U. S. 498, 57 S. Ct. 309), *Wilson Milling Co.* v. *Commissioner* (138 Fed. (2d) 249. Certiorari denied, 320 U. S. 800, 64 S. Ct. 430).

The Congress should not delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I remind the members of the majority party that we will have a conference in this Chamber at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio speech.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects most widely discussed at the national convention of the American Legion at San Francisco was that of the ceilings imposed upon students and trainees taking on-the-job training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as amended, ceilings imposed by Public Law No. 679, enacted in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a ceiling of $175 on single veterans and $200 on married trainees. On that subject the following report and resolution was adopted by that convention:

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Under title II of the Legion's GI bill a method was provided for on-the-job training with a subsistence allowance for veterans seeking improved skills and to those veterans who previously were without employment experience. The tremendous possibility of benefit to the veteran and ultimately to the Nation itself is commonly recognized. Your convention committee reports with sincere regret that in the closing days of the last session of Congress the Veterans' Administration presented to the Congress a measure that did untold harm to the on-the-job-training program. This action was taken by the Veterans' Administration either without their being properly acquainted with the actual facts and the disastrous results that the measure would bring down, or was due to a virtual admission on the part of the Veterans' Administration that despite the powers vested in the Veterans' Administration as provided in the Legion's GI bill the Veterans' Administration was not properly supervising the on-the-job-training program.

The unfortunate publicity that accompanied the passage of this amended bill did untold harm to many thousands of honest employers and the hundreds of thousands of veterans who were receiving the beneficial provisions of these programs. This measure, S. 2477, now Public Law No. 679, was entitled with the disguised designation, "An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to reimburse State and local agencies for expenses incurred in rendering the services in connection with the administration of certain training programs for veterans and for other purposes."

In addition to performing the function designated in the above title, which is a proper one, the bill as finally drafted by the Veterans' Administration and enacted by Congress set a ceiling of $175 for single men and $200 for married men, including compensation and subsistence, and further limited the course of full-time training to a period of not more than 2 years. This measure was passed by the Congress without hearings being conducted to secure the views of employers, the veterans' organizations, and others interested in this program, and was passed within six legislative days. It is significant that the Legion's GI bill required 6 months from the time of its original drafting to its final enactment by the Congress, with innumerable lengthy public hearings being conducted thereon by both the Senate and House committees. This convention should emphatically protest this hurried action by the Veterans' Administration and the Congress in rushing this important legislation through without conducting proper hearings and predicated upon false assumptions.

The press releases both prior to and subsequent to the enactment of this law by the Veterans' Administration stressed the many flagrant abuses that had arisen in the conduct of on-the-job training programs by unscrupulous employers and gold-brick veterans. The Legion, of course, at no time has condoned any such violations. A survey conducted by the American Legion indicates conclusively that there were no widespread flagrant violations, and whatever improper programs existed, such could have been corrected by the Veterans' Administration without securing additional power.

Twenty-two resolutions protesting the hurried action of Congress in the enactment of Public Law 679 and requesting that the ceiling and training limitations of these provisions of this amended bill be repealed, were received. Your committee recommends that the 23 resolutions, being Nos. 301, 66, 67, 140, 165, 189, 200, 228, 229, 348, 356, 425, 426, 476, 497, 518, 593, 594, 621, 622, 708, 751, be combined in Resolution 301, which is recommended by your committee for adoption, and is as follows:

"Whereas title II of the Legion's GI bill, among other educational benefits, provided for on-the-job training programs with a subsistence allowance so as to afford an opportunity to World War II veterans who entered the armed forces without previous employment and to those seeking a skilled trade or occupation, to improve their future station in life; and

"Whereas on-the-job training programs as contemplated by the American Legion, if properly initiated, approved and supervised, can be of untold material benefit to veterans and to the future well-being of the Nation; and

"Whereas in certain States instances have arisen, due to improper approval and supervision, whereby veterans have been exploited by certain unprincipled employers and such training programs have in some instances been otherwise abused; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration caused to be presented to the Seventy-ninth Congress, in the closing days of the second session, S. 2477, a bill entitled 'An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to reimburse State and local agencies for expenses incurred in rendering services in connection with the administration of certain training programs for veterans and for other purposes,' and hearings were hurriedly conducted in both the Senate and House on said bill without permitting the American Legion or other interested parties or organizations to properly present their views on this important measure or to present their experiences and recommendations of on-the-job training programs; and

"Whereas said act, although disguised by title, among other provisions, unjustly places a ceiling of $175 for single men and $200 for married men, including subsistence, and further limits the course of full-time training to not more than 2 years, and many veterans now pursuing on-the-job training programs, and other veterans who contemplated undertaking such programs, will be denied the full benefits contemplated by the original GI bill in providing for such program: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled at San Francisco, Septemper 30 to October 4, 1946*, That we protest the hurried action of the Veterans' Administration and the Congress in rushing through this important legislation without affording the American Legion and all other interested groups an opportunity to be heard on important measures of this nature, and further submit that many of the abuses found to exist in the administration of on-the-job training programs could have been instantly corrected if such programs had been properly supervised by the Veterans' Administration as contemplated by the Legion's GI bill; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge the Congress to be called into special session immediately in order to immediately repeal the ceiling limitation provisions of $175 for single men and $200 for married men, and to repeal the 2-year limitation of full-time training as now provided by Public Law 679 (S. 2477)."

As a delegate from Kansas, I was called upon to address the convention upon the circumstances under which this law was enacted. During my remarks, some of which will be repeated in substance here, I stated that one of my first acts would be to introduce legislation designed to remedy this situation.

On Friday, January 3, I introduced a measure now designated as H. R. 145. To fully explain this action, it is necessary to discuss some legislative history so that the memories of Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress may be refreshed and new Members may have these facts to aid them in reaching a decision.

The original law—the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—was enacted in 1944.

In the popular, though erroneous, reference to this measure as the "GI bill of rights," the purpose, the very heart, of the legislation—readjustment—was lost from sight.

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, with veterans of both World Wars in its membership, trying to anticipate the problems of 15,000,000 returning servicemen, after weeks of hearings, discussions, study, and conferences with all major veterans' organizations, recommended the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to Congress. Most of its provisions were new—experimental—and were admitted to be such. No other nation had ever undertaken such a program.

Its objective was to assist these veterans, many with as much as 5 years of service, to readjust themselves in a changed civilian world, to help them help themselves prepare for and face their futures and to realize dreams long postponed.

After the Readjustment Act became law, actual experience proved that some changes in it were necessary. Many amendments have been made, more are probably on the way.

Originally, the bill was designed to apply to those young men who had been denied opportunities for training or education because of being called into military service. The act automatically presumed those who entered service at the age of 25 or under had had their training interrupted or delayed. Those over 25 needed only to make a reasonable showing of this interruption. In other words, having deprived them of their opportunities, it was the duty of the Government, as far as possible, to make up to them that lost or delayed opportunity.

One of the many amendments removed these limitations and opened the doors of schools, shops, and stores to all veterans. Another section provided that in the event Congress should enact a measure in the nature of adjusted compensation, benefits paid hereunder would be deducted. That section was later eliminated. The results of that congressional action are self-evident.

Hundreds of thousands of those drafted into the armed forces were men of mature years whose need or desire for training or education was passed. Their need or desire was for a home for their families, or a farm, or a chance to own and operate a business. Guarantee of loans through the Veterans' Administration was at least a partial solution to their problem of readjustment.

Other millions of young Americans, just reaching the age for continuing education or training, were drafted into the armed forces. Their opportunity for more education or training in many lines of endeavor was interrupted and delayed.

How well these veterans have done in our schools is told in the following letter from Prof. J. F. Wellemeyer, dean of Junior College, Kansas City, Kans., a record made by young men I have known since their infancy:

> Knowing your great interest in the welfare of our veterans, I feel that I should write you regarding the great educational program now under way in favor of discharged veterans of World War II. As dean of the Junior College here, I have had a good many veterans on our rolls. We have at present 350 in our Junior College with possibly more to be enrolled the latter part of this week.
>
> I have been in school administration for a good many years, but I think I have never witnessed a finer attitude on the part of the students than is displayed by these veterans when they return to the classroom. It is perfectly evident that these young men welcome with gratitude the distinction between Army life and school life. In other words, they come to school with a definite purpose in mind. They don't attend college for purely social reasons.
>
> In my opinion the presence of discharged veterans on our campus raises the level of scholastic attainment very definitely. Even those coming to us directly as high-school graduates are affected by the serious attitude of the veteran. Of all plans for the aid of servicemen in the past two wars, I think you will agree with me that the present plan is by far the most constructive.

That this splendid record is of national scope is demonstrated by a recent article by Dr. Garry C. Myers, part of which follows:

> About three-quarters of a million veterans of World War II are going to college, and at Uncle Sam's expense. Nothing else Congress ever did for war veteran and their country was a wiser service than this. Thanks to the GI bill of rights, some hundreds of thousands of young Americans of ability and ambition are gaining a higher education who otherwise would have been prevented by economic barriers from doing so.
>
> As I have gone about the Nation and asked high school principals and deans of colleges what kind of a student the average GI is, the answer always has been highly favorable. Most have said he is superior.
>
> In a recent issue of School and Society, Dr. Raymond Walters, president of Cincinnati University, reports a careful study of veterans' education and the colleges and universities.
>
> Harvard teachers reported to him that veterans last spring did do superior work, "better than our prewar students."
>
> University of Texas faculty: "The veterans have done a better scholastic job than the nonveterans."
>
> University of Utah: "Noticeably superior work."
>
> University of Wisconsin: "Veterans ahead of nonveterans in five colleges."
>
> University of Illinois: "Caliber of scholarship of veterans has been extraordinarily good."
>
> Swarthmore: "Good quality."
>
> Connecticut: "High grade of work."
>
> Wesleyan: "Outstanding academic work."
>
> And so on.
>
> Dean Walters adds that in the college of law of the University of Cincinnati, veterans now in class are among the best ever to attend this century-old school.

To those of us veterans who entered our schools after World War I, this record of achievement is no surprise.

Many young men never cared to go further than the elementary grades; others became convinced that their future happiness would not be attained with diplomas, but rather with a skill or training not available in schools—learning that could be obtained by doing only—taking on-the-job training.

But whether these youngsters sought readjustment at school or on the job, the United States, through Congress, initially provided subsistence allowances, $50 per month for single men, $75 for married men, to be added to their wages and to help in their support while seeking to fit themselves for the future. Later these amounts were increased to $65 and $90.

In the Army, out of the Army, everywhere we go, there are always some persons not appreciative of a privilege who, not caring what the violation of a privilege may do to someone else, will abuse that privilege. The privilege of subsistence allowances was abused in a few cases, not only by veterans, but by employers who sought by devious means to get Uncle Sam to carry part of the pay roll.

On Monday, July 29, in the last week the Seventy-ninth Congress was in session, too late for hearings to be held, too late for discussion of the merits of any measures on the floor, when no amendments could be offered, General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with two or three of his staff, appeared before a hastily called meeting of the Veterans' Legislative Committee and urged the passage of what is now Public Law No. 679.

The second section of 679 places a ceiling of $175 per month on single veterans and $200 on married veterans in school or taking on-the-job training. This slight difference of $25 seems to indicate that the Veterans' Administration thought that two or more can live almost as cheaply as one.

No actual facts were presented to the committee, no witness other than General Bradley was heard, only three indefinite cases of abuse were mentioned, without details as to persons or places. No information was presented showing upon what facts the $200 ceilings were fixed. No one knew how many veterans would be affected. Personally, I doubt if the general or any or his staff can tell where that figure came from, or what it was based on.

While some persons disagree with my views, I still think this bill, drafted by the Veterans' Administration, became law because General Bradley urged its immediate passage. General Bradley cannot deny his paternity of the legislative child.

My recollection is that I was the only Member to seriously question the general, to object to the measure in committee, and to urge, pending a thorough investigation, a ceiling of not less than $250 for married veterans. However, the measure was reported favorably by the committee in the closing days of the session. The House, on August 1, concurred in previous action of the Senate, and, with the President's signature, Public Law No. 679 became the law of the land.

What happened to the veterans affected by this unexpected action? They were momentarily dazed. They had made their plans for the present and future based on the program authorized by the Readjustment Act. Budgets had to be revised—many had to abandon plans made, plans that were rapidly readjusting them to the changed living conditions they encountered as civilians. Some became bitter, discouraged, and said, "To h—— with it," an attitude which certainly did not aid in their readjustment. Most of them, good citizens

as well as good soldiers, buckled their belts tighter, whittled down, kept on, and placed their faith in Congress to remedy the situation and place a reasonable ceiling, if one is found necessary, on incomes, including the subsistence allowance—a ceiling which will enable them to readjust after their arduous and valorous service.

For instance, the Missouri-Pacific Railroad has shops and a roundhouse in Osawatomie, Kans. Ordinarily, 17- and 18-year-old boys of that area enter apprentice training. The war stopped that. When they were again in a position to think about apprentice training they were mature men—22, 23, 24, or 25, married, and with families. With the subsistence allowance and the apprentice pay which calls for automatic increases each 6 months, they were earning from $225 to $235. New civilian clothes were needed, housing shortages made the purchase of a home necessary, furniture to reestablish housekeeping was a "must" item. Not luxurious homes, but they and their families, again united, were happy. They were willing workers, eager learners. Their progress was good. The railroad officials told me they were the best group ever entered in the training. Everyone was profiting—future emergencies would find us with more trained men. Without the subsistence allowance these men, family men, could not have undertaken this training at the starting wage, less in many cases than their Army pay.

Then came Public Law No. 679.

Retrenchment—to the tune of $25 or $35 per month—not much, but with increased living costs, extra expenditures not required by those who stayed home, it was a tough $25 or $35 to do without. In fact, it was a little more than $25 or $35, because from that portion there was no income- or social security-tax deduction.

Undoubtedly, a thorough investigation will disclose many newly returned veterans lost all hope for the future—lost their homes, furniture, cars—due to this hastily enacted, ill-advised legislation.

H. R. 145 reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso limiting the total of subsistence allowance plus compensation payable to veterans in training programs, paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended by section 2 of Public Law No. 679, Seventy-ninth Congress, is hereby repealed, effective from the date of the approval of this act.

While its purpose is declared to be the outright appeal, my main objective is to bring the subject before the Nation, Congress generally, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs particularly, so that—with time available—a thorough study can be made of on-the-job training in all its phases—and particularly as it relates to these arbitrarily fixed ceilings.

Then, a full hearing had, with witnesses from the Veterans' Administration, veterans' organizations, and affected veterans themselves, if ceilings are found to be necessary, those that are reasonable, those that will aid and not hinder the readjustment of veterans, may be adopted.

This is but one of the many matters relating to veterans which you will face in the Eightieth Congress, but I am sure that they can be better solved if you will but hold in mind, and so refer to it, that the law discussed during this period is the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

At the time I introduced H. R. 145 I also placed in the hopper H. R. 144, designed to repeal Public Law No. 679 in its entirety—so that study can be made of its other provisions.

At some future time I hope to be able to discuss with you other phases of Public Law No. 679 which need thorough research and study—such as the first portion, which provides for reimbursement of the States for money spent in their part of on-the-job training program, a situation which is also subject to abuse. Another portion of Public Law No. 679 needing a full airing which it did not get is the one limiting on-the-job training to 2 years, placing restrictions on employers, providing burdensome requirements which have discouraged many employers and veterans and have again brought to business institutions of America a flock of investigators and supervisors—bureaucrats, if you please—just when it was the universal desire to rid ourselves of this plague.

Sound judgment, not sentiment, will be required in consideration of this and other measures relating to veterans.

With so many veterans of World War II coming into this Congress I am sure their advice on these matters so close to them and the men they served with will greatly contribute to constructive, helpful, and sound legislation.

In closing, I wish to call your attention to an article in the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday, Sunday, January 12, by Tyrell W. Krum, a veteran of World Wars I and II, who, since his discharge from service, has edited a daily column entitled "Veterans' Affairs." Mr. Krum has keen insight and a sound understanding of the problems veterans face.

The article follows:

One of the very first chores which the new Republican House and Senate should undertake—so far as the broad field of veterans' affairs is concerned—is to immediately straighten out the GI training-on-the-job mess inherited from the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress.

It will be recalled that during the closing days of the last session, a measure known as Public Law 679 was quietly railroaded through both Chambers as an amendment to the GI bill of rights, placing a ceiling on the total amount of wages and Government subsistence which veterans might receive while undergoing job training to better enmesh themselves into civilian life.

The whole deal was concluded with such secrecy and stealth that not even the closest observers on Capitol Hill, including legislative representatives of the major old-line veterans' organizations, knew about it until the act was signed by the President at the White House on August 8.

However, the Veterans' Administration later admitted it had sponsored the measure and pushed it through to final adoption. The fact there was no advance notice given the public, that the usual open hearings were not held, and that the measure was sneaked along through resort to the unanimous-consent legislative device indicates clearly the depths to which the VA palace guard stooped in bulldogging the measure through the Congress, which is supposed to protect the rights of all the people.

It's up to the new Congress to act immediately to alleviate the damage already inflicted on the morale and spirits of hundreds of thousands of American veterans who entered training-on-the-job programs with high hopes and sincere good faith only to receive the bitterest kick in the teeth administered any veterans of America's armed forces down through all the years.

We want to emphasize that the fault definitely does not rest with General Bradley, because if he had his way, I know he'd order the whole thing held in abeyance. But he's bound by the law of the land and must await congressional action before he can move.

Therefore, we respectfully and strongly urge Congress to immediately abolish the $200 ceiling by joint resolution and direct the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to launch a formal investigation to determine the proper path to pursue in the future.

Furthermore, pending establishment of a definite policy on training on the job, we urge General Bradley to resume paying all qualified veteran job trainees their full subsistence, in addition to any and all wages received on the job.

And, finally, that all demands by the Veterans' Administration for refunds for overpayments so far made to trainees be immediately rescinded and the thousands of checks now held up by the Treasury be released at once.

Because, we want to point out, a half million or more war veterans, as well as members of their families, are burned up at what they call the "lousy deal" they've been handed and are looking to Congress to come to their rescue.

I know of actual cases in which veterans and their families are about to be evicted from their homes because of the hardships worked on them by the Veterans' Administration "palace guard" in its inane and stupid handling of the situation during the past 5 months.

There are many new Members of the Congress—a lot of them World War II veterans, themselves—who may not have the complete background picture on what has happened up to date. We think they should know full well just how fouled up the whole training-on-the-job program really is at this stage of the game so they can do something about it forthwith.

We shall present all the facts in this space during the next few days, and we hope all you Representatives and Senators will follow them.

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a resolution of the American Legion, parts of two letters, and some newspaper articles.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has time to address the House at this moment, but he agreed that I could take some time if I could get the consent of the House. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has a special order for 10 minutes. If there is no objection, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] may proceed for 5 minutes at this time.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, I was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation when the bill to which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has just referred was passed.

May I take this occasion to say that I doubt that we have ever had a public servant since I have been in Congress who was more conscientious and more able in the discharge of his duties than Gen. Omar Bradley, the present head of the Veterans' Administration. He came to the committee and said that there were many abuses of the law and asked for the passage of this curtailment. The matter was laid before the committee, of which the gentleman from Kansas was a member, and a bill was passed out, if I remember correctly, unanimously.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It was not passed out unanimously because I did not approve the legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kansas did not call for a roll-call vote in the committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. He did not oppose it on the floor of the House when it was passed by unanimous consent.

There are a great many phases of this proposition that will be gone into, and I hope the gentleman from Kansas will remain a member of the Committee on Veterans' Legislation. I have been a member of that committee since it was created. I have probably taken more criticism on account of veterans' legislation than any other man who ever served in Congress. I opposed the administration when the economy bill was put through, which injured and probably cost the lives of many tubercular men whose very existence was hanging on by a thread.

From that day to this I have endeavored to get those benefits back that were taken away. I have put the interests of the disabled men first in my service on that committee.

The Veterans' Administration came to us and said that in some places a racket was being carried on and that if certain changes were not made there would be a Nation-wide scandal. General Bradley came before the committee. We laid the measure before the committee, and it was passed out. The gentleman from Kansas, if he had wanted to, could have called for a roll call, and the chairman would have granted the request. The bill came to the floor of the House and was passed by unanimous consent. If I remember correctly, it was passed in the Senate in the same way.

It may be that some changes are necessary to be made, but do not forget that there are untold millions of servicemen who are getting nothing, there are untold millons of servicemen who went back to their old jobs, who went back to the farm, to the factory, and to the store and did not ask for unemployment pay, but they are today serving this country and helping to pay the taxes to carry on this program.

They, too, must be considered. I spoke at the University of Mississippi the other night. There were about 900 of these ex-service boys there. I heard little or no complaint; probably one or two. But I never saw a more alert set of young men in my life. They were more alert, in my opinion, than the young men were when I was in college there many years ago, because they had been through the service. They were hard students. The chancelor told me they were among the best students in the college. What I am after is to give them every opportunity, and if theer is any change necessary in this law I shall certainly go along with it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In connection with my remarks there will be inserted excerpts from letters and articles pointing out that the record these men have made that the gentleman has mentioned is universal; that they are the tops of the students in the schools throughout the country.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman is right, and I for one do not want to hamper them in preparing themselves for the great battle of life that lies before them. I am willing to support any reasonable amendment, but I do not want us to overlook the fact that there are untold millions of servicemen who have not asked for a penny to go to school, who have not asked for a penny of unemployment compensation, but who are just as much entitled to our consideration as any one else.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman will recall, there was a section in the original act known as section 1505 which had in mind just exactly the kind of men that the gentleman is talking about, which provided that in case there was a law in the nature of adjusted compensation the benefits that those other men received would be deducted; as we called it, the equalization section.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that when this matter was first brought to our committee, the original bill did not have any on-the-job-training provision in it at all. I insisted that we ought to provide for these trainees, and we inserted a provision for that purpose.

We want to see that the veterans get the full benefit of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE WORK OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, of which I have had the honor to be chairman, was established by the Seventy-eighth Congress to investigate and report upon all matters relating to postwar economic policy and problems. The committee was continued by the Seventy-ninth Congress and completed its work last month. Based upon extensive hearings and exhaustive studies, 11 reports and several supplements have been issued dealing with various phases of the country's economy. Each report contained specific recommendations to Congress. In the final report—the eleventh—and the supplement thereto, of the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee, copies of which were sent to each Member of Congress in December last, a summary of the work, the problems, and the recommendations of that committee was made. Since some of these recommendations require further action by the Congress, I should like to make some comments at this time which I think are pertinent and seasonable. I should like particularly to request the membership of the Congress to compare carefully the views there expressed and unanimously approved by the members of the committee with the report just issued by the President's Council of Economic Advisers; the report of that body is now awaiting action by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Economic Report, which was authorized by the last Congress. I make bold to suggest to the joint committee that the thorough and detailed study of the present state of this Nation's economy at home and abroad prepared by the staff, and analyzed and approved by our committee, will prove most useful in dealing with the President's Economic Report. The time for setting up this new joint committee and then having that committee report to the Congress on the report itself, which has just been laid before Congress by the Council of Economic Advisers, is set by statute as February 1, 1947. That does not afford much time for thorough study of some very difficult problems about which Congress will have to be advised in the consideration of the economic report.

May I respectfully suggest to the members of the new joint committee that the 3 years of hard work put in by the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy are in a measure brought to fruition in the eleventh report and supplement. I believe this final report, in the section that deals currently with the same material dealt with in the President's Economic Council's report, may readily serve the new committee, because of the unanimity expressed in the eleventh report, without regard to party, as a fine basis for judging and acting upon the Economic Report.

I wish to take this opportunity to present to the Congress a brief summary of the work done by the committee and of the recommendations relating to the economic problems which still face us.

CONTRACT TERMINATION AND SETTLEMENT

Because of its importance to a speedy reconversion, the first problem studied by the committee was the settlement of terminated war contracts. Legislation recommended by the committee was enacted with only minor changes. Accomplishments under the legislation have been extremely gratifying and the ob-

jectives set by Congress have been reached. In sharp contrast to the long-drawn-out and much criticized procedure after World War I, one year after VJ-day contract settlement was 98 percent completed. Congress is to be commended for the passage of this legislation well in advance of the end of the war and the events fully justified its action. The Office of Contract Settlement is likewise to be commended for the efficiency of its entire operation. The speed with which the claims were settled, payments made to the contractors, and plants cleared of Government property undoubtedly played an important part in the quick reconversion of industry and the avoidance of an immediate postwar slump in employment and production.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

The second problem studied was the disposal of surplus property and plants, which the committee foresaw as being an extremely important and difficult task. After thorough study the committee recommended legislation which it considered necessary for the expeditious disposal of surpluses. The House passed a bill which substantially embraced the recommendations of the committee and under which certain broad policies and standards were set up by Congress with the details left to the discretion of an administrator. The bill, however, was so changed in the Senate and in conference that it was unacceptable to the committee as finally enacted. And, notwithstanding, the fact that the House bill bore my name, I announced to the House when the bill came back from the Senate that it would prove unsatisfactory and unworkable, and I personally voted against it.

Progress in the disposal of war surpluses under the act has been slow and disappointing. The difficulty of the task is increased by the fact that the large quantities of varied surpluses must be disposed of with a minimum of dislocation to the economy.

After experience with the Board which was set up under the original act, legislation was enacted which carried out the recommendation of the committee for a single administrator, but most of the other defects remain. Congress must accept full responsibility for the unsound provisions in this legislation and, in great part, for the delays caused by conflicting and unworkable priorities and preferences granted under it.

The committee still feels its original recommendations were sound and to meet the present current situation it recommends that: First, the Surplus Property Act of 1944 be simplified; second, that recognition be given to the urgency for speed in disposing of surplus goods while the current sellers' market exists; third, that the owning agencies declare their surpluses to the War Assets Administration immediately; and, fourth, that the property now owned by the various agencies be surveyed by the executive department to expedite the declaration of surpluses.

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT

The committee prepared the legislation which established the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The purpose of this Office was to integrate the policies of the many governmental departments which would be concerned with the problem of successful demobilization of returning servicemen and war workers and their speedy reabsorption into peacetime work. While the committee feels that this Office has not adequately fulfilled all the functions which were originally intended, the experience does indicate the need for the continuation of a Presidential agency to act as a sort of over-all general staff to coordinate the formulation and execution of policy.

The committee also recommends that the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report of the President should either be broadened in its functions to cover all governmental economic policy or that a permanent committee should be established in each House with the mandate to continue the type of work done by the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. There is at present a lack of legislative vehicles for taking over-all views of policy, particularly in the economic field.

It is recommended that a study be made by such an over-all joint committee on economic policy into the effect of military expenditures and occupation policies on the total economic and fiscal problems of the Government. The committee also feels that consideration should be given to an immediate setting up of a War Resources Board to insure civilian control of the economy in wartime. Such a board would have a skeleton personnel and an adequate reserve subject to immediate call on the same basis as a military reserve.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Due to no small extent to the advance action taken by both business and Government on a wide front, demobilization of the armed forces and civilian workers, and reconversion have been carried out with much less shock to our economy and with much less unemployment than was generally expected. On the other hand, the adjustment of wages and working conditions to the postwar economy has been accompanied by an increase in strikes. The committee has not analyzed specific legislation with respect to labor relations, but it feels that corrective legislation is needed. It recommends that prompt action be taken by Congress so that sound, constructive—not punitive—legislation may result.

The committee felt that unemployment compensation is one of the most important measures to minimize the effects of a decline in employment and in September 1944 recommended to the State authorities that they give immediate consideration to improving the State laws by increasing the duration and the level of benefits. At the same time it recommended that the Federal Government set up a loan fund from which advances could be made to the States to protect their funds against the threat of depletion. Such action was taken by Congress, and the committee was also pleased that the great majority of States have liberalized their benefits both in amount and duration. The committee also recommended that unemployment compensation be extended to groups not then covered, particularly the employees of small firms. Some action has been taken in this direction but not in all the States. There is now available in the State unemployment-compensation funds about $7,000,000,000, which would seem to be adequate to meet demands for benefits to those becoming unemployed.

Favorable action was also taken by Congress on the committee's recommendation that credit be given under the Federal old-age-insurance plan for service in the armed forces. The committee in 1944 recommended that the question of financing the old-age-insurance plan should be studied carefully in relation to the general fiscal problems of the Government. The Ways and Means Committee has made such a study and submitted a report, but no action has been taken. The committee recommends that this study be continued and that a definite financial program be submitted to Congress. No action has yet been taken on the committee's recommendation that many of the groups not now covered under the old-age-insurance plan should be brought into the system.

PUBLIC WORKS AND CONSTRUCTION

In a report issued in July 1945 the committee made a number of recommendations with respect to the stabilization of the construction industry in the postwar period. It forecast a large demand for private construction during the first postwar year after the war. It therefore recommended that public construction be limited during this period of active private construction to projects of immediate necessity, but that at the same time plans and specifications be drawn up in advance by public agencies so that public programs could be expanded when private ones slackened. Congress, on the committee's recommendation, appropriated $65,000,000 for advances to State and local governments for the preparation of drawings and specifications. The committee was gratified with the progress made in this program. Private construction has been very active, with contracts ahead of the capacity of the industry. Public agencies have been cautious in letting contracts and public construction has been kept at a low level. The committee in its final report recommended that public construction still be limited to projects of immediate necessity while work should be continued on plans for useful public works of less immediate urgency.

Good progress has been made by the States and local governments in preparing plans and specifications; the advances for this work have exhausted the $65,000,000 appropriation. The committee recommends that the balance of the $150,000,000 originally recommended be appropriated for this purpose. Funds will also be needed by the Federal governmental agencies to prepare the plans and specifications for projects already authorized by Congress.

The committee also recommended previously that machinery should be set up to coordinate the construction policies of the various agencies of the

Federal Government and, in turn, to coordinate these policies with those of the State and local governments and with private industry. The Council of Economic Advisers would seem to have the authority needed to set up the machinery, and steps to this end should be taken at once.

The committee was pleased that many of the controls to which it called attention in the eleventh report as causing delays in construction have now been eliminated.

FEDERAL BUDGET AND TAX POLICY

The committee in its fourth report, issued in September 1944, stated that the postwar national fiscal policy should be aimed at an orderly reduction of the national debt and that the starting point of such a program must be a firm determination to hold Federal expenditures down to a minimum consistent with proper functioning of the Government. The committee was disappointed that greater progress has not been made toward reducing expenditures and balancing the budget for the current fiscal year.

Under present conditions the prime concern should be the balancing of the budget and the creation of a surplus in order to reduce the inflationary forces. The committee feels that expenditures can be reduced, without interfering with national defense or the normal functions of the Government, to a level which would permit a substantial surplus for the next fiscal year and also a reduction in Federal taxes from the present high level.

The committee recommended that a tax system should be developed which would raise the necessary revenue and still distribute the tax burden in a manner that will provide adequate incentives for venture capital, creative effort, and business growth, and also permit expansion in consumer demand.

The committee in 1944 recommended that the excess-profits tax be repealed soon after the end of the war, as was done.

The committee also recommended and still feels that future issues of State and local governments be made taxable and that consideration be given to elimination of double taxation of dividends, that averaging of incomes for tax purposes be permitted, and that excise taxes should be kept to a minimum.

MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

In a report issued in March 1946 the committee pointed out that strong fiscal and monetary measures were necessary to effect control over inflationary forces. Among other measures which it recommended were curtailment of Federal expenditures, balancing of the budget, limiting of current expenditures for public works, and the institution of campaigns to urge individuals to increase or maintain their holdings of Government securities. Progress has been made in all these directions but much yet remains to be done.

There have been further additions since the end of the war to the large liquid savings in the hands of the public. Purchasing power is at an unprecedented level and could be exerted to push prices higher. It is thus necessary that moderation be shown by all groups in order to check the threat to a continued inflationary trend—by consumers in spending, by labor in wage demands, by business in pricing policies, by government in its own spending, tax, and monetary policies.

WARTIME CONTROLS

In its fourth report, issued in the fall of 1944, the committee recommended that the objective of the Government should be to release wartime controls at the earliest practicable moment after the end of the war. In line with this policy the committee prepared and submitted to Congress in March 1946 a carefully developed program for the gradual and orderly elimination of wartime controls. This program was adopted only in small part. Unfortunately the absence of all controls for a period last summer and the final enactment of make-shift legislation resulted in considerable confusion to the economy, some of which could probably have been avoided if a plan such as the committee recommended had been adopted. The committee in its final report recommended the continuation of only a very limited number of controls for a few months to meet certain situations in which shortages still exist, as the committee feels that the balance of the anti-inflationary fight must now be waged with general fiscal and monetary policies.

AGRICULTURE

In a report issued in August 1946 the committee proposed a long-range postwar agricultural policy to Congress which it had developed after a long period of study and consultation with the various farm groups. At the same time the committee expressed itself in favor of the price support guaranties provided in the Steagall Act. Just before the end of 1946 action was taken in declaring the end of the national emergency, as the committee had recommended. During the 2-year period which now remains for the price support, the committee recommends that a study should be made of the parity concepts in two respects: First, relative levels of comparative prices between one commodity and another and, second, the validity of the general level of all agricultural prices as defined in terms of the 1910–14 parity base. Study should be conducted and legislation prepared prior to the end of the Steagall period so that farmers will not be called upon to make their plans in the dark.

The committee would call particular attention to the recommendations for a solution of long-range agricultural problems as contained in its tenth report, the objective of these recommendations being the achievement of a high level of stable income for farmers over the years.

FOREIGN POSTWAR ECONOMIC POLICY

In 1945 the committee issued a comprehensive survey of the foreign economic policy of the United States and made a number of general and specific recommendations for the postwar period. The report received extremely favorable comments from the press, the New York Times, for instance, calling it "one of the most carefully thought-out and balanced sets of recommendations to come out of any congressional committee in recent years," and the Washington Post calling it "a highly valuable document."

The committee was pleased that a number of recommendations which it made at that time have since been carried out.

First. The proposals made by the committee for developing a freer private trade and breaking down the increasing bilateralism of international trade were accepted in general without significant change in policy objectives in the terms of the American trade proposals issued by the State Department.

Second. The committee proposed that an international conference be called to consider the problem of a general reduction in trade barriers throughout the world. A meeting of representatives from 16 countries has just been held in London to prepare for such a general conference and the establishment of the International Trade Organization.

Third. The committee proposed the reduction of trade barriers by trade agreements with individual countries under a strengthened Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Progress has been made by renewing this act for a period of 3 years, with greater latitude being given to the executive department.

Fourth. The committee pointed out the necessity of freeing our postwar international monetary system from restrictive controls. The International Monetary Fund has been established for this purpose and now has a membership of 39 countries.

Fifth. The committee recommended the establishment of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and that the resources of the Export-Import Bank be increased. Both of these recommendations were adopted.

Sixth. The committee in a later report recommended that certain conditions should be incorporated in any proposed loan made to Great Britain; the agreement finally reached contained a large proportion of these conditions.

While these developments are hopeful indications of the future course of world trade, the committee in its final report pointed out that serious obstacles are yet to be overcome if a system of unrestricted multilateral trade envisaged by the committee is to become a reality. It also reiterated the statement made in its previous report that "high levels of output and employment at home are an essential requirement for expanding world trade."

The committee is pleased that action was taken by Congress in carrying out its recommendation that the Foreign Service of this country be made more attractive as a career, but feels that further action is necessary to recruit and maintain the highest class of representatives abroad.

ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE

Based upon the visit of seven members to the principal countries of Europe and the Middle East, the committee in November 1945 presented a report on the economic reconstruction of Europe. In this report the committee made specific recommendations on the immediate economic problems then facing Europe, such

as transportation, fuel, raw materials, communications, relief, and finances. In addition it made recommendations regarding our relations with the United Kingdom, with Russia, and the reconstruction of Germany. Many of the specific recommendations contained in the committee's report have now become a part of American foreign policy and have helped to restore the economy of the world along the lines of its previous report on foreign economic policy.

In a supplementary report to its eleventh report, released on December 30 last, the committee surveyed the progress made during the past year in European economic reconstruction. I would particularly call this report to your attention as Congress will soon be called upon to take action on many of the problems discussed in this report.

Time will not permit me to comment on the specific recommendations, but I would like to mention the general recommendations of the committee in regard to our relations with Russia and the reconstruction of Germany.

There has been criticism of the supplementary report from certain left-wing groups, as was to be expected. They seem to be trying to build up a smoke screen by distorting our recommendations regarding Germany in order to detract attention from some of the points brought out in regard to Russia.

RUSSIA

On the committee's return from its mission to Europe in the fall of 1945, it strongly recommended to the administration an abandonment of the appeasement policy toward Russia. The committee feels, as stated in its final report, that it can take justifiable pride in the fact that its recommendations have been largely followed. It is more convinced than ever, in the light of subsequent events, that a firm policy in dealing with that country is imperative.

The committee in its eighth report called attention to the economic possibilities for extensive trade between this country and Russia but that the realization of these possibilities would depend upon the active cooperation of the two countries. When Russia demonstrates a willingness to keep its war promises and postwar settlements, then economic cooperation becomes reasonable and proper.

The committee in its final report submits for consideration by Congress a proposal that, until Russia meets its political obligations and accepts full and effective international control of atomic energy, there should be a limitation in shipments of certain products of special military and economic character and that control also be established over the furnishing of technical know-how. The committee also recommends that appropriate control be established over the export of American processes, technical know-how, and products to all state trading countries.

GERMANY

The committee feels, as it stated in its final report, that our objective for administering the economic affairs of Germany is to make that country self-sustaining without at the same time permitting it again to threaten the peace of the world. This goal cannot be obtained without Russian, British, and French cooperation. With the stripping of German industries for war-making purposes having already been carried out, if the proper system of inspection and the proper control of imports of strategic materials are inaugurated, there is little possibility of Germany again building up a war machine.

The committee has previously pointed out the dependence of the industries of the other European countries upon German raw materials and German manufactures and if we went beyond the limits of destroying the war-making power of Germany and prevented production in the ordinary industries, the effect would be to depress the whole standard of living of Europe. At the same time the burden of relief, in addition to heavier occupation costs, would be imposed indefinitely upon the Western Powers, principally the United States, if widespread disease and unrest were to be avoided in Europe.

The committee pointed out that the key to most of the problems lay in our ability to get the occupation Allies to carry out the Potsdam declaration that "during the period of occupation Germany should be treated as an economic unit." If real cooperation toward this end had been possible, expenditures for relief and the necessity for loans for raw materials might have been greatly reduced by the increased ability of Germany to feed its own population and to build up production and exports with which to pay for its necessary imports.

In its final report the committee recommended to Congress immediate hearings on the whole problem of the financial obligations which the United States is bearing under its occupation policy, with a view to substituting productive and self-supporting economies in the ex-enemy countries under our control for the present method of paying reparations, in effect, out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Unless such a policy is adopted, once more we shall pay a major part of German reparations, this time not by private income but by occupation costs and relief for western Germany.

My committee's report called for further study of seven other important matters that fall within the jurisdiction of standing committees of Congress, which may be found summarized on pages 12–13 of the supplement to our eleventh report. These require further action, we think, by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation and sincere thanks to the members of the House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. They are Messrs. Cooper, of Tennessee; Walter, of Pennsylvania; Zimmerman, of Missouri; Voorhis, of California; Murdock, of Arizona; Lynch, of New York; O'Brien, of Illinois; Fogarty, of Rhode Island; Worley, of Texas; Gifford, of Massachusetts; Welch, of California; Wolverton, of New Jersey; Hope, of Kansas; Wolcott, of Michigan; LeFevre, of New York; and Simpson, of Illinois. Together with former Representatives Fish, of New York; Dewey, of Illinois; and Reece, of Tennessee, who retired from Congress, and Mr. Thomason, of Texas, who was forced to leave the committee due to other important assignments, these gentlemen have made up the personnel of the committee during its existence. They have labored long, earnestly, patriotically and without regard to party affiliation in the task assigned them of making the necessary study and recommendations to the Congress and the country, to achieve the goal of converting our wartime economy to a peacetime economy with as little friction as possible. I doubt if any select or standing committee of the Congress has ever worked together more harmoniously or has issued as many unanimous reports as has this committee. I deem it a great honor and high privilege, Mr. Speaker, to have served as its chairman.

Any statement about the accomplishments of this committee could not be complete unless it was frankly stated that a considerable measure of this unanimity was a result of the high level of ability, devotion to the public interest, and objectivity of our staff director, Mr. Marion B. Folsom. The confidence which he inspired in the committee and in the country is a monument to his ability, patriotism, and sincerity. I believe also that his consultants were the reflection of his high devotion to his country.

I would like to express the committee's gratification for the cooperation it has received from the leadership, the standing committees of the House, and in general for the action which has been taken by the Congress upon its recommendations.

Moreover, the committee takes pride in the fact that it has practiced its recommended policy of economy in government by conducting its activities during the past 3 years within the appropriation which was granted to the committee for 1 year with a substantial balance from the original appropriation being returned upon completion of its work. I believe that, too, is a unique record.

The committee does not recommend that it be continued in the present Congress, as it was established to consider the economic problems of the reconversion period, which is now practically over. It would strongly urge, however, that serious consideration be given by Congress to the several recommendations relating to current problems, which were presented in its final report. As stated above it also urges that a permanent committee on economic policy be established to continue the type of work of the special committee, or that the functions of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President be broadened to cover all phases of economic policy.

In the past, under the American competitive enterprise system, wages and the standard of living have steadily advanced over the years because of the increase in productivity and reached a level not remotely approached by any other system.

May I quote the following concluding paragraphs from the committee's final report:

The individual freedoms enjoyed by all groups of producers, both management and labor, and by the ordinary citizen in every walk of life have, in spite of defects under the system, unleashed the creative powers of human initiative and enterprise to accomplish these unparalleled results.

Confidence in this free system, derived from its accomplishments and its prospects, is the basis for the committee's recommendations on economic policies. With the excellent record achieved in reaching the present high level of employment, with the backlog of demand for many products still unsatisfied, and with the unprecedented amount of liquid savings in the hands of the consuming public, the committee feels that we have the basic conditions for maintaining a high level of both production and employment. A start has been made toward this goal. The task ahead is to develop economic conditions which will encourage stability of productive employment at a high level.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information this morning.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 14, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

104. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

105. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; to the Committee on Public Lands.

106. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act from January 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

107. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

108. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, stating that the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 requires the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to submit quarterly reports on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him in the performance of his statutory duties. On December 22, 1946, Executive Order 9809 consolidated the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion into the Office of Temporary Controls; therefore, accordingly, pursuant to the direction of the President, no comprehensive quarterly report will be prepared by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 854. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 855. A bill to amend section 116 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments under said code from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 856. A bill to provide for the tenure of office and retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 857. A bill to remove the racial restrictions upon naturalization and to amend the immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 858. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of American Samoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 859. A bill to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 860. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 861. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii to entertain suits for damages against the United States for the illegal internment and imprisonment of certain citizens of the United States residing in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 862. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 863. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 864. A bill to provide for the appointment of the adjutant general of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 865. A bill to terminate price-control powers in the case of rice; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 866. A bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 867. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to prevent certain payments by the Veterans' Administrator to any educational or training institution which consistently pursues a policy of discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 868. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 869. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 870. A bill to amend certain provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 871. A bill to establish within the Department of Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 872. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 873. A bill to create an Enemy Property Commission, to provide for the disposal of certain enemy property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. R. 874. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the island of Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 875. A bill to revoke certain orders withdrawing and reserving public lands in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 876. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 877. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry, thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 878. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to corruptly influence participants or officials in contests of skill, speed, strength, or endurance, and to provide a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 879. A bill to punish bribery in connection with interstate athletic competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 880. A bill to repeal the National Labor Relations Act, approved July 5, 1935, and to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Mediation Board to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 881. A bill relating to the application of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to prisoners of war and others in the Philippines during Japanese occupation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 882. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious

objectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 883. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the San Antonio River, Tex.: to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 884. A bill to provide additional income-tax exemption for persons who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 885. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 886. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to urge that the 1952 Olympiad be held in the city of Detroit, Mich., United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of Manuel DeSousa Grade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Russell F. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Jessie Thompkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 891. A bill for the relief of Kenelm E. Rucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Michel Ferapontow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 893. A bill for the relief of Myron R. Leard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 894. A bill for the relief of Pacific Fire Insurance Co. and American Orchestra Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 895. A bill for the relief of Rose and Simon Joseph Lowy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 897. A bill for the relief of Sumi Serizawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of Yukiko Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 899. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 900. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lo Chin Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 901. A bill for the relief of Kiyoichi Koide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seiko Adachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 904. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mickey U. P. Shon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Y. S. Hu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of the estate of Yoshito Ota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 907. A bill for relief of the legal guardian of Mitsuo Higa, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Ellen Miyoko Kondo, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Kondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 910. A bill for the relief of the estate of Koichi Kondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Eishin Tamanaha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 914. A bill for the relief of George Corenevsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of P. L. Orso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 917. A bill for the relief of Hawaii Brewing Corp., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bernice P. Bishop, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of George Ernsbarger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 920. A bill for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Wah Chan Thom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of Tong Fat Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Leo F. Hannegan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 924. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 925: A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 927. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Riyoko Patell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful Father, our times are in Thine hands and we trust that gratitude is in our hearts. We pray for the directive force of Thy wisdom, that through invigorated understanding we may have clearer discernment in the solution of all problems. As ours is a moral duty which no one can ignore and no individual can evade, let our names be on the rolls of those who, in every age, have wrought righteousness and slain wickedness. In the volume of our labors, let our courage of faith and devotion to human liberty be recorded.

Give Thy gracious blessing unto our Speaker and our leaders; may all their decisions spring from balanced judgments and a genuine sympathy for the needs of our country. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 47), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope (chairman), Kansas; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; George W. Gillie, Indiana; Edwin A. Hall, New York; William S. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Hadwen C. Fuller, New York; Ernest K. Bramblett, California; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Abe McGregor Goff, Idaho; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Appropriations: Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York.

Committee on Armed Services: Walter G. Andrews (chairman), New York; Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; William E. Hess, Ohio; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Jack Z. Anderson, California; William W. Blackney, Michigan; Margaret Chase Smith, Maine; Leroy Johnson, California; Harry L. Towe, New Jersey; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott (chairman), Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Howard H. Buffett, Nebraska; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; William G. Stratton, Illinois; Hardie Scott, Pennsylvania; Parke M. Banta, Missouri; Charles K. Fletcher, California; Ellsworth B. Foote, Connecticut.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Everett M. Dirksen (chairman), Illinois; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Sid Simpson, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John McDowell, Pennsylvania; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Gregory McMahon, New York; Harold F. Youngblood, Michigan; Robert N. McGarvey, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Education and Labor: Fred A. Hartley, Jr. (chairman), New Jersey; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Max Schwabe, Missouri; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York;

Ellsworth B. Buck, New York; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Wint Smith, Kansas; Charles J. Kersten, Wisconsin; George MacKinnon, Minnesota; Thomas L. Owens, Illinois; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Richard M. Nixon, California.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Clare E. Hoffman (chairman), Michigan; George H. Bender, Ohio; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; Henry J. Latham, New York; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Forest A. Harness, Indiana; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; Melvin C. Snyder, West Virginia; J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Mitchell Jenkins, Pennsylvania; Howard A. Coffin, Michigan.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton (chairman), New Jersey; Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Bartel J. Jonkman, Michigan; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Jacob K. Javits, New York; John Davis Lodge, Connecticut; Donald L. Jackson, California.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte (chairman), Iowa; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; William C. Cole, Missouri; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; James Gallagher, Pennsylvania; Gregory McMahon, New York; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Howard A. Coffin, Michigan.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton (chairman), New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Evan Howell, Illinois; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Robert Hale, Maine; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; Edward J. Elsaesser, New York; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; William J. Miller, Connecticut; Henderson H. Carson, Ohio; John B. Bennett, Michigan.

Committee on the Judiciary: Earl C. Michener (chairman), Michigan; John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana; Frank Fellows, Maine; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey; E. Wallace Chadwick, Pennsylvania; Albert L. Reeves, Jr., Missouri; Kenneth B. Keating, New York; Edward J. Devitt, Minnesota.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Fred Bradley (chairman), Michigan; Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Henry J. Latham, New York; David M. Potts, New York; Willis W. Bradley, California; Franklin J. Maloney, Pennsylvania; Thor C. Hollefson, Washington; Raymond H. Burke, Ohio; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Horace Seeley-Brown, Connecticut; John C. Brophy, Wisconsin; Robert Nodar, Jr., New York; Edward T. Miller, Maryland.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees (chairman), Kansas; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; John C. Butler, New York; William C. Cole, Missouri; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; James P. Scoblick, Pennsylvania; Robert J. Twyman, Illinois; Katherine St. George, New York; Thurston Ballard Morton, Kentucky; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Harold F. Youngblood, Michigan; Homer R. Jones, Washington; Francis J. Love, West Virginia.

Committee on Public Lands: Richard J. Welch (chairman), California; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; William Lemke, North Dakota; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Jay LeFevre, New York; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Montana; Norris Poulson, California; Charles H. Russell, Nevada; John Sanborn, Idaho; Edward H. Jenison, Illinois; William A. Dawson, Utah; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Publi Works: George A. Dondero (chairman), Michigan; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; George H. Bender, Ohio; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Earl Wilson, Indiana; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Roy Clippinger, Illinois; Edward G. Rohrbough, West Virginia; Fred Norman, Washington; W. Kingsland Macy, New York; Frederick A. Muhlenberg, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen (chairman), Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Forest A. Harness, Indiana; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Un-American Activities: J. Parnell Thomas (chairman), New Jersey; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; John McDowell, Pennsylvania; Richard M. Nixon, California; Richard B. Vail, Illinois.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers (chairman), Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Frank A. Mathews, Jr., New Jersey; William J. Crow Pennsylvania; W. Howes Meade, Kentucky; Richard B. Vail, Illinois; Herbert A. Meyer, Kansas; Edward A. Mitchell, Indiana; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Dayton Phillips, Tennessee; Robert Tripp Ross, New York; George W. Sarbacher, Jr., Pennsylvania; Claude I. Bakewell, Missouri.

Committee on Ways and Means: Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; Hal Holmes, Washington; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to announce the unanimous selection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for the position of majority whip of the House of Representatives, one of the most important positions in our organization. The gentleman from Illinois came here at the same time I did. It has been a great pleasure to serve with him and to work with him. He has brought to his job here the most conscientious and honest consideration of all the problems coming before the Congress. In his term as whip of the minority he operated efficiently and well. He saw to it that as far as it was within his power the Members on our side knew and were well acquainted with the issues coming before the House, and he has continuously cooperated with the leadership in helping to bring about the presence of Members on the floor at times when matters of consequence were under consideration. So I am sure everyone will join with me in extending to him our best wishes for a successful term as majority whip.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to acquaint the House, particularly the Democratic Members, with the fact that the Democratic committee on committees has completed its work and is ready to report tomorrow. At 11:30 a. m. there will be a caucus of the Democrats on the floor of the House, and I hope that shortly thereafter we will be prepared to present our committee assignments to the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It was suggested the other day that we hope to adjourn over tomorrow until Thursday. Will that interfere with the gentleman's plans? I take it if the conference is not to be until 11:30 you will not be ready with your resolution tomorrow anyway?

Mr. FORAND. We had understood that the gentleman from Indiana had made the announcement last week that there would be no session on Wednesday. We want to be doubly sure that on Thursday we can present to you our list of assignments.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from a national magazine.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news article.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, I obtained permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Year of Decision. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and

will cost $140, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable John Q. Tilson, of New Haven, Conn., a distinguished member of this House for 22 years and for 6 years the majority floor leader of the House, speaking before the Graduates Club of New Haven, Conn., on December 4, 1946.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

WHO DESERVES CONSIDERATION UNDER PORTAL-TO-PORTAL THEORY?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the membership of the House to an editorial that today I am inserting in the RECORD. This editorial was written by Mr. George Kochendefer, of the Mansfield News-Journal. Mr. Kochendefer is one of the outstanding editorial writers of the country and this one brings up a new phase on the portal-to-portal pay controversy.

Mr. Speaker, at a future date I would like to have some of those individuals who believe in this portal-to-portal pay theory answer the question raised in this editorial. If portal-to-portal pay is to be given to the workers in industry during the war period, why not give it to those of our armed forces?

Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I refer follows:

VETERANS ALSO DESERVE CONSIDERATION UNDER PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY THEORY

Whether seriously, or with a touch of grim humor, some of the veterans of World War II are presenting the thought that if portal-to-portal back pay is to be granted to industrial employees, to the extent of billions of dollars, the same principle should be applied to returned veterans and men still in military service.

It is even being suggested that various veterans' organizations—the American Legion, VFW, Amvets, AVC, DAV, and others—may have thus far been rather negligent in failing to retain a flock of lawyers to build up a case based on the portal-to-portal theory, including, of course, a claim for compensation equal to that paid industrial workers during the war.

Recognizing the importance of war work, it is difficult for many veterans to see why such relatively safe work at home was worth more—in money—than the military service they performed, at the risk of their lives and under conditions which sometimes involved great hardships and extreme discomfort.

And they remember that they were doing all this for less pay per month than some war workers were getting per day.

Also keenly in mind are the many returned veterans who are in hospitals, destined to endure years of suffering—and others who lost an arm or a leg, even an occasional one with both legs and arms amputated. What is to be the fair compensation for such as these, if their fellow-workers who stayed safely at home are to receive extra pay for work they didn't do?

One writer on this subject puts it: "The guys overseas felt that war workers had as much of a duty to perform as the soldiers did; that they should work overtime, or all night, if necessary, and not stick up the taxpayers for it. The soldiers did not get paid for extra guard duty, or for nights spent in bomb shelters, or traveling all night in truck convoys."

There will be a rejoinder, of course, that military service is "a patriotic duty," that the great debt of gratitude to veterans "can never be paid"—but what greater obligation rests upon one American than another in time of war—and why should the producers of munitions and other war supplies be more highly paid or live more comfortably than those who did the actual fighting, suffering, and dying?

It will be said, also, that it would be financially ruinous to attempt to equalize the "back pay" for veterans with that of factory workers during the war—but would that idea be any more fantastic than the demands for billions of dollars in portal-to-portal pay now being made by various union labor organizations?

Yes; it would take many billions of dollars, maybe hundreds of billions, possibly trillions, but what do strings of ciphers amount to when jockeyed by self-seeking labor leaders who are chiefly concerned about assuring their own tenure in highly lucrative positions?

Thoughtful people, which naturally includes a majority of those who are being made to appear to be demanding portal-to-portal pay, as a result of suits already filed, or in prospect, seem inclined to regard the whole thing as a joke—but it is not a joke to the returned servicemen who have recollections of what they went through and who find many of their stay-at-home associates comfortably housed, spending liberally out of good pay, and asking for more money, while countless veterans are without homes or crowded in with relatives, because more attention has been given to politics, profits, and appeasement of labor leaders than to the welfare of veterans.

If special privileges are to be granted, or extra compensation awarded, it is the underpaid veterans who should receive first consideration—and if the portal-to-portal fantasy, as applied to customary industrial practices, is to attain the status of court sanction, then no demands made upon the Government by veterans' organizations can be fairly regarded as extreme.

The element of ridicule has already entered so strongly into public discussion of portal-to-portal pay that mention of the subject is likely to evoke a laugh—except among ex-servicemen, who are more inclined to sneer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the American Press entitled "Mr. Congressman—Here's What America's Country Editors Want Done About Our Nation's Problems."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on the passing of its editor, Ogden Reid, a most distinguished public servant, under whose direction for one-third of a century that newspaper became one of the most outstanding in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by our former colleague, Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, which will run an estimated cost of $220.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the president of Cornell University.

SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS TO VETERAN STUDENTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask at this time to call attention of the membership of the House the need of immediately correcting the situation indicated in the following telegram I just received:

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Conditions prevailing University of Illinois due to extreme and unwarranted delay by Veterans' Administration in making subsistence payments to veteran students is disgrace. Veterans required to borrow if possible but more often forced to do without necessities and even withdraw from school. As the Representative of 125,000 alumni and former students, you are urged to immediately force Veterans' Administration to eliminate red tape and bring all payments to date. Advise action taken by you.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,
VICTOR CULLEN, *President.*

I have also called upon the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to correct this situation.

REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I think it due the Republican membership of this House that it should be publicly said of them by one belonging to the minority that their behavior since the election of last fall has been as nearly perfect in my judgment as is possible for human conduct to be.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is referring to the House, I presume.

Mr. COX. I am. They have taken their victory with becoming modesty, just as a gallant warrior should take victory over a fallen adversary. There has been no boasting, no threats, and no arrogance, but only an evident desire and purpose to serve to the best of their ability the best interests of our country.

The example that they have set, Mr. Speaker, is one that might be emulated with profit by others. If fate should mistakenly decree that the next President of the country must be a Republican, I hope he will be selected from the Republican membership of this House. Mr. Speaker, I observe that the eyes of my brethren are all turned to the very able and the very popular occupant of the chair.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a service this House did not complete in the last session, that is, to provide cash payments for terminal leave. The Members of this House will recall the speech I made when we adopted the conference report. I said then that the first bill I would introduce in this Congress would be to provide that these bonds be redeemable in cash—see page 10588 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 31, 1946. To carry that out I have introduced H. R. 3 of the Eightieth Congress, providing that terminal-leave-pay bonds shall be redeemable in cash. I hope the Committee on Armed Services will give immediate consideration to that bill.

Let me quote what the now distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], said on the occasion of adopting conference report, as shown on page 10583 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 31, 1946:

I want to serve notice that nothing is ever settled until it is settled right. If the officers could have cash, then there is no reason on earth why the private soldiers should not be treated the same. After all, it is the good old private and noncom who carried the greater burdens of war. I believe, whatever we do today, this fight will continue. If we do not give fair, equal treatment today, why, then, the next Congress will see the injustice is corrected. Eventually the American people will see that fair play prevails.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that with your good influence you will see that this bill is considered early, and passed without delay. Justice and fairness cry out for the passage of this bill, No. 3 of the Eightieth Congress.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to the abolition of capital punishment. I have noticed in the press that on this coming Friday the State of Mississippi will execute two children. For that reason I am again introducing my resolution. I hope it will be approved by the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is misrepresenting the State of Mississippi. That State is getting ready to execute a couple of the worst criminals that ever murdered an innocent man.

Mr. HUBER. The press says they are children. I do not know the facts of the case, but they are still children.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman should not smear a State until he gets the facts.

Mr. HUBER. The fact is that they are children.

Mr. RANKIN. The fact is that they are among the worst criminals in this country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by General Bradley.

PRODUCTION OF FERTILIZER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reliable, old-established fertilizer dealers tell me that the Army and the Commodity Credit Corporation have taken all available tank cars away from the fertilizer industry for the purpose of shipping sulfuric acid to make ammonia sulfate for export. These dealers also inform me that unless these orders are canceled and fertilizer is permitted to be produced for the farmers of this country, the farmers will not be able to obtain even 20 percent of their usual requirements.

It is somewhat strange, but I must admit somewhat in keeping with some other steps being officially taken, for our officials to work so directly and adversely against our people.

AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am certain we have all been distressed at the information that has come of numerous air accidents during the last few months. I wish to assure the House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is intensely interested in this subject. It has already taken steps through the agencies that now exist to obtain all the necessary data that will enable it to recommend to this Congress such legislation as may be necessary to promote safety. To that end I have today, as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce introduced a resolution that will give the committee full authority and the right of subpena to investigate these accidents.

A copy of the resolution I have introduced today reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or by the direction of its chairman any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or a member thereof designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee, among its other duties, to investigate such accidents as may have occurred to aircraft during the year 1946 and which may occur during the years following as the committee may deem important, with a view to ascertaining the cause or causes thereof, particularly as they may relate to the laws and regulations and the administration of laws and regulations relating to operation and inspection of airplanes and safety equipment and devices and the adequacy of airways facilities, flight control, communications, and landing aids and any other matters which the committee may deem necessary to investigate for the purpose of obtaining information to enable it to make recommendations for the improvement of safety and flight operations.

SEC. 3. In carrying out its powers and duties, the committee or any subcommittee thereof may call upon any department, agency, or establishment of the United States to furnish facilities and assistance to aid in such investigation.

The following letter was addressed to Hon. William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; Hon. James M. Landis, chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Theodore P. Wright, Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

JANUARY 14, 1947.

In view of the many accidents that have recently occurred in the operation of airlines, I would appreciate it if you would immediately submit to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce all data that is readily available which would show the number of accidents, the number of lives lost and the number injured, and also the lines on which the accidents occurred and the locality of each, as well as the amount of property damage involved in these accidents, together with any reports that have been made after the investigation of such accidents.

I would also like to receive for the committee any recommendations that you have made up to this time which in your judgment would promote better safety, together with any other information which would give

the committee any light in fixing the responsibility for these accidents and that would assist the committee in the consideration of this important subject.

Your immediate attention to this request will be of considerable help, even if at the moment you are able only to submit a partial report.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce say what he has just said. There are facts which should be brought to life on the air accidents of this Nation, which would astound every sensibly thinking person in this Nation. Remember this: Neither Eddie Rickenbacker nor any other executive of any line in the Nation can explain away to the satisfaction of the dear ones whose charred bodies are lying in North Carolina, Virginia, and the rest of the States of this Union, the reason for these accidents. The only people to whom the American people can come and get redress is the American Congress. They are asking you and me today, as American Congressmen, to do something. We cannot explain away our responsibility, my colleagues, and if we do not do something now and do it well we will never be in a position to properly discharge our duties.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I sincerely hope that my friend is not pointing an accusing finger at Eddie Rickenbacker.

Mr. RIVERS. I am not pointing an accusing finger at anybody.

Mr. COX. I trust that the gentleman would not do that.

Mr. RIVERS. May I point this out to the gentleman. Eddie Rickenbacker is the head of the Eastern Air Lines. I am not saying anything abusive about anybody. I am pointing an accusing finger at anybody who wants to explain away the reason why an airplane is 60 miles off its course by saying, "Maybe it was this, or maybe it was that." I say to you, there should not be any such explaining away. I think the American people ought to know the reason for a plane being 60 miles off its course. I think the American people ought to know whether or not the CAB is properly staffed. I think the American people ought to know whether the CAA was derelict in its duties. Lastly, I think the American people ought to know whether or not the Congress has been penny-wise and pound foolish in not giving these people a sufficient amount of money to properly man these stations. Something should be done, my colleagues, and done now. And anybody who is at fault should be accused and, furthermore, they should be accused in the public forum of American public opinion.

Mr. COX. I think Eddie Rickenbacker is being done a great injustice if the inference can be drawn from what the gentleman says that there has been any dereliction on his part. Mr. Rickenbacker, in my judgment, is one of the most distinguished citizens of the country and has already been punished as a result of neglect far beyond what is excusable.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the gentleman that Eddie Rickenbacker has not been impugned or accused any more than the American Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may have an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I am personally well acquainted with Eddie Rickenbacker. I think he is one of the great heroes of all times. I do not think Eddie Rickenbacker is personally responsible for this air wreck. I think I could tell you where one trouble lies.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will pardon the interruption, do I have this time or does the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RANKIN. I am asking you.

Mr. RIVERS. Then may I answer the gentleman?

Mr. RANKIN. I am saying this in the gentleman's own time. That is the reason I asked for this time for the gentleman. I do not want to see Eddie Rickenbacker done an injustice.

Mr. RIVERS. In answer to the gentleman, I do not want the Congress to say I am trying to accuse Eddie Rickenbacker. I say not Eddie Rickenbacker or anybody else can explain away the reason why an airplane is 60 miles off its course with people getting killed and not having anything done about it. I do not want the impression to be left that the record of the air lines is not a great one. I understand that for domestic operations alone, there were only 1.24 passenger fatalities per hundred million passenger-miles in 1946 as compared with 2.14 in 1945, an improvement of approximately 40 percent. This is over twice as safe as the 1945 record—1946 figures not yet available—for passenger automobiles of 2.9 deaths per 100,000,000 passenger-miles. I want our air lines to be the greatest on the face of the earth. At the same time I feel that Congress should be alert to its duty in assisting in any endeavor on the part of this great industry to improve, protect, and expand throughout the globe. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a brief which I am respectfully submitting to the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman-designate of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has just announced on the floor his introduction of a resolution to go into the whole air picture. I sincerely and earnestly hope that no secrecy will veil the deliberations of this great committee. Any secrecy surrounding the interrogation of any witness, be they Government or otherwise, will not be understood by the American people.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman-Designate, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am most respectfully enclosing some thoughts I have on some of the elements that should be considered by your subcommittee when it convenes to investigate the air-lines set-up.

You have, I am sure, observed from the press that certain deliberations of the Senate have been secret. May I ask you to avoid secrecy when witnesses are called. The public will greatly misunderstand any reason for not making every part of the testimony before you available to them.

With full expression of my high esteem, believe me to be

Sincerely yours,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

[Enclosure.]

To continue my remarks of yesterday with reference to the dilemma in which we now find the air-transportation industry of this country, I should like to make a few pointed suggestions.

I, for one, am not willing to let the disastrous accident of Eastern Air Lines at Galax, Va., last week pass by without a complete and thorough investigation by Congress. It is high time that some agency ferreted out the cause or causes of at least one accident and made a full and complete report thereof to Congress, together with the remedies necessary to prevent future accidents. Therefore, in the case of this accident in which 18 lives were lost, I demand that such an investigation be immediately undertaken and that the following parties be subpenaed to place on the record their expert knowledge of their version of this disastrous incident:

1. Eastern Air Lines' management, including the meteorologists, maintenance manager, and dispatcher who were responsible for this particular flight.

2. The engineers of the manufacturer of the ship in question.

3. The manufacturer of the aircraft engines which were installed in the ship.

4. The manufacturers of the instruments in this particular plane.

5. The appropriate official of Aeronautical Radio Corp., Inc.

6. The United States Weather Bureau officials in the area of the accident.

7. The Civil Aeronautics Administration's representatives in the area of the accident; and most important of all, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, its inspectors of the flight in question, control-tower operators who were in contact with the flight, and the division head of that agency who recommends the civil air regulations which are promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and all appropriate officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board who deal with the investigation and reports on accidents.

So serious is this situation that it is my purpose to limit the scope of this investigation as much as possible at this time. However, the unpardonable delays which are being experienced by certain cities of this Nation receiving air-transportation services due to the cumbersome administrative processes of the Civil Aeronautics Board, prompts me at this time to also demand that the Civil Aeronautics Board file a report with Congress of every new route proceeding which it now

has before it in which the public hearing has been held but no decision rendered. The Board should be required to show the date upon which the hearing began and ended, and the length of time that has elapsed without any decision having been reached.

It is my conviction that the taxpayers' interests, as represented by the city and State officials and their duly elected Members of this Congress, have been too long ignored in these new route cases by the Civil Aeronautics Board. I can cite you in my own State of South Carolina alone a number of excellent airports with complete facilities installed at the taxpayers' expense which have been waiting for years for decisions by the Board in new route cases that would offer them the advantages of air transportation to which they are justly entitled.

It is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Administration has, during recent months, entered on a program of inactivating certain range stations and control towers throughout this Nation. It occurs to me that this may be an ill-advised economy project, and that if they are inactivating such stations they may very well also be failing to keep the maintenance standards of the operating stations up to the high level of efficiency that is necessary for public safety. The full and complete facts concerning this situation must be revealed immediately.

If there ever were agencies created by Congress which, of necessity, require the services of thoroughly competent technical experts, they are the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board. I therefore propose that the investigation which I have suggested be broadened sufficient to inquire into the qualifications of the technicians and regulatory experts of both of these agencies in connection with this entire matter.

THE NATIONAL CONSERVATION PLEDGE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during 1946 a very interesting national contest was held among conservationists throughout America to try to arrive at an appropriate wording for a national conservation pledge. It is the hope of the sponsors of this contest that this pledge might be popularized to the extent that children would learn it in school and that people include it in their speeches and articles in order to help quicken the conscience of America to the need for a wise conservation of its great natural resources.

I would like to read at this time the wording which has been finally chosen by the judges as the text of the national conservation pledge:

I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to defend from waste the natural resources of my country—its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, World War II, as World War I, was a great consumer of our natural resources, and this Congress will do well, as I know it will, to devote some of its attention to the conservation of our natural resources, including pure waters, forests, minerals, our wildlife and our soil.

The contest to select a national conservation pledge was directed by Raymond J. Brown, editor of Outdoor Life. It brought in hundreds of worth-while suggestions. It was my privilege to serve as one of the national judges and I am sure that the winning text serves as a conservation pledge which faithfully reflects the sentiments of millions of conservationists in this Republic. I hope it will aid in the program of education required to make Americans conservation-minded.

If we protect our natural resources now, our natural resources will protect us all in the years to come.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therein an article describing the only bill that the Spanish-American War veterans are asking to have passed at this session of Congress, which is contained in the Stars and Stripes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am dropping in the hopper today a bill at the request of the Spanish-American War veterans which is the only bill they are seeking to have passed during this session of Congress. I am sure the committee will want to give this bill a hearing at an early date.

The National Tribune, of January 16, 1947, published an explanation of the bill, as follows:

SPANISH WAR VETS ASK HORIZONTAL PENSION BOOST FOR ALL ON ROLLS—BASED ON LIVING COSTS, ARE READY TO INTRODUCE NEW BILL IN HOUSE—ALSO ASK MODIFIED WIDOWS' BENEFITS BASED ON CIVIL WAR PRECEDENT—GENERAL BRADLEY IS SPEAKER AT ANNUAL MEETING—OTHER COMMITTEES ALSO CONVENE IN WASHINGTON

The principal legislative effort of the United Spanish War Veterans during the Eightieth Congress will be on behalf of a bill to grant a 20-percent horizontal increase in pensions to all beneficiaries now on the pension rolls, both veterans and dependents. Also, every effort will be made to obtain a change in the widows' law so that those dependents who married after December 31, 1937, may be eligible, under certain conditions, to receive pensions.

The United Spanish War Veterans will also support any effort made to eliminate the "pauper oath" in its application to veterans' and widows' benefits, and will encourage the naming of a major committee of the Senate to consider all legislation pertaining to their group.

Meeting in its board room at the national headquarters in Washington last Sunday, the national committee on legislation and its administration quickly got down to business and wound up its work in one session, under National Chairman Judge Edward S. Matthias, of the Ohio Supreme Court. The group listened to a brief talk by Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Gen. Omar N. Bradley, in which particular reference was made to those problems facing the veterans of 1898–1902, their widows, and dependents. The committee and members of their families, together with numerous other officials and Members of Congress, were guests of Commander in Chief John White on Monday night at a dinner at the Mayflower Hotel.

Also meeting over the week end were the national finance committee and the national executive committee.

FOLLOWED MILWAUKEE MANDATE

After a review of legislation enacted for Spanish War veterans and their widows had been made by Judge Matthias and the history of both legislation and the manner of its administration had been discussed, the committee unanimously adopted the policy which had been endorsed at the Milwaukee encampment last August. By it there will be followed only such precedents as have already been established for veterans and dependents of the Civil War. Generally, this policy received executive sanction in 1935 with the approval by the then President of the 1935 act. In order to seek a just bill that would assist all of the membership and its auxiliary women to meet increased living costs, the 20-percent increase across the board was decided upon as the most equitable.

It was also determined to include in one bill, the suggested text of which appears later in this article, a provision to make eligible for pensions those widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Uprising who married after December 31, 1937. Such widows, under the proposal, must have reached the age of 60 years, must have lived with their veteran husbands for at least 10 years next preceding death, except where the separation is without fault of a widow, and they cannot have remarried. This program follows exactly the law enacted December 8, 1944, for Civil War widows who married after June 27, 1905. That is Public Law 471, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Although it was decided not to introduce separate legislation seeking the elimination of needs clauses, particularly as they apply to hospitalization of Spanish War veterans, the committee voted to support such legislation as well as bills which would place the jurisdiction of all affairs relating to veterans and their dependents in one Senate committee.

WAR CLAIMS CENTRALIZED

Following the presentation of General Bradley, the committee went on record by resolution in an expression of appreciation for the services he has rendered to veterans as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

General Bradley told the group it had been his decision to retain, centralized in Washington, all of the claims relating to Spanish War veterans and their widows, basing his decision on the fact even though every effort was being made to completely decentralize the activities of all other veterans and widows, problems facing the Spanish War group are peculiar to them. The retention of their claims folders in Washington, he said, should obviate any necessity of training expert claims men who would have to be furnished if folders were farmed out to regional offices.

The General spoke of the present 215,000 employes now under his jurisdiction, and said that even though it had been hoped to get along with fewer, it was his belief that the employment load would soon level off and reduce itself. He sought the assistance of the Spanish War group in the unlimited field of rehabilitation being undertaken by his agency. Bradley noted that although the last available figures showed less than 3,000 Spanish War veterans in hospitals, and 870 under domiciliary care, there were all-told some 96,000 veterans occupying hospital beds now, 83,000 of them in Veterans' Administration hospitals. He reviewed his trials in obtaining competent physicians and surgeons, and related that the service has been vastly improved, that there are now some 4,000 doctors employed full time and that others "on tour" with the Army and Navy will join the Veterans' Administration soon.

General Bradley also announced that although the 116 hospitals now in operation include 17 Army and Navy units of temporary construction, "There are 50 new hospitals now on the drawing board, and we are working

on revised criteria to make them the best in the country. We have working with us closely the American Institute of Architects."

In their larger terms, Bradley discussed other major problems, including insurance, which he said was his biggest headache, and he indicated that complaints about that branch would be largely dismissed within another 6 months, a third sooner than they were solved following World War I. He issued a warning, however, that "we must weigh very carefully what further is to be done for our veterans, who must have the most just and reasonable program available consistent with what is best for the country."

MANY OFFICERS PRESENT

Only one member of the committee, Judge Leon McCord, of Alabama, was absent, he having had to prepare for the opening of his court in New Orleans. Those present, in addition to Chairman Matthias, were Past Commander in Chief Joe R. Hanley, vice chairman, of New York; P. C. C. William J. Otjen, Oklahoma; P. C. C. Thomas W. Payne, Michigan; P. C. C. George A. Eberly, Nebraska; P. C. C. Guy A. Boyle, Indiana; P. C. C. Halsey B. Leavitt, North Carolina; Quartermaster General Walter E. Downey, Washington, D. C.; Charles W. Bernhardt, Georgia; Guy B. Groff, Washington; John U. Shroyer, Pennsylvania; D. B. Todd, Tennessee; Henry H. Hunt, Connecticut; Dan S. Hewitt, California; Fred R. Hamilton, Arkansas; George A. Bauer, Wisconsin; Walter S. Lawrence, Alabama; John H. Daugherty, Texas; Harry Bierma, Illinois; E. E. Carle, Nebraska, and B. A. Bowers, Iowa.

Among staff members present were Adjutant General Peyton Irving, Jr., of Texas, and Surgeon General Dr. LeRoy Jones, of New Mexico.

The finance committee, which is headed by Senior Vice Commander in Chief Horace M. Havner, of Iowa, is also composed of J. B. Derden, of Texas, and J. Frank Ferguson, of Oklahoma; all of whom were present.

Members of the executive committee present were, in addition to the commander in chief who is chairman, Senior Vice Commander Havner; Junior Vice Commander in Chief Charles R. Barefoot, of Ohio; Tom Gibson, of Mississippi; and W. Ross Duke, of Texas.

Officially representing the national auxiliary and present at the legislative sessions were Mrs. Julia A. Kull, of New Jersey, national president; Legislative Chairman Nora V. Eveleth, of Massachusetts, past national president; Louise W. Williams, of Washington, D. C., national secretary; Mrs. Henrietta Lynott, of Washington, national treasurer; and past national presidents, Mamie B. Schmidt, of the District of Columbia; Mary A. McGauley, of New York; and Lou Ella Allen, of Texas.

Also present were Paul J. Clarke, of Washington, D. C., national president of the Sons of Spanish-American War Veterans; Department Commander Charles H. Appich, of the District of Columbia, and members of his staff; Past Department Commander William G. Copley; State Service Officer William Rapier, of Louisiana; Mrs. Beulah Cope, of the District of Columbia, department auxiliary president; Mrs. Edna Summerfield, national assistant conductress; and numerous local commanders and their staffs.

Among wives who accompanied their husbands to Washington were, Mrs. White, Mrs. Downey, Mrs. Schroyer, Mrs. Otjen, Mrs. Eberly, Mrs. Leavitt, Mrs. Matthias, Mrs. Cain, Mrs. Hunt, Mrs. Bowers, Mrs. Bierma, Mrs. Carle, Mrs. Boyle, and Mrs. Rapier.

On Sunday afternoon officers of all committees, their wives, and others who attended committee sessions were guests at a buffet luncheon at the home of Past Commander in Chief John Lewis Smith. Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Bertha P. Mattocks, and Mrs. Mary A. Rice were cohostesses.

Be it enacted, etc., That all monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection and dependents of such veterans which are payable under laws reenacted by the act of August 13, 1935 (49 Stat. 614; 38 U. S. C. 368, 369) or under acts amendatory or supplemental to such laws are hereby increased by 20 percent. The increases provided by this action shall be effective from the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The dependent unremarried widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, who is barred from the receipt of pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to December 31, 1937, but who is otherwise entitled to such pension under the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382; 38 U. S. C. 364a, as reenacted by the act of August 13, 1935 (49 Stat. 614; 38 U. S. C. 368) shall be entitled to pension in her own right under said act, as amended, under the conditions specified therein (except date of marriage) and at the rate authorized by section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 611, 79th Cong.) as amended by section 1 hereof and to the additional pension provided for children under the act of May 1, 1926, as amended, provided she married the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death except where there was a separation which was due to misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided,* That if pension has been granted to a child or children of the veteran, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized by this section until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this act, then the difference between said amounts will be paid to the widow: *Provided further,* That no pension shall be payable under this section to a widow under 60 years of age.

SEC. 3. Payment of pension as provided in section 2 shall be effective from the date of receipt of application in the Veterans' Administration, after the date of enactment of this act, in the form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Pension under section 2 shall not be paid to the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, who has remarried either once or more than once since the death of the veteran, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated. The penal and forfeiture provisions of laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration providing pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, shall be applicable to the provisions of this act.

THE GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with much the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] had to say about the Members of the opposite party as far as it referred to the membership of the House.

But I do not underwrite the lynching of my State in another body.

To my mind, it was a deplorable fiasco, and one that set a most dangerous precedent. If a few hold-overs whom the people have not voted on for many years can shut the doors in the face of a man who has just been elected, deny him the right to defend himself, and his State the right to representation, in order to pander to certain radical elements, and certain un-American elements whom that Member has offended by fighting for American principles, I cannot underwrite or applaud such unwarranted proceedings. That could not happen in the House.

But I arose to reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER], who has just attacked the State of Mississippi because a few communistic intermeddlers cannot bluff Hon. Fielding Wright, the Governor of my State, into stopping the execution of a couple of young Negroes who went out and conspired to murder an innocent person, then took their guns and perpetrated one of the most brutal murders ever known.

Just such stuff as this is causing crime to spread over the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] knows, if he reads the papers, that an innocent white nurse was raped in the shadow of the dome of this Capitol, right out there on the Library grounds, only night before last by a black Negro brute, and he is said to have been waylaying another woman when the police caught him.

Mr. HUBER. It has nothing to do with the murder of innocent children.

Mr. RANKIN. These criminals to which the gentleman refers were not innocent children. Their ages have been flagrantly misrepresented. They were old enough to take their guns and go out and conspire and murder an innocent man, and they are old enough to take the consequences.

All the Communists in America cannot bluff Fielding Wright, the Governor of Mississippi.

But just such stuff as this is encouraging crime. There have been more white women raped by Negro brutes in the District of Columbia in the last 10 years than there had been in the entire history of the District of Columbia up to that time.

They have been encouraged, if not inspired by just such silly attacks as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] has just made on the State of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a powerful sermon rendered recently by the Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart, bishop of Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 25 minutes.

WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE-UNIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the charge made by the American Federation of Labor that four American military government zonal manpower division chiefs in Germany had recently conferred in Paris with officials of the so-called World Federation of Trade-Unions "to stampede German trade-unions into affiliation with the WFTU." The American Federation of Labor called this a "desperate attempt by the Kremlin to grab control of organized labor in Germany." Although this charge was subsequently denied by Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States military governor in Germany, the following facts stand out:

Mr. Michael Ross, American CIO representative at the meeting of the WFTU executive bureau, held in Paris on December 16 to 18, did not deny that these manpower chiefs were present. Nor did he deny that at this bureau meeting a resolution had been adopted, indicating the desire of the WFTU to secure eventual affiliation of the German trade-unions.

It should also be noted that Mr. Max Lowenthal, recently appointed general counsel to Lieutenant General Clay, is a man with long-established ties to Communist organizations and whose loyalty record is highly questionable. Another adviser and close associate of Mr. Lowenthal is George Shaw Wheeler, whose loyalty record is even more questionable.

The American Federation of Labor legitimately raises the question why representatives of the State and War Departments were not consulted on this matter and emphasizes the seriousness of any possible entanglement in our military zone with what they call the Kremlin's world-wide fifth column. In view of the fact that the record and the activities of the World Federation of Trade-Unions and its affiliates shows a policy of definite hostility to the United States, I am seriously concerned about the attitude taken toward this organization by our representatives not only in Germany but throughout the world. Let us look at the record, which is significant because never in its brief career has the WFTU uttered a single world of criticism of the policies of the Soviet Government or of labor and working conditions either in Russia or countries under its control.

The syndicalist minority of the French General Federation of Labor has pointed out that the WFTU has never "protested the uprooting of millions of people, the forced-labor camps, and the terrible conditions in which millions of vanquished now live" in Soviet-controlled territory. Small wonder that the Soviet bloc of delegates to the United Nations has displayed a marked tenderness for the World Federation of Trade-Unions.

No individual has done more in the interests of world labor than William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. Nevertheless, he felt constrained to point out the serious limitations of the World Federation of Trade-Unions in dealing with the conditions of labor, as follows:

> Any attempt to improve the standard of living of all workers on an international basis would face the difficulty that the Russian trade-unions would never and could never assume responsibility for putting the decisions of the World Federation into effect on the territory of the U. S. S. R. Even the prevention of unfair competition by cheap labor would be acceptable to the Soviet delegates only on condition that Russia be exempted from these decisions with regard to the products of Russian prison labor and also with regard to underpaid Russian free labor. (New Leader, August 4, 1945, p. 1.)

The allegedly defunct Communist International and its affiliated Communist Parties are carrying out a world-wide agitation against "the trusts". The target of this barrage is, of course, the United States. The WFTU and its affiliates have echoed this type of propaganda, as the following illustrations will show:

In September 1945, it adopted a resolution demanding "that the World Federation of Trade-Unions be asked to study measures to be taken to control trusts and international monopolies."

The Indian delegate to the WFTU meeting, in September 1945, presented the following alternatives to his fellow delegates:

> The choice before the workers of Europe and the workers of the world is between the finance capital of the United States on the one hand and the social economic order which is represented by Soviet Russia alone on the other.

Coupled with this agitation is an attempt to accuse the United States of inciting war against the Soviet Union. Surely the world knows we have bent over backwards to seek peaceful and satisfactory adjustments with the Soviet Government; we have sought no territorial aggrandizement, while they have armed to the teeth and have entered upon a campaign of active expansionism. Nevertheless, this is the Communist and WFTU refrain throughout the world. Let me cite Mr. William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., in the Worker of April 21, 1946:

> It is imperative that the world's workers, through the World Federation of Trade-Unions, should intervene in the proceedings of the United Nations in order to defeat the imperialists who are now active in that body and are threatening the peace of the world. * * * It should ring with protest against the war-mongering course now being followed by the American delegation in the United Nations. It should let Truman and Byrnes know that they are violating the peace will of the American people.

In an attack upon the American Federation of Labor and the United States, Benoit Frachon, Communist secretary of the French General Federation of Labor, WFTU affiliate, declared on October 26, 1946:

> These men are ardent interventionists on the side of the cavaliers of the atomic bomb. They are protagonists of a new war, provided its purpose is an attack on the Soviet Union and the European democracies that don't care for the kings of the dollar and the men of the trusts to dictate their form of government.

A leading representative of the WFTU in the Western Hemisphere is Toledano of Mexico, pro-Communist leader of the Latin-American Federation of Labor, who has maintained a continuous diatribe against American interests, through his official organ, the CTAL News. Permit me to quote from the utterances of this vicious demagog:

> North American imperialism is stronger and more aggressive. In Japan it fights democratization by forbidding the splitting up of feudal estates and by protecting the monarch and the rule of feudal lords and monopolies. In Korea it does not hesitate to make use of Japanese and quislings. In the Philippines it jails the guerrilla leaders and flirts with the puppet Roxas. . . . In China it intervenes with loans, arms, planes, and troops in favor of the Chungking government with the aim of wiping out democratic and progressive movements (November 19, 1945).
>
> When Wall Street or its Latin-American feudal gauleiters speak of the good-neighbor policy, they mean that the United States should be the big owning country, exercising complete military, economic and political domination over 20 good neighbors or colonies, to the south (May 13, 1946).

The National Maritime Union—CIO—which is affiliated with the WFTU and which has received every consideration from the American Government in its dealings before Federal labor boards, has taken a similar position at its National Council meeting in December 1946. I quote:

> We must make these imperialist tie-ups of the American shipowners clear to our members and to the American people. We must make it clear that the imperialist plans of American big business mean unemployment and substandard wages for American workers, as well as enslavement for other peoples. We must engage in an all-around fight that will expose this international conspiracy and bust it wide open. * * * We must strengthen the WFTU as an instrument for fighting imperialism.

In line with accepted Communist policy, the National Maritime Union calls upon workers throughout the world to join in international strikes against the so-called American imperialists. Says the NMU:

> We must enlist their support for our program, and develop joint struggles with them on the broader issues of American foreign policy.

This meeting also called for the building of ship committees, a Communist device for subverting discipline aboard American ships.

The NMU expressed its close solidarity with Toledano's Latin-American Federation of Labor, as follows:

> The trade-unionists in the United States have a special responsibility to expose and fight against the ravages of American imperialism upon the Latin-American peoples. * * * We should * * * strengthen our relations with the CTAL.

The WFTU and its affiliated organizations have sought to encourage the Communist policy of international strikes intended to disrupt American commerce and industry. Prior to the June 15, 1946, deadline of the threatened strike of the Committee for Maritime Unity, headed by Harry Bridges, against the United States Government and American shipping interests, this committee had received assurance of strike support from the WFTU, the Latin-American Federation of Labor, and affiliated waterfront workers of Australia, New Zealand, and

other countries. In the name of 800 French seamen affiliated with the WFTU, Hyppolite Dennis pledged "full support to the NMU-CIO strike by not sailing on any ships until the NMU has won its strike"—Daily Worker, September 19, 1946, page 3.

For the first time in history—

Declared the Communist New Masses exultingly—

the newly formed WFTU, with 60,000,000 members, will throw its earth-encircling weight behind an American strike.

In the CTAL News of June 10, 1946, Toledano announced:

Two hundred thousand sailors of the merchant marine, longshoremen, and warehousemen are committed to resort to strike unless the shipowners of the United States accede to their just demands. * * * Should the maritime strike be called in the United States of America, the workers of Latin America, and especially sailors and dock workers, will know and be ready to the duty, the welcome duty, dictated by their solidarity with their comrades in the north.

The WFTU is presently agitating such solidarity strikes on an international scale against Franco Spain, to further Soviet designs in the Mediterranean.

Would you know some reason why sugar is so scarce in the United States? Then look into the international strikes conducted by Harry Bridges and other WFTU adherents in Hawaii and Cuba among the sugarcane workers. While pretending to be interested in the working conditions of these workers, their real aim is to cripple the American sugar industry.

While the World Federation of Trade-Unions has not dared to demand independence for Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Finland, or any other Soviet puppet state, it has taken up the cudgels for the independence of Puerto Rico, which was interpreted by a United Press dispatch as "a slap at United States administration."

The World Federation of Trade-Unions and its affiliates are being utilized particularly as instruments for the condemnation of American foreign policy in order to force us to accede to Soviet expansionist aims. On September 7, 1946, the leaders of the Polish trade-unions adopted a resolution which read, in part, as follows:

Mr. Byrnes' speech constitutes a great danger, a danger of diverging from the road of general peace followed by the United Nations during the war, which road they promised to follow after the war.

Mr. Byrnes' speech strongly undermines the policy of democratization and denazification of Germany, and may contribute to the rebirth of German imperialism. * * *

The policy which Secretary of State Byrnes proposes to follow by encouraging German imperialists constitutes a danger to Poland for whom German imperialism is always fraught with the threat of new aggression. * * *

The organized workers of Poland appeal to the workers of the United States * * * and to the leaders of the CIO, and the AFL * * * to oppose strongly in the name of peace the reactionary groups which tend to restore German imperialism.

According to the CIO News of March 25, 1946, the World Federation sent an investigating commission to Germany, which reported in critical terms on conditions in the American zone, while commenting with highest praise on conditions in the Soviet zone. It charged that Nazis are being sheltered in responsible jobs in the American zone. By curious coincidence, the Soviet Government has expressed a similar criticism recently—New York Times, January 9, 1947.

Louis Saillant, general secretary of the WFTU, went so far as to defy the decisions of the United Nations, in advocating the Soviet-sponsored plan for the German trade-unions. According to the New York Times of June 19, 1946, he declared:

The World Federation of Trade-Unions executive committee will demand a centralized German trade-union movement regardless of what political arrangements are made for Germany at the Paris Conference.

Four organizations, including Yugoslav unions and the Italian General Confederation of Labor, whose representatives had been meeting in Paris under the auspices of the World Federation of Trade-Unions, demanded that American troops be withdrawn from the Trieste area—Worker, November 3, 1946, page 15. They condemned the Allied military government for its action against an illegal strike of WFTU adherents calculated to pressure the decisions of the United Nations—New York Times, October 22, 1946, page 10.

In the Shansi Honan-Hopei liberated area of north China, alleged representatives of 15,000 organized railway workers voted to appeal to the World Federation of Trade-Unions for the withdrawal of American forces from China—Daily Worker, January 21, 1946, page 8. The WFTU has never taken any similar action against the occupation of Soviet troops anywhere in the world.

Unions affiliated with the WFTU have shown a marked anti-American attitude particularly where issues of American security were involved. The Federation of Icelandic Trade-Unions called a 24-hour strike in the Reykjavik area in protest against the proposed granting of air-base privileges to the United States—New York Times, September 25, 1946, page 6.

The Ecuadorean Federation of Labor was aligned with the Communist Party of that country in November 1945, in opposition to the granting of air bases to the United States and denounced the alleged attempt of United States monopolies to obtain economic hegemony over Latin America—CTAL News, November 12, 1945.

Similarly the Cuban Federation of Labor attacked United States Army officers at the San Antonio de los Banos Airbase as violating the Cuban constitution in their attitude toward the Cuban unions. These forces have vigorously opposed granting air-base privileges to the United States on the island of Cuba—CTAL News, November 12, 1945.

American Army officials are deeply concerned at the present time by the well-financed drive of the United Public Workers of America—CIO—led by well-known Communists in the Panama Canal Zone, in which 17,000 workers have allegedly been enlisted. Full details are given in an illuminating article in the magazine Plain Talk for November 1946. Toledano's Latin-American Federation of Labor and the Pan-American Federation of Labor have announced their full support of this campaign directed at the very heart of our continental defense system.

In the CIO News of January 6, 1947, Len De Caux, its editor, applauds the decision of the recent Costa Rica conference of the Latin-American Federation of Labor denouncing the Truman Inter-American defense plan as "big stick" diplomacy, seeking United States imperialist domination over its weaker neighbors. The Clayton trade proposals are also criticized as an attempt to break down tariff protections for infant Latin-American industries. While Philip Murray, president of the CIO, has never attacked Russian imperialism by name, he has fulminated against imperialism in foreign affairs according to the Worker of September 1, 1946, page 2. Against whom is Mr. Murray directing this attack? We would all like to know.

Permit me to add some significant comments from the able pen of Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin in the New York Times of January 9, 1947, page 18. Commenting on the Communist-controlled National Maritime Union—CIO—and its affiliated organizations in the maritime industry, all linked with the WFTU, he declared:

Complete control of these unions by the Communists could hog-tie America in a time of international crisis. * * * The Congress must make impossible a repetition of last summer's catastrophic blow to Alaska and the Aleutians, a geographical area of tremendous strategic importance. Any shipping strikes that virtually strangle Alaska as the recent strikes did, and that also imperil an adequate defense in the Hawaiian Islands cannot be tolerated.

This Congress in considering labor legislation must take a firm and definite position toward all labor organizations giving evidence of operating under foreign control or discipline.

In its world-wide assault upon the American system of free enterprise, the World Federation of Trade-Unions is seeking to undermine and destroy a way of life that has given the American workers the highest standard of living in the world, under conditions of freedom and opportunity which no country can surpass. I do not claim that the United States is a blissful paradise, that we have no evils which we must correct. But I do claim that in terms of human values, social, economic, and individual freedom, we shine by comparison with that self-proclaimed workers' paradise, the Soviet Union, with its slave labor camps, its dictatorship, and its denial of the dignity of the individual.

American labor has recognized this. Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, in an article entitled "We Back America" in the July 1946 American Federationist, has declared:

In its relations with the other nations of the earth, our country must of necessity be a

unit if it is to be effective. There cannot be one foreign policy for the American worker and another for the American businessman. * * * We must succeed or fail as one indivisible unit. * * * Did the people of America want to win in order to acquire the territory of some other nation? Did our national will to win have its inspiration in the hope that we could control the thinking of other peoples along religious lines? Did we, as a people, desire by military victory to impose our form of government on any other peoples? All these questions can be truthfully answered in the negative.

In view of the facts I have presented, which could be amplified, it should be clear to anyone that the World Federation of Trade-Unions—whose membership figures may be as inflated as the PAC claims—is an organization basically hostile to the interests of the United States and subservient to the interests of the Soviet Government. Our representatives before the United Nations and in all occupied areas should quit pussyfooting and treat it as such.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that it is claimed by these various organizations that they number 50,000,000 members scattered throughout the various parts of the world, and that they are dominated by communistic influence centered in Russia?

Mr. DONDERO. That is substantially what I said.

Mr. ROBSION. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This Congress, as has several previous Congresses, has abetted and encouraged and promoted and fertilized this whole movement in the United States and throughout the world. We cannot throw the blame on anybody else. It comes right to the well of this House. We might just as well be very plain about it.

What is this Congress going to do about it? What is the Republican administration going to do about it; I mean these labor laws which encourage this situation nationally and internationally. We let the maritime strikes come along and cut the economic throat of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska. We do little about it. That organization and its operations against the units of this Government in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, and Alaska is just as terrible to those offshore areas as this great international set-up is to the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman asked me what this Congress is going to do about it. This Congress, including every Member on both sides of the aisle who believes in America, is going to answer the demands made by the people of this Nation on the 5th day of last November by doing something to clean it up.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope that will be carried out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not go all the way with my distinguished friend from Michigan when he says the Congress is responsible for this condition, but the Congress has the responsibility of correcting whatever is wrong.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is right.

Mr. RANKIN. A man who does not have courage enough to vote the laws to protect this country ought not to be a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan on his very fine statement, and to recall that a year ago last summer he and I traveled in many countries of the Old World. I wonder if the gentleman did not reach the same conclusion I reached, that one of the basic principles in the Soviet foreign policy is to spread communism wherever and whenever possible in all parts of the world.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank my fine friend from New Hampshire. There is no question about it. I think I came to the same conclusion as the able and distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, that when we arrived back on the shores of America we felt like kneeling down and kissing the earth in gratitude that we were American citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MORE SUGAR FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS IN 1947

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], has today appointed a seven-man committee, all of whom are members of the Committee on Agriculture, to investigate the food and agricultural production situation, which is of great concern to all citizens of the United States. I will be privileged, under appointment from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], to serve as chairman of this important committee. The committee has been authorized to investigate food shortages, and other problems relating to the production of agricultural commodities in short supply.

Because of the urgency of the situation which exists, in the case of sugar, fats and oils, including flaxseed and linseed oil, the committee will begin its investigation today. We hope to make frequent reports and recommendations on our findings. Our objective will be to secure greater production and larger allocations of foods and agricultural products, now in short supply, for American consumers.

I am prompted today to briefly mention the sugar situation. I do so, because the International Emergency Food Council will meet within the next few days to allocate the world supply of sugar, and particularly that part of world sugar production which is controlled by the Government of the United States.

We have been told by reliable sugar authorities in the Department of Agriculture that the allocation of sugar for the world will be made for the entire year of 1947, and on the basis of existing production estimates. I might state here that since I received this information I have been informed by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allocation will now be made on the basis of the first quarter rather than for the entire year, which will be helpful.

Present estimates of world sugar supplies for 1947, are stated to be more than 30,000,000 short tons, as compared with 26,692,000 tons last year. Reliable private estimates indicate there will be more than 32,000,000 short tons of sugar for world consumption. Prewar production of sugar—1935–39—is given at 34,544,000 short tons. Nineteen hundred and forty-six and forty-seven production of sugar in Europe, and other parts of the Eastern Hemisphere has increased by 30 to 70 percent over last year's production. It should, therefore, be quite obvious that the sugar-claiming countries, outside of the United States, will not require as much sugar from our sources of supply as they received in 1946.

Government estimates and reliable reports from industry sources on 1946–47 sugar production for Cuba and the United States, which includes Hawaii and Puerto Rico, is now figured at 9,691,500 short tons, as compared with 7,846,000 short tons last year. This leaves an additional supply of around 1,800,000 tons over last year, which comes under United States control, and I insist that this additional sugar, under our control, less the amount not contracted from Cuba, should be allocated to the American people.

Assuming that the 1946–47 production of sugar from United States areas and Cuba will yield a net increase of from 1,500,000 to 1,700,000 short tons, the per capita distribution of sugar for United States citizens can be increased by 15 pounds for 1947, with an increase of approximately 25 percent for industrial users. Such a distribution is entirely fair and equitable, and would give American consumers each 40 pounds of sugar, as compared with 25 pounds last year, and would increase supplies for industrial users from 60 to between 75 and 80 percent of their base period allowance. Secretary Anderson has promised the American housewives an extra 5 pounds of sugar in April, but this is not enough when we consider existing sup-

plies. No one can give any good reason why we should continue to take from our supplies of sugar and give it to people in other countries, when most of them are now back to nearly prewar production. It is about time that the administration gave a little more consideration to the American people.

I recognize that there are certain officials who want to cut down on American sugar consumption. I have little sympathy for such a policy. In view of the fact that the International Emergency Food Council will meet this month to divide our sugar, I definitely feel that the American people should be advised as to what is taking place, and I also insist that no allocation of sugar should be made for more than the first quarter of 1947 by the Council, and that the amount allocated should not exceed the amount provided in the first quarter of 1946.

The committee will proceed with a thorough investigation of the sugar situation. Hearings will be held and all available data assembled, and it is hoped that a report can be made with recommendations before the end of this month.

Our committee wants an increase in the production of sugar in the United States and offshore areas for the future, and we want to secure our full share of the increased supplies as the result of production in 1946 and 1947. The American people are entitled to such consideration at the hands of their Government. We pay for a large portion of the sugar that is going to other countries of the world either directly or indirectly. A substantial amount in the past has been turned over to UNRRA for distribution in the Balkans and some of the other countries in Europe. UNRRA is being discontinued but I assume that the International Emergency Food Council will see to it that all of those areas, even though they have increased their production of sugar, will have their share, whether it be for domestic purposes or for them to sell in countries of the world.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Who is it that will comply with that demand of this international set-up that we should take sugar from our people and send it to countries that have not been any too friendly to us within recent months? In fact, some of them have shot down and murdered our nationals.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think our officials in charge should use the utmost care in the distribution of this sugar.

The last distribution of sugar for 1946 was made by the Combined Food Board, which consisted of officials from Canada, Great Britain, and the United States. The Combined Food Board has gone out of existence, and the International Emergency Food Council has been set up in its place, which includes 18 or 20 nations of the world, all of whom would like to get in on this sugar deal.

We met this morning with the Secretary of Agriculture and presented our views to him, and I am satisfied that if it is within his power to help us get more sugar for the American people he will do so. Unfortunately, he is not always the one who has the last word, because the State Department has something to say about it, and I assume the President also expresses his convictions on what we should do with the sugar that comes under our control.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I noticed one citation of figures gave the consumption per capita at 94 pounds before the war. I think that was the year directly before the war. I wonder what the gentleman's proposal would be in comparison with that figure.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The figure which the gentleman cites, around 93 pounds to 103 pounds per capita as prewar consumption, is the consumption of sugar in all forms, including soft drinks, bakery goods, candy, and also the direct consumption of sugar. What I have proposed is to secure more sugar for the housewives and individuals in the United States for 1947, both direct and indirect consumption, suggesting an increase of 15 pounds of direct sugar, which would make a total of 40 pounds, and then an additional 20 or 25 percent for the industrial uses.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman will bear me out when I say the No. 1 kick, as far as consumers are concerned, is sugar.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from New York has made a very patent suggestion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it would be correct to assert that in 1943 at which time UNRRA was conceived, the plan was then laid down for UNRRA and the International Food Organization to handle this proposition, UNRRA to do the immediate job which we will say is now about finished, and the International Food Organization to follow in the coming months and perhaps years. Is not that correct?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe that is substantially correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To the extent that that is generally true I think we are up against the coldblooded proposition that our Government has already substantially committed itself to go forward with this International Food Organization and collaboration. Now, if this organization is about to make a division or allocation of all sugars that are available and the people of the United States are to receive their first quarter allocations of 1947 then it seems to me the gentleman's committee is coming in at the right moment. Certainly it should not be delayed from coming in as rapidly as possible to dampen down somewhat the desires of those in our Government who are so anxious to diffuse this sugar away from consumers located here on the continent; and I hope the gentleman will continue the good job he is doing. I have great hopes and I am pleased with his ability.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is not the International Food Organization an integral part of the United Nations organization?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not positive of that but I would assume that it is.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course it is. So there is a task to be met. If we want sugar we must go to the United Nations organization for it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to bring up this point for consideration, living in one of the largest sugar-beet-producing areas in these United States, if not in the world. There are three problems we face if we are to increase our beet acreage, which means an increase in the continental sugar in the United States:

No. 1 is farm machinery. We have heard even today that in 1946 we had an increase in the volume of farm machinery, that is, from the standpoint of the amount of money put into farm machinery. That, however, does not mean a thing in the world to the sugar-beet producer who cannot get the type of farm equipment that is necessary.

No. 2, what are we going to do about labor? How are we going to get hand labor for the additional beet acreage?

No. 3, which is very important as far as I am concerned, what will be the attitude of the Department of Agriculture concerning competing crops? How can you influence the farmer to increase his beet acreage which requires extra money and many extra hand laborers when he can produce beans or potatoes with much less help? I wish the gentleman would discuss these three things.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish I had the time to discuss the gentleman's three proposals, for surely they are important. Possibly in the case of potatoes the overproduction of this year may help solve that problem.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I share, of course, the interest of the gentleman in securing every possible pound of sugar for the American consumer, but for the benefit of the other Members, would not the gentleman want to add to his statement that the increase in the European countries is, for the most part, in countries which are not the recipients of any sugar allotted to this organization?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot quite agree to that according to the figures that have been provided to us by the Department of Agriculture; but I may say, in part, that is correct.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a table and statement prepared by the Department of Agriculture showing the production figures for 1946 and other years in all of the countries of the world.

WORLD SUGAR PRODUCTION UP 12 PERCENT

World production of sugar, beet and cane, for the 1946–47 season is estimated at 30,000,000 short tons (raw value), about 12 percent more than the 26,700,000 tons produced in 1945–46 but 14 percent less than the prewar (1935–39) average of 34,700,000 tons. Most of the increase this season occurred in Europe where beet-sugar production made a sharp recovery from the wartime low level, and in North America and the West Indies where conditions have been favorable for the planting and growth of the beet and cane crops. In 1946–47, as in the season just closing, it will not be possible to increase supplies of sugar for consumption to any appreciable extent by drawing on carry-over stocks, because these stocks have been reduced to minimum operating levels.

For the calendar year 1947, it is generally estimated that the world would require at current prices about 5,000,000 tons more sugar than is in prospect if there were no rationing controls. Although there is a prospect of an increase in world production of 3,300,000 tons in 1946–47 over that of the previous season, North America and western Europe (the principal sugar importing areas) are likely to have available only 1,000,000 tons more or about 10 percent, than the 10,900,000 tons recommended for allocation to these areas in 1946.

The Combined Food Board and its successor, the International Emergency Food Council, recommended allocations of sugar for the calendar year 1946 providing for consumption of around 65–70 percent of prewar levels in the major countries where wartime rationing controls are maintained. The recommended allocations were based largely on the out-turn of the 1945–46 sugar crop. In some sugar-exporting countries and in some importing countries, particularly in Central and South America, wartime increases in purchasing power of consumers has resulted in greatly expanded consumption of sugar.

In North and Central America and the West Indies sugar production in 1946–47 is expected to total 10,800,000 tons or about 1,200,000 tons more than was produced in 1945–46 and 2,100,000 larger than the 5-year (1935–39) average. Production of beet and cane sugar in the continental United States is indicated at 2,200,000 tons, compared with 1,800,000 tons in 1945–46. The increase this season is all in beet sugar. Small increases are indicated for Hawaii and Puerto Rico, but the total from the two areas combined probably will be smaller than the prewar average.

In Cuba, information relating to the acreage for harvest, growing conditions, and an early start of the campaign, indicated a production of about 5,000,000 short tons which would be about 12 percent more than in 1945–46. In the Dominican Republic and the British West Indies production prospects are also more favorable than in the previous season.

Production of sugar in South America in 1946–47, indicated at 2,800,000 tons, is about 6 percent larger than in 1945–46 and 16 percent more than the prewar average. Most of the increase occurred in Argentina, Brazil, and British Guiana. Argentina is expected to have some sugar for export in 1947 in contrast to the necessity for imports in recent years. In addition both Cuba and the Dominican Republic are expected to have larger free export quantities of sugar available for South and Central American markets. With the export surplus expected to be produced in Peru, supplies should be more than sufficient for the area as a whole.

For Europe, as a whole, sugar production in 1946–47 is estimated at 7.4 million tons, compared with the wartime low of 5.5 million tons in 1945–46 and the 5-year (1935–39) average of 10.4 million tons. With the exception of Spain's small production of cane sugar all of the output in this area is beet sugar. There was a marked recovery in production this season in the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Poland from the unusually low levels of last season. Production in United States, France, Belgium, the Soviet Union, and some of the Balkan countries also shows further improvement. Excluding the United Kingdom, the small 1945 output in Europe resulted in net imports totaling about 700,000 tons in the calendar year 1946, but the improved production prospect this season may reduce somewhat this requirement in 1947. For the United Kingdom the net import requirement in 1946 totaled about 1.5 million tons.

The output of sugar in Africa in 1946–47 is estimated at 1.3 million tons, or about 12 percent more than in 1945–46. A substantial increase in Mauritius was partially offset by a sizable decrease in the Union of South Africa.

In Asia sugar production estimated at 7 million tons in 1946–47 is about the same as in the previous season but 3.8 millions tons less than the 5-year 1935–39 average. Production in India and China is about equal to the prewar output, but there has been very little recovery so far in the important exporting areas of Formosa, the Philippines, and Java, where production was practically eliminated in the course of the war. These three areas are not expected to produce sufficient sugar this season to meet local requirements. Because of the political distribution in Java, no definite information is available as to the extent of stocks available there. If sizable stocks should become available in 1947, they would be useful in meeting the deficit occurring in the middle-eastern and far-eastern countries, which were formerly good markets of Javanese sugar.

No improvement in the production prospect in Oceania is indicated for 1946–47. An increase in production in the Fiji Islands was about offset by a reduction in Australia.

Sugar (raw value): Production in specified countries, averages 1930–34, 1935–39, and annual 1943–46

[1,000 short tons]

Country	Average		1943	1944	1945	1946 [1]
	1930–34	1935–39				
North America, Central America, and West Indies (cane):						
Canada (beet)	66	76	76	88	85	90
United States (beet)	1,396	1,520	998	1,056	1,278	1,740
United States	236	474	498	437	482	450
Hawaii	1,042	986	875	821	700	800
Puerto Rico	894	974	723	964	910	1,000
Virgin Islands	3	6	3	4	6	6
Cuba	2,847	3,168	4,738	3,923	4,476	(5,000)
Dominican Republic	439	491	567	407	506	540
Haiti	28	44	64	50	44	45
Guatemala	38	38	62	54	64	65
Salvador	23	19	23	20	20	25
Mexico	268	364	460	439	460	490
British West Indies:						
Antigua	19	25	18	23	26	27
Barbados	90	133	95	111	127	135
Jamaica	69	119	170	170	200	190
St. Christopher	25	36	31	32	32	35
Trinidad	121	148	83	86	123	130
St. Lucia and St. Vincent	6	9	7	8	8	8
French West Indies:						
Guadeloupe	40	53	32	31	40	44
Martinique	49	62	6	12	26	25
Total	7,699	8,745	9,529	8,736	9,613	10,845
South America (cane):						
Argentina	381	482	453	506	495	600
Brazil	1,130	1,155	1,411	1,322	1,320	1,350
British Guiana	163	209	155	174	185	200
Dutch Guiana	21	19	4	5	5	5
Paraguay	7	7	11	11	8	12
Peru	441	449	460	466	475	475
Ecuador	22	24	29	26	35	38
Colombia	32	46	80	89	95	95
Venezuela	23	27	36	36	40	40
Total	2,220	2,418	2,639	2,635	2,658	2,815
Europe (beet):						
United Kingdom	497	527	607	510	630	641
Eire	37	89	120	103	116	93
Sweden	252	340	279	338	325	315
Denmark	173	257	213	196	211	220
Netherlands	262	255	204	100	66	231
Belgium	274	259	269	215	154	220
France	1,112	1,053	676	350	508	735
Spain [2]	374	209	150	178	150	240
Italy	397	416	329	61	21	293
Switzerland	8	12	23	26	31	27
Germany	1,838	2,122	2,097	1,777	(850)	[3] (1,200)
Austria	192	196	119	91	(20)	(50)
Czechoslovakia	806	721	601	607	493	672
Hungary	158	139	182	216	(8)	65
Yugoslavia	89	95	39	26	38	75
Bulgaria	36	24	[3] 50	[3] 39	[3] (21)	32
Rumania	113	129	[3] 171	[3] 155	[3] (28)	35
Poland	546	548	(500)	[3] (480)	[3] 208	367
Finland	7	13	7	[3] 6	[3] 6	6
Soviet Union [4]	1,584	2,887	808	[3] 1,270	[3] (1,500)	(1,750)
Turkey	41	75	118	110	11	110
Total	8,796	10,366	7,562	6,854	5,494	7,377
Africa (cane):						
Egypt	161	167	184	190	198	200
Mauritius	236	321	345	223	145	300
Union of South Africa	366	498	585	614	553	480
Mozambique	93	79	65	65	65	65
Reunion	64	92	28	17	25	35
Madagascar	8	13	14	13	18	23
British East Africa	30	63	71	67	78	87
Angola	26	38	58	58	46	50
Belgian Congo	5	20	15	14	14	15
Total	989	1,291	1,365	1,261	1,142	1,255

Footnotes at end of table.

Sugar (raw value): Production in specified countries, averages 1930–34, 1935–39, and annual 1943–46—Continued

[1,000 short tons]

Country	Average		1943	1944	1945	1946[1]
	1930–34	1935–39				
Asia (cane):						
Iran (beet)	4	21	25	28	27	30
China	285	529	635	(825)	(500)	(500)
India [5]	5,082	6,168	6,560	6,073	6,033	6,100
Formosa	889	1,202	984	550	175	75
Japan [6]	186	234	(105)	(105)	(105)	10
Java [7]	1,731	1,447	550	125	22	55
Philippine Islands [8]	1,176	1,127	(150)	(75)	115	200
Indochina	59	76	(30)	(30)	(30)	(30)
Total	9,412	10,804	9,039	7,811	7,007	7,000
Oceania (cane):						
Australia	667	893	587	736	717	652
Fiji	117	143	60	77	61	105
Total	784	1,036	647	813	778	757
Total cane sugar	19,635	22,655	22,097	20,060	19,786	20,817
Total beet sugar	10,265	12,005	8,684	8,050	6,906	9,232
Total cane and beet sugar	29,900	34,660	30,781	28,110	26,692	30,049

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes a small quantity of cane sugar.
[3] Data not comparable with previous years because of boundary changes.
[4] Includes Latvia and Lithuania.
[5] Data for India are in terms of gur, a low grade brown sugar.
[6] Includes cane and beet sugar produced in Japan proper and cane sugar produced in the mandated South Sea Islands.
[7] Data for Java are for the calendar years following the years shown.
[8] Includes centrifugal and muscovado sugar.

Compiled from official and trade sources where available; estimates made by Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations shown in parentheses. Figures are for crop years; generally the sugar-harvesting season begins in the fall months of the year shown or in the early months of the following year, except in certain cane-sugar-producing countries in the Southern Hemisphere such as Argentina, Australia, Mauritius, Union of South Africa, etc., where the season begins in May or June of the year shown.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. PACE. In order to avoid any misunderstanding I believe that the problem of a 15-pound increase to the American housewife carries with it a pretty big "if." That is to say, if the increase this year is one and one-half million tons more than last year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right and, it is based on a large Cuban sugar crop. Of course, that is one of the reasons why I insisted earlier in the day and brought up the question that no allocation should be made beyond the first quarter. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that the Secretary had said that would be the policy so far as he is concerned.

Mr. PACE. But the Secretary is not ready to give us assurance that increase will take place?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know whether he can anticipate what is going to happen in April, May, or March as far as sugar production is concerned. No one will know what the total sugar supply will be until at least the latter part of April.

Mr. PACE. Let me say that it is a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Minnesota in order to try to develop the facts and get every possible pound.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has always been a pleasure to me to work with the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEFEVRE. If we can increase the production a million and a half tons, will that bring the total for the United States to better than 7,000,000 tons for 1947?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will bring it up to between six and seven million tons, very close to 7,000,000 tons.

Mr. LEFEVRE. I understood we needed around 7,500,000 tons.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will not quite bring it up to that amount. That may be one reason why we will still be short and possibly there may be a continuation of some form of allocation and rationing.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the House and for my particular interest, representing one of the sugar-producing areas of Louisiana, whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture indicated in his conference with the gentleman this morning what he anticipated domestic production will be for 1947?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of cane sugar?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Cane and beet.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, the figures as given out by the Department contemplate 451,500 short tons of cane sugar and approximately 1,550,000 tons of beet sugar, raw value.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Adding to what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], said about the problems confronting the beet industry, I should like to point out that the grave problem confronting the cane industry in Louisiana at this time is not only labor and machinery, but fertilizer. I hope the Secretary is cognizant of that fact.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will try to impress it upon the Secretary and his associates to see that the sugar-beet growers and the sugarcane growers get an adequate supply of fertilizer.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. May I say that I also appreciate the opportunity of working with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. Did the gentleman at this morning's conference ascertain from the Secretary of Agriculture what percentage of the Cuban crop for 1946 was allocated to the United States and what percentage to foreign shippers, and also how does that compare with 1941?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot give the gentleman the figure for 1941, but I can state how the division was made last year. Out of a Cuban crop of 4,476,000 tons we received 2,125,000 short-tons, which was less than half of the Cuban crop. What it will be this year when the Cuban production is up to 5,500,000 tons, and even up to 6,000,000 tons, is problematical. We are trying to get that extra amount for the American people.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In addition to the well-advertised fact that there has been a disproportionate amount of sugar exported overseas during the past year, I wonder whether or not the gentleman has satisfied himself as to the manner in which the sugar which has been consumed domestically has been distributed and divided as between commercial and family use?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We will no doubt go into that. Our committee was just created today and it is something that should be gone into.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure that it will show some rather startling disparities from the standpoint of the matter in which this sugar which we do have is made available to the American people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think you will find many startling things if this investigation can go forward the way it should.

Mr. MUNDT. Just let me say that I am sure it will go forward under the able leadership of my neighbor from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion if there were a proper allocation of the supplies of sugar already available, that the American people could have more per capita during this present year than they had during the last year?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have suggested an increase of 15 pounds per capita due to increased production.

Mr. MERROW. Just one more question I want to ask. In order to bring about that proper allocation, is it necessary to have mandatory legislation on the part of Congress in order to get the Government agencies to do it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, they may hold that the House of Representatives has nothing to do with that, seeing that this distribution is an international matter. It may be in the nature of a treaty over which we would have no control. But we might indicate very strongly in Congress, by resolution or otherwise, what we thought should be done for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. MERROW. I hope the gentleman introduces the resolution.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Would the gentleman give us a little clearer idea of just how long we are committed to this international food set-up?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry I cannot. If it is part of the United Nations organization, as has been indicated, that is supposed to last quite a few years, as I understand it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I think it might be timely to place in the RECORD the fact that sugar is now and has been, for a number of years past, an international commodity.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. PACE. That is, there is a combination, namely, the United States and Great Britain, that buys the Cuban sugar crop under agreement that they will equitably distribute it among the consuming nations of the world. It is an international commodity itself, and necessarily must be.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So I will say that cotton is international, too, and I assume that this International Food Council will discontinue its functions when supplies in the world become adequate so that people generally can buy sugar without any allocation.

Mr. PACE. I am not sure what the Cuban yield will be.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Sugar is primarily international because the Congress made it that way through approving a sugar act which allocates the sugar market in the United States to certain sellers of sugar, and in thus allocating the market the Congress by that act said to you, and you, and you, "There is no need for you to build a sugar plant in the United States and grow sugar beets and sugarcane because if you do you will not have any place to sell your sugar." Now, the people in this country are getting sick and tired relying on an international agreement which denies the housewives of this country the sugar they want with which to preserve and produce the food to go into lunch baskets to feed their working husbands and their children, and that is what we need to clean up.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman has stated the facts correctly, and we might help clean it up by encouraging abundant production of sugar in the United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So that we will have enough to take care of the needs of the American people.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to give you just one illustration. At the present moment we are probably producing, in the territory with which I am more familiar in Colorado, not over 150,000 acres of sugar beets, and in times gone by we have produced as high as 240,000 acres of sugar beets.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think you could probably produce 1,000,000 acres of sugar beets if you were given the proper incentive.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. In looking for a direct remedy, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has suggested, in certain quarters in the State Department there is a desire, or they have found that they can encourage that desire to have sugar all over the world from us. Do you not think the Director should cut down that personnel that has that tremendous desire in the State Department?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say to the gentleman I think the personnel of all agencies in the Government could be cut at least 50 percent without injuring any of the essential services that the Government is supposed to provide for the people.

Mr. CHURCH. I think that is one of the direct remedies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENSEN). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a fact, I may say to my friend from Illinois, that the State Department takes the categorical position that we shall not allocate to the people of the continent and our off-shore areas under the United States flag a greater percentage of our market, but that we shall allocate a greater percentage to foreign countries. Wherein is there any inducement to you or me or the other fellow to invest our savings in sugar plants in this country or elsewhere under the American flag?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not true that there is a very considerable acreage now devoted to crops of which we are going to have a surplus, that should be devoted to the growing of sugar, of which there is a positive shortage?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that. There may be a remedy for the situation. The land in the surplus areas, such as the potato areas, corn areas, and wheat areas, where they can grow sugar beets, could be made available for sugar production to make the American people self-sustaining in that respect.

May I say in conclusion that many of you will receive and have received scores of letters from your constituents and others who want you to get more sugar for them. It will be the purpose of our committee to recommend and have initiated policies that will bring about an increased sugar supply to the American home. In addition, our job will be, as I see it, to secure increased production of sugar for the future, so that we can get away from this dependency upon foreign production.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I wonder if the gentleman will not concur with me in this statement, that the committee is convinced that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, is concerned about the welfare of the American producers and is doing his best to protect their interests.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly will subscribe to that. As I said earlier, I feel that we have the wholehearted cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, who I know is interested. If he is given the authority by those who formulate policies higher up we will not have any difficulty in getting more sugar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ERADICATION OF CANCER, POLIO, RHEUMATIC FEVER, AND OTHER DEGENERATIVE DISEASES THROUGH GOVERNMENT COOPERATION

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, and other degenerative diseases of mankind.

The bill provides, among other things:

That in order to secure the full development and application of the Nation's scientific and technical resources for the national health and welfare, there is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Medical Research Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

The Foundation is authorized and directed to initiate, conduct, and support scientific research with respect to the cause and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, Bright's disease, asthma, arthritis, leukemia, encephalitis, arteriosclerosis, aplastic anemia, rheumatic heart disease, diabetes, and other degenerative diseases of the human race.

The powers and duties of the Foundation shall be exercised by a governing board (hereinafter called the "Board") of four members, consisting of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, a representative of the American Medical Association to be nominated by said association, and a representative of the American Cancer Society to be nominated by said society, and a member of the American Heart Association to be nominated by said association. The members of the Board shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling expenses, and the expenses of subsistence (or a per diem in lieu thereof) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their office.

Section 6 of the bill provides an appropriation to enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties in the amount of $10,000,000 annually, to remain available until expended.

Private research suffers from the crippling restrictions of lack of sufficient funds and scientific equipment. With groups of scientists working together and with many such groups stationed in a number of centers throughout the country and supplied with the best and most advanced instruments and equipment, the cooperation of these brains and scientific equipment, with their consequent exchange of ideas and plans, will advance research immeasurably. The program contemplated under the provisions of this bill will draw together the talent and energy which the problem of eradication of degenerative diseases demands. In order to accomplish this we must assure scientists and the keenest brains of the medical world a decent and an assured income and the most modern scientific laboratories in which to carry out their research programs.

To find the cause and cure for degenerative diseases the Government must become a partner in such research, and thus make it possible to abandon the inadequate methods of prewar medical research, and adopt in their place modern methods such as was used in the discovery of the atomic bomb.

Considering the vast mortality from degenerative diseases in this country, assistance from the Government is an absolute necessity.

The purpose of this bill is to make possible the cooperation of the best scientific and medical brains of the country and the construction of research laboratories and institutions throughout the United States, equipped with the most modern scientific machinery and apparatus, where the keenest brains of the world may carry on independent research, with one purpose and determination in mind—the establishment of the cause of and to discover a cure for degenerative diseases.

Mr. Speaker, one American dies from cancer every 3 minutes, 20 every hour. It is estimated by the American Cancer Society that there are now 500,000 people who have cancer, and that 17,000,000 of those who are alive today will eventually die from that dread disease. In other words, one out of every eight of our population who are now living will die from cancer; and, more tragically, cancer deaths are increasing year by year. In 1900 the number of deaths from cancer was ninth, and today it is second on the list. Only heart disease kills more people annually than cancer. One hundred and seventy-five thousand people die from cancer every year.

In World War II 273,000 American boys died in action. In 1942, 1943, and 1944 approximately 500,000 Americans died from cancer. Between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day cancer killed 607,000 Americans, more than twice the number killed by our enemies in the war. It is the greatest killer of women between the ages of 35 and 55, and the second greatest killer of men. Approximately 2,000 children die from cancer yearly.

According to a Gallup poll, 87 percent of the people of the United States have indicated their approval of scientific research at the expense of the Government to find ways and means for preventing or curing cancer; and 72 percent of the people of this country went on record as being personally willing to pay additional taxes to provide funds for research. Approval of a scientific research program to discover the cause and cure of degenerative diseases was found among all major groups of our people, American men and women of all ages and levels of society, ranging from 82 to 91 percent. More than three out of every four persons in all groups in this country indicated their willingness to pay higher taxes personally in order to be assured of scientific research to find the cure for degenerative diseases under Government supervision, such as is provided in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from people and institutions from all parts of the country, and from every State, including insurance companies, veterans' organizations, farmers' organizations, women's groups, physicians and surgeons, who approve and endorse this bill, which would provide a foundation to conduct and support scientific research to find a cure for cancer, infantile paralysis, rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, and other degenerative diseases.

We all know the ravages caused by infantile paralysis which has been raging throughout every state in the Union during the past years. In my own State of Wisconsin, 50,000 children were stricken with infantile paralysis during 1946. Epidemics of poliomyelitis have been plaguing every community in our nation from time out of mind.

Infantile paralysis is a disease which is an increasing menace to public health because of the increasing frequency of epidemics with an increasing death rate throughout the United States. Hardly a single community has escaped an epidemic of severe intensity. About 80 percent of the cases are children below 15 years of age but the disease may attack people of all ages.

Experience has shown us and has proved that infantile paralysis has not been conquered by the usual endowments and foundations and March-of-Dimes drives established in this country for that purpose. There have not been sufficient funds provided to make it possible to assemble a sufficient number of scientists and medical men and women to make the concentrated attack that is necessary to wipe out this scourge of the human race.

With réference to rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, I am told by experts in heart diseases that rheumatic fever is a disease that attacks various organs of the body, particularly the heart, joints, blood vessels, the skin, and the brain, and that death or permanent disability occurs in many cases because the majority of patients who may have recovered from the acute attack of rheumatic fever have permanent heart damage, leaving them with the so-called rheumatic heart diseases.

This disease usually attacks infants and young people. At the House of the Good Samaritan in Boston, members of the faculty of the Harvard Medical School followed the cases of 1,000 children who had been stricken with rheumatic fever for a period of 10 years. They found that at the end of 10 years 203 of the 1,000 children were dead, and of those who survived, 135 were so incapacitated they were forced to lead sedentary lives; 209 could not participate in any competitive sports, and of the 1,000 children studied only 439 could lead a normal existence. These scientists also state it is expected that further mortality and disability would occur among these children in the period after the first 10 years following the attack of rheumatic fever.

Dr. O. Hendley of Philadelphia states that the life expectancy of individuals with rheumatic fever or rheumatic heart disease is less than 35 years in contrast to a life expectancy of 64 years for the general population.

Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of the problem of rheumatic fever is great. These diseases are the commonest cause of death of children between 5 and 19 years of age, and the second commonest cause of death of those between 19 and 24 years of age. In New York City the number of deaths from rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease is 5 times as great as the combined total of deaths of six common reportable diseases.

Rheumatic fever was prevalent among the members of the armed services during World War II. In the Army and Navy and in the Air Services thousands of cases of rheumatic fever developed.

The funds which have been made available through endowment and private subscriptions for reseach into rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease to date have been comparatively small. These funds have not been adequate even to start research study along the lines of rheumatic fever. Funds that have been allocated to the various States for these diseases have been almost entirely used in programs for the care of rheumatic patients and not for research purposes. During the war the large number of cases of rheumatic fever developing in the Army, Navy, and air services required the expenditure of huge sums of money used entirely for the care of patients who were members of the armed services.

At a recent meeting of the American Heart Association the following resolution was adopted:

This conference is strongly in favor of the extension of public programs supported by Federal funds for the study, prevention, and treatment of rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease.

Sufferers from rheumatic fever are predominantly among the lower income groups. The investment of Government funds annually to establish the Foundation provided for in this bill will repay the taxpayers of the United States manyfold. Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease are serious public-health problems. They deserve adequate attention and the concentrated scientific effort of the best brains of this country to find a cure therefor.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours, describing the ravages of all the degenerative diseases.

The key to success in the discovery of the cure of the degenerative diseases through scientific and medical research can be brought about through large-scale cooperative research by physicians, chemists, biologists, and other scientists, just as this was the key to the success in the discovery of the atomic bomb by the Manhattan Engineering District. The discovery of the cure of degenerative diseases is no more impossible than was the development of the atomic bomb. The outstanding results accomplished by organized research on atomic energy prove that this country has the facilities to make degenerative and so-called incurable diseases as rare as is typhoid fever and diphtheria today. With the funds and scientific "know-how," and the cooperation of the best scientific and medical brains of this country, miracles can be accomplished in the discovery of the cure for degenerative diseases, just as was accomplished in less than 2½ years under pressure of war in the atomic field. Medical science and research can profit from the new techniques and the tools developed in atomic research, with the aid of the brains and energy of many of our scientific experts who contributed to the medical part of the Manhattan project.

To continue to attempt to find a cure for cancer, poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, and other degenerative diseases through present-day methods of striving to interest philanthropic foundations and charitable-minded individuals to finance such research by the usual method of contributions is not adequate to solve the problem. What is needed in order to find a cure for these dread diseases is a sustained attack, enlisting the best scientific and medical brains of this country. The efforts of a cooperative force of brains and government funds, forming a research foundation as provided in this bill, will bring together the talent and the energy necessary to find the cure for these diseases. Research of this kind demands that this Government adopt similar methods as were used in the discovery of atomic energy. The vast multitude suffering from these diseases makes it absolutely necessary that the Government get back of a program of this nature. With the cure of degenerative diseases as its goal, and a foundation set up and backed by the United States Government with funds appropriated by this Congress to carry out the program, I have no doubt we will find the scientific and medical brains to solve the problems and provide the cures for all degenerative diseases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENSEN). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in all the confusing statements about the Budget, just one thing is apparent to every one who has studied the Budget far enough so that they understand it and that is that the Budget message of the President is so confusing and so mixed up that almost everyone has been misled into statements that are not in the least correct. This has come from a failure of the President and the Budget to realize that the only way to set up a budget is to set it up in the same way that the appropriation bills are set up and to keep the Government accounting in that same way. Unless that is done we are going to have continual confusion. It is impossible to take the daily Treasury statement and make anything out of it because of the confused manner in which it is set up. I am hopeful that this picture can be corrected so that the thing can be done on a businesslike basis by the time the next Budget is presented.

The facts with reference to the President's Budget are these: The President has submitted budget estimates for appropriations covering $31,276,000,000. That appears on page M14 of the Budget message. There is concealed in the Budget estimate a proposal to transfer illegally upward of $400,000,000. One hundred and fifty million dollars from the Naval Stock Fund and the Naval Clothing and Small Stores Fund and $250,000,000 from the RFC.

There are also contract authorizations totaling over $1,000,000,000.

Many people have called the table of proposed expenditures for 1948, which aggregates $37,500,000,000, the Budget. That is merely the President's statement of what he expects the Government will spend. Part of that $37,500,000,000, perhaps twenty-five or twenty-six billion dollars, would be made up, if the President's budget were allowed, out of the appropriations that will be made this year and the other part, from the ten or twelve billion dollars, out of the balances remaining available to departments for expenditure out of funds previously appropriated. My understanding is that these appropriated and authorized but unexpended items will aggregate as of next July 1, if no rescissions are made, something like fifteen or sixteen billion dollars. They are items that have been appropriated without year. They are items that have been appropriated and the money contracted for the construction of airplanes, ships, buildings, dams, and almost every conceivable form of governmental activity. This explains the difference between the Budget and the estimate of expenditures.

I have asked for, and expect immediately, a schedule of the funds available to the departments and agencies and unexpended as of January 1. I will then immediately expect the Appropriations Committee to start hearings on the rescissions of every dollar not needed for the welfare of the Government. I would be unable to make an estimate of how much would be rescinded. On the other hand, I know that many hundreds of millions of dollars should be available for rescission.

With reference to the amount that should be spent by the armed forces, I give this little illustration, just to indicate that the President's proposed expenditures and proposed 1948 figures are not well thought out. Resulting from the drop in number of Army personnel of an average of 365,000, we have a nonrecurring item of $1,095,000,000, which unquestionably can be cut out of the budget. On the basis of current expenditures and requirements, we should have a balance of at least $300,000,000 out of the present year's appropriations of $7,468,000,000. The expenditures for this current fiscal year, for the first 6 months, were $3,735,000,000, just half of the appropriated amount. With a reduction, which will average $50,000,000 a month on account of personnel pay below the figures for the first half of the year, it shows that unquestionably they should have a balance of $300,000,000 this year.

As a result of the reduction of personnel alone the budget for next year should not under any circumstances, without considering any other item, exceed $6,073,000,000. That is a mathematical operation which is perfectly clear.

There are many other items in the War Department budget of the same character and there is no question but what we can make substantial cuts in the Army and the Navy appropriations without hurting national defense. That is the last thing I would want to do. I might say to you that I have served upon committees which have had charge of appropriations for these departments for 23 consecutive years and I have a rather intimate knowledge of what their requirements are.

In the Navy, a like situation with reference to personnel exists. But besides that there is too big a set-up for shore stations and too many of them. There is too much tendency to build new structures at this time. Much money has been wasted the last year in that way and it has interfered with the efforts that would otherwise have resulted in increased housing for our people. The needs of the Navy for ships in commission, numbers of ships, and numbers of planes, and all that sort of thing must be determined by the international picture. It might very well be that between the time of the presentation of this Budget and the conclusion of the hearings the international situation might be such that we could go a long way. On the other hand we have all got to recognize that if it goes the other way we have to do likewise.

At the end of the war with Japan, practically all of the military instruments of war, such as guns, planes, tanks, shells, and that sort of thing were obsolete, both as a result not only of the inventions of our own people but also as a result of the experiments which were taken over. At the present time our activities along that line are in a state of

flux. We must proceed with our developments and we must proceed with the creation of new weapons and of new explosives, so that we may keep the United States ahead of all the rest of the world from a scientific standpoint as to airplanes, guns, ammunition, and everything else. On the other hand we must coordinate our operations so that we will avoid as much duplication as possible. I have already started a coordination set-up which I believe will be effective in preventing the duplication of Army and Navy experiments and development but also prevent either one of these agencies with competing with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In the meantime, we should not produce too many things that will be obsolete before completion.

Just so we may have a picture of some of the civilian activities of Government and what has been presented to us, I call your attention to the estimate for the Federal Communications Commission, an increase in personnel from 892 in Washington to 1,068, 25 percent, and enormous quantities of money; the Federal Power Commission from 588 to 625; the Federal Trade Commission from 523 to 802; the Interstate Commerce Commission from 1,629 to 1,793; the National Archives from 373 to 469; the National Labor Relations Board from 483 to 797. These are just samples. I shall on Thursday expect a place in the RECORD for a breakdown of my comments on the personnel set-up. The President only proposes a reduction from our present 2,300,000 to about 2,089,000 of civilian employees. Most of that cut comes in the War and Navy Departments and there is an increase in almost every other agency. The net increase in other agencies is 40,000 employees. One of the worst offenders is the Department of Commerce, which has a set-up of an increase from $156,000,000 to $199,000,000 over-all, with an increase in personnel of enormous proportions—over 25 percent. This is absolutely unconscionable.

The Department of Interior is given an increase from $259,000,000 to $295,000,000. It even proposes the setting up of regional offices to take over certain departmental activities without doing away with the set-up for the Department.

I have been over the appropriations requested. I am satisfied that the figure which I have given heretofore, $29,000,000,000 is a top figure for appropriations. In other words, I am satisfied that the President's $32,000,000,000 Budget can be cut to $29,000,000,000. In making up my figures I have allowed $2,500,000,000 margin for deficiencies and for things that perhaps we should be unable to keep to my estimates. I shall not go into the details of my proposals until we come before the House with a resolution for a legislative budget, and until we reach the items in the appropriations bills. I believe that by rescissions and by the proper trimming of the 1948 Budget estimates of $32,000,000,000 we can reduce the spending program for 1948 by from three to four billion dollars.

The most discouraging factor about the President's Budget estimates is this: That he proposes expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 at a rate of $500,000,000 in excess of the expenditures for the first half of 1947.

Let us get that situation straight in our minds. The expenditures for the first half of this fiscal year from July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, were $18,487,000,000. Twice that amount is a little less than $37,000,000,000. In other words, if we went on the next year as we have done during the first half of this fiscal year we will spend $37,000,000,000 and he is carrying in his estimates $37,500,000,000—a proposed increase over the rate that we are going now. In addition to that, with the $37,000,000,000 spent, with the expenditures going at the rate of less than $18,500,000,000 for the first half of this year, he is proposing that we have an over-all expenditure for this fiscal year, up to the 30th of next June, of $42,000,000,000. What does that mean? It means he would be spending $5,000,000,000 more in the last half of this present fiscal year than he spent in the first half of this fiscal year. To my mind that is unconscionable and intolerable. There is absolutely no reason why we should not keep the expenditures of this fiscal year down to the estimated revenue of $40,000,000,000. We really should be $3,000,000,000 below that. From what examination I have been able to make of the Treasury situation, I believe that $40,000,000,000 of revenue is a low estimate rather than a high one. With expenditures of the first half of 1947 running $18,487,000,000, he tells us on page M14 that he thinks the expenditures for the fiscal year 1947 will be $42,523,000,000. This means increasing expenditures from January to June by $5,536,000,000 over the expenditures from July to December in the present fiscal year. I wonder if the people of the United States like that kind of economy. I wonder if the people of the United States like the idea of increasing expenditures for the last half of this year by about $5,000,000,000 over the first half of the year.

It is about time for us to begin to cut down and reduce. There is no reason under heaven why the Budget should not be balanced this year with estimated receipts of $40,000,000,000. One may go through almost every agency of the Government and find plenty of people unnecessarily employed sitting at their desks without enough activity to make them alert. That situation must be stopped and it can only be stopped by a reduction in our Federal pay rolls.

That reduction will be in the interest of the Federal employees because the reduction will make them more active, more alert, and more valuable to themselves and to the Government.

Opportunities are going to be presented to the Congress to reduce this staggering budget and the terrific estimate of expenditures. A public debt of $260,000,000,000, direct and indirect, and of $300,000,000,000 of potential obligations, demands reduction. The economy of the country demands that taxes be placed on a basis where the people can have some incentive to go out and produce. The only way it can be accomplished is by our having courage enough to say to the bureaucrats "you have got to clean house," and that is what I propose that the Members of this House shall have an opportunity to vote on.

The elected Representatives of the people must and will take charge of the spending of the people's money.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the committee planned to look into the spending for the last half of the fiscal year 1946–47?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely. We have got to do that.

Mr. ROBSION. May I state this: Some of the Members on the floor recall that when the Republicans took charge in 1919 we reviewed the appropriations that had been made and cut down, I think, a little more than a billion dollars. I think that can be done at this time.

Mr. TABER. I think we can cut out much more than a billion dollars.

Illustrative of the way they are dragging, I have before me a memorandum that was handed me this morning. Fifteen thousand five hundred employees on the pay roll of the OPA today, nine-tenths of them with nothing to do. Twenty-two publicity agents in the main office of the OPA—not in the rent-control set-up, but in the main office of that set-up. That is just a sample of the way we are being treated by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will it not be necessary for us, if we want to keep this country solvent, to do away with some of the functions of Government that are costing a great deal more than they are actually worth to the American people?

Mr. TABER. We should certainly do away with every possible activity of the Government that is not in the interest of the public.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], a few minutes ago, indicated that a great many of the personnel in one of the departments had found a way to get sugar to so many people in other countries. Everybody wants sugar. Apparently they are being encouraged to eat more and more sugar and candy. Does not the gentleman think that one of the direct ways of cutting down that encouragement of that desire to take this sugar away from the American people and give it to people who have not been used to it at all, is to cut down the number of personnel in that department which encourages that desire?

Mr. TABER. I think that set-up in a governmental department which has been handing out our money without a fresh, clean appropriation—that is lend-lease—should be wound up and wound up immediately. I do not think we ought to allow that to go any longer. If we are going to provide relief for foreign countries, we should do it by direct action, and know what we are doing, and not have any more of this wiggling and

twisting around to cover up what is going on.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The very able gentleman from New York has just pointed out that these reductions in personnel would help the employees themselves. Does not the gentleman feel that many thousands of these employees have become indolent because of their being in a position of little or nothing to do and thereby wasting the taxpayers' money as well as their time—setting a low standard and poor example—because they are in a position of sitting around doing nothing? In Chicago in some of the War Assets set-up I have seen those people wasting their time day after day. They cannot but set a bad example to the people who ought to be working instead of loafing in this country.

Mr. TABER. I would not be able to answer that question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a radio address he delivered the other day and also a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in support of the rather vigorous budget statement by my esteemed chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], indulge me for a little while I belabor the subject from a different angle. A budget should be built from the bottom up and not by just cheese paring from the top down.

When the President announced to the country and to the Congress that the over-all for authorizations, estimates, and otherwise, resulted in a budget for the fiscal year 1948, which begins on July 1 of this year, will in round numbers be $37,500,000,000, it was quite difficult to believe by those who have been giving some thought to it. That was three times the Budget of 1940, and four times the Budget of 1939.

Let it not be forgotten that hostilities came to an end a long time ago, and for all practical purposes we should be considering a peacetime budget similar to the last peacetime year prior to World War II.

Let me say to the Members of the House that we have a very special responsibility in the matter and we cannot pass the buck. When the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, it contained a provision in section 138 that required a joint committee of the two spending committees and the two revenue committees of the House and Senate to examine the President's estimate, to counsel and to confer, and then to strike a ceiling on expenditures. Now that word "ceiling" is not new. Somehow it has ingratiated itself into the nomenclature of the country until every man and woman and child is quite familiar with it; and I say that our responsibility now under the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act is to provide a ceiling on expenditures, making due allowance for deficiencies, and to gear it to the estimated revenues. We ought to be clear and we ought to refresh ourselves on that section of the act, because it is not permissive, it is not a thing we can do if we want to and put aside if we do not want to; it is a thing that we are directed to do. This joint committee of Congress is required to come in with a ceiling, to include it in recommendations in a report, to bring in a concurrent resolution, and to do it all by the 15th of February 1947. So that is our responsibility.

There will be no buck passing on this budget proposition to the President of the United States. The fine art of buck passing that started way back in the Garden of Eden will not work. You will remember when the Lord chastised Adam he took refuge in an excuse, and he said: "The woman Thou gavest me didst give me of the fruit of the tree and I didst eat." Then you will remember that Eve said she was urged to eat of the fruit by the serpent the Lord put into the garden. I have often thought that perhaps that incident ought to be modified a little bit, that it was too bad the serpent did not have someone to pass the buck to. But there is no question here of any buck passing; it will not do. You cannot say that that was Harry Truman's budget, because when we get through, it will be our responsibility and once more we shall become the custodians of the public purse. So when you go home and make your accounting of your stewardship with the folks in your constituency you must stand up and be counted on expenditures. It will be our responsibility.

But more than that, it has an extraordinary sense of responsibility about it because of what happened on an eventful day which will be inscribed in red letters on the calendar as November 5, 1946. People are expecting things. You remember we went before the people with a campaign on many issues about confusion and about communism in high places and about corruption, waste, and extravagance. So, now, people are expecting things and if we fail in our responsibility, if they shall be frustrated and disillusioned, that is going to be our headache too. It will not do for the congressional mountain to labor and bring forth an economy mouse.

You know, this is a good time to talk about fiscal affairs. On Saturday last a great American's birth anniversary was observed. It was Alexander Hamilton. He was only 33 years of age when he sat in the Constitutional Convention, then later became a great Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. His statue stands down here on Pennsylvania Avenue. It is refreshing once in a while to look upon the finely chiseled features of that great fiscal adviser who felt that solidarity at the base of government in the form of sound finances was the best guaranty of freedom. So, because we observe his birth anniversary in January, it is a good time, you know, to reexamine our own responsibilities.

Let me say to you that until our budget problem is solved, until our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and his committee can get this matter solved, why talk about debt reduction and why talk about tax reduction? First, we must know what we are going to spend. If we spend more than we take in, any tax reduction to which we devote ourselves will only increase the unbalance in the Budget. You see, you come right back to this question of spending. Why talk about reducing the debt until we find out what our going expenditures for all purposes will be? There is no virtue in talking about it until we get back to it. So we revert to this question of the Budget and, may I express my profound admiration for the tenacity and for the vigor with which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has devoted himself to this whole question.

There is a moral approach to it also. There is no magic in a figure. There is no magic in thirty-seven billion or forty billion of forty-one billion or nineteen billion. Why, the late President of the United States proved that there was no magic in a figure, for when the time came to devalue the dollar he reached up into the air, according to Mr. Morgenthau's chronological biography, and seized the figure 21 and said it should be 21 percent because 21 was 3 times 7 and that is a very lucky number. John, I was going to say to you, maybe we ought to reach up and take 21. Maybe we ought to take twenty-one billion instead of thirty-seven and one-half billion, and at long last bring some comfort and some assurance to the taxpayers of the country who have been carrying this load so long.

Mr. TABER. Kind of a 7-come-11 game?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me point out how important this thing is and how explosive and dangerous our fiscal problems can be. Has it ever occurred to you that the national debt reflected in the last Treasury statement is 180 percent of the national income? That is a pretty big obligation for good, sound management in times of economic reversal, in times when the forces are not moving very fluidly and so well in the economic stream of the country, and you have a debt two hundred and sixty-seven thousand million dollars to look at, because it may rise up one day in a weak moment when the inhibitions are down to plague us and to threaten the financial integrity of the United States of America. Let us not forget it. So that adds then to what I regard as something of a sacred responsibility because we are the custodians and trustees for 141,000,000 American people, and if through lack of courage or mismanagement or maladministration on our part the economy starts going into the proverbial handbasket then, of course, we will all be running for cover. But we will be doing something more. There will be men stand up on this floor when that time comes and say, "Mr. Speaker, I believe more power ought to be dele-

gated to someone high in office, without spelling it out too closely or placing any restrictions on it, and I believe more power ought to be delegated to some Moses to lead us out of the wilderness," and then you are walking a dangerous and twisted, tortuous path that leads to what a great British economist called the road to serfdom. I adjure you, this is the most important thing with which Congress is going to deal.

In the first place, our problem is to unloose the creative energies of the country, but we have got to give a man a chance to keep a little of what he makes. So you get back to taxes, you get back to expenditures, and then you get back to the whole fabric of confidence which involves this question of debt. So I say, that is the moral approach. The way to reduce is to reduce. The way to cut is to sharpen up your trusted jackknife and cut, and cut deep.

Let me say especially for those fine new Members who have come into the Eightieth Congress for the first time, that from the list of people who have been skilled in coaxing money out of Congress year after year, you will hear all the reasons in the book why you cannot cut. You cannot do this and you cannot do that. This function is sacred and that function is sacrosanct, and so profane hands must not be laid upon them. I say to you, as a good rule of thumb, just make up your mind what is imperative as distinguished from what is desirable. I could think of the most beautiful ways to spend the money of the taxpayers that you ever saw or was ever put on paper. Why, I could reach up into my imagination right now and out of the recesses of memory find ways of spending several billion dollars that I think would be highly desirable; it would be lovely; it probably would expand the enjoyment of living for people, but the question is, Is it imperative in a dangerous hour when our debt is $267,000,000,000, and it represents 180 percent of one whole year of national income? So, use the rule of thumb, Is it imperative? Make that the rule and then it will not be so difficult to put the ax where it belongs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman could not underscore the importance of the $267,000,000,000 by recalling to mind the fact that a very talkative, although not a very talented, Secretary of the Treasury by the name of Morgenthau one time said that if the national debt ever exceeded $67,000,000,000, he would wash his hands of any of the future integrity of the country. He exceeded that by $200,000,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. The other day a friend of mine out in my home country quibbed a little sentence out of a house organ that is published in Cleveland, Ohio, I think it is called the Latch String, and the sentiment that he put on a post card was this:

> Stay on the job and pay your taxes. The boys in the bureaus and in Washington are counting on you.

Now, let us be sure that the folks back home will not count in vain when they count on us and say "Let the ax go deep." I suggest that as we go into these Budget deliberations maybe it is well to go back to the fiscal year 1940 and there see what our last peacetime Budget was and then to build from that foundation, and after a while we will probably achieve a firm figure that will be fairly representative of the imperative obligations that we have.

Nineteen hundred and forty was the year when a gentleman by the name of Winston Churchill was the man of the year. Denmark and Norway were already under the Nazi heel. The blitz was on. The Luftwaffe was pasting Coventry and others of those great communities of Great Britain. In that fiscal year of 1940 we got some estimates. We were not at war, because it was 18 months before Pearl Harbor. That fiscal year began on July 1, 1939. We got some estimates from the then President of the United States that aggregated $13,200,000,000. That was $9,700,000,000—and I just use round figures—in the regular estimates, and $3,000,000,000 plus in the supplementary estimates. So for a firm figure, in the peacetime year of fiscal 1940 our estimates and also our appropriations were roughly about thirteen and one-fifth billions.

Now, here is the first real firm peacetime year after World War II, but instead of a Budget of thirteen and one-fifth billions the President of the United States sends in an estimate that is three times that large. I ask you, now, Are we three times better off? That is something that maybe we might well keep in mind as we begin to ladle out the money over which we are trustees and which belongs to the people that are scattered from one end of the country to the other.

What was this Budget for in 1940? It was very, very simple, the 1940 Budget. For regular establishments of Government, $6,500,000,000. That included everything. It included Agriculture. It included $1,600,000,000 for national defense. It included $560,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. It included the Commerce Department, the Justice Department, Labor, and all the 30-odd independent agencies of the Government. Six billion five hundred million dollars, that was the regular Budget. Then for relief we estimated and appropriated nearly $2,500,000,000. You see, we have no relief in 1948, except to relieve some of these despairing souls, perhaps, who are presently upon the Federal rolls and who are getting ready for the long exodus home, God bless them. Two billion five hundred million dollars for relief. We paid a billion dollars of interest on the national debt. You can believe it or not, we actually made a payment on the principal amounting to $600,000,000. Then there were trust funds of $1,900,000,000, and miscellaneous $700,000,000. It totaled about $13,200,000,000.

That was way back in that ancient period of 1940, the last peacetime year before World War II. Now in this modern day, with the Budget of 1948, you might be interested in percentage-wise figures as to how it is apportioned—30 percent will go to national defense. As a rule of thumb you can say that out of every $100 $30 will go to the defense of this our blessed Republic. International functions, 10 percent; veterans, 20 percent; agriculture, 4 percent; national resources, 3 percent; transportation and communication, 4 percent; general government, 4 percent. Interest—mark you well, interest—interest alone on the national debt will take 13 percent of the whole budget estimated for the fiscal year 1948.

Finally, there is an item of refunds of 6 percent and then there are some general items. So there you have it, sort of broken up, and the question is: At what point in this whole picture can we insert the scalpel and do a fine little job of amputation so that we can get it down to what Senator Huey Long called frying size, that is, manageable size so that you could get it in the frying pan.

There are many items here that will bear the most careful scrutiny. For instance, under national defense there is $530,000,000 for research. Think of it. That is a lot of money for research. Perhaps it is needed. But here is $530,000,000 for military and naval research. To find new and more effective instrumentalities of death with which to kill people in the future. There is $132,000,000 in the defense item for public works. In the international estimate, which will take 10 percent of the budget, there is $1,200,000,000 for the British loan. The Export-Import Bank expects to lend the money of the people of the United States to countries everywhere in the world so the President has estimated $730,000,000 for loans. There is an item of $950,000,000 for foreign relief. Six-hundred-and-fifty-odd-million dollars of that will be administered by the Army. It may be that some agency which will take the place of UNRRA, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, will be created to spend the other $300,000,000.

I will not analyze the rest of it but will conclude with this thought. It seems to me that if we are going to make a frontal assault on this thing and do a fair, timely and forthright job, perhaps we had just better tear the house down and build it from the bottom up.

What would be the matter with starting with 1940, the last peacetime year? Let us take that figure of $13,200,000,000. First, let us deduct relief. That is $2,500,000,000. That reduces it to $10,700,000,000. Let us take out what we spent for defense that year, which was $1,600,000,000. That brings it down to $9,100,000,000. Let us add $4,000,000,000, because that is the difference in our interest payments between the fiscal year 1948 and 1940. We paid $1,000,000,000 in interest that year. Five billion dollars will be the amount in 1948. So we add $4,000,000,000. That will bring it up to $13,100,000,000. There are $2,000,000,000 of tax refunds to people who have overpaid their taxes and who are entitled to those refunds. It is a commitment. It is nothing over which we have any real control because it is simply restoring to them the money which they paid to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Therefore, that must

be paid back to them. That adds $2,000,000,000, and brings it up to $15,100,000,000.

There you have a base—you not only have the regular expenditures of Government exclusive of Army and Navy expenditures, but you have $2,500,000,000 to pay off on the national debt. You see we are not giving enough attention to this matter of debt reduction. That is gospel with me. We are teaching our GI's to be thrifty. Under the GI legislation we insure loans and expect them to go into the building and loan associations or into the banks and pay back those loans and liquidate the mortgages on their homes, their farms, and their businesses. We urge them to practice thrift. You cannot urge your people to thrift but what you also must indulge in a little thrift yourself as a government. Therefore, something has to be done about starting ourselves on the road toward liquidating the national debt. Mr. Truman stated that by good management at the end of the current year there might be $200,000,000 of surplus to pay off on the national debt. If we pay it back at that rate, it will take 1,300 years. If that time is measured going back in history, it will take you back to the year 600, long before the Crusaders ever thought of moving into the Holy Land. No, it will not be done that way. That is not a proper discharge of our responsibilities. A substantial debt reduction item must be included, in my judgment. So I am including it. All right. Where are we? We have got a rounded budget up to $15,100,000,000. But it does not include veterans and it does not include the Army and Navy. It does not include some of these items that Mr. Truman has in his very astonishing Budget. I bear out my distinguished chairman [Mr. TABER] that there is some confusion in that Budget message. As a matter of fact, I labored on it by lamplight last night, and I wondered if it could be more confusing if they had actually tried to confuse it a little.

So we have got to do a simple thing. You know they tell a story about an old man 80 years old, who was interviewed by the press on his eightieth birthday. After a lot of questions about his life and background, one of them said, "Well, grandpap, I guess you have seen a lot of changes in your time, haven't you?" He said, "Yep, and I have been agin every one of them."

You know, he had a very simple approach to life. You may not agree with him; but you have got to whittle this down to the compass of your own thinking, a little. Think of it as nothing more than a budget exercise in your own household, only squared and cubed and double cubed until it reaches these monumental proportions that are represented by this monumental sum.

So here is a rounded budget now. It is 1940. So we add up the reductions of the committee and we get up to fifteen and one-tenth billion. Now the committees of the Appropriations Committee and also every Member of this Congress must give some attention to how much we shall expend for national defense; how much for the Veterans' Administration. Certainly we regard it as a sacred obligation, but that is no reason why we should be wasteful. It can be sacred, and we can still perform our duty to the boys who marched off in battle. That is no reason why through mismanagement and extravagance and waste and bad tinkerings and processes and lack in the whole administrative set-up, money ought to be thrown away. If we can reduce it, then it is our solemn obligation to reduce it. You will get no credit either in your constituency or in heaven for having wasted money even though for the moment it seems to have been in a good cause.

Here is an estimate of $7,200,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. Ladies and gentlemen, for years, in company with my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who will be chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], year after year we would sit down here in a little cubbyhole with the Veterans' Administration, and day after day we would labor with mountains of figures. As late as 1940 that obligation we were meeting was $560,000,000 in a single year. Here in 1948, 8 years later, it is seven and two-tenths billion. So, it has grown. But it is an obligation to men who wore the uniform and in whom some disintegrating seed has been sown. We have got to do the job. Next comes national defense. We all favor a strong defense but let it not be wasteful or extravagant. Look at that research item for instance. Must we spend that much for that item? Certainly we are for national defense. But you know the waste and extravagance that is one of the inevitable incidents of war. I was privileged to take a trip in 1945, all across the world for 90 days, and I poked into a good many things. I saw waste and I saw extravagance. I did not quarrel too much. The grim business of war had to be taken to a successful conclusion. But since sanity has returned now, like good bookkeepers, good accountants, and good public servants, we are going to have to take a little look at it.

Look at that item of international relief. How much shall we spend for relief? We have done pretty well. We gave UNRRA $2,700,000,000 in the last 2 years. Let nobody ever rise up in any far corner of the earth and reproach us for having been niggardly at the expense of human distress; we have not. Then there are lend-lease funds and 30-year loans made by the Export-Import Bank at 2⅜ percent. Way down deep we know pretty well we are not going to get a lot of that money back; we know that now. So we have erred, if anything, on the side of generosity and compassion and charity. But do we lay out this much now in 1948 when we have a problem of our own?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the head of natural resources there is an atomic item of $443,000,000. It is a lot of money. You know that is not hay even in my home town, and it is a town of 20,000 people—$443,000,000. Then there is $255,000,000 for War Department civil functions, and $176,000,000 for reclamation. Then there is an interesting item headed "Transportation and communication" that was never there before. They have broken it down functional-wise.

Mr. TABER. Are they getting so they travel a good deal? Is that what it means?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I expect so.

There are $200,000,000 for the Merchant Marine, $300,000,000 for navigation aids, $430,000,000 for highways. Let me tell you an interesting story, because sometime you may get this reaction yourself. Out in the Middle West the president of a large company wrote me several years ago and castigated me as a Member of Congress and particularly as a member of the Appropriations Committee for wild "squandermania," and insisted that something be done about cutting down expenditures. The very mail that brought his letter brought a letter from the vice president of the same company. It was shortly after the action contemplated by this House that estimates for highways which were at that time at $250,000,000 for a single year should be cut in half and the $250,000,000 used over a period of 2 years instead of one. This particular company was interested in the building of equipment that was used in highway construction. So in the same mail that brought the letter from the president of this company castigating me for expenditures, the vice president in charge of sales wrote me because we were not spending enough, for bigger expenditures would mean more equipment on the highways. So I put the president's letter in an envelope and sent it to the vice president, and I put the vice president's letter in an envelope and sent it to the president, without myself writing to either of them. Neither one talked to me for some time, but they are all right now. You see the perspective always changes. But there should be courage about this thing as we move into it because people are going to rise up back home, and in the language of the Scripture, "call you blessed" because they know that what we do in this field is going to be some safeguarding of the essential freedoms of the country.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, and then I will bring this discourse to an end. It is a rather interesting thing, if this figure is correct, that actually, exclusive of the War and Navy Departments—the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], has already referred to this—we have more civilians on the rolls today than we had on VJ-day. Evidently it takes more to lick, shall I say, our beloved bureaucrats, than it does to lick our enemies. It is an amazing thing, it is a staggering figure, if you please, but on the 30th of November 1946, exclusive of War and Navy, we had 1,296,000 civilians on the rolls. I am not insensible to the fact it takes people to run the Government, but it should not take two people for every job. After all, when the war in which I was a soldier terminated in November of 1918, the top for all personnel purposes was only 917,000. You

see, we had gotten way up above 3,000,000 in World War II. Maybe this war was three times bigger, I do not know. It certainly was in point of expenditure, it certainly was in point of the number of people who were upon the civilian rolls.

In the light of all that, fancy coming along and asking for more money for personnel in many agencies than they had in fiscal 1947. Can you imagine what the folks back home will think, particularly in the tenor of that little squib "Stay on the job, boys, pay taxes, the folks in Washington are counting on you."

Let us take that sentiment to heart and let us do our job. Let every man constitute himself a subcommittee of one of the Congress of the United States, because it is our collective duty and our individual responsibility. The buck cannot be successfully passed to another branch of Government because the Constitution put the power of the purse right here.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that his discussion this afternoon and that of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations ought to hearten each and every one of us. It certainly ought to give some assurance to the country that we mean business and that we are going to try to carry out the mandate that was given us on November 5. Since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives the address of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee today has given me more encouragement than I have heard from the chairman of any Appropriations Committee since Mr. Buchanan, of Texas, was here. I believe the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and his associates on that committee have a great responsibility to cut down expenditures—if we give them cooperation, and we can do it if we will make up our minds. I hope that the membership of the House will remember this. Where are you going to get the money to do what you men are talking about?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this discourse must wind up. I simply reassert and reaffirm to you the text: Let us do a job of building this Budget for 1948 from the bottom up, not by cheese paring from the top down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it has not been possible to call the Budget Committee together because of the fact that the committees have not been made up. It was only on yesterday that the majority side took final action on its selections, and I understand the minority has not yet presented its committees to the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What was the inquiry?

Mr. KNUTSON. Have the minority members of the committees been reported to the House?

Mr. DOUGHTON. We are going to be ready to make a report tomorrow so that our work can be passed upon by the House on the following day, if the House is in session.

Mr. KNUTSON. On Thursday. Obviously the Budget Committee cannot be called together until the members of the committees have been named and approved by their respective bodies. It was my thought that we might meet on Friday if by that time the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had ready an outline of his budget for 1948.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. It was announced earlier today by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], chairman of the minority conference, that they hoped to be able to present their nominations for the committees on Thursday when we meet at that time.

Mr. KNUTSON. It had been my hope that we would call the Budget Committee together on Friday, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has requested that the call be deferred until Monday. So I will now advise the House that the Budget Committee will be called to meet at 10 o'clock Monday morning, and the members will receive due notice of the meeting place.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

SUGAR

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the afternoon we have listened to a very interesting and illuminating discussion on the question of sugar, which is a very important subject to the American people. I take this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that today I have introduced a measure which I hope will solve the sugar problem.

Immediately upon the passage of the bill I have introduced all rationing and all price control of sugar will end. Furthermore, it is provided in the bill that I have introduced that the Government shall get out of the sugar business. I have also asked in my measure that there be appointed by the President a commission of seven, three from the Government and four from the industry, representing wholesalers, retailers, refiners and producers of sugar, and that this commission shall have the power to allocate fairly and equitably all the sugar that is held by the Government. I think that this is necessary if we are to receive more sugar during the present year.

My bill further states that it is the policy of the Congress to curtail shipments of sugar abroad until our own needs have been satisfied. The commission which I propose will have the power to curtail shipments abroad until our own needs have been met. The people expect action on this important matter, and the bill that I have introduced today, if passed by the Congress immediately, will solve the sugar problem.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the bill which I have introduced today to terminate price controls and rationing in the case of sugar, to terminate Government sugar operations, to authorize the placing of limitations on the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to terminate price controls and rationing in the case of sugar, to terminate Government sugar operations, to authorize the placing of limitations on the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. As used in this act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Federal Sugar Commission established by this act.

(2) The term "Government agency" means any department, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, in the executive branch of the Government.

(3) The term "sugar" means (a) any sugars which are principally of crystalline structure and which are to be further refined or improved in quality, and any sugars which are principally not of crystalline structure but which are to be further refined or otherwise improved in quality to produce any sugars principally of crystalline structure, and (b) any sugars which are principally of crystalline structure and which are not to be further refined or otherwise improved in quality.

(4) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means the States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(5) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

TERMINATION OF PRICE CONTROLS AND RATIONING IN CASE OF SUGAR

SEC. 2. (a) After the date of the enactment of this act the authority granted by section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," as amended, may not be exercised for the purpose of allocating or rationing sugar. At 12 o'clock postmeridian on the date of the enactment of this act all regulations or orders under such section 2 (a), insofar as they provide for or relate to the allocation or rationing of sugar, shall cease to be in effect.

(b) After the date of the enactment of this act the authority granted by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or by the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, may not be exercised for the purpose of establishing or maintaining any maximum price in the case of sugar. At 12 o'clock postmeridian on the date of the enactment of this act all regulations, orders, price schedules, or requirements under either of such acts, insofar as they provide for or relate to the establishment or maintenance of any maximum price in the case of sugar, shall cease to be in effect.

LIMITATION ON GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF SUGAR

SEC. 3. Hereafter no Government agency shall purchase any sugar for resale; except

that this section shall not prohibit the carrying out of any purchase agreement lawfully entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

ALLOCATION AND DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SUGAR

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall allocate on a fair and equitable basis, for sale within the United States, all sugar purchased by Government agencies for resale, whether heretofore or hereafter coming into the possession or under the control of such agencies, which is not needed for purposes of fulfilling contracts of sale entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(b) No sugar which the Commission is directed by subsection (a) to allocate shall be sold or disposed of otherwise than in accordance with allocations made by the Commission pursuant to such subsection (b).

LIMITATIONS ON EXPORTS

SEC. 5. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that exportations of sugar from the United States should be curtailed to such extent as may be necessary in order that domestic needs for sugar may be satisfied at the earliest practicable time.

(b) The Commission shall issue such order or orders, prohibiting or curtailing the exportation of sugar from the United States, as in its judgment may be necessary to carry out the policy declared in subsection (a).

(c) Any person who violates any order of the Commission issued under subsection (b) shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

FEDERAL SUGAR COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established an agency to be known as the Federal Sugar Commission, to be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President. One of the members so appointed shall be representative of wholesalers of sugar, one shall be representative of retailers of sugar, one shall be representative of refiners of sugar, and one shall be representative of producers of sugar. The President shall designate a member to act as chairman of the Commission, and the Commission may elect another of its members as vice chairman who shall act as chairman in the case of absence or incapacity of the chairman. A majority of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. Members of the Commission shall not receive compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions vested in the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to employ such personnel as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions.

(c) The Commission, in the performance of its functions, is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other Government agency to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the head of such Government agency, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such Government agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Columbia Daily Tribune.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. DOUGLAS, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. MILLS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

109. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting annual report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

110. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

111. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

112. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

113. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

114. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

115. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

116. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

117. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

118. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale, loan, exchange, or gift of United States naval ordnance material to foreign governments, and vice versa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

119. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

120. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

121. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

122. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the commissioned grade of medical administrator in the Hospital Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

123. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

124. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

125. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

127. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate school; to the Committee on Armed Services.

128. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

129. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

131. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

132. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

133. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

134. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective; to the Committee on Armed Services.

135. A letter from the president, the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

136. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

137. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

138. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

139. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 930. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 931. A bill to amend the civil-service retirement rights—persons in military service, approved November 9, 1945, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the merchant marine; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 932. A bill to authorize the incorporation of National Association, Rainbow Division Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 933. A bill to make bribery in connection with athletic contests an offense under the laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 934. A bill to provide the same exemptions from distraint and sale with respect to Federal taxes as are allowed under the applicable State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 935. A bill to provide for an appropriation of $150,000 with which to continue the survey of the old Indian trail known as the Natchez Trace through Louisiana and Texas, with a view of constructing a national road on this route to be known as the Natchez Trace Parkway; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 936. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 937. A bill to amend chapter 16 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 938. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 939. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to air transportation by marine transportation and shipping companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 940. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 941. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 942. A bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 943. A bill to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 944. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each district court of the United States, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 945. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 946. A bill providing for the creation of the Curtiss Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 947. A bill to provide for the promotion of moral, temperance, and character education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education; and to provide for cooperation with the States in preparation of teachers of moral, temperance, character, and good-citizenship subjects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 948. A bill to confer military status upon certain persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 949. A bill to authorize the transfer of Fort Schuyler Military Reservation, N. Y., to the State of New York for nautical-education purposes: to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 950. A bill for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 951. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 952. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 953. A bill to provide for a United States air-mail postal card and to authorize the transmission by air mail of private mailing cards (post cards); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 954. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 955. A bill to provide for the extension of the air-mail postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 956. A bill to provide adequate markets and fair prices for agricultural commodities produced in the United States; to eliminate the necessity for mandatory reductions in crop production; to provide a method for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities for products of foreign countries on a basis mutually advantageous to agricultural and manufacturing interests in the United States, and to such foreign countries; to promote foreign trade in the interest of friendly and peaceful relations among nations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 957. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 958. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 959. A bill to amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 960. A bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education or on-the-job training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 961. A bill to amend section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 962. A bill for the erection of a public building at Hemingway, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 963. A bill to amend section 116 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments under said code from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 964. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 965. A bill to provide that at least one-half of the members of general courts martial of the Army and Navy shall, exclusive of the member senior in rank, be enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 966. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 967. A bill to authorize compensation for employees removed or suspended unjustly

from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 968. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 969. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pensions payable to Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 970. A bill to increase the compensation for total disability granted employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 971. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ private organizations and individuals for the construction of transmission lines or related facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 972. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 973. A bill to amend section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to include a review of a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 974. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, so as to provide for the retirement of the outstanding capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 975. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 976. A bill providing for the promotion of certain substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 977. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, and certain other degenerative diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 978. A bill to repeal Public, No. 252, an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 979. A bill to terminate price controls and rationing in the case of sugar, to terminate Government sugar operations, to authorize the placing of limitations on the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 980. A bill to prohibit the exportation of sugar and to abolish sugar rationing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 981. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 982. A bill to amend the act of April 4, 1944 (58 Stat. 189), relating to the public-works program of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1000. A bill creating a commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims by American nationals who were members of the armed forces of the United States and who were prisoners of war of Germany, Italy, or Japan, for payment of its awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution providing for the administration and protection of Territories and possessions of the United States by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the abolition of capital punishment in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding any State or political subdivision thereof to deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of failure to pay a poll tax or property tax assessed against him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the Navy and Marine Corps should be permitted to express views upon unification of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 983. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Doerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 985. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 986. A bill for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 987. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 988. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 990. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patricia Ann Moore, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 991. A bill for the relief of A. W. Estabrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 992. A bill for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 993. A bill for the relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb, Naomi R. Cobb, and Garland L. Cobb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 994. A bill for the relief of H. Ward Eaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 995. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 996. A bill for the relief of Edgar D. Sebring and Jay Purple; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of Harold M. Ensley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 998. A bill for the relief of Thelma McMullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mondell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1001. A bill for the relief of Rachib Shriay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1002. A bill for the relief of the York Products, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Valley Savings Bank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1004. A bill amending the act of October 14, 1940, entitled "An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Nicholas G. Karas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Georgios M. Tsarouchas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1006. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Peribolares (also known as Constantinos Perivolaries or Gust Aspiotes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1007. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Mastrogeorgakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1008. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1011. A bill for the relief of Oskar Arne Rudolf Eriksson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1012. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bezalel Schatz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1013. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga Pevsner Schatz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of Stavros Theodoratos, alias Steve Feilaretos Theodore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of Fred Pittelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur Earl Troiel, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1017. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1018. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of W. B. Hussey and J. O. Hussey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Weaver; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 1021. A bill for the relief of Joseph Villar (Youssouf Tchikvaoglou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Ruth Eva Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1023. A bill to authorize the appointment of Joseph A. Southworth, formerly an ensign, to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Wagnon Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the forty-second annual convention of the New Jersey State Building and Construction Trades Council, urging enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

45. Also, resolutions adopted by the New Jersey State Building and Construction Trades Council at its forty-second annual convention, relating to the continuation and expansion of certain features of the Federal Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

46. Also, resolution adopted by the forty-second annual convention of the New Jersey State Building Trades Council, relating to subsistence allowances for veterans in training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

47. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of the employees of the American Spring Co., and citizens of Holly, Oakland County, Mich., asking that all available sugar be retained in the United States and at no increase in price to the consumer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

48. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, recommending that an adjustment be made on floor-stocks taxes on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

49. Also, petition of the New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, favoring a reduction of the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

50. Also, petition of the New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, recommending that no cabaret tax be charged against a licensee except where an admission charge is made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

51. Also, petition of the New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, recommending that the copyright law be amended providing that no license fee be made for use of copyright music in a licensed place of business unless an admission charge is made thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

52. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of Hartford, Conn., Post No. 51, relative to amending immigration laws to permit veterans of the Polish Army stranded homeless in England and Italy free and unrestricted immigration into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

53. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Junior Woman's Club of Emporium, Pa., protesting present sugar allotment for home use; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we acknowledge that Thou dost govern in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without Thy notice, how can we think Thou art indifferent to what we say and do here?

If this day Thou dost want us to do, or not to do, any particular thing, we pray that Thou wilt make it plain to us, for Thou knowest how blind we can be, and how stubborn, in our own intentions. We pray for Thy help in our thinking and Thy love in our hearts. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 13, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is detained on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD M. CURRAN TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to make an announcement in behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee has received the nomination of Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. A routine hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 20, 1947, at 10:45 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, to hear anyone who desires to testify with respect to the nomination.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

MARK THISTLETHWAITE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I deem it an honor, although a sorrowful one, to pay tribute today on the floor of the United States Senate to one of Indiana's great men, the late Mark Thistlethwaite.

It is only fitting that the Senate today observe a moment's silence in respect for a man who for 40 years has been an outstanding figure in the Halls of the Capitol of this great Nation, first as secretary to Vice President Thomas R. Marshall, and then as one of the country's most prominent newspaper reporters.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I had no idea the Senator from Indiana was going to refer to the lamented death of Mark Thistlethwaite, but I should like to utter a sentence or two.

Mr. Thistlethwaite was one of the first newspapermen I met when I came to Washington 24 years ago. Much could be said of him, all of it good. He was a gentleman, he was a scholar, and one of the fairest men in presenting views on anything about which he wrote that I have ever encountered in my lifetime.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CRUDE-OIL FACILITIES OF CANOL PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on the crude-oil facilities of the Canol project (Canol-1) and also a copy of the preliminary report, entitled "United States Owned Petroleum Facilities Located Abroad"

(with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A report from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Secretary on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSFER TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN DUTIES OF ROAD COMMISSIONERS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1946 (December estimated) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, appointed Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. HILL, and Mr. MAYBANK members on the part of the Senate on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FROM MRS. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Mrs. Josiah W. Bailey, of Raleigh, N. C., expressing appreciation for the floral wreath of the Senate on the occasion of the death of the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey of the State of North Carolina, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of New York, remonstrating against the seating of Senator-elect THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States of America, and the Italian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary with relation to the arrival of the Honorable Alcide De Gasperi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, in this country and the need of financial and economic help for Italy from the Government of the United States of America

"Whereas the Honorable Alcide De Gasperi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, has arrived in this country as a guest of our Government to discuss financial and economic help from the Government of the United States of America, necessary for the rebirth of his country and to alleviate the bitter suffering of his people; and

"Whereas the people of Italy are united to us by long standing ties of friendship and Italy was our cobelligerent in the war, and is endeavoring to rehabilitate itself in a new regime of democracy; and

"Whereas our country has fought a victorious war to establish a rule of justice and freedom among the peoples of the world, and in order to win the peace we have to assist those countries which are suffering the ravages of the war, and which, like Italy, are anxious to join with us in the maintenance and defense of Western Civilization; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States of America are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to extend to Italy all possible help; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the recording clerk of the house from Rhode Island to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to the President of the United States of America and to the Secretary of State of the United States to be transmitted by him to the Italian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary."

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INSURED BANKS—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Nebraska Bankers Association, at Lincoln, Nebr., favoring the enactment of legislation to gain relief for all insured banks by a reasonable reduction in FDIC assessments, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the capital funds of the FDIC will soon reach $1,000,000,000; and

Whereas the sum being invested in United States Government securities will produce sufficient income to leave an excess after the operation costs of the corporation are deducted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Bankers Association, That we petition our Representatives and Senators to initiate legislation [to gain relief for all insured banks by a reasonable reduction in FDIC assessments] after the net assets of the corporation have reached $1,000,000,000, and that the present $5,000 insurance coverage shall not be increased.

Adopted at Lincoln, Nebr., October 12, 1946.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 22. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926 (Rept. No. 2);

S. 26. A bill to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape (Rept. No. 3), and

S. 27. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war (Rept. No. 4).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report three nominations which the committee ordered reported this morning, as follows:

Raymond Michael Foley, of Michigan, to be National Housing Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Frank Creedon, of Massachusetts, to be Housing Expediter, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

John D. Goodloe, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1946, to be effective January 17, 1947, vice George E. Allen, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the reports will be received and the nominations will go to the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably sundry routine nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and ask that they go to the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be received as in executive session and placed on the Executive Calendar.

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

William C. Trimble, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul;

John Willard Carrigan, of California, now a Foreign Service Officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul;

Isador Lubin, of the District of Columbia, to be the United States member of the Economic and Employment Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Mrs Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be the United States member of the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Philip M. Hauser, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be the United States member of the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Miss Dorothy Kenyon, of New York, to be the United States member of the Commission on Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be the United States member of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the United States member of the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. CAPPER introduced S. 198, to provide for uniform regulation of marriage and divorce, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 199. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States by establishing a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and by assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less for necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 200. A bill to provide for exclusion from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts received as retirement pay by retired military personnel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 201. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes;

S. 202. A bill to provide for the selection and appointment of substitute rural carriers;

S. 203. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 2 cents per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 204. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945;

S. 205. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; and

S. 206. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 207. A bill to permit all people from India residing in the United States to be naturalized; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 208. A bill to increase the subsistence allowances for veterans receiving educational benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 209. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 210. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate and fix rates of pay for employees and officers of the Government Printing Office," approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 211. A bill to create the National Capital Metropolitan Water Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 212. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States, No. 34450; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 213. A bill declaring a temporary policy with respect to immigration to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 214. A bill to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. OVERTON):

S. 215. A bill to fix the amount of the annual payment of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 216. A bill to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 217. A bill to make credit available to small business enterprise and to continue the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of effectuating a policy of credit assistance to competitive small business enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 218. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to advance Lt. Alfred R. Eubanks, United States Navy, retired, to the grade of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 219. A bill to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland;

S. 221. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes;

S. 222. A bill to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by certain agencies of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 223. A bill to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 224. A bill to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases;

S. 225. A bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

S. 226. A bill to authorize the sale, loan, exchange, or gift of United States naval ordnance material to foreign governments, and vice versa;

S. 227. A bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 228. A bill to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

S. 229. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

S. 230. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 231. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 232. A bill to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

S. 233. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

S. 234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.;

S. 235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city;

S. 236. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective;

S. 237. A bill to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics;

S. 238. A bill to establish the commissioned grade of medical administrator in the Hospital Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 239. A bill relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and the postgraduate school; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 240. A bill to authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo;

S. 242. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts; and

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 244. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 245, to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 246. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 247. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 248. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the use of Coast Guard radio stations for commercial messages; and

S. 249. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 250. A bill to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended, to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities under such act to persons who have not paid retirement deductions for their last 5 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 251. A bill to establish the National Elks Scenic Area and Park in the San Juan Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 252. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Ryohei Kubota;

S. 254. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Horst Specialty Manufacturing Co.;

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Yoneo Sakai; and

S. 258. A bill for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 259. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced S. J. Res. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to marriage and divorce laws, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election and terms of office of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THYE):

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Eriksson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. MYERS also introduced S. J. Res. 34, prohibiting War Assets Administration from disposing of certain pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil until 6 months after final report and recommendations of the Federal Power Commission in its Docket No. G-580 have been submitted to the Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAWS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I reintroduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to marriage and divorce laws. At this time I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the problem of conflicting marriage and divorce laws in this country was recognized as long ago as 1884, when a measure similar to the one I am proposing was first introduced in the Congress. For several years I have continued the movement to secure enactment of this vital legislation.

During World War II it was understood that no action on constitutional amendments would be taken until most of our veterans returned to their homes. The time has come for such action, and I firmly believe this matter should be given prompt consideration and—I trust—early approval.

Mr. President, the Nation was properly shocked last September when the Federal Security Agency released provisional figures on marriages and divorces in 1945. Frankly speaking, the figures are startling. The Federal Security Agency recorded these provisional statistics: 1,618,331 marriages and 502,000 divorces in 1945. In other words, for every three couples that marched to the altar, one wedding ended in the divorce courts.

But let us look at the figures for this year. The Census Bureau estimates that in 1947 there will be nearly 40 percent as many divorces as there are marriages. Are we going to allow this problem to wreck our homes, the very core of civilization and human progress? I am convinced it is one of the greatest dangers confronting the American people today and we must do something about it. After careful study of the problem over a number of years, it is my conclusion that uniform Federal regulation of marriage and divorce laws through a constitutional amendment is necessary to correct the situation. Keeping in mind our responsibility of preserving the institution of the home, I therefore urge the favorable consideration of this resolution.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to introduce for appropriate reference a bill on the same subject. The measure contains a program which might be approved by the Congress following adoption of the constitutional amendment.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to marriage and divorce laws, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 198) to provide for uniform regulation of marriage and divorce, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SECONDARY MARKET FOR FARM LOANS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to purchase from approved lenders, for cash, loans made under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, popularly known as the GI bill of rights. Loans under section 502 of the GI bill are those made to veterans for farming purposes—to purchase lands, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, supplies, or implements, or to repair, alter, construct, or improve land, equipment, or buildings, to be used in farming operations conducted by the veteran, or for working capital for the farming operations.

A number of the smaller banks and other local lenders, as well as veterans' organizations, have informed me that many responsible lenders may be unable to make such loans in the volume needed by veterans in their local communities unless the lending agencies have a dependable secondary market where they can sell loans already made to obtain funds for further loans. A secondary market is therefore needed to enable the veterans who require farming loans to obtain such loans from the lenders in their own home communities.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has arranged to provide a secondary market for home loans made to veterans under section 501 of the GI bill. It is felt that the secondary market for veterans' farm loans should be provided by a governmental farm lending agency.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation appears to be the appropriate agency to provide this secondary market for farm loans. The Corporation is

wholly Government-owned, it is part of the Farm Credit System, and it is thoroughly experienced in farm mortgage lending, having been engaged in administering farm loans since its creation in 1934 and the creation of the Federal land banks in 1916. Moreover, the Corporation has the resources and facilities to carry out the program for purchasing GI farm loans, and no additional appropriations of funds would probably be necessary.

It is not likely that the purchase of GI loans would involve any substantial risk of loss to the Corporation. Under the GI bill, the Veterans' Administration guarantees up to 50 percent of the loan, the guaranteed amount not exceeding $4,000 for real-estate loans or $2,000 for non-real-estate loans, or a prorated portion of those amounts on a combination of both types of loans. When a loan is defaulted, the lender is entitled to receive the guaranteed percentage of the loan balance from the Veterans' Administration, and the lender may then recover the unguaranteed remainder of the loan from the security.

For example, if a real-estate loan for $6,000 were guaranteed for 50 percent, and after repayments of $1,000 the borrowing veteran defaulted leaving an unpaid balance of $5,000, the lender would recover $2,500—50 percent of the unpaid balance—from the Veterans' Administration and would then be entitled to recover the remaining $2,500 from the real-estate security which was appraised, when the loan was made, at $6,000 or more. The lender, therefore, ordinarily has little risk of loss. The Corporation, of course, would acquire the rights of the lender when it purchased a loan.

The bill (S. 245) to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF BYRD ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the three heroic naval officers who recently lost their lives in the Antarctic came respectively from the States of Rhode Island, Virginia, and Tennessee. Therefore, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. STEWART], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], and myself, I submit a resolution of condolence and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was read as follows:

Whereas Ensign Maxwell Albert Lopez, of Newport, R. I.; Aviation Machinist's Mate First Class Frederick Warren Williams, of Huntingdon, Tenn.; and Aviation Radioman Second Class Wendell Keith Henderson, of Portsmouth, Va., lost their lives in the crash of a plane while on a photographic mission of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition; and

Whereas the deaths of these men were the first casualties of this historic expedition; and

Whereas they were engaged in scientific investigations and extraordinary aerial explorations the results of which may possibly prove of inestimable scientific value to the future of mankind and of great national importance to the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its condolences to the families of the deceased and expresses its gratitude for the heroic services of these men; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of each of the deceased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. For the time being, at least, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island will go over, under the rule.

COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCCARRAN BEFORE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, among the very notable addresses delivered at the 1946 meeting of the American Bar Association, held in Atlantic City, N. J., was one by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] entitled "Improving Administrative Justice: Hearings and Evidence, Scope of Judicial Review." The importance of this address appears from the two opening sentences of an editorial in the American Bar Association Journal for December 1946, which read as follows:

If the 1946 annual meeting of the association had produced no other contribution to the cause of law-governed justice and the rights of persons and property under our Constitution, the address of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, on improving administrative agency justice would have made the occasion profoundly worth while for the lawyers and people of America. Of course, the sessions had many features of great interest and usefulness, but none could surpass Senator MCCARRAN's statement in its timeliness and significance.

In view of the great importance of this admirable address, which it was my pleasure and privilege to hear, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial appearing in the American Bar Association Journal for December 1946 be printed in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DISCRETION

If the 1946 annual meeting of the association had produced no other contribution to the cause of law-governed justice and the rights of persons and property under our Constitution, the address of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, on improving administrative agency justice would have made the occasion profoundly worth while for the lawyers and people of America. Of course, the sessions had many features of great interest and usefulness, but none could surpass Senator MCCARRAN's statement in its timeliness and significance.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary expounded the place and part of the Administrative Procedure Act in restoring a government of laws and of defined and limited powers, in the place of administrative arbitrariness and agency discretion. He showed that the Congress must enact and set the standards and procedures for the agencies, require conformance to them, and vest the courts with both the powers and the duties to review and redress all legal wrongs done by the agencies through action or inaction. He pointed out the need that the cult of discretion be curbed, through plenary review.

The cosponsor of the McCarran-Sumners law went through it, section by section, to show that the above objectives had been plainly intended and attained by the Congress. We had read the statute as he says it was intended to be. Senator MCCARRAN'S authoritative statement, elsewhere in this issue, as to the legislative intent, is the most cheering and reassuring message that could be brought to lawyers and their harassed clients. Every lawyer will want and need to read his statement, line by line.

There will be agencies, and there may be courts, which will try to avoid and ignore or sabotage the plain intent and wording of the new law. The lawyers, the public, and the Congress, must be vigilant continually against any such encroachments or evasions. As former Attorney General Cummings said in Atlantic City, in presenting most appropriately to Carl McFarland the association's gold medal for conspicuous service to jurisprudence: "These gains (from the new act) must not be frittered away."

The association is honored that its assembly was the forum for Senator MCCARRAN'S epoch-marking statement, and the Journal feels highly privileged to bring to its readers a message which comes like a clearing wind after a night of fog and heralds the dawn of a new day.

GAGGING THE SERVICES—ARTICLE BY GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to take a brief moment to read an excerpt from an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star. The article was written by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, who is certainly a reliable reporter on military matters, and who tells us that—

The budget figures for the Army and Navy, as submitted by President Truman, do not represent the considered judgment of our military and naval leaders as to the needs of our national security. The budget figures are far below what those leaders consider necessary.

This, Mr. President, is the significant point. Major Eliot says:

But they can't talk about it. They can't even tell Congress about it when the time comes for budget hearings. They have been specifically and definitely gagged by Presidential order, reinforced by continual repetitions at every turn of the road.

It is, of course, the usual practice to bar any direct and open criticism of the budget figures. The service Secretaries, the Chiefs of Staff, and the Department and Bureau heads are supposed to appear before the Appropriations Committees to defend the budget, not to criticize it. But—

And this is a point I think will appeal to everyone who has ever served on the Appropriations Committee—

But it has always been the practice that members of the committees could ask for and receive professional opinions as to the adequacy of the budget figures on any particular point. Not this time. An officer so questioned by a Member of Congress can only say, unhappily, that he is not permitted to state his opinion—by order.

Mr. President, that is a very serious condition, and it is one which I think should interest every Member of this

body, regardless of party, because the national defense is not a partisan question. If we are to be deprived of the only source of authoritative opinion on the maintenance of our national security, I think it is a very serious thing indeed, which should engage the attention of the Appropriations Committee and of the Committee on Armed Services.

I do not think we want to accept the judgment of the Budget Bureau on military matters and do it by accident. If we are going to accept their judgment on a matter, upon which in my opinion they are not competent to pass, we ought to do so deliberately.

I ask that this whole article be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and I express the hope that every Member of the Senate will read it carefully.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAGGING THE SERVICES

(By George Fielding Eliot)

The Budget figures for the Army and Navy, as submitted by President Truman, do not represent the considered judgment of our military and naval leaders as to the needs of our national security. The Budget figures are far below what those leaders consider necessary.

But they can't talk about it. They can't even tell Congress about it when the time comes for budget hearings. They have been specifically and definitely gagged by Presidential order, reinforced by continual repetitions at every turn of the road.

I have had a good deal of experience in reporting the progress of military and naval budgets, but I have never encountered a gag situation as strict as this one.

It is, of course, the usual practice to bar any direct and open criticism of the Budget figures. The service Secretaries, the Chiefs of Staff, and the Department and Bureau heads are supposed to appear before the Appropriations Committees to defend the budget, not to criticize it. But it has always been the practice that members of the committees could ask for and receive professional opinions as to the adequacy of the budget figures on any particular point. Not this time. An officer so questioned by a Member of Congress can only say, unhappily, that he is not permitted to state his opinion—by order.

It looks as though it is going to be a difficult matter for the Congress and the people to get the facts necessary to enable them to make up their minds whether, in this troubled and by no means secured world, they are taking adequate steps for their security during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

What they are getting now, let me repeat, is not the sober judgment of the Chiefs of Staff and the military and naval planners as to what the national security requires. What they are getting is the judgment of the Bureau of the Budget as to what part of the national expenditures should go to the Army and Navy. If this were confined to a simple statement by the Budget Bureau to the service departments of a limitation, in amount or in percentage, of the total sum available, the situation would not be quite so dangerous as it is. If, in effect, the Bureau said, "Look, boys, all you can have is so much; now you cut your coat to fit that pattern," there would be less ground for anxiety. Unfortunately, the Budget Bureau does not work that way. It goes into details which it is not competently staffed to decide. It tells the services that certain specific items must be cut out or reduced, instead of fixing an over-all limitation and allowing the seasoned judgment of the service chiefs to determine what items should have first priority.

It does not require any inside information to see how this works out. All one has to do is to analyze the published figures in the President's message against the known fact that heavy reductions have been made from the estimates originally submitted by the War and Navy Departments. The message estimates expenditures for military purposes (both Departments) at $11,100,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1948. This is divided into two principal classifications—(1) $5,200,000,000 for pay, subsistence, travel, welfare, training, clothing, and medical expenditures for military personnel; and (2) $5,900,000,000 for all other purposes, including procurement, research and development, construction, operation and maintenance, and citizen reserve activities.

Now the total numbers of regular personnel as presented in the final Army and Navy estimates have been published, and they have not been reduced in the Budget recommendations. Hence, there has been no substantial reduction in pay, subsistence, welfare, clothing, and medical care. In fact, the message notes considerable increases over 1947 in the cost of each man of these items. The only possible reduction in this category is in training.

The real reductions from the departmental estimates to the Budget figures must have come in the second category—which means, specifically, that research and development plus the procurement of new weapons and equipment and experiment therewith (as in the Arctic expeditions of last year) have taken a severe beating. This is precisely the category of military expenditures in which more, not less, money is required under existing circumstances—circumstances which make it possible for sober, well-informed officers to say that the whole armament of American forces may be drastically altered by 1951.

The whole situation now comes to the hands of the Congress. This is an economy-minded Congress, as reactions to the Budget message already have shown. But it is to be hoped that before Congress decides as to the military items of the Budget it will find means to obtain the considered judgment of the officers charged with responsibility for national security. It is further to be hoped that the people back home will insist, for the safety of their own hides, that Congress does exactly that.

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, I had the pleasure recently of appearing before a conference of the regional directors of the Bureau of Reclamation presided over by Commissioner Michael W. Straus. I was invited to give some of my views to the field representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation who were present, and I did not hesitate to tell them that the Congress expects action by the Bureau of Reclamation on the construction program for which appropriations have been made. The Bureau of Reclamation will be judged by the results it produces. It has an excellent record, but cannot afford to rest on past laurels.

As a construction engineer engaged in railroad building in the West in my earlier days, I know something about construction activities and I appreciate the problems before the Bureau of Reclamation in its irrigation developments. It was because of my experience and my interest in the development of the natural resources of the West, particularly land and water, that I sought membership on the Committee on Public Lands. I am highly pleased at the personnel of this committee on both the majority and minority sides. We will, I am sure, work together for the development of the West.

I wish to announce that at the organization meeting of the committee this morning we decided to hold our regular meetings weekly each Monday morning at 10:30.

Last October 10 in my home State of Nebraska, at the fifteenth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, Commissioner Straus delivered a forward-looking address entitled "Reclamation: Where Do We Go From Here?" He outlined a program for the consideration of the people of the West and Congress, to which I desire to direct attention.

Mr. President, I request that the address may be printed following my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

It is of happy significance to come again before the National Reclamation Association at its annual meeting, this time in Omaha, which is a funnel for the great Missouri Valley—a sixth of the Nation embracing the heart of America in which reclamation is now embarked on its most difficult, most needed, and possibly most fruitful program.

I was encouraged when a number of leaders of this group recently gave me an opportunity for prolonged conferences during which many perplexing problems with which we are now beset were discussed frankly. There was a meeting of minds on most courses of action that all of us in our assorted capacities must carry through to achieve our end-purpose of proceeding with and assisting in the development of irrigation in the West. As did my distinguished predecessors—the late Dr. Elwood Mead, John Page, and Harry Bashore, all of whom in turn gave me such of their wisdom as I could absorb—I wish to make here the Commissioner's annual report of the progress of reclamation. Also I wish to point out possible solutions of some of our immediate problems and, most important, to recommend ways of liberalizing the reclamation law.

The war's end, as you all know, left this country with an accumulated investment of almost a billion dollars in reclamation works—an investment built up over the 44 years of Federal reclamation. This now comprises over 4,000,000 acres of irrigated land and the biggest and best power generators in the world. The whole national standard of living would decline if it were not for the crops that Federal irrigation yields, which last year alone had a value of $420,000,000—in 1 year only, virtually equal to half the total Federal expenditure over nearly half a century. In my opinion, the United States never made a better investment. The end of hostilities also left us with new reclamation developments virtually at a standstill and our reclamation men, materials, and money on military furlough. Our future, but already authorized, program to extend reclamation to 10,000,000 additional acres and double power capacity was paralyzed.

The first postwar effort of the Bureau of Reclamation was to implement the plans which had been gathering dust during the years that the vital construction program was laid aside for the more vital destruction programs laid upon us by a war for national survival. Efforts to revive development were well received by the administration. In its first postwar reclamation appropriation, less than a year ago and again last July, Con-

gress was generous to the extent of making the greatest single appropriation ever made in the history of the United States for reclamation. On July 1 all funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation for this fiscal year totaled $213,000,000, opening to the West the biggest irrigation construction program in its history.

But plans and appropriations themselves do nobody much good until the gap is bridged to actual resource development and putting the waters to work. It was to spanning that hazardous gap that the main effort of the Bureau was bent for the first 7 months of this year. We buckled down to driving our program into contracts and construction with results which are of interest.

In the last quarter of 1945, after demobilization started and we could take our attention away from doing things to the enemy and devote it to doing things for ourselves, the Bureau awarded $2,000,000 in construction contracts. The awards rose in the first quarter of this calendar year to $34,000,000 and in the second quarter of this year to $70,600,000. This meant $105,000,000 in new reclamation work driven under contract in the first 6 months of this year—a figure of which your new Commissioner was and is particularly proud. It also meant that the velocity that the reclamation program actually attained was at the rate of $210,000,000 a year—a record never approached heretofore in the history of this Nation. I also want to tell you that it is my personal conviction that the Bureau must be enabled to double that velocity in coming years. It will have to if we fulfill our trust. Congress has now authorized nearly $2,000,000,000 worth of reclamation work but funds therefor have not been as yet provided. On the authorization base, that means that there lies ahead and undone twice as much work as has been accomplished in 44 years.

Now our national reclamation program is not a program that can be properly operated on a stop-and-go schedule. It cannot be squeezed in and pulled out after the fashion of an accordion player operating on his instrument. It is an integrated program of planned heavy construction reaching to the very base of many communities and involving a myriad of operations in compliance with multiple myriads of State and National laws, regulations, and requirements. A national reclamation program, or even any single great reclamation program project, such as the Missouri Valley here or the Columbia Basin or the Central Valley of California, in the development period, is more like a great freight train which by constant nursing can, over a period of time, be accelerated to roll. But once the momentum is accumulated, it cannot be stopped short without wreckage, destruction, and waste. That is why all the effort was put into acceleration during the past months when, with authority approved by the Executive and the Congress and with generous appropriation of funds, it seemed that the road ahead was clearing. That is why we seek so desperately to achieve 10- and 20-year steady programs for the future. That is why it was particularly distressing to the reclamation world when, for national and international reasons, entirely beyond the control of water user's organizations or the Bureau of Reclamation, the President felt compelled to clamp ceilings upon our program far lower than those he, himself, the administration, and the Congress had approved but a few months prior. This is a matter of great interest to you, and I wish to be clear on exactly what has happened.

On August 2, because of a general and an alarming inflationary aspect in our national economy, two actions were publicly announced by the President. One action established an $85,000,000 construction ceiling on the Reclamation program for a 12-month period with a similar ceiling for the succeeding 12 months. Another action established a procedure under the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion for arresting and screening of future scheduled contract awards. The President at that time made it amply clear that this was not a revocation of reclamation funds or authority but a general change in schedule of various Federal construction work for the primary purpose of immediately combatting inflationary tendencies, eliminating competition, and aiding housing programs. This was in no sense an antireclamation move. It was an anti-inflationary temporary expedient, proclaimed as such, with clear enunciation of the fact that a permanent endeavor against inflation was being made by other means—principally, increased production. No projects were abandoned, no appropriations were revoked, no authority was removed, no program was discarded, no policies were scuttled. Were this hiatus to result in lower construction bids, it would mean lower-cost water and power for users in years to come. However, a violent change in schedule was imposed.

On the day the $85,000,000 annual ceilings were announced the Bureau had already assumed obligations virtually totaling that amount for the current year. Further contract awards were perforce suspended. We already were bumping that ceiling. It is this ceiling that now controls the program. We have not even got into the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion procedure for sifting projects. There is little purpose in so doing until the ceilings are altered.

The President's orders have not required any abandonment of our program. The program has merely been spread over a longer period. Our planning and preconstruction work is continuing. None of the contracts let has yet been canceled. They all remain in force. Those jobs are continuing or going into construction in all of your States. But few more contracts can be awarded under the present orders. In many cases those contracts which are already awarded and in construction only advance but cannot complete projects into finished useful operating and earning units, putting water on dry land and generating needed kilowatts. That is why lifting of the freeze is anxiously awaited. That is why it would be more economical, from many points of view, if national conditions permitted us to complete our job on an orderly, brisk, and businesslike schedule.

We have the velocity of the program up so high that we can run on accumulated, but declining, momentum of construction contracts already awarded for a short time. But that does not bring forward the new projects that various sponsors have served so well and looked forward to so hopefully. There is no denying the fact that if the economic situation compelled the administration to impose a protracted freeze instead of a temporary suspension it would be a serious blow to western reclamation and a great disappointment to the plans of reclamationists.

That is why the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation immediately appealed the limitations on reclamation and made our case strong. The President has referred the reconsideration to the Bureau of the Budget. We have pleaded the case with fervor. Today we await the decision.

Involved in this decision are many questions of national economics, fiscal policy, and procedure, all of which are being discussed. This is no place for me to repeat the case, but I want to correct, through you, some popular misconceptions of the discussion that I have seen in print.

Of course, Reclamation does not compete with industry for the general field of irrigation endeavor, for business is not generally interested in building irrigation systems today. Also, there is little competition between reclamation construction and the other more common forms of construction requiring those building materials that are in short supply.

Reclamation is primarily an earth-moving and concreting operation. Naturally, there is no shortage of earth to be moved and, believe it or not, there remain some cement mills in this country not operating at full capacity. The area of overlap with other building in competition for short-supply materials is a narrow, changing area of less than 3 percent of the materials reclamation needs, in which the principal item is lumber, largely used in forms. By the priority system, housing construction has first call on lumber under any circumstances. Reclamation takes second place. Reclamation cannot compete there.

Another fact I wish to bear down on is that reclamation housing should not be considered competition with veterans' housing. That is because reclamation housing itself is a true form of veterans' housing, and nobody can compete with himself. Dwellers in any reclamation housing—be it temporary, prefabricated, or permanent; be it in construction camps, for maintenance people on operating projects, or for settlers on new farms—are nearly 100 percent veterans. Ex-servicemen, by Bureau desire and policy, as well as by law, get preference on the reclamation jobs in construction, maintenance, and settlement. So, reclamation is not only veterans' housing, entitled to the privileges this country grants those worthy servicemen; it is also veterans' jobs through the employment it gives veterans during the construction period, plus veterans' settlement when water comes to the land giving, with priority, ex-servicemen an opportunity to establish themselves in a firm and staple civilian economy.

You, gentlemen, have established the fact that reclamation is no part of any general grab-bag of Federal public works. In the first place, no reclamation projects have been presented to the Congress for approval since long before the war on the ground that they are needed for employment purposes. All the pending reclamation projects that Congress has approved won their clearance on the straight ground that they represented needed natural-resources development.

Reclamation development, in addition, is the one type of Federal public works which must pay for itself in hard cash. It is time we see to it that reclamation is segregated from other categories of works and is accorded its proper preferred position as a unique Federal regenerative activity. It is dynamic in its effects on industry and business throughout the Nation and a prerequisite if the United States is going to clothe, feed, and maintain its steadily increasing population up to American standards. It is time we see to it that the whole Nation knows that reclamation is no newfangled type of get-rich-quick western promotion. One-fourth of the world's population now is fed and clothed by the irrigated land on which it lives. This has been developing for 6,000 years. How long does it take some people to learn?

United States money put into reclamation is not money just spent. It is a conservative form of investment. I am a pretty conservative citizen. I am just selfish enough to want my money well and wisely invested and I don't know any form of Federal spending that approaches in secure fundamental values the irrigation water and power works of the West.

There are many other matters on which I could elaborate, but I will only tick off a few of them at this time.

First, the Bureau of Reclamation's traditional policy of recognizing States' and local laws and rights still holds. Despite a welter of oratory for convenient purposes on diverse occasions, the proof that that policy prevails is its practice day in and day out. I propose no change.

Second, the irrigator's greatest service to reclamation is to figure how he can live up

to his contractual obligations and not to figure how to get out of them. Most irrigators do honor their contracts, and that is well. The Congress has told me plainly that when they don't, Federal aid to irrigation stops.

Third, construction costs have soared, and new water is going to cost you more in dollars. That means repayment estimates are also up over initial estimates figured before the war on many projects engineered then and being built now. Likewise, the benefits reaped are more in dollars. I honor such irrigation groups as those on the Frenchman-Cambridge project, right here in Nebraska, or the Provo River project, in Utah, who met this situation fairly and squarely by advising the Secretary of the Interior that their repayable obligation can be increased 50 percent.

Fourth, in these days of almost instantaneous repercussions of a complex economy, it is an absolute prerequisite of successful natural-resource development that the several Federal agencies dovetail and integrate their plans in their various fields and with local and State agencies. To that end, the Bureau of Reclamation will work closely with the able Army Engineer Corps and others through the interagency committees and other coordinating groups.

Fifth, and finally, irrigation of arid lands always has been, is, and will remain the primary purpose of the Bureau of Reclamation. Other multiple purposes, including power generation, are secondary but, nevertheless, vital and essential. Power has become the paying partner in most present and future reclamation works that makes them financially feasible. Don't be fooled on this. It has to be low-cost power or the irrigationist loses—loses not only as a big power purchaser and consumer but also as a water user. Run up your reclamation power rates and we no longer command and create the wide power markets that produce the revenues required to aid irrigation. Lose those broad low-cost power markets and most of your present reclamation construction and even more of your future jobs go out the window under existing law as financially infeasible. This is the third time I have so reported at these annual meetings. I will keep on repeating it as long as necessary and as long as it is true.

These observations bring me to the chief subject of my report, which is to invite your attention to the present status of the Federal reclamation laws. They have been, in my opinion, splendid laws which have, for the past 44 years, served us well. They undoubtedly will receive some overhauling in the coming session of Congress. You and the Bureau of Reclamation want that overhauling to be one that forwards the cause of reclamation in the West.

In 1902, when the basic reclamation law was written by leaders of the West under Theodore Roosevelt, it was a liberal law conceived chiefly for single-purpose local irrigation projects. It remains the basic law today. But the world does move. What was so forward-looking that it was almost revolutionary in 1902 has, in some aspects, become so static that it is perhaps reactionary in 1946. And a law which served well to aid the easy and simple local single-purpose project, now all built, is not a modern instrument of legislation for today's and tomorrow's complex multiple-purpose projects which must be conceived and executed on a valley- or basin-wide scale to meet, as they must meet, the demands of your States. Reclamation's famed engineers can only function within the area permitted them by the laws that set their tasks.

Thomas Jefferson, who looked forward and not backward, died too soon to be with us today. But he gave us a philosophy that laws must change with the times that meets our situation verbatim this afternoon.

"I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws," wrote Jefferson. "But I know that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times."

Reclamation here today is an institution that also does not advocate abandoning any of the time-tested and sound fundamentals of reclamation law, including the tenet that those benefited should contribute to the expense in accordance with their rewards and their ability to pay. But we have a strong case to present to the Congress next year for a change with the times.

Today, as our country fills up, there is increasing and undeniable interest in the development of our recreation and fish and wildlife resources. This growing demand should not be contested but should be well served at future multiple-purpose reclamation reservoirs. They offer this opportunity without detriment to irrigation. So, during the last days of the Seventy-ninth Congress we obtained a new law (Public Law 732) worthy of your attention, which authorized allocations on a basis that the irrigator need not repay that part of the cost of our reclamation projects that can properly be allocated to benefits to fish and wildlife.

We have already had this success on the legislative program that I outlined to you last year in Denver. Why now should the reclamation laws not be amended in the same way with respect to purely recreational features of a reservoir so that these benefits are achieved without saddling the expense of the vacationist or the nature lover at reclamation reservoirs on the local water users—as required by the present law? The answer, of course, is that such action is due. The Bureau of the Budget and the President have already approved a proposal by Reclamation to have recreation benefits allocated as nonreimbursable national benefits, thus lifting this fiscal burden from the backs of the irrigationists. With proper attention of the Western States, this proposal, already approved as to language, will pass Congress and become law. But the modernization of the reclamation laws should not stop there.

Why, for an example of inconsistency, should the United States charge western power users 3 percent interest for investments in developing the power of rivers right in our country here while the same United States lends billions of dollars at less than 2 percent interest to countries all over the world for the same and other purposes thousands of miles from our homes? I am satisfied that our reclamation power interest rate should be lowered to at least 2 percent. We are discriminating against ourselves and must continue to do so under the present laws until you change them.

Why should we insist, as the law now does, that water users return all allotted costs of construction in 40 to 50 years for dams, reservoirs and canals with a proven useful life of 100 or 200 or, for all we know, thousands of years? Railroads, power companies, and other public service corporations are set up on a perfectly proper and legal basis that provides financing contemplating repayment only within the useful life of the works built. Of course, they generally never repay their construction investment but merely keep their plant in shape and then refinance and refinance all within the useful life of the works. That is considered sound practice. Why does the great United States, when it undertakes to aid its own citizens develop their own national resources, impose such harsh terms? Reclamation must—until the law is changed. You can speed that change.

Why do we take an astigmatic view of Federal irrigation? Why, when we study its place in our economic picture, do we look through the wrong end of the spyglass? Legislativewise we keep our books on the basis that any balances due on a project—on Boulder Dam or Coulee Dam—are debts. But in balancing the books we seem to be blind to the fact that these and similar capital investments on the other side of the ledger become credits ranking, without challenge, among our most productive national assets.

When irrigation creates from the desert or sagebrush a Phoenix, a Boise, a Scottsbluff, or, specifically, a Yakima—on which an investment of $37,000,000 over a period of years brought back in the single year of 1945 crops worth $78,000,000—are we or are we not broadening the tax base? Is the wealth created at a Yakima taxable or not—and is it taxed?

Why isn't that hard-cash form of Federal tax revenue, resulting directly from Federal irrigation and as nonexistent as water in the desert without irrigation, entered on Uncle Sam's books when Reclamation's account is cast up? Do, or do not, these reclamation communities open new markets to pour revenue into the National Tax Treasury of the United States of America, not to mention the taxed treasuries of the United States Steel Co., the United States Rubber Co., the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the American Tobacco Co., the National Biscuit Co., the National Cash Register Co. (and let's not overlook those distinguished supplemental irrigators, the National Distillers Co.), and all the rest of the star-spangled corporate galaxy that collectively form our economy. Can we afford not to build these reclamation projects and broaden our tax base? Can we halt inflation and balance the Budget without creating this real new wealth? Why don't we recognize these facts in our laws?

For a number of years now, the United States has considered expenditures to control floods—expenditures in the national interest to be paid from the National Treasury and not by the local beneficiaries. Of course, this has naturally lured many localities to disguise irrigation development as flood-control proposals with frequently sad results. But what no one can explain is why in the name of logic, consistency, or wisdom, it is a local reimbursable benefit for which the farmers should pay to aid agriculture by putting water on acres, and at the same time it is not a local but a national and nonreimbursable benefit for which the farmer should not pay to aid agriculture by holding water off acres—frequently the same acres at different seasons.

And, by the same token, will someone please tell us why flood control is, under our laws, a national and nonreimbursable purpose, and silt control, which is vital in the Southwest, is not so considered? They are both tremendously damaging, except that one happens to be a flood of land and the other a flood of water.

Please understand me clearly. I make no criticism of the flood-control laws. But I for one would like to see the same standards applied to wealth-creating irrigation which happens to be what is needed in the dry but fertile West. Perhaps you will put these remarks down to the fact that your reclamation commissioner suffers from a vocational disease that makes him want to see water work so he prefers the positive benefits of full irrigation reservoirs to the negative benefits of empty flood-control reservoirs. But at any rate let us join together and secure rational and reconcilable policies and laws. And, as we undertake that task, please consider where your interest and your people's interest lies.

The last Congress started a reexamination of the reclamation laws. The undertaking will be resumed by the next Congress. Now is the time to liberalize the reclamation laws. Our ability to discharge the tasks we have undertaken in great measure rests on further development of the ever-evolving reclamation laws that are both our legal foun-

dation and our actual ceiling. Give this matter your full attention and wisdom in the coming months so that we may be enabled to go forward undeterred to our mutual goal of putting all the available water in the arid West to useful work.

AMERICAN DOLLARS FIGHT FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Dollars Fight for Peace," written by him and published in the November issue of the American Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOUGHTS FOR OUR TIMES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Thoughts for Our Times," written by him and published in the October 1946 issue of the magazin· Think, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR TAYLOR, OF IDAHO—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD articles by columnists commenting upon the position taken in the Senate by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA RISES TO A NEW DESTINY—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America Rises to a New Destiny," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, before the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Minneapolis, Minn., January 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RED CROSS RECORD—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Red Cross Record," from the Washington Evening Star of January 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JOB AHEAD IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM E. WARNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Job Ahead in the Missouri River Basin," delivered by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Bismarck, N. Dak., Chamber of Commerce, November 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED JEWS IN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of Jewish displaced persons in Europe, delivered by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, October 1, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—EDITORIALS FROM THE BOSTON HERALD AND THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Act, But Study, Too," from the Boston Herald, and one entitled "Approach to Labor Legislation," from the Washington Post both on the subject of labor legislation, which appear in the Appendix.]

APPROACH TO LABOR LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me what I consider to be one of the best editorials I have read in many a day on labor problems; I refer to the editorial which was published in yesterday's Washington Post entitled "Approach to Labor Legislation." I find myself to be completely in agreement with the tenets laid down in the editorial. I had intended to ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, but I understand it has been printed in the Appendix on request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. So, I shall not ask that it be printed twice, but content myself with this statement.

FARM PRACTICES INFLUENCING THE INCIDENCE OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS—ADDRESS BY DR. JAMES ASA SHIELD

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Farm Practices Influencing the Incidence of Multiple Sclerosis," by Dr. James Asa Shield, on November 7, 1946, at the convention of the Southern Medical Association, at Miami, Fla., which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL PACIFIC SALMON FISHERIES COMMISSION—ADDRESS BY A. L. HAGER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by A. L. Hager, chairman, International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, at Hotel Vancouver, Vancouver, British Columbia, November 25, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOW POWER RATES—EDITORIAL FROM SEATTLE (WASH.) STAR

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Region Is Entitled to Its Low Power Rate," published in the Seattle (Wash.) Star, of Wednesday, December 18, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES SENATE—PAPER BY MISS POLLY KURTZ

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper prepared by Miss Polly Kurtz, of Clearfield, Pa., on the subject of the United States Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 46, a resolution continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 46, Calendar 2, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Maine, which is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 46), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941; Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 20, 1943; Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944; and Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to August 23, 1944, and Senate Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the Senator from Utah. To Senate Resolution 46 I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the resolution it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "until December 31, 1947."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I merely want to explain the amendment. It limits the life of the committee, so that it will not be continued or extended through the entire Eightieth Congress, but only until December 31, 1947. This committee undoubtedly has not had time to finish its work. Within the present session of Congress we can reappraise the situation and determine whether the committee should be continued beyond December 31, 1947. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I inquire of the Senator from Illinois if that is the only amendment proposed to be offered to the resolution which is now before the Senate?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I am just informed that there is another amendment to be offered. But I have offered my amendment and ask for its adoption.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendment is debatable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is debatable.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In accordance with discussions had with some members of the Committee on Armed Services I have prepared an amendment which I should like to offer at this time so it will be on the table, if that will be agreeable to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is agreeable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending. There cannot be two amendments pending at the same time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will offer the amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment, as it covers both the matter of time and also the matter of limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Maine offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I withdraw my amendn ent to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his amendment.

The Senator from Maine submits an amendment, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 and 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "defense program): is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided*, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further*, That the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948, at which time all powers and duties conferred upon the committee shall terminate."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not at this time wish to address the Senate in regard to the merits of the amendment just offered by the Senator from Maine or in regard to the merits of the resolution which the amendment would change. I wish to discuss the main point, which is the fundamental consideration in this whole discussion, as to the meaning and intent of Congress when it enacted the reorganization law.

As a member of the Committee on the Organization of Congress and as one who I think understood the purpose of placing a limitation upon select committees, and the reason for it, I was surprised to see the request made for the continuation of certain select committees. I thought, of course, that such a resolution would be referred to one of the standing committees; and if it were reported favorably it would at least have the recommendation of such standing committee before it came to us for consideration.

From a parliamentary standpoint, I feel—although I am not pressing the point—that the submission of Senate Resolution 46 itself might have been questionable, and that probably a point of order could be made. I say that because I feel so keenly on the subject.

One of the reasons why Congress loses control of itself is that it divides itself up into so many activities. I am sure that if Senators will study the past they will conclude that investigations which have been carried on by subcommittees of standing committees have been quite as effective as those conducted by special investigating committees. Such investigations have had the added merit of having passed in review before a standing committee every time a request has been made for renewal of authority or for additional funds. In that way the Senate retains control of the activities of its committees. In no other way can it maintain control, because an investigating committee is a never-ending affair.

There was a time when I argued for continuation of an investigating committee on the score that the committee in being was of great worth to the country. The mere fact that it existed was of great value. The committee was then considering matters which were of vital importance to the whole country, and the committee was used for the purpose of allowing the whole country to have a clearing house of discussion. But even at that time the process of review existed, because the particular committee was a subcommittee, and whenever the subcommittee asked for additional funds or for a continuation of authority, there was a double review by standing committees of the Senate. The request had to be approved by the standing committee of which the subcommittee was a part, and before money could be obtained the request had to be approved not only by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but also by the Senate itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me finish this point. That method seems to those of us who were working on the reorganization to be sufficiently broad and careful and at the same time to permit all that might be desired to be done, leaving complete control with the Senate. That was the fundamental reason for the change.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am not clear whether the Senator is now a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah is not a member of the Committee on Armed Services at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think perhaps the Senator is not aware that this question has been the subject of rather thorough discussion and exploration in the Committee on Armed Services, which is the primary committee having jurisdiction. I am sorry that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is not present in the Chamber at this time. However, it is my understanding that at least a majority of the committee is prepared to approve the resolution with the amendment which I have offered. I can not speak for the minority. I assume that we shall hear from them in due time. So the question has been informally cleared along the lines which I think the Senator so properly suggests.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I was not informed that the resolution had been referred by formal action to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not mean so to indicate. It was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I believe, before the Senate was fully conscious of all the problems which were presented. Following that, I was asked to appear before the Committee on Armed Services, and I have had rather full discussions of the question with members of that committee. So I think I am warranted in saying that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota, speaking for a considerable number of members of the committee, feels that the resolution, as proposed, states the views of those members of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator will agree that my point is still valid, that if upon the submission of the resolution itself it had been referred to the Committee on Armed Services and had been favorably reported by that committee, the committee sought to be authorized would have the standing of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. At least that would be implied. That is the argument which I make.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Utah is saying. He is entirely correct as to the procedure which should be followed. But let me disabuse his mind. It never was intended that the resolutions now being considered should be referred to the respective standing committees. On the contrary, those committees were purposely bypassed; the fact that the subject-matters were appropriate for consideration by the respective standing committees was disregarded, and the resolutions were reported and placed in our hands without hearings. They are the first two resolutions to come before the Senate in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is as I understand the situation. I should like to say in connection with this discussion with the Senator from Maine and the Senator from New Hampshire that the committee which became the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program had its origin in the Committee on Military Affairs. The question was considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and when the resolution was first reported it was with the understanding that the investigating committee would be a subcommittee of the Committee on

Military Affairs. Afterward, as a result of formal action by the Senate, it became a special committee. That was after the resolution had been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and after it had been considered by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I wish to confine my remarks to a limited field, in an attempt to show what our committee had in mind, I shall try to confine myself to my notes.

I listened with absorbing interest to the debate last Friday and the following Monday on Senate Resolutions 20 and 46, one providing for the appointment of a special committee to study the problems of small business and the other proposing to continue the authority for the investigation of the national defense program. These resolutions raise questions of fundamental importance involving efficient legislative procedure and the role of special investigating committees in the legislative process.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that the Senator is now discussing the Small Business Committee. Has the Senator finished his discussion of the war contract problem?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As I stated, I do not intend to discuss the merits of either of the resolutions. I merely wish to discuss the question of select committees and the procedure which should be followed, as well as what was attempted to be accomplished by the Reorganization Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to refer specifically and in some detail to the original resolutions, and I thought it might be proper to ask a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I did not mention the original resolution with respect to the Small Business Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was speaking of the original resolution in connection with the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, was he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall withhold the interruption until later.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to discuss these questions on the high ground of the basic principles of good legislative organization and administration, without reference to personal ambitions or partisan advantage.

In discussing these important questions I can claim to speak with some knowledge and objectivity. Before coming to the Senate I had been for many years a teacher of government at my State university. Later I served as vice president of the American Political Science Association—the professional association of the teachers and practitioners of political science in the United States I was associated with the committee on Congress of that association which made a long, impartial survey of the machinery and methods of our national legislature. I had the honor of being a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which made a prolonged, careful, and intensive study of legislative organization and operation, and which produced the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. President, I must have deemed this question quite important, because this is the first time in my life I ever made an introduction of my own activities in quite that way. Probably I was not conscious of it when it was done, but I am conscious now that I have done something which I have never done before.

Speaking both as a close student of representative government and as an experienced practitioner of the political art, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and especially newcomers to the Senate, to consider the issue before us with open minds and with a view to the long-run welfare and repute of the United States Senate.

BACKGROUND OF REORGANIZATION ACT

The older Members of this body well know the circumstances that led to the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act last July, but the recently elected Senators may not be equally familiar with them. The executive branch of our National Government had been somewhat reorganized in the late 1930's to carry the burden of increased domestic activity. But since 1921 Congress had made no reorganization or improvement of its facilities and procedures even to meet the rising burden of its peacetime business. Recurring national crises, induced by two world wars and a great depression, had called forth strong popular leader Presidents, accelerating the trend toward Presidential government and threatening to convert Congress into a mere ceremonial appendix to bureaucracy. While the onward sweep of science and technology and the mammoth wartime mobilization of our human and industrial resources were raising the Nation to new pinnacles of power in world affairs, Congress still was working with the tools and techniques inherited from the wig and snuff-box era. And when, after the Second World War, the administration sought to streamline its sprawling agencies, many legislators seemed content to carry on with our antiquated stagecoach equipment.

Mr. President, that is not meant as an attack on Congress. It is not even meant as an attack on what we have done, because, thank goodness, Congress has held its power in our country and the Congress has never lost its head. But with the development of our country administrative and executive activities were so greatly multiplied that Congress was not able to keep up with the growth of our executive and administrative agencies. Those are facts which everyone realized. That condition came about quite naturally. It did not come about by design, it came about as a result of circumstances, and probably will come about again if we have to pass through the same sort of conditions.

Mr. President, I cannot repeat too often the statement that under the Constitution of the United States Congress is the policy-forming branch of the Government; and having that power and that right, if Congress at any time finds itself working at disadvantage with the administrative or executive branches, then the very intent of the fathers of our Constitution becomes frustrated.

Mr. President, those are facts of history. We know that the Congress is not the body to execute, it is not the body to administer; but it is the body to direct. By resort to the expedient of special committees, Congress to a great extent actually loses control because of the independent way in which investigating committees set about and carry on their work without review by a standing committee of the Senate.

That is the history of many investigations. They started out to look into particular facts in a very narrow field. One thing after another comes up, and before we realize it they are not only covering the whole country geographically but, as a result of the war activities, the committee having to do with the investigation of the national defense program found itself compelled practically to extend its investigation all over the world.

As an illustration of how special committees evolve, I cite the way this particular committee has grown and developed, and how the original intent was lost sight of almost completely as a result of such growth and development. I cannot speak with certainty, because I have not studied all aspects of the question, but I know that originally the committee was thought of at least as combining Army and Navy activities, and therefore it was made up of members who were interested in those branches of our Government. As time went on, however, others were added to the committee until, as I remember, reports were made to the Senate from that committee by Senators who were not members of either of the armed-service committees. In no time Senators taking new assignments on that committee found themselves in fields which were never anticipated. That is the reason why the Senate should retain control, as I have suggested.

Alarmed by the growing imbalance between the legislative and executive branches of the National Government, and warned as well by the fate of parliaments in the totalitarian countries of Europe, the protagonists of efficient representative government in Congress itself began to consider ways and means for strengthening the legislative branch. Firm in the faith that legislative assemblies are the first defense of democracy, they launched a series of independent surveys into the causes of congressional decline and possible remedies.

Mr. President, we had seen what had taken place in other nations of the world. We saw what was taking place in this country. A deliberative body made up of representatives of the people has always been, since that technique of government was thought of, the first objective of public concern, and therefore in all governments it becomes the first objective of ridicule, if ridicule is in order, and it becomes the first objective of those who would wish to change the form of government or weaken the idea of popular sovereignty. These things actually

threaten here, as they have threatened in other countries, where changes have actually occurred. I remember well the first visit I made to the old Austro-Hungarian Parliament and the impressions I received and the confusion which existed there. That was an international parliament, without the control which now prevails in international meetings, for there were no formal translations, no formal order; but on the floor of that parliament there was the opportunity to use several official languages. To all who from the gallery viewed the proceedings of that parliament, there seemed to be utter confusion.

Then, too, Mr. President, I remember Hitler's description of that parliament because he, as a young man, saw the same parliament at about the same time, I imagine, that I did. As a result of the apparent disorder which he saw in that parliamentary body, Hitler condemned the whole parliamentary system, thereby condemning democracy and condemning representative government.

In this country many of our citizens receive impressions of confusion with respect to our own legislative bodies. Many of our people do not understand the committee system of parliamentary bodies. They do not understand that in every branch of government, including the Senate and the House of Representatives there are certain officials who keep track of things. Many of our people do not understand that the proceedings in our parliamentary bodies are actually very orderly and efficient, even though sometimes, as viewed from the galleries, they do not seem to be overly orderly, and they are criticized. Such criticism leads to other criticisms, until the whole legislative process or the representative system is pointed out as not doing its part. Legislators must live in gold-fish bowls. The sessions must be in public, if popular sovereignty is to prevail. These are the risks which any democracy runs, and these are the risks to which our Congress is exposed at all times.

All of us know the results. Where was the interest? Who was talked about? Was notice given in the public press which is supposed to be the guardian of popular sovereignty? Under the old scheme of things the public press was spoken of as the fourth estate, which I think it is, and which I hope it will always be—the information bureau for the people, to inform the people regarding what the people's agents are doing. It is unfortunate when administrative and executive agencies of a democratic government become so active and so attractive—the prima donnas of government, so to speak, and I use the word advisedly—that interested persons look only to them and not to legislative bodies. If we review what has taken place in the past 10 or 11 years in our country, we find that the praise, the eulogies, the pomp, if we wish to call it that, and the splendor, which should never be mentioned in a democracy, have chiefly been given to or associated with the administrative branch of government. Under such circumstances democracy can always be in danger and throughout the history of the world democracies have been assumed to be the least stable of all governments. On the contrary, democratic institutions have been very stable.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know that I have been able to understand fully the implications of all the Senator's remarks, but I am sure he did not intend in any way to imply that the gentleman who for 4 years served as chairman of the particular committee under discussion and is now President of the United States, was a prima donna.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has completely misunderstood what I said. I was speaking only of the administrative branch of the Government; and under the logic of my remarks, the only time the former chairman of that committee has had a chance to be a prima donna has been since he has moved into the White House.

Mr. President, as I said a few moments ago, firm in the faith that legislative assemblies are the first defense of democracy, the protagonists of efficient representative government launched a series of independent surveys into the causes of congressional decline and possible remedies. These surveys, including that conducted by our own joint committee, reached substantially the same conclusions as to the defects of our legislative structure and operation and as to the appropriate correctives. It was generally agreed that Congress was neither organized nor equipped to perform adequately its main, modern functions of determining policy, supervising the administration, controlling Federal expenditures, and representing the people.

Devised to handle the simpler tasks of an earlier day, our legislative procedures and machinery were by common consent no longer competent to cope satisfactorily with the grave and complex problems of the postwar world. They would have to be modernized if we were to avoid an imminent breakdown of the legislative branch of the National Government.

Mr. President, one of the greatest compliments paid to American democracy in a long time has been the respect of our leaders, and especially the Republican leaders, since now they are in control in the Congress, for the reorganization scheme and law as passed by Congress. All during the past summer there were predictions that Congress would pay no attention to this law, that especially the committee in which I was so interested, the committee studying the proposed unification of the armed services, would be ignored, and that the recommendations of that committee would not be carried out. However, we find that the leaders in both Houses of Congress have stood by the law, have respected it, and are respecting it.

Recognizing alike its own serious deficiencies and the rising popular demand for positive reforms, Congress created, 2 years ago, a joint committee to study its internal organization and operation. The committee took its assignment most seriously, in fact, Mr. President, at one time I felt that the committee, of which I was a member, was taking its assignment too seriously, especially when it invited every Member of the Congress of the United States to come before it and testify. In other words, we extended the invitation to testify to everyone who had a vital interest in the reorganization of Congress. When we did that, I thought we not only had on our hands a 2-year job, but a 5-year or perhaps a 10-year job. However, it did not turn out that way. It turned out that practically every suggestion was worth while, was seriously offered, was worthy of attention, and it received attention by the committee. Probably seldom are there open hearings in which the interest is so keen and in which the motives of all the witnesses are so clear and so splendid. That, Mr. President, is a compliment to the Congress of the United States.

Our committee took its assignment most seriously, as I have said. It made a full and complete study of every aspect of the legislative process. The committee held 39 hearings and many executive sessions. We heard the testimony of more than 100 witnesses, including distinguished political scientists, public-spirited citizens, and spokesmen for civic and professional organizations. Forty-five Members of Congress testified in person and many others submitted written statements and suggestions. One of those who appeared was Robert Heller, well-known efficiency engineer of Cleveland, Ohio, chairman of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress and author of an objective study of the whole subject.

Our committee shared the widespread congressional and public belief that a grave constitutional crisis existed in which the fate of representative government itself was at stake.

Mr. President, I think that is not an overstatement, as will appear if we go into the details of the acts which we ourselves have passed in attempting to correct what had become an evil. The present acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], was author of a resolution wherein the practice of borrowing experts from the administrative branch of our Government was condemned, and it went so far as to require that a report be made to the Secretary showing the experts so borrowed. We found at one time in the Senate—and I think it was the Senator from Nebraska who pointed it out; it would have been consistent for him to do that—that the Presiding Officer had to order the floor of the Senate cleared of persons who were not entitled to be on the floor, who were not connected with the legislative branch, who had been borrowed from administrative activities, and were working here with Senate committees. I think it is not an overstatement for me to say that matters had gotten into such shape that reorganization was necessary, and that it should have been carried out.

The Joint Committee on Organization carefully studied the testimony we had received and deliberated upon our rec-

ommendations for many months. Finally, last March, we submitted to Congress a 35-page report—unanimous save for minor reservations—to which we all contributed our best thought and judgment. This report was not the work of any one or two members of the joint committee. Rather, it was a cooperative undertaking and joint product of the 12 Senators and Representatives who composed the joint committee.

Mr. President, as this statement deals with history, I think it should be pointed out that Senator La Follette was not our first chairman. Our first chairman was Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, who died soon after becoming chairman.

Something rather significant, and what was in harmony with what our committee is trying to do, happened. It is not often that the representative of the minority in the Senate and in the House is made chairman of a joint committee. Senator La Follette, however, was almost unanimously chosen—his choice was unanimous when it came to formal action. Other names had been suggested for the chairmanship, following the old rule of observing seniority. But Senator La Follette was made chairman of the joint committee, and he submitted the report of the committee as a Senator of the United States, not in any sense as a representative of the minority side of the Senate or any partisan group.

In our meetings there was never any mention of partisan advantage one way or the other, and anyone who will study the committee report and study the law which was passed will discover that nonpartisanship, so far as expert advice and the whole field covered by the original report was concerned, was observed, and everything was done on the basis of merit, and not on the basis of politics. In setting up the machinery for a permanent structure there must be fairness on each side, and not a seizing of advantage, or we may undo much of what has been done.

ADOPTION OF THE REFORM PROGRAM

On May 13, 1946, Senator La Follette, chairman of the joint committee, introduced the legislative reorganization bill in the Senate, which passed the measure, after 5 days' debate, on June 10, by a vote of 49 to 16. The only noteworthy provision of the bill which the Senate failed to approve was that for the creation of a personnel director, who would have had the task of coordinating the scattered internal housekeeping services of the Congress, and of recommending a modern system of personnel administration for its employees. This provision was denounced as setting up a "superlord over the Senate," by half a dozen Senators who, had they foreseen the approaching change in party control of this body, might have supported this barrier to the patronage system as a protection against the recent dismissal of their qualified appointees.

During the Senate debate on the bill, a few Senators, including Senator MEAD and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] questioned the desirability of section 126 which imposed a ban on the future establishment of special or select committees. But their doubts on this score appeared to be set at rest by Senator La Follette's assurance, first, that the jurisdiction of the reorganized standing committees had been so comprehensively described in the bill as to cover every conceivable subject of legislative concern; and, second, by his reminder that the Senate can always expand the jurisdiction of a standing committee to embrace some unanticipated problem, or suspend its rules by a two-thirds vote and establish a special committee to deal with a novel subject.

With this assurance, opposition to this provision evaporated and the Senate approved of the entire measure by a 3-to-1 vote. As the reorganization bill passed the Senate only 7 months ago, it contained this language:

SEC. 126. No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

HOUSE ACTION ON THE BILL

After the reform bill passed the Senate last June almost intact, except for the decapitation of the personnel "director-generalissimo," as one Senator described him, it was messaged to the House of Representatives where for 6 weeks it rested quietly on the Speaker's table, while the House managers of the measure negotiated with the House leadership over the conditions of its admission to the floor of the House. The upshot of these protracted negotiations was the deletion from the bill the Senate had approved of a group of provisions designed to bring about a better meshing of our governmental gears. Closer liaison between the Senate and the House of Representatives by means of joint hearings of their parallel committees on matters of mutual interest; coordination between the standing committees of each House, and over-all planning of the legislative program by means of policy committees; and better teamwork between Congress and the President via a joint legislative-executive council, were among the major items in the price that had to be paid before our bill received a green light to the House floor. Those who are familiar with the need for these improvements in our governmental machinery will appreciate how heavy a price it was. As one of the authors of these important provisions, I sincerely hope that the new leadership of Congress, who are responsible for keeping the means and ends of American government in balance, will take steps at an early date to strengthen Congress by restoring these stricken provisions.

The point there is that the Senate did pass upon that provision.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator just stated that when section 126 was up for consideration in the Senate Chamber the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the then Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, debated quite strongly the issue as to whether we should continue special committees. In connection with the history which is now being given, I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that back in the early stages of the consideration of the joint committee the House Members raised the point that because their standing committees did not have the subpena power they desired that there be contained in the act provision for the right of the House to create special committees. It seems to me that somewhere I got that impression, either from the report or from talking with Senators relative to special committees.

I am asking the Senator if he recalls whether it is not true that, either under the leadership of the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, or under the leadership of Senator La Follette, the House never did intend to write into the act section 126, because the standing committees of the House did not have the subpena power, and that the only time they wanted to give that power, as I understood then and understand now, was in the creation of special committees under resolutions providing for such power. Does the distinguished Senator remember anything about that discussion?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I cannot answer the question with definiteness, Mr. President, but I have heard words like that somewhere.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems that in referring to the history of the Reorganization Act and the debate on it in the Senate and in the House that point is left out. I think it is very important. Within the past 24 hours I talked with a distinguished Member of the House, who is now a member of the minority party, who told me that the House did not intend to surrender the right to create special committees. That was because of a situation which developed when years ago too many fishing trips were taken by a standing committee which had the power of subpena. It caused difficulty, and Members of the House thought the thing to do was by resolution to grant the subpena power to special committees when it was asked for in particular instances. I am sure that somewhere along the line I have heard that in the early hearings of the joint committee that had this under consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Nebraska if it is not a fact that under the Reorganization Act, as the committees have now been set up, the standing committees have the subpena power?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore the argument that it is necessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpena witnesses may be conferred is not sound, since such authority has now been given to the standing committees. That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to break into the statement of the Senator from Utah giving what appears to be a chronological history of the Reorganization Act which ought to go in the RECORD. So if it is agreeable to the Senator from Maryland this colloquy may appear following the speech of the Senator from Utah.

I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Utah, however, in answer to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the very reason the House eliminated section 126 was that, in accordance with the history and traditions of the House, they wanted to grant the subpena power only when they set up a special committee. For that reason they opposed section 126, and deleted it from the bill. In the conference, that was the reason they assigned for deleting it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to prolong this interlude, but I should like to point out that we are not dealing with a House resolution here, we are dealing with a Senate resolution. I should like further to point out that former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, in the closing days of the session, did not want to accept the House proposal, but was forced to do so in the spirit of expediency and compromise, because of the approaching end of the life of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the question again comes down to this—and I shall not now argue it—that there is absolutely nothing, in fact almost minus nothing, if that is possible, which a special committee purports to do that the standing committees are not authorized to do, equipped to do, and can do a great deal better than the special committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator so far as the Senate is concerned, but that was not the point I raised. As a matter of information, I asked whether the Senator could advise us as to the situation in the House, which is where the difficulty arose.

There is no dispute over what the Senate did, but the law which was passed did not contain the provision outlawing special committees. It is my opinion, as I think the distinguished Senator from Utah will agree as he reviews the history of what happened in the joint committee, that the main reason the House did not go along with that provision was the mechanical reason I have given relative to the procedure of standing committees. The practice which is still in vogue in the House is to create special committees, cutting across the standing committees, to give such special committees the subpena power, and not to give it to the standing committees. It is not now given by the House to standing committees.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think no one need recall anything from memory; I think the record itself shows that both what the Senator from Maryland has said, as well as what the Senator from Nebraska has said, is thoroughly consistent with the facts as to the way in which the two Houses acted.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The fact that the subpena power is given to the Senate standing committees merely proves that in our minds we were thinking of making the standing committees powerful and enabling them to go into any field that might be desirable. One of the sections that was eliminated from the reorganization bill while it lay on the Speaker's table in the other House was section 126, which banned special committees. What the motives of the House leaders were in thus emasculating or denuding the Senate-approved bill in such a fashion I have no idea, but the effect of their action was to deny the membership of the entire House of Representatives an opportunity to express their will with respect to the proposed ban, as well as with respect to other stricken sections.

Therefore it was not the House of Representatives but a few leaders thereof who are responsible for the amputation of the reform bill and for the deletion of the ban on special investigating committees.

Thus amended, the reorganization measure came back to the Senate on July 26 for our consideration. The Senate sponsors of the bill were anxious to restore, as affecting the Senate at least, the provisions which had been stricken on the House side, including the ban on special committees, but it was too late in the session to risk sending the bill to conference. Members of the House were leaving town in large numbers, and there was grave danger that the conference report would fail of acceptance in the other body because of the absence of a quorum.

In order to salvage what was left of the original bill, former Senator La Follette moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments, and the Senate so concurred, but in so moving and acting neither former Senator La Follette nor the other Senate members of the joint committee, nor the Senate itself, yielded their original conviction as to the desirability of prohibiting the establishment of special committees in the future.

It is an erroneous interpretation of what happened on that occasion to say that in the Legislative Reorganization Act Congress expressly refused to abolish special committees. We yielded to a parliamentary situation. We have not changed our minds.

The passage of the legislative reorganization bill last July met with overwhelming public approval. To veteran correspondents in the press galleries, its passage was a legislative miracle, making Capitol Hill a new "beat" to cover. The press of the Nation hailed the act as a skillful combination of the ideal and the practicable. In signing it President Truman described the law as "one of the most significant advances in the organization of Congress since 1789."

A comparison of the Reform Act with the 37 recommendations of our joint committee shows that 24 of the joint committee's proposals were fully incorporated in the new law, six were partially provided for either in the act itself or in supplemental legislation, and seven failed of enactment. Quantitatively, the act embodies 80 percent of the original recommendations of the joint committee. Of the seven omitted recommendations, three were of major importance, in my opinion:

First. That for a joint legislative-executive council.

Second. That for a director of congressional personnel, and

Third. The recommended ban on special committees.

WHY SPECIAL COMMITTEES SHOULD BE BANNED

On grounds of principle and legislative efficiency, there are several reasons why I think that special committees should be discontinued. In his remarks on this subject in the Senate last Monday, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] summed up the arguments succinctly. I think so much of those arguments, which are short, that I shall read them to the Senate, so the Senate may again have the benefit of them, and so as to complete, in this one place, the history of what has taken place in regard to committees. The Senator from Oregon advanced the following reasons why special committees should be banned:

First. The jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to create a special committee is to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee.

Second. The standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpena power for this purpose. Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

Mr. President, I pause in my reading from the Senator from Oregon, to give an illustration. In the midst of the war, after the creation of the Special Committee on Postwar Planning, which was headed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee had worked out what we thought was more or less a model housing bill, but it was untimely because it could not then be effective. The need existed, but the bill was untimely in its execution. As sponsor of the bill I felt it was even wrong to present the bill to the Senate at that time, and I suggested to the Senate that we make an exception to our rules, and that the bill be referred to the Special Committee on Postwar Planning for its consideration, due to the fact that it fitted practically into what were the fundamentals of that committee's activities and also it was in harmony with the theory behind that committee's scope of activities for the postwar period.

I asked that the bill be referred to the Special Committee on Postwar Plan-

ning. The Parliamentarian said it was in order, and the Senate permitted the reference. But in a day or two I was reminded that such action was contrary to the Senate rules. The bill was sent back from the special committee, and of course referred to a standing committee, which was as it should be. The reason why I asked that the bill be referred to the special committee was that if it were practical at that time for the committee to take jurisdiction over it, it would have served a beneficial purpose. But the special committee did not take jurisdiction; probably it could not take jurisdiction.

I mention that case to show that even though it may be thought desirable to refer a bill to a special committee which is engaged in studying the subject matter with which the bill is concerned, it may not be practical so to refer it, because of the question of timing, and that a standing committee probably is much better informed and better able to make recommendations to the Senate respecting the subject matter. Therefore I think standing committees should act upon various measures which may be proposed.

I read further from the statement made by the Senator from Oregon:

Third. The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition, Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

Fourth. Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from downtown departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] will endorse those words uttered by the Senator from Oregon.

Fifth. Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden to, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate.

During the first part of the war much of the press of the country had one standing criticism respecting congressional committees, and editorial after editorial was written on the subject. That criticism was that the Chief of Staff of the Army, the admiral at the head of the Navy, and individuals who had charge of war activities generally, were called to appear before one committee and then called to appear before another committee, and so on. I am very thankful, Mr. President, that Congress has reorganized the committees dealing with the armed services, so that hereafter there will not be the duplication of effort which occurred during the late war and the division which formerly existed in the departments engaged in the field of national defense or "common defense," as it is called in the new law. The heads of the various departments will now appear before one group of Senators and one group of Representatives, and that practice will tend toward the development of expert knowledge among the members of the respective committees.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to call the Senator's attention to what happened during the Seventy-ninth Congress in connection with the matter the Senator is now discussing. During that Congress the Senator from Illinois was chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Special committees had to have their requests for money to carry on investigations approved by my committee. At one time there were three special committees in the Senate investigating surplus property. I was told that in addition there were also committees in the House of Representatives investigating the same subject. No doubt that is true. I am further told that General Gregory appeared one day before a special committee of the Senate and was kept practically all day before that committee giving testimony; that the following day he appeared before another committee of the Senate, giving the same testimony; and the third day he was summoned to the House of Representatives to give the same testimony over there on surplus property. That is an example of what the Senator is talking about—taking the time of important men in the executive branch of the Government of the United States and constantly bringing them before committees to go over the same subject-matter time and time again. If the Reorganization Act functions as the Senate said it should function in the debates we had when we passed the bill, when the time comes for these men from the executive branch of the Government to come to the Hill to testify, they can go before either one full committee or a subcommittee of a full committee. Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Illinois. No one knows better than the former chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate the confusion which resulted because of the various requests for continuation of select committees.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] brings out an additional point on exactly the same subject:

Sixth. Sporadic inquiries by select committees lack continuity and fail to provide the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information gathered. In cases where legislative action is indicated, standing committees find is necessary to do much of the work over again.

Seventh. Special investigations should be conducted by subcommittees of the reorganized standing committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter involved. Thus, for example, inquiries into the condition of small business might well be assigned to a standing subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Eighth. On June 10, 1946, the Senate approved of the ban on special committees by a vote of 49 to 16 in passing the La Follette bill.

Ninth. Modernization of the congressional committee structure, achieved by the Legislative Reorganization Act, was the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. To set up a series of special committees now would be a regressive step that might lead to the ultimate destruction of this fundamental reform.

I think the whole Senate should thank the Senator from Oregon for summing up his reasons as concisely as he has done. Perhaps some of my colleagues may wish that I were as concise. I have already consumed considerable time.

There is one further argument I should like to add to the cogent statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. While some special committees in the past have been "black sheep," some truly progressive committees in recent years have made a major contribution to public understanding of our economic and social problems. I applaud their achievements. But I say that all the advantages which are claimed for the special committee technique can now be enjoyed by our reorganized and newly staffed standing committees and their subcommittees. Armed with the power of subpena and staffed with expert investigators and empowered to keep constant watch over the activities of the executive agencies within their jurisdiction, there is no reason why our great standing committees of the Senate should not serve the Congress and the country as well as certain outstanding special committees have done in the past.

It was a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which conducted the great civil liberties investigation before the war. It was the standing subcommittees on War Mobilization and Reconversion and Surplus Property of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in the Seventy-ninth Congress whose inquiries and reports contributed so much to the intelligent guidance and ventilation of these problems.

I hope that the newly elected Members of the Senate, who have not yet given hostages to fortune, will seriously weigh these arguments.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. During the course of his remarks the Senator from Utah was discussing the work of special committees, and the difficulty of obtaining attendance of committee members during sessions of the Senate. I am reminded that under the new Reorganization Act we have set forth certain rules, regulations, and restrictions, in some instances, upon our regular standing committees, one of which is that they shall not meet during a session of the Senate, unless by special permission. Would such restrictions apply to a special committee, or would it be entirely free from the rules which we have established for the guidance and direction of standing committees?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Under the old rules, special committees should have obtained permission to hold sessions during sessions of the Senate. Under the

new rules I do not believe that that subject is covered, because it was assumed that we would not have special committees. However, the standing committees are not supposed to meet while the Senate is in session, without permission.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of no quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we have before us at the present time for debate the question of the adoption of a resolution to continue the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. The resolution was reported by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. It would extend the authority of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. That committee's authority had been extended to January 29, 1947. The purpose of the resolution is to continue during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress the authority of that special committee.

Earlier today the Senator from Maine had proposed an amendment which would strike out lines 12 and 13 of the original resolution, and would insert in lieu thereof the following: "defense program); is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided,* That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further,* That the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948, at which time all powers and duties conferred upon the committee shall terminate."

Mr. President, during the previous discussion on the subject of the resolution now before the Senate, it has been suggested by some Members of the Senate that the burden of proof is upon those who favor the continuation of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. Since that statement has been made and since the Senate, in order to act with the full facts before it, would be obliged to turn to those who have served on special committees for the information which would constitute proof of the need of the continuance of such committees, I feel impelled to lay before the Senate the facts within my knowledge as to the Special Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and the considerations which, in my judgment, make it imperative in the interest of government by the people that that committee be permitted to complete its work.

Had this challenge to present proof not been made, I would have been reluctant to express myself on this question, because, in a sense, it is my own work, as well as the work of other members of the Truman-Mead committee, which is now subject to attack. But, Mr. President, having been for 4 years a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, and therefore having some special knowledge of the committee, I feel called upon to present the facts which I think are conclusive in demonstrating that this special committee should be continued. I have gladly devoted a great deal of my time to the work of the special committee. I have done so because I considered the committee a valuable instrumentality of the Senate in the effort to make our form of government work.

In my judgment, the question before the Senate today is one of major importance, because it involves the effectiveness of a republic in our modern, complicated society.

The thought I have in mind can be no better expressed than by using the words of the former chairman of the committee, now the President of the United States, with whom I had the privilege of serving, on the occasion of his resignation as chairman of the committee. In this body, on August 7, 1944, President Truman, then Senator Truman, said:

> The work of this committee has demonstrated what can be accomplished through investigation by a committee of the Congress. Our industrial economy has become so complex and the necessary changes so numerous that it is impossible for the Congress in legislating to provide all the safeguards that are necessary for proper administration. If an attempt were made to do so, great delays would ensue, and in many cases the detailed requirements of specific legislation would be harmful rather than beneficial.
>
> For these reasons it is important that Congress not only continue but enlarge its work of investigation. In my opinion, the power of investigation is one of the most important powers of the Congress. The manner in which that power is exercised largely will determine the position and the prestige of the Congress in our future. An informed Congress is a wise Congress, and an uninformed Congress surely will forfeit a large portion of the respect and confidence of the people.
>
> The days when Webster, Clay, and Calhoun personally could familiarize themselves with all the major matters with respect to which they were called upon to legislate are gone forever. No Senator or Congressman, no matter how able or diligent, can hope himself to master all the facts necessary to legislate wisely.
>
> The accomplishments of the Truman committee (and I am referring now to the other members of the committee and its staff rather than just to myself) present an example of the results that can be obtained by making a factual investigation with a good staff. Similar accomplishments can be made by other special committees, and I particularly urge upon the Senate that it be liberal in providing ample funds for the prosecution of proper investigation. The cost of a good investigation is negligible when compared with the results that can be obtained.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wonder why the Senator has changed his mind since we had the debate last summer on this very question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I say to the able Senator from Illinois that I have not changed my mind.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understood the Senator's last statement, it seems to me that he is in favor of any law concerning investigations that will bring forth certain things which he has discussed. If I did not misunderstand what the Senator said, that was the point the able Senator made last summer. I know the Senator from Michigan took part in the debate on the reorganization bill and, at least by implication, supported the bill, including the provision eliminating all special committees and calling for the abolishment of all special committees. That is what the Senator from Michigan did when the bill was before the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall answer that point during the course of my remarks.

What I was doing when I was asked to yield was reading the remarks made by President Truman, then Senator Truman, when he resigned as chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I misunderstood. However, I assume that the Senator from Michigan will adopt those remarks as his own, if he was reading them. But if that now is his position, perhaps I was wrong in interrogating him as I did.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do adopt those remarks; otherwise, I would not have read them into the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I thought. So that brings me back to the same question, namely, if the Senator was so determined last year to eliminate special committees—and he voted to do so, and he played a part in doing so by his vote

here in the Senate—it is difficult for the Senator from Illinois to understand the change of heart and mind, overnight, of the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when the vote on this question is taken, I think it will be interesting for us to bear in mind that on the side of the aisle to which I now point will be found a repudiation of what the President of the United States, then Senator Truman, had in mind when he made to the Senate the statement I have just read.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to have the RECORD show clearly which side of the aisle the Senator referred to in the statement he made just a moment ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had my hand pointed to the minority. I say that in order that the RECORD may be clear.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it will be a sorry day for America when the Senate of the United States curbs or throttles its power to find out about the people's business and renders itself unable to penetrate the shroud of secrecy with which administrative officials are prone to clothe their administrative mistakes and their administration of the people's affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Michigan, as indicated by the last statement, contend that no investigation of the kind and character he is now discussing can be made under the Reorganization Act?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I answer the question by saying that if the Senate undertakes to investigate the entire war effort by the standing committees of the Senate, there will occur exactly what I have said would happen; and I say to the Senator from Illinois that time is of the essence. There were occasions when we were told that because military secrets were involved we could not go into the files and the records of the administration. The time has now arrived when, because of the declaration by the President of the United States that hostilities have ceased, we can for the first time expect to be able to look into the activities of these various agencies.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate today that time is of the essence, because it is a matter of record, and it is known, that files formerly in existence are not now in existence. I say that speed is necessary in this investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this time. I wish to say to the Senate that last year a Member of the present minority, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] proposed to the Senate the creation of a permanent joint investigating committee. That proposal came before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was chairman, and that committee, of which I was a member, voted to report the proposal, because we believed that a permanent joint investigating committee was necessary so that all the committees, the whole Senate, and all the people of the country, could know what had happened with the money which had been appropriated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. One reason why I voted to report the bill was in order that we might have one committee and avoid the creation of many special committees. I will add that in my opinion the Reorganization Act does substantially what we had in mind in reporting that bill by giving to the Committee on Expenditures the power to make investigations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was just coming to that point.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator answer my question, if he will, instead of making a long speech about something else. I should like to have him answer this one question, Whether or not he contends that under the Reorganization Act as passed, which he apparently supported last year, the Committee on Armed Services, headed by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], has less power, ability, and capacity to do as good a job of investigating war profits as the select committee the Senator is now discussing?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall come to that.

Mr. LUCAS. Just come to it now.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am going to answer the question, but not in the language of the Senator from Illinois. I am going to answer in my own language, and say what I believe, and I am going to read from the Reorganization Act to show the facts.

I wish to say that the new Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which committee I am a member, does not have the staff and will be unable to obtain the staff in time, and will be unable to review all the complaints and all the circumstances and read all the testimony the special committee has collected, covering literally thousands of pages. That is why I say it is necessary to continue the special committee. That is an answer to the question.

Mr. President, in the interest of democracy, in the interest of informing our citizens about their own public affairs, in the interest of providing those facts without which intelligent decisions cannot be formed, the crying need of the hour is not to limit but to expand the investigative function of the Congress.

The investigative function of Congress is, in my opinion, one of its most important functions. It is the means whereby legislators may inform themselves on the subject matter concerning which they contemplate legislation. Since Congress is the policy-making branch of our Government, before arriving at a policy it is necessary to obtain the facts and look into all conditions. The investigative power of Congress is of equal importance in examining the manner in which administrative bureaus carry out the duties which have been entrusted to them under the statutes. The investigative power of Congress is the means through which Congress may, if it has the courage to do so, recall unto itself the legislative authority which, in the past decade, it has permitted itself to lose, through the delegation of broad authority to the executive branch of the Government.

Those who now advocate destroying the Truman-Mead committee have resorted to an extremely ingenious strategy. They seek to place those advocating the continuance of the committee in the light of opposing the spirit and purpose of the act reorganizing Congress. I, for one, refuse to be placed in that position. We could tell from the questions of the Senator from Illinois that the very purpose is to draw a red herring across the trail so as to obscure the real issue, and to suggest that Senators who voted for the original reorganization bill, which was not passed by both Houses, but passed alone by the Senate, now want to violate the spirit of the act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is no stronger advocate than I for the modernization of the structure of the Congress. The reorganization bill was altogether too slow in coming. The former majority, now the minority, did not see fit to reorganize the Congress, even though they had complete control of the Congress for many years. But it has been reorganized, though the Reorganization Act, excellent as it is, has not, in my judgment, completely brought the Congress up to date, so that it is fully able to discharge its policy-making functions in our modern complicated economy.

Anyone who has had any experience with such matters must realize that effective investigations require a great deal of work of which the public, or for that matter even members of the Senate who are not directly concerned, have little or no knowledge whatever. For example, the public hearings conducted by our committee on the Garsson case ran from July 1 to July 29, 1946, but the complaint was received by the committee in the late spring of 1945. Between the receipt of the complaint and the holding of the public hearings, there was over a year of intensive work. This was not alone the work of just one investigator, but several investigators of the committee, as well as a force of auditors of the General Accounting Office. There was also considerable work on the part of officials in various

branches of the War Department. Furthermore, the committee held six executive hearings before any public announcement of the investigation was made.

After the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program conducted the hearing and it became public, we now discover in the press that a grand jury has been called by the Department of Justice of the United States to look into these facts.

I say to the Senate that if during the war the Department of Justice had done its full duty the Senate would not now have to investigate the fraud and the corruption that have been going on in the administrative agencies. But, Mr. President, until we pointed out the facts in the Garsson case, the Justice Department saw fit to do nothing about the case. It was only when it became public that they stepped in and laid it before a grand jury.

It is very significant that we now hear this opposition to an investigation. A few days after the election, because of the change in the majority in the Congress of the United States, I felt there would be opposition. We merely want to disclose the facts.

The pattern in the Garsson case is the same as has been used by the Truman-Mead committee during its entire history. It has sought the facts and has dug for the facts through its investigators weeks and months before the public ever hears about it. This is the secret of the success that it has had.

Not only has this preparatory work been responsible for successful investigations, but it has been in the interest of fairness to those against whom complaints have been made to the committee. The Members of this body have no conception of the number of complaints which have been referred to our committee and which, after preliminary investigation, have been rejected as not deserving of public hearings by the committee. The very fact, when announced publicly, that the committee is investigating a certain firm or a certain department is interpreted by the press and the public as indicating that there is something wrong with that firm or that department. The preliminary investigation permits the committee to avoid unjust condemnation in the public eye by assuring itself in advance that the subject warrants thorough public investigation.

The Reorganization Act provides in section 132 as follows:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

Today, almost 2 weeks of the first session of the Eightieth Congress have already passed and we all know that not one of the newly organized 15 committees of the Congress is staffed, provided with funds, and organized so as to proceed at once with investigative work. We all know that it will take some time before that is possible.

I was not a Member of the Senate when the Truman committee was organized. Resolution 71 of the Seventy-seventh Congress was adopted on March 1, 1941. The original members of the committee were appointed on March 8, 1941. Mr. Hugh Fulton was appointed chief counsel of the committee's staff on March 31, 1941. The first public hearing of the committee was held on April 15, 1941, 6 weeks after the committee had been created, and it consisted principally in listening to prepared statements by the Secretary and the Under Secretary of War. The committee's first interim report on aluminum—Report No. 480, part 5, of the Seventy-seventh Congress—was filed on June 26, 1941. The first annual report of the committee was filed on January 15, 1942, 10½ months after the committee was created.

The Reorganization Act was revolutionary. How revolutionary, we will probably learn during the eightieth session of Congress. We are now groping our way. We are at the very beginning of the session. Let us not act hastily and destroy a useful instrument of the Senate before we have provided ourselves, in actuality, with other and better instruments to take its place. No one is more convinced than I that the investigative function should be exercised by the Congress more effectively than it has been done in the past, and I am convinced that many investigations which will be useful to the country can be conducted by the regularly constituted standing committees if only we will provide those committees with adequate investigative staffs and funds. The great bulk of the investigative work in the past has been done by special committees, with an uncertain and tenuous existence, constantly required to seek additional funds from the Senate, and in the past sometimes required to recruit their personnel by borrowing from the Federal agencies, some of which were under investigation. I am also fully aware of the weakness of the special committee unless it is given specific power to recommend legislation, a power which most of them have not had in the past. They have been limited to investigating and reporting.

The argument that the immediate destruction of the Truman-Mead committee is necessary to avoid jurisdictional conflicts with the newly organized committees of the Senate will not bear close scrutiny. There were standing committees under the old structure of the Congress, and the Truman-Mead committee, in its 6 years of existence, did not invade the field of these standing committees nor duplicate their work. On the contrary, Senators, time and again, have complimented the work of the Truman-Mead committee and have praised the useful service it has rendered Senators individually, Senate committees, and the Senate itself in discharging our responsibilities to the people. Not only need there be no conflict in jurisdiction with other committees under the reorganized Congress, but it is precisely when these committees are establishing themselves in the execution of the investigative function on a permanent basis that the Truman-Mead committee can be of greatest assistance in transmitting to these newly organized committees, at their request, the experience, know-how, and investigative techniques which have been gained during the past 6 years. As the staffs of the new committees are assembled and the preliminary investigating work proceeds and the standing committees commence to function in fields where the Truman-Mead committee has hitherto done work, it will be a very simple matter for the Truman-Mead committee to withdraw from those fields and prepare its final report to the Senate.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment proposed by the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is to limit the jurisdiction of the special committee, but to enable it to perform the services which in the opinion of the sponsors of the resolution, and I am sure of all Senators who will vote for it, should be performed. There is a job to be done and it cannot be done by the other committees at the present time.

The work the Truman-Mead committee has done in various fields can be made available to the standing committees interested therein, but this work, representing the investment of substantial funds of the Senate and the time and effort of the staff and the members of the committee, will be wholly lost if the committee is abruptly destroyed.

It seems to me it is incumbent upon those who allege that the work of the Truman-Mead committee will invade the jurisdiction of the standing committees to cite instances in which this has occurred in the past.

During the war, the committee frequently refused to comment upon decisions made by military and naval supply officers or to insist on receiving information labeled secret, on the ground that it did not wish to run any risk, however slight, of interfering with combat operations. The committee simply urged that the agencies themselves reexamine programs which appeared to the committee to be extravagant or unwise and warned that public officials should bear in mind that the day would come when the shroud of secrecy would be removed and the people would demand an accounting. I say to the Senate that that day has arrived, and no time should be lost in removing the shroud of secrecy and telling the people what was done under the circumstances of war.

If the move to destroy this committee is now successful, that accounting may never be had.

When the Senate strikes down its own agency, there will be rejoicing among those who have just cause to fear the spotlight of a senatorial inquiry.

So that the record may be complete, I should like to read to Senators at this point a few of the comments which have been made concerning the work of the Truman-Mead committee by public officials whose work has been the subject of the committee's investigations. I read excerpts from an address by the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, at the American Legion Victory Day observance, Washington, N. C., August 14, 1946. In speaking of the investigation of the Garsson case by the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National De-

fense Program, Under Secretary Royall said:

By its investigation the committee has performed a public service of high order—not only for the country, but also for the War Department.

The committee has rendered a great service to the American people in exposing other conduct, a part of which was at least reprehensible and some of which may well prove to have been criminal. This committee, including all its members and its counsel, has been diligent and determined in its investigation.

The War Department appreciates the evidence which the committee has developed.

I also wish to read excerpts from a statement made on May 9, 1946, by the Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, at a public hearing of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, concerning the diversion and improper procurement of Navy provisions and supplies in the naval ammunition depot, the ship's service store of the submarine base, and the so-called civilian housing area No. 3 at the navy yard, all in or near Pearl Harbor, T. H., as follows:

I would like to begin by saying that I think the services of this committee have been most useful, first in directing attention to the abuses that subsequent investigation developed, and I don't want to unduly compliment the functions of a legislative investigating committee, but I think that, seriously speaking, this whole series of incidents illustrates the proper use of a legislative committee in aiding an executive department to carry out its duties. I say that without any reservations.

Further I read an excerpt from the book The Industry—Ordnance Team, by Lt. Gen. Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr., United States Army Chief of Ordnance 1942–1946, published in 1946. In chapter 1, in speaking of the Ordnance Department's encouragement of investigations of itself by congressional committees, General Campbell says:

One of the most helpful of these committees was the Truman committee, now known as the Mead committee. When a group of the importance and ability of the Truman committee paid Ordnance a visit, we did all that we could to show committee members what they wanted to see—and everything else we thought might be of interest to them.

I wish also to read excerpts from a book written by one who was not connected with the Army or the Navy but was the head of the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson. I read excerpts from his book Arsenal of Democracy (New York, 1946). On page 128 appears the following language:

This was the origin of a long series of encounters between myself and Congress, which I really enjoyed and which, I believe, had a salutary effect on defense and war production activities. Bureaus appointed by the Executive were very lucky to be weighed and assayed by an investigating group as honest, impartial, and objective as Senator Truman's committee. * * *

I always enjoyed tremendously the little brushes which we had with Harry Truman's investigators, who were invariably able men.

And on page 394:

The famous Truman committee likewise had been looking ahead. On March 4, 1944, it issued its third annual report, a piece of work extremely sound, like everything which this committee did.

The Congress voted funds and granted power to the administration to spend billions of dollars of the people's moneys and to risk the lives of our citizens in the war effort. Congress assumed the duty and responsibility to the people to investigate the spending of the funds and the administration of the power and to make certain that mistakes were recognized and corrected as soon as possible and to show that the money was properly spent and every precaution taken for the protection of the lives of our men in the service.

Mr. President, as one of the members of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to say that that committee did not have a sufficient staff, and did not have the time, and could not look into the details of the expenditure of the money which was being asked for during the war, but the committee approved appropriation of money in a lump sum of as much as $8,000,000,000 at one time, because it felt that the Congress of the United States could look into the matter and investigate the expenditure of the funds appropriated, and account to the people of the United States as to what had happened to the money. Are we now to forsake that duty and say to the people, "Oh, yes; we will have no investigation of what was done with those billions of dollars"? Mr. President, I am sure the Congress does not wish to forsake that duty.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at that point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want the Senator from Michigan to know that I do not care how much the Senate investigates the billions of dollars spent during the war so long as the investigation is conducted under the new Reorganization Act. But I should like to ask the Senator this question. If we are to investigate the expenditure of $400,000,000,000, which was spoken of by my colleague the other day, and which is now being spoken of by the Senator from Michigan, I ask the Senator whether he thinks that can be done by January 1, 1948.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer by saying that with the amount of information the special committee has in its hands it can do a reasonably good job unless it is throttled by the various agencies of government that are to be investigated. If we can get the cooperation of the various departments, including the Department of Justice, in my humble opinion this committee will be able to point out what has taken place. At least it can furnish a pattern which will be of great aid in the future if this country ever faces a war such as we have had—God forbid!—but we should not now close the books and say, "We are unable to profit by the experience of the past war."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator expect any objections or intrusions upon the part of the executive agencies, in view of the experiences which he has had on the Truman committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. We have had some rather severe objections. I remember that on two occasions it was necessary to subpena the records of the Attorney General of the United States in order that we might get the facts.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator is talking about the money which has been spent through the War and Navy Departments, he has just finished telling the country about the great things which the Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of War have said about the Truman committee. I am wondering whether, in view of his use of the testimony of those men, he expects any unusual difficulties from the War or Navy Departments?

Mr. FERGUSON. I expect cooperation.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has given us a clear indication that he does not expect it.

Mr. FERGUSON. That may be the opinion of the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator left the innuendo that if we can get cooperation from the executive agencies we can do this job within a reasonable length of time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely answered the question of the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to find out whether the Senator had any unusual difficulties in securing that kind of cooperation when he was a member of the Truman committee, in view of the fact that he had already given the country quotations from the Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of War as to the great things the Truman committee has done.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee has had difficulties. Naturally we expect cooperation in the future. I believe that the departments will probably wish to cooperate in the future, and give the greatest possible aid to the committee. It may be that because of the change in the Congress there will be a change in the administrative agencies.

To do this job, however, the Senate created a special committee to act as guardian of the powers of Congress, equipped it with wide authority to investigate, and ordered it to report currently to the Senate with respect to the administration of the war program. Before the job is done and a report of the findings fully made, it is now proposed that we dissolve the committee. Will anyone seriously argue that the present standing committees which are being formed, and whose staffs are not fully organized, with all the legislative work now before them during the Eightieth Congress, and without the background and the special knowledge of this committee as a result of its 6 years of investigating our war effort, could possibly be as efficient or as effective as the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program? It would require a year of intense study and work by a new standing committee and its staff to read and familiarize themselves with the information and knowledge which members of the staff of

the special committee now have at their fingertips.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Am I to understand from what the Senator from Michigan has said that it is the intention of this committee, if it is reconstituted, to retain the same staff in its entirety?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I could not answer for the committee as a whole. I believe that the committee staff has functioned well. I would assume that the present staff, with some exceptions—probably some additions of more efficient men or women—would do this job. I anticipate no wholesale removal of the staff, because in the past this committee has done a fine job. Until election day there was not a minority report from the committee. There was no minority report from the committee until after November 5, 1946. So the staff, so far as I am concerned, is a nonpartisan, bipartisan staff serving the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that there were no bipartisan decisions until after the election of 1946. That brings to my mind the question upon which there was a division of opinion between Democrats and Republicans on the committee. On that point I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he construes the amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] as giving to the committee the right, for example, if incompetency and inefficiency were found in the construction of an air base at Trinidad, to go to Trinidad to make an examination?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am unable to answer for the committee. I am unable to answer for the chairman of the committee. I am assuming that I shall not be chairman of the committee. I could not answer the question.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me that it is important that we know whether or not under the terms of the resolution the committee is prepared, if it finds extravagance and mismanagement abroad, we will say, in the construction of an Army base in the occupied zone of Germany, to make that kind of an investigation. Would the committee have the power to go abroad to make that type of investigation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer that question, because it has been discussed by the committee with members of the Committee on Armed Services. It is not my idea that the committee plans to leave the United States to go into Germany to do any investigating. That is not to say that I feel that the investigation should not be made. It was voted by the entire committee. But there have been changes, and certain things have happened. There has been an understanding between the Committee on Armed Services and the special committee that from this point on it is not the intention of the special committee to usurp one iota of the power and authority of the Committee on Armed Services. That would include the field of the present occupation of Germany, Japan, or any other place. The Committee on Armed Services will be glad to do its job.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amendment deals with war profiteering. Let me ask the Senator this question: Suppose that the investigators of the special committee were to discover that war profiteering took place in connection with an Army base in the occupied zone. I conceive it to be wholly within the power of the committee, if necessary, to go to the place in question and make an investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. This amendment was drawn as a result of discussions in the Committee on Armed Services. That committee has pointed out the situation to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, and language has been drafted to deal with that question, confining the activities of the special committee within continental United States, and limiting it to transactions occurring prior to June 30, 1946.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand, then, that in due course the Senator will offer an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; in compliance with the suggestion of members of the Committee on Armed Services, in order to accomplish the very thing which the Senator has intelligently suggested.

Mr. LUCAS. In reading the resolution and the amendment to it I cannot understand why, taking either a strict or a liberal interpretation of it, almost anything in any place in the world could not be investigated where fraud, corruption, waste, and extravagance were found.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the discussion with the Committee on Armed Services that point was gone over, and it was exactly as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] says; and we were very happy to follow this language in accordance with their suggestion.

In dealing with the German situation there were two aspects of it. One was the charge of black marketing and other irregularities of the occupation troops. The charges were made by highly responsible officials just back from Germany, which in September the committee unanimously voted to investigate. The other aspect dealt with the occupation policy and the transfer from military to civilian control. That was a dominant factor. It began to present certain problems in foreign relations which gave concern to some of the members of the committee.

There was also a question of the Army situation. Most of the military men, including General Clay, are very much concerned that there should be a transfer to civilian control. The transfer from McNarney to Clay means, I assume, that the military will never be in favor of transfer to civilian control. The only obstacle hitherto had been that Secretary Byrnes declined to take on any more responsibilities of any character in his Department because of the administrative problems involved. It would be my hope and expectation that General Marshall, because of the military concern that the Army might be blamed for economic or social ideological problems, would perhaps feel far more amenable to such a transfer. But whatever may be the view, we are entirely happy to transfer the entire problem to the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to get into any discussion as to our foreign policy. What I am trying to find out is what this resolution means, without going into what General Marshall is going to do or what Mr. Byrnes' policy is. I think I understand now that what the Senator proposes to do is finally to offer an amendment which will confine the investigation to continental United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On that point I assume that what the Senator has reference to is that we will not go into any investigation of the occupation of Germany or Japan or any of the territory acquired during the war. I do not understand that that would exclude the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, because we have a number of investigators there. I do not think it is within the sense of the matter brought up by the Committee on Armed Services that we would be foreclosed from any investigations in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the committee would be entitled to a trip or two. I am not going to be too technical on that point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I understood that there had been a division in committee and that minority views were filed. What was that about?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was on the case of the Senator-elect from Mississippi. That is, the report was not unanimous.

Mr. HATCH. Then there were no minority views filed?

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to correct my statement if I said minority views were filed. There was simply not unanimous agreement to the report.

Mr. HATCH. I thought maybe there was something I did not know about.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it a fact that minority views have never been filed in the committee; but in one instance there was a dissenting vote on a report? Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad that the Senator called that to my attention.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was on the Bilbo case?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Following the question propounded by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I am not quite clear in my own mind as to what the new geographical limitation is going to be. I am thinking about South American matters where

there were some expenditures made. Would they be within the limitations?

Mr. BREWSTER. The only episode in connection with that matter was the Inter-American Highway, and I think that our report on that is ready, so that there is no occasion for further exploration; although I will defer to the Senator from Michigan, who, I think, was chairman of the committee which considered that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should say that if we want to complete that particular report there should be hearings of Mr. McDonald, Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration. That is all I know of at this time. Every member of the committee will remember that there are certain secret agreements which have always been withheld from the committee in relation to certain work in South America and in Central America. As to whether or not the committee might feel that under the terms "corruption," "extravagance," "inefficiency," and so forth, they should look into that, that is a question to be considered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. On that point, unless a limitation is seriously made along the lines which the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has suggested will be made, I do not think it would be possible to construe the language of the resolution limiting investigations of the committee to any place.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that if we should limit the resolution it might have the approval of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator from Maine that in view of my announced position, made long ago, I intend to oppose the creation of any special committees. I do not think an amendment could be offered that would cause me to change my decision. But I think it is important that the Senate know just what functions are to be performed and what functions are possible in the event that this work should be extended. Is it contemplated or is it possible that the committee could go into South American countries and conduct investigations of expenditures made there?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. So far as the South American picture is concerned, I have just returned from a trip there, which was not a junket, but which was paid for in good State-of-Maine money, and I have formed the impression that there are many current problems in South America concerning our defense which are going to occupy the immediate and intimate attention of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is the very type of problem which, in my judgment, we should turn over to those committees. I hope they will give them immediate attention. We will give them the benefit of our files and records in this matter. So much of the problem is concerned with military and commercial policy that it is a subject which in my judgment we should go into a little further.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago the Senator from Maine spoke about an agreement reached with the Committee on Armed Services. Will the Senator explain to the Senate what that agreement is?

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has the language which was discussed with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which committee suggested the interpolation in the amendment after the words "World War II" of these words:

within the Continental United States, prior to June 30, 1946.

The question whether or not that language could be construed to include Hawaii and Alaska, which was suggested by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and which is apparently agreeable to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], is a question on which I should like to receive further comment before the amendment is actually offered, recognizing the suggestion that the territorial limits of the United States might be within the scope of what was contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the able Senator from Maine if he feels that the Committee on Armed Services is incapable of making the kind of investigation which he has reserved for the special committee in his resolution?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not at all incapable. I would say, rather, unprepared, in view of the things essential to this work, including the training, which we found in our own experience was a matter of many months. I think that would be also true when contemplating the problem of securing experts under the reorganized structure, as well as the problems of unification of the services, and universal military service. It seems to me, as I have previously stated to the Senator from Maryland, that our committee might well be considered for continuation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator a question. If the Committee on Armed Services were instructed to undertake the work set forth in the Senator's resolution, would it be feasible and possible to transfer to the Committee on Armed Services the staff to which the Senator has alluded, together with the files and the investigators which the committee already has?

Mr. BREWSTER. The only point is that it would not be possible to transfer the senatorial committee along with them. Although I do not wish to be immodest or to violate a Presidential confidence, nevertheless let me state that when I reported to the President that I had been named to fill, insofar as possible, the shoes which he had occupied, he suggested that we had had a considerable training in that field and should know something of the problems which we would face. So if it is not immodest, I would suggest that that suggestion be taken into account, along with our suggestion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say that I hope the genial Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] will see fit to interrupt these interrogatories at any time he desires to do so, because I do not wish to interfere with the continuity of his remarks.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a further question. He has already made out a very good case, in his colloquy with other Senators here, as to why the functions or the work to be performed by his committee in certain instances, namely, the South American matter to which he has just alluded, should be performed by the Committee on Armed Services. He has already said that he seeks to turn that particular part of the initiatory work of the special committee over to the Committee on Armed Services, as I have understood him. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is not correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator from Maine just said that he did not propose to have the special committee go outside the United States. I thought the Senator just said that there were certain commercial and military matters in South America which he was very glad to turn over to the Committee on Armed Services, and I thought the Senator said he hoped that committee would undertake to work there at an early date. Did I correctly understand him in that connection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Whenever the Senator from Maryland has concluded, I shall be glad to reply.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have concluded now, and I am waiting for the Senator to answer my questions.

Mr. BREWSTER. My position is that although under the scope of this resolution, as the Senator from Maryland has hitherto pointed out, we could practically take in, particularly in view of the basket clause at the end, the entire universe—past, present, and future—we are now undertaking to limit it, as the particular objections which have been made would indicate.

As to the South American matter, let me say that we have not spent any particular amount of time on the broader phases of the inquiry to which the Senator from Maryland has referred. There were some contracts of a rather unusual nature in that South American picture. I think our inquiries with respect to them have not extended over very many hours. The staff has done some work in that connection. We have had one or two executive hearings, but we have not had a public hearing on that subject. It relates to matters which may well invite exploration, which might well be within our scope, but which we have not undertaken to investigate. However, it does involve matters which in my judgment are going to be very much more significant in our current relationships as time goes on, and that is the precise type of

thing as to which I think the more quickly it is turned over to the standing Committee on Armed Services and the standing Committee on Foreign Relations, the better it will be. That is my position.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. With the forbearance of the Senator from Michigan, let me say that the Senator from Maine is using a great many words to say, "Yes; the function should be turned over to the Committee on Armed Services, for the very reason that the Committee on Armed Services must find the remedies which exist."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Maryland is entirely inaccurate in its assumption that the matters to which I refer are ones to which we on the committee have ever given particular attention, or with which our concern is more than, shall I say, 10 percent. The question of whether there were irregularities has never been presented to us. So, regardless of whether the contracts would even come within the scope of the activities and interest of the committee, and the contracts were of a very comprehensive nature, so far as I know there was never a suggestion that they were irregular or improper. However, they could be charged with that, I presume, although they have not been.

So the attempt, with the ingenious and intelligent approach of the Senator from Maryland, to involve this as a precedent which should then be enlarged, with a camel's nose under the tent, to assume all the responsibilities and authority which the committee has exercised, seems to me to be unwarranted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I rose and asked the Senator from Maine the simple question of whether he said that he thought this South American question should be turned over for further exploration to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BREWSTER. But I did not say that it was a matter which we ourselves in any event were going to investigate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Neither did I.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maryland assumed that.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I did not assume it. The Senator's imagination has gotten away from him in the course of his discussion.

Mr. BREWSTER. I followed the remarks of the Senator from Maryland as closely as I could.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from Maine will read the RECORD tomorrow, he will see that there was no allusion to it in my remarks.

Mr. President, let me say that if the Senator from Maine uses the premise that because of the factors involved there, the South American matter should be investigated by the Committee on Armed Services, rather than by the special committee, then by the same logic the Committee on Armed Services should do the same thing in regard to matters here in the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. I suggest that the Senator from Maryland present his arguments to his own committee, the majority of which have approved the continuance of the special committee. The Senator can present his arguments to them, rather than to us.

I think the question of jurisdiction in connection with the proposed continuation is perfectly clear. I can understand the desire of some of those who wish to see this work stopped, but I do not think we are obliged to defer to the alleged logic of the Senator from Maryland on that account.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will further yield to me——

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that by insinuation he has attributed to me and to others on this side of the aisle and to some of those on the other side of the aisle a course of action which is not contemplated by anyone who is opposing this investigation by the special committee, for I myself shall offer a resolution calling for the exact investigation, to be made by a standing committee of this body, which the Senator from Maine seeks to make. Therefore it cannot be said, even by way of insinuation or innuendo, that any of us are opposing this investigation. The resolution will be affirmative, and we shall have the committee whose function and duty it is to make that investigation, make it, for the further reason that when the investigation is concluded, it will be the Committee on Armed Services that will have to write the corrective legislation to prevent the abuses of war profiteering when contracts are let in the future, and at that time the special committee of the Senator from Maine will be out of existence, just as much as last year's bird's nest will be out of use.

Therefore, Mr. President, those who are going to write the legislation of a corrective nature should be the ones to saturate their minds with the facts involved, so that they can act first hand, not second hand, on that matter.

Accordingly, when the Senator from Maine says he has thrown overboard his proposed and rather brief and cursory investigation into the fields in South America, which lasted only a few hours in the committee, and inasmuch as the Senator from Maine seeks to have the Committee on Armed Services handle that matter henceforth, let me inquire what logic there is for not letting the Committee on Armed Services do the whole job, so that the members of that committee can write such legislation as may be necessary as it should be written?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the certain force of the suggestions of the Senator from Maryland. The only thing I suggest is that in the very friendly discussions which we had regarding the limitation of our scope it was not suggested at that time by the Senator from Maryland that in respect to any limitation which we might introduce in the interest of getting a modus vivendi to accomplish this problem he would immediately use any such limitation to which we would agree as a precedent for holding that we had therefore eliminated ourselves from the matter. I regret that the Senator from Maryland departs to that degree from what it seems to me are the amenities of friendly intercourse.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield once more.

Mr. TYDINGS. My frame is shaking with grief and remorse at this affront which has been given to the Senator from Maine. I am standing here almost beside myself, with a feeling that is so terrible in its ramifications that I hardly can find the words to tell the Senator how truly sorry I am.

Let me say that the Senator from Maine just made the statement that a majority of the Committee on Armed Services have agreed with some point of view which he has expressed. The Senator himself well knows there has been no meeting of the Armed Services Committee called for the purpose of agreeing or disagreeing, and whatever was done was ex officio, not binding on the committee, and cannot be cited as committee action, for no Democrat was asked to that meeting. Does the Senator mean to say that the majority have to take this matter behind closed doors and call in only the partisans, and put it up to them, and that the majority is afraid of these outnumbered Democrats who sit on this side of the aisle? I am astounded at the Senator. I thought his courage was at a higher level than that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say that I am glad I did yield the last time, in order that the Senator from Maryland might clear his conscience.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think perhaps the RECORD should be complete. I think when the Senator reads the RECORD tomorrow, as I am sure he will, he will find the only language I used was that the majority of the committee had indicated their concurrence with the solution of this matter. However, I think it should be added also that I appeared at the request of the chairman before the full committee and stated fully my position, and had a most interesting and friendly colloquy with the Senator from Maryland, in which this matter was thoroughly gone over. I do not mean to intimate there were any agreements by the Senator from Maryland, but that he merely suggested—and I think I quote him correctly—if some limitations were introduced it might modify the ardor of his opposition. That was the extent to which he went, and I am still looking forward hopefully.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not desire to trespass further on the patience of the Senator from Michigan——

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I should like to say one word, and then I promise the Senator that, outside of a direct affront, nothing shall pry me from my seat.

I hope that neither the Senator from Maine nor other Senators on his side of the aisle, nor any Senators on this side

will longer make the argument that what some of us are trying to do is to prevent an investigation into war-profits frauds and the matters covered by the resolution, for, as I have told the Senator, there will be offered an affirmative resolution for the performance by a regular committee of the Senate of exactly the work the Senator proposes to have done by the special committee. Therefore, it seems to me, in view of the statement I have made that, whatever has been preconceived, such an argument is not fair, and should not be indulged here, and I hope it will not be in the future.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. For what purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. To ask for a clarification of a portion of the Senator's speech.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator to say that the amendment was so drafted as to limit and confine investigations henceforth to those fields which it was desired to have investigated, and to preclude the special committee from going into other fields. I have understood from the colloquy between the Senators from Maryland and Maine, which has been most interesting, that it has heretofore been orally agreed, as between the proponents of the resolution and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, at least two fields would not be entered by the special investigating committee from now on, namely, questions affecting the armies of occupation, and questions affecting matters of foreign affairs and commercial affairs, looking into the future. My question is, Whether or not there are other limitations, which are understood orally as between the proponents of the resolution and the amendment, and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall have to answer that question by saying that if the Senate of the United States adopts the amendment, the amendment will be the limitation, except as explained here on the floor of the Senate, and there will be no personal, private agreements between any Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask a specific question of the distinguished Senator who has the floor, and whose exposition of this matter I think is so full. I also direct the inquiry to the Senator from Maine, if he cares to answer, because he has participated in the colloquy. My question is whether there are any other verbal understandings regarding this resolution with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; because if there are I think the Senate is entitled to know them.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall answer first, and then ask the Senator from Maine to give his version. I know of no secret agreements, other than what is expressed here in the language.

Mr. HOLLAND. Other than those disclosed by the colloquy?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator refer to the South American matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. The matter having to do with the not entering upon matters concerning the armies of occupation, and not going into questions which have primarily to do with foreign affairs and with commercial interests in the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question of looking into the occupation of Germany was a different question, and is entirely outside the language used in the instrument itself, so I am not including that as a secret agreement. It is outside the language.

Mr. HOLLAND. I might say that, as I understood the Senator from Maine, he agreed that the wording was sufficiently broad to have covered an investigation into matters in Germany, under certain conditions, and that it had been understood verbally between him and the chairman of the standing Committee on Armed Services that there should not be any such interpretation or any such action.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think there is a little confusion, in the first place, about secret agreements. I think that everything that was said on this matter was said by me in the full meeting of the Committee on Armed Services a few days ago. I am not sure whether or not the Senator from Florida was present. Is he a member of that committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not. I may say that the word "secret" was introduced into the discussion by the able Senator from Michigan, not by me. The words I used in the colloquy were the very language used by the Senator from Maine, namely, oral agreements between him and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Florida has misunderstood. I refer to the oral agreements which went on as the discussion proceeded with the chairman of the committee and the full committee. Then, the Senator from Maryland suggested that an amendment be prepared which would represent and embody these discussions. Such an amendment has been prepared, and was submitted to the chairman of the committee, as well as to the Senator from Maryland and others interested, and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], suggested that it did not cover the point to which the Senator refers. So that additional phraseology was prepared, to be presented at whatever should be the appropriate times, as an amendment to the pending amendment, which would cover the point to which the Senator now refers.

The South American matter would simply be incidental to that. I mean, that would come within the scope of the amendment. So that it does not refer to any secret or oral agreements of any character.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator mind stating categorically whether there are any oral agreements other than what have been disclosed on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is understood, so far as I know, that everything that has been said is embodied within the scope of the amendment and the amendment to it which will be presented.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator whether or not he would consider the investigation of housing a proper function of the committee, under the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I did at the time it was suggested, and I do now, but it will not be covered now under what I take the language here to mean.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, the limitation would eliminate such an investigation?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Whatever housing investigation is undertaken will be finished the 30th of this month. I think it had a salutary effect upon the administration of housing, and what has been done up to date has been well worth while. I look at it as important in this respect, that if it had not been done, we probably would not have had regulations now.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator permit a further observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for asking the questions is an effort to ascertain definitely what the resolution would do so far as an over-all investigation is concerned, because I think the Senator knows that once we delegate power to one of these investigating committees they do not pay much attention to what is in the allegations of the resolution. They go far afield many, many times. I have never known of a committee which did not go outside the scope of the allegations contained in the resolution, once it got its foot in the door and started an investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am looking forward to the time when as a Member of the Senate I can pass over to the various standing committees matters which come to my attention that should be investigated, because I think that we all know, based upon very good information, that a great deal of investigative work is to be done, and that all the committees will really be working at "full steam ahead," if they properly conduct the investigations. But I recall that when the Pearl Harbor joint committee had its hearings we ran full head into the famous Wyman case. It was referred to the War Investigating Committee, which took it up and appointed as chairman of the subcommittee the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], but nothing has been done in that famous case. I am hoping that something will be done, and I am waiting for the opportunity to advise the Army of that matter so that they can make an adequate investigation. Such an investigation will lead outside the continental United States.

Mr. President, since last Friday when the opposition to the continuance of the Truman-Mead committee first became apparent, I have sought to find the real reason behind this movement. One is reluctant to come to the conclusion that it proceeds from a fear of what the committee may expose. Of course, the opposition will not agree or admit that

it is based on any such grounds, and the administration would not dare publicly admit that it seeks to dispose of the one instrument which is presently equipped to discover errors, waste, incompetence, and dishonesty in connection with the hundreds of billions of dollars we have spent in the war effort.

Certain powers and privileges granted to this committee are extremely important and a background of knowledge of the whole picture is likewise extremely important to any committee of Congress charged with the responsibility of investigating war profits. Without those powers and privileges, the job of investigating the war profits would be much more difficult and the chances of discovering frauds or abuses would be more remote. We, here in the Senate, can attribute the desire to abolish this committee to the streamlining of Congress, the Reorganization Act, but the people of this country, I fear, will not interpret the desire to destroy the committee as anything other than the desire to keep from the people the truth in regard to the way in which their money has been spent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think a statement ought to be made now, in view of the Senator's interpretation of what he fears may be public sentiment in regard to what we are seeking here. He admits that we are in good faith in our opposition to this proposal on account of the streamlining of Congress under the reorganization bill, but that the public may get a different view of it. That is probably true because of the fact that over the radio certain commentators are charging to this side of the Senate some ulterior motive in that regard, and in one of the regular columns of the newspapers an intimation of that sort has been made. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] a moment ago I think, undoubtedly by some insinuation, left the impression that there might be some reason why someone on this side would oppose any investigation at all. If that is what he had in mind, I wish to call attention to the fact that during the entire progress of the war, when we were in the majority and not in the minority, we proposed every investigation which has been carried on. The original resolution, No. 71, was offered by the then Senator from Missouri, now the President of the United States. It was amended seven or eight times afterward on the motion of Senators on this side who were then of the majority.

All the investigations which have been had, looking into war expenditures or the conduct of the war, or the beginning of the war, or anything connected with it, have been sponsored by Members on this side of the aisle, who were of the majority, and who felt a responsibility for what had been done.

Mr. President, because now we are taking the position that with the reorganization of Congress, we should concentrate in the standing committees all the work that has heretofore been done by special committees, and because we have undertaken to define clearly their jurisdiction, it seems to me it is unjust, unfair, and without foundation even to insinuate or to express the fear that the people may conclude we are not actuated by any worthy motive, but are actuated only by a desire to stop or interfere with an investigation.

I want to say, for myself, and so far as I can speak for this side of the aisle—I cannot undertake to speak for Senators on the other side of the aisle, even though some of them may agree with my position on this particular proposal—that there is now no desire on the part of any Senators in the minority, who have been recently in the majority and have sponsored these investigations, to stop them, to interfere with them, to conceal anything that is valuable to the Congress in enacting legislation, or that is valuable to the American people in determining the merits of service in the Houses of Congress or in the executive branch of the Government.

I hope that we may proceed with this discussion without insinuations of any sort, hinted or otherwise.

I am not charging, and I have not heard of anybody on this side who has charged that this resolution is being sponsored on account of politics or some desire to obtain political advantage, and I think it is equally fair to say that nobody who is opposing it is doing so out of any ulterior motive or out of any fear of anything that may be disclosed by reason of the investigation. Certainly I desire to have brought out every pertinent fact to which the American people are entitled, and to which Congress is entitled, in order to frame appropriate legislation.

I am not now arguing the merits of the resolution—I shall do so a little later—but I wish to say, while I have the floor, that at the beginning of this Congress, when we are starting out to make a record in line with what I have felt was the spirit and the intent of the Reorganization Act, it is proposed to start off on a course of action which will rise up to plague us in the future when we are undertaking to funnel into the standing committees which we have established, and whose jurisdiction we have defined, all the work that ought to be done by Congress, either as a basis for legislation or for the purpose of giving information to the American people.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me for the purpose of making that interjection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to reply briefly to what the Senator from Kentucky has said. If anything which I said intimated any impropriety of motive, I certainly apologize, but I will suggest to the distingushed majority leader that the first two blows below the belt——

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. I thank the Senator for the designation he has just given me. It is as hard for him to become accustomed to my position as it is to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. It will take some time to become accustomed to it. I wish to say to the distinguished minority leader that the first two blows below the belt came from the other side of the aisle, from none other than the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], both of whom intimated what I think was rather clearly impropriety in the motives which were actuating Senators on this side. But I suppose those are matters incidental perhaps to the heat of conflict, and I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will continue to exercise his very excellent control on both sides of the aisle to keep this matter under Marquis of Queensbury rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator, and I shall invite his cooperation in that respect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho, and then I shall refuse to yield further until I have finished, at which time I shall be glad to invite all questions Senators may desire to ask.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to clarify the discussion a little by asking a question of the Senator from Michigan. A moment ago he said the public might receive the wrong impression if the Senate were to vote to abolish the special committee in question. The vote is not to abolish the committee, as I understand; the vote is to reconstitute it and give it some of the functions of a standing committee. Is that really not what the vote to be taken by the Senate will be?

Mr. FERGUSON. The vote will be taken on the proposal for continuation of the committee. The committee will be abolished automatically on the 31st day of this month if the Senate does not vote to continue it. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. President, I think the remarks made by the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] with respect to what the public might think should be answered in this way: I read from a column by David Lawrence. The column is headed "Congress move seen to bar investigations—New Dealers look for way out under Reorganization Act."

The column appeared in the Washington Star of last evening. The article in part is as follows:

> It begins to look as if the New Dealers who spent billions of dollars of public money without an audit of their expenditures and as if the bureaucrats who abused public power are about to escape scrutiny, and perhaps punishment altogether, by the device of banning special congressional investigating committees.
>
> The Republicans will prove themselves poor politicians and will virtually hand over the 1948 election to the Democrats if they go along with the let-bygones-be-bygones spirit which is behind the effort to kill off investigating committees.
>
> The Republican Party won in 1946 because the public at last saw through a decade of New Deal propaganda and finally got the

impact of governmental controls operating at their worst. But the true extent of governmental mismanagement has never been disclosed to the public. It had been believed that in the next 2 years there would be an opportunity to turn the searchlight of publicity on the misdeeds of the last decade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article in full published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MOVE SEEN TO BAR INVESTIGATIONS—NEW DEALERS LOOK FOR WAY OUT UNDER REORGANIZATION ACT

(By David Lawrence)

It begins to look as if the New Dealers who spent billions of dollars of public money without an audit of their expenditures and as if the bureaucrats who abused public power are about to escape scrutiny, and perhaps punishment altogether, by the device of banning special congressional investigating committees.

The Republicans will prove themselves poor politicians and will virtually hand over the 1948 election to the Democrats if they go along with the let-bygones-be-bygones spirit which is behind the effort to kill off investigating committees.

The Republican Party won in 1946 because the public at last saw through a decade of New Deal propaganda and finally got the impact of governmental controls operating at their worst. But the true extent of governmental mismanagement has never been disclosed to the public. It had been believed that in the next 2 years there would be an opportunity to turn the searchlight of publicity on the misdeeds of the last decade.

Now, however, the Democrats see a chance to squelch investigating committees by arguing that the Congressional Reorganization Act was designed to do away with special committees. It is being contended that the regular committees of the Senate, for instance, can do the investigating. This is a fallacy, for the regular committees are much too busy with their regular assignments to do all the investigating necessary to penetrate a complicated field of inquiry, which is usually the reason for a special Senate resolution ordering a special committee to take testimony.

PRECEDENT IS SOUGHT

The issue arises, to be sure, over the continuance of the Truman-Mead committee, but it goes far deeper. For the Senate is being asked to establish a precedent and let all committee investigating be done by regular committees.

The Congressional Reorganization Act will become a mockery if it is constantly interpreted as a device to curtail the rights of the Congress itself. There is nothing sacrosanct about a reorganization bill which is invoked every day as a reason for not doing what the Congress is supposed to do—namely, to protect the people's interests against abuse.

The same persons in Congress—with an exception here and there on both sides of the aisle—who are inveighing against special committees took a sadistic delight in using committee investigation powers to harass their political opponents. Even the income-tax returns of citizens which were supposed to be secret were tossed before investigating committees by the New Deal administration in its ideological combat that precipitated the present wave of class warfare in America.

WAY TO BLOCK ABUSES

It is true that some investigating committees go too far but on the whole they do more good than harm. It is true also that some of the regular committees have succeeded in squelching inquiries and that the only way the House of Representatives, for example, got a chance to investigate the labor situation under the watchful eye of Representative HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, a few years ago was to appoint a special committee. The regular Labor Committee of the House was stacked by the prolabor elements in this country against an inquiry.

It will be easy for the lobbyists to get to some of the regular committee and stack the membership in the future, as in the past, by concentrating against the one or two members who hold the balance of power. When Congress, however, is free to look into any subject at any time with a special committee, the lobbyists have everything to fear and so have the individuals who abuse the power of Government.

While the Congressional Reorganization Act is a good thing, it was intended to assist routine procedures and not to rule in advance on substantive matters of legislative interest. If the barrier of the law is to be brought forward every time some of the Members of Congress want to make an inquiry, it will gradually weaken the act itself and bring about repeal. Certainly, as between a curtailment of the power of Congress to investigate and the so-called streamlining of routine procedures, it would be better to give the benefit of the doubt to the investigating process, which is the sole instrument that really scares many bureaucrats from committing abuses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the greatest respect for Mr. David Lawrence. I realize the fact that over the years he has been a consistent opponent of some of the things he calls New Dealism. But it seems that in his article he is assuming to advise the Republicans they ought not to throw away the election in 1948 by accepting the theory that bygones should be bygones. No one is advocating that. No one desires that. There is no basis whatever for the assumption or the insinuation that because some of us here are seeking to stand by what we have done in the reorganization of the Congress, we are actuated by some fear, or by some motive, that is not up to the highest standards of what ought to actuate us here in the Congress of the United States. I have expressed over and over again, and I reiterate now, the hope that Congress during the next 2 years will not spend its time trying to maneuver for position in order that somebody may be elected or that somebody may be defeated for President of the United States in 1948. I do not know of anything in the present status of American opinion and American attitude, as well as that of the world, that would be more deplorable or in my judgment more against the interest and the welfare and the opinion of the American people than to see both parties or either party spend 2 years trying to maneuver itself into position so that it would have some advantage in the next Presidential election. I hope that neither side in this Chamber can truthfully be accused of any such waste of the legislative time and any such misconception of the verdict of the American people, either for or against an political party. That is my own individual opinion about the matter, and I think it is shared by very great numbers of Members of this Chamber and of the American people.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to have yielded to the Senator from Kentucky in order that he might make an explanation, because I feel that the public is entitled to the explanation. I am glad that what I had to say on the Senate floor has caused debate upon this important question, for I sincerely feel that if the special committee in question is discontinued the work it has hitherto begun will be delayed, and delay, as we all know, in many cases is a denial of justice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me again? I am sorry to continue to interrupt the Senator's speech.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted to state, in order that it may not be regarded as a partisan matter, that while we were in the majority, and while we were expecting still to continue to be in the majority, I may say——

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. We had already decided not to continue these special committees. At the last session, in order that they might wind up their work, in order that they might have a month of this session to do what they had been unable to do, so that they might complete their work and make their final reports, we extended them until the 31st day of January. So, the fact that the political complexion of the Senate changed as the result of the election has not had any effect on our attitude, because following the enactment of the Reorganization Act we occupied the same position that we occupy now. As I recall, in the debate here during the consideration of that measure, there was no serious disagreement among us as to the desirability and advisability and the wisdom of stopping the creation of special committees.

As we all know, when the House amended the measure, and it came back here, the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, was, as I said the other day, facing the point of a gun. We were about to adjourn the Congress. There was no time for an extended conference to work out the differences between the two Houses. The Senator from Wisconsin explained that situation on the floor, and stated it was necessary to yield to the amendments of the House in order to get any legislation at all, because Congress was going to adjourn soon. I think it had already agreed on a date practically upon which it would adjourn, and that had a great deal to do with the yielding of the Senate to the House amendments which have been discussed heretofore. Be that as it may, we were compelled to act hastily in order to get any legislation at all; and most of us felt that if we did not get the bill through at that session it might be a long time before we could ever get it considered again, if ever.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. From what the able and distinguished minority leader has just said, I take it that there was not really very much justification for the complaint by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] the other day on the question of the two resolutions being reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without, as he put it, adequate hearing for the minority members. As I understood the able Senator from Kentucky, the Democratic Members of the Senate had made a unilateral determination of policy not to continue these committees, even before the country had spoken as to who should control the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not inconsistent with the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. He was complaining that, according to his judgment, this matter was rushed through the Committee on Rules and Administration without any opportunity for hearing. I do not know what happened in the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am not a member of that committee. I see nothing inconsistent between the statement made by the Senator from Arizona, insisting that opportunity be given in the Rules Committee for hearing, and the statement that I made that we had all practically agreed, without any formal understanding among those of us who discussed it on both sides of the aisle, that special committees should not be continued.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the distinguished minority leader does not intend to imply that the conclusion of what was then a rapidly disappearing majority should bind the Members of this body. We have had an influx of new blood. There are 17 new Members on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that it would be most ungracious to suggest that the conclusions of the disappearing majority should bind new Senators who have come fresh from the grass roots.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine is too clever to assume that I meant any such thing. What I was undertaking to do was to convince even the Senator from Maine, who is sometimes stubborn and hard to convince from my viewpoint, that our attitude on this resolution is not something that has suddenly arisen because we find ourselves in the minority. That was our attitude all along, after we passed the Reorganization Act and during its consideration.

I may say on that point, while I am on my feet, that from time to time while we were in the majority and were creating special committees on motion, or as a result of resolutions sponsored by Members on this side of the aisle, many Members of what was then the minority, including the distinguished and able minority leader, the late Senator McNary, of Oregon, who preceded the very able present majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], frequently complained because, as he said, special committees were going to seed and were absorbing and usurping the power and jurisdiction of standing committees. He stated that, so far as he was concerned, he was ready to cooperate in an effort to stop the practice. That was before Congress was reorganized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I suggest that we should observe the Biblical injunction to "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," because it was a special committee which accomplished the reorganization to which the Senator from Kentucky now pays such profound tribute. If that special committee had not been created, we never would have had the reorganization for which we are all so grateful.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was a joint committee and not the sort of committee which we are now considering.

I appreciate the Senator's reference to the Biblical injunction, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," because the Senator from Maine and I are both young enough to remember our creators at our present ages. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it appears from what has been said by the able minority leader that the minority—last year the majority—had decided that the war investigation should cease so far as any special committee was concerned, and that any investigation in the future should be made by the standing committees.

There has been a great deal of discussion in this debate which seems to be based upon the proposition that special investigating committees are prohibited by the spirit of the Reorganization Act. I submit that there is not a sentence in the act itself which would justify us in saying that there is any spirit of the act which would prevent special committees. If we were to say that, we would say that a bill or joint resolution passed by one branch of Congress should be the law. I find no reason for any Senator saying that if a law is enacted during the closing days of a session it should be given a different interpretation from that which would attach to it if it were passed on the tenth day of the session. I have never heard anyone argue to a court that because a law was enacted near the close of a session, therefore the people should not regard it as the law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield, because I wish to finish what I have to say.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is true that the reorganization bill, as it first passed the Senate, contained such a prohibition. I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 10, 1946, which shows that the vote was as follows: Yeas, 49; nays, 16; not voting, 31.

At that particular time I was in Bermuda performing certain duties in connection with a legislative committee, and I did not vote. Today we are told that the 17 new Members on this side of the aisle, 31 Members who did not vote at that time, and 16 Members who voted "nay," should have nothing to say about special committees in the future. Can anyone imagine the Senate adopting a rule similar to the rule with respect to unlimited debate, that nothing can be done in relation to a special committee unless by a two-thirds vote? I say that if we ever adopt such a rule, it will mean that one party will be allowed to control the United States Senate. However, in the view of Senator La Follette, even this prohibition could have been overcome by a two-thirds vote, which he believed would be done in an important matter not clearly within the jurisdiction of any standing committee.

Whatever the situation may have been under the Senate version of the bill as it originally passed, that situation does not exist today. The House deleted section 126 entirely, and the Senate accepted the position taken by the House. Thus Congress clearly and expressly rejected the proposition that special investigating committees be abolished.

If the House of Representatives had accepted the Senate version of the bill, it would have been impossible to appoint a special committee on the occasion of the President's appearance at the joint meeting of the two Houses. Nothing could have been done with relation to special committees if the House had adopted the version which it now appears should not have been adopted.

How, then, can it be argued that the spirit of the Reorganization Act will be violated by the continuation of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program? Not only is there no language in the act justifying this proposition, but the proposition was advanced and expressly rejected, leaving no doubt that it was the intent and will of Congress that it be free to continue its practice of creating special committees to explore specific subjects.

We have other special committees. We have the Atomic Energy Committee. We have the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and from time to time I know that there will be occasions when special committees will be essential to the welfare of this great Nation.

As to jurisdiction, it has been suggested that the work of the Truman-Mead committee can be handled by the Armed Services Committee. This, it seems to me, overlooks the fact that it was not the Army and Navy alone which expended money for national defense in the last war, which was a total war. A review of the committee's work will reveal that its inquiries went far beyond the scope of the activities of the War and Navy Departments alone. A great deal of its work was concerned with the special war agencies and the relationship between them. In fact, some of the committee's most valuable work was in

calling attention to overlapping and duplication between various war agencies and conflicts in certain war programs. A committee limited in scope to one agency, whatever it might have done internally within that agency, would have been handicapped in doing what the Truman-Mead committee was able to do.

It should also be remembered that most of these war agencies did not owe their existence to specific legislation but were created by Executive order under the war powers delegated by Congress to the President.

I think it would be helpful in considering the question of jurisdiction to name the various war agencies and departments from which the committee obtained information during its 6 years of existence. I ask the Senate what standing committees today would investigate the following-named agencies which do not come under the War and Navy Departments. They were creatures of the Executive department alone. These are the agencies:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Defense Plant Corporation.
Rubber Development Corporation.
Metals Reserve Company.
Smaller War Plants Corporation.
Office of War Information.
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.
Office of Defense Transportation.
State Department.
Foreign Liquidation Commissioner.
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. President, when the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program was investigating the Inter-American Highway in Central America, to my amazement we discovered that the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs spent a million dollars of the taxpayers' money to build a road around the edge of a lake in Honduras.

Is there any need for an investigation other than of the War Department?

When this committee was in Trinidad investigating, it found that the Navy Department had built, at a cost of half a million dollars, a highway 7 miles long, over a mountain which was 1,850 feet high.

When we were in Bermuda we found that the War Department, or some other department of our Government, had resurfaced all the roads of Bermuda.

Is it not time that there be some accounting for what was done?

Let me add that the use of automobiles is now permitted in Bermuda. Formerly Bermuda was in the "horse and buggy" age. Now automobiles are used. I saw nothing but small black cars of about 10 horsepower operating upon the highways. To my amazement, I discovered that a law had been passed in Bermuda prohibiting the use of automobiles with a greater horsepower than 10. Therefore, the United States, not manufacturing that kind of car, cannot ship any automobiles to Bermuda.

Do I see any reason why we should make investigations?

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean to imply that the United States, through the Army or other agency, has built automobile roads throughout the entire Bermuda Islands?

Mr. FERGUSON. They have resurfaced the roads.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are several islands in the group, and I am wondering whether the Senator means that the United States Government resurfaced all roads in Bermuda, or only in that portion of the islands where we had our bases.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am unable to tell the full extent. I saw a great number of roads which had been resurfaced.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difference would be quite important, because it is my understanding that only such resurfacing was done as was necessary to carry out the purposes involved in the construction and utilization of the base or bases which we had in Bermuda, and not all the roads in the entire Bermuda group.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the Senator from Kentucky if he knows anything about the highway that was built over the mountains in Trinidad.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know nothing whatever about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason given to us was that it was desired to have a bathing beach constructed for the Navy in Port-of-Spain.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not interrupt the Senator to discuss Trinidad, because I know nothing about it. While I am on the subject of Bermuda, the information I have is that an improved road was built to connect the bases at either end of one of the islands on which we obtained bases, and that such work was not done at any other point.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is my understanding that more than a connecting road is involved. Roads not connecting with our bases are paved.

Continuing with the list of war agencies, we find the following:

Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.
Foreign Economic Administration.
Office of Lend-Lease Administration.

I shall have something to say later about that agency.

Treasury Procurement Division.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Agriculture Department.
War Food Administration.
Interior Department.
Petroleum Administration for War.
Federal Works Agency.
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
National Inventors Council.
Maritime Commission.
War Shipping Administration.
National Housing Agency.
War Assets Administration.
Office of Production Management.
War Production Board.
Office of Price Administration.
War Manpower Commission.
Labor Department.
War Labor Board.
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.
Civilian Production Administration.
Office of International Trade.
Veterans' Administration.
Federal Communications Commission.
Office of Alien Property Custodian.

The titles of the reports of the committee also clearly disclose that the work of the War and Navy Departments, although important, was only a part of the subject matter explored by the committee. These reports conclusively show that they do not deal exclusively with the War and Navy Departments. Nor did the expenditures relate to only those departments.

I ask that the list of titles of reports be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report No. 480 (77th Cong., 1st sess.):
Part 1. Aluminum.
Part 2. Camp and cantonment construction.
Part 3. Priorities and the utilization of existing manufacturing facilities.
Part 4. Statement of committee policy.
Report No. 480 (77th Cong., 2d sess.):
Part 5. Annual report of committee investigations.
Part 6. Light metals, aircraft, and other matters.
Part 7. Rubber.
Part 8. Conversion to war production program of War Production Board.
Part 9. Conversion program, War Production Board. (Accompanies pt. 8).
Part 10. Investigation in connection with Senator Albert B. Chandler's swimming pool in Kentucky.
Part 11. Manpower.
Part 12. Shipbuilding at the South Portland Shipbuilding Corp.
Part 13. Gasoline rationing and the fuel oil situation.
Part 14. Lumber.
Report No. 10 (78th Cong., 1st sess.):
Part 1. Barges.
Part 2. Farm machinery and equipment.
Part 3. Interim report on steel.
Part 4. Second annual report.
Part 5. Renegotiation of war contracts.
Part 6. Labor.
Part 7. Concerning faking of inspections of steel plate by Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp.
Part 8. Shipbuilding and shipping.
Part 9. Conflicting war programs.
Part 10. Aircraft.
Part 11. Comparative merits of rayon and cotton tire cord.
Part 12. Outlines of problems of conversion from war production.
Part 13. Transportation.
Part 14. The Canol project.
Report No. 10 (78th Cong., 2d sess.):
Part 15. Investigations overseas: Section I—Petroleum matters.
Part 16. Third annual report.
Part 17. Magnesium.
Part 18. Merchant shipping.
Part 19. Ream general hospital.
Part 20. Accumulation of surpluses.
Report No. 110 (79th Cong., 1st sess.):
Part 1. Disposal of surpluses other than industrial plants.
Part 2. Investigations overseas.
Part 3. Aircraft—Conditions at Curtiss-Wright Corp., Buffalo, N. Y., plants.
Part 4. Fourth annual report.
Part 5. Investigations overseas — Surplus property abroad.
Part 6. Aircraft—Production, development, and research.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee will have to consider some far-reaching legislative matters concerning present and future national defense, such as the size of the armed forces, universal military training, unification and organization of the armed forces, and numerous other important subjects. Obtaining the facts necessary to make wise decisions on these current and pressing matters will tax the members and staff of that committee. How much time will that committee have left over to explore expenditures in World War II? It will have very little time during the Eightieth Congress in which to do the job now before it, the great job of legislating and providing for our future defense by the armed services.

The real question before the Senate is whether the Senate and the people want to know any more about how their agents discharged their public trust in the handling of the vast powers and in the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars in the most gigantic enterprise in the country's history or in the history of the world.

If there are more Canol projects, do we want it known, or do we want it to remain forever buried? Do we want to know the truth, or do we want it suppressed?

I would like to ask how many Senators present ever heard of the alleged war project known as the Rama Road before last August. I never had. I learned about this project almost by accident, when I was down in Nicaragua investigating the Inter-American Highway. The Rama Road is not a link of the Inter-American Highway, but $4,000,000 were allocated to its construction out of the secret fund appropriated to the President by the Congress for war purposes. I say the construction of the Rama Road had nothing to do with winning the war. It has no tangible nor sound connection with the prosecution of the war. However, it has been suggested that the United States will now be required to put up $2,500,000 more to fulfill President Roosevelt's secret agreement with President Somosa of Nicaragua concerning the Rama Road.

In order to advise the Senate just what the country is faced with in this regard, I quote from the public hearing held by the committee on the investigation of the Inter-American Highway on Saturday, September 28, 1946, with respect to the completion of the Rama Road:

Senator FERGUSON. Is it your contention that this country is bound, by a signed obligation, to build this highway, no matter what it costs, to Rama, on the basis of making it equal to the Inter-American Highway?

Mr. Cabot, of the State Department, said:

It is not bound to make it equal to the Inter-American Highway, but we are bound, by the exchange of notes, to build the highway. In other words, it would be extremely embarrassing to go to the Nicaraguans and say we could not build the road.

Senator FERGUSON. No matter what it costs?

Mr. CABOT. It was on the basis of our own estimates.

Mr. Meader, counsel for the committee, asked this question:

Are we obligated to build the highway or simply to pay the $4,000,000?

Mr. CABOT. I would say to build the highway.

Mr. MEADER. In your opinion, the obligation is to build a road from San Benito to Rama, not to give them $4,000,000?

Mr. CABOT. No; it was to build the road.

Mr. MEADER. Do you think it is an obligation of this Government to spend the additional $2,500,000 over Mr. James' estimate?

Mr. CABOT. As I remember the notes, I think it would be an obligation of this Government to build a road from San Benito to Rama.

Mr. President, the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua is only one instance of the use of the President's emergency fund for national defense which has come to my attention.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator from Michigan consider that the various matters which he has just mentioned come within the purview of section (b), with respect to the Committee on Expenditures in the Government Departments, which provides for jurisdiction in connection with studying the cooperation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining their economy and efficiency? Is it the Senator's opinion that this committee could do the work about which he has been talking?

Mr. FERGUSON. I construe that language to mean that if the committee were adequately staffed and if it had the knowledge which is presently had by the investigating committee, which was acquired as the result of the expenditure of some $300,000, it could do the work.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator from Michigan with a majority of the Senate would vote to turn over to the standing committee the files and staff of the investigating committee, the standing committee could carry on that activity, as charged under the law, could it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe so. I believe that if we wish to have the job done well, the work should be handled under the present set-up.

Mr. McMAHON. Is it the contention of the Senator from Michigan that the Senators who would be on the special committee would have greater talent than the Senators who have been named from both sides of the aisle to serve on the standing committee which I have mentioned?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at all. The Senators on the special committee merely have experience and knowledge which has been acquired from the special committee's work.

The question now before us—and we are facing it squarely—is whether we are willing to cast aside all that experience and all that knowledge, whether we are willing to throw it to the winds, and then start all over again.

Mr. President, now that the war is over, it seems to me that a great deal of the expenditure out of this tremendous fund, for which no detailed accounting was required during the war, should be explored and made known to the people, because the veil of secrecy has been removed, for the President has declared that hostilities have ended. How many more expenditures, similar to the Rama Road, were made out of this emergency war fund? I think the Senate of the United States and the people of the country are entitled to know.

There has also come to the committee's attention other expenditures of which the people generally know nothing, and which, I dare say, very few Members of Congress know about. One of these is the expenditure of nearly half a million dollars, as I previously mentioned, on other highways. This was done without any express appropriation from the Congress for that purpose, and without advising the Congress of the expenditure.

One matter before the committee which does not involve either the War or Navy Department is the procurement of items for lend-lease by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. The committee has in its files, but has not explored in public hearings, instances of inordinate profits made by individuals out of sales of small hardware items to Treasury Procurement for lend-lease to our allies in the war. I wish to mention just one instance out of several which the committee has investigated. I shall do so without naming the company involved, because I believe that would be unfair, until the committee has determined to conduct a full public hearing. This item is a small steel pin, approximately 3 inches long. I have one of those pins in my hand, and I now hold it up for inspection. This pin has not been milled smoothly. It would seem to be made of wrought iron, or perhaps it is a rough steel pin, judging by its appearance.

Sixty-seven thousand of these pins were bought by Treasury Procurement from a firm which had no manufacturing facilities whatever. That firm, in turn, sublet the entire production of the pin to another firm. The firm which actually manufactured the pin received 3 cents for each pin, but the Government paid to the firm with which it had its contract 34 cents for each pin. In this case the middleman's profit, which the Government paid, was 955 percent over the manufacturer's price. Mr. President, do we need an accounting, or do we not need an accounting?

There are other, similar instances of procurement by the Treasury Department for lend-lease where contractors having no manufacturing facilities were paid prices 50 to 1,000 percent higher than the manufacturer's price. These matters do not affect the field of foreign affairs, but they relate to contracts, solely domestic matters, made by the

Treasury's Procurement Division. In the cases examined by the committee, doing business in this fashion has cost the Government $2,000,000 over the manufacturer's actual price.

Mr. President, is it time that the Senate looked into the favoritism shown to certain manufacturers? Why should the Government, during its greatest emergency, when it was fighting for its very life, pay 34 cents for a pin which cost 3 cents to manufacture, and thus pay a profit of 955 percent? I wish to raise my voice today in behalf of this investigation. I wish to talk to those who desire to have proof that this special committee is needed. That is why I stand here as a member of the committee, because I feel it is my solemn duty, knowing what I do from the files and from the work I have done on the committee, to urge each and every Senator that the work be continued by the special committee and that the public be given an accounting of the expenditure of these billions of dollars.

Mr. President, in a democracy I think the people are entitled to the full and true facts about the public business so that they may judge for themselves. When we take the position that it is none of the peoples' business how their money is spent we approach the kind of governmental authority which Hitler enjoyed. It was always my view that we fought the war for the precise purpose of saving the form of government in which the people could know the facts, and in the light of those facts make the ultimate decisions.

I know there is not a single Member of the Senate who wants to keep the people from knowing how their money has been spent in the war. There is not a single Senator who has the remotest desire to protect dishonesty, extravagance, and unfaithfulness to the public trust. But will the people understand? We all know that the vast expenditures in this war have not been fully explored. Under these circumstances, can the destruction of the Truman-Mead committee be interpreted as anything other than an attempt to stifle and suppress the truth regarding war expenditures?

I do not believe we can convince the public that we are destroying the Truman-Mead committee in the interest of progress.

I sincerely hope the vote on this resolution will not be a party-line vote, though the indications today are that it will be. Such a vote is certain to be understood by the people—and I am sure the American people will remember this vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly to the question now before the Senate, and to associate myself completely with the very splendid exposition of the work of the committee by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who has preceded me. So I shall not labor the issues which he has placed in their historical sequence. I should merely like to clear certain misconceptions which it seems to me have been rather pressed in questions at certain times, as to why it is felt that the existing investigating committee has any special qualifications for its task.

I do not know whether a sporting analogy would hold, that we have a team which has been functioning for 4 years, composed of Members of the Senate, six of whom have survived the recent elections and are still continuing members of the committee, and the staff of the committee, who have been with us in some instances from the beginning, and in other instances for a very considerable period, and have developed a comprehension of the problems and an understanding of the methods of approach which it seems to me would take some time to duplicate with other Members of the Senate or of the staff.

Second, as to the reorganization of Congress, I realize the force of the arguments which have been made. I have been one of those who strongly supported the reorganization. I would point out, however, that in the first place the proposed statutory limitation upon the creation of special committees was struck out before the action on the bill was completed, so that there is no inhibition of that character. Certainly, the creation of special committees has proved very salutary in the past, as illustrated by the Special Joint Committee on Reorganization, as the minority leader has pointed out, which accomplished this herculean task.

Third, in the instance of the special investigating committee, while technically the resolution was not referred to the Committee on Armed Services, the standing committee having jurisdiction of much of the material, it has been a matter of intimate discussion, and understandings have been reached with the majority of the committee, with the full knowledge of the minority, which indicates that jurisdictional problems would be reduced to a minimum, and it was the feeling, as I understand, of at least a majority of the Committee on Armed Services, that not only would the continuation of the special committee not encroach upon the jurisdiction which they contemplated exercising, but that they would welcome the completion of the great work in which this committee has been engaged, by its carrying on to conclusion the investigation of irregularities incident to war procurement, and by completing this with a rounded-out report covering the whole problem of procurement in time of war, which, with the thousands of pages of evidence we have accumulated, can well furnish the material upon which any constructive future legislation may be based.

It is for these reasons that it is my hope that the Senate will conclude that it will be wise to continue the special committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to strike out lines 12 and 13, and to insert in lieu thereof certain words.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Wyo
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that nominations have been received for the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is the purpose of the Chair to refer these nominations to the Senate section of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy as soon as it is reorganized. These nominations will be held on the desk of the President pro tempore until we can complete the reorganization of the Senate section of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to be absent on Friday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

REPRINT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT (S. DOC. 248)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I particularly invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Maine, the majority leader, to the fact that in the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill was passed and signed by the President, and it is now the law, known as the Administrative Procedure Act.

At that time, pursuant to an order of this body, there was printed a complete résumé of the entire act, with its history, and significant expressions coming from the hearings. Ten thousand copies were printed. The demand coming from the public, and especially from the bar of

America, was so great, at 50 cents a copy, that there now remain but about 60 copies, although none of the Senators have received a copy, and no Member of the House has received a copy.

It is the desire of the American bar and the American people generally that additional copies be printed. These copies are purchased by the public at 50 cents a copy, but a number of them should be available for the Members of the Senate, that they in turn might distribute them to their constituents.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that there may be a reprint of the publication to the extent of 2,500 copies, so that a copy may be furnished to every Member of Congress, and so that the public may obtain copies upon the payment of 50 cents a copy, as they have been required to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

DISPOSITION OF BIG INCH AND LITTLE INCH PIPE LINES

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution dealing with the disposition of the Big Inch and Little Inch pipe lines; and I should like to address myself briefly to the joint resolution.

This measure would prevent the sale of these two transcontinental pipe lines by the War Assets Administration for a reasonable period—the resolution provides 6 months—after the submission to Congress of a final report by the Federal Power Commission on its current investigation of the natural-gas industry and its recommendations for the development of a national natural gas policy. The pipe lines figured largely in their studies of natural gas.

The reason for my action at this time, Mr. President, is that the War Assets Administration is once again asking for bids for these pipe lines, and has indicated it will give natural gas equal priority with petroleum products in considering sales awards. This is an about face by War Assets to its previous position, which was that bidders proposing to use the pipe lines for the transportation of petroleum products would be given greater consideration than those proposing to use the lines for the transportation of natural gas. The decision was reached, I am afraid, as a result of the excitement and near hysteria which accompanied the last work stoppage in the bituminous coal mines. Strident demands were made at that time that the pipe lines be converted to natural gas in order, so the proponents maintained, to help alleviate the coal shortage. Hearings before a special committee of the other House, the House Surplus Property Investigating Committee, featured much testimony and a great deal of opinion regarding the merits of this proposal. Soon thereafter the War Assets Administrator prepared a report, which was submitted to Congress January 3, 1947, providing for the sale of the pipe lines to the highest bidders regardless of usage those bidders intended to make of the facilities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator identify the pipe line about which he is speaking? I think I know, but I think the record ought to be made clear, if that has not been done.

Mr. MYERS. I indicated at the begining of my remarks that the resolution deals with the Big Inch and the Little Inch pipe lines.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret I was not present at the time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the remarks made by the able Senator from Pennsylvania upon the subject on which he is speaking, because the report first made by the War Assets Administration ordered both the Big Inch and the Little Inch pipe lines to be sold for the transportation of oil, as has been stated here by the Senator, while a new report was filed on January 1 which provides that the lines might be sold for any purpose of transportation.

Mr. President, under the law dealing with the disposition of surplus property that report becomes law unless Congress changes it or refuses to accept or adopt it. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and I introduced a joint resolution which is now pending before the Committee on Armed Services, asking an extension of 90 days within which Congress may consider the new report.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I know of the joint resolution which the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Wyoming have introduced, and I am entirely in accord with the purpose and the spirit of the measure. However, I believe that Congress should have probably more than 90 days within which to consider the matter, and that we should have the report from the Federal Power Commission before any action is taken on the disposition of the two pipe lines.

Under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the Congress presently has only until February 3, 1947, as the able Senator from West Virginia has said, to act on this recommendation and if it takes no action by that date the Administrator can then carry out the proposal he has made.

To my mind, it will be impossible for the appropriate committees to give this proposal the study it requires in the limited period yet remaining before this February 3 deadline. This is a very serious matter. This is a matter which affects the future economy of one of the largest single economic areas in my State. It is a matter which threatens one of our greatest industries.

If these pipe lines are sold for the purpose of bringing natural gas to the eastern seaboard, it is not merely likely, but probable, that the anthracite mining industry will have been dealt a blow which could conceivably wipe it out. We would have a situation which the Federal Government as a wartime measure expended millions of dollars and great energy constructing facilities designed mainly and primarily to help win the war, and then turned these facilities, constructed under those unusual circumstances, over to one industry in order to help it wipe out another industry. To me this is unthinkable. I know that there is a reasonable doubt in the minds of many that the flow of natural gas through these pipe lines to the eastern seaboard would actually put a very sizable dent into the markets of the hard-coal industry. These persons might reasonably point to the fact that the volume of natural gas which would flow through these pipes would be only a small percentage of the heating needs of the area to which this gas would be directed. That is correct. However, I want to point out that this percentage of the market which would be diverted away from the hard-coal industry—about 10 percent—is substantial enough to represent the difference between profit and loss in the anthracite industry. Our export market for United States products generally is only about 10 percent of our total market, yet all of us recognize the fact that 10 percent in many industries is the difference between breaking even and making money or losing money. The same holds true for anthracite coal. We need the market we now have in order for anthracite to remain a healthy industry. The Government of the United States and the people of the United States have an important stake in the health of that industry. We needed it badly in war. We will always need it in peace. We must see to it that it remains a healthy industry so that it can function.

The Congress last year appropriated $450,000 of the taxpayers' money to help carry out the Government's obligations to see that this industry remains healthy. That money is earmarked for the construction of a scientific laboratory in the anthracite region designed to find new uses for anthracite coal, to develop more efficient methods of mining it, and to promote more convenient use of the fuel. Now to destroy that industry by Government favor to a competing industry would make our proposed new laboratory useless.

I want to address myself for a few moments to the factors behind the apparent desire of many persons to see natural gas introduced through these Government-constructed pipe lines to the east coast. The most familiar reason which has been cited is that these pipe lines would help to break what these persons say is the grip of John L. Lewis over the economy of the Nation.

This is a fallacious argument. It is altogether unrealistic and substitutes emotion and hysteria for reason and

fact. The anthracite industry is only a very small segment of the entire coal industry in the United States. Uses for anthracite are restricted now almost entirely to domestic heating. When the last coal walk-out occurred—and mark this, Mr. President, this walk-out was largely restricted to the bituminous coal industry—the pipe lines were put forward by many articulate sources as one answer to the industrial crisis presented by the coal shortage. Yet the natural gas these lines could carry to the East would have little or no effect on industrial fuel requirements but would largely go into the same channels which anthracite coal now serves—private houses and other heating plants. There was no crisis in anthracite supply.

Another thing, the anthracite industry which would be affected so drastically by Government-aided natural gas competition is not at present in Government hands, as is the rest of the coal-mining industry in the United States. It is under private management and ownership and control. It is free enterprise. It is enlightened free enterprise. Anthracite mine owners were able, where bituminous owners were not, to reach agreement with the United Mine Workers Union last year on a wage and working-condition contract which is outstanding in the history of the private—as against Government-operated—mining industry.

In order to punish John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers, for that seems to be the philosophy largely behind the effort to introduce natural gas through the pipe lines to the east coast, some articulate groups in this country would disrupt and perhaps ruin a Pennsylvania industry providing the livelihood of nearly 2,000,000 Pennsylvanians, but there would be little if any sizable effect on the rest of the mining industry or on the Lewis union.

Anthracite production, practically all of it in Pennsylvania, in 1946 totaled about 60,500,000 tons, an increase of more than 10 percent over the 1945 total, according to production figures released yesterday by the Solid Fuels Administration. Nineteen hundred and forty-five production was likewise high. The anthracite mines of Pennsylvania helped to keep the eastern seaboard warm throughout the war when users of oil and other fuels in the east were shivering. Members of this body, who lived in homes or apartments heated by hard coal, can thank the anthracite miners of my State for being warm and comfortable here in Washington during the war.

All I ask today is that the Senate—with the House, I hope, concurring—agree to give this industry a fair chance to defend its life. The Federal Power Commission has been making a thorough investigation of the natural-gas industry and its effect or probable effect on other fuels and other industries. The pipe lines and their prospective uses figured largely in testimony during hearings before the Commission. The Commission is now preparing its report. This agency of the Government has been charged with original jurisdiction in drawing up national policies in this field. Let us wait, Mr. President, until it can report its findings and recommendations; let us study those recommendations, and then, in calm and deliberative manner, decide what we want done, with full realization of the effects of our decision on the economies of large sections of our Nation.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate can understand the importance of this issue. Were the Government, by the provision of special facilities to a competing industry, to encourage, let us say, the ruination of the cotton industry, every Senator from the South would, with real justification, bitterly object. Senators from other sections would rise and oppose with every means at their command special governmental favors to industries which would spell disaster for the economic future of groups much smaller than the 2,000,000 who might be adversely affected by use of these pipe lines for natural gas.

There is now before the Senate Committee on Armed Services a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) which would extend for a period of sixty additional days after February 3 the period in which Congress may take action to modify the recommendations made by the War Assets Administrator in the disposition of these pipe lines. That measure has real merit. Mr. President, I believe that the Senate needs more time, and that before acting it should have the benefit of hearings, advice, information, and recomendations from the Federal Power Commission on this general subject.

I invite the attention of the President pro tempore to the fact that pipe lines come under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the Congressional Reorganization Act, and I respectfully suggest that my joint resolution, dealing more broadly with policy in regard to pipe lines than with the specific Surplus Property Act provision to which Senate Joint Resolution 20 is directed, be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me what the occasion is for this particular speech? Is the claim made that the pipe lines have already been sold, or are they being advertised for sale?

Mr. MYERS. Under the Surplus Property Act the Administrator recommends that the pipe lines be disposed of.

Mr. LANGER. Has he made such a recommendation?

Mr. MYERS. His recommendation came to Congress on January 3. We must act within 30 days. If we do not act, then he may dispose of the pipe lines to any person who may bid, to whom he may desire to sell.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is aware of the fact that these pipe lines cost our Government $141,000,000 or $142,000,000, and that we made a profit on them of $138,000,000. As a matter of fact, our Government has practically nothing invested in the pipe lines, has it?

Mr. MYERS. That is approximately true.

Mr. LANGER. In the last Congress I introduced a bill providing that the Government should simply retain ownership of the pipe lines. Can the Senator see any objection to keeping them in the possession of the Government, so that they will be available in case of necessity? There is no necessity for their sale.

Mr. MYERS. The pipe lines might be put to some good use. I am only arguing that to use them for natural gas would not only not be putting them to a good use, but would be destructive of a great industry, affecting 2,000,000 people.

Mr. LANGER. I understand the Senator's argument; but the Government has practically nothing invested. What objection could there be to the Government continuing to own the pipe lines?

Mr. MYERS. The Senator may be correct. I am not prepared to say at this time that there is not some good economic use for the pipe lines. The Senator may be correct in his view.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania introduces a joint resolution which he asks to have referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MYERS. I did not ask that it be so referred. I merely pointed out that another measure dealing with somewhat the same subject had been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I merely introduce the joint resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that the joint resolution should go with the other joint resolution, to the Committee on Armed Services. If that is unsatisfactory to the Senator from Pennsylvania the Chair wishes to give the Senator an opportunity to move a different reference.

Mr. MYERS. No, Mr. President. I do not believe that any Senator should ask that a bill or resolution be referred to a particular committee. I merely pointed out to the Chair that I thought this measure differed in some respects from the other. I did not ask, and would not urge, that the Chair refer it to any particular committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would agree with the Senator if the property had left the control and ownership of the Government.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) prohibiting War Assets Administration from disposing of certain pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil until 6 months after final report and recommendations of the Federal Power Commission in its docket No. G–580 have been submitted to the Congress, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have listened with interest to the Senator from Pennsylvania. What would the Senator do with these pipe lines? The Government has more than $100,000,000 invested in them. I understand that the investment of the Government is aproximately $147,000,000. If the Government does not sell them or use them, would the Senator leave them in the ground to rust? What would he do with them?

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from North Dakota has just propounded that question to me. I stated that I doubted very much if that was the proper way to handle the subject of the pipe lines. I stated that I thought probably there might be some good economic use to which they could be put. However, Mr. Symington, the former Administrator, originally filed a report with the Congress recommending that they be used for petroleum products. His successor has changed the policy, and advocates that they be used for petroleum or for natural gas. I am only objecting to the use of the pipe lines for natural gas. I am not objecting to the use of the pipe lines for transportation of other petroleum products.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to authorize an appropriation of funds to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within States by establishing a national floor under educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and by assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less for necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations, and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an analysis which contains two or three tables, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. AIKEN. This bill, divided into two titles, to be cited as the Educational Finance Act of 1947, represents a new and somewhat different approach to the problem of Federal aid to education in the States than the Congress has heretofore considered. There exists today a widespread conviction as to the imperative need for Federal financial assistance to the States for the purpose of assuring more uniformly adequate educational opportunities. This need is underscored by the increasingly critical shortage of qualified teachers, a shortage generally attributable to the shamefully low salaries paid teachers; which, in turn, is due in large areas of the Nation to the inability of States and local communities to provide the necessary financial support for education.

How shall this need best be met? Shall it be by taxing the wealth of the Nation wherever it exists for the support of education in only the poorer States? Or shall it be by the establishment of a national floor under educational expenditures in all States in relation to the number of pupils in average daily attendance? The former would require fewer Federal dollars than the latter; but would leave the incidence of taxation for the support of education where it now largely rests, that is, on real estate and other tangible personal property. The latter method, recognizing that the national interest in more adequate educational opportunities extends to every pupil, uses the tax sources available to the Federal Government to tap wealth where it exists for the benefit of the education of children wherever they are. It would result in shifting a portion of the tax load for the support of education from the shoulders of the real-estate owner in each local district, where it now rests far too heavily, to the shoulders of all who contribute through direct and indirect taxes to the Federal Treasury. It would result in leveling the expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in the schools of each local school administrative unit in all States but especially in the poorer States.

Another new feature of S. 199 is contained in title II, which has for its purpose the provision of a modicum of relief to those who now support nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less. Under this title such schools would be reimbursed for not to exceed 60 percent of the cost of providing necessary pupil transportation, school health examinations, and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books. The rationale supporting the granting of financial aid from the National Treasury to nonpublic tax-exempt schools was set forth in a separate statement of views, to which I subscribed, which accompanied Senate Report 1497 during the last Congress, and from which I quote:

> Implicit in the concept of democracy are differences of opinion, philosophy, and culture. It is not democracy's function to destroy these differences, but to provide a healthful and proper environment in which they can flourish and mature, or perhaps wither and die, and in which the values they develop may be integrated into the culture and thought of all Americans. Thus, as we see it, the Federal Government in providing aid to education must be careful not only not to interfere with local and State systems of education but not to encourage or discourage one system of education as against the other. Its aim must be the general welfare of all its citizens. Federal aid to education must not operate merely for the benefit of some children, be their number ever so large, but for all children. To do otherwise would, in effect, penalize those who are not eligible to receive the benefits of the act, and inequity would result.

The bill which I have introduced frankly faces the most difficult issue in Federal aid to education by proposing a plan which would authorize the use of tax moneys collected by the Federal Government to reimburse nonpublic tax-exempt schools of noncollegiate grade for an important part of their expense of operation, namely the provision of necessary pupil transportation, school health examinations and related school health services, and nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books. The principle of such aid has already been recognized in legal provisions for tax exemption for such schools. The further extension of this principle to include reimbursement for an important part of the operating expenses of nonpublic tax-exempt schools is proposed as a measure of equity that would be both generally acceptable and practicable in administration.

Briefly summarized, the proposed Educational Finance Act of 1947:

First. Includes absolutely no Federal control of the administration of education in the States.

Second. Recognizes the complete responsibility of State educational agencies for the administration of public education in the States and wholly depends upon those agencies to carry that responsibility.

Third. Is designed markedly to equalize educational opportunities among and within the States.

Fourth. Assures in each local school district in all States by 1953 a national floor for education equal to at least $100 a year per pupil in average daily attendance.

Fifth. Applies to the Nation as a whole the sound and time-honored principle of school support traditionally recognized in the States and local communities, namely, "tax the wealth equitably wherever it exists; expend the revenue equitably in terms of the number of pupils to be educated wherever the pupils are."

Sixth. Is brief, easy for all to understand, and simple of administration. It contains no complicated formulas.

Seventh. Will undoubtedly relieve the burden of taxation on real estate for the support of schools in practically all local school districts.

Eighth. Extends aid to pupils of private tax-exempt schools for necessary transportation, school health examinations, and related school health services and nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. How does this bill differ from the bill for which we voted 2 years ago? I believe it was Senate bill 667.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not read that bill.

Mr. LANGER. We voted on it 2 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I think, if the Senator will read this bill, he will find that it

differs radically in its make-up from any bill which has ever been introduced or acted upon heretofore.

Mr. LANGER. How does it differ from the Mead-Aiken bill of the last session?

Mr. AIKEN. This one is very much simpler. There is no formula whatsoever for allocating funds. This provides for an appropriation of $20 per pupil in the public schools, increasing $10 a year until it reaches $60 per pupil. It makes appropriations for health services and certain amounts in nonpublic schools. The amount that could be allocated to a pupil in a nonpublic school or private school, such as the old academies in New England, would not be over a third to a half as much per pupil as would be allocated to students in public schools.

Mr. LANGER. At the time we had hearings on S. 667 the testimony was that in one State—I shall not mention the State now—a white child received, roughly, $51.12 a year, and a colored child received approximately $12. Would a continuation of that discrimination be permitted in case this bill should pass?

Mr. AIKEN. Not to that extent. This bill would not provide equality among all schools. It would require that after 1953 a pupil in any State must have at least $100 expended on him in 1 year for his education. There is no restriction, however, against expending $125 per pupil in any locality if the State can afford it. The bill puts a floor under the education of all children, regardless of race, creed, or color

Mr. LANGER. But the discrimination as to the amount spent by a State could still continue under the terms of this bill?

Mr. AIKEN. This bill simply put a floor under the education of all children which is considerably higher than it is today in a great many sections of the country.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, a certain amount of money would have to be spent for the education of every child?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. But a State which wished to do so could continue to discriminate?

Mr. AIKEN. Any State which had schools for different races could continue to spend $25 a year more for white children so long as it spent $100 a year for the education of colored children.

Mr. LANGER. There might still be a difference in a State in which $400 a year would be spent for the education of a white child and, say, $10 a year for the education of a colored child?

Mr. AIKEN. No; they would have to spend $100 a year for every child, compared with $10 which the Senator refers to now. I do not know to what State or what locality he may be referring, but I understand that there are some localities where there is great discrimination. That is not proper because every child, regardless of race, creed, or color, has the right to the adequate education which this bill would provide. I do not think there is any way that we can provide that education in all schools in the same State or the same county shall be equal; but this bill seeks to provide a floor which will mean that every child in the country will have an adequate education, regardless of his color or condition.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Vermont would have any objection to a provision or an amendment to be made to the bill to the effect that no State could receive any of the money to be provided in connection with the bill unless the white and colored children within the State were treated equally, under the laws of the State.

Mr. AIKEN. I think this bill would require that twice as much be spent on colored children as is spent now in States which perhaps the Senator has in mind. In formulating the bill I took into consideration the needs of children all over the country and also the practical matter of getting the bill enacted, and I tried to overcome the objections which might be raised and which have been raised to the various bills on the subject which have been introduced heretofore. If the Senator will study carefully the bill and the analysis of it which I am having printed in the RECORD, I think he will come to the conclusion that it gives at least a modicum of equality to all children, although I do not think the time ever will come when all children will be educated in schools of exactly the same caliber or at exactly the same cost.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the explanation and for giving me the time to ask these questions, because in the entire Senate of the United States there is not a more sincere friend of education and of the children of the United States than the senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

EXHIBIT A

S. 199

A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States by establishing a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and by assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less for necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books

Be it enacted, etc., That this act, divided into two titles, may be cited as the Education Finance Act of 1947.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that in order to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare it shall be the national policy to provide for the greater equalization of educational opportunities among and within the States and Territories (a) by the establishment of a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at all public elementary and secondary schools and (b) by the payment of not to exceed 60 percent of the cost of providing necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books for pupils attending nonpublic tax-exempt elementary and secondary schools.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL FLOOR UNDER CURRENT EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURES, PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 101. For the purpose of more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States by the establishment of a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at all public elementary and public secondary schools, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, $400,000,000 or $20 per pupil in average daily attendance at such schools during 1946, whichever is greater; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $600,000,000 or $30 per pupil in average daily attendance at such schools during 1947, whichever is greater; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, $800,000,000 or $40 per pupil in average daily attendance at such schools during 1948, whichever is greater; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, $1,000,000,000 or $50 per pupil in average daily attendance at such schools during 1949, whichever is greater; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and each fiscal year thereafter, $1,200,000,000 or $60 per pupil in average daily attendance at such schools during the second fiscal year next preceding, whichever is greater, to be allotted to the States as set forth in section 102 hereof.

ALLOTMENT TO STATES

SEC. 102. The amounts appropriated under section 101 shall be allotted to the respective States in the ratio that the number of pupils in average daily attendance at all public elementary and public secondary schools in each such State during the second year next preceding the year for which an appropriation is made under this title bears to the total number of pupils in average daily attendance at all such schools in all the States during such year.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 103. (a) In order to be eligible to receive funds under section 101 and section 102 of this title, a State through its legislature, shall—

(1) accept the provisions of this title and provide for the administration of funds to be received;

(2) provide that the State treasurer, or corresponding official in the State, shall be the custodian of the funds paid to the State under this title;

(3) designate or create a State educational authority having all necessary powers to determine policies under which, in accordance with the provisions of this title, the funds allotted to the States shall be distributed and expended;

(4) provide for an audit of the expenditure of Federal funds received and expended by local school jurisdictions;

(5) provide for a system of reports from local school jurisdictions to the State education authority;

(6) provide that the State educational authority shall submit to the Commissioner such reports in such form and containing such information as he may reasonably require.

(b) In order to receive its allotment of funds under section 102 of this title—

(1) for any fiscal year, a State shall have spent for current expenses from State and local revenue sources in the second fiscal year next preceding the fiscal year for which the allotment is made an amount per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools equal to or

greater than the amount expended from such sources in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount;

(2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for any succeeding fiscal year, a State shall have spent for current expenses in each local school administrative unit from all revenue sources (including funds received under this act) during the second next preceding fiscal year a sum per pupil in average daily attendance at the public elementary and secondary schools in such unit during such second next preceding fiscal year (A) not less than $50 in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, (B) not less than $60 in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, (C) not less than $70 in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, (D) not less than $80 in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, (E) not less than $90 in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and (F) not less than $100 in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and in the case of fiscal years ending thereafter;

(3) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each succeeding fiscal year, a State which maintains by law separate schools for separate population groups shall have complied with the requirements of subparagraph (2) with respect to the schools maintained for each such separate population group in each local school administrative unit.

CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 104. On or before August 1 of each year the Commissioner shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts allotted under this title to each State that has accepted its provisions and otherwise qualified under section 103 hereof to receive an allotment. The Secretary shall, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount so certified for each fiscal year in two equal installments as soon after the first day of September and March as may be feasible, beginning with the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this title become available. Each such treasurer shall account for the moneys received as trustee and shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 105. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system to which funds have been allotted or paid under this act.

SEC. 106. The United States Commissioner of Education, under the supervision of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, shall be responsible for the administration of this act; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Education such sums as may be necessary for its efficient administration. The Commissioner shall cause an annual audit to be made of the expenditure of funds under this title by each State. If the Commissioner, after notice and hearing, finds that any portion of such funds has been used by any State in a manner contrary to the provisions of this title or has been lost or otherwise unlawfully used, he shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall withhold from the next ensuing payment to any such State an amount equal to that improperly used, lost, or unlawfully used, until such time as the State shall have replaced such amount and expended it for the purpose originally intended. The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 107. As used in this title—

(a) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(b) The term "number of pupils in average daily attendance at public elementary and public secondary schools" means the aggregate days of attendance by pupils regularly enrolled in such schools during the school year divided by 175.

(c) The term "public elementary and public secondary schools" means tax-supported elementary schools and high schools at least 90 percent of whose pupils are in full-time attendance, and, in the case of secondary schools, at least 50 percent of whose graduates are under 18 years of age at the time of graduation, and which are under the control and direction of the State or a local subdivision thereof.

(d) The terms "current educational expenditures" and "current expenses" mean any and all expenditures for the operation of public elementary and secondary schools and school systems, excluding expenditures for interest, debt service, and capital outlay.

(e) The term "local school administrative unit" means a county, township, independent or other school district which is under the administrative control and direction of a single board of education or other legally constituted local school authority.

(f) The term "State educational authority" means, as the State legislature may determine (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE TO NONPUBLIC TAX-EXEMPT SCHOOL OF SECONDARY GRADE OR LESS FOR NECESSARY TRANSPORTATION OF PUPILS, SCHOOL HEALTH EXAMINATIONS AND RELATED SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES, AND PURCHASE OF NONRELIGIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING BOOKS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 201. For the purpose of reimbursing nonpublic tax-exempt schools and school systems of secondary grade or less for not to exceed 60 percent of their actual expenses incurred in providing (a) necessary transportation of pupils, (b) school health examinations and related school health services, and (c) purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and annually thereafter the sum of $60,000,000 to be apportioned to the States in the proportion that the number of pupils attending nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less bears to the total number of such pupils in all the States.

CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 202. At the beginning of each fiscal year the Commissioner shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts apportioned under this title to each State which has agreed to accept the provisions of this title and to disburse the funds received for the purposes set forth in section 201 to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less. The Secretary shall, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount so certified as soon after the 1st day of September as may be feasible, beginning with the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this title become available. Each such treasurer shall account for the moneys received as trustee and shall pay out such funds only on the request of the State educational authority: *Provided, however,* That if in any State, the State educational authority is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this tile to nonpublic tax-exempt schools in the State, the Secretary shall withhold the funds apportioned to any such State, said funds to be disbursed by the Secretary directly to such nonpublic tax-exempt schools and school systems of secondary grade or less as have been certified by the Commissioner to be entitled to receive the same in such States.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 203. In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under section 201 hereof a nonpublic tax-exempt school or school system shall annually submit to the State educational authority, or in the case of States not permitted by law to administer the provisions of this title, to the Commissioner, (a) an application for funds in reimbursement for not to exceed 60 percent of the actual expenditures incurred during the next preceding fiscal year for the purposes specified in section 201; (b) a report of the number of pupils in average daily attendance during the fiscal year for which the reimbursement is claimed; (c) an agreement to permit an inspection or audit of its accounts of expenditures made for the purposes specified in section 201 either by the State educational authority or by the Commissioner, as the case may be.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 204. As used in this title—

(a) The term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(b) The term "number of pupils in average daily attendance" means the aggregate days of attendance by pupils regularly enrolled in such schools during the school year divided by 175.

(c) The term "schools of secondary grade or less" means elementary schools and high schools at least 90 percent of whose pupils are in full-time attendance and, in the case of high schools, at least 50 percent of whose graduates are under 18 years of age at the time of graduation.

(d) The term "nonpublic tax-exempt schools" means any private school exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

(e) The term "State educational authority" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) The chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education.

(f) The term "related school health services" means services of physicians, dental hygienists, nurses, nutritionists, and similar health-service personnel employed by the school authorities to provide preventative and diagnostic health services, other than actual medical, surgical, or reparative dental treatment.

EXPLANATION OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE ACT OF 1947

PURPOSE

Section 2, Declaration of Policy, states: "In order to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare it shall be the national policy to provide for the greater equalization of educational opportunities among and within the States and Territories." This purpose is to be accomplished (1) by the establishment of a uni-

form national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at all public elementary and public secondary schools; (2) by contributing to the equalization of educational opportunities for children whose parents feel constrained to send them to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less through providing Federal grants sufficient to pay not to exceed 60 percent of the cost of providing necessary pupil transportation, school health examinations and related school health services and nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books, for such schools. The means for the accomplishment of these two purposes are set forth in titles I and II, respectively.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS (TITLE I)

Section 101 of title I authorizes the appropriation of amounts as follows:

For the fiscal year 1948, $20 per pupil reported in average daily attendance during 1946.

For the fiscal year 1949, $30 per pupil reported in average daily attendance during 1947.

For the fiscal year 1950, $40 per pupil reported in average daily attendance during 1948.

For the fiscal year 1951, $50 per pupil reported in average daily attendance during 1949.

For the fiscal year 1952 and each fiscal year thereafter, $60 per pupil reported in average daily attendance during the second preceding fiscal year.

It is estimated that the appropriations so authorized would amount to approximately $400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948; $600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949; $800,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950; $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951; and $1,200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952 and thereafter.

In arriving at these estimates 19,602,772 was taken as the number of pupils in average daily attendance in public elementary and public secondary schools of the continental United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, as reported to the United States Office of Education. Assuming a national income for the fiscal year 1952 of $150,000,000,000 the Federal appropriation of $1,200,000,000 for that year under the terms of the proposed act would amount to less than 1 percent of the total national income.

BASIS OF ALLOTMENT TO THE STATES (TITLE I)

Funds are to be distributed to the States in proportion to the number of pupils in average daily attendance in all public elementary and public secondary schools of the State during the second fiscal year next preceding the year for which an appropriation is made. Thus the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 would be distributed on the basis of State reports of the number of pupils in average daily attendance for 1946. This provides sufficient time for all States to secure and compile accurate and uniform statistics concerning the number of pupils in average daily attendance and concerning their expenditures per pupil for current expense and to report the same to the Commissioners as the basis for allotment of funds. Table I, which follows, shows allotments to States for the fiscal years 1948 and 1952. This table is necessarily based upon statistics of average daily attendance for the fiscal year 1944, the latest year for which such statistics were available from the United States Office of Education.

TABLE I

State	Current expenditures per pupil in ADA[1] 1943-44	Number of pupils in ADA[1] 1943-44	Federal allotment 1948, at $20 per pupil in ADA[1]	Federal allotment 1952 and thereafter, at $60 per pupil in ADA[1]
Continental United States	$116.99	19,602,772	$392,055,440	$1,176,166,320
Alabama	54.17	527,281	10,545,620	31,636,860
Arizona	120.10	87,201	1,744,020	5,232,060
Arkansas	52.36	320,449	6,408,980	19,226,940
California	164.79	1,047,413	20,948,260	62,844,780
Colorado	125.44	168,362	3,367,240	10,101,720
Connecticut	151.09	216,687	4,333,740	13,001,220
Delaware	131.54	35,727	714,540	2,143,620
Florida	82.76	313,155	6,263,100	18,789,300
Georgia	55.70	547,070	10,941,400	32,824,200
Idaho	102.12	90,746	1,814,920	5,444,760
Illinois	158.02	950,995	19,019,900	57,059,700
Indiana	111.27	569,016	11,380,320	34,140,960
Iowa	116.08	382,672	7,653,440	22,960,320
Kansas	114.58	282,858	5,657,160	16,971,480
Kentucky	75.28	414,457	8,289,140	24,867,420
Louisiana	90.57	361,183	7,223,660	21,670,980
Maine	83.17	140,281	2,805,620	8,416,860
Maryland	110.51	245,984	4,919,680	14,759,040
Massachusetts	161.00	517,849	10,356,980	31,070,940
Michigan	124.21	831,188	16,623,760	49,871,280
Minnesota	134.29	388,281	7,765,620	23,296,860
Mississippi	42.25	444,898	8,897,960	26,693,880
Missouri	100.58	530,696	10,613,920	31,841,760
Montana	159.11	78,168	1,563,360	4,690,080
Nebraska	112.01	200,253	4,005,060	12,015,180
Nevada	149.30	19,450	389,000	1,167,000
New Hampshire	119.66	57,615	1,152,300	3,456,900
New Jersey	185.07	539,761	10,795,220	32,385,660
New Mexico	113.52	92,856	1,857,120	5,571,360
New York	185.12	1,587,260	31,745,200	95,235,600
North Carolina	65.16	728,412	14,568,240	43,704,720
North Dakota	118.88	100,473	2,009,460	6,028,380
Ohio	124.86	1,000,544	20,010,880	60,032,640
Oklahoma	88.71	386,061	7,721,220	23,163,660
Oregon	132.96	166,801	3,336,020	10,008,060
Pennsylvania	131.14	1,371,950	27,439,000	82,317,000
Rhode Island	148.87	80,974	1,619,480	4,858,440
South Carolina	58.22	364,033	7,280,660	21,841,980
South Dakota	130.82	97,559	1,951,180	5,853,540
Tennessee	62.21	491,833	9,836,660	29,509,980
Texas	88.15	1,005,994	20,119,880	60,359,640
Utah	111.87	122,414	2,448,280	7,344,840
Vermont	111.97	47,820	956,400	2,869,200
Virginia	75.30	458,191	9,163,820	27,491,460
Washington	146.57	279,276	5,585,520	16,756,560
West Virginia	92.06	360,271	7,205,420	21,616,260
Wisconsin	127.31	432,777	8,655,540	25,966,620
Wyoming	150.17	39,832	796,640	2,389,920
District of Columbia	161.73	46,592	931,840	2,795,520
Alaska	212.79	5,112	102,240	306,720
Hawaii	77.35	76,244	1,524,880	4,574,640
Puerto Rico	40.09	276,734	5,534,680	16,604,040

[1] Average daily attendance.

The basis for the distribution of allotments to the States contained in section 102 and illustrated in table I recognizes:

(1) That the national interest in education extends to each and every pupil in attendance at public elementary and secondary schools;

(2) That the contribution of the Nation to the support of education in the States is, therefore, best related directly to the educational load that each States carries as measured by the number of pupils in average daily attendance;

(3) That the Federal Government through its fiscal policies and machinery should collect taxes from all citizens in relation to their ability to pay;

(4) That a portion of the tax moneys so collected by the Federal Government should be returned to the States for educational purposes in direct proportion to the number of pupils being educated;

(5) That the Federal funds so returned to the States should provide a uniform national floor under education, thereby contributing

markedly to the equalization of educational opportunity among and within the States.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS (TITLE I)

Section 103, Availability of appropriations, sets forth explicitly and completely each and every Federal condition for the receipt of funds by a State. These Federal conditions or standards are of two general types, the first having to do with State acceptance of the Federal grants, safeguarding of the funds, assuring expenditure only for the national purpose intended by the Congress. Thus, to receive its allotment, a State through its legislature must (a) accept the provisions of the act, (b) provide for official custody of the funds, (c) designate or create a State educational authority to be responsible for the policies under which the funds are used within the State, (d) provide for an audit by the State of the expenditure of Federal funds by local school jurisdictions, (e) provide for a system of reports from these local school jurisdictions to the State educational authority, (f) provide for reports from the State educational authority to the United States Commissioner of Education.

The second type of Federal condition, set forth in paragraph (b) of section 103, is in the nature of required matching from State and local revenue sources of the Federal funds allotted to the States. Thus, States must (1) continue to spend per pupil in average daily attendance for current expense from State and local resources at least as much as they had been spending in the fiscal year 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount; (2) spend from all sources, namely, Federal, State, and total in 1948, and thereafter an amount per pupil in average daily attendance not less than the specified minima until the national minimum or level floor of $100 per pupil is reached in the fiscal year 1953 and thereafter.

Table II indicates how the standards respecting the availability of Federal funds would operate to establish a national floor under educational expenditures for current operating expenses in each local school administrative unit by 1953 of not less than $100 per pupil in average daily attendance.

TABLE II

State	Current expenditures from State and local revenue sources per pupil in ADA [1] in 1944	Minimum current expenditure required per pupil in ADA [1] in 1953 and thereafter from all revenue sources	Amount per pupil in ADA [1] to be received from Federal allotment in 1952 and thereafter	Minimum amount per pupil in ADA [1] required from State and local revenue sources	Optional additional amount from State and local revenue sources to equal expenditure per pupil in ADA [1] for 1944
Mississippi	$42.25	$100	$60	$40	
Arkansas	52.36	100	60	40	
Alabama	54.17	100	60	40	
Georgia	55.70	100	60	40	
South Carolina	58.22	100	60	40	
Tennessee	62.21	100	60	40	
North Carolina	65.16	100	60	40	
Kentucky	75.28	100	60	40	
Virginia	75.30	100	60	40	
Florida	82.76	100	60	40	
Maine	83.17	100	60	40	
Texas	88.15	100	60	40	
Oklahoma	88.71	100	60	40	
Louisiana	90.57	100	60	40	
West Virginia	93.06	100	60	40	
Missouri	100.58	100	60	40	$0.58
Idaho	102.12	100	60	40	2.12
Maryland	110.51	100	60	40	10.51
Indiana	111.27	100	60	40	11.27
Utah	111.87	100	60	40	11.87
Vermont	111.97	100	60	40	11.97
Nebraska	112.01	100	60	40	12.01
New Mexico	113.52	100	60	40	13.52
Kansas	114.58	100	60	40	14.58
Iowa	116.08	100	60	40	16.08
North Dakota	118.88	100	60	40	18.88
New Hampshire	119.66	100	60	40	19.66
Arizona	120.10	100	60	40	20.10
Michigan	124.21	100	60	40	24.21
Ohio	124.86	100	60	40	24.86
Colorado	125.44	100	60	40	25.44
Wisconsin	127.31	100	60	40	27.31
South Dakota	130.82	100	60	40	30.82
Pennsylvania	131.14	100	60	40	31.14
Delaware	131.54	100	60	40	31.54
Oregon	132.96	100	60	40	32.96
Minnesota	134.29	100	60	40	34.29
Washington	146.57	100	60	40	46.57
Rhode Island	148.87	100	60	40	48.87
Nevada	149.30	100	60	40	49.30
Wyoming	150.17	100	60	40	50.17
Connecticut	151.09	100	60	40	51.09
Illinois	158.02	100	60	40	58.02
Montana	159.11	100	60	40	59.11
Massachusetts	161.00	100	60	40	61.00
District of Columbia	161.73	100	60	40	61.73
California	164.79	100	60	40	64.79
New Jersey	185.07	100	60	40	85.07
New York	185.12	100	60	40	85.12

[1] Average daily attendance.

Column 2 of table II shows by States the expenditures for current expenses per pupil in average daily attendance for the fiscal year 1944.[2] These expenditures range from an average of $42.25 per pupil in Mississippi to $185.12 per pupil in New York. It may be fairly assumed that the expenditures of these various States as shown in column 2 represent about what the citizens through the years have found it practicable to do in support of education in their respective States by employing State and local revenue sources.

Column 3 of table II shows how in the fiscal year 1953 and thereafter a national uniform floor under educational expenditures of $100 per pupil in average daily attendance would be achieved.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1952, Federal grants-in-aid (column 4) would total $60 per pupil in average daily attendance. Each State would be required as a condition for the receipt of the Federal grants to expend from State and local revenue sources at least $40 per pupil (column 5) thus assuring the national floor of $100 per pupil.

Column 6 shows the additional amounts, i. e., in addition to the required minimum of $100 per pupil in average daily attendance from all sources, which States would at their own option need to provide from State and local revenue sources if they should desire to equal their expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance for the fiscal year 1944.[2]

Undoubtedly most of the States will wish to provide a richer educational program than that represented by an expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance of $100. The States which were expending more than $100 per pupil in 1946, such as New York, New Jersey, California, and others, would have the choice from the beginning of the operation of the act in 1948 of using all or part of their share of the Federal grants either (1) as an offset for State and local taxes for the support of elementary and secondary schools or (2) to improve still further their systems of education. Other States, such as Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, and others (see table II), which were expending less than $100 per pupil in 1946 would each year have to continue to spend from State and local revenue sources at least as much as they had been spending in 1946 until such time as the combined expenditure from Federal, State, and local sources reached or exceeded $100 per pupil.

[2] Data for 1944 are useful in table II for illustrative purposes only since that is the latest year for which data were available. The bill itself requires that figures for 1946 be used.

TABLE III

Fiscal or allotment year	Amount of Federal allotments	Conditions States must meet to qualify to receive Federal allotments
1948	$20 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1946.	
1949	$30 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1947.	
1950	$40 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1948.	(a) Must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1948 not less than amount per pupil in average daily attendance spent during fiscal 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount. (b) Must have spent from all revenue sources in 1948 not less than $50 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit.
1951	$50 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1949.	(a) Must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1949 not less than amount per pupil in average daily attendance spent during fiscal 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount. (b) Must have spent from all revenue sources in 1949 not less than $60 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit.
1952	$60 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1950.	(a) Must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1950 not less than amount per pupil in average daily attendance spent during fiscal 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount. (b) Must have spent from all revenue sources in 1950 not less than $70 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit.
1953	$60 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1951.	(a) Must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1951 not less than amount per pupil in average daily attendance spent during fiscal 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount. (b) Must have spent from all revenue sources in 1951 not less than $80 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit.
1954	$60 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1952.	(a) Must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1952 not less than amount per pupil in average daily attendance spent during fiscal 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount. (b) Must have spent from all revenue sources in 1952 not less than $90 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit.
1955	$60 per pupil in average daily attendance during 1953.	(a) Must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1953 not less than amount per pupil in average daily attendance spent during fiscal 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount. (b) Must have spent from all revenue sources in 1953 not less than $100 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit.

Table III shows in tabular form for succeeding allotment years beginning with 1948 the amount of the Federal allotments and the conditions States must meet to qualify for the receipt of the allotments. Thus, in 1948 all States would receive $20 for each pupil they reported as having been in average daily attendance during the second fiscal year preceeding 1948, i. e., 1946.

For the allotment year 1949 all States would receive $30 for each pupil they reported as having been in average daily attendance during 1947.

In order to be eligible to receive the 1950 allotment, States must meet two conditions: (a) they must have spent from State and local revenue sources in 1948 an amount per pupil in average daily attendance not less than that spent during 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount; and (b) they must have spent from all revenue sources in 1948 an amount not less than $50 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local administrative unit.

To illustrate, let us take the State of Mississippi. In 1948, in order to receive its Federal allotment of $20 per pupil in average daily attendance Mississippi, having accepted the provisions of the act, would merely report to the United States Office of Education the number of pupils that had been in average daily attendance during 1946 and the amount of the State's expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance during that year for current operating expenses. Assuming, for purposes of illustration, that the number of pupils in average daily attendance and the amount of Mississippi's expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance were the same as those reported for 1944, i. e., 444,898 pupils and $42.25 per pupil in average daily attendance, respectively, then Mississippi would receive in 1948 an allotment in the amount of $20 per pupil in average daily attendance, or $8,897,960.

In 1949 Mississippi, in order to receive its allotment of $30 per pupil reported as having been in average daily attendance during 1947, again would merely report to the United States Office of Education the number of pupils in average daily attendance and the amount spent per pupil in average daily attendance during 1947 from State and local revenue sources.

Beginning in 1950, in order to qualify to receive its Federal allotment of $40 per pupil reported as having been in average daily attendance during 1948, Mississippi's report to the United States Commissioner of Education would have to indicate (a) that it had spent from State and local revenue sources in 1948 an amount per pupil in average daily attendance not less than that spent during 1946, or $100, whichever is the lesser amount; and (b) that it had spent from all revenue sources, i. e. Federal, State, and local, in 1948 not less than $50 per pupil in average daily attendance in each local school administrative unit. Since Mississippi would know, when it received its first allotment of $20 per pupil in 1948, that this standard would have to be met as a condition precedent to the receipt of its 1950 allotment, it would govern itself accordingly in the distribution of the Federal allotment to local school administrative units within the State and would thus not only raise the general level of education throughout the State but would secure a marked increase in equalization of educational opportunities within and among all local school districts.

Missouri, on the other hand, since it was already spending in 1944 (and presumably in 1946 and thereafter) at least $100 per pupil in average daily attendance (see table II), would have the option from the beginning of the operation of the act of using all or part of its Federal allotment either to improve its educational program or to reduce the burden of school taxation resting upon State and local revenue sources by substituting Federal dollars for State or local dollars above the stipulated national minima, provided only that it met the stipulated national minimum expenditures in each local administrative unit.

ADMINISTRATION (TITLE II)

Administration is by the United States Commissioner of Education. Section 105 expressly prohibits any Federal control over personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system in any State receiving or expending Federal funds. The Commissioner has no authority under the act except to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to be allotted to each State which has accepted provisions of the act and otherwise qualified under section 103 to receive an allotment. The Commissioner is required to make a Federal audit of State expenditures under the act but this audit extends merely to the determination of whether or not the funds have been used to equalize educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools in each local school administrative unit up to the amounts stipulated in section 102 of the act.

It is the intention of the act to require States to continue to expend from State and local tax sources only so much as is necessary when added to the Federal allotments to attain the specified minimum or national floors. Any States which have been spending from State and local revenue sources an amount or amounts per pupil in average daily attendance in every local school administrative unit greater than those specified in section 103 may, if they choose, use part or all of the Federal grant either to relieve State and local educational tax burdens or to improve still further their educational programs.

PURPOSE OF TITLE II

Title II has for its purpose assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less by reimbursing them for not to exceed 60 percent of their actual annual expenses incurred in providing (a) necessary transportation of pupils, (b) school health examinations and related school health services, and (c) purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books.

The case for some financial aid from the National Treasury to nonpublic tax-exempt schools has been ably stated in the separate statement of views by myself, Senators Murray, Walsh, and Morse accompanying Senate Report 1497 on S. 181, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, from which I quote:

"In spite of evidence to the contrary, some people sincerely fear that Federal aid to church-controlled schools would bring about the union of church and state. We have considered this problem very carefully and we have concluded that such a fear is groundless. If it were not, we would be the first to oppose such aid. Another tenet of our democratic belief which we hold to be just as sacred and important as the separation of church and state is that of freedom of religion. Such freedom should not be limited by imposing, in effect, certain penalties on those who faithfully carry out the practice and teachings of their religion. In this connection, also, we must recognize that the Government does not wish to supplant the duty of parents in the instruction and training of their children, but merely wishes to supplement and facilitate it."

The bill proposes frankly to face the public-private-church-school issue through a plan which would authorize the use of tax moneys collected by the Federal Government from all the Nation's citizens to reimburse nonpublic, tax-exempt schools of noncollegiate grade for an important part of their expense of operation, namely the provision of necessary pupil transportation services, school-health examinations and related school

health services, the purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books, to be provided to pupils attending such schools. Such aid from tax sources would encourage the establishment of privately controlled schools of secondary grade or less. Some encouragement to such schools has long been given by existing legal provisions for tax exemption. The provisions of title II carry encouragement one step further by relieving somewhat the competitive disadvantage under which the nonpublic tax-exempt schools at present operate.

AMOUNT AUTHORIZED AND BASIS OF ESTIMATE (TITLE II)

On the basis of an estimated 1944 average daily attendance of 2,203,121 pupils in nonpublic tax-exempt elementary and secondary schools the amount annually authorized for appropriation by section 201, i. e., $60,000,000, amounts to approximately $20,000,000 more than the 60 percent of an estimated $30 per pupil in average daily attendance, i. e., $10 for pupil transportation; $5 for health examinations and related school health services; $15 for nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books. The amount of the appropriation authorized should be sufficient, therefore, to provide for reimbursement of expenditures for increased enrollments up to a total of approximately 3,333,333 pupils in nonpublic tax-exempt elementary and secondary schools.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS (TITLE II)

To qualify to receive Federal-aid funds nonpublic tax-exempt schools or school systems must submit either to the State educational authority or to the United States Commissioner of Education an application for reimbursement together with a report of their average daily attendance and of their expenditures for the aided purposes for which reimbursement is claimed. They must also agree to permit a State or Federal inspection or audit of their accounts of such expenditures.

The purpose of these conditions is simply to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds for the purposes specified. No direct or indirect controls of the operations of the schools receiving reimbursement is made possible.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on Saturday evening the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate made his first address to the public in his new capacity as the eminent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The able Senator from Michigan spoke with his characteristic candor, conviction, sincerity, and eloquence. With many of the remarks which he made on that occasion I am in the most hearty accord. I especially take note of the vigorous, able statement of the senior Senator from Michigan in his declared advocacy of reciprocal-trade agreements. I commend the Senator from Michigan upon that farsighted policy. I hope he will be able to carry with him not only his party but the Senate, as well.

I especially commend the Senator from Michigan upon the following statement which he made in the course of his speech:

In any event, partisan politics, for most of us, stopped at the water's edge. I hope they stay stopped—for the sake of America—regardless of what party is in power. This does not mean that we cannot have earnest, honest, even vehement domestic differences of opinion on foreign policy. It is no curb on free opinion or free speech. But it does mean that they should not root themselves in partisanship. We should ever strive to hammer out a permanent American foreign policy, in basic essentials, which serves all America and deserves the approval of all American-minded parties at all times.

Nothing could be more appropriate or fair than that statement, Mr. President. I am glad to hear the Senator from Michigan declare that principle, namely, that in regard to a matter respecting the foreign policy of this country, on something as vital to the people of this Nation as war or peace, we may all honestly and with equal patriotism speak our honest sentiments.

There are many other sentiments in the address which I could and would commend, were I to take the time to refer to them specifically. But there are two portions of the Senator's address to which I feel I am not in position to give my concurrence. And I think the Senate owes it to the world to let it be known that there may be differences of opinion in this body, as well as perhaps in this country, as to those two particular points which were emphasized by the Senator from Michigan. In his address the Senator, turning to the Far East, said:

While recognizing the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek, we have—through a year's mission headed by our distinguished General Marshall—been impartially urging that it produce unity with a rival armed party—the Chinese Communists. Under the determined leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, a national assembly has just produced a new constitution and the government has been reorganized with a coalition of non-Communist parties. We can hope that this Nanking charter, with its first great national election promised before next Christmas, will weld together a strong and competent China. It is my own view that our own far-eastern policy might well now shift its emphasis. While still recommending unity, it might well encourage those who have so heroically set their feet upon this road, and discourage those who make the road precarious.

Mr. President, those remarks on the part of the Senator from Michigan have especial significance, first because of his position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and second because of his distinguished record, in collaborating with the able Secretary of State who has just resigned, with the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and with others of the American delegation, which would cause the world to place great emphasis upon the remarks of the able Senator from Michigan and probably to regard anything he said as being an expression of the two major parties of the United States.

Although I do not wish to suggest that the Senator from Michigan spoke other than in his individual capacity, because he said he spoke only for himself, yet, as I have said, so great is the prestige of the Senator from Michigan and such is his distinction as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that we must take particular care that his utterances may not be understood to be the expression of the opinion of the Senate of the United States, unless it should be hereafter declared to be the opinion of the Senate or of the Government of the United States and of the people of this country.

Mr. President, General Marshall, than whom no American today is more greatly honored or more highly esteemed, I think, has just been appointed by the President and been confirmed by the Senate of the United States to be Secretary of State of the United States. I pause here to say that in a conversation which I was privileged to have with Mr. Winston Churchill in London in 1945—and I quote the substance of Mr. Churchill's remarks—he said that in his opinion the greatest figure who had emerged from the war was Gen. George C. Marshall; and he paid detailed compliments to the magnificence of General Marshall as a military strategist, as a diplomat, as a soldier, and as a great citizen of America and of the world. For my part, I think the President could not have made a wiser choice than his choice of Gen. George C. Marshall.

General Marshall, as the able Senator from Michigan has pointed out, has just returned from a year's mission in China, where he engaged in a strenuous and commendable effort to bring together the people of that war-torn and chaotic country into a new democratic unity. He has risked his life, and labored endless hours, in an effort to bring together the government headed by Chiang Kai-shek with the non-Chiang Kai-shek elements in China, principally the Communist group, which he said, and told the Foreign Relations Committee, are not directed from Moscow, which constitute 90,000,000 of the people of that country, and have an army of a million to bring them into a new accord, so that there may be peace in that ancient and great country.

General Marshall has told us in his report that he has other ideas than those expressed by the Senator from Michigan. He says:

Between this dominant reactionary group in the Government and the irreconcilable Communists, who, I must state, did not so appear last February, lies the problem of how peace and well-being are to be brought to the long-suffering and recently inarticulate mass of the people of China.

I am quoting from the Evening Star's report of January 7 of General Marshall's statement. I continue to quote:

The reactionaries in the Government have evidently counted on substantial American support regardless of their actions. The Communists by their unwillingness to compromise in the national interest are evidently counting on economic collapse to bring about the fall of the Government, accelerated by extensive guerrilla action against the long lines of rail communications, regardless of the cost in suffering to the Chinese people.

I quote further from General Marshall, and this is General Marshall's suggestion for the future of China and the policy of America, made on his way back from China after a year's mission there:

The salvation of the situation, as I see it, would be assumption of leadership by the liberals in the government and in the minority parties, a splendid group of men, but who, as yet, lack the political power to exercise a controlling influence. Successful action on their part under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would, I believe, lead to unity through good government.

Mr. President, I am not the only one who has detected a difference in policy between the able Senator from Michigan,

the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the new Secretary of State, who has made that declaration of principle. I am reading now from the columns of Joseph and Stewart Alsop in the Washington Post of January 15. I quote:

In his important speech at Cleveland, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG specifically demanded overt support for Chiang. He did not insert the proviso which General Marshall wisely insists upon. But Marshall should have no difficulty in harmonizing VANDENBERG'S view with his own, since VANDENBERG will be the first to acknowledge that there is no sense in aiding a regime which is inherently a bad investment.

Mr. President, all I wish to say is that I was a little surprised that the new chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations would lay down what obviously the people of China, and many other parts of the world, would take as American policy, coming from the chairman of the committee and an illustrious representative of the American Government in many councils of the world, on a matter which was in the intimate knowledge of the new Secretary of State, before the Secretary of State was sworn in, and in the opinion of many of us, including Mr. Alsop, in contradiction to the recommendation of General Marshall as to what should be the policy of this country, for the future unity and security of the people of China.

I merely wish to state that for my part I do not desire to commit America to support, as General Marshall says they are expecting, and I quote again—

The reactionaries in the Government who have evidently counted on substantial American support regardless of their actions.

General Marshall says:

Now that the form for a democratic China has been laid down by the newly adopted constitution, practical measures will be the best. It remains to be seen to what extent the Government will give substance to the form by a genuine welcome of all groups actively to share in the responsibility of government.

As I have said, I merely wish it understood that neither the American Congress, or the American Government, has committed itself to give support to the corrupt, the reactionary, or the feudal element of China, any more than we would propose to give our support to the irreconcilables in the Communist Party, whom General Marshall, with equal and impartial severity, has condemned.

Mr. President, it must not be understood in any part of the world that America is associating itself with the reactionary, the corrupt, or the backward-looking elements where the people are endeavoring to find a new highway for prosperity and peace for the people in those lands.

Mr. President, I turn to a reference in the able chairman's speech to South America and to what our policy should be with respect to Argentina. The able chairman in his address used the following words:

But I think it is past time to hold the Pan-American Conference which we promised in 1945, and there to formally renew the joint New World authority which is the genius of our New World unity.

On the same evening the Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, spoke to the same audience. I have said here in the Senate that I have not concurred in all aspects of our foreign policy, but I was glad I had the privilege to pay tribute to Hon. James F. Byrnes, who I believe will be remembered in the history of this country by a grateful citizenry as one of the most distinguished Secretaries of State we have ever had. Speaking on the same subject, on the same occasion as the Senator from Michigan, this is what the Secretary of State said:

It was our fostering of a common fellowship that gave vitality to the good-neighbor policy in the Americas. It was a common fellowship which made the act of Chapultepec possible.

We are eager to proceed with the negotiation of a mutual-assistance treaty in accordance with the act of Chapultepec at the projected Rio de Janeiro Conference. But we do not wish to proceed without Argentina, and neither our Ambassador nor any official of the State Department is of the opinion that Argentina has yet complied with the commitments which she, as well as the other American Republics at Chapultepec, agreed to carry out.

Again, Mr. President, the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has spoken upon a subject relating to a vital matter in South America in direct contradiction to the present declared policy of the State Department, and before the new Secretary of State has had an opportunity to give expression to what should be the new policy of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I saw in the Evening Star 2 or 3 days ago a statement to the effect that Secretary Byrnes was denounced in Argentina. His critics tried to distinguish by saying they did not denounce him as Secretary of State, for what he said at Cleveland, they denounced him as a private citizen. Did the able chairman of the committee mean to leave the impression that the American Senate, or his committee, or this Government, or this people, is willing to embrace Argentina again to its breast before it has been found by our competent agencies that it has purged itself of its iniquitous collaboration with nazism during the war? Do we wish to lay ourselves open to the accusation by any such statements as this made by the Senator from Michigan that we are growing friendlier and friendlier with our proven enemies, and more inimical toward our proven friends?

Surely, Mr. President, it cannot be helpful to the new Secretary of State in trying to find the policy which will lead to harmony in this hemisphere, to have it already declared by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee before the new Secretary has taken office, that the present policy of the State Department is wrong and that another should be put in effect.

Again, I do not want any misunderstanding by the people of Argentina that the able Senator, eloquent and convincing as he is, speaks other than his own individual convictions or the convictions of those who concur with him in this matter.

I have said these things, Mr. President, with some hesitancy, because I feel that we must exercise the utmost restraint lest the impression go around the world that the American Government is getting closer and closer to the reactionary if not to the feudal and sometimes the corrupt and sometimes the fascistic influences of the various lands of the earth. I am sure that when we reflect upon it we want everybody to understand, as the Senator clearly said in another part of his address, that we are standing with those forces which stand for democracy and for peace. We want the world to enjoy, at long last, its deserved inheritance of both.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. On behalf of the junior Senator from Maine, I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment he had previously offered, which I send to the desk, and on his behalf I withdraw the amendment he previously submitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the previous amendment is withdrawn and that a new amendment is offered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. The Senator from Maine is still here.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the substitute amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. BREWSTER to the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program. Strike out lines 12 and 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "defense program); is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided*, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority shall be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States (including Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico) prior to June 30, 1946: *Provided further*, That the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948, at which time all powers and duties conferred upon the committee shall terminate."

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask how this differs from the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not realize the Senator from Florida was going to

speak on this issue. The new amendment adds Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the new amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I inquire of the majority leader what his plans are? It is obvious that we cannot vote today on the pending proposal, and at this hour it is a little unfair to expect Senators to begin speaking.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have sympathy with what the Senator from Kentucky has just said, but I express the hope that if we now adjourn we may be able to conclude the discussion and vote on this matter and finally dispose of it on Friday.

I think I ought to suggest that we probably will hold something like a continuous session on Friday, in an effort ultimately to dispose of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I say to the Senator that there is no disposition on this side to prolong the discussion or to delay a vote.

I wish to say that there are several Senators on this side who have prepared to address themselves to the matter of principle involved. It is important. We are beginning the session, and what we do may have a far-reaching effect upon the conduct of the Senate in the future, and I think it is a subject that is worthy of fair discussion.

While I share the hope that we may vote Friday, we know that as the debate proceeds, like that which took place today, it is impossible to know how long any Senator will occupy the floor, that depending on the number of questions asked him and his willingness to yield.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, none of those who oppose this resolution have had an opportunity today to discuss it except by interjection in the speeches of others.

I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Maine that the matter go over until Friday, and I think there is a fair chance that we may be able to reach a conclusion then.

Mr. WHITE. I repeat, I appreciate, of course, the suggestion of the minority leader and his eminent fairness in all matters between the two sides, but I have been asked by some Senators to move to recess until Thursday. I think, having reached the agreement or the general understanding that we will meet on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, we ought not to depart from that understanding, certainly without giving adequate notice to all Members of the Senate, so that they could accommodate their commitments to the new situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I share that view, and I appreciate the Senator's fairness about it.

I might say that the committee involved in the pending resolution will not expire until the 31st day of January. It is in existence now, and will continue until the end of this month. There is no other legislation ready for consideration, and therefore there is no rush sufficient to justify preventing what ought to be a fair and constructive discussion of the principle and merits of the question itself.

Mr. WHITE. I would have to agree with the Senator from Kentucky, but I still hope that we may ultimately dispose of the matter on Friday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what is the last amendment that was sent to the desk?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The last amendment is the final substitute language which the Senator from Maine requests be presented as the pending amendment, and it is now the pending amendment to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair means it is the final amendment unless another final amendment is brought in at a subsequent date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; it is the final amendment up to date.

Mr. LUCAS. This is not an amendment to an amendment; this is a substitute for the other amendment that was offered first?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine withdrew the other amendment and presented the new amendment, which is an amplification of the original.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair, and I should like to make this observation in the time of the able Senator from Maine, if I may, about this rush. It is now 5:15 o'clock on the first day of the debate, and it is suggested that now, for the first time, we have in final form the resolution the Senator wishes to have presented by his side. Perhaps when we meet again there will be another substitute. We began with the original resolution. Then an amendment was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], which was withdrawn. Then the Senator from Maine offered one, and he withdrew that and submitted another in its place. It is difficult for me to keep up with the amendments, and I should like a little time at least to look over the last amendment before we vote.

Mr. WHITE. I feel very sure that any amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would be so clearly stated that we could all readily understand its purport.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure about that. I am not sure what these amendments mean. I do know what the investigating committee will do, once they go into action.

Mr. WHITE. Let me add just a further word. I think I ought to suggest to all Senators who are now present that it may seem necessary to run into the evening on Friday, if there will thereby be a chance to make final disposition of the pending measure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I rise to comment on the statement of the minority leader about the Democratic side not having had an opportunity to present its views this afternoon. I am sure he did not intend to minimize the contribution of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] who addressed himself to this matter in his usual clear manner.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am subject to that correction. The Senator from Utah spoke first after the Senate assembled, but the remainder of the day has been taken up with reports and other matters.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not want it to seem that we had occupied all the time, and I think the RECORD also will indicate that there was great liberality in yielding by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the suggestions from the other side.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not criticizing, but I am calling attention to the fact that circumstances have prevented four or five Senators who have prepared themselves to discuss the matter on its merits from obtaining the floor, and I am sure nobody wishes to cut them off.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Maine yield further?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Replying to the Senator from Illinois, I will say that I submitted the revised amendment at this time in order that there should be full opportunity for everyone interested to become familiar with it. I am quite appreciative of the Senator's interest in the matter and the attention which he has given to it, and also of his comments regarding the provisions of the amendment.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15, 1947:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Carroll L. Wilson, of Massachusetts, to be the General Manager within the Atomic Energy Commission, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

David E. Lilienthal, of Tennessee.
Robert F. Bacher, of New York.
Sumner T. Pike, of Maine.
Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia.
William W. Waymack, of Iowa.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

William A. Rowan, of Illinois, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., in place of Thomas Temple Hoyne, deceased.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE PROFESSOR OF MILITARY ART AND ENGINEERING AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Col. Vincent Joseph Esposito (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James H. Meadors, Tuskegee, Ala., in place of E. W. Thompson, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Tom C. Morris, Berryville, Ark., in place of Tom Morris, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

William R. Woods, Gustine, Calif., in place of R. S. Woodruff, resigned.

Mary Louise Reid, Sloat, Calif., in place of P. A. Zimmerman, declined.

FLORIDA

Chandos W. McMullen, Bay Pines, Fla., in place of A. W. Martin, declined.

Henry S. Thompson, Perry, Fla., in place of J. P. Puckett, resigned.

IDAHO

Sam O. Noble, Bruneau, Idaho, in place of E. M. Grant, resigned.

Fred O. Stedman, Kendrick, Idaho, in place of C. H. Daugherty, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Jesse B. Thacker, Butler, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles J. Murphy, Oak Park, Ill., in place of J. L. Lynch, resigned.

Roy M. Martin, Springerton, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

INDIANA

Edward L. Pequignot, Pierceton, Ind., in place of J. R. Smith, transferred.

IOWA

Francis L. Porter, Clarion, Iowa, in place of Richard Tomke, deceased.

Kenneth I. Morrow, Diagonal, Iowa, in place of E. E. Wiley, transferred.

LOUISIANA

T. Oliver Thibodaux, Donaldsonville, La., in place of P. T. Thibodaux, retired.

MAINE

Chester C. Tuttle, Kennebunk, Maine, in place of W. D. Hay, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Fremont F. Getz, Brown City, Mich., in place of W. H. Cronin, retired.

Sara Devine, Copper City, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Vincent E. McIntee, Leslie, Mich., in place of E. E. Scofield, transferred.

J. Willard Krause, Manistee, Mich., in place of E. J. Talbot, deceased.

Mabel C. O'Neill, Saline, Mich., in place of A. E. O'Neill, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Raymond Stevens, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strope, deceased.

NEW YORK

Henry W. Johnson, Cementon, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert White, Bunn, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH DAKOTA

Kenneth O. Martwick, Kief, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Kvam, transferred.

OHIO

Ralph C. Bennett, Amesville, Ohio, in place of W. L. Carpenter, resigned.

Joseph Yanka, New Washington, Ohio, in place of A. G. Shealy, transferred.

OREGON

John W. Karasti, Clatskanie, Oreg., in place of E. L. Mueller, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Elizabeth Claycomb, Imler, Pa., in place of A. F. Stufft, retired.

Harold E. Hake, Lewisberry, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Cordelia C. Hill, Beeville, Tex., in place of D. W. Hancock, resigned.

Ellen Lucile Kerr, Grand Prairie, Tex., in place of R. L. Hight, resigned.

Walter L. Hunter, Lake Dallas, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Pauline Stagner, McDade, Tex., in place of J. H. Watson, resigned.

Charles L. Haynes, San Marcos, Tex., in place of W. M. Burnett, resigned.

Euel B. Britton, Stamford, Tex., in place of R. C. Thomas, deceased.

WASHINGTON

John A. Croy, Chelan, Wash., in place of W. K. Kingman, resigned.

Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish, Wash., in place of R. I. Matheson, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Bow down Thine ear, O Lord, and hear our prayer for Thy name's sake. We thank Thee that neither time nor place can separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

In the spirit of the Teacher of Galilee, we would draw near to Thee and ask that in all things we may put first things first—patience, unity, and consecration to the public weal. Allow us not to indulge in selfishness, with its illusion of gain, but in the goodness and stability of our Republic. We pray for decisions to come through with wisdom and skill. Make us all susceptible to helpful influences, born in deep conviction, in the spirit of fairness, and away from those dreams that dazzle for a day. Arouse within us the ambition, in public service, to be led and directed by Thee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 14, 1947, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Rotarian, copied in the Reader's Digest.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech prepared by him for delivery at Lincoln, Nebr., before the Reclamation Association.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Kansas City Star and a portion of a letter.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a portion of a speech he made about UNRRA in 1944, together with an editorial from the Times-Herald, and in the other on the subject of Poland abuses UNRRA, an article from Life.

BRITISH LOAN AGREEMENT

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the last few days have carried several startling stories about an apparent direct violation of the British loan agreement by Great Britain in its trade pact with Argentina a few months ago.

In order that the Members of Congress and the people may know the full facts about this situation, I am today writing Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder for complete copies of his correspondence with Hugh Dalton, Chancelor of the British Exchequer, on this development.

It is obvious that the House of Representatives has a continuing responsibility in this matter.

Eight hundred million dollars has already been advanced under the British loan agreement. Until full information has become available to the House, it is impossible to indicate whether action on the part of the House will be necessary.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 49), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: John W. Flannagan, Jr., Virginia; Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina; Orville Zimmerman, Missouri; Stephen Pace, Georgia; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; Walter K. Granger, Utah; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Eugene Worley, Texas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Appropriations: Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson, Georgia; Patrick H. Drewry, Virginia; R. Ewing Thomason, Texas; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Lyndon B. Johnson, Texas; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland; James J. Heffernan, New York; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence, Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma; John H. Folger, North Carolina; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Albert Rains, Alabama; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Hale Boggs, Louisiana.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray, Tennessee; John E. Lyle, Texas; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George

P. Miller, California; J. M. Combs, Texas; Earle C. Clements, Kentucky; J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Virginia; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Laurie C. Battle, Alabama; James C. Davis, Georgia.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; ——; ——; ——; ——.

Committee on Education and Labor: John Lesinski, Michigan; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; John S. Wood, Georgia; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; Arthur G. Klein, New York; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Wingate Lucas, Texas.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Carter Manasco, Alabama; William L. Dawson, Illinois; John J. Delaney, New York; Chet Holifield, California; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; J. Frank Wilson, Texas.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Sol Bloom, New York; John Kee, West Virginia; James P. Richards, South Carolina; Joseph L. Pfeifer, New York; Pete Jarman, Alabama; Wirt Courtney, Tennessee; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Helen Gahagan Douglas, California; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; William M. Colmer, Mississippi.

Committee on House Administration: Mary T. Norton, New Jersey; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Tom Pickett, Texas; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Omar Burleson, Texas; Hugh A. Meade, Maryland; Toby Morris, Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, Florida; John Bell Williams, Mississippi.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Clarence F. Lea, California; Robert Crosser, Ohio; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina; Virgil Chapman, Kentucky; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; George G. Sadowski, Michigan; Richard F. Harless, Arizona; Dwight L. Rogers, Florida; Benjamin J. Rabin, New York.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Sam Hobbs, Alabama; William T. Byrne, New York; Estes Kefauver, Tennessee; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Fadjo Cravens, Arkansas; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Martin Gorski, Illinois; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky; Ed Gossett, Texas.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Schuyler Otis Bland, Virginia; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Cecil R. King, California; Emory H. Price, Florida; Franck R. Havenner, California; Leo F. Rayfiel, New York; Prince H. Preston, Georgia.

Committee on Public Lands: Andrew L. Somers, New York; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Clair Engle, California; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; Preston E. Peden, Oklahoma; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; John A. Carroll, Colorado; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Public Works: Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas; William M. Whittington, Mississippi; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota.

Committee on Un-American Activities: John S. Wood, Georgia; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: John E. Rankin, Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; Melvin Price, Illinois; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Glen D. Johnson, Oklahoma; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Georgia L. Lusk, New Mexico; W. M. Wheeler, Georgia; Hamilton C. Jones, North Carolina; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with serious attention to the Budget message of the very able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, who has been in the Congress, I understand, for 23 years; a hard, conscientious worker who has turned in a magnificent performance. I am willing to take the recommendations of a man of his experience and judgment after 23 years on the Appropriations Committee.

I want to assure him, as I believe other Members of the House should, that I stand with him for a balanced budget, a reduction in governmental expenditures, and a substantial yearly reduction of the national debt.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from New York that the Budget should be no greater than $30,000,000,000. We should apply about $3,000,000,000 each year of savings effected to the reduction of the national debt.

We all should insist upon and demand economy in Government and the elimination of unnecessary bureaus and departments, a reduction of the Federal pay roll, and I also might add that it is about time we take about 1,000,000 payrollers out of the lush pasture of political patronage and off the backs of the American taxpayers. Now is the time to call a halt to excessive Federal spending, and the Appropriations Committee can do exactly that.

I believe that the Members of Congress should wholeheartedly support the position of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and assure him that we agree with and will support his position that the Budget should not be greater than $30,000,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, January 20, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders that may have been heretofore agreed upon, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject, Is It Wise To Cut Income Taxes Now?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the business of the day and any other special orders that may have been heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JANUARY 20, 1947

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader what the program for next week will be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the majority leader is in position to tell us what the program for next week is going to be, we, on this side, would appreciate his telling us. I may say, however, that I would not be disappointed if there were none.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman from Texas understands, we have just now completed the assignments to committees. It is expected they will be getting organized and ready to consider such matters as may come before them.

So far as I know, there are no legislative matters for consideration next week. A number of Members on our side wish to address the House. I am hoping that we can arrive at some determination as to the days on which we shall meet next week in order to permit individual Members to take care of pressing matters in their offices, and also to permit the committees to perfect their organization and otherwise get under way.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute; and I also ask unanimous consent to include an address by the Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, who has just been made presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday at the Washington Cathedral, it was my great privilege to witness the installation, as presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, of my bishop of Massachusetts, the Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill. It was one of the most inspiring ceremonies I have ever witnessed. That great cathedral was filled to overflowing. Five hundred clergy were in the choir, clergymen of every denomination, and the congregation packed the building. It was an inspiration to witness the deep fervor with which the entire assemblage sang the religious songs and took part in the religious exercises. Such a thing is of great national importance; indeed, of world-wide importance. It was almost like a revival of religion, which is sorely needed today. Bishop Sherrill is a profoundly religious man and a great leader. His address follows:

In a very few words I express my appreciation of the trust which has been placed in my hands and my gratitude for the generous kindness of many friends. My reticence is due to no lack of personal feeling, but in these times no life is of great significance, especially when this happens to be your own. It is the cause to which we are all committed which is of supreme importance. Nor shall I at this time attempt to suggest any detailed program for the church or the national council. Such plans demand careful study and certainly more knowledge than I have at present. Furthermore, while programs are essential, they are entirely theoretical unless there is a consecrated and convinced membership of the church eager to translate strategy on paper into determined action in life. It is therefore of the temper and mind of the church of which I would speak. My remarks are directed to you not so much as a normal congregation but as representatives of the entire membership of our communion, hundreds of thousands of men, women, boys and girls, clergy and laity scattered throughout the world. While I am thinking especially of our own household of faith, what I have to say is applicable to every Christian communion. Whatever our differences in faith and order may be, we all live in the same world, sharing great truths, and facing the same responsibilities and opportunities.

Certainly, no true Christian can be complacent today either about the state of the world, the church, or himself. Such a statement would seem to be superfluous, were it not that so many of us are apparently content to move along the same conventional routines and paths. What do we need to see before we are stirred to face realities? Twice within our generation so-called Christian nations have engaged in the most devastating and cruel of wars which have involved not alone the fighting forces but entire civilian populations from the aged to infants in untold suffering and privation. We live in a world not only of starvation and want, but, more dangerous even, of suspicion and of hatred. With new and terrifying weapons of destruction, without a new understanding and spirit, man stands on the verge of not divine but self-destruction; this on the word not of the preacher but of the scientist and of the military leader. Nor can we in our own country rest back on self-righteousness. Democracy is a great ideal, but it must work. War, with the pressure of common necessity, brings cooperation and united sacrificial effort. When that pressure is removed, we revert to selfish aims and objectives. There are evidences of ugly racial and religious intolerance. The divorce rate goes up alarmingly. Out of broken homes comes the widespread problem of juvenile delinquency. Deeper than all of these outward signs is to be found a growing spirit of secularization evident in the atmosphere of our homes, our schools and colleges, our personal lives. These are not the opinions of a prophet of pessimism and of doom. These are stern and hard facts well known to us all. I recount them here for one purpose: to emphasize as strongly as possible that we of the church face an heroic and tremendous struggle in the name of Christ. Let us have done with easygoing, thoughtless complacency.

This struggle would be severe were even the entire membership of all the churches of Christ on the firing line. When we stop to examine the facts, we find that in every parish and diocese it is largely the few who bear the burden and heat of the day. It is as if an army were engaged in a life-and-death struggle, with a large proportion of the soldiers busied in some other activity or else taking the position of spectators or neutrals. The churches are at a tremendous disadvantage, for we are in essence waging a desperate spiritual warfare in a most critical period of history, at the same time carrying a vast weight of nominal Christians who, as someone has remarked, having been once inoculated by weak religion, seem to be impervious to the real thing. Dean Hodges, late dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., used to say that the task of the church is to make the indifferent different. We must begin to do this within our own ecclesiastical family.

I wish to make it entirely clear that I am in no way faulting the faithful here or elsewhere, and least of all am I reading any group out of the church, for we are, all of us, fallible human beings. But I do feel that the times call us to be more clear cut, to examine more critically our own beliefs and practices and, more particularly, our own personal sincerity and loyalty.

The faith of the Christian is complex, and yet in essence is extremely simple. We see in and through and behind creation, as well as in history, the will and purpose of an eternal and living God. We look at Jesus of Nazareth, living in the limitation of space of time and of human form, and we believe that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us—that in Him we find the way and the truth. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." We have faith that God does not dwell in some far-distant heaven but that His Holy Spirit is at work in the world, especially in those who have given themselves to God in the fellowship of faithful people in the church.

These are such familiar statements to Christians that they have ceased to have startling news value. But there we are wrong; if they are true there is nothing possibly in all the world of greater significance. If there be a God revealed to us so personally in Christ, if Christ has shown to us the divine pattern for our lives, if there is in Christ the power to make us become the sons of God, then here is the news to make all other affirmations of any character whatsoever insignificant. If these statements be not true, then no one of us should wish to make any pretense of either believing or of acting upon them. Here is too serious a matter for trifling, or for mere lip service. The point is that the members of our church do say that they believe. We join in the words of the creed: "I believe in God, I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son, I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church." Many thousands of our people have stood in the chancel of some church and have solemnly of their own will pledged themselves to follow Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour. It is now time to ask ourselves what we mean by these words and by these acts. No one asks for perfection. We all are weak and we constantly fail. That is why there are confessions of sin in our liturgy. But we do have a right to expect of ourselves and of others an underlying sincerity of effort and the realization of the greatness of our commitment.

If we truly believe in God in Christ, then worship becomes no conventional act of outward respectability, but the very bread of life through prayer and sacrament. If we truly believe, then brotherhood becomes more than a slogan; it is a conviction that we belong, all of us of every nation and race, to the family of God. Selfishness, intolerance, hatred give place to the compulsion of love. If we really believe, then Christian discipleship, the mission of the church are not inconsequential asides or the task of peculiar people. They are the absorbing responsibility and opportunity of every member of the church. In one of the most popular of missionary hymns, joined in lustily by every congregation, we sing, "Give of thy sons to bear the message glorious; give of thy wealth to send them on their way, pour out thy soul for them in prayer victorious; till God shall bring His kingdom's glorious day." Are these mere words? If so they are shocking in their insincerity. If they are meant, then there is demanded and implied a consecration of life and of our means.

I am not naive enough to believe that the solution of our present difficult problems is easy or simple. I know full well the complexities of our world. But I am convinced that these questions, whether of international conferences, of industry, of labor, of the home, of education, or of human relationships can only be given satisfactory and definite answer by the standard of the mind and spirit of Him we call our Lord and Master. But before we can dare to apply Christ's teaching to the world, we must meet Him in our own minds, wills, and hearts. The world must find evidence of the presence of Christ in the membership of the Christian church. "If the salt have lost its savor wherewithal shall it be salted?" "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness." The first task is to see that we and all who are of the church are Christian.

The American people have on the whole seen the importance of education and of health. We have thought of these causes rightly in large terms of millions upon millions of dollars, with the enlistment of a personnel of remarkable ability. I mention this only in contrast to the small way we have envisaged the work of the church, in terms of both money and workers clerical and lay. Similarly, we talk much of democracy in world terms. Democracy emphasizes the worth and the value of the individual. But apart from a faith in God, of what eternal significance is personality? Apart from human souls, what incentive is there to care passionately for human minds and bodies? In the faith of the Christian is to be found the inspiration of the finest and best in our civilization. It is time that we think of the church in large terms of intelligence, interest, and support. For if the Christian Evangel be true, here is the greatest of all causes given by God into the hands of men. Upon this rests all other efforts for the attainment of peace and of righteousness.

If there are stern realities to be faced courageously and realistically, it is equally true that there are firm grounds for encouragement. Never before has the cause of Christian missions been so justified by the march of events. It is not so long ago that the Christian who talked of the family of nations, of human brotherhood, of the world community of interest was considered to be an impracticable dreamer. Now we know that such a Christian talked hard common

sense. The organization of the United Nations, the proposals for World Government, every peace conference of the leaders of the nations, indeed every newspaper headline prove the essential correctness of the Christian view of the world and human nature. With the advent of modern methods of communication and of transportation we have an unprecedented means and opportunity of telling the good news, not of our western civilization, but of the Christ who would draw all men unto Him.

Furthermore, we can rejoice that not in many centuries has there been evident such a spirit of cooperation among the many of the great communions of the Christian Church as shown in programs of vital importance. I am happy to emphasize a resolution passed overwhelmingly by both houses of our general convention as indication of the mind of our own church:

"Resolved, That this general convention herewith goes on record as expressing its sincere intention to seek closer cooperation and joint action with other churches and with the Federal Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches in facing together in the light of our Christian faith, the material, moral, and spiritual issues of our day."

If the Christian forces of the world can stand together for Christian truth and practice, then there is reason for the conviction that the powers of evil can be overcome.

But of course the great reason for realistic and determined confidence is in the character of our faith. If to the best of our ability, we are true and loyal, then we work not in our own feeble human strength but as living channels of the power of God in Jesus Christ. Like the servant of old, if we have the eyes of faith we shall know that "around and about us are the horses and chariots of fire," that "they who are with us are more than they that be with them."

So as this month, by the act of the general convention, I assume a position of leadership within the church, I ask of every bishop, clergyman, layman, and laywoman: "Where do we stand? What do you believe? What do you plan to give of your means, above all of your life, in this cause?" If you are not deeply concerned, then let us know that and have it settled where we stand and upon whom we can count. Again I say let each of us throughout the church face again the overwhelming implications of the Christian faith and his own sincerity in affirming that faith.

Numbers are important, but not vital. The essential things are consecration, determination, loyalty, the character of the Christian community that God may use us as instruments of His purpose and will. Here today, as representatives of all our people, in humility, in trust, in thankfulness for all that God has given to us, we rededicate ourselves, our souls, and bodies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Air Accidents."

Mr. HOPE and Mr. CELLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a news item.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include abstracts from a series of articles appearing in recent issues of the Log of America's Maritime Industries.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution and in the other a newspaper article.

GREAT BRITAIN'S PACT WITH ARGENTINA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as one who voted against the British loan, I note that Britain's trade pact with Argentina provides that in case Argentina has an unfavorable trade balance it can draw on its bloc sterling account, but this money must be spent in the sterling area. This is a violation of Britain's pledge to dissipate the sterling bloc pool within 1 year from the date of the agreement.

Britain intimates that the Argentine violation will not be repeated in other trade agreements. I doubt this.

Furthermore, Britain has done little to settle India's large sterling balances which are upward of £1,300,000,000. Britain owes other sterling areas billions more. We were unwilling to become a new creditor to the extent of three and three-quarter billions without definite assurances that other creditors of Britain would scale down their credits. Again Britain is unfair.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of a letter and a resolution.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a speech he made in New York on October 18.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill, on the subject Portal to Portal, and further entitled "A Challenge to Congress."

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H. R. 575, seeks to raise the yearly income-tax exemption of single persons to $2,500 and to increase the tax exemption of married persons to $5,000.

This bill was drafted and introduced by me because I sincerely believe that it will give much needed relief to our farmers, veterans, small businessmen, white-collar employees, and the laboring men and women of the country. In other words, it will definitely raise the income of the "little fellow" in that he will have more "Saturday-night rattling change" after present high-cost living expenses and taxes have been met.

Compare my bill with the flat 20 percent tax-reduction bill which has been introduced. This bill is calculated to save money for the rich man. For instance, it is estimated that the "little fellow" who makes a net yearly income of $2,000 would have a savings of only $38 per annum or about 70 cents a week, while the person with an income of $250,000 would save over $38,000 yearly, or around $730 per week.

It may be argued by those who see fit to oppose my bill that it will cost the Treasury, in the loss of income taxes, some $6,000,000,000 per year, and that such would keep the Budget in the red. However, I contend that, although the Government may lose this sum of money in the form of income taxes from our "little fellow," nevertheless the Treasury will receive a like or similar amount of money through the medium of excise taxes. In other words, my plan would only shift the burden of taxation from income tax to the excise tax, insofar as the small wage earner is concerned.

The individual who now earns less than $5,000 per year must, through necessity, spend the bulk of it. By allowing him this income-tax exemption, we would leave him more "defrosted cash" on pay day, hence, more money to spend. As a result, he would drive his automobile more frequently, buy more gasoline, oil, tires, and tubes. Each time he would make a purchase of any of these items, he would pay a Federal excise tax. Likewise, he would be in a position to buy more tobacco, furs, and jewelry. He would make more long-distance calls, send more telegrams, go to more movies, see more ball games, and actually be in a position to take the "little missus" to a dance now and then. All of this would swell the excise taxes to such an extent that little would be lost through the medium of the raise in the income-tax exemption.

It is my belief that by giving this income-tax relief to Mr. and Mrs. Average American, our entire economic structure will be strengthened because it will enable the little fellow to pay his debts and to be able to spend, all of which will put more money in circulation, create more buying power and, in the final analysis, return a like or similar amount of Federal revenue into the Treasury through excise taxes in lieu of income taxes.

In this manner, our Federal Budget would not be tipped out of balance, because by retaining our luxury taxes for a reasonable length of time, the tremendous appropriations now required by our armed forces would not be jeopardized.

Let us balance the budget of little John Q. Taxpayer and he will balance our Federal Budget.

VETERAN AMPUTEES

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the programs adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress—which I believe was most successful—was the appropriation of $30,000,000 in order that men who had lost one leg at the ankle, and who had suffered perhaps further injuries, could receive automobiles at the expense of the Government. Recently two men who had lost legs came to my office in Springfield, Mass., and told me that they appreciated greatly the fact that they had these automobiles. It has given them a chance to get around and to earn a livelihood and has built up their morale greatly. Similarly this past week a mother came to my office and told me that her son had one such automobile and that in her opinion the gift of this automobile by the United States Government was the greatest morale builder which the Congress had given to the veterans in any legislation. Also during this same time two other boys, and they were boys although one of them weighed over 200 pounds, came into my office. Each wore an artificial arm. Each of them asked me why they had been discriminated against. One of them had been a truck driver. He said that if he had an automobile with the contrivances to permit him to drive it, having lost one arm and having an artificial arm, he felt that he could earn a livelihood which he was otherwise deprived from doing. So, in order that these men may have the opportunity to go ahead just as the men who have lost their legs, I am introducing a bill today to give to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authority to purchase automobiles for men who have lost at least one arm at the wrist. I hope it will receive your prompt, careful, and favorable consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include excerpts from the financial report of Anderson, Clayton & Co. for 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there are two very timely reasons why I must discuss the United States Department of State at this time.

First. Gen. George C. Marshall, for whom we all have the highest admiration, soon will take office as the new Secretary of State, and, therefore, will be presented a first-rate opportunity to "clean house" of the Communists, "one-worlders," and multimillionaire playboy diplomats who have been using American funds indirectly to increase their family fortunes.

Second. Conferences are being held this week relating to further extension of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Presumably, the Department of State is listening to the pleas of more American industries before it cuts the economic ground from under a new group of American employers and employees. One of the men in the Department of State who is taking a leading hand in these deliberations and will have a great deal to say about any final agreements is William Lockhart Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Mr. Clayton is a well-known "one-worlder" in "do-gooder" circles, and I must admit that he does believe in one world—one world for Will Clayton and family.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about war contractors and Congressmen in recent months, and it was well that the American people learned these facts which were made public. It helped in bringing about the present Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, for the Congressmen who now are in the majority on the Republican side did not move across the aisle. They were sent across the aisle by the American people.

Now, of course, the American people want us to let them in on some more secrets of this swollen bureaucracy that is Washington. They want us to throw back the iron curtain which the New Deal has kept firmly between the public and the activities of high Government officials during the years when our money was being thrown to the four winds for every kind of foolishness and fol-de-rol it was possible for the mind of man to conjure.

Let me just give the American people a little data about Will Clayton—the man who is in charge of the reciprocal trade-agreement program for the Department of State. Then, I am sure, they and other Congressmen will join with me in calling on incoming Secretary of State Marshall to get rid of Mr. Clayton and others who have been posing as pious, public-spirited servants of the people while making exorbitant profits by reason of their high places.

Mr. Clayton, if there are any who do not know it already, is always in favor of foreign loans. He made the first announcement in 1945 that the British were seeking a three- or four-billion-dollar loan and it was he who opened the preliminary discussions in London. He was the principal negotiator of the three and three-fourths billion-dollar British gift-loan which a Democratic Congress passed and a Democratic President signed. Now, Mr. Clayton also is something else besides the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. He is the principal shareholder in Anderson, Clayton & Co., the largest cotton firm in the world.

He and members of his immediate family jointly own 40 percent of the stock in this company. When he came to Washington to join the New Deal in 1940, he resigned as president of this company, but he did not divest himself or members of his family of their huge stockholding in a company that depends for its very livelihood on foreign dealings—and, to a large extent, on the decisions made by Will Clayton.

I hold in my hand a copy of the last annual report of this company and its consolidated subsidiaries. This report, dated October 21, 1946, and for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1946, reveals that the company made a total net profit of $14,138,877 after taxes. Of that amount, more than $5,500,000 went to Under Secretary of State Will Clayton and his wife and children, who own 40 percent of the stock.

The record earnings, it is clear, were made in the year in which Great Britain was given a three and three-quarter billion American dollar loan. Remember, that loan was negotiated principally by and through Will Clayton.

Without American dollars, Great Britain would be unable to make large cotton or other purchases in this country.

As we all know, Mr. Clayton is an active propagandist for more loans to other nations—to China, to France, to the Netherlands, and to Italy. His reasons are that these nations need more American dollars to buy more raw materials—including cotton.

But a study of his record and his words, Mr. Speaker, does not show that he is interested primarily in American cotton or the American cotton farmer. On the contrary, Mr. Clayton's company depends on cotton from other nations as part of its huge volume of trade. It can be shown that this company, headed until recently by Will Clayton and still controlled by him indirectly through his ownership of stock and friendship ties, actually has hurt the American cotton farmer—perhaps fatally.

This company was active in helping promote the growth of cotton in Brazil. Before World War II, Brazil cotton production reached a peak of several hundred thousand bales annually. It is predicted now that Brazil soon will be producing millions of bales annually. Other countries are competing with our cotton farmer for his world market—Russia, and Egypt for two examples.

But does Will Clayton care if American cotton production falls year by year and foreign production increases? Not in the least, for his company does not care where cotton is grown as long as it can handle the sales. Its profit lies not in adding to the wealth of the world through producing cotton, but in handling that white gold wherever it is grown. He is for a greater volume of cotton trading, no matter how much it costs the American taxpayer in loans or the American cotton farmer in lost markets, because Mr. Clayton's profits depend upon volume of sales.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to the Members of this Congress that Mr. Clayton's presence in his high State Department post is as much a reflection on the executive branch of this Government as the presence of any Senator or Representative accused of accepting favors from war contractors is a blot on the Senate or the House. I make the statement that he has to have as little moral sensibility as any other money

changer to sit in a high public post and advocate policies by the American Government year after year that directly and definitely and without doubt enrich his own family coffers. If he has any idea of responsibility left, after making all his millions by misusing American tax money, I call on Mr. Clayton to exercise it and to resign from the Department of State.

Let me read some statements from this annual report of the Anderson, Clayton & Co. to show how closely its profits are tied into the policies of the Federal Government. Then, I challenge anyone to explain the difference between Mr. Clayton's activities and those of some rather notorious characters on Capitol Hill who lately have been run through the mill by the Nation's editorial writers and their fellow Congressmen.

On the first page of the report to stockholders we see this statement:

Export sales were facilitated by the Government export subsidy of 4 cents per pound and by Export-Import Bank credits to foreign countries for the importation of United States cotton.

A little further on we read:

Satisfactory progress has been made in the reestablishment of the company's sales agencies in China, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland, all of which are in active operation and contributed importantly to profitable sales during the year. The agencies in England, France, Spain, Norway, and Finland are intact, but their scopes are limited by the continuance of centralized Government purchase of cotton in those countries.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that Will Clayton will see to it that some more officials of his company in those countries where the governments are interfering will worm their way into important Government posts and rectify the situation.

I continue quoting from this financial report:

The company has made sales to the central buying agencies of these five countries and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, Will Clayton came to Washington in 1940 as an official of the Export-Import Bank, which is concerned primarily with the promotion of foreign trade, and later he served as Surplus Property Administrator. But this latter post offered him no opportunity to promote his own self-interest well enough, so through wielding his enormous funds and his enormous influence in places where they counted for most, he was able to become Under Secretary of State.

But Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clayton is not the only advocate of increased foreign loans, more reciprocal-trade agreements, and general one-world policies in the Department of State. It is honeycombed with men who think more of the almighty dollar than they think of their duty to the millions of working men and women who are the backbone of this Nation and whose taxes have been ladled out in vain efforts to lift up other nations. These efforts have succeeded only in impoverishing America, raising prices here and enriching those who played a big part in making the ladling possible. I am not talking about $25,000 bribes, or $1,000 bribes, I am talking about open, flagrant advocating of policies and practices that brought millions of dollars into the pockets of those in the executive branch of the Government.

There is another Under Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. He is not officially in charge of economic affairs, but you can be sure that he is seeing to it that he is not personally left out of any economic affairs that are going on. I refer to Dean Acheson, beneath whose voice of idealism you can detect the rasp of the money changer.

Acheson, it will be recalled by all who read the newspapers, is another man who is always speaking for foreign loans. He favored every loan I ever heard proposed, and likely he is in favor of a whole raft of loans that are yet to be proposed. And, of course, he is there nodding his head when any suggestion is made by Will Clayton to reduce the American tariff further and thus to wipe out another American industry or two.

Mr. Acheson, when he is not passing out America's millions in loans, is a member of the Washington law firm of Covington, Burling & Rublee, one of the wealthiest and largest in the Nation. Acheson himself has done well enough through his partnership in the firm to maintain two very nice homes, but whether he calls them Dream House No. 1, or Dream House No. 2, I cannot say.

I hold in my hand a copy of the New Leader, one of the most respected anti-Soviet and proliberal magazines published in the United States. On the front page of this copy, dated January 4, 1947, there is a very interesting article relating to Mr. Acheson and the members of his law firm, all of whom undoubtedly work together closely, although Mr. Acheson has to stay busy at the State Department issuing idealistic statements.

This article in the New Leader states that, at this moment, a member of Acheson's law firm is actively trying to help Poland to extract a $500,000,000 loan from the American Government. This lawyer-partner of Acheson is reputed to be Donald Hiss, formerly chief economic adviser to Acheson in the State Department before he took off his mask and actively became a member of Acheson's law firm. The fee, if the loan goes through, is supposed to be $1,000,000. That, of course, is short cotton compared to the long staple that Will Clayton gets, but it makes an appreciably large green bale when you put it all together.

Donald Hiss has for several years been associated with a pro-Soviet group in Washington whose directing genius has been Lee Pressman, now chief counsel of the CIO—

According to this New Leader article:

Another member of this group was Donald's brother, Alger Hiss. It was this association which resulted in Alger Hiss' resignation under doubtful circumstances from the Department of Agriculture in 1935. Later, Alger Hiss also turned up in the State Department, and also as an economic adviser. With the backing and friendship of Harry Hopkins, chief architect of the State Department's Soviet appeasement policy, Alger Hiss became secretary-general of the San Francisco United Nations Conference. Recently Alger Hiss left the State Department to become president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mr. Speaker, my feelings for the late President Roosevelt are well known. I thought he was mistaken on many points, and I want to mention another point on which I have just discovered that he was mistaken. Henry Morgenthau, the former Secretary of the Treasury, relates in his voluminous diary that Franklin Roosevelt once termed Dean Acheson a "lightweight." This was interpreted by Morgenthau as being a gentle hint to get rid of Acheson, who then was an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, so Acheson left that post shortly thereafter. My research proves to me that Mr. Acheson is not a "lightweight." It shows clearly that, along with the other great financial wizards of the New Deal, he has learned well how to feather his own nest while serving in a public post. He can now practice law and hold his official post at the same time. He can even say to himself that he is obeying the Biblical injunction not to let his right hand know what his left hand is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I planned to introduce a resolution to investigate these men who have so much to say about where our American tax money is going. But in view of the elevation of General Marshall to the post of Secretary of State, I am withholding that resolution to see if he will not clean house of these men who are using public posts for private gains. I am hoping against hope that integrity can be restored to the executive branch of the Government by an aroused public, just as we know it has been restored to other branches of the Government in days past by the same aroused public.

SOIL CONSERVATION YEAR

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the year 1947 should be conservation year. The Nation has just emerged from the most destructive war in all history, with its resources depleted and energies dissipated. This is especially the case with reference to the soil. Intensive cultivation over a period of several years for the purpose of producing record wartime food crops, without the compensating soil restoring and erosion-control practices, has taken much of the vitality and fertility out of the ground. I therefore propose that 1947 be known as soil conservation year and, during this time, we place special emphasis upon all methods of rebuilding and restoring our most fundamental of all assets—the soil. I hope this Congress and the President will see fit to accept this recommendation and the people of this Nation to place it into practical execution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on soil con-

servation appearing in the Country Gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE MAKING OF A CONGRESSMAN—A 1947 REVISION

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of June 1930 the Honorable Guy U. Hardy, who had been for 14 years a Representative from Colorado, inserted in the RECORD, for the benefit of Members of Congress and the general public, a compilation of information which was one of the most valuable contributions ever made. He entitled it "Many Questions That Many Ask About the Congress, Its Works and Ways, Are Here Answered."

Since that date other contributions have been made based on Representative Hardy's original, none of which has contained all of the subject matter, and none of which has entirely brought up to date the information contained therein.

Both the Honorable Arthur P. Lamneck, a Representative from Ohio in the Seventy-second through the Seventy-fifth Congresses, and I have undertaken at one time or another to use a part of the material.

When Mr. Hardy spoke in the House on the works and ways of the Congress he started something, the value of which is evidenced by the demand, then, for reprints of his address and, later, for copies of my own speech, The Making of a Congressman, made in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on February 24, 1939, and based largely on his earlier contribution which I endeavored to revise and to extend along certain informative lines.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress—which embodies the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, necessarily makes obsolete or incorrect some of the information contained in the original and in the 1940 revision of "The Making of a Congressman."

Since, as I say, I have had over the years a great many requests for copies and since the demand continues even today, I feel the speech should be brought up to date. Therefore, at the request of many Representatives, I have attempted to correct and extend the speech I made.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I submit this 1947 revision.

On the 27th day of February, 1882, the then Senator James G. Blaine, of Maine, delivered a memorial oration before the two Houses in commemoration of the life and death of President James A. Garfield. In the course of his oration Senator Blaine said:

> There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the House of Representatives; there is no place where so little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired, or to eminence won outside; no place where so little consideration is shown for the feelings or the failures of beginners. What a man gains in the House he gains by sheer force of his own character, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy, and will receive no sympathy. It is a field in which the survival of the strongest is the recognized rule, and where no pretense can deceive and no glamor can mislead. The real man is discovered, his worth is impartially weighed, his rank is irreversibly decreed.

The truth of the above statement is just as obvious to all of us who sit in this Chamber today and observe its inexorable demonstration as it was 65 years ago.

"The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small" might well be a text for a sermon to those who in any session of Congress attempt the rapids before they have learned to swim.

How, then, may a newly elected Representative fit himself for efficient service and the discharge of his duties? This is an ever recurring question with which all of us are confronted. So it may not be out of place, and I hope may not be considered presumptuous, Mr. Speaker, if, with a due appreciation of my own limitation, I undertake to pass on to others some of the answers, counsel, and advice so generously given by those older and more experienced in service to whom we have turned for such counsel as has helped us to steer past whirlpools wherein we most surely would have at least capsized and has saved us from many prospective bumps and bruises and made life bearable for us.

One of the wiser and more farseeing of my friends advised me to familiarize myself with Lewis Deschler's Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives.

Says House Parliamentarian Deschler:

> From the beginning of the first Congress, the House has formulated rules for its procedure. Some of them have since gone out of existence. More of them have been amplified and broadened to meet the exigencies that have arisen from time to time. Today they are perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced, and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body of the world. Under them a majority may work its will at all times in the face of the most determined and vigorous opposition of a minority. * * *
>
> I believe that I am not making too broad a statement when I say that the parliamentary practice of the House is a system of procedure that ranks second to none. It has proven adequate to meet all the emergencies that have arisen in the past. It will meet the emergencies and problems of the future with the same degree of success.

Having done that, my friend advised me to study Representative CLARENCE CANNON's Procedure in the House of Representatives.

CLARENCE CANNON, as you know, is our colleague, the distinguished Representative from the State of Missouri, former Parliamentarian of the House and long the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. In the foreword to his work, he says:

> The time of the House is too valuable, the scope of its enactments too far-reaching, and the constantly increasing pressure of its business too great to justify lengthy and perhaps acrimonious discussion of questions of procedure which have been authoritatively decided in former sessions.
>
> The purpose of this book is to provide a synopsis of the procedure of the House for use on the floor where the authorities and sources, because of their bulk and diversity, are not always immediately available. While comprehensiveness and detail have been sacrificed to brevity and accessibility, no notable decision has been omitted, and each topic is, for practical purposes, a complete résumé of the procedure on that subject.

Having studied these, it was suggested then that I make it my business to attend the sessions of the House regularly in order to learn by observation and assimilation the application of the rules and how the House operates thereunder.

Then one man of long years of service said to me:

> PLUMLEY, you will never know what it is all about and why unless and until you read Legislative Procedure, Legislative Assemblies, Legislative Principles, and Legislative Problems, four recognized works of authority written by Robert Luce, the eminent parliamentary authority from Massachusetts.

In Legislative Procedure, Mr. Luce states:

> Lawmakers must themselves be governed by law, else they would in confusion worse confounded quickly come to grief.
>
> It is true that with Coke and Blackstone and Kent we do not ordinarily class Hatsell and Hinds. It is true that the literature of parliamentary law is scanty and that it deals with minutiae of seemingly little consequence to human rights. Yet think what the law and the practice of legislative assemblies really mean. They make it possible under a representative form of government for the will of the people to be ascertained. Starting with the assumption that this will is the will of the majority, we can give it expression and effect only by processes that at the same time endow it with form and win submission by the minority. Lacking either achievement, chaos follows.

Again he says:

> Herein lies the safety of the minority, and this it is that makes parliamentary law and procedure of the greatest consequence to the public safety. Government survives because the lesser part yields to the greater part. Teutonic peoples have had more success than others in self-government because with them the minority, however convinced of its own wisdom, consents to be ruled by the majority until in orderly fashion the minority can make itself the majority. The minority insists on only the right to be heard. Theirs is the cry of Themistocles to Euripides, "Strike, but hear me!" Give them but the chance to present their arguments fairly, fully, and they will abide the issue. This is what we call liberty, though just why it would be hard to tell. * * *
>
> Thomas Jefferson took the same view. Referring to Hatsell in the introductory words of his Manual, he recalled that Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say: "It was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by your ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were in many instances a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power." So far, said Jefferson, the maxim is certainly true and is founded in good sense,

that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary from time to time and are become the law of the House; by a strict adherence to which only the weaker party can be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

I commend the foregoing references to your careful consideration, and I also suggest a thorough study of the provisions of Public Law No. 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

And now we come to the practical proposition which has confronted us all, as to the source of information with respect to our daily duties, and as to where we can get information, and from whom, and what shall we do next.

With certain deletions, therefore, and with several additions of my own, I now offer for your consideration the Hardy original brought down to date:

WHAT IS CONGRESS?

Congress is the legislative body of the United States Government. The functions of the National Government are divided into three parts: Executive, judicial, and legislative. States have their State legislatures. Cities have their city councils. The Nation has its Congress. Its existence, authority, and limitations are provided by the Constitution. Article I, section 1, reads:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

HOW LONG HAVE WE HAD A CONGRESS?

The First Congress met 158 years ago, on March 4, 1789, in New York City, where the first and second sessions were held; subsequently, including the first session of the Sixth Congress, Philadelphia was the meeting place; since then Congress has convened in Washington, D. C.

The earlier Continental Congress, 1774–89, to be sure, had various places of meeting and included Philadelphia; Baltimore; Lancaster, Pa.; York, Pa.; Princeton, N. J.; Annapolis, Md.; Trenton, N. J.; and New York City.

Incidentally, the President is authorized by proclamation to convene Congress at such place other than Washington as he may judge proper when "from the prevalence of contagious sickness, or the existence of other circumstances, it would, in the opinion of the President, be hazardous to the lives or health of the Members to meet" in Washington.

WHEN DOES CONGRESS MEET?

The Constitution, article I, section 4, provides that—

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year * * * on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Pursuant to a resolution of the Continental Congress, the first session of the First Congress convened March 4, 1789; up to and including May 20, 1820, 18 acts were passed providing for the meeting of Congress on other days in the year. Since that year Congress met regularly on the first Monday in December until 1934, when the twentieth amendment to the Constitution became effective, changing the meeting of Congress to January 3, unless the Congress shall, by law, appoint a different date.

The general elections held in the fall of every even year determine the composition of the House membership for the ensuing 2 years with the Members-elect subscribing to the oath of office and being inducted into office in the January following.

WHAT IS A CONGRESSMAN?

Strictly speaking, a Member of either the Senate or the House of Representatives is a Congressman. However, in general practice we speak of a Member of the Senate as a Senator and of a Member of the House as a Congressman, although the official title of the latter is Representative in Congress.

HOW MANY MEMBERS?

There are 96 United States Senators, 2 from each of the 48 States in the Union.

There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives, each State being entitled to the number its population justifies. The Member or Members of the House to which each State is entitled is determined on the basis of the decennial census. There are two methods under existing law which may be followed in making the apportionment; one method is known as that of "major fractions," and the other is known as "the method of equal proportions." Under no circumstances shall any State have less than one Member.

While Congress, by law, apportions the number of Representatives to each State, the State legislatures establish the districts from which the selection shall be made.

In addition to the Members of the House from the various States, Alaska and Hawaii each have Delegates, and Puerto Rico has a Resident Commissioner. The Delegates and Resident Commissioner have the right of debate but have no vote upon legislation appearing before the House for action.

WHAT QUALIFICATIONS ARE REQUIRED FOR MEMBERSHIP?

The Constitution provides that a Member of the House of Representatives must have attained the age of 25, have been a citizen of the United States for 7 years, and be an inhabitant of the State in which he is elected. In practice he is usually a resident of the district which he represents, but that is not a constitutional requirement. A United States Senator must have attained the age of 30 years, have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and be an inhabitant of the State which elects him.

WHAT OATH DO MEMBERS TAKE?

The oath of office taken by the Members of the House is administered by the Speaker, and by the Vice President to the Senators. It reads:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me, God.

The Constitution provides that the President of the United States, Senators, Representatives, members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution.

WHAT ABOUT EXTRA SESSIONS?

The President may call the Congress to meet in extraordinary session at any time he thinks the interests of the country justify it.

There has been only one four-session Congress, the Sixty-seventh, during President Harding's administration.

The longest session of the Congress was the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, from January 3, 1940, through January 3, 1941. The shortest session was the 10-day session called by President Pierce to enact an Army appropriation measure in 1856. The Senate, alone, has been called into special session even for 1-day or 2-day sessions, but in such cases it was for the purpose of confirming Presidential appointments; the latter body may be called in extra session, without the House, to consider treaties, try impeachments, and confirm appointments.

HOW ARE VACANCIES FILLED?

Members do die in office, and occasionally one resigns, usually to take what he considers to be a better office, however. When a Senator dies or resigns, the governor of his State may appoint his successor to serve only until an election is held, providing his State legislature has given him the authority. If a Representative dies or resigns, his place cannot be filled by appointment. The governor of his State may call a special election to fill the place, if he desires, or, as is done in many cases, the place may be left vacant until the next general election.

WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF A MEMBER?

They are many and manifold. He should study legislation and attend the meetings of his House. He should listen to a good deal of the debates, but not all of them by any means. Many Members are kept in committee meetings many hours of many days of every session. The average Member develops a large office business. The Members get a vast amount of mail. This requires much study, dictation of replies, and often visits to different executive departments downtown. The departments are far away and often far apart. Many ex-servicemen bring their problems to their Congressman, and he is always glad to help them out when and wherever he can, although he has not the power always to do as much as he would like.

A Member will get a thousand letters, or maybe several thousand letters, in a session from citizens advocating or opposing proposed legislation. Usually a Congressman answers every letter,

though he cannot tell everybody what he thinks about every bill that has been introduced. He must wait developments through committee hearings and give thought to those measures that are being brought forward by favorable committee action.

WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT COMMITTEES?

The two most important are probably Appropriations and Ways and Means. All bills that relate to the appropriation of money must be considered by and reported out by the Appropriations Committee of the House. This committee consists of 43 members, 25 Republicans and 18 Democrats. It reports out bills that carry appropriations for billions each year.

The Ways and Means Committee has to consider and report out all bills that have in any way to do with raising revenue, tariff, or any sort of taxes. This committee consists of 25 members, 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats. All revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives and come out of the Ways and Means Committee.

There are 19 standing House committees and 15 standing committees in the Senate.

HOW ARE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS MADE?

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides that—

All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

The act provides, further, that—

Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more, except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

In actual practice the selections for committee assignments are made for the Republicans by their Committee on Committees, and for the Democrats by the Democratic Committee on Committees. These selections are then confirmed by election by the House.

As a rule, once on an important committee a member stays there as long as he is in Congress. If a vacancy occurs on an important committee, a member from another committee may be given the place by the Committee on Committees if he desires it, and if he has the seniority and influence to get it. New Members get the places left available.

WHO APPOINTS THE CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES?

They are elected by the House. In actual practice, however, the Member of the majority party who has served longest on any committee is selected as chairman. Here seniority plays an important part. The chairmen, of course, all come from the majority party, and the majority of the members of all committees are of the dominant party.

WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE ON RULES?

This is one of the most important committees as it controls the destiny of more proposed legislation than any other. Bills from the Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees have the right-of-way, so to speak, and can always be brought up for consideration. Other committees have only a few calendar days in any one session on which their bills may be brought up. So many bills reported out cannot be brought up for consideration. The Rules Committee can report a rule for consideration of a bill any day. It can bring in a rule for the consideration of any bill that has been reported out of any committee any time. In the last days of a session special rules to bring out special bills are much in demand. The Rules Committee has much power, certainly has the power of selection, but it must be fair and discriminating, selecting what the majority of Congress seems to want most, as the rule it brings in must be adopted by the House.

WHAT IS THE STEERING COMMITTEE?

This is a committee not much heard of nor mentioned in the newspapers. And I dare say that hardly two dozen Members of the House can tell the names of all the members of the steering committee. This is a little party adjunct to help promote legislation the majority is interested in, and to help iron out a program of procedure, especially in the closing days of a session. It is composed of nine of the older majority Members. In addition, the majority leader acts as chairman. When important matters are up for consideration the Speaker and the chairman of the Rules Committee sit in. This committee really has a good deal of influence in helping to shape up the legislative program.

WHAT ARE CONFERENCES AND CONFEREES?

The House passes a bill, for instance. It goes to the Senate and may be much amended over there, as are appropriations and tariff bills usually. The House will not accept the amendments. So the bill is sent to conference. The House appoints three or five Members as conferees and the Senate appoints an equal number. These gentlemen meet and hold a conference and discuss the points in disagreement. The conferees of the Senate give up some items and the conferees of the House agree to some. Finally they get together on a bill somewhere between the position taken by each House. Sometimes the conferees do not give up easily; sometimes the conference drags on for days or weeks, and they have run for months. Usually they get together, and usually the conference report is adopted by both Houses. Which end of the Capitol is the most stubborn? Well, the other end, of course.

WHAT RESEARCH ASSISTANCE IS AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS?

One of the chief reasons for the new legislative reorganization was a growing recognition of the fact that proper and effective functioning of the Congress depends upon adequate preparation, and of the further fact that a Congressman's day, like everyone else's, has just 24 hours.

What is available, then, in the way of time-saving and preparation beyond a Member's own staff? The new Legislative Reorganization Act points up some of the aids, but I would emphasize to you that developments under the new system are matters of degree rather than of kind. Congress did not in 1946 become for the first time aware that it needed expert assistance in the drafting of legislation, or that its committees needed specialists in the fields of their particular interest, or that the resources of the Library of Congress could be of tremendous assistance if adequately interpreted and brought to bear on specific problems. Committees had hired experts before, but on a special-job basis. Congress had set up for itself a drafting service back in 1919; and ever since 1915 it has had a Legislative Reference Service, in the Library of Congress, expanding as we have increased our calls upon it, and recently equipped to undertake even more varied and important research than ever before.

Do you have questions of fact or law which must be answered and which your office staff is not equipped to handle readily? Telephone or write the Legislative Reference Service; put your question frankly and clearly; they are your confidential agents for the purposes of your particular inquiry. They will not pretend to give a legal opinion, but they will identify and analyze the law for you; they will analyze a given issue and line up the arguments pro and con; they will run down facts and present them without bias. They are not field investigators, but so far as published sources are available to them, they will ferret out, compile, and analyze data at your request and to the extent of their staff capacity.

It is this matter of staff capacity which is forwarded by the Reorganization Act. Under its provisions the staff of the Legislative Reference Service is being strengthened all along the line, but especially at the top levels, with the intent to have at the service of Congress research men of the very highest ability in the fields where they are most likely to be useful.

If any Member wants to do research himself, excellent facilities are available to him. He need only call the congressional reading room at the Library of Congress and a desk will be reserved for him with attendants to give him every possible assistance.

Do you want to follow the significant periodical press and yet find you have not time to do it? Call the abstracts office of the Legislative Reference Service and have them send you their public affairs abstracts of selected current articles on matters of prime importance.

Do you want to discuss some problem personally? Call the Director of the Legislative Reference Service. If he has someone on his staff versed in the subject matter, he will suit your convenience. At present there are experts available in American government and public administration, congressional organization and procedure, international relations, international trade, law, labor, money and

banking, national defense, price economics, State government, taxation, and so on.

We have in the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress a tool of proven value and enlarging possibilities. It is Congress' own answer, based on experience, to the need of committees and individual Members for further help in the complex business of legislating for the Nation.

HOW DO MEMBERS KNOW TO WHOM TO ADDRESS INQUIRIES?

With an expanding Federal service and the growth of governmental machinery, it has been found necessary to bring into being a clearing house known as the Government Information Service. Handling thousands of inquiries asking general information concerning all phases of governmental activity, the Division of Public Inquiries of the Government Information Service, in addition, edits the United States Government Manual, in which is recorded integrated authoritative information on the organization and functions of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. It is a volume which no congressional office could well do without.

Incidentally, in this connection, I want to call to the attention of the newly elected Members that valuable compilation entitled "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?" This is House Document No. 465 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, compiled by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. Although, in view of the Legislative Reorganization Act, this document, too, is in need of revision—and probably will be revised later this session—there is a tremendous lot of information in it which is still authentic and reliable. It is a cumulative composite of all the attempts of many people to get into one document the answers to the many questions asked by constituents and others concerning our Government. It well repays examination.

HOW ARE BILLS WRITTEN?

Although many bills are written by the Members themselves, the Congress has wisely provided for legislative counsel to aid the Members and the committees in drafting measures of a more complicated nature. This corps of expert legislative draftsmen take note of the general objective sought to be attained by the Member and mold his idea into parliamentary legal form.

When his bill is written up, the Member drops it in the basket on the Clerk's desk. It is then referred to the appropriate committee. Many bills lie in committee undisturbed and are never heard from again. In some cases they have served their purpose without further action. They have advertised the Member and the project. Many bills are introduced that have not the slightest chance of serious consideration or passage.

STAGES OF A BILL IN THE HOUSE

First. Introduction: By a Member by laying the bill on the Clerk's table informally. A Member sometimes introduces a petition only, leaving to the committee the drawing of a bill; such a petition, referred to a committee having jurisdiction over the subject, giving authority to report a bill. Sometimes communications addressed to the House from the executive departments or from other sources are referred to committees by the Speaker and give authority for the committees to originate bills. Messages from the President also are referred by the Speaker of the House and give jurisdiction to the committees receiving them to originate bills.

Second. Reference to a standing committee: Bills are referred under direction of the Speaker. A bill is numbered and printed when referred.

Study of the bill is then undertaken by the committee membership, oftentimes by a subdivision of the committee, before whom proponents and opponents of the contemplated legislation are heard. The various governmental subdivisions to be affected are consulted, and Members of Congress other than committee members are heard.

Third. Reported from the committee: Committees having leave to report at any time make their reports from the floor; other committees make their reports by laying them on the Clerk's table informally. The bill and the report are printed when reported.

Fourth. Placed on the calendar: Occasionally a privileged bill is considered when reported, but usually it is placed with the unprivileged bills on the calendar where it belongs under the rule by direction of the Speaker.

Fifth. Consideration in Committee of the Whole: Bills which do not raise revenue or make or authorize appropriations of money or property do not go through this stage. All other bills are considered in Committee of the Whole. The stages of consideration in Committee of the Whole are: General debate; reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule; order to lay aside with a favorable recommendation or to rise and report; reporting of the bill to the House.

Sixth. Reading a second time in the House: Bills not requiring consideration in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full, after which they are open to debate and amendment in any part. Bills considered in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full in that Committee and when reported out with or without amendments are not read in full again, but are subject to further debate or amendment in the House unless the previous question is ordered at once.

Seventh. Engrossment and third reading: The question on House bills is taken on ordering the engrossment and third reading at one vote. If decided in the affirmative, the reading a third time usually takes place at once, by title. But any Member may demand the reading in full of the engrossed copy, in which case the bill is laid aside until it can be engrossed. Senate bills come to the House in engrossed form, and the question is put on third reading alone. When the question on engrossment and third reading of a House bill or third reading of a Senate bill is decided in the negative, the bill is lost as much as if defeated on the final passage. The question on engrossment and third reading is not made from the floor, but is put by the Speaker as a matter of course.

Eighth. Passage: The question on the passage of a bill is put by the Speaker as a matter of course, without awaiting a motion from the floor.

Ninth. Transmission to the Senate by message.

Tenth. Consideration by the Senate: In the Senate, House bills are usually referred to committees for consideration and report, after which they have their several readings, with opportunities for debate and amendment. The same procedure takes place in the House as to bills sent from the Senate.

Eleventh. Return of, from the Senate without amendments: If the Senate passes a House bill without amendment it returns it to the House, where it is at once enrolled on parchment for signature. A bill thus passed without amendment goes into possession of the Clerk and is not laid before the House prior to enrollment. If the Senate rejects a House bill, the House is informed. Similar procedure occurs when the House passes a Senate bill without amendment.

Twelfth. Return of, from the Senate with amendments: House bills returned with Senate amendments go to the Speaker's table. If any Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole, the bill is referred by the Speaker informally to the standing committee having jurisdiction, and when that committee reports the bill with recommendations it is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to be there considered and reported to the House itself. When no Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole the bills come before the House directly from the Speaker's table.

Thirteenth. Consideration of Senate amendments by the House: When a bill with Senate amendments comes before the House, the House takes up each amendment by itself and may vote to agree to it, agree to it with an amendment, or disagree to it. If it disagrees, it may ask a conference with the Senate or may send notice of its disagreement, leaving it to the Senate to recede or to insist and ask the conference.

Fourteenth. Settlement of differences by conference: When disagreements are referred to conference, the managers embody their settlement in a report, which is acted on by each House as a whole. When this report is agreed to, the bill is finally passed and is at once enrolled for signature.

Fifteenth. Enrollment on parchment: The House in which a bill originates enrolls it.

Sixteenth. Examination by the Committee on House Administration to see that the bill is correctly enrolled.

Seventeenth. Signing by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate: The enrolled bill is first laid before the Speaker for signature, whether it be a House or a Senate bill, after which it is transmitted to the Senate and signed by the President of that body.

Eighteenth. Transmittal to the President of the United States: It is the duty

of the Committee on House Administration to carry the enrolled bill—when it shall have originated in the House—to the President. This duty is performed in the case of bills which have originated in the Senate by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Nineteenth. Action by the President: He may, first, promptly sign the bill, whereupon it becomes law as of its effective date. He may, second, hold it without taking any action, in which case it becomes law at the expiration of 10 days—Sundays excepted—without his signature, provided Congress is still in session. He may, third, hold the measure, and by so doing, kill it, if Congress adjourns before the bill has been in his hands 10 days—the so-called pocket veto. He may, fourth, veto the bill outright.

Twentieth. Action on, when returned disapproved: The House to which a disapproved bill is returned has the message read and spread on its Journal. It may then consider at once the question of passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections, or may postpone to a day certain, or refer to a committee for examination. The vote on passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections must be carried by two-thirds. If the bill fails to pass in the House to which it is returned, it remains there; but if it passes it is sent to the other House for action.

Twenty-first. Filing with the Secretary of State: When approved by the President a bill is deposited in the office of the Secretary of State; and when the two Houses have passed a bill notwithstanding the President's objections, the Presiding Officer of the House which acts on it last transmits it to the Secretary of State.

VETOES

Contrary to the practice followed in most of the State governments, the Chief Executive must approve or disapprove a bill in its entirety; he cannot accept part and reject part.

Nevertheless, not so many bills are vetoed as one might expect. By and large, the opinion of Alexander Hamilton that the veto would "generally be employed with great caution" has been borne out. Grover Cleveland set an all-time high, however, with 358 vetoes, until the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, whose vetoes exceeded Cleveland's considerably.

It is interesting to note that seven Presidents made no use of the veto power whatever, the last of these being President Garfield.

ARE MANY BILLS INTRODUCED?

The all-time high record is held by the Sixty-first Congress, during which 33,015 bills were introduced in the House, and 10,897 in the Senate. More nearly normal, although still above the average, is the number introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress, 18,754 bills.

Not all the bills introduced are enacted, however. The chances are, roughly, about 1 in 10 that the bill introduced will be enacted into law.

WHAT IS UNANIMOUS CONSENT?

Many little actions are taken in the House by unanimous consent. The Member asks for unanimous consent to do this or that—to correct the RECORD, to speak for 5 minutes or more out of order, to insert remarks in the RECORD, to change an amendment he has offered, to have a letter read. If there is no objection on the part of any Member, then consent is granted. Frequently a gentleman says, "I object," and that settles that.

The leader of the majority makes many unanimous-consent requests, and usually they are granted. He may ask consent to meet at a certain hour, to adjourn over for a day or two, to hold a night session, to have so many hours for debate on a bill, to take up specified matters on certain days out of order, to set days for the Private and Consent Calendars. The granting of the request saves the passing of motions or the making of rules.

Many bills are passed by unanimous consent. All bills of a private character go on the Private Calendar.

And another character of bills go on the Consent Calendar. On days when these bills are in order the Clerk reads the title of the bill, the Speaker asks, "Is there objection?" Any Member may say, "I object," if he desires, in which case the bill cannot be taken up; and the next title is read. If no objection is made, the bill is read and passed very quickly, usually. The theory is that if no one cares to object to a bill certainly many would not vote against it, so it ought to be passed. Both party organizations have several Members who make it their business to study all bills on the Consent Calendars and be ready to object or insist on what they think proper in the way of amendments before consent is granted for the bill to be considered.

Often a Member will arise and say: "Reserving the right to object," and ask questions about the bill. This gives the author of the bill a chance to explain or defend it, and sometimes quite a little debate is stirred up even on consent days. After a while somebody may shout, "Regular order!" The Speaker says, "Regular order is demanded"; whereupon the gentleman who started the trouble by "reserving the right to object" must immediately make his objection or withdraw it. He may be just as apt to do one as the other, and on his decision rests the destiny of some anxious Member's important bill—for all bills are important to their hopeful authors. On consent days Members with bills on the calendar are most patient, polite, and persuasive in their ways toward the gentlemen who sit at the table and whose business it is to inquire into the merits of bills coming up.

HOW ARE THE VOTES TAKEN?

Four different ways. Usually the Speaker puts the question in this form: "As many as are in favor (of the motion) say 'Aye,'" and then, "As many as are opposed say 'No.'" In most instances the vote taken thus is decisive enough to satisfy. But if the Speaker is in doubt, or if it sounds close, any Member may ask for a division. In this case the Speaker asks those in favor to stand up and be counted. Then those opposed to the proposition are asked to stand up and be counted. The Speaker does the counting and then announces the result. But if he is still in doubt, or if a demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum—that is, 20 in the Committee of the Whole or 44 in the House—tellers are ordered. The Speaker appoints one gentleman on each side of the question to make the count. The two tellers take their place at the head of the center aisle. All Members favoring the proposition walk through between the tellers and are counted. Then those opposed walk through and are counted. This vote settles most questions.

But a roll call may be demanded by anybody on any question in the House, and if supported by one-fifth of those present it is ordered. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution. The Clerk reads the names of the whole membership, and as his or her name is called the Member answers "Aye" or "No." The names of those not voting the first time are read a second time, so that all Members in corridors, cloakrooms, committee rooms, or offices, who have been notified of a roll call by signal bells, may come in and vote.

Roll calls are ordered sometimes to get a full vote on a measure, because of a lack of a quorum, sometimes because Members want to be on record on a measure, and sometimes to put the other side on record against the measure for imaginary political advantage. The roll calls are published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are sometimes quoted to a Member's advantage or disadvantage, as the case may be.

Many bills of lesser importance and some of greater importance are passed without a roll call. This can be done if a quorum is present when the vote is taken and as many as one-fifth of those present do not demand a roll call. This is done often to save time and sometimes to save Members the embarrassment of having to be recorded for or against a measure.

WHAT IS A QUORUM?

Everybody who ever attended a literary society knows that it requires a quorum to do business. In the House of Representatives a quorum is a majority of the membership. When there are no vacancies in the membership a quorum is 218. There are usually a few vacancies—Members who have died or resigned and their places yet unfilled. So an actual quorum is usually a little under that figure. Much business is transacted without a quorum. But no business of any character, except to adjourn, can be transacted without a quorum present if any Member objects. All any Member has to do to get a full House is to arise, address the Speaker, and make the point of order that "no quorum is present." The Speaker says, "I will count." If he cannot count a majority present, the doors are closed, the signal bells are rung in the corridors and House Office Building, and the roll is called. This usually produces a quorum, and business proceeds.

When the House is in Committee of the Whole, a hundred Members make a quorum.

IS LEGISLATION MUCH INFLUENCED BY ORATORY?

Not much. People back home may picture the House as a forum for debate

upon the merits of the many bills they read about. It is in a way, but most of the debate is as potent as a sham battle. Very few bills that are brought up in the House for action under general or special rules are defeated. I think more than 95 percent of bills thus brought up are passed, despite the forensic display of oratory that may be directed against them, and usually is, by the minority or the opposition. Hardly one amendment in 40 offered to bills on the floor is adopted unless offered or accepted by the committee reporting out the bill which is up for consideration.

Legislation enacted by any Congress is largely that originating with or sponsored by the majority party. Important measures brought up have had thorough scrutiny and a favorable report by a well-organized committee. They have probably had strong backing from the country. Some have had the approval of the steering committee and some have been reported out by the Rules Committee. Such measures are on the program for passage, and long debates and much oratory cannot defeat them. On the other hand, bills that are not slated for passage do not often get up for action in the House.

Committee responsibility is great and committee action influential. On most amendments and on most bills a majority of the Members vote most of the time with the committee—and it is difficult to break into that influence even with fine oratory.

WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF THE SPEAKER?

He presides over the House, appoints the Chairman to preside over the Committee of the Whole, appoints all select and conference committees, has the power of recognition of Members, makes many important rulings and decisions in the House. The Speaker may vote, but usually does not except in a case of a tie. He may appoint a Speaker pro tempore but not for more than 3 days at a time without the consent of the House.

WHAT IS A PARTY LEADER?

There is a majority leader and a minority leader. In talk on the floor we do not refer to Democrats and Republicans usually. It is more dignified, it seems, to refer to the majority and the minority. The majority leader has the more influence, of course, since he has the majority of the membership back of him.

The leader is all the title implies. He leads in party debate, brings forward party programs and policies. His advocacy of or opposition to proposed legislation indicates the party preference. The majority leader has much control over what comes up and when on the legislative program from week to week. When he makes a motion it is nearly always carried. He usually makes the motion to adjourn, and it always carries. If someone else, not authorized to do so, makes a motion to adjourn, it is nearly always defeated.

WHAT ARE THE CHAPLAINS' DUTIES?

Both Senate and House have a chaplain, who offers prayer at the opening of each daily session, usually at 12 o'clock noon. Both are eloquent and godly men. The prayers are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the proceedings each day.

WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF THE WHIP?

The whip is not an official position. It is a party designation. Both parties have their whips. The whip looks after the membership of his party, advises them of weekly programs, and endeavors to have all present when important measures are to be voted upon. When the vote is apt to be close, the whip checks up, finds out who is out of the city, and advises the absent Members by wire of the important measure coming up.

The efficacy of the majority in securing the legislation it desires and of the minority in making felt its opposition depends upon the efficiency of the party machinery on the floor. The party whips are vital cogs in this machinery.

WHAT IS PRINTED THAT BEST TELLS OF THE CONGRESS?

The Constitution of the United States is the most informative thing printed dealing with the Congress. It provides the authority for Congress, specifies its duties, powers, privileges, and much of the procedure in both Houses of Congress. The Constitution is not very long, is easily obtainable in any city or town, and should be read occasionally by every citizen. It will surprise you how much information it contains.

HOW OLD IS THE CONSTITUTION?

It was adopted by the Federal Constitutional Convention in 1787, ratified by the several States, and the new Government provided for by it became fully operative with the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States on April 30, 1789.

HOW CAN THE CONSTITUTION BE AMENDED?

A proposal to amend the Constitution must be passed by the Congress by a two-thirds vote of the Members present in both House and Senate. The proposed amendment then must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States or by conventions in three-fourths of the States; the choice of method of ratification rests with the Congress.

HAVE MANY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS BEEN ADOPTED?

No, not very many; only 21 in 158 years, and this question brings out some interesting figures and dates.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were proposed by the First Congress in 1789 and were practically agreed to before the adoption of the Constitution. It is these first 10 amendments which make up our Bill of Rights.

The eleventh and twelfth amendments were proposed in 1794 and 1803. Since 1804 when the twelfth amendment was ratified, over a period of 143 years, only nine amendments have been adopted to the Constitution.

The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments relate to abolition of slavery, rights of citizenship, and the franchise, coming after the Civil War, and were proposed and ratified between 1865 and 1870.

Since the Civil War period only six amendments have been ratified, as follows:

Sixteenth amendment provides power for Congress to levy a tax on incomes. It was ratified in 1913.

Seventeenth amendment provides that United States Senators shall be elected by popular vote. Previous to its adoption Senators had been chosen by State legislatures. Proposed in 1912 and ratified in 1913.

Eighteenth amendment provides for prohibition. It was proposed in 1917 and ratified in 1919; subsequently it was ratified by all States in the Union except two.

Nineteenth amendment provides the right of suffrage to women. Proposed in 1919, it was ratified in 1920.

Twentieth amendment is the so-called lame-duck amendment. It relates to the terms of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives and sets the time the Congress shall convene. It was adopted in 1933.

The twenty-first amendment repealed the eighteenth or prohibition amendment to the Constitution. It, too, was adopted in 1933.

ARE AMENDMENTS SOMETIMES PROPOSED BUT REJECTED BY THE STATES?

Yes; that has occurred several times. Amendments were proposed in 1789—two—1810, 1861, and 1924, that were not ratified by the States. All of these except the last one are out of date, of no use now, and time has shown the wisdom of their rejection.

The one submitted to the States in 1924 was known as the child-labor amendment and reads in part:

> The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

So far 28 States have ratified this proposed amendment. Since 36 States must ratify an amendment to make it effective, it would appear that this one also has been lost. Recent social legislation on the part of the various States has materially decreased the alleged necessity for its enactment, however.

WHO PAYS FOR SPEECHES MEMBERS MAIL OUT?

The Senator or Congressman pays for the speeches he sends out. They are printed usually at the Government Printing Office and are charged for at cost price, but the cost price is about what they would cost in a privately operated print shop. A Member will often send out another Member's speech on some subject he thinks will be of interest to his own constituents.

In the fiscal year 1939, Members paid the Public Printer $60,488.47 for speeches. Ten years before, in 1929, the sum was $66,400.07.

WHAT OF THE INFLUENCES OF SENIORITY OR LENGTH OF SERVICE?

In no other place, perhaps, in this broad land of ours does seniority or length of service cut so much figure as it does in the Congress of the United States.

It is the first discouraging thing the new Member meets, and many have been the bitter denunciations of its rule. Right or wrong, however, the rule of seniority has long been an important factor in the Congress, and no one these days has the optimism to predict that it will soon be abolished.

The new Member meets the rule of seniority when he applies for his first office room. He gets only what is left after all older Members have made their selections. He may file on a vacant room in the House Office Building. Another Member who has served before may come along and take it away from him. He may file on numerous rooms and see them go to older Members. The oldest Member, in point of service in the Congress, requesting a vacant office room gets it.

He meets with the seniority rule at any official dinner he attends. The new Member sits near the foot of the table; the older Members, in the order of their term of service, near the head of the table.

The new Members find the rule of seniority when they apply for committee assignment. The older Members are given the favored places; the new Members must work their way up. The new Member finds it in the committee room when he attends the first meeting of his committee. He finds his name on his place at the foot of the table. The oldest member of the committee will probably be the chairman at the head of the table. And by length of service they rank down to the newest members at the foot.

New Members are welcome and are shown every courtesy on the floor. They are never hazed or snubbed. But there are some years in the beginning of their service when new Members must feel that they are hardly in the thick of things—when they must think that they would like to sit, even in the committee room, up near the middle of the table.

The important places in the House go to the older Members. Choice committee assignments as a rule go to the older Members who desire them. The chairman of every committee is, almost without exception, the longest-serving majority member on the committee. Chairmen of committees have a good deal of influence and get their names on the most important bills.

A great deal of legislation is written by or determined by the conferees on conference committees between the House and Senate. Almost invariably the conferees appointed by both House and Senate are the oldest—in point of service—Republicans and the oldest Democratic members serving on the committees reporting out the bills in each House. Conferees have had much to do with the final writing of appropriation and tariff bills especially, as well as with many other important bills in which there is a difference between House and Senate. Members may orate and the two Houses may vote, but the conferees, the old boys, bring back the language agreed upon, and it will be adopted.

Of course, this seniority influence is not unique nor original in the Congress. It works similarly in every legislative body in the country, from the city council up. It works in the local lodges and grand lodges of every order. It is especially strong in the national meetings of a number of church organizations. It is particularly noticed in the Congress and commented upon because the Congress is more or less a permanent working body of long standing and represents all the people of our country.

Legislation is unquestionably much influenced by the men who have served long and occupy these important places in the organization of the House, and greater influence in and with the departments is certainly felt by those who have had the advantage of knowledge and acquaintance gained by years on the job. This long service in the House brings Members in contact with the personnel of the several departments and helps them to be of service in many little and some big ways to their constituents back home.

Seniority or length of service in the House of Representatives is certainly a large factor in giving a Member position and influence in the Congress and in Washington. Brilliance and unusual ability, of course, count for much, but without years of service they do not get one far here. Those districts which have returned their Members of proven ability term after term have contributed much toward the cause of good government and are today represented in Congress by Members who have standing and influence in Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on portal-to-portal pay made by John P. Frye, president of the metal trades department of the A. F. of L.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I arise to pay tribute to the memory of a true gentleman of the press, Mark Thistlethwaite, whose funeral will be held here tomorrow.

President Truman, Senators, Congressmen, colleagues of the Press Gallery, all have expressed their sympathy to his widow and mourn his loss. As the New York Times said of him yesterday:

> Mr. Thistlethwaite was known in Washington and throughout the country as an old-school reporter who represented the finest traditions of his craft.

Born in Richmond, Ind., March 17, 1879, he attended school there and graduated from Swarthmore College in 1901. Having worked as a reporter in Philadelphia, he returned to Indiana and held various assignments on Indianapolis newspapers.

An ardent Democrat, he never let partisanship creep into his newspaper copy. Mark became secretary to Gov. Tom Marshall, of Indiana, in 1909. He came to Washington when Marshall became Vice President and remained his secretary throughout two terms.

In that capacity he learned many inside facts about the last days of President Wilson in the White House. But he declined to capitalize on these secrets by writing books in the backstairs gossipy manner.

He became and remained until his death the Washington correspondent of the Indianapolis News, Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, and the Terre Haute Tribune. Throughout the years he came to know intimately all the political and journalistic leaders of his time.

With his background of intimate history he often was interviewed by other reporters, yes, and statesmen, seeking facts. Even more he was sought out by those who wanted sympathy and understanding. For Mark Thistlethwaite had the great gift of remaining calm in a confused world.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MILLER of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. LODGE), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

A meeting of the committee will be held in the Ways and Means Committee room, New House Office Building, Friday, January 17, 1947, a 10 a. m.

THE FINANCE AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

THE WAYS AND MEANS AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

A meeting of the above committees will be held in the House Ways and Means Committee room, New House Office Building, on Monday morning, January 20, at 10:30 a. m., as provided in section 138 (a) of the reorganization law.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

140. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the bimonthly report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation small-business activities during the period October 1 through November 30, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

141. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

142. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a supplementary report on the crude-oil facilities of the Canol project (Canol-1); also a copy of the preliminary report titled "United States-Owned Petroleum Facilities Located Abroad"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

143. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as

of June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

144. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John C. Garrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the bimonthly report of small-business activities of the Department of Commerce during the period August 1 through September 30, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

146. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the operation of the agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

147. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixtieth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

148. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 1,187 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1025. A bill relating to the posthumous award of the decoration of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1026. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, so as to exempt from the tax imposed by such section the transportation of persons by certain aircraft not operated on established routes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1027. A bill to provide an additional surtax exemption to certain heads of families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1028. A bill to expedite the disposition of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1029. A bill to amend the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 5), to authorize and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase aluminum for stock-piling purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1030. A bill to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation all salaries and other sums paid for and incident to the services of all persons in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1032. A bill to permit foreign ships to carry passengers and merchandise between ports in Alaska and between United States and Alaska ports; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (by request):

H. R. 1033. A bill to amend section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 for the purpose of appointing veterans as veterans' employment representatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1034. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. R. 1035. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1036. A bill to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1037. A bill to establish the method by which the United States must determine the cost, net cost, or lowest rate available to public housing agencies of or for insurance covering low-rent or slum-clearance projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 1038. A bill to provide incentive and encouragement for the formation of independent small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1039. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the purchase price of automobiles or other conveyances purchased by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 1040. A bill to authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1041. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (act of June 25, 1938, ch. 676, sec. 16, 52 Stat. 1069; title 29, U. S. C., sec. 216); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1042. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 1043. A bill authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 1044. A bill to grant a certain right-of-way in Crawford County, Wis., to the Iowa-Wisconsin Bridge Co.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1045. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1046. A bill to amend sections 203 (52 Stat. 1060) and 216 (52 Stat. 1069) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1047. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1048. A bill relating to the foreign tax credit in the case of an individual owning a majority of the voting stock of a foreign corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON (by request):

H. R. 1049. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 1050. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the widows of persons who died in service or as a result of service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1051. A bill designating the first Monday of October in each year as National Farm Day and declaring such day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 1052. A bill to amend section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments to $1,440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1053. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 1054. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1055. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to extend the time for reinstatement for level-premium term insurance on a comparative health basis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1056. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of the rivers of the New England States to further the program for the generation of electric energy in such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1057. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1058. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1059. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1060. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON:

H. R. 1061. A bill providing for the registration of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1062. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 1063. A bill to improve the facilities for transcontinental motor transportation; to provide additional facilities for the national defense; to aid in the relief of unemployment; to promote the public safety; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to require the head of each department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government to appear monthly before the committee of the House of

Representatives concerned with its activities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the unlawful destruction or disposition of property under the jurisdiction of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. Res. 50. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study public-relations activities of the executive branch of the Government and the employees engaged therein; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 51. Resolution to provide for expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 50; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. Res. 52. Resolution requesting the postponement of further reduction of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. Res. 53. Resolution providing 1 year's salary and $250 funeral expenses to Carrie Belle Trimble, widow of South Trimble, late Clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1064. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of Maria Del C. R. Jablonski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1069. A bill to authorize payment to Annie Brown Corson and Charles S. Brown, in lieu of pension not paid to their father or his widow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Dora M. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1071. A bill to authorize the award of a medal to Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazumi Noda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Juan Dominquez Argibay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Walter P. Gardner, sole surviving trustee of the property of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1075. A bill for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Chester O. Glenn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1077. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Farmers Rural Telephone Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 1081. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph Lundborg and others against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of Antonio Del Serrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 1084. A bill to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Weimar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Mae Bonne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Leo M. Bilinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Georgios Andreas Apostolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Pete O. Rosales, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

54. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Kenosha County Board of Supervisors, Kenosha, Wis., pertaining to old-age assistance and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

55. By Mr. FOGARTY: Resolution adopted by House of Representatives of State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 15, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, before whom one day we shall all have to give account, lend us Thine aid, that this day's work may be well pleasing unto Thee.

If there be any here sulking as children will, deal with and enlighten him. Make it day about that person, so that he shall see himself and be ashamed. Make it heaven about him, Lord, by the only way to heaven, forgetfulness of self, and make it day about his neighbors, so that they shall help and not hinder him. Forgetful ourselves, help us to bear cheerfully the forgetfulness of others. Give us courage, and faith, and the quiet mind. Give life to our good intentions, lest they be still-born. Bless us in all that is right, and correct us in all that is wrong. We ask of Thee this help and mercy for Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 15, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Monday and Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] be excused from the sessions of the Senate until Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, during the last session of the Congress I was honored by being appointed a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I was appointed by the then President pro tempore of the Senate. I should like to ask the Senate for permission to be relieved of the duties of membership on that committee and to have some other Senator appointed in my place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire that he be relieved from service on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from

New Hampshire is excused from further service on the joint committee.

The Chair would like now to complete the membership of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

On the majority side, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] holds over. The new appointments from the majority side will be the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

On the minority side, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] hold over, and the new member on the minority side will be the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 1,187 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON USE AND COST OF PENALTY MAIL

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use and cost of handling penalty mail for the quarter ended September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, together with a detailed statistical report of soil and water conservation practices carried out by farmers since the inception of the program in 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT BY COMMERCE DEPARTMENT ON SMALL-BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a bimonthly report of small-business activities of that Department during the period August 1 through September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixtieth annual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BIMONTHLY REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ON SMALL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a bimonthly report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation small business activities during the period October 1 through November 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

JOHN C. GARRETT

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John C. Garrett (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AND SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to amendments of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission recommending the enactment of legislation to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1934, providing credit to employees transferred from a Federal position to employment with an international organization in which the United States participates; to the Committee on Civil Service.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY POLICY COMMITTEES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement for the general information of the Senate.

The Reorganization Act passed at the last session recommended that the majority party and the minority party should each at the beginning of each Congress appoint a policy committee of seven members, for the formulation of over-all policies for the respective parties. The provision of the law leaves action under it wholly discretionary with each party and makes no provision for recording the action of the two parties. It seems to me, however, that there should be an authorized statement of the action of the two parties with respect to the establishment and membership of these committees. I am therefore advising the Senate that the majority has made the first seven members of its steering committee its policy committee. These representatives of the majority are the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The steering committee of the majority has two additional members, making a total of nine on the steering committee. The limitation of the policy committee by the statute to seven members precludes the appointment of those two steering committee members to the policy committee; but I should like to say for the further information of the Senate that those two members will be called in constant consultation and that the steering committee will be in fact the policy committee of the majority party.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the same connection I wish to state that I agree wholly with the suggestion, which the Senator from Maine and I have discussed privately, that there ought to be some record made in the RECORD of the proceedings, I think, and in the Journal perhaps, concerning the identity of the two policy committees.

As the Senator will recall, when the Reorganization Act was before the Senate it provided for majority and minority policy committees. When the bill reached the House the Members of that body decided they did not want that provision applicable to them, and it was eliminated, with a sort of understanding that when the bill making appropriations for deficiencies for the legislative branch of the Government came up provision would be made for the two policy committees representing, respectively, the majority and the minority of the Senate. The appropriation bill did not say how they should be selected, whether they should be chosen in a formal or informal way, or whether any record need be made of them; but in order that the two committees may have a legal status and be authorized to select members of their staffs I have felt that there ought to be an announcement of record as to the membership of these two committees so that they would have a legal status.

In the conference of the minority the matter was brought up for discussion and action, and the conference authorized me as chairman of the conference to select the policy committee representing the minority with the provision that I should be chairman of it. I have exercised the authority conferred upon me by the minority conference and have in addition to my own name, which they proposed themselves, selected the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as members of the minority policy committee.

In a sense the same situation as that referred to by the Senator from Maine with respect to two members of the majority steering committee arose regarding the minority whip of the Senate and the secretary of the minority conference. It was felt that, in view of the position held by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as the whip and the position held by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], that they would not be assigned to the policy committee but they will be invited, as all other members of the minority of course will be invited, and will be free to sit with the policy committee and advise it whenever it is necessary and desirable without the power to vote.

I send the list of the names I mentioned to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that any action by the Senate is necessary in respect to these appointments.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the United Home Owners of Illinois, an organization of property owners, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a 30-percent increase in rents now in force; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., Richmond, Va., relating to racial discrimination; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of teachers of the high school at Barceloneta, P. R., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Mariano Villaronga as commissioner of education of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

NOMINATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind both the majority and minority leaders in this connection that there are still being held at the desk nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission awaiting the completion of the Senate membership on the Joint Atomic Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state, representing the minority, that I think an announcement may be made from this side with reference to that matter today.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to report the recommendations of the Finance Committee on the nomination of Archibald L. M. Wiggins, of South Carolina, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury in place of O. Max Gardner, and of William A. Rowan, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., in place of Thomas Temple Hoyne, deceased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reports will be received and the nominations placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nominations and move that they be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I inquire what are the nominations?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The nomination of William A. Rowan, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Chicago and of Archibald L. M. Wiggins, of South Carolina, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury. The nominations of both these gentlemen have been unanimously approved by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have about 15 minutes on the Rowan matter. I should like to discuss it with the Senator from Colorado to find out if he is the man I have in mind.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator have any objection to the nomination of Mr. Wiggins?

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, of course if we adhered strictly to the rules, the action proposed would not be in order, but I understand these recommendations come unanimously from the Finance Committee of the Senate and, under the circumstances, I make no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that there will necessarily be an executive session of the Senate later this afternoon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then I shall defer the request until that time.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) extending for seven months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 22, submitted by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] on January 6, 1947, and I request its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 22) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES O. ANDREWS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 27, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on January 6, 1947, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 27) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Charles O. Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CATHERINE M. FLYNN

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 37, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] on January 8, 1947, and I request its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 37) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Catherine M. Flynn, the sum of $1,002.29, as compensation for services performed by her in the office of Senator-elect RAYMOND E. BALDWIN during the period November 6 to December 26, 1946.

CHARLOTTE D. WORDEN

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 48, submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] on January 10, 1947, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 48) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Charlotte D. Worden, widow of Floyd Worden, late an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 54, submitted by me on January 13, 1947, and I request its present consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the able Senator explain the resolution?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a resolution authorizing the appropriation of $35,000 for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, in carrying out the duties of investigating contests which have been filed with the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the resolution reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. BROOKS. All the resolutions which I have reported have been acted on unanimously by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution as requested by the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 54) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND PRESENTATION OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 55, submitted by me on January 13, 1947, and I request its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 55) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking from subdivision (o) (2) thereof the following language:

"Such committee shall also have the duty of examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the Senate; and, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate."

Resolved further, That rule XIV of the Standing Rules be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after paragraph numbered 4 the following paragraph, to be numbered 5:

"5. The Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate."

Renumber paragraph numbered 5 of said rule as paragraph numbered 6.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution which I send to the desk, and I request its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 60) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-ninth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1946, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Weaver; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 261. A bill for the relief of Lewis L. Dudley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 262. A bill to provide for the payment of subsistence allowances to members of the armed forces who were held captive by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 263. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; and

S. 264. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 266. A bill to promote on the retired list without increase of pay all line officers of the Army who have been or may be specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat; and

S. 267. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 268. A bill authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced S. 269, to create an independent Air Safety Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. FERGUSON introduced S. 270, providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 271. A bill to suspend for a period of 5 years the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 272. A bill to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 273. A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 274. A bill to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 275. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 276. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel;

S. 277. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 278. A bill to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

S. 279. A bill to amend further section 10 of the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 145), as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions thereof, relating to the determination of the fact of dependency, permanently effective;

S. 280. A bill to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong.);

S. 281. A bill to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; and

S. 282. A bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to provide for transportation of dependents and household effects under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazumi Noda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF ADVERTISEMENTS OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages. I have introduced this bill in each Congress for several years as it is my firm belief the proposed legislation is necessary for the proper regulation of such advertising in the separate States.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 265) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, an editorial entitled "Thirteen Years of Repeal," written by Dr. Raphael Harwood Miller, formerly pastor of the National City Christian Church, of Washington, D. C., and now editor of the Christian Evangelist, in which publication this article appeared on January 8, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTEEN YEARS OF REPEAL

The American Businessmen's Research Foundation will publish in the next issue of The Foundation Says an appraisal of 13 years of the prohibition repeal period.

These data are generally suppressed or ignored by newspapers and periodicals which carry liquor advertising. We select a few items of special significance, both to those who favor and those who oppose national prohibition.

Those who favored repeal promised "the saloon will not return." Now there are 407,000 of them. The saloon is back in politics and in crime records. Obscured windows, low lights, illegal dancing, gambling, selling to drunkards, selling to under-age children, and other law violations were found in 75 percent of Chicago's 7,000 saloons by a Government-financed, independent investigation.

Since 1932 arrests of drinking drivers increased 45.2 percent. In 13 years of repeal there have been 12,000,000 arrests for drunkenness, driving while intoxicated, disorderly conduct and liquor-law violations—an upswing of 51.3 percent per 100,000 population in cities alone. A pall was cast over the recent Christmas in many cities by traffic deaths and crimes against children caused by drink. In the city of Los Angeles the jail booking office was swamped with arrests for

drunken driving and drink-in-automobile cases.

We were promised "taxes will be reduced." During prohibition, taxes took 12.6 percent of the national income. During repeal (excluding war years) taxes took a 50-percent increase, and the national debt (before the war) increased up to $42,000,000. Wets claimed that liquor taxes would fill depleted public treasuries. Instead, for every liquor-tax dollar paid to Federal, State, and local governments, the "trade" has cost the people, and legitimate retail business, at least $5—fifty-nine billions diverted to the brewer and distiller, plus the cost of social and economic waste due to liquor.

The official Massachusetts legislative survey of liquor traffic revealed that in 1943 liquor taxes aggregating $13,139,266 were staggeringly offset by a cost to the State of $61,000,000 outlay to care for liquor-bred insanity, crime, dependents, etc. This $61,000,000 was exclusive of the direct liquor bill of the State, conservatively estimated at more than $200,000,000.

Under prohibition, according to an authoritative Government survey made in 1930, the consumption of beverage alcohol dropped more than 65 percent (from the high mark of the legalized liquor traffic in 1914 to the year 1929). Under repeal, more and more people are drinking more and more intoxicants.

The Foundation says that Bert F. McCann, vice president of the National Beer Wholesalers Association, has labeled the 4 years of the World War as a "sales honeymoon." This was a gross income of $10,680,000,000 for brewers and beer sellers while 10,000,000 American boys went out to fight and, if need be, to die for democracy.

Not a single argument for the benefits of repeal as against the evils of prohibition is sustained by the facts. A United States Government survey in 1930 showed there had been a drop of at least 65 percent in known per capita consumption of beverage alcohol since 1914. The past 13 years have shown an 81½-percent increase.

The sole aim of the restored saloon is not temperance but to provide more and more intoxicants to more and more drinkers. It is estimated that 50,000,000 Americans, which is half of all Americans over 15 years of age, drink some form of beverage alcohol.

The $100,000,000 annually spent on liquor advertising is getting the desired results to induce nondrinkers to drink, to turn moderate drinkers into inebriates, and to manufacture and sell liquor without limit.

PRESERVATION OF FORT WAYNE MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the recently announced decision by the War Department to abandon Fort Wayne has made a deep impression on the city of Detroit. When the announcement was made, our common council appointed a committee, consisting of George Edwards, president of the common council; Charles G. Oakman, councilman; William G. Rogell, councilman; Ernest Jones, Commissioner of Purchases and Supplies; and Homer R. Marson, city controller, as a committee to look into the acquisition of this property.

This is of great interest to the civic leaders of Detroit, who are fearful that Fort Wayne may be razed; that is, that the fort may be destroyed. It is universally agreed that the destruction of the fort would be a tragedy and that every effort should be bent to insure the preservation of this symbol of a bygone day.

Certainly the interest of the people of Detroit in this property goes beyond that of any agency, public or private. It follows that no agency other than the city of Detroit can put it to such good use. No other agency can so well serve the public interest, for the city's intentions transcend the mere utilization of the physical property as such. It proposes to preserve for posterity the historically significant portions; to develop the old fort as a permanent historical museum and the grounds around it as a public park.

These are the long-range objectives. But the city also has immediate and urgent need for many of the facilities now standing on the property. For example, it needs the dwellings and barracks as emergency housing for veterans, the hospital to furnish necessary health facilities to the west side citizens, the vacant areas as playgrounds for the youth of the neighborhood. Furthermore, it is anxious to cooperate with the local units of the Michigan National Guard to enable that organization to use some of the buildings as a temporary armory.

Fort Wayne has been a Detroit landmark for more than a century. Located in the heart of the heavily populated west side, it is the embodiment of important periods of the city's history. It should be placed under the guardianship of the municipality to insure that it will be preserved for the inspiration of generations yet unborn.

The city fathers of Detroit, Mr. President, have set forth in a pamphlet the reasons this property should be conveyed to the city of Detroit and not declared surplus property, and disposed of as such. At this time I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill which would provide for the conveyance of the fort to the city of Detroit, and I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. At the same time I ask to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the pamphlet issued by the city fathers of Detroit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Michigan will be received and appropriately referred, and the Chair may add the blessing of the senior Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the pamphlet referred to will be published in the RECORD pursuant to the request of the junior Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 270) providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The pamphlet, presented by Mr. FERGUSON, is as follows:

FORT WAYNE: A PLAN FOR ITS PRESERVATION UNDER THE GUARDIANSHIP OF DETROIT AS A HISTORICAL MONUMENT

Fort Wayne remains today the only significant physical reminder of Detroit's historic past. Gen. Anthony Wayne, coming to take possession of Detroit in 1796 for the United States, landed at Springwells, the present site of the fort. During the War of 1812, the land on which it stands was used as the camp ground for the victorious American Army, following the Battle of the Thames.

The fort itself was commenced in 1842 and is a fine specimen of American fortification of a century ago. The original barracks building within the bastions is considered one of the best architectural examples of that era. In this section of Michigan the rapid growth of our cities has destroyed nearly all the fine old buildings. Only Fort Wayne remains. Thus it is the more valuable.

Fort Wayne is the last in a succession of posts and forts built in Detroit. Fort Pontchartrain, established by Cadillac in 1701, has left no physical trace. The same must be said of the citadel of Fort Detroit, built in the 1760's. During the American Revolution, the British constructed Fort Lernoult, and in 1796 it was occupied by American troops under Gen. Anthony Wayne, by whom it was renamed Fort Shelby, in honor of Gen. Isaac Shelby, of Kentucky. Of this structure, only a few logs have survived to be preserved as museum pieces.

But Fort Wayne still stands much as it was constructed over 100 years ago. It has continually served Detroit and the Nation throughout those years and through five wars. From the Mexican War to World War II, it has been a center for recruiting, training, and equipping men from this area to fight for their country.

The very abandonment of the fort as a military post has historical significance, for this act is a striking testimonial to the bond of understanding and friendship which has long existed between this Nation and Canada. Its preservation as a historical memorial would be a fitting symbol of the existing good-neighbor relations.

Detroit needs a dynamic symbol of her debt to the past, and the preservation of Fort Wayne as a historical memorial would furnish her with that symbol. The city has no other.

Communities which have preserved significant historical sites and buildings derive much benefit from their stimulation of civic pride and national patriotism. Three well-known examples in this area are Fort Niagara near Buffalo, Fort Snelling at Minneapolis-St. Paul, and the island Fort Mackinac. Travelers as well as residents not only enjoy inspection of such historical sites but gain an understanding of the history of the area and a just pride in our common heritage.

The educational and patriotic value of historic sites and monuments is incalculable. Those which have been preserved are annually visited by tens of thousands, and this would doubtless hold true for Fort Wayne. Most historic monuments of this type have small museums in the barracks building, containing materials directly relating to the history of the site and telling the story of the structure and its place in American history. A similar collection could be housed at Fort Wayne, where it would be within easy reach of all the school children of Detroit.

The fort has other values, too. It typifies military construction of 100 years ago. The heavy brick-and-masonry structures are fine examples of craftsmanship. The barracks are a standing lesson in the architectural style and construction methods of that period. Finally, there is an Indian mound on the site which calls attention to the culture of a race which has practically vanished from the city.

Fort Wayne was built to insure the security of the United States and most especially to protect the people of this region. It has served well. It should continue to serve, not as a fortress, but as a historical museum which will foster a deep and abiding patriotism throughout the community and throughout the Nation.

As a reminder of a noble history and a harbinger of a challenging future, as a continuing tribute to those who have served this country in the past and to those who are serving it now, the flag of Fort Wayne must be kept flying.

AS A MAJOR PARK

Ultimately the city of Detroit would convert the 90 acres of land surrounding the old fort into a fine riverside park—an appropriate setting for a significant and historic military monument which will attract visitors from all the 48 States of the Union.

But the park would do more than this. With its half mile of river frontage, it would bring healthful recreation to many, many thousands of Detroit's vast population—give them the opportunity to relax, to walk along the river's edge—an opportunity now denied them. For Detroit is sadly lacking in riverfront parks. Except for two small playfields, there is not a single park on the river west of Belle Isle Bridge—a distance of more than 10 miles. Furthermore, because of the intense utilization of the water front by industry, there is small likelihood that such facilities can ever be developed in this section, unless the city acquires Fort Wayne.

By a peculiar coincidence, the area from which this park would draw most of its patronage—the densely populated west side—is singularly deficient in recreational facilities. For example, those portions of Congressional Districts 13, 15, and 16, lying within the city of Detroit, west of Woodward Avenue and south of Grand Boulevard and Tireman, have a population approaching half a million. Yet they contain within their borders only 66 acres classified as major park lands.

In view of these circumstances, it is imperative that Fort Wayne, the last waterfront park site available in the down-river section, be dedicated to serve the people of Detroit.

AS A COMMUNITY CENTER

It is generally admitted that there exists in Detroit a serious shortage of recreational facilities of all kinds, a situation which the present administration is striving strenuously to correct. As has already been pointed out, the area immediately surrounding Fort Wayne suffers most acutely from this shortage. However, the very nature of the district, which is almost entirely built-up and which contains a great concentration of heavy industry, makes the acquisition of adequate recreational facilities very difficult.

According to minimum standards, the neighborhood should have in playfield and playgrounds, as distinguished from park lands, three times the area that it now has.

The situation is so serious that for some time local groups have been insisting that something be done about it. Recognizing the scarcity of vacant land, they have even gone so far as to apply for permission to use property owned by one of the huge industries in the vicinity.

If Fort Wayne is entrusted to the city of Detroit, it will make possible the development of a major community center to serve these people and to provide not only indoor facilities, but baseball fields, football fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, dockage for small boats, etc. It is generally agreed that adequate recreational opportunities are essential to the building of good citizens. Acquisition of Fort Wayne will enable Detroit to give these opportunities to large numbers of its youth and its industrial workers who are now denied them and who undeniably have the most urgent need for them.

AS A TEMPORARY ARMORY FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD

The Michigan National Guard in the Detroit area is plagued at this very moment with an acute shortage of armory facilities. The main armory, a converted factory building, located at Piquette and Brush, is hopelessly inadequate for its needs, and the situation will be intensified when local units of the guard are built up to full strength. This will occur in the very near future, and when it does, there will be stationed in the Detroit area more than twice as many guardsmen as there were in the entire State of Michigan in 1938.

Eventually, when the State erects permanent armories for the use of troops stationed in Detroit, the crisis confronting the guard will undoubtedly be relieved. In the meantime, permission to use certain of the buildings in the Fort Wayne grounds, even temporarily, would be an undisguised blessing for the organization.

Responsible officers have indicated that the guard could put the present motor supply warehouse to immediate and effective use as headquarters for infantry battalions. They have also expressed a desire to obtain the use of the group of nine smaller buildings near the river, together with the paved area surrounding them.

The aspirations of both the National Guard and the city of Detroit in regard to Fort Wayne have been fully discussed by representatives of the two agencies, and they are in complete agreement. If control of Fort Wayne passes to the city, steps will be taken immediately to make available to the guard, on a temporary basis, the facilities enumerated above.

AS TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR VETERANS

The shortage of housing in Detroit is still as serious as it ever has been, and the prospect of easing the situation in the near future is lamentably dim. Thousands of returned veterans are unable to buy or rent accommodations for themselves and their families. Every interested agency in the city is swamped with appeals from desperate home seekers. Their files are filled with documents revealing the most pitiful situations. Yet very little can be done to alleviate them.

It is estimated that the barracks and dwellings now standing at Fort Wayne could accommodate the families of around 200 homeless Detroit veterans. Granted that this is not a large number compared with the total need, it still would represent a most welcome addition to the city's housing supply.

Because of the large number of heavy industries which surround the Fort, good city planning argues against the permanent utilization of this property for residential purposes. But as a temporary expedient, to help relieve the pressure of the present emergency, the use of existing buildings as housing for homeless veterans would contribute significantly to the common good.

AS AN EMERGENCY AND INDUSTRIAL HOSPITAL

Among the buildings on the Fort Wayne property is a small hospital. This facility could be put to immediate use to help relieve the present shortage of hospital beds in the Detroit area. A recently-published survey of Michigan hospitals, conducted by the Kellogg Foundation, estimates this local shortage at no fewer than 1,952 beds.

The situation in southwest Detroit is undeniably acute. Conservatively, the section should have at its disposal approximately 550 beds. It actually has at the present moment a total of 177. Of these, 72 are in the Delray General Hospital, 70 in the Lincoln Hospital, and 35 in the William Booth Hospital. Thus, there is today an apparent need of 370 additional beds in this section.

If the hospital now located at Fort Wayne were operated by the city as a general and industrial hospital, it would obviously help greatly in alleviating this serious situation.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 248, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Administrative Procedure Act—Legislative History, Seventy-ninth Congress," of which 1,000 copies shall be assigned to the Senate document room and 1,500 copies to the House document room.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO EXPEND CERTAIN FUNDS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the unobligated balance on February 1, 1947, in the contingent fund of the Senate to the credit of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, created by Senate Resolution 179, agreed to October 22, 1945, hereby is authorized to be expended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, created by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman.

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF BYRD ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, there is on the calendar of the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, Senate Resolution 58, which I ask at this time to have considered and agreed to. It is a resolution tendering the condolences of the Senate to the families of certain members of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition killed in a recent airplane crash. It was offered by me in conjunction with the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. STEWART], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate Resolution 58, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) tendering the condolences of the Senate to the families of certain members of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition killed in an airplane crash.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no possible objection to the resolution itself, but I should want it considered with the understanding that it would not displace the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. WHITE. Then I join in the hope that the resolution will be immediately agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to hear stated again the purpose of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will again read the title of the resolution.

The title of the resolution was again read.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas Ensign Maxwell Albert Lopez, of Newport, R. I.; Aviation Machinist's Mate First Class Frederick Warren Williams, of Huntingdon, Tenn.; and Aviation Radioman Second Class Wendell Keith Henderson, of Portsmouth, Va., lost their lives in the crash of a plane while on a photographic mission of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition; and

Whereas the deaths of these men were the first casualties of this historic expedition; and

Whereas they were engaged in scientific investigations and extraordinary aerial explorations the results of which may possibly prove of inestimable scientific value to the future of mankind and of great national importance to the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its condolences to the families of the deceased and expresses its gratitude for the heroic services of these men; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of each of the deceased.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND TARIFFS — ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Reciprocal Trade Agreements and Tariffs," delivered by Senator HAWKES, before the Mining and Metallurgical Society Mining Club, at the annual dinner meeting in New York, January 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTECTION OF PUBLIC IN LABOR LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Need a Pro-Public Labor Law," written by him and published in the October 1946 issue of the magazine Kiwanis, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO SECRETARY OF STATE BYRNES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from various papers concerning the resignation of Hon. James F. Byrnes as Secretary of State, which appear in the Appendix.]

THERE'S A FOUR-LETTER WORD FOR IT—EDITORIAL BY W. E. ZIPP

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "There's a Four-Letter Word for It," written by Mr. W. E. Zipp, vice president of the Ceco Steel Products Corp., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW RESEARCH LAW—EDITORIAL FROM THE FARMERS BUILD NEWS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Research Law," from the Farmers Build News of November 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF AUTOMOBILE PRICES BY FORD MOTOR CO.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a great step in our economic life was taken on January 15, 1947, by Henry Ford II, of Detroit, when he announced that the Ford Motor Co. would reduce the prices of Ford cars. At that time he made a statement which I would like to insert in the RECORD.

I think it is well for us to have the Ford statement in mind when we hear from many sides that there will be a continuation of the inflationary movement. Furthermore, I think it is well to keep the statement in mind in view of the fact that until recently there were many who felt that the only way America could proceed without inflation was by resort to regimentation or price regulation by the Office of Price Administration. I think this is a lesson in economics.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Mr. Ford's complete statement.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Looking back over the economic history of the United States, is it not a fact, I will ask the Senator from Michigan, that the same Ford management in this and another generation has always exhibited a high degree of business acumen and perspicacity, and its action in this instance is in line with its past actions?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator. I think its latest action is in harmony with the series of actions the Ford company has taken during the years.

Mr. TOBEY. I concur.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Although more than one million of our customers are waiting for delivery of their cars at present prices, we are immediately reducing the price of every Ford car—some models as much as $50.

This is our down payment toward a continued high level of production and employment in the months ahead. We believe that the shock treatment of prompt action is needed to halt the insane spiral of mounting costs and rising prices and to restore a sound base for the hopeful period of postwar production we are now entering.

Let me review briefly the considerations which have led us to take this important step.

The Ford Motor Co. is in the mass production business. Mass production depends upon large markets. It will continue to succeed only if it can produce more and more at lower and lower cost so that more and more people can buy. Large markets begin to disappear when prices rise.

The un-American spiral of mounting costs and rising prices has hurt everybody—some groups more than others. Many have not benefited from postwar wage increases, but have had to share the burden of resulting higher prices. Already, millions of American families are unable to buy the things which, in normal times, make up their standard of living.

In the short view, we can see inflation. In the long view, there is danger of depression.

The period since VJ-day has been an unhappy and costly period of reconversion to peacetime production. Ford Motor Co. has lost millions of dollars since VJ-day, even after all tax adjustments.

But the crisis of this wild aftermath of war seems to have been passed. Our own production, though still limited by material shortages, is now steadier. Productivity of our employees, which hit a new low during the period, seems to have started its return to normal. Ford Motor Co. made a modest profit for the last 3 months of 1946, and we intend to continue to operate in the black.

The American economy now stands at a turning point. Mounting costs and rising prices have warranted caution and hesitancy. There is even general fear that this dangerous, un-American cycle cannot be corrected without an economic recession. We think this fear can be dispelled by common sense and action. And among free men that becomes an individual responsibility.

The Ford Motor Co., therefore, proposes to accept its losses since VJ-day as an item of the cost of a great and victorious war. We are closing our books on that phase of our production history. We have decided that now is the time for us to make an investment in the future.

Because they must build up depleted cash reserves or because they are still losing money, many businesses may not be able to follow suit. But we hope that our suppliers, our employees, and our other economic partners will back, each to his own ability, our attempt to return to the economic pattern which has helped to make America great—the principle that higher wages and a higher standard of living for all depend upon lower costs and lower prices through increasingly efficient large-scale production.

We hope, as we move forward, that we will be able to reduce prices further, and that we will not be forced to raise them again to compensate for cost increases.

CREATION OF CONTINUING CONGRESSIONAL-STATE STUDY COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a matter which I feel is of first importance and is imminent because of the pending discussions of the National Budget and the tax situation. What I have reference to is the pending tax rivalry between the Federal Government and the several States.

During the war the States very properly had to give up various sources of taxation because of the war effort. In many instances, I am advised, they were assured that with the close of the war these sources of taxation would be restored to them.

In my own State of New Jersey we are embarrassed at the present moment because practically all our important sources of taxation have been absorbed by the Federal Government and we are at a loss to know where to turn in order to meet some pressing needs, and particularly financial aid for our educational program. The plight of the teachers in our public schools is deplorable, and we need to find sources of income in order to take care of that problem.

Mr. President, I hope to address the Senate on this subject at greater length at a later date, but for the moment I desire to read into the RECORD a very able presentation of this issue by the distinguished Governor-elect of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll, which he made in Chicago yesterday before the eighth general assembly of the Council of State governments. Governor-elect Driscoll, in his remarks, urges the creation of a continuing congressional-State study commission to ease competition for the tax dollar. I concur wholeheartedly with Governor Driscoll's proposals.

I quote the following challenging statement of Governor-elect Driscoll which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune this morning, Friday, January 17:

We no longer can afford the luxury of 49 tax programs, each unrelated to the other. I am deeply concerned with the State-Federal competition for the tax dollar, and with the invasion of the Federal Government into the same tax field.

ASKS FEDERAL WITHDRAWAL

I would like to see our States, in concert with the Federal Government, reexamine and redefine the duties of each level of government, to eliminate overlapping functions and administrations. The present confusion almost certainly will lead to disaster.

The solution to the present confusion is to be found in the withdrawal of the Federal Government from certain tax fields, and the reservation of those fields to the States. For example, the income tax, I believe, should be purely Federal, but gasoline and liquor taxes should be reserved to the States.

The emphasis of the national administration has too long been to treat the States as competitive centers of political power. Nor have the States themselves appeared particularly willing to adopt any common policy of State action, except on a few narrow and indecisive fronts. The time has come for those of us who are responsible for State affairs to stop thinking and talking in the hackneyed, nineteenth century notions of State rights.

What we need is a master plan of working federalism which will give expression to the most effective capacities of both the States and the Federal Government. Such a plan could, in principle, stake out the appropriate areas of policy determination for our various States.

If the past is to teach us anything, it is that the present hit-or-miss alteration of fiscal resources results in the compensating expenditures of the Federal Government being offset in large part by a necessary reduction in State and local expenditures in time of economic depression.

WOULD HAVE STATE COLLECT

The whole idea that there is something mysteriously more competent about the Federal Government pervades much of the thinking directed toward simplification of tax administration. We are told time and again that the Federal Government should collect one tax or another and remit to the States their respective shares.

Speaking for New Jersey, we would be very glad to reverse this emphasis with respect to Federal excise taxes. Not only are we ready and able, with interstate cooperation, to collect such taxes as the alcoholic-beverage tax and to remit the Federal share to the Federal Government but we are ready and able to do so with less red tape and at decidedly less cost. We could operate similarly with pay-roll taxes.

I submit that the trend toward greater centralization will continue unabated, regardless of the party in power, until the States demonstrate a capacity to undertake common problems from a reasonably consistent point of view.

It is to the end of developing such a capacity that I have urged upon you the creating of facilities through which to arrive at a concordance of viewpoints, so far as possible, among our States.

ATTITUDE OF BRITISH GOVERNMENT TOWARD RESISTANCE MOVEMENT IN PALESTINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I note in the New York Times a dispatch from London which states that the British Government has again directed the attention of our State Department to advertisements in United States newspapers soliciting funds for the support of the resistance movement in Palestine. A Foreign Office spokesman was quoted as saying that the British Ambassador in Washington has seen Secretary Byrnes to express British concern over the advertising campaign which was critical of British policy in Palestine and sympathetic to the Hebrew patriots who are fighting for Palestine independence.

I also note, Mr. President, that the British Government has announced that military authorities were preparing the strongest offensive in modern Palestine's history in order to crush what they term an open rebellion by the underground forces. All branches of Britain's army in the Holy Land, estimated in excess of a hundred thousand men, are to take part in these operations. Troops from Egypt are said to be reaching the Holy Land daily by road and by rail as reinforcements.

Asked whether the United States State Department would be informed if these large-scale operations were put into effect, the Foreign Office spokesmen indicated that there would be no occasion to inform the American authorities of such developments. In other words, Mr. President, in the eyes of the British Government it is none of America's business what the British military authorities do in connection with their responsibility as the mandatary, notwithstanding the fact that a solemn treaty exists between the United States and Great Britain with respect thereto. At the same time, the British Government regards it as a matter of great concern to them that American citizens exercise the right of free speech and free press to express their sympathy for a much persecuted and long-suffering people in their fight against oppression.

For my part, Mr. President, I am on occasion, pro-British and, on occasion, anti-British. I am pro-British when Great Britain acts in fairness and in justice. I am anti-British when Great Britain violates the principles of fairness and justice. In this instance I think the attitude of the British Government violates those principles in both announcements. I am exceedingly anxious that the British Government recognize, first, that Americans are intensely concerned in any measure which Great Britain might adopt to suppress civil liberties in Palestine and to impose upon the citizens of that country restrictions inconsistent with the principles of English and American law; second, that Americans will exercise freely their right to adjudge the justice of resistance to British rule or influence in any part of the world, and that we will lend our moral assistance to any cause which we think is right and just.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an Associated Press dispatch from London dated January 6, published in the Washington Star of January 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH MOBILIZE TROOPS TO CRUSH PALESTINE REVOLT—ALL HOLY LAND FORCES WILL TAKE PART IN DRIVE ON EXTREMISTS

LONDON, January 6.—Government sources said today British military authorities were preparing the biggest offensive in modern Palestine's history to crush what they called the open rebellion against law and order by Jewish extremists.

All branches of Britain's Army in the Holy Land, estimated to total about 100,000 men, will take part, these sources said. Troops from Egypt are reaching the Holy Land by road and rail as reinforcements.

The trigger for the operation is expected to be British Cabinet ratification of proposals formulated in conferences among Palestine's high commissioner, Gen. Sir Alan Cunningham, Field Marshal Lord Montgomery, Prime Minister Attlee, Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, and Colonial Secretary Arthur Creech Jones.

The informants said the British Government took the view that whatever settlement finally emerged for Palestine, the reimposition of law and order was Britain's first obligation.

NO POINT IN INFORMING UNITED STATES

Asked whether the United States State Department would be informed if large-scale operations were put into effect, a Foreign Office spokesman said:

"There would be no advantage in informing the American authorities of whatever day-to-day measures we may be contemplating for the Holy Land."

A final decision on Palestine's fate also may come from Britain this week. The possibilities include:

1. A partition plan for the Holy Land, which would create independent Arab and Jewish states there.

2. Considered a last-resort solution, British surrender of the League of Nations mandate to the United Nations.

UNITED NATIONS RATIFICATION NECESSARY

Whatever solution is finally adopted, with or without Arab and Jewish consent, Government sources said the United Nations would have to ratify the new arrangement.

The Arab League said yesterday its seven member nations would be represented at a conference on Palestine scheduled to start here January 21 under sponsorship of Britain, which governs the Holy Land by mandate.

At the same time, Haganah, relatively moderate Jewish underground defense organization, broadcast from Palestine a secret radio plea for an end to violence and professed knowledge that the British Government just now is preparing a solution of the Palestine problem.

JEWS STILL HAVE NOT ACCEPTED

The Jews, however, still have not accepted an invitation to the London conference. The World Zionist Organization voted in Basel, Switzerland, December 24, not to participate under existing circumstances but left the final decision up to its general council if a change should take place in the situation.

The Arab League's decision to come to London was made public by Secretary-General Abdel Rahman Azzam Pasha in Cairo. He said League delegates would demand an independent Arab government in Palestine and oppose any partition scheme or further Jewish immigration.

The League represents Egypt, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, Lebanon, and Yemen. Yesterday's announcement came in the face of a Christmas plea by the Palestine Arab executive committee that the League boycott the conference unless Britain invited Haj Amin el Husseini, exiled Mufti of Jerusalem, and agreed to discuss Arab independence.

PRESS URGES STRONG MEASURES

London newspapers, meanwhile, demanded strong measures to end violence in the Holy Land. The Sunday Dispatch called for all-out methods, the Sunday Times for sterner, direct methods against the terrorists themselves. The News of the World, declaring Britain needed more practical support from the United States, said the fact of news in New York State seemed to color the view of the White House.

In its broadcast, Haganah blamed Irgun Zvai Leumi and the so-called Stern Gang, extremist Jewish underground groups, for recent attacks on British troops. Its announcer said Haganah would not allow Zionist work all over Palestine and the hopes of a Jewish nation to be destroyed.

Irgun Zvai Leumi, however, in another underground radio broadcast, said flame throwers would be used further against the British, as they were last Thursday. The broadcaster listed British casualties in Thursday attacks as one officer killed and 20 soldiers and 5 policemen wounded. He said underground casualties were only two wounded. He reported the flamethrowers were converted fruit-tree sprayers.

TRAFFIC BLOCKED BY BLAST

Meanwhile, traffic was stopped by the blasting of a deep hole in a highway north of Rehoboth, and a police guard chased off a group that fired at the Hadera station of the Haifa-Tantura railway. No casualties were reported from either incident.

The Government announced 33 arrests, 4 of them women in searches in Hadera and Kafar Atta, north of Haifa, and confirmed the tightening of Palestine Jewish and Arab newspaper censorship in the previous 24 hours to avoid heightening already tense public feeling. The censorship does not apply to news sent abroad.

In Egypt 11 British soldiers were hurt, 2 dangerously, in a hand-grenade attack near Benha, 25 miles north of Cairo, on a train traveling toward Palestine. Unknown assailants threw two or three grenades into one of several troop coaches in the passenger train and one grenade exploded.

On the Mediterranean island of Cyprus some 10,000 Jews were being moved from temporary quarters at Caraolos internment camp to a new winter settlement of Nissen huts on the coast of Xylotymbou. They still will be behind barbed wire and under armed guard. They were taken off ships on which they tried to enter Palestine in defiance of British immigration quotas.

RECENT AIR-TRAVEL FATALITIES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States must in the last few months have been startled by and must now be deeply concerned in the apparently increasing number of fatalities in air travel. Fatalities have been so numerous and the crashes have been so frequent that, as I am advised today, travel by air in the United States seems to have been discouraged.

Mr. President, when it was my privilege to write the 1938 aviation law, which is now the law governing civil aviation, there was placed in the law, after long study, a provision for an independent safety board. That was not done haphazardly. It was done after receiving the advice and counsel of the best minds of the country. It was done against some opposition, but it was placed in the law in a very effective manner. The President of the United States, under a reorganization act, took it upon himself to change the aviation act of 1938 and in the reorganization which followed his advisers prevailed upon him, against the advice of others, to eliminate from the law the Independent Safety Board.

Mr. President, with every ounce of energy I possessed at that time I opposed the approval of that reorganization act, one reason being the elimination of the Independent Safety Board. This body thought differently, and by a divided vote approved the Reorganization Act. But from that day until now—and especially now—crashes and fatalities in the air, in my judgment—and I speak from a careful study and observation of the subject—have been traceable directly or indirectly to the absence of the Independent Safety Board. Many of the crashes which have taken place would not have occurred if there had been an Independent Safety Board. I have in mind the crash which took the life of one Member of this body, the late Senator Lundeen. The accident happened in Virginia. There is no question in my mind that if a safety board had existed at that time that plane, with its load of human beings, would not have been permitted to leave the airport. Its condition at the time did not warrant its leaving the field.

The first bill which was introduced in the Senate in this session, Senate bill 1, is a bill to rewrite almost the entire aviation law, and to incorporate into it the results of observation, training, and experience since 1938. The committee to which that bill has been referred, and which will study it, may possibly deem it necessary to give longer study to the bill, because it is voluminous. There is in that bill a provision for the reestablishment of the Independent Safety Board.

Thinking, perchance, that the committee might deem it necessary to take a longer time to make a study of the entire bill, I am today introducing as a separate bill, to be considered by the committee, a portion of Senate bill 1, with the hope that we may, in a shorter time than would be necessary to study the whole subject, have a favorable report from the committee and reestablish by law the Independent Safety Board.

I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 269) to create an Independent Air Safety Board was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I believe that all of us who have heard of the terrible disasters resulting from airplane crashes during late months sense the importance of the subject matter and the necessity for early attention by Members of the Senate.

For 2 days during the past week members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate have been in conference with members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and there has been a very thorough discussion of the whole subject matter. There has been discussion of the causes which have led up to these disasters, so far as they could be ascertained. As a result I was authorized by the committee to appoint a subcommittee, and I have done so, naming the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] chairman of a subcommittee of five. My colleague seemed the natural selection, because of the long study he has given to the problems of aviation and the intimate knowledge he has, both of domestic and international questions arising in this field of activity.

That committee has had referred to it Senate bill 1 and Senate bill 3. It is anticipated that from time to time legislation dealing with the problem of safety in the air will be referred to that subcommittee. I take it the subcommittee will promptly organize, that hearings will be begun, and that a thorough and painstaking study will be made of all that is involved in the situation, so far as investigation can disclose.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Before I yield to the junior Senator from Maine I should like to say that for some time in the past I had the privilege of serving with him on the Committee on Commerce. The selection of the junior Senator from Maine to be chairman of the subcommittee is a most commendable selection, and I am indeed glad that he has been selected, because he has given time and study to the subject, and has devoted his fine intelligence and experience to it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD clearly show that I asked the Senator from Nevada to yield before he laid these flowers on my desk. I rose for the purpose of naming the members of the subcommittee associated with me in the inquiry. They are the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. The subcommittee promptly organized this morning, and will proceed as rapidly as possible.

I wish at this point to express the profound regret of all those interested in the great aviation industry at this very critical time that circumstances made it impossible for the Senator from Nevada to continue as a member of the committee having jurisdiction, as his interest during the past decade has been one of the most outstanding contributions to the progress of aviation. It is a matter of gratification that his activity in introducing proposed legislation indicates that his interest will continue, although he is not a member of the committee immediately concerned. I am sure that his assistance will be most helpful to the committee and to the country.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it appropriate to add that one of the four technical assistants which the committee was authorized to appoint has already been selected. He is an authority in the aviation field, and he has been assigned to work with the new subcommittee.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, is it in order to speak on the pending resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 12 and 13 and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "defense program); is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned

periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided*, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority shall be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States (including Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico) prior to June 30, 1946: *Provided further*, That the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948, at which time all powers and duties conferred upon the committee shall terminate."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments in relation to the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 46, which brings definitely into focus one's position in relation to the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, concerning which I have previously stated as follows:

First. This law was not meant as a strait-jacket to limit the functions of Congress.

Second. Even if it were conceived as such—which I doubt—the law itself would have no binding effect upon the present Congress unless the Congress gave it such effect.

Third. This Congress cannot pass the buck to any past Congress or any future Congress. If, in the interest of the public, it is thought necessary to continue the War Investigating Committee, then this Congress should have the vision and the judgment to do what is needed.

Fourth. I believe that the present standing committees, which are 15 in number, have plenty to do to attend to their present and prospective knitting. I am sure that is true of the Judiciary Committee because there have been added to it the many new functions of protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; patents, copyrights, and trademarks; immigration and naturalization; claims against the United States; and so forth.

THE ISSUE

The issue to me is very simple. If I feel, as I do, that the public interest will be best served by having the old special committee continued, then it is up to me to so cast my vote. If I felt that any of the regular committees created by the La Follette-Monroney Act were specially constituted for looking into the past with its waste and criminal negligence and could do it more efficiently than this War Investigating Committee, then I would not vote for the continuance of that committee.

The resolution contemplates that we continue this very effective congressional instrument for 1 year. I believe that the resolution, besides coinciding with my present judgment, expresses the will of the people. The people want the Congress to find out if their servants in the past have been faithful servants. If not, these servants must be held to account.

The fine work of the committee in the past justifies its continuance. If one has a good tool and a job to do, he does not throw that tool away and start the work anew with a blunted tool.

But let us not fall into the rut of worshiping mere mechanisms. After all, what we want is results. I know that the public has been sold and oversold on the miraculous structure of the Reorganization Act. But we who are now operating under it are finding that after all it is the working ability of the men that counts, and not the structure.

The resolution now before the Senate really challenges the reason and the judgment of each one of us in that we will have to decide whether we are going to place a road-block on the way to finding out about waste and corruption, or whether we are going to remove that road-block. America knows that this committee is not on a witch hunt, but that the purpose of the committee is to learn from the past how to avoid waste and corruption so that in case we have another challenge to our national life, we can avoid those pitfalls.

I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bricker	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk, and shall ask the clerk to read immediately, a proposed substitute for the so-called Brewster amendment, using the exact words of the Brewster amendment as it has been presented but providing that the investigation shall be conducted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, rather than by a special committee created by the Senate.

I ask the clerk to read the amendment which I now offer as a substitute for the Brewster amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland in the nature of a substitute for the Brewster amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "hereby," in line 3 of the Brewster amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided*, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority shall be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States (including Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico) prior to June 30, 1946: *Provided further*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Maryland, if he will permit, that inasmuch as, with the exception of the first two lines, the language is identical, instead of offering it as a substitute, it be offered as an amendment to strike out and insert.

Mr. TYDINGS. As a perfecting amendment. I think that would be preferable.

So we have the issue drawn in almost affirmative terms. The amendment which the Senate has just heard read is, with the exception of the name of the committee, verbatim the words of the original Brewster resolution. There is not a change of a comma, a semicolon, or a word in it. The sole question remaining before the Senate is not whether there shall be an investigation or whether there shall not be an investigation, as has been implied heretofore, but whether or not a committee of this body which is already charged with performing this very specific kind of work shall perform it, or whether the Senate shall throw that committee overboard and appoint an entirely new committee to do the work of the committee which the

Senate has already constituted to perform such functions.

More than that, Mr. President, who constitutes the membership of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments? Listen to the personnel:

On the majority side: GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, chairman; HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan.

Pausing at the reading of the second name, one of the members of the so-called special committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is already a member of the standing committee which would be charged to perform this service.

Next, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa. I do not recall at the moment whether Senator HICKENLOOPER was on the original Truman committee, but I know that he has been on numerous investigating committees, and is an able Senator and an able investigator.

JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio; EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota; JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin; and IRVING M. IVES, of New York. On the Democratic side the members are JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas; JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi; CLYDE R. HOEY, of North Carolina; GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; and HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland.

I should like to ask the Republican members of this committee, and also the Democratic members, if they feel incompetent to do this work. I shall pause for a reply, if any of them see fit to answer the question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator please repeat the question? I was so busy reading the amendment that I did not hear the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The question was this: I read the membership of the committee, and I stated that the only reason I could see for taking away from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments the function for which it was created, and lodging it in a special committee, would be that the members of the standing committee felt incompetent to do the job.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, all I wish to say in reply to the Senator from Maryland at this time, inasmuch as I have not even had an opportunity to read his amendment, is that I feel that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments does have a very strong personnel. I am sure it would not shirk any duty which devolved upon it. But beyond that, I do not care to commit myself until I have an opportunity to read and analyze the amendment which the Senator from Maryland has offered; and that may take me some time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is very fair about that, and I do not think he ought to be asked peremptorily. I asked the question only by way of illustrating the absolutely childish situation into which the Senate has maneuvered itself. Two weeks ago or less, the Senate created 15 standing committees; it assigned to each committee certain very definite functions, and then decided on the personnel committee. Furthermore, experts and this and that are to be furnished each committee. Now, however, the Senate is about to say, "Yes; it is true we have created a Standing Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and have put fine and able men on it, and one of its functions is to investigate all expenditures in the departments of the Government; but we are not going to use that committee. We are going to set up an entirely new committee, not the old Truman committee, per se, but we shall use some of the old members of that committee, and shall set up a new committee to do the work with which the standing committee is specifically charged."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Maryland has made some remarks which I did not fully follow; but when he was discussing the Committee on the Expenditures in the Executive Departments it occurred to me that in the past such a committee has been charged with the investigation of expenditures in the executive branch of the Government. When he read the membership of that committee, I observed that on the Republican side there are four Senators who have been governors of their States and are thoroughly familiar with expenditures on the executive side, and on the Democratic side of the committee there are two Senators who also have been governors of their States.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps I rose prematurely. I was going to correct the Senator from New Mexico by saying that of the 13 members of the standing committee 6 have been governors of their States. However, he has brought out that fact himself.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, I ask Senators to listen to these words before they cast their votes on this important question. What is the work of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—

to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects—

What are the following subjects? They are these, among others:

Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Mr. TOBEY rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. This matter is new to me, but I should like to propound a question to the author of this perfecting amendment. As I heard it read I came to the conclusion—and I ask the Senator please to confirm whether I am correct in that judgment—that the effect of the amendment, if adopted, would be that the Senate of the United States would live up to the letter and spirit of the Reorganization Act, as it was passed by the Senate last August? Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. And more than that, that all experts and investigators who now are a part and parcel of any special committee bearing on this investigation could readily be made available and transferred, to report to and work through and under the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. So there would be no loss in efficiency, but the great gain would be made that the Senate of the United States would be living up to the Reorganization Act, in its letter and spirit, as it passed it and sent it to the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct. I may add to what he has said—and I say this not with the desire to asperse anyone or to attribute to anyone motives which he probably did not have when the original Brewster resolution was submitted—that if the Senate should not accept the amendment offered by me, which confers this power on a standing committee recently created in this body, the Senate in effect would insult every Member, Democratic and Republican, of that standing committee, because the Senate would then say, in effect, that they are incompetent to do the work.

Mr. TOBEY. In other words, it would be a reflection on the standing committee, would it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. If I were a member of the standing committee I would feel that it would be a reflection; and I cannot see how any member, Republican or Democratic, of that committee who might vote against my amendment could be considered as saying other than that, "I feel incompetent to do the work for which that committee was created and which it is charged with doing."

Mr. TOBEY. I concur.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is the issue. No longer is there any debate on whether there shall be an investigation or shall not be an investigation. All the oratory which has attributed bad faith to some of those who were opposing the resolution now goes out the window. There will be an investigation. It will be conducted exactly within the purview of the language offered by the Senator from Maine, and it will be conducted by a committee which is preponderantly Republican, and upon which one of the outstanding investigators, a former member of the Truman committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] will serve as a member.

Mr. President, what excuse is left now for the creation of a new committee, when we have already in being a committee which is equipped and set up to discharge this very function?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I simply wish to point out to the Senator from Maryland that the attitude the minority or those of us who feel as he does about this matter have taken today in supporting his position is not a new attitude at all. It is an attitude which we took in the Rules Committee when this matter was first broached. I think the country should know, as the Senator from Maryland has so clearly stated, that the Members on this side of the aisle are not opposed to any investigation of any crook, no matter where he may reside or who he may be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has ably stated the case. Let me add, by way of an appendix to his remarks, that the Truman committee itself was created by the present President of the United States, then sitting in this body; and the investigations authorized then were approved by a Democratic majority then existing in this body; and the committee did not hesitate, regardless of its political affiliation, to bring to light anything that was regarded as unseemly or improper, so that it might be corrected. So the whole genesis of the investigation was in the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, now that the amendment is offered by this side, and inasmuch as the only difference proposed by the amendment is that a standing committee of this body, created to do this very job, shall do it, I cannot see how, in the public interest, aside from every other consideration, Members of the Senate on either side of the aisle can now go back on their own child and can adopt a foster child, of somewhat bastard parentage, to do the work involved in this kind of legitimate undertaking.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The point has been made by the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the only real difference as between the standing committee and the special committee has to do with the question of experience. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Michigan, a member of the present Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, is also a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I say that with all due deference to the other members of the committee that he has been the spearhead in investigatory work and has vast experience in investigating matters of the character we are discussing.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Michigan was put on the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments by our colleagues on the other side for the very proper reason that there is no more able investigator and overseer of Government activities in this body than is the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was somewhat interested in the Senator's comment on this measure being of bastard parentage, which is rather strong language on this floor, particularly as the origin of the special committee was in the gentleman who is now President of the United States. I feel confident that the Senator did not intend to reflect upon his parentage of the committee.

The Senator has repeatedly referred to the committee as a new committee, although I think everyone else in this Chamber and in the country knows that it is not a new committee, but is a continuation, as the resolution clearly provides, of a committee which has been in existence for 4 years, and concerning whose work the country is quite familiar.

As to its bastard parentage, I am a little interested in the origin of the Reorganization Act which the Senator so eloquently espouses, as there would be some ground for argument as to the parentage of that act, particularly as Senators on the other side have been beating their breasts so vehemently, not regarding the letter of the act, as they are quite careful not to mention the letter of the act, which clearly leaves ample scope for action of the character proposed, but they constantly refer to the spirit of the act, and what it was intended to do. When they emphasize the spirit, it means they lose sight of the letter and decline to depend on the letter.

Who is most competent to interpret this act? I think it would be profitable to call attention to the debates and the votes in this body on June 10, 1946, when the Reorganization Act was debated and decision was reached, in the determination at this time as to the parentage of the Reorganization Act, and to whom the child belonged. We find that 17 Senators on the opposite side of the Chamber, on my left, were absent at the time, not sufficiently interested, or not able to be present for undoubtedly adequate reasons, and 13 Members on the other side voted against the adoption of the Reorganization Act, with the spirit of which they are now so much concerned

When I turn to this side of the Chamber, I find that 23 of the votes that adopted the act came from the Republican side, and that there were only 3 votes on this side against it.

So, it seems to me, while Senators on the other side exhibit great concern regarding the spirit of the act, it is perhaps true that this child is far more the child of this side than of the other side of the Chamber. Whether for that reason it is proper to charge it with bastardy I do not know, but, at any rate, it is our child, we are proud of it, and I think we are more competent to interpret the spirit as well as the letter of the act, for whose existence upon the statute books this side of the Chamber is primarily responsible.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for making one of the best arguments in support of the proposal I have offered that I expected to hear on this floor. He has just said that his side voted 23 to 3, as I recall, for the adoption of the Reorganization Act. I am wondering if Senators on the other side will vote 50 to 0 against their own baby which the Senator from Maine so eloquently claims they fathered.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to propound a question to my friend and colleague, the Senator from Maine. Referring to the 23 Republicans who voted for the bill, was the Senator from Maine one of the number?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will verify it. I am very sure I was. [After a pause.] I find I was one of those not voting.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order due to the noise and confusion in the galleries, and I ask the Chair respectfully to notify the occupants of the galleries of the stringent rule of this body with respect to the maintenance of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point of order is well taken. The Chair respectfully asks the visitors in the galleries to refrain from applause or noise of any character.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to know why the occupants of the gallery should be blamed for the hilarity in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is force in my assertion that the 23 Republicans who made it possible for the act to be passed are certainly better qualified to interpret its spirit than are the very considerable number on the opposite side who voted against it, or were included with myself among those who were absent. It may be said, however, that I have been quoted on this floor as one of those who testified concerning this matter before the special committee by whose activities alone the act came into being, in favor of steps along this line. I think my remarks upon this subject have been rather voluminously quoted on both sides of the Chamber in the discussions which have proceeded hitherto. So that there is no need of any doubt in the RECORD about my position before and after the passage of the act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In just a moment. Again I must say that the remarks of my good friend and colleague, the Senator

from Maine, are somewhat shot through with sophistry. He says that those who voted for the act should be in a better position to interpret whether it applies or does not apply to the particular situation we are discussing than those on this side who perchance may have opposed it. Incidentally I am one of the Senators who voted for it; but if the Senator's argument is sound, then by the logic of what he says he should be the last man in the world to ask for a special committee to be set up, because he was not present, and he had a position on neither one side nor the other of the proposition. Yet if his proposal is adopted, he would head the committee, and he certainly would not be one of those who would be in a position to interpret the act, according to his own definite statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know as to the position of any of the other Senators who were absent on the day when the vote was taken, but, as I have previously stated, my own record in the matter is fully apparent in the hearings before the special committee which considered this subject, before whom I testified at some length, and, as I have said, quotations from what I said have been embodied in the record of the present debate. Whether or not that would permit me to participate in the parentage of the act, at any rate, it leaves no doubt as to what my consistent position has been.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is only byplay.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me a moment, I shall yield later, but I should like to develop a point or two. However, the Senator from Nebraska has always been courteous to me, and I yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to suggest to the able Senator from Maryland, who, I know always wants to be fair, that on the day the vote was taken, as I was the one charged with the duty of making announcements, I announced that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was not present on that occasion, and that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. One more matter. I voted with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Undoubtedly the Senator did.

Mr. WHERRY. We were on the same side respecting the issue before us. I think the distinguished Senator from Maryland will agree with me that no one has been more persistent in seeking to eliminate the use of borrowed clerical help in connection with special committees than I have. Does the Senator agreed with me in that?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not familiar with the Senator's record in that regard, but I am sure that if he makes the statement it is accurate.

Mr. WHERRY. As one who voted with the Senator, after the colloquy was engaged in between Senator La Follette and several others, Senator La Follette, who was the Senate proponent of the measure, said the provision was not a bar to special committees, if the Senate felt they should be constituted. I think the distinguished Senator from Maryland will remember that. So that I think when we voted for the Reorganization Act, we did so with the full knowledge that if 15 committees did not accomplish the purpose, and it was the opinion of the majority of the Senate that special committees should be set up, the Senate would have the right to create them.

I for one do not consider it a violation of the act if a committee that cuts across these lines is proposed, and I would support the creation of such a committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should say, though, that it is a very unusual procedure for the majority within a week to set up two committees to do the same thing.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very anxious to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Senator from Maryland is making statements on the floor which I think should be answered. I think he should not cut me off from an observation.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Nebraska can have his time.

Mr. WHERRY. I can make a speech in my time; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to be courteous to the Senator. I thought he had concluded his point.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to him, to enable him to conclude his point.

Mr. WHERRY. The point is, there is nothing unusual about this proposal. It conforms to all the precedents of the Senate. There is nothing unusual about the procedure. Since an interval will elapse before the standing committee can be completely organized and staffed, with due respect to its ability, and acknowledging that it is composed of men just as able as those on any other committee, I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who is always fair, if he does not feel that, considering the set-up of the present special committee and the information it has, it would be advisable for the special committee to continue?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is the first time in my service here that I have ever known of a proposal to create two committees in 2 weeks to do the same job.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have a fair memory, and in the particular statement I am about to make it is very distinct. Referring to the colloquy that has just ensued, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that as he remembers, no doubt, he and I were both members of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. I have a very distinct recollection—I like to recall it; I have, repeatedly, since then—that in one of the last meetings of that committee, which passed out of existence last year, my friend the Senator from Nebraska told me with great earnestness that he was opposed to any special committees and they ought to be discontinued.

Referring to remarks by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] which he just made, I now read, if I may, from an address or a speech which I delivered here last Monday, in which I gave citations to remarks in the committee hearings made by various Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle in connection with the passage of the reorganization bill.

I quote from my remarks of last Monday:

> The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] said that it was archaic and grotesque to continue the conditions then prevailing in the operations of the Senate.
>
> He referred to the confusion and overlapping in the jurisdiction of Senate committees. He said that special committees have been used to correct this condition, and then added:
>
> "I do not think we can rely indefinitely on this creation of special committees."
>
> He emphasized particularly the necessity of adequately staffing the standing committees, since without such staffing it becomes easier to seek the creation of special committees.
>
> That staffing, I interpolate, was provided.
>
> The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 addressed itself specifically to the problems of providing a substantial staff for each standing committee. The Senator from Maine told the joint committee considering this legislation of the grave dangers which will increasingly arise unless Congress adequately staffs its standing committees.

The perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland transfers the investigatory work heretofore performed by the special committee to the standing committee, thereby conforming to the spirit and letter of the reorganization bill as it passed the Senate.

I may say further, in contradistinction to the statement just made by my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], that the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is already organized and eager to begin its work. Let us give it a chance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I like to be courteous, but I have practically made no argument at all thus far along the lines I intended to develop for the reason that we have had a good deal of good-humored by-play. I should like to address myself seriously to this question. If the Senator from Nebraska will bear with me a while, I will yield to him a little later. I should like to emphasize the thought that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was created for the very purpose embodied in the pending resolution. Indeed, the language of the Reorganization Act itself says so, for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was created for the purpose of studying the operations of Government activities at all levels, with a view of determining their economy and efficiency.

There are many other functions specifically conferred on it, but I have read only that one. What caused me, the first day it came up, reluctantly to challenge

the resolution of the Senator from Maine was that the resolution encompassed everything. Under it the committee could have investigated the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Commerce Department, the Interior Department, and the armed services abroad. It could have investigated the consulates, and all the independent agencies of the Government; indeed, it had no limitations worthy of the name. So when I pointed out this fact to the Senator from Maine, he came before the Armed Services Committee, and there I suggested to him—I hope I use my exact words—that he would reduce the area of hostility to his resolution if he would confine it to graft, corruption, and so forth, with reference to war contracts, not that I would be for it then, but that at least it would have more merit than if it authorized an investigation of anything the Senator might have in mind.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not yield for the moment. I will in a moment.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator's statement——

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not yielded.

The reason I did that was that I had been interested in some of the newspaper reports of statements attributed to the Senator during the past 2 or 3 months. He had said that he was going to investigate the armed services in Europe. He had said he was going to investigate certain diplomatic propositions, as I understood, in South America. He had covered many fields that had nothing to do with graft or corruption or war contracts direct, so that it looked to me as if we would be letting the bars down for everything.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a minute, but let me finish. I have not concluded.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator's statements are so much at variance——

Mr. TYDINGS. No; but just let me read. I have in my hand the 40 or 50 questions which the Senator's committee—and I understand he himself—directed to the War and Navy Departments, and I should like to read some of the things that the committee said it wanted the War and Navy Departments to provide, for example:

1. Information on the American Army program for demilitarization of Germany and a comparison of that program with the demilitarization programs for Germany made by the other three allies.

2. Full details of the organization of the military government in the British, French, and Russian zones.

3. The relationship between the military government of each of our three allies and their respective national governments.

What I am reading are matters addressed by the Senator from Maine to the War Department, and I want the Senate to know what the special committee intended to look into just a few months ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. As soon as I finish reading.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to find out who submitted the questions, and the date that they were submitted.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will give that information, but I will go back and get it from the desk after I have finished reading it, and put it in at the end:

4. The extent to which authority has been delegated to the United States military governor and to the military governors of our three allies, and a comparison of the two.

5. The estimates of the annual total cost of operation of military government for each of the fiscal years of 1947 and 1948, together with a break-down showing the larger items in each year and an explanation of the methods by which those figures are arrived at.

6. The relationship between the military governor and the deputy military governor, together with all documents bearing on that subject.

7. The consolidation of the military government of the United States with the military government for Germany as a whole.

8. The consolidation of the Berlin and Frankfort offices of the American Army and the American Government.

9. Communications between the Chief of Staff in the European theater and the office of military government, together with the consideration of the best basis for relationships between the two.

10. The relationships between the lower echelons and the higher echelons of military government and the American Army in Germany.

11. The staff divisions and functional offices of American military government, together with coordination of such offices.

12. The number of United States personnel in military government in Germany, with detailed break-downs as to type of worker, place where employed, etc.

13. The degree of training for professional and clerical positions of the persons now holding them in military government in Germany.

14. The question of the usefulness of the training in military government provided by the War Department heretofore and at the present time.

15. Details on the plans to convert the War Department personnel from military officers to civilian officers.

16. Estimates of the number of personnel required at various dates, past and future.

17. The effect on the costs of military government resulting from the conversion of military officers into civilian officers.

18. Details of the programs already in existence or contemplated for review of the civil-service ratings of War Department employees in military government.

19. Number of German personnel now employed by the Army in Germany and a statement of the estimated increase or decrease in such number each year for the next 3 years.

20. A statement of how the Army pays such German personnel.

21. Turn-over of employees hired by the Army for military government in Germany—by month, by division, by separation between civilian and military, and by separation between professional and clerical.

22. A discussion of the Army's policy of requiring military personnel who have served overseas for 3 years to return to the zone of the interior. Many subordinate questions on this subject.

23. A statement of the type of positions for which Germans are used by the American Army in Germany.

24. A statement of the American Army plans and activities on the subject of providing food rations in the United States zone.

25. A statement of the amount of imports of foodstuffs by the American Army for the 3 years 1947, 1948, and 1949.

26. A biographical sketch of present and former personnel employed in the largest division of the American military government in Germany, from the highest position to as low as section chief. A specification of many types of details to be provided in each biographical sketch.

27. The present status of the demilitarization program in the American zone in Germany, including details with respect to the method for dismantling plants, a list of those dismantled, the value of those plants, the apportionment of costs of dismantling and shipment, the method of appraising the value of plants, etc.

28. Full details on the knowledge of the American military government of the demilitarization in the zones of our three allies.

29. Full details on the subject of the liquidation of the war potential, both in the American zone and in the zones of our allies, with particular reference to the subject of quadripartite inspection of such liquidation.

30. A statement of the method used in transferring Army surplus stocks to German industry, the method of payment for such transfer, the Army appropriation to which the funds involved are charged and credited, and a list of the principal items and quantity transferred, to date.

31. Statistics by months on the physical condition of prisoners of war held by the American Army in Germany.

32. The elements of information on which the deputy military governor in the American zone conducts his business.

33. The types of agencies which furnish information to him.

34. The agency which is primarily responsible in collecting and preparing information for him. A list of the other agencies which are used for this purpose, together with samples of the kind of information they submit.

Mr. President, all these things are to be gone into by the committee whose function it is to investigate war expenditures, to hunt for graft, corruption, and waste.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not finished reading yet. Let me finish reading the list and then I will yield to the Senator.

35. Details on the coordination of the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the Army with military government.

36. The agencies responsible for gathering information on whether Germans are carrying out the orders of the American Army in Germany.

37. The exchange of information between the American Army in Germany and the armies of our allies.

38. Details on the way in which the American Army in Germany keeps in touch with the opinion of the German public.

39. Examples of information requested by the deputy military governor, by staff divisions of military government, and by the lower echelons of military government in Germany, together with details as to dates, time elapsed in getting responses, etc.

40. Number of personnel engaged in collecting information for military government. A comparison with figures for the personnel employed by our allies.

41. Full discussion of the conduct of American troops in Germany, with particular emphasis on details from February 1 to October 1, 1946.

42. The relations between the office of intelligence in the American Army in Germany and other parts of the American military government in Germany.

The foregoing is only a partial list of the subjects of investigation of the American Army and of the War Department in Germany, as proposed by Senator BREWSTER'S

special committee in October 1946, and as published by the Republican members of that committee in December 1946.

That is just a month ago.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it the able Senator from Maryland has read into the RECORD a questionnaire submitted by the counsel for the investigating committee which is the subject of our discussion. As I understand, the list of questions was prepared while the counsel for the committee, and some of his associates, were in Germany investigating the very matters that the committee, under the leadership of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], was proposing to investigate.

I do not think anyone will deny that if the information sought in the list of questions had been obtained the committee would know a great deal more about the occupying force in Germany than it does today. I think the record ought to show clearly that the committee itself unanimously voted to look into the subject of the occupying troops in Germany, and at the time the committee so voted, it was unanimously of the opinion that the counsel for the committee should make the investigation which he made. The then chairman of the committee, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] went to the White House and conferred with the President of the United States on this very subject. They discussed a specific program which was to be followed and the matters that were to be looked into, and the list read by the Senator from Maryland merely represents a carrying out of the program which the President of the United States discussed with the chairman of the committee, and approved, as to the matters which should be gone into. So as I see it now, the mere fact that the committee at the present day does not believe it should continue the investigation of the occupation forces in Germany does not mean that the committee was not justified in going into the subject when it did go into it last October and even prior thereto.

Mr. President, I returned to the Capital in the month of August of last year, and I remember that at that time the committee, then under the control of the Democratic majority, which is now the minority, was holding a conference or an executive session at which the Members were looking into this very matter. I think anyone who will read the record which was produced in that executive session will come to the conclusion that the time had then come when the Congress of the United States should look into the question of the occupation forces in Germany. I have not changed my mind in that respect one particle. I believe the matter should be looked into. But owing to changes which have occurred and different circumstances existing, I think that the investigating committee, if its life is to be extended for a year, can investigate what we have suggested as the proper subject for investigation, namely what occurred in connection with the war effort, the contracts which were entered into, the profiteering engaged in, and the corruption which resulted, so that in the future we will have some idea of the history of that phase of the war effort.

Oh, yes, it can be said that that is all spilled milk; but all history, as a matter of fact, is spilled milk. I think the Senate of the United States has a right to go into the question of what caused the spilling of the milk, so that in the future we may avoid such pitfalls. It has been said——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was very generous the other day in yielding.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to yield further; but will the Senator allow me to interrupt him and point out that under my amendment the Senate could go into the question of spilled milk. There is not the slightest difference between the two proposals on the matter of going into the question of spilled milk. The only question is that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], in redrafting his amendment, has brushed aside all the questions which were formerly considered as appropriate for investigation, and has agreed that henceforth such investigations shall be undertaken by the Committee on Armed Services. By the same logic, the investigation of war frauds ought to be undertaken and concluded by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The logic of one position brings us face to face with the logic of the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I thought for one moment that that committee was equipped at the present time, or in the near future could become equipped, with the knowledge which is necessary to do the job, I would say that it should undertake the investigation. It is not a question of waiving the jurisdiction of that committee. I will be just as jealous of the jurisdiction of that committee as is the able chairman, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. But I wish to repeat what I said the other day, that time is of the essence. If we spend the next year on this particular investigation, we shall be able to do a much better job than could the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. There are many side issues.

When I previously asked the Senator to yield I wished to discuss the question of the spirit of the act, because I think that is the red herring which is being drawn across the trail today, as it has been on previous days.

I was not present when the reorganization bill was voted upon in the Senate. I was in Bermuda on Senate business, and could not be present. It is a matter of record that I am registered as being in favor of the act. The RECORD shows that if I had been present at that time I would have voted "yea"; and I still feel the same way about it. However, I invite the attention of the Senate to something else in the act, which has greater force than what was taken out of the bill. Let me read it:

SEC. 101. The following sections of this title—

That is, title 1—

are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and—

This is very material—

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules—so far as relating to the procedure in such House—at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

In other words, we have reserved to ourselves the right, at any time that circumstances should demand, to change these rules. I for one believe that at the present time it is necessary for the Senate to change the rule, even though it has been enacted. It is necessary to change the rule if we are to do this job now and do it thoroughly. As I have said many times, time is of the essence. The departments are being shrunk, and their files are being dissipated to the various archives. If we are to do this job, we must do it now.

We are not waiving the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Yesterday at our meeting I saw upon the desk of the chairman a pile of papers which will take weeks to digest. There will be work for every committee. If I did not believe that we should try to do this job through this particular committee, I would be urging that it be undertaken by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. But I believe that this job must be done if the people of the United States are to have an accounting of their funds in our war effort, if they are to look behind the shroud of secrecy and see what has taken place.

Therefore I again urge that, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate once voted for the idea that there should be no special committees, the Senate did not finally vote for the proposition. The act says:

With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

We now have the solemn duty and obligation to look the facts squarely in the face and decide what is best for the Nation. That is our duty.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont. I hope that Senators to whom I yield—and I shall try to be as liberal as possible in yielding—will not occupy too much time.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall not take much of the Senator's time.

The Senator seems to have tossed a very large lighted firecracker into our midst. I admit that I should like to have a little more time to decide what to do about that firecracker.

I have the greatest respect for the earnestness and ability of the ranking member of my committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I usually agree with what he says. However, I do not wish to concede that the committee of which I am chairman, which committee is composed of 12 able Members of the Senate in addition to myself, could not perform a duty such as that proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], if such duty were imposed upon it by the Senate.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, it would transfer to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments the staff—if we desire it—the files, the funds, and the authority of the existing War Investigating Committee. With the Senator from Michigan standing ready as a member of the committee to take the lead in continuing the investigation, I do not concede that we could not perform that duty. My committee will not dodge any duty which is placed upon it by the Senate. I do not yet know just how I shall vote on this question, but I do not admit that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments could not perform a duty required of it by the Senate if the Senate were to transfer to that committee all the means of performing that duty.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to yield to the Senator; but before he takes advantage of my yielding, I request that he make his remarks rather brief, because two other Senators have already consumed 15 minutes of my time. While I wish to be liberal, at some time during the afternoon I should like to pursue my own argument and state my own conclusions.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only reason I rose was in connection with certain statements and the use of my name. I know that the Senator from Maryland would wish to have the statements corrected. Otherwise, they would leave an unfortunate and erroneous impression.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall address myself only to that point.

I am sure it is generally understood by Members of the Senate that no question has been raised on this side of the aisle as to the competency of any committee or any Member to carry out any task.

Mr. TYDINGS. I disagree with the Senator on that point. Such questions have been raised on the other side of the aisle, by virtue of the submission of the pending resolution. It is argued that a standing committee could not do the job as well as could a special committee. So I must take issue with the Senator on that point. He has been making that argument, and so have the Senator from Michigan and other Senators during the past 3 or 4 days.

Mr. BREWSTER. I used the word "competency." As I have understood, it has been the contention of Senators who favor this resolution, not that any of the Senators who have been mentioned, or the Senator from Maryland, would not be competent—I have already had evidence of their celerity and intelligence—but that it is a matter of background and training, and the knowledge as to approximately 50,000 pages of record which have already been digested in the activities of the committee, which work would be continued. I do not mean to labor on the point; I merely desire to keep the record clear.

First, I should like to correct the statement as to what I said in recent months with regard to conducting investigations in Germany. The only thing which I have ever said in that regard was to concur with the distinguished chairman of the special committee when it was the Mead committee, in August and September, when the committee unanimously decided, after a 3-hour hearing, of an intelligence officer from Germany, that the investigation should be continued. I concurred.

Second, the Senator referred to the committee as the Brewster committee last fall. It was not the Brewster committee; it was the Kilgore committee. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was chairman. He, following the decision of his predecessor, former Senator Mead, also decided that the committee should carry forward the investigation, and, after conferring with the President of the United States, sent the counsel of the committee to Germany with instructions.

The Senator referred to the questionnaire as a Brewster questionnaire, or made some reference of that character to it. The Senator from Maine never saw the questionnaire to which reference has been made. The questions were the result of instructions of the full committee as conveyed to the counsel by the distinguished chairman, the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator be good enough to name the full committee which approved the questionnaire?

Mr. BREWSTER. The full committee never approved the questionnaire. The questionnaire was made out in Germany after the counsel arrived there. The counsel had instructions when he went there. He had an agenda of eight or nine points which were discussed with the President, and he subsequently went over to carry on the investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough for me to explain how that questionnaire was made up after months of investigation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TYDINGS. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wanted to explain in a few sentences how this questionnaire was brought about. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield, but this will be the last time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to conclude, then, if I may, the correction. As I say, my knowledge is limited to what I have stated.

Finally, the Senator made reference to diplomatic inquiries in South America, which I am somewhat at a loss to understand. There has never been any suggestion in the committee, and, so far as I know, any inquiry on this subject other than what I referred to on the floor. My recent visit to South America had no connection whatsoever with the committee, either as to authority or expense, or any activities of the Senate. It was concerned with a matter which seemed to me very desirable to inform myself about on my own account, but it was in no sense as a member or as an official of the committee that I went. I should like that to be clear in the RECORD. My position as chairman of the committee has been a matter of only the past 2 weeks.

Mr. TYDINGS. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan; but I request most courteously that he be as brief as possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say that it is my information that these questions were submitted by counsel to the military government in Germany after the counsel and his aides in Germany had proceeded with 8 or 10 days of investigation, and that the questions were a summary of the facts that had been related, so that we might get the answers directly from the War Department.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that. Let me say, however, in contradistinction to the Senator from Maine, that I have in my hand a copy of the New York Times of November 26, 1946, containing an excerpt from an article by Mr. Felix Belair, dated Washington, November 25, The heading of the article is "Occupation study balked by Kilgore; Senator blocks vote on inquiry into military government of Germany, Austria."

The Senator from West Virginia, when I questioned him about this matter told me that due to the fact that a campaign was on, quite often he was the only Democrat present; several members of the opposite party were present; that the only thing he could do was to raise the question of the absence of a quorum in order to keep matters somewhat under control, and that he went to the President with some of these propositions, but I never understood him to tell me that the President approved them or that he either approved or disapproved them.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator is in error in his chronology. The original direction by the committee which was in September was unanimous and it was at that time that the Senator from West Virginia, with the counsel of the committee, having just taken charge of the committee following former Senator Mead, went to see the President and discussed the matter. The discussion was harmonious. Following that the counsel went to Germany, in October, during the campaign, with the understanding that following the election the committee would carry on the investigation. After the election there

was a change of viewpoint, and it was during that time that opposition developed to the action of the committee, which resulted in the first divided vote it has ever had, when 6 to 4, all the committee members being recorded, it voted that it would not carry on the investigation in Germany at that time, although the Senator from West Virginia—and I think he would confirm this statement if he were here—indicated then that he hoped and expected that the investigation would be carried on after Congress convened.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me read the first three paragraphs of this article:

A projected Senate inquiry into the American military government in Germany and Austria was spiked today.

Chairman HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, of the War Investigating Committee, prevented the issue from coming to a vote of Members present. But Republicans who have been pressing for the inquiry promised to review the project when Congress convenes in January, with their party in control.

The action coincided with the disclosure of secret testimony before the committee by Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, placing at $200,000,000 a year the cost of the military government of the American zone in Germany, of which he is deputy military governor. He said a Senate investigation now would vastly complicate the democratization programs under way in the American and British zones.

That was the thought I had in mind when I referred to this subject.

In the New York Herald Tribune of December 8, 1946, there is an article by Mr. William L. Shirer which deals extensively with this and other matters and has to do with the Meader report. So far as I know, the statements of Mr. Shirer have never been challenged. Perhaps the Senator did not see the statements.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was out of the country at that time. I think the only charge the Senator may make is that some of us did not change our opinion after the election.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate unduly; but what have we now before the Senate? The Senator from Maine wants to have an investigation made into war corruption, undue profits, graft, political influence, and other activities of a similar nature. There can be no question that he is right about that. If there is evidence anywhere that leads to the fact that there has been improper conduct in the execution of war contracts or what not, there is ample justification for a complete investigation. That is what I propose shall take place.

What have we done here? After starting out to investigate the whole wide world, which could have been accomplished under the original resolution offered by the Senator from Maine, he himself has reduced the area of the purported activities in which the committee would indulge; he has reduced it to those which apply only to the United States and certain territories, and which occurred before a certain date in 1946. So all that is now agreed to.

My resolution is identical with his. Therefore, what remains? The only thing that remains is the question of who shall do the job. I respectfully submit that only 2 weeks ago the Members on the other side of the aisle were fighting for places on the important committee called the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is perfectly plain to me, from reading the list of the personnel of that committee, that both sides picked out very good men to serve on that committee, because it is obviously one of the ablest committees of this body. To prove my point, let me state that one of the members of the committee is the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who has established a fine reputation, both in his native State and since he has come to the Senate, as being an outstanding, comprehensive, and skilled investigator. He is on that committee. The Senator from Maine is on other committees, in addition to the special committee. He has a great deal of work to do in connection with his regular committees. I have forgotten what they are, for the moment; but they are two of the most important committees established in the Senate. The Senator from Michigan is also on other committees. The other members of this so-called special committee, if it is established, will be members of other Senate committees. Therefore, Mr. President, why not have the one committee which was created for this very purpose undertake this investigation?

We hear it said, "It will take the other committee 18 years to familiarize themselves with the work." Mr. President, I shudder to think what would happen to this Republic if the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were to meet with a serious accident which would necessitate their remaining in the hospital for 3 or 4 months. The dome of the Capitol would crack and shake. Justice would disappear from all the law chambers of the Republic and the Senate would stand impotent before the war grafters and criminals and would not be able to do a thing about them because, forsooth, no other committee could step into the gap and carry on this glorious work to a successful conclusion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield at that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is illustrated here one of the interesting questions dealing with reorganization, inasmuch as when this resolution was originally submitted the apparent challenge on the basis of the question of encroachment on jurisdiction came from the Committee on Armed Services. Its challenge was that we were investigating Army and Navy affairs and that we were encroaching on its jurisdiction.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; when the special committee was dealing with military government, it was encroaching on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was called before the Committee on Armed Services, which claimed that it had primary jurisdiction in the matter, to answer very searching inquiries addressed to me by the able Senator from Maryland, inquiries as to what we proposed to do, and why. I answered them as well as I could. I was charmed, as always, with the attitude of the Senator from Maryland, who did not quite complete his quotation of the conversation in regard to what he asked, as he has referred to it here, for when he asked the Senator from Maine to present an amendment which would somewhat define the scope of the future activities in accordance with our conversation, he stated that if that were done, it might moderate the vigor of his opposition. He did not commit himself.

Mr. TYDINGS. I stated that it would reduce the area of hostility. Those were the exact words I used.

Mr. BREWSTER. And I think the Senator from Maryland will recall that he subsequently said it might moderate the vigor of his opposition.

Mr. TYDINGS. And it has, because if this resolution had remained in its former shape, I think the arguments against it could have been so forcefully marshaled that even the Senator from Maine would have voted against his own resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. If this be moderation, then I am intrigued by the limitless capacity which the Senator from Maryland thus arrogates to himself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not by me, but by the Senator's own side.

Mr. BREWSTER. But now, after 2 days of debate, I suddenly find that the question of jurisdiction has been transferred to another committee, and it is now charged that anything dealing with this matter should be handled by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am not presuming even to express an opinion in a matter which has been so learnedly discussed. I point out, however, that it presents again the question that, pending the fuller development of our new procedure under the reorganization, a great many of these problems will necessarily arise, and the fact of this transitional period it seems to me further accentuates the wisdom of continuing the committee, concerning whose jurisdiction and activities there certainly would be no doubt.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Maine be good enough to bring to the attention of the Senate—I do not happen to have it here—the names of the Republican and Democratic Members of the Senate who now are on the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. The Members on the Republican side of the aisle are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. TYDINGS. And yourself?

Mr. BREWSTER. And myself.

On the Democratic side of the aisle the survivors are the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator

from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. They are the six members.

Mr. TYDINGS. In any event, how large will this special committee be, if continued?

Mr. BREWSTER. It will be composed of 10 Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many members will the Democrats have of the 10?

Mr. BREWSTER. All the discussions have contemplated that the corresponding division which prevailed when the Democrats were in the majority would henceforth prevail. In other words, there would be six Republicans and four Democrats. That is subject to the decision of the Presiding Officer who makes the appointments.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be true, then two new Republican members and two new Democratic members will have to be appointed to the special committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. So to begin with practically 50 percent of the committee will be brand new.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let us say 40 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we leave out the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who will be on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and whose experience will be carried over from the old special committee to the newly created standing committee, the special committee will be on a 50–50 basis. So all this talk about the experience of the old committee really reduces itself to almost nothing, for, in effect, the committee will be half new anyway, and the files and the experts and the men who made the investigations will be just as available to the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont as they will be to the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, there should be no more of this talk that the Democrats want to interfere with this investigation. I have said nothing or done nothing, either in public or in private, that would lead anyone to believe other than that I want this investigation to be made. The whole point is that it should be made by a committee which the Senate but 2 weeks ago constituted for the very purpose under consideration. The reason the opposition of the Committee on Armed Services has been eliminated is, as the Senator from Maine has said, that when he appeared before that committee, he said he would try to draft the resolution in such a way as to stay out of all matters over which that committee had charge, and that so far as he was personally concerned, he himself would do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is absolutely inaccurate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean matters such as military government, operating the Army and the Navy.

Mr. BREWSTER. Any current matters concerning the Army and the Navy. That was the whole purport of the discussion, but not as to the fact that these matters might be claimed——

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not talking about war contractors. I am talking about Army and Navy matters per se, matters such as military government, and so forth.

The Senator from Maine likewise stated, and he has made his representation good, that he was not going outside the United States and possibly some of the Territories. That allayed the fears of the Democrats on the Committee on Armed Services and the fears of some of the Republican members of that committee.

Now I think he should allay the fears of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Certainly if it was fair to take that part of the investigation away from himself, so that the Committee on Armed Services might deal with matters affecting the Army and the Navy in their general routine operation, by the same token he should leave out of it the State Department.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not know that the State Department entered into the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. After the Reorganization Act was passed the Senator was one of four who approved writing to the War Department asking all the questions which I have read at length, some 40 of them.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not an accurate statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator mean to say that that was done without his knowledge?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have already stated here that I had never seen the questionnaire which the Senator read. It has further been stated on this floor that that questionnaire was developed by the counsel of the committee in Germany after he had made 2 weeks' investigation, and that his action over there was the result of instructions he received from the chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and former Senator Mead, and that so far as the then minority was concerned, to my knowledge, we had no knowledge of this until the matter was returned here, and that the only divided vote was on the question, in November, whether or not the committee at that time should proceed overseas.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not true that the Senator visited the distinguished President pro tempore, now presiding, and considered making certain investigations, and discussed the matter with him in New York?

Mr. BREWSTER. The matter was gone into very thoroughly with both the Secretary of State and with the distinguished President pro tempore, who was an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. TYDINGS. And as the result of that the Senator then moved away from certain phases, perhaps, of the scope of his investigation, because he felt it was beyond the purview of the special committee?

Mr. BREWSTER. Because the committee has always tried to exhibit the utmost deference in problems of that kind, particularly where any possible diplomatic questions were involved.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not a fact that after the Senator from Maine had the conference in New York with the Senator from Michigan and the Secretary of State, when he returned a vote was taken as to whether the committee would go to Europe, and did not all the Republicans vote to go to Europe notwithstanding that conversation?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is quite correct, but it is not correct that the scope of the investigation was not then curtailed in accordance with the advice of counsel and discussion we had with the diplomatic authorities concerned. It was understood that we should not move into a field which might seem to present possible occasions of conflict or embarrassment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it seems to me that from the country's standpoint, there is very little of real merit in this effort to have a special committee override the normal functions of the Senate. It does not make any difference whether the amendment I have offered, which is identical with the Brewster amendment in all respects but one, shall be agreed to, or whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine shall be adopted, for in either case there will be exactly the same kind of investigation. The experts of the present special committee will be available to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] or to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], depending upon which committee the Senate entrusts with the work.

The point is that there have just been a Democratic caucus and a Republican caucus, and all the old Members and all the new Members have fought for places on the 15 committees which now take the place of the 33 old committees. They have said to their friends on the steering committee, "Get me on this and get me on that if you can." They have written letters to the chairmen of the conferences showing their preferences. Finally, a week ago, the names were made public, and one of the finest and ablest committees of this body is the committee created to have supervision over the expenditures in the executive departments. That means the expenditures in the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of the Interior, the Treasury, and all other departments of the Federal Government. No sooner is that committee created than a measure is brought into this body which says in effect that that committee is not able to do the work—"I want to do the work, I want it done as I want it done."

I exculpate all Senators from being politically ambitious, because long experience in the Senate has shown me that that mean thing called political ambition does not pervade the Senate. No one here is politically ambitious. There is not a Senator who would take the Presidency unless it were thrust upon him, and then at terrific sacrifice. He would only do it to serve mankind. I know that my friend the Senator from Maine has not any thought in his mind except the welfare of the Republic. I do not think the matter of a few headlines

is worrying him in the slightest. He wants to make this investigation, and if the press makes up its mind to disregard his findings and not to connect his name with this crusade for truth and righteousness, probably in the silence of his chamber he will thank Almighty God that the press was so considerate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the observations of the able Senator from Maryland, I was wondering whether he recalls the story that is told in the history of the Senate by Haynes to which Speaker Reed, so-called "Czar" Reed, when he was Speaker of the House, is reported to have given currency. Speaker Reed said he dreamed that the United States by constitutional amendment provided for the election of President by a secret vote of the Senate, and the time came for the first Presidential election by the Senate. The Senate convened and there was a secret ballot under the new plan while those in the galleries looked tensely down on the scene, and the Nation waited with bated breath for the result. When the ballots were all tallied it was found that each Senator had one vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. TDYINGS. Mr. President, there is no question as to whether the investigation shall be made or shall not be made. The question is, Shall the standing committee of the Senate which has been created to make it go ahead and make it, or shall we have many special committees interfering with the work of the standing committees? There is nothing else to it—not a thing in the world. That is all there is at stake.

I repeat, with due deference, and with all the frankness of which I am capable, that in my opinion if the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is passed over and a special committee created to do this work, it will be a direct reflection on the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, an indication that the Senate feels they are not competent to perform the services for which their respective parties have selected them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from Maryland is saying about the investigation being carried on, and being carried on vigorously. I think every Member of this body, regardless of which side of the aisle he sits on, favors an investigation.

I have been to the desk just now and have read the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Maryland, and have observed that he followed the language, as he said, of the original resolution, which contains a limitation of time, fixing June 30, 1946, as the limit as to which an investigation shall be made; in other words, that the committee shall not investigate into any matter which occurred after June 30, 1946.

I wish to ask the Senator if he would not consider striking out that time limit. Crookedness is crookedness whether it occurred after June 30, 1946, or before. There are vast proceedings now under way in various departments of the Government, involving vast sums of money, surplus properties, and things of that kind, which may require continual investigation. I suggest to the Senator that he give thought to striking out the time limitation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the substitute I have offered shall be adopted, I shall then be in favor of striking out any limitation on time whatsoever, or at least perhaps on more lengthy reflection fixing a different one. The only reason why this limitation is included is that I did not wish to deviate from the measure presented by the Senator from Maine. I have no objection at all to doing what the Senator from New Mexico suggests. But let me put to him a case. Let us suppose we had set up a special committee to investigate war profits the Government's handling of war profits and the handling of war contracts; does the Senator from New Mexico know of any restriction which would thereby be placed on the committee having charge of expenditures in the executive departments from doing the same identical work?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly not, and I should like to suggest to the Senator a point I had in mind in relation to the time limitation. These investigations have been proceeding and they will continue over a long period of time. Regardless of what Senators now say as to the experience of the members of the special committee, and that they are the only ones with adequate experience in the particular field, they have repeatedly said that it is the purpose to terminate the special committee at a date not too far distant in the future. Whenever that time comes, I venture the opinion there will still be work to be done in the way of investigation, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will have to take over and carry on investigations which must be made. Why not have that committee take over now?

Mr. TYDINGS. The suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico is very much in point. Some of these investigations may go on for 3 or 4 years before they are finally concluded. Take the Teapot Dome case. It dragged on and on before it finally came to a head. Therefore if this special committee should die a year from now and the work should go over to the standing committee, which is made up preponderantly of able members of the majority party in this body, why not start it and let it go through and finish the whole job, and not have a hiatus in the middle of the investigation?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. That is especially true, when the special committee is being reorganized, new members are being added, and it will start out in effect as a new committee with the exception of the few members remaining.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct, and particularly when one of the ablest Members on that committee will be a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, who will carry his experience to a committee that is ready to go ahead.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think I ought to make my position clear, that if the substitute amendment of the Senator from Maryland should be adopted, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would not be restricted in their investigations by any date terminating the life of the War Investigating Committee. We might be restricted by the funds made available, but the reorganization law giving authority to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, on page 6, under (2) (B), states:

> Studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

I interpret that to mean any executive agency of the Government.

In section 134 (a) of the same law we read:

> Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of $10,000 for each committee, during any Congress)—

That might be a limitation—

> as it deems advisable.

Then we read this:

> Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words.

So I interpret the law to mean that any date would not restrict the investigation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, because, as I see it, we would have the entire field of executive agencies, and we have the authority under section 134 to subpena witnesses, books, and so forth, and to make investigations into any matter, which means any department of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I think there can be no question about the purpose of the act which has just been read, especially the section that bears upon standing committees, and the continuing, not privilege, but obligation to make investigations and to keep in constant contact with the executive departments of government. But under the resolution as offered, when the limitation was inserted in it, it occurred to me it would be better to remove the limitation so there would be no doubt at all. I agree with the Senator that his committee is a continuing committee, with continuing power that should not be taken from it.

Mr. AIKEN. As I interpret it, the power of the committee would not be restricted by the date, but the use of the funds appropriated to it might be restricted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. As I see it, in my judgment, this limitation in no wise affects the power that is contained in the Reorganization Act affecting this particular committee. In other words, when under the proposed limitation the power of the special committee ended, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would immediately take over, under the present terms of the Reorganization Act, which gives the committee the unlimited power of which the Senator has spoken.

Mr. AIKEN. But it does not give the committee unlimited funds.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. The committee is limited to $10,000.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true, and the question of funds ultimately becomes, of course, a matter for determination by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. KNOWLAND rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado, and then I will yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield for that purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bricker	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have yielded considerably, Mr. President, but I will yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, his point of view in connection with the amendment which he has proposed as a substitute. I should like to ask him specifically with respect to a number of types of cases which have come before the Committee Investigating the National Defense Program and whether he thinks that under his substitute amendment such cases could properly be gone into by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I refer particularly to the question of foreign surpluses. Would the Senator feel that that subject would fall under the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. TYDINGS. War surpluses?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That subject has nothing to do per se with fraud or graft or corruption. As I understand, the purpose primarily of the Committee Investigating the National Defense Program is to uncover improper war profits, graft, corruption, and the like, and the mere existence of war surpluses——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator consider that either wastefulness or corruption in the disposal of war surpluses, if any exists, would come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. TYDINGS. They very properly could.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not going to yield any further, because I have been very generous, and have done very little more than answer questions. From now on I should like to present my case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator from Maryland consider that the question of lend-lease settlements would come under the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program?

Mr. TYDINGS Unless there were fraud or corruption or wastefulness which was almost criminal, I would consider that that question came under the purview of other committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator consider the subject of military government abroad to be under the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; that would be under the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator considers that would be under the Committee on Armed Services. Now let us take the question of the Inter-American Highway as an example. Would the Senator consider that to come properly under the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. TYDINGS. I certainly would.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now want to call the Senator's attention specifically to this question: During the hearings before the committee, when we had General Clay before us, the question came up——

Mr. TYDINGS. Hearings before what committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. The question came up relative to the flooding of the American zone with Russian occupation marks. In other words, the American, British, French, and Russian Governments all used the same type of occupation marks. The question was asked by me in the committee whether there was any check on the amount of Russian printed money that had come into the American zone to be redeemed, and I should just like at this point——

Mr. TYDINGS. That ought to be considered, in my judgment, by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. By the Committee on Armed Services rather than the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. TYDINGS. Although if an investigation of that particular matter were being held, and I were submitting a resolution dealing with the subject I would be content with the reference made by the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If it is a question in which the American people are profoundly interested——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California if he will not allow me to conclude. I have answered six or seven questions, and I secured the floor to tell the Senator what I believe should be done, and I do not want the Senator to tell me what he believes should be done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the question I have in mind relates to a matter which should be cleared up because it is definitely something in which the American people have a very vital interest. I shall pursue the matter when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have a very high regard for the Senator from California, and I hope he will not think I am discourteous, but I have been on the floor a long while and I have yielded very liberally to every Senator who asked me to yield. I should like to conclude my remarks and turn the floor over to some other Senator. That is my only reason for appearing to be a little short.

Mr. President, there is only one problem involved. The investigation will be made in any event. It will be made by the Senate. It will be ordered by the Senate. Whether the Brewster resolution or some other resolution is adopted, there will be an investigation. Do we wish to place that investigation in the hands of a committee which will die within a year? When it does die, the regular standing committee must pick up the threads of the work of the special committee and carry on the investigation for a year, 2 years, or 3 years longer. Do we want a hiatus in the investigation? If we are really going after the crooks and criminals, one committee ought to carry the investigation all the way through, even if it requires 4 or 5 years.

The special committee is limited by the resolution of the Senator to a mere year.

What an affront it is to new Members on both sides of the aisle to take this work away from the very committee which was created to undertake it.

First, there is the chairman, the Senator from Vermont, GEORGE D. AIKEN, a former Governor of Vermont and a long-respected Member of the Senate.

The next name on the list is that of HOMER FERGUSON, the junior Senator from Michigan, who was a judge on the bench in Michigan, and in this body is one of the ablest investigators ever to be associated with any investigation in the history of the American Republic. He is No. 2 on the committee.

Name No. 3 on the list is that of BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Iowa has been a very active and energetic member of the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946. He is eminently qualified to be a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Incidentally, he is a former Governor of Iowa.

Next we come to the name of JOHN W. BRICKER, the junior Senator from Ohio, of whom Republicans thought so much that in the last campaign he was their Vice-Presidential candidate. Now Republican Senators would spurn him and say, "While he is a member of the committee charged with doing a particular job, we will not let him do it. He has not had enough experience. He does not know his way around." Yet only 2 years ago Republicans were beating the bushes and asking the people of all parties to support this outstanding American who has been three times Governor of Ohio and a Vice-Presidential candidate. Now it is said, "BRICKER is not experienced enough to conduct a Senate investigation."

Who else is on the committee? The next name is that of EDWARD J. THYE, the junior Senator from Minnesota, a former Governor of his State. As I understand from a long distance, he is the lieutenant of that eminent progressive Republican candidate for President, Hon. Harold Stassen. If he is good enough to be an ambassador without portfolio in this body and elsewhere for Governor Stassen, if Governor Stassen should become our President the junior Senator from Minnesota would sit close to the throne. He is well qualified to be a member of this committee.

The next name is that of JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, a former judge, a young man with a fine war record. He is a member of the committee and is anxious to go to work and do a difficult job.

The next name on the committee is that of IRVING M. IVES, the junior Senator from New York, who comes from another segment of the Republican family. He made a fine record in the New York State Senate. I can speak only unofficially, but I suspect that sometimes he is the voice of the distinguished Republican who lately asked the suffrage of the people for the highest office in our Republic—the Presidency.

That constitutes the list of majority members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

On one of the early days in this session an event took place which seemed of very small moment, but in a way it was significant. We had had a set of precedents connected with the chaplaincy of the Senate. We never had removed Chaplains, whether the administration was Republican or Democrat. A change was made only in the event of death or a vacancy. However, I think largely in a thoughtless way—I am certain that it was not done deliberately—there was a change of Chaplains, effective on that date. I understand that the result of that change was to put a Republican out, and unwittingly to put a Democrat in. I am advised that that is what happened. At any rate, there were Senators on the other side of the aisle who felt a certain degree of humiliation because thoughtlessly they had got into a situation which they, as well as their colleagues on this side of the aisle, regretted.

There is a large amount of the same human element involved in what we are now doing. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is specifically charged with inquiring into all the business transactions in the many departments of the Government, both in war and in peacetime. Senators fought to get on that committee. On this side of the aisle we placed some of the best men we had on that committee, so that it would be well balanced, and so that able Senators on the other side of the aisle would not run off with the market wagon. On the other side of the aisle the top men were selected including a former Vice-Presidential candidate, the representatives of three of the leading Presidential candidates in the last election, as well as the coming election, and that able investigator the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. We shall hand over to that committee, lock, stock, and barrel, the existing trained staff to go ahead with this undertaking, and give the committee all the records. What excuse, therefore, is there for saying, "No; we are going to violate the letter of the Reorganization Act. We are going to throw that over. We are going to throw BRICKER over. We are going to throw AIKEN over. We are going to throw HICKENLOOPER over. We are going to throw THYE over. We are going to throw all the Republicans on that committee over." In effect, the proponents of such a course say to the people whom those Senators represent in their respective States, "We Republicans did not think enough of those men to let them discharge the functions of the committee to which they were appointed. We felt that they ought not to have any part in the investigation. Therefore we gave that work to a special committee headed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]," who we all know has no political ambitions whatsoever.

That is the problem. I know, as well as I know that I am standing on this floor, that the matter of the chaplaincy was a matter of extreme regret to Senators on both sides of the aisle, when the full import of what was taking place came home. Do not minimize this incident. We shall hear more about it. It is a precedent. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that eventually one special committee after another will be organized, as has been done in the past, if once we get away from doing the work through our standing committees. Already, besides this committee and the Small Business Committee, there are resolutions on the desk to create other committees. When we do that, all we have left of the Reorganization Act is a salary grab, an increase from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, under the guise of reorganizing Congress and having experts in order to do a more efficient job. The very first act after we assemble is to cut down all the remainder of it.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Do not forget the retirement fund also, which is more important and valuable than the salary increase.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appeal to new Members on this committee to protect their own interests. Twenty years or more ago which I came to this body, in a weak moment, I told the Democratic leader to give me any committee assignment that other Senators did not want. I have been paying for that generosity for 20 years. Senators will pay for their actions. Make no mistake about that. This investigation will go ahead no matter which of the two courses we adopt. The abler Senators will be on the standing committees. Practically half of the special committee will consist of new Senators.

The standing committee is staffed with preeminently able men who have had great experience in executive administration. There is nothing involved except a difference in machinery, because the Republicans will control both committees, so it makes no difference whether the Senate adopts my amendment or that of the Senator from Maine. Let us perform the work of the Congress through standing committees and show the country that when we widely advertised this great reform there was in our words a sincerity that is now backed up by action.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune, dated December 8, 1946, by William L. Shirer; also an article appearing in the New York Times under date of November 26, 1946, by Felix Belair, Jr.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 8, 1946]

RELEASE OF MEADER REPORT HELD BLOW AT UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELATIONS

(By William L. Shirer)

That the state of affairs in both American military government and the United States army of occupation in Germany is far from perfect is obvious to anyone who has passed even a fortnight or two in the Reich. George Meader, counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, visited Germany for only a few weeks last fall, but his confidential yet much publicized report on the subject has raised a hullabaloo in Washington.

Whether the situation can be improved by conducting a senatorial investigation in Germany, as the four Republican members of the committee propose, is highly doubtful. What is not doubtful at all is that such an investigation could greatly damage both our

occupation job in Germany and the very prestige of the Republic in foreign affairs, as Senator VANDENBERG has tried to explain to his Republican colleagues on the committee.

It surely is obvious to the more thoughtful Republican Members of the Senate such as Mr. VANDENBERG that whatever political footballs are uncovered and booted about when the party takes control of the Congress in January, our occupation of Germany should not be one of them. Too much that is vital to America's position in the world is involved.

This does not mean that whatever is wrong with our occupation of Germany should not be exposed and corrected. But action, it seems to me, should come from the President, the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is hardly the responsibility or even the concern of a special Senate committee which has no mandate whatsoever to meddle in the Nation's foreign affairs.

This, I have reason to believe, was made clear to Mr. Meader, in the midst of his brief and breathless investigation, by Senator VANDENBERG himself at a meeting in Paris on October 12. When the committee's counsel explained to the Senator what he was up to in Germany, Mr. VANDENBERG strenuously objected, pointing out that Mr. Meader and his committee were invading the field of foreign relations in which they had no business.

The advice was repeated, I am informed, at a private meeting at the Waldorf in New York on November 13. Three Republican members of the Senate committee, BREWSTER, FERGUSON, and KNOWLAND, accompanied by counsel Meader, met on that day with Secretary Byrnes and Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY. The three men who have been carrying the load in the delicate negotiations of their country with the other powers protested vigorously at the proposal of the Special Committee To Investigate the American Occupation of Germany. They explained that this would necessarily be an investigation into our foreign policy, that it would seriously interfere with current negotiations of the American Government in the United Nations and in the Council of Foreign Ministers, and that it would greatly weaken our position in dealing with other nations.

QUESTION GENERAL CLAY

The Republican Senators do not seem to have been unduly impressed by this advice. On November 18, one learns, they asked Gen. Lucius D. Clay, deputy military governor in Germany, whether the proposed investigation would have a damaging effect on our Government in dealing with other governments. The general replied that he did not want to advise the committee on such a matter, but after detailed questioning he made it more than clear that, in his opinion, an investigation would be extremely damaging. In answer to questions, he gave a number of details on confidential matters to show what damage could be done to the Nation's position and to its ability to negotiate with other nations.

It is a curious comment on the mores of our times that Counsel Meader's confidential report on his 3 weeks in Germany was made public last week. For, as the Republican members of the special committee, Senators BREWSTER, BALL, FERGUSON, and KNOWLAND, who directed Mr. Meader to release his report to the press on their authority, emphasize:

"It is not a committee report and has not received the approval of the committee or any member thereof. It was drafted as a confidential report and contains information which was intended for the members of the committee only and not for publication."

Moreover, on November 29, the Secretary of War informed the chairman of the committee that the War Department opposed the release of this report. "It is the view of this department," he wrote, "that this report gives a distorted and frequently erroneous picture of military government in Germany. From information available it appears that the subject matter of the report is based on unsworn statements, and in many cases, on hearsay evidence."

If neither the committee nor indeed even a single member approved the report, which was confidential in the first place, and if the Secretary of War, a highly-respected official, thought it to be "distorted and frequently erroneous," why then did the four Republican Senators direct it to be made public?

Their excuse is that excerpts of an earlier draft of the report and portions of testimony given in committee hearings "giving distorted and inaccurate impressions" had already appeared in the press and that therefore "the only way to correct such inaccuracies is to release the full text." They admit that the full committee declined to authorize its release.

TWO OTHER ASPECTS

Surely there must be few, if any, precedents for such a strange procedure and an ordinary citizen must wonder whether matters of a confidential nature, which all mature governments have to undertake, can ever be properly handled by our own.

There are two other minor aspects of the whole business which, so far as I know, have not been cleared up by the minority members of the committee. The first concerns a decision of the committee taken on November 18 that Senators KILGORE and BREWSTER should confer on November 25 with the Secretary of War on the advisability of a Senate investigation of our German occupation. Senator BREWSTER was in Florida on November 25 but Senator KILGORE, it seems, requested each of the other three Republican Senators to go with him to keep the appointment with Secretary Patterson. They declined to go.

As to the charge that portions of testimony before the committee had leaked to the press, "giving distorted and inaccurate impressions," it has been maintained by those in a position to know that the leaks were by no means one-sided. The first confidential matter in connection with the proposed inquiry into the American occupation of Germany appears to have come up at a hearing on August 14. On that date the committee heard charges made by Col. Francis P. Miller, formerly an AMG officer. They were serious charges and later the Inspector General of the War Department, after a special inquiry, cast doubt as to the accuracy of many of them.

Colonel Miller's testimony was taken in executive session of the committee and was never released to the public.

What some members of the committee are now asking is whether an article published in the November 9 issue of Liberty magazine by a member of the committee, Senator BREWSTER, did not in fact contain a paraphrase of the colonel's confidential testimony?

If so, they ask, who did some of the leaking, anyway?

[From the New York Times of November 26, 1946]

OCCUPATION STUDY BALKED BY KILGORE—SENATOR BLOCKS VOTE ON INQUIRY INTO MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF GERMANY, AUSTRIA

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, November 15.—A projected Senate inquiry into the American military government in Germany and Austria was spiked today.

Chairman HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, of the War Investigating Committee prevented the issue from coming to a vote of members present. But Republicans who have been pressing for the inquiry, promised to revive the project when Congress convenes in January, with their party in control.

The action coincided with the disclosure of secret testimony before the committee by Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, placing at $200,000,000 a year the cost of the military government of the American zone in Germany, of which he is deputy military governor. He said a Senate investigation now would vastly complicate the democratization programs under way in the American and British zones.

WARNING CITED

Testifying before an executive session of the committee last week, General Clay said that the future cost of his military government would depend on conditions prevailing there and the extent of economic unification achieved with the British zone. But he warned that it would be considerably more expensive even under unification before it became any cheaper.

General Clay's testimony included a statement that he was encountering "serious difficulties" this year in collecting assigned quotas of agricultural production from German farmers in the American zone and that "we may have to resort to strong-arm methods" to bring about desired results.

An unscheduled meeting of the committee developed when Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, missed an appointment with Chairman KILGORE to confer at the War Department on the projected investigation with Secretary Robert P. Patterson. Learning that Mr. BREWSTER had left for Florida, Chairman KILGORE sought out Senators JOSEPH H. BALL, Republican, of Minnesota; HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan; and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California. With them Chairman KILGORE proposed to keep the date with Secretary Patterson, but they refused and demanded a vote on the investigations in Germany and Austria.

VOTE INVALIDATED

Senator Hugh B. Mitchell, Democrat, of Washington, had appeared meanwhile but Chairman KILGORE ruled out the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present.

Chairman KILGORE made the further point that there had been no notice of the present meeting to members. He ruled that no further action on the matter could be taken until there had been a poll of absent members. At the same time he recalled that Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, James Mead, of New York, James M. Tunnell, of Delaware; and Frank P. Briggs, of Missouri; all Democrats, had opposed the investigation. Chairman KILGORE added that he was very loath to see any action taken on the project in view of the stated objections of Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, who is slated to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the new Congress.

Although the State and War Departments had gone all out in their opposition to the projected investigation, General Clay's testimony clinched the outcome, according to some of those who heard him.

CLAY POINTS TO DIFFICULTIES

Although he described the differences between the American and British authorities as "very apparent," General Clay said he thought the prospect for eventual economic unification very good. The chief difficulty at present was that the British thought they were contributing a great deal more than the Americans.

This was true, in a sense, General Clay said, although he pointed out that it was a relatively greater contribution of German resources rather than British. But he said the British did have the "valid" point that they had to provide German coal miners and steel workers with a daily diet of 4,000 calories and that, if we expected to benefit from their out-

put, we should be willing to share the expense of feeding them.

At the time of his departure from Germany, General Clay said, about $8,000,000 of products had been exported from the American zone and $3,000,000 more was covered by contracts scheduled for delivery "in the forthcoming months."

EXPLAINS FOOD PROBLEM

The difficulty with the collection of assigned quotas of foodstuffs, according to General Clay, was that they were paid for with occupation marks, which were good only for such things as food and rent. "Those things are not attractive to the farmer who wants shoes and clothing," he said.

General Clay explained that at the latest meeting of the state governments he had asked the administrators "to enforce the measures they had at the present time and to go out and get the food in or we might have to resort to large inspection forces and go out and find it ourselves and take it away."

Asked about the relative merits of civilian as against military administration of the American zone, General Clay explained that, while he preferred to make no comment on the question of taxing involved, there was no question that "essentially and basically the final job will have to be civilian. We can't democratize any country with men in uniform," he remarked.

General Clay said that the projected investigation would be deliberately twisted by the Russian-controlled press in Germany "to criticize and discredit not only American but British military government."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a few weeks ago there was much speculation as to whether or not the new Congress would observe the reforms instituted in the Congressional Reorganization Act or whether it would choose, in the exercise of its rule-making power, to ignore that statute and continue the multiplicity of committees which formerly existed. After we convened the country heaved a sigh of relief upon learning that both parties planned to follow through on the streamlining of Congress.

Yet today, less than 2 weeks from the opening day, a move is on foot to subvert the La Follette-Monroney Act, not through direct action, but through circumvention. We do not dare to face the public and tell them that we are ignoring the act which was passed last year amid a fanfare of so much favorable publicity. Instead we tell them that we are following the act, but we proceed to find ways to avoid its effect.

The attempt to create special committees today is an attack at the very heart of the La Follette-Monroney law. It is an attempt to exploit one of its loopholes and to drive a train through it—a "gravy train," I might add.

Under the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of the standing committees was carefully described. The rules covered every conceivable subject of legislation. To create a special committee we must therefore trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee. For example, legislation to benefit small business is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Judiciary Committee has a very excellent bill which was drafted by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and of which I have the honor of being a cosponsor. I have taken especial interest in title V of that bill, which has to do with loans to small business, and have introduced it as a separate bill, which has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The chairman of that committee has already announced hearings on that bill and other legislation which will be of particular assistance to small business units, but which is nevertheless inextricably tied together with broader subjects.

And so with other subjects of legislation dealing with small business. Each of them falls into the jurisdiction of an existing standing committee. To take this subject matter away from standing committees would be to imply that the members of such committees are derelict in their attitudes toward small business.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Am I not correct in understanding that at a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee the other day it was the unanimous decision of both Republicans and Democrats that a Small Business Subcommittee should be appointed to which such matters should be referred, and that it was only a question of when it should be done?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator's statement is correct. At the meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee it was not even deemed necessary to authorize the chairman to appoint a small-business subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator further yield on that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was conceded by every member of the committee that the law required it and granted the proper authority to do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct. Let me add that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has made it known that he intends to constitute a small-business subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

With the greatest respect to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] I do not think we can say that his solicitude for small business is any greater than that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The creation of a rash of special committees along commodity lines—for silver, wool, petroleum, and so forth—will break down the regular standing committee structure whose realinement was the heart of congressional reorganization. It will also add correspondingly to the work load of the Senators appointed to serve on special committees.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has mentioned committees dealing with silver, wool, petroleum, and other commodities, on some of which I have served. Some of them have done great and valuable service. There is yet work to be done by those committees. If a committee is set up now for one purpose, will the Senate deny the right to have other special committees likewise continued?

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that pressure will be put upon us to do everything possible in connection with the various commodities, and if a special committee is set up for one purpose we shall be asked to establish special committees to protect our interests in the West, and it will indeed be difficult for us to hold back the tide if a hole is opened in the dike.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that other resolutions have been introduced—I know of at least one—providing for special committees?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. President, the standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional and expert staffs to assist them in dealing with the agencies on a day-to-day basis, and for this purpose they have been armed with the subpena power. The diffusion of energy and responsibility among many standing and special committees, with overlapping jurisdictions, is not conducive to the formulation of coherent and consistent legislative policies. Neither is it conducive to developing a well-recognized and continuing relationship with executive agencies. The philosophy of the Reorganization Act requires that the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose, instead of relying upon special investigating committees, which cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

Mr. President, an example of that would be as follows: Suppose a special committee on small business were set up. It would delve into various small-business problems, hear testimony, and then make recommendations with respect to needed legislation to one or more of the standing committees. Then the standing committee would have to hear the whole problem over again. There would be a duplication of effort, a waste of time of the Senators involved, and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

It is reported that the Senate Committee on Armed Services has consented to share its jurisdiction over national defense with the proposed Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. No standing committee has the right, under the rules, to delegate part of its assigned authority to a special committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DWORSHAK in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Idaho has said, as I understood him, that the Committee on Armed Forces offered to share its responsibility.

Mr. TAYLOR. At least it has made a deal. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, and I wish to state, not only on

my behalf but for the other minority members of the committee, that I have never made any such deal, and I do not think any other of the minority members have done so.

Mr. TAYLOR. The understanding which we have gathered from Senators on the other side of the aisle has been that representatives of the two committees have talked over the matter and have arrived at an amicable solution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say for myself that I do not think either I or any of the other minority members of the Committee on Armed Forces have arrived at such a solution or have done anything which would warrant such an impression.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I gained such an impression. From the discussion which I have heard so far I have gathered the impression that there was no conflict of interest and that they were divorcing themselves from that phase of the subject. That may be the impression of the majority members, if not that of the minority members.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator from Idaho that that is not the impression of the minority members.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly I am glad to know that.

Mr. President, on Wednesday the junior Senator from Maine insisted that a standing committee could not investigate war frauds, because it would be unable to review all the complaints and read all the testimony the special committee has collected. But that is a strange reason for prolonging the existence of a special committee. Certainly, the standing committee would be in no better position to review past testimony, after several more months of hearings, than it is now. At that time the task would be all the more difficult.

Parenthetically, I might point out that most Members of the Senate are already familiar, through the press, with the hearings of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. Indeed, not only are we familiar with its hearings and reports, but we are familiar with its interoffice memos, first drafts, and rejected manuscripts.

Last fall, just before elections, the Senator from Maine dug out of the files of that committee some uncompleted notes on the housing situation, and gave them to the press. He described them as a suppressed report. In fact, they were not a report at all, and the material was found to be erroneous and deceptive; but it happened to be released at a moment when rebuttal could not be made until after the election.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator from Idaho happen to know through what agency that release was made public?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I do not know its history. If the Senator from New Mexico knows about it, I should be very happy to have him explain.

Mr. HATCH. The article which appeared in the New York Times stated that it was released through the Republican National Committee. Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, the Republican National Committee, when releasing a so-called report from a committee of the Senate of the United States, chose to make that release on the 27th day of October, just as the Senator from Idaho has recalled—a very short time before a national election.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. But I am quite sure that politics had no bearing upon that matter in any way whatsoever.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was just arriving at the same conclusion in my own mind, as the Senator spoke.

Similarly, Mr. President, we were also treated to the dairy notes made by committee counsel during a brief junket to Germany. These, too, were released without authority and were unveiled by the press, a large majority of which, at least, is always cooperative with Republicans, as another suppressed document. This document was eventually disavowed by everyone, including its own author. It slurred our occupation troops and smeared the honor of the American soldier.

With respect to the Special Committee o Small Business, I am informed that the staff of that committee has already been liquidated, and that the chairman plans to file its final report next Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. In connection with the Senator's mention of the Small Business Committee, let me inquire whether the Senator from Idaho is also informed that the able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has already appointed a subcommittee of that regular committee to deal with the problems of small business.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not aware that he had appointed such a subcommittee. I knew it was his intention to do so. But the Senator from New Hampshire is so eminently fair, and always has striven to avoid any appearance of trying to steal a march on anyone, that I understood it was his intention to wait until the matter of the appointment of a special Small Business Committee had been settled on the floor of the Senate. Certainly that would be fairer than what I would do if I were the chairman of a committee and clearly had authority and jurisdiction over a certain subject. I would appoint my subcommittee and would present them with an accomplished fact. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee may have done so. I hope he has.

Mr. President, one of the great virtues of the La Follette-Monroney Act is the fact that it would make it possible for all Senators to budget their time. Each of us now serves on two committees. We no longer have three and four conflicting committee meetings on the same morning. We are no longer compelled to scatter our attention helter skelter over the Senate Office Building and the Capitol. Important legislation will no longer come up before committees whose members are absent on other business. If we break down this system, if Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, in addition to their standing committee assignments, the burden of committee work will be multiplied, and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the able Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator, who has been in the Senate a number of years, whether he has found that when a special committee, with a large staff, is holding hearings, other Senators, even though not members of such special committee, frequently receive telegrams from their constituents, and are met by delegations from their home States, asking them to attend the meetings of the special committee, although they have their own committee meetings to attend? That has been my experience.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that, during the last session of Congress, the Special Committee on Small Business very often had great difficulty in obtaining a quorum at its meetings in order to enable the committee to do its work. At times I have served as acting chairman of the committee and have been the only member of the committee in attendance at its hearings; after we located a sufficient number of Senators who were members of the committee to proceed with its business, the other members of the committee would drift away and would leave me to conduct the proceedings entirely alone, simply because there were so many committee meetings that they could not attempt to attend all of them.

Mr. President, let us look at the subject realistically. A special committee, having no legislative responsibility, and having a broad and continuous mandate, often amounts to nothing more than a large personal staff for its chairman. It inevitably becomes a platform for the personality and the ideas of the men who are running it.

Mr. President, I submit that this is an extremely wasteful procedure. Some of our members who are dissatisfied with the allowance supplied for their office staffs have dug into their own pockets to hire additional help. Those who can afford this are welcome to do so, but it seems highly extravagant for the Senate to confer these extra conveniences upon any of its Members, particularly now that individual Senators have been authorized to employ administrative assistants, and that the standing committees have been authorized to hire clerical and professional staffs.

Where is the vaunted economy to which Republican spokesmen have so frequently referred? Where is the concern for the taxpayer that is said to lie so close to the heart of the majority? Is economy to be practiced only by the executive branch? Are we going to discharge employees and cut salaries in downtown departments only to indulge in a Bacchanalian orgy of self-indulgence on the Hill?

And where, too, is this great concern for the efficiency of the executive departments? Can we expect efficient management if Cabinet officers are constantly called to appear before a mul-

tiplicity of committees to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before groups with conflicting and overlapping jurisdiction? And where, too, is that stalwart opposition to Government propaganda? Is it to be forsaken for the syncopated whir of mimeograph machines and the three-ring circus of special committee hearings?

One of the great ends of the Reorganization Act was the cultivation of expertise by the Members of the Senate. We were each to gain in competence through constant familiarity in certain fields of legislation, but this will be defeated if large and important questions are to be carved out of the committee's jurisdiction and handed over to special committees. Sporadic inquiries by special committes will lack continuity and fail to provide the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information gathered. In cases where legislative action is indicated the standing committee then finds it necessary to do much of the work over again.

Let us not forget that on June 10, 1946, the Senate approved of the ban on special committees by a vote of 49 to 16. This clause was removed in the House, but not by the membership in open discussion. It was cut out of the bill by the Speaker as part of the price of the bill's admission to the House floor.

Members of the House never had an opportunity to vote upon that provision, and it cannot be said that they rejected it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. When the Senator says that the banning of special committees was included by a vote of 49 to 16, what he had in mind, I take it, was that the bill containing that particular provision passed the Senate by that vote. The provision itself was not put into the bill by a vote of 49 to 16. In other words, it was the entire bill that passed the Senate and went to the House by the vote the Senator mentions.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct, but it would seem that that would be an endorsement of the provision. However, we will not argue the point.

One very significant item emerged from the very able presentation made by the Senator from Michigan yesterday. In support of his claim of popular support for these committees he read a newspaper article by David Lawrence. As he read on, he came across this interesting paragraph—and as he read it blushes came to the faces of his colleagues, but it was too late to stop. I quote:

> The Republicans will prove themselves poor politicians and will virtually hand over the 1948 election to the Democrats if they go along with the let-bygones-be-bygones spirit which is behind the effort to kill off investigating committees.

This appears to be the crux of the matter. The 1948 election is to be won on the playing fields of the hearing rooms. Special committees are to run interference for the 1948 Republican nominee. The 1948 campaign headquarters of the Republican National Committee are going to be opened, at public expense, in the basement of this building.

Gentlemen, never before has such a crass and unconscionable raid been made on the United States Treasury. Surely it is not necessary to ask the Government to pay for the advance barrage of propaganda that will help the new Hoover around the corner to the White House.

Let us not forget, too, that the Reorganization Act has set a special standard for standing committees. It has provided that every committee should have an adequate staff of trained experts, and that some of these experts should be employed by the minority. These provisions were intended to elevate the level of committee work and to facilitate our deliberations. They were intended to provide us with the sort of staff work which is essential for good legislation. The provision of minority staffs is particularly important in this respect because it insures constructive work on the minority side rather than mere sniping and obstruction. Indeed, it is significant that last year the Senate majority strongly supported a grant of funds to make the group which was then the minority more constructive in its approach. The creation of special committees makes it possible to ignore this safeguard. It makes it possible to create committees which do not have staff assistance for the minority members. It is a convenient device for giving large staffs of assistants to the majority without any assistance whatever to the minority.

This, Mr. President, is a direct contradiction not only of the spirit but the letter of the Reorganization Act. The committee was intended by that act to be a deliberative body of the highest order. The special, or loophole committee, will be a loudspeaking system for its chairman.

The action taken today is up to the majority, but the majority should be warned that it will be judged by that action.

Mr. President, the action threatened today has not escaped the attention of those who supported the Reorganization Act. The Washington Post, a newspaper which probably did more than any other to bring this issue to the attention of the Congress and the people, ran two editorials on the subject over the week end. It also ran two brilliant cartoons by Herblock which I regret cannot be inserted into the RECORD. However, they can be described.

I have in my hand a cartoon by Herblock which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. The picture is a streamlined automobile, which presumably represents the streamlined reorganized Congress. Uncle Sam is in the automobile waiting to go places. But there are two fancy horses hitched to the streamlined automobile, and they are labeled "Extra Committees." There is a gentleman sitting on the horses carrying a banner inscribed "Look—I'm a Committee Chairman." It is a very amusing cartoon.

There was another by Herblock in the Washington Post on Monday, January 13. It is a picture of a gentleman who evidently is newly married. His wife is standing inside the house waiting for the husband to come in, and he is in the act of carrying a second lady across the threshold. There is still another lady standing outside, and probably there are more beyond view, whom we cannot see. The lawful wife is labeled "Reorganization," and the extra lady the new groom is carrying in is labeled "Extra Committees."

Some editorials on the same subject have likewise appeared. The Senator from Michigan quoted from editorials, and he would have had us believe that the public was greatly disturbed and wanted to continue the special investigating committee. I think it only proper that we should present evidence from the press on the other side.

I have here an editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, January 13, entitled "The Senator Is Right." It is about the remarks made on this floor by the very able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. It reads:

> We think the public will agree with Senator TYDINGS that the attempt to add incongruous patches to the streamlined congressional structure before it gets fully into operation makes a very sorry spectacle.

The remainder of the editorial continues in the same vein. I shall not burden Members of the Senate by reading it, but I ask that the entire editorial be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed, as follows:

THE SENATOR IS RIGHT

We think the public will agree with Senator TYDINGS that the attempt to add incongruous patches to the streamlined congressional structure before it gets fully into operation makes a very sorry spectacle. There can be no disagreement over what the reformers intended. "We recommend," said their report, "that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned." The new broad-gaged committees were given such extensive jurisdiction that special committees are an excrescence. Since he was an advocate of the reorganization plan, Senator BREWSTER now makes himself a laughing stock by asking the Senate to prolong the life of the War Investigating Committee so as to give him the privileges that would go along with its chairmanship.

Today this issue will be taken up by the new Committee on Armed Services, which should hereafter control all investigations in the military sphere, and perhaps by the Senate itself. We hope both will ponder Senator TYDINGS' words:

"From the public viewpoint, the principal part of the reorganization bill was the salary increase to $15,000. In my humble judgment most of us would have been red in the face had we voted for a salary increase without a reorganization of the Congress. * * * So we reorganized, and every Member of this body knows that one of the reasons why many Senators voted for the bill, in order to justify the over-all act, was that of efficiency, and the disposition and division of duties of the various committees, aside from the salary increase.

"Now we have no sooner met than we say nothing about the $5,000 salary increase, but we proceed to go off in all directions at the same time, with numerous special committees, which in my judgment is a direct reflection upon the membership of the standing committees whose reasonable right and duty it is to make certain investigations."

Mr. TAYLOR. Here is another editorial, from the Washington Post of Saturday, January 11. The title of this editorial is "Slipping." It says:

Republicans in the Senate have begun hacking at the streamlined machinery of Congress almost before it has gotten into operation.

The remainder of the editorial goes on to point out what a mistake this is, that the present committees are authorized to do the work. I ask that the entire editorial be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed, as follows:

SLIPPING

Republicans in the Senate have begun hacking at the streamlined machinery of Congress almost before it has gotten into operation. A cardinal principle of the new organization set up by the La Follette-Monroney Act is the division of all the work of the Senate among 15 standing committees. The act carefully outlines the duties of these 15 units and leaves no room for the functioning of any others. Yet the majority members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration have voted to create a new Small Business Committee and to extend the life of the War Investigating Committee.

We can see no valid argument for either of their special appendages. Under the old system there was probably good reason for setting up a special Senate committee to investigate wartime activities. It was argued that a special committee was needed to do a wartime job of extraordinary importance. Now, however, that particular job has been finished. Whatever further investigating is to be done ought to be related to improvement of future organization or to correction of mistakes in the reconversion program. The House Committee on Naval Affairs recently gave special emphasis to investigations of the constructive type. "Mistakes [in the reconversion from war to peace] have been made, and undoubtedly mistakes will be made," it wrote. "But the investigatory theme must continue to be preventive rather than punitive, forward rather than backward."

Our point is that this kind of investigative work can be undertaken much more readily by the new Committee on Armed Services, so far as military experience and organization is concerned, and by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, so far as reconversion activities are concerned. Indeed, the latter unit is expressly commissioned to study "the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Similarly, small-business legislation falls clearly into the field of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If the Senate is to have a committee on little business, why should it not also have one on big business, on domestic business, foreign business, and several other varieties? Obviously this trend is running straight back to the splintering process which caused so much confusion, overlapping, and waste effort in the last Congress.

Apparently the Democrats are preparing to resist this whittling away of the reforms so recently put into effect. We hope that a large majority of the Republicans will do likewise. This is not a partisan issue. Rather it is a question of sound and effective organization of the Senate. We should think the Republicans would be taking the lead in strengthening Congress for its formidable tasks instead of slipping backward again.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, on Wednesday the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] made the following statement:

The only point is that it would not be possible to transfer the senatorial committee along with them.

I assume that is the staff about which he was speaking.

Although I do not wish to be immodest or to violate a Presidential confidence, nevertheless let me state that when I reported to the President that I had been named to fill, insofar as possible, the shoes which he had occupied, he suggested that we had had a considerable training in that field and should know something of the problems which we would face.

The emphasis on the word "should" is mine, Mr. President.

So if it is not immodest, I would suggest that that suggestion be taken into account, along with our suggestion.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Maine took unfair advantage of the President by trying to make a courteous personal compliment appear as an endorsement by the President of special committees.

If this practice of taking literally every compliment of our colleagues and capitalizing upon it becomes widespread, the Members of this body may become so cautious and cagey that we might well lose our hard-earned reputation as the most courteous legislative body in the world.

The newspapers headlined this incident as though President Truman had endorsed the continuance of these special committees. Yesterday I saw the President, and I asked him if this were his sentiment. He said that he had intended no such expression, and that several years ago, when passing on the reins to Senator Mead, he had expressed the opinion that the committee was strictly a wartime body whose functions should be wound up promptly after VJ-day.

While everybody acclaims the Congressional Reorganization Act, few seem to have taken the trouble to read it. Here we have the spectacle of a group of Senate leaders proposing a committee to investigate wartime expenditures of funds, on the ground that no standing committee is equipped to do it. That statement may have been true in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is not true today, because among our new standing committees is the bright and shiny new committee called Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is a new committee, with a broad grant of jurisdiction.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the interest of accuracy I desire to call the Senate's attention to the fact that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is an old committee. It has been in existence for several years. Unfortunately, it may be considered as a new committee, because it has been completely inactive in the last 2 or 3 years, but I happened to have been a member of that committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. We, on our side of the aisle, of course, are in the minority, and our judgment would not prevail, but we consider every committee as being a new committee, and each member was placed on committees according to his seniority in the Senate, with no regard to seniority on committees.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has been described as the general investigating committee of the Senate. Indeed, this committee will still be inactive if, without a struggle, it permits its functions to be stripped from it. I, personally, do not propose to permit that to occur.

The first item on its list of powers is the power to investigate misuse of funds and departmental waste and inefficiency. Certainly, Mr. President, no language could be plainer than that delineating the authority of this committee.

It is set up, as are all other standing committees, with a Republican majority. It will have a full staff and a subpena power. Its chairman, the able senior Senator from Vermont whose rock-ribbed integrity and rigid puritanism in matters of public morality have earned him the respect of the righteous and the fear of the wicked, can be trusted to lead his committee vigorously and courageously. He has never been suspected of tolerance toward the reckless bureaucrat. Indeed, he has already announced his intention to probe a subject which the Special Defense Committee has considered too hot to handle—the corruption and graft of the Maritime Commission. As a minority member of that committee I will press for investigation of another subject which the War Investigating Committee has disdained: the excessive freight rates paid to the railroads by the "railroadmen in uniform" who negotiated freight rates for the Army and Navy.

The Expenditures Committee could investigate these matters, not in the sporadic, catch-as-catch-can manner of special committees, but in a serious constructive manner, with an eye toward over-all improvement in the handling of Federal funds.

With all respect to the Truman-Mead committee and its eminent chairman and members, I would like to raise one serious question concerning its functions: Is it not true that most of its investigations could have been handled equally well by a prosecutor, by a special unit of the Justice Department, or by a special grand jury? Is it not true that it did a job that should have been done by the executive branch?

I ask this with all deference. I respect the committee for having done a job that others failed to do. But I think that the legislative job must be a broad, policy-making job. Rather than capture individual wrongdoers, we must make it impossible for all wrongdoers to function. When we investigate we must do so with an eye on future legislation.

All this is elemental. The War Investigating Committee of course realized it. But my point is this: It is much easier for a special committee to forget this than it is for a standing committee. A standing committee always gets back to its calendar of bills, and it remembers its responsibility to report back in terms of proposed corrective measures.

This is not a political question. The majority will control standing committees as well as special committees. It is a question of far greater importance. It is the test of the Congressional Reorganization Act. Either we observe its letter and its spirit or we publicly show our contempt for it by beginning a process of whittling it away, bit by bit.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to introduce one more editorial into the RECORD as part of my remarks. This one is from the News. That makes another Washington newspaper which is opposed to these special committees. The title of this editorial which was in the News last evening is The Reorganized Congress. It begins in this way:

Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, is spreading himself rather thin. He is a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which will have a lot to do on budget and tax matters.

He is a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which handles legislation affecting land, sea, and air transport and communications. And he has been suggested for chairman of its subcommittee to investigate what's causing all the plane crack-ups.

And, if Senate Republican leaders have their way, which seems likely, Senator BREWSTER will be chairman of the special Senate War Investigating Committee, which is to continue its work of uncovering frauds in war contracts.

The editorial continues in the same vein.

I ask that the remainder of the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is argued that this special committee is justified because members of the Armed Services Committee, which might logically assume jurisdiction, are too closely and uncritically tied to the Army and Navy for a really tough investigation.

There may be enough merit in that argument to warrant making one exception to the general principle of the La Follette-Monroney Act that standing committees should not be weakened by assigning their chores to special committees.

But what of the other special committee Senate Republican leaders are sponsoring? It's to be a new Small Business Committee. So far as we can see, its primary purpose is to give Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, a chairmanship.

They had a Small Business Committee in the last Congress. It was just a boondoggle. Almost any legislation handled by the Labor Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee or the Finance Committee would affect small business. There's no more reason—beyond the political reason—for a Small Business Committee than for a Big Business Committee.

If the Senate goes on with this policy of creating special committees, what's to prevent a special committee for oil, another for wool, another for silver, ad infinitum. And soon we'll be back where we started before the La Follette-Monroney Act cut down the number of committees to make the legislative branch more efficient and make Congressmen earn their higher pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. Frankly, Mr. President, if political considerations were all that mattered to me, I should be most happy to have the Republicans set up special committees, because certainly I think it would react to their political disadvantage. But I have a greater interest, which is the interest in the efficiency of the operation of the Congress and the welfare of our Nation and its people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. I happen to be one of the junior members of that committee, not having had the long years of service of some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I know, however, that under the able chairmanship of the now President of the United States and under his successors on the other side of the aisle, with the cooperation of Members on this side of the aisle, the committee has done, as I believe it will continue to do in the future, a constructive job that needs to be done for the American people.

We have already had a chance to discuss from time to time whether there is any violation of the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act. I do not believe there is any violation whatever of the spirit of that act, if there be such a spirit. I supported the reorganization legislation, and I believe it was one of the most constructive measures passed during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

I wish to point out to the Members of the Senate that there is one point that seems to have been overlooked. It has been said that it would be rather easy either to transfer the staff or transfer the members of the special committee and scatter them among either the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or the Committee on Armed Services. I believe, however, that those who make such statements lose sight of one thing. The situation is somewhat like that of a football team. If the members of the special committee team, which has worked together over a period of years and is composed both of Members of the Senate and of the professional staff, were spread around, the same effectiveness would not be secured.

In my opinion, with the tremendous expenditures of the Federal Government which are now under way and which will continue under the President's budget, which proposes an expenditure of some thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars, there will be ample work to keep the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments busy investigating the current expenses of the Government of the United States.

If we believe there is a job to be done investigating past expenditures, then I believe the only way it is going to be done is to have the investigation conducted by a special committee. If such a committee did not now exist, Mr. President, and if the American people and the Senate of the United States wanted to have done the job of investigating what became of the $400,000,000,000 spent during the war, there would be a need for creating a committee to do the very thing that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program is set up to do.

I now wish to call attention to the fact that the type of staff used on a special investigating committee is different from the type of staff normally used in connection with a legislative committee considering the current problems of the Government and working on current legislation. An investigating committee, such as the special committee in question, requires investigators. We have on the staff of that committee individuals who were formerly with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such a committee requires individuals who are familiar with war-fraud type of investigation and of income-tax evasion type of investigation. The normal staff of a Senate committee or of a House committee would not have among its number experts of that character. I believe we will lose the momentum which is under way, which the special committee now has, if we terminate its life and refuse to permit it to proceed.

I desire also to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that there are a number of factors that would cut across the various committee lines. As we travel about or as we hold our investigations we find that one thing ties into another. In holding an investigation on the disposal of surplus property overseas we might tie into information that leads us on to something else. When we have an integrated investigating committee of this kind we are better able to proceed and follow the tracks wherever they may lead.

The able Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has read an editorial from the Washington Post, one of the leading newspapers of the United States, and a newspaper for which I have the highest respect; but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial which the same newspaper published on December 31, 1945. I shall ask that the entire editorial be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, but I want to read to the Senate a couple of paragraphs from the editorial. It is headed "Army hoarding." I read as follows:

Far too little attention has been given to the Army's hoarding program which has now been upset by the Mead committee and the Hodges board. Senator Mead told the story more than a week ago before the adjournment of Congress. Since it involves a glaring case of official misrepresentation as well as shocking disregard for the general welfare we think it should not be allowed to pass with the casual treatment thus far given to it.

I might say at this point that I was rather amazed when my able colleague, the Senator from Idaho, suggested that the investigation of the administrative branch could best be done by another section of the executive branch of the Government. Certainly it is not the customary practice to turn the administration loose to investigate itself. I believe that as it was our responsibility as Senators of the United States to provide the vast sums of money which were necessarily spent during the war, and to provide the current expenditures of some $37,500,000,000, we, as Senators of the United States, have a responsibility to investigate to see how the money is spent. We do not have the right to pass that job on to the executive branch of the Government which is doing the spending.

I continue reading the editorial from the Washington Post of the date I mentioned. It concludes by saying the following:

The results of this one investigation more than justify the existence of the Mead committee and point to the necessity of continuing its work throughout the demobilization period.

I now ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY HOARDING

Far too little attention has been given to the Army's hoarding program which has now been upset by the Mead committee and the Hodges board. Senator Mead told the story more than a week ago before the adjournment of Congress. Since it involves a glaring case of official misrepresentation as well as shocking disregard for the general welfare, we think it should not be allowed to pass with the casual treatment thus far given to it.

The hoarding policy began with a War Department directive last September 14 forbidding officers to declare various items surplus until huge reserves had been built up. The purpose was to accumulate reserves large enough to supply the Army through the period of demobilization, during the period of the occupation of Germany and Japan, during the peacetime years and for "the first year of the next war." When the Mead committee learned of the plan, it held a number of hearings. At one of these, several reporters misunderstood a War Department table of reserves in civilian-type goods. They thought it represented actual hoarding of the items named, whereas it reflected only what the Army intended to accumulate before releasing any of its stocks in those categories as surplus. To correct this impression the War Department issued a press release on December 5, but this statement was more misleading than the erroneous stories had been.

Instead of having enormous quantities of the goods in question on hand, the release said, the Department had on hand only very small quantities—sufficient to last for 12 days to 18 months. This information, according to Senator Mead, was based on the stocks in Army depots in the United States. The release neglected to state that vast quantities of the same items may be found in Army posts, camps, and stations in the United States, in depots in foreign combat theaters and in the hands of troops both in this country and abroad.

The flagrant character of the deception effected by this release is illustrated by the statement that the Army had blankets enough to last only 3.7 months. The Hodges board has since made plain that the Army will have enough blankets to supply it until June 30, 1949, and can in addition immediately release 2,000,000 as surplus. Senator Mead's condemnation of this offense against accuracy and the whole truth in the conduct of the public business was altogether too mild in our opinion. None of the officers who have testified before the committee would accept any responsibility for the release. We think that the committee is under obligation to follow up its demand for a full report and the Army must punish its double-talking information men to maintain its own self-respect.

Scarcely less shocking is the fact that the War Department planned to withhold from the market vast quantities of surplus tractors, shovel cranes, service boots, blankets, flashlights, watches, and so forth, that are urgently needed in our civilian economy. Some of these items were to be kept for use as late as 1970. It is estimated that civilian items to be placed in reserve under the original plan would be worth about a billion dollars. Yet no careful study had been made of the cost of transporting and reconditioning these items for storage, of the deterioration that would take place or the interest costs on such a long investment of borrowed money. Apparently the Army went ahead with its hoarding plan without a thought of the public interest.

After the Mead committee began its investigation, the War Department appointed General Hodges chairman of a special board to review the strategic reserve program. His first report, which has been adopted by the War Department, will result in the immediate release of $400,000,000 worth of civilian-type supplies now held in the United States. It is estimated that another $400,000,000 worth of such items will be added to Army surpluses available to the public later. All of the vast hoard of service boots and bleaching material will be given up under the Hodges plan as well as 52,222,000 of the 54,071,000 wool blankets. The results of this one investigation more than justify the existence of the Mead committee and point to the necessity of continuing its work throughout the demobilization period.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I previously mentioned, during the address made by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], an executive committee hearing which the special committee held with General Clay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With reference to the Washington Post editorial from which the Senator from California has just read, let me ask him if it is not true that the present policy, recently adopted, is to abandon all investigations of war matters?

Mr. KNOWLAND. At present all investigations of current War Department matters will now be handled by the Armed Services Committee. Any matters overseas will now be handled by the Armed Services Committee. But during the period of time discussed by the editorial that was not the case. The investigating committee performed a service which no other committee had performed in calling the hoarding situation to the attention of the Senate and the people of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not see why the able Senator from California complains about the newspaper changing its position when the majority side of the Senate has changed its position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not complaining about the newspaper changing its position, but inasmuch as a recent editorial has been read, I thought it would be enlightening to the Senate to know what, a short period before, the same newspaper had said about the very able and capable work which was being carried on by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. That was my only point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but, of course, the editor who wrote the newspaper editorial could not quite keep up with the rapid changes and the fast maneuvering that goes on here.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the date of that Washington Post editorial to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I gave the date before reading it, so there would be no misunderstanding on that point. The date was December 31, 1945.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. The last line of the editorial, if I correctly understood the distinguished Senator from California, stated that the committee should be continued throughout the demobilization period.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that while the President of the United States recently—a few days ago, in fact—declared that hostilities were at an end, we have not yet declared that the war is at an end, or that the national emergency is at an end.

During the period of time when the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program held one of its hearings we had General Clay before us. I cite this because I think it is the type of thing which the American people have not yet had brought to their attention and in which, as citizens and taxpayers, they have a vital interest. It makes no difference to me as a personal matter whether the job of investigation is done by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program or whether it be done by a standing committee of the Senate. Personally, I believe it will be done only if it is done by the special committee. Certainly we as individual Senators have a grave obligation, should the Senate not continue the special investigating committee, to see to it that some committee of this body investigates the various matters which the special committee has uncovered, or with respect to which it has leads looking toward items which need investigation.

I read from the record of the hearing on page 29:

Senator KNOWLAND. Is there any check on the amount of allied military marks that may have come into our zone from either the Russian or the British zones and which had to be redeemed by the American military authorities in American dollars, and to that extent was a charge on the American taxpayers?

General CLAY. We know how many we hold. We have more than we have actually issued.

Senator FERGUSON. Could anyone other than an American soldier or civilian obtain United States dollars for the allied money?

General CLAY. No, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. Is the amount of the allied military marks that we issued and the amount that we hold military secrets or is it something we could disclose?

General CLAY. No, sir. We have those figures not only for our own zone but also the British and the French zones. We have never been able to obtain the figures from the Soviet zone.

Senator KNOWLAND. What did we issue in our zone?

General CLAY. I wouldn't be able to give you those exact figures. I think it was in the neighborhood of about two billion, of which about half had come back into our Treasury.

Mr. MEADER. Two billion marks or dollars?

General CLAY. Marks.

Senator FERGUSON. We have cashed about one-half of that?

General CLAY. Yes, sir.

* * * * * *

Senator KNOWLAND. What is the highest denomination of the allied mark?

General CLAY. One hundred marks.

Senator KNOWLAND. A 100-mark note?

General CLAY. Yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. How many notes of 500, 1,000, or 10,000 marks are there in the American zone?

General CLAY. Very large quantities.

Senator KNOWLAND. Which is indicative that they were not issued by the American authorities.

General CLAY. Yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. What is the largest denomination that the British issued?

General CLAY. One hundred, also.

Senator KNOWLAND. You say that about one billion has been returned to our Treasury over there. About how much of that would be of denominations over 100 marks?

General CLAY. I know that it was substantial, sir.

I merely wish to cite the fact that in this field alone we have a situation in which the American taxpayer has apparently been called upon to redeem large quantities of occupation military marks which were obviously not issued in the American zone, because the American Government does not issue marks in denominations higher than 100 marks. They were not from the British zone, because the British do not issue military marks in denominations greater than 100 marks. And yet our zone has been flooded with huge quantities of marks of denominations of 500, 1,000, or 10,000 marks.

This is one fact which had been kept from the American people; and I believe that some committee of the Senate—it may be the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the Committee on Armed Services, or the special committee, or would have been the special committee except for the limitations that we have now accepted—some committee has a grave responsibility to the American people to furnish them with the full facts as to how much of a burden they may have assumed in helping to subsidize the Russian zone in the occupation territory.

I also wish to invite attention to the fact that when our committee was overseas I went with the then Senator from Delaware, Mr. Tunnell, on a 30,000-mile trip around the world, investigating the disposal of Army and Navy surplus property abroad. Largely as a result of our findings we were able to expedite the return of a large quantity of surplus commodities which were urgently needed in the civilian economy of this country during the period when we had a short supply. In the islands of the Pacific, in the Orient, and in Europe we found large quantities of tractors which were vitally needed by veterans on farms as well as by municipal and State governments in highway work, and also needed by the public in the construction of homes and in construction work generally. Yet when they could not obtain these items, tractors were practically being given away, on the basis of 10 cents on the dollar, more or less, or were left to rust in distant places. Largely as a result of what we uncovered on that trip, we were able to get the Government departments and agencies to start returning much of that usable equipment to this country, where it could be put to use. I believe that every Senator has had the experience of having constituents write to him, representing either the highway department of a State or county or individual veterans and others who have been desperately in need of tractors of one kind or another. Yet recently when our chief counsel was overseas he found a situation in which the American authorities had permitted the delivery of $1,300,000 worth of tractors to a British firm which had taken delivery of them and had removed them from France across the channel into Great Britain. We found that those tractors had not yet been paid for, and as of today they have not yet been paid for.

Yet when an American veteran or an American farmer tries to get a tractor he must pay for it on the spot at the place of sale.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true in that particular case that the rules and regulations required payment prior to delivery, and that payment was not made? Delivery was made in violation of the orders and regulations; and, so far as we have learned, there has been no disciplinary action against those who permitted delivery of thousands of dollars' worth of tractors, or even a couple of million dollars' worth of tractors. So we find that the agencies will not police themselves. They will not look into the various transactions and really perform their duty. Therefore it was necessary for the committee to do that kind of work, and it will continue to do the job of policing the various agencies, because they refuse to police themselves. Is not that true?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Michigan is absolutely correct. In this particular case, as the Senator has pointed out, the situation is that the regulations and requirements provide that payment shall be made prior to delivery. However, delivery was made to the British firm and the tractors were transported across the channel. Permission was given by someone in one of the Government agencies to do an illegal act. To date we have not been able to find out whether disciplinary action has been taken.

I may add that the latest information I have is that finally, after the matter was called to the attention of the proper authorities, they filed some type of injunctive proceedings in the British courts in order to prevent disposal of the tractors which are now on the British side of the channel.

I merely cite this as one of several examples. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has cited others, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has cited others. They are things which need to be gone into by the Senate of the United States in discharging the high obligation it owes to the American people. I say to Senators, including the able Senator from Idaho, that I do not believe that the type of investigative work which is so necessary to the taxpayers of the country can be done if the job is turned over to one of the administrative agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am in doubt as to the number of Senators who would be on the special Senate committee if resolution 46 were adopted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The number would be 10, the same number as have been on the committee.

Mr. MORSE. How many of the 10 would be new appointees?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Four would be new appointees.

Mr. MORSE. Four who had never served on the committee before?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. That point was raised and answered, perhaps before the Senator arrived.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry I did not hear the point raised. I should like to say to the Senator from California that I have followed his argument very carefully, and I think there is a great deal of merit in it. However, the most important issue is still before us. The Senate still has to decide what is the most efficient way to proceed with the war contract investigation, which I think the American people are entitled to have consummated by the Senate at the earliest possible time.

It seems to me that if we are to have a committee of 10, including 4 new members—I understand that some of the members of the present committee are Senators who have served a relatively short time on the committee—we shall have a committee representing a considerable amount of inexperience on the part of a substantial number of the members. If I am correctly informed, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has on it some of the already proven investigators of the Senate, who would bring to their colleagues on that committee a considerable amount of experience and investigatory background. I see no reason why the most competent of the investigation staff could not be transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Furthermore, with my mind still undecided as to what decision we ought finally to adopt, may I point out that the argument to the effect that standing committees are very busy committees should be very carefully scrutinized. I say that because the real point is that individual Senators are very busy men, whether they are on special committees or on standing committees. When the Senate places a Senator on a special committee it is simply giving to him a job on a special committee which he would still perform if he did the same work on a subcommittee of a standing committee. After all, 96 Members of this body can do just so much work, whether it be done on a special committee or on a subcommittee of a standing committee.

I think the argument which has been made by some Senators to the effect that we are going to encumber the work of a standing committee if we send this type of work to a standing committee is fallacious. After all, each of us, no matter where he is assigned, is able to do just so much work within so much time and with so much energy to expend. As a general principle I think we will save the time of individual Senators and of standing committees if we channel these investigations through a subcommittee of a standing committee.

So I think we have got to go back to the real issue which is involved in this controversy, and that is, if this job needs to be done—and it does need to be done—how can it be done most effectively, most efficiently, and in the shortest possible time in the interest of the country? If we proceed by way of a special committee, we must make sure that it is surrounded with all the restrictions that are needed, so as not establish a precedent which will undermine the Reorganization Act.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the concluding portion of the remarks of the Senator from California the thought was expressed that the job of investigation could not be done by administrative departments; that administrative departments could not be trusted to police themselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say at this point that no reflection upon the present administration was intended except that as a matter of policy no executive department of the Government should be expected to conduct such an investigation. I think Congress has the prime responsibility of doing that as a matter of public policy.

Mr. HATCH. I do not disagree with the thought or policy at all, but I am puzzled. I noticed that the Senator from California mentioned the Senator from Idaho. I listened to his speech and I did not hear him express such a thought. Has any one proposed that the Senate should abandon its duties and leave the policing to the administrative branch?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly understood the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], in the course of his remarks, to suggest that as a possibility the Department of Justice or one of the other departments of the Government might be better equipped to do this investigative work.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the commerce of the United States is now in a state of semiconfusion because of the portal-to-portal pay cases. I have been listening to the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee for some time, and there seems to be quite a difference of opinion among the learned lawyers who are testifying as to what should be done to untangle the condition that now exists. I have prepared two amendments which I believe, if enacted, would straighten this matter out. One amendment is to the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would simply make it plain, so that there would be no further misunderstanding in connection with portal-to-portal pay rates. The other amendment which I intend to propose is an amendment to House bill 71, amending the Internal Revenue Act. This would effectively settle the portal-to-portal dispute in case the bills which have been introduced should fail. The amendment which I intend to propose to the Internal Revenue Act simply provides that in cases in which suits are brought for the collection of portal-to-portal pay, any moneys recovered through such suits shall be subject to a 100-percent tax by the Federal Government. That might discourage the filing of such suits. Furthermore, the amendment would provide that anyone compelled to pay a claim on suits filed under this portal-to-portal pay requirement would be entitled to deduct the amount he paid from the amount he owed the Government on his 1947 income tax, and to carry the balance, if any, over to future years, for 5 years, until he recovered all he had been forced to pay. Mr. President, this method of recovering windfall money was adopted by Congress when the processing tax was declared unconstitutional. The money left in the hands of processors for which they had rendered no service was taxed nearly 100 percent. I hope the method I am proposing will be adopted promptly, so that the burden and uncertainty of commerce may be relieved.

Mr. President, I ask that two amendments which I send to the desk be properly referred and be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. O'DANIEL to the bill (S. 70) to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes, was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following:

"SEC. —. (a) Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) As used in this section, the term "workweek" shall include only the time during which an employee is engaged in productive work. In determining productive work (1) time consumed in going to and returning from work stations (except in cases where transportation is furnished by the employer and by custom in the industry or by agreement between the parties such travel time is compensable), and (2) time consumed in changing clothing and in preparing for productive work, shall not be included.'

"(b) Hereafter, no action for the recovery of wages, penalties, or other damages (actual, liquidated, or exemplary) shall be commenced under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in any court by reason of any time spent by any employee in other than productive work."

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. O'DANIEL to the bill (H. R. 71) to amend the Interial Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939, was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new sections:

"SEC. —. The Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding after section 15 the following new section:

"'SEC. 16. Tax on Unjust Enrichment.

"'(a) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the windfall income of every individual a tax of 100 percent of the amount of his windfall income.

"'(b) Windfall income: For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'windfall income' means amounts received by any individual during the taxable year as wages, penalties, or other damages (actual, liquidated, or exemplary) under an order of a court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, if liability for the payment of such amounts would not have been incurred had section 7 (e) of such act been in effect on and after the effective date of such act.'

"SEC. —. The Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding after section 22 the following new section:

"'SEC. 22A. Additional exclusion from gross income: Amounts received during the taxable year as windfall income shall not be included in gross income.'

"SEC. —. The Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding after section 35 the following new section:

"'SEC. 36. Credit for Windfall Income Payments.

"'There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax, amounts paid during the taxable year as wages, penalties, or other damages (actual, liquidated, or exemplary) under an order of a court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, if liability for the payment of such amounts would not have been incurred had section 7 (e) of such Act been in effect on and after the effective date of such Act.'

"SEC. —. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by section — to — shall apply to taxable years commencing after December 31, 1946."

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bricker	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the pending resolution.

We all agree that when the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress, of which I had the honor to be a member almost from its inception, reported to the Senate the proposed reform of the Senate rules, it contained a flat prohibition against special committees. In fact, the language of the act as reported by the special committee, and later adopted by the Senate, contained the following provision:

> No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

It was pointed out by the able chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin at the time, Mr. La Follette, that the reason for the specific prohibition against special committees was the feeling on the part of the joint committee that if there were not a flat prohibition, just such proposals as those before the Senate today would be repeatedly made and often adopted. So that the Senate might be relieved of that temptation and of that inclination the joint committee reported that there should be a flat prohibition against special committees. It was provided, however, that that prohibition could be removed in a very clear-cut and simple way, namely, for the Senate by a two-thirds vote to waive the rule prohibiting special committees.

So, the joint committee after months of study reported to the Senate that there should not be special committees appointed by either House, unless the rule should be waived by a two-thirds vote prior to the adoption of a resolution authorizing a special committee.

We all know that when that provision was considered by the Senate it was approved by the Senate by a vote of 48 to 16; and I had the honor, as others have indicated they did, to be one of those favoring that prohibition against the special committee.

The reasons are elaborately given in the hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress as to why it was desirable to abolish special committees, and one of the reasons was the item of expense. It is only natural that a special committee should employ new personnel, and as a general rule—and I think the statement can be confirmed by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] who was chairman in the last Congress of the Audit and Control Committee, and who is now on the floor—the personnel of the special committees receive compensation far in excess of that enjoyed by the personnel of the standing committee. Is that not a fact, I will ask the able former chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida is eminently correct and when the time comes that the Senator from Illinois may have an opportunity, as he will, to discuss this question, I propose at that time to go into each and every special committee that was active at the time the reorganization bill was passed, showing the number of their employees and the amount of money spent by them. Almost every so-called important special committee has had as many, and as a matter of fact, in numerous instances, a far greater number of employees than the standing committees.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the able Senator.

So the first and one of the signficant reasons for the prohibition of the special committee, recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, was to save expense in the employment of new personnel, which ordinarily received far in excess of the compensation received by the personnel of the standing committee. Furthermore, it was to promote efficiency, because the work of the special committee often and generally overlapped the work of some general committee of the Congress.

The second important reason, Mr. President, why the Joint Committee recommended a ban upon the special committee was that the Senators themselves might not be burdened with membership upon a multiplicity of important committees. If I may make a personal reference, I believe I was a member of 10 active committees in the last session of the Congress, when all the special committees of which I was a member were functioning, along with my regular committees and the subcommittees and the regular committees of which I was a member. I know mine was not an exceptional case. As has well been said by other Senators who have spoken so ably on this subject one of the principal objectives we sought to achieve by the streamlining of the congressional committees was to make it possible for Senators to attend to their committee business.

We are now proposing to set up a multiplicity of committees.

The able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] no doubt would be the chairman of the Special Committee on War Investigation. I read in the press a day or two ago that he had been appointed chairman of a subcommittee to investigate safety in air travel. The able Senator is to be commended for his interest in the safety of people who travel in the airplanes of the commercial air lines. That is a big job, a principal investigating task, which has already been assigned to the able Senator from Maine by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MCMAHON. I wonder why it was that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] did not suggest the formation of a special committee to investigate the subject of safety in air travel.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know why the Senator from Maine did not make such a suggestion, unless he did not wish to claim for himself the jewel of consistency in his approach to this matter. So, Mr. President, that is one committee which might be called special in character with which the Senator from Maine is already charged, and which will carry him rather outside the scope of his duties on the regular committee into a vast field of inquiry.

The Senator from Maine is a member, of course, of two important regular committees of the Senate, and no doubt, because of his energy and ability, he will be appointed chairman of other subcommittees of those regular committees, or certainly he will be a member of subcommittees of his regular committees. I dare say that even if the able and energetic Senator from Maine performs only his regular committee duties he will discharge a very great obligation to the Senate and will tax even his own great capacity.

He now proposes to launch upon an inquiry that is probably larger than any of the others, an inquiry, the limit of which can hardly be imagined, as it will no doubt work out in practice.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida has just been discussing a very important question with respect to airplane accidents and casualties which seems to me to be a very appropriate subject of investigation. I am wondering whether the Senator from Florida would care to comment on what the Senator from Maine might have done had a Republican Senator or a Democratic Senator submitted a resolution proposing to set up a special committee to investigate airplane accidents.

Mr. PEPPER. Knowing the diligence of the Senator from Maine, I can hardly imagine any Senator being on his feet ahead of him to protest against the grievous transgression of the jurisdiction of the regular committee that such a proposal would have constituted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the procedure of the Senate, prior to the adoption of the Reorganization Act, if any Senator had desired to submit a resolution setting up a special committee to examine into airplane accidents, he could have found ample precedents for so doing. I recall resolutions under which such committees have been appointed in the past.

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly so. That simply emphasizes that if we once start

again the evil practice of creating special committees, there is no limit to it.

I have as a part of the hearings of the joint committee the testimony of a House Member who said that already 17 special committees of one sort or another were functioning in the Congress. Today it happens to be the able Senator from Maine who proposes that the Senate create a special committee to investigate the conduct of the war. Incidentally, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has indicated that there should be hardly any limits to the scope of such a study. I do not know but that he may have in the back of his mind the prolongation of the committee on the Pearl Harbor inquiry, because I got the impression that the Senator from Michigan was not satisfied, owing to the fact that that committee had seemed to exculpate President Roosevelt from the responsibility of entertaining a sinister design to get this country into the war, and that the able Senator from Michigan thought probably that inquiry should be further pursued.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment.

If the special committee were created, and if he were a member of it, I am sure that the able Senator from Michigan would consider it was perfectly within the range of the activities of the committee contemplated by the Senator from Maine to try to project the inquiry into the material that was otherwise fully and lengthily considered by the committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor circumstances.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. TYDINGS. Following the remark of the able Senator from Florida, that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is already on two important committees, I note he is on the Committee on Finance, and that he is on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Merely considering the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, there will be subcommittees of that committee, no doubt, dealing with railroads, with pipe lines, with the telegraph and telephone, with aviation, with radio, with television, with intercoastal shipping, and with all that tremendous variety of subjects which after a war will come to the fore. I should hate to think that the energies of the Senator from Maine would be taken from the Interstate Commerce Committee, for there are only seven members of his party on that committee now, under the Reorganization Act, and only, as I recall, six Democrats. Now, with this reduced committee size and with the subcommittee work that must flow from the reduction of the committee membership there seems to me to be an additional and all-abundant reason why a special committee ought not to be created. I do not believe the Senator from Maine can do the work on the two committees of which he is a member, and undertake this other work which will take him all over the United States, much against his will, for he will have work to do here also.

With respect to the work of the Finance Committee, we find all the wartime taxes, with a possible 20-percent reduction in personal income taxes, with a need for balancing the budget, and yet the Committee on Finance has only seven Republican members. So, frankly, if the Senator from Maine is leaving to perform work elsewhere, the committee complexion will be six Republicans and six Democrats on each of the two main committees of which he is a member. The Senator from Maine should know that it is not going to be wise to leave matters in that situation, because we Democrats might take control of those two committees at some time if the Senator from Maine were in Idaho or California or Maryland looking for matters to investigate in connection with the defense program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland. Since he has called attention to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Maine is a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a member of the Committee on Finance, let me read the jurisdiction of the two committees as set forth in the rules of the Senate itself as part of the act reorganizing the Congress. Here is the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.
2. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines.
3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.
4. Civil acronautics.
5. Merchant marine generally.
6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.
7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.
8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.
9. Merchant marine officers and seamen.
10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, life-saving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.
11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
12. The Coast Guard, including life-saving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
14. Weather Bureau.

I am sure the able Senator from Maine might even be interested in the inclination of the weathervanes to indicate certain aspects of the weather in this country.

15. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.
16. Inland waterways.
17. Fisheries and wild life, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

I may say that I am sure the able Senator from Maine is interested not only in fisheries, but also in fishing, as I will be able to indicate in a moment, according to some of the patterns made by the inquiries of the committee itself previously, and suggestions made by the Senator from Maine while he was a member of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not mean to intimate that the Senator from Maine is not also interested in wildlife?

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure he is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to complete a reading of the list, and then I shall be glad to yield.

18. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

It took Congress a good long while to figure out some of those standards, I believe.

Mr. President, I have just read 18 subjects of jurisdiction under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce alone, of which the able Senator from Maine is a member, and a subcommittee of which he has already been named chairman, and obviously there will have to be other subcommittees of that committee, of which so able and important a majority member as the Senator from Maine will necessarily be a member.

Let me now read the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance:

1. Revenue measures generally.

As the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, the whole tax system of this country.

2. The bonded debt of the United States.
3. The deposit of public moneys.
4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.
5. Reciprocal trade agreements.
6. Transportation of dutiable goods.
7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.
8. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.
9. National social security.
10. Veterans' measures generally.
11. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.
12. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.
13. Compensation of veterans.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has 18 enumerated subdivisions of jurisdiction and the Committee on Finance has 13 enumerated subdivisions of jurisdiction, and the Senator from Maine is already on both those committees. The principal purpose of the limitation against special committees which the Senate first adopted was to keep from breaking down even the exceptional capacity of a Senator like the Senator from Maine, and encourage Senators to become experts in all the many fields of service in connection with committees and enable them

to perform their services with credit in their positions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to ask the Senator only one question. After I reflect on what he has just read, I believe the Senate made a mistake. I am sure it would have been wiser to have put a Senator on one committee only, because if he attended to the work of that one committee, and worked to cover the scope of the committee surely he would have his hands full. Then to put him on two committees and then even to put him on an extra committee is too much. He simply cannot do the job, even though he is as superhuman as is the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PEPPER. What the Senator from Maryland has just said is borne out by the fact that for years the House of Representatives has followed the practice of having a Member sit on only one important committee. I heard the Senator from Illinois the other day in the Committee on Agriculture say that by virtue of that fact, while he served as a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, he learned more about agriculture during that time because he could devote his attention to that subject, than he had ever learned in any other period of his public life.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the interest of proper order in the Senate, the Chair would like to call attention of Senators to the procedure which under the Senate rules should be followed, of Senators first addressing the Chair, if the Senator who has the floor is to be interrupted, so that the Presiding Officer may ask him whether he desires to be interrupted, rather than carrying on a conversation back and forth in the Chamber itself.

Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question. He has read a list of the matters that come within the jurisdiction of the two committees, the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I just heard the Senator who now occupies the chair, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether he desired to yield to the Senator from Michigan. Has the Senator yielded to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I said I yielded first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he said he yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PEPPER. No. The Senator from Michigan was the second Senator to request that I yield to him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from Florida that the jurisdiction which is conferred on these two committees involves a great deal of hard and grinding, but necessary, work. I have in my hand the Evening Star for Friday, today, and I see a headline: "BREWSTER sees new sensations if war investigators continue."

I have read the story. I point out to the Senator that there is nothing of an assurance in it that if this special committee is continued there will be a fair, diligent, honest effort to catch any crooks no matter where they might be, but we are promised a sensation a day. I wonder if the Senator from Florida thinks that after the Senator from Maine has read the list of jurisdictions and the duties of the two committees to which he is assigned and then sees the glowing prospect of a sensation a day, as the Star puts it, that would have any effect upon the desires of the Senator from Maine in this matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Maine should be given the opportunity to excite the glamour-loving people of the country by disclosing one new sensation a day. I think they are doing fairly well now with the number of sensations they already have available to them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is apparent that the remarks of the able Senator from Florida were for the purpose of denying permission to the junior Senator from Michigan to reply to his remarks in relation to the Pearl Harbor investigation. I wish to put the mind of the able Senator from Florida at rest. The junior Senator from Michigan has no desire at the present time to attempt to reopen the Pearl Harbor investigation, because of the fact that there is in existence an Executive order by the President of the United States which makes it impossible to complete the investigation of the Pearl Harbor incident. Therefore so far as the able Senator from Florida is concerned, there is no danger, if this resolution is agreed to, that there will be an investigation of the Pearl Harbor incident under the resolution.

However, the junior Senator from Michigan believes that the time will come in the history of the United States when it will be possible to look into the files of the Secretary of State, the Army and Navy files, and the executive files, in order that the people of the United States may know all the facts in relation to Pearl Harbor. History demands that the white light of investigation be thrown upon any incident about which the people should know. I have no desire at the present time to follow up that inquiry; but the time will come in the future when the people will learn, if it is possible to obtain the information from the files, the whole story of the Pearl Harbor incident, and how we could be attacked without being ready for the attack.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Michigan for his statement. I had been impressed by the breadth of some of the statements which the Senator from Michigan made in his address on this subject a few days ago. If I recall correctly, he made a statement about the time of the election, or about the time of the conclusion of the Pearl Harbor investigation to the effect that there should be further investigation of the subject. So I thought from what the Senator had said that if this committee were re-created he might avail himself of the committee to make such an inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say that Senators on the other side of the aisle can rest assured that if this resolution is agreed to, so far as the junior Senator from Michigan is concerned, there will be no investigation into the Pearl Harbor incident, as to how we could be attacked without anticipating the attack.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to rehash the circumstances surrounding the Pearl Harbor investigation. That investigation lasted for nearly a year. It was made by a joint committee of the two Houses. On that joint committee there were six members of the majority and four members of the minority. When the joint committee had finished its investigation and made its report 8 of the 10 members of the joint committee signed the report. Two members did not sign it, but filed minority views, based very largely upon the fact that the committee, by a nonpartisan vote, decided not to require the production of the private diary of the Secretary of War and the private diary of the Ambassador to Japan for 10 years, and also did not undertake to override the Executive order of the President that the private files of the President of the United States should not be invaded by the committee for fishing purposes. I will say in fairness to the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maine that throughout the investigation they insisted that the diary of the Secretary of War and the diary of the Ambassador to Japan, as well as the private papers of the President of the United States be looked into for anything pertinent to the inquiry. Everything thought to be pertinent was submitted. There was disagreement on that point. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maine both felt that wider latitude should be given in the inspection of those private documents, or any documents which might be found in the files in those particular repositories.

I do not know whether the committee, if it were re-created, would go into the Pearl Harbor matter or not. I think the overwhelming majority of the committee felt, without regard to politics, that the investigation was one of the most exhaustive investigations ever made by the

Senate or by the Congress, if not the most exhaustive. Be that as it may, I do not know what any new committee would seek to do. As I recall, interviews were given out by the Senator from Maine. I do not know whether the Senator from Michigan participated in them or not. There was an intimation in the newspapers that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program might see fit to undertake to go further into the Pearl Harbor matter. Whether the Senator said that or not I do not know, but he was quoted as saying it.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor. He yielded temporarily to the Senator from Kentucky. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wished to finish one thought.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, in order that he may finish what he was about to say.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of any intention on the part of any Senator who might be a member of the special committee with respect to reopening the Pearl Harbor investigation, I myself do not take the position which I take on the pending resolution based upon any fear that that committee, if extended, would go into a further examination of the Pearl Harbor incident. Whether it does or does not does not concern me at all in regard to this question. The record of the Pearl Harbor Committee is public. It has made its reports. They stand on their own merits, whatever they may be. Whether the special committee would undertake to go into that question again or not has no influence whatever with me in determining my attitude on the pending resolution. I take it for granted that the committee would not undertake to reopen that matter then, if at all. I suppose the Senator from Michigan had in mind a moment ago that he hoped the time might come when there would be no Executive order which would deprive some committee of the right to invade all the private papers to which reference has been made, which right was denied to him as a result of the Executive order.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly the position of the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the full and frank statement of the Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished minority leader. If any newspaper quoted me as intimating that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program ever would go into the Pearl Harbor affair, there was absolutely no authority for that statement so far as I am concerned. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me, I will say that a statement to that effect appeared in one of the Washington newspapers. My recollection is that the Senator from Maine was not in the city on the day when that article appeared. My recollection also is that the Senator from Michigan stated in that connection, either on the same day or a day or two afterward, that he did not share in that view, if it was the view of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. This is the first time that I have realized that there was any serious suggestion that the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program had ever had any jurisdiction of that question, because the Pearl Harbor incident occurred before the war started. It was the beginning of the war. I do not know under what tortured construction of language it could even be conceived to be within the jurisdiction of the special committee. At any rate, it has never been suggested in our committee, in the 4 years of its history, and so far as I know it has never been considered by any member of the committee. I think the episode to which the Senator from Kentucky refers may be the result of the occasional statement which has appeared, to which the Senator from Kentucky referred, that neither the Senator from Michigan nor I was satisfied with the extent of our exploration in that case. The items of which the Senator speaks were the conspicuous ones which we felt should have been gone into further.

I entirely concur in the statement of the Senator from Kentucky that the Pearl Harbor investigation was one of the most extensive and exhaustive investigations ever conducted by any committee of the Senate, and I think that as to most of its phases, particularly military and naval affairs, nothing further could have been expected or required. On the diplomatic phase, however, I was not satisfied, as the Senator from Kentucky knows, and I shall not be satisfied until more of the diplomatic history of the events preceding Pearl Harbor is known. Those facts are in the archives. I do not think the Senator from Kentucky means to intimate that papers of the President of the United States on file in our archives are private papers. They are generally recognized as public documents.

I of course do not concur in the suggestion of a "fishing expedition," which seems to me to be a provocative term. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maine earnestly desired an exploration of those affairs by responsible members of the committee, as was constantly stressed, but that was denied. It seems to the Senator from Maine that this is not the time or the place further to extend that discussion; but the record should be clear.

With respect to a quotation which was read this afternoon in the absence from the Chamber of the Senator from Maine referring to a sensation a day, according to the quotation from the newspaper, the only knowledge which the Senator from Maine possesses is the repeated statement made on the floor and elsewhere that since the recent election results were known there has been a greater tendency for some fairly well informed persons of a more responsible character than informants frequently are to supply more details concerning things which, in my judgment, require investigation. There has been a considerable accumulation of such information during the time when the committee has been in a state of suspended animation. Those things have not been substantially explored.

That was the substance of my statement on the floor and to the press. Whatever inferences or conclusions might be drawn, the same procedure would be followed by this committee in the future as in the past, with the most careful exploration of every intimation of this character before any public hearings were held.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire merely to make one observation. I associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in what he has said about Pearl Harbor and in the position he has taken. I do so because I was a member of that committee. I know what a part of the press of the country is saying. I do not know who is responsible for giving out information of one kind or another, but I know that a hostile press in certain sections of the country at least has said over and over again that there would be another investigation of Pearl Harbor; and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] said that on two different occasions, according to my memory, during the hearings on the Pearl Harbor incident. As for myself, I do not care how many investigations of Pearl Harbor may be undertaken. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that nothing in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation has anything to do with my position today in trying to sustain a congressional reform which has been needed for a period of the past 40 years.

Since the pending resolution has been submitted an effort has been made to convince the public that we on this side of the aisle are attempting to hide or conceal something under a dark, mysterious curtain which is constantly referred to. So far as I am concerned, any activities of the Democratic administration may be probed, investigated, and attacked from now until doomsday, whether relating to Pearl Harbor or otherwise, but one thing I have said consistently and constantly is that whatever the Senate of the United States does in connection with any investigation should be done through a regularly constituted committee or a subcommittee thereof, in line with the purposes and concepts of the Reorganization Act.

I want to make my position plain so far as the Pearl Harbor investigation is concerned. I do not care how much investigating is done. It can continue for another 6 months if it is so desired. If another joint committee of the House and Senate is to investigate, the chances are that the same minority of two will be crying about the Pearl Harbor situation, even when the Republican Senators get

the files which they have looked for so long, the files that have been so surreptitiously suppressed. When the words "destroyed," "suppressed," or "concealed" are used it is always possible to get a sensational headline in the daily press. It is easy to say, "Today I talked to a very important military man and he told me there was something suppressed in one of the files that the Senate ought to have." A Senator goes to the press and says, "Here is a sensational item. Someone is concealing something in one of the files."

I see that the Senator from Maine is smiling; he apparently knows what I am talking about. I repeat, any statement made that is concealed or suppressed makes copy. The Senator from Illinois wants the majority to get under the alleged great iron curtain of secrecy, provided it is done by a regular standing committee. At present an attempt is being made to confuse the American people in an effort to gain support for this special committee. Certain Senators want them to think that there has been corruption or extravagance and that the special committee is the only committee that can find out about it. I hope Senators will have a good time fishing in the private and personal files.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield so that I may ask the Senator from Maine a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have before me the amendment, which contains the following language:

Provided further, That the foregoing authority be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States prior to June 30, 1946.

Just what is meant by that? Does the Senator mean that since the 30th of June 1946 anything that has happened elsewhere in the world can be examined by the committee?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. It limits the activities of the special committee to matters which occurred prior to June 30, 1946; and it further limits the investigation to war frauds, corruption, and matters of that character related to the war effort.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that, but it says:

Limited to transactions which occurred within the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. It means such transactions which occurred prior to those dates.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about such transactions since those dates?

Mr. BREWSTER. The authority contained is limited to things which happened prior to that date, within the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I am talking about. Suppose the special committee had been extremely anxious to go to Germany to investigate the military government of Germany, and to go into all matters relating to the administration of affairs in Germany. According to this language, if a matter occurred after June 30, 1946, the committee could not investigate or study it.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator from Texas will read the language somewhat more carefully, I think it will indicate that it is entirely language of limitation, and that nothing outside the recital therein contained could thereafter be within the scope of the investigation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas has read it a number of times, and while he has great respect for New England literary traditions and ability, he still does not understand it. I wish the Senator would explain it. What about transactions which occurred since June 30, 1946? There is no limitation as to them.

The Senator from Maine could send the committee over to Germany, to find out what happened last July or what General Clay did about this or what General McNarney did about that, and to find out about displaced persons or what the military government is going to do and is doing.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it appears to me that the Senator from Texas may be overlooking the significance of the comma after the word "therein", which appears at the end of the following language:

With respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein.

What is the limitation? It is limited to "excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste," and so forth, "connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II" prior to that date. If it is limited to an investigation of those subjects prior to that date, it would seem to me to be clear that the committee could not go outside that scope. This matter has been before the Senate for 2 or 3 days. It was submitted to the Committee on Armed Services, and able Senators on the minority side have given the matter consideration, and the question has not previously been raised. All this argues that possibly the other Senators had interpreted it in the way that the Senator from Maine did. Certainly that was the intention.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Maine now give us the assurance that the special committee does not intend to go to Germany or to any other European country to investigate any transactions which have occurred since June 30, 1946?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine is fully authorized by all the surviving members of the committee, other than the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], to give that assurance; and I am sure the Senator from Texas agrees with it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with it. It should have been written into the resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the reason the Pearl Harbor matter came up was the suggestion of the Senator from Florida that the scope of this inquiry would reach to almost unlimited dimensions, and the simple basis of the newspaper reports and suggestions of one sort or another that it might even go so far as to consider certain aspects of the Pearl Harbor inquiry. I wish to make very clear that in no sense of the word was the Senator from Florida suggesting any fear of or resistance to any inquiry on that subject which any authorized agency of this body or of the sister body might care to make. I was speaking about the scope of the inquiry only, in those remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Referring to the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] regarding the scope of the inquiry and the diplomatic phases, without referring to his suggestion as to the motives in this matter, let me say it was a matter of reassurance to the Senator from Maine and to others interested when he suggested that when the Senate and the people of the country come to know the contents of these diplomatic communications, they would discover that there was nothing unfortunate or undesirable in them. That is rather reassuring as to the future control of that executive department—namely, that sometime we shall find it out. If there is nothing of a character that would be objectionable to those in authority, the more quickly this is disposed of, the more quickly it will cease agitating the public mind. If all is well, there need be no hesitation in permitting this to be known. It seems to me that is the obvious answer to the suggestions of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of the things which I wished to emphasize, which is the vice of the special committee, is the practical impossibility of confining its jurisdiction to any reasonable limitation of subjects or authority. The able Senator from Maine, for example, has given us a modified form of his resolution. If I have the proper one before me, as furnished to me by one of the clerks of the Senate, the subject of the inquiry would be limited to the following:

Provided, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures.

It would be limited to all those subjects. If I have any knowledge of grammar, all those matters relate to the subject of expenditures "connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II."

It is further provided:

Provided further, That the foregoing authority shall be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States (including Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico) prior to June 30, 1946.

That is the modification, as I understand, of the able Senator's resolution. Yet, Mr. President, one of the newspapers published this very afternoon, the Washington Evening Star, carries an article over the name of Mr. J. A. O'Leary, certainly, I think, a reporter whom all of us regard as responsible and capable. We find, first, a certain headline and then

certain material in the body of the article. I wish to quote first the headline:

BREWSTER sees new sensations if war investigators continue—Will probe special funds and secret report on Senate approval of extension.

Here are a few of the passages in the article by Mr. O'Leary in this afternoon's Evening Star:

New sensations in connection with the cost of the war were promised today by Chairman BREWSTER of the Senate War Investigating Committee if the committee is kept alive another year.

As the Senate neared a vote on the extension the Maine Republican said that if given the go sign he will call on the White House for:

Detailed information on how the late President Roosevelt and President Truman spent about $648,000,000 of special war funds that were clothed with secrecy while the fighting was going on.

A secret mobilization report, prepared before this country entered the war. Senator BREWSTER said Mr. Truman tried without success to get this report while he was chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee.

If the Senator from Maine will permit me to continue for 4 or 5 minutes, let me say that in this very article, published on this very day, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] not only is quoted by Mr. O'Leary—and I refer to an article appearing in today's Evening Star—as proposing to inquire about a secret fund handled by the present President of the United States and his predecessor in that office, both of whom were Commanders in Chief of our armed forces in the prosecution of the war, and the fund referred to was to be used in the prosecution of the war, but the article by Mr. O'Leary also quotes the Senator from Maine as proposing to inquire into a secret mobilization report. The article has a little more to say about the secret mobilization report:

Chairman BREWSTER told reporters the committee already has gathered material that would make its earlier investigations look like "small potatoes."

One member of the Cabinet, Senator BREWSTER said, has called to suggest that the committee look into renegotiation of war contracts.

"We want to look over the big fellows, the little fellows and many dummy corporations," Senator BREWSTER declared. "You can be sure that the things to come will make the Garssons and similar exposés seem unimportant."

He was referring to last year's hearings into a group of Garsson munitions companies, whose wartime activities are also being studied by a Federal grand jury.

The secret mobilization report which Senator BREWSTER would like to go into was prepared by Edward B. Stettinius, Jr., while the steel executive was a defense adviser to Mr. Roosevelt before American entrance into the war.

Mr. President, on the very day when we are discussing the limited authority which this special committee is seeking to have, a reputable newspaper and a reputable newspaper reporter quote the able Senator from Maine—I am not saying whether they correctly quote him—as saying that he proposes to inquire into the matter of a special secret fund which was used by the two Commanders in Chief in the prosecution of the recent war, and, secondly, to inquire into a war mobilization report, which to my knowledge has nothing whatever to do with what the Senator from Maine said he would limit the inquiry to, as stated in the resolution—namely, excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program.

That is what I was emphasizing. One of these special committees becomes so steamed up, it acquires so much momentum, it falls so much into the psychology of the sensational, that it is almost impossible even for members of it, even for its chairman, to limit its jurisdiction to the subjects which were contemplated when the resolution was adopted by the legislative body.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that certainly any secret mobilization report prepared by Stettinius or anyone else would have very little to do with the subject matter contained in the pending resolution; but that would not make any difference to the Senator from Maine. That would be just a very small matter once they started investigating.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will not the Senator speak so that we can hear him on this side?

Mr. LUCAS. I say that would make little or no difference to the Senator from Maine. If he thought that was a pertinent matter for inquiry, that it would be a sensation throughout the country, he would not hesitate to investigate, of course.

What I said a moment ago is applicable to the statement in the newspaper as to the secrecy of something that is somewhere in the archives, a mobilization report of some kind or character which fires the imagination of the American people. I do not know what it is. Perhaps it should come out. Neither does the Senator from Maine know what is in that secret report. But his action in giving the statement to the newspaper, so that it is headlined all over the country, I think is not quite fair; "it is not cricket."

Why did he do it? It was done merely because this debate is proceeding today. That is the reason for the sensational headlines about the statements of the Senator from Maine. He wants to make the American people believe that his committee is the only committee that can elicit information as to alleged sensational matters involving far greater inefficiency, extravagance, and waste than was disclosed in the Garsson case.

I think the Senate shculd know about some of these alleged sensational conditions. We ought to have the facts.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator will stop talking, he can find out.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield to the Senator at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Illinois does not have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Nor does the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I have yielded to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the committee headed by the Senator from Maine were the only committee in the United States Senate that could bring out all these things, it seems to me they should set forth an agenda of some kind to inform the Senate and the country what they have in mind, instead of proceeding through insinuation and innuendo to fire the imagination of the American people

I know what the then Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, said last year when he asked the Senate for $85,000. Senators who were then members of the Audit and Control Committee know that Senator Mead had a most difficult time laying down an agenda and establishing a budget for $85,000. The committee did not know how or where they were going to spend that money. Senator Mead said definitely that "When the $85,000 is spent and when January 1st comes along, the special committee headed by myself will be a thing of the past." That is what the former chairman of the committee said, and now, overnight, since the Senator from Maine got hold of this committee, colossal sensations are coming along day after day!

Mr. PEPPER. I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not wonder there should be some misunderstanding about the mobilization report, for the language of the newspapers might well mislead Senators on the other side. The report referred to an industrial mobilization, and so far as I know that has been made clear in every discussion of the matter, and most of the reporters clearly understood it.

This is not a novel matter, as it has been discussed from time to time here and elsewhere, and the statement of the Senator from Maine has always been that it was an industrial mobilization report, and the final paragraph of the article which the Senator has just read would apparently make this rather clear. This is the statement in that paragraph. I quote:

The secret mobilization report which Senator BREWSTER would like to go into was prepared by Edward B. Stettinius, Jr., while the steel executive was a defense adviser to Mr. Roosevelt before American entrance into the war.

This supplemented the report of Louis Johnson as Acting Secretary of War on industrial organization, and constituted a restudy of that question on the request of the President, and it took on more significance in connection with the study.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Maine will allow me to interrupt at that point, I respectfully submit that, while it might be interesting and pertinent for someone to go into it, I do not consider that if it is an industrial mobilization which the Senator has in mind it would be embraced within the definition of his own resolution "to excessive profits,

fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II."

Mr. BREWSTER. It is necessary for the Senator from Maine to suggest that the Senator from Florida has put a construction on the matter which apparently did not appeal to the distinguished former chairman of the committee, Mr. Truman, now the President, as I read from a report made under his jurisdiction on March 3, 1944, on page 4 of the report which I hold in my hand.

Mr. PEPPER. That was the old resolution, which was almost unlimited in the authority it granted, and that resolution has been expressly limited by the amended resolution the Senator from Maine has now proposed. In other words, he has never asked his colleagues to give him the jurisdiction the Truman committee had. He asked only for a limited jurisdiction. So I say that what Senator Truman did under his original broad resolution would not have any pertinence to the limited resolution now before the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the turbulence of the Senator will permit me to complete my statement——

Mr. PEPPER. I am sorry.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is apparent that under the limited resolution, inefficiency is still within the scope of the committee's function. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That would include the inefficiency of a general.

Mr. BREWSTER. In procurement.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is not going to limit himself to finding fraud, then? He is going to set up his committee as an appeals committee, to scrutinize and to review the conduct of every man, not whether his conduct was fraudulent or corrupt, but whether he acted in accordance with some standard of efficiency which some efficiency expert might promulgate or lay down.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The question of what comes within the scope of inefficiency and war expenditures may be a matter of argument, but the language which I quote is from Senator Harry S. Truman, as chairman of the special committee, on March 3, 1944, and seems to me to have a distinct relevance. I quote from page 4:

> From its inception, this committee has insisted repeatedly on the need for clear-cut authority centered in single executives rather than multiheaded agencies to administer the war program.

Mark these words:

> The delay of 18 months in establishing such an administrative set-up was responsible for many weaknesses and failures criticized by the committee in the early months of the war effort.

That seems to be an expression of opinion by one whose opinion will not be challenged, that the failure to have a competent administrative set-up was responsible for many weaknesses and failures. Whether or not that is inefficiency may be for any Member of this body to determine, but the securing of the so-called Stettinius report or the earlier report of Louis Johnson, as Acting Secretary of War, regarding industrial mobilization has always been considered a matter of great concern. It was that report which we asked of Mr. Roosevelt as President, during the war, and which he declined to give.

It is that report, which has not been made available to the committee, which has a very decided bearing upon the appraisal of the efficiency of the war procurement program.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me suggest that the failure of this country to have a long-range defense program beginning 20 years ago embarrassed us very much at the beginning of the war, but that would not be within the jurisdiction of this special committee.

Furthermore, the failure of the Congress to provide selective service at an earlier date injured and impaired our ability to defend ourselves when we were attacked, but because that had something to do with our weakness at the time of the Pearl Harbor incident I should not suppose it would be within the jurisdiction of the Senator's committee.

Anything that had to do with our State Department, our foreign policy—all those things might have had a relevancy to the strength of America when war came, but I am talking about what committee now has jurisdiction to investigate.

Mr. BREWSTER. "The inefficiency of war expenditure" is the phrase.

Mr. PEPPER. In order to prove the point I was trying to make, let me say that even under the modified but specific limitation of jurisdiction the Senator from Maine has submitted to his colleagues—and undoubtedly he tried to draft the provision with care—we are debating, I am sure with equal sincerity and honesty on both sides, whether or not the whole industrial mobilization program would be within the proper jurisdiction of this committee. Yet the fact, as the Senator said a moment ago, that the reach of the special committee is so broad, its scope so unlimited, and it may see such pertinency and proximity in such remote causes, makes it almost impossible to limit the jurisdiction of the committee in actual practice.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the senior Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I desired to inquire of the Senator from Florida whether he would prefer to terminate his speech this evening, or would it be appropriate to recess at this time or to discuss possibly the question of an agreement as to a time for voting on the pending resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Maine would allow the Senator from Florida about 5 minutes more, he would like to conclude his remarks for this afternoon and resume at the next meeting following this.

Mr. WHITE. I shall yield to the Senator's suggestion of taking 5 minutes more.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what I have stated is also borne out by the past conduct of the committee. I have referred to the headlines appearing this afternoon in the Evening Star. I have in my hand a copy of Liberty magazine for November 9, 1946, and the headline over an article in a red banner, reads, "Is scandal brewing in Germany?" as any observer can see, in a streamer across the page, "By Senator OWEN BREWSTER."

Here is an excerpt from the article:

> Grave conditions exist in the American occupied zone in Germany, according to the information received by the Senate War Investigating Committee. An intelligence officer of responsible rank and experience gave as his considered judgment that German troops occupying France had made a better record in their personal contacts with the population than have the American troops occupying Germany.

Is it within the scope of a Senate special investigating committee to pass judgment on the American Army as compared with the German Army which had its heel upon the occupied country of France?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know, and I am sure the Senator from Maine can tell me, where he got the information for that article, whether or not it was taken from the secret report that was brought back by the counsel for the committee, which was supposed to be completely secret so far as the committee was concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The statement of the Senator from Illinois is as inaccurate as most of the statements he has made this afternoon. The contents of the article were based entirely upon the testimony of an intelligence officer, who, outraged by the things he had observed, came back and asked permission to appear before our committee, in August.

Senator Mead, as chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the other Senators present had his testimony taken in detail. It was understood at that time that the investigation would proceed. One month later no steps had been taken.

The Senator from Maine urged and demanded that the matter should receive attention, and it was then agreed by all the members of the committee that the counsel should proceed to Germany to conduct the investigation, but the article contained no reference to and was based upon no knowledge secured by the counsel for the committee in his expedition to Germany. It was written long before the counsel had returned.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to violate my agreement and take a moment more. The article continues:

> The reported conditions are so bad as to threaten defeat of the purpose of our occupation—the establishment of a peaceful self-government in Germany after the complete

disarmament and denazification of that country. Our shoddy conduct is in sharp contrast to our lofty stated aims.

The officer's testimony was given to the committee in executive session on August 14. It was my understanding that a subcommittee would be sent to Germany without delay to make an investigation on the spot. That has been the uniform practice in such cases. But when I inquired about the progress of the case a month after the officer's testimony, I was surprised to learn from the committee's counsel that nothing would be done until after election.

It appeared that the Democratic majority on the committee, whose chairman at the time was Senator James M. Mead, of New York, had suppressed the information, whether for political or other reasons I do not know. In any event, it was not until Senator Mead resigned as chairman on September 26 that the committee began its investigation. Significantly, it is unlikely time will permit any results to be announced before election day.

I am speaking out now through Liberty magazine—

Which is not exactly an official publication of the Senate—

only because the American people are entitled to know the available facts at once. If only part of what the intelligence charges is true, our scandalous occupation of Germany reflects seriously upon the Truman administration.

I want to suggest that the old jewel of consistency, while it subjects one to certain criticisms on occasions, is certainly a precious inheritance, and I wish some of our friends and colleagues who are so apt to refer to our distinguished Chief Executive with such approval when they want his testimony, would always use him as their witness to corroborate good causes.

The truth when ascertained cannot but have serious repercussions on our foreign policy.

Furthermore, Mr. President, to show how far afield these investigators go, the article on page 68 states:

Part of the picture that is little known in this country concerns the conduct of Negro troops, who are reported to be more undisciplined and uncontrolled than the whites. A German bishop addressed a scathing letter to the American military government beseeching it to do something about its Negro soldiers.

What is the limit of an investigating committee, when it goes into everything including a comparison of our army with the Nazi army, the conduct of the Negro soldier of our service, and the foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the publicity which the Senator from Florida is giving to an article which I wrote and sponsored. It was interesting to note the question as to the official character of the publication. It would appear to me that a publication of that character, reaching the American people and giving them the information expressed under oath by a colonel in the military intelligence, was fully as appropriate a forum as when the Senator from Florida, during one of the most critical stages of our negotiations with the Russians, appeared in Madison Square Garden and with his denunciations of the policies of the Truman administration invited the hisses of 20,000 so-called Americans in Madison Square Garden because of his characterization of the President of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has now, and unmistakably, shown further how far afield he can readily and easily go when he desires to make a comparison between the Senator from Florida, who said what he did in his own right and upon his own individual and single responsibility in a public meeting purporting to represent nobody but himself, on a subject related to the peace or the war of this country, and the Senator from Maine, who reveals to the American people, through a magazine article, information which he has himself admitted he got in executive session of the War Investigating Committee, without ever disclosing the name of the author from whom he got the information, upon subjects with respect to which he purported to speak factually, whereas the Senator from Florida at Madison Square Garden spoke his opinion on a matter of public interest. I shall be glad to have a comparison made by the Senate or by the country or by history.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine assumed full responsibility for whatever was said in that article, designating very clearly the sources from which it was secured.

Mr. PEPPER. Anonymous.

Mr. BREWSTER. Wait a minute.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator give the name of the officer?

Mr. BREWSTER. I gave the name of the source of the information.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, the Senator quoted an author whose name he has never disclosed to the public, to my knowledge.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is now a name which is fully available to anyone who is interested; a responsible officer.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator did not tell the public that at the time he wrote the article.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me finish. The information, as was stated clearly in the article, had been in the hands of the committee from August 15. It had been announced that the subject would be pursued, and it was not pursued, and finally, as the article stated, it became evident that it was determined that that information which was in the possession of the majority then in control, should not be permitted to be divulged to the American people until after they had made the solemn decision in the election as to whether or not the majority then in control of the Congress should be continued. The Senator from Maine is entirely willing to accept personal responsibility for that disclosure at that time, and under the circumstances, as he has stated, and believes that it was a public service of the first order to let the American people understand something of what were the methods being pursued by the majority of that committee in refusing to permit an investigation of that kind to go on.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but the Senator from Maine did not tell the American people in the Liberty magazine article that he was quoting, without any authority from his committee, information which he obtained as a committee member, and that he was purporting to disclose, without authority of the committee, facts that they had from what, so far as the public knew, was an anonymous source. Mr. President, that is not the only time that something comparable to that has occurred.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I remind him that the 5 minutes have passed?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I desire to refer to one more article, and then I assure the Senator that I shall not yield to any one else, and I shall have concluded.

I have here what purports to be a release from the New York Times of October 28, 1946, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, October 27.—Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, made public tonight what he said was his copy of a long-suppressed report by the Senate War Investigating Committee asserting that the administration's war-housing operations failed miserably.

The copy released through the Republican National Committee was dated April 6, 1945.

Mr. President, it was a timely discovery that the committee had been dilatory in the publication of this report.

Mr. BREWSTER is a member of the investigating committee. Drafted by the committee's staff of experts, the report had this to say, among other things, about the housing program and how it was handled.

Mr. President, I shall not take the Senate's time now to discuss this phase of the matter, but I shall do so when we convene again.

I have a memorandum signed by Mr. Hugh Fulton, previously the counsel for the War Investigating Committee, telling about this report, by whom it was prepared, the circumstances of its preparation, and so forth, and then I also have a signed statement by Mr. Rudolph Halley, who at another time was the general counsel of the War Investigating Committee.

Yet, without knowledge, so far as this newspaper report discloses, of his colleagues on that committee, without any finding by a majority vote that anyone had suppressed a pertinent report, the Senator from Maine takes a staff report, his copy made available to him as a member of the committee, on the eve of the election—and all of us recall the big headlines that it got—and disclosed it to the American people. So, Mr. President, the inference is almost irrefutable that in the past there has been the widest latitude for these special investigating committees, and, in the second place, that there is evidence that they have also been used for political purposes and to achieve political objectives.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I told the majority leader that I would decline to yield to any Senator, but I will let the Senator from New Mexico proceed.

Mr. HATCH. There is just one question on the point the Senator was discussing. He said the report was released by the Senator from Maine. I got the impression from the article the Senator read that the report of this committee, or the supposed report, was released by the Republican National Committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Well, ex officio. It was by a member of the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida, I understand, has yielded the floor for today. This discussion has now continued for three full legislative days, and I hope the time is coming, and that it is almost at hand, when we shall be ready to proceed to a disposition of the resolution. I am wondering, and I address my inquiry to the minority leader of the Senate, whether it is possible at this time to reach a unanimous-consent agreement as to a definite time for voting on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have consulted with the Senator from Maine, or he has consulted with me, about this matter, and I am agreeable to the suggestion of a suitable hour on Monday for a vote. As we have all seen, the discussion has gone along rather freely, and I am sure each Senator who has occupied the floor has probably occupied it longer than he intended, the result being that there are still three or four or perhaps five Senators within my knowledge who desire to make remarks, including the Senator from Kentucky, who will be brief, I assure the Senator from Maine. All of which leads me to the conclusion that we may not be able to agree on quite as early an hour as we discussed earlier in the day. I am prepared to suggest to the Senator from Maine that we agree to vote not later than 4 o'clock p. m. Monday on the pending resolution and also that on Monday, assuming that we recess until Monday, the time be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the proposition.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Kentucky has said, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the Senator makes the request, I will allow the request to be made, and then, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an observation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Monday, January 20, 1947, at not later than the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to Senate Resolution 46, continuing the authority for the investigation of the national-defense program, and upon the question of agreeing to the resolution itself.

I ask further, Mr. President, that the time between the convening of the Senate on Monday and the said hour of 4 o'clock fixed for voting, be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the resolution, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and by the Senator from Kentucky——

Mr. BARKLEY. By the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. WHITE. And by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in the first place I would be agreeable if the Senator from Maine were to include in the request that the Senator from Florida may conclude his remarks. I should be willing to limit the time, but I should like to conclude my remarks when the Senate next assembles.

In the second place, I certainly think that 5 o'clock would be the earliest practicable time. I submit that thought to our able leader on this side of the aisle. He can use his own discretion about the other aspects, but I know that there are other Senators who contemplate speaking, and I wish to address myself to the subject a little further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assure the Senator from Maine that there is no disposition on the part of any Senator on this side of the aisle unduly to delay the vote. The request is for a vote at 4 o'clock It is obvious that after the vote is taken on the pending resolution we shall not be able to transact much other business during the day. Personally, I would be agreeable to any reasonable hour, but I suggested 4 o'clock. The first suggestion was 3 o'clock, but I could not agree to 3 o'clock under the circumstances I think 4 o'clock is a reasonable hour. I do not know how long the Senator from Florida desires to speak, but I think all Senators will recognize the fact that if we vote at 4 o'clock, that will leave less than 2 hours on either side. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] desire to speak. I wish to make a brief statement. So we shall be crowded for time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to make an observation, which appears to me to relate to a matter of great importance. The discussion which arose a while ago about the meaning of the limitations in the present resolution was not satisfactory at all to me. I think there is quite a difference of opinion as to what the limitation proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] actually means. I think that question should be thoroughly debated, and we ought to know exactly what the limitations are to be on the new committee, if it is to be authorized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico. In the 2 days that will elapse between now and the next session of the Senate, if better phraseology can be found to express what is clearly in the minds of Senators on both sides of the aisle, I am sure that it will be considered. The question had never been raised until the Senator from Texas raised it. The question was taken up with distinguished parliamentarians and litterateurs on this side of the aisle, and there seemed to be a consensus of opinion that the language meant exactly what it said, and was clear. But if the Senator from New Mexico can better phrase it, his suggestions will be welcome.

Mr. HATCH. There is not only that particular point; but there was the discussion between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Florida as to expenditures, and qualifying words—whether they meant everything that was included. I recall that the Senator from Maine stated that that was a matter for each Senator to determine for himself. That could not possibly be. We must have a definite understanding and know what we are doing, because I am certain Senators are influenced by this limitation. We ought to know what it means. The debate may require some time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest, if possible, that the minority leader and the majority leader agree on the hour of 4 o'clock, not because there is any desire to shut off debate, but 1 hour will not make a great deal of difference in the debate on this issue. I am satisfied that ff the hour can be fixed at 4 o'clock it will be satisfactory to Senators with whom I have talked. I hope an agreement can be made on that basis. There is no inclination to shut off debate, but 1 hour will not make a great deal of difference in the debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I have indicated, I am perfectly willing to agree to the hour of 4 o'clock, although I think that will cramp some of us who wish to discuss this subject, and who have not yet had an opportunity to do so. This is one of the most important problems that will confront this session of the Senate, because what we may do in this regard may set a precedent for what we may do in the future. There is no urgent business awaiting attention. That does not mean that we wish to delay the vote, but it is an argument in favor of giving Senators who wish to speak a reasonable time in which to express their views. I myself do not see much difference between 4 and 5 o'clock Monday, inasmuch as we shall probably not transact any other business on that day. I am still willing to agree to the hour of 4 o'clock if some other Senator does not object, even though I may be crowded out altogether.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make my position clear for the RECORD.

The change in the alinement of the Senate from a Democratic to a Republican majority has in no way changed my view as to the soundness of the general policy of objecting to such unanimous-consent agreements as are requested this afternoon. However, I believe that each request should be considered on the basis of its individual merits, as I did in the closing months of the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

I believe that this particular request is reasonable, because I think we have debated the pros and cons pretty well, provided that the majority leader can accept the suggestion that the hour be 5 o'clock. I believe that when one Member of the Senate asks that such an agreement be extended for only an hour, that is a perfectly reasonable request.

Let me say further, Mr. President, that I particularly do not like, as a matter of policy, unanimous-consent requests which propose that the time for debate on the floor of the United States Senate shall be placed at the disposal of particular leaders, or be made subject to parceling by any group of Senators or any two Senators. As a matter of general policy I shall object to any such infringement upon the rights of individual Senators, because I am well satisfied, on the basis of what has already happened in the Eightieth Congress, that those of us on this side of the aisle who represent certain minority points of view must at all times exercise the utmost caution in protecting ourselves from action which would make it impossible for us to enjoy our full rights on the floor of the Senate.

As a general policy I shall object to any unanimous-consent agreement which proposes to give to any leadership in the Senate the right to parcel out time unless we can have an agreement behind that agreement, that Senators representing minority points of view shall have a certain portion of the time satisfactory to the minority group.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oregon that it is my understanding that he desires to speak on this measure. In the event that I have anything to do with the time, so far as I can control it he will not be slighted in the control of that time if he is unable to obtain from the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object to any unanimous-consent agreement tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, to the extent that I may be included in any unanimous-consent agreement, and to give my assurance to the Senator from Oregon that he will not be slighted in the division of time. I hope that nothing that he said was intended in any way to indicate any doubt as to the fairness of the Senator from Maine, because our relationships have always been most cordial.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we are transacting most important business in the Senate, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum and also ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the roll call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to make another effort to reach an agreement as to the time for voting on the resolution and amendments. My suggestion of 4 o'clock on Monday does not seem to have met with general favor. I ask, therefore, that from 2 o'clock on Wednesday the limitation suggested be enforced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that contemplate that all day Monday the debate will be free from restrictions?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator that he include in his request that after the convening of the Senate on Wednesday until the vote at 2 o'clock, the time be divided equally among those opposed to and those favoring the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I am very happy to include that as a part of my unanimous consent request.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, am I to understand that we are to vote promptly at 2 o'clock?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Let us make it a definite hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that under the unanimous consent request all debate would stop at 2 o'clock, and then the Senate would proceed to vote upon the pending amendments without further debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that the time on Wednesday be divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From the time the Senate meets on Wednesday until 2 o'clock, the time is to be equally divided.

Mr. WHITE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MARCUS GEORGE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report from the Finance Committee Senate bill 86, a bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans' Memorial Hospital, and to submit a report (No. 6) thereon. I also request immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Marcus George Veterans' Memorial Hospital.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Finance be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 6) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 86) to provide for designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans' Memorial Hospital, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

The official record of service of the late Lt. Joseph Marcus George, United States Naval Reserve, Active, is as follows:

1911, November 16: Born in Vienna, Ga.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

1935, January 21: Enlisted in Company L, One Hundred and Twenty-first Infantry, Georgia National Guard. February 2: Promoted to rank of sergeant.

1936, June 15: Discharged.

ENLISTED UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE SERVICE

1938, July 13: Enlisted in United States Naval Reserve. October 10: Enlistment terminated.

OFFICER, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE SERVICE

1938, October 11: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as aviation cadet, United States Naval Reserve, to rank from October 3, 1938. October 30: Reported to United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for active duty undergoing training.

1939, September 18: Designated naval aviator (heavier-than-air). October 20: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as ensign, A–V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to rank from October 15, 1939. October 20: Detached United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., and transferred to Patrol Squadron 53 for active duty involving flying. Reported November 9, 1939. Further transferred to Patrol Squadron 83 for duty involving flying.

1942, January 23: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as lieutenant (junior grade) A–V (N), United States Naval Reserve, for temporary service. June 27: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as lieutenant, A–V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to rank from June 15, 1942, for temporary service.

1943, February 7: Detached Patrol Squadron 83 and transferred to a bombing squadron for duty involving flying. Reported February 18, 1943.

Education: University of Georgia.

Medals: American Defense Service Medal—Fleet Clasp—Purple Heart.

Died: Presumptive August 8, 1944. Officially reported to be missing in action as of August 7, 1943, when the plane which he was aboard was lost in the Atlantic area. In compliance with section 5 of Public Law 490, as amended, death is presumed to have occurred on the 8th day of August 1944.

Place: Atlantic area.

Cause: Plane lost (enemy action).

According to the records on file Lieutenant George was listed on the records of the Navy Department in the status of miss-

ing in action as of August 7, 1943. He was on board a plane which took off from the Naval Air Station, New York, on an anti-submarine patrol flight. Several minutes after the plane took off, it was instructed by its base to proceed to position 37°35' North latitude and 71°20' West longitude, in order to investigate that area and to stand by a plane which had landed to pick up survivors of another plane which had been shot down by an enemy submarine. The last message received was an acknowledgement of the receipt of the above message. Weather conditions in the area at the time included excellent visibility and a calm sea with light swells. Extensive but unsuccessful search operations were conducted. Reports received state that the reason for the failure of the plane to return is unknown but its loss is believed to have been the result of enemy submarine gunfire.

The committee is in full accord with the purposes of the bill and recommends its enactment.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to submit a resolution, and I wish to make a brief statement in explanation of it. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be received at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 61) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That a duly appointed subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed to—

(a) Make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to existing and proposed Federal grants to State and local governments for welfare, education, and health programs, and for other programs within the jurisdiction of such committee, the volume, types, purposes, and administration of such grants, and the standards and conditions applicable to such grants, with special emphasis upon the need for such improved legislative and administrative policies as will more effectively meet the needs for which such grants have been or may be authorized, eliminate duplication and inconsistencies, promote economy and efficiency, clarify the relationship between the Federal Government and States and local governments, help solve the problem of the development of underdeveloped regions, and contribute to the development and maintenance of sound fiscal policy;

(b) Consult, in the course of such study and investigation, with State and local governments, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are directly concerned with Federal grants to State and local governments, with the Federal agencies administering such grants, and with such other agencies or persons as the committee or subcommittee may see fit to consult;

(c) Report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such proposed legislation and other recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the resolution which I have submitted provides that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be duly appointed to investigate Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments. In my opinion the present situation in regard to Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments is extremely chaotic. Over a period of years the Federal-aid-to-local-government program has been developed without any attempt to formulate a sound, coordinated program and policy. Some Federal grants merely substitute Federal funds for local funds, with a resulting apathy on the part of our State and local governments. Some programs provide the most money for the States which are less in need of the money. In general, the Federal-aid situation is a wild morass of red tape and administrative confusion.

Inasmuch as more than a billion dollars, which is a great deal of money, is involved in Federal grants to State and local governments, it is imperative that the Eightieth Congress make a careful review of this entire subject, particularly with respect to grants for heath, education, and public welfare. The chaotic situation in this field was recognized by the President of the United States in what I consider to be the very able Economic Report which he made to the Congress on January 8, 1947. In that report the President indicated that the Council of Economic Advisers would undertake a broad study of this question. On page 27 of the report we find the President using the following language:

> I have asked the Council of Economic Advisers to cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies concerned, and with State and local advisory committees, to undertake a study of Federal grants to State and local governments to determine to what extent revised standards for the distribution of these grants may take into account more fully the needs for support that exists in various parts of the country.

Mr. President, I think that is an excellent recommendation, and I believe that the resolution which I am submitting at this time seeks to implement and carry out that recommendation of the President. I think the issue is so clearly a nonpartisan one that by all means the recommendation should be implemented.

In fact, I think that as we face the fiscal problems of the Federal Government, the time has come when we need to find out, first, what amounts of money we are spending in the various agencies of Government, and, second, for what purpose we are spending it. I think that is a much sounder way to effectuate economy in government and to promote an efficient fiscal policy than it is to announce to the American people an across-the-board 20-percent reduction in income taxes, when we do not yet know, I submit, either within the Republican Party or within the party represented by the Senators across the aisle, exactly what all our money is being spent for or what economies can be brought about by such an investigation as the one I propose in the resolution I have submitted. I think this type of investigation should be conducted in a great many other segments of the executive branch of our Government.

I think it should be decided to what extent we wish to spend money and on what we wish to spend money, before we can determine where we can save money and how much money we can save in the executive departments. I think it is necessary to do that before we can determine what services we can dispense with. I think it is a form of deception to lead the American people to believe that we can have an across-the-board percentage tax cut without first telling them specifically the effect of that tax cut upon the services now being rendered. We wish to find out first what the American people need, insofar as Government service is concerned, before we follow that type of policy.

So, Mr. President, I say that it seems to me this is a matter of such great importance that we should not leave it to the executive branch of the Government. Congress has the prime responsibility of appropriating funds. Therefore, it must be the responsibility of Congress, as well as of the Council of Economic Advisers, to undertake this type of study.

The resolution is thoroughly consistent with the principles of the Reorganization Act. Instead of proposing the appointment of a special committee to study the question, it delegates the problem to a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the standing legislative committee which has legislative interest in the majority of Federal-aid programs.

Incidentally, Mr. President, let me say that in the Seventy-ninth Congress I submitted a similar resolution. I succeeded in having it reported by the Committee on Education and Labor by the unanimous vote of that committee. Unfortunately, I was unable to convince the Republican members of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate that they should support the resolution. The Democratic chairman of that committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], had notified me that if the Republican members of the committee would approve the resolution the Democrats on the committee, who at that time were in the majority, would not object to its adoption.

In view of the failure of the Republican members of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to cooperate in this matter at the last session of Congress, I think that now that we on the Republican side of the aisle are in the majority we should go forward with the resolution and should proceed to carry it to adoption. Unfortunately, for reasons of their own, it was the Republicans who prevented the adoption of that resolution in the Seventy-ninth Congress, at a time when the Democrats were in the majority in this body.

So, Mr. President, if what we really wish to do is to inform the American people and ourselves what are the facts in regard to an expenditure of more than a billion dollars in Federal grants-in-aid, I think this resolution should be adopted at a very early date, so that we can proceed with the investigation before we reach final decisions as to what should be our fiscal policy in the Eightieth Congress.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to move an executive session.

Mr. PEPPER. If I may have unanimous consent to resume my remarks at the beginning of the next session, I shall take my seat at this time.

Mr. WHITE. I understood that that was the condition upon which the Senator yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Ellis Mundy, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia; and

George Morris Fay, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

John Nicholas Brown, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably the nomination of Archibald L. M. Wiggins, of South Carolina, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of O. Max Gardner; and I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I am indeed happy that a real American banker, who has been president of the American Bankers Association, and who knows a great deal about business and industry, is to be elevated to this position, and I thank my dear friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for reporting the nomination.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it has been suggested that the more orderly procedure would be to have the nomination go over, and I am perfectly agreeable to the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I also report the nomination of William A. Rowan, of Illinois, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be received and placed on the calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations already on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MEMBERS OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Isador Lubin, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Economic and Employment Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be a member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be a member of the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip M. Hauser, of Illinois, to be a member of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be a member of the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Miss Dorothy Kenyon, of New York, to be a member of the Commission on Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmations which have been made down to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William C. Trimble, of Maryland, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Willard Carrigan, of California, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John D. Goodloe, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1946, to be effective January 17, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond Michael Foley, of Michigan, to be National Housing Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Creedon, of Massachusetts, to be Housing Expediter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are all routine appointments reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Unless there is further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Joseph M. Bobbitt to be scientist (major), effective date of oath of office.

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER

Franz J. Maier

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICER TO BE TEMPORARY NURSE OFFICER

Louise O. Waagen

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Dal M. Lemmon, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Hon. Martin I. Welsh, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Saxton Daniel, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia. (Mr. Daniel is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires February 18, 1947.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(* Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Fluegel, Fred C.
Higgins, Ronald D.
Mills, Ralph E.
Munroe, Frank A., Jr.
Perdue, Charles H.
*Shipman, John B.
Esling, Thomas A., Jr.
Randolph, Ralph B.

LIEUTENANTS

*Cross, Harold E.
Day, Walter D.
Harris, Morgan H.
*Mott, William C.
*Reynolds, Robert M.
*Torian, Melvin C.
Vischio, Attilio A.
*Chambliss, William C.
*Molesworth, George W.
*Richardson, Norval R.
Toner, Raymond J.
Arntz, George D.
*Callahan, Edward C.
*Conlin, Elmer H.
*Countryman, Gilbert L.
Dodson, Bennett M.
Fligg, Claude M.
*Fowler, Oliver N.
*Leigh, Philip P.
*Lechtenwalner, Jay Y.
Long, Harry A.
Murphy, Owen B.
Petersen, Adolph J.
Premo, Walter E., Jr.
*Shepherd, George C.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bright, Cooper B.
Brown, Carl W.
Centner, Richard L.
Cockey, Richard K.
Fahnestock, Robert E.
Hackett, Donald J.
Hart, Joseph E.
Hirschy, Harold H.
Hitchins, William S.
*Holt, Pliny G.
*Kotrla, Raymond A.
*Levick, John H. K.
*Lohmann, Eric A.
Magan, John W. Jr.
McMahan, William A.
*Morrin, Thomas H.
*Munster, Joe H., Jr.
O'Connor, Desmond K.
Paterson, John A.
*Patroni, Salvatore J.
Petty, Robert M.
Robinson, Alvin
Russell, Erickson W.
Staggs, William R.
Standish, Edwin O.
White, Frederic H.
Whittier, Mark T.
*Wicks, Delbert S.
Wing, Robert C.
Winslow, Walter G.
*Fischer, Charles F.
Hoffman, Thomas H.
*Humphreys, George C.
Such, Bennie F.
Whitby, Frank R., Jr.
Wood, Philo
Angel, Craig C.
*Atwood, Newell A.
*Blackmore, Frank E.
*Boone, Gilbert E.
Bretland, Robert B.
Brooks, William K.
Buckley, Walter J.
Carroll, Charles B.
*Chace, Alden B.
*Chisolm, Harold V.
Christiansen, Frank M.
Cooper, Henry G.
*Cote, Oliver H., Jr.
Cottingham, Claybrook B.
*Dyke, Herbert G.
*Escobar, Frank A.
Feddern, Robert
Ford, Lewis, M. D.
*Gaboury, Warren D.
Hopkins, Robert H.
Huddleston, James C.
Jadrnicek, James R.
Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Whitson M.
Keighley, William H.
*Knepper, Edward W.
Lair, Harold P.
Leon, Strauss S.
*Libby, Rawdon
McAuliffe, John B.
Meiere, Joseph W.
Morse, Walter H.
Pond, Robert W., Jr.
Reuland, Walter P.
Rhodemyre, John L.
Rush, Samuel O., Jr.
*Russell, Joseph H.
Schwartz, John R.
*Sullivan, George D.
*Swiderski, Francis E.
Waliszewski, Henry L.
White, Theodore G., Jr.
Madden, Walter F.

ENSIGNS

*Albrecht, Edward M.
Allison, Cecil G.
Allmon, William C.
*Alm, Carlton F.
*Amen, Richard A.
Andersen, Wayne G.
Anderson, Emil
Andrew, Norman W.
Antink, Joseph R.
Arneson, John R.
Ashby, William T.
Atkinson, Aubrey E.
Ayers, Frank W.
Baker, Harrison H.
Baker, Quentin "F"
*Balsley, Frank H.
Barbor, Robert T.
Baribault, Arthur B.
Barkley, Paul H.
Barrett, Henry T.
Barron, Willard D.
Baumann, Edward W.
Baumeister, Charles, Jr.
Baumgart, William F.
Beaudoin, Jerome W.
Beilock, Philip
Bell, William R.
Bennett, Richard
Benson, LaRoyd E.
Berg, Richard T.
Berrey, David L.
Beyer, Fred W.
Bienia, John P.
Bisek, Walter G.
Blades, Jehu L.
Blanchard, Frank M.
Bolton, Horace Q.
Bonnett, Ira W.
Booth, Buford A.
Bouldin, James M.
Boutte, Lester H.
Boyles, Eual F.
Brady, Norman K.
Brady, Wade J., Jr.
Brchan, Edwin D.
Breen, John M.
Brex, John W.
Bridwell, Samuel L.
Brocato, Samuel J.
Brothers, Jack W.
Brown, Robert W.
Brown, William P.
Buckowski, George A.
Buell, Harold L.
Burch, Jack H.
Burg, Donald J.
Burgesser, Charles B.
Burgo, Daniel F.
Burns, Warren "H"
Byrd, Ramond D.
Callahan, Maurice D.
Carey, Neil G.
Carlson, Richard R.
Carper, John E.
Carr, Loran H.
Casey, John W., Jr.
Cash, George O., Jr.
Cevoli, Richard L.
*Chapman, Donald "D"
Cheal, Wayne R.
Chrisler, Robert P.
Christofferson, Donald L.
Clapp, Atlee F.
Clapp, Walter C.
Cochran, Robert C.
Collins, John D.
Cooper, Parker C.
Conant, Eugene L.
Cook, Harry W.
Cook, William C.
Corboy, Edward D.
*Cormack, John G.
Cox, James L.
Cox, Joseph B.
Crawford, Robert D.
Cronemiller, Carl F., Jr.
Cure, Harold R.
Curley, George
Curtright, Jess L.
Cutet, Armory
Daley, Richard B.
Dalzell, Samuel, Jr.
Danner, Harry T., Jr.
*Dannevik, Hubert W.
Davis, Harry O.
Davis, William R.
Deily, Francis W.
Demmler, Charles F.
De Paul, Raymond
Diana, Daniel J.
Dibble, Edgar J.
Dickinson, John W.
Dillard, Chester L.
Dillon, John M.
Doherty, John P.
Donnally, Edward W.
Downes, Melvin R.
Drace, Thomas N.
Duacsek, Anthony W.
Dubois, Robert E.
Duvall, Richard A.
Eakin, Edward M.
Eash, John W.
Eckert, Virgil H.
Eddins, William R.
Edwards, Frederick L., Jr.
Elicker, Clare H.
Emomns, Roderic C.
Emslie, William F.
Engstrom, Joseph P. D., Jr.
Ennis, Bruce S.
Epley, Robert H.
*Erickson, Whitney A.
Essary, Melvin S.
Etcheson, Kenneth C.
Evans, Simpson, Jr.
Fader, Kenneth B.
Farley, Paul G.
Farmer, Lewis T.
Farrell, Ferris L.
Fetter, Joseph E.
Ficek, Walter
Fischer, Elmer M.
Fisher, Robert A.
Fitzpatrick, William K., Jr.
Fleeger, Eugene G.
Flowers, Alonzo M.
Flynn, Arthur C.
*Focht, James L., Jr.
Foote, Ovid C., Jr.
Ford, Jones H.
Forward, Richard B.
Foushee, Clarence L.
Fretwell, Uncas L.
Frink, Clifford L.
Gage, Rex A.
Gallagher, Theodore J.
Garodz, Leo J.
Gaskill, George R.
Gehringer, Edmund W., Jr.
Germo, Mark L.
Gillette, Robert W.
Glenzer, Hubert, Jr.
Godding, Talmai, F., Jr.
Goetz, Raymond
*Goldbeck, Page
Good, Dale S.
*Grady, Daniel B.
Graessle, Howard D., 2d
Graham, Woodrow W.
Green, James O.
*Greene, Walter E.
Greeson, Richard O.
Grieb, George E.
Grimm, Oscar R.
Groover, Gordon L., Jr.
*Gurry, Edward A.
Hagan, Joseph F.
Halstrom, Paul R.
Halterman, Robert "J"
Hansen, Ivol E.
Hansen, Theodore W.
Hanson, Harold G.
Harben, Luther A.
Harman, John A.
Harper, George, Jr.
Harris, Jack
Harrison, Leo W.
Harvey, Clinton "D"
*Haskell, Russell A.
Hauser, William F.
Hazen, Alan M.
Heid, Robert S.
Heine, Heinrich, Jr.
Herman, Richard D.
Hermann, Edward P.
*Hickey, Dermott V.
Hickman, Howard H., Jr.
Hodge, Ervin "F"
Hodges, Ashley "R"
Holcombe, Wallace P.
Hoop, Louie B., Jr.
*Hoover, George "W"
*Hopkins, William A.
Horn, Francis R.
Horne, Philip A.
Horner, Clyde S.
Horty, Thomas J.
Hoskins, Floyd E.
Houston, Joseph A.
Howland, Frank S.
*Hughes, James L., Jr.
Houghes, John E., Jr.
Hummel, Durwood C.
Hunt, Thomas W.
Hutcheson, Edward L.
Ifft, James D.
Irgens, Donald L.
Irwin, Edward F.
Jackson, Harry E.
Jackson, William J.
Jardine, Carlton T.
Jensen, Robert W.
*Jeremiah, William E.
Johnson, Allen R.
Johnson, Francis F.
Johnson, Howard R. H.
Johnson, Melvin O.
Jones, Enoch D.
Junkin, John L.
Kasberg, Richard J.
Kaufman, Jack E.
Keim, Joseph J.
Kelly, William W.
Kelsey, Philip C.
Kendrick, Harold E.
Kenniff, James A.
Kibler, Robert L.
King, Fred
King, Milton H., Jr.
King, William C., Jr.
Kipe, Richard E.
Kishler, Claude L., Jr.
Knell, Floyd M.
Knight, Charles A.
*Koch, Robert A.
Koelsch, John K.
Kohl, Jaroslav
Koskan, James L.
Krattli, James A.
Krause, William B.
Kroger, Bruce G.
Krolczyk, Stanley P.
Kronemyer, Robert E.
Kurtak, Charles R.
Labyak, Robert W.
Laird, Ian M.
LaMarre, Allen W.
Larkin, Daniel F., Jr.
Lauff, Bernard J.
Laughlin, Leonard R.
*Lawrence, Clayton G.
Laws, Walter T.
Leary, Walter J. J.
Lee, Ellis E.
Leland, Harley G.
Leonard, Charles R.
Lernihan, John J.
Lewis, Thomas G.
Lichnerowicz, Emeryk
*Line, Bryant W.
Little, Charles E.
Livingston, William H.
Long, John B.
Macgovern, Robert N.
Mann, William G., Jr.
Marocchi, John L.
Massey, Robert J.
Mattson, Alfred W.
Mayencourt, Herman
McClintock, Ernest L., Jr.
McLure, Huston B.
McCollum, Alvin A.
McCormick, James B.
McCuskey, Elbert S.
McDaniel, Hector S.
McDonnel, James L.
McFall, Hoyt H., Jr.
McGrath, Herman G., Jr.
McIlwaine, James S., Jr.
McKee, Clarence W.
McKee, John R.
McKenzie, Frank E.
McLeskey, John F.

McManus, John P.
McMullen, Cornelius E.
McNeill, Howard G.
McPherson, Clyde C.
Merchant, Robert E.
Mikulich, John L.
Miller, Clarence K.
Miller, Gordon A.
Miller, Leigh G.
Mohle, Robert L.
Moloney, Robert J.
*Montgomery, John A., Jr.
Moore, Bobbie P.
Moore, Franklin B.
Moore, Harold P.
Moore, James H., Jr.
Moorhouse, Dean O.
*Moran, George R.
*Morris, Robert C.
Morrison, John E., Jr.
Morton, Henry S., Jr.
Mueller, Robert H.
Mullins, Thomas P., Jr.
Murphy, Francis J.
Murphy, John H., Jr.
Murphy, Thomas J., Jr.
Myles, Harley D.
Napolitano, Ciro J. F.
Neighbours, James W.
Nelson, Arthur E.
Nelson, Loren E.
Newcomb, John H.
Nicholas, Charles
Nicholas, Lester J.
Nichols, Robert G.
Nightingale, William R.
Nilson, Clifford E.
Noga, Edward L. S.
Obert, Orlon J.
O'Brian, William H.
O'Connor, Joseph P.
Odom, James R.
O'Hagan, Martin J.
Oliveri, Vincent A.
Olson, Erling G.
Osterholm, Robert E.
Otterlei, William K.
Pabarcus, John P.
Padbury, Harry R.
Pennoyer, Frederick W., 3d
Perry, Walter I.
Peters, Ralph L.
Pierre, Emile E., Jr.
Pittman, Robert T.
Podhradsky, Henry B.
Pommer, Donald
Post, Edward E., Jr.
Poulsen, Harold N.
Powell, Raymond H. J.
Prada, Gerald W.
Pressler, Louis P.
*Price, Edgar E.
Prindle, Dayo D.
Purcell, Jones W.
Pyne, George C.
Quast, Robert J.
Rambur, William M.
Randolph, Karl W.
Ransom, Nealand L.
Rapelyea, Oscar F.
Rawn, John R.
Redding, Lester A.
Reid, Robert C.
Ress, Joseph
Reynolds, Allan J.
Rhodes, Thomas L., Jr.
Rhymes, William S.
Richmond, Charles D.
Riddell, Theroll A.
Ries, Robert E., Jr.
Rifenburgh, Edward G.
Riordan, John B.
Rishovd, Sigurd A.
*Rivers, William J.
Roberts, Gerald M.
Robinson, Earl N.
*Robinson, John O.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Rogers, Ormand P.
Romano, Joseph L.
Roohan, James F., Jr.
*Ross, John W., Jr.
Ross, Robert M.
Roth, Walter J.
*Rowett, Ernest J.
Roy, Paul T.
Ruefle, William J.
Ryan, Thomas J.
*Sack, Edward E.
Sahaj, Joseph
Sampson, Russell
Scarborough, Charles N.
Schetky, Malcolm O.
Schmidt, Henry W.
Schroeder, Leonard H.
Scruggs, George C., Jr.
Seeman, Clifford E.
Seeschaf, Howard W.
Seith, William
Sellers, Harry S.
Sepper, Frank
*Sharp, Sidney A.
Shipan, James V.
Shoemaker, James M.
Sifford, Andrew J.
Sipes, Lester H.
Skinner, Walter E.
Slattery, Thomas G.
Smith, Bruce K., Jr.
Smith, Delbert M.
Smith, George H.
Smith, Lowell H.
Smith, Myrtis B.
*Smith, Walter D.
Smith, Warren F.
Snell, Roy G.
Sokol, Louis J.
Sowar, Joseph F.
Spiess, Morris K.
Sprague, James B.
Stauffer, Howard C.
Steele, Allen L.
Stendahl, Stanley J.
Stephens, William E., Jr.
Stephenson, Walter A.
Stevenson, Robert F.
Stewart, Ernest L.
St. Marie, John W.
Stoinoff, Robert R.
Stoops, William A., Jr.
Streff, Robert J.
Stroud, Heber L.
*Stuart, John M.
*Studebaker, Marvin F.
Stull, John O.
Sullivan, John
Sullivan, John P.
Sutton, Sheldon L.
Swan, Alfred W.
Sweatt, Robert A.
Sword, James D.
Symons, Floyd M.
Taylor, Edward A.
Taylor, John C., Jr.
Taylor, Ray A., Jr.
Taylor, Waymon
Terry, Bernard E., Jr.
Thede, William L.
Thienes, Robert L.
Thompson, Christopher S.
Thompson, Robert F.
*Thorp, Charles S.
*Timblin, Charles
Todd, Lewis G.
Tompkins, John D.
Treadwell, Archie B.
Treece, George H., Jr.
Turkot, Andrew
*Turner, Burr V.
Twedell, Jack L.
Tyson, Warren A.
Ura, Hendrick M.
Vales, Robert F.
Vaught, Dan H.
Vessell, Frank G.
Viall, Kenneth T.
*Vicars, Earl C.
*Vincent, Manuel daC.
Wade, Felix W.
Wadleigh, George C.
Wagner, Robert P.
Warren, James A.
Weiler, John S.
Weir, Thomas E.
Welch, Leonard D.
Westervelt, John D.
White, James T.
*Whiteman, Armand D.
Wiesendanger, Carl F.
Williamson, Cecil O.
Wilson, Francis R.
Wolfram, Rodger B.
Wondergem, John M.
Wooster, Franklyn S.
Wright, Albert G., 3d
Youman, Harold R., Jr.
Young, James T.
Young, Thomas C.
Yount, Robert R.
Zentz, Bernard L.
Zimmerman, George G.
Zylla, Daniel P.
*Alders, William H.
Andreason, Raymond R.
Bagby, Lee A.
*Barr, Leon V.
Bell, Samuel V., Jr.
Bibb, Thomas Z.
Bonner, Kermit H.
*Brannan, Leonard L.
Brock, John R.
Burbach, Charles R.
Cantwell, Richard A., Jr.
Cassidy, Melvin W.
Clayton, Raymond I.
Conger, Stephen B.
Cramer, Donald S.
Curry, Raymond F.
*Davis, Ernest R.
Dickson, Herbert E.
Drummond, Charles R., Jr.
Economou, Constantine J.
English, Elbert H., Jr.
Evans, Jack R.
*Ferguson, Emmet M.
Fluitt, William S.
Foutch, John W., Jr.
Gates, Jack C.
Goeppinger, James P.
Graham, Howard E.
Groesbeck, James D.
Hanna, Peter
Harrell, Robert B.
*Hatch, William N.
Hewett, Benjamin M., Jr.
Horn, Marcus P.
House, James O., Jr.
Jensen, Duane L.
Johnston, Richard G.
Kemp, Robert M.
Kingston, George W.
Kodis, Anthony "J"
Krebs, Paul E.
Kaird, William M.
Leahy, Denis G.
Leslie, Jene L.
Lippincott, Lincoln H., Jr.
Mankin, Lee P., Jr.
McAdams, Anson M.
McDermott, Frederick P.
McLaughlin, Lachlan D.
Mallek, Robert A.
Michel, Eldon L.
Moreland, Milton B.
Munroe, William R., Jr.
Niemann, William E.
O'Connell, Daniel J.
Olson, Hilding G.
Pendergraft, Vernon L.
Phipps, Harry W.
Pounds, John R.
Quanstrom, Carl R., Jr.
Rawls, Hollis C., Jr.
Reeves, Columbus D.
Risley, Clayton E., Jr.
Rodimel, John L.
Rothermel, James L.
Salop, John
Schreiber, Robert S.
Schweer, William W.
Seaman, James T.
Sherriff, William J.
*Simmers, Richard
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Willis "A", Jr.
Spinella, Glenn P.
Stevenson, Frank B., Jr.
Streig, Frederick J.
Tache, Joseph A.
Taylor, Oliver E.
Thatcher, Roland C., Jr.
Thornton, Samuel T.
Toline, Francis R.
*Turner, Humphrey L.
Vierregger, William T.
Wagner, Arnold A.
Weart, Bruce F.
Wickersham, Charles A.
Wilson, Philip A.
Young, Miles M.
Zelibor, Joseph L.
*Zschoche, William H.
Abbott, Cecil C., Jr.
Adams, John C.
Aikins, Bruce M.
Alexander, John S.
Alexander, Samuel H.
Allred, Jimmie "B", Jr.
Alotis, John
Ancenny, Charles L.
Anderson, Bernon G., Jr.
Anderson, Jack D.
Anderson, Joseph F., Jr.
Andrews, Robert
*Archbold, Fred G.
Asmundson, Franklin J.
Atkins, John R.
Averrett, Rufus M.
Bachert, John O.
*Bailey, Bernard J.
*Bailey, Henry C.
Ball, Mottrom J.
Banks, Stanley C.
Barco, Leslie T., Jr.
Baskin, Donald
Bauersfeld, Max P., Jr.
Beardsley, James H.
Beeland, Cecil H.
*Bell, Charles R.
Bender, William C.
Bennett, Walter F. V.
*Berg, Frank M.
*Bergman, Howard J.
Berns, Elbert O.
Berree, Norman R.
*Besancon, Moody
Best, Isaac S.
*Bishop, John L.
*Black, Norris E.
*Blade, Thomas E.
Blaylock, Mabry, Jr.
Bloomfield, Carolus M., Jr.
*Boland, George T.
Boney, Bobbie E.
Born, Robert J.
Bott, Alan R.
Boulding, Austin L.
Bowden, Daniel T.
Bower, Arthur E., Jr.
Bower, Eric B.
Bradbury, Albert W.
Brazil, Rudolph E.
Brender, Bernard W.
Briggs, Chester E., Jr.
Briggs, Donald L.
Brigham, Stanley F.
Bright, Willam E.
*Brill, Arthur T.
*Bristol, William I.
Brown, Edward A.
Brown, Fleming L.
Brown, John W.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Robert M.
Brumwell, Arthur
Buchal, Robert J.
Buchanan, Charles S.
Burger, Glenn W.
Burke, William E.
Burkhart, Calvin G.
Burnham, Russell O.
Burns, Michael J.
Burns, Robert J.
Burton, James K.
Burton, Roy E., Jr.
Butcher, Harold K.
Buxton, Richard W.
Calhoun, John E.
Callahan, Edward J.
Campbell, Donald L.
Carlson, Nils A. A.
Carnahan, William R.
Carpenter, Clayton E.
*Carr, Earle A.
Carrell, Sam L.
Carroum, Jefferson H.
Casey, "J" "T"
Cash, John J., Jr.
Chamberlain, Donald A.
Chapman, James F.
Chapman, Ralph D.
*Chartraw, Raymond R.
*Chastain, John A.
Cheney, Harlan L.
*Chewning, Walter L. Jr.
Church, John W.
Clapp, Clarence M.
Clause, Harold
Cleland, William H.
Coker, John H.
Coleman, Joseph W. H.
Collins, Robert E.
Connellee, William L.
Connelly, John J., Jr
*Connolly, Robert J.
Conrad, Arthur A., Jr
Corbell, Billy J.
Cote, Joseph J.
*Coullard, John B.
Cousins, John E.
Cox, Harry W.
Crance, Elmer L.
Craw, Stanley R., Jr
Crittenden, Muir C.
Cullen, Harold M., Jr.
Cwirko, Walter A.
Czerwenka, Adolph P.
Damon, Stewart W.
Daniel, Frank C.
Darter, Eslie "L"
Davenport, John A.
*Davies, Herbert E.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Milton W., Jr.
*Decker, Stiles M., Jr.
Dederick, Theodore E.
De Fries, Hugh O.
Deiner, Frederick G.
Delaney, David P.
*Derlin, Howard W. A
Dersam, Harold G.
*DeVico, Anthony J.
*Dick, Raymond H.
Dicks, Carl C.
Di Cori, Ralph
*Dipirro, Charles
Dixon, Earl L.
Dorich, Alberth
*Dormer, Robert L.
*Dougherty, Joseph J., Jr.
Dowlen, Wayne L.
*Downs, Benjamin H.
Downs, Malcolm C., Jr.
*Doyle, William T.
Drew, Brand W.
Dukin, William
Duncan, Donald N.
Durkee, David M.
D'Urso, Daniel L.
Dussel, Alexander N.
Earl, Billy O.
Ecker, William B.
Eden, James D.
Eden, James E.
Eidson, Lee M.
Edmonston, Lilburn A.
Edwards, Harry W., Jr.
Edwards, Robert E.
Ellis, Howard F.
Ellis, William H.
Ennis, Wilbur J.
Eppler, Harold J. W.
Estler, David S.
*Etter, William H.
Fain, Edgar M.
Ferguson, "S" "N"
Ferrante, John M.
Ferree, Richard J.
Fetherolf, William P., Jr.
*Fey, Norman J.
Fiore, Alfred E.
Fitzgerald, Walter T.
Fitzhugh, William B.
Fleming, George L.
Folop, Albert A.
Folsom, Oscar, Jr.
Foltz, Ralph E.
Foote, Harlan W.
Foster, Forrest W.
Frasch, Elmer T., Jr.
Freeborn, John W.
*Fuller, Max E.
Fulton, Robert D.
Funston, Harry C., Jr.
Furney, Maynard M.
Gais, Frederick S.
Gardner, Clyde G., Jr.
Garrett, Robert R., Jr.
Garrison, Robert G.
Gawthrop, Wilson R.
Gearhart, Ralph W., Jr.
Getchell, Douglass D., Jr.
Gilchrist, Darrell P.
Gillespie, Nivin J.
Ginn, Benjamin F.
*Gisvold, Paul A., Jr.
Gleason, Wesley A.
Glomb, Francis V.
Godman, Robert J.
Goetter, Ralph F.
Golson, Norman R.
Goodwin, Thomas P.
Gordinier, Harold R.
Gorman, John P.
Gossage, Howard L.
Graham, Frank W.
Grant, Walter H.
Graw, James C.
Gray, Charles B.
Gray, Hugh M.
Greenan, Arthur F.
Grentzer, John
Griffin, Edwin C.
Griffin, Phil H., 3d
Grime, Frank Jr.
Groves, Samuel N., Jr.
Grubbs, Harmon C.
Hacker, Arthur E.
Hall, Ray E.
Hancock, Stoddard P.
Haney, William E.
Hanley, Walter A.
Hansen, Henry J.
Hanson, Donald J.

Hardy, Lawrence S.
Hare, Roland W.
Harper, Walter E., Jr.
*Harrison, Cecil
*Harrison, Edward W.
Harrison, Gordon A.
Harrison, Howard H.
Harrison, Julius C.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Hartman, William F.
Harty, Kevin D.
Hastings, John E., Jr.
Havu, Arne W.
Hawkins, John F.
Haynes, William M.
Heady, Richard S.
Hedrick, George H.
Heffernan, James M.
Helm, Donald F.
Henney, Ludver K.
*Henning, Richard E.
Henriques, David N.
Heule, Franklin I.
*Hlywa, Harry.
Hoar, Charles H., Jr.
Hobbs, Brack W.
Hoey, Richard
Holcomb, John K.
Hollingsworth, Henry E.
Hollinshead, Charles W., Jr.
Holmes, Francis M.
Holmes, Wilbur T.
Hooper, Charles A., Jr.
Hooper, James A., Jr.
Hopfinger, Richard M.
Horrall, Eugene F.
Houck, Richard
Howard, William L.
Howson, William B., Jr.
Hoyt, Raymond E., Jr.
Hughes, Richard Z.
Hugus, John A.
Humphries, George E.
*Hunsaker, Owen O., Jr.
Hunt, Edward R.
*Hunt, Richard C.
Hunting, Martin S.
*Hurd, Charles W.
Hurley, William G.
*Hussong, William J.
Ikenberry, Henry C., Jr.
*Irish, Jermain S.
Jackson, Richard J.
Jackson, Robert W.
Jacobs, Charles S., Jr.
Jahn, Waldemar P.
James, Daniel V.
Jenkins, Henry C.
Jenrette, Homer W.
Johns, Walter W.
Johnsen, Clarence S.
Johnson, David A.
Johnson, Derald W.
Johnson, Franklin D.
Jones, James A.
Jones, William M.
Jordan, James, Jr.
Jorgensen, George D.
Joslyn, Harry L., Jr.
Juve, Bernard R. C.
*Kane, Saul A.
Karge, Orville, B.
Karr, Walter G., Jr.
Kartman, Arthur R.
*Keenan, Francis J.
Keeney, Carl R.
*Keicher, Joseph P., Jr.
Kelley, Arthur R.
Kelly, Thomas V.
Kemper, George E.
Kenefick, James P.
Kennedy, John P.
Kenyon, Jack S.
Kerfoot, Dale L.
Keys, James E.
Kiernan, William A.
King, John E.
King, Joseph L.
Kinnebrew, Robert E.
Kinney, Grayson C.
Kirstein, Irving
Kissling, Paul T.
Klain, David P.
Klaus, Edward L.
Kneule, Stanley K.
Kopko, Paul
Kramer, Joseph "D"
Krapf, Harry J., Jr.
Kron, John A.
*Kushman, Howard B.
*Kwasinski, Eugene A.
Ladley, Herbert V.
Languedoc, Arthur J.
Larkins, Bowen S.
Lassiter, "A" "C", Jr.
Laurie, Robert G.
Ledridge, Robert B.
Lee, Marvin C.
LeFevre, Adolphe C.
Legare, Rupert W., Jr.
Lenson, Robert H., Jr.
Levy, Jerome E.
Lewis, George H.
Lillich, George T.
Lindenmuth, Harlan W.
*Little, Robert C.
Lockee, Garette E.
Lockett, William
Lomas, Charles W.
*Long, John G.
Long, Melvin E.
Lorenz, Samuel, Jr.
Lovett, John F.
Lucas, Burke D.
Lundy, Robert T.
Lyon, Gaylord B.
Maier, Robert L.
Malone, Joseph W.
Marquart, Phillip G.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
Martin, Merrill K.
Matthews, Joseph A.
Matthews, Walter L., 3d
McAllister, Jean E., Jr.
McCafferty, Donald N.
McCann, William E.
McClintock, William W., Jr.
McCloskey, Roy P.
McClung, Donald H.
McCormack, Virgil L.
McDonald, Edwin A.
McDonald, James R.
McFadden, Frank H.
McGaha, Curtis "D"
McGahuey, Dwayne L.
McGlothing, Charles V.
McHugh, Lee T.
McKeever, Elmer V.
McKellip, John W.
McKinley, Donald E.
McMahon, James T.
*McNally, Irvin L.
Mead, Albert E.
Meadows, Thomas N.
Meahl, Melvin E.
Meiners, Frank J.
Melick, Roger E.
Mellott, Forrest L.
Metze, George M.
Meyer, John M.
Meyers, Francis W.
Michel, Glenn C.
*Miller, Edgar S.
Miller, Frank E.
Miller, James E.
Miller, Lawrence L.
Miller, Patrick G.
*Miller, Richards T.
Miller, Robert W.
Miller, Samuel J.
Mitchener, Gerald C.
Moore, Harry R.
*Moore, Larry D.
Moore, Marion E.
Moore, Ralph L., Jr.
Moore, Raymond A.
Morey, William R.
Morgan, Bobby G.
Morgan, Joseph L., Jr.
Moro, Albert J.
Morris, John
Morrison, Joseph B.
*Morton, Marvin P., Jr.
Mulligan, Charles E.
Mulligan, Hampton E.
Mumford, Richard J.
*Munson, John R.
Murchison, John D., Jr.
Murphy, George R.
Myers, Ora E.
*Myers, Frederick R.
Myers, Robert E.
Neeb, Lewis H.
Neiman, Jack, Jr.
Nelson, Charlie S.
Newbill, Henry L., 3d
Newell, William M.
Nichol, Philip W., Jr.
Nixon, John H.
Norris, Crockett J.
Nott, Dwight D.
Nugent, Frederick C.
Odegaard, Alf T.
*Odiorne, Robert G.
Odom, Frank A.
O'Hopp, Michael
O'Neil, Walter B.
O'Rourke, Vincent P.
Osterhous, Louis J.
Overman, Dana C., Jr.
Owens, Walter R., Jr.
*Page, Horace C.
Park, David E., Jr.
Parker, Edwin J.
Parks, William L., Jr.
Pauls, Robert H.
Payne, Robert C.
Pearl, Samuel
*Pendergrass, James T.
Perez, Raul B.
Peron, Hugo D.
*Perry, Thomas M., Jr.
Pilkington, Samuel S.
Pilmer, Edwin H., Jr.
Piotrowski, Alexander W.
Pitts, Raymond L.
Pond, Robert B.
Pope, Albert J.
Porto, Jose F.
Poteat, Jack L.
Potter, Ralph K.
Prater, Charles L.
Preston, Clare A.
Price, Arthur L.
Pringle, Robert C.
Pruitt, William R.
*Ragsdale, Milton M.
Raposa, William C.
Rawlings, Grover L.
Raymond, Robert H.
Reavis, Philip A.
Reed, James W.
Reeves, Charles E.
Reigher, Joseph M.
Reinhardt, William C.
*Rex, Daniel F.
Reynolds, Thomas E.
Rhodes, Raleigh E.
Rian, Gerald R.
Richards, Harold O.
Richardson, Guy D.
*Richter, Ralph G.
Ricketts, Max V.
Rickman, James M.
Reike, Norbert A.
Riley, Jack
Riley, Raymond R.
Ring, Eli D.
Rishel, Maurice O.
Robb, Roger W.
Roberts, Edward R.
Robertson, Clayton L., Jr.
Robertson, Gordon H.
Robertson, Horace L.
Robinson, David F.
Robinson, Jack W.
Robinson, Wallace C.
*Rohland, Curt J., Jr.
Ronan, Walter B.
Ross, Otto O.
Rostan, David A.
Rudnicki, Thaddeus F., Jr.
Rueger, Robert B.
Runion, Dallas E.
Rusk, Stephen L.
*Rusteberg, Carl W.
Ruzicka, Lumir, Jr.
Ryles, John W., Jr.
*Sage, Robert L.
Sanderson, Veriel E.
Satterthwaite, Fred C.
Scambos, Thomas T.
Schildmacher, William F.
*Schlegel, Rowland F.
Schlembach, John E.
Schmidt, Henry E.
Scholl, Ray E.
*Schrader, Edward D.
*Schroder, Henry M.
Schroeder, William A., Jr.
Schuld, Emil P.
Scott, Benjamin F., Jr.
Scott, Sampson, Jr.
Scurria, Norman V.
Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Segal, Stanley L.
Selvidge, James C.
Selway, John G.
Semanski, Stanley A.
Sette, Lyle H.
*Shallenberg, Lowell W.
Sharpe, Winton C.
Shead, Theodore M.
Shearer, Albert T.
Sherwood, Gordon A.
Shively, Howard B.
*Short, Donald H.
Shouldice, D'Arcy V.
*Showers, Donald M.
*Shumaker, Clifton
Simons, Harold D.
Sirginson, Arthur W.
Skipper, James C., Jr.
Smith, George S.
Smith, George T.
Smith, Henry L.
Smith, Herbert J.
Smith, Mahlon D.
Smith, Michael P.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Wayne R.
Smyth, Terence J.
Soper, Robert T.
Southall, Donald L.
Southworth, Robert E.
Speer, Austin N.
*Stanziano, Arthur J.
Stark, Norman P., Jr.
Staub, Frederick A.
Staveley, Ernest
Stephens, Franklin T.
Stephens, Russel T.
Stevens, Wynne A., Jr.
Stewart, Doyle
Stimac, Nadan F. J.
Stockert, Howard J.
Stokes, Robert E. L., Jr.
*Stone, Joseph
Strayer, Louis M.
Stuart, Willard T.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Suker, Waldo A.
Sullivan, Thomas J.
Sumrall, Elton L.
Swegle, Bruce B.
Swope, John R.
Talley, "R" "B", Jr.
Tanner, Henry J.
Taylor, Ralph S.
Telfair, Peter
Thomas, Arthur R. W.
*Thomas, Willis L.
Thompson, Jerrold W.
*Thornton, Joseph H., Jr.
Tierney, Glenn A.
Tierney, John F., Jr.
Tracy, Vern W.
Traxler, Donald K.
Tremayne, Frederick F.
*Trettin, Harold D.
Tucker, Thomas W.
Tull, John "L" D.
Turner, John W.
Turner, Joseph E.
*Underwood, Maurice J.
Untiedt, Hugh D., Jr.
*Vanderburg, Elden R.
Vegelahn, Norbert P.
Vislocky, John
Waldron, Harvey M., Jr.
Wallenstien, Robert J.
Wanee, Donald V.
Ward, Leslie J.
Warfield, John B.
Watts, Dell "R"
Webb, Jack L.
Weidlein, John L.
*Weidner, Ralph B.
*Weisert, William E.
Weiss, Haskell
Weldon, Harry V.
Welles, William T.
White, John N.
Wiese, Charles W.
Wilde, Norman W. W.
Williams, John G.
Williams, Reginald M., Jr.
Williams, William G.
Willyard, Harold A.
Wilson, Embree D., Jr.
*Woodford, Robert L.
Wohlers, Robert J.
Woodburn, Fred K.
Woosley, David G.
*Worley, Arthur R.
Worthing, Lewis K.
Wyatt, James R.
Yelavich, Paul
York, Arthur A.
Young, Carl A.
Zenner, Harold J.
Zerendow, Paul
Zimmerman, Ernest L.
Zoske, Frank H., Jr.
Andrews, Carroll A.
Ball, Robert
Bell, Samuel M.
Blount, Robert H.
*Brown, Charles B.
Cole, "R" "K" Stewart
Connel, Lee J.
Crouch, Verron N.
Deckwa, Ralph E.
Elmore, Fletcher L.
Farley, Russell J.
Files, Harry W., Jr.
Fourt, Maynard H.
Gee, Robert D.
Gilmer, James R.
Givens, Robert W.
Granberry, William A.
Hague, Henry W.
*Hamilton, John A.
Hand, Marshall H.
Hannah, Clyde B.
Hanson, Robert L.
Harrison, William R.
Heimbach, Hilton R., Jr.
Heimer, "O" "F", Jr.
Heising, John C.
Henson, Robert F.
Hopkins, Barry P.
Hoselton, Gerald J.
Houck, John F., Jr.
Howard, Walter F.
Hulihan, John W.
Hunt, Joseph F.
Iselin, Earl C., Jr.
Jackson, Bryon M.
Johnston, James E.
Johnstone, James W., Jr.
Joy, Bernard F., Jr.
Justice, James O., Jr.
Kallen, Robert G.
Kotsch, William J.
Kushner, William F.
Kyle, Richard A.
Lanning, Donald T.
Lemmon, Donal D.
Lewis, John B.
Lyall, Peter W.
Lyons, Thomas J.
Mason, George E.
Matherson, George P.
McMahan, Charles B.
Metzger, Daniel T.
Miller, John "X", Jr.
Mitchell, John E.
Morris, Roland L.
Murray, Arthur H., Jr.
Shields, John W.
Smith, Ernest E.
Stone, Christopher H.
Van Osdol, George W.
Waldo, George A.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Bowen, Harold J.
Brown, Byron F.
Carmody, Robert F.
Denton, Charles L.
Eberhart, John J.
Heintzelman, John H. L.
Hoxie, Derrick A.
Kirk, William W.
Potter, Leo E.
Rickard, Harold J.
Winter, Sherl J.
Sanders, Russel F.
Thomas, George C.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Amberson, Julius M.
Bennett, Darwin E.
Britten, Sidney A.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Beckman, Edward L.
Cone, Thomas E., Jr.
Conner, James F.
Flom, Reynold P.
Hedgecock, Lewis E.
Hershenhouse, Samuel B.
Hunter, Thomas R., Jr.
Johnson, Howard A.
Knud-Hansen, John I. F.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Reilly, Eugene V.
Sevensma, Eugene S.
Stoecklein, Herbert G.
Wagner, Vincent E.
Feinman, Samuel E.
Heffernan, Edward V.

Lowry, Elmer F., Jr.
Pizzo, Anthony
Snell, William E.
Walker, Robert K.
Rock, Robert E.
Farrington, Robert F.
McCorkle, James K.
Robbins, Howard M.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Smith, Bertran D.

PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Brewton, Glen F.
Love, Robert H.
Bacon, Walter G.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Abbott, William G.
Embree, Donnelley S.
Johnson, Raymond E.
Kelley, George A., Jr.
McCune, Stanley B.
Owens, Bruce
Roszel, Joseph R.
Adcook, Kenneth L.
Lynch, Robert F.
Barta, Louis J.
Brandow, Henry W.
Cherry, Jerome
Greenhalgh, William T.
Guthrie, Alfred R.
Jones, Allen L.
Ray, Charles F.
Twitchell, William A.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Adair, Winston L.
Bain, Louis E.
Barnhill, William J.
Bayer, John F.
Boaz, Bascom B.
Bowles, Fred B.
Breault, Roland W.
Briggs, Arthur A.
Butschek, Edgar J.
Campbell, Emmett M.
Chapman, Walter C.
Clemons, Peter "J"
Corbett, William H.
Davis, Lynn M.
Errett, Robert B.
Fogle, Grover D.
Fontaine, Leo A.
Good, John W.
Greenough, Thomas L., Jr.
Hennings, Roy
Higgins, Vincent H.
Hobgood, William W.
Inglesby, Robert H.
Jones, Everett H.
Jones, Raymond P.
Keever, Karl N.
Killion, Clyde D.
Kost, George J.
Leish, Calvin R.
Lenox, Wilbert W.
Link, Milton A.
Marlett, Orville L.
Marsland, Lloyd C.
Maugans, Frank O.
McClain, Leo M.
McDermott, Thomas J.
McDugald, Jesse
McNutt, Richard L.
Middleton, Clyde L.
Mills, Hubert P.
Minor, George E., Jr.
Moseley, Francis W.
Neely, Joe B.
Parry, Walter
Riceman, Ernst A.
Rigg, Donald C.
Robinson, William J.
Swain, Garwood R.
Vaughn, Roger C.
Voegeli, George L.
West, John E.
West, William B.
Wexler, Howard D.
Whitver, John A.
Balon, Joseph M.
Bishoff, Jack T.
Bradley, William J.
Burke, Thomas R.
Carroll, Arthur H.
Effner, James E.
Essig, John S.
Geer, Richard W.
Hansell, John C.
Heuser, Gustave F., Jr.
Hoobler, George L.
Jones, Raymond A.
Kelleher, John C.
Kubacki, Edward L.
Lindsay, Reisner C.
Martling, William K.
McDaniel, John M.
McKenzie, Harry F., Jr.
Miller, John C.
Mogle, Howard N.
Newton, Ernest C.
Peterson, Clarence P.
Robinson, Thomas E., Jr.
Rossell, William T., Jr.
Szyperski, John P.
Warner, John B., Jr.
Westfall, Daniel L.
Williams, Richard A.
Aitken, Douglas G.
Allen, John P.
Armstrong, Earl F.
Baker, Emile W., Jr.
Bennett, Keith
Berning, John R.
Bickart, Richard W.
Biggins, Arthur L.
Bofenkamp, James E.
Brooks, Carol H.
Bulfer, Joseph E.
Burns, Robert S.
Carr, James E.
Chappell, Charles W.
Clonan, Merritt P.
Coombs, Robert H.
Cooper, Wilfred A.
Corbett, Fenner S.
Cornell, Felix C.
Cox, Alfred D., Jr.
Crowley, William V.
D'Antoni, Lawrence F.
Dean, William B.
Dorfmeier, Glenn W.
Elam, Paul
Eppler, John V.
Evory, Donald H.
Fairchild, Benn A.
Farr, Samuel W.
Findlay, George J.
Gould, Gene F.
Gregg, William B.
Grisell, Elbert L., Jr.
Groby, Nathaniel C.
Hall, James M.
Harper, George W., Jr.
Hayden, Ralph H., Jr.
Hendrix, Tommy
Hoft, John W.
Holladay, Clifton "M"
Hopwood, Alonzo L.
Hubert, Ross P.
Jones, Joseph C.
Kingman, Edward R.
Lally, Leonard J.
Lightermann, Richard T.
Littleton, Terrell W.
London, Harry S.
Magill, Paul L.
Matson, Kenneth R.
McDonough, Edward M.
McKnight, Maurice P.
McLaughlin, Joseph D.
McManus, Hugh A.
Moore, Wyly A.
Morey, George M.
Mosolf, Lewis E.
Mulholland, Donald E.
Neilsson, Birger N.
O'Brien, Michael J. J.
O'Leary, John P.
Ott, John E. C.
Owen, Charles S.
Rampey, Alvin H.
ReDavid, Louis F.
Rinehart, Harry E.
Roe, William M. D.
Roesch, Robert D.
Rogers, Robert C.
Ross, Clayton G.
Schanze, Fred, Jr.
Schmitt, Earl J.
Sherrieb, Melvin K.
Shorb, Norman W.
Simpson, Robert W., Jr.
Smith, Lewis R.
Sorensen, Karl A. N.
Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
Sullivan, Frank A., Jr.
Surran, Charles R.
Washburn, Dale W.
Wick, Milton H.
Wiedman, Charles, Jr.
Williams, Earl O.
Wilson, Edward C., Jr.
Windham, Albert C.
Woodworth, Philip L.
Woolard, Kenneth A.
Zenk, Lawrence P.
Zivnuska, Robert W.
Boylan, Walter J.
Caldwell, William F.
Clift, John W.
Conry, William H.
Creed, Henry P.
Gallagher, Granville W., Jr.
Hanten, Kenneth S.
Hastings, Stephen J.
Haun, Robert C.
Joslyn, William C.
Kennell, James E.
Korman, Paul M.
Kuehm, Frederick L. G
Little, Henry E.
McMillan, Samuel E.
Polk, William E., Jr.
Rice, Robert A.
Starr, Donald A.
Van Teslaar, Everett A.
Walton, Clarence H.
Watts, Ralph C.
West, Walter A., Jr.
Williams, Edward P.
Wright, James M.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

McDonald, David H.
Davis, Lewis K.

ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Anderson, Seth E.
Andresen, Soren H. F.
Bonner, Roy L.
Brewster, Earl R.
Cassaday, Kermit R.
Curry, Matthew A.
Davis, Walter J.
Dierks, William T.
Fix, William T.
Gendron, Anthony L.
Hughes, Benjamin F.
Insko, Myron C.
Kapalczynski, Eugene J.
Lewis, James W.
Lonergan, Vincent J.
Marks, James R.
Maxwell, Henry F.
Milne, William P., Jr.
Nodel, Julius J.
Oglesby, Glynn A.
Ruleman, Robert N.
Sobel, Samuel.
Sodt, William G., Jr.
Watts, John E., Jr.
Bennett, Fred D.
Burk, Lawrence W.
Jordan, Daniel M.
Lipscomb, James W.
Martin, George L.
Michaels, Emmelt T.
Northrup, Clarence V.
Sharp, David A., Jr.
Stretch, Robert N.
Meehan, Daniel F.
Shilling, John H.
Wells, Henry H., Jr.
Whitman, James A.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Carlson, Oscar L.
Zola, Stanley P.
Saunders, Edward E.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Bagley, Harry H.
Emery, George C.
Johnson, William S.
McHenry, Joseph A.
Nichols, Madison
Shaid, Henry C.
Tate, Jule C.
Rehler, Joseph E.
Schepers, Robert W.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Avera, Ewing L.
Barnes, George W., Jr.
Buller, Rudolf G.
Clampet, William T.
Davis, Charles F.
Irvine, John W.
Johnson, Argan N.
Jones, Joseph V.
McPhillips, James E.
Minwegen, Arthur P.
Nuckel, John, Jr.
Rowe, Harry C.
Seeboth, Albert J.
Spuler, Pearl L.
Staniunas, John F.
Wills, Harry C.
Bamberg, Edward C.
Corn, Harold D.
Frate, Lawrence P.
Johnson, Loys A.
Klay, Andrew S.
Miller, David H.
Reilly, Charles A., Jr.
Seibel, Roy K.
Terry, Alfred G.
Barrett, George A.
Burke, Jasper R.
Childs, Felix J.
Cline, Warren F.
Coe, Henry E.
Etter, James H., Jr.
Huey, Arthur S., Jr.
Jones, Frank W.
McCrorey, Charles E.
Miller, William A.
Mong, George L. W.
Palm, Edgar H.
Reno, James N.
Roberts, Palmer W.
Smith, Irwin M.
White, Joseph A.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Krieger, John E.

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Smith, Cyrus D.
Beal, Sumner M.
Burch, Joseph P. C.
Guay, Edward T.
Hass, Albert P.
McNitt, William H.
Schechter, Simpson I.
Stolitsky, Justin F.
Chapman, Judge C.
Halvorson, Delos G.
Metaxas, Gus G.
Petkovich, Ogden L.
Reilly, John V.
Swearingen, John C.
Fossum, Kenneth C.
Scofield, Henry H., Jr.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Blakely, Silas M.
Bradley, John R.
Comorat, Vincent T.
Ellis, Mack D.
Ford, Donald G.
Martin, Harold G.
McLane, John B.
Oban, Arthur W.
O'Brien, Eugene A.
Swanner, Linden R.
Van Limburgh, Robert C.
Cely, Frederick W.
Fidler, Harold J.
Kerns, Clifford D.
Nowak, Edward E.
Stalker, Harold L.
Walden, Walter A.

CHIEF GUNNERS

Abbott, Cecil J.
Austin, Jesse R., Jr.
Bieri, Reuben V.
Bixby, Norman W.
Brunner, Harold R.
Burns, Joseph W.
Bushey, Charles L.
Campbell, Colin
D'Angelo, Anthony S.
Dean, Charles H.
Dower, Victor H.
Dunn, William A.
Ely, Richard C.
Floerchinger, Ivan C.
Frano, Joseph J.
Freeman, Herbert E.
Golding, Kenneth C.
Gould, Robert E.
Henning, Charles W.
Hoffstadt, Wilbur F.
Hurley, Ellis L.
Kay, Francis
Kindt, Gilbert O.
Knotts, William W.
LaRue, Richard M.
Leffingwell, George D.
Liedtke, Fred
Lisenby, Harry C.
Longtin, Finley J.
Marshall, Louis S.
Miller, William J.
Montgomery, Wilfred L.
Moore, George W.
Morgan, William N.
Nixdorf, Perry A.
Oglesby, Everett
Patton, Robert C.
Powell, Alexandre C.
Putnam, Travers D.
Simerville, Louis R.
Sledge, Milton C.
Sparrell, Herbert F.
Sutton, Harold L.
Uht, Christian E.
Vehorn, Robert N.
Wenger, James E.
Whaley, Elton M.
Zok, Leo J.
Becknell, John W.
Briehler, John F.
Burnside, Leland N.
Claytor, Samuel T.
Dill, Mason H.
Elliott, James O.
Fraise, George J.
Furey, Laurence J.
Harrison, Cecil M.
Horsman, Donald G.
Kerr, Thomas E.
Leahy, Roger B.
Loader, Harold W.
McGill, Myron G.
Moreau, Gilbert C.
O'Connor, Thomas C.
Plapp, Francis G.
Rice, Myron K.
Smithson, Garnet M.
Turner, Arcia O.
Vollmer, Wayne F.
Wiseman, Harold A.
Besco, Steve
Callaway, Congrave C.
Davis, Thomas H., Jr.
Loflin, Eugene P.
Rosekrans, Leslie A.
Weimer, John B.
Woznack, Francis J.

CHIEF TORPEDOMEN

Posey, Eugene V.
Robinson, Golden P.
Williams, Andy W.
Stokes, Frederick W.

CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Ayer, Nathan J.
Bell, Reginald "H"
Bishop, Gordon E.
Bowman, Clingmon E.
Callies, Leo B.
Carter, Louis T.
Chivington, Thomas E.
Clemens, Guy W.
Collier, Leland "H"
Cook, Charles L.
Denton, Delmas H.
Dochnahl, Joseph W.
Duvall, Charles T.
Ellis, William S.
Forde, Widar J.
Geary, John J.
Gustapson, Karl W.
Henderson, Paul R.
Iverson, Willard M.
Jarvis, Walter E.
Lovell, Chester
Maurel, Andre A.
Miller, William A., Jr.
Mitchell, William V.
Moore, William R.
Nelson, Arnold J.
Pitts, Clyde
Poston, Charles G.
Rice, Thomas G.
Satterthwaite, Guilford W.
Sharp, Ralph H.
Shriver, William A.
Stone, Doyle L.
Stuart, Harold H.
Wittenberg, Rudolph P.
Bick, Alfred Q.
Burr, James K.
Cartwright, Morgan R.
Colldeweih, Irwin R.
Dawson, Floyd W.
Dukelow, Clarence W.
Epperly, Virgil L.
Gibbons, William J., Jr.
Hoffos, Peter N.
Lewis, Aerlyn M.
McClaren, Robert L.
Moody, Earl R.
Nelson, Oscar B.
Reese, Orville F.
Sei, James
Snethen, Claude E.
Williams, Loris D.
Gutzmer, Albert W.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Adams, Joseph
Allison, Howard G.
Ballard, Albert L.
Barnhill, Paul E.
Blain, Earle J.
Bland, Paul N.
Bodenheimer, Robert B.
Bostwick, James L.
Brower, Abrahm H.
Brown, Robert S.
Burns, James F.
Carter, Robert J.
Coffland, Albert E.
Connolly, Walter S.
Cullinane, Lawrence O.
Davis, Leslie D.
Diedrichsen, Raymond T.
Dilley, George B.
Eckberg, Joseph M.
Elles, Edward J.
Franks, Bryan W.
Hall, James B.
Halpin, John B.
Haynie, Ray H.
Hewson, John F.
Hicks, George D.
Jacobs, Gerald M.
Jessup, Charles R.
Kirinich, Andrew
Koslosky, Harry
Langford, Byron G.
Lee, John W.
Love, Walter B.
Marcozzi, Phillip
McCaskill, Jesse M.
McMakin, Charles H., Jr.
Milloit, Henry A.
Monroe, Buster
Murray, James F.
Newberry, Denny A.
Nylund, Walfred A.
O'Donnell, Joseph P.
Pendrey, Warren K.
Perkins, Henry C.
Phillips, Pearly L.
Polansky, Lewis J.
Postlethwaite, Charles W.
Ragsdale, Robert R.
Russ, John E.
Sayers, John N.
Shapard, Harold J.
Simpson, Martin E.
Steele, Roy M.
Taylor, Ray M.
Tipton, Alexander H.
Townsend, Norman R.
Triplett, Franklin A.
Tucker, Ray H.
Weland, Gerald G.
Whalen, Roy K.
Williams, Charles A.
Williams, Frederick E.
Ball, Ira H.
Berkery, Edward G.
Blevins, Edwin K.
Boyd, Charles A.
Brunson, Robert E.
Clanton, John L.
Conway, James P.
Denson, John M., Jr.
Dostal, Norval F.
Forman, Conrad M.
Heath, Philip E.
Hill, Girthel R.
Kane, Harry F.
Landahl, Charles E.
Lewis, Charles S.
Mattis, Johnnie E.
Mennecke, Norman F.
Morrison, John M.
Nunnally, Charles H.
Ormsby, Howard C.
Perry, Smith
Reynolds, Edward C.
Secovitch, Tony
Snay, Charles A.
Thrush, Thomas W.
Tracy, Frank L.
Watson, Raymond C.
Whitlock, Vernon R.
Jordan, Paul C.
Lake, Edward W.
Morrow, James R.
Roscoe, William T.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Bilbo, Charles A.
Bratkovic, Frank A.
Burgener, Bernard L.
Camblin, Wilbur J.
Clark, Joseph R.
Coe, James R.
Doyle, Clement C.
DuBois, Maynard S.
Fincher, David L.
Fisher, Willie C.
Futrell, Robert C.
Garbrous, Joseph V.
Geise, Emery C.
Gibson, James B.
Guyer, William R.
Harper, Lee
Harrison, William T.
Heft, Norman E.
Hess, Harold C.
Hicks-Beach, Fred
Hippe, Leonard N.
Hobbs, William I.
Holmes, Emerson H.
Huey, Robert N.
James, William R.
Johnson, Clarence E.
Jorgenson, Marvin C.
Littmann, George C.
Newell, Thurman E.
Page, Irving M.
Ramsey, Harry E.
Redman, James L.
Rustin, John I.
Schott, Lester G.
Stasney, Lawrence H.
Taylor, John W.
Thompson, Norman.
Timmons, Harry S.
Trimble, Howard S.
Twibell, Murrell D.
Vaught, Claudie R.
Viegelmann, Adolph
Wagoner, Leonard H.
Watkins, Walter R.
West, Walter G.
Wheeler, Robert E.
Wigner, Frank A.
Wilcox, Earl E.
Wood, William R.
Young, Oran W. V.
Zavodny, Roland J.
Bremer, Woodson P.
Caswell, Charles H.
Denman, Wilbur D.
Eldred, Hubert W.
Fry, William E.
Garriott, Richard R.
Grace, William E.
Harrison, John M.
Helm, Clarence
Hilsenberg, Hubert E.
Holder, Perry D.
Ioli, Dominic J.
Jones, Charles L.
Mason, Donald F.
Porter, Henry L.
Reeves, Edward R.
Shearon, Bruce C.
Thompson, James C.
Tinsley, Dennis P.
Vaughn, Lionel B.
Vlasnik, Donald J.
Wells, Claude V.
White, Artie F.
Williams, Reuben K.
Wright, Joseph L.
Zink, Turner O.
Kerr, Phillip W.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Acton, Thomas E.
Ashworth, Calvin A.
Bain, Allen W.
Baran, Sylvester F.
Barnhardt, William L.
Beal, Ralph W.
Bednarck, Stephen J.
Bilbray, Hubert P.
Blackburn, Earl S.
Bossert, John W., Jr.
Boyer, George H.
Comstock, Richard B.
Conners, Francis F.
Dixon, Dolson D.
Drown, Loraine "E"
Elliott, Chester E.
Englehardt, William F.
Field, Eugene A.
Frye, Henry H.
Gorman, John R.
Grant, John E., Jr.
Hancuff, Ray L.
Hayes, Eual A.
Henson, William L.
Hubbell, William H., Jr.
Kennan, John T.
Kemper, Reuben J.
Kenney, Robert S.
Kenton, Roy M.
Kratochvil, Edward J.
Mataczynski, Louis P.
McCammond, Hugh H.
Miller, Lyle N.
Morton, John A.
Nicholson, Hiram A.
Odom, William B.
Owen, Marler W.
Peek, Charlie
Powell, Henry O.
Price, Van M.
Reynolds, Russell F.
Rice, Francis W.
Schooler, Charles L.
Schumaker, Richard F.
Sommers, Harold E.
Stone, Horace "E"
Ullrich, Howard C.
Valencia, Walter S.
Vermeersch, Rennie
Wessinger, Hall B.
Williams, Charles F., Jr.
Wood, Ernest K.
Alford, Lester C.
Baker, Jeriod I.
Bartholomew, Albert A.
Berck, Henry F.
Bok, Stephen
Boynton, Mack M.
Dewitt, Fred
Duval, Harold F.
Epps, Robert W.
Gay, Theodore S., Jr.
Gundrum, James O.
Heidenreich, George
Jackson, Herman V.
Kennedy, Henry E.
Kisela, Joseph
Ludley, George J. M.
McLeod, Don E.
Outlaw, Jessie B.
Phillips, Patrick
Purcell, Jack R.
Sagen, Alvin O.
Short, Henry L., Jr.
Turnquist, George
Van Rheeden, Frederick D.
Whelchel, James S.

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERKS

Berg, Royal D.
Blakeslee, Garth "M"
Dutton, John P.
Eastman, Albert J.
Wohlers, Henry F.
Cavanaugh, Joseph J.
Glezen, Glenn F.
Vessella, Joseph W.
Beck, George W., Jr.

CHIEF AEROGRAPHERS

Hudson, Edward S.
Rodems, Charles R.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHERS

Abel, Burton C.
Bryans, William J.
Chamblin, "J" H.

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Curtis, Charles E.

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Ager, George H.
Alexander, Charles C.
Anderson, Carl I. B.
Backer, William
Bengtson, Gorden W.
Bevans, Thomas W.
Blick, Johnnie Y.
Bodine, Vernon H.
Cameron, Francis C.
Carter, Paul R.
Cooper, Joseph K.
Corbett, Theodore W.
Crutchfield, William J.
Cullen, Curtis
Doyle, John P.
Ehlers, Ervine B.
Foster, William L.
Fox, Chester C.
Goolsby, Loyd
Gore, Welburne H.
Grande, Marvin
Gray, Terry L.
Greene, Joseph M.
Grego, Anthony
Griffin, Clarence R.
Gunkel, Frederick H.
Hartlove, David G.
Hazzard, Lois H.
Honadle, Robert K.
Jacobs, Howard F.
Johnson, Carlton W.
Johnson, Walter H., Jr.
Jones, Redden P.
Keck, Earl B.
King, William E.
Lewis, Richard W.
Marcom, Tillman M.
Metcalf, Paul J.
Newton, Richard E., Jr.
Owen, George L.
Powell, Robert C., Jr.
Rainbolt, Darrell L.
Salmon, Douglas A.
Schneider, Willard N.
Smith, Courtenay A.
Sumrell, Guy H.
Therien, Robert B.
Walker, Lewis F.
Woodside, Dwight R.
Amundsen, Melvin S.
Beauchamp, Arthur J.
Blankinship, Hubert A.
Browne, Peniston E.
Caughman, Adam F.
Crowder, Edward W.
Bobbs, Lewis
Forgette, Arthur J.
Fox, Roy W.
Grafe, Edward E.
Green, Eugene B.
Griffin, Charles E.
Hart, Robert F.
Head, Roscoe C.
Jackson, Hal E.
Johnson, Roy S.
Kaiser, Joseph G.
Knecht, John P., Jr.
McCord, Eyrie L.
Olbrey, Harold M.
Prosch, Edmund J.
Schell, Joseph N.
Stroud, Densil C.
Thomas, Toxie A.
Wright, William D.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Allen H. Turnage to be a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 4th day of October 1946.

Maj. Gen. Keller E. Rockey to be a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January 1947.

Brig. Gen. Leo D. Hermle to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February 1944.

Brig. Gen. Alfred H. Noble to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 3d day of February 1944.

Brig. Gen. Franklin A. Hart to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 10th day of September 1944.

Brig. Gen. William J. Wallace to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 3d day of December 1946.

Col. Henry D. Linscott to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of December 1943.

Col. Dudley S. Brown to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of December 1943.

Col. Robert H. Pepper to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of December 1943.

Col. Edward A. Craig to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of December 1943.

Col. Merritt B. Curtis to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of May 1944.

Col. Fred S. Robillard to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 8th day of May 1944.

Col. Vernon E. Megee to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 23d day of December 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Willard L. Thorp to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

UNITED NATIONS

UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Warren R. Austin to be the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy.

UNITED STATES MEMBERS OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Isador Lubin to be a member of the Economic and Employment Commission of the Economic and Social Council for a term of 4 years.

Edward F. Bartelt to be a member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt to be a member of the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

Philip M. Hauser to be a member of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

Stuart A. Rice to be a member of the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

Miss Dorothy Kenyon to be a member of the Commission on Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

Arthur J. Altmeyer to be a member of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 2 years.

George P. Baker to be a member of the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 4 years.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William C. Trimble
John Willard Carrigan

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

John D. Goodloe to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1946, to be effective January 17, 1947.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Raymond Michael Foley to be National Housing Administrator.

Frank Creedon to be Housing Expediter.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF CAPTAIN FROM THE DATES INDICATED

John H. Peters, September 1, 1946.
George C. Mattison, October 1, 1946.
Kenneth T. Adams, October 1, 1946.
Frederic L. Peacock, January 1, 1947.
Ray L. Schoppe, January 1, 1947.

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF COMMANDER FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Oliver S. Reading, September 1, 1946.
Francis L. Gallen, October 1, 1946.
Cornelius D. Meaney, October 1, 1946.
John A. Bond, January 1, 1947.
Augustus P. Ratti, January 1, 1947.

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Charles A. Schanck, September 1, 1946.
Joseph P. Lushene, October 1, 1946.
Curtis LeFever, October 1, 1946.
Henry O. Fortin, January 1, 1947.
Edwin C. Baum, January 1, 1947.

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE) FROM DATES INDICATED

Miller J. Tonkel, June 28, 1946.
Robert H. Brown, August 8, 1946.
George E. Russell, Jr., August 8, 1946.
Norman E. Taylor, October 16, 1946.
William E. Randall, December 13, 1946.

TO BE AIDES WITH RANK OF ENSIGN FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Lewis V. Evans 3d, September 1, 1946.
Allen L. Powell, September 1, 1946.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 15, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, we remember Thy promise that wheresoever two or three are gathered together in Thy name, there Thou art in the midst of them. We claim that promise this morning, and pray that each one of us may be aware of Thy presence, for Thou knowest our needs, and how inadequate we feel ourselves to be in the presence of world problems and the challenges of this hour. If Thou wilt help us, O Lord, then shall we be better than we are, wiser than we know, and stronger than we dream.

In this prayer, we bring unto Thee the Members of this body, its officers and its servants, for Thy blessing; men who feel the weight of responsibility and the need of divine guidance; men who are often sorely tempted and who need the support of Thy grace. Bestow upon them the courage to do the right as Thou hast given them to see the right, and make it clear unto us all, for Jesus sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 17, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED SENATORS—RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE MINORITY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions unanimously adopted by the conference of the minority as tributes to the memories of Hon. Charles O. Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida; Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina; Hon. John H. Bankhead 2d, late a Senator from the State of Alabama; and Hon. Carter Glass, late a Senator from the State of Virginia.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES O. ANDREWS

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague the Honorable Charles O. Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the conference of the minority this 2d day of January 1947.

BRIEN MCMAHON,
Secretary.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the conference of the minority this 2d day of January 1947.

BRIEN MCMAHON,
Secretary.

JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2D

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable John H. Bankhead 2d, late a Senator from the State of Alabama; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the conference of the minority this 2d day of January 1947.

BRIEN MCMAHON,
Secretary.

CARTER GLASS

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable Carter Glass, late a Senator from the State of Virginia; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judg-

ment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the conference of the minority this 2d day of January 1947.

BRIEN MCMAHON,
Secretary.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are necessarily absent on important business in their respective States.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DAL M. LEMMON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 28, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Dal M. Lemmon, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Hon. Martin I. Welsh, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD M. CURRAN TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I give notice that there will be a public hearing on Thursday of this week, January 23, 1947, at 10:30 o'clock in the morning, in the Judiciary Committee room, 424 Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GORDON R. CLAPP TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works I give notice that there will be a public hearing on the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945, the hearing to be held tomorrow, Tuesday, January 21, at 10:30 o'clock in the morning, in room 412 of the Senate Office Building.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication addressed to the President pro tempore by the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 17, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate pro tempore.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the state of the Union message of January 6, 1947, I stated that I would communicate with the Congress in the near future with reference to the establishment of a single department of national defense.

For many months the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have been endeavoring to settle the differences existing between the services on this question.

I am gratified to advise that success has crowned their efforts and the armed services have reached an agreement on a plan of unification. I enclose herewith copy of a letter, signed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy under date of January 16, 1947, containing the basic elements of this agreement. I enclose also copy of my reply to them on the same date.

In addition I submit a copy of a proposed Executive order, agreed upon by the services, which presents the functions of the armed forces. It is contemplated that this order would be issued after the passage of appropriate legislation by the Congress upon this subject.

Representatives of my office and of the armed services are engaged in drafting a bill to be submitted to the Congress for its consideration. These men, of course, are available to you at any time for consultation.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The accompanying letters and Executive order will be printed in the RECORD, and the communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letters and accompanying papers are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 16, 1947.

The Honorable ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
The Secretary of War.

The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
The Secretary of the Navy.

GENTLEMEN: I am exceedingly pleased to receive your joint letter of January 16 in which you advise that you have reached full and complete agreement on a plan for the unification of the armed services.

I recognize that each of the services has made concessions in the effort to reach this agreement, and I feel that it constitutes an admirable compromise between the various views that were originally held.

The agreement provides a thoroughly practical and workable plan of unification and I heartily approve it.

You have both worked ably and effectively, with your respective staffs, in bringing about this result. I appreciate your fine efforts and I congratulate you upon an accomplishment which, I am sure, will contribute greatly to the efficiency of our national defense.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 16, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On May 31, 1946, we jointly submitted to you a letter which gave our respective views on the major elements involved in establishing a greater measure of unification of our armed forces.

In your letter of June 15, 1946, you expressed gratification at the progress made in narrowing the zone of disagreement which had previously existed between the services and stated your position with reference to the essential points on which disagreement still existed.

In our opinion the necessity for agreement between the military services is now even greater than at the time of our earlier letter. We and our representatives have been meeting in an effort to secure further resolution, within the scope and the spirit of the statement of your position, of the views of the two departments. We are pleased to report success in this undertaking.

We agree to support legislation in which the following points are incorporated:

(a) There shall be a Council of National Defense, a National Security Resources Board and a Central Intelligence Agency (which already exists) as agreed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in their letter to the President of May 31, 1946.

(b) The armed forces shall be organized under a Secretary of National Defense so as to place the Army, the Navy (to include the Marine Corps and Naval Aviation), and the Air Force, each with a military chief, under the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force respectively. Each shall be under a Secretary and, under the over-all direction of the Secretary of National Defense, shall be administered as an individual unit. The Secretary of any of the three Departments may, at any time, present to the President, after first informing the Secretary of National Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his Department which he may deem necessary or desirable.

(c) A War Council shall be created, consisting of the Secretary of National Defense as Chairman and with power of decision, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, and the military heads of the three services. The War Council will concern itself with matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces.

(d) There shall be a Joint Chiefs of Staff, consisting of the military heads of the three services, and also the Chief of Staff to the President if that office exists. Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of National Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will provide for the strategic direction of the military forces of the United States, will formulate strategic plans, assign logistic responsibilities to the services in support thereof, integrate the military requirements and, as directed, advise in the integration of the military budget.

(e) There shall be a full-time Joint Staff, to consist initially of not over 100 officers, to be provided in approximately equal numbers by the three services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof, shall carry out policies and directives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(f) The Secretary of National Defense shall head the armed forces establishment, shall be vested with authority, under the President, to establish common policies and common programs for the integrated operation of the three departments and shall exercise control over and direct their common efforts to discharge their responsibility for national security.

We are agreed that the proper method of setting forth the functions (so-called roles and missions) of the armed forces is by the issuance of an Executive order concurrently with your approval of the appropriate legislation. We attach for your consideration a mutually agreed draft of such an order.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.
JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, I hereby prescribe the following assignment of primary functions and responsibilities to the three armed services.

Section I—The common missions of the Armed Forces of the United States are:

1. To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

2. To maintain, by timely and effective military action, the security of the United States, its possessions and areas vital to its interest.

3. To uphold and advance the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To safeguard the internal security of the U. S. as directed by higher authority.

5. To conduct integrated operations on the land, on the sea, and in the air necessary for these purposes.

In order to facilitate the accomplishment of the foregoing missions the armed forces shall formulate integrated plans and make coordinated preparations. Each service shall observe the general principles and fulfill the specific functions outlined below, and shall make use of the personnel, equipment and facilities of the other services in all cases where economy and effectiveness will thereby be increased.

Section II—Functions of the United States Army:

General:

The United States Army includes land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may be organic therein. It is organized, trained and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. The Army is responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

The specific functions of the United States Army are:

1. To organize, train and equip land forces for:

a. Operations on land, including joint operations.

b. The seizure or defense of land areas, including airborne and joint amphibious operations.

c. The occupation of land areas.

2. To develop weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of Army combat and service elements, coordinating with the Navy and the Air Force in all aspects of joint concern, including those which pertain to amphibious and airborne operations.

3. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To assist the Navy and Air Forces in the accomplishment of their missions, including the provision of common services and supplies as determined by proper authority.

Section III—Functions of the United States Navy:

General:

The United States Navy includes naval combat and service forces, naval aviation, and the United States Marine Corps. It is organized, trained and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat at sea. The Navy is responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war, and in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

The specific functions of the United States Navy are:

1. To organize, train and equip naval forces for:

a. Operations at sea, including joint operations.

b. The control of vital sea areas, the protection of vital sea lanes, and the suppression of enemy sea commerce.

c. The support of occupation forces as required.

d. The seizure of minor enemy shore positions capable of reduction by such landing forces as may be comprised within the fleet organization.

e. Naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping. The air aspects of those functions shall be coordinated with the Air Force, including the development and procurement of aircraft, and air installations located on shore, and use shall be made of Air Force personnel, equipment and facilities in all cases where economy and effectiveness will thereby be increased. Subject to the above provision, the Navy will not be restricted as to types of aircraft maintained and operated for these purposes.

f. The air transport necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities.

2. To develop weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements, coordinating with the Army and the Air Force in all aspects of joint concern, including those which pertain to amphibious operations.

3. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To maintain the United States Marine Corps whose specific functions are:

a. To provide Marine Forces together with supporting air components, for service with the Fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of limited land operations in connection therewith.

b. To develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces.

c. To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy.

d. To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

e. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

5. To assist the Army and the Air Force in the accomplishment of their missions, including the provision of common services and supplies as determined by proper authority.

Section IV—Functions of the United States Air Force:

General:

The United States Air Force includes all military aviation forces, both combat and service, not otherwise specifically assigned. It is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained air offensive and defensive operations. The Air Force is responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

The specific functions of the United States Air Force are:

1. To organize, train and equip air forces for:

a. Air operations including joint operations.

b. Gaining and maintaining general air supremacy.

c. Establishing local air superiority where and as required.

d. The strategic air force of the United States and strategic air reconnaissance.

e. Air lift and support for airborne operations.

f. Air support to land forces and naval forces, including support of occupation forces.

g. Air transport for the armed forces, except as provided by the Navy in accordance with paragraph 1 f, of section III.

2. To develop weapons, tactics, technique organization and equipment of Air Force combat and service elements, coordinating with the Army and Navy on all aspects of joint concern, including those which pertain to amphibious and airborne operations.

3. To provide, as directed by proper authority, such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To provide the means for coordination of air defense among all services.

5. To assist the Army and Navy in accomplishment of their missions, including the provision of common services and supplies as determined by proper authority.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to fill the vacancy on the Board of Directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women.

DIRECTOR OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces the assignment of the new Senate membership on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The hold-over reappointments are the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The new appointee is the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Also hold-over appointments are the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Under the terms of the Congressional Atomic Energy Act the Chair now refers to the Senate members of the joint committee nominations by the President of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948, and the nomination of the General Manager of the Commission, as in executive session.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESCISSIONS OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, together with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed rescissions of portions of appropriations available for the fiscal year 1947 and subsequent fiscal years for various departments and agencies of the Government, amounting to $563,888,579.48, together with a reduction of $132,000,000 in contract authorization (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FOR VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

COORDINATION OF FORWARDING AND SIMILAR SERVICING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the period May 13, 1946, to January 9, 1947, showing that all maritime forwarding contracts and forwarding traffic orders for the servicing of waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States have been canceled and that the Commission contemplates no further activities in that connection (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITION

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH) presented the following resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States of America, and the Italian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary with relation to the arrival of the Honorable Alcide De Gasperi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, in this country and the need of financial and economic help for Italy from the Government of the United States of America

Whereas the Honorable Alcide De Gasperi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, has arrived in this country as a guest of our Government to discuss financial and economic help from the Government of the United States of America, necessary for the rebirth of his country and to alleviate the bitter suffering of his people; and

Whereas the people of Italy are united to us by long standing ties of friendship and Italy was our cobelligerent in the war, and is endeavoring to rehabilitate itself in a new regime of democracy; and

Whereas our country has fought a victorious war to establish a rule of justice and freedom among the peoples of the world, and in order to win the peace we have to assist those countries which are suffering the ravages of the war, and which, like Italy, are anxious to join with us in the maintenance and defense of western civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States of America are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to extend to Italy all possible help; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state from Rhode Island to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to the President of the United States of America, and to the Secretary of State of the United States to be transmitted by him to the Italian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

RENT CONTROL—DISCONTINUANCE OF OPA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Kent County (Del.) Real Estate Board urging that the Congress proceed to eliminate OPA in its entirety and that the States be given the opportunity through their legislative bodies to set up any regulations they may see fit on rent control. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas rent control, as administered by the Office of Price Administration, continues to be an inequitable function; and

Whereas owners of property have been and continue to be faced with increased costs of maintenance and repair as well as increased taxes; and

Whereas a mere percentage increase of income now talked of and discussed in Congress will not cure the inequalities now existing; and

Whereas the continuance of rent control on real estate might well become an opportunity for the development of socialistic trends affecting the basic principle of home and property ownership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kent County Real Estate Board of Kent County, Del., in regular session met, That the Congress of the United States proceed to eliminate the Office of Price Administration in its entirety and that the respective States be given the opportunity by and through their duly constituted legislative bodies to work out their own regulatory control in such States as might deem it necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Delaware Representatives in Congress.

PROTEST AGAINST WARTIME EXCISE TAXES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from John Newcomer, a prominent theater manager of Osawatomie, Kans., a telegram in the nature of a memorial remonstrating against wartime excise taxes on luxury items, which now include theater admissions. I ask unanimous consent to present Mr. Newcomer's telegram for appropriate reference and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OSAWATOMIE, KANS., *January 17, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your attention is respectfully called to the recent announcement by Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON that he will sponsor continuation of wartime excise taxes on luxury items which now include theater admissions.

When this tax was increased to 20 percent it was accepted by theaters as a wartime measure that would last only for the war emergency period.

The continuation of this excessive tax would place theater attendance in the luxury class of liquor and expensive furs and jewelry, which is not the case. The bulk of theater patrons are low-salaried working people who are seeking entertainment and relaxation. It is the only type of entertainment many families can afford.

You therefore are urged to consider the above facts and if you are interested in easing the tax burden on the little fellow to use your influence to see that the theater-admission tax is returned to its normal level.

JOHN NEWCOMER,
Manager, Osa and Kansan Theaters.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND HOMEMAKING PROGRAMS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a fine letter from the director and other officers of the Inman Rural High School, Inman, Kans., urging favorable action by Congress in behalf of the Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture and vocational homemaking program. I ask unanimous consent to present and to have this letter appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INMAN RURAL HIGH SCHOOL,
Inman, Kans., January 7, 1947.

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I am writing you in behalf of the Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture and vocational homemaking program. We understand that one or more bills for appropriations for this purpose will be introduced when the legislative body meets.

We wish to inform you that we have had the vocational program in our school for a number of years and are interested in its expansion throughout the rural high schools of the entire State. We believe that the program includes fundamentals for the vocational education of rural youth.

We urge that you, as our representative, support any bills that may assist in the development of the program.

Very truly yours,

M. S. KAUFMAN,
Principal.
J. C. GAEDDERT,
Director.
E. W. EVANS,
Secretary.
C. O. HEIDEBRECHT,
Treasurer.

RESTRICTION OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, copy of a resolution adopted by Lodge 693 of the International Association of Machinists at Coffeyville, Kans., in which they express their opposition to any legislation that would restrict the freedom of any individual or group of individuals.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas labor is being accused of being responsible for most of the ills now befalling this great land of ours and, whereas we feel the actual facts do not justify these accusations; and

Whereas certain elements of our citizenship are circulating propaganda in an effort to compel Congress to pass legislation restraining labor: Be it therefore

Resolved, by the membership of Lodge 693, International Association of Machinists, That we urgently request our representatives in Congress to carefully consider all the facts before sponsoring or voting for any type of legislation that might tend to restrict the freedom of any individual or group of individuals; be it further

Resolved, That we call to the attention of our representatives some of the facts and conditions which we feel are responsible for the present existing industrial strife, to wit:

In 1942, in an effort to stabilize the economy of the Nation, Congress froze wages at a level not in excess of 15 percent above the 1939 level with the assurance to labor that prices of commodities would be held at their price level at that time. For some reason which we have been unable to ascertain those responsible were unable to hold the line on commodities with the result that living costs had risen by the end of the war to 33 percent above the 1939 level.

In an attempt to equalize wages with living costs, the Government proposed another wage increase of 18 percent which they claimed industry could grant without increasing prices. With the insurance of a normal profit, whether they operated or not, through the surplus profit-tax refund from the Government, some industrialists in an attempt, which we feel was an organized attempt to discredit labor, refused to grant any portion of this wage adjustment, thereby forcing labor to resort to the only means at their command, the strike. We should like to call to your attention the results of this latest attempt on the part of our Government to stabilize our economy. Industry, through threats, withholding of products from the market, and other means, forced Government again to grant price increases that were far in excess of those necessary to offset the wage increases allowed.

Government records show that in 15 basic industries it would have required 1.8 percent increase in prices to offset the wage increases, while the price increase actually granted was 6.4 percent. From the figures we are able to get it would appear that industry is again making unjust or surplus profits. As we go into the year of 1947, while wages have risen less than 40 percent above the 1939 level, living costs have risen to approximately 60 percent above 1939 level. On the basis of these facts we believe that labor needs a helping hand rather than an obstructing one. We urge you, as our representative in Congress, to sponsor and vote only for such legislation as will give all classes of our economy their just share of the fruits of their labor or resources; be it further

Resolved by the membership of Local 693, International Association of Machinists, That we do most vigorously oppose any legislation that might in any way tend to restrict the conditions of any collective bargaining agreement; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be mailed to the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, the Honorable CLYDE REED, and the Honorable HERBERT MEYER.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 284. A bill to clarify the procedure for apportionment of funds on the basis of area under the Federal Aid Act of July 11, 1916, and the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 285. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 286. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 287. A bill to extend the maturity for mortgages under the National Housing Act in the case of property owned by veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming):

S. 288. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 289. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission; and

S. 290. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz; and

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Samuel Augenblick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 293. A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 so as to establish a National Air Policy Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yvonne Nguyen-Thi-Tung Rogoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 295. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 296. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for addition to the Fredericksburg National Cemetery; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 297. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach, and others, for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 298. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) introduced Senate bill 299, to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 300. A bill to reinstate Walter C. Smith with the rank of first lieutenant and to authorize his retirement; and

S. 301. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 302. A bill to facilitate settlement of claims, and for other purposes; and

S. 303. A bill to facilitate filing and settlement of veterans' claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 304, to provide for the redemption of terminal leave bonds by the use of any surplus of Federal receipts over Federal expenditures, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to provide for use of the words "Observe Sunday" in the cancellation of United States mail; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Commission on Individual War Memorials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the settlement of Jamestown Island, Va., and in celebration of the opening of a series of dramatic presentations by the Jamestown Corporation portraying sig-

nificant events in the early history of Virginia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to prohibit temporarily the sale of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas. In connection with the bill, I request that a joint statement which we have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN) is as follows:

EXTENDING THE RECLAMATION LAWS TO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS—STATEMENT OF SENATORS J. W. FULBRIGHT AND JOHN L. M'CLELLAN

Senators FULBRIGHT AND MCCLELLAN introduced in the Senate today a bill providing for the extension of the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas. If approved, the Bureau of Reclamation would be authorized to enter the State for study of its problems relating to irrigation, drainage, municipal and industrial water supplies, recreation, and fish and wildlife propagation and lend its influence toward supplementing existing programs for flood control and steam and hydroelectrical power development. Among the principal objectives of the bill would be to further augment and coordinate local, State, and Federal activities in the promotion of industrial development, and to bring about the fullest possible utilization of lands adaptable to agriculture or other purposes.

The original act limited the use of receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands, restricting such activities to 17 Western States. Arkansas remains as one of the richest States in the Nation in undeveloped agricultural and mineral resources, and it is in the national interest that the tremendous potentialities for development of these resources be implemented through the multi-purpose program of the Bureau of Reclamation, which may be adapted to many areas within the State.

No section of the Nation possesses such outstanding abundance of undeveloped natural resources necessary for a balanced agricultural and industrial economy, and in view of the fact that the population in the State is rapidly increasing, it is essential that a sound balance be maintained between agricultural and industrial development to stabilize the State's economy and raise the per capita income of its citizens. The Bureau of Reclamation is in a position to render great service to the State, and there is no section which is prepared to make better use of the services offered through this agency.

Specifically, there is a possibility of greatly expanded agricultural production in the area east of the White River and in the St. Francis River basin through a coordinated drainage and irrigation program. Estimates of the acreage which could be developed for agricultural purposes vary from a half million to a million acres in this area. Possibilities also exist for developing irrigation for vegetable crops on between 50,000 and 100,000 acres along the Arkansas River. Comprehensive investigations available through the Bureau of Reclamation are required to determine the full extent of the area within the State which might be reclaimed by irrigation.

Lack of adequate drainage has prevented profitable use of millions of acres of potentially valuable lands, and reclamation through drainage is an outstanding potentiality at a time when productive lands of the Nation are declining. Although privately financed drainage districts in Arkansas have helped in keeping some areas in production, the enterprises have often been ineffective, and coordination of such efforts would materially increase the effectiveness of the drainage works. Many of the districts are in financial difficulties, administration often is inefficient, drainage structures in the main are inadequate, maintenance frequently is neglected, and uncoordinated operation of some systems affects adjoining ones adversely. As a result of these difficulties, large bodies of land have reverted to disuse and considerable additional areas eventually will go out of production unless corrective measures are undertaken.

The total acreage of undrained woodlands and cut-over lands that could be reclaimed has not been determined. Detailed investigations required to estimate the acreage and the extent of benefits which might be derived as well as to determine the practicability of reconstructing and rehabilitating present drainage systems, merging or coordinating existing districts and developing new systems would be one of the first objectives of the Reclamation Service, if the bill is approved.

The State's rich valleys have not been developed to their full potentiality for agricultural production, even though annual precipitation, which averages 48 inches, only occasionally falls below a level sufficient for crop production. In some years, rainfall is poorly distributed and crops fail or yields are reduced because of lack of moisture during critical growing periods, even though the total annual rainfall would be sufficient for optimum crop production if properly distributed. Only in the famous Grand Prairie and Oak Flats rice-producing areas has irrigation been practiced to an appreciable extent in Arkansas. Greatly increased production of various crops, particularly specialty types, such as vegetables and rice, has been shown to be practical and profitable through development of irrigation projects in a number of sections.

The Grand Prairie area, where about 640,000 acres have been adapted to rice production, requires a supplemental water supply to offset effects of receding ground-water levels now threatening the present development. It is estimated that an additional 200,000 to 300,000 acre-feet of water will be required annually for sustained production in this area. The Oak Flats area west of Crowley's Ridge includes about 1,500,000 tillable acres of which only a small percentage has been developed for rice production. Many additional acres can be developed in this area by irrigation.

Another opportunity to obtain benefits through multiple-purpose developments is in the field of municipal, industrial, and rural water supplies. Flows in the lower reaches of the Arkansas, Ouachita and Red Rivers have been polluted by natural mineralization, domestic sewage, oil field brines, and other industrial wastes. Heavy withdrawals of ground water in the lower White River Valley have reduced municipal water supplies of several communities. Water courses in the Ozark-Ouachita highlands often are dry during the summer. Shallow ground water is scarce and deep wells often are too costly for the average user. Storage of surface flows to carry over dry summers is urgently needed.

Scenic attractions of the Ozark Mountains of northwestern Arkansas and the Ouachita Mountains form a magnet for thousands of tourists and vacationists annually. Artificial lakes developed on the streams in the two mountain regions to supplement and coordinate existing recreational facilities under State and Federal programs would enhance their drawing power, with great economical and cultural benefits to the State. The streams and lakes of Arkansas afford excellent opportunities for fishing and for fish propagation, while the lowlands provide extensive nesting and resting places for migratory birds.

Although much has been accomplished through recent protective flood-control projects, the State is still subject to major property losses from floods. Multiple-purpose projects constructed in many of the 17 Western States by the Bureau of Reclamation include provision for flood control and development of hydroelectrical power features. The Bureau cooperates with the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in the development of flood control and irrigation in the West. It is desirable that this same cooperation be extended into Arkansas, in coordination with existing local and State agencies.

The bill has the approval and endorsement of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus, Department of Interior, who, in a letter addressed to Senator FULBRIGHT on January 7, 1947, stated:

"It is my opinion that the extension of the Reclamation Project Act to the State of Arkansas is highly desirable, for it undoubtedly would bring to that State the means of increasing agricultural and industrial activities through further development of irrigation, drainage, and low-cost electric power. All together, these certainly would substantially raise the standard of living in the State of Arkansas, and benefits would extend into the surrounding States as well. Since such an extension is for the local, State, and national welfare, it has my wholehearted support."

DISPOSITION OF BIG INCH AND LITTLE BIG INCH PIPE LINES

Mr. HAWKES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete study and investigation of the desirability of disposing of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines to private ownership, the reasonable price to be charged for such pipe lines and the necessary facilities in connection therewith, the use to which such pipe lines should be put when privately owned, and such other pertinent matters in connection therewith as the committee deems advisable. The committee shall report its findings to the Senate, together with its recommendations, not later than June 1, 1947.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS (S. DOC. NO. 6)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as required by law, on January 8 the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress his Joint Economic Report, which has been printed as House Document No. 49. On December 18, 1946, the Council of Economic Advisers made a

brief report to the President. I ask unanimous consent that that report be printed as a Senate document for the use of the Senate.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

ARTICLE BY RUSSELL B. LONG IN DEFENSE OF HIS FATHER, HUEY P. LONG

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Russell B. Long, son of the late Senator Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, which, in part, I desire to read. He says:

I have written a brief article, In Defense of My Father, answering one of the many fallacious articles that have been published about my father. * * * I would greatly appreciate it if you would see that this article is submitted and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article in question was published in the North Baton Rouge Journal, and I desire to read the note of the editor of that journal before asking unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD. I read:

EDITOR'S NOTE

Concerning the recent spread in Life magazine, The Huey Long Legend, Louisiana friends and foes of the late Huey Long are almost unanimous on one point:

The article contained many inaccuracies about Huey and Winn Parish.

Since that article was published in Life many Louisianians, Russell Long, son of Huey Long and a Baton Rouge attorney, have written to the magazine protesting its Huey Long legend.

Russell Long has requested Life magazine to give him as much space for a defense of Huey Long as it devoted to Hamilton Basso's Huey Long Legend. His letter, to date, Long said, has been unanswered.

Since the death of Huey Long, 11 years ago, many articles and an increasing flood of novels have been centered around the former Governor and Senator.

The North Baton Rouge Journal editors believe that one of the mandates for a free press is publication of both sides of every controversial issue. This article, which may be the basis for a feature to be submitted by Russell Long to Reader's Digest, is certainly by a person qualified to take the pro-Huey Long side.

Mr. Long's views are not necessarily those of the North Baton Rouge Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Russell B. Long be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSELL LONG WRITES—IN DEFENSE OF MY FATHER

I venture the assertion that no man of our times has been more abused, vilified, and misrepresented by the American press to its reading public than my father, Huey P. Long. Most commonly he has been accused of being a ruthless dictator who would have destroyed our system of democratic government as well with the charge as a noisy low-grade rabble-rouser. A mass of fictional novels pictures him as possessed of an obsessive lust for sexual indecencies. All glory in the fact that at law there is no right of suit by the decendants or relatives of a deceased person who has been libeled.

It now appears that Life magazine is desirous of creating a new American legend in which Huey Long is to play the role of Satan to the epic of American democracy. The fact that these far-fetched inventions of morbid imagination are untrue is easily established by anyone who would make the effort to investigate them at their source, but so powerful and complete is the press alliance in spreading these falsehoods that by constant repetition the average disinterested reader is led to accept deliberate falsification and imaginative assertion as truth.

As the son of the man, I must protest against such enormous misrepresentations.

First as to the charge that my father was a dictator. An investigation into the facts in Louisiana during his life will reveal indisputably that no man in American politics within the century had so much powerful opposition within his State and yet succeeded in winning enough elections to stay in power. His opponents pictured themselves as the righteous minority, but it was not right that bothered them. Their great concern for the preservation of decency, democracy, or what have you, reduced itself in the last analysis to a mighty indignation of the fact that he was taking taxes off the one-horse farmer and shifting them to the oil producer and the large corporation within the State; that he was reducing utility rates. The powerful vested interests in Louisiana and their spokesman press did not object to his giving free books to the school children, building a system of good roads and free bridges, homestead exemption from taxation for small home owners, building of a great State university, halving the number of illiterates. Ordinarily the wealthy and affluent in Louisiana would have been happy to see Huey Long bring such things to pass. What they objected to was that they were made to pay for all this. Taxes were placed on the severance of oil and other natural resources of the State. An income tax was passed. Taxes were placed on oil and gas, and horror of horrors, even on the business of refining oil.

If the Huey Long opposition were to have attacked him on the grounds that he was aiding the masses of the people of his State, improving the State generally, and all of this by the radical, yea, even bolshevik tactics of taxing those best able to pay or soaking the rich, their approach would have been foolish indeed. The masses would have surged to his defense. Far better to say that he had indelicate table manners, that he was a self-seeking, power-loving autocrat. Accuse the man of having no chivalry because he refused to commute the sentence of a wife who assisted in the brutal murder of her husband. Better yet, insinuate that he had designs on another man's wife. Accuse him of using high-handed tactics. The only thing I can recall the daily press missing was that it failed to imply that he snored in his sleep.

Such a campaign of steady and constant derogation could be effective. The laws permit a paper to print untruths about a public figure unless it can be established that the paper was in bad faith and well knew that the assertion was false. The defense of fair comment sometimes turns freedom of the press into freedom of libel insofar as public figures are concerned.

Except for the brief period of the 1 year in which Huey Long was elected Governor, during which a few papers supported him, his opposition included every daily newspaper in the State. He was the first Governor of the State ever to attempt to continue in public life in spite of their continuous attack, and the only one ever to succeed in it. They twisted his every statement, his every act. The fact that they could not defeat him was attributable only to the fact that he was able to convince the majority of the people that the attack was due to his program of taxing the vested interests for the benefit of the State and its masses. To the outside, the Louisiana press explained its failure to defeat him on the theory that the majority of the people of Louisiana were a mass of stupid illiterates in the hands of a rabble-rouser. There seems to be a code among gentlemen of the press that an outsider does not generally distrust the work of his fellow publisher. The disbeliever may want to get off a "white one" himself someday.

Surprisingly little is ever mentioned of his accomplishments. When he became governor he found his State deep in the muck and mire of backwardness and indifference. Finding an almost impossible highway system with 75 hard-surfaced miles; he constructed 2,000 miles of concrete highways and 1,000 miles of asphalt roads at an expense less than similar construction cost anywhere in the Nation. The State had few bridges over its streams, and many of them toll; he spanned every major stream with modern free bridges. When Huey Long succeeded in giving free school books to the school children, the enrollment in Louisiana public schools increased 20 percent. He provided natural-gas service to every population center in Louisiana. All of the State hospitals and institutions were modernized and their capacity increased more than 50 percent. Quality of improvement showed as the death rate in the New Orleans Charity Hospital fell from 4.1 percent to 2.8 percent despite a decline in per capita expenditure cost from $1.74 to $1.31. The enrollment at Louisiana State University was increased from 1,700 to approximately 8,000 students, the increase representing students who might not have had a college education but for the help that Huey Long's administration gave that institution. The charges of the Port of New Orleans were reduced 25 to 50 percent. The State penitentiary, which had cost the taxpayers $500,000 per year, was put on paying basis. These by no means constituted all of Huey Long's achievements but they are enough to cause a fair-minded man to understand why Huey Long was supported by the majority of the people of his State.

As to the charge that he was untrained, uneducated, lacking in understanding of the better things of life, I would rely upon the court records. It is a seldom-revealed fact that Huey Long was one of the most brilliant young lawyers of his time. I say young because his brilliance as an attorney began to show at about the age of 25 and he died at 42. His briefs and pleadings would do credit to the ablest practitioners before the American bar. Chief Justice Taft of the Supreme Court of the United States is reported to have said that Huey Long was the most brilliant young attorney ever to appear before him. Many laws of legislature, the first of their type, such as the severance tax or the tax on chain stores, were drawn by him and upheld in the United States Supreme Court notwithstanding the severest attack by the ablest attorneys employed by major concerns. As a Public Service Commissioner before the highest courts in the Nation he represented the Louisiana Public Service Commission on its major rate cases, and invariably won them. In speaking during campaigns, he purposely spoke with a down-to-earth simplicity, an avoidance of high-flown language such as would be expected of the average man of the community. This type speech was seized upon by his enemies to make him appear unlearned. Some imaginative writers today have him using language that would be an injustice to the most illiterate man in America. Let them search for common speech in his briefs and pleadings before the appellate courts of the Nation!

A momentous campaign was made to link his memory to the Louisiana scandals, which occurred years after his death. One of the few accusations never made of my father during his life was that of dishonesty, largely because both friend and enemy knew that he cared not for money other than his needs of the moment. He had the utmost con-

fidence in his own ability to make money whenever he needed it and he felt that leaving large amounts of money to his children would make them worthless individuals and parasitic citizens. At his death his estate was not a lot larger than the amount he had accumulated before he rose to prominence. And that only because he was raising funds for a campaign at the time of his assassination.

After his death, however, his successors in power did not have the same aloofness from monetary temptation, but they were not alone in their greed. Numbers of his erstwhile enemies joyously came into the fold and got in on a good thing while it lasted. Daily newspapers which had so vehemently disapproved of Huey Long ran quadruple-sized issues congratulating the new Governor on his second month in office, his third month, etc. Huge full-page and full-spread ads carrying the new Governor's picture with the compliments of large corporations and State contractors added to the burden of the delivery boy. If anything was amiss, no one would have known of it. Not at least until the new Governor unwisely chose to divert the advertising to a newspaper of his own. Meanwhile a sales tax was replacing the tax on oil refining and the new State administration was burying the quarrels between Long and Roosevelt and getting itself on the good side of the Federal administration in the days of billion-dollar relief spending.

The scandals broke 4 years after Huey Long's death. Every story of an indictment had as much about the fact that the unfortunate man was a friend of the late Huey Long as the facts of the indictment. The term "Huey's heirs" was used by the press until it seemed to be one word. Yet, never was it shown that any alleged irregularity could even be traced back to a time when Huey Long was living. By this standard, everyone having known a man who committed an unlawful act would also be partially to blame. Every effort was made to convey the impression that Huey Long was in some way responsible for it all.

As for his share-our-wealth program, his enemies should be careful in their criticism lest the details of his plan become too well known. As a practical matter he never actually promised to give anything to anyone in his plan. He proposed to make it possible for people to get an education, a home, a good job, and a pension in old age. A large portion of his proposals have been adopted since his death. The present GI bill of rights together with the Social Security Act has for a large number of our people gone as far as anything he ever recommended. One of the few things remaining is to find a way to pay for what the Government is now doing. The paying, of course, reverts back to the old bugaboo of the privileged class. Huey Long wanted to place a capital-tax levy on all fortunes over $1,000,000. His theory was that the power of wealth in a few hands is a very bad thing for the Nation in a great many ways. One of them is that it leads to dishonest attempts to thwart the legislative and legal will of the majority of the people in a democracy. Sometimes this is done by bribing their public officials; more often by controlling the press.

And there you have the motive for a desire to make of Huey Long a Lucifer in the pageant of democracy. It is useless to attempt to make unpopular the idea of betterment of the poor man and the Nation by taxing where there is the best ability to pay. The end must be achieved by making the most altruistic of public servants appear to be Satanic characters. This is not necessary of the ordinary worthy who is incapable of note. But when a man comes along who is capable of achieving the utmost heights he must have special treatment. Murder is not enough. He must be maligned for all eternity. His praiseworthy deeds must be obscured or made to appear as the means of fostering fiendish purposes. He must live in history as a legendary character of the underworld.

I often wonder whether, from a niche in the heavens, an angel can look back onto this place of strife and turmoil to see what we earthlings are now doing. If my devoutly religious father could do just that, I know he would find comfort in the words of Jesus: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven."

GOVERNMENT AND A FREE PRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Government and a Free Press," delivered by Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia at the annual banquet of the Virginia Press Association, Richmond, Va., January 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TESTING AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Testing Our American Citizenship," written by him and published in the October 1946 issue of Public Service, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTITUDE OF SECRETARY FORRESTAL TOWARD UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forrestal for Unification," published in the Boston Herald of January 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JUDGE JOHN D. MILLER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Judge John D. Miller, published in the December 17, 1946, issue of the Dairymen's League News, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Development of the Colorado River Basin," delivered by William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, at Omaha, Nebr., on October 11, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOISE, IDAHO—ARTICLE BY BIERNE LAY, JR.

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the city of Boise, written by Bierne Lay, Jr., and published in the January 18, 1947, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUANCE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national-defense program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to Senate Resolution 46. Under the unanimous-consent agreement when the Senate recessed Friday night the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the debate on the question now pending before the Senate is, in my opinion, being very closely followed and scrutinized by the press and the people of America. The issues involved should, I think, be made clear. The parliamentary situation is that the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] submitted a resolution proposing to set up again a special committee to investigate certain aspects of the war effort. Discussion ensued as to whether such a special committee should be constituted in view of the Reorganization Act which Congress recently enacted, and thereafter the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] offered an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Maine. That amendment proposes, if I understand it correctly, that the investigatory task contemplated by the Senator from Maine to be performed by a special committee of the Senate shall be performed by a standing committee of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. President, let me make it clear at the outset that the question is not whether any aspect of the conduct of the war shall be investigated by the Senate or the House of Representatives or by both. No Senator on this side of the aisle has any objection to, nor would any Senator on this side of the aisle throw any obstruction into the path of the progress of such an investigation; indeed, it would make no difference if the minority should interpose objection, because a Republican Senator is chairman of each standing committee of the Senate, and each standing committee has a majority of Republican Senators in its membership. That statement applies, of course, to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which has to do with providing special funds out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and it applies to the Committee on Appropriations, which holds the purse strings of the Senate of the United States, and, of course, there is a comparable committee in the House. So the Democratic Senators, with respect to this matter, want it clearly understood that not only are they interposing no objection but they have no hesitation in agreeing to the most full and thorough and complete investigation of any aspects of the war effort.

I think here I might well call attention to the fact that in the conduct of an American war the Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, who was also the President of the United States, showed himself to be first of all an American when he appointed to the high places of Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War two eminent Americans with a long record of distinguished service in what was then the minority party, the Republican Party. So the Republican Secretary of War and the Republican Secretary of the Navy were principally responsible for the conduct of the war effort. But as I said, I wished to make it clear to the country that what we are saying here has no relationship whatever to any desire or intention to obstruct, delay, or hinder any aspect of an investigation which might touch any phase of the war effort.

The second point which I desire to make clear is that it is not merely a question as to which is the better investigating unit, a special committee of the Senate or a standing committee. I think much could be said in favor of the desirability of an investigation by a regular standing committee. I think Senators will recall from their experience that in the past as a general rule investigations by standing committees which have had legislative power and which could propose legislation to the Senate after the investigation have probably accomplished more substantial, material progress in the long run than have investigations by special committees. I think it might also be said that the standing committee usually costs less than a special committee. I believe that an examination of the files of the old Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate would disclose that, generally speaking, special committees have had more numerous personnel, and that they have been paid higher salaries than has been true in the case of standing committees.

I think it will also be found that an element of sensationalism sometimes creeps into the work of a special committee, because of the peculiar psychology involved. Sometimes there is an element of politics, which seldom enters into the deliberations and functions of a standing committee. I believe that the standing committees of the Senate have made a record which will compare favorably with the record of special committees. If it were a question as to which was the better agency of the Senate to make inquiry upon any subject, our experience and knowledge would advise us that the standing committee is a more desirable, more efficient and, in the long run, more effective agency than the special committee for such investigative functions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I make that statement with peculiar reference to the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which reads as follows:

> Legislative oversight by standing committees—recommendation: That the standing committees of both Houses be directed and empowered to carry on continuing review and oversight of legislation and agencies within their jurisdiction; that the power of subpena be given them and that the practice of creating special investigating committees be abandoned.

I believe that recommendation was embodied in the Reorganization Act. So in the case of the standing committee, for example, which investigates, we will say, the War Department, it has a continuing jurisdiction to supervise the functioning of the War Department. It does not end with a certain time, or with a certain Congress. The standing committee continues with each succeeding Congress. If some abuse in the keeping of accounts is discovered, or if some abuse in methods of procurement is found by a special committee, all the special committee can do, having no legislative power, is to publish the fact in the newspapers and file a report with the Senate, which will come to the Secretary as a bulky document which Senators will never have an opportunity to read. But before any legislative action can be taken to remedy the defect or correct the wrong, the Committee on Armed Services must take all that material, acquaint itself with it, assimilate it, draft legislative measures to counteract the evil, then consider the proposed legislation, hold hearings, and finally vote; and at last, if it acts favorably, recommend action to the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator has emphasized the last point. I think every Senator, and especially new Members of the Senate who are not familiar with the rules, should thoroughly understand that whatever recommendation the special committee might make in the way of legislation would have to go first to a standing committee. The standing committee, if it did its duty, would have to go over the material which had been assembled by the special committee before it could prepare and recommend intelligent legislation for the Congress.

Let me point out the further fact that it is a strict parliamentary rule that no special committee can be appointed unless it is predicated upon the theory that some legislation will be produced as a result of the investigation made. That is another extremely important point.

Let me say to the able Senator from Florida, while I am on my feet, that an inquiry to the counsel of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program discloses that not a single piece of legislation has been recommended by that committee during the past 18 months of its existence.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Supplementing the remarks of the Senator from Illinois and his inquiry to the Senator from Florida, let me point out that in this specific instance as to special committees that custom and rule was entirely disregarded. The question was not submitted to the respective standing committees. The rules, as well as the custom and tradition of years, were contravened. Why the rush? What is the motivation behind it all? Before we are through, I think we shall elucidate that subject on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator from Florida does not object, I should like to amplify the point made by the Senator from Illinois and the point being made by the Senator from Florida.

Previous to this time the Senate itself had organized in such a way that it anticipated that, instead of select committees being the general rule, as had been the case—a condition which the Joint Committee on Organization tried to overcome—they would be a very special exception.

The Senator from Florida has suggested that the Committee on Armed Forces could, in its ordinary procedure, appoint subcommittees to carry on an investigation. That has been done, as the Senator knows. But there is one other fact in regard to such committees as the old Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and others; and that is that the Senate itself saw the need for continuity between the legislative committees and the committees which have charge of more or less executive review. It was one of the rules of the Senate that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the ranking minority member of the Military Affairs Committee should sit with the Appropriations Committee whenever it was considering matters relating to the War Department. That was also true of the Navy Department and the State Department.

The fact is that the reorganization scheme did nothing new. It merely followed the usual practice of the Senate itself under its own rules up to that time. That is why the reorganization bill passed the Senate so overwhelmingly. Senators understood exactly what was being done.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a matter which he himself has been stressing when he stated the fact that standing committees of the Senate are continuing bodies. There is something in the new Reorganization Act which I think we should bear in mind as we consider this problem, and that is that the professional staffs of the standing committees are to be chosen for their peculiar fitness and qualifications for their work, without regard to political affiliations; it being the intention that those men on the staffs of the standing committees shall continue in their positions, even though there be a change in the political complexion of the committee, giving a permanency and continuity to the standing committees which no special committee could possibly have.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator makes a very good point, and I thank him for it.

If an investigation were made by the Committee on Armed Services certainly one or more of the four experts attached to that committee would follow the investigation through all its ramifications, maybe through many months of hearings, and, for aught we know, perhaps in many parts of the world. One or more experts would be chosen for proficiency on a nonpartisan basis, as the able Senator has pointed out, selected not by the chairman, as is ordinarily true in the case of a special committee, but by a majority of the whole committee; and such staff members would follow the inquiry all the way through its many ramifications and labyrinthine course, and they would be in position to advise the committee technically and fully with reference to all the aspects of the investigation, whereas, as the Senator has made clear, in the case of a special committee, unless by accident some member

of a special committee staff should happen to be chosen as an expert—which is not likely, I imagine, when an investigation is conducted by a special committee—the personnel that conducted the investigation would probably never have any contact with the standing committee before which the matter would later have to come if any legislative results were to be achieved by the inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, following out the inescapable logic of the conclusions of the Senator from Florida, let me cite a very concrete case: Let us suppose that the special committee is continued; let us suppose it does a good job; let us suppose that as a result of its investigation it makes numerous recommendations for remedial legislation; nevertheless under the terms of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine the special committee would go out of existence in about a year. Let us assume that about the time it would go out of existence it should conclude that certain legislation ought to be put on the statute books to prevent a recurrence of the very conditions that had caused it to enter into the investigation.

I assume that inasmuch as it deals with Army and Navy purchases or with expenditures in the executive departments its recommendations would probably go in part to either or both of the two standing committees so that they could carry on hearings and gradually find a remedial policy to be incorporated into law.

We would then have the situation of the standing committees making the same inquiry all over again into the background of the matter in order that they might know the reasons for the recommendations and have sufficient comprehension of the facts to write a full and accurate and compensatory remedial provision into the law. So why not give it all to the standing committee in the first place?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator and it seems to me that the logic of what he says is unanswerable.

I was about to say that under the rules of the Senate a standing committee can invite a comparable committee from the House of Representatives to conduct a joint inquiry, without a special resolution by either body, because that is permissible under the rules. But that is not true in the case of a special committee. If the special committee were to make this inquiry it would simply be a Senate committee and would have no jurisdiction unless it received specific authority from the Senate to have joint meetings with a corresponding committee of the House; and if the House did not set up such a committee, there would be no House committee with which the Senate committee could meet. However, if the inquiry were made by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, it could invite joint inquiries and joint deliberations with a House committee, and Congress could accomplish legislatively.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the Senator from Florida knows. the Senator from Maryland has been a Member of the Committee on Appropriations for a long time. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that at the very beginning of the war it became necessary to try to throw around appropriations and the letting of contracts all the provisions that reasonably could be conceived of, with the object of saving Government money and to cut down unconscionable profits. As a result, we had attorneys for the War Department, the Navy Department, and other interested Government agencies finally work out a formula, and while it was not efficacious, in many instances an attempt was made to do what will have to be done in light of any future investigations which any standing committee might conduct, because, if there have been unreasonable profits made out of the war, if there have been waste and extravagance and inefficiency in the methods which were followed in the last war, then it stands to reason that the investigation, except as to criminal aspects developed, will have come to naught unless remedial and corrective legislation is written on the statute books by Congress. Out of his experience on the Committee on Appropriations the Senator from Maryland would like to make to the Senator from Florida this observation, that had we done that as a result of the investigation of World War I, instead of waiting until World War II, we might have saved the Government a great deal of money.

Obviously the committee that conducts this investigation ought to be a standing committee which can recommend legislation to make sure that in the future, in time of great haste and expediency, which accompanies war, the Government's money will not be subjected to unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Maryland for his observations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD excerpts from a press release from the New Council of American Business, Inc., and then to ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed in the RECORD. I do this simply to show that the arguments which have been made here on the floor have not been lost on the American people and that this discussion has served a very useful purpose. I ask that the press release be printed at the end of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement, in part, reads as follows:

> The New Council of American Business, representing independent businessmen throughout the country, is interested in the present discussion before the Senate on the resolution to continue the Small Business Committee.

Of course, that is not the fact, but this question of special commitees is tied up in one bundle. I quote further:

> Moreover, the debate in the Senate has disclosed that under the Congressional Reorganization Act, the standing committees of the Senate will be more effective for legislative purposes than will be any special commitees.
>
> The New Council of American Business does not believe that a special committee of such limited scope as provided in Senate Resolution 20 will adequately serve the pressing needs of independent business.

It goes on further to urge that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee study and report to the Senate legislation to provide credit assistance to all business, and it points out that the standing committees will have authority to recommend legislation and report it to the Senate.

(For complete press release see exhibit 1 at the conclusion of Mr. PEPPER'S speech.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Idaho, and his contribution gives me a chance to reiterate that it is not the objectives of the resolution we are opposing. As I have said, none of us has any desire to interfere in any way with the most thorough, fair, and full investigation of any aspect of the war effort. By all means we also favor a continuing inquiry by the Senate into the problems of small business.

I had the honor to be for a year or two recently past a member of the Senate Small Business Committee. A splendid job was done by that committee, which was headed by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If I thought that investigation would be halted by the rejection of the resolution proposed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who, I believe, is the author of the Small Business Committee resolution, then I should be very reluctant to oppose it, but we already know that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], is prepared, as soon as the pending matter is settled by the Senate, to designate a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to deal exclusively with the question of small business problems.

We also know that there are two other committees of the Senate which have jurisdiction which might affect the subject of small business. One is the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over interstate and foreign commerce generally, which might, of course, embrace small business. The third standing committee which has jurisdiction is the Committee on the Judiciary. Subhead No. 7, defining the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, is as follows:

> Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McFARLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I believe the Senator from Illinois rose first, and I yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Florida whether anything in the proposal of another resolution to create a special committee for the investigation of small business problems, which we will discuss later, would keep the Committee on Banking and Currency from proceeding and doing the same job, as I understand they expect to do.

Mr. PEPPER. On the contrary, I am informed that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has already formulated a purpose, and the names of the personnel, to constitute a standing subcommittee of his committee to investigate the problems of small business.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may, I should like to observe further that in my opinion—and I think the able Senator will agree with me—what is true with respect to the Small Business Committee is true with respect to the committee which is now under discussion. The committee headed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has untold power, under the Reorganization Act, and in my judgment, the Senator from Vermont, would have a clear right to proceed to set up a subcommittee to do the very thing the special committee is now asking to be empowered to do under the resolution we are discussing.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly; the able Senator is absolutely correct. There are two committees, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Armed Services, which have jurisdiction over this field, and could carry on the investigation without, of course, any resolution on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the further point that even if the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments wanted to carry on, notwithstanding the Senate saw fit to set up the proposed special investigating committee, it could do so, and duplicate the work being performed by the special committee.

Mr. PEPPER. That is so, without any question whatever. There is, of course, nothing in the resolution which in any sense impairs the authority of a standing committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over the subject matter. I am glad the able Senator from Illinois emphasized that point.

I now yield to the able Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I was about to add another committee, a fourth committee, as having jurisdiction of the subject matter embraced in the resolution covering small business. I refer to the Committee on Public Lands. Take the subject of mining, for instance. That should be the subject of a continuing study, which should not be stopped by the death of any committee. It should go on indefinitely.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator made that suggestion. I had not thought of the Committee on Public Lands, but the Senator's statement is obviously correct; and there are other committees which will touch the perimeter of the small business resolution in some way.

Mr. President, it has already been pointed out, but let me again, for the adequacy of the record, refer to the personnel of the Armed Services Committee and the personnel of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee is the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who has been a long-time member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate.

The next Member is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I believe he also in the past was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Then there is the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who, as I recall, was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the past. The next is the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], then the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. Those are the Republican members of the Committee and would the able Senator from Maine, who is the author of the pending resolution contemplating a special committee, wish to say that that distinguished group of Republican Senators, many of them with experience on the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs during the war, are not qualified to carry on the most thorough and effective investigation of any aspect of the war effort?

On the Democratic side are the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I am inclined to think that every one of those Senators was on either the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs during the progress of the war, and surely no one would suggest that there is an abler and a better informed group of Senators than the members of the minority I have named.

The members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the chairman of which is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Those are all able, distinguished men. I believe it has already been pointed out that a number of those Senators have been governors of their States. I know the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was the governor of his State, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was governor, as well as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been a distinguished circuit judge. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has rendered distinguished service as a State senator in his State. So they are all men of experience in public life, and, of course, of unquestioned integrity.

On the Democratic side are the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

So, Mr. President, undoubtedly no one would question the competency and the responsibility and the integrity of the personnel of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

As I said a while ago, obviously the objective of the resolution is the passage of legislation, for in the concluding part we find the following:

Provided further, That the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948, at which time all powers and duties conferred upon the committee shall terminate.

Unless the able Senator from Maine and the other proponents of the resolution do not really mean to end the committee on January 31, 1948, unless they really intend that it shall be a continuing committee which will be in continuous competition with the standing committee, they are asking the Senate, for all practical purposes, to restrain the hand of certain of its regular standing committees, and entrust for about a year to a special committee the task of investigating certain aspects of the war effort.

As already pointed out, the special committee would go out of existence on a certain date. In all probability their staff would not be available to the standing committees; the personnel of the special committee would not be the same, I dare say, as the personnel of the standing committees; so to a large degree all there would be would be a great deal of newspaper publicity, a great many sensational headlines, and a bulky volume or many volumes of testimony taken in many places and dumped into the lap of the Secretary of the Senate, and, by him, into the lap of a standing committee, there to repose until it accumulated dust in some already crowded corner of the committee room.

On the other hand, Mr. President, if the inquiry were made by a standing committee, there would be a personnel acquainted with the subject matter; there would be members of the committee who were familiar with the objective and the accomplishments of the inquiry, and they would be anxious to put into the form of legislation the recommendations they might have determined to make as a result of the inquiry.

So, as I said, Mr. President, if the question were the matter of determining which is the better qualified, a special committee or standing committee, to make inquiries of this sort, in ordinary times, at least, I believe that the experience of the Senate with special committees and standing committees would lead the Senate to prefer the use of its standing committees.

Let me advert here to the practice that has been growing up in the Senate, anyway, to use a subcommittee of a reg-

ular committee, even when funds had to be obtained from the Senate itself to make possible effective functioning by the subcommittee. I am thinking particularly of the Military Affairs Committee, which I know had one or more subcommittees that made very creditable investigations, and I think accomplished a great deal of good.

I am thinking of a subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], which went into the question of cartels and other subjects. There were other subcommittees of the Committee on Military Affairs that functioned almost like special Senate committees during the war, but they were always amenable to the committee chairman; they were always in association with the other members of the standing committee, and there was continuity in what the committee itself did.

If I may mention another case, there was a subcommittee of which I had the honor to be chairman, the Committee on Wartime Health and Education, which was authorized by the Senate. I did not request in the resolution that the Senate appoint a special committee; on the contrary, I requested that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which has jurisdiction over the subject of public health, be the subcommittee to make the inquiry. I am sure from experience that we were in the long run able to accomplish more, because that was a subcommittee of a standing committee, than if we had been a special committee which had no further association, after the end of the life of the special committee, with the regular Committee on Education and Labor.

As it is now, several of us who were members of that subcommittee remain as members of the standing committee, and we are able to carry on with continuity the inquiry and the effort we first made through the instrumentality of the subcommittee.

As I said, Mr. President, there does not seem to be the psychology of sensationalism in the standing committee that there is in the special committee.

On Friday in my remarks I pointed out an instance when there was printed in a magazine article information the publication of which the full committee had not authorized, which they obtained in executive session from an anonymous intelligence officer, who testified, according to the article, before the Special Senate War Investigating Committee.

I also pointed out the report that was released by a member of the special committee, through the Republican National Committee; and yet it had never been released by the full committee; it was not a full committee report. It was prepared by a staff member, and in the opinion of one of the distinguished members of the committee that it should be made public, he made it public through the instrumentality of the Republican National Committee, a few days before the election. It certainly gave the impression to some observers that an effort was being made to use this material to influence the results of the election.

It is seldom, according to my knowledge, that we have a record of that kind of experience with a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Undoubtedly, the Republican National Committee did not release the statement of the Inspector General of the Army, who denominated as false, and completely false, the statement of the "colonel," or whoever he was, whose blast was handed out just before election.

Does the Senator from Florida know it to be true that the Inspector General, who went over these same allegations by the so-called colonel, the intelligence officer, repudiated every one of them?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not know that, but it is likely that such a thing can happen, after sensational testimony is given, which, when it is sifted and examined by impartial and responsible sources, is found to be at least unreliable, if not designed for some other purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield further to the Senator from Connecticut, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McMAHON. I understand, on reliable authority, that that is the case, that the testimony in the instance referred to was repudiated by the Inspector General of the Army.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for the information he gives to me and the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine, from reliable information which he has received, thinks that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], undoubtedly in all good faith, has taken in a little too much territory in his summary, as the facts will reveal that the chief one criticized by the "colonel" was very promptly relieved from duty, a general in our services overseas, who was sent home. Whether or not that was because of the charges or for other reasons has never been explained.

The facts will also reveal that several other changes in personnel were made, which seemed to be directed to a solution of the problems presented by the one who had made the charges before our committee; that our committee had immediately submitted to the War Department a full transcript; and that 3 months elapsed between the time when the charges were made and the time when any public reports were made thereon.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question directed to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if it is not true that when the War Department finally released its comments upon these allegations which were made in executive session, they were a complete disclaimer of the charges that were made by the "colonel."

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not my impression. Of course, the charges were of so comprehensive a character, I am sure, that not even the Inspector General would say there was no basis for them. It was entirely a matter of estimating their significance. As a matter of fact, many of the charges which were made had already been publicized by the War Department itself in earlier reports regarding black marketing and other irregularities of our troops in the army of occupation. The estimate of the amount of such activities and their significance is a matter of opinion, of course. But, as Senators well know, very high officers were tried for black marketing. Whether that reached such a point that it constituted a reflection on the higher officers in charge was the problem which was presented, and it still remains.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question, with the permission of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask this question: Did the Senator from Maine, upon receiving in executive session the allegations of this officer, submit them to the War Department and obtain the War Department's reply, before they were released through the Republican National Committee?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. There was a delay of 3 months without a reply, which seemed an indication of a certain attitude, as has previously been stated by the Senator from Maine. A month elapsed, after the charges were made and were submitted to the War Department, but during that time no action whatsoever was taken, insofar as our records showed. At the end of that time, the committee met again, and again the matter was pressed. It was then unanimously determined by the committee to send the investigator overseas, but with the understanding that there would be no further report until after the election.

It was at that point that it seemed to me that the matter was being delayed without necessity and without warrant, and it was following that that the releases were made.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, the fact that the election was coming on entered into the calculations of the junior Senator from Maine, I assume.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The idea of the election did not enter the thoughts of the Senator from Maine. It so happened that the election in the State of Maine had already been held. But when a month had elapsed and still no action had been taken, which was most extraordinary in the experience of our committee, the subtle and sinister thought did intrude itself upon the mind of the Senator from Maine that possibly the matter was being delayed for purposes which would not invite full disclosure. It seems as if the people of the

United States had some rights in the matter, and from that time the action which has been a subject of discussion here was taken.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida further yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. In other words, the Senator from Maine tells us that, as he puts it, the sinister thought did occur to him that this matter was being sidetracked; and thereupon, in order to bring it out into the open, he gave the country the benefit of the matters which had been divulged in executive session. With the permission of the Senator from Florida, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine whether he communicated with the Secretary of War before he gave out this confidential report which had been received in executive session.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine, through the committee, had communicated this matter to the Secretary of War 4 weeks before the second meeting of the committee, and there was a further delay of 4 weeks before it was released.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator from Maine indicate to the Secretary of War that he was going to release it?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine did not.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was just saying that sometimes, perhaps without intending it, an element of sensationalism enters into the work of special committees. I have already read the reference in the Liberty magazine article which was prepared by the distinguished Senator from Maine, and appeared in the issue of November 9, 1946. The heading, which appears in big red streamers is, "Is scandal brewing in Germany?" The article states that it was prepared by the Senator from Maine. At the bottom, also in large red streamers, appears the following:

A sensational report of grave American misconduct in the Reich has been placed before the Mead committee. Senator BREWSTER reveals its ominous contents, and calls for immediate investigation.

In the first two sentences we find the following:

Grave conditions exist in the American occupied zone of Germany, according to information received by the Special War Investigating Committee. An intelligence officer of responsible rank and experience gave it as his considered judgment that the German troops occupying France had made a better record in their personal contacts with the population than have the American troops occupying Germany.

Mr. President, had the distinguished and able Senator from Maine reflected upon the subject I do not believe he, an eminent Senator and a patriot, would have given currency to the statement of a single intelligence officer without giving his name—a statement which gave to the gullible reader the impression that the behavior of the hordes of Hitler, the evil Nazis, in dealing with the people of subjugated and subjected France, was better, as an occupying army, than the treatment of the people of Germany by the American troops of occupation. I do not believe that a standing committee or the special committee, if it itself ever acted and if it had reflected upon the seriousness of that accusation, would have disparaged and discredited the American Army by stating that its conduct compared badly with that of the German Army upon conquered France's soil. Yet, Mr. President, as I have said, that appears to be one of the things which creep into the special committee because of a sort of peculiar psychology of sensationalism which seems to accompany the special committee.

On Friday afternoon I read here on the floor of the Senate a sensational headline which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, over the name of Mr. J. A. O'Leary, an eminent reporter of that newspaper. The article stated:

BREWSTER promises further sensation provided the special committee is continued.

Mr. President, I have before me now the Boston (Mass.) Herald, of January 15, 1947. It contains an article by W. E. Mullins. The headline is:

BREWSTER lashes two-billion-profit "fix."

The article states:

Maine's tenacious Senator OWEN BREWSTER firmly believes that greedy American war profiteers pillaged the Government for nearly $2,000,000,000 on a single phase of lend-lease.

Subsequently the writer of the article ties in that statement with the desire of the Senator from Maine to continue the special committee. The Senator from Maine is quoted as follows:

We have a staff of 30 reliable and competent investigators. We have lots of material. We have names, dates, companies, sums. I hope we can give this information in an orderly, legal manner to the American people.

Mr. President, that is a fine thing, and the Senator from Maine is to be commended for his desire to ferret out anyone who has done anything in connection with the war which is either illegal or contrary to good public policy. But, Mr. President, day after day we see statements such as that coming from the special committee, and they confirm the impression that there is a tendency toward sensationalism in the special committee; whereas the regular committee would simply go about its job of getting the facts, and, after ascertaining them, recommend to the Senate legislation of a type which would cure such abuses, and, if possible, would prevent their recurrence in the future.

So I say that I think, if all of us reflect upon our experience in the Senate with special committees, as compared to the standing committees, we will vote for the functioning of the standing committee as compared to the special committee.

I said in the first place, Mr. President, that this is not a question of stopping an inquiry into any aspect of the war. It is not a question of preventing the making of an inquiry about the problems of small business, because for several years I was a member of the Small Business Committee, and I wish to see its work continued. It has done a great deal of good. It is not a question of whether we prefer a standing committee or a special committee as an agency of the Senate to make the inquiry. The fundamental question involved here is one of the integrity of the reorganization of Congress. It is a question as to whether the Congress, which has excited such high hope in the country that we have become a body new in technique and new in spirit, will, before the month of January has passed, lapse back into the old ways of doing things, ways from which we departed by the Reorganization Act itself. That act took effect just at the beginning of this Congress. Many Senators made sacrifices in committee chairmanships or in seniority on committees in order that we might have a Congress which could more perfectly serve the interests of the people of the United States. Furthermore, Mr. President, the Reorganization Act certainly imposed upon us certain burdens, but it has given us unmistakable benefits. It has raised our salaries, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has emphasized, from $10,000 a year to $15,000 a year. It gave each of us in the Senate an administrative assistant in our offices, and he will draw a salary of $10,000 a year. It has added to the staff of the legislative counsel's office, in order that better advice in respect to legislation may be accorded us than we had before. It has added hundreds of thousands of dollars of appropriation to the Library of Congress so that the Legislative Reference Section there might be better staffed and so that we might have access to data which would help us to serve the people of America.

All that, Mr. President, we have done for ourselves, and the people of the country have applauded it almost with unanimity. The people have said, "We want Members of Congress to receive decent compensation. We want them to have adequate staffs. We want them to be able to draft legislation in a competent manner. We want technical data to be within their reach. But we want them to use the greater amount of money to the end that better government may be assured the people of America. Yet, Mr. President, in the very beginning of this plan, in the very first month of its life, Senators come on the floor and say, "Oh, we will keep our $15,000 a year; we will keep our administrative assistants at $10,000 a year each; we will keep the personnel of the legislative counsel's office; yes, we will cling to the additional appropriations for the Library of Congress and other advantages, and to the retirement provision."

Today Members of Congress have retirement benefits such as are available, aside from the armed services, to no other branch of the Government. We passed a law and provided a retirement system which gives us security in our old age at a lower rate than the ordinary civil-service employees of the United States Government pay, but the people have not objected to that. The people say, "Very well, we will recognize that it is in the interest of public service by public men that they not be frightened of the time when they shall die in the poorhouse, or fall, as one ex-Senator did, on the streets of an American city from hunger." They say, "Let Members of Con-

gress not be afraid to do what they deem to be right in the Halls of the people's Congress." And some of us now say, "Yes, we will keep all the benefits of the act, but we cannot make the sacrifice of giving up the right of exploiting a special committee. We are going to ask for more special committees again, and spend more money, when we already have standing committee staffs which can do the job, or the legislative counsel's office, or can receive aid from the Library of Congress so the standing committees can do the job. We are going to transgress upon the jurisdiction of the standing committees." I suspect many people will think that the primary purpose of the present move, because it is contemplated for only a year, is not to get the job done, but to be able to use the instrument of the special committee perhaps to make political capital which could not be availed of through the instrumentality of the standing committee.

So, Mr. President, I say that the fundamental issue involved before the Senate is the integrity of the Reorganization Act. Are we going to emasculate it in its very youth and infancy or are we going to maintain it and support it and make it stronger as the days and the years pass by?

Mr. President, I have here the debate in the Senate when the reorganization bill was here under consideration. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] asked of the able chairman of the Reorganization Committee, of which I happened to have the honor to be a member—and this appears on page 6394 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6 of last year——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, do not bother. The absence of a quorum, Mr. President, emphasizes the point I have previously made.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I cannot help but observe, as does the Senator from Illinois, the almost complete absence of Senators from the floor of the Senate. It is true it is during their lunch hour, and Senators must eat, which reminds me of a proposal heretofore made by the Senator from Florida. One of the things sought to be accomplished by the Reorganization Act was to enable Senators to be on the floor of the Senate when important debates were going on. The argument the Senator from Florida is making is important. To my mind, it is unanswerable. Regardless of his wishes, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope my distinguished friend will withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wish to express my concurrence in what the Senator from New Mexico has said. Members should, to the limit of their time and opportunity, be present on the floor of the Senate when debate is going on. I share the views expressed by the Senator from New Mexico in that respect.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very grateful to the characteristically kind and generous and wise majority leader, and this gives me an opportunity to refer again to the suggestion I made, which the Senator from New Mexico has been kind enough to recall. Here it is 1:25 p. m. We know that it is the general practice of Senators to wait around on the floor until around 1 o'clock and then go downstairs to eat in the dining room. Much of the time we all do it when we are not occupied on the floor. We must eat at sometime. There will be some Senators speaking from now until the Senate recesses at the end of the day. I would not want to interrupt a single Senator and cause him to jump up from his table, come running up to the Senate Chamber, stick his head in the door, wave to the clerk, wait until his name is called, and then go downstairs and finish his lunch. So a calling of the roll would not accomplish anything at this time except to interrupt Senators who are eating their lunch. When the roll call has been completed they will return to the dining room because maybe they have guests eating with them in the dining room, the meals may be on the table, they must eat at sometime, and this is the ordinary time when Senators eat their lunch. But the situation emphasizes the point I ventured to suggest the other day of carrying out the spirit of the Reorganization Act in having sessions of the Senate on days when there are no committee meetings; and also there ought to be a time when Senators could go to lunch while the Senate was not in session, and come back to the floor before the Senate reconvenes. What is a Senator who has the floor going to do? Either speak to a few kind Senators who are good enough to remain, or say, "Well, there are no Senators present; perhaps I might as well conclude my remarks." I certainly have no feeling that anything I can say is as good as anything absent Senators can eat in the Senate dining room. So I hope that my kind friend the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. The matter under discussion, absence from the Chamber of Senators, and the necessity that we all eat—I myself have just returned from lunch, so I cannot complain—is important, so much so that the majority leader has just now reminded me that this matter of the possibility of having a recess for a lunch hour received consideration by the joint committee when we were discussing the Reorganization Act. I am sorry that the suggestion was not adopted or a plan in some form worked out. But Mr. President, in the light of what the Senator from Florida has said, against my will I am overly persuaded not to make the point of no quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely want to express myself on the same subject as has the Senator from New Mexico. The Reorganization Act has certainly not brought about all the reforms in connection with reorganization that are necessary and which I hope some time it will be possible be bring about. I hope we may be able to begin the session of the Senate at a time after the lunch hour or a sufficient time before so that a recess may be taken for the lunch hour, and there may be full attendance of Senators on the floor which debate always deserves.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. I want my friend the Senator from New Mexico to know that I appreciate what he has said.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a statement respecting the same matter?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was pointed out that we might if we wished violate our American custom and consider following the British practice of holding evening sessions. That is a matter which also should be brought into consideration, I believe.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly agree. I have noticed, and I am sure it has been the observation of the Senator from Maine, that evening sessions are usually the best attended sessions we have.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Florida put his suggestion for earlier sessions of the Senate, with noon recess, into any resolution calling for a change in the rules?

Mr. PEPPER. I made it only as a suggestion on the floor; but probably it would be well to incorporate it in the form of a formal resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that if the Senator expects any action he should put it in the form of a resolution; and if he decides to do so and the language is appropriate, the Senator from Oregon will be very happy to join in the support of such a resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon is always an effective force on any side. I should be honored to have his support. I think I shall try to reduce the suggestion to the form of a resolution.

Mr. President, I was about to read the colloquy which took place in the Senate between the able chairman of the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress and the present distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the

Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. On page 6394 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 1946, I find the following:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question with reference to section 126 of the bill which reads:

"No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives."

My first question to the Senator is this: If that were the present law, would it have been impossible for the Senate to have set up, for example, a special committee to deal with the subject of atomic energy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; except as the Senate has suspended the rules for that purpose. While the Senator was at lunch today at the White House, I discussed this matter with other persons. It does not, of course, affect any joint committees which may now be in existence, such as, for example, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It would not affect the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, if we were confronted today with this rule, and the subject of atomic energy suddenly loomed on the horizon, and it was felt to be necessary to create a select or a special committee of either the Senate or of the other House, or a joint committee of both Houses to consider that highly important subject, it would be necessary for the Senate and the House, if the committee were to be a joint committee, to suspend their rules or, if the committee were to be a special committee of either House, it would be necessary for the House concerned to suspend its rules.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the purpose of section 126 is to frown, so far as it can, upon that method of approach to legislation?

I invite attention to the following words of Senator La Follette:

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The committee came to the conclusion that if we could reorganize the committees, and staff them adequately, it would be in the interest of orderly and efficient legislative procedure to have the standing committees or subcommittees thereof conduct studies and investigations, because, after all, if legislation is to flow from these activities, normally the select or joint committees do not have legislative power, and it is often necessary for the standing committee to thrash over much of the straw and the wheat that has been thrashed over by a special or select joint committee, as the case may be.

However, I express it as my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that at any time when a matter of great consequence, such as atomic energy was when it first became a subject for consideration, and still is, for that matter, I have no doubt that the Senate and the House would suspend the rules to meet a situation of that kind.

The reason why we have drawn this tight ban is that we know full well, from long experience, that unless there is a ban, to obviate which very extraordinary action such as suspending the rules is required, we will not check the tendency to appoint select committees of both the House and Senate, and joint select committees, of which we now have a considerable number in both Houses, and I anticipate that as time goes on, unless the action here proposed is taken, they will multiply in geometric progression.

There are three things in that statement to which I wish to call attention. The first is the prohibition of special or select committees in the reorganization bill as it came to the Senate and the House from the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. The second is the fact that the recommendation prohibiting special committees was adopted by the Senate; and, thereafter, had the House concurred—and I shall discuss that point—it would have been impossible to have had a special committee in the Senate, except by waiver of the rule, which requires a two-thirds vote.

Senator La Follette stated the reason for the ban, which would require a two-thirds vote instead of a majority vote to create a special committee. He stated that the danger was that if we did not require a two-thirds vote the Senate would yield to the temptation to establish special committees, and the first thing we knew they would multiply in geometric progression.

I have before me page after page of the hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Those who appeared before the committee stated their reasons for the suggestion to abolish special committees, except by a two-thirds vote of the Senate in case of a real emergency.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I invite the Senator's attention to the very obvious fact that the special committee which studied the situation and wrote the reorganization bill realized that the act itself would have defects which would appear after it went into operation. Apparently with that in mind they wrote into the law, as it relates to the duties of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the following provision:

Such committee shall have the duty * * * of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

In other words, when they wrote the act they realized that it would prove to be imperfect, and perhaps inadequate. There are already indications that they were correct in that assumption. So they made provision for a study of the effect of the act itself upon our legislative work.

As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I believe that this is an important part of the work which will devolve upon the committee. I think I am safe in saying that we will undertake a study of the effect of the Reorganization Act on the legislative branch. It will require some time. The defects in the act will not be apparent all at once. It already appears that certain committees are overwhelmed with the duties which have been placed upon them, and it may be that we have streamlined the Congress to an undue extent in reducing the number of committees to 15, although it was perfectly obvious to all of us that 33 committees were entirely too many.

What I wish to point out is that the act itself provides an orderly manner for the creation of new committees, for evaluating the effects of the act, and for making recommendations to the Congress for its revision. It is our purpose to comply with that part of our duties.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. Everyone who is familiar with the distinguished record of the able Senator from Vermont must know that he will preside over his committee with integrity and distinction. I am glad to have him call attention to the point which he has mentioned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator is discussing this point, I wish to mention a matter with which I am sure he is entirely familiar, and which he probably intends to discuss. I hope he will amplify the discussion, because in my opinion the point is important. I refer to the difference between the method of handling the pending resolution and the cautious and careful method prescribed by the Reorganization Act.

The Senator will recall, I am sure, the provision in the new law that the Committee on Rules and Administration shall not consider any manner of substantive law unless it has been first considered by the standing committee having jurisdiction. I submit that the resolution extending the authority of the special committee is a substantive matter. It was not referred to any standing committee. I am not critical of the Presiding Officer, but as shown by the RECORD there was not even a unanimous-consent agreement that it go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from Maine merely presented his resolution and the Chair referred it to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Thereafter, as the Senator recalls, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] ably explained, as a member of the committee, how the committee met one day without any notice that these resolutions were to be considered, and after a brief discussion voted to report them favorably, although the minority members of the committee were not notified that they were to be acted upon, and when they asked for time to give the matter consideration it was denied them.

Mr. PEPPER. That is my understanding of the facts, and I am very glad that the Senator has brought the situation to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the act is plain as regards the reference of bills and resolutions to the two committees, the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, because it states that the Committee on Rules and Administration shall have jurisdiction of matters relating to parliamentary rules and floor and gallery rules.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is charged with evaluating the effect of the entire law upon the work of the legislative branch of the Government. The Committee on Rules and Administration unquestionably has jurisdiction of the matter of parliamentary rules and floor and gallery rules as well as a great many other duties.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is correct. It is a very serious question as to whether it was appropriate for the

Committee on Rules and Administration in this particular case to recommend a special committee without any consideration having been given to the subject by any standing committee of the Senate, especially in view of the fact that the jurisdiction of the special committee necessarily impinged upon and overlapped the jurisdiction of at least two standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress clearly contemplated, when it made its recommendation, and the Senate clearly contemplated when it adopted the joint committee's recommendation banning special committees, that there should be no special committee except by a two-thirds vote of the Senate waiving the rule banning special committees.

Senator La Follette, the able chairman of the committee, made it clear in the debate between June 4 and June 10, when the reorganization bill passed the Senate, that if the Senate were confronted with the need for further committee study or jurisdiction it could do one of two things without a two-thirds vote, but only by a majority vote.

First, it could extend the jurisdiction of a standing committee. If there should be any question in the mind of the able Senator from Maine [Mr BREWSTER] or of any other Senator that any of the standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration or some other committee, does not have adequate jurisdiction to investigate any aspect of the war, all he would have to do would be to submit a simple resolution to amend and enlarge the jurisdiction of a standing committee, have it go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, let that committee report it to the Senate by a majority vote, and let the Senate by a majority vote, if it cares to do so, adopt it, and the whole difficulty will be solved. The Senate still has its standing committees, with the same Senators, the same expert staffs of four, and the same expert groups of six clerks each. Incidentally, members of the staff are paid a base salary of $8,000 a year, which, in gross I suppose, would be at least $10,000.

Under the Reorganization Act, every standing committee of the Senate is authorized by majority vote to name four staff experts at $10,000 a year gross, and to name six clerks who may be paid up to $8,000 a year. I believe that would be about $10,000 a year gross. There is personnel available to every standing committee of the Senate without creating a special committee, hiring any more persons, or spending any more money.

So the first method, without any reference to a special committee, is to enlarge the jurisdiction of a standing committee if there is some problem that is not covered by the jurisdiction of the standing committees outlined in the Reorganization Act.

The second way that the Senate may meet the problem is to create a new standing committee. For example, if the Senate thinks there should be a standing committee to investigate the war, if that is the proposal of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] let it be a standing committee. All he has to do is to submit a resolution to add one more standing committee and have the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. If it is favorably reported and adopted by a majority of the Senate, the committee is created. Then the Republican side will have a majority on the committee and will have the chairmanship of it. I dare say that if it can show reason for such a new committee there will be no objection on this side of the aisle. There, again, the jurisdiction of the Senate is adequately expressed. But the Senator from Maine does not propose either of those courses in harmony with the Reorganization Act. He proposes starting again the old vicious practice of creating special committees. Yet the Senator from Maine himself, when he testified before the committee, made the following statement. I am reading from page 231 of the hearings before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress. I quote:

> I think Congress must function primarily through the responsible committees, and my emphasis would be upon that.

The Senator from Maine, I venture to suggest, was nearer right as a matter of public policy when he spoke before the committee sometime ago, when he placed his emphasis upon the standing committee, than he was when he offered the resolution to create a special committee. Someone may say, "If the Senate version of the Reorganization Act had been adopted by the House it would have required a two-thirds vote by the Senate to have created a special committee." But it is said that the House did not adopt the Senate version. It cut out the ban against the special committee.

The House did not do that. It was done in the parliamentary way that the matter was handled in the House. I understand that the Reorganization Act was not allowed a place on the calendar in the closing days of the Congress unless a substitute for the Senate version were offered from the floor leaving out this ban against the special committee. So the House of Representatives never voted on leaving out the ban against a special committee. By the parliamentary technique under which the measure was brought up in the other body the ban against the special committee was simply eliminated, and the House never voted on the question at all.

In the second place, the situation in the House with respect to standing committees has been and continues to be different from the situation with respect to standing committees in the Senate. In the Senate, as we all know, a standing committee has the power of subpena. In the House a standing committee does not have the power of subpena. The House has followed the practice of not allowing standing committees to subpena witnesses without the express authority of the House itself. It may be that that difference between the rule of the House and the rule of the Senate was responsible for the action of the House in seeking to strike out the ban against special committees for both Houses of Congress.

But, Mr. President, again I emphasize that the House never voted upon the question of the deletion of this prohibition, and the Senate itself never had the matter called to its attention—I believe I am correct about this—when the Senate actually voted upon the bill. It will be recalled that in the closing days of the last Congress, the able Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was anxious to get the bill acted upon. The House struck out all after the enacting clause, and left out the section about banning special committees. There may have been some other minor changes, but that was one of the few changes made by the House. I was a member of the Joint Committee on Organization. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] also was a member of it. In the haste to have the matter concluded, Senator La Follette never even called a meeting of his committee. After talking to several representative members of the committee, and no doubt to the then majority leader and perhaps to other Senators, he simply thought the situation justified his moving that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House, without further discussion or further delay. The able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who was another distinguished member of that committee, I believe will concur in the statement that that is what happened. We never debated the matter, but we simply gave our concurrence to the action of the House, in order to get the bill passed at that time. But surely we did not change the view of the Senate, clearly expressed when the Senate debated the question. Able Senators such as the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the present President pro tempore, and the former distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, asked Senator La Follette about the effect of this ban, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, if I correctly read the RECORD, indicated at one place in the RECORD that the answers made by Senator La Follette were satisfactory to him.

So that was the view of the Senate, although, of course, we are not bound by it now, because the provision was deleted in the sister body of Congress. But it raises a question of policy, namely, whether we wish to depart so soon from a provision which was viewed by almost everyone to be so salutary and to represent such sound views in regard to good policy in dealing with congressional committees.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the view of the Senator from Florida in regard to the manner in which the reorganization bill was acted upon by the House of Representatives is very interesting. I wonder whether the Senator has heard of any plan under way for the creation of special committees in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not informed on that subject, I may say to my able friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the action of the House, I think it would be interesting to learn whether there are under way

any plans for the creation of special committees in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me say that Representative Cochran, of Missouri, appeared before the Joint Committee on Organization. I shall read briefly from his statement:

> These investigation committees have gone so far it is a joke. In my opinion, they will soon have to name an investigating committee to investigate the investigating committees. I thought we were not going to have any in the House this year until you made your recommendation. Then, there were two postwar planning committees—

And so on. Next, he said this:

> I think we have passed resolutions up to now for 17, and I believe we have got about 30 resolutions pending before Mr. Cox's committee. Haven't we, Mr. Cox?
>
> Mr. Cox. About five, I think.
>
> Mr. COCHRAN. We have already about 17.

He understood that they had about 17 special committees, and it was his view that it was desirable to get rid of them.

Here in the Senate we had numerous special committees. It was the consensus of opinion of the Senate that we should get rid of them and that we should function through the standing committees.

Mr. AIKEN. So during the last Congress 17 special committees had been authorized by the House of Representatives, and 30 resolutions requesting the creation of additional special committees were before the House of Representatives at that time. I understand that those committees have not been continued during the present session of Congress, and are not to be, without further action on the part of the House.

I asked my previous question in order to find out whether any plans are under way for the continuation of other special committees on the part of the House of Representatives. I myself have heard of none.

Mr. PEPPER. I have heard of none.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not know whether the Senator from Florida had heard of any.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I have not.

Mr. President, I desire to conclude my remarks in a few moments. I have said that above every other issue involved in this controversy is the essential question of the integrity of the Act reorganizing Congress. I do not know of another piece of legislation which has received such widespread approval from the press and from the people of the country as has the Reorganization Act, which the Congress courageously enacted at the last session. Great business firms and engineers, whose fees undoubtedly run into very large figures when they are working for private clients, volunteered their information free of charge in order to help the Congress determine how to function more efficiently for the people, and the Congress likewise had the suggestion of the distinguished and lamented late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, that in this day we should try to reorganize our own machinery so that it could function more efficiently in the public interest. Time after time we had heard doctors tell individual Senators that they were killing themselves by trying to carry a load of work which they could not carry physically and could not do well because they were thus required to do more than they could possibly do.

So, Mr. President, we made a great step forward. It was a bipartisan step. No one claims the credit for it. The bill was introduced by a Democrat. The chairman of the committee, chosen at a time when the Democrats were in the majority in the Senate, was a Republican, and as fine a man as ever sat in this or any other legislative body, the distinguished Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin. The work was bipartisan. We did not act as Democrats or as Republicans, but we tried to act as Senators and as Americans. I respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I wish to say to my Republican colleagues, with all respect, that it will not do the Republican Party credit in the eyes of the press and the people of the United States to be the first ones to break the dam which we built against the flood of special committees and irregular instrumentalities of that kind. The Members of Congress have been so noble and have acted so unselfishly and so patriotically in creating this new efficiency for the Congress, that I wonder whether the majority party now wishes to bear, in the eyes of the people of the country, the responsibility of being the first to break the dam and thus to loose the kind of flood which will then pour forth.

Mr. President, we know that today the issue is raised by a resolution calling for the creation of a Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, and we know that there happens to be a second resolution calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Small Business. Both subjects are important. But are we prepared to say that there will not be other subjects of great importance which may call for the creation of other special committees? If we create a Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and if we create another Special Committee To Investigate and Study the Problems of Small Business, shall not we be called upon to create a special committee to investigate public health and other special committees to investigate other aspects of our national life? When and how can we stop, if once we break the rule which we deliberately laid down last year, namely, that special committees should not be authorized, except by means of a two-thirds vote of the Senate—by waiving the rule, so to speak—because of the emergency of the demand.

Mr. President, this is a difficult time for democracy in the world. Many persons are alarmed about the displacement of democracies in many areas of the earth by ideologies which are the antithesis of democracy. Mr. President, the only time when I am fearful about the survival of democracy anywhere on earth is when democracy fails to work effectively. We cannot point to a country on earth in which nazism or fascism or communism prevails, except where preceding such prevalence there was a failure of democracy, regardless of whether the country was Italy or Russia or Germany.

I have said on this floor repeatedly, and I am almost embarrassed to say it again, that I was in Germany in 1938. At that time I saw the scars on the walls from street fighting. The reason Hitler came to power was that there were 7,000,000 unemployed in Germany, because the struggling democracy was not able to carry the task against the obstacles it had to face; and because democracy failed in Germany, Hitler with his perfidy came into power, and was the monster that in the war he brought about devoured 50,000,000 men, women, and children on the face of the earth.

Then consider Russia. There never would have been a revolution in Russia in 1917 had it not been for the centuries of oppression, for the night that had been closed down over the minds and the bodies and the souls of the Russian people by the age-long absolutism of the czars. It was against that that the people rebelled. Or consider Italy. We find that when Mussolini marched to power it was because democracy had collapsed in Italy.

So, Mr. President, if we will make democracy strong we need not fear nazi-ism, we need not fear fascism, we need not fear any foreign ideology. But let democracy collapse, let democracy fail, and they will rush in as air flows into a vacuum, and it will be impossible by any direct attack to keep them out.

I believe that is true of all dangerous ideologies. The best way to keep them out of America is to make the example of democracy's working so strong and so persuasive that anybody who suggests anything other than American democracy is designing, he is fooled, or he is a fool, when he makes the suggestion.

Mr. President, what we have done by virtue of the Reorganization Act has a very direct relationship to making democracy work. I believe that at this critical time, when the eyes of men everywhere are looking for hope in the continued strength and efficiency of American democracy, we should not repudiate the forward step we have so recently taken.

EXHIBIT 1

NEWS FROM NEW COUNCIL OF AMERICAN BUSINESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

In a statement released to the press today, George C. Hatch, president of the New Council of American Business, announced that his organization favored discontinuance of the Senate Small Business Committee so that the established standing committees of the Senate could move immediately to consideration of bills to aid small business.

The New Council of American Business declared that a mere investigative committee which has no power to report out legislation will serve no useful purpose for small and independent businesses. Instead in a three-point proposal the council urged that the Banking and Currency Committee act on legislation to give credit aids to small business, that the Judiciary Committee act on anti-monopoly proposals, and that a permanent subcommittee be established in a standing Senate committee to prepare a comprehensive legislative program to protect competitive business.

The statement follows:

The New Council of American Business, representing independent businessmen throughout the country, is interested in the present discussion before the Senate on the

resolution to continue the Small Business Committee.

On January 10, the New Council of American Business wired Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, who has performed a distinguished service for American business in his chairmanship of the committee, urging that the work of the Small Business Committee "be extended and enlarged in scope by the new Congress." The findings of this committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress demonstates that the problems affecting independent business are of such urgency and of such magnitude that it is imperative, if competitive enterprise is to survive, that the Senate move to immediate consideration of the legislative needs of independent business. Senator MURRAY has stated that he is prepared to offer now more than 50 major recommendations intended to arrest the growth of monopoly. We were surprised to learn, therefore, that instead of creating a committee with enlarged powers, the resolution to reconstitute the Senate Small Business Committee (S. Res. 20) extends the committee without greater power and for a period of only 8 months. Moreover, the debate in the Senate has disclosed that under the Congressional Reorganization Act, the standing committees of the Senate will be more effective for legislative purposes than will be any special committees.

The New Council of American Business does not believe that a special committee of such limited scope as is provided in Senate Resolution 20 will adequately serve the pressing needs of independent business.

The council proposes instead that standing committees with legislative powers give immediate consideration to all measures which are intended to protect the competitive position of small and independent business. In particular, we urge as a most urgent need that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee study and report to the Senate legislation to provide credit assistance to small business and that the Senate Judiciary Committee study and report to the Senate legislation to curb monopoly. The council urges further that a permanent subcommittee be created within the appropriate standing committee of the Senate to study the continuing problems of small business and report to the Senate comprehensive legislation to preserve competitive business in our country.

The deep concern of the Senate with the needs of independent and small business in the past makes us certain that the present session will continue that interest. We trust, however, that the Senate will recognize the urgency of the problem and because of that recognition will refuse to establish a mere investigative committee which, since it has no legislative power, will serve no useful purpose. Rather, the New Council of American Business urges that the Senate give its immediate attention to the legislative solutions for the problems of small and independent business.

JANUARY 17, 1947.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Cooper
Barkley	Butler	Cordon
Brewster	Byrd	Donnell
Bricker	Cain	Downey
Bridges	Capehart	Dworshak
Brooks	Capper	Eastland
Buck	Connally	Ecton
Ellender	Lucas	Revercomb
Ferguson	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Flanders	McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Saltonstall
Green	McGrath	Smith
Gurney	McKellar	Stewart
Hatch	McMahon	Taft
Hawkes	Magnuson	Taylor
Hayden	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Thye
Hoey	Millikin	Tobey
Holland	Moore	Tydings
Ives	Morse	Umstead
Jenner	Murray	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	Wherry
Kem	O'Daniel	White
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Knowland	Overton	Williams
Langer	Pepper	Wilson
Lodge	Reed	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator. I desired an opportunity to make a very brief statement in connection with the resolution seeking to continue the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that the Senator will not take more than 3 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall probably take less time than that.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I desire it clearly shown in the RECORD that the Armed Service Committee, feeling their responsibility for the proper functioning of the committee in connection with all matters appertaining to the operation of the Army and the Navy, immediately asked the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to appear before the committee and state what his intentions were as to matters he would not investigate.

I desire stated in the RECORD my belief, and he so told the committee, that so far as concerns any future matters affecting the operations of the Army and the Navy, or any of the armed forces, his committee would in no way interfere with matters that he felt properly belong to the regular standing committee, the Armed Services Committee.

He also stated definitely that matters affecting the disposal of war surplus material, either here or abroad, would in no way be handled by his committee but would continue to be one of the subjects that the Armed Services Committee would handle.

Furthermore, inasmuch as there had been statements in the press in reference to the proper regulation of occupational forces both in Germany and in the Pacific, it was stated that if any matters such as that should need investigation it would be the proper function of the Armed Services Committee to conduct it, and that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program would not in any way interfere.

In general, the Senator from Maine informed our committee that the activities of his special committee would be confined mostly to contract work, to transactions that occurred in the past, and from now on would in no way affect problems incident to the control and regulation of the Army and the Navy.

As chairman, I should like to say that in this formal committee meeting I am sure that a majority of those present were convinced that the operations of the special committee in the future, if it be retained, would in no way interfere with the responsibility of our committee.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in connection with the enlightening statement made by the Senator from South Dakota, I think it should be mentioned at this point in the RECORD, especially if investigations are to be carried on in regard to contract settlements and military contracts, that the Contract Settlement Act itself contains a provision that the office which brings about the settlements shall make periodic reports to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and the Military Affairs Committee of the House; so that as far as that field is concerned, it has been completely taken care of by the very law which created the Office of Contract Settlement.

WRONGFUL DIVERSION OF CLOTHING

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, during 1946 there was set up an organization known as the Victory Clothing Drive, and under it a corporation known as the United Nations Clothing Collection, Incorporated. This committee was set up by the President to conduct the work, Henry Kaiser being appointed by the President to head that organization. For the most part the Victory Clothing Drive accomplished a great amount of good for the poor and destitute people of Europe. But one thing occurred which I think should be called to the attention of the Senate. Although small in scope it may have a tremendous effect in the West because what occurred represented fraud and corruption within this organization.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter from the Cavalier County Republican, which explains this incident better than I can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

CAVALIER COUNTY REPUBLICAN,
Langdon, N. Dak., January 15, 1947.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

FRIEND MILT: Last week while on my regular trips calling on the elevators and business places in our trade territory, I called on Lars Midjaas, of Clyde, who in the course of

our talks told me about a letter his wife had gotten from a lady at Hazelton, N. Dak. It seems that this lady at Hazelton answered an ad that she saw in the Farmers Union Herald from a Chicago house advertising dresses for 100 at $18—in other words 18 cents apiece. She answered the ad and sent the $18 and received the dresses. All of which were used dresses and in the sleeve up near the shoulder inside was a note pinned which read as follows:

"This note is to wish you lots of good luck and I hope this garment will be of some real comfort and use to you. I would like to hear from you in return so that we can see what part of the country and friends this reaches overseas.

"Sincerely,

"Mrs. LARS MIDJAAS.

"FAIRDALE, N. DAK., U. S. A."

It so happens, Milt, that this dress was given to the clothing drive conducted last year in January under the sponsorship of the Federal Government and was the drive that was conducted with Kaiser at the head. She gave this dress to the preacher at Fairdale, Rev. O. J. Bilstad, and his wife was chairman of the drive in that town; they in turn took the clothing to the Kedney warehouse in Grand Forks, which was the collection depot for this territory, and from there I don't know where it went.

This lady at Hazelton, Miss Elizabeth Ohlhouser, described the dress to Mrs. Midjaas and it was the dress that was given to the drive.

The name of the Chicago house is: V. Portnoy Mail Order House, 567 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, Ill.

I have the letters from Miss Ohlhouser to Mrs. Midjaas, and also have the letters that were written to Mrs. Midjaas the second time asking for more information by Mrs. Midjaas, and also have a circular from the mail-order house which shows the ad for 100 dresses for $18.

It looks like they evidently have overlooked taking this note out of the sleeve, because it was inserted so that it was not easy to find.

We are blasting this thing in our paper tomorrow, and I think that it would be a good thing to start investigating, as there will be a lot of people wondering if their clothing went to the same place.

I would appreciate hearing from you as to your findings in regard to this, as we will want to keep our public informed as to what has been done by the Government on this.

* * * * *

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

DICK FORKNER.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if I may add just a word or two more, I believe the very fact that the clothing donated for charity finds its way to commercial channels represents fraud and corruption in probably its worst form, and just so soon as I find out and can determine what committees should investigate given subjects I intend to submit a resolution requesting a full investigation of the matter to which I have called the Senate's attention.

In connection with my remarks, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted at this point an editorial from the Cavalier County Republican.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To many people VE-day and VJ-day signified the end of the war. President Truman very recently proclaimed that hostilities have ceased.

However, suffering in many countries in Europe has not ended and an incident bared very recently indicates that war grafting has not yet ended.

There have always been doubts whether donations of money and materials have reached their destinations. Enough letters of appreciation have been received by people in Cavalier County and throughout the Nation to convince donors that a great deal of good has been done.

However, an occasional incident like the one recently disclosed makes a serious blot on all the good that has been done and makes each succeeding drive harder to conduct successfully.

It would not have required many stories like the one involving a dress from a Cavalier County woman to make it impossible to make future drives successful. Some might think that the story is unimportant because hostilities have ceased. The fact remains that people in many parts of Europe still need clothing badly, whether they are being shot at or bombed or not.

The story of a dress donated at Fairdale turning up in a mail order shipment of 100 dresses for $18 from a Chicago concern is one that deserves the strictest investigation and diligent prosecution.

Miss Elizabeth Ohlhouser, of Hazelton, in this State, ordered a bargain assortment of women's dresses for $18 from V. Portnoy Mail Order House, 547 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago. She had received catalogs and circulars from the concerr for several years, and the order she bought and received in November or December 1946 was not her first. She had the impression, probably from advertising previously received, that the merchandise had been traded in on new merchandise. The circular from which she ordered most recently did not state whether the 18-cent dresses were new or used.

In one of the dresses she received in the recent shipment she found a note pinned in an inconspicuous place inside the dress. It was from Mrs. Lars Midjaas, of Clyde. The note was dated January 12, 1946, at Fairdale, Mr. and Mrs. Midjaas having been living at Fairdale at the time.

In the note Mrs. Midjaas had written: "This note is to wish you lots of good luck, and I hope this garment will be of some real comfort and use to you. I would like to hear from you in return so that we can learn what part of the world and which friends this reaches overseas."

Miss Ohlhouser wrote to Mrs. Midjaas December 11, telling her about receiving the dress with the note in it, a wine-colored dress, size 16, still in very good condition. In her letter the Hazelton woman lamented that such a good dress, given for such a worthy cause, had fallen into the hands of racketeers.

Mrs. Midjaas acknowledged the letter and heard from Miss Ohlhouser again in a letter dated December 26.

Mrs. Midjaas donated the dress in the victory clothing drive which was sponsored early in 1946 throughout the country under the general chairmanship of Henry J. Kaiser, prominent wartime shipbuilder and contractor, now manufacturing automobiles, farm implements, and other items. The drive was headed in most counties by the county agents with ministers, homemaker clubs, and many other organizations and individuals cooperating.

Mrs. Midjaas gave her dress, among other items, in the drive at Fairdale, where Rev. O. J. Bilstad, Lutheran pastor, was local chairman. Contacted by the Republican Saturday, the Reverend Bilstad confirmed the fact that the Fairdale drive was a part of the victory clothing drive headed by Kaiser and reported that the Fairdale collection had been delivered in February to the Kedney warehouse in Grand Forks, as instructed.

How the dress got from the victory collection into the hands of the Chicago concern and who besides the Chicago mail order house might have profited will make interesting reading, interesting if rather discouraging to those who donated so much in the various drives and the many who worked so many days and weeks without thanks to manage the drives in the counties and towns all over the country.

The case of the 18-cent dress is being called to the attention of United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, and it is expected that a report may be made public in the future.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I understood the Senator from North Dakota to say that when he found out what committee was going to do the investigating he would have a matter to submit for investigation. I was going to suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that if he will vote against the resolutions which are being submitted for the creation of special committees, he can then take the Reorganization Act, read down the list of standing committees, and ascertain exactly what committee will have jurisdiction to investigate the matter he has spoken of.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois again yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I yield; but this will be the last time I will yield.

Mr. YOUNG. My answer to the Senator from Connecticut is that I think, in the Government of the United States, the work of investigation by committees is so important in order to keep people straight and to promote faith in democracy, that if I could have my way, I would create a permanent investigating committee to which would be referred all matters requiring investigation. In this particular case, the matter I just presented, I was wondering just what committee would have jurisdiction. I should like to consult with the chairman of the committee which would have jurisdiction over such a matter, but I have no way of knowing what that committee is.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to advise the Senator from North Dakota that under the law the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has full authority to receive the complaint of the Senator from North Dakota. That is my interpretation of the law, and I believe I am absolutely correct in it. If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to turn the complaint over to the Committee on the Expenditures in the Executive Departments the committee will be glad to take appropriate action on the matter, and we do not need any further resolution respecting it, so far as I know, in order to take action.

Mr. YOUNG. I appreciate the information. I have already spoken with several able and distinguished Members of the Senate, and no one seems to know what committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that what he has just said represents the weakness of the present situation. Members of my own party do not know where the jurisdiction lies. They have not read the La Follette-Monroney measure. Jurisdiction in the case referred to lies with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the stalwart Vermonter who sits beside me, GEORGE AIKEN. That committee has full power to act, to subpena witnesses, and examine into this matter and other kindred matters.

PLANNED AIR TRAFFIC

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress a bill introduced by me, the so-called All-American flag line bill, received considerable attention at the hands of the Committee on Commerce. I notice that the principle of that bill is now receiving the attention of the press. I have in my hand excerpts from Newsweek of January 13, 1947, in which, among other things, is the following:

Last week, after 2 years under the Chicago agreement, America was still far ahead in world aviation. But the Government-subsidized "planned-order" lines of other countries were beginning to cut in on traffic and the outlook was for further decline in American predominance.

Again the article said:

The growth of the foreign, government-operated, air-transport systems has dashed any hopes that the United States ever had for freedom of the air. At the same time it has strengthened the British call for planned order.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR: PLANNED TRAFFIC

Back in December 1944, United States negotiators entered an international air conference at Chicago seeking freedom of the air—the right for planes of any country to fly anywhere in international trade just as ships ply the seas. The British, at that time far behind in commercial aviation because of the war, insisted on a planned order in the air, with competition controlled and countries dividing up routes. The conference ended with a compromise. International air travel would be regulated by bilateral agreements between countries.

Last week, after 2 years under the Chicago agreement, America was still far ahead in world aviation. But the government-subsidized, planned-order lines of other countries were beginning to cut in on traffic and the outlook was for further decline in American predominance.

ENTERPRISE VERSUS MONOPOLY

At the start of the race the United States had all the advantage—the best transport planes, the crews, and the ground facilities built up by the Army in its global transport system. The State Department sent negotiators over the world to sign agreements for landing rights. To get them they traded landing facilities in the United States, knowing that what they gave was not as valuable as what they received because the other countries were not prepared to use our airports and won't be for several years.

There were some bad spots. The Russians refused even to talk about a possible air agreement and may call for a loan from the United States and perhaps a free hand in their satellite areas if negotiations ever reach a bargaining stage. But agreements in most areas were reached sooner than the airlines could take advantage of them, and some routes, although the Civil Aeronautics Board has granted certificates for air lines to operate, still are not being flown. Latin American and European agreements were signed quickly, and a recent one with India will permit Pan American, TWA, and Northwest Airlines to get their Far East routes started—around-the-world flights from New York to New York in 100 hours.

By last week agreements with 28 nations had been signed. Negotiations with 12 other nations were under way. No other country had done so well—in number of agreements.

The actual traffic picture was less encouraging. At the start, for example, the North Atlantic had been almost an American lake. Foreign competition began to be felt last summer. By September the British, French, Canadian, Scandinavian, and Dutch lines—all government-operated—were flying one-third of the passengers between New York and Europe. Currently the foreign lines have increased this proportion to about one-half.

The competition has become so stiff that passenger loads of American planes were down to between 60 and 70 percent of capacity. Travelers no longer have to wait for space to Europe, and the waiting list in Europe is expected to be down to the same basis by April or May.

Competition is also strengthening in Latin America. British planes are seen more and more on the airfields of Brazil and Argentina. Argentina itself is expanding its government-operated line, and governments in several countries are heavily backing their own air fleets.

SIGNIFICANCE

The growth of foreign, government-operated air-transport systems has dashed any hopes that the United States ever had for freedom of the air. At the same time, it has strengthened the British call for "planned order."

As a consequence, the British are expected to propose this year a new multilateral air pact which would bind signatory nations to allocate traffic between way points and with each other. Naturally those countries which operate their own air lines may be expected to back the British plan.

Whether American carriers can submit to planned traffic sharing overseas and still get enough business to make money remains to be answered. If they cannot, some kind of Government support appears to be the alternative. Such support will probably come through postal rates.

North Atlantic air-mail rates—the Government's payments to the carriers—are pending for 1946 and 1947. The CAB set $1.50 a ton-mile for 1945, despite an air-lines protest that it was too low. The temporary rate now in effect is much lower—75 cents. Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, the CAB may consider the needs of national defense in setting air-mail rates.

Thus, if foreign subsidized lines become too great a threat, American international air lines—lacking freedom of the air—have the potential backing of the Government Treasury.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national-defense program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I was tremendously interested in the statement a few moments ago made by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. GURNEY]. Every Senator well understands the original resolution which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Main [Mr. BREWSTER], which clearly sought to continue for at least 1 year all the power that was delegated and lodged in the old Truman-Mead-Kilgore committee.

Then the Senator who submitted the resolution discovered that he would have trouble with the Committee on Armed Services because of the overlapping jurisdiction. With the full realization that if he had trouble with the Committee on Armed Services his resolution could not pass, he then began his retreat, and the resolution was completely changed by limiting the geographical boundaries of the investigation to the continental limits of the United States. In other words, the proponents of the resolution were willing to retreat when they realized they did not have the votes to pass the original resolution. They were willing to retreat to the point where they would encroach only on the duties of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as they had originally tried to encroach on the duties of the Committee on Armed Services. That is exactly the situation as I see it. They now believe that they have the votes to override the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and adopt the resolution. It is well understood that if they had continued to press the original resolution there would have been trouble. However, the original resolution is what they really wanted because the real investigation which this committee wanted to make dealt with the occupation forces in Europe, as everyone knows from the reading of the questionnaires which were submitted here the other day by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. That was the primary reason for the continuation of the committee; and when the Committee on Armed Services said, "No; you cannot go that far," they knew they did not have the votes, so they retreated. Now they are attempting to do the same thing to the committee headed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that they tried to do to the Committee on Armed Services headed by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. And they make this second attempt because they feel that they have the votes to run over the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in this fight. That is all there is to it. Every Senator knows that if we follow the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act there is no place for this particular special committee to continue its investigation.

I wish to discuss somewhat the background of the Reorganization Act and some of the things which were said on the floor of the Senate last year, to show how far reaching the act is, if we can believe some of the statements made by the proponents of this all-important piece of congressional reform.

The winning of the global war by the Allies was the greatest military and naval victory in all history. That these United

States played the dominant role in this victory no one will challenge. No greater tribute has ever been paid to democracy than in the victories achieved.

Out of this war came complex and intricate problems—problems which in this reconversion period are being daily presented to the legislative and executive branches of this Government.

As a result of this, a serious situation has developed—a situation which challenges all America as to how domestic and foreign difficulties presented to the legislative arm of government can be solved in such a way that government will still remain close to the people. As an example, when one thinks in budget terms of thirty to thirty-seven billions of dollars to operate Government for 1 year in times of peace, that alone staggers the imagination. It is alarming and thought-provoking.

Mr. President, I have no crystal ball which tells me what the future holds for my country. However, it takes no clairvoyant to suggest that in the years that lie ahead the legislative branch of this Government will be confronted with domestic and foreign problems which will tax the mental and physical strength of the best men this Nation has produced, if we are to remain a free government and leaders in the affairs of mankind throughout the world.

Mr. President, I am certain that the Senate of the United States in the Seventy-ninth Congress recognized these growing pains when it voted so overwhelmingly to pass the Reorganization Act last year. I shall never forget the statement of our former colleague, the Honorable Robert La Follette, the man who was more responsible than any other for bringing to the Congress of the United States this fine piece of legislation dealing with congressional reform. When debating this bill he said:

> I think the fate of democracy is bound up in the reorganization and modernization of our National Legislature.

That, Mr. President, is important to me; I do not know whether it means anything to other Senators. I do not know whether politics means more than the statement which I have quoted or not. Sometimes I think perhaps it does, when I see some of the maneuvering with some of the new Senate Members who are wholly unfamiliar with the rules and wholly unfamiliar with the spirit and the letter of the act, and I recognize the reasons behind this maneuvering. I do not make that statement in any spirit of reflection upon any of those Senators.

But, Mr. President, I know what it is to come to the Congress of the United States for the first time. All of us who have had experience either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate know that it takes some time for a new Member to get his feet upon the ground. In the House of Representatives it required a couple of months before I learned what the rules were in that legislative body.

The first vote which I cast in the United States Senate was against the administration. I have been fairly independent all my life, and I propose to continue to be so, so long as I remain in politics. The first important vote I cast was on an item increasing by half a billion dollars the appropriation for the WPA. There was a great deal of pressure put on me, just as pressure has been put on Senators on the other side of the aisle. But the more pressure that was put on me the more I was inclined to go the other way. In the beginning I had an open mind on the half-billion-dollar appropriation, but I decided that if I were to remain in the Senate and permit pressure to be brought on me from the beginning until the close of my career, I never could do justice to my constituency in Illinois and to the people of the Nation. I thought it was a good time then and there to keep people off my back, to keep those in the various departments of Government and Members of the Senate from telling me what I could or could not do upon important legislative matters.

From that time on, in the 8 years during which I have been in the United States Senate, no one has ever attempted to influence me unduly with reference to a single vote.

Mr. President, I have quoted what Senator La Follette said. It is an important statement, and that is one of the reasons why I am so much interested in the Reorganization Act. If Senator La Follette was right—and I think he was—the question ought to be considered upon a high plane. It ought to be considered in the light of the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act and not for any political advantage of either party. I read again what Senator La Follette said:

> I think the fate of democracy is bound up in the reorganization and modernization of our National Legislature.

He further said:

> The fate of democracy will depend upon whether we make the legislative arm of the Government efficient and responsive to the will of the people.

Mr. President, those are strong statements. I dare say that few persons have thought anything about the fate of our democracy being bound up in this legislative reform, and whether the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, was right in that conclusion.

I remember well how that experienced and brilliant legislator stood on this floor debating and answering all questions in a way that brought to him high praise and overwhelming success in accomplishing this great legislative reform. After he had finished, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 49 to 16, with only 3 Republicans voting against it. The only issue is whether or not Republican Senators meant what they said last June when only three Republicans voted against the reorganization bill. Did they mean what they said then, when they were in the minority and thought that the legislative branch of the Government ought to be reformed to the point where special committees should fall by the wayside?

Mr. President, I distinctly remember what my good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said in the Senate at that time, after he had listened to the then Senator from Wisconsin and had a very interesting and educational colloquy with him upon this question. After the Senator from Wisconsin had convinced the able Senator from Michigan that special committees should go, this is what the Senator from Michigan said—one of the most profound statements I have read in a long time, and which could come only from a man like the Senator from Michigan.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

> I take my seat, but before I do so I should like to say to my able friend from Wisconsin that while in his long career as a Senator he has often rendered spectacular and distinguished service, I doubt whether he has ever put the Senate and the country under greater obligation to him than in the amazing, constructive, and able way in which he has led his special committee in the presentation of the legislation now proposed.

And the Senator from Michigan voted for that bill.

Mr. President, those were beautiful words, words of a statesman at his best, words which have the ring of intellectual integrity and honesty of purpose, words of firmness and sincerity, typical of the kind of utterance which vanquished many a foe and which impressed world leaders in the recent efforts of the Senator from Michigan with other Americans in search of an everlasting peace.

If this reform is as important as Senator La Follette said it was on the floor of the Senate, it is wrapped up in the peace in which the Senator from Michigan has been so interested.

We shall soon see, and the country will see, whether or not the Senator from Michigan meant what he said on the fateful day of June 6, 1946.

I turn to another statement, made by none other than the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. After the Senator from Ohio had asked some pertinent and material questions of the Senator from Wisconsin, he too became enthusiastic about the reorganization bill. He was not going to be outdone by the Senator from Michigan in the generous praise which he gave to the Senator from Wisconsin. This is what the leader of the Republican Party on the other side of the aisle said at that time:

> Mr. President, I very highly commend the work of the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I thoroughly approve the bill and intend to vote for it.

He did not simply approve it; he thoroughly approved it. When the Senator from Ohio thoroughly approves a thing, it is thoroughly approved. He further said:

> I believe we must begin on a complete reorganization of Congress if Congress is to operate under modern conditions.

The Senator from Ohio is now the leading advocate of breaking down and sabotaging this congressional reform in the third week of the Eightieth Congress.

He further said:

> I may disagree with one or two provisions. No Members of Congress having intimate contact with the matters which are related here can possibly agree on every detail, and I think it is perfectly proper to offer amendments on any such details.

Amendments were offered on details. I recall that the able Senator from

Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] offered several amendments on details which were agreed to by the Senator from Wisconsin. But the Senator from Ohio said:

> However, I feel strongly that the bill as a whole is an important step forward and I certainly intend to vote for it.

I may say that when the Senator from Ohio made that persuasive and far-reaching statement about the reorganization bill, the question of continuing special committees had been voted on; indeed a provision had been written into the bill eliminating special committees, and the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio did not touch the section dealing with the abandonment of special committees.

So, Mr. President, we find one of the great leaders of the Republican Party, here on the floor of the United States Senate, making a strong, persuasive statement in favor of the enactment of the reorganization bill, telling the country it was time for Congress to reorganize and reform, and yet today he is taking the lead in attempting to drive the Senators on the other side of the aisle into his camp and compelling them to do his bidding on this particularly important matter which Senator La Follette said may affect the fate of democracy in this country.

Mr. President, references used to be made to the "New Dealers" as the "rubber-stamp crowd." It was said that we followed the whims of the late President Roosevelt, and that some Democrats did whatever he wanted to have done. It will be interesting to find out, on the approaching vote, who will be "rubber stamps" in repudiating the Reorganization Act. I know what has been going on. I know about the many conferences which have been held. I know the committee assignments which have been made by those on the other side of the aisle. I know what has been done, and the country will know, too: How they have taken up onto the mountaintop some Senators who have recently come into the Senate, and have sold them an orange grove below, although there is no orange grove there.

Mr. President, the words I read above were spoken by an outstanding Republican, a man who is referred to, perhaps, as much as any other man in the United States for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1948. If the Senator from Ohio were not a good lawyer, I could understand how he might think that it would be all right to depart from the Reorganization Act, as an ordinary layman might think. But the Senator from Ohio is too able a lawyer not to know what he is doing here. The step which is proposed is a regressive step, rather than a progressive one, in connection with the reorganization of the legislative branch of government.

Mr. President, what were the basic objectives of this progressive and forward-looking piece of legislation which so stirred the feelings of practically all Republican Senators at that particular time? What was there in the reorganization proposals which caused such men as the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to make such persuasive speeches on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. President, there have been major and minor reorganizations of the congressional committee structure over the years, since the Republic was founded, the last one having taken place in 1921. That modern conditions made necessary another complete overhauling, few people will deny. So the Seventy-ninth Congress was delegated to do the job. Under the bill that was passed, we reduced standing committees from 33 to 15; and we provided, with few exceptions, that no Senator should serve on more than two committees. Every one of these committees is a major committee. All of them are important. The change which has been made is a real innovation in the committee structure and is a step in the right direction, certainly, because under the new arrangement every Senator will confine his work and study to the bills and resolutions coming to his own committees. I wish to say to the Senate that one of the reasons I supported the reorganization bill was the result of the experience I obtained as a Member of the House of Representatives. When I became a Member of the House of Representatives I was fortunate enough, after being there for 3 months, to be appointed to the Committee on Agriculture. I stayed on that one committee for 4 years. That was the only committee to which I was assigned and in which I had any interest, under the rules of the House of Representatives. I say to the Senate that in the 4 years I was a Member of the House of Representatives I learned more about basic problems dealing with agricultural legislation than I have learned since I have been in the Senate during the last 8 years, and during these 8 years I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Why is that true? It is true because when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, all my time was spent in dealing with agricultural problems. That is why I am glad to be on only two committees now, the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Last year I was on nine Senate committees. I did not have time to do anything adequately; I neglected myself, I neglected my State, I neglected the problems of my State, I neglected the people of the Nation as a whole, attempting to keep up with the work of nine committees. I wish to say that I am very happy to be on only two committees at the present time, because I believe I can do them some justice, as a result of the passage of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, the reduction of the number of committees and limitation of membership on committees is an absolute necessity if the committee system is to work efficiently. The crux of the La Follette-Monroney Act is in those provisions limiting the number of committees and defining the jurisdiction of all the committees created under the Reorganization Act. Here is something that has never been tried before. It is the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. It is also the complete answer to those who seek to undermine the foundation stones of this legislative act by insisting that special committees be appointed. The very reason we spelled out in the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of each and every committee was that special committees were being eliminated. Therefore, when an investigation was called for, we specified by which committee it should be conducted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The point the Senator from Illinois has just been discussing is one which has concerned me greatly, because I agree with everything the Senator has said about committee work and about how impossible it has been for us to attend to half a dozen different committees.

Regardless of whether the act contains any provision prohibiting special committees, nevertheless it is the plain intent of the act that, except in a few cases, no Member of the Senate shall serve upon more than two committees. That is the greatest reform of all. If now we begin to create new committees, regardless of whether they are called special committees or anything else, are not we in effect actually destroying the greatest reform brought about by the act?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico is eminently correct. Anyone who says that by creating the special committee now proposed we shall not be violating the letter of the law, as well as its spirit, simply does not know what he is talking about, because in connection with each and every one of the standing committees established under the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of each committee is clearly spelled out, word for word, and as a result of designating clearly the jurisdiction of the 15 standing committees, anything under God's high heaven can be investigated. In my opinion, if new committees are created, both the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act will be violated.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on that very point let me say that it had been my purpose to discuss the question the Senator from Illinois has just mentioned, namely, that whenever we invade the jurisdiction conferred upon a standing committee, by creating a special committee, we violate the exact letter of the law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there can be no question about that. I have talked to a number of lawyers about it. I am a lawyer, but obviously I do not practice much. However, I am of the opinion that what the Senator from New Mexico has said on that point cannot successfully be challenged.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I concur in the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Illinois about special committees and the danger inherent in creating them and continuing them, and in

violating and vitiating the La Follette-Monroney Act if that is done. Let me point out that even today the line is forming on the right for more special committees. I know that to be so. The big parade is on. If we break down the La Follette-Monroney Act in spirit as well as letter by action such as that which is contemplated by Senators on this side of the aisle, then we shall have made a shambles of that act, which has received the wholehearted approval of the people of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is manifestly correct. Already several resolutions calling for the creation of other special committees have been submitted.

I ask this question in the utmost good faith: Once we violate the Reorganization Act, and thus set a precedent, how can we deny requests for a special committee on petroleum or a special committee on small business or a special committee on wool, or any other special committees which might have merit? Once we set such a precedent, how can we deny such requests?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

I should like to point out one or two things; and, further, I request that subdivision (4) of section 102 of the act, as set out on page 10, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, subdivision 4 states that each Senator shall serve on two standing committees, and no more.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. What Senator has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, Mr. President; I have yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was about to say that subdivision 4 of section 102 of the Reorganization Act provides that each Senator shall serve on two standing committees, and no more, except in the case of Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, who may serve on three standing committees, and no more. The entire emphasis in the wording of the act is with respect to standing committees. If we come right down to the letter of the law, it does not say that a Senator shall not serve on a special committee or on a joint committee which may be created. It simply says that Senators shall serve on no more than two standing committees. I simply wish to point that out to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I agreed to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, because I know he has a complete answer to the comment which has just been made by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely wish to answer the Senator from Nebraska by saying that when the reorganization bill was enacted, the only thing incorporated in it with respect to committees was the reference to standing committees of the Senate, with the exception of special committees which might be set up and authorized under the suspension of the rule, and for which a two-thirds majority vote would be required. So long as those provisions are not complied with, so long as they are not followed, and so long as special committees are set up in violation of that rule, special committees will transgress and infringe upon the jurisdiction which has been given to the regular standing committees, and thus the letter of the law will be violated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield again to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to argue with the Senator, because the law explains itself, and he can interpret it any way he cares, but I am satisfied the Senator from Illinois, who is making a very eloquent plea based on the statement of the former Senator from Wisconsin, will find that the Senator from Wisconsin explicitly stated, just before the quotation repeated today, that when a special committee was necessary—and he gave the illustration of the Atomic Bomb Committee, as well as others—it would not be a violation, and would not run counter to the intent or the letter of the law, for the Senate, if in its wisdom it so desired, to set up a joint committee or special committee for a very special purpose. I am sure the distinguished Senator knows that. The statement occurred before the quotation the Senator gave. I know he desires to be fair about the matter, and if he would include in his remarks the quotation from Senator La Follette to which I call attention it would give the complete story. In answering the query of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Wisconsin made it plain that there would be no violation of the law if the Senate in its wisdom decided by a majority vote that a special committee was necessary to handle any special question the Senate might consider it wanted investigated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am familiar with the record, and I know exactly what the Senator from Wisconsin said. He said that the Senate could violate the Reorganization Act the very next day after it passed it, if it desired so to do. That is the very thing I argue against. The Senator does not think Senator La Follette would be upholding the Senator's side of the question if he were here, does he?

Mr. WHERRY. If he were here and had a chance to interpret the act, he would say now exactly what he said when the debate was taking place at the time the bill was passed, that whenever the Senate in its wisdom decided that a special committee should be set up, such as the Atomic Bomb Committee, or the War Investigating Committee, and the Senate voted it, it would not be a violation of the spirit of the act or the letter of the law. That is exactly what he would say.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator on that at all. The Senator from Wisconsin said we could violate the rule. Of course we could have done so on the following day had we wished. He discussed a two-thirds vote as being necessary to a suspension of the rule, but he also said that if the Senate wanted to violate the Reorganization Act by a majority vote, of course it could do so, and that is exactly what we are asked to do now, when Senators on the majority side ask for this special committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to call attention to the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska that because Senators are prohibited from serving on more than two standing committees, or three under special circumstances, therefore by implication special committees were sanctioned. There is no such implication whatever in the Reorganization Act. It starts out by saying "The following standing committees shall be created." That has been one of the customs. Committees are always referred to as standing committees shall be created." that it mentions them as standing committees, and says no Senator shall serve on more than a certain number, carries with it no implication of any kind that by the use of the word "standing" special committees were sanctioned by implication or otherwise. That is merely the habitual way by which we have referred to the committees of the Senate, and the same thing is true of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think anyone can read the debates of last June and reach any other conclusion than that the Senate, notwithstanding the action of the House to the contrary, voted to ban special committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. There can be no question about it, and there was not any serious debate over it in the Senate. The bill passed the Senate by a vote, as I recall, of 46 to 18 or 19.

Mr. LUCAS. Forty-nine to sixteen.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was passed by a vote of 49 to 16 with that provision in it. There was not any serious objection to it, because we had all recognized for a long time the vice of growing, expanding special committees. No one contended then, and no one contends now, that the Reorganization Act nullified that provision of the Constitution of the United States which provides that each House may adopt its own rules. There is no controversy about that. The question is whether we desire now, on the very threshold of the administration of the Reorganization Act, to break down the barrier which we tried to set up in the Reorganization Act against special committees, and which I have no doubt would have been kept in the law if it had

not been for the fact that we were about to adjourn the Congress, there was not time for cool conference and deliberation at the time, and the Senator from Wisconsin stated that if there was any delay even in accepting the House amendments the whole bill would be in danger, and it might be a quarter of a century before we got another.

Mr. LUCAS. The mere fact that the House struck out the provision did not take away the intent of the United States Senate when it debated this matter so conclusively and thoroughly for 3 days.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Illinois referred to my record on the Reorganization Act with great kindness and hopefulness. He indicated, however, that, on the basis of the record, unless I declined to approve an extension of this special committee, I would not be in harmony with my original position.

I know the Senator would not wish to do the record any injustice and, therefore, with his permission, I should like to call his attention to the remainder of my colloquy with the able former Senator from Wisconsin, on the prior page of the RECORD from which he read.

Mr. LUCAS. What page is that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Page 6394 of the RECORD for June 6, 1946. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that after I had interrogated the Senator from Wisconsin about my belief that there were sometimes situations which could better be served by special or select committees than by regular committees, and he had made his reply substantially conceding that such a situation could arise, I said—and I read from the RECORD:

I think this is one of the few places in the bill where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin.

Then I call the able Senator's attention to the additional statement in the following colloquy, when I again said:

However, I would not want section 126—

The section proscribing special committees—

I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees.

To which the able Senator from Wisconsin, the author of the bill, replied:

I grant that point, and have conceded it in the brief time we have been able to devote to the consideration of the bill today.

I am not entering this controversy on the pending resolution. I am merely indicating to my able friend from Illinois that I think a fair interpretation of the RECORD will show that my position with respect to special committees, as indicated in the debate from which the Senator quoted, is that if there is a situation which in my judgment recommends a special committee as the more useful approach to a successful conclusion, it is my interpretation, and was at the time, that I would be free so to vote; and I think the Senator from Wisconsin concurred that I would enjoy that freedom.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment; I am sorry.

I do not want to prolong the debate too long with respect to our good friend from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I remember the Senator from Michigan was talking about special and select committees and joint committees, and the Atomic Committee. But now that he has quoted that particular part of the debate that he had with Senator La Follette, I think the RECORD should show that Senator La Follette, on June 6, 1946, at page 6395, spoke as follows:

I grant that point, and have conceded in the brief time we have been able to devote to the consideration of the bill today. I have conceded the point several times, but I have also contended that when ar issue or a problem of similar magnitude arises, it will not be difficult to get the respective House which may be concerned, or both Houses, to suspend the rules.

Furthermore, section 122 is designed, by giving blanket authority for joint action, to eliminate the necessity for special action to bring the opposite number of committees of the two Houses together, and it is our hope that that practice will grow—

It is my hope, Mr. President, that joint committees will grow upon important matters of this kind, as a matter of efficiency and good government, the practice of having joint committees will grow—

and, as a result, that it may save the time of witnesses and administrative officials, and may help to bring into better coordination the relationship of legislative activities in the fields of joint committees as they may come to collaborate.

The Senator from Michigan and I have seen perhaps the best example of that in the work of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

And here is the reply of the able Senator from Michigan, now President pro tempore of the Senate:

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement, and I think our statements are in substantial agreement.

I take my seat—

And so forth. I read into the RECORD a moment ago what the able Senator from Michigan said at that point, but there is another remark the Senator from Michigan made I wish to read.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment, if I may.

Mr. VANDENBERG. While the Senator is inquiring further into the RECORD, I should like to remind him that the Atomic Energy Committee, which we were then discussing, was not a joint committee; it was a select Senate committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but it ultimately became a joint committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was unable to obtain authorization for a joint committee, which I originally sought, and we had to develop the legislation in a special select Senate committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Be that as it may, it became a joint committee, and in discussing this very question, on page 6440, after Senator La Follette explained to the Senator from Michigan that a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be necessary, since section 126 was in effect the rule of the Senate, subject to suspension, the Senator from Michigan said:

I thank the Senator for his statement. I think it conclusively answers any objection I could have had to section 126.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I might agree that the quotation by the Senator from Illinois is correct. The Senator is always very fair, and I am sure he will agree that I entered a reservation on the question of select committees, and that the Senator from Wisconsin and I found ourselves in agreement that under the Reorganization Act, if a subject mounted to the dignity which the Senate thought required a special committee, it would not be in violation of the spirit of the act, if the Senate was prepared to proceed by a two-thirds vote to establish it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The difference in the situations is that we are proposing to establish it by a majority vote instead of by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that is the point I wished to emphasize. I am afraid the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] did not make that as clear in his remarks as no doubt he intended to do. It is absolutely correct that if it had remained in the bill, the Senate by a two-thirds vote, if it had thought proper, could have abrogated the rule and set up a special committee, but the only other way that a special committee could have been created by a majority vote would have been to have abrogated the rule entirely by a change in the Senate rules, after which there would have been no prohibition.

If any matter were of such urgency that two-thirds of the Senate would say that a special committee should be created, it was never intended by the Reorganization Committee, that such action should be outlawed, made impossible, but it was intended to prevent special committees being created without a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and now we are asked to create a special committee by only a majority vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If there is a point of difference between "one-half" and "two-thirds," I respectfully submit the point is canceled by the fact that section 126 went out of the bill entirely and is not in the law at all.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not disagree with the last point that the able Senator has made; I think definitely a majority vote is all that is necessary. It is unnecessary to have a two-thirds vote. But when section 126 was stricken it did not take away what we did by our previous vote on the floor of the United States Senate.

If anyone can convince me that the committee which the Senator from Michigan is talking about, is one of those committees necessary to handle an extraordinary situation that no standing

committee can handle, then I might believe there is merit in his argument.

Here is a committee, Mr. President, that a year ago had hardly sufficient material to carry on. I have made this statement before. The then Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, came to me and cut down the appropriation that he desired. As I recall, he wanted originally $125,000, and he finally cut it down to $85,000, and his committee had a difficult time giving to the Committee on Audit and Control an agenda that would justify that amount. What is the agenda today that places this committee in the extraordinary class to which the Senator from Michigan refers? Is there anything so gigantic, colossal, and important in the continuation of this special committee? Not at all, Mr. President.

The Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, last year came to our committee for money, almost begging, and said definitely, "We will close up shop on January 1, 1947."

What great development has taken place that has caused this committee to come within the category described even by the Senator from Michigan? It just is not there. It is a political illusion and nothing more.

It is an affront to the able Senator from Vermont, head of the Committee on Expenditures. It was an affront to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the able Senator from South Dakota, and because he did not take the affront it became necessary to revise the resolution depriving the Brewster committee of a trip to Europe to investigate matters under the control of the State Department and the War Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am not yielding. They could not go to Europe. The plan, a well-laid plan, as everyone knows, was to go into the zone of Army occupation. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] objected. The proponents of the Brewster resolution did not have the votes, and they retreated to the continental limits of the United States.

They are now doing the same thing to the committee headed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that they attempted to do to the committee of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The only reason they are proceeding now is because they think they have the votes; that is all. They knew they did not have the votes to take over-all jurisdiction. I hope no one will believe they retreated voluntarily. They wanted jurisdiction over the whole universe. That is exactly what they wanted in this special committee—jurisdiction of the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. They have visited all parts of the world. I think they relinquished the wrong jurisdiction. If anybody is going to investigate things on the outside of the United States, the so-called Brewster committee would be experts because they have been traveling throughout the universe.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Now I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator state to whom he was referring when he said the statement was made that the committee would be closed at the end of the last session.

Mr. LUCAS. I was referring to the former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, when he came to our committee and said what I have repeated. I do not know whether the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was there at the time; at least Senator Mead made the statement in my presence.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The statement was made in my presence, and in the presence of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], that the special committee, the Mead committee, would ask for not one penny after January 1, 1947. At the meeting we recommended for the committee an appropriation of $100,000. I was there.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The question was not what statement was made, but who made it. It sounded on this side as though the distinguished Senator from Illinois said it was the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire the RECORD to be made clear as to who said it.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish the RECORD to show that the Senator from Michigan said he would close up anything by January 1, 1947.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I desired to have made clear.

Mr. LUCAS. I had much experience with my good friend from Michigan in the Pearl Harbor investigation. I know that he is a very methodical investigator, and that it takes him a long time to do things. He just could not close up an investigation in that length of time. I am sorry; I apologize to the Senator if I indicated that he was attempting to hurry anything along in the course of his investigation, because he just does not work in that way.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Illinois for all his courteous acts. I find a copy of what is apparently the statement of the former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, in presenting the budget of the committee, under date of March 28, 1946, which I assume is the date to which the Senator refers. This I hold in my hand, and shall be happy to present it, if the Senator desires, for the RECORD. In this statement former Senator Mead simply refers to the carrying on of the work of the committee for the remaining 9 months of the year from April 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946. There is no language in the statement which indicates anything one way or another as to the future of the committee. Senator Mead was simply asking the committee for the money necessary to carry on the work of his committee to that date.

Subsequent to that time, on July 24, 1946, when the Congress was nearing the conclusion of its work, there is a further statement, which I have in my hand, presented by the former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, the then chairman of the committee, to the Senator from Illinois as chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reciting as follows:

> If the committee is to carry out what it conceives to be the wishes of the Senate and the public to conduct an intensive investigation of war profiteering at this time, involving the holding of committee hearings during recess and the preparation and development of facts for public hearing, not only will the reduction of the staff be impossible, but additional investigative and clerical personnel must be obtained and the existing staff will be unable to take the extensive vacations planned. Furthermore, such an investigation will involve higher expenditures for the travel of investigators and witnesses, witnesses' fees, the reporting of conferences and executive hearings, and higher general administrative expenses.
>
> Therefore the committee—

After assigning some of these projects which were under way at that time—

> requests an additional appropriation of $65,000 for the last 6 months of the present session of the Congress.

Giving the details on which that request was based. Those are the two statements, so far as I know, dealing with these matters.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I recall very well the last appropriation that was given to the special committee, which was sometime in the middle of the summer during the investigation of the Erie Basin case, when the committee requested the additional $65,000. Let me tell the Senate what former Senator Mead said on the floor of the Senate in June of last year, at the time when the committee was investigating the Erie Basin case. In a colloquy with Senator La Follette, Senator Mead made this statement:

> Let me say to the able Senator that I wish to commend him for this splendid report which he has presented to the Senate, and the able manner in which he has presented his views. I am in agreement with him in regard to most of the provisions of this bill. We usually have quite a number of special committees. Although I am a member of several special committees, I am not concerned with continuing to be a member of them. I feel that all of them should be eliminated.

That was on the floor of the United States Senate, a statement made by the then Senator James Mead, chairman of the Mead committee, which is the committee that is sought to be continued at the present time. In other words, in the midst of the sensational Garsson case, the chairman of the committee told the Senate of the United States and the country that he thought all special committees should be abandoned, and it is in line with the statement he gave to the Senator from Illinois, who at that time was chairman of the Committee To Audit

and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to the effect that when January 1 came along this particular committee should be discontinued.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Maine has discussed the budget which was submitted to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in April of last year. It is a very interesting document. I shall discuss another budget some day when a request with respect to another special committee comes up. Under a resolution offered by the able Senator from Nebraska every committee seeking money had to submit a budget dealing with the amount of money requested and showing how the committee was to spend the money, if the resolution called for more than $5,000. I noticed that the Senator from Nebraska was the first Senator to violate the rule in the Eightieth Congress when, in a resolution submitted by him, he asked for a cool $50,000, and the request went to the Committee on Rules and Administration without any explanation, without any budget. That committee reported the resolution, and it is now pending on the calendar, ready to be acted upon when we conclude the business which is now before the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to take the Senator from Illinois off the floor, but I wish to present an amendment to the pending amendment. It would not be in order as an amendment to the amendment unless the author of the amendment is willing to accept it. The amendment not being in the nature of a substitute but in the form of an amendment. I wish to add to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Maryland the following:

Provided further, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is specifically authorized to obtain from the Treasury Department or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the income-tax returns or any information indicated therein of any individual, person, copartnership, association, trust or corporation deemed by said committee to be useful or necessary to it for the proper discharge of its duties under this (S. Res. 46) resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be very glad to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, and I ask that the suggestion he has just read be sent to the desk and incorporated in my original amendment, and that the whole amendment, with the added part just read, be reprinted, so it will be available for Senators at the next regular session of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say a word in regard to the matter now under discussion. I realize that the statute provides for such action as the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Maryland have requested. I also realize that the authority of the present Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program to have access to some income-tax returns stems from a Presidential order. In view of the possibility that the functions of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program may be transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I called the President a few minutes ago and was assured by him that the same courtesy in permitting the examination of income-tax returns which I believe has been granted to the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program during its existence would also be granted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should the function of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, with the files, staff, records, and so forth, be turned over to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to address an inquiry to the Senator from Vermont, who has just spoken to the President. Am I to understand that the President has indicated that he would give his consent to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to look into income-tax returns if the committee did not get the files of the Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, or only if the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments obtains the files of the special committee?

In other words, if the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland, including the language now proposed by the Senator from Georgia, is adopted, then the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would be given permission to look at the income-tax returns; is that correct? I think it is a very valuable privilege and power.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me add that the amendment which I am now suggesting could not be offered under the rule, it being an amendment in the third degree. If the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, with the amendment which I am now suggesting, should be agreed to in the form proposed, the whole controversy would be beyond the realm of dispute.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan, with the permission of the Senator from Illinois, that I think he will recall that the Executive order signed by the President conferring this authority on the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program was a limited power, to be exerted only under certain circumstances, whereas the proposal made by the able Senator from Georgia is all-encompassing, so that hereafter no special case would have to be made. Hereafter the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would have direct authority to go to the Treasury and obtain any returns the committee desired, without having to ask the permission of anyone. So the net result of the amendment as now proposed to be amended by the Senator from Georgia would be to give to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments unimpeded and complete authority over the whole matter of income-tax returns and other returns, should that committee desire to have such authority in the case of any individual or corporation. In some respects this is stronger and broader and more definite power than that now enjoyed under an Executive order of the President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for the purpose of clearing up one point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that if the able Senator from Maryland accepts the modification it will cover all cases. But if the amendment of the able Senator from Maryland were not agreed to, and if the original resolution were adopted, has the President indicated to the able Senator from Vermont that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will possess the power to inspect income-tax returns notwithstanding the possible failure of the Senate to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. AIKEN. The President assured me that the same courtesy would be extended to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as has been extended to the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have that statement, because it will be of great aid to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will further yield, it might be well to read into the RECORD the authority for the amendment which has been accepted by the Senator from Maryland, and which was suggested by the Senator from Georgia. That authority is found on page 30, volume 53, part 1, of the Internal Revenue Code. I read from section 55:

(D) INSPECTION BY COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

(1) Committees on Ways and Means and Finance.

(A) The Secretary and any officer or employee of the Treasury Department, upon request from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or a select committee of the Senate or House specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House, or a joint committee so authorized by concurrent resolution, shall furnish such committee sitting in executive session with any data of any character contained in or shown by any return.

(B) Any such committee shall have the right, acting directly as a committee, or by or through such examiners or agents as it may designate or appoint, to inspect any or all of the returns at such times and in such manner as it may determine.

(C) Any relevant or useful information thus obtained may be submitted by the committee obtaining it to the Senate or the House, or to both the Senate and the House, as the case may be.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the statute.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that with the statutory authority, with the adoption of the amendment proposed by the

Senator from Georgia, and with the assurance of the President that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would be granted the same courtesy as has been granted the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would be clothed with ample authority to examine any income-tax returns in connection with its duties.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I have framed this amendment within the meaning and spirit of section 55 of the Internal Revenue Code. It takes the whole question out of the realm of controversy.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The proceeding is upon the assumption that the standing Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments is a select committee.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senate by resolution selects a committee to do a particular work, it is a select committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the parliamentary significance of the word "select"? Does it usually refer to a standing committee or a special committee?

Mr. GEORGE. It refers to any committee charged with a specific duty; and under section 55 of the Internal Revenue Code the same authority may be given to even a joint committee of the House and Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. Or to any standing committee which is charged with a specific duty. That is my understanding.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have this point cleared up. From my experience I had the impression that a select committee referred to a special committee. The language of the act further would imply that. It says:

> A select committee of the Senate or House specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House.

That would seem to be the significance of it. I do not think this is now a matter of great consequence, since the statement of the President to which the Senator from Vermont has referred, and the assurance of continuing under section 55. In any event, when the President is given full authority to authorize such a proceeding, that would clarify it beyond doubt. However, there is the question as to whether or not the Senate would have authority to take action independently of joint action.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that this particular section 55, with the several amendments which have been made to it from time to time, was a compromise with the old section at one time included in our revenue acts, making individual income-tax returns completely public, making public records of them. The committee finally decided—and the Senate sustained the viewpoint—that income-tax returns ought not to be made public willy-nilly, without any restrictions. So the decision as to the conditions under which they might be made public was placed in the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States. Furthermore, the committee was unwilling to cut itself off from the power to examine all returns, and the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives therefore wrote this particular section. We were also willing that any other committee which was specifically authorized by resolution of either House should have the same privilege of examination of the returns and use of the returns. The use of the word "select" in the statute undoubtedly means any committee on which had been imposed a specific duty or a specific work.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I was very happy to yield for the purpose of having the able Senator from Georgia suggest this modification of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Maryland. It seems to me that as a result of what has been accomplished here, or will be accomplished when this amendment is adopted, there can be no reason under the shining sun why the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should not make the investigation contemplated in this amendment.

Mr. President, if the Brewster amendment should be adopted, the Senate of the United States would make a most serious mistake. We would depart from the reorganization bill on almost the opening day of Congress. For the life of me I cannot understand why it is that Senators on the other side of the aisle continue to fight for the committee which is headed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]; and that is especially true in view of the fact that the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I know that the Senator from Maine has served on a great many investigating committees. I happened to serve on one with him, and I know who did the work on that particular committee, so far as the minority at that time was concerned. I take off my hat to the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for his constant, vigilant work. The able Senator from Maine was on that committee, but he was in and out. He would come in for about 30 minutes, ask a few questions, get the "headlines," and away he would go. The Senator from Michigan was there every day. I know that, because I, too, was there every day. I was there to watch him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator asked the question as to why those on the other side of the aisle were exerting such great efforts to bring about the continuation of the special committee. Does the Senator suppose that the story in the Star last Friday had anything to do with it, with the promise of a sensation a day?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know about that. I can hardly believe that that would have anything to do with it. I think it is something that is closer to the people than that, if the Senator knows what I mean.

Mr. McMAHON. I could guess.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator can guess I shall not speculate further.

The more I read the debates upon the reorganization bill last year the more firmly am I convinced that those who were responsible for this congressional reform believed the statement of Senator La Follette that the fate of democracy was wrapped up in that reorganization bill. Yet we find Republicans fighting day after day to destroy the basic and fundamental structure of the Reorganization Act. Once that is done, the creation of other special committees cannot be prevented.

I do not know what the Democrats will do about special committees once the bar is down; the chances are that if the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] wants an oil-investigating committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] wants a wool committee, and some other Senator wants another committee their wishes will prevail. Once the door is opened and they get their feet in, the whole body will eventually enter, and the Reorganization Act will be broken down to the point where it will be completely ineffective.

By reason of being chairman of the old Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I know exactly what special committees will do. I was opposed to most of them. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was usually trying to help me get rid of special committees then. But not today. The picture is a little different today, Mr. President, from what it was at that time. I have a list of special committees which went out of existence, or which were supposed to have gone out of existence with the passage of the reorganization bill. There are approximately nine of them. I do not know how many million dollars have been spent on special committees, but, as an example, for the past 25 years there has been a Special Committee on Wildlife, which spent more than $125,000. What they have really accomplished is subject to debate.

Mr. President, once the camel gets its nose under the tent—or it may be an elephant this time—it means good-by to the Reorganization Act.

I return to the budget which the Senator from Maine was talking about a while ago. I asked the counsel of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program to write me a letter as to what had happened to the five propositions laid down in the budget under the caption "Future work of the committee." This is what they said they would investigate: First, Inter-American Highway; second, aircraft; third, disposal of movable domestic surpluses; fourth, disposal of surplus industrial plants; and fifth, review of national-defense activities in World War II.

I asked the counsel of the committee to tell me what had happened to those five different activities submitted to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in March 1946. Listen to his reply:

> You asked me telephonically about the status of the five subjects referred to in the proposed budget of the Mead committee dated March 28, 1946.

His letter is dated January 11, 1947.

The subjects were as follows:

1. Inter-American Highway.
2. Aircraft.
3. Disposal of movable domestic surpluses.
4. Disposal of surplus industrial plants.
5. Review of national defense activities in World War II.

Briefly, the status of these matters at the present moment is as follows:

Inter-American Highway: A field investigation trip along the route of the highway in Central America was taken in August and September of 1946 and hearings were held in Los Angeles and in Washington. A preliminary memorandum has been prepared, but has not received the approval of the committee, and there has been some discussion that further public hearings in Washington should be held. This investigation is nearly complete and a report should be filed with the Senate in a very short time.

I doubt that they would have any jurisdiction in that matter under the new resolution. This letter is dated January 11, 1947, and the matter involved is beyond the continental limits of the United States. I think they are out under this resolution if it is adopted. Under any theory, the counsel says that the report is about ready to be filed.

Reading further:

Aircraft: This report was filed with the Senate by a subcommittee, of which Senator Mitchell was chairman, on June 7, 1946, being Report No. 110, part 6. This is attached as an appendix on page 125 of the fifth annual report to the committee, a copy of which is enclosed.

So there is nothing left as to the subject of aircraft. That is No. 2.

No. 3 is disposal of movable domestic surpluses. I quote further from the letter:

Subsequent to the date of the budget you referred to, a number of congressional committees held hearings on surplus property, some of them being subcommittees of standing legislative committees. Although our committee did hold a few hearings and continued to handle routine matters referred to it, it did not emphasize this aspect of its work because of the attention this subject was receiving by the other committees.

That relates to other committees investigating surplus property. Yet this was one of the subjects the Mead committee said it wanted to investigate when it asked for $85,000. That committee did not investigate that subject, because other committees were investigating it.

It would be interesting to know how many committees in Congress have been investigating surplus property in the past year.

Quoting further from the letter:

The committee has not filed a report on domestic surpluses since report No. 110, part 1, filed with the Senate on March 22, 1945. A copy of this report is also enclosed.

Disposal of surplus industrial plants: The committee held a hearing on November 21, 1946, which related to the disposal of the Chicago Dodge plant, as well as the controversy between the Tucker Corp. and the Lustron Corp., and Mr. Wilson Wyatt (National Housing Administrator) and Mr. George Allen (Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation). However, the hearing was held principally because of the housing aspects of the matter, rather than the disposal of the plant. The committee had understood that Senator O'MAHONEY'S subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee was concentrating on the disposal of Government surplus real estate, and although routine complaints were handled by our committee, no report was issued.

So there is nothing in that for the committee to investigate.

I read further from the letter:

Review of national defense activities in World War II: The fifth annual report discussed lessons as to future national defense which could be gained from the committee's experience during World War II. It cannot be considered a complete review or a detailed discussion of the entire work of the committee since its creation on March 1, 1941.

Subsequent to the budget request filed with your committee on March 28, 1946, the committee commenced its war-profiteering investigation and appeared again before your committee on July 24, 1946, and requested an additional allowance of $65,000, which was granted and which contemplated in the estimated budget submitted an addition to the staff to handle the increased work involved in this investigation. Personnel was borrowed, with a provision for reimbursement, from the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the General Accounting Office.

This investigation, which consumed a great deal of the committee's time, both of the members and the staff, resulted in three public hearings—the Erie Basin Metal Products case, the case of Congressman John M. Coffee, and the case of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

The work involved in the war-profiteering investigation is also responsible for the slackening of the committee's efforts in the field of surplus property, as well as the fact that several other congressional committees were active in the surplus-property field.

I hope the foregoing will supply the information in which you are interested, but in case it does not, please advise me.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEADER,
Chief Counsel.

Mr. President, the point I make is very simple. It is that under the rule which was laid down in connection with the functioning of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Fund of the Senate, some kind of a budget, some kind of an explanation, should have been submitted to the Rules and Administration Committee, as well as to the Senate, in regard to what the special committee proposed to do. So far as anything in the 1945 agenda of the special committee is concerned, today there is nothing left for that committee to do, Mr. President.

Assuming that the able Senator from Michigan was correct, I say that the situation in regard to the special committee falls far short of being in that extraordinary class which falls upon one like the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. So much for that, Mr. President. I wish to hurry along now, for I have talked longer than I anticipated.

Let me say that when the Senate adopted section 126, it abolished all special committees. Therefore, all jurisdiction in those committees, which overlapped the jurisdiction of standing committees, was automatically transferred to standing committees; hence the meticulous care with which jurisdiction was spelled out for each standing committee under the Reorganization Act.

The argument is being made that because the House struck out section 126 of the bill and the Senate concurred therein, the Senate is not bound by the original provision which it voted on for the abandonment of special committees.

Mr. President, if the rule-making power of the Senate and the House had not been reserved, under the Constitution, to each House, I would immediately concur in that line of argument; but I respectfully point out that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, under paragraph (b) of section 101, had this to say:

With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change rules (so far as are related to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] recognized this in the debates; and, after quoting the above section, he said:

In other words, the Senate, having full power over its own rules, reserves that power unto itself, even though it agrees with the provisions of this measure.

The Senator was eminently correct when he was talking for this measure. Little did I think that one so lofty in thought and so pure of heart, one who tells the country he is continually searching for the truth, could change his mind on this important question since June 6 of last year. The point I make, Mr. President, is that the mere fact that the House struck this out of an act which was in reality not binding legislation at all, in no wise affects the vote, the debates, the argument, and the almost unanimous agreement with respect to the abolishment of special committees when the matter was directly before the Senate. No good lawyer will contend otherwise.

Senator La Follette said:

Let me say that the day after this bill becomes law, every rule pertaining to the Senate could be changed or modified by a majority of the Senate, and the House could take similar action in respect to its rules.

Mr. President, that is exactly what we propose to do today, unless the amendment offered by the able Senator from Maryland is adopted. Here in the third week of a new Congress, we are asking the majority to change the rules that were passed and agreed upon by the Senate of the United States in the Seventy-ninth Congress. If that should happen, the Republicans must assume the responsibility for taking a backward step, retreating, and moving toward the old archaic organization groove in which the Congress found itself almost helpless to transact the extraordinary amount of business which it is compelled to dispose of in each session. They are not even waiting to give reorganization a chance, to see whether it will work.

If those on the other side of the aisle are successful in defeating this counter-resolution, the ultimate result may be tragic for our representative form of government. Every individual who has made the slightest study of the decline and fall of democratic governments knows that one of the great contributing factors was the failure of the legislative branches of government to efficiently and expeditiously carry out the will of the people. As a result, representative government disappeared in those countries. I undertake to say that today representative government in this

country is on trial, as a result of what is going on throughout the world.

Mr. President, from what occurred last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress, it is evident that the people of this country are vitally interested and concerned in having the Congress take a forward step in positive congressional reform. In the Seventy-ninth Congress the Senate of the United States carried out the wish of the people in regard to this matter. I am happy that I cast my vote in the affirmative. I did so in the belief that when we passed the Reorganization Act, we meant exactly what we said. So to me it is shocking and a strange coincidence that here, in the third week of the Eightieth Congress, we see positive steps taken by the Republicans in the direction of reaction and regression, as we witness this attempt to tear down the temple of congressional reform which we have constructed.

I want it understood by every Member of the Senate and every citizen of this country that the Senator from Illinois is in no way attempting to thwart or block any investigation that the majority here in the Senate believes advisable and necessary, insofar as the conduct of the war is concerned, or insofar as the problems dealing with the reconstruction period are concerned. Any insidious reference that Democrats upon this side of the aisle are opposed to the investigation for fear delinquencies of the administration might be disclosed, or that we are trying to block any investigation, is sheer balderdash, pure tommyrot, and worthless political poppycock.

Mr. President, I have been traveling down the highway of life for a great many years; I have met many people in my time, and have had intimate and close association with a great number of them, and I have discovered that those who are doing something they know they should not be doing never have any hesitancy in shifting the responsibility to the other fellow. They do it with clever words and deeds, in an insidious way.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, you can look behind the secret curtain, that deep, dark, mysterious curtain, although under the Democratic administration, under the then Senators Harry Truman and James Mead and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], we have been investigating war contracts, fraud, and corruption for quite a while. But you can continue to examine everything you wish, anything and everything your imagination leads you to think is shrouded in mystery; you can trace from the beginning to the end every dollar of the billions that were spent to save this Nation from military despots overseas. You can attack and attack and attack. You can investigate and investigate and investigate. You can fulminate and fumigate to your heart's content, with only your political conscience as your guide; you can smear, smell, fish, and hunt; and the Senator from Illinois will interpose no objection so long as it is done under the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act. Today I merely wish to know whether the present Members of the Senate who were in the Senate of the United States last June meant what they said when they were discussing that important question, or whether they were simply "kidding" the American people for political reasons.

Oh, Mr. President, what a reflection upon the various chairmen and members who have been selected to guide the destinies of these 15 committees. I prophesy now that, once the Congress of the United States lets down the flood gates of special committees, within a very short time nearly all the chairmen of these respective committees will be complaining to the high heavens about special committees cutting across and digging deeply into the jurisdiction which they will enjoy under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, no chairman of a committee under this Reorganization Act can retain his power, his prestige, and his respect, if we are to permit a rash of special committees to come to the Senate of the United States and run like wildfire over the jurisdiction of every other committee, and that is exactly what we are leading up to, because under no circumstances can this committee be justified. If it can it would be possible to justify a dozen special committees that I know will be proposed to this Senate in a very short while.

The Small Business Committee is of greater importance, from the standpoint of long-range determination of the future of our country, than is the particular special committee we are now discussing, and the Small Business Committee is the next thing we will have to consider. From an economic and social standpoint, even the wool committee and the petroleum committee, based upon the consideration of permanency and long-range performance, are of greater importance to the country than anything that would be done by the particular committee we are now considering.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has just stated that the Small Business Committee has a long-range function. If it has, and it is to be performed by a special committee, should it not be a permanent committee?

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps so.

Mr. McFARLAND. It should be formed and made a permanent committee, in addition to the standing committees we already have.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I find the leaders of the Republicans in the Senate of the United States, meeting almost daily, conferring and pledging their Members to vote for a resolution that is squarely in the teeth of congressional reform as passed in the Senate last June.

Mr. President, we are taking a step backward instead of going forward in the process of legislative reform if the counter resolution submitted by the Senator from Maryland and modified by the Senator from Georgia shall not be agreed to. We will endorse a policy which will start to whittle away the foundation stones of the Reorganization Act—a program which will ultimately bring forward the meat ax for the purpose of destroying one of the most important pieces of legislation, looking toward the perpetuity of free Government which has ever been enacted since we became a republic.

I know my last plea will not be heeded; I know the votes are already lined up, and whatever one says in the Senate will have little effect, but it is necessary to make the record, a record which will some day rise up and strike a hard blow at those who support the Brewster resolution.

I make this final plea to independent Senators on both sides of the aisle, to throw off the cloak of partisanship which has been hurriedly thrown over your shoulders by some unusual legislative and partisan move. Remember, a vote for the Brewster resolution is a vote against good government.

EXHIBIT A

(From section 102, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946)

(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at the outset of the few observations I shall make on this subject I wish to say that not only as a Republican and a member of the minority up until the 3d day of January last but also as a member of the present majority and as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I am grateful beyond expression for the solicitude for the sanctity of the office of chairmen of the committees in their respective capacities expressed by the Members on the other side of the aisle in

this sudden burst of anxiety for the Republicans and their responsibility.

I appreciate their solicitude now more especially. I have a memory going back at least 2 years, and I am certainly glad that we are now witnessing such a fine show of cooperation in the general overall conduct of the public business.

As a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments I am especially thankful for this solicitude, because it means that at long last there is united agreement upon both sides of the aisle that this committee, which has so long been dormant, shall become active in keeping with its obligations.

But Mr. President, it occurs to me to ask, Why all this solicitude now for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in connection with this particular matter, when for 2 years under Democratic control and Democratic leadership never once was a suggestion made by the then majority that the then existing Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should undertake any prying or investigatory work or examination into subjects which it is now proposed the special committee shall investigate and which in the past have been investigated by that committee?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator for yielding, but it occurs to me to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that apparently he has forgotten the fact that last July Congress passed the La Follette-Monroney reorganization bill, an act which changed the whole picture and placed the jurisdiction of all Senate business in standing committees, creating 15 instead of 45. That is the reason for the solicitude.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. At this point in the argument I think it might be worth while to interject that when the reorganization bill came before the Senate it contained a section prohibiting special committees. The bill went to the House, and that body refused to accept that provision and struck it out because they considered it most unwise. They knew there might be occasions when special committees would be needed, so they deleted the provision. It came back to the Senate, and the sponsors of the bill in the Senate, after discussing the matter with many Senators, considered it unwise to try to reinsert the provision in the bill. It was left out of the bill, which was accepted and approved by the Senate, without the prohibition in it.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me, so I may correct my friend from New Jersey, and give him a little more information which, apparently, he is lacking?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The House did not take it out, but that great concentration of power known as the Rules Committee of the House took it out. The House did not vote on it.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator means the Democratic power in the House?

Mr. TOBEY. I mean what I said—the House Rules Committee.

Mr. HAWKES. I am told an entirely different story. The House Rules Committee did not take it out. The story I got was that it was taken out through an agreement with the Speaker, because there was a realization of the impossibility of passing the reorganization bill in the House with that provision included in it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that the Senator from New Hampshire, with his experience in the House, does not mean to imply that the Rules Committee could have controlled the action of the House, if the House in the final analysis should disagree. It was only with the approval of the House that the bill came back here to the Senate with that provision eliminated.

Mr. TOBEY. I point out to the Senator from Maine he and I both having served in the House, that the Rules Committee of the House is the most arbitrary body, with tremendous power and influence. It is almost a "thus saith the Lord!" which emanates from the Rules Committee when they take a position. I remember, and present it as exhibit A, the activities of the House Rules Committee in the olden days, the glorious days of 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906, under the Republicans, when they would bring forth gag rules under which no amendment could be offered at all. That is the way they functioned. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senators for their aid in interpreting the particular action referred to.

Mr. TOBEY. Aid and comfort—put it that way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator, but as I read the RECORD, the reorganization bill has been passed, as it now reads, by both Houses of Congress. The brief triangular colloquy which occurred a little while ago reminds me somewhat of the old story of the Britisher who came to this country and was conducted on a tour of inspection of Boston and vicinity. The old fellow who was guiding him around Boston took him to Bunker Hill where the famous battle occurred. When the Britisher got there he adjusted his glasses and looked over the battlefield and said to the guide, "Is not this the place where we British gave you Yankees such a drubbing in '76?" The old fellow who was guiding him said, "I am not too familiar with the details of history, but who owns the ground now?"

Mr. President, it makes very little difference to me how the mechanics of the passage of the reorganization measure are interpreted. The fact is that it was passed as it now reads with the approval of both the House and the Senate, and it is the law, subject only to such modification as lies within the sovereign right of each body to change and amend its own rules. It does not prohibit the establishment of any special committee. That matter was considered in the bosom of the legislative branch of the Government, and the legislative branch in its sovereign authority saw fit not to include such a prohibition after an amendment looking to that end had been offered, debated, and put in the bill by at least one branch of the Congress.

Therefore the question of what went into the bill and what did not go into it does not necessarily inhere in the argument at this time. The fact is there is no prohibition, and there seems to be general agreement that there may be and there is a place for special committees to investigate special fields if in the opinion of each House such committees are essential to efficient examination into those fields.

I feel Mr. President, that here is a case perhaps above all others for the continuance—not for the establishment if you please, but for the continuance of a special committee, at least for a limited season, until the vast new congressional reorganization program under which none of the committees yet know the full extent of their authority or power, can begin to operate and the committees can take over as rapidly as possible their duties under the law.

Mr. President, I think I was as much for the reorganization bill as anyone could be. I have been in the Senate only 2 years. I think perhaps a new Member is more restive over what sometimes appear to be dilatory tactics and delays than is a Member who has been here for a more substantial period of time. Frankly, I am still restive under any procedure of this body that seems to be dilatory, that seems to involve unnecessary delay, that fails in the interest of public good to proceed expeditiously in the examination and disposition of the public business.

I now desire to call attention to one or two facts which seem to me to be significant. In the first place, I see two things that are very evident indeed. One is that for some reason a great effort is being exerted and tremendous resistance offered on the part of the present minority in this body to prevent further activity and work on the part of the special committee, and a vigorous attempt to shunt its activities, which have been well-started and well-coordinated, to a standing committee of the Senate that may or may not be fully authorized or fully equipped even under the Reorganization Act to take them over.

Secondly, there seems to be a great determination that the distinguished junior Senator from Maine shall not be permitted to use his fine powers of investigation and his tremendous vigor and zeal in behalf of the American people to take charge of all the future investigations in this field. I think both matters are very significant.

The junior Senator from Maine has established an enviable reputation for the determination with which he has sought to uncover and disclose corruption in these days of confusion, and I fear that he has been too successful in the past to suit some segments of our

population and some people who may have vital interests in that field. I feel that there is a strong personal attack on the Senator from Maine, and I feel that it is unjust and unfounded. There is an attempt to stop the special committee, but further than that, there is a determination on the part of the minority, or at least some of the Members of the minority, to see that above all the Senator from Maine does not have the opportunity to dig into the things that yet need to be explored in our recent great war effort.

Mr. President, as I said, I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I have been ever since I have been in the Senate. I may say, since the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is present, that I know how restless he has been in the past as I have been, because of the inactivity of that committee. We felt, and both of us have so stated on the floor of the Senate, that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should exercise greater functions than it has in the past and should be active. I am not at all in favor of reducing or evading the responsibilities or the field of examination of the committee. On the other hand, I am for the committee exercising its full reasonable field of authority in the examination of public affairs.

Mr. President, let me read the field assigned by the Reorganization Act to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The first is:

(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

Section 138 of the Reorganization Act itself begins to chip away at the authority of the committee because it sets up a joint committee to examine the Budget and to report, and to that extent the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has been curtailed.

(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

Certainly the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program has nothing to do with reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

(A) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports.

I see nothing there which is in conflict with the activities of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

If there is any effort on the part of this committee to go into this vast historic activity of Government in connection with the war effort and contracts, corruption if you please, if any be found, malfeasance or nonfeasance, it might come under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) in the provisions setting up that committee.

(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Certainly nothing under that provision takes in the province of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense program.

(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

That is the last field of authority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. President, all of this almost hysterical pleading for the preservation of the sanctity not only of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but of the prerogatives of the chairman, seems to me to turn upon paragraph (B), and I wish to read that again:

Studying the operations of government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

It is very probable that as an affirmative field of action in the future—at the present time and from now on—that provision is ample to study the present activities and the future programs of government. Frankly, with all due respect to the province of this committee, I doubt that any strict interpretation of that authorization would widely permit general activities such as those of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, so far as past transactions in connection with the war effort are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not undertake to limit the jurisdiction of our committee by his interpretation of the act, because I certainly cannot construe it to mean that we cannot go into the past. We are charged with planning for the present and the future, and we certainly cannot judge the work of any department intelligently by simply investigating what it is going to do in the future. We must go into the past in order to know what recommendations we should make for improving the work of the departments in the future. So I cannot accept the statement of the Senator from Iowa, who is a valued member of my committee, that we are limited in any respect in the way in which he suggests.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I am certain, as the result of visits I have had with him in the past, that we are not at all in disagreement that this committee has extensive powers. I am merely saying that, if it does have the power to go into past activities, then it derives such power from that particular provision, in my opinion, and none other. But I also say that the question is certainly open to argument. I think the power is very extensive.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator and I have discussed this question with other Members of this body. It must be the province of the committee, as rapidly as possible, to define the limits and extent of its power, what it is going to take over, and where it is going to investigate, in order that a reliable pattern of committee conduct may be had. But in my opinion, for the immediate future, and for a limited time, until this and other committees can define their limits, there is an urgency for continuing the investigation deeper and deeper into the vast expenditures of money which have been made in the war effort, and uncovering, if they exist, instances of corruption or fraud. Such instances have been brought to the surface in the past, and we may reasonably assume that there are others in existence which have not been uncovered. The very urgency of such investigation indicates to me that for a limited period of time its continuity must not be interrupted. That is not in the interest of the Senator from Maine, nor in the interest of continuance of the special committee. It is in the interest of the rapid and continuous discovery and presentation of truth and fact to the American people about the conduct of their Government and its affairs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the distinguished Senator from Iowa leaves the question of jurisdiction of the committee, I should like to ask if he can find anywhere within the provisions of the act the authority for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to examine into income-tax returns.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I find no such authority.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. All the powers now vested in the committee recently headed by the former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead—which committee was known as the Mead committee, and prior to that as the Truman committee—with respect to having access to income-tax returns, accrue under the Tydings amendment to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which committee is headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. There can be no question about that. It is confirmed by the Parliamentarian. It is confirmed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], a member of the Committee on Finance; and it can be confirmed by the President himself if necessary. The Senate will lose nothing in powers by the transfer from the Mead committee to the Aiken committee, even including access to income-tax returns.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that power arise by reason of the transfer of power from the Mead committee to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or is such power within the juris-

diction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. TOBEY. It is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance to ask for income-tax returns at any time, and to turn them over to any standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senators for their contribution. I was about to come to one phase of that particular subject. If the Senator from Maryland believes that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has the power and scope of authority necessary to go into this question, why does he consider it necessary, by a special resolution, to direct and empower the committee to do so?

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator propounds the question to me, and if the Senator from Iowa will yield——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished and affable Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I am a little long on zeal this afternoon, but my heart is in this thing, and my convictions as well. Let me say to the Senator that the reason is that we now have a standing committee headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which committee has full power to act under the terms of the La Follette Act. It is one of the 15 standing committees of the Senate, with power to subpoena, as well as the power to examine income-tax returns. That is the answer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If that be the case, then there is no occasion for the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland. Under that theory all that is necessary to do is to defeat the proposal to continue the special committee. The opposition feels that it is necessary, in order to create that jurisdiction in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to push through, if possible, an affirmative amendment lodging such powers in that committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I certainly welcome the inference of assurance from the Senator from Iowa that he will vote against the Brewster amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That would certainly be a strained interpretation, and I do not so interpret my remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It appears to me that if the Brewster resolution were not here the Senate would not have the minority party urging upon it an investigation of fraud, corruption, and profiteering to be conducted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I am positive that the Senate would not have the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], today advocating that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should have full and complete authority to look into income tax returns to ascertain if there were corruption, fraud, and profiteering in connection with our war effort. It appears to me that that is done for only one purpose, and that is to destroy the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, which has done a fine job, in my humble judgment, because of its knowledge and because of the speed with which it has been able to act. Only for those reasons do I urge upon the Senate that the committee proceed for a limited time, that it may investigate and make a final overall report to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has suggested that it is strange that some of us now feel that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should be given a status which it has not heretofore enjoyed. All of us who have been here for any length of time know that almost from time immemorial the Senate has made a stepchild of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive departments by the creation of special committees to do things which theoretically the standing committee had authority to do. The Byrd committee investigating the question of overemployment among the departments really in a sense impinged upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It may be that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, as originally conceived by the now President of the United States, in a sense impinged upon its theoretical authority. The Senate has for so long treated in that way the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that it has given that committee an inferiority complex which it was never intended it should have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It had almost a subterranean complex.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate was not wholly guiltless in connection with the stature and position of that committee, because it never paid much attention to it.

Under the new set-up the Senate has tried to place responsibility upon it. Whether it should be seeking to authorize affirmatively the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make an investigation this soon after the beginning of Congress is a speculative matter, because if there had been no effort to take away from that committee the jurisdiction which it was intended to confer upon it, the occasion might not have arisen so soon to emphasize in an affirmative way the jurisdiction, the obligation, and the duty of that committee to make investigations of all kinds. This question has been brought to our attention specifically, but it does not thereby minimize the responsibilities of the committee, and it does not thereby minimize the duty and obligation of the Senate to fix the responsibility of and keep responsibility in that committee as we undertake to give it authority. I myself am unwilling that the Senate shall continue to regard the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as an unworthy stepchild, incapable of carrying out or indisposed to carry out, the performance of its duties. I do not think it is material whether such authority might not have been sought. We have a specific situation before us.

Some of us feel that this is the proper way in which to proceed. But there is no implication to be drawn such as that which seems to have been conveyed by the statement of the Senator from Michigan, because senators are seeking now in an affirmative way to fasten on that committee the responsibility which I think Congress intended it should have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator agree that whatever power the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has with reference to the field of investigation of the Mead committee was derived from subparagraph (B) under paragraph (2) on page 6 of the Reorganization Act? That subparagraph reads as follows:

> Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a part of the authority conferred upon it, but it is not all of it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I find no other specific field than that, and I personally believe that that definition is ample.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to consolidate it in an over-all broad way with other specific references, but I think when it says that a committee shall have authority at all levels, it means at the top, at the bottom, and everywhere in between.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me ask the Senator a further question. If this committee has authority, what would be the purpose or the need of the Tydings amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes that all committees are servants of the Senate, and it is always proper for the Senate specifically to instruct any of its committees to do anything the Senate wishes such committees to do. It is sought by the Tydings amendment to instruct the committee, and to emphasize its responsibilities, its duties, its obligations, as well as its power.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was glad to have the able Senator from Kentucky give us his views, and I think that at this point I should read into the RECORD the names of those who were members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The chairman of that committee was the whip of the then majority, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The second in rank was the then majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]; the third was the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]; the fourth was the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the fifth was the

able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that during the Seventy-ninth Congress there surely were some investigations which that committee could have conducted. It had as its chairman the able whip of the majority, and had as second in rank the able majority leader. The able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the junior Senator from Michigan at times urged that there be some action. The committee was inactive and refused to take any action when it had the authority to investigate. We now find——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. It is now urged that this very committee take over the entire investigation. If it does, it will not do as speedy a job as can be done if the Senate continues the special committee for a limited time in order to do this particular job. I say that even though I am a member of the standing committee only, I am not willing to surrender any jurisdiction, because I see, not only at the present time but in the future, a great need for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a committee that will be able to serve the people of the United States through its power to investigate.

But it is not going to do it under the leadership of the minority, because the people have seen fit to change the leadership in this Congress, and have placed the leadership of this committee under the jurisdiction of the Republicans, the present majority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield to me, let me say that I presume the Senator from Michigan thinks he is making some political hay by referring to the fact that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Democratic whip, and the then majority leader were members of that committee. If he obtains any consolation from that, he is welcome to it. I knew I was hooking up with a stepchild when I consented to serve on that committee. But the present committee is entirely different from the one which existed before.

I may also console the Senator from Michigan by telling him now that we are in the minority that I am not even on that committee and therefore perhaps it is improved. Although it may be conceived that the Senate should not have continued the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, nevertheless it did continue it, and the Senate fastened certain responsibility upon that committee, by defining its duties, whereas heretofore no committee had its duties defined either by rule or by law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Toward the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I obtained a list of the personnel of this committee, which was inactive and did no investigating. I learned that it had nine employees. However, it did not even have a room assigned to it. That is the committee which we are now told can do all the work. Yes, Mr. President; it will do the work from now on, because it has new leadership. But under the old leadership I found that it was not doing the work.

Mr. TOBEY. And it will have new duties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is trying to repudiate his own new leadership, of which he boasts.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rose to answer a direct statement which was made by the Senator from Michigan before the Senators wandered so far afield. In that statement the Senator from Michigan took to task the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. He did so because he said it had not made investigations during its former life. I simply wish to remind the Senator from Michigan of a fact of which I am sure he must be well informed, but which undoubtedly he had forgotten, namely, that under the Senate rule which existed before the Reorganization Act was passed, the standing committees of the Senate only had jurisdiction and authority over the matters which were referred to them by the Senate. They had no inherent powers of their own. If the Senator will examine the resolutions which were submitted at the beginning of each Congress, he will find it to be true that no general power was given, even by those resolutions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to associate myself with the position of the Senator from Vermont as to the powers of the committee of which he is chairman, inasmuch as it seems to me that, under a fair construction of the language, not only has that committee the power to investigate every cent of expenditure made hereafter but also every cent of expenditure made heretofore, not only in the conduct of the war but in the conduct of the Federal Government from 1790, when it began, in making a study of the efficiency of governmental operations. So far as I am concerned, the suggestion which has been made here concerns itself with only this one small segment of the matter, covering a certain specific period and relating to war expenditures, with which our committee has been concerned. If this resolution is adopted, I think that matter will be continued within the committee's purview, but in that respect the committee will in no way be circumscribed or limited, for it seems to me that could not possibly be done. I have discussed this matter somewhat with the Senator from Vermont, and I think that his problem is how he is going to digest this enormous field of powers, and also how he is going to accommodate his explorations to those of the 14 other standing committees which have jurisdiction of their own—for instance, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and so forth.

I have no doubt that in the evolution of the Reorganization Act, this whole matter will be worked out with the spirit and harmony which are always so noticeable on this side of the aisle, and that these questions will be adjusted. But the fact that temporarily there are some problems, the growing pains incident to the evolution of the act, is not to be wondered at.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. First, I should like to thank the Senator from Maine for his interpretation of the act, which coincides with my own interpretation of it.

The reason I rose a few minutes ago to ask a question of the Senator from Iowa was that I did not wish to have read into the record anything which might later on be construed as delimiting the powers of the committee. I fully realize the purpose of the Senator from Iowa in making those remarks, and I realize that they were not intended to delimit the powers of the committee in anyway.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely wished to lead up eventually, as I did in a rather disjointed way, I fear, to the fact that since these powers were undoubtedly derived under that section, there must be some doubt about them, because the Senator from Maryland saw fit to submit a resolution specifically outlining them and transferring them to this committee, and that if the committee does not need extra powers, then the resolution or amendment of the Senator from Maryland is completely unnecessary and, of course, should not be adopted, because it will delimit the powers of the committee if it is adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. I construe the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to mean that the files, the funds, and any other assets of the special committee, where they now repose, would be transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I think that either a Presidential order or the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia would be necessary in order to enable the committee to have access to any income-tax returns which we might need in the course of our investigations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to assure the Senator from Vermont, as I have privately and publicly done, that I do not wish to limit the activities of the committee of which he is the chairman and of which I am a member, and I am happy to belong to it. I do not wish to limit its activities. In the process of gradual evolution in regard to taking on new duties which the committee never previously took on, as the Senator well knows, and which it probably will have to get ready to assume over the course of a little time in order to exercise its powers efficiently, I want this committee as a standing committee eventually to take over activities in such fields as may belong to it and which the special committee may now be exercising.

But let me call the attention of the Senator to the following language of the Tydings amendment:

Provided, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited——

Mr. AIKEN. I see no reason for those words in the Tydings amendment. They add nothing to it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me begin to read the proviso again, Mr. President:

Provided, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II.

I sincerely fear that if the Tydings amendment is adopted, it will be the opening wedge for a future limitation of the investigating activities of the committee of which the Senator from Vermont and I are members. I say that I do not wish to see them limited in the future, when as a committee they begin their permanent activities. That is my position, and on that point I am entirely with the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, because for 2 years past, as he well knows, I have been interested in enlarging and expanding the duties of that committee, and in regard to the complete inactivity of the committee in the past, I have been just as restless as the present chairman of the committee has. As I recall, he and I and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] have talked about the matter a number of times. I agree with him, and I wish to go right along with him. But I feel sincerely and with great conviction that a special committee which in the past has been operating under three different chairmen, and which has been able to dig into new fields and produce evidence of corruption and mismanagement which, at least, no other Senate committee has been able to produce with such vigor and accurateness, should continue on a temporary basis until a permanent committee can reach its maturity, if you please, and can take over that field. However, for the sake of the continuity of the investigation and in order that the probing into the conduct of public affairs shall not suffer or be hampered by a hiatus during the time when these functions are taken over by the standing committee, I think it is absolutely essential that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program be continued on a temporary basis. I have never urged anything else, and I shall not urge anything else.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator feel the same way about the continuation of the Small Business Committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not as yet declared myself as to the Small Business Committee, but I will tell the Senator what I did. I did not vote on the issue when it came before the Rules and Administration Committee, of which I am a member. I shall meet the Small Business Committee issue when it arises, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have refused to vote on that issue in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LUCAS. How about the petroleum committee and the wool committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those issues never have come before the Committee on Rules and Administration. There has been no showing of the need or essentiality of continuing those committees.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been my definite understanding that the Small Business Committee and the War Investigating Committee resolutions were going through because those on the other side of the aisle have the votes, and I was wondering, if that be the situation, whether or not Senators on the other side felt that the Small Business Committee was as essential as the War Investigating Committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The resolution continuing the War Investigating Committee is not going through the Senate because we have the votes on this side to put it through; it is going through the Senate because adopting the resolution is a morally right thing to do in the interest of the public, and it is a morally demanded thing to continue these investigations, and not because we have the votes on this side of the aisle.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not believe that answer will stand the test of analysis. In the first place, it is not certain the resolution is going through. I make that qualification.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was merely joining in the repeated statements on the other side of the aisle that it was going through.

Mr. TOBEY. I differ from them, that is all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That, of course, is under the heading of a conclusion of an individual. I merely speak of my own belief and my own views.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if my ears heard aright the Senator's statement, he said "if it goes through," so he put a condition on it which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire merely emphasized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I used the word "if" I did not intend to, because I am firmly convinced that the righteousness of this proposal will cause it to be passed by the Senate in the interest of public justice and the future good of public business. So I withdraw the "if," if the Senator understood it, and say that I am firmly convinced the resolution will go through the Senate.

Mr. President, I now wish to complete what I have to say. I again assert that this sudden upsurge of resistance against the War Investigating Committee, which has lifted a few of the boards and smacked such a few of the rodents that have run out from under the boards, is more than passing strange. I wonder if there are not people in this country who would breathe easier if the activities of this temporary committee on a temporary basis were discontinued. I think so. I think I could imagine certain areas where there would be much more comfort if assurance went out that the Senate was at least stalemating for the moment the continued activities of this committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As to that, I wish to say that if anyone thinks transferring the functions of the War Investigating Committee to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would result in making it easier for some of the culprits who have defrauded their Government in time of war, he is laboring under a delusion, a very great delusion, because it is my purpose, if the functions of the War Investigating Committee are transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to request the very able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to undertake to carry on this work. I am sure that he could carry it on just as vigorously in one place as he could in another. We know that the work he has done in running down some of these rodents, as the Senator from Iowa calls them, chasing them out from under the floor, has been very valuable indeed. So I do not want anyone to think that by a transfer of the work of the special committee to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments he is going to get out of anything. I do not think there is any more despicable crime in the whole category of crime than defrauding one's government in time of war, and, as I have said, I am sure that our committee will accept the responsibility if it is given to it, of ferreting out any frauds.

I repeat that I shall ask the able Senator from Michigan to head up the work, and Senators know the kind of work he has done. There is no hope for any more rats if these functions are transferred.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand the distinguished Senator. I know his zeal, and I have no fear that he will not zealously pursue these duties. I am not talking about the pursuit of the duties eventually to be assumed by the committee, but I am talking about continuity, inasmuch as the activities of the committee are continuing, and I feel sincerely that for the next several months, during the transition, the special committee must, in the interest of continuity, go forward with whatever work has been started, and what they must complete in the interest of any kind of a decent investigation.

Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Vermont again that I believe his committee must eventually take over these activities. I believe it must have, and in my opinion it will need, some enlarged definition of its field of action in the future, but I think it is the proper committee eventually to take over, and I feel it must. I shall support as vigorously as I can the eventual and orderly transfer of the responsibilities of the

special committee to the Senator's standing committee, and I shall rest assured that there will be no one in the Senate who will then more vigorously take over the duties of the committee and look after the responsibilities of public government than he. If he appoints the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan eventually to head up those activities, on a subcommittee or otherwise, I again say that the public's affairs will receive the most meticulous and thorough attention, and that the public will know that honest investigation and honest disclosure will be made in the public interest.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, will he yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understood the Senator's argument—and I want to be sure about it, because I expect to comment on it later—the Senator has stated to the Senate as his opinion that, under the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments does have full and complete jurisdiction over all expenditures, and can make all investigations the special committee could make.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I call the Senator's attention again to subdivision (B) under subdivision (2) of the law setting up the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. In my judgment, whatever authority that committee has is derived from that subdivision. It reads as follows:

> Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

I believe that eventually that particular provision will be either large enough, or enlarged to sufficient capacity, to cover almost any field of governmental activity. But it is under that provision, if any, that the committee gets its power.

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HATCH. I desire to take the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio was recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say, in connection with what the Senator from Iowa has said, that the investigatory powers of the committee are found on page 23, section 134 (a), where, after some preliminary words, it is stated:

> Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words.

Then there is some other language which anyone can read. Inasmuch as the operations of Government activities at all levels are within our scope, and we are authorized to make investigations into any matter within our jurisdiction, I am satisfied that the investigatory powers are in the law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that I think there is almost unlimited investigatory power in the standing committees, in whatever field a committee has jurisdiction. My argument was directed to the rather nebulous or generalized language in the particular section under which I believe the eventual power of our committee to go into these things will be found. If we determine that it has the power, then of course the investigating activities are virtually unlimited in whatever field and to whatever extent the committee may determine.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I rise to speak at this time on the pending resolution, because of the fact that the newly elected Members of the Senate have been called into the debate by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] this afternoon.

I also happen to be a member of the Rules and Administration Committee, which passed favorably on the resolution continuing the War Investigating Committee. I likewise have the privilege of being on the standing Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

If I were to speak selfishly or politically, no doubt I should oppose the resolution continuing the special committee. I may not be so familiar with the rules of the Senate, as suggested a while ago by the distinguished whip of the minority [Mr. LUCAS], as those who have been here longer, but because I have so recently come and have been in such close contact with the people of my State, I think I do understand and am thoroughly familiar with their feelings in regard to the investigation of war contracts and of profiteering at the expense of the Nation. I am convinced that the people of the country, and I know the people of my State desire a complete and thorough investigation of war contracts and war expenditures and any profiteering that might be found in connection therewith.

I know also that they desire to have the findings revealed to the public, and they demand that any who are guilty shall be thoroughly exposed and prosecuted, that justice may be done, that the protection of the Republic in the future may be more secure.

I voted in the Rules and Administration Committee for a continuance of the special committee, believing it to be a continuing committee, which I am convinced now that it is, by the arguments which have taken place upon the floor of the Senate, and not a new committee.

There is a continuing personnel; there is an accumulation of records in the hands of the special committee, thoroughly understood by the members who are on the committee. There are the employees who no doubt will be to a large degree continued, who are familiar with the records and who understand the duties of the committee and its methods of investigation.

All of that would have to be gone over anew by a standing committee of the Senate. They would have to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the proceedings of the past, with the records which have accumulated. That would mean a delay of many months, no doubt, until the adjournment of the Congress. In view of the fact that the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program is a continuing committee, I supported it in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I shall support it in the Senate.

I have been amazed during the course of the debate by some of the predictions made in opposition to the continuance of the special committee, especially by those who referred to the Republic as being in danger if the standing committee should not be given the obligation of making the investigation and if the special committee should be continued.

Our Republic has endured a long time. We have just prosecuted successfully a great and terrible war and the Republic still endures. The Republic, I think, will endure the continuance of the special committee, and perhaps the creation of many more committees, if it be in the public interest, as I judge the continuation of this committee to be.

After hearing that kind of argument, I discount to a considerable degree the opposition that is being made on the floor of the Senate to the continuance of the special committee.

I want the La Follette reorganization law to be accepted, perfected, and made thoroughly workable, because I believe it to be in the public interest. I followed the debates here as they were recorded in the public press. I believe it was a step forward in efficiency, in the proper operation of this body, and yet I do not, as a new Member of the Senate, wish to be chained to the La Follette reorganization law. If there is a public job to be done, I desire that it shall be done, whether by a standing committee or by a special committee or any other kind of committee.

I think there is here a job to be done which the public expects us to do, and I do not wish any delay in the carrying out of the obligation of the Senate in the investigation of war contracts.

I might have been more impressed by the opposition, too, had it not been for the suggestion of the distinguished minority whip [Mr. LUCAS], when he said that the new Members had been led up on the mountaintop and shown the orange groves down below. He is not only confused in his geography; he is drawing heavily upon an exaggerated imagination.

No member of any committee, on this side or the other side, has asked me to vote for or against the continuance of the special committee. If I had been asked, Mr. President, I should not be controlled by my stubbornness, as the Senator suggested he was in the first vote he cast after he became a Member of Congress; nor should I be controlled by a sense of servility. I shall cast my vote because I think it a public duty to continue this special committee.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am definitely in favor of Senate Resolution 46 which would continue the Special Committee To Investigate the National

Defense Program. I have given the speeches made for and against it my careful thought and consideration. There have been some good arguments against having any special committees, if the arguments are taken all by themselves and without regard to the activities of the committee in question, which has already been established and without regard to the fact that time in these investigations is of the very essence of success in serving the best interests of the American people.

I might say that, in my opinion, if the committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, should require 2 or 3 months to get into action, that length of time might represent the difference between allowing the rats to escape, if we are to call them "rats," and catching them before they leave the rat holes.

The reorganization of the Congress was a tremendous undertaking, and no one expected it to be a perfect job in the first effort.

I not only voted for but spoke in favor of the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 because I believed it was a step forward in up-to-date organization. I realized it was not a perfect bill. I recognized the fact that the body which passed the law likewise had the right to amend or change it if and when it found such amendment necessary to the effort to serve the people of the United States more efficiently and more effectively.

When the Reorganization Act was voted on by the Senate, it contained a provision against the appointment of further special committees. I did not like that provision, and that was one of the things that made me realize it was not a perfect bill, but the value of making some progress outweighed the objections to that provision at the moment. However, there were others in the Congress who felt differently. The bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House. After consultation in the House, the provision banning the appointment of further special committees was removed, and the House voted on the bill without that prohibition against special committees. Then the bill came back to the Senate for its approval, and even though there were some in the Senate, probably on both sides of the aisle, who felt that the standing committees should be able to do the complete job, nevertheless there was such strong opposition in the House, where the objection was raised, to the banning provision that those sponsoring the reorganization bill in the Senate decided to accept the House version. I believe this is very strong evidence of the fact that the reorganization bill in itself, as passed by the Congress, did not in any way preclude the adoption of Senate Resolution 46. In fact, even the earlier prohibition did not apply to any of the then existing committees.

Rules in any organization should be changed when it is wise to change them, and wise men change their minds when facts and conditions justify it.

I personally would never have voted for the Reorganization Act had it specifically provided that there would and could be no special committees established for special purposes where time might be the essence of the question.

The Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program is a going committee. I cannot believe that its continuance under the conditions facing this Congress is a reflection on the abilities of any member of any standing committee. I would not so consider it in relation to any of the committees on which I serve, and I do not happen to be a member or a prospective member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

One thing alone would cause me to vote for the continuance of the special committee, and that is my knowledge of the fact that time is of the essence of the work it is doing. My experience in life, which has been along the lines of organization and to avoid duplication of power and activity, tells me likewise that regardless of the mental qualifications and capacities of any of the members of the newly formed standing committees, it would be next to impossible for them to take up and carry forward the work now being done by the special committee without the loss of considerable time and some confusion in the minds of the new members that might be appointed by any standing committee to serve the purpose the Congress had in mind when it created the special committee.

The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] happens to be an active member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, and I might say a very able member and he has been in the past a very successful prosecutor. He is likewise a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with respect to which my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], offers an amendment for reference of the subjects which have been pursued by the special committee. The Senator from Maryland makes a good argument were it not for the fact that the people are looking for quick action and full information on any improper expenditures or wrongdoing on the part of Government departments or agencies or private citizens in connection with the prosecution of the war. The Senator from Maryland contends that no time would be lost by transferring the activities of the special committee to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I cannot feel that this contention could possibly be sustained.

Mr. President, much has been said on the floor of the Senate about the confidence that the various Members have in the ability of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] successfully to carry on the work of the special investigating committee, even though that work be transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I call attention to the fact that the able junior Senator from Michigan has spoken at great length on the floor of the Senate urging the continuance of the special committee to January 31, 1948.

The Senator from Michigan has no selfish interest to serve in this matter.

If the work of the special committee were transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, it is more than likely that the Senator from Michigan would become the chairman of a subcommittee of that standing committee to carry on this work.

Since I wrote that language, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has notified the Senate this afternoon that if this subject matter is turned over to his committee he intends to appoint the distinguished Senator from Michigan as chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HAWKES. If it is a short question I will, but I do not want it to interrupt my speech.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be a short question. What makes the Senator from New Jersey think that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would be better qualified and more ready to take over on January 1, 1948, than they are today?

Mr. HAWKES. I would leave that question to the Senator from Illinois himself to answer, because if he does not think the new committee, after it has had a year to become organized and opportunity has been afforded the members to understand each other, will be better able to take over any subject, then I cannot explain it to him.

In view of these facts, which are apparent to all, the recommendations of the Senator from Michigan must be accepted by me as important recommendations from a man who knows what the special committee has been doing and what effect the past knowledge of that committee will have upon the future work to be performed by it if the resolution continuing it is adopted by the Senate.

I am in favor of continuing the special committee for a year as provided in the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. There are many new faces in the Senate this year. As we go along, we will have an opportunity to determine whether we should amend the Reorganization Act itself so as to make a committee of the type of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program a permanent committee, cloaked with certain powers and authorities. I would not wish to say now whether I would be in favor of continuing the special committee longer than the prescribed time; namely, January 31, 1948, but I should like to have a look at what it does and how the new standing committees function and then reach my conclusion before we reach January 31, 1948.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. In view of what the Senate has said regarding the committee and its past record I should like to have a statement placed in the RECORD at the end of the Senator's remarks. There has been compiled a record of the length of service of the various members of the special committee throughout its history, and I ask unanimous consent

that the compilation be inserted in the RECORD at the end of the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who does not realize that the Reorganization Act passed by the Congress last year may have many flaws in it. The fact that we are willing to and do make changes is why we are a going body. If we never change anything we become stagnant. The Constitution of the United States has been amended many times, and it probably will be amended many more times, though it is the greatest document in the world.

Again I say, I cannot believe merely because we passed the Reorganization Act last year and are trying to make it function, that the activities of this important special committee should be abruptly terminated and transferred to any standing committee with the consequent loss of time incident to such committee becoming sufficiently organized to enable it to proceed.

We had an election on November 5 last, and I am wondering if my fine friends on the other side of the aisle would be as assiduous in trying to eliminate this committee had they remained in the majority rather than finding themselves in the minority.

Since November 5, the complexion of the Congress has changed. I am advised from reliable sources that certain people in the Government employ who have been very unwilling to talk about things which happened but should not have happened, now find themselves with a little more confidence in assisting to correct the evils that creep into Government and Government operations, not only in peacetime but particularly in wartime.

The time to catch wrongdoers and correct mistakes is before the wrongdoers leave the jurisdiction or have had time to cover up or destroy their records. Therefore, I repeat that time is of the essence in the work that the Senate and the people of the United States expect this committee to do in the interest of the people. The American people want restored faith in the activities of their representatives and they want action on time or as nearly on time as we can give it to them. I ask, Do we wish to lose the valuable opportunity to get the facts that may be available to us simply for the purpose of complying with a technicality of organization? I, for one, do not. Under the circumstances, I find myself strongly in favor of Senate Resolution 46 and strongly in favor of the recommendations made to this body by Senators who have served most actively on the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. I need not go into detail here regarding the fact that the President of the United States, when he was chairman of the committee, had a feeling that no other committee could serve the purpose of that special committee. Senator Mead, who followed Mr. Truman, apparently felt the same way and expressed the same opinions very strongly. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who succeeded Senator Mead, had a very strong feeling up to November 5 that the work of the committee should continue.

I urge my colleagues to remember that one of the best rules in life is that rules of any organization should be changed and amended or added to as necessity demands. Furthermore, I would have them remember that the American people are more interested in the accomplishments that we make as their representatives than they are in the particular type of organization that we follow for the purpose.

EXHIBIT 1

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF THE PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

From March 8, 1941: Senator Owen Brewster, Senator Tom Connally, Senator Joseph H. Ball.

From November 27, 1941: Senator Harley M. Kilgore.

From January 28, 1943: Senator Homer Ferguson.

From October 29, 1945: Senator William F. Knowland.

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM WHOSE TERMS EXPIRED ON JANUARY 2, 1947

Senator James M. Mead, from March 8, 1941.

Senator James M. Tunnell, from August 10, 1944.

Senator Hugh B. Mitchell, from March 6, 1945.

Senator Frank P. Briggs, from July 2, 1945.

FORMER MEMBERS OF SENATE NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND LENGTH OF SERVICE

Hon. Harry S. Truman, Democrat, Missouri, March 8, 1941 to August 3, 1944.

Hon. Carl Hayden, Democrat, Arizona, March 8, 1941 to April 15, 1941.

Hon. James M. Mead, Democrat, New York, March 8, 1941 to January 2, 1947.

Hon. Mon C. Wallgren, Democrat, Washington, March 8, 1941 to January 9, 1945.

Hon. Carl A. Hatch, Democrat, New Mexico, April 15, 1941 to June 26, 1945.

Hon. Clyde L. Herring, Democrat, Iowa, November 27, 1941 to January 3, 1943.

Hon. Styles Bridges, Republican, New Hampshire, November 27, 1941 to March 16, 1942.

Hon. Harold H. Burton, Republican, Ohio, March 16, 1942 to October 1, 1945.

Hon. James M. Tunnell, Democrat, Delaware, August 10, 1944 to January 2, 1947.

Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, Democrat, Washington, March 6, 1945 to December 25, 1946.

Hon. Frank P. Briggs, Democrat, Missouri, July 2, 1945 to January 2, 1947.

DATES OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Appointed March 8, 1941: Hon. Harry S. Truman, Missouri; Hon. Carl Hayden, Arizona; Hon. Tom Connally, Texas; Hon. James M. Mead, New York; Hon. Mon C. Wallgren, Washington; Hon. Joseph H. Ball, Minnesota; Hon. Owen Brewster, Maine.

April 15, 1941: Senator Hayden resigned; Hon. Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico, appointed.

November 27, 1941—Committee increased to 10 members: Hon. Clyde L. Herring, Iowa; Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, West Virginia; Hon. Styles Bridges, New Hampshire.

March 16, 1942: Senator Bridges resigned; Hon. Harold H. Burton, Ohio, appointed.

November 17, 1942: Senator Ball's term expired.

January 3, 1943: Senator Herring's term expired.

January 28, 1943: Senator Ball reappointed; Hon. Homer Ferguson, Michigan.

August 3, 1944: Senator Truman resigned.

August 10, 1944: Hon. James M. Tunnell, Delaware, appointed.

January 9, 1945: Senator Wallgren succeeded in Senate by Hon. Hugh Mitchell, leaving a vacancy on the committee.

March 6, 1945: Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell appointed.

June 26, 1945: Hon. Carl A. Hatch resigned.

July 2, 1945: Hon. Frank P. Briggs appointed.

October 1, 1945: Hon. Harold H. Burton resigned.

October 29, 1945: Hon. William F. Knowland appointed.

December 25, 1946: Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell resigned.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I had assumed that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] desired to speak this afternoon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate this afternoon, perhaps at some length. It is now 5:35 o'clock. I hardly feel inclined to proceed now, and I am sure that other Senators are not inclined to listen at this hour of the day.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say to the Senator that I know of no other Senator who desires to speak at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are several other names on the list.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think it should be clear in the RECORD that during the 4 days this matter has been under discussion the floor has been held for approximately 75 percent of the time by those who are opposing the resolution. I say that in order that it may not appear that there has been any undue claiming of time on this side. I am sure that we would all welcome the contribution of the Senator from New Mexico, who has participated in the discussions to some extent. I should be happy to remain and listen, as I am sure other Senators would be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is no way by which I can force the Senator from New Mexico to speak at this time if he does not choose to do so.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would not require too much persuasion. I rose merely to say to the Senator from Maine, in answer to the statement which he made, that I had made no implication that Senators on the other side had taken too much time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite understand.

Mr. HATCH. Nothing of the kind was in my mind. The Presiding Officer stated that there were other names on the list. If other Senators desire to speak, I am willing to remain. However, I shall forego my own right, if I have any.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that by unanimous consent this question is to be voted on at 2 o'clock on Wednesday, and that on that day the 2 hours from 12 o'clock until 2 are to be equally divided between the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has correctly stated the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. That being the case, any Senator who desires to speak at length would probably be well advised to speak today, or else be restricted to 10 minutes, or whatever time may be allotted to him.

Mr. WHITE. That was my thought. I do not know how long the Senator from New Mexico may desire to speak.

Mr. HATCH. I may not even speak at all; but whatever remarks I make on Wednesday will be so arranged as to meet the convenience of the Senator who has the division of time on our side.

HEARINGS BEFORE SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 63), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy appointed by the President of the Senate as provided in Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 1, 1946, be and they are hereby designated the committee to which shall be referred all appointments under said Public Law 585 that require the advice and consent of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee shall have the same power and authority, in connection with the holding of hearings and the conduct of investigations and reporting to the Senate thereon, with reference to such matters, as are possessed by the standing committees of the Senate in other matters requiring the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution which I have just submitted, I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request. The resolution deals with the question of hearings before the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I intend to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. I have submitted the resolution to the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who was formerly chairman of the committee. I think the first half of the resolution as it was prepared may well be eliminated. I believe perhaps there is some reason for the adoption of the second half, properly altered. Perhaps the first part of the resolution can now be eliminated. The Chair has ruled—and I think very properly under the Atomic Energy Act—that questions of confirmation should be referred to the Senate members of the joint committee. However, the second part of the resolution may be a clarifying statement as to the ability of Senate members to hold regular hearings. I should be pleased to hear the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who has considered this resolution, express his opinion, because certainly I do not wish to make a unanimous-consent request which is not fully understood.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has shown me the resolution, and I can see no harm in adopting it. I will say, for the sake of the legislative history involved, that I do not believe that it is strictly necessary. I believe that under the act as it is written the power which the Senator wishes to confer on the committee is already vested in it, but I certainly have no objection to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what has been said to me by Senators indicates to me that this resolution might provoke a somewhat extended discussion. Would there be any harm in letting it go over until after the disposition of the matter which is now the unfinished business?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. None whatever, Mr. President. I merely bring it up at this time because the nominations have already been referred. It was only a matter of clearing up the question of the right of Senate members to employ stenographic help, as provided in the second half of the resolution. But I shall not urge it at this time.

REDEMPTION IN CASH OF TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS FOR BENEFIT OF VETERANS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill and request that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I realize that the hour is late, and that it is desired to take a recess.

I merely wish to say that the bill calls for the payment of terminal-leave allowances in cash to veterans of the war who are not officers. We all favor economy. I believe that the Budget should be reduced, but I believe that any surplus accruing from a Budget reduction should go first to the soldiers, the sailors, the marines, and the merchantmen who helped win the war.

I hope that the Chair will refer the bill to a committee which will immediately report it to the Senate, because the Treasury at this time is printing bonds to be given as terminal-leave pay to young men who have served their country gallantly and heroically. The officers were all paid in cash. The bill merely provides for redemption of so many of the unmatured bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 as can be redeemed by the surplus of Federal receipts over Federal expenditures. With that money the Government will cash the bonds which it has issued. It will not cost the Government a cent. The only effect will be to redeem the bonds which the Government has issued.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 304) to provide for the redemption of terminal-leave bonds by the use of any surplus of Federal receipts over Federal expenditures, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Douglas W. McGregor, of Texas, to be the assistant to the Attorney General;

Richmond B. Keech, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia;

James R. Wright, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas; and

M. Frank Hammond, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive B, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol to extend for 1 year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions, the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The protocol is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 20, 1947.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith, in certified form, a protocol to extend for 1 year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions, the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol was open for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington from September 3, 1946, until November 1, 1946, and during that period was signed for the United States of America, "subject to ratification," and for the fourteen other American Republics which became parties to the Inter-American Coffee Agreement.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a report on the protocol made to me by the Secretary of State.

In view of the fact that the previous extension of the agreement expired on October 1, 1946, and in as much as the present protocol will extend the agreement for only one year from that date, I should be grateful for early consideration of the protocol by the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Protocol extending the Inter-American Coffee Agreement—certified copies in the English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 17, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a protocol to extend for one year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions, the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol, in accordance with the provisions of Article 4

thereof, was open for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington from September 3, 1946, until November 1, 1946, and during that period was signed for the United States of America, "subject to ratification", and for the fourteen other American Republics which became parties to the Inter-American Coffee Agreement.

The protocol retains the framework of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement for a one-year period but suspends the provisions of Articles I to VIII, inclusive, of that agreement, which relate to coffee quotas, with the exception that, under emergency conditions, such Articles of the agreement shall again become effective upon a motion approved by at least 95 percent of the total vote of the Inter-American Coffee Board.

Article 3 of the protocol provides that the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by March 31, 1947, a thorough analysis of the world coffee situation and shall formulate recommendations for the consideration of the governments now participating in the agreement and of other governments that might be interested in participating in a revised agreement regarding the type of international cooperation that appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound, prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both producers and consumers.

The one-year extension provided for by the protocol has been recommended by an interdepartmental committee consisting of representatives of the interested agencies of the United States Government, and that recommendation approved by the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy. The domestic coffee trade has indicated that it considers the extension of the agreement for one year under the terms set forth in the protocol to be a desirable measure.

Information on the background and purposes of the coffee agreement is set forth in the report of January 8, 1941, by the Secretary of State to the President (Senate Exec. A, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

Advice and consent to ratification of the coffee agreement was given by the Senate on February 3, 1941. The agreement was ratified by the President on February 12, 1941, and the instrument of ratification by the United States deposited with the Pan American Union on April 14, 1941. On April 15, 1941, a protocol was signed at Washington, bringing the agreement into force on April 16, 1941, among the governments which had at that time deposited ratifications or approvals of the agreement. The Congress of the United States, by joint resolution approved April 11, 1941, provided for the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the agreement on and after the entry into force of the agreement and during the continuation in force of the obligations of the United States thereunder (55 Stat. 133).

The agreement, which was to expire on October 1, 1943, was twice extended without modification for one-year periods by unanimous approval of the signatory countries. That action was taken pursuant to the provisions of Article XXIV of the agreement, which authorize the continuation of the agreement upon acceptance by all participating governments of a recommendation by the Inter-American Coffee Board that the duration of the agreement be extended. By a protocol open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 1, 1945, until November 1, 1945, the agreement was extended, with certain modifications, for a further one-year period from October 1, 1945. Those extensions also were approved by the domestic coffee trade.

In as much as the previous extension of the agreement expired on October 1, 1946, and in view of the fact that the present protocol will extend the agreement for only one year from that date, the Department of State recommends its early approval by the Government of the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

PROTOCOL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT FOR ONE YEAR FROM OCTOBER 1, 1946

Whereas an Inter-American Coffee Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in Washington on November 28, 1940; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed in Washington April 15, 1941, the Agreement was brought into force on April 16, 1941, in respect of the Governments on behalf of which the Protocol was signed on April 15, 1941; and

Whereas Article XXIV of the said Agreement provides that it should continue in force until October 1, 1943; and

Whereas by unanimous consent the Governments signatory to the Agreement twice extended the said Agreement unchanged for one-year periods, these extensions being duly attested by two certified and signed Declarations passed by the Inter-American Coffee Board on May 12, 1943 and July 25, 1944, respectively, which were duly deposited in the Pan American Union on June 11, 1943, and September 11, 1944, respectively, in accordance with the provisions of Article XXIV of the Agreement; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1945, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1945, with certain changes recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board.

Now, therefore, in support of a recommendation made by the Inter-American Coffee Board on August 16, 1946, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term, subject to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory to the present Protocol for a period of one year from October 1, 1946.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol agree that the provisions of Article 1 through and including VIII of the Agreement shall be inoperative, except that, under emergency conditions, such articles of the Agreement shall again become effective upon a motion approved by at least 95% of the total vote of the Inter-American Coffee Board.

ARTICLE 3

a. During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by March 31, 1947, a thorough analysis of the world coffee situation and shall formulate recommendations for the consideration of the governments now participating in the Agreement and of other governments that might be interested in participating in a revised agreement regarding the type of international cooperation that appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound, prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both producers and consumers.

b. Such recommendations shall take due account of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreement which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations prior to the submission of such recommendations.

ARTICLE 4

The present Protocol shall be open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 3, 1946, until November 1, 1946, provided, however, that all signatures shall be deemed to have been affixed under date of October 1, 1946, and the Protocol shall be considered as having entered into force on that date with respect to the governments on behalf of which it is signed.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at the City of Washington in the English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages. The original instrument in each language shall be deposited in the Pan American Union which shall furnish certified copies to the Governments signatory to this Protocol.

OCTAVIO DO NASCIMENTO BRITO,
Brazil.

EMILIO TORO,
Colombia.

RAFAEL OREAMUNO,
Costa Rica.

GMO. BELT,
Cuba.

Sujeto a la aprobación por el Senado de la República de Cuba.

EMILIO G. GODOY,
Dominican Republic.

O. GARCÍA,
Ecuador.

FELIPE VEGA-GÓMEZ,
El Salvador.

ENRIQUE LÓPEZ HERRARTE,
Guatemala.

Ad-referendum.

JH. D. CHARLES,
Haiti.

JULIÁN R. CÁCERES,
Honduras.

A. E. DE LOS MONTEROS,
Mexico.

GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA,
Nicaragua.

JORGE PRADO,
Peru.

SPRUILLE BRADEN,
United States of America.

Subject to ratification.

M. A. FALCÓN BRICEÑO,
Venezuela.

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original of the Protocol for the Extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement for one year from October 1, 1946, deposited in the Pan American Union.

Washington, D. C., January 6, 1947.

[SEAL] WILLIAM MANGER,
Acting Secretary of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Archibald L. M. Wiggins, of South Carolina, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Nicholas Brown, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Morris Fay, of the District

of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Ellis Mundy, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Rowan, of Illinois, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the President be notified in the case of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

HEARINGS BEFORE SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution submitted by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (S. Res. 63) relating to hearings before Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Iowa will have to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration unless the rules are suspended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the purposes of the resolution on the part of the Senator from Iowa. I have an inherent dislike for acting upon resolutions that have not been printed and which are called up at the last minute to be acted on by 8 or 10 Members who happen to be present. I do not know that there is anything wrong with the resolution. I do not have any idea that there is; but I would like to have an explanation of it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the doubt of the Senator from Vermont, I join with him in decrying the sudden and precipitous presentation of resolutions of this kind. I thought that this matter had been fully covered by referring it to various Members on the other side, including the minority leader and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who has been as vitally interested as anyone in atomic-energy matters. However, in deference to the opinion of any Senator on this matter, I ask leave to submit the resolution so that it can be printed.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not objecting to acting upon it; I was simply asking for an explanation of it. I would like to know what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to make a statement to the Senator from Vermont, because in the Chair's opinion there is some imminent importance to the request made by the Senator from Iowa. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that when the nominations were received for the Atomic Energy Commission the Chair referred them to the Senate members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, because Public Law 585, in section 15 (b), provides that "all bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate," and so forth, "relating primarily to the Commission," and so forth, shall be referred to the joint committee and to the Senate side of the joint committee.

The Chair's understanding of the resolution offered by the Senator from Iowa is that the Senator is simply now requesting that the rules be suspended so that the resolution may be adopted, permitting the Senate members of the committee to proceed immediately with hearings, with authority to finance hearings upon these nominations.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Chair for the explanation, and with that explanation I have no objection to proceeding with the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Senator from Iowa if the statement of the Chair is correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Chair's statement is correct, and I will say, further, that under a fair interpretation of the provisions of the public law just cited by the Chair the Senate members of the joint committee probably have the authority to employ stenographers and reporters and to subpena and pay witnesses. That probably could be worked out. Yet it is not clear, although the responsibility of interrogating the appointees and recommending the confirmation of appointments in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission is clearly placed upon the Senate members by the law itself. Therefore in order to clarify the matter and have no question about the payment of employees who are specially operating in behalf of the Senate members in connection with appointments requiring confirmation, we think it is desirable that the resolution be adopted in the interest of efficiency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asks unanimous consent that the rules be suspended for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 63), as modified, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, appointed by the President of the Senate as provided in Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 1, 1946, shall have the same power and authority, in connection with the holding of hearings and the conduct of investigations and reporting to the Senate thereon, with reference to appointments under said Public Law 585 that require the advice and consent of the Senate, as are possessed by the standing committees of the Senate in other matters requiring the advice and consent of the Senate.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, January 22, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE

Hon. Marvin Jones, of Texas, to be Chief Justice of the United States Court of Claims, vice Hon. Richard S. Whaley, retired.

IN THE ARMY

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Ira Thomas Wyche (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Inspector General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Lt. Gen. Daniel Isom Sultan, United States Army, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Archibald L. M. Wiggins to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John Nicholas Brown to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

George Morris Fay to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

J. Ellis Mundy to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

William A. Rowan to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O wondrous God, Thou who knowest all and seest all, we lift our mental and spiritual eyes to Thee. How manifold are Thy works, O Lord; in wisdom Thou hast made them all.

Out of the abundance of tranquil minds and warm hearts, grant that we may sweep away errors and fortify our weaknesses with a wholesome sense of our responsibilities. As we breathe the air of the upper world, warmed by Thy sun, awed by Thy glory, we beseech Thy guidance in all our deliberations.

We pray Thee, dear Lord, for our soldier-statesman who has been exalted to a high place in the counsels of our Nation. Do Thou crown him with good courage and good health; sustain him and lead him through all the exactions which are perplexing the minds of men. We pray in Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 16, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 86. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital.

The message also announced the President pro tempore has made the following appointments to fill vacancies on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report: Mr. BALL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. SPARKMAN.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry. The resolution recites that crude rubber, which includes all forms and types of tree, vine, and shrub rubber, is a highly strategic and critical material deficient and incapable, as the result of climatic conditions in the United States, of sufficient development as a natural resource of the United States in quantities adequate to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for the common defense.

The resolution further provides that Congress in the enactment of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act—Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress—has heretofore declared it the policy of the United States to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of strategic and critical materials, including crude rubber, so as to prevent as far as possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency. My resolution provides a program with respect to crude rubber shall be devised which will supplement that heretofore adopted in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act and declares it to be the policy of the United States that there shall be maintained at all times in the interest of national security and common defense, in addition to stock piles of crude rubber to be acquired, a technologically advanced and rapidly expandible domestic rubber-producing industry of sufficient productive capacity to assure the availability in times of national emergency of adequate supplies of domestically produced rubber to meet the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country.

The joint resolution directs that Congress shall make a thorough study and investigation of means of accomplishing such policy through the enactment of permanent legislation, the study and investigation to be completed within such time as will permit the legislation to be enacted if possible during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Pending the enactment of such permanent legislation, the United States shall be continued temporarily as the sole purchaser and seller of crude rubber to be used in the United States, and the authority of the United States to allocate crude rubber and control the uses to which allocations may be put, and the authority of the United States to manufacture and sell synthetic rubber shall be temporarily continued.

To effectuate these purposes temporary retention of certain emergency powers with respect to rubber are continued under the terms of the resolution.

World War II forcefully demonstrated the absolute necessity of having an adequate supply of rubber within the territorial borders of the United States. Never again must the United States be dependent on sources on the other side of the world for its entire rubber supply.

In the next emergency there may not be the time, and there probably will not be the time—as was the case in World War II—to develop the "know-how" and to construct facilities for the production of man-made rubber and for acquiring the skills necessary to the utilization of it.

The national security and the success of our armed forces in any subsequent conflict with a foreign enemy require that appropriate action be taken now to assure that the facilities for the production of man-made rubber of the highest quality are continued in operation and the skills necessary to utilize it in the manufacture of rubber products of maximum serviceability are preserved and are improved with the passing of the years and are not lost because of disuse.

A stock piling of crude rubber within the borders of the United States is desirable and necessary to supplement in an emergency the supplies of American-made rubber. However, it is generally recognized that no reasonable stock pile of crude rubber could supply the needs for a war of more than several months' duration. Further, a few years will be required to accumulate even a modest stock pile of crude rubber.

Entirely apart from the long-range demands of national security above discussed, the country in the year 1947 faces an extremely critical national situation in rubber which requires immediate action and which arises because of the following factors:

First. The rubber requirements of the United States during 1947 are estimated by the Civilian Production Administration to be in the neighborhood of 1,000,000 long tons, to satisfy which only about 500,000 long tons of crude rubber will be available after a reasonable allocation for stock pile. This means that nearly 50 percent of the rubber used in the United States during 1947 will, of necessity, be American-made rubber. Assuming approximately 100,000 long tons of special-purpose rubbers may be used during the year, this leaves close to 400,000 long tons of Government general-purpose rubber to be produced and used by the rubber industry in the manufacture of rubber products.

Second. During the war and continuing thereafter up to this time, appropriate Government agencies have been exercising the sole power to purchase and to import crude rubber for use in this country. They also have been determining the allocation to industry of such crude rubber, its use in the manufacture of products by directive order as to the maximum amounts that can be employed in any product, and by priorities, in order that the present short supply of imported crude rubber may be utilized to maximum advantage.

There is danger that these beneficial directive functions will be discontinued, since the Second War Powers Act, under which the allocation, specification control, and priorities with respect to the use of crude rubber is now being carried on, will expire on March 31, 1947, and since the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is now exercising the sole power of purchase of crude rubber for import into the United States, ceases to exist under present law on June 30, 1947, and there is already pressure being placed on Government to discontinue its sole powers to purchase and to import crude rubber in order to restore a free crude-rubber market in the United States.

Third. The two factors above outlined, namely, the drastic shortage of crude rubber and the imminence of removal of beneficial regulations of its use, give rise to a crisis which might well have far-reaching disastrous effects on our national interests if suitable action is not taken.

A sound long-range American rubber program should be crystallized by adequate legislation before the Government relinquishes the power now exercised by it as the sole agency for the purchase and import of crude rubber for use in this country and before making any other basic change in the existing rubber program, such as the allocation, specification control, and priorities with respect to the use of crude rubber.

A sufficient tonnage of American-made rubber for the maintenance of national security should be made and used in this country each year.

The Government's present efficient facilities for the manufacture of American-made rubber should be maintained in stand-by condition or in condition ready to be run on short notice.

Beyond the above-enumerated provisions for security, America's long-range rubber program should be based on the principle of competitive enterprise for the reason that the free play of economic forces will do more than anything else to spur research, development, and production within the United States of all types of rubbers and of more and better rubber products at lower costs, thereby providing capacities and skills in this country invaluable in a time of national emergency.

But the free play of economic forces may not entirely solve the long-range problem of American rubber security.

The important point to realize is that now is the time for Congress to turn its attention to the project of making sure

that our rubber insurance policy does not lapse—that in future years we shall not once more become a "have-not" Nation with respect to rubber.

Regardless of strictly economic factors, Congress should give early consideration to the adoption of a program assuring that—

First. The Government's efficient facilities for the manufacture of American-made rubber be maintained in stand-by condition, ready to be run on immediate notice; and that

Second. A sufficient tonnage of American-made rubber for the maintenance of national security be made and used each year.

President George Washington, in his first annual address to Congress, January 8, 1790, said:

A free people * * * their safety and interest require, that they should promote such manufactories, as tend to render them independent on others for essential, particularly for military supplies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include a brief statement from the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations headed by the new chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], deserves commendation for its efforts to economize and cut expenses wherever possible. It is, however, sometimes in the interest of economy that more and not less money be spent for some worthy undertaking. I refer to the terrible foot-and-mouth disease now raging among the livestock herds of the Republic of Mexico. The situation is alarming and if this dread disease should get into this country it would result in millions of dollars in loss to our livestock owners. I represent nearly 400 miles along the Mexican border. Some of the finest herds of whiteface cattle in America are in my district. I insist that every precaution be taken against this disease getting across the border. There are now more than 100,000 cattle in southern Mexico either infected or having been subjected to this highly contagious and fatal disease. The Bureau of Animal Industry of our Department of Agriculture is busy and cooperating with the Mexican authorities. I urge that our veterinarians be loaned to the Mexican Government and that a supplemental appropriation be passed to provide additional inspectors along the entire Mexican border. I have also insisted for years that a strong wire fence be built all along the border which would be of great value in solving many of our international problems, including the enforcement of our customs, immigration, and quarantine laws. I include as a part of my remarks a letter Dr. B. T. Simms, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, wrote Commissioner Lawson, of the International Boundary Commission and which appears in the last hearings of the Appropriations Committee:

Reference is made to your letter of January 29, 1946, advising that among the estimates of appropriations for the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, submitted to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1947, are two for carrying on fence construction along the Mexican boundary. One project contemplates fencing along the boundary west of El Paso and the other contemplates the construction of 415 miles of fence extending from Del Rio, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, along the Rio Grande border. You request a statement indicating the interest of the Bureau of Animal Industry in these projects and the benefits that might be expected from them.

The Bureau of Animal Industry is very much interested in the protection that would be furnished by the proposed fencing in both sections because of the assistance it would be to our livestock-disease control and eradication work in the United States and the protection it would furnish against the admission of animal diseases and parasites from Mexico. At the present time, however, this Bureau is particularly interested in the proposed section of fencing along the Rio Grande border from Del Rio, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico for the reason that it is in this area the danger of diseased and fever-tick-infested animals entering the United States is greatest, and the cost to the Federal Government in an effort to prevent these illegal movements of livestock is largest.

For more than 10 years United States citizens and cattle owners in the lower Rio Grande Valley section of Texas have been conducting a fever-tick eradication campaign. The tick was repeatedly eradicated from the cattle and pastures on the United States side of the border only to have this work undone and sections of the area reinfested, time after time, by stray or smuggled tick-infested animals from Mexico. The proposed drift fence along this border seems to offer the only practical solution to this problem because, except when at flood stage, the river is not an effective barrier to the crossing of livestock. A Federal quarantine is maintained on a narrow strip extending through eight counties from Val Verde County, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, and this area is constantly patrolled by Bureau inspectors in a not wholly successful effort to prevent the spread of ticks to points in the interior of Texas.

The importance of the tick-eradication project to Texas, and the State's interest in protecting its cattle and ranges from reinfestation, will be realized when it is considered that the livestock interests and officials of that State have been nearly 40 years in forcing fever-tick infestation back to the Mexican border, and this at a cost to the counties, State, and Federal Government of approximately $16,150,000 to date. Most of the State has now been tick-free so long that Texas cattle no longer carry any immunity to tick fever and with the introduction of ticks from the infected area of Mexico there is danger of a serious death loss among the American cattle. Added to this danger is the cost of cleaning up that also falls on the American cattle owners. When fever-tick reinfestation occurs, dipping of all infested and exposed animals at 2-week intervals, over a period of 9 months, is necessary to insure eradication.

At the present time the Bureau of Animal Industry finds it necessary to maintain a force of about 44 men along this border at an annual cost to the Federal Government in excess of $100,000. With the completion of the proposed fence, it is believed that it will be possible to reduce this force and expense by one-half and still furnish much better protection than is at present possible.

BILL TO CONTINUE CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES

Mr. GRANT of Indiana, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the following bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise taxes, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Union Calendar, and ordered printed:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Excise Tax Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) is hereby amended by striking out "and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

SEC. 3. Sections 1654 (termination of retail tax on luggage, etc.) and 1655 (definition of "date of the termination of hostilities in the present war") of such code are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. Section 1659 of such code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1659. Definition of 'Rate Reduction Date.'

"For the purposes of this chapter the term 'rate reduction date' means such date as the Congress shall by law prescribe."

SEC. 5. Section 302 (b) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1943 (period applicable to increase of tax with respect to billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys) is hereby amended by striking out ", and continuing through June 30 next following the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war (as defined in ch. 9A of the Internal Revenue Code)."

SEC. 6. Section 309 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1943 (relating to draw-back on distilled spirits) is hereby amended by striking out "and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war,".

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. JUDD, Mr. RICH, Mr. HART, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. HUBER.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 381, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. BELL.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WOODRUFF and Mr. COLMER.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. L. 360), the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women the following Members of the House: Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mrs. NORTON.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. DOUGHTON; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. CANNON.

DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. BLOOM.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following Members of the House: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. MCCORMACK.

COMMITTEE ON PLANS FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CEILING, REDECORATIONS, AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and Other Improvements to the House Chamber, the following Members of the House: Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. SUNDSTROM, Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. BELL.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CURE OF VARIOUS DISEASES

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] in which he admonishes us to take care of the hoof-and-mouth disease in the neighboring country of Mexico, possibly build a fence between the State of Texas and Mexico in order to keep animals with that disease out of Texas. I appreciate very much the fact that we are doing a lot to prevent diseases in cattle. I would at the same time call your attention to the fact that we should do more to prevent diseases of the human race.

I therefore ask you to get behind the bill H. R. 977, which provides for research to find a cure for such degenerative diseases as cancer, polio, rheumatic fever, arthritis, hardening of the arteries, diabetes, and anemia.

Physicians, veterans, and representatives of women's clubs from coast to coast are writing me in favor of this bill, and expressing their confidence that the Congress will give favorable consideration to this humanitarian legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Hawaii.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech prepared for the annual convention of the Montana Wool Growers' Association, at Billings, Mont.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an exchange of correspondence between the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War, on the matter of the unification of the military services and, Mr. Speaker, if the rules permit, I ask unanimous consent that this extension may be made in the RECORD notwithstanding the fact it appears that the matter will exceed the allowable limit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to insert a statement made by himself under date of January 16 and January 20 at hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook in reference to Senator VANDENBERG's proposal for China.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on taxes by a former Congressman from Indiana, the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter containing some comments on the tax-reduction bill and also two editorials on the same subject.

EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS AND PROFESSORS BETWEEN COUNTRIES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the exchange of students and professors between countries is one of the best ways at our disposal to create a happy world climate. One of the very eminent professors of Western Reserve University at Cleveland, Dr. E. E. Ecker, of the Institute of Pathology, is just returned from some months in Spain. I am inserting in the RECORD the pertinent part of a letter I have just received from him certain that the membership will be interested.

We came back enchanted with the Spanish people. They did everything possible to make our stay in their country a most pleasant one. We were free to come and go. Everyone appeared busy, the stores were full of goods, although food was too expensive for the average city laborer. Spain is an agricultural country so that the greater portion of the population appears well fed. The drought of the past 2 years has led to a serious lack of olive oil and other fats. Another difficulty arose when the sardine schools failed to return to their waters.

The Spanish people have a highly organized social system and excellent schools. The Minister of Education has been the driving force back of an enormous development of higher education and research. Their superior council of research has built several excellent research institutes, a special residence for visiting scientists, and other men of learning, and has sent numerous scholars for study abroad. These men receive a large stipend per month ($400) if they visit the United States. This allows them to travel freely and to live in comfort while in New York or other centers.

I gave many lectures at such centers as Santiago de Compostello, Madrid, Salamanca, and Valladolid. Received invitations from Sevilla, Granada, Valencia, and Barcelona, but our time was too short to accept the latter invitations. The Royal Academy of Medicine, which has a total membership of about 30, made me a corresponding member, and the clinical pathologists and bacteriologists made me honorary member of their respective organizations. While at Madrid I met British, Belgian, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish scientists who were also invited there to give lectures. My knowledge of Spanish proved to be a tremendous asset to me because the Spaniard is a poor linguist. All my lectures were given before crowded halls. I left Spain with the invitation to return whenever I find it possible to spend 2 months at the summer University of Santander.

Today I am convinced, Mrs. BOLTON, that exchange of scholars, including students, is one of our best means, if not the best, to obtain good will and understanding among the nations. One gets at the root of a people to an extent that no diplomat is able to reach by such a method. We should do everything possible to foster such exchanges with our neighboring republics. It is not enough to have their students visit us. Our scholars must be given the opportunity to teach for short periods of time in their schools, and these men or women must first acquire a thorough knowledge of Spanish or

Portuguese as well as an appreciation of the mental make-up of these people.

While in Spain I have acquired some new ideas and techniques which may prove of value to us. * * *

Early this spring I expect two Spanish scientists here for a period of 6 months at the institute.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes on the sugar situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the announcement on unification last Thursday evening, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my statement made in 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] on the hoof-and-mouth disease certainly should bring before this House the great danger to our food supply and the almost unlimited loss that it might entail if this disease is not controlled. The Committee on Agriculture has already appointed a subcommittee headed by a distinguished veterinarian of our body, the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, who helped handle the last great attack of this scourge in the U. S. A. some years ago, and we are proceeding to offer to cooperate with the Mexican authorities and with the legislative committee of this House whose business it is to look after the interests of agriculture and to protect the food supply of the Nation from disease and death.

It was with a great deal of misgivings and, I want to say, with some shock, that many of us learned last summer of the opening of the Mexican border to these unlimited importations and shipments of cattle at the very time that the Bureau of Animal Industry knew that these infected bulls had already been introduced into Mexico. We sow the wind and reap the whirlwind.

CANOL PROJECT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on about March 13, 1945, the War Department wrote off the Canol project, that fantastic excursion for oil up in the Canadian wilderness, which, I might say, would not have been undertaken by any man of experience and judgment in such matters.

Now, ex-Secretary of State Byrnes announces an agreement with Canada to liquidate the Canol project. Properties and equipment are to be sold to the highest bidder. Well, I doubt if there will be any bidders, and, as I predicted, the property would fall into disuse and ultimately be abandoned, and nature would take over.

Again I say, as I have said before, it is no great pleasure to me to see my early fears of complete failure confirmed. I brought this matter to the attention of the House on October 12 and 19, 1943, and again on March 13, 1945, when many millions of dollars remained unexpended. However, the War Department carried it to completion.

Economically, the Canol project was an absurdity of such high degree that anyone outside of Government who would propose such a subject would have been thought to be a fit subject for a psychiatrist. Militarily it failed equally flat. It did not yield as much gasoline and other products as was required on the project itself. All the steam was used to blow the whistle.

The War Department, of course, has not admitted making an error. With the tenacity and stubbornness which would be admirable on the battlefield, but is wholly inexcusable here, the War Department has sought to create the impression that Canol was, after all, a triumph.

I am of the opinion that the Appropriations Committee should scrutinize the budget of the War and Navy Departments so that we do not have another Canol on our hands. This entire project should be given an immediate investigation by the petroleum committee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee or by the Armed Services Committee.

Certainly it must be agreed that the American people are entitled to a full explanation on this $135,000,000 project, which is now being unceremoniously junked to the highest bidder. I say "unceremoniously" because, if I remember correctly, the War Department held a ceremony when it was completed, announcing to the world that the great Canol was in operation.

REDS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation were rather startled last Saturday morning to read such headlines as appeared in the Washington Post regarding a former State Department employee, Carl Alde Marzani, to wit, "Ex-State Department man indicted as Red."

I wish to call attention to the fact that on November 29 and again on December 2, 1943, I made speeches on the floor of the House concerning some of these Reds in the various departments of our Government, and also how they bypassed the Civil Service Commission, after which the Committee on Un-American Activities voted unanimously to investigate the Civil Service Commission. I do not know who was responsible for purging this man in the State Department, but whoever got him out is deserving of a vote of thanks and commendation, not only of the House of Representatives, but the people of this Nation. The Civil Service Commission knew this man's record, declared him ineligible, and on the testimony of four men who worked with Marzani in OSS but never even knew him prior to his employment in OSS, the Civil Service Commission reversed its decision and declared him eligible for Federal employment. There are hundreds of other Communists in Federal employment we ought to get out as soon as possible.

Carl Marzani in 1943 was economic editor of OCI and was on the list of the Committee on Un-American Activities to be investigated through the United States Civil Service Commission. Unfortunately for the country, this investigation fizzled out, as did most of the investigations of this nature when the Democrats were in control of both branches of Congress. For approximately 5 years evidence has been in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the effect that Carl Marzani was one of the signers of communistic petitions and that the New York police office had a record of him as an active member of the Communist Party under the name of Tony Whales. I know it was common practice for the Committee of the United States Civil Service Commission, when I was a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to let men in various executive departments influence their decisions in declaring a man eligible for Federal employment, after they had found him ineligible. I had hoped in my absence that the Civil Service Commission had discontinued this practice, but much to my amazement, upon my return to the Eightieth Congress, I find it going on as usual.

Patrick Henry once said:

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no other way to judge the future, but by the past.

Evidently no evidence of Marzani's past was either sought or considered by the Board of Appeals and Review of the Civil

Service Commission, when they only considered evidence of fellow employees in the same department as Marzani. Conditions of this kind make the entire loyalty rating system, and particularly that of the Board of Appeals and Review, positively worthless in the way it is being handled. I seriously recommend to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that they could do no better job in the Eightieth Congress than to make a complete investigation of the Civil Service Commission.

I also respectfully suggest to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that they call for the entire files on this particular case as a starting point to learn the ineffectiveness of the present system within the Commission for handling loyalty cases. If they need additional names, I will be glad to supply them with a long list.

Carl Marzani's loyalty to this Government should have been judged entirely by the Commission on his record before his employment in the Office of Strategic Services, and not on what some of his coworkers thought of his particular assignment in that department.

STOP CRITICIZING MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include some excerpts from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] attacked the State of Mississippi about a couple of Negroes who had been convicted of murder, and called them "innocent children."

Some of these Red fronts raised $5,000 and sent it down to a Negro newspaper editor named A. W. High, of Jackson, to defend these Negroes with. He went down to Natchez and talked to them, and came back and said no, he was returning the check to the sender, because, he said, "They are guilty as h——."

He said also that one of them is at least 2 or 3 years older than he pretends to be. When he asked them if they were sorry for murdering this man, one of them said: "No; I am not sorry."

This editor goes on to say, "If outside people would go to Woodville and investigate, as he did, they would find out the same as he did, that the two defendants "have been treated fairly" and that outsiders "should quit criticizing the State of Mississippi."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include a statement by Mr. Dean Acheson and Mr. Clayton, and in the other a speech delivered by Mr. James A. Farley.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JANUARY 20 AND WEEK OF JANUARY 27

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Indiana what we may expect for this week and the early part of next week, if he can give that information to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we can meet tomorrow and then adjourn over Wednesday to Thursday, and adjourn from Thursday over to Monday. The committees are being organized this week and are getting under way with their work.

There is a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) from the Committee on Appropriations that I understand comes from that committee with a unanimous report. They would like to call it up tomorrow under unanimous consent. I have talked to the minority leader about it, and I can see no reason why it should not be called up tomorrow.

There is a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means which also is supported by the unanimous report of that committee. It would extend for 15 months the right of industrial alcohol producers to produce sugars and sirups, the extension dating from February 1. It is desirable, as I understand, to bring about this extension by reason of the necessities in the sugar and sirup fields.

There is also a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means, H. R. 1030, the excise tax bill.

My understanding is that the Committee on Ways and Means will make application Wednesday to the Committee on Rules for a rule which, if granted, could be filed on Thursday, so that the measure then could be taken up next week. It is the present intention to take it up on Wednesday of next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the City Council of Alameda.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Gould Lincoln.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill introduced by him, together with two editorials.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION LAW

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide for the naming of someone to act as President in the event we should not have a person qualified to act on Inauguration Day. The chaos in Georgia certainly should be a warning to Congress to get its own house in order to prevent the havoc which would befall this Nation in the event this very real contingency of having no President should take place. There are two situations which could occur where we would not have a President or anyone named to act as President on Inauguration Day. The House passed a bill in 1941 which was introduced and sponsored by me which provided that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, if the Speaker had been elected, and, if not, the President pro tempore of the Senate should act as President in the event of the happening of such a contingency. The Senate did not act upon the bill. I have introduced it again this year and am having it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an explanation of the measure. I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will take early action on this very important matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Mississippi has seen fit to again bring up the racial issue. In introducing my resolution to amend the Constitution and abolish capital punishment I have been motivated by a sincere and humanitarian desire to end this primitive and barbaric custom.

I also resent the tie-up of communism. I am no more a Communist than the gentleman from Mississippi, and I have no more regard for the Communists than he has. I do not like the idea of his continual smearing of innocent people with the taint of communism. You can do or say anything you please about communism, but do not tie me up with it.

I resent the continual reference to the race of the children who are under sentence of death in Mississippi. I have never mentioned their race, and I am opposed to capital punishment, whether it is in Mississippi, Oregon, or any other State in the Union.

Bear in mind that a rich man has never been executed in the United States.

I sincerely hope that the Eightieth Congress will take steps to amend the

Constitution and abolish capital punishment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PROGRAM FOR PRELIMINARY HEARINGS ON ALL LEGISLATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make an announcement upon behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I think will meet with the universal approval of the membership of the House.

I refer to the action taken by the committee at its organization meeting. The action taken will enable every Member who introduces legislation referred to this committee to have an opportunity to present to the whole committee his views with respect to the legislation he has introduced, its purposes and the necessity for the same.

To accomplish this purpose, one day each week will be set aside for Members introducing legislation the preceding week to be heard by the committee. Thus, the Member can feel that every member of the committee is aware of his legislation, and the members of the committee can then better understand the purpose of the legislation and more intelligently determine, first, the necessity for a full hearing, and, second, if necessary, then its comparative importance with respect to other legislation pending before the committee, so that priority of hearings upon the bills pending before the committee can be more intelligently determined.

I have spoken generally of the benefits to be derived from the inauguration of this practice. I do not think it necessary to emphasize the personal value to the individual Member. This will be readily recognized in that it gives every Member the right within 1 week of the introduction of his legislation, the opportunity of a preliminary hearing at least before the whole committee. I am certain that every Member of this House will readily recognize the value of this opportunity and will appreciate it.

And, above all else, it is in accord with what I conceive to be one of the purposes and the intent of the Reorganization Act under which Congress is now operating.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a resolution and an editorial and comments on both.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to comment on an editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times. That great paper did me the honor of commenting editorially on a resolution which I had introduced in the House of Representatives. This editorial is the lead editorial in Sunday's issue and is a full column in length. My resolution deals with the matter of reciprocal-trade agreements. This resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the President and all agencies of the Federal Government are hereby requested to postpone any action seeking the further adjustment of duties under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act), as amended, until sufficient time has elapsed to permit a scientific study of the necessity for further action under the reciprocal trade agreements policy. The United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed to make such scientific study and report its findings to the Congress.

The purpose of this resolution is set forth clearly in the resolution. It might be well if I would give you a brief history of the activities of the State Department in its recent efforts to enter into a large number of additional trade agreements before the Congress will have time to take up the matter of the continuation of the present policy.

In 1945 the State Department announced that it would call a conference in London which would be attended by 18 of the other nations of the world and that that conference would convene in April of 1946. That conference did not convene in April 1946, and has not convened yet. Along in August or September of 1946 I wrote a letter to the State Department inquiring why this conference had not been held and suggested that the imminence of a general election was the principal reason. I think that was the principal reason. The administration knew that its policy, up to that time, had been in every agreement to reduce the duty on imports. It also knew that the manufacturers of a great number of commodities manufactured principally in the United States would be opposed to these rate reductions and if reductions were made before the election the administration would lose support. No doubt the administration expected to carry at least one branch of Congress. But now that the administration has lost both branches of Congress, it is speeding up and making preparations for this London conference. They want to make these agreements before Congress is ready to give consideration to the making of the reciprocal-trade agreement laws.

The writer of the editorial to which I have referred seems to think that this resolution is isolationist in its genesis and in its purpose. The resolution apparently raises a very important question. At least it is important enough so that one of the greatest newspapers in the country gives it a prominent place on its editorial page.

Anyone who will take the time to attend the hearings which are now being held here in Washington ostensibly by way of preparation for the London conference cannot help but see unmistakable evidence of great haste on the part of the State Department.

No person acquainted with the facts in this matter will say that the State Department has made or is making proper studies of this great undertaking. My information from many persons who are thoroughly advised with reference to this situation convinces me that Mr. Clayton and his cohorts are unduly active in their purpose to hold this London conference as soon as possible regardless of whether adequate preparations have been made. It has been suggested to me by men who are well posted with reference to these matters that it might be that certain of the 18 nations are quite well assured at this time as to what they may expect by way of concessions from the United States.

The reciprocal-trade agreements were intended to be reciprocal. As far as my study goes not one single agreement has been made that raised any duty on any commodity but that, on the contrary, every agreement that has been made has reduced the rates on all commodities included therein.

I therefore inquire, Where is the reciprocity?

The editor of this article suggests that this resolution that I have introduced suggests economic isolationism. I could with more propriety suggest that the editorial is international in its tendency.

At no place in this resolution is there any suggestion that I favor a complete abandonment of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee when this legislation was adopted. The editor refers to the able and patient efforts of Secretary of State Hull. I heard Secretary Hull before the Ways and Committee many times. His principal theme back in the thirties was that the reciprocal-trade agreements would guarantee peace. In spite of the fact that possibly some Congressmen believed his assertions in this respect, the truth is that soon after he made these statements we found ourselves in the worst war of all history.

The theme song now is that we must surrender up our home markets to foreign countries in order to appease them and to establish a good-neighbor policy. We are dealing with the very life of American industry when we carelessly and sentimentally throw our markets open to the products of cheap-labor countries of the world.

I shall expect to speak further on this subject at a later date.

In fairness to the writer of the editorial about which I refer, I am herewith extending my remarks to include this editorial:

OUR ECONOMIC POLICY

In ordinary times (if it is still possible to imagine what ordinary times are like) one might see only minor significance in such a resolution as that introduced in the House by Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, to suspend further reciprocal-trade agreements until a scientific study has been made. But in January 1947 this proposal, advanced by a high-ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, with a record of 22 years' service behind him, cannot be ignored. The Republican Party has pretty well purged itself of political isolationism. We cannot yet be sure that it has also purged itself of economic isolationism. The Jenkins resolution, which is essentially isolationist, is a test case. No one who has followed the course of the reciprocal-trade agreements, so ably and patiently pushed by

former Secretary of State Hull, can accept the pretense that a scientific study of them is now necessary. They have been based, from the beginning, on scientific studies. What Mr. JENKINS of Ohio actually proposes is to obstruct further progress.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, under amendments adopted in 1945, runs to June 1948. The agreements already made have reduced Hawley-Smoot rates by some 31 percent. Yet these reductions have been accomplished with such care and discretion that none of the wild cries of ruin that were made at the outset of the program has been justified. Representative JENKINS of Ohio, in presenting his resolution, asserts that those in charge of this program, if permitted to do so, would establish a complete free-trade system. This fear has been voiced since 1934. It has been denied by word and it has been denied by the facts of the agreements themselves.

The Government of the United States has taken the lead in seeking elimination of the mass of restrictions that obstruct the foreign trade so essential to our prosperity and to that of the whole world. It has won to this policy, by every weapon of diplomatic and economic pressure we could exert, the support of Great Britain. It is seeking to implement the policy by the negotiations with 18 nations soon to commence. It is leading the way in the establishment of the International Trade Organization, the creation of which would be an almost meaningless gesture if it was accompanied by obstruction of the reciprocal-trade-agreement program.

The whole foreign policy of the country is at issue here. The reciprocal-trade agreements, though they date from before the war, fit perfectly into the emerging picture of postwar conditions. The world has shrunk to a fraction of its former size. Economic situations thousands of miles away have their effect on economic situations in this country. If they deteriorate, we too suffer. If they grow desperate, they threaten the structure of peace. To support our political commitments for peace we must make economic commitments for peace. Foreign loans and credits, food exports to countries that need them, the stabilization of world currencies, agreements to promote the flow of goods among the nations—all are tied together and all are essential to our political foreign policy.

Senator VANDENBERG, who speaks for the Republicans with more authority than Representative JENKINS can, has gone on record with the opinion that peace and economics are inseparably akin, and in favor of the continuance of reciprocal-trade agreements, in one form or another. But he coupled these reassuring words, in his Cleveland speech, with the warning that the future of the present multilateral basis of the reciprocal treaties might depend somewhat upon the type of competition we confront from foreign state monopolies and from a growing habit of making bilateral trade agreements for political as well as economic purposes. We may need such warnings, but they must not constitute an alibi. The nations are gradually building a political peace. They can also build an economic peace. The Republicans cannot wipe out their isolationist taint unless they wholeheartedly work toward this end.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in each to include certain printed matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes on an amendment proposed to the Fair Labor Standards Act by Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO. I want to support it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one will dispute the fact that this is the best country in all the world in which to live. Here the average man and woman—and do not forget that woman—has more freedom, prosperity, and happiness, than anywhere else in all the world. We are often told, and we heard it again today, that it would be a very good thing for us if we would exchange teachers and students with other countries. That might be good for them but I am not so sure that ideas from Hitler's land and from Stalin and their disciples are good for us and our youth. The argument made today in support of that move to trade teachers and students took me back to my boyhood days when I had a flock of White Leghorn hens that used to lay around 250 to 300 eggs per hen per year. They were good hens. It also led me to think of a herd of cows we had on the farm which produced each year five or six thousand pounds of milk. Then, into flocks like that somebody got the idea of bringing a scrub rooster or two, an old hen or two, from the neighbor's flock—anything that could crow or that could lay an egg even if but one a week—and mixing them in with the good ones. They let our cows get into the neighbor's yard, with a no-account bull, and as a result we had a lot of scrub cows that gave a quart of milk a day. To my notion, we will get along pretty well here in America if we will use what we have here at home to teach and give examples to our boys and girls and keep these Red teachers and pupils who come from countries where they quarrel and fight and gouge each other over on the other side until, figuratively speaking, they can lay as many eggs and produce as much milk and butterfat as can we under our system.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Because of the quantity of my mail on reciprocal-trade agreements, I hope you will pay some attention to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. The great issue in the next campaign will be the old issue of protection. High wages for everybody and high costs; yet they are on the road to making lower rates in the tariff. I am more worried about that than perhaps anything else. Will not some of you who have real influence go down to those hearings that are now being held?

I simply rose to give you warning that 2 years from today protection will be the dominant question for the voters to decide. The Republicans will win on that issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROGRAM FOR THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign last fall I told the folks in my district about certain legislation which I thought should be adopted. I wish today to inform you and the other Members of the Congress what I feel reflects their thinking on this subject.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I represent the Fourth Congressional District in Nebraska, which is made up of 38 counties and represents some 325,000 people. The folks in this large district live far enough away from the turmoil, pressure, and confusion of Washington, and close enough to the sun and soil, to have some very clear thoughts on national problems. For the most part, they are the descendants of pioneers and are steeped in the tradition of free enterprise that has made this country great.

LABOR

It is my considered judgment that an overwhelming majority of the people of my district feel that labor legislation should have early priority in the Eightieth Congress. With that thought in mind, I have introduced a bill which would outlaw closed shops. The citizens of Nebraska voted overwhelmingly for a constitutional amendment to outlaw the so-called closed or union shops in Nebraska.

I have introduced legislation to outlaw jurisdictional and sympathy strikes and secondary boycotts.

I have also introduced legislation to set up compulsory arbitration in industries involving the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the country, when all other means have failed. When individuals cannot settle their differences voluntarily, they must submit to compulsory arbitration in our courts. Is there any reason why labor unions and employers should have a different standard, particularly in those industries which so vitally affect the health and welfare of all the people?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress should give early consideration to legislation which has for its purpose bringing about peaceful relations between labor and industry. It is the duty

of our Government to provide the necessary machinery and act as a referee in these disputes. Since VJ-day there has been almost complete chaos with a continual free-for-all tug-of-war between labor and industry. The public and our reconversion program has been thoroughly picketed. The public and the worker is the loser. They must have some protection from the unscrupulous labor leaders and industrialists who deliberately throw our economy into a tail-spin.

There seems to be no valid reason why our country should not have many years of prosperity if labor and capital can keep the wheels of industry moving. This country has the factories, the raw materials, the manpower, the know how, and the inventive genius to out-produce every other nation in the world. We did it during World War II and it should be continued in peacetime.

In considering labor measures, the Congress must not pass punitive or destructive measures. All legislation should be considered in the light of what is best for the public and not what is best for either labor or industry.

I do not claim that the passage of legislation I have introduced would be the final answer, but I am prepared to support any legislation which will correct some of the evils which presently exist.

TAXES

Yes, we would all like lower taxes and taxes are unduly high. There are several reasons why taxes are presently very high and why they will remain so. The public debt is now $260,000,000,000 and the interest on this debt is about $5,000,000,000 a year.

The war has increased our obligation to the veterans. It is estimated that this expense is now about $7,000,000,000 a year and may well exceed $10,000,000,000 in the next few years.

In the present unsettled world, it seems imperative that our military forces be given our support. The military budget for this year amounts to about 11 billion dollars. If and when a permanent agreement has been reached by the nations on disarmament, it seems likely that this part of the public expense could be greatly curtailed.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that before taxes can be greatly reduced, it is necessary that we balance the Budget. When this has been accomplished, perhaps we can have a 5 or 10 percent reduction in taxes. This can be done if the national income remains high and the present tax rates are not greatly reduced. It should be possible for this Congress to make a start on the reduction of our debt. Some means should be found whereby it can be amortized and five or six million dollars paid on its reduction each year. It should be remembered that our national income this past year has been the highest in our history. Should our national income ever drop below a hundred billion dollars, this Nation would face disaster.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, our tax bill as recommended by the President is four times that of 1939. Part of this is due to the increase in Federal activities, with its increased Federal pay roll, bureaus, and commissions.

In 1933, before the New Deal, we were able to handle Government business with about 533,000 Federal employees. This cost the taxpayers about a billion dollars a year. The Federal debt at that time was approximately $16,000,000,000. Six years later, in 1939, the number of Federal employees had increased to 933,000. The Federal debt then was $60,000,000,000. During the peak of World War II the number of Federal employees reached 3,600,000. Today, more than 18 months after the end of the war, we still have about 2,300,000 on the Federal pay roll, at a cost of $7,000,000,000.

In the past 20 years the number of bureaus and commissions have increased from 150 to 1,141. This Congress should give serious consideration to the combining of Federal agencies and bureaus, and eliminating those which are no longer necessary. Many of these Government agencies overlap in their functions. There is much waste, inefficiency, and outright extravagance which can and must be eliminated.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

It is my judgment that the large majority of the people in my district are opposed to compulsory military training in peacetime. The military is now offering rather attractive advantages and it does seem that if the problem of getting recruits is properly pursued, that the needs of the armed forces can be met through voluntary methods. Again it is hoped that the nations of the world can agree upon some general disarmament plan which will make unnecessary large standing armies. In the meantime, it might be best to exert our greatest efforts upon new techniques and experimental work in our laboratories.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Foreign affairs in this Congress should be approached upon a bipartisan basis. The people all over the world are anxious for a permanent and a just peace. The Congress should bend every effort to work with the State Department to help complete the blueprints for peace which are now in the making. Naturally, this implies a willingness on the part of the President to cooperate with the proper committees in the Congress to this end.

AGRICULTURE

The wealth of this Nation comes from the soil and our natural resources. If agriculture is sick, then the entire world and all industry will be sick. I believe this Congress should make every effort to see that the products of agriculture are on a parity with the things the farmer must buy. Our agriculture should be protected from imports from other countries which undermine and cheapen the products which come from our land.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the people of my district in Nebraska want an end to Government controls, regimentation, and bureaucracy. I am reintroducing my bill to declare the war at an end and to end the emergency powers of the President. The people want an opportunity to live their lives as they see fit and not have all their comings and goings directed by the Federal Government. It seems to me that much of the regimentation and regulations of this day could be safely turned back to the States. That government is best which is kept closest to the people.

I am anxious, Mr. Speaker, to be of as much service as I possibly can to my district and to my country. I expect to be faithful in attendance at my committees and at the sessions of Congress. I do feel that our party is on trial. The time for talking is past. The time for action is now.

Many bills may be introduced into this Congress. A number will be passed, but it should be remembered that the country is never hurt by bills that are not passed.

Let us look after first things first and give our great country a chance to get back to private enterprise and away from a continued regimentation. Then the same spirit that has brought us to our high plane today will carry us on to even greater heights.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I had in mind, may I say to the gentleman from Nebraska, is this: I think the gentleman mentioned a $100,000,000,000 national income and the disastrous effects that might come to us should it drop to that level. Would the gentleman agree that we might have $100,000,000,000 national income on a much lower price level and still approximate, let us say, $140,000,000,000 national income on today's price level? I think we should draw a line of distinction with respect to price levels when we talk about national income, but would the gentleman go along with me on that?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I think the gentleman is correct. In relation to the $100,000,000,000 of which I spoke, if our national income drops below that figure, then we are in trouble, I think the gentleman will agree.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I agree with that. Would the gentleman go along with me on this, too, that using today's price level, would it not be a national disaster of the first order for our national income to drop as low as $130,000,000,000?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is correct. He has made a great study of economics and I respect his thoughts and opinions along that line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The reason I bring up this question is because our people, as the gentleman has pointed out, are deeply concerned about these matters which the gentleman has discussed.

On this matter of peacetime universal military training, I would like to say to the gentleman that 90 percent of the correspondence that I receive on that subject is against this Congress inaugurating peacetime compulsory military training. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Have we any reason to assume that the United Nations organization can effectuate its program and be in a position to tell us, as the leading member of that organization—I mean the United States the leading member of that organization—what our responsibilities will be with respect to an air

force, army force, navy force, and the other forces that will be brought in by reason of scientific development under a period of anywhere from 18 months to 36 months away from today? How can the United Nations organization give us an answer to that question before then?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not believe they can find the answer to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Neither do I.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will say in that connection that Secretary of War Patterson will present to this Congress within the next week a program either for or against compulsory military training.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me that our people have got to be patient with Congress, as the Congress awaits what the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of War, and the President of the United States have to say to us on that important subject.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The thing that disturbs me is that the universal peace we usually hear about when they talk about building Towers of Babel seems to get more remote when the United Nations not only intervenes in the internal affairs of South Africa but attempts to stir up a Communist revolution in Spain.

It seems to me it is about time for the American Congress, which represents the American people, to give those forces to understand that they need not be trying to stir up wars for us to fight in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think I understand the gentleman's disturbance. Personally, I have great hopes that the United Nations may work out a program whereby we can get some just and lasting peace. I think recently we have made some progress along that line.

Mr. RANKIN. One other proposition. The gentleman spoke about the consolidation of the Army and Navy. The one great advantage I see from that is that it gives us an independent Air Force. We know that the brass hats and the gold braids destroyed Billy Mitchell 20 years ago, and that Pearl Harbor was the result. So I am willing to take anything the President recommends, or that the Congress recommends, that will give us an independent Air Force or a coordinate Air Force, because that will be more important in the years to come than a standing Army or a big Navy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. First, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska on his general interest in all matters of particular interest to the rural people of this country, because his district is pretty largely rural. In connection with this universal draft, I am sure there is a point the gentleman will not overlook. Last year when the draft bill was proposed, the House was very careful not to have one provision in it. That provision left an escape clause so that people who had enough of the world's goods and could send their children to higher educational institutions would not come under the draft. It passed the burden back to the groups that did not have this advantage. This provision was put in the bill in another body, but it was deleted in conference, as far as the House was concerned. I think the gentleman from Nebraska, representing a great agricultural district, and each of the rest of us from rural districts, should be very vigilant in watching what takes place and seeing who is going to be drafted in case they pass a draft bill, for the reason that the rural people are only 25 percent of the population but they have pretty nearly 50 percent of the children. In a little while all the Army would be composed of those from the low income groups in the cities and from the rural areas, because such a small percentage of the children in the rural areas ever even finish high school. We must guard against having a draft bill that will take the members of the armed forces from the rural districts primarily, and perhaps having the officers come from the other groups. The gentleman probably remembers the interest he took in that matter when it was up for consideration before.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I do. May I say, as I have said earlier, that the folks in my district are opposed to peacetime compulsory military training. I think they would accept some type of training whereby we have an extension of the ROTC in colleges or have training through the National Guard, some permissive legislation, but they do not want the compulsive part of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] this question: When the gentleman from Mississippi spoke about an independent Air Force he was somewhat talking about the United States organization machinery, but he meant an independent Air Force insofar as our own Army and Air Force are concerned, did he not?

Mr. RANKIN. What I meant was this. I will say a coordinate Air Force. I wanted to put the Air Force on an equal footing with the Army and the Navy. I am not expecting the Tower of Babel to pull us out of the hole; I am expecting the American people to look after their own affairs. We know that about 20 years ago, when Frank Reid and a few of the rest of us here on the floor fought to protect Gen. Billy Mitchell when he was trying to get us to build an Air Force; we saw him crucified. As a result, we lost Pearl Harbor and untold thousands of men in this war. If we will keep what we have in the atomic bomb and build the strongest air force on earth, then the rest of the world may decide that they want peace a little later on.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the United States under the terms of the United Nations organization charter build what might be termed the strongest air force on earth and maintain it? Are we not committed to go along with the United Nations organization?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, and I am sure he agrees with this statement, that the safety of America comes first. The American people have never had a vote on any of these foreign entanglements. If it is going to tie the hands of America to where we are going to be undermined at home and insulted abroad by the communistic elements of the world, then it is about time that Congress represented the American people and said, "We are going to see that America is protected while the rest of the world decides whether they want peace or not."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time. I appreciate the interest of the gentlemen in this subject which I have tried to present to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CANFIELD]. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WE SHOULD CUT PERSONAL INCOME TAXES NOW

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the question, Is it wise to cut income taxes at this time? is being discussed today pro and con across the length and breadth of the land. Personally, I believe it is both wise and necessary to cut income taxes now. I therefore favor prompt action on the part of Congress to make a cut in our personal income tax rate of at least 20 percent, and offer the following arguments in support of my position in this matter.

First. Our Republican leaders during the campaign stated definitely and without any reservation that if the Republicans were given control of both Houses of Congress they would promptly:

(a) Balance the Federal Budget.

(b) Reduce personal income taxes 20 percent.

(c) Cut Federal expenditures 30 percent.

(d) Make substantial payments on the national debt.

The voters accepted that statement at face value. Nothing was said as to the order in which these four objectives were to be effected, but it was generally understood that all four should be accomplished, and could be accomplished, simultaneously. That statement was a definite campaign promise. It was not "platform oratory." I believe it both wise and necessary to carry out that campaign promise now.

Second. Treasury experts tell us that a straight across the board cut of 20 percent in our personal income taxes would amount to a rebate of $3,500,000,000 to the American taxpayers, and that the greater part of this $3,500,000,000 would go to taxpayers in the lower brackets. That means Uncle Sam would not dip his big hand quite so deeply into the pay envelopes of the working men of America; it means their take-home pay would be increased by that amount; and it means the housewives of America would have that much more to spend for

necessary food, clothes, fuel, and rent. Such a tax reduction, therefore, would operate the same as a pay increase for the workers of America.

Today rumblings of industrial unrest fill the air. Threats of strikes and work stoppages that are to come are heard everywhere. An automatic increase in take-home pay for the workers of America at this time, brought about by a reduction in the amount Uncle Sam extracts from their pay envelopes, should act as an antidote for this industrial unrest and threatened strikes for higher pay. From this standpoint alone, in my opinion, it would be wise now, not later, to reduce Federal income taxes.

Third. Past history proves that a reduction in the Federal income tax brings beneficial results and is both wise and businesslike. After World War I, between 1921–29, on the advice of Andrew Mellon, the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton, Congress passed four separate and distinct tax-reduction measures, reducing personal income-tax rates and increasing personal income-tax exemptions very materially. This was done in the face of a $26,000,000,000 war debt and an industrial unemployment situation that listed 6,000,000 workmen idle. What was the result of Mellon's tax-reduction program? Believe it or not, Treasury reports show that it resulted in—

First. A balanced budget.

Second. A $10,000,000,000 reduction in the Federal debt within a 10-year period.

Third. A decided increase in the revenue receipts of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this unprecedented improvement in the financial condition of the Nation, under Mellon's tax reduction program, was—quoting the noted tax authority, Professor Seligman:

> The reduced tax rates encouraged business expansion, stimulated production, gave private initiative free play, and brought forth adequate venture capital.

If a tax reduction program did those things after World War I, then it should do those things now.

As a sample of the degree of prosperity attained during those years, Treasury reports show that capital net gains from sale of assets increased from $249,000,000 in 1922 to $2,347,000,000 in 1929, an increase in this one taxable item of almost 1,000 percent.

Mr. Speaker, most people believe that a reduction in excessive and oppressive individual income taxes will mean a loss in revenue. It has been proved time and again that the exact opposite happens—one gets an increase in revenue receipts instead of a decrease. This illustrates the fact that the total yield from an income tax depends more upon the amount of taxable income than it does upon the rate of taxation applied. Excessive tax rates always tend to dry up the sources from which the revenue comes; always encourage tax evasion; and always make the tax less productive.

Why talk today about the advisability of reducing taxes? Present-day taxation is confiscatory. It is nationalizing the income of industry, and that must inevitably end in the nationalization of industry itself. When rates of taxation reach the point of diminishing returns—as they undoubtedly have today—we must reduce those rates, and do it promptly.

In the light of past history, therefore, there are as many, if not more, reasons for cutting income taxes now as there were after World War I. What was done then can, and should, be repeated now. If it is done I am satisfied it will bring about the same beneficial results.

Under the heading "The spending goes on," David Lawrence has the following to say:

> Republicans have an opportunity to set up a fiscal system that will command the respect of the world.
>
> The prerequisites of such a plan are these:
>
> 1. A reexamination of the reason for every dollar spent in the Federal Government. This means a study of every existing statute which involves the spending of money, no matter how far back in our history that statute reaches.
>
> 2. A program that pledges the retirement of the public debt by at least $3,000,000,000 each year. It should aim at $5,000,000,000.
>
> 3. The reduction of taxes.
>
> The President has recommended a Budget of $37,500,000,000. It should be possible to reduce the Budget to $30,000,000,000 and apply half of the surplus of $7,500,000,000 to debt retirement and half of it to tax reduction.

I say "amen" to that statement.

Mr. Speaker, an early American philosopher said of Alexander Hamilton:

> He smote the rock of national resources and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth. He touched the dead corpse of public credit and it sprang upon its feet.

The financial miracles that Alexander Hamilton performed for this struggling Republic during its infancy were repeated by Andy Mellon during the dark and trying days immediately following World War I. Today a Republican Congress is pledged to repeat those same financial miracles for a financially sick nation. I see no reason for not doing so promptly. Therefore, I claim it is both wise and necessary to make a cut in our personal income taxes now.

MEMBERS OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to make a statement to clarify a situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in determining seniority on the reorganized Public Lands Committee, into which were merged six previous standing committees of the House, we made an error in the determination of seniority between the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

In order to correct that error and to bring that assignment of seniority in line with other similar assignments adopted by the Committee on Committees, I ask unanimous consent to correct the list of members of the Committee on Public Lands by placing the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] No. 4 thereon and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] No. 5 thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

REPORT ON TRIP TO PALESTINE AND GREECE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, just prior to the opening of the Congress, I sought information about certain critical world problems of primary interest to my constituents by a trip to Palestine, Greece, Rome and London in that order. The Department of State was extremely helpful in facilitating travel arrangements for me, but the trip was on my own.

I was rather careful, in the course of my trip, to reserve comment and conclusions for a report such as this to the House and to my constituents.

My visit to Rome was to seek enlightenment on the religious side. The audience which I was privileged to have with His Holiness Pope Pius XII had no political connotations and I therefore omit it from this report. The members of this House may be interested to know, however, of the terms of "love and esteem" in which His Holiness spoke of the people of the United States.

The problems presented by Greece and Palestine are of special interest. The time I spent abroad was necessarily brief—just under a month—but I tried very hard to interview men and women, representative of all shades of opinion, saw the countries, both of which are small, and tried to cover the ground as thoroughly as possible. I had given considerable study previously to the problems of these countries; and, though I do not pretend to have become an expert on them, certain facts and impressions of this experience stand out so markedly that I hope they may prove to be of value to this House.

PALESTINE

In Palestine I traveled the length and breadth of the country, literally from Dan to Bersheba; that is from the Huleh Marshes, in the northeastern part of the country, to the Negeb, in the southernmost part.

I talked not only with the man in the street—Jew and Arab alike—and with journalists but also with the heads of the Jewish Agency, with the representatives of our State Department, with the British High Commissioner and the Chief Secretary, with the British Commanding General at Haifa, where the immigration troubles with refugee ships have taken place, with the head of the Jewish community, with the president of the Hebrew University, with leading Arab intellectuals, with the chief rabbi of Palestine, with businessmen, industrialists and lawyers, and with managers and residents of Jewish agricultural settlements

throughout the country. In London I checked and confirmed my impressions through the courtesy of the British Government by conferring with distinguished representatives of the foreign and colonial offices.

An interesting phase of life in Palestine is that the Jews have achieved an economic balance there not present among them anywhere else in the world. About 20 percent of the Jewish population are farmers, which is about the same as the over-all percentage for the United States population; but throughout the world only about 3 percent of Jews are estimated to be farmers. The Jewish population in Palestine is about 600,000 and the Arab is about 1,200,000. Most of the people are engaged in agriculture and agricultural processing, though small industry is growing rapidly and the whole civilization of the middle east could well be modernized by the potentiality of this new industrial development.

The types of Jewish agricultural settlement in Palestine are of three kinds: The first, and the most numerous, is the small town—just like our own country town; second, the agricultural settlement, where the land is privately owned but where both the selling of produce and the buying of supplies are controlled by cooperatives for all—farm cooperatives are also well known to us; and lastly, the much discussed communal settlements, where there is no private property but all is held and worked together. It is significant to note, however, that in this last group are found only about 20 percent of the aggregate Jewish population of Palestine who are settled on the land.

We have all heard of the work of soil utilization in Palestine. It is very inspiring to see what are truly these miracles. In the valley of the Jordan, great boulders have been moved away with United States bulldozers, and the fields have been made into waving gardens of green. The hills of Judea have been cleared of stones and rocks and the fertile terraces of ancient days restored to bear olive trees again.

The Negeb occupies almost one-half of Palestine's 10,000 square miles. It is a dust-bowl type of parched prairie—which could, with irrigation, be as rich as the Imperial Valley of California—in which an estimated 80,000 Bedouins normally lived until the Jews threw in a dozen settlements overnight recently.

The possibilities of agricultural development in the Negeb are shown at the experimental settlement of Beth Eshel, near Beersheba, where great fruitfulness in the land has resulted from irrigation and also from special farming methods. This Negeb is the main area to be benefited by the proposed Jordan Valley development project.

Given the necessary money—the will and inspiration shown by these existing settlements indicate that the Palestinian land can certainly take a great many additional families. The doubling of the Jewish population of Palestine, now about 600,000, within a proximate period of time, does not seem at all out of line. Of the 1,400,000 Jews left in Europe, outside of Russia, the best estimate I can get is, that certainly 600,000 at the least would want to go to Palestine.

I made some inquiries into the question of cost. The estimates varied. But the consensus seems to be that 100,000 additional families could be settled on the land with an investment of outside capital of one-half to one billion dollars—certainly an attainable figure—and that this number of families could be well settled within a few years.

Social tension does not appear to be a major factor at this time between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine who, at the grass roots level, appear to enjoy cordial neighborly relations. But among the Arab ruling and owning class there is a spirit of intense nationalism and coupled with it, religious fanaticism and fear of western ideas. This group finds it hard to recognize that the situation in Palestine with its large Jewish population, its background of Turkish rule and the solemn promise of the Jewish National Homeland to be established there makes comparison with the Arab countries inappropriate.

It is very significant to note the progress which western ideas introduced by the Jews have already made among the Arabs in Palestine. For example, in the last 15 years, the Arab life expectancy has been raised from 37 to 48 years and the infant mortality has been reduced almost 50 percent—the Arab birth rate is extremely high.

I was informed by a British representative at the highest levels, that there is a deep interest in Arab communities in education and that Arabs even in outlying villages constantly ask for better schools and are even interested in classes for girls—I gather quite a departure in that country. The Arab farmers and city dwellers have already realized some part of the higher living and educational standards for them of which a free and independent Palestine would be capable.

The social tensions present in Palestine are now largely between the Jews and the British. These are based on the restraints on immigration and land purchase enforced by the British—though we should not forget that Britain is continuing to admit 1,500 refugees every month, incidentally, without causing any Arab revolution—and on the anomaly of colonial control applied to a highly civilized people. For example, the municipal activities of the city of Tel Aviv, a modern, all-Jewish city of 250,000, require the prior authorization of a British district commissioner. Tel Aviv has its own mayor and a very competent municipal council. The status of such a British district commissioner in the civil service hierarchy of a city like Tel Aviv in our country, would put him at about a department head level.

The terroristic acts in Palestine which have caused such grave tension between the British and the Jews must be condemned in the strongest terms, and have already been so condemned within and outside of Palestine by all who desire justice and the realization of legitimate Jewish aspirations there.

In an interview with the correspondents in Jerusalem, I emphasized my belief that the terroristic acts had done more to alienate public opinion in the United States from Jewish aspirations in Palestine than any event in years; that the Republican majority of this House would have little patience with terror as an instrument of policy and that it would be very damaging to the interests of the Jewish refugees in Europe. We must recognize that this terror which ends in political crime begins in political frustration, and I am convinced that a policy of justice in Palestine is the necessary moral basis for ending the terror.

On the political side, it is easy to be puzzled, as many are, about the special diplomatic considerations involved in the Palestine situation. The British say that they seek only a just solution between Jews and Arabs. The Jews say justice cannot mean breaking the promise to encourage Jewish immigration and "close settlement" of Jews on the land of Palestine, implicit in the Balfour Declaration and in the League of Nations mandate to Great Britain.

The British say that restrictions against purchase by Jews of Arab land in Palestine are essential to protect the Arab against himself; yet land, if purchased in a free market under objective supervision, would make any Arab interested in selling rich enough to command his own estate in any other Arab country. Some argue that Britain's policy is dictated by a fear that the Arabs will turn to communism if aggrieved in a Palestinian settlement, but prosperity and education for the Arabs, both of which have been concomitants of Jewish settlement, are the greatest discouragers of communism. Arab sympathy for the Palestinian Arabs is said to be greatest in Iraq and Syria, the very points where Britain has the greatest stake in oil resources. It is said that British policy is dictated by fear of Arab retaliation against Britain's trade routes and oil resources. But fear of retaliation by the Arab world is unjustified if the settlement in Palestine be just to the Arabs—and there should be no design for other than a just settlement. For all the discussion of a Jewish Palestine, we must not forget that we are speaking only of a free state with a Jewish population which may be permitted to become equal to or greater than the Arab. No one has proposed to move out the Arabs or to treat them other than as equals, and any such proposal would, of course, be unthinkable. The Republican Party platform of 1944 makes this clear:

> In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth. We condemn the failure of the President to insist that the mandatory of Palestine carry out the provision of the mandate while he pretends to support them.

There is yet another conference assembling in London tomorrow to deal with Britain's place in Palestine. Of one thing the world may be certain—the situation of the Jews in Europe and in Pal-

estine will grow worse on all counts the longer a solution is deferred and tension remains at a peak. The London Conference will not be realistic if it fails to recognize that the essentiality is land settlement, admission of refugees from Europe into Palestine, and the lifting of land-sale restrictions. Political agitation is easily advertised as a technique for bringing about land settlement, but so far it has been retarding land settlement. Most Jews I talked with in Palestine feel that partition is probably the only practicable answer. But partition will take time for agreement on boundaries, on new constitutions, on economic and political relations for the partitioned parts, and on the internationalization of the central area in which are located the shrines of Christendom. In the meantime Jewish land settlement is urgently needed and, with it, greater Jewish and Arab participation in internal administration.

The prestige of the United States is very high in Palestine. A plan by which the United States will join, through a special mission to Palestine for that purpose, in supervising increased immigration and land settlement, now, and the resumption of free land purchase is likely to ease the immediate political pressure considerably. As part of such a plan, in view of Arab interest, some financial and technical aid for Arab education should be considered as recommended by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in May 1946. Let us not suppose that new money is necessarily involved, for we are paying now for displaced-persons camps in the American zone to look after thousands who want to go to Palestine, without satisfying anyone.

In October 1945 our distinguished Speaker—among other Members—introduced House Joint Resolution 264 asking "that the United States shall use its good offices to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that they may reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall enjoy equal rights," which was followed, on December 19, 1945, by the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44. Taking those resolutions as excellent models, I urge that implementing legislation be passed at the very earliest convenience of the Congress.

Juridically, Britain is bound by a resolution adopted at the last session of the League of Nations in April 1946, providing that the Mandate continue to be administered until "other arrangements have been agreed between the United Nations and the Mandatory."

My own district which is about equally divided between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews indicated by a substantial majority a preference for a United Nations Trusteeship for Palestine with the United States as one of the trustees, in a survey of opinion by the Elmo Roper organization which I initiated to ascertain the district's views on major questions during last fall's campaign.

Any settlement on the Palestine issue would therefore ultimately come before the United Nations. Should the emphasis be placed now on a settlement which will open Palestine to renewed immigration and land settlement, consideration may well be given in parallel to an agreed partition or to a United Nations Trusteeship to see Palestine through its transitory phase before partition or independence—in such event the United States could consider acting as one of the trustees.

May I say, too, that we must not forget to savor the good we do? When Palestine was at peace in 1936, and refugees were escaping there freely from Hitler's Germany, the people of Tel Aviv were so happy they would spontaneously stop and dance in the streets. This induced a Hebrew poet to write of them, "They filled their bellies with water and thought they were drunk."

GREECE

The very land of Greece looks free and independent. From the air, the Lord seems to have thrown a handful of mountain and valley into an azure sea and made Greece.

Greece has suffered terribly during the war: Fourteen hundred villages razed, 400,000—almost one out of three—homes destroyed, the country stripped bare, the roads, railroads, and other means of communication ruined, rolling stock taken away, livestock taken off the farms—the Nazis even carted away much of the furniture out of the people's homes.

The heroic resistance of the Greek people to the Fascist and Nazi hordes in Albania, the Ruppel Pass, and on the Olympus Line, which made the Nazis' timetable a scrap of paper and gave the Russian armies a priceless breathing spell, earned for the Greeks this treatment. Battered and destroyed in its human and material resources, with its productive plant all but gone, Greece, already a poor country, faces despair. The drachma is at one-tenth of its stabilized value of but months ago, and the Greek price level is 40 percent greater than that of the United States or Britain.

UNRRA will have spent $350,000,000 in Greece in about 2 years—58 percent of it for food. The proceeds of UNRRA sales in Greece are included in the Greek Government budget, earmarked for internal relief, and when this flow ends early this year (but $22,000,000 of goods remain to be delivered in 1947) the Greek people believe their situation will be hopeless, indeed, unless we come to their aid.

During my visit to Greece, I conferred with the leaders of all shades of political opinion—those represented in the Chamber of Deputies as well as those who abstained in the last parliamentary elections—members of the Government, our own Ambassador, Mr. MacVeagh, who was most courteous and gracious, and his staff, the British Commanding General, and officials of UNRRA, and Greek-American War Relief.

Much has been said about communism in Greece, but the country is not designed for it and does not want it. Eighty-five percent of the Greek economy is agricultural and 90 percent of the land is in small holdings. Agrarian reform took place 30 years ago. Internal economic pressures in a people driven almost to despair, lead men to violence against a government which they think ought to do something about it. Such violence, of a leftist character, produces, in turn, the reaction of violence on the right. The presence of British troops now justified on grounds of internal security is another complicating element. Under the circumstances, it is not hard, and might even be attractive, for outside interests to fish in the troubled waters.

Greece, despite its desperate situation, is still trying to operate with a completely free enterprise economy. The Periclean tradition of law and human rights remains vigorous and alive. Certainly a country like that is not of a mind for communism.

The internal situation in Greece is made critical by an elementary food problem. Post-UNRRA Greece faces an annual wheat shortage of 375,000 tons at a minimum. The aid needed by Greece for elementary relief on a maintenance-of-life basis, was estimated to me at $15,000,000 per month for a year. The people of Greece hope for aid from the people of the United States. The confidence that it will be forthcoming sustains them in all their struggles. They hope, too, that a political settlement will not be sought through this aid, nor any Greek government be propped up by it.

The Greek internal economy demands drastic measures; for example, Greece with 7,000,000 poverty-stricken people, is carrying an army and civil service of 250,000—shades of Washington, D. C.—with an additional 250,000 refugees living in and around Athens dependent on the Government.

The most careful husbandry of foreign exchange and gold to provide the basic necessities of life is absolutely urgent for Greece, as are control of inflation and an equitable tax structure. It is important to remember that Greece does not have now the productive facilities to get going and deal with inflation by added production—and that these facilities have to be obtained first. Their problem in controlling inflation is much more like our own during the war period than like our own during the reconversion period.

Greece illustrates for us the basic principles which need to be observed in making a grant for urgent necessities of life to a country in need. First, such a grant should be from the people of the United States to the Greek people and should not be a diplomatic pawn. Second, it should be a grant for Greece, and should not be extended out of a fund for grants appropriated in a blanket way to the Executive. Third, it should require Greece to do as much as possible to help herself. We should, therefore, have a United States mission in Greece to supervise the use of our grant, with power to suspend or terminate payments if she is not doing enough to help herself.

In addition to its problem of basic food, Greece also has the problem of reconstruction, needing not only money but technical aid. When Greek resistance organizations were being urged by Allied radio broadcasts to sabotage the Nazis, they were promised restoration

and reconstruction by the Allied Powers of all that was destroyed, even better than it had been before. Greece remembers that promise.

Greece received no lease-lend aid from us though she was so great a factor in the defeat of the Axis. She has had $25,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank to rehabilitate her roads and harbors, and $45,000,000 to buy our Army surplus. For the 10 years before 1939, the Greek economy just about broke even and that is an important factor in calculating her credit standing. Greece seems an ideal place for a reconstruction loan by the new International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, with supervision for the expenditure of the money.

CONCLUSION

Much has been said about our world responsibility. I conceive it as our desire neither to isolate others nor to be isolated ourselves. We must share—but with wisdom and prudence and the design to cooperate, not to squander.

I have tried in both the cases of Palestine and Greece to cover the facts and my direct impressions, and it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will find these facts and impressions useful to them as the House deals with these problems or problems of similar pattern.

SPECIAL EMPLOYEE, OFFICE OF DOORKEEPER

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 54), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1947, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation at the rate of $700 per annum, payable monthly, to the special employee in the office of the Doorkeeper, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 55), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby elected Members of the following Joint Committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. LeCompte, of Iowa; Mr. Gamble, of New York; Mr. Pickett, of Texas.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. LeCompte, of Iowa; Mr. Bishop, of Illinois; Mr. Landis, of Indiana; Mrs. Norton, of New Jersey; Mr. Meade, of Maryland.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in the event the House is in session at 2:30 p. m. that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to continue their hearings on House Joint Resolution 2 on which they are presently engaged.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION WHICH WILL CONFRONT THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is looking to Capitol Hill to terminate labor strife. Everyone is interested in reestablishing labor-management peace and getting the Nation safely back on the reconversion road. Americans want no protracted interruption in our reconversion program. Their happiness and well-being are at stake. America wants full production and full employment.

American labor must produce the products, goods, and services in order to get full production which will give all citizens a reduction in prices. We must maintain a high national income in order to balance the Budget and pay off a portion of the national debt.

It is generally agreed that trade unions and corporations are here to stay. However, the American people want both restricted so that neither can place itself above the Government that represents all the people. No man or any unit of men are bigger than the Government. No segment of the population in position to control a vital industry should be permitted indefinitely to threaten the entire public economy and the public welfare.

Both industry and labor have responsibilities. Industry must win the confidence of its working organization. Every industry must improve their plan that provides a proper contact between management and the workers. Management must find a way to assure the workers of a just share of the wealth they help create without subjecting the country to domestic wars that can destroy all wealth. Management must be able to distinguish between American labor leaders and subversive labor leaders. Workers also have responsibilities. Too many workers consider a union as merely a grievance committee to secure all the wages it can squeeze out of the employer. Of course, workers will continue to strive for better pay and working conditions. Labor unions can be expected to take every possible step to hold members by getting them more benefits within the framework of the labor laws. A union must be a constructive organization designed to promote the mutual best interests of the employer and employees. They must adopt a policy to help management improve production and reduce costs. Union leadership, if worthy of its power, must accept responsibility for national well-being and national security.

As a member of the House Labor Committee for the past 8 years I believe it is the duty of Congress to set up guide posts and do everything possible to create better relations between management and labor. We must seize the great opportunity of the hour to bring about labor peace so devoutly desired by management, labor, and the public. Most of the labor bills that have been presented to the Eightieth Congress would practically destroy the labor movement or set it back to the "horse and buggy" days. Hurriedly drafted legislation to meet a particular crisis, and treating symptoms rather than causes has failed miserably. Congress has a responsibility to enact labor legislation that will be constructive and give first consideration to the welfare of the Nation. Care must be taken in shaping labor legislation, because you cannot make a man work under our republican form of government. It must be constitutional.

The right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers is one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The process of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all. Almost everyone agrees in collective bargaining. However, it is a two-way street and both management and labor should be required to bargain collectively.

The most important labor problems which face the Eightieth Congress are: Industry-wide strikes which affect the public health and safety of our citizens, breach of contracts arrived at by collective bargaining, and strikes involving issues not relating to wages, hours and normal working conditions.

Many suggestions have been made and some bills have been introduced to prevent strikes in industries which affect the public health and safety of our citizens. These strikes include those against the Government, strikes in public utilities, coal, fuel, and steel. Some suggest we handle these strikes through compulsory arbitration by a selected arbitration board or a constitutional court. Some want to use the power of injunction, while others would use an act similar to the Railway Labor Act. Still others want to repeal our labor laws.

INDUSTRY-WIDE LABOR DISPUTES ACT OF 1947

My proposal relates to labor disputes affecting commerce and the national health, or safety; providing for the taking of possession of plants, mines, or facilities by the United States in certain cases.

The bill provides:

First. A new airtight definition of interstate commerce for the purposes of labor legislation.

Second. It establishes a board of arbitration and procedure.

Third. It provides penalties for strikes and lock-outs conducted with disregard for public interest.

(a) These penalties provide for temporary Government seizure which does not deny the right to strike nor does it destroy property rights in event of seizures.

(b) It provides penalties for failure to accept arbitration which in the case of employees loss of the Wagner Act protection and in the case of employer loss of operating profits.

My proposal is one which seeks to make arbitration more desirable than a strike by both employees and employers, and recognizes for the first time the preservation of peace, dignity, health, safety of the Nation when affected by inter-

state commerce as a function of the Presidency.

After collective bargaining fails in industries affecting commerce and the national health or safety, the representatives of the parties to the dispute shall, within 5 days, select an arbitration board. Representatives of the employers shall select two persons and the representatives of the employees shall select two persons to serve on the board from their respective organizations. The chairman of the board shall be selected by the representatives of the parties to the dispute from the five Federal arbitrators appointed by the President.

Before plant seizure the President and the Secretary of Labor or the President and the Governor of any affected State must proclaim that such labor dispute threatens to cause a substantial interruption of commerce and that such interruption of commerce will adversely affect the national health and safety of the citizens of the United States.

If the decision of the arbitration board is turned down by the labor representative it shall be submitted to the employees for a vote. If the employees or employers turn down the decision of the arbitration board the Government seizes the plant, provided there is a strike or lockout.

The purpose of the airtight definition of commerce in this bill is to express clearly what I believe was the original intent of the Congress with respect to labor legislation, rather than the broad effect, created by various Supreme Court decisions.

This new definition provides a screening process by which only important disputes may reach the arbiters.

The term "commerce" shall apply only to those businesses, industries, utilities, and activities conducted for private gain, whose productive effort, as distinguished from sales effort or purchases, lies within the jurisdiction of the police power of two or more States, or of the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or Territory, or of any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and those businesses, industries, utilities, and activities conducted for private gain, whose operations were or would have been, prior hereto, subject to Federal license, or to the regulation of the Federal Power Commission or the Interstate Commerce Commission.

WAGNER ACT AMENDMENTS

There has been some talk of repealing the Wagner Act. However, most Members of Congress want to amend this act in order to get a better balance between labor and management.

Under the Wagner Act, in the past 10 years, the National Labor Relations Board has ordered the reinstatement of 300,000 who have been separated from their jobs and has ordered back pay of $9,000,000 to 30,000 workers. Six million employees have gone to the polls in 24,000 elections. Thirty-six thousand complaints of unfair labor practices have been filed of which 92 percent have been settled informally and over 600 decisions of the Board have been reviewed by the courts. Seventy-seven thousand two hundred and fifty cases have been filed, 74,000 cases closed, which leaves 3,250 cases pending. The NLRB has ordered the disestablishment of more than 2,000 inside unions found tainted with the influence of management.

Some of the changes that I have proposed in the Wagner Act are: deny workers the protection of the Wagner Act when they break a contract arrived at by collective bargaining, deny workers the protection of the Wagner Act when out on strike involving issues not relating to wages, hours, and normal working conditions; give employers the right of free speech, allow employers the right to petition the NLRB for an election when the majority representation is in doubt or where a union claims bargaining rights and threatens to strike and make collective bargaining a two-way street.

Much thought has been given to the question of legislation which would have as its aim the prevention of wildcat strikes or breaking a contract arrived at by collective bargaining. An employer is suable for a breach of contract. Unions should be liable, too, for violations of contracts if collective bargaining and the right to strike mean anything. There is a divided opinion in Congress as to the penalty which should be placed on unions for a breach of contract. Some propose that labor organizations be brought into courts and sued for breach of contract. Under such a proposal, labor objects because you penalize the funds of the entire union. Under my proposal, workers out on wildcat strikes lose their rights of collective bargaining under the Wagner Act, provided that such loss of status for such employee shall cease if and when he is reemployed by such employer.

Jurisdictional strikes should be punished by law because innocent employers should not be penalized because unions force a strike to settle difficulties between unions. The purpose of outlawing sympathy strikes or strikes to enforce secondary boycotts is to prevent interference in the industrial relations of factories which have no dispute with their own employees.

Many labor strikes and most of the rank and file of workers are opposed to wildcat strikes and jurisdictional disputes. They realize the labor movement is being criticized by the public for such tactics.

In order to give an employer a right to talk to his employees, the Wagner Act will have to be amended to define a statement of management's right of free speech. Under the present law, the NLRB has ruled that an employer cannot call workers together during working hours to give them their opinions on unionism.

Now, the NLRB permits an employer to petition for elections only when two unions are competing for a contract in his factory. Employers will be granted the right to petition the NLRB for bargaining elections when the majority representation is in doubt or where a union claims bargaining rights and threatens to strike.

The Wagner Act should be amended to make collective bargaining a two-way street.

Legislation is not the complete answer to our problems in labor relations. Much will depend upon the administration of labor laws. We need the right kind of machinery to settle labor disputes because both unions and industries have grown so big that a single strike can paralyze the Nation. The rank and file of labor believe agreements can be made without so many work stoppages. In case collective bargaining fails, the rank and file of labor favor arbitration if the arbitrators are chosen by labor and management.

I do contend that if my proposals are adopted we shall see a great reduction in the number of strikes and still preserve our rights under the Constitution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Portland Oregonian.

OUR WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION NEEDS A THOROUGH INVESTIGATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there have been repeated alterations in the operation of the Nation's War Assets Administration, but there has been no change. The more the faces have shifted, the more the whole business remains the same.

As of this date, there are literally thousands of items under the jurisdiction of WAA about which no official is ready to speak. Many of these are untagged, undescribed, and uncataloged. In fact, there is strong suspicion in some quarters that much of the material supposedly available for sale by War Assets is even unknown.

It is stored in warehouses scattered throughout the country, and when prospective purchasers find merchandise they want, they are all too often confronted with the absolute impossibility of finding out the terms of sale. When they do find out, there are so many discouragements attached to the application, the waiting period, and the processing of red tape that they give up in disgust.

If there was ever any excuse for these conditions, they have long ceased to exist. Hostilities have been over for a year and 5 months, and we have had enough time to organize our surplus properties and to dispose of them as well, if we had gone about it in a businesslike way.

There are too many people in the War Assets Administration who are not being properly employed. They could very

well be used to get the merchandise out into the daylight where it could be seen, appraised, priced, and sold.

I am asking Congress for an immediate investigation of the entire War Assets Administration.

PALESTINE—JUSTICE—ENGLAND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I note with considerable amazement that the British Government has recently filed a protest with the Government of the United States, in which complaint is made of certain voluntary organizations in this country which are collecting funds in the interest of the people of Palestine and the Hebrew people in Europe who want to go there.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the British Government regards it as objectionable that American citizens are concerned with the plight of those who regard Palestine as their country and their home. It appears that the British Government complains particularly because certain groups of American citizens are sympathetic with those people in Palestine who are willing to risk their lives to save their countrymen in Europe seeking to escape what I regret to describe, Mr. Speaker, as continuing antisemitism in Europe. In this connection, the British call particular attention to certain advertisements which have appeared in American newspapers.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I, as an American citizen, find nothing whatever in these advertisements which would not have been expected as a natural and normal reaction from the American public. The advertisement merely points out in forceful language certain things which have happened recently with respect to Palestine and its citizens. In fact, Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to add a few facts to those contained in this advertisement.

It has been now approximately a year and a half since the President of the United States, in response to overwhelming public opinion, requested the admission of 100,000 displaced European Hebrews to Palestine. After prolonged conversation, the British Government proposed the appointment of a joint committee to study the question.

What was the committee to investigate? The committee, Mr. Speaker, was to rediscover facts about the Palestine issue long since known both to the British and American Governments. It was to go to Europe to find out whether any Hebrews there wanted to go to Palestine. It was to go to Palestine to find out whether the Jews there wanted the European Hebrews to come. It was also to investigate whether Palestine could absorb any substantial number of such persons. Of course, all these things had been repeatedly investigated by competent authorities both official and unofficial. Nevertheless, the result of the British proposal was the appointment of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. After an extended and thorough investigation of 4 months, this joint committee unanimously affirmed President Truman's request and recommended the admission of 100,000 to Palestine at the earliest possible moment. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the committee anticipated their admission, or the admission of most of them, in 1946.

What did the British Government then do? I, for one, was astounded when that Government proposed the appointment of another committee to consider the recommendations of the first committee. Our long-suffering President, over the vigorous protests of large segments of the American public, finally agreed and appointed the so-called Cabinet Committee. After weeks of further consultation, this committee returned with a three-way partition proposal by the British which was acceptable to nobody. In the meantime, the 100,000 were languishing in European detention camps. The President, at this point, felt justified in publicly renewing his request for their admission to Palestine, but by this time, Mr. Speaker, the British Government had thought of another reason for delay. This time they called a conference in London for the Arabs and the Jews and themselves. Before any progress could be made, however, the conference was interrupted by the meeting of the United Nations in New York. The conference, accordingly, was recessed.

Now, quite naturally, a question of such widespread importance to so many peoples and nations was one appropriate for the agenda of the United Nations. This, of course, according to the British view, could not take place because, as you will understand, Mr. Speaker, the British were in the middle of the London Conference which was to be resumed after the meeting of the United Nations. And so it turned out, Mr. Speaker, that the Jews of Europe were unable even to get on the agenda—much less get to Palestine. The last of this month, therefore, the next installment of this tragic story is to be resumed.

I will admit that the procedure adopted by the British Government has had certain results. The problem becomes, in a sense, less pressing. If we have 18 months more of committees and conferences, the whole thing will be still less pressing for the reason that great numbers of these potential immigrants to Palestine will have no further interest in going there. Many of them are already dead and another winter will cause the deaths of thousands more.

At the same time it is entirely understandable that friends and relatives in Palestine should take matters into their own hands, and it is equally understandable that Americans should sympathize not only with the Hebrews in Europe but with their tragedy in Palestine.

I seem to recall a statement by the British Foreign Minister that he would stake his political future on solving the problem of Palestine. To date he has succeeded only in discourtesy to the President of the United States, irritation to the American people and the solidification of a determined resistance movement in Palestine. In these circumstances it is little wonder that the advertisements of which the British Government so bitterly complain appear in American newspapers.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 86. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

149. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed rescissions and provisions relating to appropriations as set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

150. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

151. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1946; the number of pieces procured during the period July 1 to September 30, 1946; the estimated mailings and the estimated costs, by departments and agencies, for the same period; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

152. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the basic elements of the unification of the War and Navy Departments (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

153. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting Report No. 14 of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

154. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration covering operations of this Administration for the fiscal year of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

155. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner for the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

157. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the period ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

158. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned

officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

159. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

160. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to provide for transportation of dependents and household effects under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

161. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint for supply duty only officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

162. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend further section 10 of the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 145), as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions thereof, relating to the determination of the fact of dependency, permanently effective; to the Committee on Armed Services.

163. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by certain agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

164. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1030. A bill to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 57. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. Senate Joint Resolution 3. Joint resolution relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees; with amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1095. A bill relating to labor disputes affecting commerce and the national health or safety; providing for the taking of possession of plants, mines, or facilities by the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1096. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1097. A bill to amend section 25 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption from $500 to $1,250; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1098. A bill to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1099. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1100. A bill relating to the reentry of Chinese laborers and Chinese wives and children into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1101. A bill to extend by 1 year the time within which a person who served honorably in the United States armed forces during World War II may file a petition for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1102. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to women members of the military or naval forces of the United States who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 1103. A bill to make it unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, who has engaged in activity subversive of the Government of the United States or is or has been a member of or associated with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1104. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1105. A bill to clarify and define the constitutional rights of retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1106. A bill for the erection of a public building at Andrews, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 1107. A bill providing for the extension of the time limitation under which patents were issued in the case of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1108. A bill to provide a method for paying subsistence allowance to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1109. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States and Territories as may be needed for the burial of war veterans and certain other persons as provided for in section 281, title 24, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1110. A bill to provide that there shall be no liability for acts done or omitted in accordance with regulations of the Director of Selective Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 1111. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 1112. A bill to provide for the independent investigation of accidents involving aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1113. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1114. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1115. A bill to amend the act of February 5, 1917, as amended by the act of June 28, 1940, providing for the deportation of undesirable aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 1116. A bill to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens, who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to deny admission to the United States of persons who, the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe, seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States, and to reduce quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1117. A bill to prohibit the entry into the United States of quota immigrants until the expiration of 10 years after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1118. A bill to amend section 101 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1119. A bill to amend section 743 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1120. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 1121. A bill to provide for the selection of an Acting President in the case of failure to qualify of both President-elect and Vice-President-elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1122. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion, and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that may not exist; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 1123. A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same becomes effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1124. A bill to require congressional approval of any executive agreement reducing tariff rates on imported products directly competitive with those produced in the United States before the same becomes

effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1125. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1126. A bill to suspend temporarily the authority to make further reductions of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1127. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1128. A bill to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1129. A bill to recognize service in the land and naval forces performed on or after September 8, 1939, but prior to December 7, 1941, as service performed during the present war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1130. A bill to terminate the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber producing industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution relating to assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a civilian administration, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, over the Caroline, Marshall, and Marianas Islands and Guam and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 56. Resolution providing for the investigation and study of the operations of the War Assets Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of State of Rhode Island, regarding the need of financial and economic help for Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1131. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Eugene Olinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Joao Marie Garganta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Raul Pereira Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Manuel Leite Silva Brandao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Agostinho Pereira de Souza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Dipriano Margues Fraqueia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1138. A bill for the relief of Edward Tyslowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1140. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Krebs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Abdolah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Theresa Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Vivian Newell Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1145. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Clarence Huso; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1146. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Simpson Woodtick; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1147. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Willard Mahlem; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1148. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1149. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Stanley Rensvold; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1150. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Arthur H. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Sanford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Antonio Parreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of Charles Edward Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie D. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schilbred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Bezalel Schatz and Miss Zahara Schatz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1160. A bill to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service, namely, the Congressional Medal of Honor, to Capt. Raphael Lobez; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1161. A bill for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of Persis M. Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Monite Waterproof Glue Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of Marie and Max Cassvan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Nandor Frieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 1167. A bill to provide for the extension of patent No. 1,808,654, issued June 2, 1931, relating to poison or powder distributing machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1168. A bill for the relief of the Atlantic Meat Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 1172. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1173. A bill for the relief of Pietro Agnello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1174. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1175. A bill for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition relative to the sugar shortage, signed by Mr. Herbert M. Boltz, of Boston, N. Y., and 135 other citizens of the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

57. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Phi Beta Sigma fraternity regarding racial discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, he that cometh unto Thee Thou wilt in no wise cast out. Out of the depths of our needs, out of the depths of our hopes, and out of the depths of our failures, we come to the mercy seat of prayer. Impress us that he who conforms to Thy holy laws deserves the blessing of Thy grace.

As the goal of Congress is the goal of all the people, we pray that we may come through these times not satisfied nor resting, but laboring and seeking the wise paths toward the frontiers of national security. Through faith, freedom will be won, and righteousness and judgment will be established. O Divine Spirit, flood all hearts, dispel all fret and anxious care, for we know that the best victory of human experience is won within the human breast. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials appearing in the New Hampshire Morning Union entitled "Senator BRIDGES and Russia."

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Hartford Courant.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials recently appearing in San Francisco daily newspapers concerning a second bay-bridge crossing.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a check which was drawn on the Sergeant at Arms on December 27. It was to pay taxes on my farm property in one of my early home towns. It has been returned to me with this notation on it, "Closed for audit." It was not honored, of course. The tax collector draws the conclusion, however, from it, I assume, that my own personal account is being audited. I do not know as I care to have that type of propaganda spread around through my district. My account is good and always has been good down here, but, of course, I cannot draw on it. So I have sent another check.

But there is another point to this. I would like to take a deduction for the amount of this check for taxes on my 1946 income, but I can only take a deduction for a sum paid in taxes for the year in which it is paid. Of course, I only sent the second check out yesterday, so now I lose this deduction. I think we should take some action about it and also see if we cannot insist that matters be expedited so far as this audit is concerned.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand there is some hesitancy about reopening the bank for fear of starting a run.

Mr. REED of New York. If there is a run on it, I shall join it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MASON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article on rent control.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered over Station WOL this morning by the distinguished commentator, Mr. Reedy.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, and in one to include an editorial and in the other a radio address.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three particulars: first, to include an address delivered by that distinguished New Yorker, James A. Farley, on the opening of the Salvation Army drive; second, to include a summary of the Federal Tort Claims Act; and third, to include a biography and the citation awarded the distinguished New Yorker and great industrialist, Sidney J. Weinberg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, of course, we all recognize the great inconvenience that has been caused the Members of the House by the necessary closing of the Sergeant at Arms office. It is not the fault of anyone here. No one now here in the House is to be charged with any blame for the situation that gave rise to the necessity for the action that was taken. I should like everyone to know that everything possible to be done has been done to expedite the coming of the day when an arrangement can be made by which our necessities can again be taken care of. There is another meeting this afternoon at 2 o'clock in the office of the Speaker. I am quite sure it is the hope of the Speaker and the Sergeant at Arms and all of us that very shortly the matter can be taken care of.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not want the Members who are interested to appear at that meeting, does he?

Mr. HALLECK. I had not thought we would make it quite an open meeting.

COMMUNISM MAKES NO REAL PROGRESS IN INDIA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, John Foster Dulles, our distinguished representative at the United Nations Assembly, the other night made a statement in part as follows:

> In India Soviet communism exercises a strong influence through the interim Hindu government.

I think Mr. Dulles is quite in error. I say from my investigation that India is one of the Asiatic countries where communism happily has made very little inroad. I would say there are no more Communists in India than there are in our own country. The Indian culture, tradition, and religion repel rather than attract communism, and I am very happy to say that. Pandit Nehru said that the reported remarks of Mr. Dulles showed "a lack of knowledge of the facts." His very delightful sister, Mrs. Pandit, said that Mr. Dulles, unfortunately, was woefully in error when he said that communism had made any progress in India. I am happy to say that it has not made any appreciable progress.

Pandit Nehru also remarked, countering Mr. Dulles, that "our policy is to cultivate friendly and cooperative relations with all countries, notably the United States, and not to aline ourselves with any particular power group."

Pandit Nehru's sister, Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, who led the Indian delegation to the General Assembly, said that Mr. Dulles might have thought that because India and the Soviet Union collaborated on racial issues before the United Nations, the Government of India was acting under Communist influence. This, she said, would be a misapprehension.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the life and character of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Mr. HARTLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with a bill introduced by him and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "American Business Opportunity" by Oscar Vogel, and include a short comment by the editor.

TRANSFER SCHOOLHOUSES BUILT WITH LANHAM ACT FUNDS TO DISTRICTS WHERE LOCATED

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 668, which will be of great interest to many Members of the House representing widely separated districts. It is not a bill that is designed to save the Nation or one to bring us permanent peace, the kind of bills that are left for the great statesmen of the House. My bill will bring justice and considerable help to a great many small communities and school districts.

Briefly, this bill provides that buildings, equipment, and lands built or acquired with Lanham Act funds for educational or recreational purposes shall be transferred by the Government to the school districts where located, providing the districts agree to use these buildings or the equipment for the purposes for which they were built or acquired.

As you know, these buildings and facilities were required by virtue of the war effort. In fact and in common sense they are a war cost. They were required to teach and train the children of the great army of war workers, servicemen, and others who left their homes and migrated to California and elsewhere to work and serve in the war effort. There is no more reason why the cost of these buildings should not be written off as a war cost than the cost of numerous other things which were required for the war, such as ships, munitions, and so forth, which have been written off.

The Federal Works Agency is now holding these buildings and trying to sell them to school districts. In many cases these districts have neither the money nor the taxing power to buy these buildings or this equipment. The buildings are rapidly deteriorating, and it seems to me to be common sense and a progressive move to turn them back to the districts where they are located, so they may be used in solving the educational problems facing these various localities where many of the migrants have remained.

In the last Congress I introduced such a bill and the FWA objected to it. Within a few days after the bill had been dropped in the hopper one of their men from the San Francisco district office came back here for a conference. He told me they were not overcharging these districts, that they were trying to get from these districts what they were able to pay. In other words they were taking whatever the traffic would bear, but if the traffic could not bear any outlay, they were holding the buildings and administrative costs were gradually eating up any value which the Government might salvage.

An educator in another State than California, who is interested in the principle of my bill and who firmly believes that justice requires us to turn the buildings back to the poor school districts where they are located, made a survey of the matter, and he got some interesting revelations, which I am placing into this statement. One was that only 15 percent of the 113 school systems which answered the questionnaire had been approached about buying the buildings, 90 percent said they could not buy the buildings even though they had to give them up.

Here are the results of a survey by an educator:

First. I received answers from 113 school systems which have one or more of these buildings.

Second. None of the 113 systems had bought any of the Federal buildings.

Third. Only 15 percent had been approached about buying these buildings.

Fourth. Ninety percent said they could not possibly buy the buildings even if they had to give them up.

Fifth. Ninety percent were anxious to take steps to try to persuade Congress to give the buildings to the schools.

Sixth. About 20 percent said that a Government which could afford billions for Yugoslavia, Russia, et al., could afford to give the American school children a few buildings.

Seventh. Five percent said that the taxpayers had paid for these buildings once, so why make taxpayers pay for them again?

Eighth. Four percent said the Federal Government was taking out of their States so much of the tax money that they could not possibly get any more tax money with which to buy the buildings.

Ninth. One superintendent said:

> It is enough to astonish the civilized world to know that the richest Nation in the history of the world is even considering squeezing from the local school systems the pitifully inadequate amount of money they now have to educate America's own children while millions are rushed to every other nation which can drum up the flimsiest excuse.

THE LATE HONORABLE ANDREW J. VOLSTEAD

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday there passed away at his home in Minnesota a former colleague who served in this body with unusual distinction from 1903 to 1923. I refer to the Honorable A. J. Volstead, the author of the Volstead Act and also of the farmers' cooperative law. Mr. Volstead, as the older Members will recall, was a man of splendid ability. He was the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary during the later years of his service here. I know that all of you who served in this body with him learned of his passing with keen regret. He was a man of strong convictions and a hard worker, conscientious, and in all respects an admirable American.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. As one of the Members who served with Mr. Volstead, I was extremely sorry this morning to read of his passing. We were, of course, members of opposite parties. But I can truthfully say I never knew a man who labored harder for the moral upbuilding of America than Andrew J. Volstead.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am glad to have the gentleman's observation because it is true.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Andrew J. Volstead we have lost a great American. Regardless of how the American people may have felt about the Volstead Act, no one can ever say that Andrew J. Volstead ever was inspired by any but the highest motives and the desire to promote the general welfare of the people of this great country, of which he was so illustrious a son.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who served in the House from 1917 to 1922 with the late Congressman Volstead, has paid Mr. Volstead a wonderful tribute, with which I heartily concur.

I should like to add at this time my personal tribute to Mr. Volstead for the great service which he has performed for agriculture as one of the authors of the famous Capper-Volstead Act. Under that act agricultural producers received the right to act together in associations, collectively advancing their cause in handling and marketing agricultural products. As a result of the Capper-Volstead Act, the vast farm cooperative structure in America has been much encouraged and strengthened.

The late Andrew Volstead will go down in history as one of the benefactors of agriculture, and the farmers of the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, and of the Nation, have lost one of the best friends they have ever had in Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances—in one to include a resolution recently adopted by the State Senate of California, and in the other a statement of the veteran population of California.

EXTENDING THE TIME TO PERMIT SUGAR OR SIRUPS TO BE MANUFACTURED SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 57, extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today extends for a period of 15 months a temporary arrangement that has already been approved by the Congress on two prior occasions. For many years our revenue laws have provided that a plant manufacturing alcohol could not produce any other product during the same period. The purpose of that was to facilitate the collection of Federal taxes on alcohol. We have found, however, that the industrial alcohol plants built during the war can be used to make a sirup with a high sugar content. Those plants have been doing it for the last 2 or 3 years. They use wet grains, soft potatoes, and many other surplus crops. These products are made into a sirup. The sirup, in turn, is used by manufacturers in place of sugar, thereby releasing more sugar for household use.

On two prior occasions we passed a resolution permitting those plants to make sirup during the same period that they make alcohol. When we adopt the committee amendment this resolution will extend the time for 15 months. It is the sincere hope of the committee that, before the 15 months have passed, permanent legislation can be presented to the House to take care of this situation so that you will not be called upon to act upon it so often.

I might say that with the present-day tax-collecting facilities of the Treasury, there is no need for this old provision prohibiting these alcohol plants from making other products.

The Treasury Department has no objection to this measure. The Secretary of Agriculture not only approves it but the Department of Agriculture finds it highly desirable and wants the legislation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. A continuance of the manufacture of sirups at these industrial alcohol plants will also help very materially in relieving the sugar shortage all over the country?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it gives us a market for soft corn, which is very important out in the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and in many instances it relieves the Commodity Credit Corporation of a loss on those products.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, this resolution comes from the Ways and Means Committee with a unanimous report?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will not my colleague agree that while the Treasury Department had no objection to this extension it has reserved its right as to what it will say if we want to make it permanent legislation?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3126 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to emergency production of sugars and sirups in industrial-alcohol plants) is amended by striking out "February 1, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1948,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF SENATORS AND SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 3, relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees.

The Clerk read the title of the Joint resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? I should like to have it read; I should like to know what is in it. I am not taking everything for granted that is said these days without investigating it.

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is merely a housekeeping bill presented originally as an amendment to the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947, relative to certain Senate employees.

Mr. TABER. It was originally presented for the purpose of straightening out some situation that resulted from the reorganization of committees in the Senate, and for the repeal of a provision which was placed in an appropriation bill last August for the benefit of certain of those employees.

Mr. CANNON. It terminates, as of January 31, the employment of certain employees who otherwise would remain on the rolls without duties until the close of March.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. In the form in which the bill stands at present, with proposed House amendments, it makes immediately available in lump sum funds which have been previously appropriated for purposes authorized by law, such funds to be expended in accordance with the Reorganization Act and until such time as further provisions shall be made.

Mr. TABER. That is correct; and it takes care of the housekeeping situation with reference to employees of the House of Representatives. There are also a large number of items that require action: For instance, in certain instances even though a man should die or resign he could not be taken off the rolls. That situation is corrected.

All of these amendments with reference to the Senate end of the picture have been approved by the Senate committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, having witnessed the fiasco at the other end of the Capitol, I am not disposed to let this go through until and unless we know what it is, certainly not until the Clerk reads the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Should we offer the amendments as the bill is read by the Clerk or should that be done later?

The SPEAKER. That should be done after consent for the consideration of the bill has been given.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (h) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—

(1) the positions and funds allocated on January 1, 1947, to the chairman of any standing committee of the Senate existing on such date shall be continued through January 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by such chairman; except that in the case of any such chairman who has died or was not reelected, committee employees shall be continued on the pay rolls of the Senate through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate, and such employees shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Senate shall prescribe;

(2) clerks and other employees of any Senator who was a member of the Senate on January 1, 1947, but who was not a chairman of any standing committee existing on January 1, 1947, and who was not reelected, shall be continued on the rolls of the Senate through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate; and such employees shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Senate shall prescribe; and

(3) the appropriations for the compensation of employees of Senators and of committee employees of standing committees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available for the compensation of employees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) The proviso under the caption "Senate" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, approved August 8, 1946, is hereby repealed, effective as of August 8, 1946.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "employees", insert "(except in the case of death or resignation of any such employee)."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "employees", insert "(except in the case of death or resignation of any such employee)."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "January 31, 1947" and insert "the date of enactment of this act."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "and."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "(2)" and insert "(2) and of the elected officers of the Senate;

"(4) employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress which is abolished by operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (except in the case of the death or resignation of any such employee) shall continue on the rolls through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Clerk of the House of Representatives;

"(5) employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress which is not abolished by operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (except in the case of the death or resignation of any such employee) shall continue on the rolls until January 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by action of such committee; and

"(6) the appropriations for 'Salaries, officers and employees, House of Representatives,' as contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available in such amounts and under such regulations as may be approved by the Committee on House Administration for compensation of employees of the standing committees of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, except the Committee on Appropriations, and shall be available for the compensation of officers and employees of the House of Representatives as authorized by section 201 and section 244 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to interrogate the gentleman from New York. In the rush to pass the so-called reorganization bill a great many blunders were made, one of which was to foist onto the Congress a bunch of alleged advisers at salaries of $10,000 a year each.

I am wondering why there was not a provision inserted here eliminating those people, since the Members of Congress now realize a mistake was made.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are some very intricate set-ups in this reorganization bill, and I would hardly think the Appropriations Committee should attempt to provide for general amendments to that bill. Legislation of that character should go to the legislative committee rather than to the Appropriations Committee.

It has been generally understood that we would try to keep out of legislation just as far as it is possible to do so. That is why we would not want to undertake the job of repealing some of these things. What we ought to provide in the nature of appropriations can be determined when that question comes before the Deficiency Committee and when it comes before the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. I do not think we should undertake the other job.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from New York. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from New York, and through him the Republican majority leaders, what is the plan with reference to the appointment of the so-called four legislative assistants for each of the standing committees. Is the majority determined to appoint all four despite the fact that the Reorganization Act says specifically that one or more shall be assigned to the minority? If it is the purpose and plan of the majority to appoint all the executive assistants, we might have the very anomalous situation arising where a very highly conservative Republican assistant might be appointed and assigned to the minority. Can the distinguished gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Indiana tell us something about that situation?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman from New York is familiar with the language contained in the Reorganization Act with respect to the four professional advisers to the various committees. I have read the language many times myself. As I read it it seems to say that the matter of assignment to majority and minority Members is for the discretion of the committees. As of this time I know of no hard and fast rule that has been made or sought to be made by the leadership as such. The gentleman from New York knows as well as I do that there are many committees serving in the House that are not political in their operations. I think that might be said, for instance, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I know I served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I do not recall any time when there was a division on strictly political lines. All I can say to the gentleman is that so far as I know, at least up to this point, while there has been some question about the meaning of that language, it is now considered to be for the determination of each particular committee. Of course, I cannot undertake to say what might later be determined.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I agree with the gentleman, it ought to be that way, but the majority party, of course, has the majority on the committee, and if they, the majority, deem it shall be political, the majority members will follow suit, and then we will have a political situation arising. I happen to be on the Committee on the Judiciary, and we have never allowed politics to enter into our deliberations, and I hope that will not be possible after these men may be appointed.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know for what the gentleman contends. I do not know whether he believes that one or two of the four should be assigned to the minority.

Mr. CELLER. I think so.

Mr. HALLECK. Or one, two, or three to the majority. As far as I am concerned, it seems to me that if a committee had been run on a nonpartisan basis, then certainly it would not be very helpful to inject politics by reason of the assignment of these so-called committee advisers. Speaking only for myself, all I can say to the gentleman is—and certainly his committee has operated with full understanding of the premises, and apparently his chairman is here and I am not undertaking to speak for him—it is my understanding that under the language of the Reorganization Act the matter is for the determination of the committee. Incidentally, I might say, the inquiry of the gentleman from New York is proper, although I doubt whether it is particularly relevant at this time.

Mr. CELLER. It may not be germane. We would like to get some enlightenment from the majority, and therefore I press the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman seen anything to make him suspicious that there was any skulduggery going on?

Mr. CELLER. No; I said nothing about skulduggery. I hope that the majority will at least give one of those appointments to the minority; one out of the four.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Inasmuch as the gentleman brought this matter up, coming from the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I happen to be a member, let me refresh the gentleman's memory by saying that he asked me this question and read the law to me, but he forgot to read the extension of the law which says that this matter, in substance, is in the discretion of the committee.

Mr. CELLER. I am aware of that, of course.

Mr. MICHENER. I gave the gentleman the same opinion exactly that the majority leader gave him, excepting the gentleman was primarily interested in knowing whether or not, if any staff member was assigned to the minority, that member would be assigned to the minority as such or to the ranking member of the minority. I assure the gentleman the Committee on the Judiciary will do as it always does, leave out the politics and act judicially.

Mr. CELLER. That is perfectly agreeable, with politics left out.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, the Speaker has just stated that this is an important piece of legislation. It deals with the Reorganization Act that Congress passed at the tail end of the last session. I think anything that deals with that act is important. I wonder if the gentleman from New York will withdraw his unanimous-consent request and give the Members of the House a little time to study this measure so that we may have some idea of what it contains. I wonder if the gentleman from New York will not withdraw his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TABER. I think my request has been granted. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. TABER. There are some things in here that should go right along. There are some things here that have to go along pretty fast. There are some repeals of legislation that were unfortunately passed that should become effective at once. Therefore I feel that we ought to go into it right away and clean it up. I shall be glad to explain the effect of every single item involved here if the gentleman would like it. I do not think it is so involved that there would be any difficulty in every Member of the House understanding fully just what there is about it. If the gentleman would like me to do so, I will start on an explanation of each paragraph.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

JOINT SESSIONS OF SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I notice in a front-page news story of the Washington Post this morning that the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services have agreed to have joint sessions to consider testimony on America's world commitments and armed strength, also that Senator GURNEY, chairman of the Senate committee, and the gentleman from New York, Representative ANDREWS, chairman of the House committee, have agreed on a plan to have department officials give members of the committee the most complete picture of international conditions and United States power that has yet been given. I think this is very fine. But the thing that disturbs me is that this matter, which is of the utmost importance not only to members of the Committee on Armed Services, but of great importance to the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and every Member of the House of Representatives, will be presented to only 32 Members of the House, those on the Armed Services Committee. Would it not be of great benefit to all the Members of the House if we could make arrangements to give 1 hour a week or 1 hour every other week to enable the Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall; the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson; and Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, who are going to be called before the Committee on Armed Services, to come here and appear on the House floor and make their reports so that all of us could hear and see what takes place and have an opportunity to participate in the discussion? The public, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would get the benefit, and every Member of the House would be enlightened and currently informed on these most vital problems. These are matters that all of us ought to know about. We can do this by simply amending House rule XVIII through the adoption of House Resolution 17, which is now before the Congress. We should certainly give this method a trial.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

PRIVATE CLAIMS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1946, certain claims against the Government of the United States are now triable and subject to determination in the courts. Prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act, I presented several claims on behalf of certain claimants in the form of bills which were not acted upon by the Congress. In accordance with the terms of the Reorganization Act, these papers in support of the claims are now on file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. I am informed by the Clerk that the only way they can be released to the several claimants for use in the court proceedings which they contemplate instituting is by direction of the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the papers filed in support of the claims of Willie B. Smith, Ray Glenn and his wife, Elfriede Glenn, and Charles Sweet, as covered by H. R. 6061, H. R. 6729, and H. R. 6987, respectively, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, may be released by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and returned to the claimants for use in the judicial proceedings which they intend to institute.

The SPEAKER. Have adverse reports been filed on any of these claims?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the claims were not acted upon by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Has the Committee on Claims made any report at all?

Mr. GEARHART. No, Mr. Speaker. The papers that were filed in support of the claims are necessary for use as evidence in the courts. Therefore, I think they should be released to these people so that they can pursue their claims in the courts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement and a short editorial by Mr. Hugh B. Wilcox.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYEES OF SENATORS AND SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, from information given me by Members familiar with the contents of House Joint Resolution 3, I find it satisfactory and I, therefore, withdraw my objection to its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (h) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—

(1) the positions and funds allocated on January 1, 1947, to the chairman of any standing committee of the Senate existing on such date shall be continued through January 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by such chairman; except that in the case of any such chairman who has died or was not reelected, committee employees shall be continued on the pay rolls of the Senate through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate, and such employees shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Senate shall prescribe:

(2) clerks and other employees of any Senator who was a member of the Senate on January 1, 1947, but who was not a chairman of any standing committee existing on January 1, 1947, and who was not reelected, shall be continued on the rolls of the Senate through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate; and such employees shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Senate shall prescribe; and

(3) the appropriations for the compensation of employees of Senators and of committee employees of standing committees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available for the compensation of employees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) The proviso under the caption "Senate" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, approved August 8, 1946, is hereby repealed, effective as of August 8, 1946.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after "employees", insert "except in the case of death or resignation of any such employee."

Page 2, line 6, after "employees", insert "except in the case of death or resignation of any such employee."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "January 31, 1947" and insert the date of enactment of this act.

Line 22, strike out "(2)" and the period and insert "(2) and of the elected officers of the Senate;

"(4) employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is abolished by operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (except in the case of the death or resignation of any such employee) shall continue on the rolls through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Clerk of the House of Representatives;

"(5) employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress which is not abolished by operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (except in the case of the death or resignation of any such employee) shall continue on the rolls until January 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by action of such committee; and

"(6) the appropriations for 'Salaries, officers, and employees, House of Representatives', as contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available in such amounts and under such regulations as may be approved by the Committee on House Administration for compensation of employees of the standing committees of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, except the Committee on Appropriations, and shall be available for the compensation of officers and employees of the House of Representatives as authorized by section 201 and section 244 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DIRECT QUESTIONING OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as one who voted for the reorganization bill and as one who studied its provisions with the utmost care and interest, I wish to make plain that I hope, in event the policy is adopted of bringing Cabinet officers and other high officials of the Government before the House for questioning, we proceed with the policy of direct questions, without having to go through a board or panel to cushion our effect, and without having the questions depart from some of the serious issues that are before the country. I think that an honest, straightforward policy in dealing with these matters should be pursued.

In voting for the reorganization bill my position was made clear on that issue. I think it will be a constructive step in our Government if such a policy is followed. Congress will be in a position to do a better job. I hope that direct questioning on the part of any Member of this House will be permitted under the provisions of this bill, in the event we adopt the policy of calling some of the high officials of the Government before the House for questioning.

It would be much less embarrassing for an official of the State Department, for instance, to submit to questions from House Members and be given the chance to defend his position than to have to read in the papers of attacks Congressmen leveled at him without any opportunity to answer his attacker simultaneously.

By the same token, Members of Congress could justify the expectations of people they represent by obtaining direct statements from high policy-making officers of our Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Right Reverend George P. Johnson, of St. Joseph's rectory, Portland, Maine.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I should work for Mr. Jones and after a time we should have a dispute as to how much he owed me, and he would not pay me and I brought suit against him, under the law as it is today Mr. Jones and I could get together and cut out the lawyers and agree upon a settlement. We could settle it and get out of court. But that is not the way it is under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Suits have been brought for compensation for overtime. Under that law we have some queer judicial decisions.

The United States circuit court of appeals had this to say about this provision—section 16 (b)—providing for overtime payment:

> Is this provision of the law as to liquidated damages mandatory or discretionary? Since the act has been violated in good faith in this case, we would indeed like to hold that it is discretionary. It seems a keen injustice for employers bewildered by strange legislation and confused by divergent authority in the courts to be subjected to such a measure. Yet no matter how much we lament its harshness, the section appears to be mandatory and virtually all the courts have so construed it. (*St. John* v. *Brown* (D. C. 38 F. Supp. 385); *Williams* v. *General Mills* (D. C. 39 F. Supp. 849); *Muldowney* v. *Seaberg Elevator Co.* (D. C. 39 F. Supp. 275); *Thompson* v. *Daugherty* (D. C. 40 F. Supp. 279); *Emerson* v. *Mary Lincoln Candies, Inc.* (Sup. Ct. 174 Misc. 353, 20 N. Y. S. (2d) 570); *Reeves* v. *Howard County Refining Co.* (D. C. 33 F. Supp. 90); *Magann* v. *Long's Baggage Transfer Co.* (D. C. 39 F. Supp. 742); *Lefevers* v. *General Export Iron & Metal Co.* (D. C. 36 F. Supp. 838); *Hargrave* v. *Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp.* (D. C. E. D. Okla., 42 F. Supp. 908); *Moss* v. *Postal Telegraph Co.* (D. C. M. D. Ga., 42 F. Supp. 807); *McMillan* v. *Wilson & Co.* (4 Wage Hour Rept. 409 (D. Minn. Ramsay Co.)); *Wagner* v. *Estate of Abe Field* (4 Wage Hour Rept. 392 (Sup. Ct. Ind.)); *Roberts* v. *Hoarel* (4 Labor Cases 60648); *Abroe* v. *Lindsay Bros. Co.* (Minn., 300 N. W. 457).)

That decision of the circuit court of appeals—One Hundred Twenty-sixth Federal Statutes (2d), pages 98–110—was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court—Three Hundred Sixteenth United States Reports, pages 572–581.

Today, there is no way of settling these disputes outside of court calling for the payment of something over $5,000,000,000, without paying the full amount, or the amount which some court later may say was due.

Last Saturday, Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO—he has been general counsel since 1936—appeared before a committee of the other body and was asked about an amendment to the law which would permit settlement of these suits. He made a recommendation, and again I want to go along and offer something constructive. I hope it will be so considered by Mr. Pressman. Perhaps he will not think it is just what he wants. He made a suggestion that the law, section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, be amended so as to provide that litigants could settle by collective bargaining these claims for compensation for overtime. He was asked by a Senator:

> Mr. Pressman, may we understand that you agree as to the reasonableness of a bill to be enacted into law which would permit the compromise of back wages of the portal-to-portal type of payments by collective bargaining?
>
> Mr. PRESSMAN. The answer is, "Yes"; as I said before, sir.
>
> Senator DONNELL. I thought it was, but I wanted to be clear.
>
> Mr. PRESSMAN. That is correct.

Note what Mr. Pressman advocates: Settlement of claims for back wages by collective bargaining. Mr. Pressman, according to his testimony, is interested in five suits for back pay—as an attorney he is interested. I think each one of these suits calls for more than a million dollars. Mr. Pressman is willing to have those settled by collective bargaining.

I have today offered an amendment to section 16 (b) that goes just one step further than Mr. Pressman. If these employees are entitled to that compensation, that money belongs to them as individual employees. So the amendment offered provides that when any employee brings a suit for back wages, overtime compensation, he may at any time—mark you, at any time—settle with his employer if they can agree upon a compromise. Is there anything wrong about that? If two of us have a dispute, is there any reason why we should not get together and settle? Is there any reason why the law should prevent parties settling their disputes without

the final judgment of a court. Certainly Congress never intended to force parties into lawsuits when they had no desire to stand suit.

Mr. Pressman is not going to like that amendment because he could not continue his suits, he could not settle them, he would not have the exclusive right to settle them by collective bargaining; because the men who have worked, who have earned the money, under this amendment, could go to the boss and say: "Now, listen here, you owe me $10, but I will take $7.50." How about that—should not that be permitted? And when I say "$10" I mean $1,000,000; and when I say "$7.50" I mean $750,000.

Is not that a good amendment?

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In a minute.

I hope the House Committee on Labor will consider this amendment next week and bring it to the House, and when it reaches the floor I hope the membership will pass it. Why? So that the men who are entitled to compensation for overtime, if they are so entitled, can get it without having a lawyer, or a collective-bargaining agent, or some union, sit back and say: "No; you cannot settle; the company has got to come across for the full amount or settle with me; pay what I, not you, ask—are willing to accept."

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Does the gentleman from Michigan mean that he is just preventing the collective-bargaining agreement or that he is to bypass the lawyer without first discharging him in the regular way?

Mr. HOFFMAN. As Mr. Pressman testified—and at the present time there is a pile of testimony piled 8 or 10 inches high—of the testimony that has been taken before the subcommittee of the Senate—I have gone through that. Mr. Pressman testified that many of those suits are upon a contingent basis. Of course, if what the gentleman is getting at is that the lawyer ought to get his cut, perhaps so; but, after all, the man who is interested in the lawsuit ought to be the client, and all good lawyers, all honest lawyers, all lawyers who follow the ethics of the profession, let the client have the final word as to a settlement. The present trouble grows out of the fact that the attorneys and the collective-bargaining agents think they are the boys who are interested, who should say whether a suit should be brought—when and for what it should be settled. The worker is just like an ox in the yoke, he can do the work, he can earn the money, but the union is the one to determine what shall—what shall not be done.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is trying to probe Mr. Pressman's mind. He wants it settled by collective bargaining. Does he not know that the employee has the right if he cannot settle to call a strike and force the employer to settle?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am not quite so sure whether the employee has any longer a right to call a strike. That is the law, of course, that is the theory of it, rather. But the strikes in my district are called by someone who does not live there, by an international representative, by somebody living in Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago, or New York.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is probing Mr. Pressman's mind. What is back of his mind, however? By not going to the court he can force settlement, is that it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure. It is giving the union leader, the man who is interested in initiation fees and dues, and the lawyer the chance of a larger cut.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. Would not this House by the very act of passing such legislation recognize the validity of these claims?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. These suits have been filed. Such an amendment would give the interested parties an opportunity to agree upon an adjustment. All that Mr. Pressman wants to do is to give the authority to compromise those suits to a collective-bargaining representative of the union. What I want to do is to say to the man who has done the work, who is entitled to the money, that he can go in and avoid litigation which in some instances, if it is successful under the construction of the act by the Court, will ruin the industry, wipe out the jobs.

There is no question but that these suits grow not out of the law as passed by the Congress, but out of an interpretation of the law which was given by the Court, a New Deal court at that. It is about time that the Congress begin to insist that it write the laws, that the courts give them the meaning the Congress intended. When the Supreme Court changes our law, the law we write, and puts into effect something which it thinks we should have passed but did not, then we should write another law and set the Supreme Court right and tell that Court in no uncertain terms just what we did mean. We did not mean a man ought to be paid from the time he gets up in the morning until he goes to sleep at night. What we meant was that if a man did some work at the request of an employer for his benefit, he should be paid, but outside of that, nothing doing.

Why wait? Why not act now on this question of what is work, of what the word "workweek" means?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special order just granted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on Thursday next, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold an organization meeting in executive session at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, January 23, 1947, in the committee room, 356 Old House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

165. A letter from the Commissioner, National Housing Agency, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting the final report of the liquidation of the United States Housing Corporation during the period March 1, 1942, to June 30, 1945, while under the jurisdiction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration pursuant to Executive Order No. 9070, approved February 24, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

166. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to amend the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, for the purpose of making certain funds available for the continued use of the United States Maritime Commission until July 1, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

167. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

168. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

169. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

170. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reorganize the Nurse Corps of the Navy and of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

171. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1177. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1178. A bill to amend the Judicial Code so as to improve the administration of United States courts outside the continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1179. A bill to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 1180. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1181. A bill to extend college education to children or other beneficiaries of persons whose death results from service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 1182. A bill to provide that F-1 loans under the regional agricultural credit corporation loan program shall be deemed to have been made upon the same terms and conditions as F-2 loans under such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1183. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs, and the distribution and disposal of property, furniture, and fixtures, derived from and by the operation of officers' clubs of the Army Air Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1184. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 1185. A bill fixing annual allowances for clerical services at certain offices of the third and fourth classes and to provide for payment of compensation to persons performing the duties of the postmaster at offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1186. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 2 cents per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1187. A bill to provide for the selection and appointment of substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1188. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1189. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1190. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1191. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1192. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 1193. A bill declaring August 14 of each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1194. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1195. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1196. A bill for the erection of a public building at Latta, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1197. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1198. A bill granting equipment allowances to postmasters at offices in which post-office fixtures and equipment are furnished by the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 1199. A bill to grant certain veterans the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON (by request):

H. R. 1200. A bill to provide an award for arrested tuberculosis cases of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 1201. A bill to provide a method for paying subsistence allowances to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1202. A bill to limit the authority to require the having of insurance as a condition precedent to operating a motor vehicle in military or naval reservations, posts, depots, or other installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1203. A bill to provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1204. A bill to remove the ceiling placed on the amount which a veteran enrolled in an educational or on-the-job training program may receive from combined subsistence allowance and compensation for productive labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1205. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Pecatonica River, Wis. and Ill., for flood control, for runoff and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 1206. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on certain publications issued at regular intervals circulated free or mainly free; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. Res. 57. Resolution requesting the postponement of further reduction of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Res. 58. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation with respect to present and future supplies of newsprint, printing and wrapping paper, paper products, paper pulp, and pulpwood; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 59. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 58; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 60. Resolution to cut red tape in the administration of the GI bill of rights by making $4,000 in cash available immediately to every veteran of World War II with which to build or purchase a home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TABER:

H. Res. 61. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for expenses of studies and examinations; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1207. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy L. Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill for the relief of Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Margaret Redmond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1210. A bill for the relief of Amadeu Valente da Fonseca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1211. A bill for the relief of Angostinho Ferreira da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1212. A bill for the relief of James E. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 1213. A bill for the relief of Zola Bronson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1214. A bill for the relief of Georgias Gianniotes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 1215. A bill for the relief of Kazue Oda Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1216. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1217. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Joseph J. Pickett; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Meyers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1219. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Apostolos Vasili Percas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Maryland:

H. R. 1220. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Maryland to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of James D. Sigler

and Frederick P. Vogelsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Eva Bilobran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1223. A bill for the relief of John A. Caneira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1224. A bill for the relief of William Redding and Mattie Lee Redding, legal heirs of Robert Lee Redding, Jr., deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of the Power Oil Co. and Leila McBride; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 1226. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

58. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 566 citizens of Harmony Township, Beaver County, Pa., requesting additional sugar allotments during the year 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

59. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Tioga County (Pa.) Masters and Lecturers Club urging Congress to pass legislation to prohibit and make illegal any time other than standard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 15, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"Dear Lord and Father of mankind,
Forgive our feverish ways;
Reclothe us in our rightful mind,
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence, praise.

"Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

Deliver us, O Lord, from the foolishness of impatience. Let us not be in such a hurry as to run on without Thee. We know that it takes a lifetime to make a tree; we know that fruit does not ripen in an afternoon, and Thou Thyself didst take a week to make the universe.

May we remember that it takes time to build the nation that can truly be called God's own country. It takes time to work out the kind of peace that will endure. It takes time to find out what we should do; what is right, and what is best.

Slow us down, O Lord, that we may take time to think, time to pray, and time to find out Thy will. Then give us the sense and the courage to do it, for the good of our country and the glory of Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 20, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. W. J. Hopkins, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa; Mr. GAMBLE, of New York: and Mr. PICKETT, of Texas, had been elected members of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The message also notified the Senate that Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa; Mr. BISHOP, of Illinois; Mr. LANDIS, of Indiana; Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey; and Mr. MEADE, of Maryland, had been elected members of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. SMITH of Virginia members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Speaker had appointed the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. DOUGHTON; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. CANNON members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. JUDD, Mr. RICH, Mr. HART, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. HUBER members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 381, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. BELL members of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WOODRUFF and Mr. COLMER members of the National Forest Reservation Commission on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. BLOOM directors of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. L, 360), the Speaker had appointed Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mrs. NORTON directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. MCCORMACK members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate, that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. SUNDSTROM, Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. BELL members of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and Other Improvements to the House Chamber on the part of the House.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46) continuing the authority for the investigation of the national defense program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Maryland, to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. Under the unanimous-consent agreement all time from the convening of the Senate until 2 o'clock is divided under the control of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. To whom do the Senators yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether in the allocation of time any preference is given as between the two sides in regard to opening and closing the debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to respond to that inquiry. The Chair would think that would have to be arranged between the

Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Maine, as we agreed, put on his first speaker, and he and I will confer further and see if we can work out a satisfactory unanimous-consent arrangement.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will ask for a quorum call at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. If there is a quorum call it ought to come out of the time of the other side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Maryland will yield, if there is a quorum call it will be taken out of the time of both sides equally, but unless the Senator from Maryland is agreeable, the Chair would not think it fair to ask for a roll call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, Mr. President, we will waive the roll call, and I yield time to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield 10 minutes to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has 10 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the importance of this particular issue has been exaggerated, and that the time devoted to it has been out of all proportion to the significance of the question involved. So far as I can see there is no moral issue, there is no other fundamental issue in the question whether or not the Senate shall continue a very successful special committee for another year until its task is completed.

I even see no vital issue in the question whether we shall have or shall not have special committees. From time immemorial the Senate has had special committees; from time immemorial it has been recognized that certain jobs are better done by special committees. Committees of the kind which are involved in this particular issue have been frequent instruments of the Senate. There was a committee on the conduct of the war during the Civil War. There was a special committee on the conduct of the war in the First World War. There is a special committee now, and until this time no one has ever questioned the desirability of such a special committee.

There are many activities which can be better carried on by special committees than by standing committees. Certainly the Democrats who are opposing the resolution now pending have used special committees frequently during the past 12 years, often very effectively, and properly.

On the question of past investigations, chairmen of standing committees have often not been particularly interested or concerned with what has occurred in the past, but are concerned with future legislation and with working out a constructive program rather than in making extensive studies of the past, which might be of great value, but which might not relate to the immediate purposes of the committee or its chairman.

During the past 2 or 3 years there has been a special Committee on Atomic Energy. The Senate felt that the question of atomic energy justified the creation of a special committee with a special staff, to make a special investigation. The responsibility of making the investigation could have been turned over to the Armed Service Committee, with a special staff, but the Senate chose not to do that.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky himself proposed a special committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster, and it was decided by the Senate, without the slightest doubt or question, that such an investigation should be made, so as to throw some light on past history, and give an example for the future, and that the investigation should be conducted by a special committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry; my time is limited.

There was the George postwar committee, to look into the question of postwar economic policy and planning, and the committee did valuable and effective work, cutting across the work of many other committees.

There was, above all, the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, the La Follette-Monroney committee, originally the Maloney committee, created under a resolution submitted by the late Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Maloney, who was such a distinguished Member of this body. The La Follette-Monroney special joint committee did work which probably never would have been accomplished by a standing committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer not to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. So, Mr. President, there is no question that the special committee has been recognized frequently as a perfectly proper weapon for the Senate to employ. In the instant case we do not have to consider the broad issue; the question we are considering is whether we will continue a particular special committee, a distinguished committee, a committee which was created under the leadership of a then distinguished Senator from Missouri, now the President of the United States. The former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, assumed the chairmanship following the elevation of Mr. Truman to the Vice Presidency and then the Presidency, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] succeeded Senator Mead. It is a committee which has made a record and has built up a staff for this particular work. It certainly is the most effective weapon which we could possibly have to investigate war contracts, which everyone agrees is a task which should be undertaken by an agency of the Senate of the United States. That is a much more limited question than might be involved in proposals to create new special committees. It seems to me we should reserve the right to create special committees, notwithstanding the fact that the power and privilege can be abused, and I think at times in the past it has been abused.

As I understand, the position of the minority now is that we should not permit the creation of special committees except under a suspension of the rules, requiring a two-thirds vote. In other words, the opponents of the resolution wish to deprive the majority party of a power over the procedure of the Senate which it has always exercised, and which it cannot exercise if a two-thirds vote is necessarily required to set up such an instrumentality for effective investigation. That was the provision of the La Follette-Monroney bill, which was wisely deleted by the House of Representatives. It has been said that I advocated and voted for the Reorganization Act. Of course I did. However, there were many things in the bill which I did not approve, as there always are in many bills. Obviously when Senators vote for a bill they do not necessarily approve every section in it. They always have the burden of balancing provisions that are good against those that are bad, of deciding if the bill contains more good things than bad. I felt then, and I feel now, that the La Follette-Monroney act as a whole has established a procedure which will contribute tremendously to the effective operation of the Congress, but certainly there can be no violation of the spirit of a particular provision for which the Senate voted but which was eliminated from the bill by the House. The fact that Senators voted for the bill with the provision in it does not necessarily commit them in any way or commit anybody in any way to that particular provision, which was not in the bill when it was finally passed, and is not today the law of the United States. Under such circumstances I cannot understand how it can be said that the pending proposal violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act. There is no such thing as a spirit in something which has not been enacted. The legislative enactment is before the Senate, and Senators can determine its terms. It does not in any way prohibit special committees. It leaves Congress free to act as it desires to act.

I think that special committees should be to some extent restricted, and we have been considering methods and means of bringing about such a restriction. I do not think they ought to be restricted by requiring a two-thirds vote for a suspension of the rules; I certainly should oppose such a proposal if it came before the Senate.

I intend, Mr. President, to submit a resolution to be referred to the Rules and Administration Committee, which will set forth my personal ideas of the kind of rule we ought to have:

Resolved, That rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"3. Whenever a bill or resolution is introduced providing for the creation of a special Senate committee or a special joint committee for the purpose of considering any subject, such bill or resolution shall be referred to the standing committee or committees of the Senate having jurisdiction of the subject matter or matters to be dealt with by such special committee. In case such bill or resolution is reported favorably by such standing committee of the Senate, it shall be referred to the Committee on

Rules and Administration, which committee shall not approve said bill or resolution unless, in its opinion, the creation of such special committee is in the interest of efficient, orderly, and economical procedure in the Senate."

I submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 64) submitted by Mr. Taft was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Democratic majority, now the minority, have used special committees for the last 12 years. They have used them as a very effective weapon for the successful operation of the Senate in accordance with the policy of the Senate. Today they come before us, saying, "This is a wicked procedure. We have repented. We are sorry we made use of special committees. We now contend, since the Republicans have obtained control of the Congress, that no more special committees should be created."

I cannot understand any possible reason for the present attitude of the minority of the Senate, except a desire to hamper and reduce the effectiveness of the investigation of war contracts. I see no other reasonable ground for the opposition to the pending resolution.

I am not particularly fond of special committees; certainly I shall try to limit them as far as possible in every way and discourage their creation; but the Senate for years has recognized there is a proper field of work for special committees, and if there is such a field there certainly is proper ground for continuing an existing committee, with an existing staff, an existing personnel, trained to do a particular job, and capable of doing it more effectively than can any new committee that may be organized, or any new committee that might undertake to take over the work, the personnel, and the spirit of the existing special committee.

It seems to me that the only possible ground for opposition to a continuation of this special committee is the fear of the minority that the investigation conducted by it will produce results which in some way may injure their political future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss this issue, but in view of developments I feel that I should not remain silent. In view of the limited time, I shall not be privileged to yield to any of my colleagues.

Mr. President, partisanship and party allegiance have a proper place in political actions and in legislative and administrative affairs in any democracy. There are times, issues, and attending circumstances where and when partisanship may well be exercised by any Member of the Congress without betraying any obligation, violating any conscience, or doing any disservice to the best interests and welfare of the Nation. In such instances, Mr. President, party allegiance and obedience are doubtless commendable virtues rising above warranted censure or criticism. But partisanship can be, and is sometimes, abused and indulged in for temporary expediency on the erroneous theory and assumption that the political ends desired justify the employment of such means for their achievement.

Such motivation and conduct can hardly be appraised and is seldom esteemed by the great majority of American citizens as being a high standard of statesmanship. Crossing party lines in support or in defense of a principle is not a grievous error, nor is it an unpardonable sin with the masses of our people in either of our major political parties. During the 4 years I have served in this body I have sometimes hesitated, but never refused, to cross party lines and vote with my colleagues across the aisle when convinced that the issue or measure before us was of such importance that it transcended purely partisan political considerations. I shall likely do so again whenever the situation warrants it.

The issue now before the Senate would hardly permit differences of opinion, except that partisanship obviously has been injected into consideration of it. The purpose of both the original resolution and the pending substitute amendment are to authorize and direct the continuation of an investigation into the conduct of certain designated phases of the national defense program. The original idea of such an investigation was conceived by a former Democratic member of this body, who has since become and is now President of the United States. It was President Truman, then Senator Truman, who secured adoption of the resolution creating the special committee that has conducted the investigation thus far. That special committee expired with the Seventy-ninth Congress. Obviously, Mr. President, the special committee was a creation of a Democratic Senate, charged with the duty of investigating and examining into specific affairs and business of Government conducted by the War Department of a Democratic administration.

I believe it is conceded by everyone that the late special committee with a Democratic majority, along with Republican members of the committee, proceeded with its work and conducted its affairs on a nonpartisan basis and rendered a valuable and high quality of national service to our Government and to the people. The old special committee had a stupendous task and was unable, in the exercise of due diligence to finish the job. Surely, most of us are in accord that the work begun by the special committee should be completed. The purposes and objectives of the investigation are not in dispute, but contention has arisen over the means, and the particular instrumentality the Senate shall employ in continuing and completing this important work.

For many years past, Mr. President, and especially since the national emergency and during the war period, the practice was freely indulged by both the House and the Senate to set up and create, by resolution, special committees for conducting studies and investigations into many subjects and many activities of Government. This practice was deemed necessary and followed because jurisdiction of regular standing committees was not adequately defined nor appropriate machinery made available to regular committees to carry on such studies and investigations. The result was, Mr. President, that this practice of setting up special committees grew to such proportions and was overindulged to the extent that it was grossly abused, and the number of such special committees created became, in many instances, a burden and a liability rather than an asset to the Congress. These special committees frequently proved extravagant, involved a duplication of effort and waste of time, and often detracted from orderly procedure and impaired congressional efficiency. That, Mr. President, was one of the substantial reasons for the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act at the last session of Congress. That act was given enthusiastic bipartisan support and was heralded by many Members of this body, among the Democrats and also by Republicans on the other side of the aisle, and by most of the public press and news commentators, as a great reform in legislative procedure. Its qualities and virtues were highly commended, and its enactment was acclaimed as a monumental achievement.

While the Reorganization Act does not specifically prohibit the creation of special committees, it was certainly contemplated by all its advocates and supporters, that with the jurisdiction, duty, and authority of the reorganized standing committees clearly defined, the creation of special investigating committees would be obviated and rendered unnecessary. This implication under the terms and provisions of the Reorganization Act and the history associated with its development and enactment is inescapable.

Both the letter and the spirit of the act strongly counsel against such practices, and in my opinion, such practices should not now be renewed nor indulged in except in very extreme and extraordinary situations and circumstances. Such an extreme or extraordinary situation, Mr. President, does not now by any stretch of the imagination exist. One of the regular standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, has specific and full jurisdiction of the subject matter involved in both the Brewster amendment and the Tydings substitute amendment now pending before us. This regular standing committee is charged with the duty of "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Mr. President, the personnel of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments and the competency and capabilities of its membership to

perform the duties with which the committee is charged under the law, I think it can be said, compare favorably with those of any other standing committee of this body. The experiences, abilities, and qualifications of the majority membership of this committee, I dare say, will compare most favorably with those of the majority membership of any special committee that could be named. Why, then, Mr. President, this concerted and determined effort on the part of the majority party to compel the establishing of a special committee to do this job when a regular standing committee is already created, is in existence, and is now ready, willing, and able to perform this function? Why, Mr. President, is the Republican majority of the Senate so anxious to abandon and depart so quickly from a rule of conduct and procedure that it so recently acclaimed as a great legislative reform? Why is this assault being made by the Republican majority on the Reorganization Act before the ink of its printing has hardly dried? The answer, Mr. President, is obvious, and the reasons advanced in this debate by our friends on the other side of the aisle are trivial indeed.

The argument that a special committee can do the job better does not have sufficient force to give it either persuasion or influence, because no evidence can be given to support that position and no facts can be produced to sustain it. So, Mr. President, it appears that the strongest purpose back of the insistence for a special committee is political in character and the advantage to be gained, if any, will be of doubtful value.

The Republican majority has the power, in numbers, to force the creation of the proposed special committee, but associated with that margin of power now temporarily enjoyed by the Republican Party in this body, goes the full responsibility and accountability for the consequences that will ensue if the special committee procedure is adopted.

At 2 o'clock today, Mr. President, when we vote, a precedent will be established, a precedent that will wield an influence of long standing, a precedent that will in effect divest a regular standing committee of this body of powers and duties conferred upon it by law, a precedent which, if followed, will initiate anew a procedure and practice that has heretofore been condemned by the membership of both parties, and the evil of which the Reorganization Act was designed to correct. Whatever others may do, Mr. President, I shall vote today to preserve the spirit, the force, and the integrity of the Reorganization Act. Others may cast stones at it, if they will, and strike a blow that will mar, efface, and weaken the structure of this edifice of legislative reform; but I am unwilling, Mr. President, either to disregard or to discard the principles and purposes and objectives for which it was enacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield me one more minute?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, I am unwilling to cast my vote so as to reflect upon the competency and integrity of any of my colleagues who are members of that committee. I am unwilling to evade or shirk any responsibility that membership on this committee imposes; and I am unwilling to abdicate and transfer to others the power, authority, duty, and responsibility which, under the law, rightfully belong to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that, as a new Member of the Senate, I inject myself into the debate at the present time, but I believe there are a couple of points which should be made clear before the vote is taken. The matter of continuing the work of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program involves two questions to be decided by this body. First, should the labors of the committee be completed and a summary of its work be made available to the Senate; and, second, if the work is to be continued, what committee or agency is best adapted to complete it?

In the first instance it is apparent that the Senate wants the work completed and the results made available for future consideration, and, second, if that be true, then since the regularly constituted Committee on Rules and Administration, made up of a bipartisan membership, has considered the resolution, heard the evidence, and submitted a recommendation that the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program be continued in order to complete the work, the matter is settled so far as I am concerned.

It is simply, in my estimation, a routine organization matter of this body and has already been given more attention and time than should have been devoted to one phase of organization in view of the important business confronting the Congress of the United States.

The past week's debate has furnished considerable time for reflection. I find that the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program was created on March 1, 1941, as a peacetime committee, apparently to consider unusual expenditures in connection with national defense. Second, that there has been a total of $750,000 appropriated and devoted to this work. Third, that there are more than 240 file drawers full of data and information pertinent to war expenditures covering nearly every phase of the work and nearly every area in the world.

It is apparent on the face of it that there is not time available for a regularly constituted committee of this body to review more than 240 file drawers of data and information and become sufficiently familiar with the subject matters then to complete the work of the committee and summarize it for the use of the Senate within the year and at the same time undertake the increased duties of the regular committees which now include anywhere from three to six or seven of the former major committees.

Fourth, we find upon investigation that following World War I a total of 32 committee were engaged in the business of investigating what happened during that Great War, and they conducted a total of 101 investigations. These 32 committees included 12 regular Senate committees, 1 select committee, 11 House regular committees with 3 select committees and 5 joint committees. The resolution approved by the regularly constituted Committee on Rules and Administration of this body confines the investigation to one experienced committee.

I repeat, Mr. President, that there are two questions facing this body neither of which should have consumed the time that has been used in debate upon the subject. First, should the work be completed and summarized for the use of the Members of this body, and, second, if it should be completed, what committee is best equipped through experience to handle the job. The Committee on Rules and Administration has answered that question in the regular course of business, and so far as I am concerned, I shall vote for the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Maine yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BREWSTER. The time of the Senator from Maryland is now running.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall take 10 minutes of the time assigned to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized on the theory that he has the permission of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Chair that that is the case.

Mr. President, as one who served on the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, I wish to express my deep regret that the pending question appears about to be resolved upon strictly a party and partisan basis. I regret that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in his argument for the continuance of this committee, should have pitched his remarks purely upon a partisan basis. If I correctly understood the argument of the Senator from Ohio, it was to the effect that because we have had special committees in the past, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, we should disregard the Reorganization Act of 1946 and continue a practice which has been assailed by Members on both sides of the aisle as rendering standing committees impotent; that we should disregard that salutary provision of the Reorganization Act which provides that each and every standing committee shall follow up the activities of the executive department in executing the laws which it recommends and follow the expenditures which are made pursuant to legislative appropriation. He would wipe away with an airy wave of the hand, the greatest reform in legislative procedure ever adopted by the Congress.

The argument of the Senator from Ohio is made in absolute disregard of the Reorganization Act of 1946, and indicates that the pending resolution is but the beginning of a plethora of resolutions for special committees which will

strike down that act and deny the people of the Nation its benefits. When Senators vote for Senate Resolution 46 they stand naked and defenseless against the stream of resolutions which will follow, and which will be based upon arguments as sound as, or sounder than, those which are made here today in behalf of this special committee.

If I were seeking mere political advantage, I would be content to see the Republican majority seize upon this resolution as a spearhead for this stream of resolutions. I doubt if Senators realize the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of independent voters in this Nation who are greatly interested in the Reorganization Act, and who will lament to see inaugurated this whittling process which will result in its destruction.

Be that as it may, when the tocsin is sounded by the Senator from Ohio for all Republicans to rally around and recreate this special committee, I point out that the question has not heretofore been handled upon a partisan basis. It should not be decided here today upon a partisan basis.

After the passing of the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, I was appointed a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It so happened that the committee had not organized, and that on that committee I was the senior member of the party in power at that time, the Democratic Party. Under the ordinary rules of partisan advantage, I was entitled to the chairmanship of that committee. I conceived, however, that this greatly needed reform transcended party lines. I had sat here for 14 years and had seen standing committees of the Senate helpless to function because of the great encumbrance of special committees. Though I was entitled to that chairmanship, I nominated and supported the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, who was not of my political faith, to serve as chairman. There was not a hint of partisanship in any of the deliberations of the committee. When the reorganization bill reached the floor of the Senate it was not considered a partisan measure; and in this body and in the other body some of the strongest speeches made for that measure were made by members of the Republican Party, which was then in the minority, as well as by some of us who belonged to the then majority.

Mr. President, I would regret to see this infant of congressional reorganization strangled and stifled while it is still in its swaddling clothes, merely because of partisan considerations. My remarks are made without any reflection upon the members of the special committee. I believe that they did a good job. I know that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] can be counted upon to pursue all investigations with unremitting zeal and unflagging energy. But I take the position that this resolution should not be adopted, because I know that it will result in the destruction of the best features of the Reorganization Act. The act sought to vest in the standing committees the power to follow through. It was not only a matter of saving time of Senators, not only a question of relieving the heads of agencies from trying to appear before three or four committees at once. The theory was that legislation should originate with the standing committees, and that the standing committees are entitled to the benefit of investigations, in order that they may draft appropriate and salutary legislation.

Mr. President, I have been amazed to hear eminent Senators say that they were supporting this resolution because of the experience of those who had heretofore been members of the special committee. In the course of the debate they have been driven to that argument as practically the last and only argument remaining to them. They say they are supporting the resolution because of the experience of members of the special committee. They say that such experience has not been enjoyed by members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That is the most specious argument I have heard fall from such distinguished lips in a great many years. Exactly the same argument could be made in behalf of all nine or ten special committees which encumbered this body in the previous Congress. It matters not what is the subject matter; when the resolution is introduced the same argument applies. Senators may have adopted it as a time-saving device, so that they will not be required to write new speeches. A Senator may say, "I am a great friend of the reorganization of Congress. I supported the bill, and I would do nothing to violate the spirit of the act. But in this case, because of the special experience of the members of the special committee, I think we ought to make an exception and continue it."

On the subject of a resolution to continue some other special committee a Senator could strike out the words "Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program," and in the case of the Small Business Committee, which follows in its wake, he could insert the words "Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises" and say, "I am a great friend of the reorganization of Congress. I supported the bill, and I would do nothing to violate its spirit. But in this case, because of the special experience of members of the Small Business Committee, I am constrained to vote to continue its existence."

The same thing will happen in the case of the special silver committee, the special wool committee, the special oil committee, and others in the list of nine or ten. All that it is necessary to do is to strike out the name of the committee in the speech and insert a different name, and every argument, and such alleged validity as it may possess will apply to the other special committees. Not only will it apply to the committees which have been in existence but it could be applied to the creation of new special committees.

Suppose, for example, that a great plague were to assail cattle in the United States; suppose the cattle tick were to attack every herd in the Nation; assume that we had in this body Senator Blank, who had made a great record in his own State in investigating, pursuing, and eliminating the cattle tick. Perhaps Senator Blank had not been so fortunate as to be appointed on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A special resolution could be offered for the creation of a special committee to combat the ravages and avert the catastrophe of the cattle tick; and Senators could, with as good faith and as sound logic as is here displayed, rise and say, "Of course, I am for the Reorganization Act. I am for its spirit, and I supported it when it was before the Senate. But we are now in the majority. Before the reorganization bill was passed there was a special cattle-tick committee back in 1906 or 1907. We have in this body a great Senator, Senator Blank, a man who has investigated, pursued, and eliminated the cattle tick in his home State. He is not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so we will create a special committee for Senator Blank, to utilize his vast experience in striking down and destroying the pest which is assailing the cattle of the Nation."

I resent the statement and the implication that those of us who are adhering to the spirit of the Reorganization Act are afraid of investigations being continued. I believe in investigations; I think they have a salutary effect; but I do not concede that all the probity and ability in this body are focused in any two or three Senators. I believe that a better job can be done by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Members of that committee may not be so accustomed to the glare of the spotlight as are Senators on the special committee, but they will go into this matter thoroughly. If I thought that men who have profited unduly while our boys were dying overseas would go unwhipped of justice I would support the resolution, but I believe that justice will be administered and the spirit of the Reorganization Act will be maintained by a vote to preserve the spirit of the Reorganization Act, and I shall so vote. The act is too important to the welfare of the Nation to be nullified for partisan purposes. It is entitled to a fair chance before being whittled away and emasculated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is extremely difficult, particularly for a new Senator, to cast any light on a subject which has been so thoroughly swallowed and digested, considered, argued, and debated for approximately 2 weeks, but perhaps it will do no harm to express one or two thoughts for the purpose of further reflection, emphasis, and consideration.

As one who has not been a Member of this distinguished body for very long,

I take it that the Senate is in full agreement on certain questions now being considered. In the first place, I believe the Senate understands and knows and feels that America wants the investigation of our national-defense program to continue. It seems self-evident and obvious to me that many of the few among the public who hesitate to encourage a continuation of the investigations are those who themselves are frightened at investigations of graft, corruption, and connivance. Every Member of the Senate knows that America wants the investigation to proceed.

Secondly, I take it to be a fact that, being a reflection, as we are, of the very best among our own citizenry, this Senate likewise wants the investigation to continue.

Thirdly, it seems to me that every Senator, be he a Democrat or a Republican, wants the investigation to go forward at the earliest possible moment.

Those are fields of discussion upon which all of us are in agreement. However, obviously there is a bone of serious differences of opinion and disagreement on the question by whom and in what manner the investigations concerning graft, corruption, connivance, and other vicious misdeeds of one character or another shall be conducted. Those who support the contention that the special committee should and must be continued feel, as I feel, speaking particularly for myself as a new Senator, that the special committee has done a good job in the past and that it can and will do a better job in the future. Those who seriously, thoughtfully, and honestly disagree with that premise maintain that a standing committee which has had placed upon it a great task of reorganization can accomplish in better fashion what all of us know has been accomplished in able fashion by the special committee under discussion. Here we have the only argument and disagreement between our two opposing forces.

Mr. President, on this matter I can speak for no other Senator on either side, but, as for myself, I take sturdy if not violent exception to some of the negative arguments which have supported the case of those distinguished Senators who think a standing committee is better qualified to do this job than is the special committee, the continuation of which we are now considering as we are drawing toward a vote. They have said, and have repeated it a thousand times, it seems to me, beginning a week ago last Monday, that if this special committee is to be given continuing or new life an epidemic of special committees will break out. Although I know not the background of all the Members of the Senate, that contention seems to me to be utterly lacking in logic, for the simple reason that in the future no special committees can be created except by the Members of this distinguished body. If an epidemic of special committees breaks out the American people can hold responsible for that outbreak those alone who have made it possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired. Does the Senator from Maine yield further time to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, a second argument which, to my point of view is untenable, is that if continued life is granted to this special committee, it becomes life in perpetuity. I see no more logic to that than to the contention just mentioned. The actual request is that continuing life be granted for the period of a single year, following which the same men who granted the extension will consider terminating it.

Finally, Mr. President, the argument has been advanced by men for whom I have a considerable and deep-seated respect, that if the special committee is continued the future of this magnificent and only body of its kind on the face of the earth will be jeopardized. To me such fear implies in the Senate a degree of futility, a degree of uncertainty, a degree of lack of moral courage, and a degree of incompetence that no normal, average, typical American citizen can accept for a single minute.

As an individual, beginning at 2 o'clock, when my chance comes, I shall cast an affirmative vote for the continuance for 1 year of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program because of the pressing need for positive action and because, from my point of view, the proposal makes good, sound common sense.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, it seems to me that there has been a very studied effort on behalf of the newspaper columnists and radio commentators who act as though they were the publicity representatives of the Republican Party to convince the American people that the minority who are opposing the continuance of the special committee are doing so because they fear an investigation. I was indeed disappointed to hear the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] join the group of men and women who have been writing stories of that kind for the last 2 weeks. I think it cannot be too clearly emphasized that we on this side of the aisle want to have made such an investigation as will uncover every single crook there may possibly be who has taken advantage of the Treasury of the United States in the prosecution of World War II.

Mr. President, why should not we feel that way? We remember the First World War, and we remember the nonpartisan way in which it was conducted. We remember the investigating committees which grew out of that war, and we remember very well the fact that as a result of their activities not a single scandal in the conduct of that great conflict was disclosed. We remember, Mr. President, that after the investigations were completed, with the help and assistance of the then minority Senators, out of the experience which they gained they went forth and were able to pick up and search out and convict the crooks of the Harding administration, who came from the State now so eminently represented by the leader of his party, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Oh, yes; we remember the Department of Justice. We remember the Veterans' Administration. We remember the raping of the country's oil reserves. We remember, too, that when the dark clouds of 1940 were gathering over this land, be it ever said to the credit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt that he selected Henry L. Stimson, an eminent Republican, to be his Secretary of War, and Frank Knox, another eminent Republican, to be his Secretary of the Navy—two distinguished Americans whose patriotism, integrity, and honorable reputations have not been surpassed in our time. Frank Knox was the Vice-Presidential candidate of his party in 1936. It was under those gentlemen and under their supervision and that of the now great Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, who is also a Republican, who then was Under Secretary of War, that the $400,000,000,000 were spent in fighting the war.

Mr. President, we, of the minority, want to have investigations made. We want investigations made of the War Production Board, and not because we know that 98 percent of the personnel of that outfit were Republicans. We know of the great concerns that got the large war contracts, concerns such as the Chrysler Corp., General Motors, United States Steel, the Sun Shipbuilding Co., the airplane companies, and other industrial organizations that are officered by the "fat cats" of the Republican Party. Mr. President, Senators on the other side of the aisle should not think for a moment that the minority will fail to see to it that some of the "fat cats" will take a trip to the gold-fish bowl along with the little fellows, until we find exactly where the Government's money went.

So, Mr. President, we are determined upon the investigation, and we are determined to make it complete. We want it made by the committee which should make it, namely, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield me a little further time?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MCMAHON. I should like to call attention to the fact that the chairman of the former Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], stated that the former chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program had appealed to him for more money, and stated to him that the investigation then being made by his special committee would then come to a close. On the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]; and neither of those eminent Senators, so far as I can ascertain, protested against the proposed termination at that time of the Special Committee To Investigate

the National Defense Program, or said, "We cannot permit that committee to cease."

I should also like to call attention to the fact that the Senators on the other side of the aisle who voted to abolish special committees did so when the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program was in full life and existence, and they did so with the knowledge that they were cutting off the very committee which they now seek to perpetuate.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against continuing the existence of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, because I refuse to say to the American people——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield; I do not have the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I refuse to say to the American people that I voted for the congressional reorganization bill simply to get a raise in pay and to obtain the benefits of a pension system, and that now at the first opportunity I shall plunge a knife into the vitals of the Reorganization Act and let the Congress of the United States sink back into its former way of doing things. We voted to change all that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

The Senator from Maine has 35 minutes remaining. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe I have 29½ minutes remaining, Mr. President.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, 5 minutes will be more than sufficient.

I shall speak very briefly as one of the 15,000,000 men who took part in the fighting of World War II. I do not speak for them, but I speak as one of them. I had not planned to speak today, but yesterday afternoon and last evening I spent approximately 3 hours at one of the veterans' hospitals. I spent that time talking to some of my friends who are permanently crippled and disabled. Rather than to speak for myself today in the Senate, I should like to repeat a few of the words that some of those men spoke to me.

One young man, a marine with both legs amputated, said—I shall try to quote him as nearly verbatim as I can: "When we were in the islands and the days were especially rough and the number of dead and injured mounted, and you would lie there at night and listen to the moan of the jungle on the one side and the music of the sea on the other, then the veil between life and death became very, very thin, and very often your good friends who had died that day were much nearer to you than those who still lived, and we knew then and know now that many of those men died because of the graft and corruption which the Senate proposes to investigate."

Another of those men said to me: "What are you gentlemen up there thinking of? You are the body who voted us into the war. Now why do you object to investigating the graft and corruption which occurred during that war?"

I tried to explain that to them, Mr. President. I explained to them that a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle have maintained long and vigorously that they want the war activities investigated and want all those who have been guilty of graft and corruption and criminal incompetence uncovered and punished, but they now say: "We do not want this job done by men who are trained in that type of work; we do not want it done by a committee which is experienced in that work; we want that work done by a new group of men—men equally competent but totally inexperienced."

Then a young chap from Texas made what I thought was a very good comment on that point. He said: "That puts me in mind of having the enemy ask us, before we went into combat, to replace all our trained personnel with an equal number of incompetent and untrained personnel." He said: "If we had done that during the war, I wonder who would have won the war."

Mr. President, I have been told that a great number of the Senators on the other side of the aisle are going to vote for the Tydings amendment, which, as all of us know, will, to say the least, postpone this war investigation for a considerable period of time, if not completely hamstring it. I hesitate to believe that many Senators on the other side of the aisle will vote for that amendment. I think, and I sincerely hope, that a great number of them will join with us in telling the wives and the mothers of the 250,000 men who died during the war—I hope they will join with us in telling the legless and sightless—that not one single individual who was guilty of graft and corruption which may have directly led to the death or wounding of an American soldier, sailor, or marine, will be able, because of delay and procrastination, to escape the just consequences of his acts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I intend to cast my vote for the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], providing that the war investigation shall be continued, but continued by a regular standing committee of this body. Because it is apparent that I am not in accord with many Senators on this side of the aisle, I wish briefly to explain my position.

In the first place, I think it is clear that there is no question, in connection with the pending amendment, as to whether or not the war investigation shall be continued or shall not be continued. The amendment which I support provides expressly that it shall be continued. I believe there is an obligation upon the Senate to continue and complete the investigation.

Speaking for myself, I hope that in the course of the investigation, every abuse which was committed during the past years may be disclosed, and that every wrongdoer, particularly those who have held positions of trust, may be discovered and may be punished.

However, I do not believe that the obligation which has been imposed upon the Senate, extends itself to an obligation to designate a certain special committee, composed of certain Senators, to conduct the investigation. For that reason I feel that this vote is no test of fidelity to any program of our party for the enactment of legislation. Rather, I believe the investigation should be continued, but if there is a question as to the committee which should conduct the investigation, I believe that it should be decided in accordance with the rule of the Senate.

I do not attempt to say that I understand all the background of the Reorganization Act, but from reading it, and from reading the report of the committee which considered it, and from listening to the debates in this Chamber, I cannot escape the conclusion that one of its declared purposes is that, in the interest of economy, not only of money, but of the time of the Members of the Senate, the work of the Senate shall be done by its regular standing committees unless it can be conclusively established that they cannot perform the particular task.

I would not take the narrow viewpoint that a special committee cannot be established, because that would defeat and hinder the work of the Senate. If in this instance, it had been clearly established that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would not undertake the task, or that, having undertaken it, would not complete it, or that its work would be obstructed in any way, I should certainly then vote for the continuation of the special committee.

I will go further. I believe that above all is the obligation to make an investigation of the war. When this vote is cast, if the Senate should determine that it is not its wish that investigation should be made by a regular standing committee, believing that the investigation of the war is preeminent, I shall not lend my vote to further delaying such an investigation but shall vote for the continuation of the special committee.

Strong argument has been made upon the ground of continuity, which I think has force, but I believe that argument has been met to a great degree. I think of another question of continuity which I think is more objective. One of the most important questions which will come before the Congress is that of determining the size, character, and function of our armed forces in the future.

I submit that determination of these questions will affect our fiscal policy, our national defense, and have its relation

to international affairs. The investigation of the conduct of the recent war will develop information of great value to the standing committees which will consider these questions. Looking to the future, I think it is important that this valuable information be developed by a regular standing committee, whose services and aid to other committees and to this body will always be available, rather than by a special committee of limited duration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have one more minute?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield the Senator another minute.

Mr. COOPER. Finally, it may be of importance to no one except the present speaker, but it seems to me, speaking from the viewpoint of one coming recently from the outside, that one of the most disturbing factors we have seen during the past 13 years has been the ignoring of rules of law, and sometimes an actual contempt of those rules, by some of those who were a part of the Government itself. For myself, I should like to uphold in this body, when I can, rules of law.

Mr. President, because of these considerations, and with some regret, from a personal viewpoint, considering my colleagues on this side, I shall cast my vote for the pending amendment providing that the war investigation shall be continued by the Committee on Executive Expenditures.

Mr. BREWSTER. I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote on the pending resolution relative to the continuation of the War Investigating Committee. I rather doubt that at this late hour many votes are going to be changed on either side of the aisle by remarks which may be made here today; but briefly, and summing up, I should like to review the situation as I see it.

Certainly there will be no violation of the La Follette-Monroney Act by the extension or continuation of the War Investigating Committee. It has been pointed out heretofore that the specific provision which would have prevented special committees was taken out of the reorganization bill in the House of Representatives, and that the Senate itself concurred in that action. Therefore, so far as the legal situation is concerned, and so far as any spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act may be concerned, the Senate is on adequate and sound ground in continuing the committee.

The second point which has been raised is that by continuing this one committee the door will be opened for the creation of many other committees, and that that might tend to defeat the purpose or the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act. I merely say, on that point, that as a member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I certainly would not consider that the adoption of the pending resolution, for the continuation of the War Investigating Committee, would be any precedent justifying opening the door for the creation of many other special committees. I think each committee must stand on its own feet, depending upon the need for it. There may be times in the future when the Senate in its wisdom will feel that it is desirable that another special committee be created, but certainly I do not believe that there will be any opening of the door to the wholesale creation of committees because the Senate may continue the present War Investigating Committee.

I think we must also consider whether the special committee has done effective work in the past. I do not believe there can be any doubt on either side of the aisle that during the long period of years, some five or six, the committee has been in existence, it has contributed to the national good. Under the leadership of the present President of the United States, under the leadership of the former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, under the leadership of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and now under the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the committee has had a record of contributing a great deal to the national welfare. I believe there is constructive work it can do in the future which needs to be done.

It has been said that by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland and the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, the records and the files can be turned over to a standing committee. I pointed out last week that, in most instances, the standing committees have not as yet been adequately organized and staffed, and that with the tremendous budget of over thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars proposed by the President the committee so ably headed by the Senator from Vermont will have enough to keep it busy watching the expenditures in the executive departments of the thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars, or whatever amount shall be appropriated, without going into the field of past expenditures.

Second, the discussion about the transfer of records and staffs loses sight of the fact that when a team that has been working together over a period of time is disbanded and its records turned over to a group unfamiliar with them and unacquainted with the background, even if they diligently pursue the matter, it will be 60 or 90 days or more before they acquire the momentum which the War Investigating Committee has at the present time.

It is my opinion that, if the country and the Congress of the United States desire an investigation of corruption, war profits, and profiteering, and if the Senate really desires it to be done, the War Investigating Committee should be continued.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the point to which I address myself was referred to during a colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan, appearing at page 455 of the RECORD of January 20, 1947. I desire to call it to the attention of the Senate for the benefit of some of those who were not present during the discussion on that afternoon, since it demonstrates rather conclusively the answer to any suggestions as to either the spirit or the letter of the Reorganization Act.

This arose as the result of a question which had been raised on the floor. I quote the language of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]:

> The able Senator from Illinois referred to my record on the Reorganization Act with great kindness and hopefulness. He indicated, however, that, on the basis of the record, unless I declined to approve an extension of this special committee, I would not be in harmony with my original position.
>
> I know the Senator would not wish to do the RECORD any injustice and, therefore, with his permission, I should like to call his attention to the remainder of my colloquy with the able former Senator from Wisconsin, on the same page of the RECORD from which he read.

The Senator from Michigan then quoted from the RECORD of those days. I quote:

> I think this is one of the few places in the bill where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin.

Speaking of the question of special committees. He goes on:

> I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees.
>
> To which—

Again quoting from the RECORD—

> the able Senator from Wisconsin, the author of the bill, replied:
>
> "I grant that point, and have conceded it in the brief time we have been able to devote to the consideration of the bill today."

The Senator went on further to emphasize that the only distinction is between whether we operate by a suspension of the rules or by a majority vote; which, as is recognized on all sides today, is within the full power and scope of this body.

No matter of principle is involved, but simply the question of how the desired result should be effectuated, and whether there seems to be in the situation here presented reasons why a special committee should continue with the consideration of this matter.

The elimination of the provision regarding special committees from the reorganization bill before its enactment certainly removes any question as to the letter of the law, and the discussion and colloquy between the Senator from Michigan and the former Senator from Wisconsin, the distinguished author of the act, and chairman, incidentally, of the special committee and joint committee that alone made possible the enactment of this very legislation, made it perfectly clear that both Senators recognized the propriety and the possibility of situa-

tions arising which would indicate the desirability of a special committee.

Whether or not this situation is of that character, it would not be for me as one of those concerned to say; but it seems to me conclusively demonstrated that to wave the flag of "the spirit and the letter" of the Reorganization Act is not warranted either by the law or by the discussions that went on between those who were most closely associated with the formulation of the reorganization legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Maine that if any other Senator on his side of the question is now available, I should appreciate it if he will yield to him at this time

Mr. BREWSTER. I think I have proceeded far.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well; I yield 5 minutes or 6 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago in a speech on the floor of the Senate I set forth eight reasons why I thought the Senate of the United States should refrain from appointing special committees, except under the most extraordinary circumstances.

I said on that occasion I thought the burden of proof rested on those favoring continuation of the Brewster committee to show clearly that such extraordinary factors exist in this situation as to justify having the war-contract investigation conducted by a special committee instead of by a subcommittee of a standing committee.

I now wish to say that in my judgment those who favor the continuation of the Brewster committee have not sustained their burden of proof for the following reasons: First, I point out that it was generally agreed by many on this side of the aisle as well as on the other side that the Brewster committee should not have the extensive jurisdiction to investigate any issue that it desired to investigate in regard to the prosecution of the war. It is well known that the Brewster committee sought at the beginning of this Congress to cross the jurisdictional lines of several standing committees, but there were many objections raised by Members, particularly of the Armed Services Committee. Hence the representatives of the Brewster committee—and let us be frank about it—sought out and obtained an arrangement with certain Members on this side of the aisle, who are members of the Armed Services Committee, that they would not exercise jurisdiction over certain issues falling within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

When they laid down that principle of entering into arrangements for votes, Mr. President, then I say their case fell, because they thereby demonstrated that in order to get the necessary votes to continue the Brewster committee, they were perfectly willing to limit their jurisdiction as to certain standing committees but not to others. After that arrangement they knew that they did not have to enter into similar arrangements with other standing committees because having the votes to pass their resolution they did not have to work out such an arrangement.

I say that is an unfortunate principle and practice for us to condone here today by continuing this committee. Further, I believe that the Brewster committee ought to investigate, if it is going to continue, any and all war contracts suspected of the taint of fraud and corruption, no matter where they may reach in their influence. If an investigation of fraud and corruption needs to be made outside of the United States, then it should be made by a single committee and not by several. Hence I am not interested in continuing the committee on the basis of the principle of approving of its practice of trading jurisdiction for votes.

The second point I desire to make, Mr. President, is that I wish the people of the United States to know that by voting against the continuation of the Brewster committee I am not voting against a continuation of the investigation of war contracts. On the contrary, I wish to see a thorough investigation of war frauds. I wish to see brought to the light of day the fraud and corruption which I am satisfied are inherent in many war contracts. I desire those responsible for such misdeeds to be brought to the bar of justice.

However, I say, Mr. President, that a subcommittee of the standing committee headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is just as competent and able to conduct and continue that investigation as is the Brewster committee. I do not argue that the Aiken committee is more competent, but I do contend that it is of equal competence in all respects to the Brewster committee.

The record also discloses that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments notified the Senate that if a subcommittee is allowed to conduct the war-frauds investigation, the man who will be in charge of that investigation will be the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. A finer, a more able, a more competent investigator does not exist in the Senate of the United States. He is now on the Brewster committee. Hence I think it most unfortunate that the impression is being given to the people of the United States that an investigation of war frauds will not proceed with maximum efficiency and effectiveness unless it is done by the Brewster committee.

I further point out, Mr. President, that this Brewster committee that the Senate is now being asked to continue is a 10-man committee, 4 of whose members are yet to be appointed. It is, as of today, only a six-man committee, and some of those six are men who have had relatively short service on the committee.

Let us be frank about another thing. We do not need a 10-man committee to conduct an investigation such as the one proposed. You and I know, Mr. President, that in these investigations, after all, the greatest load of work is carried by hired expert investigators on the staff of a committee. They do most of the work. Senators for the most part only direct it. What does one find if one attends the meetings and the hearings of many committees? One frequently finds that not even half the committee membership is present in the meetings of many of our Senate committees. I think it is a mistake to give the impression that we need a special 10-man committee to conduct this proposed investigation.

I make one other point before I close, Mr. President, and that is from the standpoint of economy I think more money can be saved by having the work done by a smaller subcommittee of the very committee that has the standing obligation to see to it that the maximum of economy is maintained in the administration of our Government. Special committees involve a certain amount of waste because of duplication of office set-up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator half a minute.

Mr. MORSE. I close with this final observation, Mr. President. I deeply regret that so much partisanship has been drawn into this fight. I wish that we could always try, as I am trying to do in this instance, to take a nonpartisan approach on issues that affect the welfare of our country. I sincerely believe that it is in the nonpartisan interests of the public that we see to it that the spirit of the Reorganization Act is lived up to, both by the Members on this side of the aisle and by the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle. I do share the view that the spirit of the Reorganization Act would be violated in this instance, because I think the proponents of the Brewster committee have failed to show those extraordinary circumstances that justify the appointment of a special committee. I think the majority of my Republican colleagues are making a grievous mistake.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the closing remarks of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] bring up the question of the spirit of the reorganization law. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the writings of a man who had a great deal to do with the writing of the reorganization law.

Dr. George B. Galloway was the counsel to the La Follette-Monroney committee. He is now a senior specialist in the Library Legislative Reference Service.

After the passage of the Reorganization Act omitting the ban on special committees, Dr. Galloway wrote a book, Congress at the Crossroads, in which the following appears on the value of special committees:

> Special investigating committees: The work load of Congress often overflows its regular standing committees and leads to the creation of select or special committees to investigate particular problems. Congress has set up such special committees many times in our history either to inquire into executive misconduct, as in the case of the

scandals of the Grant and Harding days, or to investigate economic and social conditions in Podunk Corners or Puerto Rico, or to examine campaign expenditures or the conduct of the war or a hundred other topics of public or party interest. Between 1789 and 1925 upward of 300 inquiries into executive acts alone were made by select committees.

Under modern conditions, select committees have proved to be useful devices for eliciting information, informing Congress and the country, scrutinizing executive performance, and illuminating public problems. They enable young and energetic Members to sidestep the seniority custom, to employ expert and zealous personnel rarely found on the staffs of standing committees, and to conduct vigorous and searching investigations into vital public questions (pp. 55 and 56).

I think that statement eliminates any question about there being any spirit left in the Reorganization Act so far as special committees are concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to call to the attention of the membership on the other side of the aisle an unfortunate circumstance which has latterly arisen. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] yesterday was called to the bedside of one of his immediate family who is critically ill and with grave possible consequences ahead. It would be a very gracious, a very sportsmanlike, and a very fair gesture on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle if some Senator on that side would give to this Democratic Senator from Louisiana a chance to register his position. I have never known in this body a pair to be refused when the death of some member of the family of a Senator was probable, and when, for that reason, the Senator was absent. I have been unable to secure a pair for the senior Senator from Louisiana, and that has impelled me to make this announcement. In the face of this dire circumstance I ask some Senator on the majority side to accord to the Senator from Louisiana the right that has never been heretofore denied in any case by reason of partisanship in the whole time I have been in this body. I hope some Senator will pair with the Senator from Louisiana so that his position may be recorded.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, I am sure that the consideration which the Senator from Maryland has urged was carefully studied, but I will canvass the situation on this side to see what can be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I say that I wholly dispute the Senator's suggestion that he does not know of any case in which a pair has been refused under such circumstances. Personally I know of very few cases where a pair has been granted under such circumstances when the vote is close. I merely want to make that statement because I think it is a wholly unheard-of proposal on the part of the Senator from Maryland. I have been in the Senate for 8 years, and I never heard such an appeal made, and I see no reason why the appeal should be granted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself a half a minute. The Senator from Ohio, however, has not shown an exception, and I still say I defy any Member of this body to show within the last 20 years a single case where, with the possibility of death in the immediate family of a Member of the Senate, he was unable to obtain a pair on any important question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator cite any case where it was done?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I can cite numerous cases where pairs have been arranged, some of them by the Senator from Maryland, and most notably in the case of the late Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Metcalf.

I yield the control of the remainder of my time to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the Senator from Maine to continue with the debate on his side. I am speaking in behalf of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Maine, and I suppose I would be entitled to close the debate on that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland has 13 minutes remaining. The question is on the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senate wishes to vote now I will not occupy the time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the order was that the Senate should vote at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order is that the Senate shall vote not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I am ready to vote now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Maine to Senate Resolution 46.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. How much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirteen minutes remain on the side of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and 17 minutes on the side of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I doubt if the Senate will be called upon to vote at this session on a more important issue than the one upon which we shall vote at the end of 30 minutes—the question as to whether or not we shall continue the all-encompassing Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which has been known throughout the Nation and the world as the Truman committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I assume the Senator would not yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not yield any of my time. If I may yield with the understanding that the Senator will use the time of the other side, I shall be delighted to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I repeat that I doubt if the Senate will be called upon to vote on a more important issue than the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which is commonly known in America and throughout the world as the Truman committee.

This committee is special and unusual in every way. It is an outgrowth of the war. It was all-encompassing, and certainly it was a necessary committee. When this country was led into war—and I say "led into war" advisedly—the war effort affected every household, every farm, every factory, every business, every hospital, and every school in the Nation. By vote of the Congress every able-bodied man had to respond to the call to arms. By vote of the Congress every household was subjected to restrictions, restraints, and regulations. Thousands of businesses were on the verge of folding up, because the war effort to an unusual extent necessitated the concentration of power in large industries, and in large measure placed the expenditure of money in the hands of military men who were never trained to undertake or understand the intricate details of industry or the handling of high finance.

The war had hardly got under way when the then Senator from Missouri, who was not a senior Senator in any sense, for he had been here only 6 years, rose and asked for the appointment of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I decline to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. BROOKS. Not one second, unless the Senator wishes to use the time of the other side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield. It is unfair to take his time.

Mr. BROOKS. This special committee was organized under the leadership of Senator Truman. Membership upon most committees of the Senate is based upon seniority in the Senate. Every time a new group of Senators comes to

the Senate they come with a background of the interest of their States and of certain personal experience which gives them special qualifications. They designate certain committees on which they would like to serve. In many instances they are denied that opportunity because of seniority preference, because Senators who were here ahead of them also choose the same special fields.

However, the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program was not chosen on the basis of seniority. Its first chairman had been a Member of the Senate for only 6 years. The year the committee was created four members of the committee who had that year entered the Senate—namely, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], former Senator Burton, of Ohio, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and former Senator Tunnell—were made members. Ultimately one of those junior Senators, the Senator from West Virginia, became chairman of the committee.

Because of its all-encompassing activities, the committee was made a committee of 10. The investigation into war contracts and fraud ultimately reached into the very Halls of Congress in recent months. I submit that this committee should have at least 10 members at all times.

Of the 10 members, 6 belonged to the then majority and 4 to the then minority. The investigations of the committee extended all over the world and even into the chairmanship of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

As a result of that activity, which was magnificently carried on by Senator Truman, with much of the work being done by his colleagues on the committee, he became so widely known that ultimately he became President of the United States, and his popularity rose to an unprecedented height. I believe that his fair and judicious attitude in handling that all-important committee was the major element in establishing for him the confidence of the people of the United States.

One of the members of the committee who had not been long in the Senate, and who was the junior Senator from his State, was Senator Burton. He came to the Senate the year the committee was organized and played a major role in the activities of the committee. I checked up on his activities. He made eight trips—one to New Orleans, to investigate shipbuilding; one to Kansas City, to investigate the coal and fuel shortage; one to Detroit, to investigate airplanes and tanks; one to the Pacific coast, to investigate the bottleneck in airplane production; one to Alaska, jointly with the Subcommittee on Military Affairs, to investigate defense expenditures; one to Columbus, Ohio, again to investigate the bottleneck in airplane production; one to Maine, to investigate wood pulp and its production; and one to north Africa and the Middle East during the readjustment period, to consider the question of surplus property in its relation to the readjustment to peacetime.

It was not a paid investigator who did all that. It was a member of the committee, a junior member of the Senate who saw an opportunity to serve his country as a member of the committee better than he could probably serve it in any other capacity.

I dare say that today only a few Senators can recall on what other committees Senator Truman served. I dare say that only a few Senators, those who knew him most intimately, can even remember on what other committees Senator Burton served besides the Truman committee.

The Truman committee was of great importance to America. It called forth the best efforts of its members. It called upon them to lay aside the ordinary assignments on committees, in order that they might investigate and make known to the people of America, when their sons were dying, when farms were being taken away from their owners for war purposes, when factories were being closed down, and the whole life of the Nation disrupted and thrown into uncertainty, whether there was dishonesty and corruption in connection with the war effort. Such investigations cannot be made in a few days.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this is one of the most important decisions the Senate will be called upon to make at this session. Members of the minority charge that we are motivated by political considerations. Now that we are the majority, we wish to carry on in the same fine tradition in which President Truman carried on when he was a Senator; the same high, nonpartisan tradition in which Senator Burton carried on. He did a great work. He subjected himself to the troubles and trials of travel. He analyzed the facts and wrote reports. The first appointment President Truman made to the Supreme Court was none other than that same junior Senator from Ohio who had been a member of the committee which meant so much to the people of the United States.

I say that the action proposed by the majority does not violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act. I, too, served on the committee which helped draft the act. I, too, signed the report. But the report did not contemplate doing away with this all-important committee, whose activities have been conducted in such fine fashion. No other committee, not even the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, could do as well. The latter committee was not established with any idea of taking over this responsibility. Six Members of the majority on that committee have indicated that they do not want this responsibility. The opponents of the resolution say that they want a wide-open investigation, but they want the responsibility placed in the hands of a committee on which six Members of the majority have indicated that they have enough to do, and that they do not want to devote their time to this important work. In my judgment this special committee is the most important investigating committee the Senate could create. However, we are not actually proposing to create it. We are merely asking that it be continued in the same nonpartisan fashion in which it was created and in which it has continued up to this time.

I do not question the qualifications of any member of any standing committee. No doubt the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments were assigned to that committee because they were especially interested and qualified, but they do not want added to their duties this tedious task of investigation which would take hours of time and miles of travel, and would interfere with their efforts to render service to the people of the United States. I say to Senators on this side—and not from a partisan standpoint—that in a republic there is only one way the people can investigate an administration when it is so all-powerful, and that is to elect representatives to the side opposing the administration. I say that to discontinue this special committee would be, in my judgment, a violation of the trust of the people of the United States, who gave us control of the Senate, although by a slim majority, and while there is still in power an administration which has built itself up during the past years of public spending. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has a herculean task if it can trim down the departments, without going into another field which other Senators, as members of a special committee which has jurisdiction, are willing to investigate so that they can live up to the obligation which the people of America placed upon us by their votes. I do not question any Senator's motives; but I say again that we shall violate the trust that the people have reposed in us if we do not continue this special committee, which will be composed of Members who will be willing to do all that former Senator Burton, of Ohio, was willing to do, and all that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has been willing to do, and what other Senators of their type will be denied an opportunity to do, if the investigation is handled by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I do not like the charge of partisanship; but it is strange indeed that the other side now stands soldidly against continuing the special committee, now that we have become the majority and for the first time would have a majority on the committee and be able to roll back the curtain and say, "We want to ascertain what was done with the money of the people after we joined you in voting to draft every able-bodied boy in America and send him to strange, far-away places and face death in order that we might continue to be a representative republic, a free nation, where the people by a majority vote in free elections can by mandate call for an investigation of the executive departments."

In my judgment, we must now carry out that mandate, which, to my mind—and I speak again only for myself—is a definite direction to look behind the curtain of secrecy not only in the War Department, the Navy Department, and the other executive departments, but in every branch of the Government, whether executive or any other, and trace down the culprits who benefited from the wealth of America while we poured out our blood and flesh all over the world, that

we might continue as a free, representative nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the previous agreement, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is now recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for 1 minute. I do not have very much time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it seems to me that about the only conclusion which can be drawn from the speech of the Senator from Illinois is that if this investigatory work is entrusted to a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a majority thereof will not be Republicans. I desire to point out that if it is entrusted to a subcommittee of that committee my party will have the majority of the members on that committee. I wish to point out, further, that I am satisfied that every member of that committee, if given this great responsibility and trust, will live up to his obligations under the direction and leadership of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is also a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

I think an attempt is being made to draw partisan lines, but it is just as evident on the Republican side of the aisle as on the Democratic side; and if we want to make a really nonpartisan approach to the question I suggest that we proceed under the standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me a very strange spectacle that on the closing day of this debate, any Senator should charge, as we have just heard, that six members of the committee which under the Reorganization Act is charged with the duty of investigating all departments, at all levels, are unwilling to undertake the task, and do not want to assume the responsibility. I hold in my hand a list of the membership of that committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, chairman; HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio; EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota; JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin; and IRVING M. IVES, of New York.

Those are the Republican Members. There are seven of them on that committee, and I should be surprised to learn that any six of them or any one of them would be unwilling to discharge any duty imposed upon the committee by the Senate of the United States. If any member of that committee, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, is unwilling to discharge the duties incumbent upon the committee, he ought forwith to resign from it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] said he deplored the injection of partisanship into this debate and then he proceeded immediately to inject it. It has been so long since I made a partisan speech on the floor of the Senate that I have lost the art, if I ever had it. I shall not indulge in any partisan remarks now.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] resorted to the technique of insinuating that there must be something that those on this side of the aisle desire to cover up, or otherwise we would not be voting for the Tydings amendment to the pending resolution. He referred to the fact that a special committee was appointed to investigate Pearl Harbor. The circumstances under which that committee was set up are well known. The prospects were that there would be two investigations carried on simultaneously, one in the Senate and one in the House. In order to avoid duplication, it was felt—and, I think, rightly so—that there should be a joint committee of the two Houses. That joint committee was authorized and appointed, and I think it conducted a very constructive, comprehensive, and thorough investigation.

With respect to special committees, I take the same position on the floor now that I took when the Democrats were in the majority. I take the same position now that I would take if we were still in the majority, because when I voted and spoke for the Reorganization Act, I thought, and I now think, that we intended to funnel all investigations and all legislative action and all legislative responsibility into the channel of the standing committees whose jurisdiction we have now specifically defined. In the Reorganization Act 175 duties are charged to the 15 Senate committees thus set up.

I do not claim that the creation of this special committee violates the letter of the Reorganization Act. If it will satisfy the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators, I am willing to say it will not violate even the spirit of the act itself, as finally enacted. But it does violate the spirit that actuated the Senate of the United States when, almost unanimously, it wrote into the act a provision prohibiting in the future the appointment of special committees. It is the spirit of what we did last year, regardless of the language of the act, which we are violating here today if the special committee is created.

Mr. President, there was created from among outstanding citizens of the United States a National Committee for Strengthening Congress. The chairman of that committee was Mr. Robert Heller, a very distinguished industrial engineer. He testified extensively before the joint committee, the La Follette-Monroney committee, at the time hearings were being held on the Reorganization Act. I hold in my hand a statement issued for release yesterday, January 21, in the morning newspapers by that committee through its chairman, Mr. Heller. I shall not now read it because I do not have time to do so; but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks in connection with a telegram which I have received and which I read:

JANUARY 20, 1947.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We who worked for and supported passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act consider current proposals to create special committees a serious threat to integrity of reform program. Perpetuation of these special committees would imperil keystone in the arch of congressional reorganization. The public interest demands defeat of these proposals.

ROBERT HELLER,
Chairman, National Committee for Strengthening Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter submitted by the Senator from Kentucky will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Committee for Strengthening Congress, composed of leaders of many civic and professional groups and of spokesmen for American business, labor, and agriculture, representing every section of the country, today warned the Senate and the people against adoption of two resolutions pending in the Senate that would establish or continue special investigating committees in the fields of war contracts and small business. These resolutions, the national committee stated, would jeopardize the integrity of the congressional reform program.

The national committee stresses the fact that these special committees would invade the jurisdiction already assigned by the revised Senate rules to the new standing committees of that body on the armed services, executive expenditures, and banking and currency, whose members are fully competent to carry on the contemplated investigations.

"Moreover," the national committee points out, "the standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpena power for this purpose. Hereafter, save in exceptional circumstances, the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees, which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose, instead of relying upon special investigating committees, which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations."

"The ban on special committees should be preserved," continues the statement, "for the following additional reasons:

"The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition, Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

"Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from the departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.

"Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden on, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate."

Chaired by Robert Heller, Cleveland management engineer and author of a well-known report on strengthening the Congress, the national committee urges the Sen-

ate in the interest of efficient legislative organization and operation, to maintain the integrity of the standing-committee structure and to reject all efforts to undermine it. "Now is no time for backsliding," concluded Mr. Heller.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is there any Member of the Senate who is willing to say that Mr. Heller has something which he desires to cover up, that he is actuated by any devious purpose and wishes to conceal from the American people some fact which had its existence as a part of the war effort?

Mr. President, there has just been handed to me by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] a letter signed by Mrs. Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States. It might be well for me to read it at this time:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1947.

The Honorable GLEN H. TAYLOR,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: It has come to our attention that there is considerable discussion of the possibility of creating additional special committees in the Senate rather than abiding by the spirit of the Congressional Reorganization Act of the last session. It seems especially unfortunate to us that some of the functions of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments might be put on the shoulders of a special committee, such as by continuing the War Investigating Committee. Such an opening wedge is apt to result in many special committees and a general weakening of the powers of the standing committees. The great strides forward which were made by the reorganization would then be lost.

Since you are undoubtedly aware of the possibility of decreasing the responsibilities of the Committee on Executive Expenditures and are probably as concerned as we are, we wish just to point out to you at this time that the League of Women Voters will stand behind all efforts to prevent such a move.

Sincerely yours,
ANNA LORD STRAUSS,
President.

Does any Member of the Senate charge or suppose that the League of Women Voters, an outstanding nonpartisan organization of voters, extending into all parts of the United States, desires to cover up or conceal something because it wishes to have what we understood to be the spirit of the Reorganization Act lived up to?

Mr. President, in times past many outstanding investigations have been conducted by standing committees of the Senate of the United States, not by special committees; and, similarly, many well-known investigations have been conducted by standing committees of the House of Representatives. Among them were the following: In the Forty-eighth Congress the star route mail frauds were investigated over a period of many months by the then House of Representatives Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. The Pujo investigation, in 1912 and 1913, which was very largely responsible for the development of the facts which resulted in the passage of the Federal Reserve Act, was carried on, not by a special committee, but by the standing Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. The Teapot Dome investigation in 1923 and 1924, with which all of us are familiar, was conducted, not by a special committee, but by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the United States Senate. No one ever complained that that was not a complete and thorough investigation. The investigation of the Federal Farm Board, in 1932 and 1935, was conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate. The civil liberties investigation in 1936 was conducted by Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, and a subcommittee composed of some of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate.

In 1932 an investigation was made of the operations of the Stock Exchange and of allied subjects, and that investigation was carried on for nearly a year and a half or 2 years. It was not conducted by a special committee; it was conducted by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate. It resulted in the enactment of the Securities and Exchange Act, regulating the conduct and the sale of stocks and other securities in the United States. The situation and facts which finally led up to the enactment of the Railroad Financing Act were investigated in 1935 by the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, today one of the standing committees of the Senate is the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee is composed of 13 members, 5 of whom are experienced investigators. As against that committee, there is a proposed special committee of 10 members, only 4 of whom would be experienced investigators, and there would be vacancies which would have to be filled. Certainly those who might be appointed to fill those vacancies would not be experienced in the work formerly done by the special commiteee.

For these reasons, as well as others which I might state if I had the time, I shall vote for the Tydings amendment, believing, as I do, in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; believing that it has the integrity, the ability, and the will to do a job of which the Senate will be proud when it is finished.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the time of the side of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has expired.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has two and a fraction minutes remaining.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood that I had 3 minutes remaining, Mr. President.

I yield whatever time remains to me to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make only one or two observations. I speak, not as a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, but as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

First, Mr. President, let me say that I have talked to every member on the majority side of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I think every member on the majority side of that committee has expressed himself on this issue, with the exception of the chairman, who I believe has not definitely stated the way he will vote on the pending question. But, aside from the chairman, every member on the majority side of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has stated, either on the floor of the Senate or privately, that he does not believe the committee is at this time so equipped as to be able to take over the matter of the continuance of this most vital activity, the work of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. President, let me also say that the question before the Senate at this time is the Tydings amendment, submitted by the able Senator from Maryland. If there is solicitude for the sanctity of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, let me say that the Tydings amendment assaults that committee directly, because in so many words it limits the scope of the investigation which may be made by that committee. If I read the Reorganization Act correctly, by that act the scope of the activities of that committee is unlimited. But the very language of the Tydings amendment states that it "shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein." And then it delineates the limitations of the investigation power of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am opposed to that, and I think every other member on the majority side of the committee is opposed to such an assault on the sovereignty of the power of that committee. So, Mr. President, we observe that the Senator from Maryland himself has made the first assault against the Reorganization Act, by attempting to limit the authority of a standing committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to vote on the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to Senate Resolution 46.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. When a definite time is fixed for a vote, is the suggestion of the absence of a quorum in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be the view of the Chair that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is a part of the process of voting. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to Senate Resolution 46.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will not be read, but it will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The modified amendment of Mr. TYDINGS is as follows:

In the amendment proposed by Mr. BREWSTER, strike out all after the word "hereby" in line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "transferred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided*, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority shall be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States (including Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico) prior to June 30, 1946: *Provided further*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948: *Provided further*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is specifically authorized to obtain from the Treasury Department or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the income-tax returns or any information indicated therein of any individual, person, copartnership, association, trust, or corporation deemed by said committee to be useful or necessary to it for the proper discharge of its duties under this (S. Res. 46) resolution."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). For some years I have had a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. At the beginning of the present session we reached an agreement to continue that general pair. The senior Senator from New York is absent today because of illness. I understand that if present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent because of illness in his family, would vote "yea" on the pending question if he were present.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Barkley	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Pepper
Cooper	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Eastland	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Stewart
Fulbright	McGrath	Taylor
George	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Magnuson	Tobey
Hayden	Maybank	Tydings
Hill	Morse	Umstead

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	Flanders	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Buck	Jenner	Thye
Bushfield	Kem	Vandenberg
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Cain	Langer	Wherry
Capehart	Lodge	White
Capper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Wilson
Dworshak	Millikin	Young
Ecton	Moore	

NOT VOTING—3

Overton	Reed	Wagner

So Mr. TYDINGS' amendment, as modified, to Mr. BREWSTER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if this amendment shall be agreed to there will then have to be a vote on the resolution itself. As I understand, this vote is merely on an amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the original resolution reported by the committee. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. There will be a further vote after the vote on the so-called Brewster amendment.

The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. TYDINGS and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness, and I withhold my vote because of my general pair with him.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent because of illness in his family, would vote "nay" on this question if present.

I announce also that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], whose general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has previously been announced, would vote "nay" on this question, if present.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—49

Aiken	Ecton	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	Flanders	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Taft
Brooks	Ives	Thye
Buck	Jenner	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Kem	Watkins
Butler	Knowland	Wherry
Cain	Lodge	White
Capehart	McCarthy	Wiley
Capper	Malone	Williams
Cooper	Martin	Wilson
Cordon	Millikin	Young
Donnell	Moore	
Dworshak	Morse	

NAYS—43

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Connally	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Ellender	McClellan	Stewart
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead
Hoey	Murray	
Holland	Myers	

NOT VOTING—3

Overton	Reed	Wagner

So the resolution (S. Res. 46), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941; Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 20, 1943; Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944; and Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to August 23, 1944, and Senate Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program) is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and ad-

journed periods of the Eightieth Congress (except as hereinafter provided): *Provided*, That on and after the date this resolution is agreed to, the authority contained in such Senate Resolution 71 shall be limited, with respect to the subject matter authorized to be studied and investigated therein, to excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency in expenditures, connected with the prosecution of the national defense program for World War II: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority shall be further limited to transactions which occurred within the United States (including Hawaii, Alaska, Panama, and Puerto Rico) prior to June 30, 1946: *Provided further*, That the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 31, 1948, at which time all powers and duties conferred upon the committee shall terminate.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 46 was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MARVIN JONES TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE, COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, January 29, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424 of the Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Marvin Jones, of Texas, to be Chief Justice of the United States Court of Claims, vice Honorable Richard S. Whaley, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, for the purpose of making certain funds available for the continued use of the United States Maritime Commission until July 1, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES TO ACCEPT FOREIGN DECORATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain retired officers or employees of the United States to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by certain foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON INSPECTION OF COAL MINES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

EXCLUSION FROM CLASSIFICATION ACT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL IN HOSPITALS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the National Housing Agency—Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting the final report of the liquidation of the United States Housing Corporation during the period March 1, 1942, to June 30, 1945, while under the jurisdiction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration pursuant to Executive Order No. 9070, approved February 24, 1942, and stating that "The liquidation of all assets of the United States Housing Corporation has now been completed, and all moneys therefrom have been covered into the United States Treasury, and that dissolution of the Corporation itself has been delayed by one small lawsuit which, it is hoped, may be disposed of soon" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to control and eradicate and prevent from entrance into this country of the disease of animals known as foot-and-mouth disease (apthous fever) now present among animals of several states of the Republic of Mexico

"Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has been advised by the United States Embassy in Mexico City, Mexico, that the disastrous livestock disease known as foot-and-mouth disease has appeared and exists widespread in several states of the Republic of Mexico, and diagnosis of the disease has been confirmed by both Mexican and United States Government veterinarians who have conducted extensive field investigations; and

"Whereas the United States Government through action of the Secretary of Agriculture on December 30, 1946, added Mexico to the list of countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists and thereby prohibited the importation into the United States from that country of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, and the meat thereof; and

"Whereas in accordance with the terms of the Mexico-United States Sanitary Treaty, the United States Department of Agriculture will continue to cooperate with the Mexican authorities in dealing with this serious threat to the livestock industries of the two countries, including the production of meat and milk in the United States; and

"Whereas the present outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico apparently has existed there for some time and may be associated with the importation of Zebu bulls from the Republic of Brazil; and

"Whereas there have been outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States in the past, including two in the State of California, and these have been eradicated only after great expenditure of public funds and losses to livestock owners; and

"Whereas the method of eradication used in previous outbreaks in the United States has been to destroy or burn or deeply bury all animals in affected herds and those directly exposed thereto, the last outbreak in the United States being in 1929; and

"Whereas any disruption of our food-producing processes would be serious to the public welfare, the disruption of commerce and the adverse effect on the economic life of the people would be disastrous, and the difficulties and expenses that would be entailed in effectively eradicating this disease, should it spread to California, would be tremendous; and

"Whereas time is of the essence if this disease is not to be permitted to spread to the United States; and

"Whereas it appears that the Government of the Republic of Mexico may need immediately the expert assistance and the financial help of the Government of the United States in curtailing this disease; and

"Whereas it is to the immediate interest of all the people of the United States that the disease be controlled and eradicated in the Republic of Mexico before it is permitted to spread to the United States; and

"Whereas the full administrative and financial assistance required by the United States to deal with the present outbreak in Mexico may not be included in existing laws, involving expenditures in a foreign country in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary, by legislation or otherwise:

"(a) To appropriate adequate funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry to prevent, control, and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in this country;

"(b) To provide assistance to the Republic of Mexico in locating, diagnosing, and eradicating foot-and-mouth disease in that country to the fullest extent permitted and requested by the appropriate officials of that country;

"(c) To create a joint United States-Mexico Commission empowered to deal with this problem and to control, eradicate, and prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in each of said countries;

"(d) To close the United States-Mexico border, in addition to the present quarantine regulations, to all importations or traffic of whatever kind or nature that may carry the infection of the foot-and-mouth disease into this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed, forthwith, to send a copy of this joint resolution by telegram and by mail to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and to the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in the Congress from the State of California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to providing funds to complete the veterans' temporary emergency housing program

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States appropriated $445,000,000 for the construction of 200,000 units of temporary housing to house veterans of World War II; and

"Whereas the National Housing Agency and its constituent unit, the Federal Public Housing Authority, because of increasing material and labor costs now estimate that only 150,000 units can be completed within the limitations of existing funds; and that only approximately 10,000 of the 18,000 units scheduled for California can be completed; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States through its agencies and departments aforesaid has entered into contracts with the State of California and with California communities and educational institutions to provide such temporary housing; and

"Whereas the State of California and California communities and educational institutions on the basis of such contracts have appropriated and expended more than $11,000,000 in reliance upon the good faith of the Government of the United States acting through its departments and agencies aforesaid; and

"Whereas California veterans and their families desperately need all such promised temporary housing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide sufficient funds to complete all temporary housing units for veterans for which the State of California has appropriated funds to match contributions of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Rev. Ellsworth M. Smith, minister for the Church of All Peoples, praying for the enactment of legislation providing refuge and homes for the displaced peoples of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN LABOR AND FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have received from the United Farmers of America, an organization which is interested in and is supporting a tariff measure necessary to protect American labor and farm products.

There being no objection, the statement was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED FARMERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
January 10, 1947.

Hon. Senator CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The United Farmers meeting at regular session January 9, 1947, petition your support of the protective tariff measure necessary to protect American labor and farm products.

1. Keep tariffs high enough to allow cost of production and all products of the Nation.
2. No products shall become a substitute at a lower price.
3. That Congress alone make all trade treaties.

C. C. HALL,
President.
ANNA KLINK,
Secretary.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a letter written by Arthur K. Taylor, of the Taylor Machine Co., Baltimore, Md., addressed to the editors of Time magazine expressing his disapproval of liquor advertising in newspapers and magazines. I fully approve of the sentiments expressed by Mr. Taylor, and as I have a bill before the Senate on that subject, I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The EDITORS, TIME,
New York, N. Y.

SIRS: Noting the great space and prominent positions given to the liquor interests by many of our publications, would it not be to the public welfare if a plan could be worked out by which the amount of space given to such advertising would be governed by the space in the same publications accorded to authenticated reports of the fatalities resulting from automobile accidents and fires caused by drink, as well as such domestic tragedies as in that restrained account of his father's history recently written by Upton Sinclair? As you know, such cases could be multiplied by the thousands.

By such a plan distillers would be able to use a small part of their enormous financial resources in publishing the oceans of testimony of a sort that would give a more realistic picture of their finished product, and so by this means earn space for further advertising what has at times been referred to as "an aid to gracious living."

If they believe their business and product represents a national asset, this would give them an opportunity to test their faith.

While many will consider this letter silly, its publication would at least serve to remind us that there is another side to this rapidly growing evil.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR K. TAYLOR.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. From the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to report without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees, and I submit a report (No. 7) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BRIDGES. From the Committee on Appropriations, I also ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 8) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

LISTS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEES OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the subcommittee chairmen and a list of the subcommittee members of the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Agriculture: Senator Brooks.
Deficiencies: Senator Bridges.
District of Columbia: Senator Dworshak.
Independent Offices: Senator Reed.
Interior: Senator Wherry.
Legislative: Senator Young.
Navy: Senator Saltonstall.
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary: Senator Ball.
Labor-Federal Security: Senator Knowland.
Treasury-Post Office: Senator Cordon.
War Department: Senator Gurney.
Government Corporations: Senator Ferguson.

SUBCOMMITTEES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Messrs. Brooks, Gurney, Reed, Ferguson, Cordon, Young, Dworshak, Russell, Hayden, Tydings, O'Mahoney, and McCarran.

DEFICIENCIES

Messrs. Bridges, Brooks, Gurney, Ball, Ferguson, Cordon, Young, McKellar, Hayden, Tydings, Russell, and Overton.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Messrs. Dworshak, Ball, Young, Knowland, O'Mahoney, McCarran, and Green.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Messrs. Ferguson, Reed, Wherry, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Dworshak, McKellar, Overton, Russell, McCarran, and Thomas.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Messrs. Reed, Bridges, Brooks, Cordon, Ferguson, Saltonstall, Green, Russell, McKellar, Thomas, and O'Mahoney.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Messrs. Wherry, Gurney, Ball, Cordon, Reed, Knowland, Dworshak, Hayden, Thomas, O'Mahoney, McCarran, and Overton.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY

Messrs. Knowland, Gurney, Ball, Wherry, Young, Dworshak, McCarran, McKellar, Russell, and Thomas.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Messrs. Young, Bridges, Saltonstall, Dworshak, Overton, Tydings, and Green.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Messrs. Saltonstall, Bridges, Brooks, Ball, Gurney, Wherry, Tydings, Overton, Green, Thomas, and O'Mahoney.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

Messrs. Ball, Bridges, Wherry, Brooks, Ferguson, Saltonstall, McCarran, McKellar, Tydings, Hayden, and Green.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE

Messrs. Cordon, Reed, Brooks, Saltonstall, Knowland, Tydings, McKellar, Hayden, and Green.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Messrs. Gurney, Reed, Ferguson, Wherry, Cordon, Bridges, Knowland, Thomas, Hayden, Overton, Russell, and O'Mahoney.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. HOEY):

S. 306. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 307. A bill to define the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 308. A bill for the relief of the widow of Ambrose Whitman; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 309. A bill designating American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 310. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jonah Williams;

S. 311. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr.;

S. 312. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Kills the Enemy; and

S. 313. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin W. Clincher; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Lauritzen;

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Mary Sungduk Charr; and

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 318. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Patrick Henry and to perpetuate his home as a historic shrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 319. A bill to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval personnel;

S. 320. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 321. A bill to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes; and

S. 322. A bill to reorganize the Nurse Corps of the Navy and of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 323. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 324, to do equal justice to all veterans with respect to on-the-job training, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 325. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced Senate bill 326, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, with respect to the education and training of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. LODGE) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 41, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill with the stated purpose to do equal justice to all veterans with respect to on-the-job training.

This measure might also be called a bill to play square with veterans.

I believe that every Member of this body is familiar with the fact that under Public Law 679 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a measure which was somewhat hurriedly enacted, to say the least, and which became law after the last session of the Congress had adjourned, a so-called ceiling was placed upon the total amount which a veteran might receive while engaged in on-the-job training.

I do not know the genesis of this limiting provision and I have no desire to attempt to place blame for it. The blame must rest upon the Congress as a whole. I say "blame" advisedly because the effect of this provision has been to say to the veteran that he may not take advantage of the job training Congress has promised him unless he can live on a maximum of $175 a month, if he has no dependents, or $200 a month if he has dependents, no matter how many those dependents may be.

This is telling the veteran that he must do with $175 or $200 what today requires $250 or $300 or more per month.

This is obviously unfair. It is not in accordance with the promises the Congress held out to our veterans.

I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate with a lengthy discussion of this matter. I am confident that a majority of this body would vote today, if given the opportunity, to correct this injustice; and I hope the committee to which my bill is referred will act with all possible speed to give the Senate the opportunity to vote on this measure.

The bill itself is simple. The first section amends paragraph 6 of part 8 of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to put the language of that paragraph back in substantially the same form in which it was originally passed by the Congress, and to eliminate the so-called ceiling.

Section 2 of the bill provides, in effect, that veterans who have been shortchanged under the provisions of Public Law 679 shall be paid the difference between what they got and what they should have been entitled to.

Section 3 of the bill provides that amounts collected by the Veterans' Administrator from veterans, as "overpayments," shall be returned to the veterans from whom such collections were made; and that demands for the return of such alleged overpayments, which are outstanding, shall be rescinded.

I believe this bill will meet the approval of every veteran and of every veterans' organization and of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country, who desire to play fair with the men who fought their country's battles. I commend it to the attention of every Senator and I want to stress the extreme emergency of acting promptly in this matter. Thousands of veterans are today struggling under conditions which, if not actually desperate, border closely upon it. This is not a situation to be corrected some time months in the future; it is a situation which cries out for correction at once. I earnestly hope that the Congress, in its wisdom, and responsive to the will of the people, will not long delay the corrective.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 324) to do equal justice to all veterans with respect to on-the-job training, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF VETERANS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has been apparent for some time that the limitations previously imposed by the Congress upon the benefits that may be received by the veterans who are taking either school training or vocational training have made them now, in view of the risen cost of living, grossly inadequate.

For example, the last increase in the subsistence allowance was in December 1945 from $50 to $65 for students without dependents and from $75 to $90 for students with dependents.

A study by the American Council of Education of 132 educational institutions shows that the cost of room and board alone for veteran students has risen over 25 percent in 15 months. This survey does not include other living expenses, such as: Clothing, medical care, and other items which enter into the cost of living.

The survey shows that 66 percent of the veterans without dependents and 81 percent of the veterans with dependents live off the campus of these institutions where the cost of living is higher.

The national average monthly room-and-board cost for single students on the campus is $53.53; off the campus, $64.14. For married students living on the campus with no children, $78.86; off the

campus, $105.19. Married students with one child, on the campus, $99.68; off the campus, $130.77. Married students with 2 or more children, on the campus, $106.53; off the campus, $140.56.

Between October 1945 and October 1946 food prices for moderate-income families in large cities increased about 30 percent, clothing about 12½ percent, house furnishings about 14 percent.

MAXIMUM FOR ON-JOB TRAINING

Prior to December 1945 the Veterans' Administration paid a proportionate amount of a full subsistence allowance to a veteran pursuing a course of training on a part-time basis.

It paid a veteran who pursued a course of training on the job and received compensation for productive labor incident to his training full or part of the full subsistence allowance, provided this amount and his wages did not exceed the wage he would receive upon completion of the job training.

According to the Veterans' Administration, abuses crept into the Administration of this provision of law. A course of training on the job became financially more attractive than education at a college or university.

Employers began to convert normal full-time jobs into job-training to enable veterans to get subsistence allowances.

On the basis of four major principles recommended by the Veterans' Administration, Congress, in August 1946, set ceilings of $175 for veterans without dependents and $200 for veterans with dependents—combined allowance and earnings on the job.

A study by the Veterans' Administration shows that beginning journeyman rates are usually well over $200 a month and as often as high or higher than $300 a month. Apprentice wage rates start at about 30 to 50 percent of the journeyman rate and rise in the last stage of training to about 75 to 90 percent of the journeyman rate. Very rarely does the last training rate equal the journeyman rate.

In the job-training program the middle and higher paid jobs predominate over the relatively unskilled and lower paid.

The allowance of 7 percent of the trainees—400,527—in July 1946, would be discontinued and the allowance of 46 percent would be reduced as a result of the $175 and $200 limitations, immediately, according to a study of the Veterans' Administration. The immediate effect of the ceilings would be greatest on the Pacific coast and in the New York, Columbus, and Chicago branch area, the high-wage regions of the country.

The high-wage occupations would be affected most; for example, 70 percent of the trainees in construction occupations would have their subsistence allowances immediately reduced or discontinued. This was also true for professional and managerial occupations.

The eventual effect of the ceilings: 79 percent of the July 1946 trainees had objective wages—the journeyman wage—in excess of the current ceilings, and eventually would have their allowances reduced or discontinued as they neared the end of their training program and approached their objective wage through periodic increases in training wages.

Ten percent of the July 1946 trainees without dependents would have their allowance denied and another 48 percent reduced allowances. Six percent of trainees with dependents would have their allowances denied and 45 percent reduced allowances.

Subsistence payments to all veterans in training in January 1946 was $14,738,441 to 24,627 veterans, and in November 1946, $155,324,085 to 614,882 veterans.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

The bill would make medical or dental education and training of auxiliary and medical personnel available to many who otherwise cannot afford it. It would enable many on-force doctors and dentists over 25 years of age with dependents to take advantage of the education benefits. The vast majority of armed forces and other related branches, according to a medical survey of the American Medical Association, want considerable further education after discharge.

The American Medical Association in August 1946 reported the smallest enrollment in freshmen classes of the Nation's medical schools in 17 years. Two reasons have been advanced for the slump: First, the refusal to defer young men from the draft to carry premedical studies, with the consequence a very few are adequately prepared for medical school. Second, a large number of young men whose studies were interrupted by the war have given up plans to enter medical training because of the long years of study and training and financial cost.

The broadening of educational benefits is necessary to meet the health and educational needs—in terms of more doctors, dentists, teachers, and so forth—of the Nation.

The amendment, therefore, proposes to make the increases which I have identified.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference the bill to which I have referred, and to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a memorandum giving the basis for the introduction of this measure.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 326) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with respect to the education and training of veterans, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement submitted by Mr. PEPPER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill is briefly summarized as follows:

1. It removes the requirement that the educational course be initiated not later than 4 years after discharge or termination of the war. The removal of this provision would enable veterans to take jobs now in time of prosperity in order to earn some money and to go to school when jobs are not plentiful.

2. The provision limiting the period during which benefits can be obtained to 9 years after the official termination of the war is removed.

3. The 4-year limitation on educational benefits is removed. Veterans are given entitlement to 1 year of education plus a period equivalent to length of military service.

4. For qualified veterans who desire to complete preprofessional or professional courses of education the maximum period is increased to 9 years, regardless of length of service. There is a great shortage of physicians, dentists, nurses, chemists, and others relative to the needs of our people. It is urgent that we provide veterans with the opportunity for professional training so essential to the future of our country.

5. Monetary benefits to veterans obtaining education are increased from $65 a month to $100 for those without dependents and from $90 for those with dependents to $125 for those with one dependent and $150 a month for those with two or more dependents.

6. The maximum limit on benefits and earnings from employment during job training is raised from the present $175 a month to $350 for those without dependents and from $200 a month to $375 for those with one or more dependents, and to $400 for veterans with two or more dependents.

Reports indicate present benefits are not nearly enough to sustain the average veteran attending school. Dormitory rents have increased in reecnt months. The cost of living has increased sharply since the increase of benefits over a year ago. Thousands of veterans have found it almost impossible to provide shelter, food, and clothing for their families or themselves on present allowances. Many veterans are finding that they can no longer make ends meet even though they are working on the side.

The amendment to increase the maximum for job-training allowances and earnings would remove many of the hardships which were incurred as a result of the present limitations of $175 and $200 a month. The aims of the program to teach skills to veterans and at the same time bring apprentice wages from industry to the level of the journeymen through public subsidy have been adversely affected by the present limitations. In the highly industrialized States, particularly with their attendant high wages, the present ceilings have not had a good effect on the program. For married trainees with dependents the ceilings have proved to be quite a hardship. The amendment would help to relieve the situation and still prevent major abuses from arising under the job training.

RAILROAD REORGANIZATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution relating to railroad reorganization, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 65) submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MYERS) was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas many railroads in the continental United States are in the hands of receivers and trustees because of insolvency proceedings brought under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, or through equity court procedure; and

Whereas the mileage of these railroads is approximately forty thousand, and the investment in road and equipment amounts to several billion dollars; and

Whereas many of these roads entered bankruptcy in 1933, 1934, 1935, or 1936, 10 to 14 years ago, and the earnings of these roads in recent years have been sufficient to accumulate large cash amounts, and have placed such roads in a solvent position; and

Whereas, according to the best information available, court proceedings involving some very important railroads are in such a condition that it is difficult if not impossible to approximate the time when reorganization under section 77 will be completed, and it is feasible for a number of these roads to retire part of their indebtedness, at a discount, and to refund or extend the maturity date of the balance of their indebtedness, and it further appears desirable to discharge such railroads from bankruptcy proceedings without the necessity of drastic reorganizations under section 77; and

Whereas the continued holding of roads that have become solvent in trustee or receiver operation as insolvent roads, and further efforts to reorganize, under section 77, railroads which no longer need such reorganization, are contrary to the general public interest and contrary to sound public policy; and

Whereas the President of the United States has joined with Congress in going on record in favor of modifications of present reorganization legislation and in favor of the principles proposed by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in 1946, and in favor of the principles enacted by Congress in 1946, and the President has further urged the strengthening of such proposals and the adoption of further provisions to carry out those general principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate is authorized and directed either as a committee, or through a duly constituted subcommittee, to make an investigation of the conditions surrounding the operation and handling of said railroads by trustees and receivers through the period of receivership or trusteeship; to ascertain the extent to which there should be elimination or reduction of any of the exceptions heretofore proposed to legislation on this subject; to inquire into the causes for the failures, (a) to reduce the interest rates of railroads in receivership and bankruptcy proceedings; (b) to arrange for the reduction of the rates of interest payable by such railroads on their outstanding indebtedness; (c) to arrange for the refunding and extension of maturity dates of part or all of the indebtedness of such railroads while in the hands of the courts; (d) to call for the tender of bonds and the purchase of bonds of such railroads either at a discount or otherwise, by the receivers or trustees, out of funds in their hands; (e) to discharge such railroads from court proceedings without the necessity of being subjected to drastic reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; and (f) to return such railroads to their owners as promptly as possible; to investigate the fees paid trustees, receivers, counsel, bankers or bank syndicates, committees and experts, and any and all matters relating thereto, and to ascertain the methods of reducing reorganization expenses and the possibility of eliminating, by discharge of railroads without further reorganization proceedings under section 77, the necessity for any further reorganization expenses under elaborate and therefore costly reorganization proceedings; to ascertain what legislative methods can be provided to enable railroads now undergoing reorganization to obtain management local to their lines of operation and to the communities, shippers, and passengers they serve, and to enable the owners of such railroads to secure control free from domination by interests which have not received the affirmative and express vote of the security holders subsequent to reorganization; to ascertain what voluntary methods and steps additional to those proposed in legislation adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress on this subject will be useful in expediting the discharge of railroads from costly bankruptcy and reorganization proceedings without the necessity of drastic reorganizations under section 77, and to permit reorganization by voluntary proceedings in a businesslike manner and on a businesslike basis; to ascertain what methods and procedures, additional to those provided in legislation passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress on this subject, will be useful for the protection of railroad employees and other investors in the stocks of the railroads. The committee is directed to report to the Senate as early as practicable, with such recommendations as to changes in existing law as may be found desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement respecting the joint resolution which has just been submitted.

The Seventy-ninth Congress by overwhelming votes in both Houses adopted railroad reorganization legislation. This legislation was sent to the White House shortly before the close of the session.

On August 13, 1946, the President issued a statement in which he detailed his approval of the purposes and objectives of the legislation passed by Congress. However, he thought that the legislation should be made stronger in certain respects and indicated that he believed that Congress could pass such a stronger bill in the ensuing session.

Immediately thereafter a bipartisan statement was issued by members of the conference committee which had dealt with this legislation, to the effect that a measure would be promptly introduced to carry out the wishes of the Congress, as voted by both Houses, and with the additional suggestions made by the President.

It would be useful to have the President's statement, together with the bipartisan statement just mentioned, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval of S. 1253, entitled "An act to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structures; to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes."

Even though I am familiar with the deficiencies and inequities and the evils that exist under section 77 of the present Bankruptcy Act, I fear that this new bill would not accomplish the purpose for which it was intended.

The bill contains two sections, the first of which contemplates the prevention of bankruptcy proceedings where practicable; the second contemplates the reorganization of certain railroad carriers by the institution of proceedings under section 1 of the bill for readjustment of their financial affairs.

Objections which I have to the bill include the following:

The bill fails to direct specifically the immediate reduction of the grossly excessive interest rates now wasting the funds of the railroads in section 77 proceedings. Millions of dollars per year can be saved at once for each of the railroads in section 77 proceedings, by reducing the interest rates on their bonds and other debt down to the level of the interest rates paid by railroads not in section 77 proceedings. I reiterate a statement which I made in my message to Congress on the state of the Union which is as follows, "low interest rates will be an important force in promoting the full production and full employment in the postwar period for which we are all striving."

The bill does not adequately cure the evil, present in reorganizations under section 77, of permitting improper control of railroads after their reorganization.

The bill fails to provide full protection against forfeiture of securities and investments.

The level of fees and expenses in reorganization cases under section 77 has been excessive. This is not corrected in the bill. Affirmative provisions to curb this evil and to bring it under strict control should be included in any bill which may be enacted.

The bill excludes from its benefits certain railroads which should be brought within its provisions if it is to become law. In this regard it appears that the $50,000,000 limitation in section 2 of the bill would exclude some railroads for whose exclusion there appears to be no logical justification.

This bill fails to correct a serious abuse which I condemned in the course of the Senate railroad investigation. I refer to the abuse of diverting under cover of a reorganization plan, the funds of a railroad for the purchase of its own stocks in the market.

On the other hand, the bill does incorporate principles for which I was one of the sponsors in the Senate. I commend particularly the emphasis which the bill places on the principle that reorganizations must give primary consideration to the public interest, and to the best interests of the railroads which are being reorganized.

This requires, among other things, that reorganizations shall place control of railroads in persons primarily concerned with transportation for the communities served and for the Nation as a whole, without any strings direct or indirect, conditions or otherwise, to institutions or others in distant financial centers.

Such regard for the public interest will also help the stockholders, whether they be railroad employees who have invested in the stocks of the companies for which they work, or ordinary investors, desirous of safeguarding their investment, but not of helping any interest to capture control of their railroad. These stockholders, whom the bill justly seeks to protect against forfeiture, can and should get such protection, but without enabling any financial interest to use such legislation to acquire control.

By withholding my signature to this bill I do not intend to indicate that I favor the pending reorganization plans. I am in agreement with those objectives of the bill which prevent undesirable control of the railroads, either immediately or within a few years, and which prevent forfeitures of securities.

I believe that the next Congress can pass a bill which will meet the stated objections and which will be in the best interests of the public, the railroads, the bondholders and other creditors, and the stockholders.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1946.*

STATEMENT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS REGARDING FURTHER LEGISLATION

The railroad reorganization bill, S. 1253, was the culmination of over 3 years of intensive effort to save $2,000,000,000 of investments made by hundreds of thousands of stockholders and junior bondholders in railroads now in process of reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. Those investments will be wiped out under pending plans of reorganization unless legislation is enacted to prevent it. This bill was designed and passed by the Congress primarily for that purpose.

Those who have supported this legislation will be definitely heartened by the declaration of principles contained in the President's memorandum stating why he withheld his signature from the bill. For it is clear that the broad principles announced by the President are shared by the proponents and supporters of this legislation. Broadening of the bill to meet the requirements of the President's objections can and will be drafted. Such a bill will be promptly introduced at the next session of the Congress. As Congress has already overwhelmingly committed itself to such legislation and the President has declared that he, too, favors its purposes, the prompt enactment of such a measure appears certain.

While this legislation was under consideration in the committees of the Senate and House, a number of courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission recognized the appropriateness of cooperating with Congress in meeting this public problem and abstained from taking steps which would have carried forward any of the pending reorganization plans under section 77. This was months before the legislation came up for a vote in either the Senate or House. Now that the legislation, both in the form in which it was reported by the respective committees of the Senate and House and in the subsequent form contained in the conference report, was passed by an overwhelming vote in each Chamber and the objectives of the legislation have received the approbation of the President, it is confidently hoped that the courts and the Commission will take no steps in support or furtherance of pending reorganization plans under section 77, but will instead await action by the Congress and the President on legislation giving effect to the principles favored by both.

CLYDE M. REED.
JAMES M. TUNNELL.
SAM HOBBS.
CHAUNCEY W. REED.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 14, 1946.*

Mr. REED. Mr. President, preliminary discussions have already been agreed to with Members of the House, with a view to expediting this legislation in the Eightieth Congress. It is hoped that it can be taken up, in a preliminary stage, with the White House so that the greatest possible speed can be secured for the legislation to be finally enacted in the Eightieth Congress.

It will be useful for this purpose to conduct a brief inquiry such as was authorized by the Senate on April 1, 1946. In the Seventy-ninth Congress the former senior Senator from Montana, Mr. Wheeler, and the junior Senator from Kansas introduced Senate Resolution 192, providing for such inquiry. The terms of that resolution have been broadened to cover subsequent developments, including, in particular, the suggestions made by the President on August 13, 1946, as well as the advances made in the legislation passed by Congress on this subject toward the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Subsequent to the passage by the Senate of Senate Resolution 192, as well as prior thereto, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce held prolonged and exhaustive hearings on this subject, and thereafter submitted to the Senate a full and exhaustive report of pertinent facts, in Senate Report 1170.

The subject matter requiring inquiry is therefore now far more limited than even the limited subject matter called for in Senate Resolution 192 early last year.

In view of the accumulation of the great body of material in the hearings on Senate bill 1253, the legislation considered by the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, none of the funds authorized under Senate Resolution 192 had to be expended. If the same economical handling can be effected in this Congress on the resolution now proposed, of course the same policy will be followed.

GAMBLING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL SPORTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation of the apparent raid of organized gambling upon organized national sport. I request that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 66), submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas organized baseball is an interstate system of commercialized sport operating throughout the United States under central management which exercises complete control wherever the game is played; and

Whereas professional football, hockey, basketball, and other sports are similarly organized and managed as commercial enterprises on an interstate or national scale; and

Whereas the American public supports these enterprises out of a love for athletic contests of skill and agility and in the belief that all such contests are played honestly by the players and managed honestly by the owners; and

Whereas athletic contests are an important source of tax revenue for the United States; and

Whereas there have been instances of attempts by gamblers and the underworld, by corrupting players and otherwise, to influence the outcome of such contests in order to enable them to make wagers, secure in their secret knowledge of the outcome of such contests; and

Whereas there have been numerous reports of an organized attempt by such gamblers to extend the sphere of their activities in baseball and other organized sports: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation with respect to the operation of professional sports contests, with particular reference to attempts at bribery and other corruption in connection with these contests and the extent to which Federal laws are being violated and the tax revenue of the United States affected.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire also to emphasize the necessity for this action by reading the following statement from the column of Westbrook Pegler as published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 17, 1947, a column in which he discusses the subject of baseball and gambling. He said in this column:

I anticipate that one eminent club in the major leagues will be secretly owned by the underworld soon through loans to an inept and stupid owner.

Yesterday in the Washington Times-Herald a sports columnist by the name of Jimmy Powers made this statement:

Gamblers still operate openly in many ball parks, waving fistfuls of currency and shouting odds.

I ask unanimous consent to have both articles printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 17, 1947]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

A short time after the death of Judge K. M. Landis, the baseball industry was invited to consider Elmer Irey as his successor. The owners chose, instead, Happy Chandler, of Kentucky, a politician and, by the process of that occupation, a Senator.

He was not a good Senator and the qualities which recommended him to his new employers were his defects, not his virtues.

They wanted a man less narrow-minded than the old judge had been and an optimist who would look for a silver lining in a sewer.

Mr. Irey was coordinator of the intelligence services of the Treasury. That means he was general manager of the Secret Service, the Narcotics and Alcohol Tax Units, and several other groups of investigators and fly cops. He was retired.

In his career with the Government, Mr. Irey had general charge of the investigations which turned up the evidence against the Pendergast gang in Kansas City, of which President Truman is a proud alumnus in affectionate defiance of our perfunctory morals; against the Huey Long gang and Al Capone.

This long experience necessarily made Mr. Irey familiar, as few other men are, with the personal relationships and the interlocking interests of the criminal underworld of New York, the Miamis and Hollywood, and the night club and radio departments of the mutually nasty amusement, gambling, and narcotic industries.

Now, professional—and, in some phases, amateur, as it were—sports are invaded by the same vermin who infest our other enjoyments.

Being apart from politics and objective by temperament, Mr. Irey would have come to the job of baseball commissioner free of the old associations and the debts of political gratitude which might handicap a man with Happy Chandler's history.

The proprietors of the major league teams are the trustees of a curious industry which

is carelessly regarded as the national game of the great Republic. They have lowered the standards that Judge Landis maintained.

Landis was arbitrary and he invited damage suits by his decrees of banishment against individual rascals. He also excluded, on general, but beautiful, principles all race-track men and race-track money from the ownership of major league teams or firms.

This verboten was abandoned soon after his death.

Landis kept the players on warning to shun gangsters and keep out of underworld hangouts of politicians, crooked Hollywood movie and radio dignitaries, and bookmakers. That social demarcation has been obliterated.

The most conspicuous common resort in New York today of players, gamblers, face-makers, panoplied sound effects, and the lower parasites who feed off their boots, is a saloon which is mentioned so often in print and on the air as to seem to be the capitol of baseball. For that matter, if baseball has a capitol today, it is.

Mr. Irey is no longer a candidate for the job, if he ever was a candidate. I mention him in this connection only to emphasize the need of an uncompromising attitude in the industry toward the underworld and of a man on top who knows crooks in all guises and how they operate and cooperate.

Hollywood is not merely a branch office of the criminal underworld. It is an autonomous state of corruption, but with royal and diplomatic relations with other criminal sovereignties.

Gangsters have become powerful, even illustrious, and enjoy the status of "celebrity." The social standards of Hollywood permitted Willie Bioff, a brothel keeper, so foul that he had to take salt below Charlie Chaplin, to fraternize with the peerage in command of the industry.

A noted magnate of this art recently asked what was wrong with the movies and undertook to answer his own question.

He could not have understood if he had been told the truth, because the worst fault is the social and ethical squalor of his own friends. He would see nothing wrong with them, nor in his own mirror.

I say, let professional baseball go its dirty way. It is not, really, a public institution, anyway, and the nobility and moral splendor which it exploits for the profit of methodical mercenaries and noisy adventurers are an illusion of an affectionate public.

I anticipate that one eminent club in the major leagues will be secretly owned by the underworld soon, through loans to an inept and stupid owner.

If baseball never comes back to respectability, all right.

We had a Nation before we had professional baseball and our civilization will not explode if the ball yards are sown to apartment houses.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 21, 1947]

THE POWERHOUSE

(By Jimmy Powers)

NEW YORK, January 20.—All the average New York fan knows is that Larry MacPhail let him down. MacPhail's conscience must bother him because he acted strangely when telephoned by reporters. He was surlier and more ill-mannered than usual. Newspapermen are accustomed to his boorishness, but even the most callous, including our veteran Jim McCulley, were stunned. McCulley, incidentally, was the only baseball writer to vote for MacPhail recently when discussion of the award of a plaque for services to baseball was introduced.

GREENBERG CASE HARD TO TAKE

If MacPhail's explanation of why he did not go all out financially for Greenberg sounds silly just read all the quotes out of Detroit. One of the zanier reasons why Briggs bounced Greenberg is said to be an interview written by Dan Daniel which was reprinted in Detroit. Dan is one of Hank's best wishers. All New York writers are in Hank's corner and know him intimately. Hank is a clean-living gentleman, a distinct asset to any baseball roster in any city. If the Detroit owners are starting an economy wave or feel that they wish to build with younger men, that is their privilege. But to cut off a good and faithful servant in a cloud of "best interests" innuendos is something we find a little difficult to stomach at this time.

It was particularly untimely to see the backstage conniving that must have gone on to get around the waiver rule which is on the books to protect the fans from loss of good talent.

The best home-run hitter in baseball leaves one league and goes to another. To our mind that is not an honest interpretation of baseball law. There must have been collusion. We don't mind it in pro football, where many owners are gamblers and have their own peculiar set of ethics.

BASEBALL OWNERS HAVE STRESSED HONESTY

But baseball owners have always made a great point of stressing honesty. Here we have the Paris hocus-pocus and then the Greenberg hipper-dipper. We don't mind a few stupid elbow-benders or a fraud who will rob a kid prospect of his last nickel in exchange for a sermon. They make good copy. But when you get around to double-timing the rules by the owners, how long do you think it will take those money-doodles to seep down and stain the men in the ranks?

Greenberg isn't the first star to be waived out of a league on the grounds that none of the other clubs had any legitimate use for him. It is just that the Greenberg case is unusually raw and untimely.

Baseball cannot stand too many of these booby-trap lushes, these Hollywood divorce messes, these crooked dice hookups, slugging under the stands, Happy Chandler, the Mexican expose of how underpaid many of our best men are, the boost in ticket prices, the reserving of all seats in the house to bleed the last dollar out of the lowliest fan. Gamblers still operate openly in many ball parks waving fistfuls of currency and shouting odds.

MAYBE PEGLER IS RIGHT ABOUT PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

We once said to the owners, "Look, let's clean house thoroughly. Get another Landis in there. Insist that your athletes have clean private as well as public lives. Let's make baseball the last shining bulwark of impeccable honesty." And then what happened? Along comes a backstage hocus-pocus of the rules as evidenced by the Greenberg case. MacPhail shouts obscenely at inquiring reporters and we are told in effect to go and quietly drop dead.

Maybe Pegler is right. We may all live to see the day when professional sports are so thoroughly discredited that the ball yards will be sown to apartment houses.

It is gradually dawning on millions of fans that professional sports is not a community religion. It is a hard-boiled business infested by men who are frankly out to separate the fan from as much of his money as they possibly can. We think MacPhail, a shrewd businessman, made a big mistake in not grabbing Greenberg, because that would have been good business.

Evidently there are backstage deals where one owner waives a star out in return for favors rendered. MacPhail may have been handcuffed by obligations incurred in the under-the-bridge-at-midnight deal on Hank Borowy.

Another signpost, if we need any more signposts, which indicates the trend toward a lower standard of morals and ethics in high places is the general silence that greeted Judge Branham's report. The minor league czar stated: "Baseball today is shot full of corruption. * * * There is gambling everywhere." One minor league player who was receiving less money than a New York City garbage collector, was righteously banished and the owners then changed the subject. Corruption is like an iceberg. Three-quarters of its vicious depth is permanently hidden under the surface.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is the governing body of the District of Columbia. Members of Congress in both the Senate and the House are interested in sports and are interested in keeping sports clean. The resolution which I have submitted on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself affords the opportunity now for the leaders of organized sports to purge themselves of these charges.

STATEMENT OF QUESTION BEFORE VOTES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution which would require the Presiding Officer, prior to the calling of the yeas and nays, to state in brief form the substance of the issue to be voted on. All of us know, at the present time that often it is almost impossible for a layman reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know just what the matter is that is being voted upon. Often he must leaf back through a dozen or more pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to learn the sense of the motion or amendment or resolution that is being decided.

To indicate the nature of each vote would require a very simple change in the rules which this resolution would effect. I believe that it would be instrumental in making for more intelligent understanding by all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the issues that are decided upon here in the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 67), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Immediately prior to calling the names of Senators after the yeas and nays have been ordered, the Presiding Officer shall state in brief form the substance of the issue to be voted on."

LABOR LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of labor legislation delivered by him before the Minnesota Employers Association, St. Paul, Minn., January 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT ON UNESCO—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill., on January 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THEY'RE ALL FOR LOWER TAXES, BUT—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "They're All for Lower Taxes, But—" published in the January 19, 1947, issue of the New York Times magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PATRICK HENRY, LAWYER—ADDRESS BY MICHAEL FRANCIS DOYLE

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Patrick Henry, Lawyer," delivered by Michael Francis Doyle, of Philadelphia, Pa., before the Virginia Bar Association, at Virginia Beach, Va., on September 18, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ESSAYS ON BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two prize essays on Benjamin Franklin written in a competition sponsored by the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia and radio station WPEN, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMERCIAL RADIO PROGRAMS—ARTICLE BY CARROLL CARROLL

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "America Likes Its Commercials," written by Carroll Carroll and published in Variety for January 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STATE OF THE UNIONS—ARTICLE BY MAURICE R. FRANKS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The State of the Unions," written by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers Journal, and published in the American Press for January 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees, which were, on page 1, line 10, after the word "employees" to insert "(except in the case of death or resignation of any such employee)"; on page 2, line 3, after "employees" insert "(except in the case of death or resignation of any such employee)"; on page 2, line 8, strike out "January 31, 1947" and insert "the date of enactment of this act"; on page 2, line 11, strike out "and"; on page 2, line 17, strike out "(2)." and insert:

(2) and of the elected officers of the Senate;

(4) employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is abolished by operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (except in the case of the death or resignation of any such employee) shall continue on the rolls through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Clerk of the House of Representatives;

(5) employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress which is not abolished by operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (except in the case of the death or resignation of any such employee) shall continue on the rolls until January 31, 1947, unless otherwise directed by action of such committee; and

(6) the appropriations for "Salaries, officers and employees, House of Representatives", as contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available in such amounts and under such regulations as may be approved by the Committee on House Administration for compensation of employees of the standing committees of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, except the Committee on Appropriations, and shall be available for the compensation of officers and employees of the House of Representatives as authorized by section 201 and section 244 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 20, appointing a special committee to study the problems of American small business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 20), which is as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of 12 Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small-business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, is hereby terminated.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I submit a substitute for the resolution which has been made the unfinished business, which I send to the desk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber that I did not hear what the Senator from New Hampshire said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has offered a substitute for Senate resolution 20, which will be stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for the purpose of offering a substitute for the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from New Hampshire has offered a substitute for the resolution which is now the unfinished business. He has a right to do that.

Mr. TOBEY. That is what I offered, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire can offer the substitute resolution later. It is not in order until after the Senator from Nebraska has concluded his observations.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF FISHERIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on December 18 representatives of all the fishery industries on the Pacific coast, as well as the governors of California, Oregon, and Washington, met at the request of Hon. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, and submitted to him a proposal to place fisheries on a higher level in the State Department in regard to international negotiations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the recommendations.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF FISHERIES AND THE NECESSITY FOR STATE DEPARTMENT CONSIDERATION THEREOF AT A HIGH POLICY-MAKING LEVEL

To the Honorable WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary in Charge of Economic Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It will be remembered that on December 18, 1946, Governor Wallgren, of Washington, personal representatives of Governor Warren, of California, and Governor Snell, of Oregon, together with representatives of the Pacific Coast fishery industry, and the largest American fishery labor union, conferred with you relative to the urgency of the State Department recognizing the necessity for creating a high post within the Department to deal specifically with fisheries as an active, continuing problem and not as a collateral commodity. At that conference, you requested that we submit a very brief brief on the subject.

Accordingly, we respectfully represent:

1. In 1936, when the fisheries' problem in the north Pacific was brought to the direct attention of Secretary Hull, he immediately appreciated the importance of the subject and the necessity of high-level treatment if international complications and potential conflicts were to be avoided. Initially, he appointed a committee of three top men in the Department and shortly thereafter assigned the subject to his closest friend and confidant in the Department, Judge R. Walton Moore, and gave him a special adviser to work under his immediate supervision.

2. Judge Moore passed away in 1941 and Assistant Secretary Breckenridge Long suc-

ceeded to the assignment. There was no other change in jurisdiction or status.

3. Shortly after Secretary Stettinius' advent in the Department, he undertook a blanket reorganization and in January 1944 fisheries were assigned to the Commodity Division of the Economics Branch. It is respectfully submitted that the reorganizers lacked familiarity with the actual and potential problems of fisheries' activities and thought that "fisheries" and "fish" were synonymous and were nothing but a commodity.

4. A serious effort was made to point out the specious reasoning of the reorganizers to the Assistant Secretary then in charge of the Department's organization. His explanation of the treatment which fisheries had been accorded was that fisheries were an anomaly; that they did not seem to fit anywhere in the Department's organization diagram; hence there was no other place to put them than into the Economics Division.

5. Until our conference with you, it has been impossible to interest any responsible officer of the Department in the status of fisheries within the Department's organization. We have maintained that fisheries do not belong in the Economics Division and that they are an activity involving serious, unique, and international complications, and not a commodity, and as such an activity should be the direct and immediate responsibility of an official of the Department occupying a policy-making position. The industry, the six United States Senators from the Pacific Coast States, and the three Governors of these States, have all endorsed the position we have advanced, but during the 3 years since fisheries were demoted in the Department and shifted from their proper sphere of diplomacy to that of economics you, Mr. Under Secretary, were the first to express a willingness to consider the situation upon its merits instead of treating it as a closed issue. In addition, as the facts were recited, you immediately recognized the potentialities.

So much for the historical background.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS OF FISHERIES WHICH REQUIRE A HIGH OFFICIAL AT THE POLICY-MAKING LEVEL TO HAVE FISHERIES AS A PRIMARY AND SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITY?

It is understandable that one unfamiliar with the subject might assume fisheries to be a commodity rather than an activity. He does not realize that the activity which produces this particular commodity has such a distinctive locus and nature as to make this activity actually unique. The fish must be found, reduced to possession, preserved, and distributed before it becomes a commodity.

The commercial fisherman must locate an area where commercially valuable fish may be caught in quantities sufficiently large to support the venture, and having found such an area, must be protected in the right to take fish therefrom. These areas and the right to take fish therefrom are what we term "fisheries."

Ocean fisheries have a distinct position in international affairs of a diplomatic and legal nature. In the past they have caused warfare. In fact, shortly before World War II they almost precipitated war between Russia and Japan, for on more than one occasion blood was shed and vessels sunk as the result of armed conflict between Russian and Japanese fishermen. The records of your Department show that in 1938 the Japanese were induced by the Department to withdraw from Bristol Bay and it is respectfully represented that if fisheries had not been given consideration at the highest level at that time armed violence between the Japanese and our own fishermen would probably have taken place.

There have been, are, and will be North Pacific problems as to the Russian, Japanese, Canadian, and American fishing vessels in this area. There have been, are, and will be problems in the Western and Southern Pacific and in the North Atlantic. Some of these problems are acute and are already overdue for adequate attention. As to some steps which might have been taken, we may even now be too late.

From the time of Hugo Grotius fisheries have coped with the merchant marine as an incentive to the development of the law of the sea. This law should not be and is not static, but its growth cannot properly be placed in the hands of economists. It demands the attention of trained diplomats and international legal experts. International law is a growing and vital implement to international peace. But international law, including that relating to fishing, is in a state of flux. The United States should lead in the molding of sound principles by intelligent planning and aggressive action.

The right to fish carries with it the corresponding duty to preserve the area for continuous fishing. As has been demonstrated in the case of Pacific coast halibut, an ocean fishery properly managed through international understanding can be maintained at what is practically a maximum production level. Fisheries as a resource must be preserved, and unless the rights are defined and rules of reason promulgated, areas which we have discovered and developed may well be exhausted not only by our own fishermen but by the fishermen of other countries bent on ruthless exploitation. Only intelligent international understanding can accomplish the desired result. An official at the high policy level personally conversant with this subject and heartily loyal to this Nation's objectives must be responsible for the future of our fisheries. Only such a person can conduct the program on an adequate diplomatic basis.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE PRESENT METHOD OF HANDLING FISHERIES?

Fisheries are principally considered as a commodity by the Department and are relegated to a stratum so far below the policy-making level that it is impossible for any policy-making official to be properly aware of its problems or the consequences of proposed action by this or any other nation.

When any Department policy is formulated in any field it should be known by the policy makers themselves whether it will affect our fisheries. If there is any effect, the policy should not be promulgated or changed without consultation with the fisheries industry. Under the present organization not only the industry but high policy-making officials are unaware of the indirect treatment being accorded fishery problems, sometimes not even of direct action concerning fisheries.

For example, a new concept of international law was expressed in the fishery proclamation of September 28, 1945, by President Truman after exhaustive consultation with and advice from the fisheries industry. Although the language was somewhat weakened without knowledge of those who had worked on its formulation, the proclamation affirmatively declared a vested interest in those fisheries which the nationals of the United States have discovered and developed and provided a means for their proper exploitation and preservation. It was further asserted that fisheries which have been solely developed by us will be controlled by us and that those which were jointly developed with others will be controlled jointly by those who have historically participated therein. The accompanying official release boldly stated that now the United States will be able to protect effectively, for instance, its most valuable fishery, that for Alaska salmon.

It is respectfully submitted that nothing is known to have been done by the Department to implement that declaration of national policy effectively or otherwise. On the contrary, as you will remember, it was suggested by the earnest economist in charge of fisheries that the proclamation was then being interpreted and that a new policy might be evolved—what, we do not know. The industry was not advised of the discussions or determinations within the Department but it strongly opposes any weakening of the President's pronouncement. We submit the course being pursued may vitiate 10 years of effort of the fishing industry and that the spirit and purpose of the President's mandate should not be tampered with. A study of the pronouncement itself and the history leading up to it discloses that it is essential that this matter be handled by high officials who are familiar with international law and international diplomacy.

Economists do not have the training nor background to handle the diplomatic and legal facets of the problem. That is not their field. They may perform a useful function in advising and counseling on the impact of a national trade policy of this or another nation but are in a foreign field when they attempt to formulate policies of a diplomatic and legal character.

CONCLUSION

This presentation has completely omitted producing statistics as we are of the opinion that you yourself recognized the fisheries problem as being one of an activity and not a commodity. This became obvious early in the discussion, and for that reason we are not devoting any argument to meet the frivolous concept that fisheries just mean fish and as such require no different treatment from other food products such as corn, wheat, or potatoes.

We ask that the status of fisheries in the Department shall be restored to its position under Judge Moore and Assistant Secretary Long. We submit that the misunderstanding which existed has continued far too long and to the detriment of this Nation's interests. Other nations not only recognize the necessity of placing fisheries on the very highest policy level but in addition (e. g., Canada) frequently have a member of the cabinet with the title of minister of fisheries or minister of agriculture and fisheries, who, of course, has direct contact with the foreign-affairs department at the very top level of his government. Apparently the only reason that fisheries were demoted in our departmental set-up is because the reorganizers drew a diagram in the drafting of which they completely overlooked fisheries and the importance of fisheries. It would seem that if the organizational diagram does not lend itself to placing fisheries in an appropriate status, the diagram itself must be defective and should be changed. Surely the public interest is paramount to the maintenance of the symmetry of some diagrammatic scheme.

Your suggestion that an industry advisory committee be formed is a step in the right direction, but such a committee cannot serve its most useful purpose unless it is advisory to a policy-level official. It is respectfully suggested that you give serious consideration to the assignment of fisheries as a primary responsibility to some present high Department official who is willing to assume all that goes with the responsibility or if, as we suspect, the present high officials are already too overloaded to be able to give adequate sympathetic attention to this field, then that the office of Special Assistant for Fisheries be created by the Secretary to serve until Congress authorizes an additional Assistant Secretary. (The fact that some particular person may have failed to function satisfactorily in that capacity as to petroleum is no indication of any sound objection to the plan.)

In addition, it is hoped that you will carry out your suggestion and appoint an industry advisory committee. In that case, however, it is suggested that such a committee should act directly under you, Mr. Under Secretary, and that you yourself should preside over the committee. When a special assistant, as

proposed, is appointed the committee can be transferred to him, but if such a committee is to accomplish the desired objectives it should have direct contact with an official of your Department on a policy-making level.

Upon behalf of the Pacific coast governors' fisheries delegation.

Respectfully submitted.

MON C. WALLGREN,
Chairman of the Delegation.

JANUARY 13, 1947.

LOSS OF DRIVING PRIVILEGES BY MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin for last Saturday, January 18. The title of the editorial is "Sad and Sorry." It deals with a subject sometimes considered controversial. I refer to the former First Lady, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The editorial discusses the action of New York State in depriving Mrs. Roosevelt—temporarily, I hope—of the privilege of driving her automobile, and Mrs. Roosevelt's reaction to this decision as described in her daily newspaper column.

The reason I am asking that this particular editorial be included in the RECORD at this particular time is that the owner of the Evening Bulletin, Maj. Robert McLean, who is also president of the great Associated Press, has just been honored by the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia with its medal of achievement for "outstanding leadership in establishing, maintaining, and extending an informative press free of domination by Government or special interests." The presentation was made last Friday at very impressive ceremonies marking the two hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. I had the honor to participate in those ceremonies and to say at that time that to my mind Major McLean represents in the field of information and news a modern-day Ben Franklin of whom all of us in Philadelphia are justly proud, and that his devotion to the truth is a day-to-day and year-after-year tribute to the memory of Ben Franklin.

This editorial on Mrs. Roosevelt bears out what I have said about Major McLean. It is an outstanding example of fair, decent journalism. The paper in which it appears, the Evening Bulletin, in known as a conservative publication. Politically, it seldom sees eye to eye with me or my party editorially. However, I will say that in its news columns I have always found it sincerely anxious to present the news factually and accurately, and I do not think one could ask for anything more than that.

A newspaper like this, then, can proceed, as the Bulletin has done in this editorial, to comment on the much publicized incident of Mrs. Roosevelt's loss of her driving privileges with kindness and with the human understanding that has always been associated with Benjamin Franklin.

As for the great woman about whom this editorial is written, Mrs. Roosevelt, and the gracious manner in which she acceded to a situation which would find many lesser mortals highly indignant, I commend to the attention of the Senate this editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAD AND SORRY

With the disarming frankness characteristic of her speech and writings, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt admits she is a little sad over losing her driver's license, as penalty for an accident resulting from her dozing at the wheel of her car last summer.

But she also admits the "justice of punishment for endangering other people." This is refreshing contrast to the attitude of many motorists who get in trouble with the law. They may confess their offense, yet be highly indignant when required to pay for it. Some will go to great lengths to evade the consequences of their admitted misdemeanors.

Though sorry for her share in the accident, and sad because she may not drive a car, Mrs. Roosevelt seems to find comfort in philosophy. "At all times and as long as one lives, life administers disciplines, and it is in accepting and obeying them that one learns." A great deal has been learned when a man or woman honestly admits a mistake and accepts the consequences without complaint. It is not easily done; punishments of any sort tend to arouse pugnacious instincts and the mood of self-pity and self-excusing. But Mrs. Roosevelt admits her fault, has taken her medicine and asks no favors. Many of her fellow citizens will like her better for it.

SENATOR McMAHON'S POSITION ON THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the end of the remarks which I shall now make, a speech which I delivered before the American Bar Association on October 29, 1946, on the subject of the control of atomic energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have requested this permission because it would seem to me to be apropos that I restate my position on the control of atomic energy, in view of the fact that a story has appeared in the Hearst press and has been circulated from coast to coast, under the byline of William Flythe, which purports to say that I have changed my position, which is so well known, on the international control of atomic energy. I denounce that story as pure fabrication, as utterly and completely untrue.

I called Mr. Flythe on the telephone, when the story was called to my attention. I read the story to him; and he told me that he knew the story was untrue, that it did not appear in the newspapers as he had written it, and that it had been changed after it left his hands, and before it appeared in the press.

I regret the necessity of calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I regret the necessity of calling it to the attention of the country, because my relations with the members of the press have been pleasant and agreeable, and I have received nothing but courtesy and consideration at their hands. So it is with a good deal of regret that I am forced to make this statement about the matter.

I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters from people all over the country who ask me why I have changed my position, which I have held so tenaciously since the first days after the Senate met following the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I have stated, I have requested unanimous consent to have inserted at the end of my remarks the speech which I delivered before the American Bar Association. That speech fully states my position, and from it I have not receded in any degree.

EXHIBIT A

SPEECH OF SENATOR BRIEN M'MAHON BEFORE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, OCTOBER 29, 1946, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

In discussing the great and terrible problem of the international control of atomic energy before a group such as this, I am glad to be able to turn to some of the larger legal and political problems involved. All of us here are lawyers. We know that the strength of government, the peace and prosperity of societies, the security and happiness of individuals depend upon law. We know above all that our democratic civilization and the development of free societies has been possible only through the growth of law. We look to the law to protect us in our property and in our civil rights. We, as citizens, look to the law to establish those conditions in our political affairs under which we can carry on useful and productive lives. We look to the law and to the power which supports the law to keep the peace among us.

If a condition of peace is to exist in the world, we must establish in international politics the reign of jurisprudence; the rule of law. We must set up the machinery and the guiding principles by which disputes among nations can be settled and their conflicts of interest can be reconciled without resort to force. We have just fought a long and costly war to prevent the world from being dominated by force. We must now begin the long, slow task of bringing into being the laws and the administrative instruments that must dominate the world in the place of force.

I need not engage here in any flights of rhetoric to describe what will happen if we fail. The picture of the next war has been painted by far greater word artists than I. In the next war our schools, our churches, our courthouses will be turned into heaps of pulverized stone. And that love of truth, of God, and of justice which has built them will be buried in the rubble. We will die and our children will die, and all that has made life full of hope and meaning for us will disappear in the dust of our ruined cities. We can be sure that this system of law, whose basis is popular consent and whose purpose is justice, this system of law to which you and I have given our lives, will not survive. The race of men that will emerge from another war will be men of yet more unstable natures than we; they will be poorer men; they will be more nervous, more frightened, more superstitious than we; they will be men living without hope of justice or of happiness; they will not be free men; they will be men who have lost all the instincts of freedom. This Nation, if she should gain the whole world in another war, would surely lose that

love of law and liberty under the law which is in truth her very soul.

These are all simple, well-known facts of the situation we face in the world today. We must avoid war. We must set up the legal and political system by which this can be done. The statesmen of the world early recognized this and set up at San Francisco over 2 years ago the United Nations organization. The Senate and the people of the United States recognized it and ratified the United Nations Charter. To the orderly growth and development of that organization as a means of handling disputes among nations, we must look for our only real hope for the future.

Now the explosion of the atomic bomb in the world as it is today has merely multiplied and intensified our terror. Our first, most natural impulse has been to tackle the problem directly and to try to relieve the extreme intensity of this terror. Perhaps some people have thought that if we could get security against atomic weapons, we could go on our old ways with impunity. If we could know that the world was not going to be blown up, we could continue to fight among ourselves as we always have done. If only we could make war safe again and let the world become its old familiar self once more! If only atomic energy would leave us alone so we could live like men and fight in peace! But to most of us, it has been clear all along that there is no real security against the bomb except the elimination of war, and there is no real possibility of that except by the setting up within the United Nations of a government based on law, possessed of overwhelming force, and supported by the confidence of peoples of the earth. We cannot achieve world government in atomic energy alone, but we can achieve the beginning of world government by achieving world government over atomic energy.

When the world was a place of limitless distances, in the days of the oxcart and the sailing vessel, peaceful states might survive by reaching an understanding with their neighbors. Today, in the age of supersonic speed, in the age of globe-circling aircraft, there is no nation on earth which is not neighbor to us. We must find a way to live in the same small world with all of them, or we must remove those of them we do not like from the face of the earth. I shall discuss the alternative later in my talk, but now I must proceed on the assumption that it is better to live and let live. And the only way that this can be done on the international level is the same way it is done on the local level—by the rule of law.

The cooperation of the nations of the earth in the establishment and functioning of a system of international law may, in time, lead to the establishment of some form of world government. Surely a man of vision may see in the seed of the United Nations the fruit of world government. However, it would be foolhardy to expect a seedling to bear fruit immediately. With nations, as with nature, first things come first. And the present task, the immediate task, which confronts the men of our day is to bring about the conditions of soil and climate in which the seedling of peace may take root and, it is to be hoped, may one day flourish like the proverbial green bay tree. The world is postured for peace because the world is depleted by war. I know of no people which wants war. Yet peace is not merely the absence of war. Those who desire peace must wage peace as strenuously as ever war was waged. That means fighting to remove the causes of war. That means struggling to bring under control the fears which lead to war. The one fear which, above all others, haunts the minds of knowing men today is the fear of the atomic bomb. If we can put the harness on atomic power, we may be able to control the gods of war.

It is true that the atomic bomb is not the only terrible and dangerous weapon of war. By the newest refinements in biological, chemical, toxicological, and even psychological warfare, it may be possible to kill, or at least neutralize, as many persons as quickly and effectively as with the atomic bomb. But the power of nuclear fission has been demonstrated to the world. Hiroshima and Nagasaki haunt our dreams. Men know that in dealing with atomic energy, one is dealing with the basic power of the universe. "The force," as the President stated it, "from which the sun draws its power." Men know, too, that this great power need not destroy mankind; it is capable of bringing to each living soul a richness and fullness of life hitherto undreamed of.

That is why the control of atomic energy is a good place to begin the control of war. If we can find a formula for the international control of atomic energy, then I feel sure we shall have the basic formula for controlling all weapons and all warfare.

Now comes the question: What kind of control shall we have?

Whatever the plan, it must provide effective control—that's basic.

Within the fair limits of practical justice, it must be acceptable to all parties. That's basic, too.

A plan may be as lovely as a flower and as shining as a star, but if it isn't accepted, it can hardly be very effective. Of course, acceptability is not the only criterion of suitability. Mr. Gromyko, the Russian delegate to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, has offered a plan acceptable to his country. However, we do not find it suitable because we do not find it provides an effective form of control.

We must, however, do all we decently can to avoid stalemate. Stalemate is a very ineffective form of control over so powerful a force as atomic energy. By the same token, the sand is running out. We cannot and must not permit a filibuster in the United Nations Commission. Palaver in the parlor must not be so long engaged in as to permit too long a time for deviltry in the kitchen. Mr. Baruch, the American delegate to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, says we cannot compromise on basic principle. No American can disagree with that. Mr. Wallace asks for a little "give" on both sides for the sake of securing the effective control the world needs so badly. If compromise is possible, then surely there can be no reasonable objection to it, provided we do not compromise on principle. So the problem reduces itself to an analysis of what is basic to our needs.

Mr. Baruch has recently restated succinctly what he refers to as "the irreducible minima essential to the control of atomic energy." These include full control through an international agency of the materials and means of atomic energy production, free access for international inspection and provision for swift and certain punishment of illegal activities in the atomic field. I have maintained for over a year that these are the indispensable elements of an effective program to safeguard the world from atomic warfare.

When Mr. Gromyko offered the Russian plan, which seemed to consist primarily of a unilateral agreement to outlaw atomic warfare, without effective enforcement provisions, there seemed little likelihood of common understanding. When Premier Stalin made the statement that the world was in no immediate danger of war, I called on him, in a press interview, to remove entirely the danger of a third world war by agreeing now to the internationalization of atomic energy, including an effective inspection system. "Just prohibiting the use of atomic energy for war purposes is not enough," I told him. "International atomic control with effective inspection is necessary to enforce a decent and moral way to share the fruits and wealth of atomic energy. It is because we do not wish to intimidate anybody or to be intimidated ourselves that we have taken the lead in seeking a decent, effective agreement on atomic energy."

I was pleased a short time later when the Russian member of the scientific and technical committee, a subcommittee of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, approved a report holding effective inspection and control scientifically feasible. You may be sure this report was not approved without consultation with the Kremlin.

Perhaps this is an earnest gesture of greater agreement to follow. Since the Russians are compelled by the logic of facts to agree that international inspection and control is scientifically feasible, perhaps, who knows, they may even be compelled by the fact of logic to agree that it is politically feasible as well.

It is our proposal for the abandonment of the veto as regards atomic-energy matters that seems to rouse the most inflexible Russian resistance, although I cannot help feeling that their deepest held objection has been to a system of inspection.

The American proposal, if I understand it correctly, maintains that the issue of the veto is basic and a question of principle, one on which we cannot compromise. The Russians say they will not give up the veto since that would weaken the Security Council and the United Nations. Our delegate says: "There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes." Surely no sincere lover of peace can disagree with Mr. Baruch's purpose on this point. It may, however, as a way out of the dilemma, be pertinent to inquire, whether the same purposes may not be served by some means which leave our principles unsullied and, at the same time, are acceptable to the Russians. If such a means can be found, surely it will be worthy of the end attained.

Our delegate's aim, as I understand it, is to prevent violators of an atomic energy treaty from securing protection under the veto. He wants such violators punished and punished in a correct manner with legal authority. Sometimes the way out of the densest forest is through the simplest footpath. And I would like to offer a simple solution.

Why is it not possible for the treaty itself to specify the violations calling for punishment and to name the punishment which will be meted out to the violator? The question of violation would be a question of fact for the World Court and that Court's judgment would be final. The nature and extent of punishment is already ascribed in the original instrument of agreement. There can be no question of veto; no opportunity for escape. Swift and certain punishment would await such violations as (1) illegal possession or use of an atomic bomb; (2) illegal possession, or separation, of atomic material suitable for use in an atomic bomb; (3) seizure of any plant or other property belonging to or licensed by the Authority; (4) willful interference with the activities of the Authority; (5) creation or operation of dangerous projects in a manner contrary to, or in the absence of, a license granted by the international control body.

If the delegates have stated their purposes openly and sincerely (and I most certainly believe they have), then it seems to me that this plan must meet Mr. Baruch's objectives at the same time that it eliminates Mr. Gromyko's objections.

This, of course, concerns only the question of the veto. But if we make headway in solving this problem, then the chance of solving our other problems is just that much better. We cannot afford to leave any stone unturned. We cannot leave untried any pathway to successful agreement,

because the alternative to mutual agreement is the possibility of mutual extinction. We must learn how to live together on this earth as the only alternative to what we have already learned: how to blast each other into oblivion. If we wish to live, we must live in peace, for if we have a third world war, it will be the one we looked for in the other two—the war to end war. There can be no war when there are no people left to fight it.

I believe that democracy provides the finest way of life for the greatest number of people of any form of government that man has ever known. I believe that democracy is alive and vital and growing. I do not fear the competition of communism or fascism in the economic, political, or intellectual fields. It is only those who have little faith in democracy who could think of advocating war against communism for fear we could not meet the competition.

While I do not fear the competition of communism as a way of life, I do recognize that the fundamental peace treaty that has to be made is not with Italy, Finland, Bulgaria, or even Germany. The peace treaty most fundamental to the peace of the world is the peace treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Until each is certain of the other's peaceful intentions, there can be no peace, because fear and suspicion lead to the race for arms and an arms race almost inevitably leads to war. I am mindful of the words ascribed to the dean of Columbia University that politicians are scientific ignoramuses and scientists are social and political illiterates. It has remained for a businessman, Harry Winne, vice president of the General Electric Co., to call attention to the fact that the present atomic arms race may bring to an end or at least seriously retard the possibility of the constructive use of atomic energy for the good of mankind. "Such a race," he pointed out, "would demand the cornering, concentration, and use of all available uranium. This might mean its rapid exhaustion and the whole process of development might wither like a flower as a result."

That is what may happen if we do not end the atomic arms race by international control. On the other hand, if we do obtain effective international control, the development and application of atomic energy for the welfare of humanity would proceed at an unprecedented and truly astonishing rate. This, in itself, might serve to eliminate many of the causes of war. If atomic power decreases the importance of oil sufficiently, it may no longer be worth fighting over. If radio-activated materials teach us enough about photosynthesis so that we can artificially produce sufficient food for all our people, will we not have taken a big step toward the elimination of war?

Our real purpose, after all, is to begin under international auspices the cooperative development of atomic energy everywhere on the earth and to foster that cooperative spirit among men out of which world law and a world society can grow. When we and the other nations of the world are ready to enter enthusiastically into such a development, then we need have no fears for the peace of the world or the misuse of atomic energy.

Surely it is no sign of bad faith, no cause for despair, that we in America and the leaders of Russia are not prepared to join hands this minute and announce that a world society has been formed and the millennium has arrived. The United States of America were formed originally into a confederation because they had a war to fight. They held together only after great debate because they had a continent to exploit. Atomic energy lies before us now like a great undeveloped continent. Let us trust and hope that the peoples of the world may develop it together.

This is an important thing to do. But let me repeat that we cannot achieve world government over atomic energy while we have world chaos everywhere else. We must do what we can everywhere to promote the growth of law and justice among nations. The hope for our survival and for the survival of all that we believe in lies in avoiding war. As lawyers and as students of human society, you and I know that we can hope for nothing from the growth of tyranny in the world. In the growth of law and the instruments of orderly representative government lies the future of this country as the last, best hope of free men on earth.

INDICATION ON THE CALENDAR OF THE AMOUNT OF PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the following order:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate in preparing the calendar shall, in the case of private claims bills, show the amount of the claim in the left column of the calendar under the number of the bill.

I am submitting this order because the jurisdiction over claims bills has been transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and such bills are being introduced in considerable number. So I think it would expedite the business of the Senate if Senators, when examining the calendar, were able to read the amounts involved in the case of private claims bills.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the order I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate in preparing the calendar shall, in the case of private claims bills, show the amount of the claim in the left column of the calendar under the number of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me, let me ask him whether the order comes as a recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which he is the chairman.

Mr. WILEY. I believe I discussed it in the committee. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] can verify that. However, I think there can be no objection. The order is simply that the calendar shall show the amount involved in the case of such bills. I think that matter was discussed at the last meeting of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I take it that so far as the Senator from Wisconsin recalls, there was no objection.

Mr. WILEY. I think there was no objection. There could not be, because the only purpose is to expedite the handling of such business on the floor of the Senate. The order has no other purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let it be understood that I do not lose the floor by yielding to the Senator from Wisconsin, as I have done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Is there objection to consideration of the order submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I respectfully ask the Chair to have the order restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be restated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate in preparing the calendar shall, in the case of private claims bills, show the amount of the claim in the left column of the calendar under the number of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day there came up in the Judiciary Committee four similar joint resolutions authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Inasmuch as four joint resolutions of a similar nature had been prepared and introduced, I prepared one, giving credit for its preparation to all four Senators who were concerned. I sent forward the joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire when the joint resolution was reported by the committee.

Mr. WILEY. It would have been reported at the last meeting we had, but there were four joint resolutions on the same subject. I consulted the Parliamentarian of the Senate, and I consolidated the four. Now I am requesting unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution which I have sent to the desk. I make this request in order to get the joint resolution off the committee calendar.

Mr. WHITE. I judge that the Senator from Wisconsin is really requesting a suspension of the Senate rule. Is not that true?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; to a certain extent that is what I am doing.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we can be too rigid about the Senate's rules, and yet we should not be too lax in our disregard of them. I shall not object if there is any special or particular reason for the consideration of the joint resolution at this time. But unless there is some particular reason, I think it should follow the usual course, namely, go to the calendar and be taken up in the regular order.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to say to the majority leader that I am sure he understands that if objection is made, it will be necessary to send the joint resolution back to the committee, and subsequently the committee will have to report it, at which time it will bear the names of the four Senators who have introduced similar joint resolutions. As the matter now stands, four similar joint resolutions have been introduced. Every year, for a number of years past, one joint resolu-

tion on the subject has been passed. However, in view of the fact that four Senators have introduced similar joint resolutions this year, the course I have outlined has been proposed, following the suggestion of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. WHITE. I was not troubled because of the inclusion of additional names of Senators as sponsors. I was concerned only because, as I understand the matter, the joint resolution has not been on the calendar and did not lie over, as the Senate rule requires. I shall gladly waive the rule if there is a substantial reason for disregarding it.

Mr. WILEY. The substantial reason, if any, is, as I stated, to expedite the handling of the matter. My request is of no particular consequence, except for the fact that if it is not granted, the measure will have to be returned to the committee, which already is loaded with hundreds of matters which come under its jurisdiction. If objection is made, the measure as it is will have to be returned to the committee, and then the committee will have to get the other four measures off its calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may be heard in the Senator's time, let me say that the joint resolution does not create a permanent nonjudicial or judicial holiday.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. It merely names one day of the present year as a day for the commemoration of the memory of the late General Pulaski.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me repeat that I am not concerned about the substance of the joint resolution. I am concerned about what it seems to me is a disregard of the rules of procedure in the Senate. I do not like to see the rules disregarded unless there is some real reason for doing so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the joint resolution, I have no objection to its purpose. I have no objection to setting aside the day as is proposed. However, I do think the joint resolution should go to the calendar. I can see no reason why the rule should be set aside and why this joint resolution should not take the regular procedure and the regular order of going to the calendar, where Members of the Senate will be advised that the joint resolution is on the calendar, so that if any Senator has objection or if any Senator desires to propose amendments, objection may be made or amendments may be proposed. Therefore, Mr. President, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILEY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report the joint resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary, for the calendar.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. LODGE), was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

WONDERFUL WISCONSIN LOOKS FORWARD TO 1948 CENTENNIAL, MARKING CENTURY OF PROSPERITY AND PROGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 29, 1948, the Badger State will celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of its admission to the Union as our thirtieth State. During the whole of next year, all of the three and one-fourth million souls in America's Dairyland, and the State's countless sons and daughters who have made their mark in the far-flung corners of the world, will rejoice on the completion of the Badger State's first century of statehood.

Splendid plans are being made throughout our State for the celebration of this unforgettable occasion. Every citizen is pitching in with typical Badger enthusiasm.

PLANS IN WASHINGTON

I have personally taken three principal steps to assist in the plans:

First. Coin: Introduced Senate bill 126. This bill; as amended, instructs the Director of the Mint to mint some 500,000 50-cent coins in commemoration of the Wisconsin centennial. These coins can be sold at par or at premium by our State treasurer and can help greatly to finance the centennial celebration.

Second. Stamp: Written to the Postmaster General, urging the preparation of a special centennial stamp. This will be a prize addition to countless stamp collections. So, too, the commemorative coin will be long prized by coin collectors as well as average citizens who do not have that hobby but who will be delighted to buy the coin as a hallowed memento.

Third. Exhibition: Made preliminary arrangements with the Library of Congress for the holding of a 3 to 4 months exhibition in the Library of Congress, commemorating the Badger State's progress. This exhibiton will reflect in manuscripts, prints, maps, books, magazines, and music the growth of our State since that memorable day in 1634 when Jean Nicolet touched the shores of Green Bay.

Just yesterday the Librarian of Congress, Luther Evans, wrote me:

> I am profoundly grateful for your assurance of cooperation. It extends, I sincerely hope, to your willingness to deliver an historical address upon the occasion of the opening. Meanwhile, please be certain of our eagerness to perform a worthy service for, and to render a fitting tribute to, the great Badger State.

I intend, through these and other means, to lend every possible assistance to our State centennial committee in order that our celebration will be the finest possible commemoration.

CENTENNIAL'S ECONOMIC MEANING

Every citizen of Wisconsin knows that the 1948 centennial, inspiring itself in its patriotic meaning, is important economically to our State.

Wisconsin knows that, through the means of the centennial, the Nation will become more fully acquainted with the incomparable economic opportunities provided for new industries and the expansion of old industries in the Badger State—"God's country."

Let us remember that the value of Wisconsin war production in prime contracts alone reached in excess of $5,000,000,000. Subcontracts added several billion dollars to that figure. Our Badger industries received over 175 awards of Army-Navy E flags, ordnance flags, Maritime Commission M awards, and Navy E awards. Our shipyards, our machine-tool plants, our powder plants, our food plants were but a few that rightfully won the praise of the Nation. Thirty-five firms in the State produced atomic bomb manufacturing equipment.

Let us not forget, too, that Wisconsin ranks as one of the most inventive States in the Union. Residents of beautiful Badgerland take out about one and one-quarter times as many patents per million population as the national average.

Now this magnificent industrial and business potential, with outstanding manpower, is rolling in high gear to beat all previous peacetime and wartime records of production.

THE RESORT PANORAMA

Yes; Wisconsin is all this, and a lovely natural paradise too. Through the centennial, millions of vacation-hungry Americans will learn anew the peerless beauties of "the little bit of heaven which is known as Wisconsin." They will learn anew of the 170,000 acres of our State's parks and forests, of our 7,000 lakes and hundreds of miles of rivers and streams—ideal for fishing, canoeing, motorboating, sailboating, rowing, swimming. They will learn the unparalleled facilities for summer sports and winter sports easily reached by car or bus over our 80,000 miles of model highways, by our railways and planes and steamships.

Yes; hundreds of thousands of tourists will learn of our beautiful State capital, Madison, and our great industrial and port city, Milwaukee. They will come to see our thousands of villages and towns, nestling alongside breathtakingly lovely streams and lakes.

All of Wisconsin is vacationland—the green, rolling, dairy country with its purebred cows—No. 1 in the Nation—the cool lakes of southeastern Wisconsin, the hills and valleys of the southwestern part and the Green Bay region, rich in historic lore, the ever-changing glories of the lands and beaches bordering Lake Michigan and Lake Superior, the sportsman's northwoods region, with its thousands of spring-water lakes, the lordly Mississippi on its west border.

Everywhere in these regions are abundant and well-kept hotels and resorts, large and small, together with forest lodges and lakeside cabins, modest cottages and cabins in the pines, available for inexpensive rental. They are managed by folks who pride themselves on their high standards as gracious hosts, and who take pride in their State's national reputation for unexcelled hospitality.

Visitors will particularly want to see many of our 125,000 dairy farms, which, for example, produce more nutritious, delicious, aromatic cheese than is produced by all the other 47 States combined. Our farms established new high

marks in agricultural production in spite of manpower and material shortages.

THE RICH BLEND OF PEOPLES

Visitors will see, too, our harmonious blend of the great races of the earth—Germans, Poles, Norwegians, Danes, Swedes, Finns, Icelanders, French, Hollanders, Belgians, Swiss, English, Irish, Welsh, Russians, Magyars, Croats, Slovaks, Italians—men and women of all faiths and creeds. In Wisconsin they live together harmoniously as Americans, possessing the warm fraternity of the New World while retaining the varied folklore of the Old World.

From this rich blend came Wisconsin's servicemen, and from their ranks came our 12 Congressional Medal of Honor winners.

CHALLENGE TO WISCONSIN

Our citizens know that the centennial can mark the beginning of a new and more prosperous era than ever before for our State's farmers, for its workingmen, its businessmen, its lumbering industry, its mining industry, its fisheries, and its other important economic fields.

Our State has always been a leader in the Nation in sane, orderly, and clean government. We have been a leader, too, in achieving a harmonious balance between industry and agriculture.

The name of Wisconsin and the fame of Wisconsin will spread throughout America to a greater degree than ever before in the Wisconsin centennial. And it will be up to each of our citizens to add new luster and glory to that name and fame by individual efforts to make of Wisconsin a still greater, more prosperous State in the century which lies so challengingly before us.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

I, for one, will bend every effort to further our centennial plans, not only because it is my privilege and honor to represent Wisconsin in the Senate, but because every national legislator, I believe, must back up the State governments. We must help add new honor and new importance to our States. Therein is the salvation of our Republic—establishing strong and independent States to act as a check and a balance on our Federal Government.

The people of Wisconsin have always felt a great pride in their State and in their State government, and I trust and believe that through this centennial, they will feel more closely than ever the ties that bind them as members of the great Badger community.

Forward, Wisconsin.

JOINT COMMITTEES ON PRINTING AND ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BROOKS and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Illinois. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if he will not permit two brief interruptions?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. BROOKS. I report from the Committee on Rules and Administration an original resolution which I ask to have read.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Brooks, of Illinois; Mr. Jenner, of Indiana; Mr. Hayden, of Arizona.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Brooks, of Illinois; Mr. Jenner, of Indiana; Mr. Ives, of New York; Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Holland, of Florida.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, without displacing the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution just read.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Are these appointments agreeable to the minority? Has the minority been consulted?

Mr. BROOKS. The appointments are completely agreeable to all members of the minority, as well as members of the majority. The Reorganization Act provides that the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and two members of the committee shall be members of the Joint Committee on Printing. It also provides that the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and four members of the same committee be members of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Day before yesterday, in the House of Representatives, the House by resolution elected its members of these joint committees by resolution. I have conferred with the Parliamentarian o fthe Senate, who tells me that he is not sure that we need elect the members on the part of the Senate. But the method I am suggesting would be the orderly way of proceeding, and, as I have said, the recommendation has the approval of Senators on both sides.

Mr. HILL. With the assurance of the Senator from Illinois that the minority has been consulted and that the minority approves the proposed action, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 68) was considered and agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 20) appointing a Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business.

Mr. BUTLER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, if the Senators please. Mr. President, I had intended to proceed with the debate on Senate Resolution 20, as I think we should, and bring it to a vote this afternoon. I believe the arguments which have been made in the last few days on Senate Resolution 46, the War Investigating Committee resolution, are equally applicable to Senate Resolution No. 20 relating to the Small Business Committee.

Since I have made the motion, and Senate Resolution 20 has been made the unfinished business, I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would like to offer a substitute, but would rather wait until Friday to discuss the amendment he has prepared. I do not desire to take advantage of any Senator, and I want to give the Senator from New Hampshire time to get ready. So I ask unanimous consent—if Senators wish to proceed with the resolution on Friday—I ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken on it at not later than 3 o'clock on that day.

Mr. HILL and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I know there are Senators on the other side who would like to speak on the question. We have all afternoon today, and I am merely trying to expedite the matter for the Senator from New Hampshire, and would appreciate very much if we could have such an agreement as I have suggested, if it is satisfactory to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, has the Senator made the request, or is he suggesting it?

Mr. WHERRY. I am suggesting it, and am asking if there is to be any objection to it.

Mr. HILL. I do not care to say anything except that I hope the Senator will not make his request at this time. The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is not present, and other Senators who are interested in the resolution are not in the Chamber at the moment. So I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not make his request, because if he does, I say to him very frankly that I shall have to object at this time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to be in a position of forcing the Senator from Alabama to object. I should like to suggest to the distinguished former whip and assistant leader of the opposition that if he would consult with the minority leader I might make the same request later in the afternoon, and if the Senator could give us an answer at that time it would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I shall be glad to consult the minority leader and others on this side who may be interested.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

I now yield to the senior Senator from Nebraska for an insertion in the RECORD, then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida.

PRODUCTION OF SUGARS AND SIRUPS IN ALCOHOL PLANTS

Mr. BUTLER. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding at this moment, but I do not seek recognition for an insertion in the RECORD. I wish to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a joint resolution that has

come from the House, which is identical with a joint resolution reported by the Committee on Finance and now on the calendar.

It is order of business No. 6, having to do with an extension of time, whereby alcohol plants such as the one operated at Omaha, Nebr., may, at the same time they are making alcohol, produce sirups.

I might say for the benefit of Senators now in the Chamber that during the past few months the Omaha plant has produced more than 35,000,000 pounds of sirup, which has aided materially in the sugar situation in America. They have been operating under a resolution which will automatically expire on February 1.

The House committee and the House itself have passed the identical measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol, which was read the first and second time by title.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I now ask that the clerk read the joint resolution in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3126 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to emergency production of sugars and sirups in industrial alcohol plants) is amended by striking out "February 1, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is the Senator from Nebraska asking for immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BUTLER. The Committee on Finance of the Senate has reported a joint resolution which is identical with the measure passed by the House and now here for consideration. In view of the fact that the time will expire February 1, I am asking unanimous consent that the Senate now act on the House joint resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I have no knowledge of the subject matter of the resolution at all, but I feel that, if we are going to transact business, if a request is going to be made to take up a measure for passage, there should be a quorum call.

Mr. BUTLER. If the distinguished Senator wishes a quorum call, it is all right with me, but I do not see the occasion for it, because I know there cannot be a dissenting vote in the Senate on this proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not insist upon the suggestion he has just made. This matter came before the Finance Committee and was discussed there. We had the witnesses from downtown ready to testify, and those who were in charge of the taxing of the distilleries were ready to testify. There was no objection on the part of anyone.

Since there is this deadline facing us, and, indeed, right upon us, I hope that we may make an exception in this case, and in spite of the somewhat irregular procedure, permit the measure to pass.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. BUTLER. The junior Senator from Nebraska has the floor, but I will yield if I may.

Mr. WHERRY. I have yielded to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. When a request is made for immediate consideration of a measure, who then has the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yielded for the purpose of allowing the senior Senator from Nebraska to transact whatever business he had. If there is any question about who has the floor, I submit to the Presiding Officer that it reverts to the junior Senator from Nebraska. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, if he cares to do so.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, am I to understand that the junior Senator from Nebraska yields to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am interested only in the ordinary, proper parliamentary procedure. I do not understand that a Senator may hold the floor and farm it out so as to permit other Senators to have business transacted.

I have no particular point to make at all, except to ask what is the proper parliamentary procedure. I ask, Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the junior Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Nebraska, for the purpose for which he has asked the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the distinguished Senator from Nebraska yield to me so I may make a comment?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that this joint resolution was passed unanimously by the House yesterday. A similar measure was considered here last year and was passed by the Senate, after having been reported by the Senate Committee on Finance. As the senior Senator from Nebraska has said, a Senate joint resolution of like import was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Finance on January 17.

The emergent necessity of getting action I think warrants this procedure, which is somewhat out of order. I hope the Senator will not call for a quorum or interpose other objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I still insist, Mr. President, I am interested only in the parliamentary situation. I submit it is impossible for the junior Senator from Nebraska to hold the floor and yield to the senior Senator from Nebraska for the purpose of asking immediate consideration of a measure and for a vote thereon.

In explanation I may say, in the light of what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I have no desire to suggest the absence of a quorum; very likely it is perfectly proper to proceed in this manner, but I still object to any Senator holding the floor and farming it out.

I make the point of order that no business can be transacted when the junior Senator from Nebraska holds the floor and yields for any purpose other than a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the junior Senator from Nebraska still has the floor, and that he has yielded to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope that if the senior Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent, the Senator from New Mexico will not object.

Mr. HATCH. I must object, as long as the junior Senator from Nebraska holds the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. I will say that I certainly have no objection to considering the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I do not want the ruling made by the Chair to be handed back to us in the future as any precedent, because I think the Chair is quite in error. I think it has been very well established that no Senator can yield the floor to another Senator for transaction of business by the other and still retain the floor for himself, unless he receives unanimous consent. I understand the Senator from New Mexico has objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Senator from Oregon state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. My inquiry is whether the Senator from New Mexico has filed an objection to the procedure in which the two Senators from Nebraska are now engaged?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that objection having been made, the junior Senator from Nebraska still has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] be permitted to transact the business that he has in mind, and that I may obtain the floor immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the joint resolution which came to the Senate from the House, and which was passed by the House unanimously yesterday, has been read at the desk. I think every Senator present understands thoroughly the purpose of bringing up the measure at this time for immediate consideration. The time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars and sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol expires automatically on February 1 of this year. In view of the fact that the proposed extension of time to April 30, 1948, has the unanimous support of the departments of Government interested, and has been so supported several times heretofore, I ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the joint resolution provides. I am sorry, but I was absent when the Senator from Nebraska made a statement concerning it.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sure the leader of the minority will not object when I explain to him that this measure had his support in the Finance Committee a few days ago. It is a joint resolution extending until April 30, 1948, permission to alcohol plants to manufacture sugars and sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

AMERICAN CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the Seventy-ninth Congress and the preceding Congress the senior Senator from Nevada had pending before the Committee on Commerce what was generally termed the all-American flag line bill, which proposed to set up a Government-sustained and a Government-fostered arrangement for international aviation. That bill was opposed vigorously, and it was supported with equal vigor, so much so that the Committee on Commerce by a vote of 10 to 10 at one time, as I recall, nearly voted to report the bill from the committee. However, the bill died in the Committee on Commerce, much to the regret of its author and to the regret of those who have been interested in world-wide aviation.

That we were right in our position that there should be set up an all-American flag air line has been sustained by leading writers on the subject from various angles. At this time I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the January 16 issue of the publication Contact, an aviation publication, headed "United States civil aviation faces alien rule, says J. B. Hartranft, Jr." In other words, alien rule is about to govern our pilots.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL AVIATION FACES ALIEN RULE, SAYS J. B. HARTRANFT, JR.—PRIVATE FLYING WOULD BE UNDER INTERNATIONAL REGULATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 15.—A warning that American civilian pilots are in imminent danger of being placed under the global mandate of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, PICAO, is contained in a new year's report on the state of private flying by J. B. Hartranft, Jr., general manager of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. He points out to the membership of this native-born flying association that if certain proposals are adopted by PICAO, every citizen pilot in this country will be required by law to fly precisely the same way people fly in Ethiopia, Guatamala, and Soviet Russia.

STRAIT-JACKETS DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Protesting vigorously against having our domestic aviation placed in an international strait-jacket, the report states that, "While most of us who are interested in private flying were busy fighting a war, the United States Government, on September 11, 1944, invited 55 nations to meet in Chicago to discuss the subject of postwar civil aviation." The purpose of the meeting being to fix and adopt policies concerning international air commerce. The very wording of the Government's invitation leaves no room for doubt on this point; it said plainly, "The Government of the United States has concluded bilateral exploratory conversations with a number of other governments which have displayed a special interest on the subject of international air transport." No mention was made, anywhere in the invitation, of domestic, or personal, aviation.

PRIVATE FLYING SQUEEZED OUT

Yet when PICAO was born at the Chicago Convention, and duly ratified by the United States Senate, steps were immediately taken to place pilots everywhere under world-wide rule, regardless of national preferences or geographic requirements. At the time private flying was off to the wars and could not be consulted. Then later, upon being mustered out, civilian aviation had to reestablish itself, and it wasn't possible to accept PICAO's bid to sit around the table at the Montreal headquarters.

All other interested groups, including labor, have had ample and very vocal representation there. Outstanding among whom is the rich, powerful Air Transport Association. On this point Hartranft adds, "Our association is envious of the successful campaign which the air transport industry has conducted in dominating the molding of those regulations. Backed by a strong and wealthy association of air lines, they have been able to send qualified representatives to sit in continuous PICAO sessions, a luxury which the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, cannot yet afford. Therefore, where bargaining has been resorted to it has been of little consequence that private pilots' rights and privileges have been abrogated."

Thus civilian aviation has become, according to Hartranft, a pawn of international politics; a bartering medium with which the air lines of the different nations obtain concessions and special consideration.

NOT CONGRESS' INTENT

The Congress of the United States had no intent of placing domestic aviation under alien rule. The Govenment agency responsible for what private pilots term a global sell-out is the Air Coordinating Committee, a wartime hang-over which serves principally as liaison between the United States and PICAO. Proof of this group's insensibility of our traditional freedoms comes to light in one of their bulletins, ACC-52/13, dated June 24, 1946. Fortunately for American aviation, or perhaps fearful of possible popular indignation, the recommendations set forth in the bulletin are couched in legal phraseology which offer several avenues of escape in case the people become unduly wrought up. Here is the potential death knell to aeronautical freedom.

Mr. McCARRAN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an article appearing in the publication World Transport, the issue of January 21, 1947, under the caption "Profits of United States air lines cut by inroads of rivals abroad."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS OF UNITED STATES AIR LINES CUT BY INROADS OF RIVALS ABROAD—BIGGER PLANES, POOLING OF FACILITIES, AND POSSIBLE AID FROM GOVERNMENT INCLUDED IN PLANS TO OFFSET LOSSES

Expansion of world routes by United States air lines since the war is not returning expected profits. Despite this tremendous enlargement, United States domination of the world's commercial airways is being increasingly challenged by other nations.

Income from international air routes has dropped precipitously in the last year. Passenger demand is falling off. Progressive rate cuts on some lines have been forced by intense competition from the companies of other nations.

The current difficulties of the world's air lines stem directly from the rush to satisfy pent-up demand for high-speed international travel that followed the end of fighting. United States companies jumped into an immediate lead on most routes. The availability of new sky liners gave the American services an advantage that could not be matched by any other nation.

Overexpansion on the part of several companies resulted. Many invested in surplus equipment of the United States Army that already is outmoded by postwar planes.

Extension of routes to cover the world necessitated development of terminal facilities. In 1946, United States lines added 68,000 miles to the international routes, bringing the total to 175,000. The initial expense of establishing elaborate ground organizations was enormous.

In addition, many of the costly aids to navigation, such as radio facilities and rescue equipment provided by the military services during the war, now must be furnished in large part by private companies.

Concurrently with increased expenditures for the expansion of services, the air lines are faced with continually rising costs of operation. Labor costs and the price of new equipment have gone up substantially since the end of the war.

As a result of the rise in costs and drop in passenger demand, some of the companies have canceled orders for new equipment.

Competition from abroad is becoming more intense. Originally, the lines of Britain, France, Holland, Canada, and Scandinavia were handicapped by a lack of modern planes. To overcome this disadvantage, precious dollars were allocated by the respective countries for the purchase of the latest types of United States built craft. These will be used until Britain, France, and the others can manufacture planes that will match the performance of those of the United States.

Government backing has aided companies of other nations in their efforts to overtake the United States in the air. These countries employ the chosen-instrument principle by

which one government owned, or sponsored, line is given a nation's monopoly on certain routes.

Citizens of other countries are finding it advantageous to fly on their own flag lines. Currency controls in most countries make it difficult to pay dollars for passage on United States planes. Other advantages are apparent, such as ease in clearing customs.

Effect of international competition is reflected in the decreased pay loads on American lines. This is especially true on the North Atlantic route which was dominated almost completely by the United States at the end of the war. Planes of other nations now are carrying half the passengers flying across the North Atlantic. Nearly all planes westbound are filled to capacity, due to the backlog of persons in Europe wishing to come to the United States. But many planes are flying from the United States to Europe nearly empty.

On every European route they fly United States lines are competing with at least one, and often more, rivals. The British, Dutch, and Belgian services have flights between nearly all of the major cities to which American planes are scheduled.

Competition from the British is beginning to make itself felt in South America. The British line has flights scheduled 10 times weekly from Europe to South America, with links connecting most of the countries. During 1946 it carried 5,041 passengers for a total of 23,799,151 miles. In addition, 553,556 freight-ton miles and 584,935 mail-ton miles were flown.

In the Pacific, principal contenders against United States superiority are the Australians and Dutch. The Australians have started a service to Canada. The Dutch plan to link the Netherlands Indies to the west coast of the United States, completing their circuit around the world.

Competition is coming also from the return of ocean travel. Luxury liners, not available during the war, are taking some of the potential air travelers.

Against this backdrop of difficulties the United States lines flying world routes are reconsidering their plans.

New projects call for the early substitution of larger planes capable of carrying bigger pay loads with the same size crew. Operating costs are expected to drop sharply when planes can carry approximately double the present number of passengers. Officials of United States companies believe that the big planes being produced will assist in recapturing much of the traffic now being carried by the services of other nations. Improved air liners built in the United States are considered to be well ahead of those of other countries.

United States companies may pool terminal facilities. This may lead to joint use of planes over highly competitive routes, so that profitable loads can be carried. Such common action on the part of the carriers eventually may find United States private companies in effect matching the chosen-instrument device of the other nations.

Revenue freight will be carried by more and more planes of the scheduled air lines. Transport of air cargo is recognized as a developing source of income in the future. The lines are anxious to win freight contracts on international routes to prevent contract carriers from cutting too deeply into this profitable field.

Passenger service is to be improved to match the comforts of ocean travel. Terminal facilities will be modernized. The airways recognize that people no longer fly for the glamor; that there must be more customer appeal.

Safety facilities will be improved, as more and more air lines install radar and other devices for flying under all weather conditions.

The alternative to the plan of United States companies for meeting world competition may be more assistance from the Government on world routes. Increased subsidies through air-mail contracts may result. Pooling of facilities, to place United States companies on a par with their international rivals, may be allowed. The United States Government may give the lines more of a helping hand to aid them to take over the dominant position on world air routes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on several occasions during the last Congress, I drew the attention of the Commerce Committee and of the Senate to the fact that unless the Government of the United States adopted the same principle that had been adopted by Great Britain whereby Great Britain stands behind the chosen aviation instrument of Great Britain and sustains it in its world flights, and followed the same course, our air aviation would be doomed.

Mr. President, in the Washington Star of January 19 this year appeared an article written by W. H. Shippen, Jr., under the caption "'Growing pains' making United States air industry groan" which deals with the same subject. The writer shows that today aviation in America is suffering severely because of foreign competition, and especially because of the fact that great nations such as the United Kingdom have set up a chosen instrument similar to that sought to be set up under the bill to which I referred, the all-American flag line bill. I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Star may be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GROWING PAINS" MAKING UNITED STATES AIR INDUSTRY GROAN—PAN AMERICAN'S PETITION FOR DOMESTIC ROUTES AT LOWER RATES OPPOSED BY RIVAL LINES AS NEW THREAT TO PROFITS

(By W. H. Shippen, Jr.)

The show-down being forced by Pan American World Airways on the issue of free trade in the air-transport field comes at a critical period in the American aviation industry.

In the lush days of war profits and expansion, 11 United States lines were given international routes under the Federal policy of controlled competition at home and abroad.

Now, plagued by accidents, a decline in revenues which seems temporary but certainly is drastic at this time, and overexpansion in some cases, the lines must marshal their arguments against Pan Am's all-out fight to enter the domestic field with nonstop service at reduced rates.

Pan Am's claim to equal rights with its competitors to operate both domestic and foreign routes and the arguments against it are contained in the largest record ever compiled for the Civil Aeronautics Board—more than 6,000 pages of testimony before a CAB examiner at preliminary hearing just completed.

Batteries of attorneys on both sides are now preparing briefs from the great volume of testimony and exhibits for filing with the CAB prior to oral arguments sometime next summer, with a decision from the Board not expected before fall.

PROFITS DROPPED SHARPLY

The economic picture for the industry has changed radically since Pan Am, taking its cue from what appeared a firm Federal policy of controlled competition, abandoned its fight for community operations overseas and demanded the same right to fly at home that the competition had been given to fly abroad.

Net profits from air-line operations had fallen from the war peak of $42,398,691 in 1945 to $4,788,317 in the first 10 months of 1946, a drop anticipated but doubly difficult to assimilate in a period of high costs for reconverting war equipment and general expansion. Although no figures are available for the last 2 months of 1946, it is known that passenger revenue fell off sharply except during the holiday season.

This was due, air-line officials say, to a series of disastrous accidents grouped close together plus the usual seasonal decline during winter weather. Another element was public reaction to a postwar period of rapid expansion, when facilities were jammed by a pent-up travel demand and the air lines were breaking in new staffs to handle the rush.

At the same time one of Pan American's foremost competitors for high-density traffic across the North Atlantic, Trans World Airline was buffeted by circumstances over which the management had little or no control—the temporary grounding of its high-speed Constellations, the crippling pilots' strike, a fatal accident in Ireland, and a dispute between the management and principal stockholder.

THREE COMPANIES MADE MONEY

With the exception of TWA, however, other members of the "big four," United, American, and Eastern, managed to show profits in 1946 despite heavy outlays for new equipment, although most of them lost some money in the last quarter.

While TWA has straightened out most of its difficulties which caused a loss of up to $7,000,000 in 1946, the general situation has forced curtailment all along many lines, including reductions in schedules and personnel cancellations of contracts for new equipment, and cooperative efforts to cut expenses.

At a time when Pan American is proposing to connect 13 of the country's big population centers with high-speed service at 4 cents a mile, at least one air line, TWA, has put out the first feeler for an increase in the domestic rate now averaging about 4½ cents.

Too, half a dozen air lines have applied to the CAB for higher air-mail rates, including the only big operator with headquarters in Washington, Capital Airlines—PCA, which lost over $2,000,000 last year, due largely, it was said, to rapid expansion and the addition of many four-engined transports.

Pan Am's application, backed by Washington and 12 other gateway cities on its proposed domestic network, must be passed upon under the law which charged the CAB with regulating the air lines and their passenger and mail rates to encourage the development of a strong industry "for the commerce, postal service, and national defense of the United States."

ADDED COMPETITION RESISTED

Moreover, an applicant must prove "public convenience and necessity." The dozen air lines opposing Pan Am's application contend the added competition will result in disastrous diversions or revenue from existing air lines, and that Pan Am has proved neither convenience nor necessity for a service, which, they say, can be duplicated by companies already operating between the 13 cities.

The Post Office Department has entered the case as "a friend of the court" without taking sides, but Pan Am's opponents claim the bulk of its testimony upheld their arguments that the proposed service will unnecessarily divert revenue on a scale which would jeopardize profits of the whole domestic industry.

Meanwhile, the revenue passenger loads dropped from an average of over 90 percent during the war to a general average of 59 percent in November, and air-line officials believe figures for December and the first half of January will be even lower. This happened while the air lines were doubling their passenger capacity and flying almost twice as many passenger-revenue-miles in 1946 as in 1945.

Although Pan Am is now committed against a policy of segregating domestic and international operations, and has spent at least half a million dollars backing its new stand, the old issue of an "all-American flag line" to handle all our overseas flying has been raised in the new Congress by Senator McCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada.

The McCarran bill, which would set up a single company in which present international air lines and the United States would hold stock, may have more chance of passage than in the last Congress, although enemies of the legislation say the President would veto it as contrary to the policy of free competition.

With an increasing number of nationalized foreign air lines now flying to the United States, including the British, Dutch, French, and Scandinavians, friends of the bill believe a single United States flag carrier would be the only one which could compete on an equal basis.

Pan Am points out that already brisk competition in the North Atlantic will become increasigly strong between all trading nations, with Canada, the Central and South American countries, China, India, Australia, and the Union of South Africa either authorized or negotiating for American rights.

Some observers believe our whole air policy formed under a Democratic administration may be brought up for review before the Republican-controlled Congress, where cries already are being raised in both Houses for investigations of accidents and the financial condition of the air lines.

Civil aeronautics officials, however, agree with "one of the smartest operators in the business," W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, that the lusty, if somewhat overexpanded, industry is suffering only temporary "growing pains," or, as Mr. Patterson puts it, "a shake-down period."

During the war anybody with an airplane could load it with a pay cargo for almost any destination. The Army's Air Transport Command was letting profitable contracts to carry personnel, cargo, and mail all over the world. A number of operators, Mr. Patterson said, got the idea there was nothing to it but to crank up the engines and get going.

Mr. Patterson believes the financial setbacks and decline in the huge demand for air transport came in time to prevent some bankruptcies and just when all the big lines still are in a position to revamp operations and get back on a basis of normal operations and normal profit.

"The industry as a whole will benefit from the jolts the air lines are getting now," he predicted. Their faults, he added, were on the positive rather than the negative side overconfidence, overexpansion, and a natural American impulse to do things in a big way.

On the favorable side are new transports coming off the production line, or in final test states—unquestionably the finest in the world. New high-speed, high-altitude models by Douglas, Martin, Boeing, Republic, and Lockheed, designed for convenience and economy of operation.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 20), appointing a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Vote 'No,'" published in the Washington Post of today. The editorial has reference to the creation of the special committees which are under consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTE "NO"

There never was a good case, in our opinion, for continuing the Special War Investigating Committee under the Senate's new plan of organization. Now, even the one argument that the Republican leaders had used effectively in favor of an exception for this special committee has disappeared. They had contended that it was necessar. to let the old investigating committee carry on because only that unit had the privilege of examining income-tax returns in the search for war-contract frauds and excessive profits. But when Senator AIKEN asked President Truman about the matter, he was told that the White House would gladly transfer the privilege of examining income-tax returns to the permanent Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Senator GEORGE had previously proposed that this privilege be conferred by law.

No questions remain, therefore, as to whether an effective investigation could or should be carried on. Answers have been properly returned in the affirmative. The only question that the Senate will have to decide when the issue comes to a vote today is whether the inquiry should go forward within the new streamlined structure of Congress or whether a precedent should be set for breaking down the limits of committee jurisdiction every time an investigation is to be made. We think that the advantage of keeping the inquiry within the committee that will hereafter consider all legislation in this field is so overwhelming that it will bring a whopping vote against the special committee if the issue is decided on its merits.

The only thing that stands in the way of deciding the matter on its merits is Republican prestige. The majority leadership seems to have gone all out for the special committee, although it has lost the support of Senator AIKEN, chairman of the standing committee concerned, and probably of other Members. The GOP hierarchy in the Senate ought to realize that even if it should win on this basis, the victory would be very costly. It would put them in the position of railroading through an unwise and unpopular measure solely out of caprice. That sort of triumph leaves the victors as well as the vanquished sour and makes it the more difficult to maintain party solidarity when a real issue arises. We had occasion the other day to quote the sage who said that "the greatest error of statesmanship is to cling to the carcasses of dead policies." It is precisely that sort of error toward which the Republican leaders are headed in this instance, and we hope they recognize it before the vote is taken.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is a very small Executive Calendar. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. I may say for the information of the Senator from Nevada that as soon as we have disposed of the calendar I shall move that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Frances Perkins, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, vice Lucille F. McMillin, resigned.

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency.

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John O'Dea, of the District of Columbia, to be people's counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports from committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Douglas W. McGregor to be the assistant to the Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richmond B. Keech to be associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James R. Wright to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of M. Frank Hammond to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate, in legislative session, resumed the consideration of the resolu-

tion (S. Res. 20) appointing a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that the Senate is now in legislative session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And that the pending business is the consideration of Senate Resolution 20?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I send to the desk an amendment which I wish to submit, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WHERRY. I do this, Mr. President, because a request has been made that the vote on Senate Resolution No. 20 go over until Friday. My amendment will be printed; but if Senators who are interested will turn to the second page of the resolution, in line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress," they will note that the amendment proposes to modify the resolution by inserting "for a period of 240 days after the date this resolution is agreed to."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator seeking to modify his resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the resolution, which has been reported by a committee and is on the calendar, and which we are now considering, cannot be modified by unanimous consent by the author of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained. The Senator from Nebraska may submit his amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that the amendment which the Senator submitted and asked to have lie on the table and be printed?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that course should be followed.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment can lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can be the pending amendment if the Senator so desires.

Mr. WHERRY. I offer the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress", it is proposed to insert "for a period of 240 days after the date this resolution is agreed to."

On page 2, at the end of line 19, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert "as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committees to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Nebraska if he is familiar with the fact that there are now 11 resolutions on the calendar providing for special committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe if the Senator will read the calendar he will find that they do not all provide for special committees. I believe the last one provides for an amendment to the rules——

Mr. TYDINGS. With the exception of the last one, they all provide for special committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not read all of them. I am not sure what the other resolutions provide for, but I do agree that there is a resolution to extend the silver committee, a resolution to extend the petroleum committee, and perhaps one other.

Mr. BARKLEY. The wool committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is not only a resolution to continue the small business committee, to which the Senator is addressing himself, but there is one having to do with postwar economic policy and planning.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a resolution continuing a special committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is one on national petroleum resources. There is one relating to a special committee on the conservation of wildlife. There is one on the national-defense program. There is one on the production, transportation, and marketing of wool; and there is one on atomic energy. There is one with reference to the 1946 election committee, which already has been absorbed; and I think there is a resolution submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], having to do with the further reorganization of the National Legislature.

My purpose in addressing the Senator is this: Now that the Senate has broken the rule with reference to special committees, at some time in the near future those of us on this side of the aisle would like from the leadership on the other side of the aisle an indication as to whether requests for special committees are to be general or confined to special cases. Now that the precedent has been established, some Senators who might not be in favor of all such special committees might be inclined to go along with the creation of extraordinary special committees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Maryland, I will say that I think special committees should be organized only if the Senate feels that such committees are sufficiently important to be justified. I will say further to the distinguished Senator that if those of us who are interested in continuing the Small Business Committee for 8 months cannot justify it on the basis of need and cannot justify the appropriation asked for, I think it should not be organized. It will be perfectly agreeable to me. I think that when any resolution providing for the creation of a special committee comes before the Senate it must be decided in the light of its importance. It is for the Senate so to decide whether it feels that it is important enough to create or to continue. I think that is the only basis upon which a special committee should be either extended or created.

Mr. TYDINGS. In addition to the special committee requests which I have read, there is also one which I understand is being formulated which has to do with fixing the price of gold. If that committee should be created, we would have 11 special committees, in addition to the one which has been decided on here today.

I think the leadership on the other side of the aisle ought to take a pretty firm stand on the question of how far these special committees are to go. We have opened the door, thus giving encouragement for the establishment of special committees. The question now is whether a standing committee can do the job, as was the question before. Many of these proposals are not new. The committee on wool is already in existence, I believe, and this is an extension.

I think the leadership of the other side of the aisle ought to take a stand and tell the Senate how far the organization of special committees will go, rather than have a fight on every one that comes up, because the Senator from Maryland is pretty much of the opinion that it is time to call a halt, and I think we would save time if we knew what the attitude of the leadership on the other side of the aisle was.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator referred to certain resolutions as being on the calendar. He does not mean that they have been reported to the Senate. He has referred to the list of committees proposed.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to take that question up with the distinguished Senator from Maryland and call his attention to the fact that the committees to which he has referred were in existence in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I am not sure whether a resolution will be introduced for the creation of another special committee. The only two resolutions about which we know are the two on the Senate Calendar. As the distinguished Senator knows, they have both been debated together during the consideration of the resolution relating to the war investigating committee. In answer to the Senator's question, I feel that the only time we should create a special committee is when the Senate feels that it has special work which is sufficiently important to merit the establishment of such a committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that one of the western Senators—I shall not mention his name—on the other side of the aisle told me recently that one of the reasons he was going to vote for the special committee which was acted upon was that he wanted the wool committee extended because he wanted to see continued the work which that committee had undertaken to perform. I rather think that

that will be the program with respect to all the special committees that have been in existence in the past.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, up until now, at least, that has not been the program. I do not know of any other resolution which has been placed on the calendar. But I say once again that it will be up to the Senate to decide, when any resolution is presented to create a special committee, whether or not the work is important enough to merit setting up such a special committee.

I should like to say, further, that the list of committees to which the Senator refers are committees which were created in the Seventy-ninth Congress. They are not before the Senate for consideration. As the distinguished Senator from Maryland mentioned on the floor the other day, there has been a special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources, if I remember his statement correctly, which goes back to 1915. A report of its work has not been made. I am not condemning the committee and I do not know whether I have given the exact date, but the query propounded by the Senator from Maryland can be answered only in the light of the importance of the committee which is sought to be created or continued.

If the distinguished Senator feels that there is no need for a Small Business Committee; if he feels that the work which has been done by that committee during the past 6 years has not justified the expense incurred; if he wants to cut off the Small Business Committee and not provide a place for businessmen to come to bring their problems as they have done in the past few years, it is up to the Senate to decide.

I believe if the Senator will follow the hearings and see what the Small Business Committee has done he will find that its continuance is justified.

By the amendment I have proposed we are asking that the work of the Small Business Committee may be continued for 240 days.

As I stated on the floor on the first day of the debate on the War Investigating Committee, I feel that there are times when a special committee cuts across standing committee lines, and that when that occurs it is an important committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish my statement.

When a committee such as the Small Business Committee cuts across standing committee lines, as the Small Business Committee has done and will do for months to come, it is an important committee.

As I pointed out then, and point out now, all matters relating to banking and money should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee; all matters of monopoly control and centralization should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and all matters of freight rates and practices and a hundred and one other things that come up in connection therewith should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

We need a Small Business Committee in addition to the standing committees of the Senate. In the work which the Small Business Committee has done it has cut across the lines of standing committees in the past 6 years. I served on that committee in 1943, as did the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]; and he knows as well as I do that the kind of work the committee has done would not have been done so efficiently by a standing committee as it has been done by the Small Business Committee.

Mr. President, a moment ago I asked the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the minority leader, to consider a unanimous-consent suggestion that inasmuch as a substitute is to be offered for the resolution I have submitted, and inasmuch as the Senator submitting it desires to discuss it and is not prepared to do so at this time, and because other Senators would like to speak regarding it, it would seem that it would be impossible to obtain a vote on the matter this afternoon. So I conferred with the minority leader and with the majority leader.

I should like to suggest again, and merely make the suggestion, that the Senate vote on the resolution and all amendments thereto at not later than 5 o'clock on Friday afternoon next. I should like to obtain unanimous consent to that effect, if it may be obtained. The measure is not a bill or a joint resolution, but it is merely a simple Senate resolution. It is not necessary to have a yea-and-nay vote on the question of its adoption. If there is no objection, I should like to have such unanimous consent obtained, so that the resolution may be set down for a vote at the time I have just stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska that Senate Resolution 20 and all amendments thereto be submitted to final vote at not later than 5 o'clock on next Friday?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I did not understand that the Senator from Nebraska was actually proposing a unanimous-consent agreement. I thought he was suggesting it and was directing his remarks to the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think the minority leader heard what the Senator from Nebraska said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New Mexico. My attention had been drawn to another matter in private conference, and I did not hear the request which the Senator from Nebraska made.

Let me say that the Senator from Nebraska and I have talked about the matter, and the 5 o'clock hour is agreeable to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know whether the request is agreeable to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is the author of the substitute resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. It is. The Senator from New Hampshire is not in the Chamber at this time, because he said he had a severe headache. He had agreed to a suggestion to have the Senate vote at not later than 3 o'clock. But in order to accomplish the objective of obtaining a vote, we have agreed to extend the hour to 5 o'clock on Friday afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was about to say by way of explanation that I object generally to all such requests for agreements which would fix definite times for voting. I think the proceedings in the Senate today have presented a fair example of some of the evils which arise when an attempt is made to designate a fixed and certain time for the Senate to vote.

However, in view of the fact that the Senator from Nebraska makes such an urgent appeal that the Senate agree to vote on this particular resolution at 5 o'clock on the coming Friday, I think I shall not object.

Let me inquire whether the request is to have the Senate vote not earlier than 5 o'clock or not later than 5 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. WHERRY. My request was that the Senate vote not later than 5 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. HATCH. Then I suppose it might be possible for the Senate to vote on the resolution at an earlier hour, if the Senate so desired.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. On the other hand, I shall be glad to modify the request so as to provide for the Senate to vote at an hour subsequent to 5 o'clock, if the Senator from New Mexico believes that 5 o'clock is too early an hour.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I believe that very often Senators who wish to debate questions which are before the Senate are cut off by such unanimous-consent agreements. It is to that practice that I object, rather than to the particular request now presented. But if I may be assured that the request is agreeable to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]—and I think the Senator from Nebraska has already given that assurance—then I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois object to the unanimous-consent request,

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the further request that in connection with the agreement just entered, on Friday the time between 2 o'clock and 5 o'clock be equally divided between the

two sides, the time for the opponents to be controlled by the minority leader, and the time for the proponents to be controlled by the junior Senator from Nebraska. Is that satisfactory?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the further unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska that after 2 p. m. on Friday the time on the pending resolution be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, and that the time be under the control, respectively, of the junior Senator from Nebraska and the minority leader. The Chair hears no objection, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to invite the attention of the able Senator from Nebraska to Senate Resolution 77, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was submitted by the Senator from Nebraska on February 15, 1945. That resolution authorized the payment from the contingent fund of the Senate of expenses of $75,000 for any investigation or inquiry thereafter authorized, under certain conditions and contingencies, one being that any resolution of that kind being offered should first be submitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, together with a budget, in such form as the committee might require, setting forth the committee's estimate of its proposed expenses, hearings, travel, and other information.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether or not any budget was submitted in connection with the pending resolution requesting $50,000 which went to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and was reported by that committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I advised the committee of the resolution, and I was one who felt that the then Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate should be advised of the appropriations requested, and that a statement to justify the size of the appropriation should be submitted.

Mr. LUCAS. I remember very well that the able Senator presented that matter to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. When I was chairman of that committee I agreed with him, the committee reported his resolution, and it was unanimously adopted by the Senate.

Now I am asking the Senator whether he followed his own rule when he offered his resolution requesting $50,000 for a new Committee on Small Business.

Mr. WHERRY. We discussed the original budget of $125,000, and we cited the costs. We talked around the table about it, and when the $50,000 figure was finally inserted, we estimated that it would enable the committee to continue for 8 months. It would not be a new committee in the sense that a new staff would be employed, but we would keep the expenses within the limitation of $50,000. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the matter was not worked out to the last detail, but I will say that it met with the general approval of the committee, and that the committee reported it, and it is now before the Senate.

I should like to point out for the Senator's further attention and information that the same situation arose relative to the Tydings amendment which was voted on by the Senate today. In that amendment no amount of appropriation was set forth.

Mr. LUCAS. All that amendment did was to authorize the continuance of the old committee without requesting any further money at all. I think I am correct about that matter. At this time, at least, no money is requested by the Brewster committee.

But I take it that in the future, even if the Brewster committee requests $100,000, and the Senator from Nebraska is as much interested in having budgets submitted as he was a few months ago, he will compel that committee to present a proposed budget and to explain how it will spend the money requested. I cannot understand how the Senator would bypass himself in regard to such an important resolution, on which he worked for days and nights, and which when presented to our committee was unanimously approved. In other words, I cannot understand how it was so important, when the Senator from Nebraska was in the minority, that he obtain a budget from the majority, but the moment he is in the majority he proposes to bypass his own resolution, and seeks to have the expenditure of $50,000 approved by the Committee on Rules, without submitting any written budget and without telling any member of the Rules Committee how the requested funds will be spent.

I have here a letter from the Small Business Committee dated December 10, 1945, the last time they presented their budget before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and this is what was said:

> It is necessary for the committee to be assured these funds before the Christmas recess, because, first, according to the Wherry resolution passed by the Senate—

And so forth. They asked in the budget for the tidy sum of $187,800. But it was set out in detail, and it was stated in this letter that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was a member of the Small Business Committee, and that he along with Senator Mead and Senator STEWART had examined each item and the budget had their approval. In other words, after the budget was prepared by one of the experts, a committee went over the budget and approved it. I have here in my hand some 10 pages of budget material that was submitted to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate only 9 months ago. Yet now the Senator from Nebraska comes forward and asks for $50,000 without submitting a single line of anything, so far as a budget is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois relative to the work done by the Small Business Committee and by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, relative to the budget submitted under the resolution which he just mentioned, is substantially correct, and it is strange that now the opposition, which asked me to prepare not only the budget but also the outlines for the budget, and submit them to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—and the chairman himself said he would abide by my decision in the matter—should question any budget I bring in now to enable the committee to continue for 8 months.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning any budget the Senator may bring in, because he has not brought in a budget.

Mr. WHERRY. I submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration a statement that it was my opinion that, on the budget submitted only six months ago in detail, it would take $50,000 to continue this committee for eight months, and $50,000 is provided in the resolution. If the distinguished Senator would like to have me prepare a statement showing in detail how the money is to be spent, in order to get his vote for a continuation of the Small Business Committee, I should be most happy to do that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am only suggesting to the Senate how easy it is, once the Senator is a member of the majority, for him to forget the basic principle that was laid down by the Senator from Nebraska himself. I know, from what the Rules Committee said, that there was no written, prepared budget such as the Senator from Nebraska compelled the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and his committee to submit only nine months ago, when he asked for $186,000. If the Senator from Montana had come before our committee and said, "Gentlemen, we want $186,000, and this is the way we propose to spend it," the Senator from Nebraska would have said, "You must prepare your budget in accordance with my resolution before we will pass on a single thing." I know what the able Senator would have said; and he would have been right. But the point I make is that the first time the Senator from Nebraska got an opportunity to bypass his own resolution, away he went as fast as he could to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and here we have him asking for $50,000. No one knows what it is for or how it is to be spent except the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to propound a question to him?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be happy to listen to a question.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement the distinguished Senator from Illinois has made on the floor of the Senate about the action I took and all the help I gave him in the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I will ask the Senator if he would not have faith and confidence in me to continue this committee for 8 months, and allow $50,000, because after the eulogy the Senator has

made of the careful financing I have required of the committee, and how judiciously the money was spent, and how careful I have been in all matters connected with service on the Senator's committee, there could be no other interpretation placed upon the Senator's statement than that he would be perfectly satisfied that the junior Senator from Nebraska would efficiently spend the $50,000 for which he is asking.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the way the Senator from Nebraska rushed through this $50,000 resolution, in violation of his own budget resolution, I am not quite so sure I have as much faith in the Senator as I used to have. That is the point I am trying to make. In other words, the Senator is now one of the majority, and he wants to do things just as he desires to do them, notwithstanding a rule to the contrary. So long as the majority has the votes, they can do things that way, but I submit it is wrong and they are repudiating their own rule, all of which I am at a loss to understand.

I say, in all seriousness, that I am completely surprised at the position of my able friend from Nebraska, after all the work he did as a member of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, in securing the adoption of a resolution compelling every committee which submitted a request for more than $5,000 to present in writing a budget for the total amount, showing how it was to be spent, and also requiring a statement of the number of employees of the committee and the number borrowed by it from Government departments. I went along with him in that because I thought it was good business for the Senate. I am disappointed, and I say it with all seriousness, to find that the moment my able friend gets an opportunity, as a member of the majority, he violates that sacred, solemn principle he laid down, with all the toil and energy he put into it. Today it does not mean a single thing—yesterday it meant everything.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say again, for the benefit of the Members of the Senate, that in the last Congress Senate Resolution 77 was adopted by the Senate after it was reported by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I did a great deal of work on that resolution, and especially a great deal of work for my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois. The resolution was reported really for the prime purpose of enabling us to see to it that every person who was employed by the Small Business Committee, even though he were borrowed from a Government department, should be paid for out of the appropriation made, and not from the appropriation for the department. The distinguished Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the second portion of the resolution, and only in part the reason for its adoption.

Mr. WHERRY. When the resolution was adopted it required that there be provided for the guidance of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget stating how the funds would be used.

The Senator from Illinois knows that we approved appropriations in small amounts such as that I am asking for. For instance, we approved $35,000 for the Kilgore committee. We approved, as I recall, though perhaps it is merely a rough estimate, $25,000 for another committee. It was after the resolutions were on the calendar, and we objected to the amounts, that the appropriations were reduced and the committees did not get the amounts requested.

There is nothing to the opposition on the ground now advanced. The Senator from Illinois is not going to vote for the resolution, and he does not care whether I give a detailed statement or not. If it would satisfy him, and cause him to vote for the resolution I should be glad to submit to him, for his guidance, a detailed statement of what the expenditures are to be. The only reason in the world the distinguished Senator from Illinois has flattered me about the resolution to which he has referred—and I do not recall that he ever called it to anyone's attention before—is that he desires to cause debate. The Senator does not intend to vote for the resolution anyway; if I set forth every item of expenditure the Senator would not vote for it; but, if a Senator on the Democratic side had submitted the resolution, regardless of the La Follette-Monroney law, the Senator from Illinois would vote for it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is absolutely in error in what he is saying. I am discussing only the principle. I see present in the Chamber my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who is chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I know very well that he sat in on the committee meetings when requests for money for special committees were submitted, and that he examined the budgets which were presented. I am sure that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration would not permit, and I think the Senator from Nebraska would not desire to have, for instance, the Brewster committee come in tomorrow to ask for $300,000 without a detailed and complete budget.

I should think that the Committee on Rules and Administration would be as conscientious in the discharge of its duties, in budget matters, as was the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

In connection with the consideration of committee budgets we compelled committees to tell us how they were going to spend the money, primarily because of the potent arguments made and the position taken by the Senator from Nebraska.

"What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," and all I am suggesting is that if the Senator from Nebraska is going to permit special committees to come forward and ask for $50,000, $75,000, or $100,000, and grant the requests simply because someone presents a verbal explanation, then we had better adopt a resolution which would repeal the budget resolution that was adopted at the insistance of the Senator from Nebraska. If that is what he desires, I think the Senate and the country should know of his complete about face, now that the Republicans are in the majority.

That is the only point I am making today, and I say again that I am surprised, I am shocked, I am almost at my wit's end to understand why the Senator from Nebraska repudiates his own sacred resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make two observations. It is certainly a compliment to the junior Senator from Nebraska that he should ever cause the Senator from Illinois to reach his wit's end. That is a tribute I certainly never expected to receive from him.

The second observation I wish to make is that the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not need to worry about the Committee on Rules and Administration. The membership of that committee is one of the best. I think it has a personnel that is as fine as that of any other committee of the Senate. I guarantee to the Senator that there will not be any budgets for special committees approved, and no resolutions creating special committees will be reported favorably by the committee, unless in the judgment of the members of the committee such special committees should be set up. Only the amount of money they feel is needed will be provided to carry on the work of the committee. I give my personal guarantee to that effect, because I am positive that the membership of the Committee on Rules and Administration is more anxious to preserve the economy of the country than was the majority membership of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate during the past 14 years.

Mr. President, I have prepared a speech to justify the Small Business Committee. I should like very much to continue, but inasmuch as I am sure the majority leader would like to have the Senate recess at this time, I am going to ask that I be permitted to have the floor on Friday if the Senate recesses. I shall be glad to hear a motion to recess to that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will be recognized when the Senate resumes its session on Friday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said that he was going to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate vote on his resolution at a certain hour on Friday.

I rose to my feet at that time to object to the request and sought to obtain the floor. In fact I addressed the Chair by saying "Mr. President, reserving the right to object." However, several others were making the same attempt to secure recognition from the Chair with the result that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was recognized first by the Chair. He entered into an arrangement with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that, reserving the right to object, he would like to have an opportunity to con-

sult with the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

I had no idea, Mr. President, that the request was going to be renewed this afternoon. Certainly I had no idea it was going to be renewed, in view of the attempt that I made to object to it, while I was called off the floor to the telephone. But I have been informed by the Parliamentarian that while I was on the telephone, such request was renewed and that no one objected, and that there is now an understanding that we shall vote on Friday at 5 o'clock.

I desire the RECORD to show, Mr. President, that had I been in the Chamber I most certainly would have objected. I desire also to have the RECORD show my very deep regret that no attempt was made either by the majority leader or the Republican whip to call a quorum, in view of my well-known views in regard to such unanimous-consent agreements.

I should like to have the RECORD further show that I hope that in the future there will be at least some one on the floor of the Senate who will extend to me the courtesy, in case there is a repetition of such an occurrence as the one that took place this afternoon, of giving me an opportunity at least to respond to a quorum call.

I doubt if there are very many in the Senate who are more conscientious about being on the floor of the Senate for hours upon hours of debate than is the junior Senator from Oregon. In fact, I think my attendance on the floor of the Senate during debates is an exceptionally good one. Hence, I deeply regret that, knowing my views on this matter, the majority leader did not see fit, Mr. President, first to find out what the views of the junior Senator from Oregon were in regard to this matter. I think I am justified in my disappointment over the way my known desires on this issue were treated this afternoon, especially in view of the fact that it was last Friday that the junior Senator from Oregon made himself perfectly clear on the floor of the Senate as to his position in regard to such unanimous-consent requests. I pointed out in my remarks on this issue when it was under discussion last Friday that when such requests were offered I for one, to protect what I believe to be a certain minority liberal point of view on the Republican side which will not be protected unless a few of us rise to protect it, would, as a general policy, not agree to such requests. I said that when I did agree to such requests, any agreement to divide up the time would have to be backed up by a secondary agreement, namely, an agreement with those of us who represent a minority point of view on the Republican side, that we shall be allotted a definite period of time under such an agreement.

I deeply regret this occurrence, Mr. President, of avoiding an objection from me by proceeding with the agreement while I was called to the telephone. I think it was absolutely unnecessary, because I would have been glad to try to work out a division of time as the basis of some agreement. I think it was unfortunate. I think it was most unfair to the junior Senator from Oregon, when his views on this particular matter are well known, to have the debate-limitation agreement put through the Senate while he was off the floor only a very few minutes in order to answer a telephone call. I hope that greater parliamentary courtesy will be extended to me in the future by the Republican leaders. If not, I shall try to form a protective society for those of us who find it difficult to be in two places at the same time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I would like to make an observation in response to the statement just made by the junior Senator from Oregon, for whom I have a very high regard.

In the first place, this agreement does not have to do with the final passage of a bill, nor of a joint resolution.

If I understand the rules of the Senate correctly, it is not mandatory that a roll call be had except when a unanimous-consent agreement is requested in connection with the final passage of a bill or joint resolution.

I believe I am correct. If I am, certainly there was no violation of any rule of the Senate in my suggesting to the Members of the Senate the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Friday at 5 o'clock.

Furthermore, I suggested the unanimous-consent agreement to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] who is now present. He said he would reserve the right to object. I said then, so everyone could hear me, that I would appreciate it if he would consult the minority leader, and if the minority leader could suggest a day and an hour when it would be satisfactory that we might vote on this issue, I should be glad to entertain such a unanimous-consent agreement. That was done.

I asked the minority leader if he had in mind any hour or any day certain, and between us we agreed on 5 o'clock Friday afternoon.

I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that I do not believe that in that particular instance his rights were in any way violated or prejudiced. I regret very much that he was off the floor, but certainly the thing was done aboveboard; it was done in the open. I asked for the agreement, the Senators I mentioned brought back the proposal, and I accepted it.

I desire the junior Senator from Oregon to know that I, for one, shall protect his rights at any time, especially if there may be a violation of the rules, but in this case there was no violation. I think the rights of the junior Senator from Oregon were amply protected.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. May I assure the Senator from Nebraska the junior Senator from Oregon does not charge that his rights were violated. He simply desires, however, to point out for the RECORD that he is satisfied the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as Republican whip, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] the majority leader, are well aware of the views of the junior Senator from Oregon on this matter. I agree that they violate no right of the junior Senator any time they desire to effect such an agreement as they did this afternoon when the junior Senator from Oregon was off the floor.

My only point is that I think fair dealing and parliamentary courtesy entitled me at least to have my majority leader and my whip, in view of my previous expressions on the floor of the Senate since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress in regard to such limitations upon debate, talk to me about the unanimous-consent request before they presented it in my absence. I think my point is well taken especially in view of the fact that I am sure I made myself rather clear earlier in the afternoon, that I desired to be heard on the matter. There certainly are those sitting near me that will testify that I sought to object to the proposal earlier this afternoon. Further my record on this issue is so perfectly clear in light of the many statements I made about it in the Seventy-ninth Congress and again last Friday that I just do not understand why neither the majority leader or the Republican whip failed to extend me the courtesy of a consultation on the request.

Mr. WHERRY. One further thing. I do not care unduly to prolong this discussion. The junior Senator from Oregon has been protected in his rights by the whip many, many times. It is a difficult thing to do.

There certainly was ample time here for the consideration of this unanimous-consent request, and while I respect the rights of the junior Senator from Oregon, I desire to say that the time has come when the majority party must keep the Senate in session.

The time is here when we should proceed to debate these issues and come to a vote. That is absolutely necessary, in the light of the debate that has been held here for the past 10 days on the resolution continuing the War Investigating Committee. The vote on the pending resolution should have been had this afternoon at 5 o'clock.

I desire the Senator to know that I am going to be present to keep the Senate in session. I told the Senator that the only reason why we would not stay in session any longer this afternoon was that I desired to get an early vote on Resolution 20. So when the Senators came back with the unanimous-consent agreement, which was discussed within the hearing of everyone, and everyone was protected, we agreed to it. I desire the junior Senator from Oregon to know that I shall continue to protect his rights, but the work of the United States Senate comes ahead of the rights of any one Senator upon the floor. I think we have a right to an early vote on this matter, and I think the Senator could agree with me that the least I could do was to secure agreement for a vote on Friday, if a vote could not be had this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator, as the Republican whip, ever failed to receive the cooperation of the junior Senator from Oregon in keeping the Senate in session?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not complaining about the cooperation

of the junior Senator from Oregon. I am simply telling him that I have discharged my responsibilities as the majority whip. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into on the floor of the United States Senate in good faith. The rights of the Senator from Oregon were not violated. In the orderly process of continuing the work of the Senate I think Senators should be on the Senate floor, and it was because I wanted an early vote on the resolution that I finally, reluctantly, agreed to a vote being had on Friday night at 5 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make two points. The first point is that I think I have always cooperated with the Senator from Nebraska in keeping the Senate in session. Never have I asked that the Senate recess early. In fact on many occasions I have pleaded that the Senate go into night session, as I think it should many times during the Eightieth Congress, to transact the business of the Senate.

The second point I want to make to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, is that I charge no violation of rights. I am just going to leave it to the conscience of the Senator from Nebraska as to whether he thinks, knowing my views on this matter, and in view of the fact that I was called into the cloakroom to answer a telephone call, it would not have been more sporting of him to have at least said to me, "Are you willing to go along with the unanimous-consent agreement?" He well knows my views and I think as individual Senators we should be able to feel that our majority leader and our whip will not proceed with action which leaves us with the feeling that it is not safe for us to even leave the floor to answer the telephone.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to say a word in answer to what the Senator from Oregon has said?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think I was in default in some measure at least in that I did not call the Senator's attention to the fact that a unanimous-consent request was pending. I have known the views of the Senator from Oregon. I have to a large extent shared those views. I have tried always to be considerate of and courteous to the Senator from Oregon. But the plain truth of the matter is that the unanimous-consent agreement was involved here out of a running discussion participated in by the Senator from Nebraska, by some Senators on the other side of the Chamber, and in a smaller and less consequential degree by myself, and I confess that I did not know whether the Senator from Oregon was present in the Senate Chamber or not. If I had sensed his absence from the floor I would have urged that there be a ringing of the bells and that the Senator from Oregon have his opportunity to speak his views and to take such action as he might see fit.

I beg the Senator to believe that there was no intentional discourtesy to him on my part. I was simply involved in a running discussion heading toward a unanimous-consent agreement, and I simply did not note whether the Senator was present on the floor or not. And with that and for that I express regret to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Maine that I deeply appreciate the few remarks he has made. I understand the situation perfectly. I take it for granted from what the majority leader said that if in the future I have objections to a unanimous-consent agreement and happen to be called off the floor temporarily he will hold it up until I get back. I think that is fair. Further, I think I, too, have a mutuality of obligation to the majority leader of trying to indicate to him in advance what my position will be on any unanimous-consent agreement proposal to limit debate. That I shall endeavor to do. However, this afternoon I did not have the slightest idea that this unanimous-consent agreement was going to be brought up while I walked out into the cloakroom to answer the telephone, especially in view of the fact that I was on my feet earlier in the afternoon trying to make clear that I was going to object, but at that time the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was the one who was recognized. I am sure we understand each other a little better as the result of this discussion.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. If there be no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 1 to Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

George Atcheson, Jr., of California.
Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa.
Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine.
Selden Chapin, of Pennsylvania.
Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado.
Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.
George F. Kennan, of Wisconsin.
H. Freeman Matthews, of Maryland.
Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.
John Carter Vincent, of Georgia.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thomas L. Sprague, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. William M. Fechteler, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy for temporary service.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of June 1946:

Frank A. Anderson, a citizen of Iowa.
Jack O. Arford, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Herman W. Ashlaw, a citizen of New York.
Marshall Bartlett, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.
Burl B. Bevers, a citizen of Texas.
George R. Brier, a citizen of Tennessee.
Perry T. Brixey, a citizen of Missouri.
Donald R. Brown, a citizen of New York.
George W. Campbell, a citizen of Kansas.
Stanley H. Carpenter, a citizen of Mississippi.
William C. Carr, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Lee J. Cary, a citizen of New York.
Raymond P. Coffman, Jr., a citizen of California.
Eduardo O. Coli, a citizen of California.
Charles I. Cook, a citizen of Texas.
Robert J. Daeschler, a citizen of Illinois.
Ernest K. Davis, a citizen of Michigan.
William A. Dicus, Jr., a citizen of South Carolina.
Edwin J. Dietrich, a citizen of Louisiana.
Donald W. Dowlearn, a citizen of Texas.
Robert R. Feldman, a citizen of New York.
Thomas N. Green, a citizen of Alabama.
Jean R. Griffith, a citizen of Texas.
Franz E. Guerard, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
Robert T. Hanifin, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.
Barrie H. Harmon, a citizen of Alabama.
William S. Harvey, a citizen of North Carolina.
James S. Hecker, a citizen of New Jersey.
Bernard E. Hendricks, a citizen of Illinois.
Daniel B. Hunter, a citizen of Illinois.
Merton R. Ives, a citizen of Illinois.
Harold H. Johnson, Jr., a citizen of Michigan.
Paul R. Joyce, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Daniel F. Kennedy, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.
Ordeen M. Knight, a citizen of Virginia.
William K. Kozel, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Paul A. Lockhart, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
Clinton L. Luke, a citizen of Idaho.
Daniel F. MacKinnon, a citizen of Michigan.
Edward J. Markham, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Patrick McGrotty, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Charles D. McMichael, a citizen of Arkansas.
"R" "J" McNerney, Jr., a citizen of California.
Marion W. Morrisset, a citizen of Texas.
Edward L. Nadeau, a citizen of New York.
Victor P. Neshyba, a citizen of Texas.
Ira P. Norfolk, a citizen of Maryland.
Thomas M. O'Reilly, a citizen of New York.
Austin S. Parker, a citizen of South Carolina.
Edward A. Parnell, a citizen of New York.
Robert E. Parrott, a citizen of New York.
Clifford J. Peabody, a citizen of Virginia.
Robert O. Peck, a citizen of Iowa.
Richard W. Phifer, a citizen of Ohio.
William Plaskett, Jr., a citizen of Missouri.
Lewis F. Platt, a citizen of Kentucky.
David A. Rapp, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Wayne E. Richards, a citizen of California.
Harry L. Rogers, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Robert D. Savard, a citizen of Massachusetts.
George C. Schatteman, a citizen of Illinois.
Joseph A. Schimmenti, a citizen of New Jersey.
Jack B. Shaffer, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Jack D. Sheldon, a citizen of New York.
James A. Sloan, a citizen of Alabama.
Robert A. Steinway, a citizen of Illinois.
Charles R. Stephenson III, a citizen of New York.
Donald F. Swanda, a citizen of New York.
Alvah S. Tolivaisa, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Irwin J. Vanderswag, a citizen of Michigan.
George K. Vronch, a citizen of Maryland.
William T. Walker, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Paul Weiler, a citizen of Illinois.
Arthur L. Willner, a citizen of Florida.
Harold B. Wilson, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Grady L. Yoder, a citizen of North Carolina.
Leland E. Ziegler, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Gerald B. Zwetzig, a citizen of California.

The below-named citizen to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of October 1945:

Ira T. Carr, a citizen of Mississippi.

The below-named citizen to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of February 1946:

Howard E. Reese, a citizen of Ohio.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 729, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Jack W. Harris, a citizen of Oregon.
John F. Goodspeed, a citizen of Minnesota.
Melvin W. Snow, a citizen of Maine.
Edward A. Timmes, a citizen of New York.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

James A. Drace, Linden, Calif., in place of L. B. Fearheiley, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Earl E. Sexton, East Lyme, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret B. Thornton, East Windsor Hill, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Arthur F. Merrill, Guilford, Conn., in place of W. M. Nettleton, retired.
Vincent P. Kelley, Lebanon, Conn., in place of W. A. Pultz, resigned.
Lillian M. Cooper, Middle Haddam, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
John R. MacLean, Pine Orchard, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

DELAWARE

Sidney A. Bennett, Bethany Beach, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

GEORGIA

Louis L. Brown, Fort Valley, Ga., in place of J. H. Jones, resigned.

INDIANA

Leo M. Cissell, Loogootee, Ind., in place of W. J. Smith, retired.
Richard Allen Gilmore, Monroe City, Ind., in place of Benjamin Harrison, removed.
Mae C. Tierney, Wawaka, Ind., in place of R. F. Schwab, retired.

KENTUCKY

Joseph D. Scholtz, Louisville, Ky., in place of J. E. Riddell, retired.
Victor J. Kramer, Melbourne, Ky., in place of W. B. Haigle, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Elmer Wyble, Sr., Port Barre, La., in place of J. A. Burleigh, resigned.

MAINE

Mabelle F. Rose, Tenants Harbor, Maine, in place of Ernest Rawley, retired.

MARYLAND

Vera M. Gordon, Fork, Md., in place of J. L. Smith, retired.
Cora L. Sappington, Keymar, Md., in place of G. U. Koons, retired.
Anita G. Swann, Piney Point, Md., in place of B. G. Swann, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Carmo A. Nichols, Sagola, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Sadie I. Still, Clarksdale, Miss., in place of E. W. Still, retired.
Charles C. Clark, Mize, Miss., in place of D. W. Tullos, resigned.
David L. Rodgers, Randolph, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oscar W. Thomas, West, Miss., in place of B. A. Brock, retired.

NEBRASKA

Henry A. Davis, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Nellie R. Kibler, Morven, N. C., in place of F. G. Thompson, retired.

OHIO

Clarence N. Emrick, Germantown, Ohio., in place of R. V. Condrey, transferred.

OREGON

Howell C. Welsh, Swisshome, Oreg., in place of S. V. Ransdell, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

James E. Sanders, Mount Pleasant, S. C., in place of J. M. Muirhead, resigned.
Jasper C. Moore, Simpsonville, S. C., in place of L. E. King, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Eva A. Thornton, Duff, Tenn., in place of M. Z. Greene, resigned.
Maxine F. Wallace, Jamestown, Tenn., in place of L. M. York, resigned.

TEXAS

Iris H. Wicker, Genoa, Tex., in place of C. E. Cade, resigned.
John T. Morse, Quitman, Tex., in place of W. P. Lawrence, deceased.

UTAH

Grace E. Stokes, Cleveland, Utah, in place of R. A. Nielson, retired.

VIRGINIA

Mamie B. Keesee, Sycamore, Va., in place of J. W. Keesee, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clarence D. Simonson, Milltown, Wis., in place of A. J. Clark, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 22 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Douglas W. McGregor to be the assistant to the Attorney General.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Richmond B. Keech to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James R. Wright to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas.
M. Frank Hammond to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit divine, the source of all things good and holy, dissolve our hearts in gratitude and mold our wills with Thine. Amid the labor and the calm of this day, we pray for Thine all-embracing wisdom to lead us that we may be masters of pure motives and sincere desires.

We pray, blessed Lord, that we may see the crown of that which was once the thorn, and the victory of that which was once our trial. Wherever truth is shining, wherever the rugged virtue of justice is lifting its warning finger, wherever charity and tolerance are wearing their healing garments, we beseech Thy richest blessings. Be Thou the lamp unto our pathways when our skies are overcast and the way is confused. In the name of our Saviour we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 21, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 68):

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Brooks, of Illinois; Mr. Jenner, of Indiana; Mr. Hayden, of Arizona.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Brooks, of Illinois; Mr. Jenner, of Indiana; Mr. Ives, of New York; Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Holland, of Florida.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 23, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Respectfully,

H. A. COFFIN.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, will the gentleman, as best he can at this time, give us the program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. It is our present plan to meet on next Monday, but there will be no legislative business on that day. Then I hope we can adjourn over until Wednesday. On Wednesday next the excise-tax bill from the Committee on Ways and Means will come on for consideration in the House. The rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, and it is my hope that the consideration of the bill can be concluded on Wednesday. We then will meet on Thursday

and, I hope, can adjourn over then until the following Monday.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman whether the rule that was granted for the consideration of this bill is the usual rule applicable to bills coming from the Committee on Ways and Means, in that it does not permit any amendment to the bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know just how we might characterize the usual rule. It has been the practice in the years I have been here that rules on tax bills coming from the Committee on Ways and Means provide for amendments to be offered by the committee, but not for amendments otherwise to be offered on the floor. It is my understanding that this rule is of that nature.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

STATIONERY ROOM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the Members that the stationery room will be closed on Saturday of this week at the request of the Comptroller General for inventory and stock taking.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 62), as follows:

Resolved, That WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and to rank No. 3 thereon.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 63), as follows:

Resolved, That HOMER R. JONES, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

DOCUMENTS UNDER CONTROL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JANUARY 22, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, I have received a letter requesting me to produce certain and sundry documents, therein described, in Criminal Court No. 3, United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the trial of the *United States* v. *Benjamin F. Fields*.

The papers in question are part of the files of the House of Representatives, having been received in evidence by the Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property, of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Since these papers are under the unqualified control of the House of Representatives, and the Clerk is not possessed of any right over them that would enable him to comply with such a request without first obtaining the consent of the House, the letter in question is submitted herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the United States attorney for the District of Columbia:

JANUARY 21, 1947.

The CLERK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the trial of the case of *United States* v. *Benjamin F. Fields* on January 22, 1947, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a charge of contempt of the House of Representatives, it will be necessary to have available for use by the Government as evidence the following documents which were received in evidence by the Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, and which are presently among the records of that committee:

Exhibits 1, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, 26, 48, 49, 50, 55, 65, 69, 72, 83, 84, and 90, and receipts relating thereto.

These documents should be produced in Criminal Court No. 3, United States District Courthouse, Fifth Street and Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., at 9:45 a. m., January 22, 1947.

In the course of the trial it may be necessary to make use of certain other documents having to do with the committee hearings mentioned above, and it, therefore, would be helpful if the list of documents furnished herein could be supplemented by an oral request of my assistant, William Hitz.

Respectfully,

GEORGE MORRIS FAY,
United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.
By WILLIAM HITZ,
Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 64), as follows:

Whereas in the case of the United States against Benjamin F. Fields, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia has addressed a letter to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, requesting him to appear as a witness before Criminal Court No. 3, and to bring with him certain and sundry original papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Represenatives; and

Whereas the United States attorney for the District of Columbia advises that for certain reasons it is essential that the original papers and documents be produced in court, and not merely certified or photostatic copies thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, or an official in his office designated by him, be authorized to appear at the place and before the officer named in the communication beforementioned, with the originals as well as certified photostatic copies of the documents and papers mentioned in the said communication, as well as such other papers and documents pertaining to said case as may be requested, and submit the said papers and documents to the examination of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia from time to time according to its convenience, retaining, however, the custody of the original papers and documents; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court and to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia as a respectful answer to the communication afore-mentioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION — EIGHTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF STATE OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying notice to contest the election of the returned Member from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of New York, which is also in the nature of a petition, was received in the office of the Clerk and is being transmitted for disposal.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF MEMBERS IN CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, preliminary to the publication of the biographical sketches of Members in the new Congressional Directory, I have been asked to obtain from the newly elected Members on the majority side a statement from any of them who, prior to being elected to the Congress, occupied the position of speaker in his own State legislature. If any such Member would transmit that information to me at the earliest possible date, it would make it possible for me to fulfill my obligation.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, while I am not a sales manager nor am I trying to suggest that anybody should buy copies of the speech which I made entitled "The Making of a Congressman," orders have now come into my office totaling some 60,000 copies. I am about to send the order to the Public Printer, and I do not propose as heretofore—perhaps I should not say this—to furnish some ten or fifteen thousand copies for the use of those who do not seem to think they can afford to buy them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed about immigration to this country. It does seem that the Committee on the Judiciary, now handling the problem, should immediately look into the phase of just how many aliens are permitted to come into the United States. They will need to make a full investigation, based on the facts if they can get them.

I am disturbed and concerned because of the apparent confusion in the several departments of Government covering the problems of immigration. The American people are not being told the truth. In my efforts to get information on this subject, I run into the reluctance on the part of Government agencies to furnish facts, and they make statements about a Presidential order prohibiting the giving out of such information. It is utterly impossible to get, from the State Department or from the immigration authorities, the true picture as to the types of people coming into the United States. Rumors are afloat about large groups coming in weekly. Last month the President issued orders for four ships to stop at European ports to pick up displaced persons. Yet, his report to the Congress would indicate that a mere trickle has been coming in. There seems to be no difference between a regular visa and a visa issued to a displaced person or an immigrant. How much truth is there to the rumor that individuals are entering this country by first becoming citizens of other countries with very loose quota arrangements? These questions need investigation.

Immigration is a subject that should be an open book. The Congress and the people are entitled to have complete information about it. Suppression will lead to serious consequences. It will inevitably lead to false data and rumors that will really intensify prejudices. The administration should have learned a lesson. While suppression of information of strictly military importance was necessary during the war, the broad application of the principle is now doing irreparable damage. Suppression of immigration facts and the slanting of propaganda to favor certain policies should be stopped.

I am fully aware of the fact that there are many displaced persons in the world. This country has not been derelict in its duty of supplying food, clothing, and medicine to this class of people.

The United States was formed and its governmental ideas were established by the people who came mostly from northern Europe. They came to our shores imbued with the idea of individual liberty and desired the opportunity to prosper and raise their families. When the character of our immigrants began to change the Congress set up the quota system and placed upon it some other restrictions aimed at preserving the character of our population. Until 10 years ago this system was strictly adhered to. Are the laws being as strictly observed today? The Congress and the people have a right to know.

In the confusion and secrecy that now exists, there is grave danger that large groups of disgruntled people with totalitarian concepts and individuals serving groups and powers will find their way into our country and disrupt our American way of life. I am certain a careful scrutiny of the records today will show that many of the people now coming will not make a contribution to good government. A great many of them are disturbers. Many of them are joining groups and societies that have in mind changing our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a period of readjustment. Housing is short. Great numbers of our veterans have not found their place in our postwar economy. Many are attending schools or are in training programs to fit them to return to industry. Many people who were employed in war industries are finding it difficult to get into peacetime jobs. It does seem that before we permit a resumption of immigration on a prewar scale, we should settle some of our internal problems. Indeed, it would seem that immigration should be halted for a number of years or until we find the solution of some of our own pressing problems.

No one in this Congress can be more sympathetic to the sufferings of mankind than this speaker. I have seen by personal observation, not only physical suffering, but the low standards of living and the suffering they now have in many foreign countries. The war has made these conditions immeasurably worse. I do not believe the answer to their problem is to bring them here. Not when we may endanger our country by opening our gates to the prejudices and hatreds of foreign countries. It is far better to do what we can for them there and teach them by example the kind of life they might enjoy under democratic principles.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that an investigation be made by the proper committee at once. I am sure that they will reach a decision to close our doors to further immigration. I am sure the American people and the Congress should have all the facts. After that we can formulate a policy that will preserve our institutions and at the same time offer an opportunity for those who come to our shores to have the kind of life we enjoy.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 65), as follows:

Resolved, That HOWARD A. COFFIN, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. HOLMES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include, at the request of Herbert G. West, executive vice president of the Inland Waterways Association, an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the annual meeting of the association in Portland, Oreg., October 24, 1946.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Lothrop Stoddard.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include four bills introduced at the request of the American Legion.

WHEAT PENALTIES

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture, with the acquiescence of this Congress, in 1941 changed the rules on the wheat farmers in the middle of the game, and increased the

penalties that they must pay on wheat from 15 cents to 49 cents a bushel. That was after the wheat had been planted, and in some sections of the country was ready to harvest. In 1942 the penalty was continued until such time as all quotas and restrictions on acreage were removed. In 1942 they permitted the farmer to either put up a bond or pay the penalties in cash. Those who paid in cash are, of course, subjected to the penalties, while those who put up bonds according to my information were forgiven on the bonds.

In 1941 the penalties collected from the farmers was something over $13,000,000, $2,000,000 plus of which was extracted from my Oklahoma farmers. In 1942 the wheat farmers over the country paid something over $2,000,000 before penalties were removed and approximately $275,000 of this amount was paid by the wheat farmers of Oklahoma.

I am today introducing a bill to do justice to the farmers of this country who paid these penalties. My bill would require the Department of Agriculture to refund the penalties exacted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

DEDICATION DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a joint resolution designating the 19th day of November, the anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day. This resolution does not provide that the day be declared a legal holiday. I should be hesitant indeed to add to the present number of such occasions.

It seems to me, however, that in these times, so critical for our Nation, we may well pause for a moment one day a year to listen to that outstanding classic, which has touched the hearts of men and inspired them with faith in our matchless democracy ever since those words were uttered, and will continue to do so for all time to come.

The resolution requests the President of the United States to suggest to the country that on November 19 these incomparable words be read in public assemblages throughout the country, on our ships at sea, and wherever the American flag flies and, particularly, in our schools, where it is hoped that the ideals and objectives embodied in these words may serve to dilute to some extent the effect of other teachings which carry messages to our young people far less desirable than these inspiring words of Abraham Lincoln.

I hope this resolution may have the support of this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Portland Oregonian, and in the second an article from the current issue of the United States News.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of January 19 entitled "Squeeze in Cocoa."

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 21.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the question of Carl Aldo Marzani, a former employee of the State Department.

ORIGIN OF PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY SUITS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. case, otherwise known as portal-to-portal pay suit, has touched off legal actions involving billions of dollars in portal-pay claims. Industry is threatened by this far-reaching decision.

As chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I am in possession of certain information dealing with the inspiration of the original portal-to-portal pay suit which I think every Member of Congress should be apprised of. The individual who is credited with concocting the idea of these suits, and the lawyer who brought the original action which was sustained by the Supreme Court, both have long records of Communist affiliation which I propose to give in my remarks today.

According to an article which was published in the Union, official organ of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers on January 6, 1947, page 6, Ben Riskin, former research director for the Union, is credited with being the person who conceived the portal-to-portal claims idea, and according to the Union, he pestered Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, until Pressman finally agreed to look into the matter of portal-to-portal claims. Also, Mr. Drew Pearson, in his syndicated column, the Merry-Go-Round, on January 10, 1947, stated:

WHO STARTED PORTAL FIGHT?

Some of the biggest lawyers on Wall Street are now burning the midnight oil trying to figure out ways and means of beating portal-to-portal lawsuits, while high-paid lobbyists are pulling wires to stop portal-to-portal back payments.

What these high-powered legal brains don't know, however, is that a $65-a-week CIO organizer, Ben Riskin, formerly with the CIO mine, mill and smelter workers, concocted the idea which is causing them so much trouble.

It was Riskin—not a lawyer—who pored over the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act, passed primarily to halt sweatshop conditions in the needle trades and which provides that employees must be paid for hours worked. Those last three words, "for hours worked," seemed awfully important to Riskin, but at first he couldn't even get his own CIO colleagues interested.

Finally, however, he sold his idea to Lee Pressman, CIO general counsel, and persuaded him to start suit on behalf of the CIO metal miners, who had to spend extra time traveling through mine shafts to their point of work.

Pressman made a thorough study of the question; discovered that in Europe miners were paid from the time they entered the mine, that in Arizona portal-to-portal pay was the basic law of the State, and that Montana had passed a portal-to-portal law that later was killed by the State supreme court.

This disclosure becomes extremely important because of Mr. Riskin's Communist background. If what the Union and Mr. Pearson have reported is true, then it appears that the present legal controversy between industry and labor which has been occasioned by portal-to-portal suits has Communist inspiration.

As an indication of the political views of Mr. Riskin, I call your attention to the April-May 1935 issue of the magazine the New Order, which is the official publication of the International Workers Order, one of the outstanding Communist fronts in the United States. Page 2 of this issue lists Ben Riskin as an associate editor of the magazine, and page 3 carries a featured article by him entitled "May First, 1936." He begins his article by quoting Friedrich Engels, coauthor of the Communist Manifesto:

As I write these lines, the proletariat of Europe and America is holding a review of its forces; it is mobilized for the first time as one army, under one flag, and fighting for one immediate aim. The spectacle we are now witnessing will make the capitalists and landowners of all lands realize that today th proletariat of all lands are, in very truth, united.

Then Mr. Riskin states:

Over one-sixth of the earth has been established a workers' and farmers' land, rising with incredible speed to a state of real general security and comfort, crowned with an ever-growing richness of culture, with ever-deeper plumbings into the realms of science and life.

While in the remaining five-sixths of the world (except in Soviet China where the struggles for a soviet society still go on), decadent capitalism with its 6-year-old depression holds a suffering humanity in a clammy, ruthless, and deadly grasp.

Further quoting from Riskin's article, he states:

Like rats in a corner, the bosses with their backs against the wall resort to their last trick—war.

And thus we find our present problems already outlined. They are the fight against the same old raw deal—the fight for a high living standard for all by the creation of a workers' and farmers' society through the overthrow of the capitalist society. It is with these issues that the American workers of 1935 will flood the streets of America to carry on the glorious tradition of 1886. And it is by such demonstrations of mass unity in days of struggle that we shall win the demands we raise.

This same issue of the New Order contains an article by the general secre-

tary of the International Workers' Order, Max Bedacht, who at that time was also a member of the executive committee of the Communist Party. He also had served as the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States in 1929. I should like also to call your attention to the fact that the president of the International Workers' Order, at the time this article was written, was William Weiner, alias Welwel Warzower. Mr. Weiner was also treasurer of the Communist Party of the United States, as well as a member of the executive committee. Later, in 1940, he was convicted along with Earl Browder in Federal court for traveling on a false passport. I have cited this for the purpose of making it very clear that the International Workers' Order is under the complete domination of the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, of September 14, 1940, features a story under the headline "Senate sends draft bill back—vital time is gained for fight against draft by peace forces." The article states:

> Earlier in the day representatives of the (American) Peace Mobilization conferred with Senator Wheeler in his office. Present at the meeting with the Montana Senator were John P. Davis, secretary of the National Negro Congress; Howard Lee and Joseph Gelders, of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Dr. Treadwell Smith; Fred Keller, of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; Leon Strauss, of the Furriers Union; Ben Riskin, of the Mine, Mill and Smelters Workers; and Jack Whirl, of the National Maritime Union, and a number of others.

All of the above-mentioned organizations and unions are Communist-controlled. The American Peace Mobilization, as you will recall, was a Communist-front organization which operated during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact. It is the same organization which picketed the White House protesting against lend-lease to Britain and conscription.

Mr. Riskin was also a member of the advisory committee of the League for Mutual Aid, a Communist-front, whose slogan was "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." On the executive committee of this organization was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a member of the national executive committee of the Communist Party.

There are other Communist affiliations of Mr. Riskin which could be set forth. However, I feel that the above are sufficient to give you some idea of the background of this individual who, it is reported, concocted the idea of the portal-to-portal pay suits.

Now, I should like to call your attention to the Communist record of the attorney who brought the original action in the Mount Clemens case. He is Mr. Edward Lamb, of Toledo, Ohio. Mr. Lamb, like Mr. Riskin, has followed the Communist Party line and has associated himself with numerous Communist fronts which have been set up during the past 10 years. Mr. Lamb, like Mr. Riskin, was against conscription during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact. He was a member of the Lawyers Committee To Keep the United States Out of War, of the Emergency Peace Mobilization, later the American Peace Mobilization. This organization sent a telegram to the House Military Affairs Committee against conscription. (See Daily Worker, September 4, 1943, p. 3.)

He also signed a statement to the President of the United States defending the Communist Part. (See Daily Worker, March 5, 1941, p. 2.)

He was a member of the National Committee of the International Labor Defense, an organization which serves as the legal arm of the Communist Party. He is also a member of the National Legal Advisory Board of that organization. When this organization held its national conference in Washington, D. C., June 15, 1937, Mr. Lamb addressed the national conference, along with Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party at that time. Mr. Lamb, in 1938, was executive vice president of the National Lawyers Guild, a Communist front, organized in September 1939.

He was signer of an open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union. He was a contributor to the October 1935 issue of Soviet Russia Today, also to the March 1936 issue of the same publication.

He was a member of the executive committee of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, a Communist-front organization.

He was sponsor of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, also a Communist-front organization.

He was also signer on the appeal in behalf of Sam Darcy, notorious Communist, which appeal was sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, a Communist front.

PRICE MANIPULATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to compliment President Truman on again demonstrating the fact that he is not going to subject the starving people of this world to partisan politics. He has demonstrated this now for the second time by selecting Herbert Hoover to go over to study the food conditions in Germany. I am beginning to wonder, however, if it is not just about time we took some such position as that right here in America.

During the last month or so the Department of Agriculture has issued statement after statement saying what the prices would be for certain agricultural products at some future date. Even yesterday some great man in the State of Wisconsin knew exactly what the price of butter was going to be next June. According to this morning's paper some well-known economist of New York, who is now basking in the sunshine of Florida, states that agricultural prices are coming down a certain percent.

I just wonder sometimes why people who read the newspapers have not heard about the Steagall amendment. There is one man today who knows and has something to do about future farm prices, and that man's name is Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture. The Congress and both parties are committed by legislation to support the Steagall amendment in order to maintain prices at certain levels for the next 2 years. These guessers really do not know what they are talking about.

If the speculators and market manipulators wish to carry on their activities they had better be advised that the floor prices for American agricultural products is to be not less than 90 percent of parity. The crystal ball gazers who term themselves economists can take a leaf out of the same notebook.

RESTORING TO VETERANS SOCIAL SECURITY CREDITS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a measure restoring to veterans the social-security credits put in danger by their military service. This measure restores the social-security status that veterans would have had if the war had not deprived them of their employment in insurable industry, and it should become a law with the least possible delay.

Congress cannot afford to delay the correction of this injustice. This discrimination against veterans must be outlawed.

The Social Security Act, by the terms of the bill I have introduced, is so amended that service in the armed forces shall not adversely affect the equities and rights of workers who went to war.

Under the law as it now is, workers are fully insured, permanently, if they have earned in insurable employment at least $50 in half the quarter-year periods since 1936, or since they reached 21 years of age. Military service has prevented veterans of this war from attaining this status. The law also provides for a currently insured status under which death benefits are paid to certain dependents of workers who have paid pay roll taxes in at least half the quarters in the 3 years preceding death. As a matter of course, most veterans, by reason of absence from their jobs, while in military service, have had no chance to make this contribution. They are not, therefore, currently insured at the present time.

The bill I have introduced protects the veteran's prewar social-security status and credits his account with an amount equal to what he would have earned if he had spent the time he served in the armed forces in an insurable employment at $160 a month.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of all business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may have the extreme privilege of addressing the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the Bronx as a seaport and to include an editorial from the Bronx Home News.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SALARY AND ALLOWANCES OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the right of a Member of the House of Representatives to salary and allowances is fixed by law. I see no good reason why the Speaker of the House should be required to make individual monthly certifications of such rights, nor do I see any good reason why Members should be asked in advance to sign binding receipts for salary and allowances which actually they have not received.

I suggest consideration of these matters on the part of the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Sotarios Nicholson.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two brief editorials on the Hoover Dam.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on taxes from the Fort Dodge Messenger.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an excerpt from an editorial.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the request for information by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], may I say that arrangements have been made so that Members who desire to cash their travel allowances immediately may do so by taking the signed voucher to the office of the Speaker where it will be certified as due. It may then be taken to the office of the Sergeant at Arms where Members can arrange to draw their money forthwith. I think similar arrangements may be made as to monthly salary checks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one two editorials on Presidential succession, and in the other an article from the National Education Association.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky appearing in the New York Sun.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on socialized medicine.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Traveler.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with a bill he introduced.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. J. Proctor Knott. He has been informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $160, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a resolution he received from the city clerk of Chicago, and in the other a letter he received that was addressed to Secretary of State Marshall.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Clyde T. Ellis. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $160, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL SUITS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members a bill, H. R. 1041, which I introduced a few days ago on the problem raised by the so-called portal-to-portal suits.

My bill is rather simple. It is designed to provide relief from unwarranted windfall suits based on past transactions only. It does not in any way curtail the rights of labor as interpreted by the Supreme Court insofar as new contracts are concerned. It does not attempt to redefine the workweek as now interpreted by the Supreme Court.

It seems to me that it is not so important what the definition of work shall be; what is important is that both labor and industry understand definitely what the workday and workweek are. The Supreme Court has now definitely established that in carefully considered and carefully worded opinions. It would seem to me that if we attempt to redefine the workday or workweek, we will merely invite further difficulties and disputes for the future. The way to avoid strikes and lawsuits is to avoid disputes.

I earnestly invite the consideration of the Members of the House who have been studying and who have introduced bills on this problem and I also invite the earnest consideration of the Committee on Education and Labor to the approach I have suggested in my bill. It is not my desire to criticize other bills but I feel that all of us should give the problem careful consideration and that we should present in writing at an early date, for the benefit of all of us, our conclusions.

My bill is limited to three provisos: First, relief from the penalties of the act under section 14, where the violation is not willful; second, relief from unwarranted windfall suits under section 14; and, third, a provision authorizing settlement of such disputes as have arisen or which may arise in the future after services have been performed.

The second of the above objectives is, of course, the most important to the industry, the public, and labor as well. I have undertaken to cover that by adding to section 14 of the act a proviso which I will quote in full with emphasis on two or three limitation phrases considered by me as important in the appraisal of the amendment. That proviso reads as follows:

And provided further, That in any action based upon services performed by any employee prior to the effective date of this amendment, claim for which is based on the mandate of sections 6 and 7 and/or 14 of

this act and not upon the express or implied provisions of any contract, no compensation shall be allowed by the courts, either as compensatory or as liquidated damages, where it is found by the court—

(1) That the services were rendered pursuant to a contract of employment defining the hours of work or workweek and entered into through collective bargaining and in good faith; or

(2) Where the claim is based on items of time or services which were, pursuant to general and established custom and with the acquiescence of the employee, absorbed in the rate of pay but excluded from measured time; or

(3) Where the claim is based on incidental activities required as preliminary or preparatory to the actual performance of productive work otherwise compensated, or required as incidental to the conclusion of such productive work, which incidental activities were not, because of usage or custom, included in the measured time and were not contemplated as items to be included in the measured time by either the employer or employee under the terms of employment express or implied.

SEC. 2. Section 16 of said act is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new subsection reading as follows:

"(c) Any employee may, directly or through his duly authorized agent or collective-bargaining representative, waive, compromise, adjust, settle, or release, either before or after commencement of suit thereon, any claim heretofore accrued or which may hereafter accrue to such employee under this act on account of services theretofore rendered by such employee; and a waiver, compromise, adjustment, settlement, or release of any such claim by such employee or his duly authorized agent or representative shall constitute a complete satisfaction of such claim and a complete bar to any action based on such claim."

One further word of explanation: Employment of any kind is the result of contract, oral or written, express or implied; but it does not necessarily follow that everything done is compensable pursuant to the contract of employment. Where, as in the majority of these suits, the claim is based on items not considered as compensable when the services were entered into or rendered, but are made compensable at time or time and a half by the statute, irrespective of contract or the intention of the parties, the right to such payment may be withdrawn in the interests of public policy even though the acts constituting such compensable items have been performed and suits filed thereon. It is well established, as stated in *National Carloading Corp.* v. *Phoenix-El Paso Express* (176 S. W. 564), that "rights of action based upon purely statutory grounds may be abolished by the legislature even after they have accrued."

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, last May 21 I appeared before this House to charge that John H. Fahey, Commissioner, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and his subordinates, arbitrarily and unlawfully abused the authority and discretion of their respective offices in abolishing, without cause, the Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles, and seizing the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association of Long Beach, Calif. Complaints were lodged with the Special Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies, and hearings were scheduled and held during the month of June. At these hearings John H. Fahey, testifying in his own defense, stated:

I doubt if any member of this committee or Member of Congress has less sympathy than I with public officials who, by their autocratic attitudes, abuse authority invested in them by law and invite just condemnation. I think that any official found guilty of such offenses should be displaced promptly.

In July the Special Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies issued its unanimous report, and, among other things, found John H. Fahey, Commissioner, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and Harold Lee, Governor, Federal Home Loan Bank System, guilty of the abuse of authority which John H. Fahey himself testified justifies prompt displacement from public office.

The committee, in particular, condemned the action of these men as being without foundation in law; an abuse of authority; injudicious, arbitrary, and incompatible with principles of good administration or sound policy in Government.

Since Mr. Fahey believes that public officials guilty of such offenses should be displaced, I have today introduced a resolution requesting the President of the United States to immediately remove from public office the said John H. Fahey and Harold Lee. It may interest the Members of the House to also know that the select committee unanimously recommended that the Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles, abolished by Fahey last March, be restored to its former autonomous status. The committee likewise called upon Fahey and Lee to revoke their orders appointing a conservator for the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association and recommended return of the institution to its former management. Fahey, instead of respecting the recommendations of the committee, bitterly denounced the findings of the committee and expressed his defiance of Congress to the press. It seems to me that the first order of business, in connection with the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, is the removal of Messrs. Fahey and Lee. The next order of business, logically, is the amendment of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to prevent further indiscretions and abuse of authority by the personnel of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. In the next few days I shall introduce such amendatory legislation. Finally, Executive Order 9070 should be repealed so as to allow the automatic reestablishment of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the return of some semblance of democracy to the agency that Fahey and Lee have so despotically reigned over since the date of said order.

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that John H. Fahey should be immediately removed from the office of Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and that Harold Lee should be immediately removed from the office of Governor of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, and that the Clerk of the House cause a certified copy of this resolution to be laid before the President of the United States.

FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

The great leader of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, once said that this Nation could not continue to exist "half slave and half free."

This country cannot continue to endure the dishonest, one-way freight rates with which the South and West are today punished.

Therefore, I have introduced a short bill that, if it passes and becomes law, will eliminate the most outrageous, most unjust, and dishonest discrimination ever imposed upon the people living west of the Mississippi River and the ones living south of the Ohio River.

I hope every one of you will read it, because this battle is on from this day forward.

It costs about twice as much to ship freight north from the States south of the Ohio, or east from States west of the Mississippi, as it does to ship it the other direction over the same road. It punishes the people of Kansas, Iowa, and other Western States just the same as it does us people in the South.

We have two-thirds of the Senate and about half of the House, and for the first time in history, we have a President of the United States living in the punished area, and we are going to be heard from.

All we ask is justice for the people of the entire Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DEFINITION OF AREAS OF PRODUCTION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to note the comment throughout the country and in the well of this House with respect to the subject of portal-to-portal pay, and the voluminous remedies that have been suggested to deal with that problem. May I call to the attention of the Members of the House another growing situation that will furnish the foundation for a lot of lawsuits that will be just as vicious as the so-called portal-to-portal pay lawsuit. If you are not familiar with it, I suggest that you read the recent definition of "area of production" issued by the administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and then apply that definition to

your district and to those processors who are engaged in processing and making butter or cheese or canning the products of the farm. You will find, in view of the Supreme Court decision which invalidated the former definition of "area of production" and made necessary this new description or definition, that the whole thing is retroactive, and you will find many little plants in your district that will now be confronted with claims under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act based upon this new definition as to what is contemplated by the words "area of production." I am going to make a speech on that subject at length next week and offer some legislation to deal with that before it becomes as acute as the portal-to-portal situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill, H. R. 1038.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, January 29, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by our former colleague, Hon. Clyde Ellis. The extension consists of 2½ pages of the RECORD and the Public Printer estimates the cost at $160. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONDERO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROPAGANDA LITERATURE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I know many of the Members planned to listen to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I am just going to take a few minutes until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] can get to the floor, when he will follow me. I say that for the benefit of those Members who want to hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution, now known as House Resolution 50, asking for the appointment of a small committee—I suggested a nine-man committee—to study the operations and workings of people engaged in the Federal agencies turning out so-called propaganda. I want to make it very clear at the outset that I am not attempting, nor would I attempt, to do anything to make it difficult for newspaper men and radio commentators to get all of the information that they possibly can as to the operation of the various departments of our Government. In fact, I think that that service to the newspapermen and radio commentators could, and should, be improved. I think the men in our Government who are making decisions and formulating policies should give the press an opportunity to interview them so that the newspapers would not have to depend, as they do in so many cases, on prepared "canned" press releases. But the point that I want to emphasize is the wasting of hundreds of thousands, and perhaps even millions, of dollars each year by the executive departments of our Government in publishing under the guise of reports purely propaganda documents. I have been appalled at the amount of literature printed at Government expense which comes over the desk of every Member of Congress and which has been coming over our desks for several years. In the last 2 years, when I was not a Member of the House, there was very little let-up on the amount of material that I received in my mail. I can see some justification for sending out these alleged reports to the Members of Congress, although I know that most of these communications go immediately into the wastebasket, but I can see no reason for keeping on the mailing list a large number of former Members of the House. The material that came to me certainly cost the Government thousands of dollars during the last 2 years.

Some day next week I want to show to the House a few exhibits of rank extravagance in the propaganda field. I have in my office one newspaperman's morning mail—a pile of mail actually 4½ inches thick. That mail contains three or four duplicates of exactly the same press release. While it is wrong to use the taxpayers' money in turning out propaganda, there is another phase of it that ought to be looked into. I fear that our citizens and certainly the Members of Congress are being subjected to propaganda, sometimes months before the presentation of any suggested legislation.

Let us take a rather far-fetched example of what can be done and what has been done, I am sure: Suppose somebody downtown decided that whooping cough was a great menace to this Nation. They would not immediately prepare a bill and send it up here to deal with that subject. No. They would start months in advance to put out all kinds of propaganda on the program they later intended to announce. That is going on in the Federal Housing Administration. Many thousands of dollars are being spent right now to popularize certain provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill; to popularize the work of the Federal Housing Administration. Other thousands of dollars are being spent on conferences of Federal housing officials, project managers' associations, and so forth. They have regional meetings. They have one in Boston for the New England region, for instance, and in other cities for other regions. Quite frequently there are national meetings in Chicago, Cleveland, and other places—not to study the problem of operating the projects so that they can better perform their duties, but so that they can come back to their respective communities and circulate propaganda to popularize the Federal housing program they are trying to carry out. If that money which is spent on housing propaganda would be spent on materials and supplies, the veterans would get houses much sooner.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman charge that those meetings are for the purpose of propaganda?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very largely.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am amazed at that statement.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I can prove the statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. For instance, in my city the housing authority is appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the council. Does the gentleman mean to say that all over the country those local housing authorities, having these meetings occasionally as they do, are mainly for propaganda purposes?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I say, very largely.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say is that the chairman of the Boston Housing Authority is a personal friend of mine, as well as the members of that authority. I have never had them propagandize me on any matter.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Perhaps the gentleman and myself differ on what is propaganda. The manager of my local housing project is my personal friend. He goes to those conferences and he comes back. What is his one purpose? To popularize that program. He comes back well fortified with material to make the program popular and addresses the Kiwanis Club, the Rotary Club, and various veterans' organizations on the program that is being carried out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman call that propaganda?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Of course it is.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman addresses them as a Congressman?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I certainly do not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman address patriotic organizations on matters in which he is interested in Congress?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not address them to popularize a program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly, when you address them you are trying to popularize the views you discuss on that occasion.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not call it that. I try to present factual information.

Mr. McCORMACK. In your case you do not call it popularizing the program, but in the other case you do?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Because that is not what they are paid to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman mean to say the chairman of the Boston Housing Authority does not have

the right to address the Kiwanis Club or the Rotary Club on the question of housing?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. He has a right to address them, but I do not believe the Federal Housing Administration has a right to call these conferences so frequently, for no good purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. How frequently do they call them?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot say how frequently they call them. I happen to know some officials that I am sure are away from their work on an average of once a month.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman opposed to the provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Am I opposed to what provisions?

Mr. McCORMACK. The provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Act.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am opposed to certain provisions of it, but I cannot discuss that bill in 10 minutes. I have studied it for 2 years, and I do not know all that is in it yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will concede that. That is a fair answer. Now, on the question of investigation, despite what happened in the other body yesterday, does not the gentleman feel that the regular standing committees of the House ought to make investigations under the Reorganization Act?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I was going to touch on that. I am glad the gentleman mentioned it. I have a note here to comment on it. I do not know what the policy of the House is going to be as to special committees.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all agree that if there are any unnecessary publications their number should be reduced. Some people think the Agricultural Yearbook when it was published was unnecessary. I gave my copies to my friends who had agricultural constituents, friends on both sides of the aisle. I think that in a sense they served a pretty useful purpose. To me, and perhaps to the gentleman, from the nature of our district, probably they did not mean so much.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think the yearbook is a fine thing. I do not call the yearbook propaganda. What I mean by propaganda are these things that come out with expensive lithographed illustrations, glamorizing housing projects in Podunk or Turkey Hollow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman opposed to low-cost housing projects?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am not opposed to low-cost housing projects. That has nothing to do with propaganda at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman mean by propaganda? Will the gentleman define "propaganda" for me? I have been unable to have it defined.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts knows propaganda when he sees it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am inquiring what the gentleman who makes charges has in mind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for whom we all have the highest regard, has referred to the matter of special committees as distinguished from the regular standing committees, and the provisions of the Reorganization Act in respect thereto.

The gentleman from Massachusetts certainly will recall that in the last Congress, when he was majority leader, the reorganization bill originally came before us with a prohibition against the creation of special committees. That provision was taken out of the reorganization bill. It would seem to me that would lead to the fair presumption that the House of Representatives did not want to consider itself bound by that specific provision, and is not bound in letter or in spirit.

Mr. McCORMACK. The present majority leader has just made a statement. Are we to understand——

Mr. HALLECK. Did the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts? I thought he yielded to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are we to understand now that as majority leader the gentleman from Indiana is taking the position that special committees should be appointed and that investigations should not be made by the regular standing committees of the House? If that is the attitude of the majority party from the statement just made we might just as well know it now as later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONDERO). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut may proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it that the gentleman from Connecticut had yielded to me but, of course, none of us would object to the right of the gentleman from Massachusetts to make inquiries or to make a statement at any time.

What I undertook to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts—and on that statement I stand—was that the provision against the creation of special committees was taken out of the Reorganization Act by this body when his party was in control and the gentleman himself was serving as majority leader. The only statement I make at this time, for the purposes of the inquiry directed to the gentleman from Connecticut seems to me to be perfectly and completely sufficient, is that the action of the House of Representatives in taking out of the Reorganization Act the provision against the creation of special committees leads to the one presumption, if it leads to any, that the House need not consider itself bound by the letter or spirit of the statute against the creation of special committees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield briefly, but wish to reserve at least a minute for myself to conclude.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. I believe the gentleman from Indiana knows, or he ought to know, what the general concensus was, that that was unnecessary, that with the Reorganization Act providing $10,000 to each standing committee it was assumed that the investigations would be made by the standing committees.

I still say that the statement of the gentleman from Indiana as majority leader in the light of this colloquy is a very interesting one because it indicates to the Members of the House and to the country that so far as the House is concerned the Republican Party intends to have investigations made outside of the standing committees.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield briefly to the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has now gone to another assumption which is completely erroneous and unfounded. First of all, he should read section 134 (a) of the Reorganization Act. There it appears that the power of subpena and $10,000 is given each Senate committee. Such is not given the House committees.

I do not know whether any special committees will be created. Certainly Republican recognition of the responsibilities, rights, and capacities of standing committees is not new-found. But if we find it necessary or clearly desirable to appoint a special committee, there is nothing in the Reorganization Act to prohibit such action. I am not presently discussing whether or not a special committee should be created for some specific purpose. I am merely talking about whether or not it can be done within the letter and spirit of the Reorganization Act. I say again—there is no prohibition against such action. Certainly I shall grant the gentleman from Massachusetts the right to make any assumption he wants, but the correctness of those assumptions is another matter. We will wait for the unfolding of the record to find out whether or not his assumption is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has refreshed my recollection about the $10,000, being provided for Senate standing committees, but the intent of the Reorganization Act was to have standing committees of each branch make investigations on matters coming under their jurisdiction.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want only to say in conclusion that the last statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts clearly evidences the fact that he recognizes the statement I made is a correct one because, certainly, the assumption which he would seek to assert cannot be indulged in, in reason and fair judgment, with respect to what happened under the reorganization bill and its adoption here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut has not had any time and with the permission of those having succeeding special orders, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield a fair proportion of the 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is always generous and he knows the state of mind I entertain toward him. My questioning was to bring out the gentleman's state of mind and out of it came this interesting colloquy. I have the fondest regard for the majority leader; however, my friend was fearful of what was growing out of the friendly colloquy going on between the gentleman from Connecticut and myself. I admire him for his attitude, because if they are going to have special investigating committees outside of the standing commitees then the leadership on that side ought to come out and let the country know about it. I will agree the gentleman does not go quite that far, but it does show, and I refer to the gentleman's remarks, that the leadership of the Republican Party has in mind going outside the Reorganization bill and having special investigations.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one brief observation?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very briefly.

Mr. HALLECK. The statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts that a special committee, if such should be deemed to be desirable is outside the Reorganization Act, is not a statement of the fact. It cannot be found in the reorganization bill in any place. I do not know whether any special committees are going to be set up or not, but, as far as the Reorganization Act is concerned and by everything that happened here in connection with the adoption of the Reorganization Act, there is no prohibition in spirit or in letter against the House of Representatives doing that if it sees fit.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I did not realize I was going to stir up this discussion on the reorganization bill. I say as one who was not here when the reorganization bill was passed but as one who read the debates very carefully and who has read the Reorganization Act, I assume that there were no prohibitions against the creation of a special committee if one were desired. I do not care who gets the information. It does seem to me, however, that there is a need for somebody finding out what all these people are turning out, what I insist is propaganda and the gentleman knows what I mean by propaganda, finding out where the money is coming from, why people get one title and then spend their time turning out various booklets, pamphlets, movies, and what not. This is only a small example, but I know that the State Department as of today is sending men overseas in far parts of the world at salaries of $7,000 a year and shipping an automobile with them and in at least three cases the fellows never earned $50 a week as cub reporters in the United States. There was no examination, no nothing; they were simply appointed. They will serve out there for a year or two, come back, take an examination, and be frozen on the pay roll forever. I do not know why we want publicity men over in the Far East. I do not see the need for that sort of stuff. This is going on in every department of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered this resolution in good faith. If the Committee on Expenditures has the time to go into this or the Appropriations Committee has the time to go into it, all very well and fine. I thought that eight or nine Members of the House without expending any great amount of money, but working hard, could find out from the Department how many people they were employing in this kind of work, what it was for, what they hoped to accomplish, if anything, and what it is costing the taxpayers. I would like to know. I have heard and read all kinds of statements as to this running into millions of dollars, and I do not think there is any Member of the House that knows just what is being spent for that purpose in the various departments.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just did not want the gentleman from Massachusetts to commit the entire Democratic side to his attitude on special committees. I helped to create the Dies committee, a special committee that rendered some of the greatest services ever rendered to the American people, and other special committees, and I would not want to see the hands of Congress tied to where we could not create special committees if the occasion arises.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is my point.

Mr. RANKIN. I may not support the gentleman's motion——

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I realize that.

Mr. RANKIN. But I do not want to be committed against any special committees at all.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I say in all sincerity that I assume your side was committed to continuing special committees. I know that the prohibition against special committees was stricken out of the reorganization bill when it came over here, so I assume that the Democratic leadership was not opposed to special committees. But as I said, I do not know what the policy of the House is going to be. I will abide by it, but I would like to get information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONDERO). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RED FASCISM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, three things have happened or will happen which to the average reader and observer may have no connection, but in my humble judgment there is a line of connection and relationship. The first one is in the nature of a program that has been announced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, with which I concur. The second is the passing of a former Member of this House from the State of Minnesota at the age of 87, and I refer to the Honorable Andrew J. Volstead. The third is a resolution that I shall introduce today in the hope that this body will see fit to approve the publication of 500,000 copies of a public document with which I had some identity and some interest, and which I am pleased to say has become something of a Government best seller since Labor Day of last year.

Let me begin by observing that as the Eightieth Congress now moves forward into its work, it is well to go back every so often, and get just a little orientation upon some of the major problems that engross the attention of the country. We have problems, and solutions are being offered. The best evidence of solutions is the fact that up to this noon, 1,226 bills have been dropped into the House hopper and 332 in the hopper of the Senate. Thus far, therefore, in the infant life of the Eightieth Congress nearly 1,550 proposals that will deal with every phase of human endeavor and will be a suggestion for remedy for some of the problems that challenge our attention have been presented.

It is hardly necessary, of course, to enumerate those problems because they lie in the field of industry, in the field of labor, in the field of business, in the field of agriculture, in the field of taxes, in the field of security, and everywhere else. So it is incumbent upon us to get some sense of direction as we move along. Perhaps a little background this afternoon within the time allowed may be of interest.

I have often told that little squib that I saw in Reader's Digest a good many years ago about the lady who climbed on a double-decker bus in New York on Lexington Avenue and promptly unfolded a large colored map of Manchuria and began to peruse it very intently. There was one vacant seat on top of that bus. The bus stopped along the route and picked up a man who had looked a little too long and lovingly upon the flowing bowl, and whose ideas and whose eyesight were just a little nebulous as a result. He clambered up that little, narrow companionway and found this seat beside the lady. When he noticed this colored map, it struck consternation and dismay to his very soul. After a while he could contain himself no longer. He looked at her and said, "Lady, are you sure you are on the right bus?"

Well, we have to be sure that we are on the right bus, and I propose to belabor a little bit what I regard as the primary and No. 1 problem not only in this country but throughout the whole wide world, and that is, oddly enough, the problem of human freedom.

You can talk about taxes and labor and security and portal-to-portal pay

and all the rest, but they will be as exactly nothing if the freedom of this country and its people is impaired or if we fail in the ultimate objective of a crusade that over the last few years has taken perhaps over 30,000,000 human lives. So freedom is the great, transcendent issue of the country, it is the great, transcendent issue everywhere. In my humble judgment, freedom is in jeopardy in this country and in the world today. It is the No. 1 problem.

As a matter of fact, this country was born for the purposes of freedom. I remember seeing a squib by Thomas Paine one time—the same Thomas Paine whose last resting place is hardly marked today. He said that if it had not been for this infant country on this side of the Atlantic, the lights of freedom would have gone out in all the corners of the earth. So what some British statesman said in your time and day and generation is not new, when he talked about the lamps of freedom being extinguished in the Old World when World War II began in September of 1939. It has been a great problem in the tortuous course of mankind, of man reaching and seeking somehow to get into the upper air of human freedom. It was the great lesson of Bethlehem, as a matter of fact,. the anniversary of which we so recently observed in December of 1946. I remember standing out there in 1945 in the Holy Land looking at that place that marked the beginning of Christian civilization, and I was so deeply impressed with the fact that that was the beginning of a great movement that somehow imparted a great, shall I say, divinity to human personality, when people for the first time began to look up instead of look down, to look to the stars instead of to the terrain, and then marched on and on through generations, through Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, until we have achieved a great and felicitous kind of freedom in this country that they do not know anywhere else in the world.

How strange, then, that as late as 1939, in your lifetime and in mine, young men had to be put in uniform and had to be marched away into all the corners of the earth, had to be placed upon vessels to travel the blue waters of the seven seas, in the interest of this thing called freedom. What an astonishing thing it is. The crusade never comes to an end. You cannot put your finger on some date or day in the calendar and say, "This day freedom was achieved and durably achieved, and there is nothing else to be done." It is a resurgent problem that comes in every generation. So human freedom is a great problem right now here and everywhere.

As we think about it we think of the departures from freedom and we think about the jeopardies to freedom and the forces that would jeopardize it. And as I think of the jeopardies to freedom, that is where Mr. Volstead comes in, oddly enough. Back in 1918, 1919, and 1920, when his presence graced this body, he was the spearhead of a great crusade that did not relent until they amended the Constitution of the United States. There was something very singular about that eighteenth amendment. It was very different from anything else in the Constitution and it was quite different from anything in the Bill of Rights. When you examine the Bill of Rights you find suddenly that the Constitution makers said, "Congress shall make no law respecting the abridgement of the freedoms of the people." That is very clear and unequivocal. It was an interdiction upon the lawmakers and upon the Government. Suddenly, along comes the eighteenth amendment and it departs in style and character from the things that were contained in the Constitution. It did not put a restriction upon the Congress; it very plainly put a restriction upon the people. It said, "You and you and you, as citizens, shall not do certain things." And so we reversed the whole constitutional processes of freedom. It took 14 years or thereabout for the people to shout "Uncle" and cry "enough." It went out, as you remember, in 1933. That was the first departure from freedom. The whole issue of prohibition is not a liquor issue with me; it is an issue in the ethical and moral domain of freedom.

The second departure came in 1932. I do not expect anybody who has been so assiduously devoted to the ideals of the New Deal to agree with me particularly, but I still contend that in 1932 and 1933, when I was privileged to become a Member of this body, we started upon a great departure from the course of freedom. You know, economic desperation somehow frustrates and blinds people and ofttimes they are willing to throw their liberties overboard in order to achieve an economic objective. I remember going home from that 100-day session in 1933. Standing at every highway that entered the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois were billboards. Placed upon those billboards was an interesting symbol that you hear so little about today. It was a blue eagle. I tried to find one of those old placards. You cannot find them anywhere. I hope some historian or archivist has gathered up some of them to exhibit to future generations as an indication of what happened in the year of our Lord 1933. They assembled here in Washington for the first time under a new leadership that took us into a semicollective field—and that is a departure from freedom. I say, a semicollective field. You need only review the whole picture of this very fantastic situation which was a mixture of the blue eagle, and Sally Rand, and of Hitler and Mussolini, and Pearl Harbor, and penicillin, and the Maginot line, and Senator Claghorn, and dipsy doodle, and flat-foot-floogie, and all the rest, to get a kind of fantastic picture of what happened in the generation that is now slipping away when we put our feet in the pathway of a departure from the very fundamentals of freedom. Now we are beginning to breathe the fresh upper air again and we begin to see a little more clearly. So the question is in this rather feverish world whether or not we are going to move to the right or move to the left. It is one of those things that disturbs one as he sees the forces and the ferment on the world horizon.

Who knows for sure whether or not we may become just a little isle in a great red sea that splashes all around us and whose waves somehow break upon every shore and unless we are vigilant might some day break upon our shores. Yes. It is a question of direction for this generation. And when I say whether we go right or left, I think sometimes of the days when circuit judges rode about on horseback. I am advised that down in Kentucky in those early days when Abraham Lincoln was a member of the Illinois Legislature, they had a judge who had a great fondness for corn liquor. Of course, he had to be circumspect about it. So he put a bottle in his pocket and he had a rubber tube going up to his mouth. He could sit on the bench all day and puff vigorously but never any smoke curled from the bottle. But in the afternoon he would get what they call in Kentucky "slightly mellow." So this day he went out to throw the saddle on his horse. A young lawyer watching the operation noticed that he had the pommel where the cantle should be. He said, "Your honor, you have got your saddle on backward." Then, with that kind of dignity that only the judiciary can assume, he said, "How in the devil do you know in what direction I am going?"

We have to know, when we stand at the crossroads, in what direction we are going. It is not such an easy thing to rationalize when you seek to appraise these affairs and take realistic stock of them. That is the job we have to do in determining a sense of direction, and how much devotion and attention we are going to put into this fabric of freedom that is probably the most precious inheritance that a country and any people ever had.

I say to you categorically that in my judgment the greatest menacing force to freedom in the world today is red fascism. That is just another term for communism, but I think it is a little more impressive and accurate when you call it "red fascism." And it is on the move, not only in our own country but abroad. I was astonished in 1940 to sit for 12 hours in the bleachers on Avenida Juarez in Mexico City and see a parade that in size and length would have beggared the parade of any American Legion convention I have ever attended. But it was not the size of the parade nor the personalities that was impressive. It was the thousands of banners, here in this republic just south of us, which pictured a likeness of Stalin and carried the symbol, "Viva el Comunismo." You see the virus is on this hemisphere. It is reported by the New York Times and others who have gone to South America to make an inspection, that probably in Brazil they will roll up a million and a half votes. Strange, is it not, that a country that has so recently emerged from dictatorship of Getulio Vargas that a new sinister force is coming up in South America. It is only within the last 7 weeks that an affiliate of the Communist Party was made President of the Republic of Chile. So, as you explore that situation in the hemisphere to the south, that virus is there, and that virus is working. You see it elsewhere in the world. I think one of the most astonishing things I ever heard on a Sunday

morning was to stand at the gateway of the old Arab bazar in Tunisia, that place where Hannibal and his legions had their origin in ancient history, and there to see a tottering, impoverished Arab shouting, "Comunismo," as he was hawking newspapers printed for the benefit of those who are affiliated with the Moslem faith.

I always thought that of all individualists in the world the Arab was No. 1. Yet the red fever has gotten a start on the shores of Africa. You can go up into ancient Tehran, and there, of course, you see that whole area that comes under the influence of the Soviet Union, and they will look you over, no matter who you are, when you come within 150 miles of the Soviet border. You need only go to ancient Greece and see the hammers and sickles that are painted upon the ancient landmarks, the ancient Acropolis and all the buildings, to know what is happening there. What they call the KKE group, the so-called liberalist group in Greece, is moving along in order to do the job of imposing communism upon Greece. You see it in Italy. Ask any soldier who has been in the Po Valley or the Arno, who has been at the Caserte, who has been in the Eternal City, and he will tell you of the Red flags and the pennants and hammers and sickles and the strength of the Communist movement in Italy. And so I can imagine the agitation and dismay of the great holy head of that great church in that ancient city who is deeply concerned about this strange play of forces there.

I remember a conversation with a former Prime Minister of Italy who said to me: "I will not hold this portfolio for very long."

I asked, "Why?"

He said: "Because I am not in the grace of Togliatti."

And who is Togliatti?

"Well, good sir, Togliatti is the chief of the Communist Party in Italy."

So they have gotten strong enough to make prime ministers. That can be duplicated in many places.

Then lift your eyes to a country steeped in the liberal tradition, like France, and what do we see? A Communist is going to be Defense Minister in the French Cabinet. They can wreck the country any time by calling a general strike. Jacques Duclos knows that; Maurice Thorez knows that. I would not at this moment give a fig for liberty in France. To be sure, they compromise right now and say they will not go as far as the original Soviet line; but that is only for the present; and it will not be long before France will have been engulfed, and then, of course, this blight of "red fascism" will come right up to the Atlantic's shores. Added to what we have got in South America at the present time, it must be apparent to anyone to what it forbodes; that it menaces and jeopardizes this thing called freedom. And so freedom is a lively issue. Today hundreds of millions of people are beating their breasts at this very moment wishing they might be free and out from under the dictatorship such as they have in Yugoslavia under Tito, and such as they have in Russia under Marshal Stalin, and such as they have in Poland right now—God save the mark. I remember when a professor of the Warsaw University was here this summer. He said: "I want you to go back to Warsaw with me."

I said: "My good friend, I cannot."

There are other responsibilities that kept me here at that time. He indicated then, however, what was going to happen, and it did happen.

Go back and read the remarks Winston Churchill made to Parliament in February 1945—and I was in Parliament the day he made his report on Yalta—to the effect that at long last freedom had been achieved for the Poles. The late President of the United States sat in this well and gave a report on Yalta to the membership of this body in March 1945. He said that while he had not achieved and accomplished everything, at least here was a provisional government for national unity in Poland that had been set up, and so there was going to be freedom for the Poles. But was it the kind that was expressed last Sunday when the Moscow Government impressed itself in that election? You know full well there will be no freedom in Poland. Let us not kid ourselves about it, the red danger is marching.

So once more I say to you as you lift your eyes, like the prophets of old and look at the world horizon. Freedom is in jeopardy and hundreds of millions of people are looking perhaps to this country for a ray of hope. As I think of it I think of it as a testimony to a man who had an ideal and who had a passion. His name, if you will remember, was Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov. That may mean nothing to you. We know him by an assumed name, Nikolay Lenin. You remember that in 1917 he was locked in a railroad carriage and sent from Switzerland to Moscow. He had one idea and one passion. The idea was somehow to take the hatred and chaos that had been churned up by the Czars and direct it against the white ties and the black ties, symbolically speaking, and to drive on and on and on and spread his idea everywhere in the world. He succeeded in great measure. Five hundred million people in the world today, who have no freedom, who are subject to the knock of the gendarme to be taken away at will to a concentration camp, are testimony to Nikolay Lenin who had a hate in his heart and who had an idea and made it stick in 30 short years. Yes, that red fascist menace is marching. Now we see it on our own shores. Distinguished members of the Un-American Activities Committee have given much time and energy to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have made no speeches on the subject here. I somehow thought that perhaps speeches and scolding do no good, but I am not insensible to the fact that if ever there was a time to be vigilant it is now. Suppose, and God grant that it will never come, that some kind of economic reverse should come to our blessed country. Do you know what will happen? The same thing will happen that happened in 1933 when we assembled here. The first bill that was introduced in this Congress in 1933 was not even in print. It was in typewritten form. It delegated a very broad power to the Chief Executive and it took a long, long time to reclaim that power and to wipe out some of the bitter fruit when veterans and civil servants were so generously, with wild abandon, taken from the Federal rolls under the euphemism of the Economy Act.

You see, that is what desperation does. I voted against that bill in 1933. There came 1,500 letters and telegrams to my desk scolding me. Some of my best friends stated, "You are going to be a one-termer." There was a surge of feeling to go along with the delegation of power. You see, we set the pattern by a departure from freedom in 1933 and economic desperation can do that again.

Suppose fur coats and fancy apartments go out of the window once more in an economic slide; if the market takes a dip, do you know what will happen? You will be engulfed with letters and telegrams. You must give power to a Moses to lead us out of the wilderness, and then we will put our feet in the same pathway unless we can resist that political pressure and show our devotion to this thing called freedom as distinguished from collectivism and semi-collectivism.

Mr. Speaker, it can happen again. So it is because of the economic uncertainties here and elsewhere for the moment and because this red fire is burning with a high and livid tongue that freedom is constantly in jeopardy and becomes the transcendent problem for us and everybody in this Nation. Yes, I repeat, it is an amazing thing that so many lives were surrendered to it even in our own generation.

I used to see these GI's around the world. I would ask a sergeant: "Where are you from?" "I am from New York." "How would you like to be there today walking down Lexington Avenue, Broadway, or Park Avenue?" He would say, "Do not talk that way. You make me homesick." After a while you would say, "Sarge, what is this business all about? Why are you here in Marseilles, Delhi, or Calcutta?" He would not cite the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. He would look at you and say, "Congressman, I guess it is about freedom." You see, that is the one thing that had somehow taken root. Thus we had that crusade for freedom that was sparked by the Atlantic Charter and it cost 15,000,000 soldiers' lives and 15,000,000 civilians. Yet it is the great question, it is the great problem of the moment.

Mr. Speaker, the jeopardy then comes from these forces that are operative and that have taken root in the country—red fascism and communism. I subscribe to the program that was announced by the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee yesterday. There is going to be an exposé of those who are on the Government pay rolls identified with this sinister and this infamous force. We have had some difficulty in the past, and this may be of interest to those who had no participation in it. I offered the first amendment on this floor to knock one Communist sympathizer off the pay roll of the Government. His name was David K. Lasser. He lived in Philadelphia. He was the president of the International Workers,

or some such organization, and had an executive counsel around him that was dominated by card-carrying members of the Communist Party. His executive secretary hauled his card out and showed it right here in the committee room in this Capitol. An interesting thing. So Mr. Lasser had to go. The House passed a bill, with a rider, making no funds available to pay Mr. Lasser. The Senate approved and the President of the United States approved it. But oddly enough it only applied to those agencies for which we were appropriating in that bill, namely, the independent offices bill, containing some 30 agencies. They did take Mr. Lasser off, but they transferred Mr. Lasser to another agency of the Government and gave him a substantial raise in pay. Marvelous, is it not? Yes; there is something fluid about the Government, so we have our difficulties. Now, we were successful in separating Mr. Lasser but we were not so successful in removing three professors who had an oblique viewpoint and whose loyalty was questioned, namely, Dr. Lovett, Dr. Dodd, and Dr. Watson. This House finally set up a special committee to investigate. The present Secretary of Agriculture was a member of that subcommittee. I remember the day that Secretary Anderson, then Representative Anderson, stood in this well and made a great case and a fine talk against these people, so we insisted on taking them off the pay roll. But it is not so simple. We can take them off the pay roll all right, but there is a court over there that said that the appointive power lies in the President of the United States. So these men were free to file a claim before the United States Court of Claims for the salary that they did not receive under their term of appointment.

That is one of the difficulties that we have, and yet, notwithstanding that difficulty it becomes necessary now to assist the Committee on Un-American Activities and to go through Government carefully; see that everybody gets a fair shake, gets the right of appeal, does not become the recipient of the tarred stick until we make sure that there is an appeal and that it is unemotional and fair, the Committee on Un-American Activities is going to do that job and I trust it can fairly and realistically get at the very heart of disloyalty in Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Secondly, they are going to move into Hollywood and they are going to move into some of the labor unions that are dominated by red fascism. They are going to take a look at the educational system. Then there is one item in their program that struck me very forcibly, and it is a thing to which I should have devoted all of my remarks, and that is the creation of some counterpropaganda, if you want to call it that, but at the educational level. How necessary that is. That is the thing I want to talk about for a moment, because it is the reason why I am going to introduce this resolution earlier referred to. You see, we are trying to hold the text together: Mr. Volstead, the resolution, and the question of freedom. That is the thing I had in mind.

How much have we done, as a matter of fact, in bringing information to our people on what red fascism really is? And, after all, what is the great weapon that is available in order to push back the forces of communism? Is it not knowledge? In proportion as you educate the citizenry of the country and make them aware of it, that is the best guarantee we have that they will want nothing of an ideology of government that is so inimical to freedom and that would destroy freedom if it could? Now, as a contribution to this educational matter I got very much interested last year while I was addressing a group of farmers out in the Sherman Hotel in Chicago. I was telling them a little about these forces that are operating today, and when it was all over they came up to the speaker's rostrum and they said, "Mr. Congressman, where could we get a book that is not slanted and not oblique, that just actually tells the story of how communism works?" I said, "There is no such book." But I said, "Gentlemen, I will tell you what. I will write you a book." Well, that was a great challenge, and I did not know whether they would accept it seriously or not. But as I boarded the plane for Washington I got to thinking it over and I got out a notebook and I jotted down in outline form the type of book I would write if I would write a book, and if I had time. I could expand those notes somewhat, but the thing that I was most interested in was not in EVERETT DIRKSEN'S unsupported opinion about red fascism. I was most interested in having people know what communism was really like and then to have every statement documented. That is the important thing, to make sure that it will stand up in any forum, at any time or any place, so that the values and the statements and the assertions cannot be controverted successfully. I called in the Library of Congress and they did a lot of work in expanding and documenting those notes. The result was a document, known as House Document 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, under the title, "Communism in Action." It got a little longer than I had anticipated. There are about 141 pages. But this was designed to tell what communism would do to the American farmer if you had it here. It is designed to tell what would happen to our school system. It is designed to tell what would happen to freedom of the press. It is designed to tell what would happen to religion. It is designed to tell what would happen to labor. It was designed as a reference and educational. So let us see what it says, for instance, about this question of labor.

If the average American laboring man could know what is going on in Russia he would run from red fascism as if it were the plague. Here is the documented information, and I will read just a little of it to you:

> Although the Government publishes no statistics regarding the camps—

Meaning the concentration camps—

> in which persons are concentrated and thus confuses and throws out of line all of its other employment statistics, there can be no reasonable doubt that in the Soviet Union several million workers are employed under police discipline and receive only miserable keep for their labor.

That is what happens to men and women in the Soviet Union.

When did these concentration camps begin? Are they something new? Let us see what the experts said:

> The first concentration labor camp was established in 1923.

Why, it was from Russia that the infamous Hitler got the technique for Dachau. Make no mistake about it, it was borrowed from the people who would create an empire of the mind in the world and destroy freedom in this country.

Who are these people? Let us see what the documentation is on this:

> The population of these camps was drawn from political offenders, nonconforming engineers, and intellectuals, kulaks, recalcitrant peasants, former industrial and other officials, and deviating Communists of the right and of the left.

How many of these people are in these concentration camps in Russia today? These estimates, appearing on page 56, by observers who were there at one time or another run all the way from 6,000,000 to 18,000,000. Think of it! That many adult men and women in concentration camps of the Soviet Union today. And still you have people toying with this infamous and brutal idea, and who would try to give it currency here in this Republic.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is discussing "Communism in Action," which is one of the greatest documents on communism in the history of America, the first time, I believe, that an objective, scholarly study has been made by such men as we have in the Library of Congress. The country as a whole owes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a great vote of thanks for having implemented that study, and owes to Dr. Ernest Griffith, of the Library of Congress, an equally great vote of thanks for having done a factual and courageous job.

May I say that our House Committee on Un-American Activities referred to that book and recommended it in our annual report of January 2, now available in the Document Room, which in itself is an unusual report, different from any ever before published by our committee. I recommend it to the serious reading also of every Member of this House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am deeply grateful for the gracious contribution by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In order that nobody may misunderstand what the Communists are driving at, I quote as nearly verbatim as I can the statement of William C. Foster, head of the Communist Party. He has admitted this statement under oath and it is in the record of the hearings. He said, "No Communist, no matter how many votes he should get, could ever be President of the present Government of the United States." But he said that the Communists would take over this country "just as surely as the sun rises." And he said, "When that day comes it will not be a capitalistic Government but will be a Soviet Government, and behind this Government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Anybody who does not know that the Communists are out to overthrow this Government and destroy Christianity and everything built on Christianity certainly has his head in the sand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now, without trespassing too long upon your patience, gentlemen, the point I make is that we ought to utilize the educational weapon in dealing with this matter which is so essential. There are a lot of things that one could incorporate in a program. I wonder about the advisibility, for instance, of undertaking the cancellation of the naturalization certificates of people who come here and enjoy the advantages of this country and then seek to give us an Old World government and an Old World ideology. I think about the necessity of requiring the front organizations to carry descriptive language on their letterheads and their literature so that we would know what they are really doing. For instance, does the average citizen of the United States know what the Amtorg Trading Corp. is? For all we know, it may be a corporation in Oskaloosa, Kokomo, or Detroit. Do they know that it is a Russian organization? Do they know what the Artinko Pictures, Inc., is? Would you guess that it was Russian? Would you guess that the Inreklama Service doing business in New York City is identified with Soviet Russia? There are a great many such organizations and perhaps it is possible by substantive legislation through the Postmaster General and through the Attorney General to deny the use of the mails to any organization that does not by appropriate descriptive language on their letterheads and literature tell with whom they may be connected.

Those are things that can be done. But when all is said and done, we still have the responsibility of more education in the field of foreign ideology for when the farmer, the laboring man, and the misguided altruist or any other citizen in the country knows what this brutal and infamous scheme of "red fascism" is, and how it works in practice, we will have engendered a force that can cope with communism, or "red fascism," and ultimately throw it back. So the burden of this disquisition today is to bespeak your support of a House concurrent resolution, the purpose of which is to authorize the publication of 500,000 copies of Communism in Action to be distributed to the Members of the House and the Senate in the following ratio: 375,000 for House Members and 125,000 copies for Members of the Senate. In quantity, it will cost about 10 cents. Five hundred thousand copies will be $50,000. Gentlemen and ladies, I submit to you, is it a good investment in freedom or not?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that today the Communists are working through what are called Communist-front organizations all over this country. The Committee on Un-American Activities is going to bring these Communist fronts forcibly to the attention of the Congress and the American people at the earliest possible date. This Communist drive must be turned back if our country is to survive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

FRED A. GOTTLIEB

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the papers in support of the claim of Fred A. Gottlieb, covered by H. R. 4943 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Claims on May 24, 1946, but which was not considered or passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to a great speech just delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I address my remarks to the broader implications, rather than what he said in relation to our domestic matters. For example, he made reference to the passage of the Economy Act in 1933. The gentleman voted against it. He referred to that as an indication, as a trend toward the loss of liberty. I voted against that bill in 1933. There were 33 of us who voted against it. We were pilloried. I know because at that time it was predicted that I, like the gentleman from Illinois, would not be reelected. When our late friend, Billy Connery, and I arrived in Boston we had a parade of 15,000 veterans marching through the main streets of Boston in our honor for voting against that measure. While I opposed that bill, I did not consider its passage a trend toward loss of freedom.

I am not going to address myself to that part of the remarks by the gentleman from Illinois with reference to legislation passed, because he and I honestly disagree in some respects, but I am going to make some remarks on the broader implications of what the gentleman said, and with which I am in complete harmony.

The gentleman said "freedom" is the great issue. He is absolutely correct. He said that "red fascism" or "atheistic communism" is on the march. I have said that before. We might just as well face the facts. On July 27, 1946, in a speech on this floor, I exposed conditions existing in Yugoslavia under Tito. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in my opinion, is absolutely correct in the issue involved in its broad aspect. We are confronted in the world of today with a clash of two concepts of life, one the Marxist concept, the state, all powerful, the state supreme, with its viciousness; and on the other hand, the western concept, the concept of those who believe in one God, Catholic, Potestant, or Jew, the Christian concept of life. There is a clash today, and we must face the situation and face the real conditions in a realistic manner. In facing this situation, there is no middle aisle dividing us. There are no Republicans and no Democrats on that issue. We are all concerned with the national interest of our country. We find the boring in; we find coalition governments; we find the taking over; we find the suppression of labor; we find the constant encroachment; we find the inability to have agreements made on fundamentals; the representatives of our country and other countries willing to do so, but always uncertainty, confusion, and chaos existing due to the practices and actions of the Soviet Union. We find the Balkan Nations behind the iron curtain, except little Greece, and that country is besieged. We find the Baltic Nations behind the iron curtain. We see conditions existing in China. All of these things should bring to our conscious mind, those of us who believe in the concept of life that we do, that our way of life is being challenged. We are not challenging any other concept of life, but our concept of life is being actively and directly challenged. We saw it in Yugoslavia with the unfair trial, persecution, and imprisonment of Archibishop Stepinac. He is an archbishop of the Catholic church, of which I am a communicant. He is the symbol of the persecution of all religions. If they can drive underground the Catholic religion, the attack of other religions will follow. "Divide and conquer" is the policy. We have plenty of evidence of a constant challenge and attack on the fundamentals of life in which we believe.

What is the answer? That is what concerns me. My good friend from Illinois made a brilliant statement, a correct statement, of world conditions that confront us. He says "eternal vigilance"—yes; we know that is the price of liberty, but what are we going to do to bring about eternal vigilance? Are we going to fight defensively—when I say "fight" I use the word advisedly—or use our powers defensively? We are a powerful country, we are not a small nation, like, for example, Liberia. We are one of the great nations of the world, and from an industrial angle the most powerful nation in the world today. I am con-

cerned with the type of leadership we are going to give not only in the field of government but in the field of religion, in the field of business, in the field of finance, in the field of labor, among all of the Americas.

I am concerned with strengthening ourselves internally first. We have got to do it.

I am concerned with preventing bigotry existing in America. Bigotry in any form is a force of distintegration.

I am concerned with leadership in all spheres of human activity, not only on domestic matters but on foreign problems, that type of leadership which will be for the national interests of our country and of our people. We, in this Congress, are faced with that very situation now.

I am concerned with an Army and a Navy, for example, consistent with the national interests of our country at this time. That issue directly confronts us as Members of Congress.

I am concerned with sound progressive leadership. I am talking about leadership that considers the economic conditions of the people. The communistic form of government, in my opinion, is the most reactionary form of government that could exist. The answer is not to fight it negatively. We should not go on the defensive. Democratic institutions of government do not constitute a negative form of government. The religions of the western civilizations are not negative; they are affirmative. You and I who believe in God must think and act affirmatively to obey His commandments and His law. Democratic government is an affirmative type of government. Democratic government requires leadership of an affirmative, not of a negative nature. It certainly requires affirmative leadership to meet the challenge that exists today. As the gentleman from Illinois well said, "red fascism," or "atheistic communism," is "on the march." There is no reason why those of us who have similar views on this subject should refrain from expressing our thoughts. Certainly, there is no withholding of expression of the objectives of the Soviet Union, as far as that country is concerned.

The bringing about of permanent peace rests mainly upon the United States and the Soviet Union; both countries have this responsibility. Our country is doing everything it possibly can to bring about permanent peace.

I publicly charge that the failure to bring about permanent peace today is due to the unwillingness of the representatives of the Soviet Union to cooperate with the understanding necessary to bring about world peace. Persecution, concentration camps, viciousness in all forms, even resulting in death, follow in the wake of atheistic communism. The sordid election in Poland is but another incident. The national interest of our country calls for affirmative action. This means we must develop and use the powers of our country, and maintain our powers so that the representatives of our country will be supported by a powerful army, a powerful navy, a powerful air force. The people of America should be aroused to the challenge of atheistic communism which is attempting to encircle, and, if possible, envelop our country.

Mr. Speaker, I was chairman of the first subcommittee that investigated communism a dozen or so years ago. We investigated Nazis, Fascists, and the bigot, for whom I have nothing but contempt. I have contempt for anyone who hates his fellow man because of the accident of birth, or because of difference of race, color, or creed. My committee was the only one, in over 30 years, that recommended legislation on that subject which has passed the Congress and is now law. The Alien Propaganda Registration Act came out of my committee. The bill making it a crime for anyone to willfully advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, now a law, was recommended by me. That came out of the special committee of which I was chairman. Also the bill, now a law, giving the Army and Navy real power to control subversive activities in our armed forces came out of my committee. It took us over 3 years to get such legislation through the Congress. There was great resistance from certain directions. But they are all law now.

Mr. Speaker, I think I know a little something about communism. I know something about how Communists operate. The only legislation put through the Congress in over 30 years on that subject was passed as the result of the recommendations of a special committee of which I was chairman and under my leadership.

We are not going to meet this problem by sitting back and letting it roll up on our shores. Yes, we are on the last line of defense in Europe now. If Italy goes communistic—and the prediction is if the Allied troops are withdrawn it will—if France goes communistic, and if Spain goes communistic, our national interests will be adversely affected—the country that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe. Yes, the country that controls Europe thus controls Asia and Africa. We had better face these practical facts. In addition to the European situation, we must also consider similar communistic efforts in Asia and all over the Far East. We must consider, first, the national interests of our country. We must look at this situation from the angle of the national interests of America. What can we do? What should we do in our national interest to help all countries combat communism? What can we do to start rolling back the so-called iron curtain?

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is making a very forceful exposé of communistic interests. He spoke a moment ago about the forces of hatred, which certainly is one of the factors that communism has always used. Does not the gentleman think it a bit sad that in our own country our military has for 19 months after VE-day taught our young soldiers to hate the people of another land? Is not that sort of thing kind of bad in connection with what the gentleman says?

Mr. McCORMACK. If what the gentleman says is correct, may I say that I do not differentiate between any kind of hatred.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does not the gentleman think it is part of our job as Members of Congress to investigate that sort of thing?

Mr. McCORMACK. If what the gentleman says is correct, that is, that our Army is engendering hatred into the minds of our soldiers against the people of another land, then that condition should not be tolerated.

Mr. BUFFETT. Let me add this: The policy has been officially abandoned. I got this information from an article by Felix Morley, who is pretty much of an authority, that for 19 months that policy had been going on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I concur in what my colleague from Nebraska said, that the gentleman from Massachusetts, as he always does, is delivering an informative and timely address. The gentleman mentioned Poland a few minutes ago. Does the gentleman for a moment believe that the election held in Poland on Sunday last, which registered 80 percent in favor of communism, reflected the true sentiments of a Christian people?

Mr. McCORMACK. The percentage was more than that, and my answer to the gentleman's question is "No."

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course not.

Mr. McCORMACK. There was nothing free or unfettered about it. It is all consistent with what the gentleman from Illinois said about this march of "red fascism." That constituted a consolidation within the communist orbit of Poland for some time to come. The great majority of the people of Poland never would tolerate communism. It was not a free election; it was not an unfettered election.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has not every election that has been held under Communist auspices been preceded by terrorism?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly; the gentleman is absolutely right. My purpose is to follow the broad line taken by the gentleman from Illinois, who has made a powerful contribution, and to give my views in implementation of what he said and to go one marked step forward. He talked about the danger. Yes. I want the answer. We have had these dangers in bygone centuries against the civilization in which we believe. These dangers were subdued and conquered. But it had to be by affirmative and courageous leadership I do not want to sit back and let this encircling movement of atheistic communism be successful. There is no question but from an ideological standpoint there is

an encircling movement going on and directed against the United States, and in my opinion it is a part of the military plan of the Soviet Union. I want affirmative leadership in our foreign affairs, and affirmative leadership in our domestic affairs, to mold our people together, and to enable our country to take those steps which will give us the right type of leadership. Such leadership will be consistent with our national interest, and with our plans and hopes for a future decent world.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentleman agree with me that the way to bring that affirmative action about is to maintain strong military and naval forces, because, paradoxically as it may seem, when we are strong in a military way we are strong at the bargaining table when we want to make deals to bring about permanent peace?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I referred to in my remarks.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Having in mind the report of Attorney General Biddle—in the report that he made about 3 years ago concerning the Communist movement in this country—and having in mind that the gentleman himself served as chairman of the Committee on Subversive Activities some 10 years ago, does he still believe that the words of Attorney General Biddle run true about the Communist organization in this country today—that they are dedicated by force and violence to overthrow the Government of the United States?

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, there is no question about it. Twelve years ago when we had Browder and Ford, the Communist candidates for President and Vice President, before our special committee, they frankly admitted there was a political continuity between the Communist Party in America and the Third International. That fact is clear, and the committee of which the gentleman from Mississippi is a member has plenty of evidence on that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I read the gentleman's report many, many times in regard to that point. I have it in my office. But the very fact that the International Comintern has been dissolved, as they say, does that make any difference?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it has been dissolved in name only.

I want to conclude by again complimenting the gentleman from Illinois. I rose to implement his remarks by trying to drive home the thought that we should not sit back and wait until communism comes to our shores. Affirmative and courageous leadership is the answer to this challenge.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a petition I have received from the people of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Daily Times, of Hammond, Ind., regarding my fellow Hoosier, our very able assistant here on the floor of the House, Johnny McCabe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM IN HOLLYWOOD—AND ELSEWHERE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1945, I offered the resolution to create the permanent Committee on Un-American Activities. I was made a member of that committee and have been a member of it from that day to this. I have received more abuse and more persecution at the hands of the Red element of this country and their stooges than any other man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

But my country comes first. If it did not, I would not take the time of the House today to bring more forcibly to your attention, if possible, the grave dangers with which we are confronted.

Communism is based upon hatred for Christianity. It has come down the centuries. It is the same old gang that constituted the fifth column of the crucifixion. They hounded the Saviour during the days of his ministry, persecuted Him to His ignoble death, derided Him during the moments of His dying agony, and then gambled for His garments at the foot of the cross. For more than 1900 years they have been doing everything possible to destroy Christianity and everything based on Christian principles.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that we should not wait until communism gets here, but I want to inform him that it is already here. The enemy is now within our gates.

A few years ago ex-President Hoover visited Europe—about 1936—and I heard him say over the radio that there was a great banner stretched across the gate of Moscow reading, "Religion is the opiate of the people."

Communism is making a world-wide attempt to destroy Christianity and all free governments that are based on Christianity.

There was no such thing as personal freedom until the Saviour came into the world and taught the dignity of the individual as well as his duty to God, his country, his neighbor, and himself. That is when human freedom began. That was the beginning of our Christian civilization, the only civilization that has ever existed that was really worthy of the name.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am highly gratified that we are spending as much time as we are today on this very important subject, which has not only its domestic implications but also very serious ramifications in the field of foreign affairs. I think it will be mighty worth-while reading for the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read the speech by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the speech by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the speech to come by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. If we do nothing else, I hope that in this discussion today we can clinch one point in the mind of the American people, and that is the proper definition of the term "communism." We think of it perhaps as an economic theory or as a political theory.

Our committee for the past 2 years has been drawing the attention of Congress and the American public to this vital fact which is brought out in Communism in Action, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred and which was published by the Library of Congress. That is, communism is something more than a political theory or a political party and something more than an economic theory. I want to quote at this point a very short definition from a highly authentic source, the New York Times, which editorially gave a splendid one-sentence definition of the Communist Party in its issue of January 21. I read:

> The Communist Party is not a political party but a conspiracy which uses democratic methods to kill off democracy and resorts to bullets when the ballots go against it.

That, my friends, is what the Communist Party actually is. If we keep that in mind we will know better how to deal with Communists on the Federal pay roll, and we will know better how to deal with Communists in America and Communist ideologies pushing in on us from abroad.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota, who is also a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

There is no more democracy in a Communist country than there is in Sing-Sing Penitentiary. I made the statement to a Member of Congress from Missouri who had just come back from Europe that there was no more human liberty in a Communist country than there was in the penitentiary of Missouri or Mississippi. He said, "Not as much." "For," he said, "in the penitentiary you at least have religious freedom. In addition to that, you have a chaplain to pray for you." "Besides," he said, "you have the hope of getting out some day, either by a pardon or by the expiration of your term. But a man is chained to a job for life in a Communist country. There is no hope of escape." He said that the convict has the assurance that at least his wife and children will not be forced to suffer the same fate. The Communist has no such assurance.

Communism is already manifesting itself here through various Communist-

front organizations, such as the so-called Southern Conference of Human Welfare.

All these racial disturbances you have seen in the South have been inspired by the tentacles of this great octopus, communism, which is out to destroy everything for which you and I stand.

As I said, so far as I am concerned, my country comes first. Regardless of what it takes, I am for driving every Communist and every fellow traveler from the Federal pay roll. I am for a housecleaning in every department, and a fumigation if necessary. I am for driving them from every State pay roll and every county pay roll in America. I am for driving them from the radio. I am for driving them from our educational institutions. I am for driving them from the motion pictures, with which they are poisoning the minds of our children. I received this petition from the patriotic people of California. I will read it to you. It says:

To the Congress:

(Attention Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN, the Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities.)

We, the undersigned American citizens of the State of California, congratulate you on your plans to investigate the Communist plot, now centering in Hollywood and the west coast area. We realize that because of this investigation you and your committee will be subjected to much persecution, ridicule, and attack. We are, therefore, signing this petition to give you encouragement and support in your defense of Christian America.

I expect to put all these names in the RECORD. I want you to read all the thousands of names of the people of California who signed this petition.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. For the purpose of the RECORD, how long is that petition? Have you measured it?

Mr. RANKIN. No; but if somebody will take the other end of it, I will unroll it, and you will see that it is something like a hundred or a hundred and fifty feet long.

Mr. Speaker, that is the voice of America, appealing to us, appealing to the Congress of the United States, whether Democrat or Republican, to stand up for this Government which has been entrusted to our care, to uphold our Christian civilization and protect our American way of life.

I want to tell you one thing, they may continue their vicious attacks on me over the radio, they may continue their attacks in the press, they may continue to manufacture their scurrilous films with which they attempt to smear me and my section of the country, they may continue to malign the Committee on Un-American Activities, but so help us God, if the Congress will stay with us, we will drive this infamous influence from American soil and send our country down to the future, as Henry Grady once said, "holding high the torch and making light the way up which all other nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An executive session of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, January 28, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The opening meeting of the full committee will be held in the Armed Services main committee room, suite 313, House Office Building, Tuesday, January 28, at 10 a. m.

The meeting will be open to all members of the press. At this time announcement will be made in regard to formation of subcommittees, duties, chairmanships, and members, the general policies of the committee, and tentative plans on agenda for hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

172. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

173. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a notice to contest the election of the returned Member from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of New York, which is also in the nature of a petition; to the Committee on House Administration.

174. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

175. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

176. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on disposal of certain records of the United States Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

177. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending March 31, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

178. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a copy of the eighth annual report of the Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

179. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain retired officers or employees of the United States to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

182. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

183. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1227. A bill to repeal the special tax on retail dealers in oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1228. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1229. A bill to repeal the act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1230. A bill to make available the unused immigration quotas for all nationalities to displaced persons and refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. R. 1231. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Patrick Henry and to perpetuate his home as a historic shrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1232. A bill to provide support for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 1233. A bill to require that defense counsel designated to act for any person to be tried by military or naval courts martial be of the same or higher grade than the grade of the prosecuting officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1234. A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its charges depending on the point of origin or destination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1235. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1236. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1237. A bill to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1238. A bill to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States: to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1239. A bill to amend section 6 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 323), entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," and authorizing necessary appropriations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1240. A bill to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 1241. A bill to provide for the avoidance of multiple taxation of air commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1242. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 1244. A bill to authorize the issuance of service medals to members of the American Expeditionary Force who participated in the occupation of Siberia in 1918–20; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1245. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national system of air markings for the facilitation, encouragement, and safety of aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1246. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smeltering loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1247. A bill to amend title 11 of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1248. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed at Erie, Pa., the Carl Louis Mango Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1249. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of 100,000 displaced persons and refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1250. A bill to facilitate the admission to the United States of displaced persons and refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1251. A bill to provide for immigration into the United States by displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1252. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemptions of a single person to $1,500 and of a married person to $2,500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1253. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide for a final review of dishonorable discharges; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1254. A bill to include consequential damages as part of just compensation in taking private farm property for public use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1255. A bill to restore allowances to retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1256. A bill to limit the period within which contract actions may be brought by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1257. A bill for the purpose of enlarging the post office at Hartsville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1258. A bill to provide a uniform code of descent of trust or restricted Indian estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1259. A bill to amend the third paragraph of section 92 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 29, 1934; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1260. A bill to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1261. A bill to provide that the terms of peace to be imposed upon Germany and Japan shall include agreements by such countries to pay indemnities to American military and civilian prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 1262. A bill to increase from 1 to 2 years the time within which to file claim for disability pension or death compensation or pension in order to receive benefits from date of discharge or release from active service or date of death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1263. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1264. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the rating schedules so as to provide total ratings for the most severe functional nervous diseases or psychoneurotic states; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 1265. A bill relating to Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to provide for the refunding of all penalties collected and for the cancellation of all uncollected penalties on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1266. A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination or medical treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1267. A bill to define loss of use of an eye for the purposes of granting the statutory award of $35 per month under the provisions of subparagraph (k), paragraph 11, part 1, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1268. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans' Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 1269. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1270. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 1271. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures of five tours of duty per week for rural letter carriers for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1272. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1273. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to lease the interest of the United States in the minerals in or under certain real property located in Muskogee County, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1274. A bill to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1275. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1276. A bill to amend Public Law 383, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 261, second session, H. R. 3936, entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1277. A bill to declare, and act with respect to, a national emergency; to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1278. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1279. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1280. A bill to increase the rates of compensation payable for disability incurred

during peacetime service in the armed forces of the United States so that such rates shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during wartime service in such forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1281. A bill to provide a commission to supervise the construction of a chapel, to be constructed for religious worship, and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1282. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for veterans who served in both World Wars; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 1283. A bill to authorize waiver of statutory or regulatory limitations under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1284. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1285. A bill to authorize the payment of fair compensation for furnishing or arranging to furnish strategic or critical minerals and metals for the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to create a Temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to authorize creation of a special commission to be designated as the Commission on the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution designating the date when certain American vessels now under charter to Great Britain contrary to the intent and purpose of the Merchant Ship Sales Act, 1946, shall be returned to the United States flag; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to issue instructions pending trade-agreement negotiations to the effect that no commitment shall be made which will interfere with the imposition of an import duty on rubber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution to appoint a joint committee to investigate matters connected with the succession to the Presidency and the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. Res. 66. Resolution requesting the postponement of further reduction of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Ways and Means to make a study of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in all fields, with special reference to the field of taxation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 68. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 69. Resolution requesting the President to remove from office John H. Fahey, Commissioner, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and Harold Lee, Governor, Federal Home Loan Bank System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Reves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1287. A bill granting an annuity to Mrs. Frank W. Carpenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1288. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a private right-of-way to Roscoe L. Wood; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Avelino, Francisca, Stella, and Iris Iglesias, and Avelino Iglesias, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1290. A bill for the relief of F. L. McGary, of Breckinridge County, Ky.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Petros Nicolaos Pagonis, also known as Peter Pagonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Li Chen Hwang, also known as Chen H. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of Miss Helen Morren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1294. A bill for the relief of Miss Doris High; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1295. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to rehear and enter judgment upon the claim of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Jesus Vieiro Cividanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yanatos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of the city of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Jakob Kardas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 1301. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Maria Cruz Zapien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Samuel Spiegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1305. A bill for the relief of Alex Bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1306. A bill to authorize the Soil Conservation Service Administrator to sell certain submarginal lands in Billings County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Georgelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of H. C. Biering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 1309. A bill for the relief of Arthur De Filippis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Antonio DeAngelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1312. A bill for the relief of Luigi de Adamich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Lange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 1314. A bill for the relief of Antoine (Tony) Accristo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of Archer C. Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1317. A bill for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Calvin J Frederick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1320. A bill for the relief of John Machustek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

60. By Mr. RANKIN: Petition of American citizens of the State of California, congratulating and endorsing the plan to investigate the Communist plot now centering in Hollywood and the West Coast area; to the Committee on House Administration.

61. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting prevention of the contemplated scheduled lay-off of employees at the United States Naval Torpedo Station at Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

62. By Mr. RAYBURN: Petition of Mr. Joseph Moore, attorney at law, Lebanon, N. H., relative to the fitness of NORRIS COTTON, Representative-elect from the Second New Hampshire Congressional District; to the Committee on House Administration.

63. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Woman's Club of Williamsport, Pa., urging the modification and revision of our present labor laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 15, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father in heaven, ere we become involved in the routine of the day, we pause to seek Thy help. Experienced in the ways of men, we know all too little of the ways of God. But Thou knowest us, each one of us, by name and by our needs. Turn our wayward minds and hearts to Thee. Forgive the faults and failures of the past and set us free from them. Forgive, O Lord, our failure to apply to ourselves the standards of conduct we demand of others. Forgive our slowness to see the good in our fellows and to see the evil in ourselves. In our differences may we be kind; in our agreements may we be humble, that Thy will may be done in us, and through us in our beloved land. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 22, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask to be excused from attendance on the Senate on Monday through Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from South Carolina.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR COOLIDGE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday a former distinguished Member of this body and an honored citizen of Massachusetts passed away. I knew every Member of the Senate who served with Marcus Allen Coolidge, of Fitchburg, Mass., liked him. He was a Senator from Massachusetts from 1931 to 1937. Mr. Coolidge, a former mayor of his city, was held in high respect as a thoughtful, energetic leader in public life. In private life he was a successful businessman and loved by those who worked with him. His family life was always most happy. Born in modest circumstances, by his own enterprise he rose to become one of our prominent citizens. The people of Massachusetts deeply regret his passing.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it was my privilege to succeed the late Marcus A. Coolidge as junior Senator from Massachusetts in January 1937. Consequently, I was in a position to develop an informed judgment on the esteem in which he was held by Senators who had served with him here. His good humor, his wide knowledge of affairs, and his public spirit were qualities which endeared him to his colleagues in the Senate just as they had won for him so many friends in Massachusetts. A fine citizen has gone to his reward. I mourn his passing and extend my warm sympathy to the members of his family.

MEETING OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, subject to the approval of the Senate, I desire to call an organization meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for this afternoon at 2 o'clock in the District of Columbia Committee room, adjacent to the Senate Chamber.

There has been great difficulty in finding a time not in violent conflict with the convenience of many Members in connection with their other duties. Two o'clock this afternoon seems to be about the only time that is available.

The meeting, which is for organization purposes only, will, in my opinion, take not more than 20 minutes. I, therefore, ask permission of the Senate that the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Senate be permitted to attend the meeting at 2 o'clock in the District of Columbia Committee room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Iowa is granted.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR McMAHON

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to notify the Senate that as soon as I can be recognized on Monday I shall deliver an address on the international control of atomic energy.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to acknowledge a letter from the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], announcing the election of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to serve with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who hold over in their membership upon this committee.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting drafts of a proposed agreement between the United Nations and the United States with reference to arrangements for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year

ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET AND OPERATING STATEMENTS OF RFC

A letter from the secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting copies of the consolidated balance sheet and operating statements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries as of June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel for the period ending March 31, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 39

"Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a permanent naval postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

"Whereas the present training facilities of the United States Navy are inadequate to meet the requirements of the postgraduate training program for officers of the naval service which is designed to preserve and enhance the estimable position of our Navy as the finest and most efficient Navy in the world; and

"Whereas additional naval training facilities for officers must be acquired to provide competent, qualified, and proficient officers in sufficient numbers for the increased strength and size of our postwar Navy; and

"Whereas this assembly in its fifty-sixth session fully endorsed and went on record in favor of the establishment of a permanent naval academy on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas members of congressional committees which inspected proposed sites for the location of a postgraduate school for the training of naval officers have favored the selection of the Del Monte site, located at Monterey, Calif., which the Navy Department considers best located, suitable, and adaptable to the needs and requirements of the postwar training program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be memorialized to enact, at this session, legislation to establish a permanent postgraduate naval officers' training school on the Monterey Peninsula, at Monterey, State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Navy, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from California."

A resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of California, favoring the enactment of legislation providing sufficient funds to complete all temporary housing units for veterans for which the State of California has appropriated funds to match contributions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Northwest Public Power Association, an organization composed of cities, public utility districts, and rural electric cooperatives in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, relating to the Foster Creek Dam site on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the forty-fourth annual meeting of delegates, American Automobile Association, San Francisco, Calif., relating to the national rubber policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the eighth general assembly of the States, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to prevent, control, and eradicate hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Evangelicals, Boston, Mass., relating to observance of the Lord's Day; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the president of the National Parks Association, Washington, D. C., praying for the reestablishment of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., favoring extension of time for availability of funds under the Federal Aid Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation relating to the unappropriated balance of $3,000,000 to finance the improvement of highways across large areas of Federal public lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., favoring completion of the highway between the United States and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D. C., relating to the Inter-American highway project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 554

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to lend their efforts to the fullest capacity to prevent the contemplated scheduled lay-off of employees at the United States naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I.

"Whereas the United States naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I., was established by act of Congress approximately 75 years ago, and is one of the oldest naval institutions in the country; and

"Whereas the contemplated scheduled lay-off of employees at said naval torpedo station will present a serious unemployment problem in a community which has depended for years upon torpedo manufacture as a major industry in the county of Newport; and

"Whereas a large number of the employees at the naval torpedo station have their families and homes in Newport County and many of them are veterans who will thus be thrown out of employment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the Rhode Island General Assembly protest earnestly and vigorously the decision of the United States Navy Department to reduce the number of employees at the naval torpedo station, at Newport, R. I., directing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to lend their efforts to the fullest capacity to halt said proceeding and to have said decision reconsidered; directing the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, to Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Crosser bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AVAILABILITY OF ROAD FUNDS UNDER FEDERAL AID ACT OF 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the South Dakota State Highway Commission in regular session on January 14, 1947, favoring extension of the time for availability of funds under the Federal Aid Act of 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6009

Extension of time for availability of funds under Federal Aid Act of 1944

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorizes the apportionment of certain funds for each of the first three successive postwar fiscal years for Federal-aid highways, for Federal-aid secondary roads, and for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas; and

Whereas section 4 (d) of said act provides that any sums so apportioned to any State shall be available for expenditure in such State for only 1 year after the close of the fiscal year for which it is apportioned and that any sum so apportioned that remains unexpended at the end of such period, shall lapse and revert to the Treasury of the United States; and

Whereas the aforesaid provisions of section 4 (d) of said act will operate to cause South Dakota to lose that portion of such funds apportioned to it for the first postwar fiscal year that may not be expended by June 30, 1947; and for the second postwar fiscal year not be expended by June 30, 1948; and for the third postwar fiscal year not be expended by June 30, 1949; and

Whereas the South Dakota State Highway Commission is certain that due to the elements of inflation and certain acute shortages of labor and engineering personnel, materials, and equipment, that are known to exist, will make it difficult, if not impossible, to have these funds expended within the time now prescribed by said act, notwithstanding that the State highway commission and the public generally realize that the need for the expenditure of such funds on highway work is and will be more intensified by reason of deterioration, increased unit cost, and ever-mounting traffic volumes; and

Whereas the South Dakota Highway Commission as agent for the counties of South Dakota, which counties, through their privilege, as provided by the afore-mentioned act,

may cooperate with the Federal Government in the construction of Federal-aid secondary farm-to-market roads, is aware of the fact that due to lack of the necessary surveys and plans in the hands of the counties of South Dakota, due to the lack of engineering personnel available to the counties, that unless additional time is provided, as requested herein, the funds made available in the above-mentioned highway act, cannot possibly be used by the counties of South Dakota within the time prescribed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the South Dakota State Highway Commission in regular session on January 14, 1947, That the South Dakota Members in the Congress of the United States are hereby petitioned to use their best efforts in securing an extension of the periods of availability of such funds for 12 months after June 30 of each of the years 1947, 1948, and 1949.

Adopted this 14th day of January A. D. 1947.

SOUTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
By FRANK M. MITCHELL,
Secretary.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Brotherhood of State Firemen and Oilers, Lodge 618, of America, in which they favor income-tax exemptions of $2,500 per couple and $1,000 per dependent.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANDAN, N. DAK., *January 23, 1947.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous approval, Brotherhood State Firemen and Oilers, Lodge 618, of America favor $2,500 per couple and $1,000 per dependent income-tax exemptions.

HARRY M. REYNOLDS,
President.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 327. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide for regulation of certain restrictive employment practices; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. 328. A bill to provide for daylight saving time in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 330. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 331, to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 332, to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 333. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381), as amended, so as to extend the monthly family allowance benefits, and for other purposes; and

S. 334. A bill to establish the Medical Associated Sciences Corps in the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. GURNEY (by request) also introduced Senate bill 335, to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. GURNEY (by request) also introduced Senate bill 336, to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs, and the distribution and disposal of property, furniture, and fixtures, derived from and by the operation of officers' clubs of the Army Air Forces, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. GURNEY (by request) also introduced Senate bill 337, to amend the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 338. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 339. A bill for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 340. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 341. A bill for the relief of Robert Irvin Mobley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 342. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 343. A bill for the relief of Arturo Goncalves Nunes; and

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Manuel Fernandes Pego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

S. 345. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 346. A bill providing for an increase of and continuance of payment of compensation or pension to a child of a deceased World War I or II veteran during education or training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 347. A bill to grant free postage to veterans being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the amount of personal exemption for income-tax purposes with respect to the taxpayer, and to reduce the amount of such exemption with respect to dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 349. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of South Dakota to Clarence E. Forman; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 350. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 351. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to provide for the return of premiums on war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 352. A bill to provide for the reestablishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission with the same functions which it had prior to the time Reorganization Plan No. 2 became effective; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. CAPEHART introduced Senate bill 353, to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 354. A bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 355. A bill for the relief of E. R. Ensey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 356. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to audit the accounts of all Government agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, and request that a letter from Henry P. Chandler, Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the letter presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 331) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In behalf of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, I herewith transmit a bill for an act to supply basic legislative authority for certain personnel of the courts, particularly secre-

taries of circuit and district judges for whom it is now lacking, and I would request that the bill be introduced and enacted in due course.

Provision has been made in the annual appropriation acts for secretaries for circuit and district judges for at least the last 50 years, but there is no other express statutory authority for these employees. During the consideration of the Judiciary Appropriation Act for 1946 in the House of Representatives in the spring of 1945, a point of order was made and sustained to the appropriation for miscellaneous salaries of the courts covering the compensation of the secretaries to judges among other employees. The appropriation was restored during the consideration of the bill in the Senate and this action was concurred in by the House so that the appropriation was included in the 1946 appropriation act for the judiciary as passed. A similar appropriation was made without objection in the appropriation act for the current fiscal year, 1947.

Pursuant, however, to expressions of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses that basic acts should be secured for any purposes included in appropriations for which it was then lacking, consideration was given by members of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges in 1945 to the drafting of legislation to provide for secretaries and law clerks of circuit judges and district judges, and some other miscellaneous employees of the courts paid out of the appropriation for miscellaneous salaries. A bill was recommended which on October 1, 1945, was introduced in the House of Representatives in the last Congress (H. R. 4230). The bill passed the House in the form introduced on March 18, 1946, and on June 14, 1946, passed the Senate with some amendments. The Houses disagreeing, conferees were appointed and a conference report was filed on July 27, 1946, recommending that the House agree to the Senate amendments. This report was agreed to by the Senate but no action was taken on the report in the House and the bill lapsed with the adjournment of the Congress.

The Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges considered the matter again at its annual meeting in October 1946 and recommended the enactment of the bill previously submitted, with the addition of the amendments attached by the Senate. The bill as so amended is now submitted.

The terms of the bill give to the Congress from year to year through the annual appropriation acts complete control of the number and compensation of the judicial employees involved. In this respect the bill follows the pattern of the corresponding provision for clerks and other employees of the executive branch (5 U. S. C. 43). One amendment of substance which was added to the original bill in the Senate extended to the creation of any new position for employees embraced in the bill, a requirement which is applicable under the present law (28 U. S. C. 128) to the appointment of law clerks by district judges, namely that the senior circuit judge of the circuit shall certify to the need for such an employee. This amendment and the formal amendments made by the Senate in the bill the Judicial Conference approved.

It is essential for the effectiveness of the Federal judicial organization that there be no interruption in the secretarial service furnished to the judges and the services rendered to the courts by other personnel now appropriated for. I, therefore, hope that the enclosed bill may receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Yours very respectfully,

HENRY P. CHANDLER,

NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT OF 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Justice, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the National Firearms Act of 1947, for the registration of firearms in our country, and for a tax on their transfer.

POSSIBLE OBJECTIONS TO BILL

In the past some objections have been raised to the registration of firearms in our country. I believe that these objections should be adequately heard, but that prompt action should be taken in consideration of legislation such as that I am introducing.

Question may be raised as to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. In this connection, we might note that the constitutionality of the National Firearms Act of 1934 was sustained as an exercise of the taxing power of Congress.

I am not committed to the language of this proposed bill as final, but I am anxious that a measure of this type should be thoroughly and quickly evaluated by Congress.

I would be the very last person to suggest that the Federal Government intrude on any matter pertaining exclusively to our State governments and localities. But the problem of crime is a Nation-wide problem, and the responsibility of the National Government is great. I point out, too, that nothing in the proposed legislation will impair the right of any State or locality to pass its own laws which might regulate the carrying of concealed weapons or the licensing of traffic in firearms.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The situation to which the Attorney General calls attention in his letter to me regarding the vast unaccounted-for amount of firearms in our country, which is contributing to the present crime wave, must, I believe, be promptly corrected. Right now we require registration and tax the transfer of machine guns, submachine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and silencers, but do not require registration of nor do we tax the transfer of pistols, rifles, semiautomatic rifles, or ordinary rifles. The headlines in every paper telling us of new crimes demand that we consider some action on the latter group of deadly weapons.

It will be noted that the proposed legislation exempts from these requirements all shotguns and all rifles with a caliber of .22 or smaller, firing rim-fire ammunition, unless they are already covered by the provisions of the National Firearms Act. Firearms of these calibers are generally used for sporting purposes and, therefore, need not come within the purpose of the proposed legislation.

I believe that the vast group of hunting sportsmen in our country will be the very first to recognize the necessity for curbing conditions which lead to the very unsportsmanlike use of firearms in crime. Countless parents throughout the country, too, who are concerned with the problem of juvenile delinquency, will recognize that some such legislation as this may prove very important in preventing their own youth and other youth from securing firearms and entering into a wayward life of crime.

I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks and that a letter to me from the Attorney General on this subject also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 332) to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "firearm" means any firearm from which a shot is discharged by an explosive, other than firearms included within the provisions of the act of June 26, 1934, known as the National Firearms Act, but does not include any rifle designed to fire rim fire ammunition, the caliber of which is .22 or smaller, or any shotgun.

(b) The term "person" includes a partnership, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

(c) The term "importer" means any person who imports or brings firearms into the United States for sale.

(d) The term "manufacturer" means any person who is engaged within the United States in the manufacture of firearms, or who otherwise produces therein any firearm for sale or disposition.

(e) The term "dealer" means any person, other than a manufacturer or importer, engaged within the United States in the business of selling firearms. The term "dealer" shall include wholesalers, pawnbrokers, and dealers in used firearms.

(f) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

(g) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(h) The term "to transfer" shall include to sell, assign, pledge, lease, loan, give away, or otherwise dispose of.

SEC. 2. (a) Within 60 days after the effective date of this act, or upon first engaging in business, every importer, manufacturer, and dealer in firearms shall register with the collector of internal revenue for each district in which such business is to be carried on, his name or style, principal place of business, and places of business in such district, and pay a special tax at the following rates: Importers or manufacturers, $100 a year; dealers, $5 a year.

(b) Whenever any tax imposed by this section accrues at any time other than the 1st day of July in any year, it shall be computed proportionately from the 1st day of the month in which the liability to the tax accrued to the 1st day of July following.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person required to register under the provisions of this section to import, manufacture, or deal in firearms without having registered or paid the tax imposed by this section.

The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person in any year who has paid for such year a tax imposed by section 2 of the act of June 26, 1934, known as the National Firearms Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon every transfer of any firearm a tax at the rate of $1. Such tax shall be paid by the transferor and shall be represented by appropriate stamps to be provided by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. The stamps herein provided shall be affixed to the order for such firearms, hereinafter referred to. The tax imposed by this section shall be in addition to any import duty imposed on such firearm.

(b) All provisions of law (including those relating to special taxes; to the assessment, collection, remission, and refund of internal-revenue taxes; to the engraving, issuance, safety, accountability, cancelation, and distribution of tax-paid stamps provided for

in the internal-revenue laws, and to penalties) applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by section 1 of the act of December 17, 1914, as amended (U. S. Code, title 26, secs. 2550 and 3220), and all other provisions of the internal-revenue laws shall, insofar as not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, be applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by this act.

(c) Under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe, and upon proof of the exportation of any firearm to any foreign country (whether exported as part of another article or not) with respect to which the transfer tax upon this section has been paid by the manufacturer, the Commissioner shall refund to the manufacturer the amount of the tax so paid, or, if the manufacturer waives all claim for the amount to be refunded, the refund shall be made to the exporter.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to transfer a firearm except in pursuance of a written order from the person seeking to obtain such article, on an application form issued in blank in triplicate for that purpose by the Commissioner, which order shall identify the transferee by such means as may be prescribed by regulations under this act. If the transferee is an individual, such identification shall include his fingerprints. Copies of the application and fingerprints shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) Every person transferring a firearm shall set forth in each copy of such order the manufacturer's number or other mark identifying such firearm and shall forward such order in duplicate to the Commissioner. The original thereof, with stamps affixed, shall be returned to the transferor for delivery to the transferee.

(c) If the transfer of a firearm is exempted from the provisions of this act as provided in section 11 hereof, the person transferring such firearm shall notify the Commissioner of the name and address of the transferee, the number or other mark identifying such firearm, and the date of its transfer, and shall file with the Commissioner such documents in proof thereof as the Commissioner may by regulations prescribe. Copies of the aforesaid notification and accompanying documents shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) Importers, manufacturers, and dealers who have registered and paid the tax as provided for in section 2 of this act shall not be required to conform to the provisions of this section with respect to transactions in firearms with dealers or manufacturers who likewise have registered and have paid such tax, but shall keep such records and make such reports regarding such transactions as may be prescribed by regulations under this act.

SEC. 5. (a) Within 6 months after the effective date of this act every person possessing a firearm shall register, with the collector of internal revenue for the district in which he resides, the number or other mark identifying such firearm, together with his name, address, place where such firearm is usually kept, and place of business or employment, and, if such person is other than a natural person, the name and home address of an executive thereof. If the applicant for registration is an individual, the application for registration shall include his fingerprints. No person shall be required to register under this subsection with respect to any such firearm acquired after the effective date of this act and in conformity with the provisions thereof. Copies of the aforesaid registrations and fingerprints shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) The residence of a person possessing a firearm in violation of this act shall be presumed to be the place where the firearm shall be discovered or seized, but this presumption shall be rebuttable.

SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any person to receive or possess any firearm which has been transferred to him in violation of section 3 or 4 of this act. Whenever on trial for a violation of this section the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of such firearm at any time after the expiration of the period prescribed for registration by section 5 (a), without having registered the same as required by section 5, such possession shall create a presumption that such firearm came into the possession of the defendant subsequently to the expiration of such period, but this presumption shall be rebuttable.

SEC. 7. (a) Any firearm which has at any time been transferred in violation of the provisions of this act shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture, and (except as provided in subsection (b)) all the provisions of internal revenue laws relating to searches, seizure, and forfeitures of unstamped articles are extended to and made to apply to the articles taxed under this act and the persons to whom this act applies.

(b) In the case of the forfeiture of any firearm by reason of a violation of this act, no such firearm shall be sold at public sale. If such firearm is in the possession of any officer of the United States other than the Secretary, such officer shall deliver the firearm to the Secretary; and the Secretary may order such firearm destroyed or may sell such firearm to any State, Territory, or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or retain it for the use of the Treasury Department or transfer it without charge to any other executive department or any independent establishment of the Government for use by it.

SEC. 8. (a) Each manufacturer and importer of a firearm shall identify it with a number or other identification mark approved by the Commissioner, such number or mark to be stamped or otherwise placed thereon in a manner approved by the Commissioner.

(b) It shall be unlawful for anyone to obliterate, remove, change, or alter such numbers or other identification mark. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any firearm upon which such number or mark has been obliterated, removed, changed, or altered, such possession shall create a presumption that the defendant obliterated, changed, or altered such number or other identification mark, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

SEC. 9. Importers, manufacturers, and dealers, shall keep such books and records and render such returns in relation to the transactions in firearms specified in this act as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations require.

SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying the provisions of this act into effect; and shall cause suitable forms to be prepared for the purposes of this act, and to be distributed to collectors of internal revenue and such other persons as he shall determine.

(b) The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to accord the use of the facilities of the Post Office Department for the distribution of registration forms required of this act.

(c) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall investigate violations of this act and shall have access to the files and records of the Commissioner relating to the administration of the act.

SEC. 11. This act shall not apply (1) to transfers of firearms to the United States; or to any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof; or to the District of Columbia; (2) to transfers of firearms to any peace officer or any officer or employee of the United States, designated by regulations of the Commissioner; or (3) to transfers of any firearms which are unserviceable and which are transferred as a curiosity or ornament. The provisions of section 5 of this act shall not apply to any transfer referred to in clauses (1) or (2) of this section.

SEC. 12. Any person who violates or fails to comply with any provision of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, or 9 of this act shall be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 13. The provisions of this act shall apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, and the Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 15. This act shall become effective 90 days after the date of its approval.

SEC. 16. This act may be cited as the "National Firearms Act of 1947."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1947.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to bring to the attention of the Congress an important problem arising out of the traffic in firearms.

One of the principal difficulties confronting law enforcement agencies is the comparative ease with which criminals procure deadly weapons. Recent developments have accentuated this condition. At present, thousands of small arms, principally revolvers and automatic pistols, originally issued to the members of the armed forces, are in the possession of persons who do not appear to have acquired them legitimately. This situation is, in part, due to the fact that prior to August 6, 1940, the War Department authorized the sale of such weapons to officers of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps, to officers of the Reserve Corps, to members of the National Guard, and to members of the National Rifle Association. While one of the conditions of these sales was that the firearms were not transferable, nevertheless, a great many of them were sold by original purchasers and changed hands many times.

During World War II, thousands of firearms have been brought into the United States by soldiers returning from abroad, or have been stolen from various units of the armed forces within the United States and from National Guard armories. Moreover, the armed forces have reported that a tremendous number of small arms have been lost or unaccounted for. For example, between November 1941 and December 1944, the War and Navy Departments have submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation over 1,300 reports of losses of firearms, such as revolvers, automatic pistols, machine guns, rifles, and the like. Recently a considerable number of various types of firearms, frequently of foreign origin, have been found in the possession of members of the underworld. Investigation has shown that many of these weapons have been smuggled into the United States, either by returning soldiers and sailors or by merchant seamen on return voyages from foreign countries, and eventually have found their way into illicit channels. These conditions constitute a potential menace and danger, and may lead to an increase in crime. The problem is Nation-wide in character, and adequately can be attacked only on a national basis.

At present, there are two Federal statutes partially regulating and limiting traffic in firearms. The first is the National Firearms Act (act of June 26, 1934, 48 Stat. 1237; 26 U. S. C. 2720–2733). This statute relates to machine guns, submachine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and silencers. This act imposed a tax on all transfers of firearms of the foregoing type. It also required all persons possessing such firearms to register them with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In addition, the act imposed a tax on importers, manufacturers of, and dealers in such firearms. The constitutionality of this act, as an exercise of the taxing power of Congress, was sustained in *Sonzinski* v. *United States* (300 U. S. 506), and *United States* v. *Miller* (307 U. S. 174). Experience has shown that the act is exceedingly effective within its sphere. Nevertheless, the fact that its scope is restricted to firearms of specified limited types and does not reach such weapons as pistols, rifles, semiautomatic rifles, ordinary rifles, and shotguns, renders it inadequate.

The Federal Firearms Act (act of June 30, 1938, 52 Stat. 1250; 15 U. S. C. 901–909) relates to interstate and foreign commerce in firearms. It created a license system in respect to manufacturers and dealers who transport, ship, or receive firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce. In addition, it prohibits the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of any firearms by any person who is known to be under indictment or as having been convicted in any Federal or State court of a crime of violence, or is known to be a fugitive from justice. It is made unlawful for any such person to ship, transport, or cause to be shipped or transported, any firearm or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce. This act does not solve the problem confronting law enforcement agencies in view of the fact that it is based upon the commerce clause and, therefore, is confined to transactions in interstate or foreign commerce. This circumstance renders the act inapplicable to numerous situations involving improper possession and use of firearms.

I recommend enactment of legislation requiring the general registration of firearms and the levying of a tax on the transfer of such firearms in the United States. I would, however, exempt from these requirements all shotguns and rifles with a caliber of .22 or smaller designed to fire rim-fire ammunition, unless they are already covered by the provisions of the National Firearms Act of June 26, 1934. Firearms of these calibers are used for sporting purposes and would seem not ordinarily to come within the purposes of the proposed legislation.

The result to be achieved can be accomplished by extending the scheme of the National Firearms Act. The application for registration and the record of the transfer should be accompanied by the fingerprints of the applicant. Copies of such fingerprints should be transmitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, all importers, manufacturers, and dealers in firearms should be required to register and pay a tax. In order not to impose an undue financial burden on owners of firearms, I suggest that the tax on transfers of firearms be fixed at only $1.

The proposed legislation would result in a record of firearms in the United States and would make it possible to observe traffic in and the flow of firearms. Persons failing to comply with the requirements of the act would be subject to criminal penalties. The measure would place difficulties in the way of organized gangsters who may endeavor to equip themselves with firearms for the purpose of carrying on their criminal activities. It would make it more difficult for dealers to engage in illicit transactions in firearms. In addition, it would afford law enforcement agencies an effective means of tracing sources of supply and of detecting dealers who furnish firearms to criminals, as well as assisting in the identification of specific weapons.

For some years this Department has urged the enactment of legislation of the type here proposed. Because of the conditions described above, the necessity for it is even greater at this time than it has been heretofore.

Attention is called to the fact that the proposed legislation would not require a person purchasing or possessing a firearm to procure a license. It would merely require him to register the firearm and to record any transfer of the weapon. The burden imposed upon a law-abiding citizen who desires to possess a firearm would be inconsequential. It would be no greater than that involved in the registration of an automobile. Yet, laws requiring the registration of automobiles have never been regarded as unduly onerous. Registration of deadly weapons is at least as necessary as the registration of motor vehicles.

Nothing in the proposed legislation would impair the right of a State or local subdivision to pass laws regulating the carrying of concealed weapons or the licensing of traffic in firearms.

A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate this recommendation is enclosed. I urge its enactment.

I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

NATIONAL AIR CORPS RESERVE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, by request of the National Air Corps Reserve of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference three bills. This organization held a convention in Memphis, Tenn., in November, and adopted certain resolutions outlining their ideas respecting the Air Corps Reserve and setting forth how it should be established. I believe Congress should have the benefit of their ideas. I certainly should like to have them fully explored.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 335. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training;

S. 336. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers clubs, and the distribution and disposal of property, furniture and fixtures, derived from and by the operation of officers clubs of the Army Air Forces; and

S. 337. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended.

PROHIBITION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF FLAMMABLE WEARING APPAREL AND FABRICS

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 353) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I had intended to make on the floor of the Senate may now be printed in the body of the RECORD in order to save time. The statement deals with the bill I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill that I feel confident will attract the immediate attention of every Member of the Senate.

I am sure all Senators read some months ago of the several deaths that resulted right here in the Washington area when children wearing so-called cowboy suits were fatally burned when their clothing became ignited. I do not know how many deaths have been caused throughout the country in the past several years by flammable garments, but I do know that from a preliminary survey the situation demands our immediate attention. Hence, I have introduced a bill that I believe it will be agreed is the type of legislation that is needed.

This bill has been drafted after nearly 2 years of study by the best technical minds in the country. Committees of the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists working in conjunction with manufacturers, processors, finishers, and retailers, have drafted a bill that will, I believe, cope adequately with the problem. I am happy to sponsor it here. Certainly the purpose of this measure is in the highest public interests, for it will rid the market place of dangerous wearing apparel.

That this problem is not confined to children's play suits, let me give a few examples of what is happening:

A Chicago woman was severely burned when a pair of slacks she was wearing ignited when she struck a match. Even the furniture in her apartment was damaged by the flames.

Here in Washington a woman received serious burns when the chenille lounging robe she was wearing caught fire and burned rapidly.

Last March in Berlin, N. H., a young expectant mother died 3 days after being critically burned when her clothes became ignited as she was preparing dinner. An apron she was wearing caught fire, turning her into a mass of flames.

An 18-year-old Texas co-ed died from burns that resulted when her dress caught fire at a sorority initiation. On and on go these horror stories. I cite these cases for you in order that you may realize the seriousness of this problem of flammable wearing apparel.

The bill I introduce is the culmination of long months of study on the part of the best technical minds in the country.

Briefly, this bill would prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing appareal and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals. It covers not only garments and piece goods, but also articles of personal adornment such as bracelets, buttons, brooches, and similar items. The administration of this measure would come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, an agency well qualified through experience in this general field to administer such an act.

Although I have always been, and still am, a stanch supporter of State rights, I believe in this instance that a Federal measure is the only solution to the problem. At the present

time, California has on its statute books an act that has for its purpose the control of flammable wearing apparel, and I am informed that no less than 23 other States are studying the problem with a view toward enacting similar legislation. If this were to happen, it would result in an impossible situation for manufacturers and finishers of this type of merchandise. I think it goes without saying that there would be no uniformity among the States and that manufacturers would be placed in the position of trying to conform with 24 different regulations. For this reason, I believe a strong, but fair national statute is the only solution to this problem. In fact, I am advised that the California Legislature is watching with a great deal of interest the progress of this bill, and for the sake of uniformity may withhold the effective date of their measure until the Federal act becomes operative.

Let me say in closing that this bill is supported by the National Retail Dry Goods Association, an association of 7,000 department stores, and by the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists, as well as others interested in this problem. All are acting unselfishly in an effort to protect the useless waste of lives that has resulted from the manufacture and sale of wearing apparel made from flammable materials. Because of the urgency of the situation, I recommend that this bill be given serious consideration and attention.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] asked to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which he would have delivered if he had had an opportunity to do so this afternoon. I am not objecting to this speech being printed in the RECORD today, but I wish to say that it is highly irregular to have speeches printed in the body of the RECORD unless they have been delivered on the floor of the Senate. I can recall one instance in which the printing of a speech in the body of the RECORD when it was not delivered on the floor contributed to the defeat of a Senator in the election which followed soon after.

It seems to me that we should not permit any more speeches to be printed in the body of the RECORD unless they are delivered on the floor of the Senate, because there might be something in such speeches to which other Senators would like to take exception, which they would not have an opportunity to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the Senator from Vermont that the statement of the Senator from Indiana will be printed in small type, and not in the regular type. It is in the nature of a statement, and not a speech.

Mr. AIKEN. That is perfectly proper, as I understand; but I merely heard the request to have the speech printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not construe the request as the Senator from Vermont construed it. Otherwise the Chair would not have given his own consent.

POSTPONEMENT OF REDUCTION OF DUTIES UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution requesting the postponement of further reduction of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the resolution just submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for himself and the senior Senator from Nevada is, I think, or sufficient importance to be brought to the immediate attention of the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which is very brief, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 69), submitted by Mr. DWORSHAK (for himself and Mr. MCCARRAN), was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the President and all agencies of the Federal Government are hereby requested to postpone any action seeking the further reduction of duties under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act), as amended, until sufficient time has elapsed to permit (1) a complete study by the Committee on Finance of the necessity for further action under the reciprocal trade agreements policy, and (2) action by the Congress with respect to any legislation proposed by such committee as the result of such study.

GENERAL SURVEY OF CONDITION OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed, during the Eightieth Congress, to exercise the authority conferred and perform the duties imposed upon the Committee on Indian Affairs by Senate Resolution 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States.

The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, out of funds heretofore authorized by the Senate for such study by the Committee on Indian Affairs, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES IN CONNECTION WITH NONTAXABLE GOVERNMENT-OWNED LAND

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the burdens imposed upon the States, and political subdivisions thereof, by reason of the location within their boundaries of real property of the United States which is not subject to State and local taxation, and with respect to the extent, if any, to which the United States should contribute to the financial support of the governments of the States, and political subdivisions thereof, in which such real property is located.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. MILLIKIN, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the following bills, and they were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 112. A bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; and

S. 118. A bill to guarantee honorably discharged veterans their right to work regardless of whether they are members or nonmembers of any labor organization.

On motion of Mr. MILLIKIN, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 304) to provide for the redemption of terminal-leave bonds by the use of any surplus of Federal receipts over Federal expenditures, and it was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Under authority of Senate Resolution 55, agreed to January 17, 1947, the Secretary, on January 23, 1947, presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SETTLEMENT OF GREAT SALT LAKE VALLEY—HYMN OF THE PIONEER

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is 1947. On July 24, 1847, the Mormon pioneers entered the Great Salt Lake Valley to make their home. The one hundredth anniversary of this event will be recognized by community and State-wide celebrations throughout this centennial year.

In 1909 the Grand Army of the Republic held its annual national encampment in Salt Lake City. In order that the Civil War veterans might catch the spirit which directed the hearts and the purposes of the Utah pioneers, Kate Thomas wrote the Hymn of the Pioneer. This poem reflects an idealization of the hope which inspired the hearts and the minds of the founders of Utah. Because of the Nation-wide interest in this year's celebration, I deem it not out of place to ask unanimous consent that the poem be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HYMN OF THE PIONEER

(By Kate Thomas)

Courage, my soul! All is not barren plain.
What tho' the way be long and strewed with dead.
His word is sure who knoweth all thy pain.
Lift up thine eyes, His heaven is overhead.
Praise God! Praise God!
His sun broke thro' the night
On—on—press on—
His love is all His might.

Courage, my soul! Yon is the Promised Land.
There shall white winter make thee no more cold;
There shalt thou rest thee of the burning sand;
Sweet streams shall lave thee, smiling dreams enfold.
Praise God! Praise God!
Deem not the conquest vain.
On—on—press on—
Thy sorrow is thy gain.

Courage, my soul! The Promised Land is drear?
Still fruitless desert, bitter, burning sun?
Still must thy back bend to a task severe?
Lift up thine eyes! Thy glory is begun.
Praise God! Praise God!
Thy burden is thy crown,
On—on—press on—
Nor stoop to lay it down.

Praise God, my soul! Behold the desert flowers.
Nations and tongues and peoples turn their feet
Towards a fair land, made fair by weary hours.
Lift up thine eyes! Thy triumph is complete.
Praise God! Praise God!
His love makes trial light.
On—on—press on—
The Promised Land is bright!

Praise God, my soul! My children reap the seed
Sowed by my faith and watered by my tears.
God of the nations, God of every creed,
Let them be just to what my soul reveres!
Praise God! Praise God!
Omnipotent above!
On—on—press on—
Till all the world is love!

INADEQUACY OF TEACHERS' SALARIES—SERMON BY DR. J. WARREN HASTINGS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced a bill which is now pending before a committee of this body looking toward assistance from the Federal Government to the teachers of America. Just a few days ago a sermon was delivered by the Reverend Dr. J. Warren Hastings, minister, National City Christian Church of Washington, D. C., in which, among other things, he said:

The situation is tragic. Public-school teachers are leaving the teaching profession in droves. The average school-teacher salary in 1941 was $1,470. The average salary for lawyers in independent practice for the same year was $4,794. Birth-rate statistics, the highest on record in our history, indicate that the public school now, and in the next 20 years, is more important to the preservation and dissemination of our democratic ideals than ever before in our history.

The sermon is so illuminating and apt to the subject, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALLED TO TEACH

"And He gave some teachers * * * for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." (Ephesians 4: 11, 12.)

Jesus believed in teaching. To Him life evolved around the twin principles of teaching and learning. He who had knowledge taught, and the uninformed learned. That was, and is, the way life progresses. Jesus picked up a little child and said: "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child shall in nowise enter therein." He would begin teaching children at a younger age than we do in our public schools.

COLONIAL EDUCATION FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

There is no greater responsibility than that of awakening the personality of another person, of trying to direct his footsteps along the right pathway. To the Pilgrim Fathers, following the basic tenets of religion to the best of their ability, teaching was the main undergirt of their religion. In the beginning of the life of the colony, the children gathered in the kitchen of one of the village homes. Here they were taught from the Hornbook. One learned his letters, and so to read, in order to be able to study the Bible. A stands for Adam who sinned in the fall, and then they had what B stands for and C, etc.

Religion and education were closely allied in early America. The mind was to be informed and quickened and character was to be formed. Horace Mann (1796–1859) contended that just so far and so fast as education is extended, true democracy is ascendant. He believed that proper teaching would awaken an individual personality. Jesus would agree with that position.

Our first universities were founded by the Church. Harvard College, William and Mary College, King's College (now Columbia), Yale—all stemmed from religious sources.

PUBLIC SCHOOL THE FOUNDATION OF DEMOCRACY

The sociologists tell us that the world can be completely changed in three generations if people are taught correctly. Believing in public education as we do, we are prone to say: "Well, let the school do the proper job and be done with this terribly slow process of kingdom building." But that is not happening, for our public-school system is suffering from many ills. Admittedly the public schools are of the very warp and woof of America but at this moment they are ailing.

Most of us are products of the public-school system. The melting-pot experience which Zangwill talked about, and which is a vital, fundamental part of American life, took place in the public school. The children of the poor sat by and fellowshipped with the children of the rich. Clean and unclean played together until the teacher helped the unclean to be otherwise. The youngster who was not too brilliant had a degree of fellowship with the boy who had a high I. Q. The thing that made democracy was the fact that boys and girls from all sorts of homes and backgrounds could come together in a give-and-take, fair, and sportsmanship experience. This was the public-school system.

Where did you first learn your ideas of democracy? In the public schools. Where did you first learn the meaning of the Stars and Stripes and have a loyalty for the flag? In the public schools. Where did you first learn that "a man's a man for a' that"? In the public schools. Where did you first learn that a foreigner could come to our shores, learn our way of life, seek and secure citizenship, and then be one of us? In the public schools.

Recall these lines from the Ballad for Americans: "I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French and English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek and Turk, and Czech and double Czech American. And that ain't all. I was baptized Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Atheist, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Jewish, Presbyterian, Seventh-Day Adventist, Mormon, Quaker, Christian Scientist, and lots more."

TODAY'S TRAGIC DECLINE IN PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM

Something strange has happened to us. The public-school system which was the Nation's melting pot and which really made democracy possible is waning. The public schools can do more to mold the people of this Nation together than any other of our institutions, but it cannot be the vital factor for building America that it might be without our support. Since 1939, 350,000 public-school teachers have quit. Nine hundred thousand teachers are required to staff our schools. It has been impossible to replace many of the teachers who have turned elsewhere for employment, with the result that our schools are at present understaffed.

There are 5,000,000 children of school age in this country who are not in school. In one State 36 percent of the people have not been to school more than 4 years. Most people seem to care very little about these deplorable conditions.

It will shock you to learn that there are 10,000,000 illiterate people in the United States. The United States Army turned down 676,000 for educational deficiency. Three hundred and fifty thousand of them could sign only an X for their names. Even in the Nation's capital city we have a fraction less than 9 percent illiterate.

There is a strange decline in educational emphasis so far as the public schools are concerned. Those who have entered the teaching profession in the last few years have 1 year less preparation than did the group beginning to teach in 1940 and in the years immediately prior to it. In 1920 22 percent of the students in our institutions of higher learning were preparing to teach. What percent today? Seven percent. There are almost 800,000 GI's studying today in our colleges and universities; less than 18,000 of them are preparing to teach. Yet the public schools are the very foundation of our democracy.

What do you think is the average educational level in the United States? The ninth grade, that is the first year of high school.

The situation is tragic. Public-school teachers are leaving the teaching profession in droves. The average teacher salary in 1941 was $1,470. The average salary for lawyers in independent practice for the same year was $4,794. Birthrate statistics, the highest on record in our history, indicate that the public-school teacher now and in the next 20 years is more important to the preservation and dissemination of our democratic ideals than ever before in our history.

SOME ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEM

What can we do about this situation? I trust that some of you who have left teaching will return to the profession. A former high-school teacher sat in my office not long ago and said: "You know, I often get homesick for the classroom, but I am making several hundred dollars a year more working for the Government than I can teaching school." Exactly so. And there are thousands in the same category.

How can you produce character unless you do it with people early in their lives? You are a churchman. When did you get the roots of your character? Did your mother bring you up to do as you pleased until you were 25 and then tell you to decide for yourself what your character would be? She did not.

Many of you received your early education in one- or two-room schoolhouses, and it was in them that your character was bent in the right direction. Today there are 9,000,000 school children living in the country areas of this land. Their teachers are the poorest paid of all public-school teachers. More than 40,000 of them get less than $600 for their year's work.

The people who played a major part in building character in my life were public-school teachers—Miss Dare in the fourth grade; Miss Baker, the strict disciplinarian, in the sixth grade; and Miss King in the eighth grade—to mention a few of them. Miss King was in her late fifties or early sixties when it was my privilege to sit under her. She had white hair and she was as straight as an arrow. The memory of her is an inspiration to me to this day. The very heart of my boyhood was my public-school experience.

The public-school system and all that it means was part of the religious life of this Nation. We were putting into practice the

philosophy of Jesus, which was that in every personality there were tremendous potential possibilities. The only way those potential powers could be awakened and aroused was for the teacher to brood over the pupil and thus bring out the best there was in him. That is true today. This principle lies at the heart of the existence of our democracy.

You say it costs too much to have an adequate public-school system. Bear in mind the fact that we spend five times as much in the segregation and rehabilitation of our criminal group, which is about 2 percent of our population, than we do on public education for our children. As Horace Mann said: "If you do not improve the schools you must enlarge the prisons."

We spent billions for military equipment, training men to fight, and for war. It is not asking too much to ask that the public-school system be adequately and properly financed.

Every well-meaning citizen of this land has a responsibility in this matter. Let us awaken from our long sleep and do something about it. Let us do our utmost to give to posterity the kind of government which we call democracy. Only by everyone having some part in this effort can our labors meet with success.

CONDITIONS IN JAPAN—ARTICLE FROM NEWSWEEK

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the January 27 issue of Newsweek, which is on the news stands today, there appears a very thought-provoking report by a reporter respecting the general economic situation in Japan in connection with our administration of that government. The article is entitled "Behind the Japanese Purge—American Military Rivalries." I ask that this short news story may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE JAPANESE PURGE—AMERICAN MILITARY RIVALRIES

"All I can do now is make a good black-market connection or join the Communist Party."

That was what a typical Japanese businessman last week told Compton Pakenham, chief of Newsweek's Tokyo bureau. He was bewildered. Some 25,000 to 30,000 of his nation's businessmen, financiers, and industrialists faced removal from their jobs. Furthermore, all their relatives to the third degree were also forbidden to hold such posts, thus making a total of 250,000 victims. In effect, the brains of the entire Japanese economic structure were being removed. The inevitable result—to turn Japanese economic life over to shinyen (new yen) millionaires, black marketeers, and speculators. The extreme left could capitalize on such a situation to the advantage of the ever-watchful Russians, the advocates of severe purges.

The Japanese businessman was bewildered because these things were being done under the orders of the only remaining great capitalist power, the United States. The original purge directive had been issued by General of the Army MacArthur, and was largely used for a political house cleaning. But now the economic application of the purge cuts off the most active, efficient, experienced, cultured, and cosmopolitan section of the nation—the very section that has always been the best disposed toward cooperation with the United States. These classes consider that they helped make the occupation one in which the United States has been able to reduce its occupying forces to a minimum because resistance to them has been practically nil. Now these Japanese are concerned about the growth of a possible underground with Soviet connections.

Many occupation officers on all levels shared the bewilderment of the Japs. Some felt that instead of pressing for an investigation in Germany, Congress should send a committee to Japan to discover why American capitalist principles are being undermined by American occupation authorities.

They felt that such an investigation would help clear General MacArthur of any blame and would repair the damage already inflicted on his dignity in the eyes of the Japanese. Finally, these officers believed that only a congressional investigation could clear up the mystery of American occupation policy.

Insofar as could be ascertained by Newsweek's sources, this was what lay behind the current purge: The original purge order was issued on January 4, 1946, by General MacArthur. Theoretically it was designed to eliminate from Japanese life those who had aided militarism and plans of conquest. On November 21, 1946, and January 4, 1947, MacArthur's original directive was deepened and broadened in the economic field by Japanese ordinances. Because of the structure of Japanese business this worked out as would a similar order in the United States purging all businessmen who contributed to the war effort and members of the National Association of Manufacturers. It was thus nearly all-inclusive, unlike denazification in Germany which has a specifically political basis. It was given to the Japanese Government to implement but its execution was closely supervised by occupation authorities.

A HOUSE DIVIDED

The purge originated in the military government branch of the occupation. This branch has long been involved in a four-cornered fight for authority with the G–2 section of Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, the economic and scientific section of Maj. Gen. William F. Marquat, and the civilian information and education section under Lt. Col. Donald R. Nugent. The relations between these four sections of military government have progressively degenerated as their aims and methods diverged.

Both Willoughby and Marquat are professional soldiers accustomed to operating through channels. They therefore make their recommendations through a chief of staff, who is primarily interested in the occupation force rather than Japanese internal affairs. Their opinions were thus often shelved. This has been particularly irking to G–2, which observers account the most efficient and effective of any of the occupation sections in the art of dealing firmly with the Japanese.

On the other hand, the chief of the military government section, Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney, went straight to MacArthur with his ideas. Thus in the occupation a curious feature of prewar Jap Government was revived: The man with direct access to the throne had the best chance of gaining his objectives. Whitney also had the advantage of coming from Manila, a city with which MacArthur has long been associated. There Whitney was a lawyer, a skilled county-courthouse type of orator with the ability to turn dramatics off and on. He is a red-faced man of about 5 feet 6, inclined to be portly and short-tempered.

One odd development: Even though Whitney's MG fathered the purge, some MG officers are already claiming that it had to be undertaken because of direct orders from the 11-nation Far Eastern Commission sitting in Washington, where the Russians put something over. This alibi was not borne out in Washington, where neither the FEC nor the War Department even possesses up-to-date information on the purge—although the State Department knows of the extent of recent developments.

THE BEATEN WONDER

Such is the background of the purge. The mystery remains as to why an American military government fell into this confusion of motives and actions. One possible reason was cabled by Pakenham: "Military government officers arrived expecting to run Japan and were disappointed at finding the Japanese Government functioning, although guided by MG. The MG contains many theoretical experts in limited phases, but otherwise they are immature, untrained for local conditions, blindly unconscious of their tremendous power, and unconcerned over the practical consequences."

It is an open question as to the extent to which General MacArthur is aware of the ideological implications of the actions of his military government. The very aloofness that made him a virtual god to the Japanese and was at least partly responsible for the original success of the occupation has also insulated him from contact with many developments.

There has, however, been no mystery about the results of the purge. One Japanese put it this way: "We know better than any that we have been beaten. We know the United States is entitled to impose any punishment it wants and to force us to make any amends it sets. But we can't understand why, when America could have all Japan working in its own interest, it is now engaged in wrecking the country so as to leave it as an eventual prize to the Russians."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I suggest that in connection with any consideration of this general subject which might be had as a result of the questions raised in the article, consideration also be given to certain things of a disquieting nature which have been reported in connection with our administration of and our activities in Korea.

JEWRY'S ROLE IN WORLD WAR II

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Truman Shares Pride in United States Jewry's Role in World War II"; an address entitled "Our War Record," delivered by Louis I. Dublin; and an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, at a dinner given by the National Jewish Welfare Boards in New York City on January 9, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a debate conducted by the magazine Pic, as printed in its issue of October 1946, regarding the size of Government forces, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL LABOR RELATIONS—ARTICLE BY DR. THOMAS H. HOWELLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Permanent Remedy for Strikes," written by Thomas H. Howells and published in the Daily Camera, of Boulder, Colo., on December 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASIA AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT—ARTICLE BY OWEN LATTIMORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Asia and the State Department," written by Owen Lattimore, Director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY USBORNE IN BRITISH PARLIAMENT

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Henry Usborne, a member of the British Parliament, on November 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 20) appointing a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state the parliamentary situation. The Senate is proceeding today under a unanimous-consent agreement. At the hour of 2 o'clock the time will be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the pending resolution, under the control of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on one side and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on the other.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to Senate Resolution 20, as printed and on the desk.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the question is on the adoption of the two amendments which I have proposed to Senate Resolution 20.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Nebraska may wish to ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered together.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments may be considered together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the two amendments which I have offered to Senate Resolution 20 are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress", insert "for a period of 240 days after the date this resolution is agreed to."

On page 2, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to."

By unanimous consent just granted the two amendments are to be considered together as one.

The mechanical result of the amendments is to change the termination date of the committee, and limit its life to 8 months. If the resolution, as proposed to be amended, is adopted, the committee's activities will terminate on approximately the 1st day of next October. In other words, the Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business would operate during the time Congress is in session, and if it should happen to continue to be in session into the month of August, which is likely to happen, then the committee would have approximately 30 days in which to publish its report, clean up its work, and terminate its existence by the 1st day of October of this year. I want the Members of the Senate to understand that I am sincere in offering the amendments to the resolution. When the time for termination of the committee arrives, as provided by the amendments, if in the opinion of the Senate there then is no further need for the special committee, it will be perfectly agreeable to me that it terminate its work, with the hope that the standing committees will by that time be fully organized so they can take jurisdiction not only of matters dealing with finance, not only with transportation rates and other transportation matters, not only with questions of monopoly and centralization of business, but that all standing committees will be so organized that the small businessmen of the country will have some place to go, where they can present their problems and have their difficulties ironed out.

Mr. President, if there are any questions to be asked concerning the amendments, I should be glad to answer them now. The amendments are merely mechanical in their nature. As I stated, the purpose of the amendments is simply to provide that the special committee shall function from this time until the present session of Congress ends, and when that time comes it will be perfectly agreeable to me to have a standing committee of the Senate take over the work of the special committee, if the standing committees are then sufficiently organized, and to have the special committee dealing with matters affecting small business then terminated.

Mr. President, the second amendment simply gives the present committee the opportunity to file such reports as it may have which have not been filed, and to pay off its personnel. They are entitled to their wages until the 31st of January, under a resolution adopted by the previous Congress which continued the committee until that date. The old committee should be given an opportunity to clear off its desk so that the new committee will not have to take over any unfinished business. I think it is only proper mechanically that the old committee should wind up its own affairs, pay its own bills, and publish its own reports, and that the new committee should not be responsible for any of the bills of the old committee, or for any reports which are not filed, or for any unfinished business. That is simply a mechanical amendment, such as is usually made in the case of a committee when it is terminated and another committee is created.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us why he asks for the creation of a new committee, instead of extending the old committee?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to do so. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I tried in every way I could think of simply to extend the old committee.

At this point in the RECORD I should like to have printed as part of my remarks the original resolution creating the committee back in 1940.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable, and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked to have the original resolution printed at this point in the RECORD in order to show that the language of Senate Resolution 20, which proposes to create a new committee, is identical with the language of the original resolution, with one exception. Senate Resolution 20 provides for the appointment of a committee of 12. The membership of the old committee consisted of 12—7 Democrats and 5 Republicans. If the old committee were to be continued, there would be no way to bring about the proper numerical representation on the majority side. The present membership consists of six Democrats—former Senator Mead not now being a member of the Senate—and five Republicans. Senate Resolution 20 provides that the President pro tempore shall appoint a new committee of 12, so that the representation may be 7 on the majority side and 5 on the minority side.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not that be done by a simple continuing resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. It could not be done by a simple continuing resolution because that would call upon the President pro tempore to take 2 members from the Democratic side and replace them by 2 Members from the Republican side. I feel that that is a matter for the majority to consider. The majority should submit the names of Members, as is done in connection with all other committees.

A simple continuing resolution, such as the Senator suggests, would place the President pro tempore in an embarrassing situation. In my judgment, this is the only proper way to do it. I consulted several lawyers, and also the Legislative Counsel, and was informed that this way the only proper way to accomplish the purposes for which I submitted the resolution. I trust that that explanation is satisfactory.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks the colloquy engaged in on June 6, 1946, between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the distinguished former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette. This colloquy is found on pages 6394 and 6395 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question with reference to section 126 of the bill which reads:

"No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives."

My first question to the Senator is this: If that were the present law, would it have been impossible for the Senate to have set up, for example, a special committee to deal with the subject of atomic energy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; except as the Senate has suspended the rules for that purpose. While the Senator was at lunch today at the White House, I discussed this matter with other persons. It does not, of course, affect any joint committees which may now be in existence, such as, for example, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It would not affect the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, if we were confronted today with this rule, and the subject of atomic energy suddenly loomed on the horizon, and it was felt to be necessary to create a select or a special committee of either the Senate or of the other House, or a joint committee of both Houses to consider that highly important subject, it would be necessary for the Senate and the House, if the committee were to be a joint committee, to suspend their rules or, if the committee were to be a special committee of either House, it would be necessary for the House concerned to suspend its rules.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the purpose of section 126 is to frown, so far as it can upon that method of approach to legislation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The committee came to the conclusion that if we could reorganize the committees, and staff them adequately, it would be in the interest of orderly and efficient legislative procedure to have the standing committees or subcommittees thereof conduct studies and investigations, because, after all, if legislation is to flow from these activities, normally the select or joint committees do not have legislative power, and it is often necessary for the standing committee to thresh over much of the straw and the wheat that has been threshed over by a special or select joint committee, as the case may be.

However, I express it as my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that at any time when a matter of great consequence, such as atomic energy was when it first became a subject for consideration, and still is, for that matter, I have no doubt that the Senate and the House would suspend the rules to meet a situation of that kind.

The reason why we have drawn this tight ban is that we know full well, from long experience, that unless there is a ban, to obviate which very extraordinary action such as suspending the rules is required, we will not check the tendency to appoint select committees of both the House and the Senate, and joint select committees, of which we now have a considerable number in both Houses, and I anticipate that as time goes on, unless the action here proposed is taken, they will multiply in geometric progression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can understand the purpose the Senator and his committee had in mind. Among other purposes, I assume, it is in line with the purpose to limit and concentrate the service which individual Senators themselves give to the problems assigned to their responsibility. On the other hand, I think this is one of the few places in the bill where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Assuming that there eventually will be some kind of reorganization of the House committees, or even if there is not, the bill does encourage joint action by the committees of opposite number in the two Houses.

The Senator has put his finger on one aspect of the situation, and I tried to mention the other. If he will look at the committee assignments of Senators in the directory, he will find that a great many Senators are now serving on select and special committees and joint committees. Our effort in this bill is to reduce the committee burden of Senators, so far as the multiplicity of committees is concerned, to the point where they will have sufficient time to discharge their full responsibilities to the committees upon which they serve.

I hope the Senator will give further consideration to the statement which I have made, which may not be a complete answer from his standpoint, but I think if a subject of vital importance comes up, and it is obvious that a special committee should be created, there will not be undue difficulty in having the rules of either House suspended for that purpose. But I fear that if we did not have this ban we might conceivably reorganize and reduce the Senate committees, and find our whole purpose and object defeated by a rash of select and special committees in the future, which would put us right back where we started.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator give me the citation in the bill where joint hearings are encouraged?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Section 122 provides:

"The standing committees of the two Houses are authorized to hold joint hearings with respect to the subject matter within their respective jurisdictions."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I had not seen section 122. That goes a long way toward answering the thought I had in mind, for it seemed to me that in attempting to streamline the efficiency of congressional action there were many points at which the only possible practical approach was through an elimination of needless duplication between the House and Senate of activities in respect to legislation.

I particularly had in mind the precise point which is covered by section 122. So that my distinguished friend disarms me substantially by his reference to that section. However, I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to point out this particular passage in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, when he stated, in reply to the former Senator from Wisconsin.

On the other hand, this is one of the few places in the bill—

The Senator from Michigan was speaking of section 126—

where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin.

The colloquy continues to the next page. These are the words of the then Senator from Wisconsin in reply to that observation:

I hope the Senator will give further consideration to the statement which I have made, which may not be a complete answer from his standpoint, but I think if a subject of vital importance comes up when it is obvious that a special committee should be created, there will not be undue difficulty in having the rules of either the House or the Senate suspended for that purpose.

I point out once more to Members of the Senate that those were the words of the then Senator from Wisconsin, who drafted the bill and sponsored it on the floor of the Senate. He was speaking in reply to the query of the Senator from Michigan, who inquired of the Senator from Wisconsin whether it was his intention, in view of the elimination of section 126 prohibiting special committees, that such committees should ever be created. The Senator from Wisconsin stated that they should be created whenever a majority of the Senate felt that it was important that they be created. I think it is important to have that colloquy in the RECORD at this point. We now have a precedent, inasmuch as the Senate has adopted the resolution continuing the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I claim that that precedent is supported by the spirit of the interpretation given by former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the colloquy engaged in on January 20 of this year between the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This colloquy is found on page 455 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Illinois referred to my record on the Reorganization Act with great kindness and hopefulness. He indicated, however, that, on the basis of the record, unless I declined to approve an extension of this special committee, I would not be in harmony with my original position.

I know the Senator would not wish to do the record any injustice, and, therefore, with his permission, I should like to call his attention to the remainder of my colloquy with the able former Senator from Wisconsin, on the prior page of the RECORD from which he read.

Mr. LUCAS. What page is that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Page 6394 of the RECORD for June 6, 1946. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that after I had interrogated the Senator from Wisconsin about my belief that there were sometimes situations which

could better be served by special or select committees than by regular committees, and he had made his reply substantially conceding that such a situation could arise, I said—and I read from the RECORD:

"I think this is one of the few places in the bill where I am not sure I agree with the philosophy of my able friend from Wisconsin."

Then I call the able Senator's attention to the additional statement in the following colloquy, when I again said:

"However, I would not want section 126"—

The section proscribing special committees—

"I would not want section 126 to be read as meaning that we do not recognize that there may be extraordinary situations, of which the best illustration at the moment is the control of atomic energy, which are better served by special and select committees, and perhaps by joint committees."

To which the able Senator from Wisconsin, the author of the bill, replied:

"I grant that point, and have conceded it in the brief time we have been able to devote to the consideration of the bill today."

I am not entering this controversy on the pending resolution. I am merely indicating to my able friend from Illinois that I think a fair interpretation of the RECORD will show that my position with respect to special committees, as indicated in the debate from which the Senator quoted, is that if there is a situation which in my judgment recommends a special committee as the more useful approach to a successful conclusion, it is my interpretation, and was at the time, that I would be free so to vote; and I think the Senator from Wisconsin concurred that I would enjoy that freedom.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I invite special attention to the answer which the Senator from Michigan made to the Senator from Illinois relative to whether or not we have authority to create special committees. The distinguished Senator from Michigan called the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the words of Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, stating that if and when the Senate felt it to be sufficiently important it could by a majority vote, create a special committee for any purpose which the Senate might desire.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska brought my name into the discussion by referring to the colloquy with the able Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan took the very definite position in the colloquy he had with the Senator from Illinois that when he felt that a subject matter was of extraordinary importance—I believe he referred to the Atomic Energy Committee by way of example—he would feel justified in supporting a proposal to create a special committee to investigate such a subject. I think he used the word extraordinary. Certainly the Senator from Nebraska will not contend that the continuation of the Small Business Committee comes within the category to which the Senator from Michigan referred the other day. If he does so contend, then Senators on the other side of the aisle must support a request of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] for a special petroleum committee. They must support the request of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] for a special wool committee. They must support requests for practically every other special committee. In my judgment the Small Business Committee is not as important from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of national economy as is the Special Petroleum Committee, which, from those standpoints, is really worth while.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Illionis be printed at the end of my remarks, because I am trying to make a record that will be of interest to other Senators. If the Senator from Illinois would like to engage me in a colloquy at the end of this speech, I will be glad to answer any interpretation that he might place on the remarks of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. LUCAS. I object to that, because I want my remarks to appear in this part of the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like to say, in answer to the observation just made by the Senator from Illinois, that he has a perfect right to interpret what was said by the Senator from Michigan in any way he wishes; but I submit, upon the RECORD—and I am only speaking on the RECORD with reference to what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, pointed out in no uncertain terms: That if the membership of the Senate felt that a subject matter was sufficiently important to be submitted to a special committee, such a special committee might be created. I am simply following the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield at this point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield at this time. I shall be glad to answer any questions when I have concluded. I never refuse to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

We are going to hear our friends across the aisle say "This is not important." I wish the RECORD to show that Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, who sponsored the reorganization bill, stated that under the provisions of section 126 if, in the opinion of the Senate, subject matter was of sufficient importance to call for such action, that the Senate could suspend the rules without violating the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act. The Senator from Illinois has a perfect right to interpret the act in any way he sees fit; I am not questioning that; but, as I read the remarks of Senator La Follette, that is exactly what he said.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in the colloquy last Wednesday with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, again stated his position in the matter, and I propose to quote his words:

I am not entering this controversy on the pending resolution. I am merely indicating to my able friend from Illinois that I think a fair interpretation of the RECORD will show that my position with respect to special committees, as indicated in the debate from which the Senator quoted, is that if there is a situation which in my judgment recommends a special committee as the more useful approach to a successful conclusion, it is my interpretation, and as at the time, that I would be free so to vote; and I think the Senator from Wisconsin concurred that I would enjoy that freedom.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield in a moment.

That was the answer of the Senator from Michigan; and certainly he has the right to interpret his own viewpoint with regard to the La Follette-Monroney Act. It is written in the RECORD. It is my interpretation, as I stated when the resolution was submitted, that it resolves itself down to this simple equation, that the resolution which is before the Senate, creating or continuing the special committee, involves a matter of sufficient importance as to justify the Senate in continuing the Small Business Committee for a period of 8 months. That is the only question before the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is no doubt in the world, I think, that the Senate can create a special committee if it cares to do so. It took such action on Wednesday last. But I would like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not feel that it is a reflection on the able, competent, and outstanding Committee on Banking and Currency to take away from that committee a function which is specifically set out in the Reorganization Act as being a part of the work of that committee, namely, the problem of small businessmen. That is set forth in the act as one of the specific functions of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask the able Senator from Nebraska, is it not a reflection upon the mentality, the competence, and the standing of this committee, so recently created and given this particular work, to say, "No; it cannot do this work. Another committee can do it better, and therefore we are going to ignore the specific language of the Reorganization Act."

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to answer the question. It is a perfectly fair question and it is asked in good faith, and I shall answer it in that way.

We are not reflecting, in this resolution, upon the mentality or the ability of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or of any member of that committee to which any problem of small business might be submitted. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Maryland the fact that when the resolution creating or extending the Small Business Committee was brought before the Senate there was some discussion about it. Does the Senator recall that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] asked a parliamentary question? He said, "I believe that this resolution extending the Small Business Committee should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce." Does the Senator remember that? He then took his seat, and the distinguished

Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] arose and said that he had a parliamentary inquiry. The occupant of the chair said, "The Senator will state it." The Senator from Georgia said, "If the present occupant of the chair were now to rule as to the committee to which this resolution should be referred, to what committee would it be referred?" Does the Senator recall what he said?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator. He was present that afternoon. The Chair stated that if it were left to him and he were to refer the resolution, he would refer it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Does the Senator remember that colloquy, now that I have called it to his attention?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. It is in the RECORD. The Senator can read it.

Another thing happened. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has been here longer than most of us have and knows more about the rules than does the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland together. He rose to his feet and said he objected to the opinion of the Parliamentarian, and that the resolution should go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggested that the Committee on the Judiciary might have an interest in the subject matter, inasmuch as I understood that the purpose of the Small Business Committee was to prevent monopolies, and that that was a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I did not express the opinion exactly as attributed to me, because, obviously, there are many phases of the question. That was one phase of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arizona be placed in full in the RECORD at this point, because his remarks are self-explanatory and will answer the question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and myself, I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 40, providing for the extension of the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources. It had been my expectation that that resolution would be referred, as these other two resolutions were referred, to the Committee on Rules and Administration; but I notice that it has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which I believe to be an erroneous reference. I should like to have unanimous consent, since there has been no action on the resolution, that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that the rule of the Senate up to this time has been that no special investigating committee could be created unless a resolution had been reported by the appropriate standing committee of the Senate and then referred to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The functions of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate have been absorbed by the Committee on Rules and Administration. When the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] introduced his resolution on Wednesday he asked unanimous consent to have it referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that is how that committee got it. In suggesting references, normally the Parliamentarian is perfectly right.

The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That paragraph (o) (1) (A) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That any resolution proposing to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a special or select joint committee, shall not be referred to any other standing committee of the Senate but shall be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration of all phases thereof, including the substantive matter.' "

Until the Senate adopts such a rule, under the rule of the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma should be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. That is where it belongs. I object to its reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration until the Committee on Public Lands has considered it.

* * * * *

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to paragraph 7, on page 7, of the Reorganization Act, under the heading "Committee on the Judiciary." It provides that that committee shall have jurisdiction of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

I understand that the real purpose of the Small Business Committee is to assure protection of small business against restraints and monopolies. So I think that the question hinges upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has asked me a question and I am trying to answer it. The Senator has said that the action referred to was a reflection, and I say it is not a reflection. Under the La Follette-Monroney Act the Committee on Banking and Currency would take jurisdiction of matters affecting small business only when a financial question was involved. The Committee on the Judiciary would take jurisdiction of monopoly and centralization questions. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would take jurisdiction of freight rates and transportation matters. So the answer is that when a special committee cuts across the lines of the Committee on Banking and Currency it is no reflection upon that committee because that committee, if it stays within the jurisdiction which the act assigns to it, does not have jurisdiction of two-thirds of the matters that come before other standing committees of the Senate which would have to handle those problems.

So if the work were centralized in one special committee, such committee would simply do the work of the full committees which have been mentioned as having some interest in that field. On the committee, probably, there would be not only some of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee's subcommittees which deal with the problems confronting small business but also some of the members of the Judiciary Committee and some of the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Such a membership would enable the special committee to function all the way along the line.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not through yet. The Senator from Maryland asked me a question, and I wish to answer it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Nebraska had answered my question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems. For instance, I refer to the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as well. When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20. Because of that fact I have amended the resolution so as to provide for the continuation of the special committee for only 240 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for his answer; but let me state that questions as to where a bill is to go or is not to go, or what was said, or what was not said, are irrelevant to this debate, because, I point out to the Senator from Nebraska, that the argument adverted to took place on the floor of the Senate before the Reorganization Act went into effect. Today we have the Reorganization Act, under which 15 committees have been set up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the colloquy I have mentioned occurred last Monday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to finish?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am speaking of the creation of the original Special Committee on Small Business, at which time the Reorganization Act had not gone into effect.

Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the very argument he now makes for the Special Committee on Small Business could not likewise be made for the continuation of the Special Committee on Wool, which has to do with freight rates and with Government finance, direct or indirect, and with small business dealing with all the things the Senator has mentioned. Could not the same arguments be made for the continuation of the Special Committee on Silver, because related to silver are questions regarding the private manufacture or use of silver, in connection with the making of silverware, as well as a variety of other things, such as the medical and scientific uses of silver?

So, Mr. President, every argument which is being made for the Special Com-

mittee on Small Business could be made equally well with respect to the need for the continuation of every other special committee which is or will be sought to be established despite the existence of the Reorganization Act.

Therefore, if we set up a special committee for small business, we would be committed to set up other special committees for all the other special subjects which have been mentioned; and the result would be the destruction of the machinery of the Reorganization Act, which was so widely heralded by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Maryland whether what he has just stated is a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a question. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it is true that the same argument which he is making for the continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business could be made with equal force in favor of the continuation or creation of the Special Committee on Wool or a special committee on gold, or a special committee on petroleum, or a special committee to deal with any other subject with which a special committee might concern itself?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to that question, I wish to state in all sincerity that I believe that the Special Committee on Small Business is the most important special committee which could be organized by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall answer the Senator's question now. I have the floor.

Let me say that I have been on the Special Committee on Small Business for a number of years.

Mr. TYDINGS. I simply wished to point out to the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not yield at this point. I am going to answer the question the Senator from Maryland has asked me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I was about to say, I have been a member of the Committee on Small Business for 4 years. I have handled complaint after complaint, some of them coming right from the State of the Senator from Maryland. I have handled many complaints arising because of priorities and because of control regulations. At this time the special committee has 20 applications for investigations. One of them is for an investigation into the newsprint situation. We have already set that matter for a hearing. It involves every small newspaper in the State of Maryland, as well as every other small newspaper in the United States of America.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not choose to yield at this point. I am answering the question which has been asked me by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, in the past 4 years there have come before the Senate's Special Committee on Small Business more than 200,000 letters, more than 200,000 messages from small business throughout the United States, asking for aid. In the consideration of those requests, the Special Committee on Small Business during the last 4 years has conducted 3,000 open hearings, at which people from all the States of the Union have appeared. Representatives of tire manufacturers, of furniture makers and dealers, of bakers, and of various other industries, of almost every industry in the United States, have appeared at those hearings. Representatives of practically all industries have come to the Special Committee on Small Business requesting relief and seeking the removal from their backs of Government controls.

I remember very well the hearings on the meat situation. Does not the Senator from Maryland also remember them? They were held in the days when the Senate was deciding whether the Government should continue the controls on meat. I wish to state that 90 percent of the evidence which was used on the floor of the Senate in the debate on the question of continuing or removing the controls from meat was obtained directly from the Special Committee on Small Business of the Senate. Let us not forget that. At that time we were convinced from the reports which we received from small businessmen, such as the butchers, the meat packers, and practically all the other businessmen concerned, that the controls on meat should be removed and must be removed; and when the question of the removal of the controls from meat was being discussed on the floor of the Senate for 31 days, I said that if the Congress removed those controls, it would be possible for the people to purchase meat. But the Senator from Maryland and many of his associates on the other side of the aisle said, "Oh, no. Leave the ceilings on. If they are removed prices will skyrocket, and people will not be able to buy meat." But, Mr. President, the ceilings were removed; and today our people can buy meat at prices comparable to those of June 1946. Today the question is whether the price of meat will have to be maintained rather than reduced.

So, Mr. President, if I am asked whether the Special Committee on Small Business is important, I say it is one of the most important committees in the Senate of the United States. It is all very well for the Government to prosecute the men who recently have been charged with improperly obtaining $400,000,000; but I say to you, Mr. President, that the ones who need special help during this postwar period are the small businessmen—the small grocers, the small druggists, and other small businessmen of their type.

So I shall refuse to permit myself to be talked down or to consent to a cessation of this activity for the next 8 months, merely because someone says it is in violation of the La Follette-Monroney Act. I was one of the Senators who voted for the passage of that act; and when I did so it was with the full knowledge that I could vote for the continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business, if I so desired. When I vote for the continuation of that special committee it certainly is not a breach of faith on my part. The continuation of the Small Business Committee certainly cannot be construed to be a precedent, and certainly it is not a step counter to the interpretation made by Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, or counter to the remarks and interpretation made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The Special Committee on Small Business is important, and it should be continued for 8 months, for it is the only committee that will give the small businessmen of America the relief they need now, until the regular committees take over the work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield now.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have listened to the Senator's remarks with great interest, but let me call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Maryland who now is speaking was absent on a mission, in accordance with a law passed by Congress, for a great deal of the time at the end of the last session of Congress, so probably the Senator from Nebraska is a little too inclusive in his statement of facts when he incorporates the Senator from Maryland in his assertions.

However, I have listened to the Senator from Nebraska with interest. He has not yet answered my point, which is that I am not able to understand why all the purposes he has mentioned could not be as well accomplished by the Committee on Banking and Currency as by the special committee which is proposed to be set up. Every argument he has made would apply with equal force to the efficiency of the Banking and Currency Committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], whose particular duty it is to handle that character of work. I do not deny that during the war the Special Committee on Small Business, on which the Senator from Nebraska served, has done everything it possibly could do to aid small business. But at present, the fact is that we have before the Senate the question whether the standing committee concerned can do the job or whether it cannot; and by inference the Senator from Nebraska has been arguing that the standing committee cannot do the job. Certainly there is no other reason for the continuation or creation of the special committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the colloquy and the observations, because, as he knows, I have great admiration for the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The feeling is mutual.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say that continual reference by way of argument to special committees on this, that, or the other subject is beside the point. The only question now before the Senate is whether Senators in their judgment believe that the Special Committe on Small Business is of such importance that it should be continued for 8 months. That is the only issue before the Senate. If Senators do not wish to give small businessmen the protection they need, if Senators wish to cause chaos for the next 8 months, if Senators wish to drive the

small businessmen here and there, and make it impossible for them to know where to go, Senators have a perfect right to do so. All Members of the Senate have a perfect right to do whatever they wish to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to answer the Senator's other question. We hear the same old contentions urged as to this committee and that committee. I do not know about the special wool committee. I do not know what we will do about other special committees. The only question now before the Senate is whether the Small Business Committee is to be continued for 8 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Not now. I shall yield when I conclude my answer to the Senator's question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the only question is as to the continuance of the Small Business Committee for 8 months, and in his "needling," if it may be called such, the Senator from Maryland is attempting to distract from what I am attempting to say, and he is not going to have very much luck, because the question to be decided is simply this, Is there a desire to continue the Small Business Committee? I say it is the most important committee in the United States Senate. I have a right to my interpretation, and the distinguished Senator has a right to his.

There is no reflection at all upon the standing committee, because if the Senator will take the Reorganization Act itself and turn to page 5, subparagraph (d), he will find the only jurisdiction the Committee on Banking and Currency has over small business; and that pertains merely to loans. Unfortunately, today, with the blanket termination policy announced by the RFC, there is not a place in the world for the small businessman to go to get a loan except to his banker.

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator from Nebraska will yield, let me say that he is wrong in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield. I am answering a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois after I finish the answer. There is no one to whom I would rather yield than the Senator from Illinois. If there is any provision for a loan, it is so difficult to get it that a small businessman cannot even start to get it. Under the Reorganization Act that is the only subject matter of which the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction. It does not, as the distinguished Senator knows, have jurisdiction of questions relating to the monopoly control of newspapers. Such matters go to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Banking and Currency has no jurisdiction over rates, transportation, or 101 other things which come within the province of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I am merely saying, Mr. President, that today the only way problems of small business can be handled in a coordinated way, after 6 years in which the small businessmen have been taught to come to the Senate's Small Business Committee and the House Committee on Small Business, is by seeking that avenue of relief. They have been taught to come here, and the only thing I am asking is that we continue that relief and continue that avenue for 8 months, until in the meantime the standing committees can be organized.

If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency desires to appoint a subcommittee to study these problems, he is entitled to do that, but certainly the distinguished Senator from Maryland will not contradict the statement that that committee, in the absence of broad authority conferred upon it, has no authority to take up matters relating to monopoly control, and centralization in interstate commerce.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is making out a spendid case——

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TYDINGS. For action by this body in the field of small business, but he is not making out a case showing why the standing committees which ought to have, and do have, jurisdiction over this subject matter should not do the job. It is to that point that I should like to have him address himself.

Mr. WHERRY. I have certainly gone over that point time and time again, and I do not want to take further time of the Senate to elucidate it. If the Senator from Maryland is not convinced, and will telephone me in my office, I will nave a private interview with him, and try to tell him what I have been attempting to tell the Senate for some time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have here——

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Illinois going to talk about the Budget?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am going to talk about small business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has the blue-bound volume before him.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska made a statement about the continuance of the Small Business Committee. I wish to call his attention to some remarks he made before the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate when there came up before that committee the question of the continuance——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not asking me a question. I yielded only for a question. I shall be glad to take that up at the termination of my remarks. I shall not yield for any other purpose than for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator declines to yield.

REASONS WHY THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SHOULD CONTINUE ITS WORK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the prime reason for the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee is to have a committee to which the small businessmen of the country can turn during this transition period. It is essential pending the time when the standing committees are organized and able to take over the work that has been done by the Small Business Committee.

It should continue to fill this gap, as I have stated many times, because the small businessmen of the country for 6 years have come to the Small Business Committee with their problems. So long as we have regulations and priorities to the extent that we have them now, there is a dire need for a committee to handle these problems until the standing committees are acquainted with them and can set up subcommittees to assume this burdensome work.

Even though the standing committees of the Senate made every effort to assume the problems of small business as a subcommittee function, the proof that delay would occur is found in the fact that small business had no special place in the regular committee system prior to 1940.

When the Senate created the Special Small Business Committee in 1940, it was the first official recognition of any agency of Government that the problems of small business must be dealt with separately and distinct from the general problems of national economic concern and business generally.

Today it is neither accurate nor wise to assume that the small businessmen no longer confront the problems growing out of Government control and unequal competition with big business. Certainly that cannot be assumed, because there is an acute situation today. Even with the release of controls, it is very difficult for small businessmen to get the commodities, the merchandise, and the building materials they desire.

No one will deny that small enterprises must be preserved as a basic part of our economic fabric. The United States is founded on freedom of enterprise and free competitive activity. We cannot maintain these without a healthy, militant, and dynamic small-business community.

True, some of the hazards and obstructions confronting small business during the wartime period have been removed and others are in the process of liquidation. But the small businessman is not yet out of the woods. He still is beset with artificial shortages, governmental red tape and regulation, and the very serious situation of a big-business system grown even bigger under the stimulus of wartime conditions.

I think it was the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who, in a speech on the Senate floor, gave some figures relating to the part played by corporations in wartime activities. While I shall not attempt to quote the statistics accurately, if I recall correctly he made the statement that in the United States nearly 75 percent of the wartime tasks were performed by less than 100

corporations which were paid billions upon billions of dollars. That is the extent to which centralization developed under wartime controls.

As wartime controls are unwound, the need for a small business committee will become more and more apparent. Because of this, the Congress owes the small businessman the continued service of a special committee which is familiar with his problems and sympathetic with his objectives. I cannot see how that can be denied. I cannot see how a Senator on either side of the aisle can vote against the continuance, for 8 months, of the Small Business Committee. Of all the committees of the United States Senate, I think it is the one committee most needed. In my opinion we should have a standing committee that would do this work.

The importance of small business can be illustrated briefly in the field of manufacturing alone.

Prior to the war, small manufacturers operated 190,000 plants, employing 9,000,000 workers. Big industry, employing 500 or more workers, functioned through only 3,000 concerns, employing 6,000,000 workers. Need we have any other proof that so-called small business is a backbone of American life?

Small business does not need, nor am I here advocating, any form of paternalistic government protection. It only needs a fair chance to compete, to survive, and to prosper. The very life of small American communities depends on the small businessman—the independent merchant, and the man who publishes a weekly newspaper. It is from the weekly newspapers that we get the opinions of the people of the country; and we need to preserve the small newspapers throughout the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WHERRY. For a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield gladly.

Mr. TAYLOR. A moment ago I understood the Senator to say he thought the committee should be made a standing committee. May I ask why he does not incorporate that principle in his resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that would be a complete violation of the La Follette-Monroney Act. The Senator from Idaho would not wish to have me do that; he is for the Monroney Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. If we are going to violate it, why not violate it completely?

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator vote for such a proposal?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a standing small-business committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. Would the Senator vote for it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should be more inclined to vote for it than for this temporary extension. I might vote for a standing committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Senator from Idaho would not vote for that, and he is not going to vote for the pending proposal. We all understand that; and he has a perfect right not to do it. The Senator from Idaho may do as he pleases about it, but he has been on the Small Business Committee, and he knows as well as I do that the 3,000 problems we have handled cut across all standing committee lines. The Senator from Idaho, who sat in the hearings, over some of which he presided as chairman, will not controvert that statement. I think we all understand that the problems covered by the hearing related not only to banking and financial matters but to allocations, priorities, freight rates, and many other matters.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would not that be true of any committee that might be created?

Mr. WHERRY. I think not. I think there can be no doubt that the standing committees are given clearly outlined jurisdiction.

I admit that if this special committee is set up the Senate will be giving it authority, as has been done in the past, and I think properly so, to consider problems which, under the Monroney Act, come under the jurisdiction of various standing committees. But, in my opinion—and I think the Senator from Idaho should agree with me, because he is interested in small business——

Mr. TAYLOR. I am.

Mr. WHERRY. The continuation of the Small Business Committee for 8 months, until such time as its activities can be taken over by the standing committees where they belong, will serve to help those committees. It will assist them in getting started, and help in the determination of policy and jurisdiction, and thus enable businessmen to know what committees to consult in order to obtain needed relief. I cannot see how else it can be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot see the objective of extending temporarily the special committee, because sometime, and it might as well be now, its work will be taken over by the standing committees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has a perfect right to his opinion, but small business needs a fair chance to compete and to survive. The very life of little American communities, as I have said, depends upon small business. It is the necessary complement to a prosperous agriculture.

In my section small communities are necessary and so are the small businessmen. Many persons who live in the country are dependent upon the small towns. Sometimes the nearest one is 25 or 50 miles away, but there they go to do their shopping. We cannot afford to lose these small communities and cannot afford to lose the small businessman. It means the difference between jobs and unemployment for millions of American workers.

Our aim is to keep small business functioning, for the employment problem is involved. Every little business that can be kept operating means that much more employment, that much more production; and that is what we need in this postwar era.

This is no emotional appeal which I am making to the Members of the Senate. It is a statement of cold, hard facts. Today there simply is no agency or department of government which can concern itself adequately with the problems of small business.

With all respect to the work of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in its time and the continuing activities in the Commerce Department in behalf of small business, there remains a real and pressing need for a Senate Special Small Business Committee to act as a guiding hand and a friend at court during the transitional period of the next 8 months.

I quote an expression of the President:

The antitrust laws should be implemented—

That is for the judiciary—

and, simultaneously, small business and new enterprise should be encouraged by research and credit programs—

That is a matter for the Committee on Banking and Currency. I may add they should also be encouraged by an adequate study of freight rates and transportation problems, which is a matter for Interstate Commerce—

this for the opponents of "bigness."

The President himself is interested in the small businessman, and certainly the President, so far as was in his power, would assist any committee, whether it were a special committee or a standing committee, in its efforts to help the small businessmen to obtain materials and merchandise which they could sell to those who wanted to buy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with the Senator that small business does need help; that is, their interests must be looked after, for they need protection more than help. But will not the Senator agree that if the Small Business Committee makes investigations to determine what should be done, that their findings will have to be referred to various standing committees, who in turn will have to investigate the matters all over again in order to familiarize themselves with the subject?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho well knows that any proposed legislation which develops as a result of hearings is referred to the standing committees; and properly so. But I submit to the Senator from Idaho that in the 3,000 complaints presented to and heard by the special committee questions of legislation were not primarily involved. There were involved questions of priorities, of controls, and other questions which it would be very difficult to siphon out and assign to any one particular committee. The Senator must know that to be so.

Until the Senate can establish one committee to handle the multitudinous problems of small business and make provision which will enable businessmen to continue at work, it seems to me, if we wish to be fair and honest about it

in our own minds and eliminate politics and party-line votes, that every Member of the Senate should be glad to continue the Small Business Committee for 8 months.

In what we are undertaking to do for small business, I shall be the first man in the Senate to cooperate with other committees. I will cooperate with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is a very able man and whose ability I would not question. But some of us who have been on the special committee for 4 years, and have studied the problems presented to it, could be, I think, of real service to him in establishing a subcommittee to handle banking and financial matters for small business.

I am not on the Banking and Currency Committee, but I should be glad indeed to help the Senator from New Hampshire along that line.

I will say the same thing with regard to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It is not my intention at all to continue the special committee 1 day longer than is necessary in order to provide for the period of transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. I think there is a definite gap at this time, and I believe there is necessity that this resolution be passed so that the work of the committee may be extended for the next 8 months.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to place certain communications in the RECORD. I have here, I estimate, nearly 50 or 60 telegrams and letters. During the past 3 weeks since this discussion began businessmen from all over the country, business associations, and groups have come forward and asked that the Small Business Committee be continued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not proposing to read them all. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have understood that the telegrams and letters to which the Senator refers were solicited by the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. By the Small Business Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator how many telegrams were sent and how many telephone calls were made at Government expense by the Small Business Committee, soliciting support throughout the Nation for the continuation of this committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not believe one dime was spent by the Small Business Committee itself. I shall be glad to check with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. No request was ever made by me or my office. What telegrams I have had and the Business Committee has had, I am very well satisfied, have come from businessmen many of whom were personal acquaintances. I shall be glad to ask the Senator from Montana, or the clerk of the committee, if any solicitation was made. As the Senator must know, I do not favor pressure campaigns. If desired, I shall be glad to read every one of these communications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I will read them in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to place them in the RECORD. To the best of my knowledge, I do not believe that the Senate Small Business Committee made solicitations whatsoever. There is one committee of which Dewey Anderson is chairman, but I did not receive a communication from him. I am satisfied that these telegrams reflect honestly the opinions and the desires of the business associations throughout the country, in the interest of small business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Small businessmen in my State say they have been solicited——

Mr. WHERRY. I do not doubt that at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. By the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And by representatives of the Senate, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the Senator will find that if there has been any solicitation it has been by small business associations among themselves, who are interested in having the special committee continue its work. To my knowledge—and I believe I can speak with authority—the Small Business Committee of the Senate itself has not solicited one of these telegrams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Have any of the employees of the Small Business Committee done any soliciting among the Senators?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I do not believe so. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been so solicited.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that he has been solicited by an employee of the Small Business Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; by an employee of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Who is the employee of the Small Business Committee that solicited telegrams from the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is unnecessary for me to give names. I am telling the Senator that I have been solicited by employees of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator fron Colorado that someone else, aside from those connected with the committee, who is interested in the continuation of the Small Business Committee, may have done so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Colorado is not mistaken.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to imply, Mr. President, that the Senator was not giving his honest opinion, but to my knowledge there has been no such effort made.

I ask to have the telegrams, to which I have referred, printed in the RECORD for what they are worth. Senators can read them and judge them for themselves. There are probably 33 from a majority of the small-business associations of the country or individuals interested in small business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 20, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

National Retail Hardware Association representing over 20,000 hardware dealers urges continuation of Senate Committee To Investigate Problems of Small Businessmen.

RIVERS PETERSON,
Managing Director.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely trust Senate will continue Small Business Committee as unit to protect interest of independent small business. This association and its members appreciate fully helpful interest of this committee in past and feels continuation of committee as separate entity vital preservation of small business to have such representation in Senate.

C. R. THEBAUT, Jr.,
President, National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

On behalf of more than 16,000 farm-equipment dealers throughout United States, we recommend continuance of Senate Small Business Committee. Many problems facing businessmen in rural areas in next few months demand investigation by that committee.

PAUL M. MULLIKEN,
Executive Secretary, National Retail Farm Equipment Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

We firmly believe that the Senate Small Business Committee should be continued, and will appreciate any effort you may make to that end.

HARRY R. WAINWRIGHT,
Executive Director, Retail Gasoline Dealers Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Urgently request your strong support renewal Senate Small Business Committee.

C. C. SIMPSON,
Managing Director, National Electrical Retailers Association.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 20, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Buliding:

Our association urges the renewal and continued usefulness of the Senate Small Business Committee. This activity gives recognition to the interests of a segment of our economy that it is important to protect and foster, particularly in this postwar period, when so many adjustments are to be made. I hope you will bring all your influence to bear in furtherance of this essential work.

FRANK M. WHISTON,
President, National Association of Building Owners and Managers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Capitol:

Our association believes that the activities of the Senate Small Business Committee have been of benefit to small business as a whole, and would earnestly urge that this committee be continued by the Eightieth Congress.

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 20, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Board of directors of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute in session today in advance of annual convention beginning tomorrow. Urge strongly your support toward continuation Senate Small Business Committee. This committee always has been responsible and effective, and must be continued if small-business interests are to be adequately protected. You realize, of course, that failure to support this committee might be construed as an indication of unfriendliness toward small business.

HENRY MATTER,
Managing Director, Wholesale Dry Goods Institute.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 21, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Understand S. 20 scheduled for consideration promptly after disposition resolution relative continuation War Investigating Committee. Past experience shows more intelligent and effective attention given problems lumber wholesalers by Small Business Committees of Senate and House than any other congressional committee. While favoring improvement cumbersome legislative machinery intended by Reorganization Act, nevertheless, during formative or organization period, it would be desirable our group, representing lumber wholesalers in 38 States, to continue Senate Small Business Committee as a special committee even if only for limited period time. A special committee can the better go into many ramifications of some special problem more comprehensively than a subcommittee of some regular standing committee more or less limited to matters of broad nature. Lumber wholesalers distribute two-thirds of lumber production.

SID L. DARLING,
Secretary, National American Wholesale Lumber Association, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

End of wartime controls has not witnessed the end of the problems of small business in the wine industry. We need the continued support and assistance of the Senate Small Business Committee, which was of such immeasurable aid to us during the war. A special committee dealing only in the problems of small business must be set up by the Senate. We endorse your resolution 100 percent.

MORRIS SLEPIAN,
President, National Wine Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Senate Small Business Committee of immeasurable assistance to small business in our industry. Period of reconversion equally as important as war period. Passage of your resolution calling for continuance of committee is vital to the interests of small business throughout the country.

MAYONNAISE AND SALAD DRESSING MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Imperative that your resolution to continue the Select Committee on Small Business be adopted by the United States Senate. During the dark war years when the administration, through insidious regulations, fostered monopolies in the meat business, your committee was the only ray of sunshine for the small businessman in the meat industry. The monopolies are not giving up the ground gained during the period of Government regulations, and small business still requires an ear and a capable voice. We must have your continued help.

BUCKLEY & DANZANSKY,
Counsel, National Association Nonslaughtering Meat Processors and Wholesalers, Inc.

JANUARY 21, 1947.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the American Warehousemen's Association and its constituent divisions, the National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses and American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, I urge the continuation in the Eightieth Congress of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business. American Warehousemen's Association is the recognized spokesman for the public merchandise warehousing industry and the public refrigerated warehousing industry of the Nation, composed of thousands of independent private enterprises, of which practically 100 percent qualify as "small business" as defined by the War Assets Administration in its administration of the Surplus Property Act. Public warehousemen need during reconversion the same consideration accorded other small business enterprises to enable them to contribute to the reestablishment of our Nation's normal competitive economy.

CHARLES E. NICHOLS,
Secretary, American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

The National Association of Master Plumbers, with over 12,000 plumbing and heating contractor members, urgently requests the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee. Our members are all small businessmen in the true sense of the word, operating in business volumes from $5,000 to millions of dollars annually. Through its activities the Senate Small Business Committee can contribute much to the welfare of small operators and assure their independence. We hope you will do everything within your power to have the Senate Small Business Committee continued in the Eightieth Congress.

GEORGE O. TOEPFER,
President, National Association of Master Plumbers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Urge continuation of Senate Small Business Committee as the only Senate committee devoting its full energies toward problems of small business. Fear industries composed primarily of small business units would not receive attention commensurate with their importance if activities of this committee were to be merged with activities of other committees. Wish to record our support of this committee's work and urge its continuation.

RICHARD P. WHITE,
American Association of Nurserymen, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1947.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

The National Association of Retail Druggists, representing approximately 31,000 independent pharmacists of the Nation, are vitally interested in maintaining the Senate Small Business Committee. To us this committee represents a court wherein the problems of small business may be presented. We trust that you and your colleagues will continue this committee; it is of vital concern to us.

GEORGE H. FRATES,
Washington Representative, National Association of Retail Druggists.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

In response to inquiry the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers, representing the men's-wear stores of the Nation, would be pleased to appear at a public hearing and urge the real necessity and importance of the continuation of the Senate Committee on Small Business as a practical means of protecting the men's specialty stores, who are truly small business.

LOUIS ROTHSCHILD,
Executive Director.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *January 21, 1947.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are informed that there is some opposition in the Senate to the continuance of the Special Committee on Small Business. Speaking for wholesale lumber distributors throughout the Nation, we desire to unhesitatingly testify that had it not been for the help of the Small Business Committees of the Senate and the House, these small firms would have been entirely eliminated during the period of price control, as only through the intervention of the Small Business Committees were we given any consideration whatsoever by OPA. We know our voice is weak, but hope you will call attention to this unsolicited telegram to all Senators, especially those from the South, and say to them that their support of your resolution will be gratefully appreciated by many of their friends at home who consider the Small Business Committee their best avenue of approach concerning all matters of Government affecting their welfare. Your committee has served the small business firms faithfully and effectively without regard to party affiliations or personalities. Our earnest hope is that the continuing resolution will be passed.

SOUTHERN WHOLESALE LUMBER ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT F. DARRAH,
Secretary-Manager.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1947.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Having been informed that you have introduced Senate Resolution 20, to authorize the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee, we desire to advise you of our hope that this resolution will be acted upon favorably by the Senate.

It is our understanding that, although this committee is concerned chiefly with the problems of the relatively small business enterprises, which constitute a very large proportion of our association membership, the committee is not antagonistic to the interests of the larger operators.

We feel sure that under your able chairmanship this committee will be in a position to solve many of the problems of small businesses which might otherwise be neglected or ignored, and we wish to assure you that if the committee is continued the facilities of our association will always be available to you to assist you in any matters concerning our industry.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. FOREMAN,
Managing Director.

JANUARY 24, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Committee on Small Business Enterprises has rendered invaluable service to the American public and industry, including 20,000 retail neighborhood bakers. We hope the committee will be continued.

FRANK G. JUNGEWAELTER,
Executive Secretary,
Associated Retail Bakers of America.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
January 13, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Press announces you have introduced resolution to continue Senate Small Business Committee. We endorse your resolution, as we are particularly interested in Subcommittee on Mines and Minerals.

J. K. RICHARDSON,
Manager, Utah Mining Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 10, 1947.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Mining Association of the Southwest, representing mine owners and operators throughout Southwest, respectfully urges Senate Small Business Committee be continued. Likewise we urge the mining and mineral industry subcommittee be continued and its activities expanded. This subcommittee has been most important factor in assisting small domestic mining operations.

VICTOR J. HAYEK,
Secretary,
Mining Association of the Southwest.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 13, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are interested in the continuation of the Small Business Committee of the United States Senate and particularly the continuation of the Subcommittee on Mining and Mineral Industries. This recommendation is based on the constructive and material assistance given this company by these committees in consequence of which we were able to render outstanding service in the prosecution of our war effort by the production and supply of critical and strategic manganese. Furthermore since our plans are being formulated for the processing of low grade domestic manganese and chromium ores for the production of electrolytic manganese and electrolytic chromium. The assistance of this committee and its subcommittee will be of inestimable assistance in making these materials available not only to industry but also to our country in the event of another emergency arising.

A. C. BARKER,
President, Dominion Manganese Corp.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *January 14, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The heated debates and long delay in approving your Senate Resolution 20 by the Senate is causing great concern among small businessmen. Comments being received from different parts of the Nation wanting to know if Members of Congress running for public office meant what they said from the platform last November when they stressed the importance of taking action to protect and promote small business. Last month we sent out 109,000 ballots to Nation-wide membership on issue of continuing Special Small Business Committees in House and Senate. A tabulation of the vote shows 93 percent for, 4 percent against, and 3 percent no vote. We sincerely trust you will convey to every possible Member of Senate that unless all possible action in Congress is taken to promote small business welfare the Eightieth Congress might be the last Congress to vote upon this important American principle. Continued failure to promote small-business security can result in a socialistic government. Best regards and wishes.

C. W. HARDER,
President, National Federation of Small Business, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 23, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As is well known the trucking industry is almost wholly made up of small businesses with only a mere handful of companies of the tens of thousands within its ranks of such size that they might be classed above that scale. May we take this opportunity to congratulate you and to inform you of our full support of your resolution which would continue the Senate Small Business Committee, which has done so much for this industry and other small business enterprises in the past.

JOHN V. LAWRENCE,
Managing Director, American Trucking Associations, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Retail Coal Association which is the national organization of retail coal dealers, is desirous of seeing the Senate Small Business Committee continued, as we believe they have performed a very useful service.

J. L. NEWBOLD,
Executive Vice President, American Retail Coal Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Chaotic condition of the war surplus program is just one of the many reasons for the reinstatement of the Senate Small Business Committee. We as the National Trade Association representing many small distributors of construction machinery Nation-wide, urge your support when committee reinstated. Request that surplus be placed in top position for study and action.

ED P. PHILLIPS,
Chairman, Associated Equipment Distributors' Committee on Disposal of Government Surplus.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Twenty-five thousand retail building supply dealers represented by our association are vitally interested in the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee. This committee, above all others, is conscious of the problems confronting small industry during the reconversion period. Please do whatever you can to continue this committee at least for another year.

H. R. NORTHRUP,
Secretary-Manager, National Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

This association, speaking for most of the considerable members of manufacturers of coated and processed papers, which are primarily small companies, urge without reservation that Senate Small Business Committee be continued. The committee has been of very real service to those small business manufacturers in respect to their special industrial problems.

ARTHUR A. THOMAS,
Executive Director, Coated and Processed Paper Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 24, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:

Candy wholesalers of the country recognize and appreciate fine work of the Small Business Committee, and we strongly believe the public interest will be served by continuing it.

C. M. MCMILLAN,
Executive Secretary, National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:

This federation strongly in support of your proposal to continue Special Committee To Study Problems of Small Business. Economic background of our country point to need for continued protection of small business which had been recognized as backbone of a successful economy. Urge all possible effort be made to reestablish this important committee.

LEO F. GENTNER,
National Federation of Apparel Associations.

LINDEN, N. J., *January 24, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate:

Elimination of the Small Business Committee would be a great blow to small business. Where could we go to be heard? I urge you to continue this splendid committee.

A. E. SHILTON,
Vice President, Browning King Co.

GREENSBORO, N. C., *January 24, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

Service of Senate Small Business Committee in the past has demonstrated the urgent need for its continuance in the Eightieth Congress. In the interest of consumers and independent smaller enterprises urge your efforts to that end.

LEO J. HEER.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago, during the colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska and me, the Senator stated that there was no other way by which the work of the committee could be ex-

tended, than by creating an entirely new committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I said there was no other way, in my opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator to say that he had consulted the legislative draftsmen to determine whether any other way could be found than by the creation of an entirely new committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator, he said the only way it could be done, to give the Republicans a majority, was by creating an entirely new committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; the Senator did not catch correctly the import of my answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I probably misunderstood.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that the parliamentarian stated that the committee could be extended, but, if it were done, it would be mandatory upon the President pro tempore to name the personnel of the committee, remove surplus Democrats from the committee, and place two new Republicans on the committee. I said I thought that would be embarrassing, and that the majority should have something to say about that matter. I was informed as I recall—I know the Senator will not question my word—that the only other way to accomplish the purpose was by the creation of a new committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was only trying to ascertain what the motive was.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the only motive.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the committee was extended during the Seventy-eighth Congress the resolution previously adopted was amended so as to provide for an additional 5 members, making a total of 12.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The Democrats then had seven.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator desire to continue the members of the old committee as they now are?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that as I understand—I may be wrong—ordinarily a special committee is appointed by——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely asking the Senator a simple question.

Mr. WHERRY. I will explain. It is my understanding that ordinarily a special committee is appointed by the President pro tempore, but he does not select the chairman. When the 12 members are named, they themselves meet and organize the committee. That is my understanding, and it will be perfectly agreeable to me that the President pro tempore appoint any Senators he wants to appoint as members of the committee. If in his wisdom he feels that the old personnel did a good job and he wishes them to continue, that is perfectly agreeable to me. I have not consulted the President pro tempore, nor the majority leader, and it is perfectly agreeable to me for them to appoint anyone they wish to appoint from this side of the aisle or from the other side of the aisle. I am not asking for the appointment of anyone.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is aware of what happened 2 or 3 years ago, when a resolution was adopted extending the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. Then the same personnel continued to serve. If the same membership is now appointed, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is the senior member on the Republican side, would be chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator knows why that is. That is the result of the election in November. The Republican side now has the majority.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but I wish to give the Senator the privilege of doing the same thing as was done when the life of the other committee was extended. May I suggest that if the Senator desired to continue the same membership the committee now has, he could simply move to extend the present committee, and increase the number of Senators on it from 12 to 13. By so doing it would give the Republicans a majority.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the suggestion, but I think we are merely talking about a technicality.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is not a technicality.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my opinion that the distinguished President pro tempore will select the most able Senators he can for membership on the committee. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Nebraska will be perfectly satisfied with whomever the President pro tempore may select.

Mr. ELLENDER. My suspicion is that the Senator wants a new resolution adopted so that he can be chairman of the committee, and not permit the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is the ranking member, to be chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I knew the Senator from Louisiana would bring that out on the floor; I knew he would make that statement. He was not serious in the question he put to me at all. He wanted to bring out on the floor that I wish to be chairman of the committee. In the resolution I have presented I have not included such a suggestion. If I wanted to do so I would have incorporated in it a provision authorizing the President pro tempore to appoint the chairman of the committee and a vice chairman, as the President pro tempore did in connection with the Atomic Energy Committee. Such a provision was contained in the resolution dealing with that committee. I did not do so, however. I am perfectly frank when I say that no matter who is named to the committee I shall be perfectly satisfied. The President pro tempore can leave me off the committee and I shall be satisfied. I am interested in small business. I am not interested in personalities or in trying to get ahead, as the Senator from Louisiana has suggested.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but I think I have seen quite a few articles in the press in which such a suggestion is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; in Drew Pearson's column.

Mr. ELLENDER. And we can make a pretty good guess about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; Drew Pearson; Drew Pearson!

Mr. TOBEY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire is going to say something quite worth while, and we should have a greater attendance of Senators on the floor when he speaks.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as I turn and look around on this side I see Republican Senators present to the number of five or so. There are those few of the faithful. What I shall have to say might be useful; it might be stimulating to the minds of absent Senators; they might be interested; so let the quorum call proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall speak very frankly this afternoon, using language to convey thought and not to conceal it.

There is sometimes, and too often, a wide and deep abyss between partisanship and government. The motivations behind partisanship may at times be different from the motivations behind the struggle for good government. As a Senate we are engaged in transacting Government business. One or both of the parties, or a group in one party or another in the Senate, may at times be serving their own partisan purposes, in doing something for the sake of a partisan group, contrary to the requirements of good government.

The country has just witnessed an example of the difference between votes in the interests of clean government and votes to carry out the program of a special group.

In considering this question it is not so important whether a group which succeeds in serving its partisan or special purposes, rather than the purposes of government, succeeds by a big majority vote, or just barely noses through by one vote, and by refusing to provide a pair for a Member of the Senate, who has been called away by serious illness in his family.

In this instance it was so clear that the program before the Senate was in the service of a special group, rather than of the country as a whole, that utmost pressure and effort could get them victory by only a mere hair's breadth.

Today the country is faced with the spectacle of a second attempt to break down the efficiency statute.

I should like to show how such major steps for the defeat of good government bring with them many lesser, though important, other defeats for good government. The record of the past 3 weeks shows a whole series of inefficiencies in the operation of the affairs of the Senate, at the very beginning of the Eightieth Congress.

The Eightieth Congress opened for the conduct of public affairs under bright auspices. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 had finally gone into effect. It provided Congress with the mechanics for efficiency. It gave us, to use the language of my colleague [Mr. BRIDGES], the opportunity to operate on a streamlined basis. We opened for business with full power to transact the public business competently.

Our Eightieth Congress has so far been subjected to incompetent operations. This is so serious that I feel it my duty to present in detail the cumulative evidence of the incompetent administration of important business to date.

Competence in the conduct of Government business is the least that the public is entitled to get from us. It makes no difference whether a Government body is run on democratic principles, or is run by a boss. Both ways, the minimum required is competence. It is well known that even some of the big city bosses present in their defense, the claim that they provide competent administration of government for their cities. Even foreign dictators have resorted to this defense to show that at least they do something for the people they rule. So it was that Mussolini was widely advertised as the man who made trains run on time. But in our Senate, in the last 3 weeks, our leaders have been running the train off the rails.

The insistence in our country on competence in any work, public or private, is in the long standing tradition of our people. It has been handed down to us from the earliest days of colonization in America. The earliest colonists know that they had to build their houses solidly. They expected from the cabinet maker a solid and durable chair or other article of household furniture. They expected from the cobbler a first-rate job of leather. They knew that slap-dash work was no good.

I think the record will show that the Senate in the opening days of this Congress has already been subjected to slap-dash work.

Inefficiency in the Senate in the Eightieth Congress has not been due to any lack of ability in the leaders of the party which controls the Senate at the present time. On the contrary, the ability of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is such that he is renowned everywhere for talent, industry, and intelligence. The same may be said of others, who are taking part in conducting affairs on the majority side at the present time—the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

In others, who have participated in the making of plans and the taking of action on the particular subject matter to which I shall refer, one will find also outstanding ability—for example, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. The country is getting, from the leadership of the majority party in the Senate, ability that is as good as the country can expect.

The causes of the incompetence, as a careful perusal of the record will reveal to any reader, are due to something else. A group which starts on the wrong road will blunder and blunder and blunder.

That I shall develop in the course of this statement.

I shall take, as the example, that which was made the No. 1 business of the Senate by the leaders of the majority in the Senate. Turn to the calendar of business of the United States Senate, which is on the desk of every Member of this body. What do we find as the first order of business under general orders? We find that the first order of business is the consideration by the Senate of Senate Resolution 20, a resolution offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska to create a new special committee having to do with small business.

What did we find as the second order of business? It was the consideration by the Senate of Senate Resolution 46, the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Maine for the continuation of the War Investigating Committee.

It is particularly appropriate to consider the inefficiencies in the operation of Senate business in the last few weeks, in connection with this latter resolution, on which the Senate voted on Wednesday, January 22. That resolution provides for an investigation of certain things in the executive branch of the Government—inefficiency, incompetence, and mismanagement. At the same time that we are engaged in throwing a stone, no matter how deservedly, against inefficiencies and incompetence in the executive branch of the Government, we should not be placed in a senatorial glass house of senatorial inefficiency and incompetence.

I shall now compare the inefficient methods used in the last few weeks in handling this first business which came before the Senate in the present Congress, with the long-established and efficient methods which have been used by the Senate in the past. A study of the record will show that in the course of the current major efforts to break down the efficiency provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a number of older efficiencies which the Senate possessed, even before that statute was enacted, were thrown overboard.

A discussion of the conduct of business in the Senate is, to some extent, of a technical nature, just as would be the discussion of the conduct of business in the manufacture of automobiles. Nevertheless, every intelligent person understands how the assembly line in an automobile plant functions. If you told an intelligent person that the manager of an automobile factory, without providing a satisfactory substitute for the established assembly-line procedure, ordered his men to scrap two or three of the operations for the preparation of parts, until the entire automobile was assembled, it would be clear at once that inefficiency had been substituted for sound operation in the conduct of the business of that factory.

There is a certain order of business in handling resolutions in the Senate. It is long established. The steps which are involved are the introduction of a resolution, the referring of that resolution to the appropriate committee, the careful consideration by committees of the issues involved, and the holding, if necessary, of hearings on those issues, the vote of the committees on those resolutions, the filing of a report to the Senate which conveys to the Senate adequately the reasons for the report of the committees, and deliberations on the floor of the Senate and the final voting on those resolutions.

That is the established way of doing business on such matters in the Senate.

Unquestionably, improved methods of doing business can be developed and should then be used. But it is a very different thing to throw overboard the established methods of doing business in order to substitute a mere slap-dash method—one which has not been carefully thought through and one which is bound to result in confusion, delay, inefficiency, and waste.

That is exactly what took place in connection with the two resolutions which the Senate has been asked to consider as its first order of business.

In outlining the established steps in the handling of business on such matters, methods which have been tried for decades and have been found the best way of doing such legislative business, I do not mean to say that the members of the majority party may not hold their own caucuses for the purpose of considering what they should do in connection with legislative questions. But this is additional to the appropriate action by the Senate and the Senate committees. When we legislate by passing a resolution or a bill and when our committees consider and report bills or resolutions to the Senate, that is done not in the name of the majority party of the moment, but in the name of the entire committee and the entire Senate made up of both parties.

Now let us see how the No. 1 and No. 2 businesses which have been placed before the Senate have been handled.

I am going to take, by way of example, five of the inefficiencies which have marked our course this month.

I want to repeat that I am discussing the question, not of efficiency in a partisan operation, but efficiency in the conduct of the affairs of the Senate.

The first misstep was the deliberate bypassing of the standing committees to which should have been referred the resolutions for the creation or continuation of the special committees under

Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46. The resolutions were sent directly, not to the committees which have jurisidiction over the subject matter of the proposed investigation, but to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Even the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] acknowledged on the floor of the Senate in the debate on January 15 that another committee than the one to which his resolution was sent had the primary jurisdiction.

I should like to read a few words from the discussion on January 13 on the floor of the Senate between the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said:

I think I can show the Senate how the spirit of the Reorganization Act has been violated in this instance. Under the Rules of the Senate as they now exist, the creation of a special committee requires the submission of a resolution and the reference of the resolution to the committee of the Senate having jurisdiction of the subject matter. * * * In this instance, when the Brewster resoloution and the Wherry resolution were submitted they should have been referred to the proper standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matters.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in the course of his ensuing remarks, said:

If the Senator wants to say that we are violating the rules of the Senate, that is another question; and I am willing, when the resolution comes up, to postpone it so that the situation may be straightened out in that respect.

We all know that since there was a violation, not only of the established practices of the Senate, but of the requirements of efficiency in the conduct of Senate business, the restoration to efficiency which the senior Senator from Ohio offered to make, should then have been made. We all know that this was not done, but that instead the supporters of Senate Resolution 46 wanted no such interference with their group purposes.

On the floor of the Senate on January 22, the senior Senator from Ohio recognized that there had been inefficiency in this first piece of business to come before the Eightieth Congress. He gave notice that he intended to introduce a resolution which would require that the efficient method of doing business should be followed in the future. That method has been followed for so many years, that no resolution was needed to protect the efficient conduct of business in the Senate from those partisans who arranged in advance to bypass the proper standing committees, and to proceed by inefficient and wasteful methods.

As I read the statement and the proposed resolution of the senior Senator from Ohio, it is in the nature of putting the Senate on notice for the future that no Senator should try to induce the senior Senator from Ohio to permit the incompetence, the inefficiency, and the mismanagement which were part of the program of the persons seeking to assure for themselves the creation of special committees, before the Senate in the Eightieth Congress even had a chance to look around and to realize what was being attempted.

The second example of inefficiency introduced into the affairs of the Senate in connection with Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20 is related to the first. It has been part of the efficient handling of business in the Senate that, when a resolution for the creation or continuation of a special investigating committee is to come before the Senate for consideration, it shall first receive the views and recommendations of the standing committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter. As the senior Senator from Ohio said on January 13:

I think that any standing committee has a right to object to the creation of a special committee which will take jurisdiction from the standing committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the able Senator from New Hampshire that ordinarily if a resolution in the exact language of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska were submitted for appropriate reference, it would be referred by the Chair to a standing committee.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no doubt that it would go to a standing committee. Therefore, the resolution now before the Senate is only a subterfuge to take away from the Chair his right of correct reference. No other correct interpretation can be placed on the matter.

Mr. TOBEY. I so agree.

Mr. President, the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter knows a great deal more about it than does any other committee, and in particular it knows more about it than does the Committee on Rules and Administration, and therefore the committee which has jurisdiction is in a far better position to advise the Senate on the proper action which it should take with respect to the resolution.

There is another and even more potent reason for doing business in the long-established, efficient way. That relates to the subject of legislation.

Between investigation and legislation, there should be the least possible gap. Yet, when a special committee undertakes an investigation, there is a gap between its work and the subsequent work that will have to be done by the standing committee for the purpose of legislation. The special committee does not have the power to hold hearings on proposed or needed legislation, and, as the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said in the course of the debate on January 15, special committees are for that very reason weak.

When the Legislative Reorganization Act was under consideration in the Senate in June 1946, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] said:

I wished to refer to the question of special committees and the proper functions of our standing legislative committees. I think I am stating the fact accurately when I say that, in the case of most of our special committees, they have no legislative authority whatsoever, but are investigatory in character and in some instances are permitted to make recommendations, and that is all. That does not relieve the standing committees of the Senate of the obligation of study and of reaching conclusions. In a sense, it involves a duplication of effort.

In view of this circumstance, a standing committee which will have to legislate on the subject matter of the proposed investigation should consider how wide the gap is likely to be between the special committee's work and the standing committee's subsequent work, and whether the labor of bridging this gap will be great or small.

This fact is one which the Senate must have before it, in order to judge whether a special committee should be created or continued. Even if it were true, as argued by the supporters of Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46, that there were any advantages in permitting a special committee rather than a standing committee to investigate certain subjects under Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46, it was essential that the Senate should be able to ascertain, from the best qualified sources, whether there were any offsetting disadvantages, and the nature and seriousness of those offsetting disadvantages. Only the standing committee could really advise the Senate adequately on this point. Certainly the Committee on Rules has no qualification, for that purpose, at all comparable with the qualification of the standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proposed investigations.

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] stated on the floor of the Senate that he had dealt with the Committee on Armed Services. But most of his dealing, as became clear in the course of the debate, was only with the Republican members of that committee, and was obviously for purposes of making concessions, in order to get his resolution through the Senate, rather than for the purpose of getting the Committee on Armed Services to tell the Senate all the considerations which it should have in mind in its deliberations on Senate Resolution 46. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] amply developed this point in the course of the debate, with a clarity that made his statement wholly unanswerable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Hampshire has already passed the point about which I wished to inquire. He was referring to the exchange between the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Committee on Armed Services. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Hampshire is saying that a trade was made, a surrender of jurisdiction by the special committee, in order to obtain votes to continue it?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Mexico puts the matter rather baldly, but I think it is rather near a bull's-eye.

When, in the course of this negotiating process, part of the jurisdiction which the supporters of Senate Resolution 46 wanted to give to their special committee had to be thrown overboard, and only part was left in their hands, there was still the question of getting the views of

the best-qualified standing committee with respect to the subject matter that was still retained under Senate Resolution 46. To be sure the supporters of that resolution were very much in doubt whether they could get that resolution through the Senate, as indicated by the refusal to arrange a pair for a Member of the Senate who had been called away by illness in his family. At that stage the supporters of the resolution were in a position where they could not negotiate with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, because that would involve a surrender by the supporters of Senate Resolution 46 of the remainder of the jurisdiction which they sought to obtain for themselves.

In any event, negotiation for position, trading for jurisdictional power, bargaining for a piece of the jurisdiction which by statute has been assigned to a standing committee, is not the same thing as careful consideration by that committee of the merits and demerits of a resolution to assign jurisdiction to some special committee. The Senate is entitled to a careful report, from the standing committee, on the merits and demerits of the proposal for creation of a special committee. Instead, we witnessed simply a bargaining in the corridors and committee rooms and senatorial offices, and even that bargaining was conducted simply between majority party members of a special committee and majority party members of a standing committee. That does not permit of the type of consideration and reporting which one can expect to get from a committee, rather than from a partisan section of a committee that is not meeting in any respect as part of the Senate or as a Senate committee organization.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire prefer not to be interrupted by other Senators?

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to be fair to those who also wish to speak, and my remarks will consume some time. However, when I conclude, if the distinguished Senator from Maryland cares to ask questions, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I shall not interfere with the very cogent address of the Senator from New Hampshire, except to say, while I am on my feet—and what I shall now state is not what I wished to say when I rose in the first place—that in my opinion the overwhelming logic of his entire argument is absolutely devastating to anyone who would support a special committee, in the face of the facts which the Senator from New Hampshire has so well developed.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator.

I simply wish to rise to make a correction in regard to a statement of fact about which I think my brother Senators are inaccurate, though I certainly do not infer intentionally so. The inference has been drawn that there was an arrangement between the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Republican members of the Armed Services Committee. I am willing to say that at the first conference held between some members of the Armed Services Committee and the Senator from Maine, the chief purpose of the Republican members of the committee was to point out to the Senator from Maine that, as members of that committee, we did not look kindly upon an encroachment upon our power and jurisdiction, and we wished to know what limitations he was willing to place upon the purport and breadth of his investigation, if the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program were continued.

As a result of that conference, another conference was held, at which the Senator from Maine likewise was present, as were practically all the Republican members, and at least several of the Democratic members, of the Armed Services Committee. At that time the matter was most thoroughly and completely discussed, and an effort was made to arrive at some sort of limitation on the scope and breadth of the investigation which would be conducted by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. The matter was discussed openly, fairly, and fully, with both Democratic and Republican members of the Armed Services Committee present, in an effort to arrive at a conclusion limiting the scope of the investigation.

As a member of the committee, Mr. President—and other than the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I believe I am the only Republican member of the committee present in the Senate Chamber at this time—I have felt constrained to make this statement. It seems to me that the Committee on Armed Forces needs no defense, but I have wished to make this explanation in behalf of the committee, in order to detail what actually happened, according to the best of my recollection.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate will now proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement, which divides the time from now to 5 o'clock between the proponents and opponents of the pending resolution. The time for the proponents is under the control of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and for the opponents under the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire. How much time does he desire?

Mr. TOBEY. I should hesitate to say, not knowing what interruptions there will be, but I should like to make my address in continuity, in sequence.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the Senator 30 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. "The quality of mercy is not strained," I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. In the confusion I did not understand in whose time the Senator from New Hampshire is speaking.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is speaking in the time of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what I have to say will take me but a moment. I am very glad that my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has pointed out that when the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] met with the Armed Services Committee, he met with the full committee, at least all members of the committee who had opportunity to attend, and there were some Democratic members of the committee present.

I am glad that the Senator from Connecticut also pointed out that there was an earlier conference held by the Republican members of the Armed Services Committee. I am sure that no one would question that the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would have had greater difficulty in getting a majority vote for the adoption of his resolution had he not been willing to limit the jurisdiction of the committee so as not to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. I am convinced that he would have lost a sufficient number of Republican votes for his resolution if he had not made that arrangement.

The main point I desire to make on this subject is that I think that if such an arrangement was to be made in regard to one standing committee, it should have been made in regard to all standing committees. It is my position and one of my reasons for voting against the Brewster committee that if a fraud needs to be investigated, it should be investigated no matter where the fraud leads us. I think the arrangement made on the jurisdiction of the committee necessary in order to get votes to continue it was one good reason for voting against it.

I do think the Senator from Connecticut makes his point well when for the RECORD he makes the statement that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] met with the Armed Services Committee as a committee, and the Democrats as well as Republicans were present. However, the fact remains that most of the Democrats and a few of us on the Republican side did not approve of the principle inherent in the arrangement made for limiting the jurisdiction of the Brewster committee, which arrangement resulted in receiving a majority vote for the continuation of a special committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for the remainder of 30 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the third example which I shall present of the cutting of corners and resulting inefficiency relates to the unavoidable requirement that committees of the Senate shall do

their work thoroughly. This was true even before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The Legislative Reorganization Act sought to give greater opportunity for thorough work by the committees, which means thorough work by the Senators who serve on committees. The Reorganization Act provides that, with a very few exceptions, Senators should serve on only two standing committees.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is such a committee. Ten of its 13 members have only two committee assignments and the other three have three committee assignments each. So on this committee, under the terms of the Reorganization Act, the members had been so limited in their number of committee assignments that they would be sure to have time to consider carefully every important matter coming before that committee.

Yet, on the important question of two resolutions, each of which has a serious bearing on the operation of business in the Senate, on the work of other standing committees; and on the reform statute of 1946, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration did the very opposite of that which the Senate has a right to expect from every one of its committees.

The committee held no hearings. It had no knowledge of the views held by the standing committees in whose jurisdiction belongs the subject matter of the proposed special committee investigations. In fact, the Committee on Rules had no knowledge of whether the standing committees had considered the subject and had as yet arrived at any view on the subject.

The Committee on Rules and Administration gave no notice to the public that it was about to consider those resolutions and dispose of them immediately. No one of the large number of Members of Congress, and of the large number of experts who have made through studies of the subject of committee work in Congress, was called on to present views or was given an opportunity to indicate whether he would want to present views to the Committee on Rules.

What happened in the Committee on Rules was stated by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on the floor of the Senate on the following day, January 10, 1947, and no member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has challenged the accuracy of what he then said. He said that, first that committee in its meeting of January 9 disposed of considerable other business. I now quote from his statement to the Senate:

> Then, toward the close of the meeting, much to the surprise of some of us, action was taken on the two resolutions which have been reported by the Senator from Illinois to create special committees of the Senate. * * * Those of us who knew nothing about the resolutions and did not expect them to come up at the committee meeting requested they go over for a day of two—
>
> A reasonable request—
>
> so that we might give consideration to the major problem of whether or not the Senate should at this time attempt to wreck the system of jurisdiction that had been imposed upon its various standing committees.
>
> However, our request was very courteously but very firmly denied, and the majority of the committee decided to report the two resolutions immediately.

When a Senate committee refuses the request of the members of its own committee for time to consider a matter which they had not expected to come before the committee and refuses to do its job of thoroughly considering the merits of a resolution referred to it, there must be some especially and exigent reason for such a refusal. The need for speedy action must be imperative, because such a request of members of the committee is denied.

In fact, such was the confusion and mismanagement into which the supporters of the two resolutions were thrown by their attempt to substitute rush for efficiency that the Committee on Rules had almost an entire week in which it could have considered Senate Resolution 46, prior to the time when its supporters at long last wanted to have it even considered on the floor of the Senate, and at least 2 weeks before the supporters of Senate Resolution 20 had it up for debate.

Here is a lesson about cutting corners for partisan advantage. It introduces inefficiency, waste, and delay. We have proof positive in this instance that primrose paths are bad, not only for the conduct of Senate business, but also for those who would draw the Senate down such a path; the example that they have provided shows that they will trip themselves up.

They tried to rush Senate Resolution 46. They were stopped in their tracks by a revolt in their own party, a revolt against the attempt to steamroller one of the standing committees of the Senate. As a result, they conducted in the corridors and cloakrooms a substitute for business in committee and on the floor of the Senate. Meantime, they in effect were saying to the Senate, "Don't rush any consideration of our resolutions; we, the authors of these resolutions, are not ready; the Rules Committee was all wrong in thinking that it had no time to do its duty; the Rules Committee could have taken plenty of time; they could have done a good job rather than no job at all."

Negotiations in corridors and cloakrooms and elsewhere are permissible as an addition to the conduct of proper Senate committee business but not as a substitute.

I refer now to the record of our proceedings and its ample evidence of the unsuccessful attempt to rush the Senate, and the delays which the authors of the successful attempt to rush the Rules Committee thereby brought on themselves and on the Senate as a whole.

On the assumption that there was an emergency requiring the Rules Committee to throw overboard its duty of careful consideration of legislative proposals referred to it by the Senate, the time to begin debate in the Senate on the resolutions was at the earliest possible moment after the Rules Committee had reported those resolutions to the Senate. That debate could have begun on January 10, when the Rules Committee hurriedly reported Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46 to the Senate. To be sure, objection could have been made by any Member to the beginning of debate on these resolutions on January 10. But such objection could hardly have been expected from the group which had rushed the resolutions through the Rules Committee, without giving it a chance to create even a pretense of careful deliberation. Yet, the attempt to begin and expedite debate on that and succeeding days came from the opponents of the resolutions, and the supporters of the resolutions were the ones who delayed and procrastinated.

On January 10 various opponents of the resolutions tried to open and continue the debate. The debate would have continued except that the proponent of Senate Resolution 46, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and others of its supporters stood in the way.

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] several times intimated that debate was not appropriate on that day. Finally, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] made the point of order which brought the debate on the two resolutions to an end for that day.

It was expected by opponents of the resolution and by the entire public that the debate would begin immediately on Monday, January 13. In fact, on Friday, January 10, the junior Senator from Maine said:

> I anticipate that on Monday, when this matter will be in order for discussion, there will be ample opportunity for the discussion which its importance merits.

On January 13, I presented a full statement in opposition to the resolutions. This was followed by some desultory remarks, and then after referring to negotiations under way between the junior Senator from Maine and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made this significant remark:

> I trust that before the resolution comes before us there will be complete agreement.

Neither the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who introduced Senate Resolution 46, nor the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who introduced Senate Resolution 20, brought before the Senate on January 13 the resolutions they had respectively introduced. Neither of them, nor any supporter of either of these resolutions, asked that the debate begin on that day. They wanted to wait to have the subject come before us at some later date.

This brings me to the fourth example of the inefficiencies imposed on the conduct of Senate business, as a result of the attempt to cut corners in the effort to rush Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20 through the Senate.

The committee system, as well known and as detailed in the reports of the Reorganization Act, was set up to get as much as possible of the work of the Senate done before the entire membership is called in. This is a screening

process, using the time of a small number of men to do all that can be done before the attention and energies of the entire membership are required.

We all know that when bills or resolutions are reported out of committee to the Senate, they may still be subject to amendment, and there may still be conferences in order to reconcile differences of opinions. But so far as possible, the efficient conduct of the Senate demands that everything that can be ironed out in the course of committee hearings and committee deliberations should be ironed out in committee. Otherwise, we will convert the entire Senate into one large committee which must take over all the business of the standing committees, and turn them into mere figureheads. The Senate will be unable to conduct its business efficiently or even to conduct its business at all, if the consideration of the merits of the proposed legislation, the ascertainment of what amendments, if any, are desirable, and the screening of the subject matter, are all transferred from the period of committee consideration to the period after the proposed legislation has been reported.

That is exactly what happened with respect to the two resolutions.

On January 13, the Senate was informed by the senior Senator from Ohio that the matter was in process of negotiation. Thereafter, on January 15, the Senate witnessed a strange and unusual and, I may say, mortifying spectacle. On January 15 it became impossible to debate any resolution which could be relied on as the resolution which was going to be urged on the Senate by its supporters. Five different drafts of resolution, amendments, and substitute amendments, each to take the place of its predecessor, were rushed to the floor of the Senate on that day. The resolution which was to be debated was not introduced until the close of the day, and was not even read to the Senate. So that most Senators did not know until Thursday, January 16, what "final" draft of the resolution was to be actually considered and debated.

We found that the business of Congress, which could have been done in an orderly manner, where all the press could have been present to see and to hear, was being conducted, instead, in corridors by press interviews. We found that instead of enabling the Senate to receive the views of the standing committees and enabling the Committee on Rules and Administration to receive the views of the standing committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proposed investigations, those views were reaching the Senate, as well as its Committee on Rules and Administration, through articles in the press. Even then, the views of the standing committees which have jurisdiction in the matter, and which are entitled to be consulted, were not being obtained. All that we had were the views of a chairman of one of those committees, or some individual members of one of those committees, or some of the majority members of one of those committees. There was a running around in little caucuses and little gatherings. Here was confusion worse confounded. To be sure, a caucus of the majority members of one committee has a right to confer with a caucus of the majority of another, or with the author of a resolution, or with one or more of the leaders of the majority party. But that alone does not constitute the conduct of congressional business in a businesslike manner. This is topsy-turvy operation of the affairs of the Senate, with a vengeance.

One might be able to see some slight reason for disregarding the competent way of doing Senate business, if one could point to any satisfactory results. But all that one can point to is confusion, disagreement, dissension, and irregularity.

The Senate is a legislative chamber with a long history. The present standing committees of the Senate are consolidations of prior standing committees, also with a long history. We do not have to do what has been done on this No. 1 business of the Senate. We have been groping in the dark. We have been throwing overboard the established and successful ways of conducting the affairs of the Senate. We have been substituting slap-dash methods of conducting our legislative business.

I now present another example of the confusion, the inefficiency, and the explanations which do not explain, introduced into the proceedings of the Senate by the roundabout devices employed to achieve the undisclosed purposes for which the resolutions to create these special committees were introduced. I refer to the effect of all such inefficiency on the leadership of the Senate. They cannot admit that what is really involved is the creation of chairmanships for the faithful, and the indication to those who are not first in line that there may be more lollipops for others later. The consequence not alone on our present leadership, but on any leadership, is bound to be unfair to it, costly to its prestige as well as to the prestige of the Senate as a whole, and costly to the welfare of the country.

We should not conduct our deliberations and the business of the Senate on the basis of rewards to subleaders and to those whom it may be useful to draw into the fold of subleaders. We should proceed on the basis of logic and reasoning. When it comes to logic and reasoning, I yield to no man in my respect for the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has been acclaimed by many as the ablest intellect, not alone in the present Senate, but in this Chamber for many years past. I yield to no man in my admiration for the intellectual capacity of others of the leadership in this Senate. Yet they have been placed in the position, by some of the faithful, of defending an indefensible blow at the efficiency statute, struck by indefensible inefficiencies in the procedures used for that purpose. In short, they are in an indefensible position. I can illustrate this fact by examples drawn from the arguments made on the floor of the Senate by the mind acclaimed as the ablest in my party's leadership in the Senate. The senior Senator from Ohio told the Senate in the course of the debate on Senate Resolution 46 that he favors the principle of sending resolutions for special investigating committees to the standing committees which have jurisdiction of the subject matter—but. He said he does not like special committees—but. He said he voted for the Legislative Reorganization Act—but. I want to discuss some of those "buts."

He wants all the Senators to be put on notice, by a resolution he plans to introduce, that resolutions for special investigating committees must go not to the Rules Committee in the first instance but to the standing committee whose jurisdiction would be invaded by the proposed special committee investigation. He wants all the faithful to know, for the future, that they must not expect the kind of special dispensation and improper interference with efficient operations of the Senate that two of the faithful got as soon as the doors of the Eightieth Congress were open for business. It has not been the practice to grant such dispensations. Even in this, the Eightieth Congress, the general practice has been to refer resolutions for investigations to the standing committee having jurisdiction.

I have prepared a list of 14 resolutions introduced in the Senate up to the close of our proceedings on January 13, which demonstrate that even in this session in which irregular procedure on this point was attempted, the contrary, long-established rightful procedure has been generally followed. I ask that the list and other explanatory material on this point shall be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the foot of my remarks.

It has long been the practice to do exactly what the senior Senator from Ohio says shall be done in the future. Why not do it right now? On January 10 he said he would be glad to straighten out this irregularity, this impropriety, this violation of the efficiency requirements, when the resolution came before the Senate. I, therefore, ask him and the others in the leadership to send Senate Resolution 20 to the Committee on Banking and Currency now. As chairman of that committee, I promise them that I shall place this resolution as the first order of the committee's business. I shall ask the committee to give Senate Resolution 20 immediate, thorough, and careful consideration. I shall ask the committee to make a careful, thorough, and full report to the Senate with the utmost promptness compatible with the discharge of its duty to the country and to the Senate, the duty of careful deliberation and consideration.

Let me take up another one of the "buts" which stud the defense of the able and intellectually brilliant senior Senator from Ohio. He told us on January 13 that there is no violation of the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The purposes, the policy, and the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 are plain for every man to see. There are several aspects. One is the question whether there shall be a larger number of committees or a smaller number of committees. Every witness who discussed this phase of the matter urged that there should be a small number of committees. Every re-

port submitted to the Senate said that there should be a small number of committees. The statute itself specifies a small number of committees and names them.

Does the senior Senator from Ohio favor a smaller number of committees or a larger number of committees? That is a simple, plain, and clear issue on which Congress spoke in 1946, on which the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has taken a clear stand. Does the senior Senator from Ohio want to depart from this unmistakable policy adopted by the Senate in 1946?

Now, there is a second aspect of the policy, the purpose and the meaning of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The act was directed to the elimination of overlapping jurisdiction and duplication of the jurisdiction of the committees in the Senate. At that time there were a number of situations in which part of the jurisdiction of one committee was duplicated in another committee. That was one of the largest difficulties in the operations of the Senate. Against this, the press throughout the country, witnesses before the joint congressional committee, and the debates on the floor of the Senate directed vigorous criticism. It was one of the chief difficulties which the criticism and the legislation sought to eliminate.

Does the leadership of my party disagree with the spirit and purposes of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on this point? Either they do or they do not. If we do not, then they cannot justify resolutions to create committees which duplicate to any extent the jurisdiction of committees already in existence. That is exactly what Senate Resolution 46 and Senate Resolution 20 do—they would grant to a committee to be headed by the junior Senator from Maine and to a committee to be headed by the junior Senator from Nebraska jurisdiction which was last year placed by legislation in the jurisdiction of committees now in existence, committees for whose continuance or creation no further resolution is required at all. The two resolutions that were introduced sought to duplicate committee jurisdiction. Those resolutions set up, in effect, a conflict of jurisdiction between committees.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TOBEY. I should be delighted to yield, but my time is limited, and I am under pressure.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to make a brief observation, which I have wanted to make many times during the debate. There has been a great deal of criticism of Senators who speak of the "spirit of the law" as though there was no such thing as the spirit of the law. I desire to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that when he speaks of the spirit of the law he is standing upon solid ground and is supported by rulings which have been recognized by the courts and the leading jurists of this country and of all other English-speaking countries since the sixteenth century.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, "the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I may say that it has been almost the unanimous decision of the courts of last resort that if there is a conflict between the spirit and the letter of a law, the spirit of the law will prevail. The Senator need not apologize to anybody for the position which he takes.

Mr. TOBEY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. President, these are two specific aspects of the policy and purposes and meaning of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. On these two specific phases—the question whether there shall be a larger number of committees or a smaller number of committees, and the question as to whether there shall be duplicated, overlapping, and conflicting jurisdiction of committees in the Senate, the Senate should take a stand. Either we stand with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on those issues, or we take a stand against that act on those issues.

I come to the third of the "buts" which I have drawn as examples of the difficulty which one of the ablest minds in the history of the Senate experienced in defending the indefensible introduction of inefficiency into the affairs of the Senate. He now tells us that although he joined with the overwhelming majority of the Senate in voting last year for the reorganization bill, when it contained an express legislative condemnation of special committees, he cast his vote not for that provision, but only because there was much else of value in the bill. As far as I can remember, this is the first time that anyone has pronounced such a severe criticism of the senior Senator from Ohio. No one else has ever dared say that the senior Senator from Ohio would fail to point out on the floor of the Senate that legislation which he in general favored nevertheless contained a provision which he deemed bad. The debate in the Senate on the legislative reorganization bill ran for many days. The senior Senator from Ohio was there. He participated in the discussion and commended the legislation. Many other Senators proposed numerous amendments—for example, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was one of many who joined in supporting amendments. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] referred early in that debate to the subject of amendments. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked numerous questions about the section of the bill dealing with special committees. Throughout, if my friend, the senior Senator from Ohio, had any doubts about that provision in the bill, he did not give voice to those doubts, a reticence which no other person would have dared openly charge against the senior Senator from Ohio.

But not only he and the others now leading the Senate but any and every leadership would find themselves in difficulties in any attempt to defend these resolutions, Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46. Their position really comes down to this: they tell the Senate that they do not like to have the standing committees by-passed when such resolutions are referred from the Senate, but they ask that they be permitted to do this wrongful action just once more. They say that they do not like special committees, but they hope that they will be permitted to undermine the Reorganization Act just this one more time. They say that they do not like any of the inefficiencies which have marked the course of these two resolutions in the Senate this year, but they hope that the Senate will indulge them in this little peccadillo just once more.

With many more of the faithful hoping for similar treatment for themselves, it is going to be interesting to see whether the leaders can withstand the demands by some of their followers for more of the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I have been given this limited time, and I should like to finish my statement. I am endeavoring to develop a continuity of thought which I at least think is worth while.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure what the Senator has to say is very much worth while. The only reason I rose and asked the Senator to yield was that I wanted to read into the RECORD at that point something which the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said last year before the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which committee the Senator from New Hampshire was a member. It was during the debate on the resolution which was submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] asking for a considerable amount of money, which he did not receive because of the persistent opposition, primarily, from the Senator from Nebraska. This is what the Senator from Nebraska said:

Senator WHERRY. Just let me tell you, I supported the small-business appropriation because I felt that the showing was made that the Small Business Committee should continue as long as we have these Government agencies such as OPA and CPA.

Everyone knows they are now out the window for all intents and purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not going to inject myself into that.

Senator WHERRY. The same way with the O'Mahoney committee.

The CHAIRMAN—

And the chairman was the Senator from Illinois who is now addressing the Senate—

From the standpoint of permanency, the Small Business Committee could continue on forever, and probably do some good work.

Mr. WHERRY. I feel they ought to go on a permanent committee and not a special committee. The sooner you put them there, the more satisfactory it will be with me, if it is to be that long range.

I merely wanted to put that into the RECORD at this point to show the position

of the Senator from Nebraska last year when he was fighting practically all special committees and made the statement he did about the proposed continuation of the Small Business Committee. Mr. President, oh, how times have changed, one might say almost overnight, since the Republicans came into the majority.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

One impossible intellectual task has not yet been essayed by any of the Senate leaders, with the exception of the author of Senate Resolution 20. That resolution calls for the termination of the existing Small Business Committee and the establishment of a new small-business committee. Get that! According to the statements of the junior Senator from Nebraska in the Senate on January 13, 1947, when he was asked about this burial-and-birth procedure, the powers which his resolution would grant to the new special committee on small business are exactly the same as the powers of the existing special committee which he proposes to kill. Also, according to the answers given by the junior Senator from Nebraska, the committee he would create has exactly the same number of members as the committee his resolution would terminate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me? I will yield him additional time.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the remark the Senator has just made, I wonder what the explanation is of the fact that Senate Resolution 46 continued the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program as it was in the last session, which automatically made the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] the chairman because of his rank on that committee, while the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 20, terminates the resolution under which the Small Business Committee was set up, and creates a new committee, which automatically eliminates the ranking Republican, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], from the chairmanship of that committee altogether? Can the Senator explain why that inconsistency exists between the two resolutions?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I am coming to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I am sorry I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the answers given by the junior Senator from Nebraska indicate the reason for terminating the existing special committee and creating a new special committee in its place, then the very same reasons are applicable in equal measure to the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense. If the junior Senator from Nebraska is right in the unusual method he has proposed in his resolution, then the junior Senator from Maine was wrong in the kind of method that he proposed in his resolution. If the method used by the junior Senator from Nebraska was as necessary as he says it was, then the failure to use the same method in the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Maine is bound to get his special committee and the Senate into a mix-up, a jam.

On the floor of the Senate, there was some evidence that the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska had been prepared and rushed through with such speed that not even the present chairman of the existing special committee dealing with small business had been given an opportunity to acquaint himself adequately with the terms of that resolution. I submit that that is not the efficient way of carrying on legislative business.

The laudable purpose of aiding small business has been put forward as a screen behind which to carry out the less popular purpose of undermining the reforms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

I do not raise the question that persons whose statements confuse the issue in this way are aware that they are in fact promoting confusion, and have not thought the problem through with thoroughness.

Few, if any, people will disagree about the desirability of having an agency in the Senate that is concerned with the problems of small business and looking out for the interests of small business. Obviously, the best way to accomplish that result is by a permanent committee or subcommittee. Obviously, the thing to do is to have a subcommittee of a standing committee responsible for that work—responsible thoroughly, continuously, and constantly. If that is done, small business will not have to come to the Senate, hat in hand, every few months and have to ask for the creation or continuance of a small-business committee.

Let me say that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has already acted. On January 22, 1947, our committee, a standing committee, approved the formation of a subcommittee to deal with problems of small business, and I appointed a subcommittee of five. Three of those five Senators are now members of the existing special committee on small business. So, a majority of the subcommittee of this standing committee, appointed, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act and the jurisdiction it confers on the standing Committee on Banking and Currency, to deal with the problems of small business, are men who have been and are members of the present special committee on small business.

The real reason for now trying to create a special committee on this subject through Senate Resolution 20 has not yet been stated in the course of the debate. It is fair to ask what lies behind this strange way of doing business. It is not clear from the explanation given by the junior Senator from Nebraska. He talked about the necessity of doing in this manner what he is trying to accomplish, because of the fact that the representation on the committee must be changed.

But why is not the same thing true of the War Investigating Committee, where the resolution of the junior Senator from Maine does not propose to kill the existing committee and create a new one, but proposes to continue the existing committee.

This whole method of trying to pass a resolution with respect to small business has been wrapped around in mystery by the very terms of Senate Resolution 20, the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska. If there is a clear reason for trying to do business that way, it should be stated clearly on the floor of the Senate. When the senior Senator from New Mexico, in the course of the debate in the Senate on January 13, 1947, asked the senior Senator from Montana, outgoing chairman of the Small Business Committee, about this curious way of doing business through Senate Resolution 20, the junior Senator from Nebraska obviously thought that the senior Senator from Montana, despite his long service as chairman of the committee, might not be able to answer the question. No one can give the real answer, without giving the show away. The junior Senator from Nebraska interrupted and said that he wanted to explain what it was all about. But he failed to explain it.

I challenge any Senator in this Chamber to show any word, any phrase, any sentence, any paragraph, any column, or any page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which the reason for this manner of doing legislative business, as proposed in Senate Resolution 20, is stated clearly, plainly, directly, and forthrightly.

The members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration considered Senate Resolution 20, and a majority of them voted to report it favorably to the Senate. But they have given us no explanation in any report or in any statement on the floor of the Senate for the curious method of conducting legislative business, arranged like a jigsaw puzzle, in Senate Resolution 20. Perhaps the present chairman of that committee or some other member who voted for Senate Resolution 20 will solve for us the legislative puzzle which has been deposited in our midst by Senate Resolution 20, and which no man has yet told us that he deems himself capable of solving.

I ask once more for the reason for subjecting the Senate and its committees in the early days of this Congress to irregular and wasteful procedures in the conduct of Senate business with reference to the two resolutions. Surely we are entitled to some clear explanations on this head. Lacking that, let me give the real motivation behind it all, and that was to provide a committee chairmanship for the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Nebraska. That, Mr. President, is reducing it to the lowest terms. But it is not good enough. The price is too high.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired. The Chair does not see the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am authorized to yield an additional 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Only yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio told me that last November those Senators came before the steering committee and pleaded the cause of special committees, before the Eightieth Congress was born.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Not until I am through. I ask, why would they have come here and pleaded for the committees to be continued had they not known in their hearts that the terms and spirit of the Reorganization Act prohibited it? Surely we are entitled to some clear explanation under this head.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. When the Senator had the floor I courteously asked him to yield and he declined. I shall heap coals of fire on his head. I yield to him, provided he uses his own time.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I will resume my seat.

Mr. TOBEY. It makes a difference. The Senator is not a good trader.

In the case of Senate Resolution 20, the chairmanship is far removed from the aspirant to that office. He has to do more than get the Senate to vote for a special committee. He has to oust the present ranking Republican member of the present Small Business Committee from access to the chairmanship to which he would succeed if not ousted. So the present ranking Republican is steamrollered out of his position, to make room for the Senator whom the leaders favor.

The Senator who is to be steamrollered by Senate Resolution 20 introduced his own resolutions, to offset the threat to his position. But his resolutions have been filed away by the leadership in innocuous desuetude and remain, forgotten and unreported, while Senate Resolution 20 was hurried to the Senate from the Rules Committee so fast that no one had a chance to examine it in committee. Such procedure does not add to the prestige of the Senate or of the majority party.

One sometimes hears talk of party regularity. Regularity for what? To confer some benefit on the party in majority power? What benefit accrues to my party now in control of the Senate, from the creation of these special committees? The party will control all investigations, whether they are assigned to special committees or conducted by standing committees; the Republican Party has a majority in all the committees, standing, and special—if any special committees be created. So the party gains nothing from the creation or continuation of special committees. The only gain which accrues to anyone is to some individual who acquires a chairmanship, or to some other individual who gets a place on a special committee, conflicting thereby with some other Senator of his own party who has a place on a standing committee empowered by statute to investigate the selfsame subject.

So when there is talk of party regularity in these matters, it is not something for the good of the party in control, but for the gain of some individual. Many remarks about party regularity have been directed at me since my speech of January 13. There has been talk of party regularity requiring that Republican Senators shall remain silent about what is being done here. But that "regularity" is not something for the benefit of the Republican Party. Rather it is an attempt to use the party to advance the interests of a few individuals.

There has been talk that regularity requires that Republicans shall vote for these special committees. Again, this is something to help individuals at the expense of the party.

There has been talk that discussion of these issues hurts the party. No; the damage to the party is at the hands of those who seek to use it for their own advancement, through the acquisition of chairmanships and the like. The airing of these issues by Republicans is for the ultimate, long-term good of the party. The public realizes that there are in our party men who adhere to principle, however much true principle is shunted aside for the moment.

I appeal to my fellow Republicans in the Senate to follow their own convictions, to refuse to follow those who are using the party for their own advancement. I appeal to my fellow Republicans to place our party before the people in the light which properly belongs to our party, not in the shadow in which a few men arrange chairmanships and other perquisites.

Speaking of party regularity, I call attention to one circumstance which will greatly interest the State of Iowa. The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] stated in the course of the debate that in the Rules Committee, of which he is a member, he refrained from voting in favor of Senate Resolution 20. That resolution in effect shoves to one side the senior Senator who represents Iowa in the Senate [Mr. WILSON], and in effect says that he is not fit to be the chairman of a committee.

It will be interesting to see how members of my party vote on such an issue and why they think that the smearing in this matter of the senior Senator from Iowa and the great State of Iowa is consistent with party regularity.

The senior Senator from Iowa is a distinguished public servant who has been honored by the State of Iowa in a long series of public offices over a long period of time. He attended rural schools and high school in Iowa. He attended Grinnell College in Iowa and is a graduate of the Law School of the State University of Iowa. He served as county attorney in that State and as district judge in Iowa. He was elected and reelected and reelected to the State Senate in Iowa. He was Governor of the State of Iowa for 4 years. He was elected to the United States Senate by the great State of Iowa.

And now there is pending before the Senate a resolution which would pointedly remove him and discredit him—this man who has been so signally and so justly honored by his own State.

I turn now from this digression. I am almost through. I turn from the discussion of the subject of competence and efficiency in the operation of the affairs of the Senate.

I should like to discuss one other problem raised by the recent proceedings with respect to the two resolutions to create or continue the special committee. Earlier in the course of this statement, I referred to the importance of remembering that we are conducting the business of the Senate and Senate committees, and not merely of those members of the Senate and its committees who belong to the majority party.

I am a Republican, and I desire that my party shall be the majority voice in guiding the ship of state. But I do not wish its guidance to be in disregard of our form of government and of the principles vital to the preservation of our form of government. I would not see them harmed to the extent of one iota. I would not have our form of government subjected to a danger even as narrow as a hair.

Some of the committee and other proceedings with respect to the two resolutions, Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 46, have involved occasional lapses so that it would almost appear as if only the Republicans in the Senate have anything to do with the business of the Senate, and the Democrats might be brushed to one side. I have already referred to the fact that unnecessarily the minority members of the Committee on Rules and Administration were given no opportunity to have a genuine participation, on the basis of actual study of those resolutions, although they urgently requested that opportunity, which was their right.

Similarly, when the standing committees which had jurisdiction over the subject matter were bypassed, and thereafter negotiations were undertaken with the chairman, or several of the majority members of those standing committees, this was more than a neglect of the Democratic members of those committees. It was really a substitution of activities by Republicans alone, for activities which, under the Constitution as well as under the rules of the Senate, belong to the committees as a whole and not to any one party in them.

And when, after a while, negotiations began between the author of one of these resolutions and the chairman of one of the committees which was bypassed, this was no proper substitute for action of that committee as a whole.

I refer to this matter because of the danger such procedure may bring in its wake. If the majority in power in the Senate on more than one occasion refuses to give the minority members an opportunity for adequate participation or bypasses them altogether, the way is clear for some person or small group in the Senate, of the Republican or Democratic Party, whichever happens to be in power at the moment, to begin to neglect and bypass the members of their own party in the Senate who refuse to be yes men. And once that stage is reached, it would not be long before a ruling clique would begin to brush aside those members of their own party who have been willing to be yes men.

Mr. President, it is better to have these problems out in the open, where the entire public can know about them and express their views on them.

In conclusion, Mr. President, once we get off the hard surface of the right way to do legislative business, onto the soft shoulders, we may end in the mire.

There is just one way of clean government in this matter. Stand by both the letter and spirit of the epochal legislation, the Legislative Reorganization Act, the La Follette-Monroney Act. Let us give it a chance to prove its worth. Let us march with the American people, who from one end of the country to the other have approved this statute, and expect of us and demand of us that we keep the faith.

I submit an amendment to Senate Resolution 20, in the nature of a substitute for it, and I will ask the clerk at the conclusion of my remarks to read my amendment.

Two principal differences between Senate Resolution 20, offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska, and my substitute deserve mention.

My substitute would have the subject of inquiry of small business remain in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, where the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 placed jurisdiction over such subject matter. The junior Senator from Nebraska proposes the creation of a new special committee.

The second difference requires some discussion. The resolution offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska would give his new committee $50,000. My substitute amendment does not call for any appropriation at all at the present moment.

There are two serious objections to the $50,000 provision in the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska. I speak on these points, out of the experience which I had as the ranking Republican member on the standing Committee on Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. My fellow Republicans on that committee were the junior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Nebraska. I am troubled that they should have taken the action they did with respect to Senate Resolution 20, one as its proposer and the other as the chairman of the Rules Committee, in approving the $50,000 request in the face of the ample experience we three received on the Audit and Control Committee.

It was the practice of the Audit and Control Committee to examine requests of investigating committees for funds. We found that the old practice permitted scandalous use and waste of funds and that the old practice in and of itself amounted almost to a scandal. Under the old practice, an investigating committee would ask for $5,000, or $10,000, or $25,000, or $50,000 without making any disclosure such as is necessary in the proper conduct of public affairs and in the grant of public funds. We realized in the Audit and Control Committee that it was imperative, for the protection of the public purse, that any investigating committee which asked for money should give to our committee and to the Senate, and thus to the American taxpayers, a full and detailed statement of why the money was needed, how it was going to use the money required, the salaries involved, the number of days or months to be devoted to the work, the specific subjects of inquiry, and full details justifying every penny of the proposed expenditure.

Under the old, scandalous practice money was granted to investigating committees as the result of a deal, or a trade consummated in the cloakroom, or any back room. That method of doing business made for patronage, not for economy or efficiency.

Our Audit and Control Committee, on which, as I said before, the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Illinois were my colleagues on the Republican side, made great forward steps toward stamping out this practice and to substitute sound methods for the protection of Government money. We began to require full details from all investigating committees before they got their money, as well as after they got their money. Our progress was substantial, although the reform on which we were engaged had not been completed at the time when that committee came to an end, and the present Senate Committee on Rules and Administration took over these functions.

I am appalled to observe that the first action of the Committee on Rules and Administration constitutes a return to the old practice. If the junior Senator from Nebraska has any detailed information, such as should be supplied, let him produce it on the floor of the Senate. Certainly the present Committee on Rules and Administration under the chairmanship of my former colleague [Mr. BROOKS] in safeguarding the funds of the Senate demanded no such details from the junior Senator from Nebraska, and received no such full explanation and justification as we would have required last year and in prior years from any investigating committee that asked for $50,000, or even $5,000.

The second reason for my omission, in my substitute proposal, of any request for funds at this moment, and for my criticism of the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska for $50,000, arises out of a well-known fact about investigations. Those investigations which have continued for some years have collected a large body of data and documents, not yet introduced in hearings. For example, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] told us that his committee has 90 percent of its data. We have learned that at such a stage, it is practicable to analyze and put those documents in their logical order, and publish them without the necessity of formal hearings. Persons affected by the documents which are thus to be published are given full opportunity to offer any supplementary data they deem appropriate, and this also is included in the volumes published by the investigating committee. In this manner, the total cost to the Senate is reduced to $5,000 or less, as against the $50,000 or ultimate expenditure of $100,000 necessitated by public hearings of the ordinary kind and by trips or junkets for any hearings conducted outside of Washington. For the spread or difference in expenditure of public funds, of anywhere from $45,000 to $95,000, the public gets no gain; only a committee chairman or others get the publicity which helps them personally, and the patronage involved in keeping people on the pay roll of the investigating committee.

Why did not the junior Senator from Nebraska ask for $5,000 at this time? If his committee is created, and needs more money, they can get it. I want to see our investigations conducted effectively and thoroughly, and provided with all the funds they need for that purpose, but not to help someone's publicity and patronage needs.

At this time, as many of us know, some of the regular Senate employees, including some of the ablest, are being subjected to a pinchpenny policy. While this is being done to the regulars, are we to let special committees bring in irregulars and pay them as those committees, or more often their chairmen, may desire?

We require every department in the executive branch of the Government, every bureau, every division, every section, every smallest unit, to justify to our appropriation committees every bit of their proposed expenditure, with the most detailed agenda, budget, and details of every description. Can we do that successfully, and at the same time throw all such safeguards of the public purse out of the window when we give funds to a Senator or a few Senators to spend as they will?

If a small business tried to run its affairs on such a basis it would land in the bankruptcy court. So would a big corporation.

We have been crying economy, we have said we are an economy-minded Congress. While we distract the multitude with our breast beating and our speeches for economy, we are asked to take, as our first step, the road of lush and luxurious and unbudgeted and unscrutinized grants of large sums to some favored committee chairmen. We can spend every cent needed for a study of small-business problems, we can spend every cent needed for any and every worthy investigation, without profligacy and without those reckless methods which result in profligacy. Are we ushering in the era of economy, or a period when anything goes?

I shall ask that the material I mentioned earlier be appended at the close of my remarks, and that my amendment be read by the clerk. I have prepared numerous copies of my amendment, so that Senators may have copies before them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 1 and 2, on page 1, and the first two words of line 3, on page 1, and substitute therefor the words "*Resolved*, That the Banking and Currency Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof."; strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive, on page 2; strike out the digit "3", in line 17, on page 2, and substituting the digit "2"; and strike out the last three words in line 19, on page 2, and substituting the words "shall give all its data and information to the Banking and Currency Committee", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Banking and Currency Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of

research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, shall give all its data and information to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that his time has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will give the Senator 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire proceeds, will he yield for one question?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire in whose time is the Senator speaking?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] sufficient time to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I not have a right to ask in whose time a Senator is speaking, when the time has been allotted?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Nebraska will not be charged with any time he does not yield to another Senator; so he need not worry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made perfectly clear that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to study the problems of small business.

Mr. TOBEY. The statement of the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event the Senate should adopt the pending resolution, there will be a special committee studying small business problems, and a subcommittee of a standing committee studying the same problems. In other words, we shall have the very duplication of effort and overlapping of jurisdiction that caused the passage of the Reorganization Act. That was one of the major factors in bringing about this congressional reform.

Mr. TOBEY. And by that action we make a mockery of the Reorganization Act. I should like to say that on the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee are the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] Three of them, or a majority, are already members of the Small Business Committee.

My amendment asks that the files and data be returned to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the supplementary material referred to a few moments ago by the Senator from New Hampshire will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Resolutions for investigation in 80th Cong. to close of session Jan. 13, 1947

Name of Senator	Number of resolution	Subject matter of investigation	Name of standing committee to which resolution was referred
Senator Downey (for himself and Senator Knowland).	21	Water resources	Public Lands.
Senator McKellar	26	Nashville newspaper acquisition	Judiciary.
Senator Lucas	29	Labor relations	Labor and Public Welfare.
Senator Morse (for himself and Senator Young).	34	Courts martial	Judiciary.
Senator Kilgore	38	Military discipline and justice	Armed Services.
Senator Morse (for himself and Senator Brewster).	40	Petroleum resources	Public Lands.
Senator Langer	41	Number of Federal employees	Civil Service.
Do	42	Cafeteria operations in Government buildings.	Do.
Do	43	Classification of mailable matter	Do.
Senator Revercomb	44	Adequacy of coal car supply	Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Senator Reed	47	Adequacy of boxcar supply	Do.
Senator Baldwin	51	Sources of sugar supply	Finance.
Senator Morse (for himself and Senator Young).	56	Investigation of courts martial	Armed Services.
Senator Robertson o Wyoming	53	Resolution to continue investigation of wool production, etc., by a special committee, and to obtain additional appropriation.	Rules and Administration.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the investigating committee involved in some of these resolutions was a special committee. Nevertheless in all but one case the resolutions were referred to standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the investigation, rather than in the first instance to the standing Committee on Rules and Administration.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], when he introduced Senate Resolution 34, proposed the creation of a special committee. But on January 13 he stated specifically that he desired to substitute a resolution for the purpose of requiring that the investigation he proposed should be conducted not by a special committee but by the standing committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over the subject matter under the rules of the Senate. I might add, incidentally, that the exposition he gave of the reasons for avoiding the creation of special committees cannot be surpassed for lucidity.

After Senate Resolution 20, dealing with the investigation of small business, had been introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska and had been, at his request, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] introduced two resolutions on the selfsame subject. The adoption of either resolution would have automatically ruled out the adoption of the resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska. Since he had already conferred jurisdiction over his resolution on the Committee on Rules and Administration, the competing resolutions introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa were also sent to that committee. But that committee reported out only the resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska and took no action on either of the resolutions on the same subject introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa. I might add that both Senators are members of the existing special committee on small business problems.

Two resolutions which do not call for investigations by any committee of the Senate have thus far been introduced and have been referred to the standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter rather than to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I present the facts on these two resolutions:

Name of Senator	Number of resolution	Subject matter of investigation	Name of standing committee to which resolution was referred
Senator Hawkes	28	Purchase of military installations	Armed Services.
Senator Wiley	36	International agreements	Foreign Relations.

The appropriate cases in which resolutions are referred, directly after their introduction, to the standing committee on Rules and Administration are illustrated in the transactions of the Senate to date.

Resolutions for amendment of the rules of the Senate are, of course, sent to that standing committee. Twelve such resolutions have been introduced up to the close of the session of January 13 and all were referred to that committee—Nos. 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 39, 45, 49, 50, 54, 55, and 57.

In addition, resolutions calling for the payment of money for the expenses of Senate committees attending the funerals of former Members of the Senate and for the payment of compensation to employees or their representatives were referred to the Committee on Rules and

Administration. In this aspect of the work it is the successor to the jurisdiction of the former Audit and Control Committee. Four resolutions of this nature were introduced in the Senate up to the close of the session of January 13 and were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration—Nos. 22, 27, 37, and 48.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate at this time if the Senator from Nebraska has in mind a Senator on his side who would like to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In whose time is the Senator speaking?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I wish to extend every proper courtesy. Inasmuch as the Senator from New Mexico is on his feet and had addressed the Chair, I am glad to have him proceed and to use his time now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire how the time stands at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has 42 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has 90 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, unless the Senator from New Mexico wishes to proceed at this time, I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska use some of his time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall reserve my time until later. I wish to show every courtesy to the Senator from New Mexico, who already has addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska desire to use some of his time now?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I shall reserve my time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from New Mexico has now taken his seat. So I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska use some of his time now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that no Senator now asks me to yield time to him, I shall reserve my time until later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which side shall the time required by the quorum call be charged?

Mr. LUCAS. If the Chair rules as did the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the other day, the time required by the quorum call will be charged equally to the two sides. That very question arose the other day at the hour of 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, half of the time required for the quorum call will be charged to each of the two sides; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Buck	Cooper
Baldwin	Bushfield	Cordon
Ball	Butler	Donnell
Barkley	Cain	Downey
Brewster	Capehart	Dworshak
Bricker	Capper	Eastland
Bridges	Chavez	Ecton
Brooks	Connally	Ellender
Ferguson	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Flanders	McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Saltonstall
Green	McGrath	Smith
Gurney	McKellar	Sparkman
Hatch	McMahon	Stewart
Hawkes	Magnuson	Taylor
Hayden	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Hickenlooper	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Maybank	Thye
Hoey	Millikin	Tobey
Holland	Moore	Tydings
Ives	Morse	Umstead
Jenner	Murray	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	Wherry
Kem	O'Daniel	White
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Langer	Pepper	Williams
Lodge	Reed	Young
Lucas	Revercomb	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as a rule I do not like to indulge in what might be termed a post mortem. Day before yesterday the Senate voted to continue the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. During the course of the debate many things were said about that committee, and many things were said about Senators who had no knowledge or information about the committee, its origin or its work. Now today, at the beginning of the discussion of the pending resolution, which is akin to the one the Senate adopted day before yesterday, I wish to refer to the origin and history of the so-called Truman committee. It has been referred to in the Senate as an investigating committee as though it had been designed and created to inquire into fraud and corruption in war contracts.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Truman committee. For 4 years I served with the distinguished Senator who was the first chairman of that committee, the man who is now President of the United States. My service did not begin immediately with the organization of the committee, but it did begin within a month or so afterward.

It has been said the committee was organized during the war. That, Mr. President, is not accurate. I may say in passing that our former colleague, the then Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman, long before the war, many months before Pearl Harbor, realized that danger was approaching and that the war which was raging abroad would without question involve this country, and, being a man of military experience, having served as captain of artillery in the First World War, Senator Truman wanted to serve his country. It is a matter of common knowledge that he offered his services for active duty to General Marshall, and that General Marshall, diplomat that he was, and is, declined the offer, saying that Senator Truman could better serve his country in the Senate. Senator Truman laughingly said that General Marshall was most kind. The truth of the matter was that Senator Truman was too old to serve as an active officer in the war, and for that reason his services were declined.

Being a man of determination, of altogether patriotic design and motive, Senator Truman studied and thought as to how he could best serve his country. He came to the conclusion that there was a necessity for a Senate committee to be constituted to serve in the national defense. I emphasize the words "the national defense," because that was the name of the committee and service in the national defense was its purpose.

It may be asked why Senator Truman did not seek to have the Committee on Military Affairs conduct the study and research and undertake the work which his special committee was authorized to cover. I think I may say I had the confidence of Senator Truman, and that I can answer that question accurately, because we discussed it many times.

At the time Senator Truman offered his resolution, the Reorganization Act had not been passed. Jurisdictions of standing committees had not been defined, standing committees had not been consolidated, and Senator Truman knew that if the Committee on Military Affairs attempted the investigation and the work, there would be conflict with the Committee on Naval Affairs. So he conceived the idea of a special committee, with jurisdiction authorized by the Senate, to investigate into, and to strengthen, if you please, the war effort.

Mr. President, that was the purpose of the Truman committee, and that was the reason why it was authorized. I regretted to see the incoming chairman of the committee surrender and throw away, as he did, the main purpose of the Committee on the National Defense. I make no charge, but it is perfectly obvious that the amendment limiting the jurisdiction of the special committee to expenditures was offered in order to obtain the necessary votes to continue the special committee. In my opinion, those who advocated this change went too far. I believe the surrender was too great. I think they gave away jurisdiction which the special committee should have if it is to function as a true investigating committee.

Let me give one instance in point. Members of the committee, I am sure, will bear me out in the statement I am about to make. When I was a member I insisted that the special committee devote a great deal of its time and a great deal of its talent to investigating the disposal of surplus property which arose from the war effort. That is an essential part of the committee's activities if it is to be continued. Yet under the limitation of authority which has now been imposed on it, I do not think the committee can do that work. It is not involved in a question of expenditure at all, and the proponents of a continuation of the committee have surrendered one of the most valuable functions and parts of their jurisdiction.

Mr. President, the Senate has already acted on and adopted the resolution; it

has already authorized the continuation of the special committee. I think its jurisdiction should be sufficiently broad and sufficiently strong to enable it to do good work. So if the Senators on the committee will study their resolution, and the limitation which they themselves proposed, and come here and say, "We gave away too much jurisdiction"—as they did, if they are to do good work—"and we want to broaden our jurisdiction at least so as to take in the question of surplus property," I shall vote for such an extension of authority, because if the Senate is to have a special committee, the special committee should be a good committee, it should be a strong committee, and it should not be hampered or hindered by restrictions upon its jurisdiction.

So I suggest to the members of the majority party that they come forward and frankly say, "We went too far; we gave away too much jurisdiction. We would like to have our jurisdiction extended." If they will do that, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to surplus property. Was he referring to the investigation of the disposition of surplus property?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. If he was, I should like to advise him, as well as the Senate, that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has already made arrangements, under the authority granted it by the law, to make a comprehensive investigation of the disposal of surplus property, and the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is the chairman of the group which will make the investigation.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator. I am very happy to have that information from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but that is merely one more example of what is taking place in the Senate now in violation of the Reorganization Act. I do not think the Committee on Expenditures has jurisdiction of the subject we have been discussing, but it is immaterial whether it has or not. I know the special committee will very likely go into that subject, and, as was pointed out awhile ago, we are going to have two or three committees investigating the same subject, going over the same matter. That is what I meant when I said it was in violation of the spirit and intent and object of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator, although I am speaking under a limitation of time.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is vested with the authority to do this work under the law, and there will be no need whatsoever for any other committee to undertake to duplicate the work which our committee is going to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for merely one remark?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to advise the Senator that it is the purpose of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to cooperate with the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, so there will not be a duplication, but the work will be done jointly, as if by one committee.

Mr. HATCH. As I have said, Mr. President, I do not desire to argue matters of that kind. The inadvisability of designating special committees has already developed. There is no question about what was intended by the Legislative Reorganization Act. That has been debated so long and so effectively that it is hardly necessary to renew the old arguments. But as a lawyer and as one who has made some study of and research into the terms of the Reorganization Act and into the general law covering the subject, I should like to have the opportunity of standing before a court, arguing the intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act, and obtaining an unbiased and unprejudiced opinion from men trained in the law, whether or not special committees are authorized or intended by that act. I should welcome such an opportunity.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, Senators speak glibly—and I use that term inoffensively—as though no Reorganization Act had been passed. They do not realize that a complete revolution has occurred in the rules of the Senate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the steering committee, argued that it had been the custom in the past to set up special committees, and he enumerated as, I recall, about four. Of course that had been the custom. Of course it had been done. Of course the Democrats had done it during the time they were in power; but those were the very evils at which the Reorganization Act was directed. Can there be any doubt about that, Mr. President? Any person who reads the debates that took place, who reads the reports of the committees, who reads the newspapers, knows that that was what was intended.

The committee work of the Senate has been so heavy throughout the years that, under the old rules and the old practice, none of us could properly discharge our duties on all the committees to which we had been assigned. It was to get away from that evil, to get away from that very condition, that the law was passed and the limitation provided that no Senator should serve on more than two committees, with the exception of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, whose members might serve on three committees.

One may argue until he is black in the face that it was not intended to do away with special committees, but nevertheless reason and intelligence and knowledge of the conditions that existed all must lead to the conviction that it was the intention that Senators should serve upon two committees only. Whether they be standing committees or whether they be special committees the result is the same. If a Senator served on two standing committees and on five special committees—which I understand is contemplated—there would recur the same old evil which resulted from the former practice, and nothing would have been accomplished through the passage of the Reorganization Act except to increase the salaries of the Senators themselves and to create for themselves a retirement fund.

Perhaps, Mr. President, those are harsh words. They are plain words, and I speak what I believe to be the absolute truth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield further time to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I could not finish what I might say on this subject in 5 minutes or 50 minutes. I think probably I should now conclude my remarks and let some other Senator take the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I respectfully submit to the Senator from Nebraska, inasmuch as he has an hour and a half and I have, I think, about 22 minutes only, that he use some of his remaining time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] would now like to take 10 minutes of the time allotted to this side, if that is agreeable.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is very agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska yields 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall consume 10 minutes, but I have some very definite views on the pending resolution. Reference has been made to the activity of the Republican steering committee and what happened there, and likewise to the impropriety, as alleged, of submitting and urging the adoption of this resolution, because of the Congressional Reorganization Act.

I wish to assume my full share of responsibility in both instances. I was on the committee that helped draft the Reorganization Act, and I am a member of the Republican steering committee. I was glad to be recorded as being in favor of continuation of the Small Business Committee. That committee was brought into being as a result of the war. It was established as a result of the necessities of war channeling into big business the greatest opportunity to control the industry of this Nation that has ever occurred within my entire lifetime.

When I hear the Democrats on the other side, or Republicans on this side, complaining because Republicans wish to continue the Small Business Committee, I desire to remind every Member of the Senate that ever since 1932 I have heard the deluge of propaganda that came like the rain, year in and year out, charging that the Republican Party represented only big business. We were charged constantly with representing the "upper 10 percent." There was a theme that was followed in the press, on the platform, on the radio—everywhere—that the Republican Party represented the "upper 10 percent," the "well-entrenched minority," "the earls of privilege," "the barons of finance," the "60 families," the "200 corporations." Now, when the Republican Party, and I as a member of the steering committee, taking my share of the responsibility, wish to continue the fine activity of the Small Business Committee, it is amazing to see those on the other side solidly desiring to stop us from representing and giving small business its ample opportunity to have a forum where it and the myriad businessmen who conduct it may come to present their cause.

Why should there be a special committee for that purpose? I would state this as my reason—that during the war it was the big corporations that the Government supported. The Government gave to big corporations any number of millions of dollars to increase their plants. The Government constructed their buildings; it supplied their machinery; everything was channeled through the big corporations of the country to speed war production. Who got hurt? It was the little corporation, the small business, bound up in edicts, and directives, and regulations, and restrictions, and restraints, and rationings. Through the channeling of available material small business was tangled and strangled. Then the small corporations, the small businesses of the Nation, said, "Give us a voice. Give us a forum where we may be heard."

No standing committee could have represented or could have heard their cause. We set up, under the then majority leadership, when the Democratic Party was in the majority, this special committee. We supported the Special Small Business Committee, so that the small companies could come to the Nation's capital and not be forced to appeal to individual Senators or to the limited jurisdiction of any one committee, but could go to a committee set up for their protection, where they might present their cause. So long as the administration hangs on to the wartime regulations and restrictions, and so long as there are the bureaus still issuing their edicts and their restraining orders, it would be better to keep this committee alive, if we are going to keep small business alive in America.

That is my reason for wanting this special committee to continue. I do not want it to continue forever, but I believe it should continue until we change the bureaucratic policy of retaining war controls on small business in America. No standing committee can hear all the complaints that small business may have to make, but the special committee has done an excellent job. That was while the majority of the committee represented the other side of the Chamber. I say that now is the time for the Republican Party to represent the small business of the Nation. It ill befits the party which has condemned the Republican Party all these years for representing what they call property rights instead of human rights, big business instead of small business, now in effect to say, "No, we do not want to let you Republicans go forward with this work and represent little business, to erect a forum where the little businessmen of America may present their case."

When the vote is cast today we will ascertain who stands for the survival of that life blood of America—small business. Small business cannot have the benefit of machines and buildings we paid for with Government money. Small business is not large enough to buy them.

In the last 15 years, under the Democratic regime, industry has become more concentrated and powerful than at any other time in the history of America. I for one, Mr. President, want to assume my full responsibility as a member of the Republican Party, as a member of the steering committee, and as a member of the committee which drafted the Reorganization Act. I hope the special committee shall be permitted to live and to function.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has 19 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had 42 minutes a while ago and yielded 20. What has become of the other 3 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were used for the calling of the roll to establish a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was the calling of the roll for a quorum taken out of my time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That time was divided half and half.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not complaining. I may not even use the 19 minutes I have.

It is interesting to observe the reason given by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] for his enthusiasm for the continuance of this committee—not the continuance of the committee by the way, but for the creation of a new committee. I do not know whether his enthusiastic advocacy of this particular resolution will absolve him or his associates from any responsibility for heretofore being too friendly to big business. I am not concerned about that. If it does, well and good. But I have not yet had a sufficient answer to satisfy me as to why the two resolutions which have caused so much controversy in the Senate during the last 2 weeks were not based upon the same idea. Those of us on this side of the Chamber, and on the other side also, who have opposed these resolutions, as I have undertaken to point out heretofore, have not done so on account of any fear or any desire, ulterior or otherwise, to conceal something from anybody.

I do not wish to indulge in any partisan references, but constantly the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who seems to be entering a beauty contest of some kind, judging from the reports in the newspapers the last day or two, as between Republican pulchritude and Democratic lack of it, have constantly intimated that there is something ulterior in our attitude on this side of the aisle in regard to these resolutions. I do not think it can be correctly stated that the party which had the majority in the Senate for so long, and which initiated and inaugurated all these committees and all these investigations, the result of which is well known, has now suddenly been overcome with fear and trepidation lest something may be revealed.

In Senate Resolution 46 the Republican majority continued the existing Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. They did not create a new committee. They did not fire the old committee, as they are doing in this resolution with respect to the old Small Business Committee. They extended its power and thereby automatically provided that the chairmanship of that committee should go to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

If the Republican majority had done the same thing with respect to Senate Resolution 20 and had continued the Small Business Committee, automatically the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] would have become the chairman of that committee. But in order to get around that, in order to sidetrack him, in order to shelve him as the chairman of the committee, which he would have become if it had been continued, they propose to abolish that committee and create a new one with the understanding that the author of the resolution will be the chairman of the committee. The usual custom followed here is that when a committee is created the author of the resolution creating it is made the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, probably it is regarded as none of my business as to who should be chairman of the committees of the Senate when the majority on the other side will determine that matter. I am not mentioning it in order that I may have any influence or any control over that matter, because I have no such intention or purpose; but there is not a finer type of gentleman in the Senate of the United States than the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. Why should he have been sidetracked? Why should this legislative legerdemain, to use no worse term, have been indulged in in order to get rid of him as the automatic chairman? It may be a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the present Republican majority, but nevertheless it is a matter of some curiosity to me. If there is any other reason why the existing Small Business Committee should not have been continued, I have not heard it. I doubt whether we will. So much for that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. HATCH. I have heard it rumored that there were too many Democrats on the Small Business Committee as now constituted; that the Republicans would

not have had a majority, and, therefore, in order to get rid of the Democrats on the committee it was necessary to create a new committee. That is mere rumor and gossip. I do not know whether it is true. I am authorized, however, by at least two or three Democratic members of the Small Business Committee to say that they would have been perfectly willing to have resigned so as to have given the Republican Party its necessary majority on that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the absence of any satisfactory explanation for the different treatment of this committee from that of the other, the reason offered by the Senator from New Mexico is as logical as any other that has been given or probably that could be given. So much, Mr. President, for that.

The Senator from Nebraska has offered an amendment to his resolution modifying it by limiting the committee in time to 240 days as I recall. I suppose he was attempting to approximate 8 months. I do not know whether it occurred to him or not, but it seems to me that if the resolution is to be adopted it ought to provide that the life of the committee shall end when under the Reorganization Act the first session of the Eightieth Congress must end, not later than the 31st day of July. Under the Reorganization Act, unless the Nation is engaged in war or there is an emergency declared by the President, the sessions of Congress automatically terminate on the 31st day of July. I see no reason why, even if this committee is continued, or a new one is established, it should go beyond the session of Congress in which we are now engaged. I offer that as a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska, in the matter of fixing the time.

The resolution requires the committee to report to Congress its findings and recommendations for legislation; but after it has made its findings and recommendations it cannot report a bill to the Senate. Whatever legislation it recommends must be properly introduced and then referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The special committee is not a legislative committee. It cannot report a bill. It may make a recommendation for legislation, but it cannot report a bill; and no bill introduced can be referred to it. Every proposal for legislation recommended by the committee at the termination of its life must then be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator from New Hampshire is chairman. That committee must then consider the legislative proposal, taking advantage of whatever information the Small Business Committee may assemble. But it must consider the legislation ab initio. It may hold additional hearings. If a bill dealing with small business were introduced while the Committee on Small Business was still in existence, under the rules that bill would have to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, even though the bill were introduced before the Committee on Small Business had reported.

The Committee on Small Business, as proposed to be established, could not lend money to any small business enterprise. That is the function of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to legislation. The Committee on Small Business could not enforce the antitrust laws against large combinations which are seeking to drive small business out of the field. Legislation on that subject would go to the Committee on the Judiciary. The enforcement of the antitrust laws now upon the statute books is a problem of the Department of Justice, or the Federal Trade Commission, under certain circumstances, when matters are brought before that Commission.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. That is one of the things which has impressed me. At least half a dozen committees or agencies are required in order to handle the jurisdictional problems of small business.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Small Business Committee cannot be a part of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. STEWART. Neither can subcommittees of the standing committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. Neither can the Small Business Committee act on legislation. It can only submit a report recommending legislation, and its report and recommendation must go to some standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. That is true. There are several other committees which would have to make separate reports.

Mr. BARKLEY. It all depends upon the legislation proposed. I suppose from now on antitrust legislation will go to the Committee on the Judiciary. Legislation undertaking to help business, or to make loans to business through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other agency for lending money, must be handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency. No matter what the special committee might report, the legislation would have to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration. Inasmuch as that committee must consider legislation, inasmuch as no committee of the Senate can take charge of an executive department and become a part of the executive branch of the Government, and inasmuch as all investigations are theoretically based upon the idea that legislation will come out of them, why not refer such questions to the committee which must deal with the legislation? It seems to me that the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire, who is the very active, able, and conscientious chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is eminently sound. It has been my pleasure to serve with him on that committee for a long time. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from New Hampshire by saying that in the consideration of all questions which have come before the Committee on Banking and Currency he has taken a broad, American, statesmanlike view of them, without regard to partisan differences. I have faith enough in him to believe that he will continue that course. It is the proper course for the great Committee on Banking and Currency, which is more economic than political in its make-up, its thought, and its jurisdiction. For that reason I shall vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Six minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield if the Senator from Missouri will be very brief.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall try to be brief.

I observe that in his proposed substitute the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] authorizes the Committee on Banking and Currency "to study and survey by means of research all problems of American small business enterprises." However, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky, who proposes to support this amendment, has indicated that various subdivisions of the problems of American small business would go to numerous subcommittees of the various standing committees—perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary, perhaps the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and perhaps other committees which might be mentioned. Does the Senator from Kentucky consider that all the problems of American small business enterprises, to use the language of the Tobey amendment, belong to the subject matter embraced in the description of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as outlined in the La Follette-Monroney Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator had been listening to me he would have heard me say that, so far as the antitrust laws are concerned, or any amendments thereto, dealing not only with small business but with any business, such questions would come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has always handled such legislation. Of course, the resolution would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate all phases of small business. When it comes to actual legislation it would have jurisdiction of only that part of the legislation set out in the rules.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Tobey proposal provide for a study and survey of all the problems pertaining to American small business enterprises? In the judgment of the Senator, does not a very large part of the problems of American small business relate to problems other than fiscal problems, which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency? I can give numerous illustrations if the Senator desires.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not time for the Senator to give numerous illustrations. I suppose the Senator from New Hampshire had in mind that while the Committee on Banking and Currency should have jurisdiction under his resolution to investigate all subjects connected with small business, that committee would report only such legislation dealing with those subjects as the committee had jurisdiction to report, and it would not undertake to invade the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to yield for a further question along the same line?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has yielded to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Nebraska will yield a little time, I shall be glad to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. That will not do me much good.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator when I had only 6 minutes remaining, on the condition that he would ask a brief question. He has not complied with that requirement.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall try to comply with the requirement of brevity.

I ask the Senator whether it is a fact that in the Tobey resolution or amendment there is no limitation whatsoever as to the scope of the legislation with respect to which the Committee on Banking and Currency is to make recommendations. In that connection I read this language——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I know what the amendment provides. I have read it; and I am sure that the great constitutional lawyer from Missouri can understand it as well as I can. It will not be necessary to explain it.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that what the Senator says is true, that it is an omnium gatherum, a sort of grab bag of investigation. It does not increase the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency to report legislation, which is its function.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I decline to yield further to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator from Kentucky that, regardless of the argument made by the Senator from Missouri, which I think is a sound argument, either of the two committees could go into all phases of the problems of small-business enterprises. But when the time came to legislate, the special committee could not report legislation on any phase of the problem. It would have to turn its report over to the standing committees; whereas if the investigation were made by the Committee on Banking and Currency, a large part of the field covered by the investigation could be handled within that committee.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot yield further. I have only another minute or two. Admitting that under the terms of the Tobey substitute, the Banking and Currency Committee could go into the entire field of troubles afflicting small business, when it came to legislate it would, out of the mass of testimony and proposed legislation which it covered, sift out that which was necessary for legislation and report it to the Senate.

On the other hand, under the resolution we are now considering, assuming that the Committee on Small Business went into the same field, if it recommended certain legislation to the Senate, even if it recommended a bill or a dozen bills, they would then have to be referred to the standing committee having jurisdiction of the subject.

So, Mr. President, in the interest of efficiency, economy, and orderly legislation, it seems to me to be common sense to refer to the committee having jurisdiction of substantive legislation the investigation necessary to bring out the facts which will show what legislation is needed; for, in the absence of legislation, neither the Small Business Committee nor any other committee can for very long do any legislative business or any other kind of business, because we must give our attention to the law, and not to an effort to substitute a committee of Congress for an executive department, whether it be the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, or any other agency which deals with the financial set-up of business, whether it be large or small.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I have supported the substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. If it be rejected, I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are no other Senators to speak on our side of the question. Therefore, we request an immediate vote on the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the announcement of the Senator from Nebraska, all time for both sides has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to Senate Resolution No. 20.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ecton	Lodge
Baldwin	Ellender	Lucas
Ball	Ferguson	McCarran
Barkley	Flanders	McCarthy
Brewster	Fulbright	McClellan
Bricker	George	McFarland
Bridges	Green	McGrath
Brooks	Gurney	McKellar
Buck	Hatch	McMahon
Bushfield	Hawkes	Magnuson
Butler	Hayden	Malone
Cain	Hickenlooper	Martin
Capehart	Hill	Maybank
Capper	Hoey	Millikin
Chavez	Holland	Moore
Connally	Ives	Morse
Cooper	Jenner	Murray
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Downey	Kem	O'Daniel
Dworshak	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Langer	Pepper
Reed	Stewart	Vandenberg
Revercomb	Taylor	Watkins
Robertson, Va.	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Utah	White
Russell	Thye	Wiley
Saltonstall	Tobey	Williams
Smith	Tydings	Young
Sparkman	Umstead	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to Senate Resolution No. 20. The Senate has agreed to vote upon the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments offered by Mr. WHERRY, as agreed to, are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the words "Eightieth Congress", insert "for a period of 240 days after the date this resolution is agreed to."

On page 2, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I shall appreciate having that done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved,"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, shall give all its data and information to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness. I am informed that, if present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are paired on this vote. If the Senator from West Virginia were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea." If the Senator from Ohio were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead
Hoey	Morse	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Ecton	Murray
Ball	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Brewster	Flanders	Revercomb
Bricker	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Smith
Buck	Ives	Stewart
Bushfield	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Kem	Vandenberg
Cain	Knowland	Watkins
Capehart	Lodge	Wherry
Capper	McCarthy	White
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Moore	

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd	Reed	Wilson
Kilgore	Taft	
Overton	Wagner	

So Mr. TOBEY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "nay," and if I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). I announce the same pair between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], as announced on the last vote. If the Senator from Ohio were present and permitted to vote on this question he would vote "yea," and if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] were present and permitted to vote he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	Flanders	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stewart
Buck	Jenner	Thye
Bushfield	Kem	Vandenberg
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Cain	Lodge	Wherry
Capehart	McCarthy	White
Capper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Moore	
Ecton	Murray	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Barkley	Holland	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cooper	Langer	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd	Reed	Wilson
Kilgore	Taft	
Overton	Wagner	

So the resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of 12 Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress for a period of 240 days after the date of this resolution is agreed to, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940, as extended and supplemented, is hereby terminated as of January 31, 1947: *Provided*, That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no legislative matter now ready for consideration by the Senate, and therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. I may say that upon the disposition of the business on the Executive Calendar I propose to move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce;

William Chapman Foster, of New York, to the position of Under Secretary of Commerce;

Adrian S. Fisher, of Tennessee, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce;

Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1949, vice Claude R. Porter; and

Clarence M. Young, of California, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointment).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frances Perkins to be Civil Service Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, with respect to the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, I suggest that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John O'Dea to be people's counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there is no further executive business, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate has been regaled with a discussion of the manner in which our business has been conducted, with particular reference to the activities of the Senator from Maine and one or two others. I had the opportunity of looking at much of the material, and it seems to be primarily concerned with the discussion of the methods and the motives which prevailed in the consideration of the matter just disposed of.

The descent to a discussion of the motives of Senators immediately reduces the Senate to the scale of other bodies with which, in my judgment, we do not care to associate ourselves. So that for myself I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the details of whether or not the motives of Senators are what they should be.

I do, however, want to read into the RECORD at this time what is my final and complete statement as to a descent of this character into the motive of Senators who come here presumably in the public interest and motivated on all sides by a desire to accomplish public good. Without arrogating to myself any resemblance to the distinguished citizen of America who uttered these words, even in a very minuscule manner, I should like to read them as expressing my attitude toward a discussion of motives, and what I hope and believe is the attitude of most of the other members of this body.

These are the words of Abraham Lincoln, when he was under considerable attack as to his motives:

> If I were to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

With that I leave what I hope may be the end of the discussion of motives of Senators on either side of the aisle, and in the hope that we may go forward in the discussion of the public business without attributing to any Member of this body motives which are improper or low.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, previously during this debate I expressed myself about the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. I expressed the hope that that committee might continue. I expressed my own willingness to vote to give the committee additional authority which I thought the Senator from Maine had erroneously surrendered.

I do not know what the Senator means when he talks about motives. I certainly did not charge the Senator with any improper motives, but I am glad to say now——

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly had no reference whatsoever to anything the Senator from New Mexico said. I heard much of the remarks of the Senator, and I appreciated very deeply the suggestion as to the broadening of the scope of our committee and its responsibility. There was not a word which I heard the Senator utter—and I was quite in accord with his attitude at all times on public business—that would indicate in any way that he questioned the motives of any Member of this body.

Mr. HATCH. Anyway, Mr. President, regardless of that—and I do not know what the Senator from Maine meant—I wish to make a statement now, because I desire the Senator's committee to be strong; I desire it to be a good committee, and I am going to tell the Senator that the strength and the sinew of the Truman committee consisted in the complete nonpartisan approach which President Truman, then Senator Truman, gave to every problem that came before him.

I say very frankly to the Senator from Maine that when I heard here on the floor of the Senate for the first time the article published in the American magazine (sic) and read by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], an article which was based altogether upon an executive session of the committee, I thought the committee was stooping to party politics. I want to say further that when I also read that the Republican National Committee had released a so-called report which was given to it by the Senator from Maine 5 days before the election, and which had been prepared originally in 1942 by one investigator of the staff, and which had been rejected by the general counsel, Mr. Fulton, because it contained no factual data whatever, but was the mere opinion of the one investigator, and then later when a new general counsel was appointed, Mr. Halley, and the same investigator submitted the same inconclusive and unsupported report, Mr. Halley rejected it because it was not supported by factual data—when the Senator from Maine, through the Republican National Committee, then released that as a report of the committee, which had been suppressed—and that was the press statement——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine will state the point of order.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point of order that in what the Senator from New Mexico is now saying, directed at my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine, he is indulging in a reflection on him, prohibited by the rules. I think he is challenging the motives and the purposes of my colleague, and I make the point that he is out of order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is the point of order debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is not debatable.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I move that the Senator from New Mexico proceed in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is in order and is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Maine. I am presently going to give some good advice. That is what I am leading up to.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator from New Mexico always speaks.

I appreciate the interest of my colleague from Maine in his desire to protect what he felt were possibly my interests, and also his regard for the proprieties of this body; but while I might perhaps be more sensitive than anyone else, I am not prepared to challenge the Senator from New Mexico in what he has said.

I contemplated taking 2 or 3 minutes to answer what I felt was a very appropriate discussion by the Senator from New Mexico regarding the two episodes of which he speaks; but at this point I might say I think the suggestion that the publication in the Liberty magazine—I am sure the Senator from New Mexico does not wish to do an injustice to either Liberty or the American magazine—it was Liberty——

Mr. HATCH. Did I say American magazine?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator did.

Mr. HATCH. I meant Liberty magazine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will stand corrected. "Liberty" is a very good name.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it less American than the other one?

Mr. BREWSTER. The publication was in Liberty. I am not in the class with the Senator from Kentucky, as yet.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was merely asking whether that was less American than the other one.

Mr. BREWSTER. The publication in Liberty certainly had a political connotation, as the Senator from New Mexico properly says, it having appeared 1 week before the election. The only point that I should enter in my own behalf in the situation is that for the preceding 3 months, as I stated on the floor the other day, the material represented in the charges of a colonel in our Intelligence Service who had spent the last 2 years in Germany had, as I felt, been unjustly and improperly suppressed by the committee, of which I was a member, by a committee which in the four preceding years of its history had never had a divided report, either when the Senator from New Mexico or his successors were serving on it, and that for the first time last summer, in the feverish days of the campaign, with the chairman of our committee a candidate for Governor of the great State of New York, what seemed to me the ugly head of politics obtruded itself; the decisions of that committee were unfortunately being involved in the campaign; whereas, in the two preceding campaigns, while the committee was under the chairmanship of Senator Truman, we had never had a question of politics raised, but our committee had remained comparatively inactive for the 2 or 3 months immediately before an election.

It was to me a matter of profound regret that the committee should have had its standard to some extent trailing in the dust.

Mr. HATCH. That is right. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. BREWSTER. For my part in it, I am ready to take full responsibility. Whether or not I performed my duty as a Senator or as a citizen must remain for each one to determine. I am ready to accept the opprobrium which the Senator may cast upon me, but I say to him that it was the Senator's own colleagues on his side of the aisle who in my judgment first precipitated the issue, and that I delayed 3 months before I felt the people of the United States were entitled to know those charges which had been made.

As to the other item, the housing report, as the Senator, himself, has said, it had been on file with our committee in one instance for 3 years; in the other instance, for 1 year.

Meanwhile in the State of New York the former chairman of our committee, the candidate for governor on the Democratic ticket, was making the welkin ring with charges against the Governor of New York, forsooth, because he did not solve the housing problem. Unlike some of our associates, I have read the records of our committee, so I do not accept the statement of either the first general counsel of the committee or the second general counsel as to whether the reports in question were of a character entitled to consideration. From my own experience I was convinced that they contained material fully documented in accordance with the experience of our committee, which entitled them to consideration by the members of the committee, which, on the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, they had not yet received though they had been disapproved by the first counsel of the committee and by the second counsel of the committee. Forsooth, for what does our committee exist? Certainly for the members of the committee to act upon such reports. I have read those reports. They were documented. In the final analysis it seems to me that the people were entitled to know what the reports contained before they were compelled to listen further to what seemed to me to be the unwarranted and the unfounded charges of one who had so recently been the chairman of our committee, who spoke from a forum here in Washington throughout the early days of the campaign, with the Mead committee constantly the medium through which these campaign documents were released.

The Senator from New Mexico spoke of the Republican National Committee. I would rather take upon myself the garments of the Republican National Committee, if I were going to enter the political arena, than to clothe myself in the habiliments of the Truman and the Mead committee, which was the guise under which the chairman of that committee at that time was running for political office in the State of New York.

So forsooth, I released the housing report, and for it I have no apology in this forum or elsewhere.

I regret that politics entered our ranks. I hope that we may now go forward and continue the record made prior to the last 6 months in the great spirit of that committee under the chairmanship of the man who is now President of the United States. It will be my earnest endeavor, with the cooperation of those who may be associated with me upon either side, to restore, so far as possible, the splendid record which that committee made prior to the last 6 months.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was glad to yield to the Senator from Maine. I was very happy to give him the opportunity to make any explanation he might desire as to the reasons why he as a member of that committee wrote an article for a national publication, an article based upon facts which had not been verified, but which had only come to the committee by the unsupported testimony of one man, in executive session, information which the Senator from Maine heralded throughout the Nation as evidence that the Truman administration has failed.

Ah, Mr. President, the Senator may stand here on the floor of the Senate and make any explanation he desires, but I leave to him and to his own conscience the decision as to whether or not he injected party politics into the Truman committee.

Mr. President, I do not want anyone to charge me with being out of order, because as I stated in the beginning, what I rose to say was that the strength and sinew of the Truman committee had been its complete nonpartisanship. I served on it with the Senator from Maine and with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and we worked, I thought, with some degree of patriotism for the welfare of our country. Party politics did not enter into the question. I recall, as I look at the Senator from Michigan, that one time he and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] investigated an airplane factory in Ohio, and discovered methods of inspection which were so lax that motors were permitted to be installed in planes that carried our fighting men which were dangerous to the lives of those men. I recall that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from West Virginia revealed those defects, which were almost criminal. I think that as a result of that work there are American boys at home now safe who might otherwise be resting in that last long sleep on foreign soil.

Mr. President, I am proud of the Truman committee. I am proud of my connection with it. I am proud of my work with the Republican members of it. I want that same attitude continued. I do not want partisan articles written for a national magazine. I do not want reports released through either the Republican National Committee or the Democratic National Committee. I rose to say to the new chairman that he has a great opportunity. The Senator from Maine has a chance to uncover fraud and corruption and wrongdoing wherever it exists, and be assured, sir, it will not be alone Democratic fraud, it will not be alone Democratic wrongdoing.

The only point I make is that I want a good job done. The Senator from

Maine does have the opportunity to do it. I do not mean this offensively, but if he, as chairman of the committee, will follow in the footsteps of the man who was the committee's first chairman, he will not go wrong.

Mr. President, it has been said here that the publicity and the headlines given to Harry Truman made him Vice President and resulted in his becoming President of the United States. I do not choose to look upon it in that light. Rather I would say, as a tribute to a conscientious public servant, that the fine, nonpartisan, courageous manner in which Senator Truman conducted the affairs of the committee was recognized by a grateful people, and they gave him a just reward and said to him "Well done, good and faithful servant."

I hope the new chairman will conduct himself in that spirit and in the same way.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico, and I shall certainly heed his advice, as I want to continue the character of service which our former colleague rendered throughout the period he served on that committee. It will be my highest hope that the committee, under its new membership, with the four Members who will be associated with me from the other side of the aisle, may be able to recapture and to justify the confidence of the Senate and the country.

I think we all realize that graft and corruption are thoroughly nonpartisan.

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM B. ZIFF, COCHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR A FREE PALESTINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a press release by William B. Ziff, cochairman of the National Executive Board of the American League for a Free Palestine. Mr. Ziff is perhaps the outstanding expert in the entire United States on questions dealing with Palestine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have accepted the position of cochairman of the National Executive Board of the American League for a Free Palestine, in the belief that it affords me a very great opportunity to be of service to my fellow Americans and to the great cause of human freedom with which American world interests are directly related.

Mr. Truman, Mr. Byrnes, and all other spokesmen for our Republic have made it clear that we no longer can ignore unilateral acts of terror and despoliation imposed by force on small nations, and that the interests of our country demand an adherence to the principles of international law and international morality. The case of Palestine is a test case of these professions.

Hebrew Palestine is unique in the sense that it is the ward of all the nations. Under the assumption that international law existed, the charter for Hebrew Palestine was issued by unanimous agreement of 52 nations. These appointed one of their number, Great Britain, to be the guardian of Hebrew interests and to be responsible for an orderly repatriation of the dispossessed Hebrew people. American interests and consent were covered in a special treaty signed in 1922.

The object of the nations was to settle a terrible problem whose magnitude has since been shown in the mass murder of almost 8,000,000 Jews in Europe. Great Britain was instructed to facilitate the repatriation of the Hebrew people and their close settlement on the land of Palestine. Instead the emissaries of His Majesty's Government instituted a reign of terror in Palestine and made themselves a leading party to a gigantic conspiracy to nullify the very purposes for whose fulfillment Great Britain had been appointed.

Palestine is now the only nation in the world where officially promulgated anti-Semitic laws openly operate. Jews may be seized on the streets, shot, or exiled to concentration camps in far-away Africa without benefit of trial or even charge. A whole set of vicious regulations exist which deprive the Jewish population of basic human rights. Just as in the pale in Czarist Russia, because a man is a Jew he may not own or till land in his own country except in certain small, restricted areas. Looting and personal maltreatment by soldiers and police is an everyday occurrence.

The result was what might be expected. The answer to this terrorism was a counterviolence on the part of young patriots determined to remain free or die. In Palestine is being repeated all of the circumstances which a generation ago shook Ireland and which a century and a half ago resulted in the American Revolution. Just as the Irish and American resistance forces were libeled and traduced as terrorists, so are the young Hebrew patriots of Palestine.

It seems perfectly clear that the interests of America demand a pacification of the world based on an honest and honorable settlement of problems, and that the substitution of guns for law involves a frightening process which will one day inevitably involve the world in the most terrifying and destructive of all its wars.

There must now be an end to bloodshed and to the corruptions and terrors which proceed from oppression.

Each of the great British leaders has acknowledged for the record that the present British policy is dishonorable and violates fundamental law. Yet in an effort to justify this indefensible program, British officials are taking up where Hitler left off and are making themselves the spokesmen and organizers of world-wide anti-Semitic as well as anti-Zionist opinion.

No part of this grim situation may safely go unchallenged. The British rape of Palestine is no different in its relation to world peace than the German rape of Czechoslovakia. It is simply a case of cold greed and boundless ambition against the common rights and interests of humankind.

It is also a fact that any considered and sensible policy on the part of the United States demands the establishment in the Near and Middle East of a strong, industrialized republic built along western lines, whose self-interest compels an integration of its economy with the West. Otherwise the Near and Middle East will continue to function as a vacuum from which the West will ultimately be excluded.

The British will fail in this attempt to settle the Hebrew problem by means of Hitlerian force. The Hebrew patriots are certain to resist and to attempt to answer blow for blow. If, as has been threatened, the British attempt a massive campaign of suppression to crush Hebrew Palestine once and for all, there will be an equally massive reaction from the entire world of freemen. That is certain.

The economic and military weakness of present-day Britain is great, and may soon become desperate. Conscious of these facts, Britain is bending every energy to insure American sympathy and assistance, and is clamoring for morality in international relationships. In this respect the British must be reminded that they, too, must become moral, and that the world no longer is capable of supporting the shock of such terroristic and lawless tactics as His Majesty's Government has substituted for law in the Holy Land.

DETERIORATION OF ARMY TRUCKS AND JEEPS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared this morning in the New York Times. It contains an interview with Maj. Gen. Everett S. Hughes, of the United States Army. The article is entitled "General Hughes Cites Big Deterioration of Army Ordnance."

Ever since my distinguished colleague [Mr. YOUNG] came to the Senate he and I have worked hard to obtain trucks for the farmers of the United States. We have submitted hundreds of letters from veterans who want jeeps. We have been told time and again that none were available. Yet we find a general stating that in one field in Ogden, Utah, thousands of trucks and jeeps are rotting.

I do not know what standing committee ought to have jurisdiction of this subject. Perhaps it ought to be the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that trucks and jeeps are rotting in Utah at the very time when the farmers and veterans of the United States desire trucks and jeeps.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL HUGHES CITES BIG DETERIORATION OF ARMY ORDNANCE—HE ASSERTS 20,000 VEHICLES ARE RUSTING AWAY AT SINGLE FIELD AT OGDEN, UTAH—FURTHER JUNKING IS URGED—CHIEF REPORTS A THIRD OF HIS BUDGET IS CONSUMED BY "CARETAKING" EXPENSES

(By Sidney Shalett)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Back from a 2-week field inspection during which he said he was shocked by the sight of 20,000 Army vehicles slowly rusting away at a single field, Maj. Gen. Everett S. Hughes, Army Chief of Ordnance, declared today he would urge a revision of plans for proper storage facilities, or junking of much matériel.

General Hughes stated that the Ordnance Department is unable, because of a lack of funds, warehouse facilities, and personnel, to give proper protection and maintenance to huge numbers of all types of vehicles.

At a time when it is vital to obtain the utmost value from every available dollar, General Hughes said he believed it imperative to subject the program for storage of reserve equipment to the closest scrutiny.

It is his personal conviction, he said, that quantities of the matériel being saved will be either obsolete before it can be used again or will go to ruin unless it is given better protection.

The general stated that he intends to suggest to Army Ground Forces that the reserve equipment requirements be reviewed and matériel that can be dispensed with be either sold as surplus or junked.

The 20,000 vehicles exposed to the elements are located at Ogden, Utah, General Hughes said. They included several thousand jeeps, trucks, some tanks, combat cars, and other types of vehicles.

General Hughes estimated that about one-third of the entire Ordnance Department budget was consumed by its "caretaker" responsibilities and still the job is not being properly done.

A proper program for storage of jeeps, for example, he stated, would be one which would guarantee that the vehicles would be immediately serviceable at any period. This would mean they should be under a roof and periodically inspected by maintenance men. Also that a replacement program for tires and batteries, which deteriorate with nonuse, be organized.

Ammunition storage is another serious problem, particularly since there is a safety problem involved. It can be preserved indefinitely, but not unless it is under cover. General Hughes said he is asking ground forces to indicate what they can do without, so we can get rid of the rest.

Army Ordnance has experimented with a program of "canning" certain ordnance items such as tanks and artillery—that is, placing them inside huge steel drums fitted with dehumidification equipment.

General Hughes said he is not convinced that this method is the best means of preservation. He favors storage in warehouses where the equipment can be periodically inspected.

Postwar ordnance studies have convinced General Hughes of the need for working out an industrial mobilization program which will keep the munitions industry in a standby basis so that, if war comes again, it will not be necesary for the industry to begin an all-out production grind. The danger of such a grind is that it consumes practically the entire effort of industry and leaves little time for development of new ideas and equipment, he said.

Unification of services will pose important problems to the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, such as deciding which ordnance facilities are to be scrapped in the consolidation, General Hughes said.

Bright spots in the ordnance picture, General Hughes declared, are the excellent progress being made in research through coordinated efforts of civilian scientists and Army ordnance experts, and the impressive cooperation of American industrialists.

CONDOLENCES TO FAMILIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE BYRD ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 58, tendering the condolences of the Senate to the families of certain members of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition killed in an airplane crash in the Antarctic was agreed to by the Senate on January 17 last. There appears an error in the name of one of the persons killed. The name is stated in the resolution as "Aviation Radioman Second Class Wendell Keith Henderson, of Portsmouth, Va." The name should be "Aviation Radioman First Class Wendell Keith Hendersin, of Portsmouth, Va."

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate Resolution 58 was agreed to be reconsidered, that it be amended as indicated, and that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the vote by which Senate Resolution 58 was agreed to on January 17 is reconsidered, the resolution is amended as indicated, and the resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) as amended is as follows:

Whereas Ensign Maxwell Albert Lopez, of Newport, R. I.; Aviation Machinist's Mate First Class Frederick Warren Williams, of Huntingdon, Tenn.; and Aviation Radioman First Class Wendell Keith Hendersin, of Portsmouth, Va., lost their lives in the crash of a plane while on a photographic mission of the Byrd Antarctic Expedition;

Whereas the deaths of these men were the first casualties of this historic expedition; and

Whereas they were engaged in scientific investigations and extraordinary aerial explorations the results of which may possibly prove of inestimable scientific value to the future of mankind and of great national importance to the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its condolences to the families of the deceased and expresses its gratitude for the heroic services of these men: And be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of each of the deceased.

POLITICAL GLAMOUR CONTEST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, night before last, I believe, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made certain statements regarding Members of his party and Members of the Democratic Party concerning relative pulchritude. Today I received a telegram which I should like to read. I have been waiting for the senior Senator from Ohio to appear, but apparently he has been unwilling to subject himself to requests for the privilege of making a decision as to which of the ladies is most beautiful. I have considered that perhaps a special committee might be appointed to take jurisdiction of this question; but I should like to read the telegram into the RECORD at this time. It is addressed to me.

NEW YORK, N. Y. *January 24, 1947.*

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate:

The Swim for Health Association willing to provide neutral jury to conduct glamour contest between Democratic and Republican Members of the United States Senate. Will provide necessary trunks. Will furnish beach sweaters or coats for modest Members if necessary, will be happy to conduct beauty contest among wives of Senators, providing bathing suits or sweaters for event. Have just completed annual national swim for health week queen beauty contest at Miami Beach. Please wire if you need assistance.

MARTIN STERN,
Executive Director, Swim for Health Association.

The question which I wish to submit to the senior Senator from Ohio was whether or not he proposed to decide this question by a party vote following a caucus, or whether he was willing to leave it to a neutral body, as suggested by the telegram. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator received any information from the Senator from Ohio as to whether he intends to enter the swimming contest or the beauty contest? [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the consent of the Senator from Ohio to announce this pair, but I wish to announce that in the beauty contest the senior Senator from Florida is paired with the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will announce that that pair is a tie. [Laughter.]

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I announce that open hearings on the question of the confirmation of the Presidential nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as that of the General Manager of that Commission, will begin on Monday next at 10:30 o'clock a. m. The first meeting will be held in the meeting room of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and the first witness will be Mr. David E. Lilienthal, who has been designated as Chairman of the Commission. Members of the Senate who have any pertinent information they would like to present, or who are interested in attending, are invited to be present and submit their information.

ANTILABOR LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year Mr. Robert W. Ruhl, editor of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, a newspaper in my State, published an editorial. Mr. Ruhl is recognized, not only in my State but throughout the Nation, as a brilliant editor, and one who has always been very friendly to the best interests of the Republican Party. The editorial which he wrote I think contains some very good advice to my party on the subject of labor legislation. The title of the editorial is "Political Suicide." I find myself in such complete agreement with the advice to my party which this great editor has given to it in this editorial that I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL SUICIDE

If the Republican Party wishes to commit political suicide, they have only to pass the Ball bill to do it.

This measure would prohibit both the closed and the union shop throughout the country.

We doubt if such a law would be constitutional. But if it did pass the courts it would not be workable.

And politically, as stated, it would be suicidal.

We venture to say it would not gain one vote for the GOP. Those who want a labor prohibition law of that type are mostly Republicans anyway.

Not only organized labor, but practically all labor, and a vast majority of liberal and independent voters would vote against any party seriously advocating such a measure.

We can't believe Republican leadership at Washington could be so foolhardy and so stupid as to endorse the passage of such radical antilabor legislation at this time. But perhaps it is.

If so, it is doomed to defeat 2 years hence, and will richly deserve it.

R. W. R.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harvey Erickson, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington, vice Edward M. Connelly, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Elliott Northcott 2d to be an ensign in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 5th day of December 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 15), 1947:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Frances Perkins to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

John O'Dea to be people's counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, before whom all our pretenses fall away, who knowest our secret thoughts and our hidden fears, bless us this day with Thy Spirit and help us to discharge our duties faithfully and well. Ever sensitive to the hurting of our own feelings, may we be sensitive also to our grieving of Thy Holy Spirit when we give ourselves to the lesser loyalties and spend our time and our energies in that which is less than the highest and the best.

We pray for the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the representatives of the people, the judges of the land, and all those in authority, that it may please Thee so to rule their hearts that they may rightly use the trust committed to them for the good of all people.

Raise up among us, we pray Thee, fearless men who know that only in the doing of Thy will can we find our peace. So make it plain to us this day, and give us the courage to do it. All this we beg for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, January 24, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PROPOSED REFERENCE OF BILL CREATING A SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the President's message on the establishment of a single Department of National Defense was received, it was referred by the Chair to the Committee on Armed Services. The Chair is in receipt of a letter from the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], submitted on behalf of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which he is chairman, insisting that when the merger bill arrives it will belong in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The Chair wishes to state that this is one of those cases in which reference can be justified in either direction, and the final decision should be made by the Senate itself, inasmuch as it is a matter of policy.

Therefore the Chair is asking that the letter of the Senator from Vermont be printed in the RECORD, and the Chair is announcing that when the merger bill arrives and is introduced the Chair will be prepared to rule in open session, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to dissent from the decision of the Chair if it disagrees.

There being no objection, the letter of Mr. AIKEN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 23, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a meeting of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held this morning, there was considerable discussion regarding the jurisdiction of the committee, particularly with respect to bills relating to "reorganization of the executive branch of the Government," which, according to the provisions of section 102 (1) (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), are to be referred to this committee.

It was noted that on Monday of this week the President's message on the establishment of a single Department of National Defense was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, while on the House side this communication was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The 11 committee members who were present this morning were unanimously of the opinion that their committee should have jurisdiction, under the statute, of any bill that may be introduced to carry out the President's proposals, and felt that the existence of this sentiment on the part of the committee should be made known before such a bill is presented. I am, therefore, taking this means of bringing the matter to your attention.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that under the law two Members of the Senate are required to be appointed to act in connection with the committee of the House of Representatives in the matter of the disposition of useless executive papers, as recommended by the Archivist of the United States. The Archivist has transmitted three such reports to the Congress, and the Chair appoints as such committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who are the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Civil Service, which has jurisdiction over the National Archives.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement as to the program. The Senate will have a morning hour and at the conclusion of the morning hour will automatically proceed to a call of the calendar. Then there are some nominations which ought to be disposed of; and when the call of the calendar has been concluded, I shall ask that there be an executive session for the disposition of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Chair suggests that the Senator from Connecticut notified the Senate on Friday last that he would speak today at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER OF VESSEL TO UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Navy Department will endeavor to locate and transfer a Diesel-propelled coastal transport for use by the University of Washington, a tax-supported nonprofit institution of the State of Washington, located at Seattle, Wash., to be used in oceanographic research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

AQUEDUCT NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the construction of an aqueduct near San Diego, Calif., under a contract executed by the Navy Department with the city of San Diego, and stating "The report indicates the reasons why this contract and expenditures of Federal funds pursuant thereto are considered to be in violation of law" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

GERALD E. PHILLIPS ET AL.

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Gerald E. Phillips, David C. Watson, and Mrs. Mildred Kobylak (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh annual report of

that Board for the year ended June 30, 1946, and lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that Commission for the period beginning April 1, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

METHOD OF REVIEW OF ORDERS OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders, and to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSAL OF USELESS PAPERS IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A communication from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report that no records in the various departments and agencies of the Government were authorized for disposal under section 7 of the act approved July 7, 1943, as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945, and that no records were disposed of under sections 10 and 11 of said act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Three letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historic interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition and a memorial were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore, and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Mutual Benefit and Aid Society, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the alleged mistreatment of prisoners of war, and requesting that they be returned to their respective native countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., memorializing Congress to take immediate action to prevent the surrender of the atomic bomb until action has been approved by direct ballot or by the Congress after free and open debate; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

TAX PROBLEMS OF THE FARMERS—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its twenty-eighth annual convention, San Francisco, Calif., on the subject of tax problems of the farmers, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXATION

The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that a sound national tax policy is essential to the welfare of our entire economy. Taxes should be not only equitable and fair, but also chosen with due regard to their effect upon the economy.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to any material reduction in the income tax rates as long as inflationary tendencies prevail and there is a high level of employment. We call upon the Congress to use discretion and not use an instrument as vital to our national welfare as a tax and fiscal program for political purposes. We believe that under present conditions all possible revenues should be applied to a reduction in our national debt. Furthermore, we believe that every effort should be made to eliminate all nonessential Government expenditures and reduce essential expenditures to the minimum necessary for good government and adequate national defense. Maintenance of revenue and reduction of expenses are essential to stabilize our economy under present conditions.

The magnitude of the national debt makes it imperative that our national fiscal policies be handled prudently. Long-range plans should be made for the gradual reduction of the national debt; however, the debt retirement should be handled in such manner as to promote a stable price level and prosperous economy which, in turn, may necessitate adjusting both the amount of revenues and the volume of expenditures of the Federal Government with reference to levels of employment and national income. If this Nation is to remain solvent and meet its obligations, it is imperative that we maintain a high national income and a heavy tax program for many years to come. A long-time stable Federal tax policy should be adopted with a tax rate which balances the Budget under normal business conditions. Such a program would allow for substantial payments on the national debt during periods of prosperity. Provisions should be made which will allow for prompt but temporary reduction of the lower bracket personal income-tax rate within certain limits during periods of low business activity. At least, a tax program should be adopted which would not increase tax rates during periods of depression, or lower them unduly during periods of prosperity. The appropriate machinery for conducting research and making recommendations in the Federal tax and expenditure field should be established.

The personal income tax should be the major source of revenue for the Federal Government. We favor keeping the personal income tax base as broad as practicable through the retention of low exemptions and the avoidance of a general Federal sales tax. All self-supporting persons should make a direct contribution to the support of government. The income from all future issues of Federal, State, and local government bonds should be subject to the same taxation as other income. The personal income tax rate should be as high as necessary so that, together with Federal revenues from other sources, they will provide the funds to meet the expenses of government and provide for the gradual reduction of the national debt, without destroying the incentive for greater business activity and production. This theory of taxation should be strictly adhered to except when its continuance might lead to serious unemployment.

We recognize that if full employment is maintained, the bulk of the jobs must be provided by free enterprise. Therefore, the following recommendations are made pertaining to corporate taxes. The corporation should be exempted on that portion of its annual earnings distributed to the stockholders as dividends, where such dividends are taxed in the hands of stockholders. A reasonable proportion of corporation earnings retained should be taxed at the rate used in the first income bracket of the personal income tax. The balance of any amount retained should be taxed at a rate sufficient to encourage, but not to compel the distribution of earnings. Corporation taxes should be put upon a pay-as-you-go basis, similar to individual income taxes at the present time. Proper safeguards must be developed, if the foregoing recommendations are adopted, to prevent abuses in tax avoidance by the corporate form of business.

We favor the principle of carrying forward and back losses to be offset against gains for a reasonable period of time, both with regard to individual and corporate taxation.

Federal excise taxes should be largely limited to amusements and taxes on the so-called luxury goods, including alcoholic liquors and tobacco. The transportation tax on the movement of goods and commodities should be repealed. The Federal gasoline tax should be reduced to 1 cent a gallon and it should not exceed that amount. This tax should be paid only on gasoline used for transportation purposes, and all of the money so raised should be expended for construction and maintenance of transportation facilities. The long-recognized historic formula of allocating the highway funds among the States; namely, one-third on the basis of population, one-third on area, and one-third on post-road mileage, should be continued.

The Federal Government should declare a definite public policy in regard to replacing taxes lost to local governments through the acquisition of property by the National Government. Federally owned property, operated on an earning basis in competition with private enterprise, should be subject to payments in lieu of taxes comparable with taxes based on similar property when privately owned. Property acquired by the Federal Government, even though it does not compete with private enterprise, often diminishes the tax base of local governments. The Federal Government should compensate the net tax loss thus caused to local taxing units where such action on the part of the Government does not reduce correspondingly the expenses of the local taxing unit. Legislation should be enacted to bring the estate tax offset law of 1926 up to date.

The Federal social-security taxes should not be increased until a study of the entire problem is made, showing the need for a change from the present rate. Taxes for unemployment compensation should be levied upon employer and employee alike.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BUTLER, also from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 70) to continue the authority for a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the

United States, reported it with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 357. A bill relating to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 358. A bill to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 360. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Alva R. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 362. A bill for the relief of the J. B. Kendall Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 363, to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 364. A bill to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national-defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Horace W. Bivins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 366. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Fred Clark;

S. 367. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Peter Tange;

S. 368. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to A. C. Ladd;

S. 369. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John J. Akers;

S. 370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Everett F. McInerney;

S. 371. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Christine West;

S. 372. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Arnold L. Fast;

S. 373. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Estelle Hughes;

S. 374. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Alfred Murray;

S. 375. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Nick Langager;

S. 376. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Cassie E. Howard;

S. 377. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John Harold Brown;

S. 378. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud;

S. 379. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud;

S. 380. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud;

S. 381. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Guy R. Madison, Jr.;

S. 382. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to M. J. Schwinden;

S. 383. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Walter I. Ruggles;

S. 384. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Arnold E. Payne;

S. 385. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Richard K. O'Connor;

S. 386. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert J. O'Connor;

S. 387. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John W. Jones;

S. 388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Leslie Warrior;

S. 389. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Neil R. Potter;

S. 390. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Montana to Morris M. Padget;

S. 391. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Montana to John P. Padget;

S. 392. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Montana to James O. Garden;

S. 393. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Roosevelt County, Montana, to Earl A. Lund;

S. 394. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle;

S. 395. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle;

S. 396. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle;

S. 397. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle;

S. 398. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle;

S. 399. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle;

S. 400. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top;

S. 401. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott;

S. 402. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 403. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 404. A bill to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 405. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 406. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 407. A bill to eliminate the specific limitations on the compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances which may be received by veterans obtaining education or on-the-job training benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and to eliminate the 2-year limitation for on-the-job training under such act; to the committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 408. A bill to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Milan Jandrich;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Frank Clifford Varah;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Ghetal Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old); and

S. 412. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain immigrant inspectors and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 413. A bill providing for cancellation of certain crop production and harvesting loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 414. A bill to encourage fuller participation by small business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKES (for himself, Mr. CAIN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 415. A bill to extend rent control until April 30, 1948, and to make additional housing accommodations available for renting by eliminating rent ceilings on newly constructed or newly rented housing accommodations and by providing for limited increases in the rental ceilings on other housing accommodations not to exceed 15 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO LARCENY IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request of the Attorney General, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 3 of Public Law 534, Seventy-ninth Congress, relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce. The purpose of this bill is merely to correct an oversight in that law. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Attorney General addressed to me on the subject, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 363) to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.), introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"To establish the interstate or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act, the waybill, or other shipping document, of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which and to which such shipment was made."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to invite your attention to an apparent oversight in the drafting of Public Law 534 (79th Cong., 2d sess), approved July 24, 1946, relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce, which, in my opinion, should be corrected by the enactment of an appropriate amendment.

Public Law 534, inter alia, amended section 3 of the act of February 13, 1913, as amended (47 Stat. 774; 18 U. S. C. 411), to read as follows:

"To establish the interstate or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act the waybill, *or other shipping document*, of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which [and to which] such shipment was made." (Sec. 3, Public Law 534.)

The portion in italic indicates the words which were added, and the portion in black brackets represents the words which were deleted, by the amendment.

It is submitted that the omission of the words "and to which" from the amended section was unintentional, and should be reinstated to avoid possible confusion or difficulties which may arise in the interpretation and operation of the statute.

Evidence that the omission was an oversight may be deduced from the reports of both the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary (H. Rept. No. 1116; S. Rept. No. 1632, 79th Cong.), concerning the bill (H. R. 4180) which was enacted into Public Law 534. Comparing the construction of section 3, as it is now, with that of the section as it then existed, the reports (p. 2) stated:

"Section 3 differs only in that it adds the words 'or other shipping document' after the word 'waybill'."

The above reports made no mention of the deletion of the phrase "and to which."

Without the phrase, it may be contended that a waybill or other shipping document shall be prima facie evidence only of the place from which a shipment was made, thus requiring other evidence of the place to which the shipment was made, in establishing the interstate or foreign commerce character of such shipment in a prosecution under this statute.

Accordingly, I recommend that Public Law 354 be amended so as to restore the deleted phrase.

A draft of a proposed bill to accomplish this purpose is enclosed herewith.

I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

CONTROL OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution asking for the appointment of a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the foot-and-mouth disease threat, and I request that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease occurred in Mexico several weeks ago and has already spread to some 10 states in the vicinity of Mexico City and Vera Cruz; and

Whereas if this disease should spread to the large cattle-raising States in northern Mexico, it would not be possible to prevent its further spread to the United States; and

Whereas the rapid spread of the disease makes prompt cooperative action on the part of the United States imperative, if the disease is to be stamped out in Mexico; and

Whereas officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture trained in combating the disease have already conducted a careful study of the situation in Mexico, and their report as to what action should be taken is expected to be submitted within a very few days: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, upon receipt of the forthcoming report of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture concerning the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, (1) to make an immediate study of such report and any recommendations contained therein, (2) to make such further studies as it may deem necessary concerning the subject matter of such report, (3) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to investigate the activities of the Department of Justice in the disposition of claims arising out of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee war contracts, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 73) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas prior to and during the period of the war the United States Government acting through the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission, as contracting agencies, entered into a great many agreements commonly referred to as "cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts," with private corporations and individual citizens as war contractors for the operation and management of Army and naval ordnance works, shipbuilding yards, dry docks, factories, plants, shops, and other war establishments; and

Whereas such war facilities and all lands, materials, and equipment used in connection therewith were owned, leased, or controlled by the United States Government and all products produced, manufactured, constructed, or assembled in such war facilities were owned by the United States Government, and the use or disposition thereof was at the sole direction and discretion of the United States Government acting through the appropriate governmental agencies; and

Whereas under the terms of such war contracts the war contractor, as an instrumentality of the United States Government, managed and operated such war facilities, and as such Federal instrumentality employed great numbers of employees on both a weekly and hourly basis; subject, however, to the reservation contained in said war contracts that the United States Government acting through the contracting agency had the right to pass upon and approve or reject any employee, or cause the discharge of any employee; and, subject to the further reservation that the United States Government acting through the Department of Labor should pass upon and approve the hours of work and the rate of pay of any and all such employees; and

Whereas the United States Government acting through representatives of the appropriate contracting agency exercised its rights under such war contracts to pass upon and approve each employee and in some cases cause the discharge of any employee when the representative of the appropriate contracting agency deemed such action to be in the best interest of the United States; and

Whereas the United States Government acting through representatives of the Wage and Hour Administrator passed upon and approved the working hours and rates of pay of such employees and has filed reports with the Wage and Hour Administrator showing that all provisions of law relating thereto had been complied with; and

Whereas numerous so-called portal-to-portal and other types of actions have been filed in the State and Federal courts by individuals formerly employed under such Government war contracts for the recovery of additional wages alleged to be due under the Fair Labor Standards Act, approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1096; title 29, U. S. C. Annotated, secs. 201 to 219, inclusive), including an equal amount as liquidated damages and attorneys' fees; and

Whereas any final judgment of the courts for additional wage pay, damages, and attorneys' fees rendered in such suits constitutes a charge against the United States under the terms of such cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts; and

Whereas although in some if not all cases such management contracts provide that the employees are the employees of the war contractor, other terms and provisions of such contracts reveal that the services of said employees were performed for the sole and exclusive benefit of the United States Government, and in effect said employees were employed by the United States and their services were performed under and subject to the supervision of the United States acting through the appropriate contracting agencies and other departments of the United States Government, and in truth and in fact the United States Government is the real party in interest with respect to any suit, claim, or demand of such employees for additional wage pay; and

Whereas it appears that prior to November 1, 1945, pursuant to an interdepartmental agreement between the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government, primary responsibility for handling the claims of such employees asserted under the Fair Labor Standards Act was assumed by the respective and appropriate contracting agencies subject to the approval of the Department of Justice acting in conjunction with the appropriate United States district attorneys; and

Whereas pursuant to a "Memorandum of Agreement on Procedures for Handling Fair Labor Standards Act Claims" of such employees was entered into on November 1, 1945, by the War Department, acting by Robert P. Patterson, and the Navy Department, acting by Assistant Secretary H. Struve Hensel, and the War Shipping Administration and

the Maritime Commission, acting by E. S. Land, and the Department of Labor, acting by the Wage and Hour Administrator L. Metcalf Walling, and the Department of Justice, acting by the Attorney General of the United States Tom C. Clark, it was agreed that primary responsibility for handling such claims, both in and out of court, would thereafter be assumed by such cost-plus-a-fixed-fee war contractors, provided, however, that private counsel for such contractors would be subject to the supervision and direction of the Department of Justice acting through the appropriate United States district attorneys with respect to all plans for the defense to any claim of such employees asserted under the Fair Labor Standards Act and with respect to any settlement or compromise of such claim; and

Whereas by the terms of such interdepartmental agreements, the Department of Justice also reserved the right to cause the appropriate United States attorney to appear in such suits for the defendant in any case where it appears to the contracting agency affected that private counsel may not be adequate to protect the interest of the United States and where such fact is made known to the Department of Justice and upon investigation the Department of Justice determines that Government counsel should be furnished; and

Whereas by the terms of such interdepartmental agreement the Wage and Hour Administrator was granted leave to intervene or appear as amicus in such suits, or take such other action as might be appropriate, but counsel for any contracting agency was precluded from appearing in any such litigation; and

Whereas it appears that the Department of Justice has prohibited and is now prohibiting the appropriate United States district attorneys or any private counsel engaged in such litigation from pleading the following defenses to claims of such employees being asserted under the Fair Labor Standards Act (a) that the United States is the real party in interest and the Fair Labor Standards Act by its express terms is not applicable to the United States or its employees, (b) that the activities of producing war materials and equipment by the United States Government under such cost-plus-a-fixed-fee management contracts does not constitute interstate commerce within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, (c) that the United States is the real party in interest and enjoys sovereign immunity, (d) that the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee management contractor is an instrumentality of the United States and as such enjoys sovereign immunity, and (e) that existing applicable regulations of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division are invalid and contrary to his previous administrative determination concerning the wages and hours of such employees; and

Whereas it appears that each and all of said defenses are justiciable issues of law and have not been adjudicated by the Supreme Court of the United States; and

Whereas in some suits thus far adjudicated by the trial courts and in some suits now pending, private defense counsel and the United States district attorney, acting under the instruction and direction of the Department of Justice, have withdrawn one or more of the above defenses which may have been pleaded in such suits or have stipulated with counsel for plaintiffs that such defenses were not applicable and were not relied upon by the defendant, and numerous claims and suits of such employees have been settled and compromised on the basis of time and one-half pay for hours claimed to have been worked over 40 hours, plus an equal amount as liquidated damages and attorneys' fees; and

Whereas the exact amount of money represented by such judgments, settlements, pending suits, and claims asserted or to be asserted is unknown, but it is estimated to exceed more than a billion dollars; and

Whereas it is the duty of the Department of Justice to cause all justiciable defenses to be asserted to any and all claims affecting the interest of the United States; and

Whereas it appears that the Department of Justice, acting in cooperation with the aforementioned governmental agencies of the United States, namely, the War Department, Navy Department, War Shipping Administration, Maritime Commission, and the Department of Labor, has refused to permit such available justiciable defenses to be pleaded in any suit or asserted against any claim made under the Fair Labor Standards Act and arising out of such cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, and in cases where such defenses have been pleaded or asserted, defense counsel has been required by the Department of Justice to withdraw or abandon these defenses, all to the prejudice of the rights and interests of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the standing Committee on the Judiciary be and is hereby directed and instructed to cause an investigation to be made of the activities of the Department of Justice with respect to the handling of litigation, settlements, or compromises involving claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act arising out of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee war contracts and report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at the earliest possible date.

AMERICA, TODAY AND TOMORROW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America, Today and Tomorrow," delivered by him on December 13, 1946, at the fortieth annual meeting of the Life Insurance Association of America, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORLD FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Senator Warren R. Austin, United States representative at the seat of the United Nations, at the annual dinner of the New York State Bar Association, in New York City on January 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNCTIONS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Not the Major Aim," relating to the functions of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, the Senate now proceeds automatically to a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Overton
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bridges	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Capper	Knowland	Taylor
Chavez	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarran	Thye
Cordon	McCarthy	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Umstead
Dworshak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	Wherry
Ellender	Magnuson	White
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent, and that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PREVENTION OF PURCHASE AND SALE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order, and the clerk will state the first order of business.

The bill (S. 22) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 11, 1926, entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office" (44 Stat. 918), is amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 2:

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to solicit or receive any sum of money or thing of value whatsoever in consideration of aiding or assisting any person to obtain any appointive office or employment under the Government of the United States, either by referring his name to any executive department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States for consideration, or otherwise, or to require the payment of a fee from any person because such person has secured any appointive office or employment under the Government of the United States."

LIABILITY FOR ESCAPE OF PRISONERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 26) to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1113; 18 U. S. C. 244) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person has in his custody any prisoner by virtue of process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, and such marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person voluntarily suffers such prisoner to escape, he shall be fined not more than $2,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. Whenever any marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person has in his custody any prisoner by virtue of process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, and such marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person negligently suffers such prisoner to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think we should have a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the best explanation is to be found in the letter from Attorney General Clark which is printed on the second page of the report. The Attorney General's letter, which was addressed to me on May 24, 1946, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, constitutes the basis of the bill. I now read a part of the letter:

The recent escape of two convicted murderers from the District of Columbia jail, which was facilitated by the negligence of the guards assigned to duty in the jail's death block, has emphasized the necessity for enacting legislation which would make it a Federal offense for any person negligently to permit a Federal prisoner to escape from his custody.

Under existing law, it is a Federal offense punishable by imprisonment for a period of not more than 2 years or a fine of not more than $2,000, or both, if a person having a prisoner in his custody by virtue of any process issued under the laws of the United States, "voluntarily suffers such person to escape" (18 U. S. C. 244). Although escapes as the result of a jailer's negligence are much more frequent than those resulting from the voluntary act of an officer, it has been held that the foregoing statutory provision is not applicable to a situation involving the escape of a Federal prisoner as the result of the negligence of his guards.

Then the Attorney General cites a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. The pending bill was introduced for the purpose of curing the situation disclosed in the letter of the Attorney General.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that this bill, like the one preceding it and the one following it on the calendar, is identical in terms with a bill passed by the Senate at the last session?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct. All three bills, No. 3, No. 4, and No. 5 on the calendar, are identical with bills which were passed by the Senate at the last session.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada a question. Does this bill refer to prisoners in custody under State law?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it refers only to Federal prisoners in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS AGAINST OPERATORS OF GOLD AND SILVER MINES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I read in the report on Senate bill 27, Calendar No. 5, the statement that—

The bill as reported relates to operators engaged in mining gold and silver from any mining properties held or which were held under contracts of purchase which require the performance of work thereon, or the making of periodic payments with respect thereto, and operators who hold such properties as mortgagors, and who cannot mine gold or silver—

I particularly call attention to this language—

because of the operation of any law or regulation of the United States Government.

I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if the bill gives relief only in those cases where the beneficiary is prevented from carrying on his mining operations solely by law or regulation of the United States Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill is intended to meet a condition which arose because of the Federal regulation or order which was enforced against gold and silver mines during the war and which shut down gold and silver mining. The object, as stated at that time, was to release the labor so employed in order that it might engage in the extraction of more essential minerals. The purpose of the bill is to meet the condition which arose by reason of closing down those mines. For instance, let us consider a mine which was under what is called "bond and lease," a term known to the West with which the Senator is undoubtedly familiar. An individual who held a mine which was operating under bond and lease was required by the instrument to do a certain number of shifts of work per period, month or quarter, whatever it might be; he was required to spend a certain amount of money during a certain period; he was required to do other things. When the mines were shut down under the Government's order the operator could no longer go forward and meet the condition of the bond and lease. So it put not only the lessee but the lessor as well in such a condition that neither could assist the other. The bill would provide relief for that condition.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if the Senator will refer to page 1 of the bill, line 10, he will note that among other situations which make him unable to perform the obligation would be that the beneficiary—and now I quote from line 10—

is unable for reasons beyond his control, to obtain the necessary supplies and equipment, or because of the operation of any statute, rule, regulation, order, or requirement of the United States or any agency thereof.

The language would appear to be to broaden the basis of relief so as to include any cause, whether or not it arose because of action by the Federal Government. If that is not the purpose of the bill, I should like to have the Senator assure me of that fact.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was not exactly the intention of the bill, but it grew out of the regulation to which I have made reference, in other words, because of something beyond his control. As the Senator may recall, we visited the Department and tried to argue against the making of the regulation, but we were unable to do so. That put matters beyond the operator's control. He was cut off from getting supplies, materials, or labor.

Mr. CORDON. Then, I inquire, is it the purpose of the bill to grant relief only in those cases where the situation resulted directly or indirectly from causes arising as a result of the war? That is what I want to know.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 27?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how much is involved or may be involved in terms of dollars?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that there is anything at all involved in terms of dollars as against the Government. It is a question of granting relief by reason of statutory conditions or by reason of contractual conditions, and what may be involved no one can state. It is a matter of equity.

Mr. GREEN. What would the claims amount to under the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no way of stating at this time.

Mr. GREEN. Inasmuch as I should like information on that point, and I think the Senate also should have it, and also because the bill goes very much further than the purpose stated in the title "to cease operations because of the war," I shall have to ask that the bill go over. The bill itself, as has already been suggested, goes beyond that and refers to the operator's inability to mine the property "for reasons beyond his control." There may be a great many reasons beyond his control besides those growing out of the conduct of the war. Perhaps the Senator from Nevada will give an explanation of the discrepancy.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have stated that the bill is necessary because of the regulation that was imposed as an incident of the war. It traces back entirely to

that regulation No. 107, as I recall the number.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I prefer not to object unless it is necessary, but I shall ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PRODUCTION OF SUGARS AND SIRUPS IN ALCOHOL PLANTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call Calendar No. 7, House Joint Resolution 57, which is identical with Senate Joint Resolution 5, Calendar No. 6.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) extending 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, when the joint resolution was first brought up for consideration I asked that it go over because it had come to my attention that some question would be raised as to the propriety of passing the measure. In today's newspaper the question is raised again by Mr. Drew Pearson in an article which makes certain charges, and I would appreciate it very much if the sponsor of the joint resolution, the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], could give us a statement as to the truth or falsity of the important charges made in this morning's Washington Post by Mr. Drew Pearson.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I think perhaps all Members of the Senate have read the article appearing in the newspaper this morning, written by one of the newspaper men, mentioning my name in connection with the operation of the Butler-Welsh Grain Co., at Omaha, and also what is termed the Omaha alcohol plant.

When I was elected to the Senate in November 1940, I immediately resigned as of November 1st of that year from the Butler-Welsh Grain Co. Since that day I have had no more interest, financial or otherwise, in the Butler-Welsh Grain Co. than the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho or any other Member of this body has had. I have not participated to the extent of 1 penny in the profits of the company. Had I been here in the Senate for profit only I would have been many times better off if I had retained my interest in the Butler-Welsh Grain Co. and had never become a Member of the Senate. The reason I resigned was this: I had taken the matter up with the Department of Agriculture, and was advised that since the Butler-Welsh Grain Co. was doing a storage business with the Government, I would be ineligible to serve as a Member of the Senate if at the same time I were interested in the company. That is the reasoon I retired from the organization, which, I may say, was a partnership, not a corporation. Had it been doing business as a corporation there is no reason why I could not have continued to hold my interest in the grain company. But it still operates as a partnership. I have no interest whatsoever in it. I have no interest and never have had any interest in the Omaha alcohol plant. Like every other Senator here I have been exceedingly interested in its operation, because it provided alcohol, seven tank carloads a day, most of which during the war went direct by tanker cars to Seattle, where it was loaded on steamers for Vladivostok. It made probably the greatest contribution of any single war plant toward winning the war on the western front, because it provided high octane fuel for the operation of the war engines, airplanes, tanks, and other matériel on that front.

Mr. President, every member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Department of Agriculture, and everyone in the Government with whom I am acquainted is exceedingly anxious that that plant and others like it be continued in operation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the attitude of the Treasury Department? Heretofore it has objected to one plant producing both alcohol and sirup, for fear that material might be diverted to the production of alcohol, and that the Government might lose tax revenue. Can the Senator tell us what is the attitude of the Treasury Department?

Mr. BUTLER. When this question arose the other day I was not provided with letters from the departments. Since then I have been provided with them, and I shall be glad to provide copies for the RECORD at this point if the Senator so desires.

(Mr. BUTLER subsequently submitted the following letters, which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

JANUARY 23, 1947.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your telephone request of January 22, 1947, for a report on House Joint Resolution 57, extending the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The production of sugars and sirups from surplus and damaged agricultural commodities under section 3126 (a) of Internal Revenue Code, in our belief, fully justifies the further extension of the life of that law to April 30, 1948.

The view of the Department of Agriculture in this matter was fully set forth in the attached letter dated June 11, 1946, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury.

In view of your request that this report be submitted today, we have not had an opportunity to obtain from the Bureau of the Budget advice as to the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 23, 1947.

Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your recent letter enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 5 and requesting a report thereon (with two copies) at the earliest date possible.

The joint resolution would amend section 3126 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code by striking out "February 1, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1948." Section 3126 (a), as amended by Senate Joint Resolution 162, Seventy-ninth Congress (Public Law 437, 79th Cong.), is temporary emergency legislation which authorizes, until February 1, 1947, the production of sugars and sirups from potatoes and high moisture or damaged grain at industrial alcohol plants simultaneously with, or alternately with, the production of alcohol. The proposed amendment would extend for 15 months the period during which such operations may be conducted at such plants.

The purpose of the original legislation was to facilitate the use of a large surplus of potatoes and a large quantity of damaged corn in the production of needed sugars and sirups. The first amendment extended the expiration date of the law to facilitate the disposition of an expected surplus of potatoes. It is understood that there now exists a very large surplus of potatoes (about 80,000,000 bushels) which may be used for the production of alcohol, sugars and sirups. It is also possible that there may result from the bumper crops of 1946 a surplus of grain, the marketing of which may be facilitated by such use.

As stated in the report on the original legislation, and also in the report on the joint resolution which extended the expiration date thereof, the distillation of alcohol on the same premises where sugars and sirups are refined was forbidden prior to the enactment of section 3126 (a). The production of sugars and sirups at industrial alcohol plants, and the resulting traffic in such substances on the premises of such plants make more difficult the administration of the alcohol tax laws. It is believed such use of the plants should not be sanctioned for a longer period than necesary. However, if it should be deemed necessary to extend the expiration date of the temporary legislation to April 30, 1948, to aid in the marketing of the existing potato surplus or an anticipated grain surplus suitable for use in manufacturing sugars and sirups, the Department will make no objection to the proposed amendment.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BUTLER. The Department of Agriculture strongly recommends the continuance of the operation of the plant in the production of both alcohol and sirup. The attitude of the Treasury Department is that it is supporting the Department of Agriculture. The Treasury Department prefers that the operation be exclusively in connection with alcohol or exclusively in connection with sirup. That is the only contention of the Department. The theory is that under such an arrangement it is easier for the Department to supervise the output of the plant. A very large tax is collected on alcohol, and nothing is collected on sirup. But the Department has had no trouble whatsoever in collecting every penny of revenue due the Government from this joint operation.

The article in the newspaper this morning stated that I had proposed a measure especially for the Omaha alcohol plant. When the question first arose, the proposal was made general in its application. As the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. GEORGE] can testify, it was applicable to any plant which wished to oper-

ate in the production of alcohol and sirup at the same time. Some plants have been conducting such operations. I do not like to mention names, but a large plant at Philadelphia, several times larger than the one at Omaha, for a time produced both commodities. It may not be producing both at the moment, but it is offering sirup for sale; so it has produced both commodities at the same time.

The current authority under which such plants are operating expires February 1. We have asked, upon the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture, that it be continued until April 30, 1948, during which time the Senate may have an opportunity to consider permanent legislation which would permit joint operation of such plants.

The question at this time is whether we are to continue the operation of this particular plant. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho and other Senators who are interested that during the past few months there have been shipments from 27 States of potatoes for processing into sirup and alcohol. More than 5,000,000 pounds of potatoes have been shipped from the Senator's own State. The reason why I was late in arriving on the floor was that I was receiving some information by telephone from the plant at Omaha. I am sorry that the subject came up before the notes could be transcribed, so that I could have them before me. However, more than 5,000,000 pounds of Idaho potatoes have recently been processed in that plant.

We are approaching the time when the agricultural problem will be entirely different from what it is at the moment, when every pound of food is needed for use here and elsewhere. Before long we shall be producing surpluses; and if we continue in operation plants such as the one at Omaha, we shall be taking a step forward in the solution of the agricultural problem in America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 57?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if it is not true that at the present time there is an extreme shortage of sugar in this country?

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The second part of my question is whether this question does not entirely revolve about the point as to whether we want more alcohol or more sugar and sirup?

Mr. BUTLER. In reply to the distinguished Senator, let me say that we all know the situation regarding sugar. It is extremely critical. The Omaha plant alone has produced more than 35,000,000 pounds of sirup during the past few months. Every pound of sirup takes the place of approximately a pound of sugar. The sirup is used industrially, thus making sugar available for the housewife and other private users.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] may be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma can be recognized in his own right for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then I ask to be recognized in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I was in the West about a year ago and had the opportunity of inspecting the plant at Omaha, Nebr.

It is a war plant, constructed in the beginning for the purpose of making industrial alcohol. When the war was over, of course, the demand for alcohol suddenly decreased. The plant was left in the hands of a board which had been managing the plant for the Government.

There is a large demand for molasses. As I understand, the plant was converted to the production of molasses. I saw the plant in operation. About the time I was there I received a request from a concern in my home State for sugar to be used in patching automobile tires. I am not a chemist, and I do not know anything about the automobile tire business, but this concern had a contract to patch tires for the Army at Camp Gruber, in eastern Oklahoma. All at once their supply of sugar was cut off.

I took the matter up with the Omaha plant to see whether or not that plant could furnish the Muskogee, Okla., plant with sugar or molasses. As I understood, molasses would serve the purpose. I was advised that the supplies required could be furnished. I have heard nothing further on the subject, and I presume a business connection was satisfactorily arranged. So the plant did serve a substantial interest in my State.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me to make a brief statement?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. During the time this plant has been operating at Omaha it has produced more than 30,000,000 gallons of alcohol, at a profit to the operators of approximately one-half cent a gallon, which is not an enormous profit. It is the lowest-cost producer of grain alcohol in the country today. For the use of the plant, which cost originally approximately $7,500,000, it is paying the Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a rate ranging from 8¼ cents a gallon down to 7½ cents, averaging 7.7 cents a gallon. I believe that subsequent additions have brought the cost of the plant up to approximately $8,000,000. The operators of the plant have returned more than half the original cost to the Government in rentals. A part of the rental has been at a rate equivalent to more than 30 percent annual interest on the money invested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present at the beginning of this discussion. I had some acquaintance with this subject. In fact, I went to see the Secretary of Agriculture about it approximately a year ago. I was very much interested in this question from the aspect of the use of the plant in an experimental project, on a permanent basis, for the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities.

I related the information which I obtained, and the attitude of the Department, to the Committee on Finance. It seemed to me then, and it still seems to me, that a plant of this kind may have a very valuable use to the agricultural interests over a period of time, and not merely in an emergency.

I have no personal knowledge of the manner in which this particular plant was operated. I am sure that the Senator from Nebraska can speak for himself on that score. However, I believe that there is a very interesting possibility in a plant of this kind, in the utilization of recurring agricultural surpluses. As I understand, it is very well adapted for the use of such things as soft corn. The subject was first brought to my attention in connection with potatoes. We are all familiar with the utilization of potatoes in producing sirup as well as alcohol.

I saw the article in the newspaper this morning. I am still of the opinion that this plant, or some plant like it, would serve a good purpose. I understand that this is an efficient plant. I am informed that there are three similar plants. I believe one is located at Muscatine, Iowa. Another is located at Omaha, Nebr., and there is one at Kansas City. Anyone of those plants, or all of them, could have taken advantage of the provision permitting the production of sirup at the same time alcohol was produced.

I also recall the discussion with regard to the feasibility of collecting taxes on this plant. The Treasury Department was not very vigorous in its opposition. It merely said, "We have never done that, and it might cause some difficulty and some danger of divergence." I I should not say that the Treasury Department fought it very vigorously. In the end it said, practically, "That is our position; but we are willing to go along."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as the result of a large surplus of potatoes in California last year, I had occasion to make some investigation of the Omaha plant to which reference has been made. A very considerable volume of California potatoes, which otherwise would have been wasted, was used in that plant. As a result of my investigation I reached the conclusion that the plant had performed an outstanding and notable work during the war in the production of alcohol and that it has very great pioneering possibilities for American agriculture in coming years in providing a large salvage from surplus agricultural products. During the course of my investigation I secured some information from the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and I found him not only most courteous, but, I also thought, objective and patriotic in his attitude toward this fine institution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in 1938 the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Henry Wallace, stated in his annual report that something should be done to dispose of surplus agricultural products. The report showed that in every foreign country, including Africa, there were alcohol plants.

Last summer my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] and I had occasion, time and time again, to meet with potato growers in North Dakota. At the present time there is an excess of millions of bushels of potatoes which are rotting. They cannot be dehydrated because UNRRA will not buy them. UNRRA says they spoil before they can reach the countries where they can be used. It also claims that the cost is prohibitive.

I know that I speak for both of the Senators from North Dakota when I say that the people of our State very much approve of the alcohol plants at Omaha and the other two places, and their hope is that the operation of those alcohol plants may be continued because, if the same kind of a situation shall arise following World War II as that which existed after World War I, we shall have a surplus of apples and of all kinds of grain, which, of course, can be utilized in these alcohol plants. They can be used, as the distinguished Senator well knows, in the manufacture of material which can be utilized in connection with the making of synthetic rubber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the parliamentary situation clarified. As I understand, there has been no objection yet to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 6, Senate Joint Resolution 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been no objection as yet. The Senate is considering House Joint Resolution 57, which is the same as Senate Joint Resolution 5.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope that no objection will be made to the immediate passage of this joint resolution. I speak from the point of view of a producer and in the interest of the corn producers of the area involved. We have 340,000,000 bushels of corn in Nebraska, the largest corn crop which that State has ever produced. A great deal of it is what is known as wet corn. In some sections of Nebraska this year the moisture content of that corn reached as high as 27 percent.

I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska if it is not true that March 1 is the date on which tenants usually change farms in our section of the country. We have a good many tenants who change farms each March, and it becomes increasingly difficult to utilize wet corn if a change is made.

The alcohol plant at Omaha has been an outlet for a great deal of wet corn. It is really an emergency situation. On the floor of the Senate last week I mentioned the fact that we were endeavoring to get box cars for that section. A hearing on that subject will be held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce next Tuesday in an endeavor to move corn. A good deal of it is moved by truck to this alcohol plant. Because of that fact, I hope that no objection will be made. I ask my colleague if what I have said is not true, with reference to the movement of wet corn.

Mr. BUTLER. A report appeared in the press this morning that the grain company in which I was once a partner still profits on the grain business that is done with the alcohol plant. Originally the Butler-Welsh Grain Co. acted as a broker and buyer, but the plant equipped itself to receive grain direct from the farms. The arrangement was completed in May 1945, and since that date not one cent of income from the purchase or handling of grain has come to the Butler-Welsh Grain Co., or, so far as I know, to any other member of the Omaha Grain Exchange. The grain has come almost exclusively in trucks from the country, and as my esteemed colleague has stated, the bulk of it is wet corn which has deteriorated because of excessive moisture.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, while the subject of the disposal of agricultural surpluses is being discussed, I wish to refer briefly to the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] regarding the potato crop, which is one with the other problem, and to emphasize that under legislation which was passed by the Senate last spring, at which time the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who now is present, pointed out that in the disposal of the potato surplus it would be perfectly possible under that authorization for the Department of Agriculture to purchase the dehydrated potatoes at any figure it might deem advisable. The Department of Agriculture has not seen fit to exercise that authority.

Without discussing here the wisdom of that decision, let me say that it seems to me the Department of Agriculture in the exercise of its powers and authority and responsibility regarding the disposal of agricultural surpluses is placed in a very unfortunate position when more than 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes are now being put out into the fields to rot, to be destroyed by the weather, although it would have been quite feasible for many millions of bushels of those potatoes to have been saved for human consumption, at home or abroad, by the expenditure of what would not seem to be excessive amounts of money, the expenditure of which was contemplated by the amendment which was adopted on the floor of the Senate with the unanimous approval of all Members of the Senate then present. I do not think there was a dissenting voice.

I shall not go into the various considerations which have ramified in this matter, but I wish to make clear that the entire problem of our surplus production, the Government guaranties for which will be expiring the next calendar year, must engage the very intimate attention certainly of every Member of Congress and, I believe, of all our people if we are to avoid a debacle such as that which came after the last war, and I believe that those concerned with agriculture and, it seems to me, also those concerned with industry must give, during the next year, their constant and earnest attention to how these tremendous surpluses, which have been stimulated incident to the war, are going to be handled without disrupting and destroying our economy.

So I hope all Members of Congress will realize that the problem is coming; and I hope that the Department of Agriculture, which is the primary executive agency concerned, will realize that the people of the country view with grave concern the destruction of enormous quantities of food during a period when the whole world is apparently in need of food.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, perhaps I should make a brief statement regarding this joint resolution, which merely extends an existing act.

It will be recalled that there was considerable concern about the demobilization or destruction of certain of the plants which were built by the Government for war purposes, and several Senators were concerned regarding the preservation of at least one of the alcohol plants which had been constructed for the purpose of producing alcohol. After we ceased to need the alcohol so badly, the question arose whether one of those plants could be converted to the use of surplus farm products, for the purpose of making either sugar or sirup. As originally drawn, the legislation which came before the Finance Committee dealt exclusively with war plants, but before the committee it was broadened, so that now it is general in character. The only question involved in this extension is whether alcohol plants may simultaneously make sirup or sugar in the same plant, under the same roof. There was no reason why alcohol plants could not have made sugar at all times, except it was believed by the department in charge of our revenues that it would be difficult to collect the tax, and, therefore, for the purpose of simplifying the collection of the tax there was a regulation, based upon a statute, that a plant could not simultaneously make both sugar or sirup and alcohol. The operator of such a plant could make sugar or sirup, and then could switch over to the manufacture of alcohol.

All this joint resolution does—and it is not specific and is not confined to the plant in Nebraska, but is general—is to permit an alcohol plant to make, simultaneously, sirup or sugar. There was some apprehension on the part of the taxing authorities that perhaps there would be some difficulty and that opportunity for tax evasion would be afforded, but it is likely that there is no real difficulty in the modern manufacture of alcohol and the simultaneous production of sugar or sirup.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 57?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) extending 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 5 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign House Joint Resolution 57, which has just been passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DECLINE IN LIVESTOCK PRICES

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, in July last there occurred on the floor of the Senate considerable debate relative to a move to decontrol livestock. Those who were responsible for the effort to decontrol livestock made it very clear that they were satisfied that if such decontrol took place the law of supply and demand would very soon regulate the price and bring meat within the range of everyone's pocket. That effort was defeated at that time, but toward the end of October by Executive order livestock was decontrolled; and immediately the result which was expected took place. On November 18 prime beef on the Chicago market went to an all-time high of $37 a hundred pounds.

I think it would be of interest for the Senate to know, and also for it to be made a matter of record, that since that time the decline in livestock prices has continued. Last week the top price had come down to $28. The average decline last week was from $1 to $3 a hundred pounds on the good and choice steers, and $2 to $3 on medium and average good steers. That was for the week.

I ask unanimous consent that the release by the Department of Agriculture on cattle marketing in Chicago last week be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LIVESTOCK IN CHICAGO

CHICAGO, January 25.—Today's report of the livestock markets here by the United States Department of Agriculture follows:

"CATTLE

"Salable cattle, 500 head (estimated); total not given. Compared with week ago: in sympathy with falling dressed beef prices, fed steers and yearlings closed $1 to $3 lower; strictly good and choice steers, $2 to $3 down; medium to average-good steers and all heifers, $1 to $2 lower; general price levels lowest since decontrol; load lot of top choice steers for week, $27; short load, $28; choice light and long yearlings stopped late at $25; average-medium to strictly good steers closed at $17–$23.50; strictly medium grades, $15–$16.75; average-medium to average-good heifers wound up week on buyers' market at $15.25–$20; kinds scaling better than average-good sold late at $21; week's extreme top on choice 1,172-pound heifers, $25.50; practical heifer top for week, $25; all cows lost $1 to $1.50, in instances $2; week-end clearance complete but prices $2 to $3 and more under 2 weeks earlier; canners and cutters closed at $8–$10.25; most beef cows at $10.50–$13.50; practical outside on good cows, $14.50, compared with $17 2 weeks earlier and extreme top of $16.50 last week; due to acute scarcity, bulls held steady early in week at $16 down but closed 25 to 50 cents lower at $15.50 down; vealers firm at $28 down; thin stock cattle showed sympathetic weakness, with medium to good grades as much as 50 cents lower, but supply small and choice yearling stockers quotable around $17.75, very scarce; several loads of fleshy 850–950 pound steers went back late at $18.75–$21."

SALARIES OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4), relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this measure has had the consideration and the unanimous recommendation of the Appropriations Committee. In the past, a practice which probably is not a good one has developed and been followed to some extent, under which, instead of increasing, for instance, the pay of certain positions, provision has been made that the man who holds the place shall receive a salary of $3,000 and an additional $500 as long as he continues to be the incumbent. Such a provision applies to secretaries to the majority and minority, respectively. Although when a change in the political complexion of the Senate occurs, the majority secretary then becomes the minority secretary and vice versa; nevertheless they are the same persons. The persons concerned should not be penalized because of a transfer of political leadership. The joint resolution is a simple measure to make the salary correspond to the job, rather than to the individual man. Personally, I think the practice should be stopped, because it causes certain complications, for the reasons stated. This joint resolution corrects that condition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4), relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) in the case of any position under the Senate for which additional compensation is provided for in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, "so long as the position is held by the present incumbent," the salary provided in such act, including such additional compensation, shall be payable to any incumbent thereof without regard to the above-quoted limitation, in addition to any other compensation authorized by law for such position.

(b) The salaries referred to in the foregoing subsection shall be payable from January 3, 1947.

STAFF ORGANIZATION FOR SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) providing for a more effective staff organization for standing commitees of the Senate, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment, on page 2, in line 1, before the word "for", to strike out "$3,420" and insert "$3,720", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 of the Reorganization Act of 1946, the clerical staffs of standing committees of the Senate shall be organized and compensated in the manner hereinafter provided.

The annual rates of compensation for the clerical staff of each standing committee of the Senate (other than the Appropriations Committee) shall be $2,000 to $8,000 for one chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk; and $2,000 to $3,720 for not to exceed four other clerical assistants.

The annual rates of compensation for the clerical staff of the Appropriations Committee shall be as follows: One chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk at $5,600 to $8,000; such assistant clerks as may be necessary at $3,820 to $5,600; and such other clerical assistants as may be necessary at $2,000 to $3,420.

Such compensation shall be fixed by the chairman of each such committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there may be some difference of opinion on this particular joint resolution, but I doubt that there will be if the story is fully understood.

Under the Congressional Reorganization Act, Congress has authorized for each standing committee of the Senate a professional staff of four and a clerical staff of six, but there was no limitation, except a figure of $8,000 net or $10,000 gross, as to what any of the committees could pay their various assistants.

It seemed to be the feeling of many persons that some restriction should be placed upon the right of the committees in establishing the salary requirements of this new group of 10 staff members for each committee. After some discussion, the bill was reported without any limitation whatsoever on the professional staffs; that is, the four professional staff members could be appointed at the top salary of $8,000 net, or $10,000 gross. It is expected that in many instances, certainly, they would be appointed at much lesser salaries, giving them an opportunity gradually to reach the maximum if they were worth while.

Therefore the committees will be entirely free in what they may do as to the professional staffs, but the joint resolution does put a limit on what they can do with the clerical staffs. It provides, for example, that they may appoint a chief clerk and an assistant chief clerk at salaries up to $8,000 net, or $10,000 gross, but that the other four members of the clerical staff shall be limited to a base salary of $2,000 up to a base salary of $3,720, which roughly would mean a gross of from about $2,900 to a gross of about $5,200.

Mr. President, that is not as much of a limitation as many thought it would be wise to impose, but it seemed to be a fair compromise in order to restrict in some manner what should be paid the members of the staffs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not rise to dispute what the Senator has been saying; I think probably the limitation is wise. I merely desire to have clarified a question in my own mind. As I recall, the original reorganization bill contained no reference to the chief clerk or the assistant chief clerk; there was merely blanket authority to employ all these clerks up to $8,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. And the two new titles were inserted. I assume it was the judgment of Senators that each committee could make its own designation as to a chief clerk and an assistant chief clerk.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct, and the thought was that certainly there would be two top men in the clerical staff, to whom the committee might pay the top figures, but there would be a ceiling, so to speak, on the four other members of the clerical staff.

Mr. HATCH. My attention was attracted to another matter. I do not know whether the Senator has given it thought, but in the provision relating to the clerks for the Committee on Appropriations, which is a separate provision, I see that the maximum for clerks of other committees, the lesser clerks, is $3,720, while there is retained a maximum for such clerks of the Committee on Appropriations of $3,420. Was that intended?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but the Committee on Appropriations has always had in the past a larger staff than the other committees, and the top assistants have been paid a higher rate. We would still cling to that practice, so far as clerks needed in the Committee on Appropriations are concerned, but we all felt that the rate fixed was high enough to enable the committee to get competent stenographers and a competent messenger.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. I am in thorough accord with everything the Senator has said, but I doubt the wisdom of fixing a lower limitation as to one committee and making a discrimination as between that and other committees. This is merely a suggestion. I doubt whether such a provision would be wise.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should be delighted to offer an amendment to raise the figures in line 8 on page 2 from $3,420 to $3,720, to make the provision uniform as to all committees.

Mr. HATCH. I think that would be better.

Mr. BRIDGES. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire offers an amendment to the pending resolution which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$3,420" and insert "$3,720."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I observe that there is a reclassification of clerks, in that there is a principal clerk and an assistant clerk. Is any recognition given to the minority side in the selection of the assistant clerk?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is none provided in the reorganization legislation. Having been a member of the minority for 10 years, I personally feel that in each committee certainly the minority is entitled to representation in picking the clerks of the committee. If I had been writing the reorganization law, I personally would have written such a provision into the law, but it is not in the law, therefore it is left to the option of the various committees.

In the Committee on Appropriations we have agreed that two of the clerks shall be appointed by the minority, and we are going to establish that as a policy. Furthermore, I may say that we are keeping as the clerk and assistant clerk of the committee, the present clerk and assistant clerk, who for some time past served the present minority party when it was in control. We are making no change. We are leaving that on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that, and I think the committee made a very wise decision in that regard. But the question I ask is whether the minority will be recognized in the selection of the assistant clerks. Will the majority have the appointment of both the clerks and the assistant clerks of the various committees?

Mr. BRIDGES. My answer has to be that there is nothing in the law to require that the minority be recognized. It is my personal opinion that the minority should be recognized, but it is not in the law.

Mr. OVERTON. That is, in the selection of the assistant clerks?

Mr. BRIDGES. In the selection of the assistant clerks.

Mr. OVERTON. There are three classes, the principal clerk, the assistant clerk, and then clerks generally.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have to answer that there is nothing in the law with respect to that.

Mr. OVERTON. I was wondering whether any policy had been adopted.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; except in the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am chairman, where we have agreed on a policy, as the Senator knows, which all have considered to be fair. I could not speak as to what the other committees will do.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we have allotted to the minority an assistant clerk at $7,500 gross, and the only position he could fill would be that of assistant clerk. So far as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is concerned, we have given the minority the appointment of an assistant clerk.

I think the Reorganization Act recognizes that the minority should have control over some appointments, because it provides that certain of the clerks may be assigned to the "ranking minority member"—I think that is the way it is put—that there shall be some clerks assigned to the ranking minority member.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire. My recollection is that there is a clause in the act providing that the four supposed experts and the six clerks shall be apportioned, not in any particular fashion, but that the minority shall be given representation in their choice.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to paragraph (a) of section 202 of the Reorganization Act, which reads:

SEC. 202. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable—

And so forth.

Mr. TAFT. That language applies only to the six clerks. It does not apply to the professional assistants. Professional assistants are not intended to be partisan in any way, and so far as the committee of which I am chairman is concerned, I do not know whether the ones we select will be Republicans or Democrats, but they are not supposed to have any particular attachment to either majority or minority. I think the Senator will find it so provided in the act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that a committee attaché may himself be nonpartisan, but it seems to me the purpose is to enable the minority to tell such a man what to do, if the minority desires to have certain research work conducted.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, I am only calling attention to the fact that the provision of the act about the minority applies only to the clerks; it does not apply to the four professional assistants. There is a good reason why it should not, because, for instance, on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we expect to have an economist; a man familiar with labor questions; an expert on health problems; and one familiar with matters of education. We may also have to have a man versed in veterans' affairs. We shall have to omit one of those, because there is provision for only four. There is no particular reason to assign any one of them to the minority or the majority. They are experts on particular subjects, and we have five important subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. So that I think those professional assistants ought to be looked upon as experts chosen by the entire committee, in no way assigned either to the minority or to the majority.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator would allow the minority to attend the meetings, would he not?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not altogether agree with my distinguished friend from Ohio on that question. I think under a liberal interpretation the Reorganization Act follows the custom which has prevailed in the past. For example, in the Committee on Finance as it was operating in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the minority definitely had a professional representative working in their behalf.

It seems to me that if, for instance, the Committee on Finance is going to employ a professional staff consisting of four members, certainly the minority

members of that committee ought to have a voice in the selection of those four professionals.

I cite another reason for my conclusion. The act clearly states, for instance, under paragraph (c) of section 202:

> The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable.

In other words, as I construe that language of the act, a part of the clerical staff would be attached to the minority, and if we selected a part of that minority staff, that same personnel could be attached to one of the professionals. Unless all members agree upon the staff I can see where confusion and inefficiency could creep in.

It seems to me that very definitely we should have a right to say at least who some of these professionals are going to be. However I agree thoroughly with the Senator that there should be no politics in connection with the selection of these men. That is provided for in the Reorganization Act. They should be capable men, competent to perform the work they are selected to do. However, I certainly would never agree that the majority party should select all four members of the staff if we are to follow the letter and spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that all four have to be approved by the committees.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me absolutely necessary that the four professional members be selected and approved by the full committee without regard to partisanship, because it is perfectly obvious that if some of them were under the direction of the minority and others were under the direction of the majority, there would soon be a committee divided against itself on certain matters, and nothing but confusion would be the result.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. That of course would not prevent the majority selecting all four members, regardless of what the minority desired, because the majority party could, if it chose to do so, select the four professional members.

Mr. AIKEN. That is probably true.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I am making. In other words, it seems to me that the majority and the minority ought to agree upon the four professionals, if they can, certainly before the names are presented.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator from Illinois that I think that is just what will happen in practically every one of the committees. I hope that in all the committees there will be agreement. Certainly there has been no disagreement as yet in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The minority members suggested the name of a certain person and it was readily accepted by the majority members, because they felt he was competent.

I assume the reason the law provides that the minority shall be represented on the clerical staff is that they might feel freer to go to a member of their own party in search of certain information; but it is my understanding that the clerical staff of the committee should work for the committee as a whole, for the good of the country as a whole, and should not indulge in partisan politics on either side.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it is extremely valuable to have this matter clarified. It had been my understanding that these professionals were supposed to be of a rather permanent character, comparable to those who served so effectively in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, where the experts were continued without regard to party, and complete reliance has always been placed in them. It had been my understanding that in the development of the reorganization it was contemplated these four professionals should be of that character, which would immediately eliminate the idea that they were of any particular political persuasion.

As a practical matter, in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for instance, we have the same problem to which the Senator from Ohio referred. There are four different fields of jurisdiction. Formerly the Commerce Committee of the Senate handled the merchant marine and aviation; the Interstate Commerce Committee handled railroad and radio legislation. Those fields are entirely different. They invite the attention of the most expert professional opinion, and it has been my assumption that it would be contemplated that experts in those fields would be secured, and that if their services were satisfactory they might continue until they could in some measure match the understanding of these problems as presented by the executive departments, on whom hitherto we have been compelled exclusively to rely.

It seems to me to be unfortunate that the question of partisanship should enter into the matter of clerkships. It is obvious that an assistant clerk who could particularly serve the minority or the majority would be most helpful and in order, and I hope that will be the eventual decision which will be reached.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make one further observation on this question. I do not anticipate any trouble in the selection of the professional staffs or the clerical staffs that go along with the professional staffs. I think it would be most unfortunate if there should be any trouble in selecting these experts, but again I point out the fact that under the Reorganization Act the majority party members have the power, if they care to wield it, to select all four of these members, as well as the clerical staff.

I hope the time will not come when a record vote will be necessary in any committee upon any individual who might be serving on the professional staff. I hope we can agree in advance in every committee, as to the kind and character of men who ought to be employed, so that the selection may be unanimous; but I desire to say that in the selection of these men for the professional work, it would seem the better part of wisdom for the majority to take into consideration the wishes of the minority.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Illinois that we are worrying about something that is not going to happen. I am not happy about the manner in which section 202 (a) is drafted; but I think its intendment is perfectly clear. It says that—

> Each standing committee of the Senate * * * is authorized to appoint by a majority vote—

It does not say the majority members of the committee shall have the right of designation, but that the committee shall by a majority vote appoint these four professional staff members, and that vote might come from both sides of the committee table.

I think as a practical matter the Senators will find taking place exactly what has happened in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The committee has been moving along rather slowly. There has been no appointment made either to the professional staff or to the clerical force without the concurrence of the minority members of the committee—speaking of the minority in a political sense.

The committee has authorized me to make certain appointments, and in every instance, I may say to the Senator from Illinois and to the Senator from Texas, I have consulted with and have received the sanction of the ranking minority members of the committee. Again I am speaking in a political sense.

I think what has happened with respect to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce probably is going to happen with respect to all the committees, and that in connection with this matter no practical difficulty will be encountered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendment to the joint resolution is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The resolution (S. J. Res. 41), authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the

Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1947, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McMAHON obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a very brief executive session?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward M. Ranson, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Saxton Daniel, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TOBEY subsequently said: Mr. President, last Friday the nomination of Dillon S. Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority went over at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. On Saturday the Senator from Indiana came to my office with a group of nine prominent Legionnaires from various sections of the country, who appeared in opposition to certain phases of administration of the National Housing Act, and the United States Housing Authority, and made very serious charges of inefficiency and misapplication of the principles of the act. Therefore I told them, and I told the Senator from Indiana, and I would have told the Senate had I been here when the bells rang announcing an executive session, that I should ask that the nomination be held up until after a hearing could be had a week from tomorrow morning.

I now ask unanimous consent that the order by which the nomination of Dillon S. Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority was confirmed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire that the order with respect to the confirmation of the nomination of Dillon S. Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority be vacated, and that the nomination be returned to the Executive Calendar? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Dillon S. Myer be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce. (Received recess appointment.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Chapman Foster, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce. (Received recess appointment.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrian S. Fisher, of Tennessee, to be Solicitor, Department of Commerce. (Received recess appointment.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence M. Young, of California, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1952. (Received recess appointment.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report certain nominations approved by the committee this morning. These are all nominations for positions in the Army, Navy, and Selective Service, and under the rules should lie over for 1 day. The nominations are of high-ranking officers, from colonel in the Army and above, and from captain in the Navy and above. So I ask that these nominations go to the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations reported by the Senator from South Dakota from the Committee on Armed Services, will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. GURNEY. I now report from the Committee on Armed Services, a great number of other nominations, routine in nature, in the Army and in the Navy. They are junior officers. I may say that the committee has adopted a policy when we receive nominations of all grades and ranks, to pass a list of the nominations around to each Senator on the committee. I want to make this statement so the Senate will know the nominations have been given thorough consideration. There are 13 members of the committee. We have lists, together with a complete record of the service of the nominees in the Army or Navy. The lists and the record are given to each committee member. We hold the nominations and do not act on them as a committee until each member has had a chance for a week or more to go over the nominations carefully. That practice has been followed in this instance in the case of all the nominations to which I now refer.

I report these nominations of junior officers in the Army and Navy at this time, and ask for immediate consideration of the nominations in view of the fact that they have been so thoroughly considered in committee, and in order to save printing expense, for it would cost about $600 to have the nominations printed on the Executive Calendar. In view of those considerations I feel we are completely justified in asking for immediate consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota that the routine nominations, which he has reported from the Committee on Armed Services, may be presently considered? The Chair hears no objection, and the routine nominations are confirmed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of routine nominations upon which the Senate has just acted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE AMERICAN FARMERS' RIGHT TO PROTECTION UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Connecticut has been very kind to agree in advance to yield to me for 2 or 3 minutes while I place three items in the RECORD. The first item deals with a subject which will be of great concern, I am sure, to the Eightieth Congress, namely that of reciprocal-trade agreements. Those of us from the West are somewhat concerned, and I think rightly, over the possibility that certain segments of American agriculture may suffer unjustifiably from trade agreements that fail to give adequate consideration to the needs and rights of American farmers. I think it of such great importance to our national security that we protect the economic position of the American farmer that on January 23 I appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at its meeting held in the Natural History Museum in this city, and gave testimony on this problem. I ask unanimous consent to have my testimony printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, OF OREGON

Senator MORSE. May it please the committee, I want to make a brief statement in regard to some of the problems that I think confront us in the Congress of the United States in connection with the oncoming reciprocal-trade-agreement debates and some of the problems which I think confront us out in the West in regard to our agricultural problems.

I think you gentlemen appreciate this fact, that the testimony of any witness has to be judged somewhat by both his biases and his background, and I stand before you this morning as one who has had a lifelong interest in, and participation in, agricultural pursuits, as well as my own professional pursuit of the law.

I think it is of great importance that we recognize that if we are going to have a stable economy in America then we must have a coordinated one and we must not have trade policies that at any point seem to discriminate unfairly against any segment of that economy.

I would point out to this Board that it happens to be my opinion, subject to whatever bias you wish to attribute to it, that American agriculture is, after all, the very foundation of our private-property economy in this country. I expressed that in certain language in a press release following my recent trip through Europe and the Middle East. I expressed it by way of a statement as to my impressions of the relationship between American farm problems and international relations. If it please the Board I would like to read briefly from that press release. I said:

"The other main impression of my trip which I would stress is that it is impossible for Americans to understand various incidents that occur in Europe today unless one recognizes that the struggle for food, shelter, and clothing, in order to just barely exist physically, consumes the full time of many millions of people in Europe. People haunted by the specter of starvation and disease find little sustenance in discussions of the political ideologies—even that of democracy. They become easy victims of propaganda disseminated by those who seek falsely to attribute to America the sources of Europe's ills. The struggle for food all over Europe today should teach us here in America that the American farmer is the key person in our economic system of plenty. Without a sound, prosperous agricultural system no country can enjoy any security in a decent standard of living for all of its people."

I would digress from the press release to say that I think it of great importance that American labor and American businessmen recognize that their economic prosperity is founded upon the prosperity of American agriculture. I am sometimes at a loss to understand the position taken by American labor leaders in regard to a fair return to the farmer for the produce of the farm. I think labor defeats its own best interests in those instances in which it opposes decent prices for the farmer. I think labor needs to recognize, and should be told quite frankly by those politicians who try to be statesmen, that labor defeats its own best interests, it defeats its own best wage interests, by carrying on campaigns against decent prices for farmers.

It always has been my view that American labor should work in close cooperation with American farmers for agricultural prices which give to the American farmer a decent profit return for farm products. Unless a high purchasing power is enjoyed by the American farmer the American worker cannot expect to enjoy a high purchasing power through good wages. Likewise the American businessman cannot hope to avoid a business depression, with all the business bankruptcies that go along with a depression, if we permit an agricultural depression to hit our country.

I think it is very important that all producers within our economy such as farmers, businessmen, industrial workers, and all the rest of us should never forget that our private enterprise system in America is absolutely dependent upon maintaining a high purchasing power for all groups. In my judgment there is no chance of our avoiding serious economic disruptions in this country with resulting depressions if we permit any one economic group to be discriminated against to its disadvantage. Hence, I think it is very important that our Government, through both of its political parties, makes clear to the American farmer that it is not going to enter into reciprocal-trade agreements that do damage to the economic security of American agriculture.

Returning to the press release, I read:

"Let us not forget that if we weaken the economic position of the American farmer we threaten the prosperity of American labor and business and we also endanger America's influence in international affairs because for many years to come millions of people the globe around are going to look to the food surpluses of American farms to keep body and soul together. Wherever I went I listened to inquiries about crop conditions in America because our agricultural conditions are bound to determine the difference between life and death for many people abroad. Let our politicians here at home not forget that any political program which seeks to injure the economic status of the American farmer has a direct bearing not only on economic standards in this country but also upon international relations as well."

Now, gentlemen, with that as a preface to the few brief remarks I want to make in regard to reciprocal-trade policies themselves, let me say first that, as my record shows, I have been a supporter of the basic principle and theory of reciprocal trade. I shall be a supporter of reciprocal-trade policies if they can be worked out in a manner which will protect the legitimate interests of the American farmer. I certainly do not want to see us return to the old congressional tactics of writing tariffs on the floor of Congress. This practice reached its most unfortunate logrolling aspects with the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

I try to be a realist in American politics. I try to be objective in facing Government policies. At times when I think criticisms are deserving I object to the policies of my party. I have never been one of those in the Republican Party that has favored the old-line high-tariff Republican program, because I think we, as a party, have much to answer for as far as the development of unfortunate international economic conditions are concerned as a result of some of the features of the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

At the same time I think we need to recognize that we cannot in this country justify discriminating against or destroying any segment of American agriculture, because, and I want to emphasize this point, I think the greatest national defense we have is the American farm.

I think that unless we can continue to be a self-sustaining Nation in regard to the production of our food supply, then, of course, we will find ourselves in the decades to come a very much weakened Nation as far as international relations are concerned.

I noticed all over Europe and the Middle East that those countries which cannot feed themselves are in a very real sense at the economic mercy of the rest of the world. I am sure the American people do not appreciate to the degree they should that to a very great extent the very liberties that we enjoy as free individuals under our political system of democracy stem from the farm soil of America. By that I mean that the fact that American agriculture is capable of producing a food supply adequate for national sustenance is one of the greatest strengths of our democracy.

We should remember that when a nation is not capable of raising its own food supply it constantly runs the danger of political unrest within its border. Hungry people are more interested in food than in political ideologies. The history of totalitarian governments and the rise of some dictators, such as Hitler and Mussolini, show very clearly the relationship between the food supply of a nation and political unrest.

We have been very fortunate throughout our history that American farmers have been able to produce an adequate food supply for our people by extending our agricultural frontiers during the great development of our western country and now in the more recent years by remarkable improvements in the science of agricultural production.

I wish to stress the point, and I do not think it can be too greatly emphasized, that the American farmer is, and has been, a creator of great political stability in America because as a well-fed people we always have been able to devote our energies and thinking to the problems of self-government. However, we must be careful not to sell the American farmer short in any of our international trade policies because if we force out of production any of the major segments of American agriculture, such as livestock, fruit, nuts, and grain, because of any trade agreements which make it unprofitable for the American farmer to produce those commodities, we shall injure not only our farmers but our country as a whole insofar as its economic stability is concerned. Then, too, we should remember that once any segment of American agriculture is so weakened as to make it an unprofitable venture for farmers it will take years and years to get that segment of agriculture back into production.

Farm production cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. Fruit trees cannot be grown in a year. Good herds of livestock take many years to develop. Neglected grain fields do not spring back to full production in a year or two or three. Farm products cannot be produced on the same basis as automobiles or refrigerators. Depleted farms are depleted for a long time and sometimes permanently. Unprofitable agriculture always is accompanied by undesirable agricultural practices which farmers are forced to adopt in a desperate endeavor to make both ends meet.

Then I would point out that we as a people—140,000,000 of us—must never forget that maintaining an economically healthy and prosperous agriculture is of basic importance. It is important not only to the economic stability and prosperity of this country but also to our political stability and the national security as well. In fact, as I have said so many times, I think our American farmers are our first line of defense in protecting us as a nation.

I think it follows from what I have said that if we adopt trade policies that lower the standard of living of the American farmer, lower his purchasing power, we are not only damaging our domestic economy, but we are also damaging our international position. I repeat, unless we can maintain a very high level of farm production and a very high standard of living for the American farmer, we weaken ourselves from a defense standpoint.

That is why I have said so frequently and repeatedly that prosperous American farms are, in a very real sense, more important to national defense than strong navies and strong armies. I say that as one who certainly shall be the last in the Senate of the United States, in the Eightieth Congress, to favor any fiscal policy, of my party, which would weaken us from a military standpoint. I do not want to weaken us, either, from an economic standpoint.

So, before referring to specific segments of the agricultural industry, I want to make another general observation, and that is that I think in the development of sound reciprocal-trade programs, aimed at protecting American agriculture, we need to be realistic about the fact that there are conflicting economic groups at home that give evidence too frequently that they would be willing to sacrifice the American farmers' position for an improvement in the American manufacturers' position, as far as the shipping of their manufactured goods abroad is concerned. I think that those American businessmen that take that position out of selfish interests, which is an understandable and human failing, are in the long run destroying their own house of industry.

Therefore, I think it is important to try to get American industry and American labor and the American farmer to recognize their mutuality of interests, to recognize that we are going to have to protect American agriculture by seeing to it that reciprocal-trade agreements be not entered into that destroy the legitimate rights of American farm groups or result in the lowering of the standard of living of those groups.

The third general point I would like to make is that I think that our State Department officials should cooperate with our Congress, and I emphasize the word "cooperate." I think that in this Congress cooperation particularly needs to be emphasized. I don't think I let you gentlemen in on any secret if you read either the newspapers or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that there are those in this Congress in positions of great power who are not particularly friendly to the principle of reciprocal trade, let alone being friendly to the implementation of the principle. As I said to a State Department group the other day, I think it behooves our foreign-trade experts to be exceedingly objective about this problem of cooperating with Congress in an endeavor to see to it that we do not proceed down international trade avenues that are going to lead to a discrimination against the American farmers. If our State Department enters into agreements unfair to our farmers then some of us who are its best friends in the Congress certainly will have to resist such agreements.

The next general observation I want to make is that I think that we must make a choice between the principle of reciprocal trade and the principle of tariffs written on the floor of Congress by logrolling methods. The latter policy leads to economic isolationism and economic isolationism ultimately leads to international economic war. History teaches us that a few years of international war will lead the nations again in that vicious circle ending in military war. We must remember that we are dealing here this morning with a domestic problem which is also pregnant with international implications.

I think that we can ill afford to develop reciprocal-trade policies that will split this Nation in the eightieth session of Congress into such a serious split that we may endanger a sound program of international cooperation on the economic front. I think the problem of sound international trade is just as important as international cooperation on the political front through the United Nations if we want to develop a permanent peace.

It we are going to be realists about it, then in the development of these reciprocal-trade agreements, I think we have to recognize that today we are surrounded, for the most part, by totalitarian economic nations. In many instances they are out-and-out police states. One of the characteristics of these totalitarian states, with their governmental regimented economy, is that their political philosophy is not only in world competition with the political philosophy of democracy, but the economic basis of totalitarianism also places these police states in conflict with our system of economic competition based upon our private-property economy of free enterprise.

I think it is an exceedingly significant fact, from a politically philosophical point of view, that our political and economic democracy is in competition, as far as foreign trade is concerned, with totalitarian states and their regimented economies. As a result of trends in foreign relations there are new problems that have been created in the development of future international-trade policies on the part of our country.

When we are dealing with a totalitarian government and a totalitarian economy in competition with our private-property economy, or what has been referred to by the previous witness as our private-enterprise economy, we are dealing with a type of government that has it within its power to use its forces of government to so subsidize any one of its industries or direct governmental funds into the channels of any of its industries to whatever degree necessary to make it economically impossible for American industry to compete for foreign markets with such governmental subsidization by a totalitarian state. Hence I think in working out reciprocal-trade agreements—and I am sure that this view prevails throughout the Congress, because I have heard too many of my colleagues in the Senate discuss it with some emphasis and some feeling, too—that it is of the utmost importance in the development of reciprocal-trade agreements to see to it that those agreements contain whatever protections are necessary to protect American agriculture. We must not permit a totalitarian government to destroy a segment of American agriculture by way of concentrating on a particular farm product and flood our markets with it to the disadvantage of the producers of the same product in America.

Now, as to specific agricultural products that affect the West and are involved or are bound to be involved in reciprocal-trade agreements, I wish to refer to one which will be under discussion here this morning, namely the cherry industry. The cherry industry is afraid that it is about to be injured by some trade agreements. However, before I discuss the problem further I hasten to point out to the Board that I produce cherries—3 acres of them! Many times I have decided that it is 3 acres too much. I mention this personal interest because I am sure that if I don't mention it some enterprising newspaper reporter will dig it out and charge me with concealing a selfish interest in this matter. However, I am sure that the few acres of cherries, filberts and walnuts which I have on my small farm do not disqualify me as a witness. Rather, I think my orchard, though small in acreage, gives me a better understanding of the relation of our national foreign-trade policies to the farmers' marketing problems.

I am afraid that western agriculture in many respects is in danger of being sacrificed by some of the reciprocal-trade proposals. We in the West entertain some fears that our farmers may suffer from agreements that are aimed primarily at giving great economic advantage to eastern industry. Hence our producers of cherries and other fruit are concerned. Our nut, grain, and livestock industries are urging their congressional delegations to watch out for and protect their interests.

So my plea is that the State Department officials and this committee, in making its trade-agreement recommendations be very careful to see to it that we do not weaken the economic position of our great western agricultural empire. If we do not protect the welfare of our farmers we not only will be faced with rightful and righteous indignation on the part of the western people, which will threaten politically the whole program—and I am speaking quite realistically about it—but I think we will find ourselves faced with a congressional attempt to return us to what I think is a very unsound practice as far as our national economic welfare is concerned, and that is the writing of tariffs on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

I intend to work for and urge a maximum of cooperation between the State Department and the Congress in developing the trade-agreement program of this country, but I shall be ever ready to resist any attempt to develop that program in a direction that seeks to discriminate to the disadvantage of western agriculture.

I think I know a little bit about the cherry industry and the nut industry. I think that you who have traveled through the Willamette Valley, and through Washington and California, will agree with me that the fruit and nut industries, along with our other farm products, are vital to the economic prosperity of my section of the country.

You cannot expect our farmers in the West to ignore entirely their selfish interests, and certainly no one who represents them has the right in Congress to ignore their rightful economic interests. Protecting the best interests of American farmers need not endanger a sound reciprocal-trade program.

I have told farmers in meetings, that we ought to try to develop a workable reciprocal trade policy. They have not always agreed with me but I have tried to point out that in connection with this problem we cannot, in this country, have our cake and eat it, too. We must expect to have to make some sacrifices but those sacrifices should not place an undue burden upon one group in our society.

The point I make is that we must be shown, in the case of any sacrifice that results from

any trade policies of this Government that the sacrifice in fact is a necessary sacrifice. If it is, then I raise my last point.

It is my contention that we do not have any right, certainly no moral right, and I hope that in the not too far distant future we will not have any legal right, because, if necessary, I think it must be covered by legislation, to proceed by a trade agreement to destroy the economic position of any segment of American agriculture without seeing to it that such segment is adequately compensated for its losses.

In other words, I refer to a pretty good old constitutional doctrine that I do not think we have any right to confiscate property without adequate compensation. I think the farmers of this country have a right to know in advance, and well in advance, of the consummation of any trade policy that is going to injure their economic interests, what the terms of that agreement are going to be. Then, I think our Government has an obligation to see to it that our farmers are adequately compensated for any losses that they suffer as a result of trade policies which make it impossible to market their products at a fair profit.

I appreciate all the implications of that. But I do want to point out that after all, whatever international trade policy we adopt it must be a policy which seeks to promote the general welfare of all of our people. All of our people as taxpayers should assume their share of responsibility in, and obligations for, that policy. If it is necessary in the national interest in any particular agreement to adopt some policy that does have economically detrimental effects upon any segment of American agriculture, then I think those affected are entitled to economic compensation for their losses by way of support prices or similar Government aid. If I am correct in one of my major premises, namely, that a prosperous American agriculture is essential to our national defense program, then, surely, the individual American farmer is entitled to economic protection from his Government in case his Government adopts a trade policy that destroys a profitable market for his farm products.

I know that such a point of view will be criticized, but I am ready to meet the criticism. I am convinced that we are going to have to participate on a cooperative basis with other nations in world trade. No longer can we follow a program of economic isolationism. We must be willing, as a people, and as a government to buy goods from abroad as well as sell goods abroad if we are to have world economic stability. Without the stability produced by such trade, I think the peace of the world always will be threatened. However, we certainly haven't any right to give benefits to people abroad at the expense of farmers here at home by entering into any trade policy that has the result of destroying their livelihood, unless we are willing, as a nation, to compensate our farmers for losses that flow from such a policy.

You have been very indulgent and patient. I appreciate your courtesy in allowing me to testify. I shall be perfectly willing to answer questions that you may wish to put to me relating to anything that I have said.

Mr. ARNER. Senator MORSE, we are very glad to have your very instructive statement, and I believe I speak for the entire panel in saying that we are in agreement with your general statement, as far as the individual products are concerned. Of course, it would be out of order for us to express an opinion at this time.

Senator MORSE. I fully appreciate that, sir.

Mr. ARNER. But after an experience of 10 years in connection with the trade-agreements program, I can assure you that agriculture has always been an active participant in the program, and that the views of the Department of Agriculture have always been given a full and considered hearing.

Senator MORSE. I am sure that is so.

Mr. ARNER. I am sure it will continue to be that way. We will recall Mr. Dunlap.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the second item which I should like to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks is a very excellent editorial entitled "Camel's Nose" appearing in the Sunday Washington Post of January 26. It refers to the question of the appointment of special committees by the United States Senate. I wish to associate myself with the contents of the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMEL'S NOSE

With two special Senate committees set up within the first 3 weeks of the new Congress, the streamlined structure approved at the last session begins to look pretty ragged. It was bad enough for the Senate to continue the War Investigating Committee, with restricted powers, to pursue the work it began under the leadership of President Truman when he was still in the Senate. Considerably worse, from the viewpoint of creating unfortunate precedents, is the establishment of a new special Committee on Small Business. Here is a naked and undisguised return to the discredited idea of bloc legislation as distinguished from lawmaking from a broad view of our national problems.

Demands will certainly be pressed for other special committees dealing with problems of petroleum, wool, and other commodities. If the trend which the Republican leadership of the Senate has set in motion is followed, the whole committee structure will soon present a chaotic pattern once more. Congress will be focusing its attention more on pin-point studies of special problems than upon national interests, issues, and policies. The committees set up under the Congressional Reorganization Act are designed to cover the whole spectrum of national legislation and to keep each problem in its proper relationship to other related problems in the same sphere. Half the value of the new system can readily leak out of loopholes such as those which the Senate created last week.

In a gesture of obvious repentance, Senator TAFT offered a resolution that would permit any future measure to create a special committee to be vetoed by the standing committee on whose jurisdiction it would encroach. Special committees could also be turned down by action of the new Committee on Rules and Administration. It seems to us that acceptance of this safeguard is imperative to save the new system from being splintered once more. We hope that the chairman of the Republican policy committee will show as much zeal in getting this safeguard adopted as he has done for disrupting the work of the reorganizers in these first assaults upon it. The best he can do will not wholly offset the damage that has been done. The camel's nose is now in the tent, and an extraordinary effort will have to be exerted to prevent him from taking it over or knocking it down in the process.

SALE OF WAR-VETERAN HORSES BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last item which I should like to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks is an article entitled "Horses, Scarred Vets of War, To Be Sold Like Hardware," published in the Washington Times-Herald for Sunday, January 26, 1947.

I speak on it not only as a horseman and breeder of horses for a great many years, but I speak, too, in the interests of all those in this country who take an active interest in the work of humane societies. If the contents of this article presents the facts, then I trust that the article itself will be sufficient to stop the Army and the Surplus Property Board from disposing, in the manner described in this article, of 16 or more old horses that have served our Government well. If the facts are correctly stated in the article, then certainly I think ordinary humaneness toward animals calls upon this Government to see to it that these old horses are not sold to the highest bidder, by way of sealed bids. Such a procedure does not permit the Government to know in advance who the bidders are or what disposition is to be made of the horses.

After all, the sensitivity of government to humane principles can often be judged by such little matters as this. As one who has been very active in the work of humane societies in this country, I deplore this method of disposing of these horses. If in fact the article written by Mr. Frank M. Smith sets out the facts, which I assume it does, I think the proposed sale should be stopped at once. Hence, my plea is that the Government should reconsider at once its method of disposing of the horses and either make certain that they go into the hands of kindly owners or that the horses be humanely disposed of. They should be pensioned to pasture and good care for the rest of their lives. In any event, we should assure the animal lovers of this country that these veteran horses will not spend the remaining days of their lives receiving inhumane treatment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE BLOCK: HORSES, SCARRED VETS OF WAR, TO BE SOLD LIKE HARDWARE—AUCTION OF EQUINE "EX-SOLDIERS" BY WAA VIOLATES HUMANE PRINCIPLES

(By Frank M. Smith)

QUANTICO, VA., January 25.—Sixteen work-worn, decrepit horses far past the age of any humane use are on exhibit here at the marine post stables for sale.

Originally 17 horses were advertised, but 1 has died of old age since then. It was "destroyed," they tell you, laconically.

The sale is a closed-bid sale of the War Assets Administration. It ought to be closed, period.

SOLD LIKE HARDWARE

Rhoda Christmas (expert horsewoman), Photographer Joe Heiberger, and I drove down here to see why and what kind of horses were being sold in such a strange fashion.

Horses are usually sold at auction, not on a closed bid, like a thousand feet of barbed wire or a keg of nails.

We found out right off why they were being sold.

The question that is still puzzling us is why anyone would want to buy them.

"JUST SURPLUS"

Warrant Officer E. A. Anderson answered the first question very easily.

"They are surplus," he said. "We can only keep 40 head here. So these are surplus and have to be sold. They came from the Army remount station at Front Royal and were used at Cheltenham, Md., for recreation riding and guard duty.

"This is not the Army doing this, or the Marine Corps, for that matter. We just certify them as surplus, and War Assets sells them.

"Surplus," he said. A good way to shirk responsibility, I say.

Then he showed us the horses. Four were in a corral, six in a nearby pasture, and the rest quartered in another pasture about 7 miles from the stables. It was the considered judgment of Rhoda Christmas that the entire lot wouldn't bring an average of $25 apiece.

Anderson knew the names and characteristics of most. He spoke carefully of Harvey. Harvey, he said, would make a good horse for a child. The kind that would stop if the child fell off.

Harvey is going to stop all of his own accord very soon one of these days even if the child stays on.

Harvey is 23 years of age. He is a bay gelding, weighs 1,000 pounds, and stands 14 hands 3 inches high.

Right now Harvey is in pretty good shape, age considered.

And that is the pitiful part of the whole picture.

MUST BE SOLD

Harvey and the rest of those horses have not been used since June. For all intents and purposes they have been retired. They get good food. Are kept clean and all their ailments are given attention.

Now they are to be sold as surplus. For what? Dog food? For their hides? Or perhaps to a miserable starved existence pulling a lowly huckster wagon or dragging their brittle-creaking joints through spring plowing for a callous master.

Their days as riding horses are over or so nearly so that they will collapse any day.

The majority of them have sway backs and deep hollows over their eyes. Two are lame. Their frames have deteriorated and what flesh they have is due to the good care the Army and Marine Corps have given them.

SEVERAL CALLS RECEIVED

Harvey admittedly was the oldest horse, but they also have 4 mules for sale and 1 of them is 26 and another 19.

War Assets, still operating on the keg of nails style of sale, blandly listed the ages of the horses in their handout advertising the sale including Belle, a bay mare, 21; Muley, bay mare, 15; Virginia, bay mare, 12; Pay Day, gelding, 20; Passing, bay gelding, 13; Martin, gelding, 17; Star, brown gelding, 12; Sam, gelding 14; and Dick, 13.

A look at Star's teeth and his frame would easily convince anyone that he was closer 20 than 12. Some looked older.

Anderson said they had received 10 or 12 calls about the horses. The bids were being made to the Richmond office of War Assets. They will be opened Wednesday at 11 a. m.

And some farmers think it is cheaper to pay $10 or $15 for a horse, work it through the summer, and turn it out to die of starvation next winter than to buy a good horse. So they'll probably all be sold.

Oh, yes; War Assets has other horses for sale at the Naval Powder Factory in Indian Head, Md., and at Front Royal, Va.

And the Army has hundreds of acres of rolling pasture land at the remount station at Front Royal, where many a horse has been retired after giving his best to his country.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, our efforts to secure agreement with the nations of the earth for the international control of atomic energy constitute the most important issue facing this country and the world today. Our former delegate to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission used a vivid and descriptive phrase to describe the alternatives which face us. He said we are engaged in a choice between the quick and the dead.

How is our choice proceeding, Mr. President? How far have we gone and how far are we likely to go? What are the issues in dispute? What is the setting on the stage of world affairs where we must, perforce, play out the international drama to either a fruitful or tragic end?

It seems to me that we have reached a point in our efforts where an objective critique is in order. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in his forthright and statesmanlike address at Cleveland wisely suggested that a nonpartisan, or, as he so felicitously phrased it, an unpartisan foreign policy, did not preclude free discussion of its content. Certainly we can do only good for our people and our country if we, as Senators, give of our best thought and consideration to the problems which many of us see as the crux of the peace.

I have said before and I say again that unless and until international control of atomic energy is an existing fact, there can be no stability in the years ahead, no security against sudden and complete destruction, and no guaranty, therefore, of the continuation of this Republic.

It would seem to be underscoring what is now the obvious to point out that atomic warfare will be different in kind and not merely in degree, from any warfare we have hitherto known. Weapons that are of some effectiveness as long as other nations do not possess the bomb will be as useless as the Roman phalanx, the broadsword, and the crossbow when other nations do have the atomic bomb. As an instance of how atomic warfare is different in kind from other warfare, it is disturbing to realize that most of the ships involved in the Bikini test last July are acknowledged by the Navy Department to be still radioactive today, 7 months later.

We must here exercise continued vigilance lest we permit the conception of laissez-faire in our armed forces to lead us to catastrophe. If we do not use all of our best judgment and wisdom in weighing the security situation and in guarding against the acceptance of the traditional defenses, we may have to share with our armed forces the responsibility for our destruction.

We have indeed attained a decided measure of progress in our thinking on this question since August 6, 1945. We all recollect that the first reaction to Hiroshima of, I believe, a majority of our people—yes, a majority of the Members of Congress—was that at all costs we must, as the phrase has it, "keep the secret." I suppose that we would, as a nation, still be of the same mind if it were possible that we could do so. But I think there is no question among informed people today, as it was recognized by some of us immediately after the event, that such a policy is illusory and fleeting in its security. This is so because in all too short a space of time the so-called secret will become known to other nations; and when that happens, any security based upon our sole possession of this force will come to an end. There is nothing we can do to prevent others from learning how to make atomic bombs, because the book of nature is open to all. There is not a single scientist of note in the whole country who does not acknowledge this as an accepted fact. We could hide our so-called secrets in the deepest vault at Fort Knox and shoot all our scientists, and other nations would still learn how to make atomic bombs.

It was because I recognized this was so that I urged, on the first day of the session convening after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that we take steps to secure an international agreement for the control of atomic energy. I stated then that the control system must be enforced by an effective inspection system.

Mr. President, I urged this course for another important and compelling reason also. That was because atomic energy was capable of being turned from destructive to constructive uses. If the energies of our scientists, physicists, and engineers could be directed to research on and production of atomic engines instead of bigger and better atomic bombs, this new energy was capable of doing a vast share of the work of the world. History is replete with the exploitation and use of man's inventions, made for the easing of his burdens, to wreak upon him death and destruction. The wheel, invented to facilitate commerce, became attached to a war chariot. The Wright brothers' plane was adapted to the carrying of bombs. Thomas Edison's development of electricity was seized upon for improvements of weapons and Henry Ford's mass production of the automobile led to mechanized ground forces. But in our atomic plants, Mr. President, we had accomplished, through the urgency of warfare, the capture of a fraction of the sun's energy, not for peace but for destruction and death. And, Mr. President, there is where it will stop; there it will remain; that will be its sole use, until and unless man exhibits sufficient wisdom to achieve control over this force.

How can it be otherwise? How will it be possible to distribute fissionable material for use in atomic engines? Yes; how can we produce the appliances to use the material unless we are relieved of the necessity of bottling up our knowledge and hiding our secrets as long as we can? Competent physicists are on the record as stating that in 5 years we could have peacetime use of atomic energy on an ever-widening scale. Certainly research and use, even in the field of medicine and therapeutics alone, is being considerably impaired by the secrecy now necessary for our security.

At long last man has learned the prime secret of nature, but, alas, he cannot use it to enrich and ennoble his life because he has not yet learned how to keep it from destroying him. What a commentary on mankind's wisdom and sagacity it would be if our very failure to put this energy to work for our benefit were to result in our annihilation from this earth.

Mr. President, the moral leadership of the world has come upon us. Moral leadership imposes upon us the responsibility of guiding the world along the pathway which leads to an ever more peaceful and fruitful earth. That is a

high responsibility but one in which we dare not fail.

Great power begets great responsibility, just as wealth and prestige beget concomitant duties. This is as true in the case of nations as it is in the case of individuals. We produced atomic power. It is our duty to lead the way to the solution of the vital problems raised by that achievement.

On the whole, Mr. President, I think we have not neglected our responsibility.

For the first time in history a great people have come into possession of a controlling weapon for the conquering of the world and have not only forsworn this use but have offered to share its peaceful benefits with mankind everywhere.

In essence, we have said to the world, "Here is something which could be used to conquer mankind. We will not use it thus; rather we will cooperate with all nations not only to see that no one uses it brutally but also that it is used in the ways of peace for the benefit of all."

Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed that our offer was not immediately accepted and that we are not today in full pursuit of the gains and benefits that are bound to result from an effective agreement on the subject.

Our failure to be further along the road is deeply disturbing. The clock ticks on, and with every tick we are losing a part of our capital of monopoly. When many nations have atomic bombs, peace will be precarious indeed, and the opportunity of achieving agreement for international control may become well-nigh impossible.

Mr. President, almost a year and a half has gone by since the world became aware of the menace of atomic weapons. More than a year has gone by since the historic Truman-Attlee-King declaration called upon the world to devise effective controls over atomic weapons in order to reap the benefits of atomic energy. Why are we still without such a control system? Why is the world still engaged in a mad race for atomic armament? Why must we, because of fear, continue to deprive the people of the world of the blessings in medicine, industry, and agriculture which atomic energy can bring to their lives? What are the prospects for agreement in the near future?

The situation in the international negotiations which exists today is briefly this: In the Security Council the United States has up to now maintained that the question of atomic energy control must be dealt with before general disarmament. Russia, on the other hand, insists that the General Assembly's disarmament resolution, including control of atomic weapons, be treated together and as a whole.

It is my contention, Mr. President, that it is immaterial whether control of atomic energy is discussed prior to or simultaneously with, but not together with, discussions on general disarmament. What is important is that agreement on atomic energy be concluded as soon as humanly possible and before any agreement on disarmament as a whole. Shall we discuss disarmament? By all means let us discuss it, but let us under no circumstances actually disarm before an international atomic control and inspection system has been in operation long enough to convince us of its effectiveness.

To permit atomic energy control, which a UN subcommittee has already found to be technically feasible, to become submerged in the discussions on general disarmament is to leave the world without control over atomic weapons for the duration of those discussions and until a disarmament treaty has been ratified by each of the contracting parties. And how long might that take? The Soviet delegate has asked for a 3-month limit on the drafting of a disarmament plan. Even if such a plan were forthcoming in that space of time, it might still take years to conclude discussions on it in the Security Council and the General Assembly and have it approved by all the nations.

How long it might take to secure unanimity on the general disarmament proposal is obvious from the necessity of securing agreement, not only on atomic energy, but also on other weapons of mass destruction such as rockets and bacteriological weapons, general reduction of armed forces and armaments not included in the first two categories, creation of an international system of inspection and controls to detect and prevent violations of the arms regulations, and creation of an international police force to guarantee peace and security.

In the 7 months that the Atomic Energy Commission was in session it not only failed to secure unanimity of viewpoint on atomic energy, but did not even consider the subject of controlling other weapons of mass destruction, despite the fact that its terms of reference clearly called for such action. In some ways the problem of devising effective controls for such elements as bacteriological products may prove even more difficult and take longer to solve than the problem of controlling atomic energy. The production of atomic energy requires extensive facilities and raw materials which are fairly easy to control at the source. This, however, is not the case when it comes to controlling warfare by the spread of germs.

Consider, Mr. President, how long it might take to obtain agreement under these conditions. Following the last war, disarmament discussions and conferences, together with preliminary and succeeding meetings, continued from 1919 to 1936—a period of 17 years.

It has been asked, What American interest is served by insisting upon atomic disarmament before there is any other kind of disarmament? If atomic weapons are decisive, it is asked, why are we insisting that we give up our own decisive weapon first? The answer is that our own defense demands it.

We stand in no danger from whatever bombs may be in our possession, but we may be in mortal danger from bombs in the possession of others. It is in the interest of our own security, Mr. President, to get inspectors behind the high walls now, so that we may know what is going on now, before it becomes possible for us to be shocked into awareness by the sudden explosion of an atomic bomb in our midst. Today we have no way of knowing what other countries are doing about atomic weapons or how far they have advanced. But this much we do know: Other nations are working night and day on the problem. So long as we do not have exact knowledge, we become prey to fear and suspicion. For example, a news report out of the Soviet Union not long ago stated that their chief nuclear scientist, Peter Kapitza, had been sent to Siberia as punishment for some crime. It seems obvious to me that a more likely explanation is that Kapitza is now busily at work behind the Urals constructing an atomic fission plant. However, I cannot prove it. I do not know, and none of us know, and there is no way of knowing.

Until we have international control coupled with an effective inspection system, we shall never know who is producing bombs, or at what moment, or at what target, they may choose to launch them. Until we have such control, we shall never dare release atomic energy for the peaceful uses which might raise standards of living among the peoples of the world to the point where they would have no interest in the siren song of Soviet propaganda.

Mr. President, the discussions on general disarmament and atomic-energy control are not proceeding in a void. We must look at the setting against which this world drama is being played. As we look about us in the world today, what do we find? Out of the holocaust of the war so recently ended, two nations have emerged as leading world powers. One is the outstanding example of free democracy; the other is the sole example of Communist power.

Mr. President, I have never been one who has sought personal notoriety or advantage by means of red-baiting or Soviet-hating. My public record is ample proof of that. I know that the Soviet Union contributed much to the winning of the war and that she suffered horribly from it. But, Mr. President, facts are facts, and no amount of dialectical folderol will change them. The one outstanding and incontrovertible fact in the world today is that the Communists are engaged in a world-wide war for the possession of men's minds. This psychological warfare is directed against all democratic countries, including the United States of America, the outstanding example of free democracy.

Let me give you just one example out of many possible ones.

On January 1, W. H. Lawrence reported to the New York Times:

> A propaganda effort helpful only to the Soviet Union and harmful to the United States is under way throughout Latin America through formal channels of the Communist Party, including its newspaper and radio stations.

Daily, he reported, the Moscow radio beams a 2-hour program in Spanish to Latin America. He said:

> The United States is pictured as a wealthy, wicked nation that, if it could not dominate the world economically, would not hesitate to use its atomic bomb to ravage the nations that were opposing it. The Communist papers do not hesitate to fake news when necessary to blacken the reputation of the

United States. They play upon the Latin Americans' ancient fears of the economic and military might of the "colossus of the north" and chant constantly that every economic ill afflicting Latin-American countries is owing to Yanqui imperialism."

Mr. President, I have time to give you only one example of the kind of anti-American, anti-democratic, anti-capitalist propaganda being spread today throughout the whole world. On the one hand, the Soviet delegates present themselves to the world as upholders and defenders of the United Nations against every real or fancied attempt to weaken this structure of world unity and cooperation, while, on the other hand, Communist emissaries spread dissension and hatred among the peoples of the earth.

Mr. President, this is indeed a sorrowful and saddening spectacle. Its result is to spread fear and suspicion which, in turn, undermine the world's only instrument of present hope for the preservation of the peace—the United Nations. Can it be expected that we shall stand idly by while the Palace of Peace is destroyed all around us? It is too important to us. We fathered the United Nations. We fostered it. We believe in it, and we will continue to work in it and strengthen it. To do that, we must take measures against that which undermines and destroys it. Yes; we must fight propaganda with information. For every base lie we must tell a great truth. For every distortion we must offer a fact.

Mr. President, admitting that our political and economic system has its weaknesses, that it is capable of further development, our democratic free-enterprise society still has so much more to offer the average man than communism does that it is to our advantage to let the people of the world know the truth and give them an opportunity to make their own choice. Our lows, Mr. President, are so much higher than their highs that we have everything to gain by making the facts known. But to men and women everywhere, our system represents not only material benefits but personal liberty, freedom of conscience, and the opportunity to grow and develop to the utmost of one's abilities. And of what we have to sell, Mr. President, the greatest demand is for liberty.

Against the falsehoods and the distortions we must make tnese facts known. By every available means we must disseminate throughout the world honest, factual information about America and her way of life. By means of newspapers and magazines, by shortwave and longwave radio, by moving pictures and books, by every cultural art and by every medium of information, we must tell the good, plain people of the earth the inspiring and fascinating story of democracy in action.

But the spreading of information is not enough. Along with the facts we must spread the fruits. The story of America's high standard of living will not feed the hungry Chinese peasant or heat the freezing hut of the Polish laborer. When men are hungry and cold, when they are homeless, jobless, and hopeless, they fall easy prey to the red rash of revolution. Thus, by disseminating the blessings of our system as widely as possible, we insure our own perpetuation.

And now, with the splitting of the atom, we have the means of spreading the blessings. Cheap atomic power can help develop the backward areas of the earth. Atomic photosynthesis may help produce enough food for all. Atomic research and medicine can help to alleviate the ravages of disease and sickness.

Mr. President, these benefits to come from nuclear fission are no mere roseate dreams. The men who foresaw the atomic bomb and made it—the scientists—now foresee the peacetime applications of atomic energy, and can bring many of them to use when we give them the green light to go ahead. They tell us that atomic power from atomic energy can be a practical reality in 5 to 10 years. This very day, engineers and scientists at Oak Ridge are working on an atomic power plant to be operated under the direction of the Atomic Energy Commission. There is no reason to believe that atomic power will displace or even decrease the use of other natural resources, such as water, coal, and oil. However, on the basis of what is now known, the possibility of locating factories close to the source of raw materials, even though these are in remote and undeveloped regions, or of operating mines in similar areas, is very great. Economical motors for large carriers such as ships, and perhaps even locomotives, are considered feasible.

The scientists also inform us that present developments indicate that the greatest promise of atomic energy in biology and medicine is in the use of intense radiations and radioactive isotopes, the radio active species of elements. How does a plant use solar energy to turn carbon dioxide into food and how does man reverse the process and convert plant food into life-giving energy? What is the nature of cancer? How does radiation cause genetic changes to produce new animal and plant species? The scientist's hope today is fired by his belief that clues to the secrets of these and other questions may emerge from research with radiation and radioisotopes.

As tracers, radioisotopes should prove one of the most versatile tools known to science. Radioactive iodine has been found effective in the treatment of certain types of goiter and thyroid cancer cases, and radiophosphorus has helped in certain cancerous diseases of the blood and thyroid. Radiocarbon, introduced into plant and animal life, may eventually reveal Nature's secret of photosynthesis and possibly lead to artificial reproduction of this process for the purpose of improving and increasing our food supply.

Radiation therapy is now expected to make great advances. Biologists know that radiation actually changes the chromosomes of animal or plant cells, thus giving rise to variation of the species. Experimentation in this field may possibly bring new and beneficial species, such as the change of a frost-susceptible wheat to one which stands extreme freezes without harm, or new and improved strains of cattle.

Metallurgists, too, find radioactive materials of inestimable value in developing new and stronger alloys.

However, probably the greatest benefit to the world will be the tremendous additions to knowledge which will come in fundamental research directed toward the discovery of why radiation does what it does to organic and inorganic matter. The search for this understanding—an understanding which is basic to our knowledge of photosynthesis, cancer therapy, radiography and genetic changes—will go forward with the new tools which the splitting of the atom has given to science, unless man himself puts a stop to it. The scientists have the imagination, our economic system can provide the capital, the people have the need and yet this great forward movement of civilization is being retarded, and can be completely halted, by the overpowering fear which is paralyzing the world—the fear of atomic war. Just last week the American delegate to the United Nations Economic and Employment Commission felt it necessary to present a motion to set aside for a period of 6 months to a year a plan for a study by the Commission of the industrial uses of atomic energy.

It is for such reasons, Mr. President, I have consistently maintained that it is to our own selfish advantage—in addition to being advantageous to the world—to swap atomic knowledge for atomic control. Once we have established effective and enforceable control over atomic weapons, we can release the brakes and pour out to the peoples of the earth the munificent blessings which the good Lord in His great mercy has stored up for them. If, by doing this, we can help the "have-nots" become the "haves," if, by doing this, we can change the dissatisfied and restless into the contented and peaceful, where will the hawkers of hate and the mongers of war find their recruits? Where will the Communist propagandists find their victims? By helping to bring prosperity to the world, we assure our own prosperity. "You can't," as has wisely been said, "do business with a poorhouse." By helping to remove the causes of war, we secure our own peace.

Mr. President, because peace on earth is so vital to our well-being, we cannot—we dare not—permit anything to stand in the way of an international agreement which will put into operation an effective and enforceable system of atomic-energy controls. What is today holding up progress on such an agreement?

The Soviet delegates to the United Nations have remained adamant against one point of the American plan. They will never, they say, agree to the elimination of the right of veto on punishment because, they maintain, this would weaken the Security Council and the Charter of the United Nations. On this issue it could be possible to filibuster the negotiations for months, or even years, if we permitted it to be done.

Since the Russians say they will not relinquish the right of veto, and since we can never permit any violator of an atomic-control agreement to find protection from punishment under the veto,

it is obvious that a way out must be found at once in order to avoid stalemate and inaction.

Mr. President, it was indeed encouraging to learn last week that at long last our officials are engaged in seeking a way out of the dilemma. A story in the New York Times of last Wednesday reports that the United States has under consideration what it refers to as a new approach to the problem of how to enforce the proposed system of international atomic control.

The plan, as outlined in this press report, would give to the international inspection agency—not the Security Council—the right to declare that there had been a serious violation of the proposed agreement warranting punishment. After that, individual members of the United Nations would be authorized to declare war individually on the violator nation pending the time when the Security Council itself took action.

This plan, it is said, has the advantage of not requiring an amendment to the United Nations Charter to restrict the use of the veto, and thus might have a better chance of being accepted by the Soviet Union. That is true, but it is equally true that this plan is a complete negation of the whole United Nations' principle of collective action. It is a dangerous step backward.

Mr. President, on October 29 of last year, in speeches before the American Bar Association and the New York Herald Tribune forum in current problems, I offered a way out of the dilemma, by proposing that questions of violation and punishment be taken out of the Security Council where debate could be filibustered and punishment dangerously delayed. I offered the plan at that time because the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was then in session, and in a position to take the proposal under consideration as an easy egress from adamancy.

Referring to this plan, the Hartford Courant stated on November 1:

> Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, chairman of the Senate's Committee on Atomic Energy, in addresses last week before the American Bar Association and the New York Herald Tribune's fifteenth annual forum on current problems, presented a realistic solution of the atomic bomb impasse at the international level that deserves earnest consideration. In light of the adamant positions of both the United States in support of the Baruch plan and of Russia in defense of the use of the one-nation veto as exercised in the Security Council of the United Nations, together with the fact that time may be running out before the secrets of the bomb may be generally known, the McMahon proposal might well be for all peoples the difference between survival and extinction.

The plan, Mr. President, as suggested 3 months ago and as repeated here now, has all the virtues of simplicity combined with realism. In brief, it is this:

Let a treaty for the control of atomic energy be drawn up which will specify violations requiring punishment—just as we have done, I might add, in our domestic act. Let the treaty spell out the type of punishment to be meted out for each type of violation. Let it be written into the treaty that questions of violation are questions of fact for determination by the International Court of Justice. Let the treaty make it mandatory on the Court to hear the evidence immediately and return a finding of fact within a limited and specified space of time. The treaty should state that the judgment of the court would be final and that upon a finding of violation by the court it would be mandatory on the Security Council to implement the Court's decision in the manner specified within the treaty.

Under such a treaty swift and certain punishment would await such violations as, one, illegal possession or use of an atomic bomb; two, illegal possession or separation of atomic material suitable for use in an atomic bomb; three, seizure of any plant or other property belonging to or licensed by the Authority; four, willful interference with the activities of the Authority; five, creation or operation of dangerous projects in a manner contrary to, or in the absence of, a license granted by the international control body.

In view of the technical nature of many possible violations, it would be well to write into the treaty that the Court is to give great weight to the finding of facts as to violations made by the Atomic Development Authority.

Article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice, which is an integral part of the Charter of the United Nations, makes it clear that among the cases within the jurisdiction of the Court are legal disputes concerning the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.

In other words, Mr. President, we would simply be using a tribunal already established within the framework of the United Nations for a purpose already specified as within its jurisdiction. We would simply be using the machinery of the Court to notify the Security Council when the deputy marshals in the form of the international police power would be needed to enforce the agreement which the high contracting parties had entered into.

It seems to me that this plan meets the American objective at the same time that it eliminates the stated Russian objections, while, simultaneously, it strengthens the United Nations and implements its principle of collective action. If the Russians are sincere in their desire to do away with atomic and other weapons of mass destruction, and I sincerely hope they are, then I can see no reason why they should refuse to acquiesce in this proposal for peace and go forward to the establishment of the Atomic Development Authority and the era of world-wide peace and prosperity which must follow. If they are not sincere, we shall soon know it and we shall then know what we must do to survive in a world that has a potential aggressor.

Until such an international authority is in actual and effective operation, we must not, we dare not, disarm or weaken our defenses. Once it is in effective operation, once we have successfully solved the problem of controlling atomic energy, the problems of controlling other weapons, of reducing or eliminating armies and armaments—yes; of doing away with war itself, will be tremendously simplified and their solution greatly accelerated, for atomic energy holds the key to the future. It contains the answer to whether we, the people of the earth, shall live in peace and happiness or die a sudden and ignoble death of our own devising. May God grant us the wisdom and the fortitude so to act that we preserve for our descendants a world worthy of their ancestors, who learned how to disintegrate the atom without disintegrating the earth.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I was unable to hear the entire address made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I wish to congratulate him upon the presentation of this subject before the Senate and the country. I think he has done an admirable and constructive piece of work.

I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, in view of the statements he has made, whether or not he believes that the Budget recommended by the President of the United States in connection with atomic energy is correct. The President recommended a program which will involve the expenditure of $444,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. In the opinion of the able Senator, should that be decreased because of the economy drive that is being made?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, first I desire to express my thanks to the Senator from Illinois for his complimentary remarks. In answer to his question concerning the Budget, I may say that I have not had an opportunity to study the Budget recommendation as I intend to study it, in great detail, before the appropriation comes to the floor of the Senate; but certainly to engage in any economy that would jeopardize our progress in atomic science, to engage in any economy that would in any way hamper our efforts to keep ahead and to keep going in this science, would, in my opinion, be an economy that might result in the destruction of the American people.

Mr. LUCAS. May I point out to the able Senator that recommended expenditure of $444,000,000 compares with an outlay of $385,000,000 in the current fiscal year? In other words, there is an increase of about $60,000,000 in this recommendation by the President of the United States for the development and research in atomic science. If I understand correctly the viewpoint of the Senator, there is nothing he would do at this juncture of affairs in the world to decrease one iota the development of atomic energy in all its phases.

Mr. McMAHON. I should distinctly say not; but I may state that while I did not read the dispatch in the press, I was told about one in which a Member of this body declared that this was

one of the subjects on which it was hoped to economize, so that the proposed 20-percent tax reduction could be put into effect. Frankly, I am astonished that the Senator in question had secured sufficient information in order to arrive at that conclusion, because I think it must be solely within his own knowledge; it is not within the knowledge of anyone else.

Mr. LUCAS. My reason for making the request of the able Senator was that every Member of the Senate knows that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has made a special study of the question of the development of atomic energy. No Senator on either side of the aisle has done more research work or has applied himself more enthusiastically to this question than has the Senator from Connecticut; and I hope, in view of his peculiar knowledge of this question, that he will analyze the budget recommended by the President of the United States. Candidly speaking, I shall rely to a great extent upon the judgment of the Senator from Connecticut as to whether or not any portion of the budget should be cut, when the budget cutters begin to reduce the budget proposed by the President.

I desire to ask one other question of the Senator, if I may. The Senator stated that in his opinion we should do in this country everything within our power to communicate to other peoples of the world, either through magazines or by radio or any other form of communication or personal application, our theory and our form of government and the democratic way of life as it exists in this country, and, as I understood him, this is a matter of defense for our own free way of life. I ask the Senator this question: Has he given any study to what he thinks should be done by our Government or can we do anything as a government to put into effect the idea the Senator has conveyed?

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that during the present fiscal year the Government of the United States is spending $19,000,000 in educational programs and for the dissemination of facts to other countries. I have it on the word of our Ambassador to Yugoslavia—of course it is only an estimate, but it was made in answer to an inquiry submitted by me—that other nations were spending $44,000,000 for propaganda in Yugoslavia alone.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Connecticut has struck at a very vital point, so far as I am concerned, in connection with the spending of money. I think it would be the better part of wisdom, and it probably will be done in due course of time, to ascertain, if we can, how much other nations of the earth are spending in lands other than their own in attempting to put across their theory of government or their form of economic life or any other thing in connection with building up their own national philosophies on foreign soil. I anticipate that other great powers of the earth are spending so much more than we are it will make us look rather niggardly when our budget is compared with theirs.

I have always thought that if we utilized every possible means at our command to sell America, over the air or through magazines or by other type of propaganda, we would be doing a great service to the people of this country and would be doing much for our own security in the future. But it will be found that many people object to our spending even the $19,000,000 now alleged to be used for this type of work.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that those who will object will not be individuals who have traveled around the earth. I know of two Members of the other House of Congress who recently have concluded an extensive trip. They started on their journey prejudiced against any effort on our part to make known and promote our way of life among other peoples of the earth. The two House Members to whom I have referred have returned, and I will say to the Senator that they are the most enthusiastic proponents of this program I know of. I may say further to the Senator that, according to my information, we have in all France only 11 men disseminating information on the subject of what America means and what it stands for. In France I understand the Soviet Government employs 1,014 individuals doing the same kind of work on behalf of the Soviets. We who possess liberty and know what it means to the human race, we who realize all it has cost in blood and treasure through the centuries, and who certainly are not trying to sell, as some are, slavery in a hovel, ought to be able to convince the peoples of the earth that our way of life offers the greatest opportunity to those seeking freedom, as well as the greatest reward in the material things of life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois posed a very difficult question to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and I am not surprised that the Senator is unable to answer it. I do not think any Senator can answer the question which the Senator from Illinois posed as to the amount of money which should be spent in this enterprise in the year 1948. I do not think any Senator's judgment on that question would be very good, unless the Senator knew the purpose for which the money would be spent.

We are trying, as I understand, to work out a system of controls for atomic bombs. I do not pretend to know very much more about the matter than any other Senator. The only thing the former Manhattan project is doing is manufacturing and creating atomic bombs. If that is the purpose of the project, if that is what the money is being used for, I would not hesitate to say that $444,000,000 is entirely too much money for us to be spending. If the money is being spent for research, such as the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out is possible, that would be an entirely different matter, and in that event perhaps I would want to see twice as much as $444,000,000 spent. But the point I am trying to make is that neither the Senator from Connecticut nor any other Member of the Senate, I think, can answer the question as to whether that amount is too much or whether it is not sufficient.

Up to the present time the appropriations for atomic energy have been made entirely on faith. The Senate was not told what the purpose of the original appropriation was, and how the money was to be used, and from that day to this the Congress of the United States has opened the Nation's money bags strictly on faith. The time will have to come very shortly when judgment must be substituted for faith. I hope that time will come before the $444,000,000 is made available.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut for permitting the interruption.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further statement?

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to answer, if I can, the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

I will say to the Senator from Colorado that at least our gamble on the basis of faith certainly has so far paid off big dividends. I, however, agree with the Senator that we cannot go along on that basis. We would not be worthy of the traditions of our Republic or of the Congress if we did.

On the other hand, I think the Senator must realize, and I think it is important that the world should know, that our efforts are being devoted to the objective of directing atomic energy into peaceful channels. We know it is the cry of some that all we are doing is manufacturing bombs to intimidate the people of the earth. The Senator from Colorado knows, as I know, that such a statement is not true. If we wanted to follow that policy we would not be saying to the people of the earth, "Here are the benefits of atomic energy, and all we ask is that we be protected from its brutal use."

I may say further to the Senator from Colorado that he and I, as members of the committee, and the other Members of the Senate who have perhaps more indirect responsibility, but certainly a very grave one, must make a thorough study of the proposed budget. It is because I have not made it yet that I do not now want to commit myself with respect to it. But I still do not want to be understood as thinking that the amount of money recommended is out of proportion to the great work, and I agree with the Senator from Illinois, that instead of cutting it down we may have to think about increasing it. I do not know about that as yet.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my only reason for propounding the inquiry was that I knew the Senator from Connecticut was chairman of the committee previous to the Eightieth Congress. I know the thorough study he had made of the subject, and I thought perhaps he might have analyzed the President's budget message and given some consideration to it, to the end he might tell me whether he thought the amount recommended was adequate or inadequate. As

I said before, I am going to rely upon the Senator from Connecticut and other members of the committee to a great extent in forming my final judgment upon this item of the budget.

We must rely upon the judgment of members of all committees, and this is especially true on the atomic proposal. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has said, heretofore we have been making appropriations for atomic development on faith. I presume that to a certain extent we shall continue to make them on faith, unless we wish to give to the world the secret of the atomic bomb.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, less than a week after the election of last November 5 the Department of State announced plans for simultaneous negotiation of trade agreements with 18 foreign countries, under authority of the Trade Agreements Act which expires in June of next year. Along with this announcement the Department issued a list of products on which tariff reductions would be considered. This list covers 56 pages of rather fine print, and appears to include at least three-fourths of the articles making up our import trade. Certainly the major portion of American industry will be drastically affected by these trade agreements if sharp reductions are made on most of the items listed, as has been the case in the past. What we have, in short, is a general tariff revision by executive action.

Shortly after the State Department's announcement, therefore, I wrote Mr. W. L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State, suggesting that action on these proposed agreements be deferred until the new Republican Congress should have an opportunity to review our foreign-trade programs. I can see no need for extraordinary haste in slashing our remaining tariff rates. Mr. Clayton, however, has rejected my suggestion categorically. He has indicated every intention of proceeding with his program and making many additional tariff reductions before his authority runs out next year.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Under Secretary Clayton, Mr. Clayton's reply, and my response thereto.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 19, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLAYTON: Reference is made to the recent announcement of intention to negotiate trade agreements with 18 foreign countries. I am writing to urge that these negotiations be temporarily suspended until the new Congress shall have an opportunity to write a new foreign-trade policy. This announcement apparently indicates an intention to continue with the present tariff-reduction program, despite the repudiation of this administration by the voters. Such an intention is amazing to me.

The trade agreements program in its present form is a "lame duck" policy. The attempt to use the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, previously wrested from a Democratic Congress, to destroy our system of tariff protection, seems to me a direct affront to the popular will expressed last month.

The list of products on which tariff reductions may be made during these negotiations covers 56 pages, and appears to include at least three-fourths of our total import trade. On the list are dozens of items in which the people of my State are vitally interested. Among them are cattle, hogs, and meat; cheese, butter, and other dairy products; wheat, and other grains; wool; and a long list of fruits and vegetables. In a tremendous number of cases, tariff reductions of 40 to 50 percent have already been made in the past 12 years. Apparently you propose to further reduce the rates even on these items by some substantial amount, up to 50 percent of what protection is left.

Reductions already made under the trade-agreements program have reduced the protection to approximately half of our producers benefited by tariffs, and such reductions have averaged 30 to 40 percent. In other words, your program to date has constituted a substantial revision of our system of protection, as far-reaching as was the Tariff Act of 1930. The announcement of the new proposed treaties leads me to believe that a second sweeping downward revision of our tariff system is planned.

My views are in accord with the ostensible program of the Trade Agreements Act, that our foreign trade should be expanded by securing advantageous concessions from foreign nations, without doing substantial injury to domestic agriculture and industry. The conduct of the program to date, however, has not been in accord with this pretended goal. On the contrary, it appears that the program is being used as a cloak in an attempt to commit this country to a policy of very low tariffs. On the other hand, supposedly valuable concessions secured from foreign countries have been nullified by blocked exchanges, pool buying, and various other devices. There is nothing to indicate that renewed negotiation on the present basis will reverse this trend.

It is for these reasons that I protest your apparent decision to continue with this program, when the American people have just spoken so emphatically in the reverse direction. Cooperation between the Democratic administration and the Republican Congress in the interests of the national welfare will be difficult at best. A determination on your part to proceed with this program, in defiance of the wishes of the people, will make it almost impossible.

Your comments on any changes in your plans with respect to this program, in view of the change in the control of Congress, will be awaited with interest.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

JANUARY 16, 1947.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In your letter of December 19, which was acknowledged by my secretary during my absence from the city, you urge that negotiations under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be suspended. You advance four arguments in support of this request. First, you contend that the trade-agreements program was repudiated by the voters in the November election and that its continuation would be a direct affront to the popular will. Second, you refer to the pretended goal of this ostensible program and suggest that the concessions obtained in past negotiations have been valueless. Third, you complain that the list of products under consideration in connection with the pending negotiations is long. Fourth, you conclude that the administration intends to destroy our system of tariff protection.

On none of these points do I find it possible to agree.

First, there is no evidence to support your contention that the trade-agreements program was repudiated by the voters in the November election. Certainly, it would have been impossible for any voter to suppose that this program was an issue in the campaign. The American people had been repeatedly assured that there was no partisanship in foreign policy; that politics stopped at the water's edge. The Trade Agreements Act, first passed in 1934, had been renewed four times, each time with a substantial number of Republican votes. On the last renewal, which involved an increase in the authority of the President to negotiate agreements, the Republican vote in the Senate had been practically a tie, 15 for and 16 against. The three last Republican candidates for the Presidency—Mr. Landon, Mr. Willkie, and Mr. Dewey—had each explicitly endorsed the principle of tariff reductions through reciprocal agreements. You may recall that this principle had been advanced, many years before, by President McKinley, President Theodore Roosevelt, and President Taft.

It is not without significance that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was not raised as a national issue in the campaign. Before the last renewal in 1945, the extension of the law with increased power was specifically supported and vigorously urged by leading organizations representing American business, farm, and labor groups. This program has always had, and it continues to have, a broad basis of popular support. Any party that sought to destroy it would tar itself with the brush of economic isolationism, and it is well known that isolationism is a liability rather than an asset in contemporary politics.

Second, I shall not comment on your use of the words "pretended" and "ostensible" in discussing the administration of the Trade Agreements Act. I should like, however, to call your attention to one indisputable fact. Between 1934–35 and 1936–39, our imports from countries with which we did not have trade agreements increased 12½ percent; our imports from countries with which we did have trade agreements increased 22 percent. In the same period our exports to countries with which we did not have trade agreements increased 32 percent; our exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased 63 percent. It seems to me that this disposes of your contention that the concessions obtained through trade-agreement negotiations have been valueless to the United States.

Third, it is true that the list of products on which tariff concessions are now being considered is a long one. This list was issued for the purpose of assembling information on these products and in order to give all interested parties a full opportunity to present their views. But it should not be inferred that the tariff on all of these products will be reduced or that the tariff on any particular product will be reduced by the full amount permitted by the law. It should be noted, moreover, that the countries with which we are planning to negotiate represent not only a substantial percentage of our imports but also a substantial percentage of our exports and that the list of products on which we plan to seek concessions from other countries will be quite as long and as important as the list on which we would consider making concessions in return.

It should not be overlooked that the projected negotiations are but one part of a larger program of international economic cooperation which stems from the Atlantic Charter and includes our participation in the Economic and Social Council, the International Monetary Fund, and the Bank

for Reconstruction and Development, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other agencies which both parties in Congress have already approved by overwhelming votes.

These negotiations are a necessary prerequisite to the establishment of the International Trade Organization proposed by the United States and this organization in turn is essential to the whole structure of international cooperation in economic and political affairs. The trade negotiations and the ITO are part and parcel of a program that is designed to promote the prosperity of the United States by obtaining international agreements which will commit the other countries of the world against closing their markets to our goods. It is also designed to promote the peace by substituting consultation and cooperation for aggression and conflict in international economic relations.

Fourth, the administration has never sought to destroy our system of tariff protection. It does not seek to do so now. Changes in tariffs have been made only after thorough investigation and full hearings. During four successive renewals of the Trade Agreements Act, both Houses of Congress have built up a voluminous record that covers, in detail, every criticism that has been raised concerning the operation of the act. If you will examine this record you will find that particular groups have expressed their fears concerning what might happen to them at some future time. But you will find no demonstration that these fears have ever been justified. If any industry in the United States has suffered serious injury as a result of the operation of the trade-agreements program, the record does not disclose it. In the absence of any such evidence you will understand why it is difficult for me to give weight to the vague fears of groups who have never been hurt and who, I am confident, will never be hurt by the operation of this act.

I am glad to learn that you believe that "our foreign trade should be expanded by securing advantageous concessions from foreign nations without doing substantial injury to domestic agriculture and industry." This is the way in which the Trade Agreements Act has been administered in the past. This is the way in which it will be administered in the months to come.

As you know, President Truman assured Speaker RAYBURN, at the time when the Trade Agreements Act was extended in 1945, that no action would be taken during his administration which would result in grave injury to any essential American industry or agricultural activity. Moreover, the Department of State has announced that all future trade agreements will contain an escape clause similar to that contained in the agreement with Mexico which will permit the President to take appropriate action to protect any industry or agricultural activity which is seriously threatened by the operation of such agreements.

Far from intending to destroy our system of tariff protection, our Government is entering into the projected trade negotiations for the purpose of insuring that tariffs, rather than discriminatory import quotas, exchange controls, and bilateral barter deals, shall be the accepted method by which nations regulate their foreign trade. If it were not for the initiative which our Government has taken in this matter, the world would be headed straight toward the deliberate strangulation of its commerce through the imposition of detailed administrative controls. I need hardly tell you that such a development would be seriously prejudicial to the essential interests of the United States. Through a judicious exercise of the bargaining power which the Trade Agreements Act has placed in our hands, I am confident that we shall be able to reverse this trend. Without that power, there is little hope that we should be able to do so.

We are fighting for the preservation of the sort of a world in which Americans want to live—a world which holds out some promise for the future of private enterprise, of economic freedom, of rising standards of living, of international cooperation, of security and peace. The trade-agreements program is an instrument whose aid we need if we are to achieve these ends.

Very truly yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary.

JANUARY 23, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLAYTON: Receipt is acknowledged of your reply to my letter of December 19, 1946, with respect to the negotiation of the trade agreements now pending with 18 foreign nations.

Despite your reply, it is still my view that Congress should give renewed consideration to the problems of our foreign trade.

Attached for your information is a copy of a statement I have made to the press with reference to your letter, which was given to the press. I believe it may explain my position more fully.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, before proceeding further I should like to mention the fact that I realize that the present Secretary of State has had nothing to do with this program to date. What his views are on the conduct of the program, I do not know. Possibly he will not care to take any definite action with respect to the program, one way or the other, until he has had a little more opportunity to acquaint himself more fully with the details of its operation. In any case, I hope it will be understood that what I have to say relates solely to conditions as they have existed in the past, prior to General Marshall's appointment to the Secretaryship.

Mr. President, in my opinion the reciprocal trade agreements are a gigantic hoax on the American people. To begin with, they are neither trade nor reciprocal. Trade implies bargaining, and reciprocity means an act performed between two persons for mutual benefit.

The trade agreements under which we have been operating since 1934 are solely for the benefit of other nations. There is certainly nothing mutually beneficial about them.

This issue may shortly come before the Congress. I wish to take this opportunity to warn the American people against the perils inherent in this most glaring fraud of the New Deal.

Most of us are preoccupied with everyday living. In our smugness the word "tariff" is a mere abstraction. It is a complicated concept. It should not be so. Reduced to practicalities, tariff can carry terrifying implications. It can be a dangerous instrument. It also can be an instrument for good.

There are those in the State Department who take advantage of this national ignorance. They are the crisis boys. With them, as with the whole New Deal philosophy, there is always a crisis. If it is not to be found in domestic affairs, they launch into international affairs to scare us.

Thus, knowing that the American people as a whole—the man on the street—know little or nothing about trade agreements and that awful word "tariff," they attempt to bludgeon him into the belief that unless he accepts the economic philosophy that they espouse he is lost.

It is this frenzied attempt to jam down the American throat the concept that lower tariffs alone will save us and prevent war that I resent.

Historically, of course, the Congress had the sole power to fix tariff rates. The Congress abdicated that power in 1934 when it turned over this constitutional power to the State Department. In that year Congress gave the right to the State Department to reduce tariffs by 50 percent.

That was a mistake, and an action bordering on immorality. I say this because the people of the United States elected Members of the Congress and endowed them with the sole right of making tariff schedules. The did not elect members of the State Department. They never intended that the State Department should perform these duties.

The State Department proceeded, then, to slash tariff rates. In some cases this was done through pure whimsy or caprice. It did not matter to the global thinkers in the State Department how such actions might affect the employment of thousands of American workers or the American standard of living.

In an effort to assuage the feelings of the American businessman, the New Deal set up a strange creation called the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This is supposed to be an interdepartmental committee designed to reconcile the differences of American business in connection with the tariff. Actually, it is a fake tribunal before which the defendants are convicted without trial. It is, from another viewpoint, a packed jury. The views expressed and the pleas for protection by American business are usually ignored. For the past 2 weeks hearings have been conducted before this committee. Approximately 1,000 briefs have been filed with the committee.

These hearings are a public confession of the American businessman's frustration. This is his country, to be sure, but he does not feel that way when appearing before this committee. He has the feeling that he is on trial for his life; and, in a sense, he is on trial for his economic life. His own State Department, supported by taxes of American labor, agriculture, and business, inflames his inferiority complex, an emotional weakness played on by the British for 100 years.

Why the State Department goes through all this rigmarole when it has already made up its mind to reduce tariffs is hard to say.

The master minds in the State Department are even now planning further tariff reductions which will lower our standard of living. Already they are resolved to reduce tariff rates on hundreds of agricultural and industrial commodities. The same administration admits the necessity of a program to support our domestic agricultural prices at a fair level. Yet every student knows that such reasonable price levels cannot be maintained if a flood of competitive

imports comes into our markets at lower prices.

We have not yet felt the full impact of these give-away agreements. World shortages explain that. But, in the near future, this outrageous treatment of the American people will emerge as one of the most dangerous measures we could possibly have taken.

I am not arguing for stiff barriers against world trade. That is the impudent reply to my position which is constantly made. Obviously, I want world trade. That means business and commerce for all of us. I am merely saying we should have protection for our high standard of living. I want other nations to prosper, and prosper they can by diversifying their crops and their industries.

But let us get back to these hearings that are being held in Washington in connection with the tariff. They are a joke. Here we have millions and millions of American dollars at stake, not to mention the livelihoods of millions of our people, and the hearings on this complicated subject continue for only 3 weeks. Imagine that. Three weeks to determine the economic destiny of our people! And, of course, as I said before, the jury is packed and, I believe, the verdict has already been passed down.

It is very unfortunate that most of us do not grasp the trend of these negotiations. Most of us—mainly because we do not have the time—cannot sit down and study the whole tariff problem. But there are some of us who feel that we are paid to make a study of this subject; and I, as a United States Senator, am one of them. I wish I could get across to the people of this country the seriousness of this situation.

I am only one person. It is rather difficult for me as an individual to speak out against the myths and folklore that have been built around the sacred trade agreements. It is difficult for me to assail the intellectual and economic beliefs of those two apostles of the trade agreements—Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull. But I am as sincere in my beliefs as they were in theirs, and I think the time has come when someone should speak out in defense of American industry and labor.

My own thought is that industrial, agricultural, and labor groups should be asked to join in the actual negotiations. Three weeks of hearings before groups of minor officials are not an adequate substitute. Furthermore, I believe that trading with foreign countries is a matter that should be passed on finally by the Congress and not solely by the executive department. I believe that in this way we shall again become honest with ourselves and with the people with whom we deal. I shall have more to say about the tariff in greater detail as the subject comes before the Congress.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I repudiate the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska that no profit has accrued to the American economy comparable to what has been bestowed upon other countries under the reciprocal trade program. I repudiate the suggestion that the Government of the United States has sold down the river its own citizenry to foreign States or interests.

I repudiate the suggestion that a representative committee created by the Government of the United States to hear the citizenry of this country is a packed committee, which has already made up its mind, before it concludes the hearings, and is disposed only to ensnare the American citizen into some betrayal of his own interest and of his own country's welfare.

I say, on the contrary, Mr. President, that it is a fact, proved by unimpeachable statistical data, that the reciprocal trade agreements program inaugurated by one of the greatest of Americans, Hon. Cordell Hull, has brought immeasurable economic advantage and has made an incalculable contribution to world well-being and world peace. If permitted to continue, it will make a greater contribution in the days and years ahead.

I affirm, Mr. President, that our State Department and our other departments are not betrayers of the American people. I affirm that my own personal experience during the past week in appearing before two of these reciprocity-information committees gives me the opinion that the interests of my State were being fairly heard. We were invited to make a full statement of how we were affected by the proposed negotiation of agreements under the trade-agreement law and I have confidence in the competency and fairness of these committees.

I go further, Mr. President, and say that I hope, for the good of America and the world, the position taken by the able Senator from Nebraska is not the official position of the Republican Party. I know that it is not the official position of the Democratic Party. I know that President Truman proposes to continue to follow the path of President Roosevelt in trying to stimulate American and world trade, because America can be prosperous only when it can make a contribution to world trade and derive a profit from world trade.

If the position taken by the able Senator from Nebraska is the official line of his party, it is notice to the American people that we are headed again down the iniquitous path of economic isolation which will conclude at the abyss of another Smoot-Hawley tariff law and lay a predicate for the political isolation which will again grow from the seeds of totalitarianism out of the womb of economic chaos on earth.

I hope, therefore, that the able Senator presumes to speak only his individual sentiments, and that his party has not fallen into the delusion and the snare of economic isolation so often found to be false policy.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BUTLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCAS. I was hoping that the Senator would also say in his remarks that he hoped the State Department was not being bludgeoned in any way by this attempt not to continue wholeheartedly the reciprocal trade program that has been laid down.

Mr. PEPPER. I am indebted to the able Senator from Illinois. I have read in the press within the past few days what I regarded as regrettable instances of legislative pressure upon the executive department of the Government. I have read that leading Senators of the Republican Party in this body and representatives of the Republican Party in the House have made the implied if not the expressed threat to our Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Clayton, in charge of the reciprocal trade agreement program, that if he should exercise the authority which he now has under a law of the American Congress, the punishment upon him and his department will be a limitation upon his authority by law, or a repeal of the law.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that it is a transgression by the legislature upon the executive functions of the Government for an administrative officer of this Government to be intimidated, intentionally or unintentionally, by the threat of punitive legislation if he carries out the will of the Congress declared officially for the people of the United States.

I commend what I have observed in the press and what I believe, from my knowledge of the man, will be the course of our Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton, in saying that he believes that this program is not only right, but essential to the welfare of the country and of the world, and that he proposes to continue to exercise his prerogatives under the law until the American Congress, in proper form, with the concurrence of the President in the proper way, shall, if it sees fit, alter the law.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I did yield to the Senator from Florida, who replied to the Senator from Nebraska. Evidently the Senator from Nebraska now desires to say something in reply to the Senator from Florida. I rose on an entirely different matter, and I wish to say a word or two on that subject. However, now I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me, and I assure him that I shall trespass only very briefly upon his time.

For the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Florida, I simply wish to repeat something I said in my statement, namely, that I spoke for myself, and myself alone, and I was not speaking for any group of persons, let alone the majority side of this Chamber.

In my statement I said that I was not in favor of high tariffs. I said, in substance, that I believe in reciprocity, but

I wish to have real reciprocity. I want it to be a two-way street, instead of a one-way street. I wish to remind the distinguished Senator from Florida and other Senators that in more than 1,200 actions taken on tariffs under the reciprocal trade agreements, it is almost true, if not absolutely true, that there has not been a single advance in tariff. Almost all the changes have been downward revisions; practically none have been advances.

I desire to give one illustration, and then I shall yield the floor. I believe in reciprocity, but the illustration which I shall give is not an example of reciprocity: A certain item is made industrially in my State. During the war it was manufactured in practically all sections of the United States. That item is now being manufactured abroad, and the country from which the item now comes to us has a wage scale which is one-third the wage scale of the factory in Nebraska. The importer gets it into the United States market by paying a duty of 10 percent. On the other hand, the Nebraska manufacturer gets it into the market of the other country by paying a 33-percent duty.

Mr. President, we have been traded out of our eye teeth, under the set-up we have had under the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I said I had risen on another matter. The matter I shall discuss is so important, in a way, that I shall not take time now to enter into the discussion of the reciprocal trade agreements program, except to point out this warning and this caution—namely, that apparently there has been a move indirectly to stop the negotiation of all reciprocal trade agreement programs. No direct attack is made to repeal the law. The law is still on the statute books, and it will remain there until 1948. Under that law, which the Congress itself wrote, it is the duty of the members of the executive branch of government to negotiate trade treaties; and if they fail to carry out that duty, either because of statements made in Congress or otherwise, they fail in their duties as responsible officials of government. Certainly if an attack is to be made upon the reciprocal trade agreements program, Mr. President, I hope it will be made directly and that we shall be able to debate the whole issue here on the floor of the Senate, as well as have it debated on the floor of the House of Representatives. Let the attack be a direct one. If there is a desire to destroy the law, let the law be repealed, if it is decided that that should be done. But let us not attempt to do indirectly what we do not have the courage to do directly.

Mr. BUTLER. I quite understand the position of the Senator from New Mexico.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SGT. JAMES A. BURNS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as I previously said, I rose in connection with an entirely different matter. In common with every other Member of Congress, I have often desired to pay a tribute to every brave and gallant son of my State and of the Nation who made the supreme sacrifice during the war. Obviously that is impossible for any of us to do. But occasionally, incidents occur which do afford us an opportunity to express, even in meager fashion, appreciation of the gallant and brave sacrifices the sons of America have made.

An incident of that kind was called to my attention by one of the official reporters of the Senate, who the other evening was listening to the national broadcast entitled "We, the People," over the Columbia Broadcasting System. On that program was told one of the finest stories of a sacrifice made by an American boy that I have heard anywhere. That young man came from the State of New Mexico. Because I am so proud of him and of the hundreds of thousands of other American boys like him, I now ask unanimous consent to have read at the desk the transcript of that radio program, and I ask all members of the Senate to listen to the reading of the transcript, for I am sure that they, as Americans, will share in my pride.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the transcript will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOULTON. Today, in New York, are hundreds of people from all over the world on a mission of great importance. They're the delegates to the United Nations, and their every thought is of world peace and harmony. Here with me now, at our Gulf Oil microphone, is one of those delegates, but her mission tonight is for a different reason. For she wants to tell We the People a story—not one of many countries—but a simple story of just one country and an American boy. She's the distinguished delegate from Korea, Miss Louise Yim.

Miss YIM. My story begins in the town of Pyung-Tag, in Korea. It was a pretty little valley town. Then in July the big flood came. The great river washed away hundreds of homes. The people were desperate. Some American soldiers came to help, and one of the first was Sgt. James Burns. Many people in Pyung-Tag knew him before, for he had been a friend to the children, giving them candy and food for their starving families. When they saw Sergeant Burns they knew he would help them to safety.

Mr. BOULTON. What could he do to help so many?

Miss YIM. He worked day and night. He saved hundreds of children by getting them out of the flood area. He helped keep families together. He helped them get food. Time and time again he dove into raging waters to save people. Jimmie Burns was everywhere. He didn't think of himself. He only thought of others. On the day of the flood he was working on the river bank when he heard cries for help. Then he saw a mother and child drifting downstream on a log. Jimmie jumped in to save them. With his last strength he pushed the log to shore. The mother and child were saved. But Jimmie was too tired to fight the strong current. Before anyone could help him, he was gone. Jimmy's mother is here with me now. Until tonight she did not know the brave way her son died.

Mr. BOULTON. And this is the first time his story of courage has been told?

Miss YIM. That's right, Mr. Boulton. After that day everyone in Pyung-Tag talked of Sgt. Jimmie Burns. We tried to write a letter to his mother in New Mexico, but the words didn't come easily. We decided to rebuild the town in his honor. This we are doing. Then when I was chosen to come here to the United Nations the women of Korea commissioned me to see Mrs. Burns and to give her two tokens to express their gratitude and their sympathy. The first is this scroll.

Mr. BOULTON. I know what a handsome tribute it is. And with your permission, I'd like to read it to our listeners. It says: "To Mrs. Frankie M. Burns: Thirty million people extend deepest sympathies and honor. The heroism of your son, Sgt. James A. Burns, will be remembered forever by those he saved and by our Nation."

Miss YIM. Then I have something else for Mrs. Burns. We women in Korea wanted to give his mother a symbol of our gratitude and our affection. It is a jewel box, thousands of years old. I have carried it with me from my homeland. I'm so happy now to put this box in your hands, Mrs. Burns.

Mrs. BURNS. Thank you, Miss Yim. It is hard to believe that my Jimmie will never come home again. But I can't tell you how much it means to have these gifts, for they tell me more than any words can how much your people loved Jimmie, too. [Applause.]

RECOGNITION OF ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND AND ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH REGIMENTS, CONNECTICUT NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in maintaining the national security in the postwar era, the National Guard of the respective States is going to be relied upon very heavily. As a matter of fact, I think that under the present plan each State will be called upon to furnish a larger number of men for various National Guard units than ever before. With that thought in mind, I should like to read into the RECORD a press release from the War Department concerning two Connecticut regiments. It is as follows:

FORTY-THIRD DIVISION REGIMENTS ARE FIRST TO BE RECOGNIZED FEDERALLY

The One Hundred and Second Regiment of the Connecticut National Guard is the first regiment of the postwar National Guard to receive Federal recognition for all its units, the War Department announced today. The One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment, also of Connecticut, was the second to be recognized federally.

Both regiments are now, and were before World War II, units of the Forty-third Infantry Division. During the war the One Hundred and Second Regiment served independently in the South Pacific, after the triangularization of the Forty-third Division, and one battalion took part in the campaign on Okinawa. The One Hundred and Sixty-ninth was in combat on the Russell Islands, New Guinea, Solomons, and Philippines.

Congratulations were sent by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to The Adjutant General and through him to the Governor of Connecticut and to Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. Cramer, commanding general of the Forty-third Division.

Mr. President, as the junior Senator representing the grand old State of Connecticut, I am extremely proud to see our National Guard so active and so diligent in preparation for the defense of our country. I congratulate the officers and men of these two regiments most heartily.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, January 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1947:

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

John A. O'Donnell, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, vice John S. Young.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH OF OFFICE

Maurice S. Rodgers

NURSE OFFICER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR NURSE OFFICER

Alice L. Rorrison

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICER TO BE TEMPORARY NURSE OFFICER

Amy E. Viglione

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

The following-named officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the Judge Advocate General's Department, in the grade specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of Section 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended:

(Promotion list)

TO BE CAPTAINS

Fischer, Milton, JAG, [redacted]
Sitnek, William G., JAG, [redacted]
Routledge, Rodham C., JAG, [redacted]
Ballman, Richard J., JAG, [redacted]
Solf, Waldemar A., JAG, [redacted]
Stephens, Elmer S., JAG, [redacted]
Ransick, Clarence E., JAG, [redacted]
Barr, John, JAG, [redacted]
Mitchell, Lansing L., JAG, [redacted]
Taylor, Carlisle C., JAG, [redacted]
Ruby, Donald T., JAG, [redacted]
Perry, Edward L., Jr., JAG, [redacted]
King, Tom H., JAG, [redacted]
Roberts, William W., Jr., JAG, [redacted]
Baughn, Wilmot T., JAG, [redacted]

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and arm or service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.):

(Promotion list)

TO BE MAJORS

Lauben, Philip S., FA, [redacted]
Farr, Edward H., Inf., [redacted]
Buck, Harold A., SC, [redacted]
Murphy, Joseph C., AGD, [redacted]
Purdin, William H. P., AGD, [redacted]
Porter, David D., JAG, [redacted]
Grendon, Alexander, CAC, [redacted]
Sullivan, Francis J., Inf, [redacted]
Stephan, Audley H. F., Fin., [redacted]
Ladd, John G., CE, [redacted]
Goff, Abe M., JAG, [redacted]
Shurtleff, W. H., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Livingston, Leon J., QMC, [redacted]
Gerdes, Henry G., CE, [redacted]
Hill, Clifton C., Ord, [redacted]
Norman, Randolph G., QMC, [redacted]
Harvey, George A., QMC, [redacted]
Reese, Franklin W., Inf, [redacted]
Lee, Frederick S., Inf, [redacted]
Oje, Clifford V., Inf, [redacted]
Wheeler, Cecil G., CE, [redacted]
Brown, Elmer G., Fin, [redacted]
Zinnel, Henry W., QMC, [redacted]
Trone, John W., AGD, [redacted]
Quenneville, Rene O., CE, [redacted]
Byers, Lawrence W., CAC, [redacted]
Modisett, Benjamin F., QMC, [redacted]
Cummings, Ralph B., CML, [redacted]
Straub, Theodore F., Ord., [redacted]
Hall, Roy H., Fin., [redacted]
Wilson, Ronald F., AC, [redacted]
Knight, Robert J., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Mayson, Preston B., AGD, [redacted]
Herman, Leo I., AGD, [redacted]
Dawson, John T., QMC, [redacted]
Foote, Albert G., AC, [redacted]
Wolfe, Claudius O., JAG, [redacted]
McGaw, Hugh D., CE, [redacted]
Madigan, John J., Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Texley, Alfred G., QMC, [redacted]
Barnard, Leroy H., Inf., [redacted]
Stadfield, Harold R., JAG, [redacted]
Whipple, Howard R., JAG, [redacted]
Carter, John F., AC, [redacted]
Stratton, Frederick S., Fin., [redacted]
Reichmann, Richard E., JAG, [redacted]
Reed, Charles F., JAG, [redacted]
Chambers, Laurel L., JAG, [redacted]
Fontaine, Russell B., Ord., [redacted]
McDonnell, Harold F., JAG, [redacted]
Mann, Robert M., QMC, [redacted]
Reed, Charles L., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Davis, Kenneth I., SC, [redacted]
Kreidel, Francis A., Inf., [redacted]
Medaris, John B., Ord., [redacted]
Noyes, Melville F., AGD, [redacted]
Maloney, James P., CAC, [redacted]
Rittgers, Forest S., Inf., [redacted]
Collar, William D., QMC, [redacted]
Yost, Lowell A., QMC, [redacted]
Stockton, Ernest L., CE, [redacted]
Moore, William O., AC, [redacted]
Kenaston, Hampton R., JAG, [redacted]
Hodge, Robert D., QMC, [redacted]
Silvers, Chester D., JAG, [redacted]
Kay, Carnig, QMC, [redacted]
Okeefe, Keefe, JAG, [redacted]
Patterson, Carl M., JAG, [redacted]
Lockhart, Ralph M., SC, [redacted]
Mathews, Frank H., SC, [redacted]
Shulits, Samuel, CE, [redacted]
Felstead, Charles F., SC, [redacted]
Light, Charles P., Jr., JAG, [redacted]
Everett, Hugh, Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Bell, Lawrence D., JAG, [redacted]
Schantz, Bradford T., AGD, [redacted]
Neiger, Ruel R., QMC, [redacted]
Brittingham, A. D., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Harber, William V., Ord., [redacted]
Ebbs, Richard F., CE, [redacted]
Winters, Roy H., Ord., [redacted]
Tidwell, Moody R., Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Logsdon, Krit G., AC, [redacted]
Dick, John N., CML, [redacted]
Johnson, Vernon R., QMC, [redacted]
Smith, Terence J., AGD, [redacted]
Pittman, Lunsford C., QMC, [redacted]
Wilson, John L., Jr., CE, [redacted]
Moore, William S., Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Gault, Elmer C., AGD, [redacted]
Biles, George F., Fin., [redacted]
Hanley, James F., JAG, [redacted]
Pearson, George O., Inf., [redacted]
Warren, Frederick M., Cav., [redacted]
Michael, Jonathan H., QMC, [redacted]
Cook, Jewell H., QMC, [redacted]
Wurtzler, Herbert W., Ord., [redacted]
Rhodes, Cooper B., JAG, [redacted]
Stewart, John E., Fin., [redacted]
Emigh, Harry B., Inf., [redacted]
Reese, Frederick W. W., Fin., [redacted]
Albergotti, Julian S., CAC, [redacted]
Read, Clarence E., Inf., [redacted]
Chapman, Thayer, JAG, [redacted]
Merrill, Earnest D., AGD, [redacted]
Golden, William C., AGD, [redacted]
Barber, Keith H., Inf., [redacted]
Pitcher, Thomas A., SC, [redacted]
Kneussl, James K., JAG, [redacted]
Schenken, Carlton G., JAG, [redacted]
Slocum, A. N., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Light, John C., Ord., [redacted]
Shakel, William C., QMC, [redacted]
Howard, William H. B., CML, [redacted]
Quarles, Hugh L., QMC, [redacted]
Miller, Alton C., Inf., [redacted]
Barron, Clarence B., AGD, [redacted]
Sargent, Ellwood W., JAG, [redacted]
Hall, Alan W., AGD, [redacted]
Hayne, Paul, Jr., Fin., [redacted]
Jennerson, Horace L., SC, [redacted]
Berry, Franklin H., JAG, [redacted]
Stark, John M., Ord., [redacted]
Fried, Myer, QMC, [redacted]
Patterson, Donald R., AGD, [redacted]
Hill, Richard F., CE, [redacted]
Jones, Willie H. H., JAG, [redacted]
Brenneman, Ivan L., QMC, [redacted]
Jackson, William D., QMC, [redacted]
Lesley, Orville A., Fin., [redacted]
Higgins, Maurice C., Inf., [redacted]
Moody, Howard A., AC, [redacted]
Bruno, Angel F., Inf., [redacted]
Mearls, Walter J., SC, [redacted]
Sewell, Walter E., Inf., [redacted]
Nell, Glenn P., AC, [redacted]
Eichorn, Frederic N., Ord., [redacted]
Keller, Henry A., SC, [redacted]
Lucy, Sam G., QMC, [redacted]
Cornell, Loren, AC, [redacted]
Somerby, William A., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Barnes, Lynn C., CE, [redacted]
Robison, Raymond D., AC, [redacted]
Loveless, Winton H., SC, [redacted]
King, Dale M., FA, [redacted]
Burcher, Harry E., CE, [redacted]
Van Ness, Robert G., Ord., [redacted]
Murphy, Clarence J., Ord., [redacted]

TO BE CAPTAINS

Nesmith, Vardell E., AGD, [redacted]
Bryan, Frederic G., Ord., [redacted]
Harris, Russel O., Inf., [redacted]
Barksdale, Stoessel S., CML, [redacted]
Loftin, Harolde T., Inf., [redacted]
Brazier, Kelly L., Fin., [redacted]
Whipple, Abram L., Jr., JAG, [redacted]
Hasting, Howard H., JAG, [redacted]
Shrader, Harold D., JAG, [redacted]
Wise, Frank G., QMC, [redacted]
Reilly, James E., CML, [redacted]
Drake, Robert S., SC, [redacted]
Gilly, Clarence O, QMC, [redacted]
Bowen, Francis C., SC, [redacted]
Green, Edwin B., CE, [redacted]
Peerenboom, Maurice A., CML, [redacted]
Wilson, Robert B., Ord., [redacted]
Hickisch, Frank L., AGD, [redacted]
Wilson, Robert F., SC, [redacted]
Schneider, Carl P., Ord., [redacted]
Sumner, George B., CF, [redacted]
Searles, Jasper L., JAG, [redacted]
Dixon, Harold P., AC, [redacted]
Vest, Hugh A., SC, [redacted]
Paddock, Robert H., CE, [redacted]
Shoemaker, William S., CE, [redacted]
Tando, Kenneth H., Fin., [redacted]
McDaniel, Charles D., CE, [redacted]
Djuvik, Carl, QMC, [redacted]
McCoy, Michael N. W., AC, [redacted]
Chandler, Albert, QMC, [redacted]
Oliver, John E., QMC, [redacted]
Reguera, Cesareo, Fin., [redacted]
Moen, Philmore L., SC, [redacted]
Graalman, Walter R., JAG, [redacted]
Farmer, Herbert F., QMC, [redacted]
Kardos, Alfred E., QMC, [redacted]
St. John, Ralph P., QMC, [redacted]
Healy, John J., Inf., [redacted]
Kretlow, Stanley A., SC, [redacted]
Smith, Robert N., CE, [redacted]
Skinner, Ernest B., JAG, [redacted]
Bowman, David W., SC, [redacted]
Dawson, Wallace H., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Crook, Gerard B., JAG, [redacted]
Livingston, John J., CE, [redacted]
Mason, George J., CE, [redacted]
Gambrill, Robert E., AGD, [redacted]
White, Ralph W., SC, [redacted]
Bingham, Carlton V., QMC, [redacted]
Hoffman, William C., AGD, [redacted]
Lanning, Harley A., JAG, [redacted]
Olmstead, Loren W., CE, [redacted]

Bedell, Edwin A., CE,
Brophy, Francis J., SC,
Henderson, Hammond F., CE,
Lowry, Richard, QMC,
Doerr, Paul L., Inf.,
Dlugensky, Edmund L., Fin.,
Blum, Vernon M., Ord.,
Metheny, Lyal C., FA,
Diamond, Irwin M., QMC,
Wilkins, Frank F., FA,
Tufte, Theodore B., QMC,
Noland, Horace V., AGD,
Passink, Clare, QMC,
Mann, John W., AGD,
Bockman, Charles E., Jr., AC,
Biscoe, Stanley J., QMC,
Sullivan, William W., CE,
Marsh, Leon D., AGD,
Kent, Arthur, AGD,
Drury, Cecil M., QMC,
Houghton, Francis E., QMC,
Schellberg, Kenneth O., QMC,
Boger, Martin K., AC,
McHugh, James E., CML,
McKeague, John M., QMC,
Marsden, Earl H., CE,
Weadock, Thomas A., QMC,
Brascher, Thomas J., AGD,
Atwood, George L., CAC,
Brown, Richard O., Fin.,
Hammerness, Oscar T., Inf.,
Nielsen, Svend W., CE,
Urquhart, Henry C., JAG,
Hatfield, Ralph H., QMC,
Heyne, Kurt N., Inf.,
Brown, Lobdell P., Inf.,
Barnaby, Adolph, QMC,
Long, Herndon H., AGD,
Tandy, Frank G., CAC,
Taylor, Fred C., Inf.,
Taylor, Clyde O., SC,
Voiers, Lewis, QMC,
Mayer, Francis L., SC,
Brame, Wayne W., Inf.,
White, Edward C., SC,
Gant, Robert M., AGD,
Stephens, William A, QMC,
Burr, Ralph R., QMC,
Elkins, Horace N., Jr., Fin.,
Socks, Hugh J., AGD,
Nelson, Harlan M., QMC,
Cooley, Herbert W., SC,
Le Penske, F. J., Jr., QMC,
Brown, Washington H., JAG,
Kotrich, Edward J., JAG,
Robison, Joseph E., Jr., QMC,
Crawford, Troy W., AC,
Herrmann, Charles R., Inf.,
Kline, Robert P., CE,
Hamilton, Homer G., Ord.,
Parsons, Walter H., Jr., CE,
Brooks, Irving W., QMC,
Benton, William L., CE,
Williams, Warren C., AC,
Butler, Everett L., SC,
Radcliffe, Maurice M., AGD,
Ritchie, Alva L., Fin.,
Leney, Herber C., JAG,
Baldwin, Orval J., CE,
Warner, William A., QMC,
Hazlett, Robert T., Inf.,
Guisleman, George V., CE,
Judson, Robert R., Ord.,
Rand, Kenan M., QMC,
Maxwell, John W., MC,
McKenzie, Timothy H., SC,
Klinetop, Howard A., QMC,
Kleff, Pierre A., CML,
McGlinn, Richard M., AC,
Elliot, Owen, AGD,
Beggs, Raymond W., CE,
Strauss, Richard K., AV,
Gibbons, Gilbert P., CML,
Baker, Arthur L., SC,
Bates, William H., CE,
Kirkpatrick, H. F., Jr., CE,
Davidson, Alfred H., Jr., CE,
Babcock, Charles P., FA,
Dasche, Jay A., Inf,
Heard, William R., AGD,
Rodgers, William M., Inf,
Henderson, Blair E., QMC,
Winsper, Edwin S., QMC,
Reed, Darrell L., Fin.,
Skaggs, Robert N., Inf.,
Rees, David G., Inf.,
Kerbel, Walter, AC,
Ison, Frank S., QMC,
Allen, Robert H., AC,
Walton, Joseph R., Inf.,
La Cour, Jean P., QMC,
Reiser, Lloyd M., FA,
Bessmer, Earl S., Inf.,
Judy, Jackson K., JAG,
Luchowski, Frank J., CML,
Shipley, Byron M., CE,
Johnson, John E., CE,
Londahl, John E., Inf.,
Roberts, Frank W., AGD,
Johnson, George V., SC,
Katsarsky, Slaftcho, Inf.,
Black, James G., Fin.,
Brandt, Charles J., CAC,
Garretson, Ralph B., QMC,
Bradley, John A., Inf.,
Whitehead, William J., CE,
Norell, James A., AGD,
Raftery, Paul H., Ord.,
Engel, Harry J., JAG,
Reed, Prentiss B., Jr., Ord.,
Jones, Argyle P., Inf.,
Boogher, Arnold, CML,
Wilkinson, Raymond A., QMC,
Mills, Edwin L., QMC,
Griffith, Melville H., Inf.,
Wilkin, John L., Jr., Inf.,
Coleman, Hughe D., Inf.,
Thrift, Richard B., Fin.,
Kab, Benjamin J., CE,
Loggins, Lloyd B., AC,
Gibson, White E., Jr., JAG,
Bollero, Angelo D., AGD,
Berkowitz, Charles J., JAG,
Claps, Luigi F., Inf.,
Kabrich, Charles E., CE,
Dale, John R., QMC,
Johnson, Albert M., Ord.,
Luke, Regis W., Fin.,
Sabine, John S., CAC,
Robinson, Fred. P., Jr., Ord.,
Taylor, Ray W., AC,
Ranney, Daniel A., CAC,
Franklin, John M., QMC,
Slagle, Halbert J., SC,
Stafford, Albert T., QMC,
Higgins, Roger E., FA,
Haines, Harold H., Inf.,
Field, Winston L., JAG,
Bolton, Cecil H., Inf.,
Chilson, Lee D., QMC,
Dubia, Gilbert P., Ord.,
Hanson, Charles C., CAC,
Rinque, Donald P., QMC,
Routh, Clarence E., QMC,
McGrail, Thomas M., Inf.,
Pierce, Norman O., Jr., AGD,
Hoehne, Ervin D. K., QMC,
Wrightson, Samuel H., JAG,
Mennie, Merle L., QMC,
Reifsnyder, Harold R., CE,
Griffin, Ralph J., CE,
Usera, Vincent, Inf.,
Sandin, Ramon A., Inf.,
White, Edward L., Inf.,
Pray, Lee H., Inf.,
Baker, Charlie A., QMC,
Bass, George Q., QMC,
Hunt, Lewis A., QMC,
Jewett, John J., CE,
Dieterle, William H., CE,
Hood, Lund F., Cav.,
Akans, James E., CE,
Goetz, Hugo G., Jr., Inf.,
Rusk, Dean, Inf.,
Cox, Stuart M., QMC,
Breckenridge, J. D. C., AGD,
Cummins, T. J., Jr., CML,
Turner, John R., AGD,
Brown, Harry E., Jr., QMC,
Alexander, David C., Jr., QMC,
Ridlehuber, Walter R., QMC,
Swartz, Robert N., CE,
Locke, Richard F., Jr., QMC,
Keltner, Clyde A., CE,
Spitz, Charles E., SC,
McEachern, Joe A., CE,
Parry, Robert C., CE,
Moffett, Clewis C., CE,
McGuire, William H., AC,
Worthy, Clair M., CAC,
Levin, Maurice, JAG,
Shaw, Leslie B., AGD,
Brown, Maskell E., SC,
Butler, Robert O., Jr., AC,
Barry, George W., QMC,
Leigh, Beverly M., Jr., FA,
Ward, Frederick G., QMC,
Reynolds, James H., Inf.,
Andersen, Hal P., QMC,
Boyd, Marzelle F., QMC,
Allen, Harlow E., QMC,
Goldinger, Milton, JAG,
Evens, Robley D., Inf.,
Witt, William H., Inf.,
Kreml, Edward K., CE,
Myers, Harvey A. P., Jr., JAG,
Dillemuth, George F., JAG,
Murphy, Robert J., Jr., JAG,
Crabbe, Gerald W., AC,
Beall, Claudius A., Jr., AGD,
Johnson, Dwight E., QMC,
Miner, Howard A., Fin.,
Stahl, John A., AGD,
Baber, Clinton W., CML,
Van Blarcom, Earl B., Fin.,
Snyder, Richard F., QMC,
Santerre, Leo B., QMC,
Mack, Richard A., AGD,
Etherton, Louis M., CE,
Manning, Earl V., Ord.,
Kinsman, Simon, CML,
Courson, Everett P., Jr., QMC,
Taylor, Richard H., QMC,
Billings, Edward R., Ord.,
Webb, Lynn H., CE,
Moore, Lister R., CE,
Kidd, Elbert M., CAC,
Parsons, Thomas L., JAG,
Latham, Charles C., Jr., Ord.,
Hungate, James W., Jr., Inf.,
Hert, Paul, Inf.,
Harrison, Ike H., AC,
Sewell, George H., CE,
Falzgraf, Benjamin A., Inf.,
Little, Murray A., SC,
Lisk, Robert T., Inf.,
Bush, Morris, Fin.,
McNabb, Stephen R., Inf.,
Boas, Philippe P., Inf.,
Peters, Peter, AGD,
Rubin, Morton A., SC,
Crossett, Frederick J., Ord.,
Jennings, William E., SC,
Foster, James W., QMC,
Brugger, Vernon W., AGD,
McKenzie, Alex E., Inf.,
May, Robert W., QMC,
Shirey, Burrell P., Ord.,
Beebe, John L., Inf.,
Baker, David A., QMC,
Condon, John F., QMC,
Howdeshell, Harmon M., Ord.,
Badley, Burton E., QMC,
Hanger, John W., QMC,
Anderson, Blaine E., FA,
Graham, Floyd, QMC,
Sproul, Elliott W., CE,
Emmons, David B., AGD,
Maguire, Kenneth, CE,
Badger, Thomas J., FA,
Geismer, Oscar H., QMC,
Ballentine, John F., CAC,
Mauzy, Royall R., SC,
Harris, Glenn J., Ord.,
Whicher, John C., QMC,
Le May, Roland A., AGD,
Besse, Warren E., Ord.,
Williamson, Samuel D., QMC,
Nahas, Jack N., SC,
Schumann, Heinrich G., Inf.,
Miller, Alexander H., CE,
Smith, Vernon M., AGD,
Haines, Robert L., QMC,
Congdon, William H., SC,
Detlie, Harry C., CE,
Ackley, Charles M., CE,

Clark, Theodore S., Inf.,
Schaefer, John L., AGD,
White, Jack C., Cav.,
Lehmann, Gus E., QMC,
McKeever, Daniel J., AGD,
Helgestad, James E., SC,
Moran, John J., QMC,
Emig, Nickolaus M., QMC,
Judkins, William T., SC,
Albertie, Edward J., FA,
Ashenfelder, W. F., Fin.,
Diefendorf, John E., Jr., Ord,
Drissel, Virgil H., JAG,
Lill, Eugene M., CE,
Stoliaroff, N. S., CE,
Eastmond, Theodore L., AGD,
Wells, Ralph H., Ord,
Sheen, Clarence E., AGD,
Hunkapiller, Bill B., CE,
Nichols, Cranz, Jr., Ord,
Miller, James A., AGD,
Gasper, Albert W., CE,
Wyatt, William O., Inf,
Fabritius, William J., Fin.,
Brickell, Harold O., Fin.,
Riley, Elwyn A., AGD,
Ogden, Alban B., Jr., AC,
Adams, Marcus W., Inf,
Phelps, Preston V, QMC,
Tolve, Ralph A., Inf,
Van Oosten, A. J., Inf.,
Hess, Ulysses W., AGD,
Carlson, Martin H., Inf,
Thorpe, George M., JAG,
O'Brien, Edmund R., QMC,
Pippin, Harmon L., Jr., QMC,
Hoff, Stanford I., FA,
Peterson, Kenneth H., CE,
Davis, John H., Ord.,
Finke, John G. W., Inf.,
Cornish, George H., Inf.,
Carver, Richard K., Cav.,
Kemp, Robert B., CE,
Franks, Robert B., AGD,
Heyer, Herbert B., Inf.,
Johnson, Ernest E., AGD,
Dupree, James E., SC,
Hunter, Robert C., JAG,
Page, Gordon B., CE,
Crowley, John E., QMC,
Philips, Burton K., JAG,
Samuel, Allen T., Jr., QMC,
Davie, Robert C., Fin.,
Waits, Ward B., Inf.,
Alexander, W. D., 3d, CE,
Regar, Philip W., CE,
Jackson, Norton, QMC,
Hill, Clifford B., Inf.,
Evans, John D., Jr., SC,
Hall, Sylvester A., Ord.,
Lester, Charles J., SC,
Cunningham, Martin, Ord.,
Hirsch, Oliver M., Ord.,
Bonifay, Isaac F., Inf.,
McCarthy, W. W., Jr., QMC,
Shea, James V., AGD,
Clark, Sam J., SC,
Dyer, Kenneth R., AGD,
Harkness, Lawrence R., QMC,
Johnson, Finis G., SC,
Boyd, Robert P., Jr., CE,
Williams, Roger H., CE,
Clark, Charles T., SC,
Wylie, Henry J., Ord.,
Rafay, Stephen, Fin.,
Powers, Eames A., QMC,
Turner, William F., Inf.,
Hemion, Roger H., Ord.,
Akins, Thomas W., Inf.,
Korf, Orval A., AGD,
Haun, James R., AC,
Dews, Omer S., QMC,
Ralph, Stephen V., Inf.,
Williams, Lewis C., Jr., Inf.,
Ross, Thomas P., SC,
Covington, Carroll M., SC,
Olhausen, James N., CAC,
Weisberg, Benjamin, FA,
Marden, Lyman P., Jr., QMC,
Reichel, Michael J., QMC,
Bonnell, Dow L., Jr., Inf.,
Hall, Lewis A., Inf.,

Eaken, Andrew J., Inf.,
Bishop, Loren E., CE,
Browne, John T., CAC,
Neely, James E., Jr., QMC,
Shomion, Arthur M., Inf.,
Gilbert, Harry C., CML,
Driver, James E., JAG,

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Smith, Dan L., 2d, QMC,
Pruyn, Franklin G., Jr., AC,
Fuller, Cecil H., CE,
Clatanoff, Walter G. W., AC,
McCaffery, L. F., AC,
Eberhard, Franklin K., QMC,
Cassell, Ernest M., Jr., AC,
Campbell, Clarence S., CE,
De Russy, Rene E., Jr., QMC,
Jeffers, Richard F., Inf.,
Bush, Benjamin R., CE,
Miller, Edward M., Fin.,
Carrithers, Judd M., AC,
Remfrey, Curt A., Ord.,
Morrison, Cleo E., AC,
Dalton, James J., Fin.,
Considine, William H., Inf.,
Dunn, James S., QMC,
Utterback, James W., Fin.,
McKillips, Edward J., QMC,
Gillanders, Bruce W., AC,
Copeland, Kenneth W., QMC,
Frankel, Henry, Cav.,
Gold, William M., Fin.,
Hess, Gustin A., Ord.,
Lay, Dent L., CE,
Lynch, William F., CML,
Leech, Robert C., Ord.,
Godshall, Melvin W., QMC,
Sturm, Frederick A., Fin.,
Ralls, Howard L. Jr., QMC,
Stowell, John H., Inf.,
Boyle, Joseph E., QMC,
Smith, Leo B., Ord.,
Davie, Robert N., AC,
Blight, Edward M., Fin.,
Ormond, Robert J., Inf.,
Haberman, Howard F., Inf.,
Dorsett, Harold L., QMC,
Myszewski, Chester F., AC,
Curtis, Leon D., CE,
Teal, Gilbert E., AC,
Entwhistle, Richard R., Ord.,
Cooper, John G., AC,
Pierce, Bruce, Ord.,
Halligan, Edward G., CML,
Shofner, Emory M., Fin.,
Moffitt, Michael F., QMC,
Rigely, George A., Fin.,
Gardner, Lyman S., SC,
Weaver, Edward A., Fin.,
Austin, Frank J. Jr., Ord.,
Jefferies, Charles E., QMC,
Rankin, John B., QMC,
Fossum, Embert A., Inf.,
Gonseth, Jules E. Jr., SC,
Bennett, Dayton E., Inf.,
Barker, Leonard C., CAC,
Oleary, Francis X., CAC,
Sawicki, Stanley J., Fin.,
Shuler, Cyril O., AC,
Albro, John N., QMC,
Verde, Joe, Inf.,
Swayze, Harold E., AC,
Anderson, Woodrow W., SC,
Botsford, Charles G., AC,
Laurie, Patrick W., Inf.,
Patrick, James G., CE,
Wilson, James M., Inf.,
Dinsmore, John C. Jr., FA,
Farley, Julius B., FA,
Johnson, Leonard H., Inf.,
Parsons, William J., Ord.,
Franks, Thomas K., Inf.,
Koletty, John W., QMC,
Fay, Charles E. Jr., Ord.,
Allen, Leonard S., CAC,
Hawkins, Boyce V., Inf.,
Balas, Paul S., SC,
Margolies, Harry, SC,
Kernan, Melvin M., Fin.,
Knouse, Lloyd B., AC,
Lewis, Evan H., CML,

McCaddon, Walter L., Cav.,
Millott, James O., FA,
Henry, Joseph P., QMC,
Todd, Ralph R., Ord.,
Peake, William K., AC,
Ellis, Bertram J., CAC,
Palm, Ira A., Inf.,
Yohe, Carl J. Jr., SC,
Page, John W., Inf.,
Hubbard, Raymond M., AC,
Lucas, Charles L., Inf.,
Curtis, Jack H., AC,
Burchell, Edward L., QMC,
Pachomski, John, QMC,
Dyer, Johnnie R., AC,
Guthrie, Guy S., FA,
Folen, Clifford G., Inf.,
Howder, James D., AC,
Foster, Ernest A. Jr., Ord.,
Beck, John N., Inf.,
Powell, Maurice G., Fin.,
May, Robert L., Fin.,
Carlson, Ross S., QMC,
McCabe, E. R. W. Jr., Inf.,
Koerner, Paul M., Inf.,
Carney, Taylor E. Jr., Ord.,
King, Francis J., QMC,
Salonick, Joseph L., Inf.,
Campbell, W. R., Jr., Inf.,
Albaugh, C. C., Jr., QMC,
Hupalo, William, SC,
Killingbeck, Frank J., QMC,
Wilder, Ernest B., FA,
Dacosta, Uriel P., AC,
Baerman, Charles P., FA,
Burns, Jackson R., QMC,
Harrison, Robert L., Fin.,
Emery, Jack R., Inf.,
Crandall, George B., Fin.,
Jay, Layton L., Inf.,
Ritterbush, Milton F., CAC,
Alexander, Robert W., Inf.,
Willets, George D., Inf.,
Northrop, Edward D., SC,
Miller, Melvin O., QMC,
Coughlin, Robert L., Cav.,
Holtz, Albert E., QMC,
Mac, Connell T., 3d, Inf.,
Strawbridge, John T., FA,
Strange, Luther G., Inf.,
Fueg, John W., QMC,
Thrash, Joe M., Jr., CE,
Watts, William E., Inf.,
Jost, Harry F., Inf.,
Commerford, Leon, Jr., CE,
Waller, Marvin E., CAC,
Lemmon, Cyrus J., AC,
Leckie, William E., CE,
Shealy, William T., AC,
Bieri, George A., Inf.,
Neiswender, Carl H., AC,
Wright, Lewis W., AC,
Williams, Gardner A., Inf.,
Lain, Dalton W., Inf.,
Goodmanson, Murel M., AC,
Macken, John J., QMC,
Linvill, Robert R., Inf.,
Lyle, Clayton B., Jr., CE,
Wolfson, Jack D., FA,
Bryman, Kingsley M., QMC,
Edwards, Robert B., AC,
Davis, Griffin L., SC,
Beardsley, Ford M., QMC,
Miller, Walter A., AC,
Taylor, Thomas E., AC,
Meguiar, Robert G., CAC,
Wales, John E., 3d, FA,
Milliff, John, QMC,
Back, Klair E., AC,
Currier, Don O., Inf.,
Brill, Norris, AC,
Howard, Vincent W., AC,
Attaway, Elmer J., Inf.,
Neff, John C., Cav.,
Kellett, Donald T., Inf.,
Carlisle, Gerald, SC,
Bogart, Frank A., Ord.,
Mayberry, S. W., Jr., AC,
Dawson, Robert H., AC,
Chapman, Oren D., QMC,
Bartling, Homer L., Ord.,
Bond, Thomas S., Jr., SC,

Eckstein, Paul A., CAC,
White, Richard D., QMC,
Wild, Herman B., Fin.,
Williams, Frank V., CML,
Lipsker, Martin S., AC,
Drazen, Leonard, SC,
Golden, Barney, QMC,
Lane, Douglas H., QMC,
Nicholas, Jack D., AC,
Crook, William R., CML,
McCutchen, George, FA,
Clark, James P., SC,
Claudle, James B., Fin.,
Albert, Joseph L., CE,
Hollick, Thomas C., AC,
Shipley, George W., AC,
Norman, George B., QMC,
Nickels, Loren S., AC,
Pertl, Martin C., Fin.,
Shaw, Donald A., AC,
Hartson, Stanley W., AC,
Williams, Robert C., FA,
Irby, Claude H., AC,
Pardue, Norman C., Ord.,
McGlinchy, John E., QMC,
Colarich, George M., AC,
Ulans, Roman I., SC,
Jeffrey, Paul R., Inf.,
Nicholls, James D., SC,
Hosken, Robert T., SC,
Nash, Bertram I., FA,
Cone, Sidney L., CAC,
Gierlak, Michael P., QMC,
Muhlenberg, David D. K., AC,
Grace, William V. N., QMC,
Kling, Carl V., Ord.,
Queenin, Hugh F., Cav.,
Harper, Walter T., Jr., CML,
Hillis, William T., Ord.,
Horvath, John, SC,
Kronke, Charles J., Jr., SC,
Taranto, Salvador F., FA,
Shawver, James E., QMC,
Dudley, Edward F., CE,
Pollock, Keith K., AC,
Simmerman, James S., Cav.,
Matlock, Hallie A., QMC,
Witherspoon, W. O., Jr., Inf.,
Erb, Herbert B., QMC,
Shepherd, Joe R., Inf.,
McConnell, C. W., QMC,
Peters, Kenneth G., Ord.,
Perry, Horace E., AC,
Earl, Gerald M., AC,
Peterson, Harrison V., AC,
Miller, Gordon A., SC,
Gray, Norman, SC,
Bebout, Leroy, Jr., AC,
Reeves, Ernest A., AC,
Bailey, William R., Ord.,
Rushing, William J., Inf.,
Moritz, Gene P., AC,
Clark, Carl V., Inf.,
Williams, Leslie B., AC,
Brownfield, Page H., Inf.,
Fairchild, Clarence G., FA,
Landes, Sidney W., QMC,
Brown, Virgil. G., QMC,
Gaddis, Albert C., AC,
Bennett, James G., Inf.,
Frasher, Ross P., Inf.,
Welde, Glenn A., SC,
Sherrod, Lilbourne W., Inf.,
Miller, Raymond O., CE,
Schaffner, William J., AC,
Smith, Jerome F., Inf.,
Nichols, George P., Inf.,
Keane, William J., SC,
Hailey, Clem G., Fin.,
Workman, Robert H., AC,
Nichols, Thomas B., AC,
Uhrig, Robert A., AC,
Kramer, Lyndon P., Ord.,
Stone, Laurence A., Ord.,
Vaughn, Mildridge F., QMC,
Dempsey, Jack D., AC,
Glaze, Thomas E., Inf.,
Foxx, James E., Ord.,
Karbel, Howard W., Inf.,
Graham, Franklin H., Fin.,
Stark, Hugh G., QMC,
Long, Maurice E., Ord.,
Seel, Peter B., Jr., AC,
Ritter, Larue H., Inf.,
Giuffre, Matthew R. J., Inf.,
Couch, Gerald, CML,
Morrill, Harry E., AC,
England, James J., AC,
Grogan, Gerard J., QMC,
Carter, George E., QMC,
Bogue, Jay D., AC,
Pell, Kenneth E., CML,
Hunt, Clifford S., QMC,
Beasley, William W., Jr., AC,
Henss, Arthur C., Jr., AC,
Tennis, Langdon C., AC,
Dunn, Francis L., Ord.,
Stockwell, Warren P., CML,
Dolph, Herbert A., AC,
Marley, Frederick H., AC,
McQuain, Gordon E., Inf.,
Wiley, Earl T., Ord.,
Telquist, Clark V., SC,
O'Grady, James R., QMC,
Brewer, James E., AC,
Risque, Beverly, SC,
Petri, Fred L., AC,
White, Claude W., CML,
Adkins, James C., AC,
Swett, Raymond D., AC,
Moyer, Morgan B., AC,
Barry, William G., QMC,
Davis, Victor A., QMC,
Spratt, William J., AC,
Laitos, Jan M., AC,
Baker, Arthur L., QMC,
Schulten, Leo E., Jr., Fin.,
Huggins, Charles A., AC,
Hathaway, W. H., Jr., AC,
Ross, Orville B., AC,
Anderson, Lawrence R., QMC,
Lawson, Leroy F., AC,
James, Howard, QMC,
Johnson, Irvin A., QMC,
Riley, John E., QMC,
Rumph, Osborne R., Fin.,
Van-der-Heyden, E. E., AC,
Higgins, William A., SC,
Hanford, Samuel B., AC,
Bruner, Frederick W., AC,
Bingham, Edward C., Jr., CML,
Larowe, John S., AC,
Langbein, Leland H., QMC,
Hall, Joseph A., AC,
Schwartzman, Jack, QMC,
Stafford, Gordon H., AC,
Porter, Fred B., QMC,
Blackwell, George C., QMC,
Pederson, John E., Fin.,
Lipp, Robert W., Ord.,
Beck, Bernard B., Inf.,
Miller, Kenneth R., AC,
Hefling, Robert J., AC,
Bellavance, Armand L., Ord.,
Read, Elkins, Jr., AC,
Collins, Alfred, Fin.,
Parker, Joseph P., Inf.,
Kerr, Jean L., Jr., AC,
Sterne, Paul J., Jr., AC,
Irwin, Walter G., Inf.,
Todd, Walter J., QMC,
Brzuska, Edmund E., AC,
Johnson, William M., AC,
Branch, James S., SC,
Clymer, Benjamin F., Jr., QMC,
Daman, Marion L., QMC,
Flahaven, William J., Inf.,
Kirby, Edward F., AC,
Clark, Delair A., AC,
Dotti, John T., Inf.,
Almand, Alexander J., Fin.,
Rasmussen, Henry A., Ord.,
Freeman, Eugene M., Inf.,
Hopkins, John W., Jr., Cav.,
Zarpas, Stephen N., Fin.,
Brown, Frank L., Inf.,
Kirk, Tyrus H., AC,
Turney, John C., AC,
Boddie, James W., AC,
Stallings, McLendon M., AC,
Meyer, Norman E., QMC,
Locke, William J., CE,
Linko, George A., AC,
Greene, John S., CE,
Calahan, Robert H., QMC,
Trainer Wyatte G., CE,
McAlhany, John W., QMC,
Canty, William A., 3d, QMC,
Crutchfield, James O., AC,
McCleary, Robert J., SC,
Fox, Robert W., AC,
Gardner, Joseph M., Fin.,
Benton, Albert T., Fin.,
White, Richard A., QMC,
Hall, Thomas W., AC,
Flake, Joe, QMC,
Downs, Lemuel C., FA,
Asprey, William P., Inf.,
Carbone, Alfonso R., Inf.,
Jones, Edwin W., QMC,
Ingerski, Jerome A., Fin.,
Sablitz, Henry H., SC,
Strathy, Charlton G., AC,
Hoffman, Harold J., AC,
Simon, Edward R., AC,
Easley, Waldo G., Inf.,
Patchin, John W., QMC,
Dresser, Cornelius S., AC,
Gates, John L., QMC,
Field, Alexander C., Jr., AC,
Stanton, George L., AC,
Cumbie, Thomas A., QMC,
Arrington, Wade H., Fin.,
Vitarius, Charles A., SC,
Strihafka, Louis F., AC,
Duff, Elmer H., AC,
Reed, Edward B., QMC,
Garbacz, Joseph F., CE,
Griffith, Stebbins W., AC,
Simmons, Mabry, AC,
La Vancher, William E., Inf.,
Paulson, Gordon L., AC,
Davis, Ottis A., SC,
Little, Gerald B., QMC,
Rogers, Maurice A., CAC,
Ballard, Walter P., AC,
Caples, Robert O., AC,
Klingbiel, Sherman F., AC,
Butcher, William A., Jr., AC,
Risher, James F., Jr., AC,
Jenkins, Edward N., SC,
Schaefer, Paul B., QMC,
Savilla, Roland, QMC,
Watkins, George F., AC,
Jones, Waldo B., AC,
Maxwell, Hugh D., Jr., AC,
Petri, Edwin A., CML,
Raley, James A., AC,
Bridges, Lester, AC,
Riddick, Willis S., Jr., FA,
McMillan, S. K., Jr., AC,
Converse, William W., AC,
Pfeiffer, George, Jr., AC,
Lash, Frederick F., Inf.,
Jones, Luther G., Jr., QMC,
Thompson, Russell B., AC,
Harris, Jesse L., AC,
Hall, Robert R., Inf.,
Cumiskey, William T., AC,
Wright, James F., Jr., QMC,
Strunk, Robert W., SC,
Kunkel, John H. Jr., AC,
Fragala, James J., QMC,
Bogda, Michael P. Jr., AC,
Webb, Charles A. Jr., SC,
Olliver, Leonard F., Fin.,
Delanoy, Charles W., AC,
Blachly, Ross L., AC,
Poole, James M., Jr., AC,
Park, Lionel O., AC,
Kendig, Robert L., AC,
Allen, Harry B., AC,
Grove, Philip P., AC,
Beaudry, Emil G., AC,
Hydron, Clarence A., AC,
Gray, Gordon D., SC,
Sherrard, J. H., 4th, CE,
Hicks, Herbert C., Jr., Inf.,
Prendergast, John D., Ord.,
Harris, Herbert K., Inf.,
Cox, Omer L., AC,
Bailey, John A., Jr., CE,
Duda, William, AC,
Griesbeck, Wilson A., QMC,
Youens, John P., QMC,
Newlands, George, QMC,

Bigelow, Edgar D., AC, [redacted]
Fansler, Reginald K., Inf., [redacted]
Chapman, John W., AC, [redacted]
Egert, John, 3d, AC, [redacted]
McCullough, Chris, Inf., [redacted]
Holley, Joshua L., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Howton, James R., QMC, [redacted]
Sommers, Norval I, Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Rasper, Vincent W., Ord., [redacted]
Meltesen, Clarence R., Inf., [redacted]
Hilditch, Norman, QMC, [redacted]
MacKenzie, Stuart A., Fin., [redacted]
Bonner, Thomas W., AC, [redacted]
Webb, Charles C., Fin., [redacted]
Frassrand, John M., CE, [redacted]
Griffiths, V. E. Sr., AC, [redacted]
McCauley, Clark R., QMC, [redacted]
Lazenby, James E., AC, [redacted]
Mulloney, Daniel C., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Raymond S., AC, [redacted]
Watkins, Thomas G., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Heck, Frederick B., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Dan R., SC, [redacted]
Moffitt, Alfred F., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Ryan, Albert J., CE, [redacted]
Rall, Lloyd L., CE, [redacted]
Crary, Gerald D., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Engelman, Frederick C., FIN, [redacted]
Netcher, Thomas G., AC, [redacted]
Elliott, Frank B., AC, [redacted]
Acuff, John N., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Stulb, Joseph G., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Shaffer, William K., CE, [redacted]
Reynolds, William G., CE, [redacted]
Faust, Robert J., FA, [redacted]
Luk, William, Inf., [redacted]
Grant, Francis A., Inf., [redacted]
Crawford, Jack L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Kohnstamm, Joseph W., SC, [redacted]
Johnson, B. E., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Riggs, Solomon G., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
O'Connor, Joseph P., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Jones, Grant E., QMC, [redacted]
Baron, Oakley W., AC, [redacted]
Eisiminger, S. K., CE, [redacted]
Mann, John J., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Waddleton, Thomas R., QMC, [redacted]
Abbott, Thomas W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Talmage, Henry G., AC, [redacted]
Yamber, William J., Inf., [redacted]
Golston, Joe R., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Elliott, Glenn P., CAC, [redacted]
Harris, William N., CE, [redacted]
Head, Charles W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Lovenbury, James W., AC, [redacted]
Woodman, John D., QMC, [redacted]
Berk, Irving B., AC, [redacted]
Doyle, Lloyd G., AC, [redacted]
Eicher, Roger A., Inf., [redacted]
Bynum, Richard E., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Cosel, Richard M., SC, [redacted]
Sampson, Victor J., AC, [redacted]
Shoup, Harry W., AC, [redacted]
Hambleton, Harry B., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Smith, Raleigh D., AC, [redacted]
Pope, Robert F., SC, [redacted]
Gray, Denver D., AC, [redacted]
McDowell, James E., QMC, [redacted]
Hinkley, Paul P, FA, [redacted]
McNabb, John M., AC, [redacted]
Northcutt, Thadeus P., QMC, [redacted]
Penn, Perry H., AC, [redacted]
Tufts, Harry N., CE, [redacted]
Akins, William T., AC, [redacted]
Rybak, William, CE, [redacted]
Jaynes, Roy A., AC, [redacted]
Scharf, Henry W., CE, [redacted]
Prim, Kent J., AC, [redacted]
Koss, Irving, SC, [redacted]
Hays, Norman P., AC, [redacted]
Gary, George M., Ord., [redacted]
Harvey, Ben, Jr., CE, [redacted]
Michael, George P., QMC, [redacted]
Nelson, Arthur L., AC, [redacted]
Langley, William C., QMC, [redacted]
Hall, James M., FA, [redacted]
Parsons, Albert B., AC, [redacted]
Hopkins, Wallace E., AC, [redacted]
Kincannon, Francis C., AC, [redacted]
Mahr, Victor M., AC, [redacted]
Turner, Julian, QMC, [redacted]
Smith, Magnus L., Inf., [redacted]

Stemen, Roger F., AC, [redacted]
Appel, John G., CML, [redacted]
Teir, William, FA, [redacted]
Hess, Otto O., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Dorney, Paul A., AC, [redacted]
Chapman, Ernest W., CE, [redacted]
Lang, Clarence J., QMC, [redacted]
Shettle, Charles G., Inf., [redacted]
Stefani, Louis J., CML, [redacted]
Gray, Zack, AC, [redacted]
Brown, George E., AC, [redacted]
Ferguson, Ivan L., AC, [redacted]
Chapman, James R., CML, [redacted]
Stone, William W., Jr., CML, [redacted]
Ledford, Otto C., AC, [redacted]
Plant, Ottis M., CAC, [redacted]
Brown, Clyde H., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Tetiva, Ervin J., AC, [redacted]
Bland, Robert B., QMC, [redacted]
Wegenhoft, Victor C., AC, [redacted]
Berkow, Joseph J., AC, [redacted]
Pike, Edwin G., CML, [redacted]
Abernathy, Louis M., AC, [redacted]
Couser, Walter J., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Herman E., SC, [redacted]
Smith, William M., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Van Orne, Ronald W., QMC, [redacted]
De Jarnette, Thomas D., AC, [redacted]
Duganne, John A., AC, [redacted]
Davis, John P., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Harley L., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Murray, James L., AC, [redacted]
Flanagan, James L., AC, [redacted]
Abbuhl, Charles, Jr., AC, [redacted]
Kent, James L., AC, [redacted]
Armstrong, John F., AC, [redacted]
Harper, James H., CE, [redacted]
Armstrong, L. F., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Getchell, Wilmah M., SC, [redacted]
Stansill, John T., Inf., [redacted]
Highley, John N., AC, [redacted]
West, Jack C., AC, [redacted]
Alford, Neill H., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Newton, Albert, QMC, [redacted]
Abel, George L., AC, [redacted]
Matthews, Ira V., AC, [redacted]
Barnes, Dean W., Ord., [redacted]
Waterman, Joseph M., QMC, [redacted]
Fairbanks, Russell N., FA [redacted]
Fowles, J. Francis, Jr., AC, [redacted]
Koerschner, W. F., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Crosswhite, Clyde C., Ord., [redacted]
Beyer, Donald A., SC, [redacted]
Harris, Bentley H., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Hinchee, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
McDermott, A. J., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Service, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Bilger, Donald E., AC, [redacted]
Pierce, Charles H., AC, [redacted]
Francis, Ernest H., QMC, [redacted]
Walton, Wallace G., AC, [redacted]
Moutier, John L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Mehaffie, Louis H., FA, [redacted]
Van Sandt, William A., SC, [redacted]
Davis, Dale D., AC, [redacted]
Kronauer, Clifford J., AC, [redacted]
Goodwin, Dexter B., AC, [redacted]
Thomas, George R., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Carter, Roger M., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Jenkins, Everett K., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Rahn, Gilbert F., AC, [redacted]
Conway, Victor C., AC, [redacted]
Tingwall, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Hester, Thomas J., AC, [redacted]
James, Paul C., AC, [redacted]
Oglesby, Stuart R., 3d, SC, [redacted]
Myers, Henry V., AC, [redacted]
Looney, Ned I., QMC, [redacted]
Schaal, William R., AC, [redacted]
Wildes, Thomas, QMC, [redacted]
Kennedy, Cary A., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Dakin, Hollis, SC, [redacted]
Bridges, Dewey R., Inf., [redacted]
Edwards, Wilbur H., AC, [redacted]
Mitchell, Max O., AC, [redacted]
Folts, Rudolf H., SC, [redacted]
Cryer, Elmer H., AC, [redacted]
Cronin, Patrick M., QMC, [redacted]
Albright, Shannon D., QMC [redacted]
Bralley, Walter S., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Winfield S., QMC, [redacted]
Godding, George A., Inf., [redacted]

Kitchens, Edward B., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Mahon, George P., Fin., [redacted]
Van Epps, John S., AC, [redacted]
Sterling, Edwin L., AC, [redacted]
Edwards, Glen W., AC, [redacted]
Brandon, William D., AC, [redacted]
Simmons, Lionel C., Inf., [redacted]
Dannenberg, Donald D., CML, [redacted]
Reinburg, G. E. A., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Berger, Raymond J., AC, [redacted]
Larsen, Marvin H., AC, [redacted]
Gammon, William J., AC, [redacted]
Popovich, Francis J., SC, [redacted]
Gay, John F., CML, [redacted]
Pellis, Edward G., QMC, [redacted]
McKay, Archie L., AC, [redacted]
Redman, Frank O., AC, [redacted]
Duke, Claude L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
McAllister, Walter L., AC, [redacted]
Corbin, Joseph H., AC, [redacted]
Briscoe, Carroll D., AC, [redacted]
Kopf, John B., CE., [redacted]
Dyer, Frederick W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Curtan, Eugene R., QMC, [redacted]
Martin, Bill H., AC, [redacted]
Ferebee, Thomas W., AC, [redacted]
Campbell, Elden C., Inf., [redacted]
Bass, Glenn L., QMC, [redacted]
Lamm, Louis J., AC, [redacted]
Schrader, Henry C., CE, [redacted]
Schultz, Chester M., AC, [redacted]
Eisenbrown, Walter T., AC, [redacted]
Killip, John T., Ord., [redacted]
Davis, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Collins, Harold D., AC, [redacted]
Galt, George T., SC, [redacted]
Dever, Bernard A., SC, [redacted]
Vestal, Elvin V., SC, [redacted]
Jones, Kenneth M., QMC, [redacted]
Leavitt, Charles S., QMC, [redacted]
Urquhart, Edmond R., Ord., [redacted]
Newshaw, Charles T., CE, [redacted]
Townshend, C. S., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Langley, Charles F., QMC, [redacted]
Levine, Bernard J., AC, [redacted]
Wall, George R., QMC, [redacted]
Elliott, Wallace R., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Kinkead, William W., QMC, [redacted]
Arnold, Carl, AC, [redacted]
Moore, Floyd W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Planey, John A., AC, [redacted]
Birdsong, George P., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Gossick, Lee V., AC, [redacted]
Sprague, Carl W., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Melvin C., AC, [redacted]
Ellison, Charles J., QMC, [redacted]
Roeschlaub, John G., CE, [redacted]
Wilson, Russell J., CE, [redacted]
Toomer, Harold K., QMC, [redacted]
Cowan, Bryan, SC, [redacted]
Coley, Fred A., QMC, [redacted]
Ford, Ollie J., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Braun, Vincent A., AC, [redacted]
Cometh, Lawrence, AC, [redacted]
Ansell, Norris J., AC, [redacted]
Hertzog, Jack M., Fin., [redacted]
Draper, F. A., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Newby, Gilbert U., CML, [redacted]
Moon, Ryan M., AC, [redacted]
Macklin, John D., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Nowinski, Will M., AC, [redacted]
Dunlap, Robert E., SC, [redacted]
Horne, Richard C., 3d, SC, [redacted]
Bennett, Robert A., Ord., [redacted]
Sweeney, Arthur H., Jr., Ord., [redacted]
Callahan, Charles A., AC, [redacted]
Nixdorff, James B., SC, [redacted]
Nielsen, Edward L., SC, [redacted]
Poole, Marshall H., SC, [redacted]
Albright, Jack A., SC, [redacted]
Williams, Artha D., Jr., CE, [redacted]
Wheeler, Robert F., Inf., [redacted]
Duke, Russell A., SC, [redacted]
Hummel, Robert K., QMC, [redacted]
Ward, Joseph L., AC, [redacted]
Cameron, Ernest V., Ord., [redacted]
Testa, Louis P., Inf., [redacted]
Sheviak, Frank G., SC, [redacted]
Gilbert, Jack C., AC, [redacted]
McCracken, Delmar I., AC, [redacted]
Cameron, John W., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Warren H., AC, [redacted]

Whitley, Edgar D., AC,
Plichta, Frank, QMC,
MacArthur, John E., Inf.,
Hardzog, Walter A., Jr., AC,
Bolint, Michael J., Jr., AC,
Harvey, John F., AC,
Yehle, Vernon K., AC,
Field, Harry L., Jr., Ord.,
Henner, Ernest S., Jr., AC,
Kindig, Roger E., QMC,
Neve, Jack C., QMC,
Brown, Jack D., AC,
Baker, Harold P., QMC,
Gunn, James W., QMC,
Golladay, William C., SC,
Drinkard, Harry V., SC,
Therrell, John W., SC,
Basile, Daniel, QMC,
Schott, John L., Jr., QMC,
Challen, Henry G., QMC,
Kivipelto, Oiva, AC,
Brady, Roland H., Jr., AC,
Agers, Robert D., Inf.,
Koenig, William A., Jr., SC,
Veazey, Madison A., Jr., AC,
Hillstrom, Carl M., AC,
McCauley, Lon A., Jr., AC,
Bedford, John P., AC,
Gunn, James H., AC,
Stehling, Henry J., CE,
Laun, Wirt A., Jr., AC,
Brazee, Donald F., AC,
Workman, Jack B., AC,
MacKay, John A., AC,
Bruson, George F., AC
Otis, James D., Jr., AC,
Ray, Robert J., QMC,
Branstetter, Lyle R., AC,
Flint, Robert P., QMC,
Most, Edwin W., SC,
Anderson, Alfred I., AC,
Taylor, Noble E., QMC,
Murphy, Ralph O., QMC,
Hanifen, Thomas J., Cav.,
Kean, Marshall P., Jr., CAC,
Clark, Howard L., QMC,
Nance, Ernest T., AC,
Adair, Philip R., AC,
Hathaway, Bruce R., AC,
Belsky, Jerome, Ord.,
Alven, Harold F., AC,
McHale, Joseph P., AC,
Lindsey, Morris L., QMC,
Bunnell, Jerry A., AC,
Farrell, Everett N., AC,
Taylor, Dayton R., AC,
Perry, Henry B., AC,
Templeton, Horace A., AC,
Hedrick, Walter R., Jr., AC,
Pashley, Walter A., Jr., Inf.,
Hewitt, George E., AC,
Klam, Louis B., AC,
Humphrey, Charles V. B., QMC,
Roberts, Frank H., Jr., QMC,
Cunningham, George C., AC,
Botvidson, Charles C., AC,
McKinnon, Duncan J., AC,
Roper, Frank A., AC,
Hall, William L., AC,
McKoy, Wendell G., AC,
Dunstan, Henry V., Inf.,
Brock, John W., AC,
Burr, Frank R., AC,
Kaplan, Philip, QMC,
Bogan, Leon S., AC,
Hale, Charles E., AC,
Anderson, Bryant Y., AC,
Cromie, Charles C., AC,
Hart, Ray W., Fin.,
Bartel, Harry C., AC,
Geelan, William R., QMC,
Cochran, Collins L., SC,
Connell, Royal W., AC,
Abrignani, Vincent A., Inf.,
Bressler, Howard E., Cav.,
Arthur, Robert E., Ord.,
Hawkins, Walace E., Inf.,
De Bow, Duane L., QMC,
Albritton, Jesse T., AC,
Heit, Lee V., AC,
Harker, Chester V., AC,
Brenner, George P., Jr., AC,
Swanger, Joe N., QMC,
Fenlon, James W., AC,
Kelly, Clyde R., AC,
Reid, Michael T., AC,
Venzke, Edgar L., QMC,
Butler, John L., Inf.,
Bertie, Gilbert H., AC,
Zellefrow, Albert E., SC,
Green, George E., SC,
Murphy, John J., QMC,
Dunn, Maurice W., QMC,
Nicholson, Robert J., AC,
Jensen, Wiley O., AC,
Young, Raymond D., QMC,
Alston, Archer S., QMC,
Mantovani, John F., SC,
Mullenniex, Thomas E., Fin.,
Ray, Warren L., QMC,
Smith, Chester M., CAC,
Hyland, Edward J., AC,
Latham, Seymour E., AC,
McKee, Jack E., AC,
Hague, Owen E., AC,
Atwater, William E., AC,
Weems, Miner L., QMC,
Lundy, Irvin M., SC,
Clark, William K., FA,
Conklin, Joseph E., AC,
McCoy, Robert G., QMC,
Czajkowski, Michael L., SC,
Hansen, Paul H., AC,
Peters, Emanuel P., SC,
Lent, Robert R., AC,
Belk, Claudius E., AC,
Valentine, Dwane R., SC,
Davies, George A., Ord,
Gibbons, Russell M., AC,
Cheatham, Richard B., AC,
Kerr, Robert A., AC,
Timmermans, Henry L., AC,
Mickish, William J., AC,
Hayes, Robert L., SC,
Milliken, William S., SC,
Grossman, Bernard, SC,
Gorman, Vincent J., Ord,
Bickerstaff, Burt M., AC,
Barnett, James H., Inf.,
Christian, Clarence D., AC,
Grace, Walter K., SC,
Howell, James R., AC,
Atchison, R. B., Jr., AC,
Stewart, Thomas E., AC,
Ohearn, Daniel R., AC,
Finlayson, Harold C., QMC,
Sullivan, Charles L., AC,
Barnes, Richard W., AC,
Wolfe, Lawrence J., AC,
Whitfield, Harold N., SC,
Kerr, Gerald L., Jr., SC,
Mahone, John R., Jr., AC,
Moses, James R., Inf.,
Porter, Ernest J., AC,
Shambeck, Clarence H., AC,
Hansen, Harold C., AC,
Stubbs, Walter C., Jr., SC,
Fisher, Orville L., Jr., AC,
George, Richard P., AC,
Showalter, Roy R., Jr., AC,
Randels, James B., AC,
Gaynor, Paul, AC,
Dougherty, Russell E., AC,
Paulsel, Donald Q., AC,
Bellino, Joe O., Jr., QMC,
Baatz, David C., SC,
Herres, Harry L., SC,
Scudder, Robert K., AC,
Dessert, Donald M., AC,
Berger, Casper, QMC,
Rider, William B., AC,
Carlyle, James H., AC,
Churchwell, Alvin M., SC,
Murray, Charles B., AC,
Murray, Charles P., Jr., Inf.,
Bloecker, Victor, Jr., SC,
Laughlin, Virgil V., Inf.,
Bailey, William D., AC,
White, Lee A., QMC,
Townsend, Delbert L., Inf.,
Peters, Charles K., AC,
Daniel, Garland S., AC,
John, Ernest F., AC,
Jones, Albert W., AC,
Garvin, John T., AC,
Sarrett, Dale T., AC,
Sullivan, Alden P., SC,
Nett, Robert B., Inf.,
Donahue, Franklyn W., QMC,
Lewis, Howard J., AC,
Weir, Robert A., AC,
Cotton, Joseph F., AC,
Naugle, Paul T., QMC,
Heidt, George F., Jr., QMC,
Flint, Willard, SC,
Collins, Roger L., SC,
Morgan, Thomas W., AC,
Early, John S., AC,
Gravenstine, Donald J., AC,
MacDonald, F. A., Jr., Inf.,
Lees, Wallace W., AC,
Ware, Samuel H., AC,
Miller, Adelbert E., CML,
Christensen, R. D., AC,
Belz, Paul D., CAC,
Schmidt, Robert J., QMC,
Bowden, William W., AC,
Cook, George G., Inf.,
Winn, Chasteen G., Jr., AC,
Leavitt, Roy D., AC,
Merrill, Edward G., AC,
Reynolds, Scotty, Jr., QMC,
Anderson, James R., Jr., AC,
Valentine, James W., AC,
Hastings, John P., SC,
Fitzgerald, Charles G., SC,
Farr, Robert, AC,
Askelson, Howard S., AC,
Garrison, William H., AC,
Massey, Thomas C., Jr., QMC,
Everton, Theme T., QMC,
Toler, Harold M., AC,
Fowler, Robert R., AC,
Hancock, John J., AC,
Coleman, Patrick E., AC,
Holmberg, Herbert A., AC,
Browne, Donald V., AC,
Sullivan, Harold J., AC,
Howell, Robert G., AC,
Youngblood, Joe T., AC,
Maher, Philip J., Jr., AC,
Hall, Hubert E., AC,
Glommen, Martell J., AC,
Grimes, Robert Z., AC,
Blakeney, Charles M., Inf.,
Johnson, Charles G., AC,
Dale, Howard H., AC,
Horne, Peter L., Jr., Ord.,
Althaus, Kenneth G., Jr., Cav.,
Warner, Virgil L., Jr., QMC,
Haut, Walter G., AC,
Fairbank, Charles E., AC,
Bryan, Robert L., QMC,
Jensen, Loyd E., AC,
Mathews, Harold E., AC,
Dunnie, James J., QMC,
Bowers, Frame J., Jr., Ord.,

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Rapson, William F., QMC,
Bishop, Eugene H., CML,
Swindell, Charles W., AC,
Ruehle, John R., AC,
Leonard, William C., Jr., AC,
Stratton, Edward E., AC,
Spurrier, Paul M., AC,
Scheller, Donald R., AC,
Beveridge, Richard F., AC,
McDonald, Bill, AC,
Snoden, Charles A., AC,
Dunlap, Carl K., AC,
Latimore, Henry J., Jr., AC,
Alexander, James C., AC,
Schroeder, Norman C., AC,
Andreoli, Robert L., CML,
Shadle, Charles M., CML,
Petit, Robert C., Jr., Cav.,
Garner, Lynn E., AC,
Holley, Hazil L., AC,
Bates, Thomas L., AC,
Keal, Thomas L., AC,
Gardner, Alfred J., AC,
Ross, Marvin T., AC,

Nelon, Claude R., AC, [redacted]
Spencer, Allan M., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Kerr, Frank R., AC, [redacted]
Biles, Howard K., AC, [redacted]
Benkoski, Ernest F., AC, [redacted]
Juhn, Kenneth P., AC, [redacted]
Copeland, Francis W., AC, [redacted]
Moser, Dewey F. L., QMC, [redacted]
Swan, Algernon G., AC, [redacted]
Glover, Henry A., AC, [redacted]
Main, Ralph E., Inf., [redacted]
Blevins, Mack A., AC, [redacted]
Jeffrey, Rayford W., AC, [redacted]
Askland, Charles, AC, [redacted]
Rule, Max M., QMC, [redacted]
Romans, Basil W., AC, [redacted]
Carson, James E., Inf., [redacted]
Parks, Leonard F., QMC, [redacted]
Brothers, Herbert H., AC, [redacted]
Richards, Hilburn F., AC, [redacted]
Grisham, Leon M., AC, [redacted]
Chell, Paul L., AC, [redacted]
Broe, Thomas P., AC, [redacted]
Istvan, Edwin J., AC, [redacted]
Carrington, L. H. Jr., AC, [redacted]
Ragsdale, Herbert L., AC, [redacted]
Hansen, Harley L., AC, [redacted]
Heimstead, Douglas A., AC, [redacted]
Haughey, William R., AC, [redacted]
Cameron, George E., AC, [redacted]
Fish, Floyd H., Jr., SC, [redacted]
McDonald, T. J., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Rhynehart, Philo H., AC, [redacted]
Malkemes, William C., QMC, [redacted]
Jones, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Turner, Edward M., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Beitman, Jesse H., AC, [redacted]
Wintersole, Tom J., AC, [redacted]
Coleman, Kenneth, AC, [redacted]
Burch, John J., AC, [redacted]
Fulbeck, Charles E., AC, [redacted]
Ransbottom, Richard O., AC, [redacted]
Young, Lee R., AC, [redacted]
Neuburg, Gerald E., AC, [redacted]
Flynn, John P., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Jay H., AC, [redacted]
Sellen, Alan H., AC, [redacted]
Scanlon, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Hardy, Harry B., Jr., Cav., [redacted]
Ireland, Alfred E., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Gregor, John R., AC, [redacted]
Von Plinsky, A. H., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Filson, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Peel, Frank D., Ord., [redacted]
Cicarelli, James R., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Eglin, Frederick I., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Dietz, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Penshoff, James J., AC, [redacted]
March, Christian L., Jr., AC, [redacted]
White, Hugh J., AC, [redacted]
Duke, Daniel F., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Inglis, James, AC, [redacted]
Yeager, Charles E., AC, [redacted]
Owings, James B., CML, [redacted]
Rand, Phillip A., AC, [redacted]
Good, Ronald C., AC, [redacted]
Robinson, Jackie S., AC, [redacted]
Wiggins, Porter P., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Home, William M., Inf., [redacted]
Goland, Leonard, SC, [redacted]
Martin, Stephen G., Inf., [redacted]
Bogard, Wayne, Jr., AC, [redacted]
Allran, Braxton E., AC, [redacted]
Starnes, Harry, AC, [redacted]
Holley, James B., AC, [redacted]
McGarvey, Billie J., AC, [redacted]
Wolf, Owen M., AC, [redacted]
Ballentine, Wilbur A., AC, [redacted]
Moore, David A., AC, [redacted]
Van Duyne, E. N., 3d, Inf., [redacted]
Doyle, Richard M., AC, [redacted]
Simons, John W., AC, [redacted]
Barker, John P., Inf., [redacted]
Dwyer, John J., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Coberly, James E., QMC, [redacted]
Kirkbride, James W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Chapman, Roy M., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Foster, Donald E., AC, [redacted]
Femmer, Jasper B., A, [redacted]
Campbell, John F., Jr., AC, [redacted]

Leviton, Jay B., SC, [redacted]
Graham, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
McCarthy, Donald J., AC, [redacted]
Davis, William C., AC, [redacted]
Graham, Oscar D., AC, [redacted]
Lewis, John C., AC, [redacted]
Tootle, Vernon M., Ord., [redacted]
Dodds, John E., AC, [redacted]
Giraudo, John C., AC, [redacted]
Jabara, James, AC, [redacted]
Creech, William T., AC, [redacted]
Van Vleet, Gerald E., QMC, [redacted]
Harkiewicz, Joseph, AC, [redacted]
Rosell, Thomas G., Inf., [redacted]
Campbell, Junior J., AC, [redacted]
Perry, Frank V., AC, [redacted]
Galloway, Robert C., AC, [redacted]
Higgins, Leo A., AC, [redacted]
Montel, John P., AC, [redacted]
Byrum, Gerald B., AC, [redacted]
Avance, Donald E., AC, [redacted]
Clarke, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Harman, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Burkit, William C., Inf., [redacted]
Brown, Leslie A., Jr., [redacted]
Larkins, James R., AC, [redacted]
Sclipcea, John, Inf., [redacted]
Noble, Mark C., AC, [redacted]
Groh, Raymond A., AC, [redacted]
Hartman, William P., QMC, [redacted]
Wallman, John C., Inf., [redacted]
Koch, Travis E., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Hugh M., AC, [redacted]
Rand, William J., AC, [redacted]
Harding, Remer L., AC, [redacted]
McCleary, Robert H., Inf., [redacted]
Ogden, Ziba B., AC, [redacted]
Bach, Lawrence V., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Seward, William A., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Walden, Roger S., Inf., [redacted]
Nisos, Michael J., AC, [redacted]
Hamilton, William H., FA, [redacted]
Berg, Delbert V., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Bush, Jesse C., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Laney, Dewey R., AC, [redacted]
Connell, George W., Jr., CML, [redacted]
Lowell, Edgar L., Inf., [redacted]
Akers, Donald W., AC, [redacted]
Monasee, Charles A., AC, [redacted]
La Croix, James P., Jr., CML, [redacted]
Falkenburry, J. A., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Davis, William E., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Hansen, Leroy P., AC, [redacted]
Jablonski, Theodore M., AC, [redacted]
Yowell, Robert C., Inf., [redacted]
Guerny, Gene, AC, [redacted]
Scharth, Otto P., Inf, [redacted]
Gommel, William R., AC, [redacted]
Snyder, Lester C., Ord, [redacted]
Herring, William A., Inf., [redacted]
Wiley, Miles C., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Safreed, Joseph E., CE, [redacted]
Fleming, George T., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Heckel, Charles C., AC, [redacted]
Kenworthy, Robert B., AC, [redacted]
Garcia, Ray J., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Howard P., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Richard L., AC, [redacted]
Roberts, Gene A., Inf., [redacted]
Ellis, Calvin K., AC, [redacted]
Hoyt, Thurber L., AC, [redacted]
McMahon, Leo T., Jr., QMC, [redacted]
Lavender, Emory C., Jr., AC, [redacted]
McNeese, William J., Inf., [redacted]
Eger, Charles H., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Bryant, William A., AC, [redacted]
Bridgers, Sam, Jr., AC, [redacted]
O'Neil, Earl W., Jr., AC, [redacted]
Barr, Thomas J., AC, [redacted]
Murrell, James E., AC, [redacted]
Cleland, John R. D., Inf., [redacted]

(Nonpromotion list)

TO BE MAJORS

Elsam, Harold G., Ch., [redacted]
Bynum, Robert M., Jr., PhC., [redacted]
Donahue, Edward T., Ch., [redacted]
Iseman, Joseph W., MC, [redacted]
Tavel, Henry, Ch., [redacted]
Aldwin, Francis J., MC, [redacted]
Conrad, Harold A., MC, [redacted]

Murray, Russel, Jr., PhC., [redacted]
Strevig, John R., Ch., [redacted]
Morris, John G., Jr., PhC., [redacted]
Marshall, Irvine H., MC, [redacted]
Patterson, James F., Ch., [redacted]
Corcoran, Thomas F., Ch., [redacted]
Taylor, Harold W., PhC., [redacted]
Anthony, Thomas M., Ch., [redacted]
Quarton, Reginald R., PhC., [redacted]
Crane, Francis S., MC, [redacted]
Huchthausen, W. A., Ch., [redacted]
Dixon, Edward R., DC, [redacted]
Burke, David C., PhC., [redacted]
Thompson, Dale L., PhC., [redacted]

TO BE CAPTAINS

Clark, Benjamin P., MC, [redacted]
Egan, Thomas A., DC, [redacted]
Schliesser, L. G. H., Ch., [redacted]
Christensen, Nels F., VC, [redacted]
Huberwald, August R., DC, [redacted]
Pierce, Palmer P., Ch., [redacted]
Dickerson, Robert B., MC, [redacted]
Isenberg, Conley G., VC, [redacted]
Adams, Rowland C., Ch., [redacted]
Walters, Ralph D., VC, [redacted]
Duhan, Henry, Ch., [redacted]
Rizzolo, John, MC, [redacted]
Belanger, Renaldo G., PhC., [redacted]
Sasmore, Daniel P., VC, [redacted]
Di Giacomo, Joseph, PhC., [redacted]
Goodhand, Vernon M., Ch., [redacted]
Bowser, George G., Ch., [redacted]
Daykin, Samuel P., PhC, [redacted]
Carilia, Thomas A., PhC, [redacted]
Gould, Clinton L., VC, [redacted]
Worthen, Donald W., PhC, [redacted]
Belcher, Tolbert H., PhC, [redacted]
Beaudet, Bertrand N., PhC, [redacted]
O'Reilly, George T., PhC, [redacted]
Harrison, John H., VC, [redacted]
Correll, Walter D., PhC, [redacted]
Hempy, Jack H., VC, [redacted]
Cheatham, Richard B., Ch., [redacted]
Miller, Rahe A., PhC, [redacted]
Davies, Frank J., VC, [redacted]
Doyle, John F., PhC, [redacted]
Stephens, Seidel M., VC, [redacted]
Strode, Alfred C., PhC, [redacted]
Taylor, Victor B., PhC, [redacted]
Adams, Oscar H., PhC, [redacted]
Miller, Everett B., VC, [redacted]
Blythe, Vernon E., PhC, [redacted]
Frey, Clarence V., PhC, [redacted]
Kirksey, Hubert S., PhC, [redacted]
Lunnie, Francis M., PhC, [redacted]
Shoemaker, Harold D., Ch., [redacted]
Loney, John W., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Richek, Herbert G., PhC, [redacted]
Offutt, Richard L., PhC, [redacted]

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Caldbeck, Raymond J., PhC, [redacted]
Lambert, Benjamin F., PhC, [redacted]
Drowns, Norman S., PhC, [redacted]
Myers, Paul H., PhC, [redacted]
Hughes, Robert L., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Brooks, William G., VC, [redacted]
Funston, Howard J., PhC, [redacted]
Wright, Bertram S., PhC, [redacted]
Colyer, Andrew J., PhC, [redacted]
Marks, Edward, PhC, [redacted]
Williams, Alonzo R., PhC, [redacted]
Wilson, Ernest W., PhC, [redacted]
Hill, Harold E., PhC, [redacted]
Martin, Edward J., PhC [redacted]
Hahn, George L., PhC, [redacted]
Van Sickle, F. E., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Cunningham, Melvin F., PhC, [redacted]
Hensley, Howard C., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Hench, William S., Jr., PhC, [redacted]
Lord, Douglas V., PhC, [redacted]
Miller, Henry M., VC, [redacted]
Knickerbocker, Max E., PhC, [redacted]
Horton, Russell E., PhC, [redacted]
Stacey, Richard M., PhC, [redacted]
Holt, John W., PhC, [redacted]
Hall, Austin S., PhC, [redacted]
Walsh, Glen M., PhC, [redacted]
Normington, Joseph M., PhC, [redacted]
Knoblock, Edward C., PhC, [redacted]

Holloman, Chester C., PhC, [redacted]
Wamble, Henry L., PhC, [redacted]
Wrigley, John H., PhC, [redacted]
McGovern, John J., PhC, [redacted]
La Frankie, R. S., PhC, [redacted]
Blamer, William C., PhC, [redacted]
Goings, Charles E., Jr., PhC, [redacted]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clutter, Carroll E., PhC, [redacted]
Cheezum, Lynn R., PhC, [redacted]

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

W. Averell Harriman to be Secretary of Commerce.

William Chapman Foster to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Adrian S. Fisher to be Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

Clarence M. Young to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1952.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Richard F. Mitchell to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1949.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of the following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and arm of service specified, with dates of rank determined by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved December 28, 1945 (50 Stat. 663) as amended by the act of August 8, 1945 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.), were confirmed today by the Senate:

Donald C. Foote, QMC, [redacted], and 829 other officers, which were received by the Senate on January 8, 1947, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, beginning with the name of Donald C. Foote on page 177 and ending with the name of Wayne E. McCoy on page 180.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of the following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy were confirmed today:

Fred C. Fuegel and others, which were received by the Senate on January 17, 1947, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning with the name of Fred C. Fuegel on page 427 and ending with the name of William D. Wright on page 431.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Redeemer and our Lord, as we approach Thine altar, make us alive to the virtues divine and so dwell in us that the leaven of hate shall be in the forgotten past.

In these days, confronted by numerous entangling problems, help us if we wonder as we wander. Forgive any spirit in our land that may mar or disturb the unity of our people, and give us the will to stay our faith in the Lord of life and destiny. Stimulate us with the splendid spirit of forgiveness, not embittered by the memory of grudge or resentment. Bless all who dwell within our borders with the true spirit of brotherhood; in every way glorify Thyself through us, and Thine shall be the praise forever. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 23, 1947, was read and approved.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 17, 1947, elect the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to serve with the following other House Members who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota; DANIEL A. REED, of New York; ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. Mr. WOODRUFF has served since January 17, 1945, as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for Postwar Taxation.

Respectfully yours,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. SEELY-BROWN and Mr. FORAND.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. BREHM and Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission To Consider a Site and Design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL - GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the Construction of a Washington - Lincoln Memorial - Gettysburg Boulevard the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GROSS, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. FALLON, of Maryland.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; Mr. MCCONNELL, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. CANNON, of Missouri.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. NODAR, of New York; and Mr. KEOGH, of New York.

CANCELLATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, last week I was granted 40 minutes to address the House this afternoon on the sugar situation. The committee is now preparing a report, and I therefore ask to cancel my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 70, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1030, to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE GRACE MOORE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, a lovely flower has been crushed. From the hill country of Tennessee there came a vibrant voice and a glowing personality that enthralled untold millions of people whom Grace Moore loved. The critics have said, and Grace Moore agreed, that other voices may have equaled and perhaps excelled hers; but in simple genuineness of character, unaffected by fame, in personality and in truly democratic spirit, the glow and warmth of which the people felt and understood in her songs, Grace Moore was the peer of them all.

She was born a Tennessee girl and, though crowned heads about the world commanded her talents, a Tennessee girl she always was, magnificent, beautiful, and inspiring. Yes, Mr. Speaker, a lovely flower has been crushed. May her soul find peace and may God give the world more Grace Moores to brighten and lighten.

GRACE MOORE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague Mr. GORE in paying high tribute to the life, character, and outstanding service of Miss Grace Moore. She was indeed the flower and pride of Tennessee. From the time she sang in the choir of the Baptist Church in Jellico, she has continued to advance to great heights of fame, but with it all she kept her modesty, her love of her people, and her childhood friends. The people of Tennessee were very proud of the accomplishments of Miss Moore and they followed her illustrious career with delight. Miss Moore was of one of Tennessee's finest families. Her father, the late Col. Richard Moore, after leaving Jellico came to Chattanooga where he was a successful businessman and a citizen of the first rank. Miss Moore's mother, sister, and brothers now live at Chattanooga and I proudly count them among my closest friends and all of Miss Moore's many friends extend to them and to her husband our heartfelt sympathy.

Miss Moore, interviewed only a few days ago by a reporter of the Copenhagen newspaper Berlingske Tidende, said:

> It is wonderful to live and sing. It is a great thing to feel that one is able to help other people with one's voice. I want to play in a new opera where the heroine does not die in the last scene or go mad. That is why I love Charpentier's Louise. The girl is alive when the curtain falls—and it is wonderful to be alive, isn't it?

The memory of Grace Moore will always live.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therewith a letter from the War Assets Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am daily in receipt of communications from business concerns in my State, and from other sections of the country, deeply concerned with the question of placing contracts for various types of machinery particularly, and other equipment as well, which run into sizable sums of money. These people express concern because they cannot ascertain as of this date the amount of goods that has not yet been declared surplus. It is reasonable to expect that in placing these contracts they must take into consideration the competitive side of goods now in the hands of the War Assets Administration and the goods that have not been declared surplus, because these will in fact have a bearing upon the market and be competitive to new goods purchased.

I have asked General Littlejohn to give me a break-down of goods on hand in certain classifications, particularly those affecting farm areas and I include a copy of his letter herewith as a part of this record, and I ask unanimous consent to include it.

I was interested to read an article which appeared in the New York Times. It contained an interview with Maj. Gen. Everett S. Hughes. He states that in one field in Ogden, Utah, thousands of trucks and jeeps are standing their rotting. If I judge the language of the article correctly, this machinery has not yet been declared surplus by the armed forces but still remains in their hands. If this is true, it makes it impossible for War Assets to offer them to the public.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Special House Committee To Investigate the Disposition of War Surpluses. In our work I feel we have rendered an especially important service to the Congress and the country. We could not, however, under the resolution force the armed forces to declare goods surplus any more rapidly than they were doing. We were confined in our investigation work exclusively to War Assets and other agencies charged with the disposition of these goods.

In the New York Times article, General Hughes states that he has concluded a 2-week inspection trip in which he was shocked by the sight of 20,000 Army vehicles rusting away in a single field. He recommends a revision of plans for storage facilities or junking of much material.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that while it is reasonable to assume that the Army might wish to carry some of this material for future use, the general changing of things as years move on will render these things obsolete in a very short time, and there is not any particular likelihood of war in the immediate future, in my personal judgment. It would seem to me that these properties should be declared surplus and disposed of immediately, particularly those which qualify for the use of farmers.

Due to strikes throughout the country, particularly in plants manufacturing farm equipment, practically all farmers—especially in the Middle West—are in distress, not alone because they cannot obtain new machinery, but likewise they cannot obtain parts to keep their old machinery running. And yet upon their shoulders rests the responsibility to produce additional crops this year. Surely if it is true, as the general states, that such quantities of merchandise or machinery are rotting away in various places in the United States, by all means this should be declared surplus by the Army and turned over for use by farmers and others at the earliest possible moment.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1947.

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: In reply to your letter of January 14, 1947, regarding a general break-down of goods still to be disposed of by War Assets Administration, the following figures from the inventory control report for the period ending December 15, 1946, may be of use to you in correspondence with your constituents:

Consumer goods

Commodity Division:	*Confirmed inventory*
Automotive and machinery	$380,427,000
Hardware, general products	511,002,000
Paper, furniture, office machines	105,790,000
Drugs, medical	63,187,000
Textiles, apparel	420,010,000

Capital and producers' goods

Commodity Division:	*Confirmed inventory*
Industrial machinery and equipment	$533,473,000
Materials and supplies	164,061,000
Metal-working equipment	823,313,000
Metals	295,725,000

The specific items of construction machinery you mention, with the exception of scrapers, are immediately turned over to NHA for disposal to holders of Housing Expediter certificates. For the past 4 months the average declarations to the War Assets Administration have been as follows:

	Per month
Tractors	362
Cranes	135
Turnapulls	12
Scrapers	60

The quantities and rates of future declarations are difficult to estimate at this time, due to the uncertainty of the military program to be determined by congressional action. It has been estimated that future legislation may make possible the declaration of $2,000,000,000 in surplus general products and $3,000,000,000 in real property.

It is hoped that this information may be of use to you and your constituents.

Very truly yours,

J. W. PALMER, Jr.,
Director, Sales Planning and Analysis Division.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include letters in each.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of taxation and to include certain quotations.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and to include editorial comment in each.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a reprint of an article by Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr., widow of General Patton, on our war dead, and in the other to include the farewell address of General Stilwell to the Tenth Army.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD relating to some bills he introduced today.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner entitled "Second Bay Bridge Crossing."

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include remarks on illegal entries made into the United States, and in connection therewith to include certain excerpts from newspapers and photostatic copies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on Canol, the major scandal.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include as part thereof a letter with a draft of a bill sent to the Speaker by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a letter from Col. John Thomas Taylor, of the American Legion, in which he requests me, as chairman of that committee, to introduce three bills for them and also that I may include in my remarks copies of the three bills Colonel Taylor asked me to introduce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important to pass very promptly the bill referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as submitted by the Veterans' Administration or one containing similar provisions. Others of us have had the same idea as contained in this bill which has for its purposes the repeal of the limitation on time within which reinstatement of national service life insurance on a comparative health basis may be effected; to provide for automatic conversion of level premium term insurance to an ordinary life plan in cases in which the insured is totally disabled at the expiration of the term, but unable because of mental or other conditions beyond his control to apply for such conversion; and to provide for original issuance of national service life insurance on any permanent plan. The provision for reinstatement of yearly renewable term insurance on a comparative health basis without a physical examination in existing law expires February 1, 1947, and I feel sure the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will want to report this bill out quickly and that the House will agree to pass it, if possible, before February 1.

STUDENT WAR LOANS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend retroactively a provision of the Federal Security appropriation of 1943 having to do with student war loans. Under existing law, loans to men drafted into the armed forces under the Selective Service Act are canceled. No such relief, however, is granted to those who enter the services voluntarily. It seems manifestly unfair that men who enlisted should receive less consideration than those who were drafted.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to transfer the administration of the Library of Congress from the Office of the President of the United States, in which it should never have been, to the Congress of the United States, in which it should always have reposed. This is done without in any way attempting to prejudice the attitude of the Members of Congress toward any of the present employees of the Library of Congress, but under the terms of the Reorganization Act we are going to have to rely upon expert and professional advice to a large extent provided by the Library of Congress.

I therefore propose that a Congressional Library Board be appointed, to be comprised of the Speaker and the minority leader of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the minority leader of the Senate. We would thus have a bipartisan board selecting the personnel of the Library of Congress. Our facts should be free from bias, and our expert counsellors should be above reproach. At present the position of Librarian of Congress is considered a political appointment. Under the terms of my proposal, that office and all appointments associated with it would be entirely free from partisanship.

SPECIAL ORDER WITHDRAWN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order granted me for today and postpone it to an indefinite date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Alva W. Phelps.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article by Franklin Burdette on bringing the capital of Indiana back to the people.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the sermon of the Most Reverend Lawrence J. Shehan at the annual red Mass at Catholic University on January 26 signalizing the opening of the courts and Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the retiring president of the American Economic Association delivered on last Saturday at the annual meeting held in Atlantic City, N. J.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made recently at Nashville.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $319.59, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter I have today written to Secretary of State Marshall in respect to further tinkering with the duties under reciprocal trade agreements at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENSES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a dissatisfied people sought to change the course of government at the November election by voting the New Deal philosophy of government out, endorsing very largely the principles held out to them by the Republican Party.

They expect and insist the Republican Congress, in the House and Senate, keep its promises and give them the relief for which they voted. In the campaign we told the people what we hoped to do. It is time for action now and may I say to the 245 Republican Members of the House that each of us, as an individual, is now on trial. Your word and promises are at stake. Your party throughout the Nation is on trial. You should keep this in mind, in the consideration of each bill.

By collective effort we can carry out our promises; we must carry them out or deal a deadly blow to the confidence of the American people in representative government. We must carry them out during this session so far as it lies within our power lest an infuriated people turn against us at the next election with the danger of swinging so far to the left as to endanger representative, constitutional government. In our two-party system of government they have lost faith in the opposition party. Ours is their last refuge and hope. We must not fail them.

Mr. Speaker, the people voted for less regimentation and control in government. We can and will keep this commitment. They voted most seriously for economy in government, the eradication of useless bureaus and for a very great reduction of governmental employees.

In fact, they asked this Congress, by their votes, to demobilize bureaucracy. We can and must keep that pledge in the interest of the taxpayers of the Nation.

They voted for a reduction of the high wartime taxes in the hope that such economy in Government could be brought about by the Republicans, that taxes could be reduced, the budget balanced, and with a substantial amount left over for the reduction of the Federal debt now standing at approximately $260,000,000,000. We can and must see that their hopes are realized. In fact, the Republican Party is committed to a reduction of taxes, the balancing of the budget, and to substantial payments on the public debt. This is a great challenge, but it must be met.

Mr. Speaker, propagandists over the radio, news writers, the heads of departments and bureaus, following out the New Deal philosophy of spending without any regard to economy in Government over the past number of years, tell the people and the Congress it cannot be done. They try to influence the Members of Congress and their constituents against a reduction of taxes. Of course, the bureaucrats are against the reduction of taxes, which means a reduction of Government pay rolls. They are standing by their old policies of tax and tax, spend and spend.

Official Washington is so accustomed to the idea of spending the people's money that it cannot embrace the idea of economy. They are still steeped and controlled by the philosophy of spending, of waste and extravagance.

Mr. Speaker, official heads of the bureaus who helped to make up the budget for the President have apparently sold him on the idea that the budget for the coming fiscal year, almost 2 years after peacetime, should be $37,500,000,000. President Truman has told the Congress and the people of the Nation that to carry on governmental affairs he recommends a budget of $37,500,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. There is far too much fat in these figures. The Congress must render it out.

Out of this budget, four times higher than any prewar record, the President would have left over only $200,000,000 to apply on the national debt. At this rate it would take 1,300 years to pay it off.

Those who insist on free spending say, Where will you cut expenses? The answer is everywhere outside of fixed charges. Every request for funds should be gone over with a fine-tooth comb. There is a grim job to be done. It will require real initiative and courage, for it must be done.

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from New York, Congressman TABER, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and other House Republican Members suggested the cutting of this budget to twenty-nine or thirty billion dollars a year, official Washington and the propagandists who have served the New Deal for the past 14 years cry out that it is impossible to do this without wrecking the Government. They lose sight of the fact the Government is more likely to be wrecked unless it is done.

Under the Reorganization Act, the House and the Senate for the first time in our history have the duty to make a study of the entire cost of Government, receipts and Government expenses, and are now compelled by law to set a ceiling on how many billions of dollars the Government will spend for all purposes during the coming fiscal year.

The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate with members of the Ways and Means Committee are now making such a study and on or before February 15 the members of that committee will make such determination. The Congress will have a right to say by its votes in the two Houses what the congressional budget will be and how much money we will expend for all Government purposes during the coming fiscal year.

Congressman TABER, chairman of the Joint Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate, in making this particular study, with other members of his committee, are making the greatest effort ever made in peacetime to meet the hopes of the American people for economy in Government and to keep the pledges of the Republican Party made to the people last November.

Neither the Members of the Congress on either side of the House nor the American people will be fully satisfied with what we will accomplish regardless of the results because the task with which the Congress is confronted is so great. Due to the expense of the war and the building up of bureaucracy with its cost over the past number of years, the Members of Congress in attempting to straighten out the fiscal affairs of the Government find it the biggest peacetime job of Government financing in the history of the world.

The Republican Members of Congress cannot undo within a few short months what it has taken 16 years to build up.

To get some idea of why there will have to be appropriated many billions more in money than the general public realizes, may I set out a few fixed charges and commitments as given to the Congress by the President in his Budget message. This will give you some idea why the Budget cannot be reduced to the figures the general public is expecting.

Fixed charges

Annual interest on public debt	$5,000,000,000
Taxes which must be refunded	2,065,000,000
International commitments (Note: Of this amount, $1,200,000,000 goes to Great Britain on the British loan)	3,510,000,000
Total fixed charges	10,575,000,000

Then the President has asked for—

Veterans' affairs	$7,343,000,000
National defense, including Army, Navy, and the Maritime Commission	11,256,000,000
Transportation and communication	1,530,000,000
Welfare, health, and security	1,654,000,000
Total	21,783,000,000
Grand total	32,358,000,000

Many other large items in the budget runs the President's request up to $37,500,000,000.

Aside from these fixed charges which must be honored it will require, as you can see, a considerable reduction on all of these and other costs of government.

I believe such a reduction can be made as will justify a congressional budget of $30,000,000,000. This I submit, in view of all the facts, might well be the extreme limit and these figures may be too optimistic. So you can see it is not as easy a matter to reduce the budget as it would seem when all the facts are gone into.

Mr. Speaker, it will require a most serious effort. We Republicans must make an all-out frontal attack against waste and extravagance in Government. If necessary, we should put a new ceiling on the number of employees in Government in an effort to reduce Government pay rolls from approximately 2,200,000 at present to 1,300,000 by January 1, 1948.

As a member of the Civil Service Committee for the past 4 years I have constantly fought for the reduction of Federal pay rolls because of my knowledge that practically all bureaus in Washington are overstaffed.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republican Members of Congress who now have the responsibility and who will receive the support of many of the Democratic Members, can find it possible to set the congressional budget at $30,000,000,000 rather than $37,500,000,000, as requested by the President, we can balance the budget, reduce income taxes, and still have over $3,500,000,000 to be applied to the retirement of the Federal debt.

Mr. Speaker, if we can do that in this Congress, we shall receive the plaudits of the Nation; we will strengthen the confidence of the people in their Government, and this is extremely important.

We shall have to courageously use the meat cleaver in cutting expenses. No half way efforts will do. If we can reduce the budget to thirty billions for the coming year, it will then be a simple matter to reduce it by five billion the following year.

Expenses must be reduced. Financially our Government is now in the danger zone. With a $260,000,000,000 debt we are in a position today where we could not stand a long and sustained depression. We must put our financial national house in order, and move it out of the danger zone before it is too late. A sustained depression throwing millions of people out of work and with the Government compelled to add billions of dollars a year to the present $260,000,000,000 debt; confidence in our financial solvency would be so impaired that there would be great danger of the billions of dollars of Government bonds, now held by all the banks and insurance companies of the Nation, losing their value to a degree that might well wreck every bank and insurance company in America. There are 80,000,000 life insurance policyholders who would see their savings dissipated, banks would crash throughout the Nation, and chaos would be abroad in the land. We can prevent the possibilities of such conditions if we will cut governmental expenses now, demand greater efficiency in Government, and move our ship of state out of the danger zone. We must act now. Later may be entirely too late.

Mr. Speaker, every farmer who has accumulated some property, every little businessman, every owner of a home in America, and all of the laboring men of America who want to see industry kept going at full speed which protects their jobs and assures them a living wage for themselves and their families, all are threatened by our present financial condition.

These are some of the problems facing this Congress and these problems must be met by courageous action. Political consideration must be laid aside, and we must all pull together for the common goal in putting our financial house in order for us of today and for posterity that will come after us. The future of representative government may well depend on how well we do our job in the Eightieth Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the remarks I made before the Tariff Commission concerning sugar beets.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUGAR

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to say just a word about the remarks I am going to include in the Appendix of the RECORD today. First, I call your attention to the fact that at the end of 1947 the Sugar Act of 1937 will expire. That will be the end of it. On June 30, 1947, the War Powers Act, to control the price of sugar, expires.

On March 31, less than 60 days distant, the power of the executive department to allocate sugar to our housewives and industrial users expires. In the face of those three factors, it is only a short while until the House of Representatives must take action on the sugar question. Coming from a sugar-beet producing area, my farmers tell me they are satisfied with the price they are to receive as far as we know at the present time from our contract as presented to us by the Department of Agriculture, which price is $14.50 per ton for 16½-percent sugar content beets. But there are two things we must have, and that is the reason I am speaking to you this morning. We must have labor—hand labor; and, secondly, we must have farm machinery.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

COMMUNISTS IN THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, I believe it was, there was unfolded on the floor of the House a petition about 200 feet long, signed by Californians and addressed to the Congress, asking that the Committee on Un-American Activities investigate communism in Hollywood. While I am in complete accord with the suggestion made, I should like to say that the immediate problem is getting Communists out of the Government. The bureaucrats should not wait for congressional action, for if there is one thing that should be apparent to them it is that a determination exists on the Hill that Communists are not to be given the free hand in government which they have heretofore enjoyed and that in the effort to put them out there will not be White House interference as was the case in the not too distant past. The Committee on Appropriations has an opportunity to do a good job. I should like to mention here, not particularly in connection with what I have said, but to make an observation which I think is meritorious, that the so-called group of experts that have recently been set up in the Congressional Library under the reorganization bill need a looking over.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

THE STEEL SITUATION AND THE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed by the performance of the War Assets Administration in cleaning up the surplus property problem that should be disposed of. At the present time I am informed that they have on hand $250,000,000 worth of steel which the agricultural implement manufacturers, the automobile and refrigerator factories, and freight-car producers are short of, as well as almost every other type of consumer, and which steel is necessary to keep the wheels of industry in America turning. This steel represents 6,000,000 tons, or about 8 percent of last year's production of steel in the United States. They have refused to move this steel and put it on the market. Now is the time that they could get every dollar out of this situation that the Government has invested in it. They have 60,000 people on the pay roll, and their attitude appears to be that they do not want to kill their jobs by getting anything done.

It is about time this kind of situation was cured. It is about time that that steel was put into circulation where it would do some good, and not wait until it becomes a drug on the market, and interferes with the employment of our people in the steel mills.

I hope that in some way, by pressure from Congress or otherwise, we may put some life into that outfit and get that steel out into production in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

THE PASSING OF GRACE MOORE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in flaming tragedy, the most beloved living Tennessean, Grace Moore, passed into eternity.

From the time she was a schoolgirl in the little town of Jellico, with pigtails down her back, I knew her and all the members of her family. She was born in Slabtown, a sawmill hamlet, near Del Rio, in upper east Tennessee. Her father, Richard L. Moore, was a native of western North Carolina, and her mother, a native of Tennessee, a member of the well-known Stokely family. When she was but a child, her father moved to Jellico, Campbell County, Tenn., where he engaged in the wholesale drygoods business.

The people of Jellico are devoted to their homes and devoutly loyal to their churches. It was natural that Grace Moore, endowed as she was with a voice that was to make her world famous, should sing in the choir of the First Baptist Church.

Grace Moore was a girl of indomitable will, tireless energy, and soaring ambition. Her father, prominent and successful in business at that time in Jellico and afterwards in Chattanooga, was not enthusiastic about his daughter's ambitions, but nobody could stop Grace Moore. From light opera she sang her way to stardom and world fame in grand opera as a member of the Metropolitan Opera Company of New York.

She sang and acted the part of the world's first soprano singer. The world accepted her self-appraisal. She was the most popular singer in this country when her summons came. She herself said, "I may not have the best soprano voice in the world, but people listen to me and I can make them happy." That statement is true. She went abroad during the war and sang for thousands in our armed camps. Through song, she spoke the universal language of mankind and ministered to the welfare of countless thousands.

Grace Moore will be missed. She walked with kings and queens, and the great of the earth, but she never lost the common touch. In her home town she knew everyone, and they all knew and loved her. From that little town of 3,000 souls she went forth to fame and fortune in America and Europe.

I have seen and heard her lift thousands on the wings of song. In her, death chose a shining mark. For her, life has been, and the vast forever should be, one grand, sweet song. She has joined "the choir invisible of those immortal dead who live again. In the minds made better by their presence." She has joined the choir invisible; reached "that purest heaven," where she may be to other souls "the cup of strength in some great agony"; she has joined "the choir invisible whose music is the gladness of the world."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

THE LATE GRACE MOORE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Grace Moore is a source of great grief to the people of the State of Connecticut. Miss Moore has for some years lived in Sandy Hook, which is near Newtown in Fairfield County, in a house which the illustrious former Congresswoman, Clare Boothe Luce, occupied last summer.

It was my privilege and pleasure to know Miss Moore quite well over a long number of years. I join with many thousands of others in mourning her death. Hers was one of the great success stories of America. Hers is the type of career, the type of climbing up to the top which could be achieved only in this great country of opportunity.

I want to register the deep feeling of personal grief which I have, and also express the sympathy for her relatives and friends which is felt by all the people of Fairfield County and also by the people of the State of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial from his home town paper, and in the other to include a poem by Horace C. Carlisle.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], I desire to call attention to the fact that this was not a Republican victory; as someone said down in the dining room, it was merely a delousing of the Democratic Party.

It is true we lost some good men, but we had several on our side, and a few on the Republican side, who committed political hara-kiri by swallowing a hammer and a sickle.

All this seems to be understood by both sides here in the House, and therefore we have not had any such fiasco as the lynching of BILBO at the other end of the Capitol.

On yesterday, in New York, former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, made one of the most alarming speeches I have ever read, showing that communism is constantly preparing for war against the United States. He was a diplomat in the Balkans, and knows whereof he speaks. He is telling you what the Committee on Un-American Activities has been telling you for years.

It is my intention to invite Governor Earle to come to Washington. I would like for him to speak publicly, but, if necessary, we will hear him behind closed doors.

I can tell you now it is time for the American Congress to wake up and say to the rest of the world that we are going to keep the atomic bomb, we are going to keep the finest air force in the world, until the peoples of other countries really manifest an honest desire for peace among the nations of the earth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

VIEWS ON LEGISLATION

Mr. GIFFORD. Why 20 minutes? I have so much ground to cover I wish to correct the Speaker's statement. I asked for the great pleasure of addressing the House for 30 minutes, and it was granted. The calendar is wrong. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I had permission for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. STEFAN]. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Surely with the other special order having been abandoned you cannot regret that I have taken at least 30 minutes. I take this opportunity that my people at home may know my stand on certain public questions, but I shall take some time to make a few remarks addressed to the new Members especially. Lest I forget it, however, I wish to declare at once that I am for reduction in taxes even to the 20 percent, if necessary. I even hope for that. Later if I have the time I will discuss the subject further.

Secondly, I am not in favor of the present method of making trade agreements. They will prove highly injurious to our many and varied industries. I either want to repeal the authority, suspend it, or force the inclusion of escape clauses in each and every agreement. If I have the time, I will discuss this further.

There are other matters on which I have been requested to declare my stand, and I may come to some of them later.

Mr. Speaker, having been here for 24 long years, knowing many highly placed individuals altogether too well, meaning that I know their weaknesses as well as their strength, I often doubt their real capabilities although some of them have done splendidly. I wish to offer some encouragement to the men and women new Members. There may be some DIRKSENS among you, but I do not know. After listening on last Thursday to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I hesitated to take the time. He was certainly wonderful. I feared you would make comparisons. Who could equal his performance? What a remarkable man he is! He has a world-wide horizon of view. I could only wish I might acquire it also. But I have never traveled far.

However, the traveler sees the subject, paints the picture for us, and tells us all about it. That saves us from all the inconveniences of travel. The travelers return and tell us of the conditions more convincingly, than if we had seen for ourselves. Our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] evidently saw much and he has a retentive memory. What a picture he drew of the red menace. Never can we forget that speech in which he warned us that that menace is on the march.

Now, in reference to your committee assignments. No doubt many new Members were disappointed. Did you argue with yourself that length of service should not be the sole criterion of your advancement? Shall you just sit here and wait to be assigned to an important committee? I am afraid criticism of that practice is somewhat prevalent. I sat here for a long time. To my recollection I have never urged my assignment to any particular committee. I may have, but I do not recall doing so. You came to me, TOM JENKINS, and told me that I would be assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means—I did not come to you. I always felt if and when my service merited the respect and confidence of the Members I would receive proper recognition.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to say, in view of the fact the gentleman is addressing the new Members of Congress, that in the person of the distinguished speaker now addressing the House we find one of the most unassuming, one of the most cultured, one of the most beloved Congressmen I have ever known.

Mr. GIFFORD. I love that. But I once recited "Flattery is the food for fools." However, "now and then we men of wit condescend to take a bit." Of course, we love praise, especially when is comes from one who himself is worthy of praise. I do pride myself on the respect I seem to have among Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. I feel sure I have it. I think I have even the affection of Democrats, although I have perhaps "ribbed" them more than any other Member of Congress. Generally, it was only playful and so recognized. Probably I shall continue to be playful and avoid being disliked.

Mr. Speaker, I have mellowed with the years. I seem to love everybody. I probably ought not, but I think I do. I have my anxieties about the present Congress and the future, and as an older Member I am anxious to know what the new Members will bring to us in abilities and opinions. As I look over to my left I see the face of a new lady Member. I wish that all the other lady Members were present. May I say to her, one of the great worries I have in the Congress itself is lest we have too many of you. Although I say this in a somewhat jocular way, still I am a little serious about it.

The lady Members we have today are extremely satisfactory to us. But they, like all women, can talk to us with their eyes and their lips, and when they present to us an apple it is most difficult to refuse. Even old Adam could not resist. Women have a language all their own. I do not like to particularize, but I should. I see the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is present. I read or listen carefully to everything she says on the floor. She is a truly marvelous woman; such a command of language as she possesses. She is also a world traveler. She has also slept in far places. She convinces us that she knows what she is talking about. Because I admire her so much I could hardly resist, I fear, supporting any measure that she would propose, especially if she looked at me as such a woman can. The gentlewoman from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, who is almost always sitting over there at my left, never seems to have a vacant chair beside her that I could take and get acquainted with her. Why? She is so able and so popular. These ladies are so attractive. They are dangerous in that they may influence us too much. Suppose we had 50 of them. Seemingly, I note flirtations enough now, but what would there be with 50 of them? When I discuss problems here on the floor, sometimes serious problems, I always attempt to use a humorous handle. You must have noted it. Do not think I am joking too much, but I do try to convey thoughts that have very serious import. Perhaps I overdo it. You women now have many times the influence that you would have if the equal rights legislation should pass. I saw the picture of the leaders of the equal rights convention. I was pleased to notice that there were no Congresswomen in the group. It may be that there are some here who belong to that group, and if they ask me to vote for that legislation I suppose I would.

Well, I will say to you younger Members, as we older ones depart, your length of service will give you higher places on committees. But the Committee of the Whole is really all you need. Why wish for anything more? In this Committee you can talk on any subject. When you get to be chairman of a certain committee, then you are practically tied to that post. You are not really supposed to have time for anything else. You may be expected to give your whole attention to that committee. I would not like that. I am interested in many problems and desire perfect freedom in their consideration. Have patience, for "when the sun is set, the little stars will shine." I fear I will be giving my own swan song before long. But how I have enjoyed being here.

I do feel that I might call your attention to this worry of mine, which is of the greatest concern to me and has been for some time—and I want the women particularly to listen to this—that people want the big, strong, good looking man to be selected as President of the United States. Personally I want the issue, not the man, to be the determining factor. Am I not right about that? There are now more women voters than men, and it somehow appeals to me that they could not help but admire and prefer the man whose personality has the most appeal. Personality seemed to have elected a President for an unprecedented four terms. But I want the issue determined, even though the make-up of the candidate running for office is as homely a character as Abraham Lincoln. I warn the new Members not to be overawed by the loud speakers. Many of us who speak poorly, speak the most. I want a diminution of laws. I would like to repeal, and repeal, and repeal. The gentleman from Mississippi told you why they lost the last election. I will also tell you why. The public had grown weary. Their weariness and patience had grown very thin. They had stood Government exactions for too many years. Think of the burdens placed upon the people of this Nation because of bureaus and bureaucrats. They grew up like anthills. No wonder that so many of our citizens seem to act and write as if they "had ants in their pants." That is an old expression but it seems fitting to use it at the moment. They are uncomfortable. There are mountainous reports to be made to these bureaucrats. Let us hasten the job of ridding our people of them.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] told you there are 60,000 employees in the War Assets Corporation. Can we not demand at least a 50-percent reduction?

About 10, 12, or 14 years ago so-called Farleyism was at its height and a great multitude of jobs was created. We Republicans did not get notice of any of those vacancies. No; only Democrats were given notice of those vacancies, and they were filled with many thousands of deserving Democrats who were then enthusiastic to win elections, and they did. Yet now I hear that Mr. Farley himself is complaining of too many bureaucrats, and would get rid of them. But he, seemingly, is largely to blame for the condition.

I see my good and long-time friend, former leader MCCORMACK, watching me closely. I will yield to him now if he so desires.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Indeed I will.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not watching my friend closely because I do not have to watch him. I respect him very much.

Mr. GIFFORD. I know you do.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am listening to the gentleman with interest, rather than watching him closely, because he does not have to be watched closely.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to say to these new Members, watch out for him. Never attack the New Deal, because we have heard him so often make the most persuasive speeches defending all phases of the New Deal. Sometimes I think, John, you think the history of America began in the election of 1932. You did wonderful work in protecting the New Deal. I served with you away back in the Massachusetts Legislature some 30 years ago. I respect you. I am really fond of you. You were not always a stubborn Democrat in the Massachusetts Legislature. Often you helped the Republicans to prevent the passage of unsound legislation. But I have warned you new Members not to be carried away in admiration of him, because in oratory he is unexcelled, and

sometimes I think he really has a good argument in his strong appeal.

Someone has said that it would be better to have no laws at all than the prodigious number we now have. I can almost agree with that. Is that a foolish statement, really? Thomas Jefferson wrote that that government that governs least is the best. But you know Thomas Jefferson and Jackson are now forgotten except on their birthdays. Meetings are held in honor of their birthdays, usually at $50 or $100 a plate. They seem to capitalize on them. Very little reference is made to the wise advice they gave, which ought to be remembered. It was once said here that they held a Jackson day dinner and took all the "jack" out of Jackson. Well do I remember those methods as used even in my own district during those job placing days. They called on my Democratic citizens for contributions, and I had the names of those who gave the $50 or $100 apiece. Afterward every one of them got a good job. As I recall it, every one of them did. Do you not remember those methods? Farley probably does not want to remember.

I wish to say some comforting things, I really do, to these new Members. For some little time you should perhaps refrain from too much speaking. I did not do much speaking during my first 10 years. I can frankly confess to you I was a most frightened person when I made my first speech here. Now I wish I were frightened. I would perhaps hold my tongue. I was once provoked to warn a new Member here by remarking, "The infant mortality here is very high." I am now anything but frightened. My worry is that I will speak when I ought to hold my tongue. Our wives advise against speaking too much. After all, women are the real critics. But you are building for the future, you new Members, and the future will belong to those who prepare for it.

I want to reduce taxes. Indeed I do. Taxing people on the basis of their ability to pay? That sounds plausible, but why make it so punitive? I was brought up in the older days to learn some of the fundamental rules relating to taxation. My Governor used to send me on missions to confer with other tax cxperts. I foolishly thought I knew something about taxation. Apparently, I did not. I was early taught that taxation, like the atmosphere, should press equally upon all citizens. I found that in most State constitutions there was that phrase, that precious phrase: "Taxes should be proportionate." That now seems to have been deleted from all State constitutions. Proportionate taxation means that if you have 10 times as much as I have, you should pav 10 times as much and not 100 times as much. But now we have the so-called progressive taxation. For the benefit of the new Members, let me recite to you what that great President and long-time friend of mine, Calvin Coolidge, who was president of the Massachusetts Senate when I was a member of that body, once said on the matter of progressive taxation. Some of the older Members may recall it. It is unforgettable. He had such a concise and incisive way of speaking that it carried weight. He said, "If you take 20 percent of what a man makes on Monday, then take 40 percent of what he makes on Tuesday, 60 percent of what he makes on Wednesday, and 80 percent of what he makes on Thursday, he will not work Friday and Saturday." Ability to pay? Yes. But pay the Government all of it? No. I do not envy or hate that man who may make a million dollars. But shall the Federal Government take $900,000 of it, leaving him still to pay his State income taxes and other levies? I want him to have some ability to employ me or my children and grandchildren. I want there to be some incentive left to him to carry on. We must have incentive capital if we want to keep our country going. That word "incentive" should be kept in our minds. Why do people expect citizens to do business without a profit? Balance the budget? Yes. But tax reduction comes first. The question arises—to balance what budget? The $260,000,000,000 direct debt or the Wigglesworth $663,000,000,000 debt? And the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] does not tell you things that are not so. His figures seem to be supported by the Bureau of the Budget.

If you endorse my note, you are liable, and the banks will regard it as a liability. So I am much worried about balancing the budget. But will we balance the budget? Suppose we balance the budget by $2,500,000,000. What would that amount to? No; the paying of that debt will be our problem for perhaps 100 years, unless, like all other nations, we indulge in some sort of financial chicanery. We cut the gold dollar and took all the profits, did we not? Is my Government to call in my dollar bill and issue a new one with a value of 25 cents, and take 75 cents profit on it? Is that method of canceling our debt to be adopted? Did they not do that in France? There is one thing we must save, however, and that is the psychological effect. We must pay the $5,000,000,000 interest, because as long as you and I cut coupons, which is such a pleasant task, and collect real money on those coupons, we somehow feel reassured. But do we not know that we have to be taxed even to pay for those coupons? As I have often said, beware of phony financing. Such economics were not taught in the old book when I was a school teacher. But the comforting thing about it all is that we were assured over and over again by our recent President that we owed this debt to ourselves. Of course, we will not go into bankruptcy because we would not summons ourselves into bankruptcy, nor can anyone from the outside summons us into bankruptcy. Therefore, we can go on and on and on and on until some fatuous condition arises, when we would come to recognize that it would be foolish even to talk of paying the public debt. I am trying to explain this according to my own reasoning. Perhaps I am wrong, but tax reduction and the relief of our people come first, considering what little we can do toward balancing the budget. Many times in my life I could not balance my own budget. For years I had to borrow money to keep the wheels of industry going and to get the tools with which I could work to make money, in the belief that not only could I repay it but that I would make some money to keep other people employed.

I do not know that I have made myself clear; but I will say to you younger Members, no matter how well you speak on the floor, it does not seem to matter. We may enjoy and appreciate it, but we easily forget it. However, if you use the humorous handle, we will be more likely to remember. A couple of months ago one of my newspapers wrote an editorial about the danger of the public debt. I once made a speech on the danger especially of the short-term public debt. One magazine printed the whole of it. About 10 years ago, when I made that speech, what do you suppose that newspaper quoted from it?—

"Hush, little deficit, don't you cry;
You will be a crisis by and by."

We were having all sorts of crises and emergencies in those days. But the newspaper remembered those lines and quoted them again in the recent editorial. There may have been a little humor in it, but it did convey a thought to the people that someday there would be a crisis.

We are rich, are we? No. We are really bankrupt. What of it? Other nations say we are rich and prosperous. Are we? I cannot think so. Someone rose today and wanted to put an article in the RECORD about the great man from London who said, "If we have to live up to the terms we made on preferential trade agreements, we never can pay the debt." Already they are serving notice that the debt of $3,750,000,000 will never be paid. Some of us rather suspected that when we loaned the money. But to think they would come out with it now in that way!

I want to say to the membership of this House, when Will Clayton and others came before the Committee on Ways and Means, to my utter amazement certain members of that committee confounded them on every phase. Those men knew so little about the workings of the trade agreements. Of course, Henry Wallace came. That ought to be enough to condemn it. But what did they know about trade agreements? Only that broad viewpoint—they would make the world better and prevent wars. Perhaps it would do away with war, but I am entirely unconvinced. In 1935 I joined with you in putting an embargo on the sale of arms, because the argument was that if we would not sell munitions no nation would resort to war. Think what happened! You cannot now make me vote by appealing only to my emotions. I must face the hard, cold facts. This is to be one of your problems. It is said that Congressmen do not like hard, cold facts. It interferes with their prejudices. So many of us have to vote our prejudices, as so often we do not have the time to study problems and weigh them carefully.

I was amused to hear someone make the remark that the legislative branch of the Library was open to us, and they could furnish us with all information desired. I live at the famous Cosmos Club in Washington. Everyone there is a scientist or an expert on some subject. We

salute them all as "Doctor." I can always find someone there who knows a great deal about any subject on which I wish to be informed. Sometimes they know a great deal more than they should know, as they discourage us so. I am often worried about those persons who have a skull full of booklore. The greatest blockhead I know is someone whose head is filled with educational lumber. I want to get back to the farmer out in the country who has the gift of common sense. Common sense is really to be depended upon. The agent came to the farmer with many pamphlets and told him they would help him do better farming. The farmer replied, "I do not want to read them; I don't do as well as I know how, now."

He did not want to be annoyed with pamphlets, written by any professor who never milked a cow and probably never did any farming himself. I have milked cows. Books did not tell me how to do it.

There are many things I had expected to talk about but my time, of course, is exhausted. If I should turn to these notations there would be no end. But I did make up my mind to say a few words to the new Members of Congress, especially to warn them of certain dangers, although I think they may have an inkling as to some of them by this time. Next, I wanted to make a few declarations of where I stand on tax reduction, labor problems, and trade agreements, and to comment on the public debt. But I do not like to read speeches. Man is naturally lazy and he must have an incentive to get him to do anything. That is why we have got to reduce taxes, to give him an incentive to keep going.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the genleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman. I am pleased to have a Democrat appeal to me.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman knows the fond affection I have for him.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope so, but I have never tried the gentleman out on that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In addition to that, I think perhaps the gentleman may appreciate a little rest while I make a brief inquiry.

Mr. GIFFORD. You mean my tongue may need a rest. I myself do not need a rest.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just so the gentleman may calm himself and not let his emotions get too strong.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do I give you that impression?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks about farming. I do not, of course, come from a farming area.

Mr. GIFFORD. But I am a farmer, so be careful.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not come from an agricultural section.

Mr. GIFFORD. Nor I either.

Mr. EBERHARTER. But I am wondering whether in the gentleman's State they have a State college which gives courses in agriculture.

Mr. GIFFORD. Indeed, we do, and it is a good one.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman will agree, will he not, that a farmer who has the practical knowledge, and in addition the theoretical knowledge he learns out of books in these agricultural colleges, makes a better farmer than one who does not?

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope the gentleman did not get the impression that I was against agricultural colleges. I simply told what one farmer said, that book learning did not appeal to him.

I wonder if the gentleman ever read the old story about the farmer who gained such fame as a weather prophet that he was more often right than Old Probability. His fame spread so widely that Old Probability sent people from the departments to interview him and learn how he foretold the weather. He said to them, "I do not mind telling you. I watch my donkey out in the field. When he grazes contentedly the weather will be good. Whenever he gets uneasy I can tell by the degrees of his uneasiness how bad the weather is going to be." And it is said they went back to Washington—the story is in an old textbook—and appointed a jackass to be the head of every weather bureau in the country. That story is in Haskin's History.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will extend his remarks to go into the matter of his views on the reciprocal trade agreements because I have great respect for the gentleman's views. I know he is a great statistician on that subject. I hope the gentleman will take time to develop that in his extension.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other things that I wanted to say especially to the younger Members. We listen to arguments and speeches by men of marvelous culture; we listen to them carefully and admiringly. Then we vote against them. It is nice to have respect, and sometimes we wish to vote for measures of national good, but somehow there are people back home pulling the strings, are there not? I represent the old Plymouth district. I think the old Plymouth blood is in my veins. I am very proud of the district I represent, and the people of my district seldom have told me how I should vote. I have been, and I want to say that I still can be, independent. But sometimes we have that appalling decision to make: Shall I vote for my country as a whole or must I vote to protect my own particular district? Which should I represent? Your conscience must be your guide. But you can almost always subdue your conscience; you can always educate your conscience. "You can gauge your conscience to the plot," I think Shakespeare said, did he not?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think I once said that conscience and cowardice are the same. Then again, I said conscience is sometimes just plain yellow. Somebody from New York read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and sent me a copy and after the word "yellow" he wrote, "So are you." All the world seems not ready for liberty; the human liberties that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] told us about. I was expecting to comment further on that speech. I wanted to add "he who will give up a little liberty for a little security deserves neither liberty nor security."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE GREGORIAN CALENDAR

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, last July 15, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, introduced H. R. 7041 in the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress. This bill followed his speech clearly setting forth the defects of the present Gregorian calendar and emphasizing the benefits that would be derived by adoption of the world calendar.

Time and standards of time are not partisan. They are universal and belong to everyone. Agreement was reached by interested Members of both parties that a Democrat and Republican should join in bringing this subject to the attention of the Congress.

Under the rules of the House a bill may not be introduced jointly. Such action, however, is permitted in the other body, and Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, accordingly joined in Senate Resolution 318. The day after the speech by Mr. MUNDT, under a prior understanding with him, I addressed the House, fully subscribing to the views he had expressed and undertaking to set forth some additional considerations. I urged that "our Government should assume a position of leadership in this improvement," and that "the action we take here will not only be beneficial to this Nation but will be influential internationally and helpful to humanity."

There was no expectation that the bills would be passed by the last Congress. In introducing a companion bill in the Senate, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY expressed the sentiments of all proponents of such action within these words. He said the action was—

> In order to bring the matter to the immediate attention of the Members of this body. Of course, this measure cannot be considered during this session. It is to be hoped, however, that during the recess the Members * * * will study the proposal and will be prepared to consider it during the next session of Congress.

The introduction of this proposed legislation has served several additional purposes. The newspapers of this Nation publicized it both in their news columns and editorially. Press comment was extraordinarily favorable and the public response, as measured by letters to editors and to those of us involved in introducing the legislation, showed a widespread interest and favorable attitude. The result of this informal referendum to public opinion justifies, nay compels, us to reintroduce the legislation

and press for its enactment. Many important organizations, business, professional, social, and others, have expressed approval, and some have passed resolutions of endorsement. Government bureaus have been induced to study the matter. The governments of many other nations have renewed their consideration of the desirability of adopting the world calendar. As a result we are informed that similar bills may be introduced in their legislatures as government bills in the case of several nations. Also, a resolution is coming before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations proposing that it recommend to the General Assembly that the world calendar be adopted by the nations of the world, effective on January 1, 1950.

It is my privilege in this Congress to reintroduce the bill for the adoption of the world calendar. I am advised that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], will also address you on the subject.

A slight change has been made in the bill as originally drawn and offered. A phrase has now been incorporated showing that the four quarters of the year approximate the four seasons of the year. This is not a change in the proposed calendar but in our exposition and analysis. I need not stress that the seasons of the year are Nature's divisions. Inevitably, they result in dividing many of the activities of human life into approximately four seasonal periods.

The world calendar divides the year into four equal quarters of 91 days each. In our present Gregorian calendar there are 90 days, and 91 days in leap years, 91 days, 92 days, and 92 days in each quarter. This inequality is complicating and causes many complex, difficult, and practically impossible adjustments for statistical and other purposes. In the world calendar each quarter begins on Sunday and ends on Saturday, contains 3 months, 13 weeks, or 91 days. Each quarter is identical with the others. The first month of each quarter has 31 days, followed by 2 months of 30 days, and each month has 26 weekdays plus Sundays.

The Gregorian calendar has 181 days—and 182 days in leap years—in the first half year and 184 days in the second half of the year. Balance is obviously destroyed. The inequality of these two divisions of the year results in innumerable disadvantages and causes many difficulties. In the world calendar each half year begins on Sunday and ends Saturday, and both halves of the year have exactly 182 days. The half years are synchronized with the months.

By a shift of only a few days, eight in all, one being the world holiday at the end of the year and the other the leap-year day, the world calendar provides an ordered and reliable timetable for the year. It retains the familiar 12 months of the year. Five months correspond to the comparable days of the Gregorian calendar, namely, January, September, October, November, and December. The dates during the 6 months between September 1 and February 28 would remain exactly as they are at present.

In short, the world calendar, a civil calendar, offers a maximum of equalization with a minimum of adjustment. Similarly this affects customs and traditions, and historical dates, scientific calculations and chronometrical usage as little as possible consistent with calendar stabilization.

Briefly summarizing the major benefits that will be achieved by adoption of the world calendar, let me state them as follows:

First. It will fix the year in perpetuity in accordance with the scientific length of the year and retain the 12 months made familiar by the Gregorian calendar.

Second. It will retain and equalize the half years and make them comparable.

Third. It will reapportion the number of days in the months more equally.

Fourth. It will retain and equalize the quarters of the year.

Fifth. It will provide a uniform grouping of the months in a pattern and sequence of days in each quarter of the year.

Sixth. It will provide 13 complete weeks within each quarter and group these weeks uniformly.

Seventh. It will establish an equal working month of 26 business days plus Sundays for all the months, and will reduce the inequality between the months from a maximum of 3 days to 1 day.

Eighth. It will fix holidays so they will always fall on the same day and date.

Ninth. It will enable each year, half year, and quarter to begin on Sunday, which is retained as the first day of the week, and to end on Saturday, which is retained as the last day of the week.

Tenth. It will for the first time in history give man a year-end world holiday set apart from all other days and appropriately dedicated to world peace and friendship, and also a midyear world holiday every 4 years, in leap years.

Almost the only standard used in the world which changes each year is the present calendar. Under the present Gregorian calendar, a revision of the 2,000-year-old calendar of Julius Caesar, each year varies. Each year starts on a different day of the week, and there are in all 14 calendar patterns and 28 types of months. Holidays grasshop throughout the week. Months vary in length without a consistent pattern. The quarter years are not equal.

Is it not desirable that all the peoples of the world start the year at one and the same time? Is it not preferable that people use the same timetable in their lives? With the speed of communication and transportation, is it not necessary that a single standard of time be used so that we can synchronize plans, harmonize thought, expedite timing, and act in unison?

In the past calendars have been promulgated by emperors, kings, and high church officials, with the advice of men of science. Today secular power in democracies is vested in congresses and parliaments and the executive branches of governments. In this Nation the responsibility and duty of revising the civil calendar devolves upon Congress. Let us discharge this obligation in a manner worthy of the representatives of the people of this important and powerful Nation.

WORLD CALENDAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, time rules us all. The most powerful and the weakest are equally impotent to stay time. Mighty as is this Nation it cannot add or subtract one second, or a fraction of a second. Time is the master of man and matter.

Each of us exists in relation to time. Einstein rendered a great service to mankind in emphasizing that physicists must consider time and space as indivisible. Philosophers now recognize that all of us exist only in relation to space-time. Nothing is more fundamental or universal than time.

Granting these premises, it is nevertheless true that our measurements and standards of time are determinative of much of our practical lives. Those are man-made creations. In our modern world we are increasingly preoccupied with time itself and our apparatus and technique for estimating its velocity. Today we figure distance largely in time. We say that New York is 18 hours by air from San Francisco, or 20 hours from London by air. We say that New York is 4 hours from Washington by train or that it is 8 hours by automobile. We measure our radio communication around the world in seconds and our telephone by moments. Our actuaries talk about life-expectancy statistics in terms of years. Bankers discuss interest in terms of time accumulation. Only recently the Army and Navy of this Government changed their standards for planes on a basis of a uniform time-standard. Many of the disputes of labor are solely based upon working hours. Among our mechanical gadgets none are more in demand than those saving time. Saving time amounts to a preoccupation, if not an obsession. In every way Americans are an intensely time-conscious people, and this is one reason for our rapid progress. A great early American, Benjamin Franklin, once said: "Do not waste time because this is the stuff of which life is made."

Many persons still alive remember when every town in the world had its own time, which was based upon meridian time. Only comparatively recently have time zones been adopted. In 1872, an American, Charles Ferdinand Dowd, and in 1878, a Scottish Canadian, Sanford Fleming, proposed plans for dividing the earth by means of 24 meridians, each 15 degrees of longitude apart, and recokoning from Greenwich. Each such zone represented an hour of difference in clock time. Great Britain passed a statute in 1880 that all her clocks should use Greenwich time. Many other nations followed and similarly set their clocks at the time obtaining in their national capitals, but in relation to Greenwich time.

In 1883, Canada and the United States agreed upon the use of standard time zones. This was done primariy by the railroads of both these nations. With the increasing speed and volume of traffic on the railroads across the continent, it became necessary to have established time zones. Gradually the system was accepted and put into use by the public at large. Yet, not until March 1918 did the Congress of the United States direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to

establish these various time zones, and thus belatedly accepted what had then long become established by commercial and popular fiat and usage.

Greenwich time, the zones of standard time, and the international date line aroused some opposition when first proposed. There were those reluctant to adopt a new innovation, and they were supported by some public inertia.

In considering calendar revision we do well to recall these facts because they are practically identical today with the few instances in which opposition has occurred. It is also very desirable for us to remember that though it be but recently that these changes were made, they have now been so generally accepted, and all opposition and protest have been silenced by universal acceptance, that we recall the previous incidents only with difficulty and amazement.

Standard time has achieved uniformity and stability in setting the time all around the world. It has proved an enduring benefit contrived by human ingenuity.

We still have other time problems. For one thing we have variations in the exact period of a day, and our astronomers and scientists have been evolving the mechanisms for stabilizing this period of time. The modern astronomer has determined two mathematical formulas with astonishingly exact chronometrical certainty. One is that the earth revolves around its axis with almost precise regularity in close to 24 hours a day. The other is that in its direction relative to distant stars the earth is constant whatever its position in its orbit around the sun. Man has also devised the chronometer, clock, and watch with the day divided into two periods of 12 hours, with 60 minutes in each hour, and each minute with 60 seconds, and further corrected through astronomical reckonings each day. The comparatively new Arlington radio time signal is familiar to us all.

Our only major time standard in general use which today needs major revision is the calendar. The uninitiated tend to think of the calendar as unchanging and unchanged. Actually, like all contrivances of civilization, the calendar has evolved, and our calendar of today is the product of much trial and error.

The Egyptians used a calendar which had as its inspiration the seasonal Nile floods and then the discovery of an astronomical phenomenon, leading to an estimate of the sun year. This calendar goes back to about 4236 B. C. In 45 B. C. Julius Caesar had conquered Egypt, yet Caesar turned for guidance to Sosigenes, a Greek astronomer living in Alexandria, and upon his advice produced a calendar which ever since has been called the Julian calendar. It established the solar year as 365¼ days, divided it into 12 months, and provided for a leap-year day. In A. D. 321 the Emperor Constantine introduced the 7-day week. The B. C. and A. D. system of chronology was added in A. D. 532, and not fully adopted until approximately a thousand years later.

In 1582, only a very short period of the past as measured by history, Pope Gregory XIII found that the calendar was causing the true dates to advance slowly so that ultimately, if unchanged counterclockwise, Christmas would have come in midsummer. Pope Gregory consulted scientists, notably the German mathematician Clavius, and dropping 10 days to make the adjustment then necessary, promulgated the calendar which bears his name and is used in most nations today. The Gregorian calendar did not meet with immediate acceptance, despite its unquestionable improvement. England and the British Empire did not adopt it until 1752. This is the reason that George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate and venerate on February 22, was born on February 11, under the Julian calendar, and continued to celebrate that date as his real birthday. Japan adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1873, China in 1912, the Soviet Union in 1918, and Turkey in 1927. Calendar change is not new.

On July 15, 1946, it was my privilege to introduce as a bipartisan measure H. R. 7041. The gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. JOHN KEE, endorsed it from the other side of the aisle, and I am happy to reverse the procedure in this session and support the similar bill he has just reintroduced. I am happy to reciprocate this courtesy. May I call attention to our comment as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 15 and 16, 1946?

This was an unusual bill in more than one respect. Probably there has never before been a bill introduced in the Congress which in its terms of reference went back to the year 4236 B. C. and which surveyed the intervening centuries. These are technical aspects of this subject which we hoped to clarify. I strongly urge a careful reading of the entire bill as now offered. I also urge all citizens, groups, and organizations to make known to Congress their attitudes and wishes on calendar reform.

The world needs stability. We have been living in a period of experimentation and change. There comes a point when mere stability may be a virtue. I say this notwithstanding the fact that I originally introduced in Congress this bill for calendar change. Paradoxically, only by revision may calendar stability be achieved.

The subject has been studied intensively for more than 100 years. The League of Nations spent 14 years considering over 500 calendar proposals and in the end only one proposal seemed to it worth while, and that was the adoption of the world calendar. Fourteen nations approved and now stand ready to adopt it.

The Christmas and New Year's holidays of 1946–47 are still vivid in memory. You will recall that they happened to fall this year on Wednesday. In other words, they came in the middle of the work-week. The results were unsatisfactory to everyone. Business generally was completely disrupted for 2 weeks, and the individual also was dissatisfied. Under the world calendar we would have had two 3-day holidays always on the same days and dates.

Our social order is highly complex and interdependent. Time tables must be uniform and stable for all people because they affect all. The world calendar is perpetual. It has equal quarters, equal working periods and fixed holidays.

Those of my colleagues who have considered the subject in the interim since I introduced H. R. 7041 for adoption of the world calendar, I trust agree that we should not delay. Those who have not found an opportunity to study it I urge to give consideration to this very basic problem and this admirable solution so readily available to us. Public hearings should make clear to us all the advantages of the proposed calendar and also reveal the reasons, if any, why its adoption would be unwise or undesirable.

A few weeks after I introduced H. R. 7041 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, Democrat, and Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, Republican, introduced a companion bill in the Senate. May I point out that this was the first time in the history of this country that a bill for calendar reform had been presented on the floor of both the Senate and the House and the first time that any calendar bill had ever been presented in this Congress which has had bipartisan support. Time belongs to no party.

Were one compelled to use a single word to describe the United States, none would be more appropriate than progressive. To this continent have come many of the depressed and oppressed, of nearly all the nations of the Old World. The early settlers came to a virgin wilderness; later immigrants found here a primitive country; and even the latest arrivals have felt themselves to be in a young society still in the throes of birth and growth whose future is ahead. All have come to our shores with high hopes and in the expectation of finding a richer and better future for themselves, their children and their children's children. In a comparatively short time a great Nation has been created and developed.

Much is still to be done. Many of the aspirations of man have still not been fully realized. A few years ago, within a decade or two, there was an all too prevalent attitude abroad in this land that the period of exploration, pioneering, and adventure was ended. Now we know this people and this Nation are still but on the threshold of a richer and nobler future. Whatever the faults here we know ours is the highest general level ever attained. Practically every individual would welcome an opportunity to come and stay here. The contrast between the public welfare in the United States and any other country in the world must make us all grateful to the providence which finds us in this country.

Many factors contributed to make the United States what it is. Courage was one. Work was another. Daring was still another. These led people to leave the familiar and dare the unknown, to uproot themselves and transplant their lives, to seek to fashion their own lives and their new world in the image of their hearts' desire. They have consciously and consistently sought improvement.

New standards of living, new mechanisms to realize their aspirations, new ways of organization have all played a

part in producing this Nation. We have been willing to discard old mechanisms in the most mechanized nation of the world. We have raised productivity by substituting new and improved machinery for unparalleled mass production. We have dared to insist upon better and more useful standards.

The time has come for us to lead the way in adopting a modern calendar for the modern world. The United States has a great opportunity to bring into actual operation the world calendar as proposed in my H. R. 7041 of the Seventy-ninth Congress and Congressman KEE's bill which he has introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of postal employees of my district, supported by their national organizations, I have introduced bill H. R. 1272, to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees. This bill, in brief, provides that such employees shall receive credit for service previously rendered in determining advancement to the meritorious-service grades provided in the act of July 6, 1945. Unless such legislation be enacted, many thousands of loyal employees, men and women who have given a lifetime of service to the public welfare, will be denied any opportunity to share in the rewards which Congress and a grateful Nation have provided.

As the law has been interpreted, employees who have already completed the long years of service required for advancement to these grades must serve an additional 15 years if they are to receive the benefits provided in legislation enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. Many of these people, by reason of the number of years of service heretofore rendered and the advancing years which make retirement imminent, will never receive the benefits to which they are justly entitled.

The act of July 6, 1945, sought to correct certain defects in the salary structure of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. One notable defect in the old law was the lack of stimulant to continuing endeavor after an employee had completed the few years of service then necessary for advancement to the highest salary grade. The ultimate assurance that faithful and meritorious service performed would be rewarded was lacking, and for that reason sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 of Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress provided three additional grades, following grade 11, with salary increases of $100 for each grade, for faithful and meritorious service performed after an employee reaches the so-called top automatic grade.

The law provides that after 3 years of service in the top automatic grade, which is grade 11, an employee shall be promoted one additional grade, and after five additional years of service in the first meritorious grade 12, he shall be promoted to the second meritorious grade 13, and after 7 years of service in this grade he should be promoted to the third and final meritorious service grade, which is grade 14. Due to the wording of the law many employees who have already completed 20, 25, and 30 years of service are required to serve an additional 15 years before they can hope to attain the top grade. Many of these people are within 1, 2, or at most, 5 years of retirement age. Their length of service precludes all possibility that they will at some future date obtain the benefits they have already earned.

It should be added that in connection with their retirement annuity, this proposal is of additional importance since the average salary for the last 5-year period will, to a large extent, determine the amount of annuity they are to receive. Thus it will be seen that enactment of H. R. 1272 serves a double purpose.

Enactment of H. R. 1272 would be an honest reward for long, efficient, and faithful service performed in the postal service, and that reward would be reflected in some slight degree through the years of retirement. Surely employees who have performed such commendable service through two world wars, through good times and bad, are justly entitled to this token recognition by their Government.

The principle involved in this legislation is not new and has already proved its worth in the military services where it has justified its adoption over a period of many years. The Seventy-ninth Congress recognized the justice of this legislation and provided the means by which those employees who enter the service today will be suitably rewarded in the years to come. It failed, however, to provide rewards for those who are presently at that stage in their careers when their remaining years of service are few, and as a result they are being paid salaries identical with those of employees having only slightly more than 6 years of service. Employees who, on June 30, 1945, were in the $2,100 grade, whether they had 4 years of service or 40, are in the same salary bracket today. H. R. 1272 is intended to correct that situation.

To further illustrate the purpose of H. R. 1272, inasmuch as Public Law 134 provides that an employee who comes under the law must serve 3 years in grade 11 before he can be eligible to the benefits of grade 12; and then must serve 5 years in grade 12 before he can become eligible to the benefits of grade 13, and thereafter he must serve 7 years in grade 13 before he can be eligible to the benefits of grade 14, it follows that a postal employee who is eligible for retirement in, say, from 1 to 3 years beginning in 1947, must serve all the remaining years of his employment before retirement in grade 11, without any opportunity to receive any of the benefits of grades 12, 13, and 14. H. R. 1272 will correct this iniquity and injustice to postal employees who are eligible to retire in the next few years of their employment.

For your consideration I am setting forth in detail the provisions of H. R. 1272, which follows:

H. R. 1272

A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 6, 1945, entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes," as amended, is amended as follows:

Add a new subsection 23 (a) to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, as a reward for continuous service heretofore rendered or to be rendered hereafter, credit shall be allowed for any period of continuous satisfactory service performed prior to enactment of this act, and shall be counted in the same manner and to the same extent that a like period of satisfactory service would be counted for purposes of promotion to the three additional grades provided in sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 19 after enactment."

SEC. 2. This section shall be effective on the first day of the month following enactment.

REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 1061, providing for the registration of firearms and for other purposes, which I introduced on January 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received many protests against this bill from sportsmen's organizations and individuals. There is no one who enjoys hunting better than I do and I belong to many sportsmen's organizations.

I have tried to protect the sportsmen and in section II of this bill you will note the following language:

Any firearm of .25-caliber bore or less, or any firearm intended solely for use as a sporting weapon which the manufacturer certifies as a sportsman's model, shall be exempted from the provisions of this act.

Now, if this language is not sufficient to protect the sportsman I will insist that amendments be adopted that will fully protect them.

Many States have gun collectors' associations. In Ohio we have the Ohio Gun Collectors Association and Mr. T. W. Brown, of my home city, Canton, Ohio, is secretary-treasurer of this fine organization. One of my closest friends in Canton is Terry Brown, who is much interested in the collection of guns and has one of the finest collections in the country. I wanted to protect these organizations and these men and placed the following language in the bill:

That firearms manufactured previous to 1944 and used solely for curiosity, ornamental, or display purposes shall also be exempt from registration.

If this language does not protect them, I will support any amendment that does fully protect them.

There is nothing in this act that would in any way prevent anyone from purchasing or possessing firearms. There was never any intention to discourage the maufacture, or sale of firearms. All

this law requires is that the firearm be registered and any transfer of the weapon be recorded. There may be other and better means of keeping track of firearms and I intend soliciting the aid of the editors of Field and Stream, Sports Afield, American Rifleman, and many of the other outstanding magazines published in the interest of sports.

The introduction of this bill was prompted by a conference with my good friend, Capt. Joseph Pence, of the Canton Police Department. Captain Pence is a past president of the Fraternal Order of Police and at present is chairman of the national legislative committee of the FOP. I am a past chairman of the police pension board and have known Captain Pence for a great number of years and have a high regard for him. I have also contacted Attorney General Clark's office and the FBI. My only intention in introducing this bill was to give all possible aid to our law-enforcement agencies in combating this horrible crime wave.

The greatest concern with law-enforcement agencies is the comparative ease with which criminals procure deadly weapons. Last year over a half-million major crimes were committed in the United States by minors under the age of 18 years, the majority of them with firearms.

Prior to 1940 the War Department authorized the sale of weapons to officers of the Army and Navy, Marine Corps, officers of the Reserve Corps, National Guard, and to members of the National Rifle Association. While one of the conditions of these sales is that the firearms are not transferable, nevertheless, a great many of them are sold and the enforcement agencies have no means of tracing them.

During World War II thousands of firearms have been brought into the United States by members of the armed forces. Recently a considerable number of various types of foreign weapons have been found in the possession of the underworld.

The War and Navy Departments have reported to the FBI the loss of hundreds of automatic pistols, machine guns, and so forth, during the war. These are simply reported lost or unaccounted for and there is no means of ascertaining their whereabouts.

These problems, with many others, constitute a potential menace and danger and may lead to an increase in crime. The problem is Nation-wide in character and can only be attacked on a national basis.

My only concern was to be helpful, if at all possible, to our enforcement agencies in preventing this crime wave. In other words, I want to place as many difficulties as possible in the way of organized gangsters who may endeavor to equip themselves with firearms for the purpose of carrying out their criminal activities.

On the other hand, I want to protect the sportsmen's organizations, rifle clubs, and so forth. Let me make this one point clear—I will oppose any legislation that will in any way interfere with or retard the noble efforts of these organizations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, January 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in open session, on Tuesday, January 28, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 356 Old House Office Building, on the subjects of subsistence ceilings and reinstatement of insurance.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An executive session of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, January 28, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The opening meeting of the full committee will be held in the Armed Services main committee room, suite 313, House Office Building, Tuesday, January 28, at 10 a. m.

The meeting will be open to all members of the press. At this time announcement will be made in regard to formation of subcommittees, duties, chairmanships, and members, the general policies of the committee, and tentative plans on agenda for hearings.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Tuesday, January 28, 1947, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on air accidents.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

184. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, transmitting a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling for the period ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

185. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

186. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

187. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

188. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

189. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the eleventh annual report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

190. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a list containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board as of the end of the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

191. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the Commission's request for personnel for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

192. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $143,000 for the Office of Defense Transportation (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

193. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1947, amounting to $738,000 (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

194. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948, amounting to $981,900 (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

195. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $5,950,000 for carrying out those functions of the Office of Price Administration which were transferred to the Office of Temporary Controls by Executive Order 9809, dated December 12, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

196. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $82,300 for the National Mediation Board (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

197. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947, amounting to $3,520,100 (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

198. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations of the Navy Department and Naval Establishment (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

199. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the Medical Associated Sciences Corps in the medical department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

200. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381), as amended, so as to extend the monthly family allowance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

201. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the construction of an aqueduct near San Diego, Calif., under a contract executed by the Navy Department with the city of San Diego; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

202. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills, to regulate the method of review (1) of certain

orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission; and (2) of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a propcsed bill for the relief of Gerald E. Phillips, David C. Watson, and Mrs. Mildred Kobylak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

204. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of a proposed transfer of a Diesel-propelled coastal transport for use by the University of Washington in oceanographic research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

205. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

206. A letter from the Secretary, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting 10 copies of the consolidated balance sheet and operating statements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries as of June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

207. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 for the War Department for military activities (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 70. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1030, a bill to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 1321. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1322. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1323. A bill to provide for the hours of service by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, approved July 6, 1946, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1324. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1325. A bill to fix the amount of the annual payment of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 1326. A bill to suspend the authority to make further reductions of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1327. A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1328. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1329. A bill to suspend temporarily the authority to make further reductions of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1330. A bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the lands belonging to the United States within the exterior boundaries of said monument to the same status held immediately prior to the issuance of said proclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1331. A bill to authorize and direct the Department of Agriculture to reimburse certain farm labor associations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 1332. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the entrance of the Utah pioneers into Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1333. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1334. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1335. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1336. A bill to amend section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1337. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $100 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1338. A bill for the erection of a public building at Lake City, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1339. A bill for the purpose of enlarging the post office at Hartsville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1340. A bill to continue veteran benefits previously granted by acts of the Congress to temporary members of the Army of the United States, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including men inducted under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 1342. A bill to exempt from the individual income tax earned income earned in certain taxable years following an individual's discharge from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 1343. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1344. A bill to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1345. A bill to improve the calendar by making it perpetual, by equalizing the quarter of the year, and fixing holidays; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1346. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1347. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1348. A bill to establish a Congressional Library Board to exercise and perform certain powers and duties with respect to the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 1349. A bill to amend the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, relating to temporary weir across the Colorado River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1350. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1351. A bill to provide for the uniform administration of efficiency ratings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1352. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1353. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1354. A bill to repeal limitations on payments of subsistence allowance to veterans in training programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1355. A bill dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 1356. A bill to provide a 5-day workweek for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1357. A bill to authorize the sale, loan, exchange, or gift of United States naval ordnance material to foreign governments, and vice versa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1358. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1359. A bill to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1360. A bill relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate school; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1361. A bill to establish the commissioned grade of medical administrator in the Hospital Corps of the Navy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1362. A bill to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1363. A bill to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1364. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1365. A bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1366. A bill to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1367. A bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1368. A bill to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1369. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1371. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1372. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1373. A bill to reorganize the Nurse Corps of the Navy and of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1374. A bill to amend further section 10 of the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 145), as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions thereof, relating to the determination of the fact of dependency, permanently effective; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1375. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1376. A bill to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1377. A bill to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1378. A bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to provide for transportation of dependents and household effects under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1379. A bill to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1380. A bill to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1381. A bill to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1382. A bill to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by certain agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1383. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Department of Veterans' Affairs within the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1384. A bill to provide a commission to supervise the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., authorized to be constructed for religious worship; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1385. A bill to extend the educational and loan benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to certain widows of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 1386. A bill to provide that certain student loans under the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1943, shall be canceled; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1387. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 so as to grant certain peacetime veterans and their unmarried widows preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1388. A bill to provide for continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1389. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1390. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 1391. A bill to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. Code, title 2, sec. 25); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election and term of office of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to prohibit suits for recovery of portal-to-portal pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 71. Resolution to amend the rules of the House with respect to the powers of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. Res. 72. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to transfer jurisdiction with respect to immigration and naturalization to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. Res. 73. Resolution urging an immediate international agreement to eliminate compulsory military service from the policies and practices of all nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1394. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1395. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1396. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 1397. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of certain lands in Illinois acquired by the War Department; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1398. A bill for the relief of Andre Lan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche E. Boyt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Ayako Ishigaki (also known as Haru Matsui); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. R. 1402. A bill to continue in full force and effect patents Nos. 1,371,160 and 1,541,135; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1403. A bill to relinquish the mineral rights of the United States under certain lands in the county of Santa Barbara, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of W. E. Lampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Lykiardopoulos (also known as Jerry Poulos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Eugene Whangbo (also known as Ik Jun Whangbo, or Eugene Park Hwangbo, or Ik Choon Whangbo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Psarelles (also known as Gust Psarelles or Gust Psarelis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Curry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Arlindo Neves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 1412. A bill to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

64. Mr. GORDON presented a petition by the 425 repatriates, American-born citizens who arrived in the United States on the steamship *Ernie Pyle*, requesting that they be allowed to obtain visas for their wives and children who remained in Poland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, January 27, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of truth, who alone canst lead men into the truth that is freedom and joy, be Thou our teacher as we seek to find the way of life in times that bewilder and challenge. Teach us better to know ourselves, that, knowing our weaknesses, we may be on guard. Teach us better to understand other people, that we may view their shortcomings with charity, their virtues with appreciation, and their kindness to us with gratitude.

Be with Thy servants in this place, in all things great and small, so that small things become great and great things become possible. Father of mercies, bless their loved ones and their families and make their homes sanctuaries of love and peace where they may find spiritual resources for the strain and pressure of their duties here.

Give us now Thy spirit, to guide and direct our thinking, that when the day's work is over we may merit Thy "Well done." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 27, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD POLISH ELECTIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, so far as lies within my power, I wish this morning to register American unity behind the sturdy statement regarding Poland issued yesterday by the State Department. Inasmuch as our repeated warnings regarding the Polish election were ignored in Warsaw and in Moscow, we are bound to take serious account of the consequences. Our frank warnings to Warsaw began on August 19, 1946, continued on November 22, 1946, and were repeated on January 9, 1947. On January 5, 1947, we urged Britain and Soviet Russia, our cosignatories to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, to join us in these warnings. Britain did; Soviet Russia declined. The situation and its implications, therefore, are not difficult to comprehend.

In my view, Mr. President, a world war which started in behalf of Polish liberty can scarcely be considered adequately won until Polish liberty is something more than a rigged and terrorized election which, it is charged, defies and defeats every elementary concept of autonomy, self-determination, and democracy, and which nullifies the most solemn pledges of which Britain and the United States and Soviet Russia are capable. This finding now seems to be officially confirmed to a controlling degree by the statement issued by the State Department in Washington. I have not spoken until the State Department did.

We would have no business intervening in the internal affairs of another nation in purely domestic matters, but this is a question, Mr. President, which leaps beyond this limitation, because it clearly involves the sanctity of international agreements which are the sole source of the Polish Provisional Government's authority.

This is a four-way question, involving four powers, and not merely one.

I want to make the record upon this score so plain that he who runs may read.

Mr. President, I quote first from the Yalta agreements, which were signed on February 11, 1945, signed in person by Mr. Winston S. Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and J. Stalin. I read from the official conference report:

> This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible, on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates.

I now quote from the report made by the late President Roosevelt to a joint session of the House and Senate in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on March 1, 1945:

> One outstanding example of joint action by the three major Allied Powers was the solution reached on Poland. The whole Polish question was a potential source of trouble in postwar Europe, and we came to the conference determined to find a common ground for its solution. We did. We know everybody does not agree with it—obviously.

I might interpolate that that statement is emphatically true, because Poland itself never had an opportunity even to be consulted.

I continue to read from the President's message to the joint session:

> Our objective was to help create a strong, independent, and prosperous nation—that is the thing we must all remember—those words agreed to by Russia, by Britain, and by me: The objective of making Poland a strong, independent, and prosperous nation with a

government ultimately to be selected by the Polish people themselves.

To achieve this objective—

I am still quoting the late President—

To achieve this objective, it was necessary to provide for the formation of a new government much more representative than had been possible while Poland was enslaved. There are, you know, two governments: One in London, one in Lublin—practically in Russia.

Accordingly, steps were taken at Yalta to reorganize the existing Provisional Government in Poland on a broader democratic basis, so as to include democratic leaders now in Poland and those abroad. This new, reorganized Government will be recognized by all of us as the temporary Government of Poland. Poland needs a temporary government in the worst way—

And it certainly got it in just that way—

Poland needs a temporary government in the worst way—an interim government is another way to put it. However—

And this is the point—

the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity will be pledged to holding a free election as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and a secret ballot.

What I am undertaking to do very briefly, Mr. President, is to lay down this historic background beyond any chance of controversion.

I have now read the Yalta record. The next thing that occurred was at Potsdam. I now quote from the official report of the Tripartite Conference at Berlin, which was the Potsdam Conference, released to the press by the White House on August 2, 1945:

The three powers note that the Polish Provisional Government in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections—

This is the constant point I want to reiterate; it is at the base of this entire experiment—

agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage—

There cannot be any equivocation as to what "universal suffrage" means—

universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates, and that representatives of the Allied press shall enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Poland before and during the elections.

Supplementing that official release from the White House regarding the same Potsdam agreement, I read from the report of President Truman to the Nation on the evening of August 12, 1945, dealing with the same subject of the Potsdam agreement:

The question of Poland was a most difficult one. Certain compromises about Poland had already been agreed upon at the Crimea Conference. They obviously were binding upon us at Berlin.

By the time of the Berlin Conference, the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity had already been formed; and it had been recognized by all of us. The new Polish Government—

And these are the key words, which I emphasize—

The new Polish Government had agreed to hold free and unfettered elections as soon as possible, on the basis of universal suffrage and the secret ballot.

Then I skip a few paragraphs and continue from the President's report to the Nation:

At Yalta it was agreed, you will recall, that the three Governments would assume a common responsibility in helping to reestablish in the liberated and satellite nations of Europe governments broadly representative of democratic elements in the population. That responsibility still stands. We all recognize it as a joint responsibility of the three Governments.

One of which is the Government of the United States.

There, Mr. President, is the record of the specifications which were laid down as the indispensable price of setting up the Provisional Polish Republic. Throughout, the specifications are the clear and unavoidable challenge to free, unfettered elections in the traditional democratic process.

What happened? I think perhaps the best summary of what happened is a paragraph from an editorial in a highly responsible metropolitan newspaper. I read the paragraph, and I ask that Senators parallel it in their minds with the promises and pledges to which the honor and the faith of the three greatest nations in this world were pledged.

I quote:

What the results of the election really are may some day become known to history. The best estimates agree that if the election had been "free and unfettered," as provided in the Potsdam agreement, the present regime would have been swept from power by at least a 65-percent majority. But the election was neither free nor unfettered, nor anything except a fraud and farce even less disguised than the voting in the Balkans. It was preceded by an election campaign marked by murder, police terrorism, censorship, and suppression of the opposition, climaxed by the intimidation of the electorate to display government bloc ballots in an "open and manifest" vote to demonstrate loyalty to the regime. It was accompanied by the exclusion of all but a handful of opposition balloting supervisors. And, like the referendum of last June, it is being followed by a dishonest count to attain a majority long predetermined and divided among the Communists and their party satellites.

Now, Mr. President, the statement issued by our State Department yesterday at least substantially confirms that indictment. We must establish the total truth in respect to this indictment. We must establish the total truth in respect to the State Department's charges of yesterday, and then we must face these realities.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the State Department for its forthright statement so far as it goes, and I am sure that the Congress, the country, and the world will be interested in subsequent developments under the reservation of the future American position as asserted in the statement and to be ultimately disclosed.

I concede the difficulty in charting a further course to implement this protest, which does not further penalize the Polish people themselves, who already are the innocent, helpless, tragic victims of the same bad faith which occasions our protest. It would merely compound the outrage if the mechanism of our protest should add to the burdens of the Polish people themselves, as distinguished from their Government—the people who already suffer from this alleged tyrannical oppression, against which we now officially complain.

Our challenge is to the Provisional Polish Government and its sponsors, and particularly the government which will be the successor of the present Provisional Government under color of a so-called election which it is now formidably charged has been a vicious travesty upon the promised freedom and democracy to which we pledged our support, along with Britain and Soviet Russia, and which we have jointly underwritten. Our challenge is to the violation of solemn international agreements signed at Yalta, on February 11, 1945, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin, in person, speaking for their countries. If that were not enough, our challenge is to the violation of these reiterated warrants respecting free Polish elections, signed subsequently at Potsdam on August 2, 1945, by President Truman, Premier Attlee, and Generalissimo Stalin.

Mr. President, I do not presently undertake to say what steps are appropriate in effective furtherance of our protest, except that frank and immediate consultations between Britain, America, and Soviet Russia, signatories to the Polish guarantee, would appear to be summarily required to find out exactly "who's who" and "what's what."

The three Governments—and Poland too—are committed to the peaceful settlement of such disputes. There is, of course, no thought of any other procedure, and there is no remote suggestion beyond pacific settlement in the words I am uttering today. But I do not see how there can be any thought, either, of resting the case upon the mere filing of an unpursued indictment, when the indictment charges basic violation of the very fundamentals of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter. There must be a more convincing answer. I take it the State Department will have more to say upon this score at a later date, and I very willingly await its leadership, in view of the clear disposition it has indicated within the last 24 hours that it shares the view which I am now presenting to the Senate.

Mr. President, this is all a part of the painful, tortuous but indispensable process by which the peace-living nations—and I prefer, from here on to substitute "peace-living" nations for the phrase "peace-loving" nations—which has been used up to date in a definition of credentials—this is all a part of the painful, tortuous, but indispensable process by which the peace-living nations of the earth are striving for a new integrity and a new reliance in the sanctity of interna-

tional engagements upon which we all seek to build the edifice of permanent peace with justice in a free world of freemen. The edifice cannot be erected upon shifting sand.

We must frankly and courageously face each unfolding event in this great evolution, if the evolution shall eventually succeed and if our edifice shall stand. We must still exercise patience, until it ceases to be a virtue; but we must find the right answers and the essential protections each step of the way. We must keep the record straight. We cannot condone or ignore such a record as we here confront without a conclusive searching of the facts and then of our consciences. We must practice what we preach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there may be printed in the RECORD the full text of the State Department's release on the recent election in Poland, and the Associated Press report upon that election.

There being no objection, the State Department's statement and the newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 19 a general election was held in Poland, the results of which are expected to be announced shortly.

The United States Government has followed closely the developments leading up to this event in accordance with the commitments it accepted at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. On numerous occasions it has expressed its concern over the course of events in Poland which increasingly indicated that the election would not be conducted in such manner as to allow a free expression of the will of the Polish people.

On August 19 and November 22, 1946, formal notes were addressed to the Polish Provisional Government on this subject.

On January 5 this Government brought the situation in Poland to the attention of the British and Soviet Governments and expressed the hope that those Governments would associate themselves with the Government of the United States in an approach to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. This proposal was rejected by the Soviet Government.

On January 9 this Government delivered a further note to the Polish Provisional Government which stated among other things that if the repressive activities on the part of the provisional government did not cease immediately, there was little likelihood that elections could be held in accordance with the terms of the Potsdam agreement. The British Government has also protested to the Polish Provisional Government the violation of its election pledges.

EMBASSY REPORTS CITED

The reports received from the United States Embassy in Poland in the period immediately prior to the elections as well as its subsequent reports based upon the observations of American officials who visited a number of Polish voting centers confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free.

These reports were corroborated by the general tenor of the dispatches from foreign correspondents in Poland.

It is clear that the provisional government did not confine itself to the suppression of the so-called underground, but employed widespread measures of coercion and intimidation against democratic elements which were loyal to Poland although not partisans of the government bloc.

In these circumstances the United States Government cannot consider that the provisions of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements have been fulfilled.

The United States Government has made it clear that it has no desire to intervene in the internal affairs of Poland. By virtue of the responsibility which devolved upon it as one of the principal powers engaged in liberating the countries of Europe from Nazi occupation, it undertook, together with the British and Soviet Governments, to secure for the long-suffering Polish people the opportunity to select a government of their own choosing. It was in connection with this undertaking that this Government agreed to the decisions respecting Poland that were taken at the Yalta Conference, including the decision to recognize the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.

These decisions with respect to Poland, which were accepted by the Polish Provisional Government in their entirety, formed part of a series of agreements between the United States, British, and Soviet Governments. The United States Government considers that the Polish Provisional Government has failed to carry out its solemn pledges.

The United States Government firmly intends to maintain its interest in the welfare of the Polish people. While retaining full liberty of action to determine its future attitude toward the Government of Poland, this Government will continue to keep itself informed of developments in Poland through its diplomatic mission in Warsaw.

UNITED STATES OBSERVERS FIND MANY VIOLATIONS OF POLISH LAW IN VOTE—PEOPLE HAVE ATTITUDE OF CYNICISM, SUBMISSION, WARSAW EMBASSY TOLD

WARSAW, January 24.—United States Embassy observers reported to Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane today that the attitude of the Polish people to the parliamentary elections was one of cynicism, hopelessness, fear, and abject submission.

The reports told of frustration and regimentation among the nation's voters and attributed the condition to intimidation exercised by the pro-government bloc parties, aided by armed forces which produced what was described as mass open voting and a long list of violations of the Polish constitution and election laws.

The Ambassador said he would send detailed reports to Washington next Wednesday.

Embassy personnel and other Americans visited all the important sectors of Poland before and during Sunday's election.

VOTERS AFRAID TO TALK

Asked his opinion on the reports, the Ambassador said his own views were the same as those of the American Government in notes which were submitted to Moscow and Warsaw and which, in advance of the balloting, scored the election set-up as being neither free nor unfettered.

Embassy observers reported that everywhere they found voters feared to talk about the elections and felt the results were a foregone conclusion.

Reports from those who visited the polls in the cities of Wroclaw (Breslau), Krakow, Katowice, Gdansk (Danzig), Lublin, Posnan (Posen), and Warsaw recited numerous violations of secrecy of voting by tens of thousands.

Observers said there were many arrests of members of the PSL (Polish Peasant Party), that one jail in Kielce had 1,000 prisoners and there was large-scale pressure by security police to force the Poles to vote pro-bloc.

ARMED ATTACKS CITED

The reports cited armed attacks against PSL district headquarters, and mass disenfranchisement of voters. The reports told of no place which had booths for secret voting.

In Lublin the voting was disorderly and probably thousands were unable to cast their ballots before the polls closed, the investigators said. In many precincts only those openly pro-bloc were afforded the first opportunity to vote, they added.

The Embassy reported it had little information on the counting of ballots. But in many places there were no watchers for the Polish Peasant Party and that party was not represented on the election commission.

The British Embassy also is preparing a report to London.

Vice Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk asserted yesterday that the Government bloc had robbed his Polish Peasant Party of victory in Sunday's balloting and that "an honest and fair supreme court must declare this election invalid."

He told 50 foreign correspondents at a news conference that if the appeal to the high tribunal fails the PSL's executive committee will consider a boycott of the new Parliament by the 28 PSL members.

Mr. Mikolajczyk declared that even with the display of power by the bloc parties, the security police, militia, and army, the PSL would have obtained 60 to 70 percent of the vote if it had been permitted to have watchers at the vote counting. Unofficial returns gave the bloc 90 percent of the vote.

He said reports showed that the voters, herded to the polls early in the day by bloc-party organizers aided by armed forces, later showed widespread rebellion. If there had been an honest count of the ballots, he added, it would have shown a majority for the PSL.

Mr. Mikolajczyk outlined these three conclusions from the voting:

"First, the election was a fight of a minority using brutal physical force to overcome the will of the majority of the people.

"Second, the fact that a majority vote would have been shown in favor of the PSL was reflected in the tremendous majority given our party in those few precincts where we managed to have watchers at the vote counting.

"Third, the election should promptly be declared invalid because the new Government emerging from this election, at a decisive and difficult moment for Poland, will not be reflective of the will of the majority of the people."

NOTICE OF REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make announcement that on Friday, when the Senate assembles, as I presume it will assemble on that day, the Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources will file its final report. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who has been most diligent in his attendance upon all the meetings of the committee, and the chairman of the committee, will hold a press conference tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock in room 224, Senate Office Building, so that the members of the press, if they so desire, may receive advance copies of the report. I make this announcement for the convenience of the press and for all who are interested in the matter.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of Senate Resolution 20, agreed to on January 24, 1947, creating a special

committee to study and survey problems of American small-business enterprises, the Chair appoints the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] majority members of that committee.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 22, 1947, continuing the authority of the investigation of the national defense program, the Chair appoints the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] majority members of that committee to fill existing vacancies thereon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations submitted by the Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations made during the period from January 1, 1946, through December 31, 1946, and the areas embraced in the withdrawals in effect at the end of the period (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

TRAINING OF FOREIGN NATIONALS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL METHODS, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize agencies of the Government to cooperate, on a reimbursable basis, with the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture in programs in furtherance of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company for the year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company for the year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation exempting territorial and city and county pensioners from paying Federal withholding income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Marietta L. Edinger, of Trenton, N. J., requesting that an investigation be made of the action of the Home Owners Loan Corporation in taking property belonging to her; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Two radiograms from Puerto Rican Veterans' Brotherhoods, of Maunabo and Canovanas, signed by Julian La Fuente and Juan Farroyo, Philippine Islands, urging prompt increase in subsistence for veteran students; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROTECTION OF WILDERNESS IN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Black Hills Council of the Boy Scouts of America at Rapid City, S. Dak., favoring the proposed program of the United States Forest Service for consolidation and protection of the wilderness embraced in the roadless area of the Superior National Forest by acquisition of the remaining private lands needed now for adequate control of such areas, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK HILLS COUNCIL,
BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA,
Rapid City, S. Dak.

"Whereas protection of wilderness areas of suitable size and location is important to perpetuate the natural attractions of such areas for wildlife habitat and for public use and enjoyment; and

"Whereas the Quetico-Superior country deserves to be preserved as a representative of natural original America both for our present enjoyment and as a heritage for unborn generations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Black Hills Area Boy Scouts of America in annual meeting assembled at Rapid City, S. Dak., on the 14th day of January, 1947, place itself on record as favoring the proposed program of the United States Forest Service for consolidation and protection of the wilderness embraced in the roadless area of the Superior National Forest by acquisition of the remaining private lands needed now for adequate control of such areas; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to FRANCIS CASE and KARL MUNDT, Congressmen, and CHAN GURNEY and HARLAN BUSHFIELD, United States Senators, calling upon them to do all in their power to secure the passage by our Congress, of such measures as may be necessary for the effectuation of this conservation program; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper representative of the Dominion of Canada urging that the public agencies concerned in Canada take such steps as may be appropriate for the establishment of corresponding wilderness areas in the adjacent region on Canadian soil."

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned president of the Black Hills Area Boy Scouts of America and the undersigned Scout executive of the said area herewith and hereby certify that the above resolution was offered and unanimously adopted at a meeting of area officers and delegates to the annual meeting of the Black Hills Area Boy Scouts of America, at its meeting at Rapid City, S. Dak., on the 14th day of January 1947.

H. A. WALKER,
President.
A. D. GROSS,
Scout Executive.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BURKE COUNTY AND WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMERS' UNION, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Burke County, and three resolutions adopted by the Williams County Farmers' Union, in the State of North Dakota, relating to legislation and certain problems facing the Nation, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"We, the Board of County Commissioners of Burke County, N. Dak., memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, as follows:

"1. That the Budget of the United States be balanced;

"2. That the present rate of taxation of the United States remain as it is, save and except that as to the Federal income tax that the exemptions of single persons be raised from $500 to $1,000, and the exemptions of the head of a family be raised from $1,000 to $1,500, and that the present exemption for additional dependents be left as it now is.

"That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith to the Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota.

"Dated this 7th day of January 1947.

"THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BURKE COUNTY, N. DAK.,
"By OSCAR A. KALLBERG, *Chairman.*
"Attest:
"WM. JOHNSON, *County Auditor.*"

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the Agricultural Conservation Program has been set up by Congress to assist farmers in carrying out approved practices that will maintain and improve the soil and water resources of the Nation now and in the future, and to be administered by farmers; and

"Whereas it has been proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture to eliminate all regional offices of ACP and set up a centralized board of 5 men with 17 different departments at Washington, D. C.; and

"Whereas it was evident that this five-man board would be appointed without consideration to their agricultural qualifications and furthermore that the needs and supervisions vary in different regions of the country, thereby warranting representation through regional offices: Be it hereby

"*Resolved*, That the Williams County Farmers' Union set forth this resolution op-

posing the proposed change of administration; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to our Senators and Congressmen."

"Whereas rural electrification is one of the greatest steps forward that has ever been undertaken in the improvement of the standards of living for families on the farms; and

"Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration has proven itself an agency through which such rural electrification has been made possible for hundreds of thousands of farm families throughout the United States, who would otherwise not have been able to get such electric service; and

"Whereas widespread newspaper publicity is at the present time indicating an attitude of misunderstanding and hostility toward the Rural Electrification Administration on the part of some of the Members of Congress from various parts of the United States, which we feel is brought about by the fact that many of these Congressmen are from urban areas, and therefore do not fully appreciate the tremendous services being brought to our farm population through the development of rural electrification by the Rural Electrification Administration: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Williams County Farmers Union in convention assembled at Williston, N. Dak.*, That we express our whole-hearted support for the further development of rural electrification through the Rural Electrification Administration, and request the present Congress to grant adequate appropriations to the Rural Electrification Administration for continued development and expansion and further request the Congress to jealously guard the Rural Electrification Administration against legislation designed to deter or prevent further expansion of rural electrification through the Rural Electrification Administration; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we request the Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress from our State to do their utmost toward acquainting all other Members of Congress with our position and with the marvelous job that the REA is doing in making electricity available to the farm families."

To the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the exemptions for dependents under the Federal income tax was set up at a time when the cost of living was much lower than it is at the present time; and

"Whereas as there is a plan in our National Congress to reduce all income taxes by a certain percentage;

"Therefore, we, the delegates of the Williams County Farmers Union, assembled at Williston, N. Dak., on Saturday, January 4, 1947, do recommend that the exemptions be increased to $1,000 per dependent and that no other reduction be made on income taxes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of our Congressmen."

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO EXPEND CERTAIN FUNDS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report back favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 59, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 59) submitted by Mr. HICKENLOOPER on January 17, 1947.

The amendments of the committee were on page 1, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "February 1" and insert "January 24"; and on page 1, line 5, after the word "the", to insert "Senate section of the", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the unobligated balance on January 24, 1947, in the contingent fund of the Senate to the credit of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, created by Senate Resolution 179, agreed to October 22, 1945, hereby is authorized to be expended by the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, created by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire as to the amount of money involved?

Mr. BROOKS. It is about $11,000; but the circumstance is unusual. The committee did not spend the money which had been provided for it. It is not asking for any more money; it is simply asking to transfer from the original joint committee to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy approximately $11,000.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report back favorably, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 52) providing an increase in the limit of expenditures in connection with the study and survey of the problems of American small-business enterprises, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I would like to inquire as to the amount involved?

Mr. BROOKS. The amount is $7,754. The resolution was introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. It makes up for the unused time they had for vacation, and it winds up the committee as of January 31.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. MURRAY on January 10, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small-business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, as continued and supplemented, is hereby increased by $7,754.

STUDY OF EMERGENCY AND WARTIME LEGISLATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report back favorably, with amendments, the resolution (S. Res. 35) providing for a study of emergency and wartime legislation, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution has been unanimously approved by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 35) submitted by Mr. WILEY on January 8, 1947.

The amendments of the committee were, on page 1, line 10, after the word "than", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 2, after the word "than", to strike out "March 5" and insert "April 1", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That each standing committee of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of all existing temporary and permanent emergency and wartime legislation (including legislation which terminates on or after a proclamation proclaiming the cessation of hostilities) which falls within the jurisdiction of the respective standing committees. Each such committee is further authorized and directed to make such recommendations with respect to such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Committee on the Judiciary not later than March 15, 1947; and be it further

Resolved, That upon receipt of such recommendations the Committee on the Judiciary shall review and correlate them and not later than April 1, 1947, shall submit such recommendations to the Senate as it may deem advisable.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 416. A bill to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain exservicemen; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 417. A bill to review and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for himself and Mr. TAFT):

S. 418. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Matsukawa (nee Teruko Nagai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 420. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 421. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the entrance of the Utah pioneers into Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 422. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, with respect to farmer-debtor relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 423. A bill for the relief of John B. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 424. A bill for the relief of certain persons who suffered losses as the result of floodwaters in the vicinity of the Nebraska ordnance plant at Mead, Saunders County, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 426. A bill to provide for increasing the rate of pension for veterans of the Civil War, and veterans of the war with Spain, who are blind or helpless or so nearly blind or helpless as to require regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 427. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize the transfer of property to States and local governmental units for the public uses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

S. 428. A bill to provide for an increase in the combined amounts of retired pay for services as a commissioned officer and compensation from a civilian position with the Government which may be received by individuals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 429. A bill to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 430. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations and production-credit associations; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 431. A bill for the relief of William S. Meany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 432. A bill reauthorizing the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; and

S. 433. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 434. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, northern division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 435. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Russell-Majors-Waddell National Monument; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 436. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 437. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

S. 438. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 439. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902, being the general-license law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Steve Zevas;

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Nicola Yoanou;

S. 442. A bill authorizing the naturalization of George Zakoor; and

S. 443. A bill for the relief of Thomas Camarda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 444. A bill to provide for the payment of subsistence allowances to members of the armed forces who were held captive by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. J. Res. 45. A joint resolution to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. McFARLAND) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 46, authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and the Rio Grande border fence project, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BROOKS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 47, to provide for the formulation of plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BROOKS also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 48, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BROOKS also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 49, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

WESTERN LAND BOUNDARY AND RIO GRANDE BORDER FENCE PROJECTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and on his behalf, and on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and my colleague the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution relating to the western land boundary and Rio Grande border fence projects.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and the Rio Grande border fence project, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three joint resolutions. I think it is appropriate that they should be introduced at this time, because each one pertains to the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish hero who did so much to help make America the free country it is.

The joint resolutions introduced by Mr. BROOKS were read twice by their titles and referred as indicated, as follows:

S. J. Res. 47. A joint resolution to provide for the formulation of plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 48. A joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 49. A joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Civil Service.

TEMPORARY POSTPONEMENT OF TARIFF ADJUSTMENTS UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. HAWKES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the President and all agencies of the Federal Government are hereby requested to postpone any action seeking the further adjustment of duties under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act), as amended, until sufficient time has elapsed to permit a scientific study of the necessity for further action under the reciprocal trade agreements policy. The United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed to make such scientific study and report its findings to the Congress.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOY CERTAIN ASSISTANTS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 75), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution to amend

section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Section 138 now reads:

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $."

It is my thought that if the concurrent resolution I am now submitting is adopted and followed it will do away with deficit spending, put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, and provide for an orderly liquidation of the national debt.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), submitted by Mr. WILSON, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by striking out all of section 138 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and, after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses as follows:

"(1) A legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year.

"(2) The estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year.

"(3) A recommendation of the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure for running the Government in such year.

"(4) A recommendation of the amount to be paid on the principal of the national debt, which sum shall not be less than one-tenth of the estimated over-all Federal receipts.

"After providing for the payment in subsection (4) hereof, if the amount remaining from the estimated over-all Federal receipts is less than the amount recommended as the maximum amount to be appropriated for the current expense of government, then the committee shall in such report recommend a tax to be levied in such an amount as will produce sufficient revenue to retire such excess in not more than 2 years, and the funds derived from any such tax shall not be used for any other purpose than the retirement of such excess, and no appropriation shall be made until such levy is provided for. Such report shall be made by February 15.

"(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, setting aside the amount to be paid on the principal of the national debt and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If after deducting payment on the national debt the estimated expenditure exceeds the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall also include a section substantially as follows: 'That it is the sense of the Congress that a tax shall be levied sufficiently to retire said excess within a period of not more than 2 years, the amount of such excess being estimated as $.'

"(c) The concurrent resolution herein provided for shall be privileged, and shall not be referred to any committee, but shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (4) and subsection (b) hereof shall not be operative if the Congress by concurrent resolution determines that a national emergency exists."

SPECIAL ELECTIONS TO FILL VACANCIES OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 139) to provide for the holding of special elections to fill vacancies caused by removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and the Vice President, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and ordered to be printed.

AQUEDUCT NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIF. (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report received by the Senate a few days ago from the Comptroller General of the United States alleging the illegal expenditure of approximately $15,000,000 by the Navy Department relative to the construction of an aqueduct near San Diego, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Responsibility for World Peace," delivered by Senator SPARKMAN on the Methodist Hour, on January 12, 1947, together with the prayer delivered by Hubert Quillian, president, La Grange College, which appear in the Appendix.]

PEACE IN INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY DAVE BECK

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "For Peace in Industry," being a message from Dave Beck to members of teamsters' unions of the 11 Western States, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN THE TRUE FRIEND OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY—ARTICLE BY CHARLES T. McPHERSON

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman the True Friend of Labor and Industry," written by Charles T. McPherson, and published in the Oregon Democrat, which appears in the Appendix.]

STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at the regular meeting of the Committee on Public Lands on Monday last there was adopted a motion to organize the committee on the basis of five subcommittees and to authorize the chairman of the committee to appoint the majority members of the subcommittees, and the ranking minority member to suggest the members from the minority. That list was completed yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it may be published in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Territories and Insular Affairs: Senator Guy Cordon, Oregon, chairman; Senator Hugh Butler, Nebraska; Senator Edward V. Robertson, Wyoming; Senator Sheridan Downey, California; Senator Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona.

Public Lands: Senator Edward V. Robertson, Wyoming, chairman; Senator Guy Cordon, Oregon; Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming; Senator Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona.

Irrigation and Reclamation: Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Colorado, chairman; Senator Zales N. Ecton, Montana; Senator Arthur V. Watkins, Utah; Senator Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming.

Mines and Mining: Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho, chairman; Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Colorado; Senator George W. Malone, Nevada; Senator James E. Murray, Montana; Senator Sheridan Downey, California.

Indian Affairs: Senator Arthur V. Watkins, Utah, chairman; Senator Zales N. Ecton, Montana; Senator George W. Malone, Nevada; Senator Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Senator James E. Murray, Montana.

O. MAX GARDNER, AMBASSADOR TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, when the President of the United States nominates a distinguished citizen to the post of Ambassador to a foreign nation, he does so "by and with the consent and approval of the Senate."

On January 8 the President nominated Max Gardner to be United States Ambassador to Great Britain. The nomination reached the Senate on January 10 and was immediately referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee considered the nomination, approved it unanimously, reported it to the Senate, and it was thereupon ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar for action.

Three days later, on January 13, the Senate in executive session unanimously approved the nomination, and the President was so advised.

To a foreign nation this action may have seemed merely a normal parliamentary procedure; but, Mr. President, it was more than that, much more. Here was a nomination by the President of the United States, a good Democrat, sent to the Republican-controlled Senate for our consent and approval. It was first

referred to the Republican-controlled Foreign Relations Committee, approved unanimously by them, and then given final unanimous approval by the Senate.

The roll call of that day, January 13, showed that 86 Senators out of a total membership of 95 were present.

I hope and trust that Great Britain and the world at large will understand the full import of this vote of confirmation and approval.

It was not a party vote; it was a national vote. It was the second notification to the world in the short period of 3 weeks that the foreign policy of the United States is, and will continue to be, a national policy and not the policy of any one political party. The appointment and confirmation of Ambassador Max Gardner was a notification to the world that the United States foreign policy will continue to be one of justice tempered with firmness and equality to all nations large and small, and a policy striving for universal peace.

The President made no mistake in this nomination. If I may use a western expression, "It was a natural." Here was a man, a former governor of his State, holding high national office with great distinction, a man of brilliant attainments, respected for his ability, admired for his kindly manner, and loved for his keen sense of humor.

The nomination and approval by the Senate was a great tribute to Max Gardner. Since I came to Washington I have had an opportunity to know him, and to know Max Gardner is to admire and respect him. I rejoice with countless other friends in the great honor that has been bestowed on this fine southern gentleman. I have every confidence that he will perform the highly important duties of this office with great ability and tact.

Throughout his busy and successful life Max Gardner has received his greatest help and encouragement from his brilliant, tactful, and lovely wife, who goes with him to London.

Max and Mrs. Gardner leave our shores on February 6 on the queen of the American merchant marine appropriately called *The America*.

I feel sure I am echoing the sentiments of every Member of the Senate when I say to them, good health, good luck, and Godspeed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my profound appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming for the very fitting tribute which he has paid to our new Ambassador to London. I have often said in private—I have not had occasion often to say it in public—that in my judgment there is no more typical American in public office or in private life than Max Gardner. Not only does he represent the best that North Carolina has produced or can produce, but in my judgment he represents the best that America has produced in citizenship in public service, in the solid foundation of his Americanism, and his impartial, judicial approach to all the problems which face him and have faced him as an American.

He was an outstanding Governor of North Carolina, having held other offices before he reached the highest office within the gift of the State. He has resided in Washington for a number of years, and he has created a wide circle of friends and admirers which is not bounded by any partisan political division or by any religious division, or by any divisions which might be founded upon race, color, or national origin.

I predict, because I confidently believe, that in representing the United States at the Court of St. James's Governor Gardner and his beautiful, charming, talented, and gracious wife, whom we all know with such great pleasure, will take their places among the finest ambassadors we have ever sent to London. When I say that I have in mind Whitelaw Reid, Joseph Choate, Walter Hines Page—also a North Carolinian—John W. Davis, and many others whom I might mention as being among the outstanding representatives of this great country to the Court of St. James's. I think we may all take pride in the appointment of Governor Gardner. It seems to me—and did at the time—that it was a natural appointment. It was one that anyone would have recommended if he had thought about it, or if he had thought Governor Gardner would accept it.

I join with the Senator from Wyoming in the very deserved tribute he pays to Governor Gardner. I share with him his intimate friendship, which has been to me not only a source of great pleasure, but a benediction. He takes with him the respect, admiration, and confidence, not only of the Senate, but of all America. I have no doubt that he will measure up to every requirement of the position to which he has been called.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation of the tributes which have been paid by Senators on both sides of the aisle to Hon. O. Max Gardner in connection with his recent appointment as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's.

North Carolina has previously had the honor of having two of her sons represent the United States at the Court of St. James's. Walter Hines Page was appointed Ambassador by President Wilson, and served preceding and during the first World War. Robert Worth Bingham was appointed by President Roosevelt and served as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's during a portion of his administration. Both of these men were natives of North Carolina, though neither of them was a resident of that State at the time of his appointment. Each of them made an outstanding record of public service.

In the appointment of Hon. O. Max Gardner, who is not alone a native of North Carolina, but was a resident of that State at the time of his appointment, North Carolina takes particular pride.

I wish to express my own appreciation and that of the State of North Carolina for the tributes which have been paid to him. I think I know Governor Gardner probably better than does any other citizen. I was born and reared in the same town with him, and we have been closely associated through the years. I have watched his career in North Carolina with particular pleasure and pride. In the field of public service and private endeavor he has made a most enviable record. A great lawyer, a successful businessman and farmer, he has had a many-sided career and always has been found in the front rank of those leading the fight for progressive measures and humanitarian causes.

He served as State senator, Lieutenant Governor, and Governor of the State. During the period of his governorship he reorganized the State government and started North Carolina on a great upward march of progress. He has likewise served on national boards, in the public service, without compensation. I think he is qualified not only by nature, training, and experience, but also by superior native ability. He possesses an inherent faculty for understanding and appreciating the sentiments and the currents of thought in American life. Not only is he a great North Carolinian but he is a great American.

I predict for him a service most acceptable to this country and to Great Britain as he goes there with credentials of ability and character to represent this great Republic at the Court of St. James's.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I want my distinguished friend from Wyoming to understand that no word in the very few remarks which I shall make is in any sense critical of the remarks which he has made. I think it was exceedingly appropriate that those words of eloquence and commendation which have come from his lips should have been uttered here. It has not been my privilege to enjoy the personal acquaintance of Governor Gardner, beyond a mere meeting on one occasion, or possibly a few occasions, with the distinguished gentleman who will go as our Ambassador to Great Britain.

It happens that my own father was born in the State of North Carolina, and even during his latter days delighted in the memories of the Blue Ridge Mountains and the beauty and greatness of that magnificent Commonwealth.

The point to which I desire to address myself for only a moment is this: At the outset of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming he used this language:

> When the President of the United States nominates a distinguished citizen to the post of ambassador to a foreign nation he does so by and with the consent and approval of the Senate.

I observe in the manuscript, a copy of which the Senator from Wyoming has very kindly handed me, that the language "by and with the consent and approval of the Senate" is quoted. My only purpose in rising at this moment—and I repeat that what I have to say is not in any sense critical—is to call attention to the fact that the responsibility and privilege of the Senate is not confined to consent and approval. I observe that in the Constitution of the United States, section 2 of article II, there is the following language dealing with the office of President:

> He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint ambassadors—

And so forth. My purpose in rising is to state that by no possible construction of silence after the utterance made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming should the Senate place itself in the position, even inferentially, of interpreting the language of the Constitution in such a way as to imply that the Senate admits its only power to be one of consent and approval. We have the right to be advised with. The nomination is to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I rise simply for the purpose of making the record clear, at least as to my view with respect to that question.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to the voices of other Senators who have expressed their hearty approval of the appointment of the Honorable O. Max Gardner as United States Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain. A man who has had such a distinguished career as Mr. Gardner has had and who while stalwart in his Americanism, yet seeks to make every sound contribution to other peoples and to international understanding which is compatible with the preservation of our American standards and ideals, needs few words of commendation. His actions and his life and what he stands for in America are sufficient commendation.

I know of no two citizens of the United States who can better represent the people of the United States at the Court of St. James's than Mr. Gardner and his fine and distinguished wife. I am certain they will reflect credit upon America and that the British people will quickly learn to hold them in great respect.

I think the President's selection of the Honorable O. Max Gardner to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain was a wise choice, and I was most happy when the Senate confirmed it. I am sure all other good Americans join me in wishing Mr. Gardner full success in this very important mission at a crucial hour in the history of the world, and I am certain that Mrs. Gardner will be of great assistance in the work which she will be called upon to do as the wife of the American Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

PROPOSED REVISION OF 1939 AGREEMENT RELATING TO QUOTA AND TARIFF ON GROUND FISH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this morning the Washington delegation, including myself and other Members, appeared before the Committee on Reciprocity Information regarding their conference and deliberations on the tariff on ground fish, under the reciprocal-trade-agreement program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement by myself and my distinguished colleague, Representative HENRY M. JACKSON, from my State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION CONCERNING PROPOSED REVISION OF 1939 AGREEMENT RELATING TO QUOTA AND TARIFF ON GROUND FISH

Mr. Chairman, committee members, I am WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Senator from the State of Washington, and am appearing before you today to speak on behalf of the fishing industry of my State. Congressman HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, concurs in this full statement. Your committee is gathering facts from industry and other sources which will enable our State Department to negotiate an agreement with various countries as provided under the Reciprocal Trade Act. I appreciate the heavy responsibility upon your shoulders to at one and the same time carry out the will of the Congress as contained in this act and protect American industry from foreign competition which might be ruinous to it. I know that in discharging your responsibility you are motivated by a desire to reach that agreement which will be most beneficial to the people of this country.

The fishing industry is the third largest industry in the State of Washington. Its continued prosperity is vital to the economic health and welfare of my State. In 1939 an agreement was negotiated relating to imports of ground fish filets which imposed a duty of 1⅞ cents per pound on the first 15,000,000 pounds, or 15 percent of the average annual United States consumption for the three preceding years, and 2½ cents per pound on all in excess of that amount. At that time the average price paid fishermen on ground fish in the United States was 2.104 cents per pound. The duty imposed at that time represented an amount roughly equivalent to the price paid for the raw product from which fillets are produced. In 1945 the average price paid United States fishermen for ground fish had risen to 6.038 cents per pound. The duty on filets percentagewise was therefore reduced to approximately one-third of the price received by fishermen for the raw product. It can readily be seen therefore that the protection afforded by the 1939 agreement was far less effective in 1945 than that at the time the agreement was negotiated. Evidence of this fact can further be found by a brief reference to the growth of imports which has occurred since the agreement was negotiated, or in the last 7 years. In 1939 imports from Canada, Newfoundland, and Iceland of ground fish filets totaled about 9,500,000 pounds. By 1946 this had increased to approximately 50,000,000 pounds, an increase of 500 percent.

Statistics demonstrate that the fishing industry of the United States is capable of supplying the entire needs of the domestic market on this particular product. In fact, this year there is in storage in this country approximately 40,000,000 pounds of frozen filets in excess of the 5-year average. It is interesting to note that this excess of 40,000,000 pounds approximates very closely the imports on this item in excess of the 15,000,000-pound quota.

The fishing industry in this country and in the State of Washington represents a large investment in terms of jobs for our people, as well as invested capital. Nationwide the industry employs directly about 250,000 people and there is a direct investment of approximately $500,000,000.

Whereas I am fully cognizant of the underlying principles of our reciprocal-trade program and am in agreement with them, and am also cognizant of the stake the American consumer has in this problem, it is my firm conviction that the fishing industry of this country must have adequate protection against ruinous foreign competition, made possible by wide differentials in wage rates and standards of living. I urge your committee to weigh most carefully the facts here presented and the facts the industry has presented or will present in negotiating the agreements affecting this product.

Too often, in carrying out these agreements, the country's secondary industries have been used as a trading bait for more favorable tariffs on the major items. The fishery case this time can stand on its own feet on the facts. We must be sure those facts are not lost sight of by the negotiators. In other words, we want the same fight put up for the fisheries as is given to the major items. That given, we know the facts will sustain the effort. We want no justification for any statements that fisheries played second fiddle. To these people it is their economic life.

Because we gave foreign fishery competitors temporary help during the war food shortage years via lend-lease to enlarge their fish production does not mean that you gentlemen need consider, to the detriment of our producers, this newly acquired productive means in making the trade formula. You, in my opinion, should base your recommendations on the lower prewar foreign production and stick to them. Otherwise we will have defeated our own humanitarian purposes by having them boomerang. We can create hardships here, too, unless we stand up for America. It may be about time.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing here to speak on behalf of the fishing industry of the State of Washington.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over until Friday, because I have just received a brief handed me by some residents of this city, and I should like an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination of Edward M. Curran will be passed over for the day.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Saxton Daniel to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward M. Ranson to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The executive clerk proceeded to read certain nominations in the Selective Service System.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the selective-service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the selective-service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the same request with respect to nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed.

THE NAVY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the same request with respect to the nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the same request with respect to the nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 31, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 27), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

Francis Biddle, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, vice John G. Winant, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(* Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

*Bains, George W.
*Roberts, Norman K.

LIEUTENANTS

Maccubbin, Alfred L.
*Klaveness, Francis A.
*Sheely, William R.
*Smith, Laurence L.
*Packard, Alden C.
*Ward, Chester C.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Allen, John H.
Boyd, Robert G.
Dunstan, Thomas K.
*Evans, Lewis N.
Fletcher, Ralph H.
*Hilgedick, Winfred C.
Jones, Wesley F.
Lautaret, John D.
Leipper, Alexander
*Mott-Smith, Harold M., Jr.
*Willett, James H.
*Bollay, Eugene
Craig, Philip H.
Diekhoff, Arold H.
Gillin, Joseph S.
*Harding, Edwin T.
Higgins, John W., Jr.
Jones, Axton T.
Kenny, Leonard
Kirkland, Sanford N.
Kroeger, Edwin J.
*Matney, William B.
Mott, Charles D.
O'Toole, James M.
*Phillips, Rupert D.
*Pyne, Charles C.
*Schaffer, Donald N.
*Cheasty, John C.
Christie, William F.
*Harris, Harold J.
*Johnson, Joseph E.
Kellogg, Frederic D.
*Klein, Irving N.
*Ligon, Henry W.
*Lindstrom, Frank E.
Michels, Ralph J.
Stevens, Ralph S., Jr.
*Sullivan, George A.
Williams, Glendon D.
*Lombardi, Richard C.
Street, Gordon M.

ENSIGNS

Abernathy, Robert A.
*Albrink, Frederick S.
*Allyn, Rex M.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, Kenneth J.
Anderson, Paul E.
Arthur, Robert L.
Ayers, Robert W.
Baker, Lawrence H., Jr.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barrett, Cooper A.
Bass, Thomas E., 3d
Bates, Richard S.
*Bauernschmidt, John E.
Beever, Elmer R.
Bell, Elton H.
Bell, Rodney O.
Blackman, Frank E.
Blair, John P.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
*Blocher, Charles A., Jr.
Bloom, William R.
Boller, Jack W.
Bono, Vernon C.
Boyd, Carl J.
Brady, James G.
Brazil, Fredrick J.
Broad, David A.
Broadfield, Ward H., Jr.
Buckles, Charles A., Jr.
Buell, Arthur W.
Bushy, Willard L.
Canning, George W.
Carlson, William S.
Carter, Kenneth E.
Chute, Charles L.
Ciulis, Edward
Clark, Harry A.
Clinton, Jack W.
*Coil, John A., Jr.
*Cole, Charles T.
Collister, Louis J.
Comstock, Franklyn M.
*Conway, Harry J.
Conway, William J.
Cooper, Marvin J.
Corbett, Kenneth G., Jr.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crowder, Clyde E.
Cummings, Robert
*Cummings, Robert E.
Daniels, Robert J., Jr.
Davidson, Dale R.
Davies, Peter B.
Davis, Hector W., Jr.
Dayton, David M.
Dean, William E.
De Carlo, Eugene
Deibler, Robert R.
Del Marmol, Francis A.
Devlin, Morris M.
Diamantides, Paul D.
Dixon, Leon L.
Dolvin, Sheridan L.
Don, John D.
Doss, Robert F.
Doyle, Luther W.
Dresel, Robert F.
Dunlap, Billy F.
*Durham, Jesse C.
*Eaton, Max A.
Eggman, Benjamin R., Jr.
*Eggen, Arnold W.
Ely, Don L.
Even, Glen M.
Everett, James H.
Farley, John W.
Fisher, Joseph H.
Fleming, Marion R.
Fold, Bernard G.
Foss, Richard W.
*Foster, Randall D.
*Frederick, William
*Frey, Fred H.
Gainer, Richard D.
Gardner, Dennis D.
Garrison, Paul B.
*Gearhart, Charles A.
*Gearinger, Harold H.
Geary, Mervyn O.
Gentry, Edmond H.
Gerecke, Thomas F.
Geroy, Francis O.
Ginn, Horace V., Jr.
Goetz, Britton A.
Gordon, Jack W.
Gordon, Robert
Grant, Robert S.
Gray, Taylor W.
Guest, James L.
Gumb, Irving T., Jr.
Hackett, James E., Jr.
Hagood, Douglas R.
Hamblin, Robert N.
Harrold, Clay
Hasten, Jack A.
Hawkins, Arthur R.
Hayne, Wilbur L., Jr.
Heising, Kenneth W.
Hermes, Bernard P.
Hess, William J.
Heyer, William F.
Hillery, Daren R.
Hladik, Theodore
Hoff, Alan
Hoffman, Richard L.
Hoffman, Walter P.
Hogan, Richard J., Jr.
Holley, Horace C.
House, Edward H.
Howard, Frederick J., Jr.
Howe, Arthur W., 3d
Iglesias, Edward
Iles, Richard W.
Irving, Sam K.
Irwin, Charles M., Jr.
*Jack, Max C.
Jaeger, Earl C.
Jansen, John F.
Jefferies, James S.
Jelesnansky, Robert G.
Jennings, Robert B.
Johns, Harry E.
Johnson, Ernest S.
*Johnson, Van D.
*Johnston, Alvin C.
*Jonassen, Anthony O.
Joynton, Harry D., Jr.
Kampmann, Anthony J.
Kane, John P.
*Karl, Paul J., Jr.
Kasner, Edmund B.
*Keehn, Robert H.
Keeler, William E.
Keiser, George R.
Kelley, Lawrence W.
*Kelly, Charles B.
Knox, Robert V.
Krier, Daniel L.
Lacewell, Lasley K., Jr.
LaCava, John, Jr.
Lake, Kenneth "B"
Lambert, Joel "N", Jr.
*Lanterman, William S., Jr.
Lasky, Harry F.
Lee, Ray
*Leger, George J.
*Lehan, John P.
*Leonard, William A.
LeValley, James B.
Limbach, John N., Jr.
Longworth, Robert L., Jr.
Low, Lawrence J.
Mann, Richard W.
Marshall, Daniel V., Jr.
*Marshall, Walter L.
Matejceck, John F.
Maupin, Owen L.
McCartney, William J.
McEwan, Archibald J.
McGhee, James H.
McGrath, William F.
McGuire, James F.
*McKee, Robert L. J.
McMahon, Joseph D.
McMillan, Robert E.
McNary, Johnnie W.
McNeeley, Edward T.
Meacher, Leo
Menasco, Ralph W.
Merrill, Robert B.
Meyer, John W.
*Middleton, Charles H.
Miles, Bert H.
*Miley, Mortimer B.
Mills, Charles A., Jr.
Mitchell, John C.
Nonlux, Claude R.
Montgomery, Mark V., Jr.
Montgomery, Marvin D.
Moore, Robert S.
*Morgan, Philip C., Jr.
*Morganroth, Dan E.
Morris, Robert H.
*Mott, Albert W.
Muller, Herbert S.
Murphy, James E., Jr.
Naegele, Robert E.
Naftzger, James L.
Nall, Royce L.
Nemetz, Joseph G.
Nevitt, Fred M., Jr.
*Nichols, Edwin H.
Noel, Robert J., 2d
Norton, Wallace E.
Novak, Jerome C.
Odell, John D., Jr.
O'Hearn, Charles C.
Olsen, Harry A.
Pappas, Chris, Jr.
Pardue, Daniel G.
Pasquinelli, Leo J., Jr.
*Pate, Elbert W.
Perkins, Billie L.
Petre, Gabriel L.
Petrie, Conner Mr., Jr.
Pettet, Lawrence A.
Phares, John V.
Picton, Richard E.
Pirog, Bernard J.
Pitcher, William A.
Pitts, Joseph C.
Pollow, Charles H.
Prahar, Temple F.
*Price, William H., Jr.
Puvogel, Austin V.
Quiel, Norwald R.
Rapalus, Henry W.
*Reid, Richard J., Jr.
Rickey, Robert G.
Ricks, Robert B.
Roberts, Francis R.
Roberts, John
*Roberts, John W.
Robertson, Gene D.
*Rogers, Robert A., 3d
Roll, Walter D.
*Rosenquist, Frank T. H.
*Salter, James W.
*Salveson, Melvin E.
*Sands, Walter C.
Sauve, Douglas L.
Savidis, Charles M.
Sawick, Theodore
Schaffer, Donald R.
Schlaack, Eugene
Scholes, James A.
Schulke, Edward H.
Schultz, Dean F.
*Sconfiette, James P.
Scott, Eugene H.
Searl, Floyd C.
Seiberlich, Carl J.
Seligmann, Wallace I.
Setzer, Andrew R.
Severns, Robert L.
Sharp, Alfred C.
Shelton, Benjamin A.
Shepard, Virgil H.
Shonk, William H., Jr.
*Smith, Charles C.
Smith, Leroy P.
*Smith, Richard V.
Souza, Philip E.
Speciale, Joachim F.
Speissegger, Herman B.
Stafford, Edward M.
Steedle, George D., Jr.
Stoll, Ralph F.
*Story, Emery G., Jr.
Street, James W.
*Sullivan, Thomas J.
Taft, Jesse W.
Tanner, James E.
Tastsides, George T.
Tatone, Lige
*Taylor, Edward J.
Taylor, James D.
Tedholm, Charles E.
Tenney, Glenn H.
Thawley, Charles B., Jr.
Thompson, Lee R.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
*Tucker, Frank H.
Turner, William W.
Vaughn, Donald E.
Vidani, Paul J., Jr.
Viviano, Raymond J.
*Wade, Kenneth W.
Wakefield, Robert R., Jr.
Wannamaker, Harvey R.
*Warns, James T.
*Wasem, Edgar F., Jr.
Waters, Willard H.
Webb, Roy R.
Webb, Theron
West, Robert G.
Wheeler, Robert F.
*Whitehill, Arthur F.
Whiteley, Robert W.
*Whitlock, Duane L.
Whitmore, Quentin R.
Wichelns, Gerald F.
Wieland, Dicky
Wilcox, Nowry O.
Willard, Charles F.
Williams, John H. D.
Willis, William A.
Wilmarth, Eugene M.
Wilschke, John C.
Wilson, George B., Jr.
Winton, Matthew J.
*Wiviott, Max D.
Wolf, James L.
Wolfs, Karl E.
*Wornom, Samuel J., Jr.
Worrall, David J.
Yarbrough, Clifford J., Jr.
Yarbrough, Herbert A.
York, Daniel A.
*Young, Edwin M.
Young, Howard S., Jr.
Zinn, Charles S.
Alden, John D.
Allison, Donald
Alsover, James E.
Anderson, Elmer D.
Arthur, Russel L.
Astarita, Murray
Baiada, Laurence A.
Baker, Granville M.
Beavers, Harrison J.

Becker, Karl E.
*Benoit, Horace G.
Bergen, Franklin S.
Berkman, Robert P.
Boland, Paul
Bordwell, Lavern A.
Borysiewicz, Anthony F.
Bradley, Ellsworth J.
Breidenbach, Robert W.
Brinks, John W.
Brock, Harold A.
Booth, John W.
Brown, Ralph
*Busey, Charles W.
Campbell, Thomas H., Jr.
Carlson, Elmer "P"
Carman, Charles W.
Cartwright, Harold J.
*Castillo, Edmund L.
Chamberlin, Douglas F.
*Chippendale, James E.
Christensen, Ward L.
Conn, Alton H.
Cook, Baxter H.
Cook, Raymond L.
Connerly, Luke O., Jr.
Corley, James O.
Crohn, Arnold E.
Dansby, Robert B.
Davis, Clifton B.
*Davies, John "T"
Davis, William T.
De Lorenzi, Robert M.
*Dennis, George, Jr.
Dill, Jesse M.
Dinnel, Alfred C.
Dixon, William C.
Doolittle, Richard H.
Dunham, Roger O.
DuTemple, Lynn F.
*Dunlap, Harry B.
Edwards, John P.
Elliott, Homan O.
Erwin, Willard L.
Everman, Donald D.
Eyer, Harold R.
Faughman, Franklin P.
Ferguson, Carter S.
*Fitzgerald, Walter J.
Fitz-Patrick, Edward G.
Flados, Norman "D"
*Flynn, Maurice E., Jr.
Fox, John E.
*Fraser, Walter R.
Frazier, Walter J.
Fuller, Robert C., Jr.
Foose, Benjamin "M", Jr.
Gainor, Charles E.
Gavigan, William J.
Geantil, Gene E.
Graham, Lawrence P.
Gregg, Herbert A.
Grill, Robert W.
Griswold, Richard A.
Grothjahn, Harry C.
Gustafson, Harris F.
Guthrie, Charles E.
Hadaway, Donald L.
*Hagerty, William J.
*Hall, Richard L.
*Hamby, Edward P.
*Hamilton, Lee M.
*Hardy, Leonard R.
Hartzell, James W.
Haugh, Derald E.
Haycraft, Logan, Jr.
Hershey, Harry R.
Hickman, Harold W.
Hicks, Harry H.
Higgins, Edward M.
Hightower, John N., Jr.
Hill, Charles F.
Hilton, Jack
Hirshfeld, Ross R.
Holm, Weston
*Horn, Donald V.
Hubard, Billie
Huber, Robert Leo, Jr.
Hughes, Arthur J.
Hulshof, Andrew
Hume, Ralph S.
Hutchinson, George A. Jr.
Hyde, Harold G.
Ingels, Roland T., Jr.
Isenmann, Edward S.
Jacobs, Edward F.
Jobe, James K.
*Johnson, Clarence B., Jr.
Judge, William E., Jr.
Kammer, Robert J.
Kent, Harry S.
Keogler, Frank A.
Kerr, James L.
Kidd, Frederick C.
Kiefer, Edwin H.
Kilcourse, Robert S.
Kingsbury, Chester E.
Kington, Joseph E., Jr.
Kirby, Glenn A.
Koch, Donald R.
Lake, Julian S.
Lancaster, William W.
Larson, Melvin G.
Lawson, Harry R.
Leach, Eugene T.
Lee, Howard E.
Lemaster, Caleb M.
Lewis, Clyde S.
Light, Robert G.
Littlefield Raymond B., Jr.
Livingston, Harry D.
*Louthen, Willard V.
Lovell, Frederick A., Jr.
*Lumpkin, Pickett
Lynch, Richard J.
Mallory, Charles M.
*Mann, David O.
Maple, Charles J.
Martin, Howard N.
McCrave, Bryan
McCurdy, John D.
*McKee, Craig
McGraw, Donald L.
McMillan, Harold W.
*Medbury, Arnold H.
Miller, Richard B., Jr.
Miller, William M.
Moffit, Lloyd W.
Monson, Donald W.
Mooney, James D.
Neilson, Thomas L.
Patterson, William A., Jr.
Payne, Charles D.
Peoples, James M., Jr.
Peterson, John F.
Pierce, David L.
Pistilli, John A.
Pollock, James G.
Price, John
Price, William "M"
Provost, Thomas C., 3d
Pryor, Frank P., Jr.
Putzier, Charles W.
Rambo, Lewis W.
Reinhart, Leonard J.
Rice, James L., Jr.
Riise, Harold N.
Robertson, James H.
Ronimus, Arthur D., Jr.
Rosen, Ralph J.
Ruggiero, Carmine J.
Salzer, Robert S.
*Schuyler, Irving J.
Shaner, Lowell R.
Shipman, James L.
Sisley, William R.
*Skinner, John A.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Stanley E.
Soule, Robert M.
Sparks, Robert M.
Stacy, Ray J.
Steimer, Walter V.
Stoner, William A.
Suerstedt, Henry, Jr.
Sweeny, Robert E.
Taylor, Melville W., Jr.
Thomas, Norman C.
Tomkins, Lewis A.
Vansant, Victor W.
*Vanwolkenten, Raymond V.
Vaughen, William L.
Vorndan, August V. V.
Walker, John F.
Walkup, William E.
Ward, Thadeus F.
Warren, Charles J.
Waters, David E.
Wattenburger, Robert "C"
Wheeler, Owen E.
Wheatley, John P.
Wheatley, Thomas R.
Whitaker, Maurice R.
White, Bernard C.
Wiesemann, Arthur C., Jr.
Wilkinson, Jack R., Jr.
Williams, Robert L.
Willis, Thomas J.
Wilson, Carter L., Jr.
Wilson, John T., Jr.
Worsley, Earl A.
Zendler, Edwin E.
*Ahlers, Robert H.
Allen, Charles D., Jr.
*Anderson, Roy G.
Berry, James T.
*Black, Harvey
*Bolton, David
Boren, John L.
Brady, Donald B.
Brennan, Charles H.
Brouillette, Charles B.
Buescher, Jack F.
Bundy, William H.
Burke, Robert E.
Carney, Gerald F.
*Carson, Neil B.
Caruthers, Ralph R.
Chimiak, Walter
Clancy, Robert C.
Coble, Wallace L.
*Cole, Enser W., Jr.
Comet, Robert E.
Connor, Robert T.
*Cook, Marshall M.
Coulthard, John C.
Curley, Clyde W.
Curry, James G.
Davenport, Rodney B.
Davis, Richard L.
Dawson, Hilbert H.
Decker, Walter C.
DeLauer, Donald
Dennis, Osie F., Jr.
Denton, Robert L.
Devine, Richard O.
*Di Crocco, James V.
*Dixon, Thomas F.
Doner, Landis E.
Douglass, George M.
Dowler, Jack T.
Drain, Merwin E.
Dunham, William S.
Duss, Charles L.
Dwyer, Thomas L.
*Eddins, Joseph A.
English, James G., Jr.
Feiock, Charles E., Jr.
Ferrell, Robert B.
Fleetwood, William E.
*French, Dana P.
Gaines, Robert Y.
Gambert, Frank E.
Gass, Shelby C., Jr.
*Giard, Louis G.
Gifford, Walter H.
*Gillespie, Donald R.
Gist, Francis J.
*Glassman, David E.
Gloss, Warren J.
Grant, James "A"
Grant, Ralph S.
Grauten, Henry S.
Grischy, John S.
Hahs, Orrie A.
Hanzalek, Frederick J.
Harris, John P.
Harvey, Bruce A.
*Heile, Donald H.
Herndon, George H.
Heurer, Edward H.
*Hoot, Willard D.
*Hopkins, Charles H.
Houston, Willard S., Jr.
Howard, Clarence H.
Howard, William D.
Hutchins, Samuel F.
*Irwin, Carl B.
*Jackson, Wyman N.
Jay, Darrel H.
Jennette, Christopher R.
Jones, Charles M.
Koons, Tilghman B., Jr.
Lachicotte, Albert S., Jr.
Lange, Kenneth B.
Lange, Robert V.
Lanzit, Jerome R.
Laskowski, Walter E.
Lawler, Willis D.
Lewis, Raymond O.
Linker, Duan W.
Lyons, Thomas W.
*MacMath, Warren E.
*Major, Dale R.
Mallon, Richard J.
Marr, Robert I.
*Martin, James N.
Mason, William A., Jr.
*Mayo, Wallace
McBride, John E.
McCabe, John C.
McDonald, William M.
McKeever, James E. M.
McLane, Alpine W.
*McLeod, Daniel D.
Melchor, Jack L.
Melin, Kenneth L.
Melusky, Thomas A.
*Milano, Louis L.
Mills, Jean C.
*Mohl, Edgar V.
Murphy, Francis C.
Murray, Thomas J.
Nagler, Gordon R.
Nelson, Leo W.
Newcomer, Loyd E.
Nolen, Jack L.
Nyarady, Stefan A.
Olmstead, John B.
O'Neal, Bruce A.
O'Shaughnessy, James D.
*Owen, Paul M.
*Parry, John C.
Parry, Loren C.
Pauly, William O.
Perreault, Maurice W.
Peters, Phillip F., Jr.
Peterson, Frank
Putman, Orlin N.
Ragon, George T.
*Rathbun, Robert H.
Reed, Carl W.
Reynolds, George R.
Rinker, Jacob A., Jr.
Robinson, David G.
Rodier, Richard L.
Roe, Philip A.
Rooney, Frederick T.
Rothwell, James G.
Rudd, Norman H.
Ruth, Lloyd D.
Ryan, William J.
Samoluk, Adolph J.
Sandlin, Charles R.
*Saunders, Walton N.
Savage, Jimmie E.
Schley, John B.
Scott, Harry R.
*Scrivner, John E.
*Seydel, Morris M.
Shaw, Vernon R., Jr.
Shew, James E.
Shiers, Richard G.
Simcox, William A.
Simmons, Loyd D.
Slawson, Harry F.
Slezak, Robert W.
Smith, Alwyn, Jr.
Smith, Frederic N.
*Smith, Thomas P., Jr.
Soskey, Norman W.
Stanton, William E.
Steeper, William P.
*Tamburello, Gaspare B.
Telfair, Robert M.
*Thomas, John B., Jr.
Thompson, Bruce R.
Tougas, Eugene J.
Turnbull, Thomas
Tyler, Ellery E.
Udick, Mitchell L.
Van Demark, James L.
Van Valin, Robert D.
Vaught, William J.
Vickery, Arthur E.
Wagner, William H., Jr.
Walker, Frank T.
Wallace, Lawrence A.
Webb, Babe W.
Webb, Charles W.
*Webb, Thomas R.
Welty, Wayne J.
Werlein, Richard O.
West, David D.
*West, Horace B.
Whilden, Adolphus D., Jr.
Whitford, Rhean F.
Wiggins, Thomas J.
Williams, Robert C.
Willis, Avery L.
Wills, James K.
Wilson, Robert G.
Wood, Geoffrey C.
Woollen, William S.
Woolston, John
Wright, John H.
Yakeley, Jay B., Jr.
Young, Richard O.
Zimmerman, Lawrence J.
Abel, William L.
Allen, Bain S.
Allen, James R.
Anderson, Roy F.
Argento, Michael C.
Bedsole, Donald S.
*Bennett, William J., Jr.
Berkley, Kenneth H.
Birdsong, "D" John
Bischof, William W.
Body, Lawrence G.
Boe, Robert O.
Bohner, Earl A., Jr.
Bonner, Minor J.
Brackett, Harry T.
Brems, John H.
*Brooks, William F.
Brown, Jack Jr.
Brunt, Robert R.
*Bush, Reginald I.
Coleman, Yale
*Collins, Earl C.
Collins, Harold A.
Conder, Thomas L., Jr.
Craven, Charles E.
*Cronenwett, Wilson R.
Crosby, Derrill P.
Dacey, Joseph M., Jr.
*Davis, Jack C.
*Dopler, Thomas D.
Dozier, James H.
Eslinger, Robert "H", Jr.
Estes, Leland E., Jr.
Everett, James G.
Fox, Rex R.
Frazier, Holly G.
Free, Frank W.
Galvin, Donald W.
Gano, Paul
Geney, Richard D.
Goetzke, George A., Jr.
Gorman, Raymond
Gossett, Wallace B.
*Ham, Cyril D.
Hanna, John P.
Hanrahan, Arthur L.
Harris, William F.
Henderson, Henry H.
Herbert, Edward D.
Holland, Emmett W.
Hough, Homer H.
Hudson, William O., 2d
Ireland, Warren H.
Johnson, Morris W.
Johnson, Rolland T.
Kelley, Edward T., Jr.
Kennedy, Herbert S.
Koch, John L.
Laubach, Luther W. S.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Loggins, Lloyd D.
Lorentson, Clarence
Lovegrove, Howard C., Jr.
*Madrigan, Fred J.
Mangels, Merritt
*Markham, Richard A.
Marshall, Byron S.
*Mason, Marion A.
Maynard, John A.
McGarvey, James F., Jr.
McLinn, Frank M.
McMahon, Robert S.
Meredith, Joseph C.
Mesloh, Edmund D.
Mingo, John J.
*Morrissey, Vincent M.
Nagel, Harold
Owens, Hayden, Jr.
Panther, James E.
Park, Ernest S.
Parrish, Henry G.
Plunkett, Robert D.
Polk, Mavis X.
Powell, Michael
Probyn, Robert W.
Quinn, George D., Jr.
Rasmussen, Ralph R.
Reeb, Edward L., Jr.
Reinisch, Roland H., Jr.
Rodgers, Lawrence G.
Rudzinski, Russell R.
Ruxton, Robert T., Jr.
Schafersman, Dale A.
Sensenbach, Wilson E.
Smith, Lloyd L.
Smith, James W.
Sorem, Bernard M.
Sotos, George P.
Stern, Albert V.
Stiles, Carl
Strasser, Bruce E.
Stroh, Philip J.
Sumney, Frank F.
Swicord, Henry G., Jr.
Switzer, Leonard T., Jr.
Thompson, Robin D.
Thorndyke, John R.
Tice, John J., III
Toole, John W.
Vader, Robert L.
Van Nuys, John R.

Waite, Sumner R.
Weber, Howard F.
Wells, William C., Jr.
White, Garrett "A," Jr.
Woodham, John F.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Denneen, John P.
Fletcher, Richard H.
Long, Jerome P., Jr.
Smith, Charles H. C.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Krepela, Miles C.
Lamphier, James A.
Brunner, Endre K.
Kahn, Gustav M.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Childs, Donald R.
Goodman, Clifford "S," Jr.
Hallborg, Robert B.
Mackie, Robert W.
Rhodes, Euhlan L.
Stalter, Robert A.
Stubenbord, John G., 3d
Turville, William C.
Ulevitch, Herman
Wight, Bennett A.
Smith, Rutledge F.
Shaul, John F.
Smith, Edward L.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

La Farge, Charles A.
Herlihy, Thomas C.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Coutu, Louis A.
Escoffier, Edward L.
Frampton, Woodley E.
Hoard, Douglas H.
Neel, Daniel O.
Willis, Enos H.
Conkling, Harold E.
Tallent, John B.
Warriner, Charles T. E.
Offinger, Edward M.
Seager, John W.
Stewart, Fred B.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Anderson, Eugene F., Jr.
Anderson, Louis E., Jr.
Armstrong, William S.
Baldwin, Frank E.
Ball, Stuart M.
Beckham, John J.
Bennett, Donald E.
Borst, Maurice A.
Brown, Richard W.
Buchanan, Richard W.
Burrus, Elgie L.
Butler, Louis D.
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.
Chase, Richard H.
Clifford, George M., Jr.
Clothier, Jay "B"
Cohn, Murry
Connor, John J., Jr.
Coulter, Preston H.
Crawford, Grover W.
Crook, Lewis J.
Danko, John J.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
De Young, Warren R.
Earle, John B., Jr.
Elmore, John W.
Esperseth, Arnold C.
Farley, William B.
Gallup, Mearl
Graham, Stephen G.
Gregory, Robert J.
Griffin, Cecil L.
Grimsley, Geleter
Grinstead, Eugene A.
Gruenberg, Robert P.
Gunnerfeldt, Oscar R.
Hackenson, Bernard J.
Hagenbach, Eugene G.
Halley, Harry J.
Hamblen, Eunice A.
Hansen, Henry I.
Hanson, Harvey E.
Hanson, Clifford A.
Henn, Carl L., Jr.
Herrick, Daniel K.
Hurley, Robert E.
Jones, Rodney G.
Jones, Thomas W.
Kimrey, Delbert R.
Kosky, Walter H.
Lanes, Earl V.
Lohman, Frank J.
Maiman, Elmer J.
McCabe, Robert T.
McGill, Willie L.
McVoy, Richard E.
Moore, Alvin
Moore, Hoye D.
Mullenmeister, William J.
Murray, Eugene I.
Nimick, David A.
Nistle, Kenyon G.
Olson, Robert S.
Pehrson, Winfield O.
Perry, William A.
Philbrick, Herman L.
Purdy, Delbert C.
Pyle, John C.
Rainey, Keith A.
Reese, Lawrence W.
Ross, Clay M.
Rutherford, Francis C.
Scaturro, Albert V.
Seltzer, George S., Jr.
Sharpe, Russell W.
Shea, Francis E.
Simone, Frank A.
Smith, Joseph F.
Snyder, William J.
Soeffker, Donald P.
Speed, Donald N.
Sterns, Sydney S.
Stevenson, Thomas E.
Sullivan, Daniel F., Jr.
Sylvester, Ralph E.
Thomason, Vernon D.
Tierney, John F.
Toney, Lee E., Jr.
Van Riper, Donald G.
Walker, Richard I.
Watt, Everett P., Jr.
Webster, Robert B.
Wellington, Robert L.
White, Alan J.
Yearick, William A.
Zack, Leonard C.
Arnold, Frank H.
Avellone, Francis P.
Bailey, Edward F.
Beall, Madison L.
Beckner, Bruce A.
Bellew, Michael F. X.
Benson, John A.
Blank, Arthur E.
Brown, Richard G.
Bush, George A.
Chadbourne, Merle J.
Colby, Arden K.
Ellis, John T., Jr.
Farrell, Martin C.
Fett, Kenneth R.
Flicker, Richard H.
Foster, Thomas E., Jr.
Futral, Herschel E., Jr.
Gaver, Harry L.
Gilbert, William O.
Goodpasture, John W.
Grimm, James K., Jr.
Hancock, Robert E., Jr.
Hazen, Ralph E.
Hirsch, Henry H.
Hobbs, Junius P.
Holbrook, Philip B.
Irwin, Harry E.
Jones, John M. O.
Koe, Robert E.
Kovar, Isadore M.
Kowalick, Donald F.
Kriz, Frank J.
Larson, Albert G.
Lascara, Vincent A.
Lindig, Robert H.
Locke, James E.
London, Stanley
Maiden, Robert W.
Marrin, Alfred V. B.
McArdle, Henry R.
McCrory, Wendell
McGourty, Lawrence E.
McKee, Richard N.
Merritt, Tadius T.
Murphy, Robert W.
Nesbit, Daun W.
Paist, John B., Jr.
Patterson, Gerald E.
Paulsen, William N.
Rieseberg, Robert W.
Ristan, Albert G., Jr.
Rogers, Robert E.
Rose, Zephaniah D.
Russell, George D.
Ryan, Robert W.
Serafino, Anthony J., Jr.
Shepardson, Frederic M.
Sherman, Joel H., Jr.
Sigety, Charles E.
Sims, Gerald R.
Sittig, Raymond L.
Swart, Phillip
Taylor, William D.
Thurston, Robert O.
Tirendi, Anthony
Weidman, Donald J.
Wilson, Charles V., Jr.
Worden, Frank N.
Wyborny, David R.
Albea, John P.
Chase, Jeremiah T.
De Puydt, Harold C.
Detwiler, Fred M.
Eckfield, Kenyon C.
Gilmore, Jack D.
Graham, Rupert E.
Halter, Edwin J.
Hanson, Earl J.
Hawkins, Nobel "T"
Hirt, Harry G.
Holtslander, Herman S.
Hopkins, John G.
Hopkins, Warren G.
Johnston, Lloyd E., Jr.
Johnston, Orvel M.
Jordon, Robert L.
Kallimani, Chris G.
Kirby, Daniel W.
Lindsey, Richard A.
Loegel, Paul J.
Louks, Albert F.
MacQuarrie, Harry A.
Maggard, Rolland E.
Martin, James R.
Mataset, Ernest P.
McCloughry, John J., Jr.
McDuffie, Sydney F.
McGlaun, Albert L., Jr.
Meihls, Archie B.
Miller, Benton M.
Morrissey, John E.
Morton, Emery L.
Munyon, Marvin E.
Nichols, Horace E.
Nickson, Roy E.
Nordengren, Frederick R.
Oakes, Robert G.
Rogers, Charles H., Jr.
Saling, Frederick E.
Shepherd, Alfred J.
Sitton, John H., Jr.
Skinner, Robert E.
Smith, Frank W., Jr.
Spangler, Robert M., Jr.
Strasburg, Donald W.
Sylvest, Robert S.
Thayer, Ernest C.
Tillman, James O.
Wadleigh, Robert.
Walsh, Robert J.
Willis, Achille M., Jr.
Woodfin, Kenneth L.
Yarborough, William H.
Beazley, James K.
Bond, Calvin C.
Bordwell, James D.
Bundren, Cecil "E"
Coiner, John S.
Colquhoun, James D.
Cravis, Howard
Fisher, Edward P.
Garner, Eugene C., Jr.
Hughes, Thomas W., Jr.
Hutchison, James L.
Iampietro, Philip V.
Kilcourse, William R.
La Plante, Robert W.
Mann, Murrell
Melville, Robert E.
Meyer, Cyril E.
Meyer, Milton
Poor, John L.
Powell, Robert F.
Rybakoff, George
Schopfer, Louis H.
Schutt, Richard C.
Sessions, Milton F.
Smith, Howard W.
Smith, Theodore L.
Stringer, Carl J., Jr.
Sulcer, Robert L.
Turke, Joseph G.
Unkrur, Arthur T.
Wieseke, Edward M.
Zuefeldt, Roy H.

The following-named officers to the ranks and grades indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

CHAPLAIN WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Hagen, John F.

ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bentley, Philip C.
Boyer, Arthur C.
Brink, Frederick W.
Brooks, William E., Jr.
Budd, Allen C.
Dunn, Will-Matthis
Eckard, Glenn S.
Elwood, Carl
Fenstermacher, Harry F.
Ford, Edmund J.
Harrison, Robert M.
Heyl, Richard P.
Holmes, Norman B.
Horvath, Stephen G.
Hunter, Jackson D.
Jacobson, Erling R.
Kennedy, Deane W.
Markley, John H.
Meginniss, Benjamin A., Jr.
Miller, Ernest D.
Noce, William S.
Phillips, Lawrence R.
Reeves, George P.
Reilly, Thomas H.
Thomas, George E.
Wickham, Faber H.
Lang, Robert F.
Marley, Cecil V.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Brown, Wallace M.
Cain, John H.
Flaherty, Paul V.
Forbess, Ordis E.
Grubb, Clarence A.
Jackson, Norman M.
Lyon, James E.
Meeks, Arthur F.
Meyer, George M.
Nelson, Martin R.
Pyles, LaVern, Jr.
Stewart, Robert S.
Turnblacer, Charles R.
Beaman, James H.
Beck, Joseph F.
Blair, Charles P., Jr.
Martinsen, Norman M.
Neumann, Arthur C.
Corradi, Peter
Davis, Wendell G.
Hill, Roland D.
Scarpa, Ernest J.
Taylor, Harold I., Jr.
Treber, William O.
Graff, Charles W.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Barrett, John H.
Bayman, Charles R.
Briggs, Leroy F.
Burkman, Eugene E.
Check, Kenneth G.
Chloupek, Carl C.
Clendenen, Frank B.
Colbert, Raymond D.
Hokenson, Lynn N.
Holmlund, John C.
Koonce, Stephen J.
Lorenz, William F.
Lynch, Thomas J.
Moore, Charles G., Jr.
Morgan, Joseph E.
Petersen, John H.
Powell, Joseph E.
Sirkel, Ferdinand A.
Vanleer, Blake W.
Ward, Howard T.
Williams, Herbert C.
Dalton, Donald F.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Zak, Herbert B.
Henderson, John D., Jr.
Naylon, Henry E.
Neal, John P.
Reid, John W.
Anderson, Robert A.
Entriken, Fred "D"
Fernandez, Sergio
Kailer, Charles E.
Kaires, Anthony K.
Kubalek, Milo V.
Nickell, Raymond O.
Pfeiffer, Kenneth R.
Via, William F., Jr.
Wilde, Leslie E.
Wood, Max G.
Woodford, John U.

The following-named officers to the ranks of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Alexander, Clifford F.
Armstrong, William O.
Arthur, Earl Z.
Beaty, Chancy B.
Boggs, Carl E.
Brehm, Raymond
Brown, Robert J.
Buccini, Albert
Cagle, Johnie M.
Campbell, Hugh L.
Carter, Allen E.
Chastain, Orvia, L.
Clarkson, Junius J.
Cozad, Richard C. J.
Davis, Carl, Jr.
Davis, Charles H.
Davis, Elbert L.
Deal, John A.
Dixon, Ray V.
Doughty, Levi G.
Doyle, George N.
Emerson, Ralph W.
Farley, Floyd E.
Forkner, Charles A.

Garvey, Vardy D.
Gibson, Harold G.
Gleason, Carl T.
Gooden, Harold H.
Gore, William J.
Grey, George S.
Hansen, Hans P.
Hardin, Kermitt C.
Harvey, Chester L.
Hatchell, Edward "G"
Hitch, William R.
Hughes, Boyd D.
Hughson, Robert M.
Irby, Frederick G.
Jaeger, Martin J.
Jones, Alva J.
Judd, Roy L.
Kemmerer, Carl E.
Kimes, Leonard E.
Kollert, John H., Jr.
Kotsmith, Chester M.
Lees, James S.
Leinen, Irving M.
Leonhard, John S.
Lewandowski, Stanley J.
Lovejoy, John J.
Macgill, Harry L.
Malayter, John S.
McKissick, Ellis H.
Moritz, Jack T.
Nelson, Edward J.
Newey, Daniel
Norconk, John T.
Norwood, Alfred F.
Ohmart, Waldo P.
Orr, Stanley C.
Parrott, Merle F.
Parsons, James C.
Phalan, Robert A., Jr.
Raney, Chester O.
Reynolds, Roy A.
Rightmeyer, Harry H.
Rueber, Gerhardt W.
Samford, Kenneth L.
Sanders, Russell L.
Saylor, John B.
Shannon, Robert C.
Siebenthal, Stanley A.
Sigleer, Harry L.
Smith, Lawrence R.
Sommers, Clarence G.
Stephens, Leonard D.
Stuart, "L" "V"
Taylor, Sydney E.
Thurman, Robert K.
Toczko, Edward A.
Troike, John R.
Tufts, Charles
Turner, John R., Jr.
Tyndall, Luther L.
Valentine, Stacy C.
Watkins, James C.
Wells, Bruce B.
White, Lloyd R.
Willett, Raymond F.
Wilson, James C.
Wood, Louis E.
Wortley, Edmund L.
Byron, Walter
Dunbar, Carl F.
Habecker, Ralph H.
Lear, Charles B.
May, Elner A.
McCullar, Cecil H.
McGrath, Bob J.
Melohusky, Adam W.
Allen, Orval F.
Avery, Ellsworth C.
Bishop, William D.
Brandenburg, Charles W.
Brennan, Francis J.
Carlson, Elmer
Chatelain, Gurley P.
Cornetta, Martin V.
Craft, William P., Jr.
Craig, Charles E.
Dickerman, Ralph D.
Dorr, Theodore P.
Gandolfi, Peter F.
Gilmour, Robert, Jr.
Ginther, Roy L.
Grayson, William T.
Hilliard, Ralph E.
Homer, Vernon L., Sr.
Hoover, Clarence P.
Howard, William M.
Ingalls, Lawrence E.
Israel, Alfred C.
Jones, Robert "E" L.
Kisak, Valdimir
Leidholdt. Edwin M.
MacPherson, Walter R.
Madison, Wilbert W.
Malone, William C.
Maloney, James D.
McDonald, Walter B.
McWeeny, Jack D.
Merritt, Clinton J.
Messick, Harry J.
Metzger, John K.
Miller, Eben M.
Morley, William E.
Mundy, Kenneth A.
Musto, Vincent P.
Norris, Alfred R.
O'Brien, Robert L.
Phelps, Jack E.
Shanan, Neil G.
Sokulski, Stanley A.
Spear, Russell G.
Steger, Gordon E.
Stein, William V.
Sweet, William B.
Taylor, Robert W.
Terrio, James V.
Vautrot, Joseph E.
Walker, John B.
Wheeler, Robert I.
Wilson, Louis A.
Collins, Wilson L.
Peirano, James H.
Rhea, Charles K.

CHIEF GUNNERS

Anderson, Harry K.
Arnold, Patrick H.
Ault, Robert F.
Bird, Leroy A.
Black, Bruce L.
Carter, Clyde L.
Carter, Robert M.
Chambers, Milton W.
Cravens, Eugene D.
Dyrdahl, William "A"
Edwards, Berkeley C.
Hawkins, Victor N.
Herndon, George W.
Hoag, William F., Jr.
Holland, Donald V.
Justus, Fowler H.
Moore, Hugh
Scruggs, Franlk R.
Selby, Robert S.
Stewart, John S.
Szikney, Alphonse J.
Wilson, Vernon
Williams, Edward B.
Baczenski, Frank J.
Beall, Thomas H.
De Forest, Don C.
Forman, Robert N.
Griesbach, Gustave P.
Post, Walter E., Jr.
Punch, Robert P.
Wright, Robert R.

CHIEF TORPEDOMEN

Ahman, John C.
Darnell, Jesse R.
Farrow, Francis A.
Owen, Howard J.
Stewart, Russell G.
Beck, William H.
Fooshe, Thomas R., Jr.
Hudson, Ray G.
Curtis, Kenneth G.
Theiss, Charles L.

CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Allaire, David G.
Barbee, James W.
Beland, John
Bence, Paul
Biggers, Charlie C.
Biszmaier, Harry I.
Brown, Forest L.
Brunson, Leighton J.
Caldwell, Elmer U.
Capece, Edmund C.
Coleman, Lawrence W.
Comer, Paul R.
Daw, Hubert A.
Dunlop, Kenneth
Goodwin, Raymond J.
Guhl, Eldon L.
Haines, Lawrence I.
Hill, Edward L.
Horn, Carl G.
Howell, Roy A.
Hutchinson, Thomas F.
Jennings, Lee R.
Kline, Robert L.
Kohler, Hugo F.
Larose, Edgar H.
Maier, Charles W.
Marfleet, Albert H.
McCool, Francis H.
Mongelli, Frank C.
Oakley, Francis M.
Ramsey, Ira B.
Robinson, Guy W.
Schmidt, Edward M.
Sexton, Thomas J.
Stevens, Elvin L.
Striplin, William E.
Sullivan, James T.
Sylvester, Clyde W.
Tiara, Joseph B.
Twiss, Ernest B.
Tyler, Robert E.
Wallace, Johnny L.
Walton, Merle W.
White, Ray C.
Williams, Paul H.
Winey, Roy C.
Angleton, Joseph M.
Brice, Robert C.
Corbus, Claude L.
Felkins, Loren E.
Grimes, Joe W.
Gysi, John G.
Hatch, Ellsworth K.
Head, Gordon H.
Keys, Stuart D.
King, Chauncey B.
Kruetzfeldt, Herman B.
Linn, Ray S.
Mahaffey, Clarke R.
Near, Jesse L.
Nisbet, William P.
Nolan, Michael A.
Scheibeler, Otis L.
Steenman, Oliver F.
Toney, Edgar W.
Vanderbur, Vern T.
Wingo, Leonard A.
Wood, Jesse V.
Collier, John M.
Crownover, Edgar P.
Ellis, William A., Jr.
Immich, Francis C.
Middag, Ronald R.
Strouhal, Joseph A.
Beason, Darrell E.
Van Horn, Edward

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Alexander, Murry C.
Burton, James B.
Chrupcala, William J.
Coughlin, Leo R.
Deremigio, Dominic
Dunton, Donald D.
Gibb, Donald W.
Hair, Kirby
Momberg, Vernon B.
Myers, William A.
Poole, Henry B., Jr.
Rakaczky, Andrew F.
Rauber, Carl A.
Schweizer, Earl G.
Smith, Paul A.
Suggs, Charles L.
Wirsing, Paul J.
Anderson, Ralph H.
Blakely, Robert G.
Blasco, Vincent G.
Busby, Henry R.
Carmichael, Kenneth E.
Crews, Ellis P.
Davis, Earl W.
Fowlkes, Everette G.
Garretty, Ned A.
Goudy, David E.
Greksouk, John
Grimkowski, Chester S.
Haines, George E.
Harriman, Russell G.
Herman, Charles F.
Herman, George K.
Jackson, Donald C., Jr.
Jenkins, William E.
Johnson, Julius M.
Kisner, Homer L.
Klouck, Charles H.
Langland, Robert G.
McCotter, Roy W.
McDonald, Francis O.
McKee, Gaddis G.
Mitchell, Ralph
Monroe, "A" "L", Jr.
Noel, Wally H.
Olson, Joseph C.
Partis, George
Reynolds, Herbert E.
Seene, Jacob, Jr.
Tennant, John A.
Turner, Maurice R.
Verburg, Edwin D.
Walker, Charles H.
Watts, Lowell A.
Zielke, Clarence J.
Bolster, Keith A.
Boucher, Ausborn L.
Cain, Howard A.
Cherok, Nicholas
Crandall, Walter R.
Crumbaugh, Fred R., Jr.
Estes, Frank E.
Fuller, Joseph D.
Gamble, William J.
Geringer, Walter H.
Gill, Fred S.
Gillenwater, Thurston M.
Gmyr, Walter A.
Hall, Paul H.
Hindes, Donald L.
Johnson, William R.
Jones, John M.
Kile, Richard L.
Konko, William F.
Madsen, Wilbur C.
McAnn, James L.
McLane, Albert R.
McVay, Harley V.
Martin, Clarence R.
Merrill, Frank F.
Moore, La Vern C.
Moran, Franklin D.
Norwood, Carroll H.
Olson, Gilbert W.
Ott, Casper D.
Payne, Harley A.
Perkins, James J.
Petranek, Jerry J.
Powers, Lester A.
Pruess, Verlen E.
Scallorn, Cecil D.
Schmitt, Carl H.
Skinner, Walter L.
Stokely, George D.
Terry, Charles F.
Vermillion, Burke S.
Vernon, Lee H.
Wangsnes, Erling
Weixler, Herman J.
Wellemeyer, Herbert A.
Williams, Franklyn M., 3d
Willis, Harold R.
Winfree, Boyd E.
Besancon, Victor C.
Muenich, Gustav J.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Adams, William R.
Allen, Charles C.
Arthur, "A" "T"
Bager, Thomas E.
Baker, Russell B.
Baldock, Kenneth R.
Ballauf, Charles
Bartens, Charles F.
Barth, George T.
Bartlett, Edwin C.
Battin, Franklin V.
Berry, Lamar S.
Berry, Reuben W.
Betcher, Arnold E.
Beverage, Harry P.
Bidwell, Robert F.
Bilderback, Arthur H.
Bowman, Harlan L.
Brewster, Charles E.
Bronson, Earl D.
Brooks, Cecil T.
Brothers, George
Brown, Maurice E.
Brugman, Nels E.
Brzostek, Bernard F.
Buehlman, Joseph
Burns, Lloyd R.
Butlak, John J.
Cade, Howell A.
Calzone, Frank C.
Carmody, Edward A.
Carruth, Edward N.
Carter, Lester D.
Casey, Garland
Chambless, William H.
Chapman, Orville C
Chapter, Andrew J.
Clunie, John E.
Coffin, Granville F.
Commons, Norbert A.
Cooley, Wayne D.
Crossley, Woodrow D.
Crutchfield, Edgar J. O.
Daras, Steven
Davenport, Aaron M.
Davis, Darrell D.
Dawson, William S.
De Luca, Joseph D.
Denman, Justin D.
Dennis, Johnnie C.
Dennis, Michael P.
de Stackelberg, Richard
Dexter, Lloyd D.
Dice, Paul H.
D'Moch, Telofil
Dodge, James D.
Donnell, George G.
Drott, William L.
Du Bois, Philip C.
Dullaghan, John C., Jr.
Duncan, Norman V.
Dunwoody, Jesse W.
Dyer, James M.
Earhart, Hugh L., Jr.
Eirich, Norman C.
Eschmann, Walter H.
Esders, Wilhelm G.
Fauber, Robert S.
Feiser, Milo C.
Fish, Norris L.
Flynn, Leo A.
Forcier, Eudore A.
Fox, George L.
Franklin, Jesse W., Jr.
Franklin, Laron S.
Gibson, Oren "E"
Gilbert, Eugene C., Jr.
Gillissie, John G.
Good, Clarence W.
Haas, Walter H.
Halentic, Walter M.
Haley, Warren J.
Hall, Fred M.
Hamilton, George T.
Hantsche, Edgar M.
Harvey, Newell L.
Hastings, Harold "E"
Heist, James S.
Herdry, David
Herzig, Leroy L.
Hess, Ernest B.
Hober, Wilbur L.
Hoffman, Laurence N.
Hoover, William L.
Horn, Leslie E.
Horner, Spencer W., Jr.
Hough, Fred R.
Huffman, Chester A.
Huffman, Landon W.
Hughey, John P.
Hunter, "C" "T"
Ishie, Everett E.
Jackman, Carl S.
Jernigan, Ervan L.
Johnson, Karl H.
Johnson, Melverne E.
Jones, Elmer "S"
Kaiser, Wayne L.
Keith, Omar F.
Keith, Paul E.
Keizur, Ernest T.
Kenney, Edward J.
Keogh, John D.
Kiefer, Francis C.
Kilcoyne, Francis J.
Klein, Irvin J.
Knowles, Lloyd C.
Koski, George W., Jr.
Kraft, John D.
Kraft, Lester
Krancevich, Vito
Krogstad, Orril E.
Kullberg, Cecil L.
Kurz, William
Lafferty, John C.
Larson, Lief I.
Layne, Charles W.
LeCompte, Melville
Leidhold, Charles G., Jr.
Le Mons, Joseph L.
Lewis, William H.
Liechty, Dave A.
Lightle, Herbert N.
Lollar, Samuel R.
Loper, Roland L.
Luke, Manuel
Lyles, Glenn E.
Lynn, Ira T.
Malone, Roy B.
Manning, James H.
Mansfield, Wesson A.
Marietta, Wayne C.
Marshall, Robert W.
Mathews, John R.
Maynard, Lawrence P.
McCoy, Dale M.
McLain, Martin E.
McTigue, James T.
Miller, Irving E.
Minkler, William A.
Moore, James D.
Morgan, Chauncey J.
Morgan, Lindsay E.
Moore, George W.
Moore, Lee R.
Morris, James E.
Mudgett, Leon P.
Mulligan, Champ C.
Mulvey, James G.

Murray, Hoseia J.
Muse, Lowell H.
Myers, John W.
Myers, Oscar W.
Nalley, Joseph C.
Nemeth, Stephen J.
Niebuhr, Elmer E.
Nielsen, Byron O.
Nolde, Robert R.
Pattee, Richard M.
Peterson, James C.
Philipsen, Henry H.
Pitsenberger, Guy L.
Plecker, Owen
Pohl, Richard A.
Proctor, Charles R.
Rhoades, Donald J.
Riggs, Virgil
Ripley, Ormel F.
Roller, Donald T.
Roop, David A.
Rosenkoetter, Amos L.
Rothermel, Carroll W.
Rucker, Raymond
Schaefer, Elmer H.
Schiller, Richard L.
Schnurbusch, Thomas W.
Schuler, Elwood C.
Shripka, Harold F.
Simpson, Harold M., Jr.
Sims, Larue E.
Slosser, Daniel J.
Slusser, Arthur H., Jr.
Smith, Maurice R.
Sonner, Harry M.
Southland, Johannes
Spike, Torrance G.
Spilker, Harold F.
Squares, Irvine G.
Stafford, Edgar
Stagner, Robert T., Jr.
Steele, Arthur W.
Steele, James H.
Steeves, Harold M.
Stegall, Robert L.
Stempski, Henry J.
Stensler, Gustave G. M.
Strauss, Stuart
Sullivan, Harry Q.
Symons, Earl K.
Thomas, Alfred J.
Thomas, Harmon R., Jr.
Thompson, Lewis E., Jr.
Thompson, Dale "J"
Thornton, Robert L.
Thorp, David S.
Timmerman, John T.
Van Vleet, Carroll
Tucker, Edward C.
Tuckett, Horace E.
Tull, Frank H.
Turnauer, Joseph
Turner, Roger M.
Vroman, Earl E.
Weaver, Wallace S.
Wilson, Victor E.
Wood, Ollin L.
Woollums, Calvin W.
Worthington, Lloyd "B"
Wreath, Clarence F.
Wright, Louis W.
Wright, Richard E.
Yuhas, Charles
Baldwin, Algia M.
Barr, Charles J.
Beattie, Robert E.
Biangardi, Queady
Casterline, Robert E.

Ducoing, William F.
Du Moulin, John L.
Howard, John J.
Kerrell, Joseph H.
Lamb, Russel I.
Lorenz, John
McCann, Edward F.
Oldham, Herron
Perry, Kenneth A.
Robinson, Stanley J.
Siran, John M.
Smith, Russell D.
Timmerman, Claude E.
West, Cleevie B.
Armstrong, Herbert D.
Berning, Raymond A.
Bodes, Henry M.
Boomer, Grattan C.
Cheesman, Percy E.
Coughlin, William H.
Crosnoe, Robert E.
Cross, Lloyd G.
Culp, Robert S.
Dotzenrod, Edwin M.
Dye, Howard W.
Ertle, Leon S.
Foster, Alfred L.
Gallagher, Bernard F.
Gant, Allen C.
Gasparovic, Paul J.
Geer, Norman L.
Hall, William D.
Harnagel, Harvey H.
Higginbotham, John T.
Hiller, William C.
Hnatek, John, Jr.
Ingalls, James W.
James, Joseph H.
Jones, Jack
Kroes, Willy
McCown, Walter
Oliver, Allen
Orand, Elden D.
Otterline, Louis G.
Penrose, Robert A.
Phillips, Orville H.
Pierce, Robert M.
Pierrepont, Raymond H., Jr.
Pierson, William H.
Pizzuto, Patrick C.
Platt, Lester E.
Poole, Nathaniel
Pritzos, Michael "M"
Rank, Standlee L.
Reid, Clarence B.
Richardson, Herald E.
Riise, Morris M.
Rogers, Lloyd E.
Rooksberry, Marion C.
Sarris, Frank J.
Schirmer, Joseph E.
Schmalfeldt, Victor A.
Schmitz, Harold A.
Scholer, Frederick W.
Searfoss, Robert D.
Skonberg, Albert W.
Smith, Homer L.
Strong, Frederick L.
Taylor, Kenneth D.
Treiber, Franklin A. E.
Troyner, Joseph
Tuenge, Otto A., Jr.
Turman, James P.
Van Kirk, William C.
Virostko, Joseph P.
Wilcox, Romeo E.
Willman, Clyde A.
Wimbush, Wilfred
Brewington, William I.
Dobson, Lawrence J.
Jones, Jack J.
Reed, Rollin M.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Aufdenspring, John W.
Bagley, Amos "D"
Barden, John W.
Barrow, William E.
Berube, Herve J.
Boeck, Edward W.
Bonham, John W., Jr.
Burns, Robert
Calaghan, Robert W.
Carter, James C.
Chetwynd, Charles B.
Coder, Jay L.
Eszenyi, Stephen J.
Fedzyshyn, Michael
Fowlkes, Hubert A.
Gambill, Maurice A.
Griffin, Lee R.
Howard, Marcus N.
Huettel, Roy E.
Johnson, Edward L.
Kean, Donald T.
Kelso, Stanley J.
La Bouy, Robert P.
Langhoff, Walter H.
Margolies, Lyonel V.
McConnell, Ralph E.
Morris, Warden T.
Murphy, Joseph M.
Nelsen, Norman
Page, John M.
Parker, Alvin D.
Phelan, Robert P.
Pieper, Charles P.
Pinkos, Stanislaus J.
Quinlan, O'Neill P.
Rich, Edwin R.
Shamburg, John N.
Shelton, Edward L.
Skranski, John
Slick, Harold H.
Tellin, Raymond C.
Ulen, Fred "M"
White, Henry E.
Whittaker, Edward S.
Wood, Samuel H.
Wosnick, Walter P.
Billman, Rayman H.
Bonham, Milo W.
Duensser, John G.
Dusch, Robert A.
Lang, George W.
Miller, John F.
Toland, Clyde H.
Yuzakewich, Alfred J.
Carlson, Allan R.
Fifield, Everett H.
Hann, Edward N.
Aulenbauch, Anthony R.
Baker, Sharitt E.
Blair, Loren E.
Brown, Charles N.
Cheater, Earl S.
Cortese, Frank
French, Edward M.
Johnson, Kenneth C.
Kees, Galen D.
Kidder, Francis R.
Lemmon, William R.
Meehan, James W.
Moore, William A.
Potts, William H., Jr.
Powell, Horace H.
Preist, Dean W.
Skjaret, Jalmer H.
Sliger, Walter E.
Smith, Howard K.

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERKS

Ames, Edward G.
Arthur, John C.
Bair, Edward S.
Barry, Clarence J.
Bergquist, Alvin C.
Blyth, Robert D.
Bonnell, Edgar O.
Borowski, Arthur A.
Brewer, Sam H., Jr.
Chinn, Donald T.
Cole, Henry L.
Craig, Byron D.
Dreiling, Elmer E.
Eaton, Arthur H. M.
Falcone, Ralph E.
Garrett, Francis P.
Goodenough, Roscoe D.
Hatcher, John R.
Hoey, Ellison F.
Holland, Kenneth W.
Holmes, Clifford S.
Horn, Glenn J.
Javins, Robert P.
Johnson, Walter H.
Jones, Ben G., Jr.
Kayser, William J.
Keck, William D.
Kole, Carl B.
Kolisek, John C.
Korn, Ralph E.
Lareau, Charles E.
Lasky, Edward
Lasseter, Donald
Lee, Haman L.
Mancini, Emidio
McClellan, William G.
McGuire, Herbert W.
Meek, Vern
Misilicky, Roman G.
Murray, Walter F.
Napolitano, Tony
Nelson, Willie R.
Paige, Lennon T.
Plowden, James E., Jr.
Pritchett, Glen F.
Rhinehart, Edwin A.
Rice, Leslie B.
Richardson, Kenneth
Rorie, Durwood G.
Rothlisberger, Marche
Rulla, William H.
Saunders, Stephen I., Jr.
Seeberg, Reuben
Stone, Donald D.
Taber, Noble L.
Taylor, Grover W.
Thompson, Edward F.
Tomlinson, Leslie L.
Turansky, Louis
Wellons, William I., Jr.
Wesson, Thomas P.
White, Jack E.
Wilson, Robert E.
Wray, Dudley C.
Terry, Paul A.

CHIEF AEROGRAPHERS

Bliss, "T" J.
Herold, Charles C.
Kimberley, Harold L.
Smith, Richard E.
Barron, Charles R.
Erwin, Mason O.
Halloran, Louis P.
Olson, Engwall A.
Omang, Boyd A.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHERS

Barton, Blake M.
Bufkin, Ellis H.
Dougan, George M.
Griffin, James T.
Hansen, Peter A.
Herring, Charles C.
Miller, Peter S.
Rundall, Paul S.
Timm, Richard C.
Trahan, James J.
Carpenter, Theodore J.
Halverson, Richard L.
Stuart, James T.
Toth, John P.

CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Allers, Paul L.
Amick, Lester E.
Andersen, Albert L.
Ball, Gilbert R.
Ballard, Elmer L.
Banks, Guy L.
Bauer, Albert
Boyd, Robert H.
Bray, Harrison W.
Breathwit, William A.
Brooks, Lawrence W.
Carpenter, Alvie R.
Christensen, Charles H.
Clark, Lemuel J.
Colt, Herbert W.
Cottini, Frank P.
Dominguez, Edward
Dooley, Francis H.
Duane, Joseph P.
Dunn, Paul K.
Durham, Earl R.
Dutcher, Clinton H.
Edge, Cary O.
Edington, Benjimen F., Jr.
Flournoy, Milton C.
Fowler, Thomas G.
Gajdostik, Joseph A.
Garton, Thomas
Garverick, Charles K.
Gauthier, Leon A.
Giles, Russell H.
Gooden, Donald R.
Gray, Martin E.
Green, Clifford F.
Green, Russell E.
Griffin, James F.
Griffith, James H.
Hall, "G" S.
Hall, Howard C.
Heitz, Clarence H., Jr.
Herman, Joseph E.
Hillpot, Joseph D.
Hughes, John A., Jr.
Hutchcraft, James R.
Jackson, Elwood G.
Jarrett, Elma T.
Johnson, Frank C.
Jones, Charles D.
Kadow, Eugene V.
Kalvass, Edward P.
Kelly, James D.
Kenney, Allen W.
King, Ira V.
Klostermann, Wolfgang E.
Koepke, Milton E.
Kolodziej, John C.
Lay, Leo M.
Lee, Arve
Lenz, Sylvan E.
Lewis, Shelley "L"
Lipes, Wheeler B.
Marcello, James, Jr.
May, John F.
Mayville, Howard H.
McDaniel, James E.
Mendrala, Emanuel
Mercer, Lyle R.
Mickey, John M.
Mikus, Donald G.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Mitchell, Harrison D.
Moore, James K.
Murphy, Clarence A.
Nance, Russell S.
Parks, Henry B.
Parsons, John W.
Reese, William A.
Rentz, James F.
Rice, Jay W.
Roe, Theron J.
Russell, Raymond E.
Rustad, George A.
Ryn, Eugene C.
Sarver, Armel R.
Shepherd, Newell
Spotts, George W.
Stewart, Fred E.
Stuart, Clarence B.
Taylor, Andrew A.
Teague, Cecil
Tharp, Smith
Thorsell, George E.
Vezetinski, Anthony J.
Vitlip, Joseph J.
Vliet, Russell G.
Walker, Charles H.
Weaver, Richard H.
Willis, Paul K.
Windham, Woodrow D.
Woelfle, George C
Wolfe, Troy E.
Atwood, Eugene E.
Barrett, Howard A.
Brofft, Beltran F.
Cason, Claude C.
Cox, Harold L.
Dowler, Frank E.
Edlin, Robert A.
Flynn, Francis H.
Fry, Adam C.
Hunt, John H.
Logsdon, Ronald O.
Lomax, Jack I.
McDonald, James T., Jr.
Nagle, Carl M.
Stauffer, Frederick H.
Sylvester, Opal
Tipton, Stewart P.
Whitt, Malgum E.
Woodard, Hugh E.
Alfred, Harold D.
Duke, Clinton H.
Ferdinand, Stephen A.
Fields, Robert C.
Garrett, George P.
Gray, Adrow
Grover, Ernest N.
Haines, Orval G.
Hall, Lewis J.
Harvey, Cecil R.
Johnson, Arthur E.
Johnson, Kenneth L.
Johnson, Thurman G.
Judkins, Woodrow W.
Keyt, Edwin B., Jr.
Kuziara, William
Lembeck, Arthur C.
Lovell, Will D.
MacDonough, Robert S.
May, Jack S.
Moore, Jack F.
Moore, Thomas O.
Ogborn, Harold E.
Parker, Austin T.
Parker, James H.
Pearre, Charles T.
Petrusky, Martin, Jr.
Pierce, George F.
Pitzer, William B.
Sanders, Ernest
Scheurer, Donald B.
Snider, Herbert H.
Sontag, Frank B.
Tidwell, Herman B.
Coffelt, Desmond W.
MacBain, Arthur G.

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Anderson, John A.
Bauch, Theodore
Benjamin, Frank E.
Bishop, Ralph E.
Bordwell, James D.
Bradley, Charles J.
Bussey, Joseph O.
Conley, Howard F.
Cornwell, Raymond H.
Downs, Leonard D.
Fluke, Sidney E.
Gaffney, Robert E.
Gottschall, Levi T.
Harper, John G.
Johnson, Eddie M.
Johnson, George A.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Raymond
Keesee, Page N.
Kelley, Ray V.
Knight, Ernest C.
Leblanc, Harold
Lott, George
Mandeville, Don C.
Miller, Joe R.
Morgan, Joseph A.
Morgan, Marson W.
Mosley, William J.

Muzleski, Vincent J.	Tobin, Thomas J.
Norfolk, Samuel, Jr.	Walsh, Stephen J.
Oberg, Edgar, G. R.	Wells, John L., Jr.
Osteem, Haskell A.	Wheless, William A.
Penick, James L.	White, Luther N.
Pierson, Percy A.	Whitney, William R.
Pomel, Austin B.	Wiley, Everett B.
Ragsdale, Carl "M"	Williams, Harold J.
Schirmer, August A., Jr.	Wilson, Leslie D., Jr.
Schwarz, Robert J.	Wood, Charles "J"
Shimer, Harold J.	Wood, Clarence S.
Simpson, James F.	Wright, William H.
Skapin, Jack J.	Armlin, James F.
Slattery, John G.	Brown, Chester F.
Statia, William W.	Burk, John
Stephens, Thomas I.	Davis, James A.
Stohler, Homer R.	Girard, Leo P.
Stone, Robert S.	Hart, Samuel S.
Suarez, Cecil	Poole, Ray I.
Thomas, Martin K.	Rodgers, Ray L.
Thompson, Woodrow W.	Skillman, Edgar H., Jr.
	Stine, Philip A. P.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Edmund S. Stallworth, Beatrice, Ala., in place of J. A. Sanders, transferred.

ARKANSAS

Luther P. Gentry, Mayflower, Ark., in place J. T. Shilling, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Gerhard Wipf, Farmersville, Calif., in place E. M. Baize, resigned.

John F. Buchholz, Three Rivers, Calif., in place of N. A. Britten, resigned.

GEORGIA

Calvin C. Ray, Arlington, Ga., in place of R. R. Powell, deceased.

IDAHO

Marvin F. Crockett, Bliss, Idaho, in place of G. D. McIntosh, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Mary E. McCarl, Kinderhook, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George A. Brown, Mahomet, Ill., in place of Daisy Miller, resigned.

INDIANA

Carl C. Biedenkopf, Grand View, Ind., in place of F. H. Banks, transferred.

Sophia A. Emme, Harlan, Ind., in place of W. E. James, deceased.

Ruth M. Slevin, Nineveh, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KENTUCKY

Earl J. Lovitt, Highsplint, Ky., in place of C. H. Jones, deceased.

MAINE

William B. French, Andover, Maine, in place of C. L. Ripley, resigned.

Doretha C. Bridgham, Jonesboro, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Donald W. McIntire, Weld, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Harvey G. Allen, Hubbardston, Mich., in place of R. M. McGinn, resigned.

Elgie R. Hanna, LaSalle, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Agnes M. Regan, Negaunee, Mich., in place of Peter Trudell, Jr., retired.

MINNESOTA

Hildur C. Berg, Marble, Minn., in place of C. E. McAlpine, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Helen D. Burbridge, Alligator, Miss., in place of R. W. Burton, retired.

Thomas E. Holland, Oakland, Miss., in place of Carson Hughes, retired.

MONTANA

Roy Wayne Willis, Laurel, Mont., in place of R. A. Nutting, resigned.

NEVADA

Mildred I. Stephens, North Las Vegas, Nev., in place of M. C. Batty, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Harry L. Willits, Beach Haven, N. J., in place of A. C. King, resigned.

Kathryn W. Haines, Browns Mills, N. J., in place of Delbert Bush, resigned.

W. Campbell Harris, Mountain Lakes, N. J., in place of C. E. Kenny, deceased.

William A. Kearns, Ridgewood, N. J., in place of A. W. McNeill, deceased.

NEW YORK

Rebecca E. Traynor, Breesport, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mathias S. Fallis, Gloversville, N. Y., in place of C. P. Snook, deceased.

John A. Johnson, Greenhurst, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Helen S. Finegan, Henrietta, N. Y., in place of E. P. Williams, resigned.

Raymond F. Bennett, McGraw, N. Y., in place of D. S. Ryan, transferred.

Benjamin Zimmerman, Otisville, N. Y., in place of L. N. S. Rockwell, retired.

Louis J. Motts, Silver Springs, N. Y., in place place of L. N. S. Rockwell, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Myrtle B. Smith, Hays, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bettie W. Wall, Pee Dee, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mathilda A. Johnson, Adams, N. Dak., in place of N. H. Koppang, resigned.

Henry Lemke, Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. H. Case, removed.

OHIO

Mildred C. Sellers, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of P. A. Bond, retired.

Warren E. Snyder, West Alexandria, Ohio, in place of H. H. Unger, resigned.

Edwin E. Rawdon, Windsor, Ohio, in place of C. M. Cowell, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Ina L. Snyder, Piedmont, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry E. Grim, Boyertown, Pa., in place of H. L. Breidenbach, resigned.

Albert F. Wydeen, La Plume, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Nicholas S. Favo, Jr., Oakmont, Pa., in place of Fred Favo, resigned.

John D. Fox, Temple, Pa., in place of J. B. Althouse, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clarence E. Crocker, Glendale, S. C., in place of M. R. Sams, resigned.

Howard H. Kemp, Jr., Pineville, S. C., in place of I. H. Jefferson, removed.

TENNESSEE

Albert Keathley, New River, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Holland B. Whitaker, Petersburg, Tenn., in place of A. B. Shaddy, transferred.

TEXAS

Nelle M. Edgeworth, Seabrook, Tex., in place of Lucile Cline, resigned.

VERMONT

Fay E. Wright, Westminster Station, Vt., in place of J. M. Stone, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Emanuel Lindberg, Custer, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WEST VIRGINIA

Martha Jane Perry, Anjean, W. Va., in place of H. T. Plunkett, resigned.

Rita K. Petty, Belleville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank C. Nickell, Cass, W. Va., in place of J. H. Moyer, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Phyllis G. Andrews, Manitowish, Wis., in place of E. C. Andrews, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 27), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Saxton Daniel to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Edward M. Ranson to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

George Tinsley Garnett to be administrative officer, National Headquarters, Selective Service System.

Maj. Bentley Courtenay to be State director of selective service for Wisconsin.

Col. Harris P. Ralston to be deputy State director of selective service for Illinois.

Lt. Col. Harold M. Hayes to be State director of selective service for Maine.

Lt. Col. John B. Elliott to be deputy State director of selective service for Tennessee.

Lt. Col. Charles M. Toynbee to be deputy State director of selective service for Washington.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Robert Sprague Beightler
Donald Hilary Connolly
Sidney Parker Spalding

To be brigadier general

Wallace Harry Graham, Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Ira Thomas Wyche to be Inspector General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment.

Col. Vincent Joseph Esposito to be professor of military art and engineering at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

Col. Edward C. Gillette, Jr., to be professor of physics and chemistry at the United States Military Academy, with rank from August 22, 1946.

Col. Lawrence E. Schick to be professor of military topography and graphics at the United States Military Academy, with rank from December 19, 1946.

Calvin Ervin Glidewell to be second lieutenant of Infantry with rank from June 4, 1946.

IN THE NAVY

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thomas L. Sprague, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Paul F. Lee, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

Rear Adm. Clifford A. Swanson, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be admirals in the Navy, for temporary service

Marc A. Mitscher
Richard L. Conolly

To be vice admirals in the Navy, for temporary service

Edward L. Cochrane
John L. McCrea
Ross T. McIntire

To be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service

John H. Carson	George C. Crawford
Robert P. McConnell	Frederick I. Entwistle
Ernest E. Herrmann	William D. Johnson
Ernest H. von Heimburg	Charles R. Brown
	John M. Hoskins
Eliot H. Bryant	Joseph W. Fowler
John R. Redman	Thomas P. Wynkoop
James H. Foskett	Louis Dreller
Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter	David H. Clark
	Paul F. Lee
Francis P. Old	Evander W. Sylvester
Charles C. Hartman	Paul B. Nibecker
Wendell G. Switzer	Henry R. Oster
William L. Rees	Theodore C. Lonnquest
Heber H. McLean	
John A. Snackenberg	Charles A. Nicholson
Richard H. Cruzen	2d

To be rear admirals, Medical Corps of the Navy, for temporary service

Morton D. Willcutts	John C. Adams
Clarence J. Brown	Carlton L. Andrus
Arthur H. Dearing	William J. C. Agnew
Paul M. Albright	

To be rear admirals, Supply Corps of the Navy, for temporary service

William V. Fox
John E. Wood

To be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as indicated

William S. Parsons while serving as Director of Atomic Defense, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Herbert L. Pugh while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as indicated and during any assignment commensurate with the rank of commodore or until reporting for other permanent duty

Albert T. Sprague, Jr., while serving as deputy commandant of Armed Forces Staff College.

Wilbur E. Kellum while serving on the staff (medical) of the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet.

James W. Boundy while serving as special assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Ernest M. Eller while serving as Director of Public Information, Navy Department.

Richard P. Glass while serving as Director of Civil Relations, Navy Department.

Charles T. Dickeman, Civil Engineer Corps, while serving as superintending civil engineer, areas IV and V.

To be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral

Vice Adm. Sherwoode A. Taffinder, United States Navy, retired.

To be admiral in the Navy, for temporary service

Louis E. Denfeld

To be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service

William M. Fechteler

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be lieutenant generals for temporary service

Allen H. Turnage
Keller E. Rockey

To be major generals for temporary service

Leo D. Hermle	Robert H. Pepper
Alfred H. Noble	Edward A. Craig
Franklin A. Hart	Merritt B. Curtis
William J. Wallace	Fred S. Robillard
Henry D. Linscott	Vernon E. Megee
Dudley S. Brown	

To be second lieutenants from June 5, 1946

Frank A. Anderson	"R" "J" McNerney, Jr.
Jack O. Arford	Marion W. Morrisset
Herman W. Ashlaw	Edward L. Nadeau
Marshall Bartlett, Jr.	Victor P. Neshyba
Burl B. Bevers	Ira P. Norfolk
George R. Brier	Thomas M. O'Reilly
Perry T. Brixey	Austin S. Parker
Donald R. Brown	Edward A. Parnell
George W. Campbell	Robert E. Parrott
Stanley H. Carpenter	Clifford J. Peabody
William C. Carr	Robert O. Peck
Lee J. Carey	Richard W. Phifer
Raymond P. Coffman, Jr.	William Plaskett, Jr.
	Lewis F. Platt
Eduardo O. Coli	David A. Rapp
Charles I. Cook	Wayne E. Richards
Robert J. Daeschler	Harry L. Rogers, Jr.
Ernest K. Davis	Robert D. Savard
William A. Dicus, Jr.	George C. Schatteman
Edwin J. Dietrich	Joseph A. Schimmenti
Donald W. Dowlearn	Jack B. Shaffer
Robert R. Feldman	Jack D. Sheldon
Thomas N. Green	James A. Sloan
Jean R. Griffith	Robert A. Steinway
Franz E. Guerard, Jr.	Charles R. Stephenson
Robert T. Hanifin, Jr.	3d
Barrie H. Harmon	Donald F. Swanda
William S. Harvey	Alvah S. Tolivaisa
James S. Hecker	Irwin J. Vanderswag
Bernard E. Hendricks	George K. Vronch
Daniel B. Hunter	William T. Walker
Merton R. Ives	Paul Weiler
Harold H. Johnson, Jr.	Arthur L. Willner
Paul R. Joyce	Harold B. Wilson
Daniel F. Kennedy, Jr.	Grady L. Yoder
Ordeen M. Knight	Leland E. Ziegler
William K. Kozel	Gerald B. Zwetzig
Paul A. Lockhart, Jr.	Ira T. Carr
Clinton L. Luke	Howard E. Reese
Daniel F. MacKinnon	Jack W. Harris
Edward J. Markham, Jr.	John F. Goodspeed
	Melvin W. Snow
Patrick McGrotty	Edward A. Timmes
Charles D. McMichael	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All wise and patient Father, we bless Thee that Thou dost give us the zest of soul that sorrow cannot keep down and the cheer that burdens cannot crush. Be Thou the bow of promise in every cloud and the balance in every discord.

Heavenly Father, in this sad world where teeming humanity is struggling for mere existence, Thou alone dost hold the universal remedy for all human ills. O stretch forth those holy arms that once hung on the cross and help all to meet despondency with courage and disappointment with fadeless hope. From all tyranny of mind and heart do Thou deliver us. Bless us with the knowledge of Thy saving grace and dwell with us and all Thy people everywhere, and God Himself shall have the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 27, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 22. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926;

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees;

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate; and

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observation and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Interior.
Department of Justice.
Department of the Navy.
Department of the Treasury.
Department of War.
Federal Communications Commission.
Federal Security Agency.
Federal Works Agency.
General Accounting Office.
National Archives.
Office of Contract Settlement.
Office of Price Administration.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
Selective Service System.
United States District Court (District of Puerto Rico).

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for

the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of the Interior.
Department of Justice.
Department of Labor.
Department of the Navy.
Department of the Treasury.
Department of War.
Federal Security Agency.
Office of Price Administration.
The National Archives.
United States District Court (Northern District of Illinois).

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Justice.
Department of the Navy.
Federal Trade Commission.
Post Office Department.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1947.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I am hereby appointing the following members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to serve on the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM, Hon. DAVID M. POTTS, Hon. CECIL R. KING.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Respectfully,

FRED BRADLEY,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1947.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1947: Hon. T. MILLET HAND, Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY, Hon HENRY M. JACKSON.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Respectfully,

FRED BRADLEY,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SASSCER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the labor question.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 78) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, five of the minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 4, 1947, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Ralph R. Roberts to receive compensation at the rate of $5,000 per annum; Dominic T. Iorio (minority pair clerk) to receive compensation at the rate of $3,800 per annum; Finis E. Scott, Landon Mitchell, and W. Moseley Miller to receive compensation at the rate of $3,300 per annum respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY TO MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 74) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1947, the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation per annum, payable monthly, to certain employees of the House as follows:

"SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

"To the three minority employees whose compensation is now prescribed by law at $3,300 the sum of $500 each, so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents;

"To the minority employee (minority pair clerk) whose compensation is now prescribed by law at $3,800 the sum of $200, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent;

"OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

"To the Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs whose compensation is now prescribed by law at $3,600 the sum of $400, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE IMMIGRATION MUDDLE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members of Congress, newspaper reporters, and others have attempted to piece together the immigration picture. It has not been easy to determine how many people from foreign countries are in the United States and eligible for citizenship. Press reports indicate the number of aliens registered with the Department of Immigration and Naturalization is about three and one-half million. No one seems to know just how many are here on visitor's visas. On November 26, 1943, former Assistant Secretary of State Long testified in an executive session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that about 307,000 visas of all kinds were granted to persons from enemy and enemy-occupied territories. Most of them came on visitor's visas.

There is then the question of nonquota immigrants. To qualify for the nonquota type it is necessary to have a relative in this country who will take care of you or show that you have $1,200 available in a bank and at your disposal. There is a very neat racket now of getting a letter from a bank showing $1,200 and then transferring the same $1,200 to another bank and getting a similar letter. This goes on indefinitely. The original $1,200 will serve many people.

The latest reports I can get from the Department of State which issues visas and from the Immigration Division is to the effect that from July 1, 1946, to January 1, 1947, an average of 4,500 a month came in on the regular quota visas.

There is another 7,000 a month from nonquota countries. Attorney General Clark estimated last June 9 that 2,000 people a day were entering this country illegally, that is, without visas. This would mean 730,000 a year from this source. The Immigration Service apprehended 85,000 who came in illegally the last 6 months of 1946.

Part of the difficulty in getting information from agencies dealing with immigration is due to a directive issued by the Attorney General on May 2, 1939, which reads as follows:

All official files, documents, records, and information in the offices of the Department of Justice, including the several offices of the United States attorneys, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States marshals, and Federal penal and correctional institutions, or in control of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice, are to be regarded as confidential.

No officer or employee may permit the disclosure or use for any purpose other than for the performance of his official duties, except in the discretion of the Attorney General, the assistant to the Attorney General, or an Assistant Attorney General acting for him.

This rather effectively ties the hands of anyone seeking information about immigration.

I hold here in my hand a photostatic copy of a list of passengers on a recent flight from Tel-Aviv, Palestine, to Miami, Fla. Also a manifest of a list from Cairo, Egypt. It is my understanding that there are daily flights from these southern European ports carrying displaced persons to the United States. There are chartered planes, and the flights are made with the blessing of the State Department and the military authorities.

I also have in my hand a story from a New York paper stating that 1,000 American travelers are stuck in Italy. They cannot get transportation home. They have little opportunity of getting over to the United States within the next year. It seems a bit unusual that American citizens should be stranded in foreign countries and at the same time there is available transportation to rush displaced persons to this country.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called attention to the fact that there is much difficulty in getting accurate information relative to immigration. I am still of the opinion that the proper committee ought to have a full-dress investigation upon this important subject. This country has many difficult internal problems. Veterans are finding it difficult to get homes in which to live. Many of them are in school preparing for their future work. Does it not seem that immigration of a million people a year to this country, legally or illegally, should be stopped until there is an opportunity to get our own troubles adjusted?

Improper screening and a lowering of the bars on immigration may admit many a small-fry Axis Sally or members of the terrorist Stern gang of Palestine. It is time to call a halt.

WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Because this is a special occasion, the Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose, but this is not to be used as a precedent.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ohio delegation in Congress, I wish to thank the present Speaker and also the former Speaker for their kindness to us on this the 29th day of January each year. This is McKinley's Birthday. Heretofore for years the Ohio delegation has taken some time of the House to call attention to the character and accomplishments of William McKinley.

McKinley's favorite flower was the red carnation. Because of his fondness for this particular flower, the State of Ohio has adopted it as its State flower.

Why do we request year after year that we be given this time? It is because we in Ohio at least think of William McKinley as one of the outstanding Congressmen of all time, especially from the standpoint of his contribution to constructive activities of the Nation. As we all know, he was one of our many illustrious Presidents, but we maintain that the most distinctive work ever performed by McKinley was his work as a Member of Congress in this Chamber. His work on this floor was done in the 25 years following the Civil War. His political and economic philosophies, which were followed by Congress, contributed mightily toward the upbuilding of the Nation. While his work as Governor of Ohio and his work as President of the United States, as a war President during the Spanish-American War, were outstanding, still the basis upon which he builded for the governorship and the Presidency was laid here in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a little story recently written by a lady in Ohio that sets forth why the carnation was McKinley's favorite flower.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

THE STORY OF THE McKINLEY CARNATION

The McKinley carnation, adopted in 1904 as the official flower of the State of Ohio, finds its origin in an act of sportsmanship (1876) when Dr. Lester Lamborn (Democrat) opposed William McKinley (Republican) for election to Congress.

Dr. Lamborn was a florist and owner of a private conservatory in Alliance. William McKinley was prosecutor of Stark County. The two men were opponents—and friends.

During the campaign, Dr. Lamborn sent gifts of carnations to his Republican opponent, McKinley, who wore them constantly as boutonnieres. The gesture created deep admiration in the mind of McKinley for his Democrat friend and the carnation became his favorite flower.

This admiration rose to high esteem and when Republican headquarters were again opened in Canton, with McKinley the candidate for President, thousands of carnations were distributed as campaign emblems.

McKinley was elected (1896) and the carnation became a Washington tradition. He was reelected in 1900.

When the Buffalo Exposition was opened in 1901, thousands were seen wearing the "presidential flower." At this exposition a tragedy ended the career of William McKinley—a highly honored and beloved President of the United States. When the train bearing the cortege of the President arrived in Canton, carloads of carnations were strewn along its tracks.

Being without a floral emblem, the State of Ohio, by act of the general assembly (1904), adopted the McKinley carnation as the official flower of the State of Ohio. Careful research was made to determine the exact color specified in the resolution. The color adopted was scarlet.

Excerpt of resolution:

"Be it resolved by the general assembly, the governor approving, That the scarlet carnation be adopted as the flower of the State of Ohio, as token of love and reverence for the memory of William McKinley."

ZELLA M. VILLARD.

CANTON.

CHRONOLOGY

WILLIAM M'KINLEY, 1843–1901

1843: January 29—Born at Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio.
1849: Became a student at the district school at Niles.
1852: Removed to Poland, Mahoning County, Ohio.
1852: Entered the Union Seminary of Poland.
1859: Joined the Methodist Episcopal Church of Poland.
1860: Entered Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
1860: Left college on account of illness. Taught at the Kerr district school near Poland, Ohio.
1861: Assistant postmaster in the Poland post office.
1861: June 11—Enlisted as a private in Company E of the Twenty-third Ohio Volunteer Infantry.
1862: April 15—Promoted to commissary sergeant.
1863: February 7—Promoted to first lieutenant.
1864: July 25—Promoted to captain of Company G.
1864: October 11—First vote for President cast, while on march, for Abraham Lincoln.
1865: March 13—Commissioned major by brevet in the Volunteer United States Army by President Lincoln.
1865: July 26—Mustered out of Army.
1866: Entered the Albany School of Law.
1867: March—Admitted to the bar at Warren, Ohio.
1869: Elected prosecuting attorney of Stark County, Ohio.
1871: January 25—Married Ida Saxton, Canton, Ohio.
1876: Elected to Congress.
1878, 1880, 1882, 1884, 1886, 1888: Reelected to Congress.
1888: Delegate-at-large, Chicago convention.
1890: Defeated for Congress.
1891: November 3—Elected Governor of Ohio.
1892: Delegate to Minneapolis convention.
1893: Reelected Governor of Ohio.
1896: June 18—Nominated for President.
1896: November 3—Elected President.
1897: March 4—Inaugurated President.
1900: June 21—Renominated for President.
1901: March 4—Second inauguration.
1901: September 6—Assassinated.
1901: September 14—Died at the home of John G. Milburn, Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the House, epecially the Members from Ohio, be permitted to extend their

remarks on William McKinley at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and the other Members of the majority in commemorating the birth of a great American—President William McKinley.

At the time of his death he was loved and respected by the people of every section of the country, regardless of party affiliations. These red carnations worn by the Members today, his favorite flower, may be regarded as "the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics."

With the exception of Warren G. Harding, he was the last President to serve in either House of Congress until President Truman entered upon the duties of that exalted office; and he was the only President to serve both in Congress and in the armed forces of his country in time of war from Benjamin Harrison to Harry S. Truman.

He was a Christian gentleman. His favorite hymn was Lead Kindly Light, the very name of which carries the suggestion that Americans can well afford to follow during these trying times.

We gladly join in honoring the memory of this great American.

SUGGESTED LEGISLATION

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House of Representatives should have the benefit of the conclusions reached at a meeting held in Chicago by the Republican chairmen of 12 Midwestern States. These 12 Midwestern States comprise about one-third of the population of the United States. Their views are of great value in the deliberations of this body. I submit herewith a paragraph from a letter received from Mr. Paul C. Rosenquist, chairman of the Illinois Republican State Central Committee. You will note what is said relative to what the American people expect in regard to labor legislation. The people who actually work must be taken into consideration. Their views are not always expressed by those who claim to represent them. The people of the central West are also emphatic in their demands that there be a substantial and early reduction in personal income taxes.

Any labor legislation passed by Congress must be based on the fundamental principle that it will protect the rights of labor—meaning by labor the men and women who work. If new legislation is fair, industry will again operate freely to the benefit of all. Drastic reduction of governmental expenses must be made now. This will include the abolition of all unnecessary bureaus and personnel. Income taxes must be cut and these cuts must be applicable on the income of all citizens. Governmental legislation must be passed which will reverse the present trend of forcing small businesses into mergers. A broad base of small business is fundamental to healthy commerce. The country must go back to operation under specific laws instead of the present control by Federal commission ground rules and interpretation of laws. Every citizen of this country is now regulated by what bureaucrats and courts choose to designate as their interpretation of congressional acts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Francis G. Murray, of Philadelphia, on the subject of amateur sports.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal and in the other a resolution adopted by the retail food dealers of western Maryland.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oregon City Banner.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Everett P. Coleman.

GOVERNMENT IS OWN LAW VIOLATOR

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government always seems more than anxious to enforce obligations against its citizens. However, the Government violates its obligations, and the law of the land as well, by denying citizens of the United States payment on the bonds issued according to law. I am advised that on January 2, 1947, Mr. ———, of the ——— Co., of Bowling Green, Ohio, gave 30 days' notice that it desired to cash a certain G bond, being V-490258, in the sum of $5,000, surrendered the bond to the bank, and made application for payment, and on January 4, 1947, the ——— Co., of Bowling Green, was notified by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Ohio, that payment of the bond would be deferred to after March 1, 1947, although on the notice itself is printed the statement that "F and G bonds will be redeemed on 1 month's notice in writing," and the bond itself so states thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking why the Government is violating its obligation of contract on the bonds purchased by citizens. Such shabby treatment to the citizens of America who purchased Government bonds is beyond the realm of understanding. How can our Government expect compliance with the law while the Government itself wilfully violates its obligations on the bonds that it forced upon its citizens? The least the Government might do is to set a good example of complying with the law, instead of telling the citizens that the Federal Government is beyond the law and thereby setting a bad example of encouraging citizens to violate the law.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO COMMITTEE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 61) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and examinations authorized by section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $20,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and examination or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "exceed", strike out "$20,000" and insert "the unobligated balance on January 3, 1947, of funds made available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETURN OF CERTAIN PAPERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain papers which were filed with the House in connection with private claims bill H. R. 6820, Seventy-ninth Congress, may be released by the Clerk of the House to be returned to the claimant for his use in instituting judicial proceedings under the provisions of the Federal Torts Act.

The SPEAKER. Was there an adverse report?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No report was filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

BONUS OF 25 POUNDS OF SUGAR TO EVERY AMERICAN HOUSEWIFE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to suggest to the House a bonus, not to veterans, not to anyone else but to the individual American family. I should like to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture and

the Director of the Office of Temporary Controls to reexamine the possibility of giving a special bonus of 25 pounds of sugar over and above any regular 1947 allotment per capita to each American housewife so that she can do more baking in the home, giving her children and her family the chance to consume more nutritious and palatable food.

So far we have done nothing but shadow-box with the sugar shortage. Speaking for myself, I think the time has come to give the people we represent a break. Why deprive them of a standard of living that has made Americans the happiest people in the world?

I would not propose this if I did not know that more sugar will be available for domestic use this year than at any time before the war. We can well afford the extra distribution, especially since no family today has enough sugar on hand.

This sugar bonus will show the folks back home this Congress is on the job, looking out for their welfare, and interested in seeing a well-nourished, strong, and healthy Nation, capable of taking the lead in bringing peace and progress to the whole world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the contents of the bill are.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the minority leader that the Veterans' Administration sent this bill with a letter explaining it and asked for its immediate passage. It was approved by the Budget or the Veterans' Administration would not have recommended its passage. We took the matter up in committee and it was reported unanimously by the committee.

The reason for its passage immediately is to extend the time from February 1, 1947, to August 1, 1947.

H. R. 1353 reduced to its simplest terms provides as follows:

First. Gives persons in the armed forces the option of originally subscribing for insurance on the 5-year level premium plan, or any other permanent plan such as ordinary life, 30-pay life, and so forth.

Under the present law, the original contract for insurance can only be made under the 5-year level premium plan.

Second. If the insured is totally disabled at the expiration of the 5-year level term contract and he does not otherwise elect, his insurance is automatically converted to the ordinary life plan.

This will automatically continue insurance protection for men totally disabled who are mentally incompetent, or who for other reasons beyond their control are unable to elect some permanent plan of insurance.

Third. Extends the time from February 1, 1947, to August 1, 1947, for reinstating lapsed term insurance by submitting a comparative health statement.

This is probably the most important feature of the bill, as it will permit hundreds of thousands of veterans who were disabled in active service to reinstate lapsed insurance without physical examination.

It will also eliminate the necessity of the Veterans' Administration making hundreds of thousands of physical examinations and afford the physicians of the Veterans' Administration time to devote more attention to the care of disabled veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill is very short and I suggest that the Clerk read it. The Members ought to know what is in it. Then the bill can be explained more thoroughly.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H. R. 1353

A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every person who is commissioned and hereafter ordered into, or who is hereafter examined, accepted, and enrolled in, the active service and while in such active service shall, upon application in writing (made within 120 days after entrance into such active service) and payment of premiums as hereinafter provided and without further medical examination, be granted insurance by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force."

SEC. 2. Subsection (f) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Such insurance may be issued on the following plans: Five-year level premium term, ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65. Level premium term insurance may be converted as of the date when any premium becomes or has become due, or exchanged as of the date of the original policy, upon payment of the difference in reserve, at any time while such insurance is in force and within the term period to any of the foregoing permanent plans of insurance: *Provided*, That conversion to an endowment plan may not be made while the insured is totally disabled. In any case in which the insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued insurance protection but for such expiration, such insurance shall be automatically converted to insurance on the ordinary life plan unless the insured has elected insurance on some other available plan. All level premium term policies shall cease and terminate at the expiration of the term period. Provisions for cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, refund of unearned premiums, and such other provisions as may be found to be reasonable and practicable may be provided for in the policy of insurance or from time to time by regulations promulgated by the Administrator."

SEC. 3. Subsections (y) (1) and (y) (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby repealed.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to say that when this measure came before the committee, it was endorsed by all the veterans' organizations and by the Veterans' Administration, as the lady from Massachusetts said.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker. However, I will say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, it is hoped that this is the last extension that will be necessary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I doubt whether another extension will be necessary, I will say to the minority leader, but thousands of veterans cannot reinstate unless this bill passes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I quite understand.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include the committee report on the bill amending the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended:

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

Mrs. ROGERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendments, and recommend that the bill do pass.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize the issuance originally of national service life insurance on any of the plans of insurance provided for in the act. To fully effectuate this purpose, section 2 of the bill would amend 602 (f) of the act, as amended, to provide that insurance may be issued initially on the 5-year level premium term plan or on any of the various permanent plans therein specified. Under present law only insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan may be issued originally and it must be carried for 1 year before it can be converted to a permanent plan. Your committee believes that the wartime need for restricting original policies to the 5-year level premium term plan has passed and that an applicant should now be permitted to avail himself of a permanent type policy without delay.

Section 2 of the bill would further amend section 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that in any case in which the insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued protection but for such expiration, such insurance shall be automatically converted to insurance on the ordinary life plan

unless the insured has elected some other available plan. This amendment is necessary to protect those persons who are unable by reason of incompetency or other condition of total disability to apply for conversion of insurance within the term period and who, but for expiration of that period, would be entitled to further insurance protection with waiver of premiums during the continuance of their total disability. Under existing law such persons lose their insurance upon the expiration of the term period. Section 3 of the bill would repeal subsections (y) (1) and (y) (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Subsection (y) (1) authorizes reinstatement of level premium term insurance upon payment of two monthly premiums and a showing of good health. This provision is of a character which may require a change at some future time to protect the interests of policyholders as a group. To permit flexibility the subject matter of this subsection is, therefore, more properly one for control by regulation than by statutory prescription. However, the Veterans' Administration has stated that no change in the present regulations authorizing this type of reinstatement is presently contemplated.

Subsection (y) (2) authorizes reinstatement of level premium term insurance within 6 months after lapse or within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946 (February 1, 1947), whichever is later, upon payment of two monthly premiums, provided the applicant is in as good health on the date of application and tender of premiums as he was on the date of lapse. After February 1, 1947, term insurance which has lapsed more than 6 months may not be reinstated on a comparative health basis. The majority of discharged World War II veterans have heretofore allowed their national service life insurance to lapse. The Veterans' Administration is now preparing to institute a national campaign to inform these veterans on their rights, and it appears that the purpose of this campaign cannot be achieved unless an additional 6 months beyond the February 1, 1947, dead line specified by the law is authorized. If subsection (y) (2) is repealed, the Veterans' Administration proposes to issue regulations extending the period for reinstatement upon a comparative health basis to August 1, 1947, prior to which time it is anticipated that the Veterans' Administration will have solved its present operating difficulties and complexities to the extent that notices of lapse can be transmitted on a current basis. The Veterans' Administration further proposes that after August 1, 1947, regulations will restrict reinstatement on a comparative health basis to the period of 3 months. Your committee believes that under normal conditions the period of 6 months for comparative health reinstatement is excessive both from the standpoint of fairness to those policyholders who do not allow their policies to lapse and from the standpoint of the difficulty of determining comparative conditions of health at intervals longer than 3 months. This matter is considered to be one which should be subject to administrative regulation so that the period for comparative health reinstatement may be adjusted to any future recurrence of abnormal conditions.

There follows a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to the Speaker of the House of Representatives which further explains the need for the proposed legislation:

JANUARY 23, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed herewith draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended," with the request that it be introduced and considered for enactment.

The purpose of section 1 of the proposed bill and conforming amendments contained in section 2 thereof is to authorize the Veterans' Administration to issue originally national service life insurance on any of the permanent plans of insurance authorized by the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Under existing law, national service life insurance may be originally issued on the 5-year level premium term plan only, and such insurance must be carried for 1 year before it may be converted to insurance on a permanent plan. The need of these restrictions in existing law has passed and there is no reason why insurance on any plan should not be initially issued.

The further purpose of section 2 of the proposed bill is to provide that in any case in which an insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his national service life insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued insurance protection but for such expiration, such insurance shall be automatically converted to insurance on the ordinary life plan unless the insured has elected some other available plan.

It is anticipated that some policyholders of national service life insurance will be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of their insurance. Such individuals who will have been totally disabled for six or more consecutive months will be entitled to waiver of premiums until the expiration of the term, but insurance protection will cease at that time unless the level premium term insurance is converted to insurance on some other plan before the end of the term. Upon conversion of insurance to a permanent plan, the right of waiver of premiums which exist at the time of conversion will continue. Many such totally disabled persons, either because of incompetency or other circumstances beyond their control, may be unable to make application for conversion of insurance within the level premium term period. To guard against the hardship which would otherwise result under such circumstances, automatic conversion of insurance to a permanent plan must be provided. Under the provisions of section 2 of the proposed bill, the insurance protection and right to waiver of premiums of such individuals will be continued.

The purpose of section 3 of the proposed bill is to repeal subsections (y) (1) and (y) (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Subsection (y) (1) authorizes reinstatement of level-premium term insurance upon written application, payment of two monthly premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that the applicant, subject to the provisions of the second sentence of section 602 (c) (2), is in good health. The part of section 602 (c) (2) which is referred to contains independent provisions relating to the exclusion of service-connected disability, less than total in degree, in determining good health for reinstatement purposes. These general provisions would continue to be applicable to reinstatement as provided for by regulations upon the repeal of subsection (y) (1).

Reinstatement within the term upon the payment of two monthly premiums and a showing of good health is now authorized under Veterans' Administration regulations, and to meet existing conditions was so authorized for several years prior to the enactment of subsection (y) (1). Although no change in such regulations is presently contemplated, it is believed that the matter of reinstatement generally is so affected by changing conditions involving the interests of policyholders as a group that considerable flexibility should be permitted in determining when and upon what conditions reinstatement may be accomplished. In keeping with this general principle, the provisions of subsection (y) (1) should be repealed in order that regulations with respect to the subject matter thereof shall be susceptible of such periodic changes as may be warranted.

Subsection (y) (2) authorized reinstatement of level-premium term insurance within 6 months after lapse or within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946 (February 1, 1947), whichever is the later, upon payment of two monthly premiums, provided the applicant is in as good health on the date of application and tender of premiums as he was on the date of lapse. Under the provisions of this subsection, insurance which has lapsed more than 6 months may not be reinstated on a comparative health basis after February 1, 1947, and the Veterans' Administration will be without authority to provide by regulation for reinstatement on a comparative health basis in such cases on or after February 1, 1947.

If subsection (y) (2) is repealed, the Veterans' Administration contemplates the issuance of regulations which will allow reinstatement on a comparative health basis up to August 1, 1947, without regard to the date the insurance lapsed. Subsequent to August 1, 1947, regulations will authorize reinstatement of National Service Life Insurance on a comparative health basis within 3 months after lapse upon application and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that the applicant is in as good health at the time of application and payment of premiums as he was on the date of lapse. Such privilege of reinstatement will be similar to the reinstatement provisions now applicable to converted national service life insurance policies. This right is more liberal than the reinstatement privileges generally provided under policies issued by commercial insurers and affords reasonable protection for policyholders. In regard to permitting reinstatement to be accomplished for an indefinite period in the future on the basis of comparative health within 6 months from date of lapse, there is grave doubt that such practice would be equitable to those policyholders who continually retain their contracts in force. This conclusion is based to some extent upon the reinstatement requirements as published by other mutual insurers. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine comparative conditions of health at two periods more than 3 months apart.

A great majority of the veterans who have been discharged from World War II have allowed their national service life insurance to lapse. It will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration, on a national scale, to carry on an informative campaign so that veterans may be fully enlightened relative to their rights and privileges regarding national service life insurance. This program will comprehend the solicitation of assistance from all organizations interested in veterans' welfare. It is planned to utilize all recognized media, such as the mail, newspapers, magazines, radio, moving pictures, etc., for carrying information to the veterans. This program will have been completed before August 1, 1947. It is obvious that the proposed plan will be ineffective unless and until subsection (y) (2) is repealed.

The proviso of subsection (y) (2) authorizes the granting of an additional period not exceeding 60 days for the payment of premiums by an insured who makes inquiry

prior to expiration of the grace period disclosing a clear intent to continue insurance protection. Similar provisions were contained in Veterans' Administration regulations prior to the enactment of subsection (y) (2). For the reasons heretofore stated in support of the repeal of subsection (y) (1), it is believed that this proviso, which also was intended to meet an existing situation, concerns a matter which is more properly one for regulation.

The proposed bill, if enacted, will not involve any cost in addition to that contemplated under existing law.

Because the right of reinstatement on a comparative health basis will expire February 1, 1947, in those cases where insurance has lapsed more than 6 months many veterans will be unable to reinstate lapsed insurance after that date under existing law. It is therefore respectfully urged that the proposed measure be specially considered for enactment at the earliest possible date.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army, Administrator.

RAMSEYER RULE

In compliance with paragraph 2 (a) of rule XIII, House of Representatives, the changes in the present law made by the various sections of the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

That subsection (a) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every person who is commissioned and hereafter ordered into, or who is hereafter examined, accepted, and enrolled in, the active service and while in such active service shall, upon application in writing (made within 120 days after entrance into such active service) and payment of premiums as hereinafter provided and without further medical examination, be granted insurance [on the 5-year level premium term plan] by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force."

SEC. 2. Subsection (f) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Such insurance [shall] *may* be issued [upon] *on* the [5-year level premium term plan, with the privilege of conversion] *following plans: Five-year level premium term, ordinary life, twenty-payment life, thirty-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65. Level premium term insurance may be converted* as of the date when any premium becomes or has become due, or [exchange] *exchanged* as of the date of the original policy, upon payment of the difference in reserve, at any time [after such policy has been in effect for 1 year] *while such insurance is in force* and within the term period [, to policies of insurance upon the following plans: Ordinary life, twenty-payment life, thirty-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65:] *to any of the foregoing permanent plans of insurance: Provided,* That conversion to an endowment plan may not be made while the insured is totally disabled. *In any case in which the insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued insurance protection but for such expiration, such insurance shall be automatically converted to insurance on the ordinary life plan unless the insured has elected insurance on some other available plan.* All level premium term policies shall cease and terminate at the expiration of the term period. Provisions for cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, refund of unearned premiums, and such other provisions as may be found to be reasonable and practicable may be provided for in the policy of insurance or from time to time by regulations promulgated by the Administrator."

SEC. 3. Subsections (y) (1) and (y) (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby repealed.

["(y) (1) Any level premium term insurance which has lapsed may be reinstated within the term upon written application, payment of two monthly premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that the applicant, subject to the provisions of the second sentence of section 602 (c) (2), supra, is in good health.

"(2) Any level premium term insurance which has lapsed may be reinstated within the term upon written application, made within 6 months after the date of such lapse or within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, whichever is the later, and payment of two monthly premiums, provided such applicant is in as good health on the date of application and tender of premiums as he was on the due date of the premium in default and furnishes evidence thereof satisfactory to the Administrator: *Provided,* That when the insured makes inquiry prior to the expiration of the grace period disclosing a clear intent to continue insurance protection, an additional reasonable period not exceeding 60 days may be granted for payment of premiums due, but the premiums in any such case must be paid during the lifetime of the insured."]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement which he made before the Citizens National Committee in the Hotel Statler this week.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Sumner Welles.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles in each.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper article in each.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Judge Lewis of New York City.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Walter H. Van Hoeson, president of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an address delivered before the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers, and in the other to extend his remarks on the United States military government in Germany, and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GATHINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FRANCES BOVA

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the papers filed in support of the claimant Frances Bova covered by H. R. 4354, presented in the Seventy-ninth Congress by the Honorable Clarance Hancock, be released by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and returned to the claimant for use in judicial proceedings.

The SPEAKER. Is there an adverse report?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, at its first meeting yesterday, adopted unanimously a resolution relative to its powers and duties and the scope of its work, after considering a report from a preorganization subcommittee. Due to the interest expressed by Members of the House in this resolution and report, I am securing leave to place the full text of the resolution and report in the Appendix of the RECORD today, so that our analysis of the powers and duties of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the scope of its work, in the formulation and execution of a bi-partisan foreign policy for our country, may be understood by the House.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the president of the American Economic Association. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the operations at Camp Gordon. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on TVA.

Mr. BECKWORTH and Mr. MURDOCK asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him on last Saturday evening.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him yesterday at Columbia, S. C.

Mr. EATON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and report adopted by his committee on yesterday.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] made some remarks on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements. It is a coincidence that I have ready today an extension of remarks on this subject including therewith a timely editorial by the Honorable Robert L. Kern which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, Friday, January 24, 1947, on the very same matter. I invite the attention of the Members to this editorial and to the many editorials in support of the policy of reciprocity which have recently appeared in the Nation's newspapers, both Democratic and Republican.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago I heard the statement made in a radio broadcast that although this session of the Eightieth Congress is barely under way the House of Representatives is already bypassing the Congressional Reorganization Act by permitting closed hearings to be held by important subcommittees. The broadcaster had reference to the provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which reads as follows:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

In the last session of Congress distinguished members of the present majority party in this House created an international issue by demanding that the United States Government refuse to extend relief to any nation which would not permit full freedom of the press within its borders. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the present Congress will put itself in an indefensible position if it denies freedom of the press in its committee hearings.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN R. MURDOCK

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] was elected yesterday as chairman of the Democratic steering committee. I think it is a very fine honor that has been paid him, and it is a recognition of his years of loyal effort in behalf of the Democratic Party and of his constituents.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago the very able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], made some remarks about our foreign policy and secured permission to insert in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by that committee. His announcement was greeted with more or less applause. I wonder if the Members know what is in that resolution. Just to keep the record straight and to avoid the later charge that the statements in it were not challenged, hence here accepted, permit me to read it, and then make answer. I read:

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs make a detailed study of the laws affecting the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally and that a study be made of the international organizations of which the United States is a member.

As the unanimous expression of the opinion and desire of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution which, by unanimous consent, is to be printed in the RECORD, is directed to and no doubt will receive the respectful consideration of the Members of the House and in particular of the members of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

If designed to lessen the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, it is futile; neither is it probable that the proposed recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as to the procedure to be followed by other committees of the House will be accepted without comment. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments derives its authority from section 105 (a) of title V of the United States Code in force prior to the passage of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, cited as the Legislative Reorganization Act. Section 105 (a) reads as follows:

Every executive department and independent establishment of the Government shall, upon request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, or of any seven members thereof, or upon request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate, or any five members thereof, furnish any information requested of it relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of said committee. (May 29, 1928, ch. 901, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 996.)

Rule 11, subsection 34, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, outlined the duties of the committee.

Section 101 of the Reorganization Act reads, and I quote:

The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

"(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

Under rule X of the Reorganization Act the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to consist of 25 members is established.

On page 2 of the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, cited by the gentleman, there appears the following language:

(2) That the Committee on Foreign Affairs invited the Secretary of State to cooperate with the committee in such study and to furnish all necessary information as to the organization, the personnel and the policies of the Department of State and international agreements to which the United States is a party, and that the committee agree to safeguard such information against any disclosure which is incompatible with the public interest, and

(3) That upon the acceptance by the Secretary of State of this invitation and agreement, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs recommend to the Speaker and to other committees of the House of Representatives, that no other committee make any unnecessary duplicating studies of the organization, personnel, and operation of the Department of State.

In my opinion no committee of the House, no Member of the House, at least on the majority side, and I assume the same applies to the minority, desires to unnecessarily duplicate the action of a committee which is authorized to or which has entered upon either a study or an investigation of any executive department.

Permit me to quote the applicable words of rule XI of the Reorganization Act:

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

(1) All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively.

Turning to subdivision (h) which establishes the committee we find these pertinent words:

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Then among others we have this provision:

Such committee shall have the duty of—

* * * * *

(D) Studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

The Congress, in its wisdom, having seen fit to charge the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments with one of the duties which this resolution would impose upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, it becomes my duty to call attention to the futility of the resolution adopted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs insofar as it attempts to limit the duty of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and to announce that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will, in my opinion, be required to carry out the obligations imposed upon it by the statute, by the rules of the House, as previously written and enforced. The title of the committee is significant. It is Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. In no sense of the word can it be construed as a legislative committee. As long as your humble servant is permitted to act as chairman and to guide the activities of that committee, it will not knowingly trespass upon the jurisdiction of any other committee. It will not conduct either studies or investigations into legislative procedure. It will not attempt to lay down policy for any legislative committee. It will endeavor to at all times confine itself to the consideration of measures referred to it, to the duties imposed upon it by the rule and precedent. Its chairman, and in my opinion, its members, without exception, will seek and appreciate the advice and help of the chairmen and the members of other committees who, from time to time, honor us by an acceptance of our invitation to sit in on any and all studies or so-called investigations which may be undertaken by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Omar B. Ketchum on the subject of humane treatment of veterans who were prisoners of war.

THE LATE HONORABLE GUY U. HARDY

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I announce to the House the death of a former Member of this body, Hon. Guy U. Hardy, of Canon City, Colo., which occurred at his home in Canon City on last Sunday morning. He had been ill for several weeks but was active until the day before he passed away. Mr. Hardy represented the district I now have the honor to represent, the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. He was first elected to Congress in 1918 and began his service in the Sixty-sixth Congress in March 1919. He was reelected to each succeeding Congress until 1932, and served seven consecutive terms in this House. He was a member of the Republican Party. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] made reference to Mr. Hardy in a speech on the floor last week in which he gave him credit for compiling information on Congress and the duties of a Congressman, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5, 1930. Mr. Hardy's speech is still used as the basis for articles on the organization of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with Guy Hardy. I regarded him as not only one of the most attractive but one of the most resourceful men who ever served in the House.

I remember on one occasion when he told a story, which I hope the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] will look up, of a pioneer newspaperman who went west. When he started to publish his newspaper he found that he had lost all the f's and k's and that he had none of those letters in his possession. The method he used to spell out his words in the absence of those letters was one of the most amusing stories I have ever heard told on the floor of this House.

Guy Hardy was a Christian gentleman whom everybody on both sides of the aisle literally loved. His death brings profound sorrow to all his friends.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am deeply grateful for the comments of the gentleman from Mississippi. I am sure he expressed the sentiments of everyone who knew Guy Hardy. He made friends and retained them. I never heard of him having an enemy.

Mr. Hardy was born in Abingdon, Ill., on April 4, 1872. He attended Albion Normal College at Albion, Ill., and the Transylvania University at Lexington, Ky. After leaving college he taught school in Illinois and Florida from 1890 to 1893. He moved to Canon City, Colo., in 1894 and remained there until his death.

Mr. Hardy engaged in the newspaper business in Canon City and was editor and publisher of the Canon City Daily Record. He was recognized as one of the leading editors of the State and in 1918 was honored by being elected president of the National Editorial Association. He was active in civic and community affairs and founded the University Club of Canon City. In 1900 he was appointed postmaster by President McKinley.

Mr. Hardy served with great distinction in this body, and was a member of the Appropriations Committee. He was most diligent and energetic in the performance of his duties, and his faithful service is still remembered throughout the third district. I first met him when he was serving in Congress and we formed a close friendship that has meant a great deal to me through the years. I shall greatly miss him. Colorado has lost one of her outstanding citizens and I have lost a dear friend.

He leaves his widow, three sons, and a daughter to mourn his passing, as well as two brothers. I am sure this House wishes to express its sympathy to Mrs. Hardy and the children on the loss of their distinguished husband and father.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to express my regret at the loss of our former Congressman from Colorado, Guy U. Hardy, of Canon City. I know a great many of you in the House recall him. We in Colorado all loved

Congressman Hardy. I remember one of the first letters I received after being elected to this body was from Guy U. Hardy. He did not live in my district, but he immediately wrote me a letter wherein he gave me a great deal of advice as to what a new Congressman should know about the legislative branch of our Government and how our House committees operated. I appreciated his advice.

Congressman Hardy was a faithful, loyal, and patriotic public servant. He will be greatly missed by his friends of Colorado. Everyone of us regret his passing.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, we have been greatly shocked to learn of the death of Guy Urban Hardy, of Colorado.

He served as a Member of Congress, representing the Third District of Colorado, from 1919 to 1932, having taken up his residence in Canon City, Colo., in the year 1894.

By profession he was a newspaper editor and journalist, and his honesty and integrity in serving his community in this capacity during the early days of the growth and development of our State, won for him the respect of all.

During the years he served in Congress, he was recognized by his colleagues as a fine gentleman, of excellent character, and high ability. His devotion to his duties as a Representative, and his efforts in behalf of his people, accomplished much for us, and the people of Colorado will always be indebted to him.

We have lost a statesman who served his State and his Nation with honor, and a friend who was devoted to his neighbors. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart that I learned of the death of my old friend, the Honorable Guy U. Hardy, of Colorado.

Only a few days ago I heard indirectly from him with respect to my recent revision of the informative pamphlet of which he was the originator and in which he undertook to collect for the use of Members of Congress and the general public a wealth of valuable data concerning the Congress of the United States and its procedures.

Over the years, ever since I first undertook in 1939 to keep his compilation up to date, Guy Hardy and I have had frequent correspondence and have enjoyed each other's company on more than one occasion. It is hard for me to believe he has gone. I know his reward will be that of a just man made perfect.

Guy Hardy was a great but modest man who made an everlasting mark upon his day and generation. He exemplified Kipling's definition of character—

There is neither East nor West, border nor breed nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they come from the ends of the earth!

He was reckoned a leader in Congress because of his character, his integrity, and his ability. The call of home and the life he loved meant more to him than presence in these Halls, and after seven terms in the House he returned to his beloved hills and mountains. He felt, as did the poet, Constance E. Hoar, that—

Something that never dies lives in these hills,
The ancient forests have gone but the soil is there;
Something was born in those mountains that comes back as an avatar;
For this is the soil of America, not even a war
Can intimidate that which reaches and touches a star.

When Guy Hardy left Washington, the Congress lost an able legislator and his former associates lost the close companionship of a good friend and wise counselor.

His interest in legislative matters and procedures never diminished. The last time I saw him, he said to me: "You are to be congratulated and so is every member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.' It took courage even to present the reorganization bill to the House for consideration. It will take time to iron out a lot of trouble growing out of petty jealousy for power, but you boys are on the right track. More power to you."

Guy Hardy looked to the mountains from whence came his strength. He successfully emphasized the truth which the poet so gloriously suggested in the following lines:

"All roads lead down from the summit,"
The plodding and worldly say,
"Down from the stars and glaciers
To the roofs and walls of day."

"All roads lead down from the summit,"
Oh, not for him who knows
Those mightier peaks ascending
Above the unmelting snows.

Not for the climber spellbound
On twilight's purple crest,
When darkening golden ranges
Loom in the cloudy west!

He, with fierce wings aspiring
Where the last sunbeam dies
Soars bodiless to pathways
Where never an eagle flies.

And, in a passionate worship,
With a vision freshly born,
Perceives that from man's summits
All roads lead up and on!

That was Guy Hardy's text. God rest his soul.

PUBLICATION OF LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have an unusual request to make.

I ask unanimous consent that whoever publishes the RECORD publish in the Appendix tonight a list of the committee members. That has always been done heretofore. We have been in session since the 3d of January. I looked through the RECORD last night and I could not find a list of the members of the various committees.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to state that is a matter for the Joint Committee on Printing. The Chair will consult the chairman of that committee.

Mr. RANKIN. And if the Speaker will ask their unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, I am sure the Members will be grateful.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that be transferred until Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JUDGE GRAFTON GREEN

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week a great judge and a beloved citizen of Tennessee was called to the high bar of justice when Judge Grafton Green of the Supreme Court of Tennessee quietly passed away in Nashville. Judge Grafton Green was 74 years old, and had served as chief justice of the Supreme Court of Tennessee from 1923—24 years. He was elected membership on Tennessee's highest court in 1910, and had served continuously since that date—a period of judiciary service, more than 36 years.

Judge Green was a native of Lebanon, Wilson County, which is in my district, where he maintained his home. He was the illustrious son of an illustrious father. His father, Judge Nathan Green, was for many years professor of law at Tennessee's famed and historic law school, Cumberland University at Lebanon. His grandfather was Judge Nathan Green, who was also a member of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, where he served for 21 years. Judge Grafton Green and his father and grandfather have made a great and lasting contribution toward forming the laws of Tennessee, perhaps more than any other family our State has produced. Judge Green's opinions and decisions are recorded in more than 60 volumes of decisions of the Supreme Court of Tennessee.

Judge Green, in addition to being a great and wise liberal judge and humanitarian, was also a popular and much-loved citizen of our State, not only among the members of the bench and bar, but also a host of other friends and acquaintances. Tennessee has lost a truly great and honored son in the passing of its beloved chief justice, Judge Grafton Green. His passing is mourned in Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

WAR-EXCISE-TAX RATES

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 70.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war-excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, and all points

of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, of that time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House but a moment.

A few days ago the Committee on Ways and Means, by unanimous vote, reported to the House a bill relating to wartime excess-tax rates. A request was made to the Committee on Rules that the measure be expedited to the consideration of the House itself. By unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules, this rule, which has just been read by the Clerk, is proposed for the consideration of the membership.

The reading of the rule, as you have already heard it, explains the situation pretty completely. Briefly, this rule might be termed a closed rule, and I might say in that connection it has been the custom of the House for many years, regardless of the political party in power, that tax measures of this sort should be considered under a so-called closed rule.

The Committee on Ways and Means believes this measure should receive prompt consideration at the hands of the Congress, and the members of the Committee on Rules join in that belief.

As you have noted, the rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, half to be under control of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the other half under the control of the ranking minority member of that committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from New York that I have seen a great many of such bills brought in and passed under suspension of the rules, but I do not believe I ever saw one that also waived all points of order and at the same time confined amendments to members of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall not argue the question with the gentleman from Mississippi, but my recollection runs to the contrary. This is not an unusual procedure. In any event, the situation that confronts the industries of the country demands action on this matter, and whatever it may be it should be prompt, because there are various industries in the country important in size and character which are for the moment left in a state of uncertainty as to what their future shall be. Doubtless many Members of the House have received communications to that effect.

I do not intend to address the House any further upon this subject. The rule is plain. I have yielded 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and no disposition to consume any myself.

While I am on my feet I think I may properly make the observation, and pleasingly so, that in the resolution we find confirmation and approval of the record made by the minority, while it was in the majority, in the handling of matters of this kind. This is a closed rule, and it is the kind of rule that the Democrats when in power supported for the consideration of legislation of this type. It is the only manner, we believe, in which such legislation can be properly and efficiently handled.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Since amendments are denied to anyone except members of the committee and since points of order are waived, why the necessity for 3 hours of debate?

Mr. COX. The committee feels that it is of such importance that probably that much time is needed in order that the country may be informed by speeches made by interested parties.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, points of order as to the bill itself may be waived, but I seriously doubt if the House has a right to waive any point of order based on the Ramseyer rule, that is, that the provision of law amendment shall be published in the report.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no opposition either to the rule or the bill itself. I therefore yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] such time as he desires.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, we have before us for consideration House Resolution 70, which is a rule under which H. R. 1030 will be considered. H. R. 1030 is more commonly known as the luxury-tax bill. May I read to you a portion of what House Resolution 70 contains:

No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what is known as the gag rule, and I have always opposed the gag-rule procedure. I have high regard for the great Committee on Ways and Means of Congress, but I believe my people sent me to this legislative body to consider each paragraph of every bill that comes before us, and not to be forced to follow the dictates of one individual or a small group of individuals. I firmly believe that every bill that comes before Congress should come before this body under an open rule, so that the membership will have an opportunity to amend such legislation. I believe each bill and every paragraph of each bill should be passed or defeated on its merits or demerits. To me the gag rule does not adhere to our principles of government.

I believe that H. R. 1030 should be discussed under an open rule and subject to amendments, because there are articles now taxed as luxuries that certainly do not come under that category but are really necessities.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons stated, I am opposing House Resolution 70 and will vote against it, because we should not be forced to vote "yes" or "no" on a measure without the opportunity to amend the various sections of that legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight and in answer to my very dear friend from Georgia, I wish it to be recorded that our approval of the continuation of these excise taxes is from necessity and not choice. The Republicans are sorry it is necessary to continue these high taxes, but we always have to do that because of the high debt that is always bequeathed to us by the Democratic Party.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the motion.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yielded back my time but I find I have one request for time. Will the gentleman yield the time back?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this body should give long thought and sound, calm deliberation as to how it shall vote on this proposed rule.

One of the major questions of the last campaign was that of taxation. The Republican Party in that campaign promised clearly and definitely to reduce all taxes. The people evidently had faith in the promises of the Republican Party, for they returned a Republican majority to both this and the other House. There is not a man nor a woman in this country whose pocketbook is not vitally affected by this bill which will come before us if this rule is approved. Yet, here we are with a bill given to us by the Republican-dominated Ways and

Means Committee to which we are not allowed to make either amendments or deletions, despite the fact that it will take several billions of dollars out of the pockets of taxpayers of this country. The bill is being brought in under a closed rule which does not give the people's Representatives the opportunity they should have to discuss and revise this measure. Because some have taken a flip-flop and have forgotten their campaign promises in the last few days, I do not think that the entire House should be penalized. There should be an open rule. If we are going to do our duty to those whom we represent, let us vote this rule down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, let me make just one statement. My reference to the approbation that we were here giving to the record with reference to what the minority did during the last session had reference to procedure and not to the substance of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1030, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, aside from the fact that this bill, H. R. 1030, bears my name, there is perhaps no reason why I should inflict myself on the membership at the outset of this debate, except perhaps for the fact that our chairman, being the able general that he is, has sent his shock troops out in front and has reserved the big guns to bring up the rear.

This bill is known as the excise-tax bill of 1947. It comes to you with the unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means. May I say that as a new member of that committee, just privileged to have been assigned thereto at the beginning of this Congress, I have been very deeply impressed with the attitude with which the members of that committee, both the majority and the minority, have approached the problems of our Nation's fiscal affairs. Many of them, as many of you, have problems very greatly affected by the bill that is now before us, but in each case those individual problems have been submerged to that greater interest, the country's good, as evidenced by the unanimity of the report with which this bill is brought to the floor.

This bill has the endorsement of the Treasury Department, and as you know, the President in his message to the Congress at the beginning of this session recommended the continuance of these war excise rates. The purpose of the bill H. R. 1030 is to continue without a definite termination date the war excise rates that were imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943, and that, at the present time, in view of the proclamation by the President that hostilities ended on December 31, 1946, are due to expire on June 30, 1947. Ever since it became known that these war rates were due to expire at the end of next June there has been considerable stagnation in the marketing of furs and jewelry and luggage and other items covered in this bill. It is imperative that this situation be remedied and it must be done promptly. The effect of the indefinite continuance of these war excise rates as proposed by this bill would be to increase the receipts from these excise taxes by $1,130,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. In addition, too, receipts for the fiscal year 1947 will be increased by $37,000,000 due to the effect on current consumption. In other words, it is thought by those in the Treasury Department who did the estimating that there will be some resumption of buying between now and the end of June. When this situation has been clarified, by doing away with the present termination date of June 30, they estimate that additional income to the Treasury for this fiscal year will be another $37,000,000. Receipts for the year 1949 will be increased by approximately $100,000,000, due to the lag of receipts behind liabilities. In other words, reports on these taxes are made at the end of each month and receipts for the last month of the coming fiscal year, the month of June 1948, will spill over into the fiscal year 1949. In the aggregate the net effect is to increase receipts for these 3 years approximately $1,267,000,000.

Section 2 of this bill would continue without a definite termination date again the war-tax rates on admissions, cabarets, membership fees or dues, jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, distilled spirits, wine, beer, billiard and pool tables, bowling alleys, and electric-light bulbs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand, this bill just continues the excise taxes indefinitely?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. That is right, without termination date.

It also includes telephone and telegraph service, transportation of persons, and transportation of property.

The war-tax rates and the previous rates are all set forth in detail in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 3 in similar fashion continues the retailers' excise tax of 20 percent on luggage, brief cases, toilet cases, purses, billfolds, and so on—imposed by section 1651 of the Internal Revenue Code and by virtue of section 1654 made dependent on termination of hostilities—which otherwise would be replaced after June 30, 1947, by the former manufacturers' excise tax of 10 percent on luggage and toilet cases. This section 3 also eliminates the definition of the term "date of termination of hostilities in the present war," which no longer would have any application to the war excise-tax rates.

Section 4 is the technical amendment made necessary to retain in the Internal Revenue Code the present provisions for the mechanics for making floor stocks refunds of war-tax rates on distilled spirits, wines, and beer, and electric-light bulbs held by retailers and wholesalers, if and when such war rates on these items are repealed. Also retained is the technical provision for reduction of the war-tax rates on communications on a bill-rendered basis, if and when such rates are eliminated.

Section 5 is another technical amendment made necessary in connection with the indefinite continuance of the war-tax rates on billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys.

Section 6 is a technical amendment which would continue indefinitely the present rate of draw-back on distilled spirits used in the manufacture of certain nonbeverage products, mainly medicinal, at the rate of $6 a gallon, which is necessary in view of the continuance of the war-tax rates on distilled spirits, upon which such $6 draw-back is based.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to compliment the gentleman on the clear statement he is making regarding this measure. There is one question I should like to ask. Upon what theory is an electric-light bulb or a telephone classed as a luxury rather than a necessity?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think the gentleman has stated a very fair question. The same question could be put as regards communications, such as Western Union telegrams and local and long-distance telephone service. May I point out to the gentleman, however, that a number of our wartime excise rates were written into the Revenue Act of 1941. Others were written into the Revenue Act of 1942. Those tax rates are on the books without any termination date. Others were written into the Revenue Act of 1943 with a termination date of 6 months after the end of hostilities. It is the desire of the committee by this legislation to place those items covered by the Revenue Act of 1943 in the same category as those items which are still taxed under the Revenue Acts of 1941 and 1942, there to remain until such time as this Congress can apply itself to the overall problem of excise taxes and correct such inequities as certainly do exist.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then, as I understand it, this extension merely incorporates those which are embraced in the original act of 1943?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. That is right. It puts them in the same category as are all the other items on which excise taxes are today paid.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I, too, wish to congratulate the gentleman on the very fine statement he is making with respect to this legislation, and I congratulate him particularly on the fact that he is presenting the legislation, being one of the very new members of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, I wish the gentleman would make this point crystal clear. I can well understand the impropriety of fixing a definite termination date of these so-called luxury taxes. At the same time, it is my understanding and the understanding of the members of the Committee on Rules who voted to support the rule and who will vote to support this legislation that because the date is left undetermined it does not mean that the Committee on Ways and Means will not quickly make a reappraisal of the whole luxury-tax situation. As has been ably pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] and others, there are many things in this bill that some of us do not think should be too long delayed in the matter of reappraisal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. RIZLEY. We hope the fact that we are supporting this legislation today, which was recommended by the President, the Treasury Department, and everyone concerned, does not mean that the committee will not hurriedly, expeditiously, and quickly reappraise this whole luxury-tax situation.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee will give the gentleman's suggestion the very earliest possible attention.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Indiana has already referred to the total amount of revenue by which the Treasury will benefit as a result of this legislation. I notice in the report on the bill that following the total of $1,267,000,000 there is carried this sentence:

> This does not include the increase in postal receipts that would result from restoration of postal rates affected by the President's proclamation which would amount to an additional $65,000,000.

May I ask the gentleman from Indiana whether or not any of the provisions of this bill, by direct reference or in any other way, affect the postal rates or restore those rates?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. No; the provisions of this bill have no application whatsoever to the matter of postal rates. That is a different proposition and the gentleman understands, I am sure, that there is not the urgency on the question of postal rates that there is concerning the extension of these excise rates. For that reason, it was deemed necessary and advisable to deal with that separately. Postal rates are not included and are not in any way concerned in this legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I simply thought we ought to have that point made clear so that it would be understood that additional legislation would then be necessary to protect that $65,000,000 in revenue.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The gentleman is correct.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would like to know: What is the purpose of indefinitely extending the excise-tax rates?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I can answer the gentleman very quickly. If we fix another definite termination date, be it 90 days or 9 years, we are only fixing another dead line against which people can sit and wait before making their purchases until the tax is removed. That is the very situation we want to avoid.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If I understand the temper of the people, as expressed in the last election, they are expecting some relief from high taxes. If we wrote this bill and put on the time limitation and extended it as a war measure, I cannot understand why we could not do the same thing in peacetime. My point is that I do not believe the people will feel very good about the situation when they learn that the very first measure we are passing relating to taxes is the reenactment of a tax measure for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will join me in supporting this bill, because when this proposed legislation is on the books we are going to be doubly sure that we are going to be able to give the country that tax relief and make those payments on the debt about which the gentleman is so rightfully concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman has in mind, from the point of view of the gentleman from Indiana, is that the extension of these wartime excise taxes is permanent. Does not indefinitely mean permanently?

Mr. KNUTSON. No, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is what it means from the gentleman's point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana so that he may enlighten the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, enlightenment is always very difficult to get from the gentleman from Minnesota. Indefinite means permanent, does it not?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Indefinite in this case means until such time as the Congress gets around to the matter of surveying the whole hodgepodge of tax legislation we inherited from the New Deal.

Mr. McCORMACK. When this bill passes, it will be making these temporary taxes permanent; is that not correct?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. It is making the terminating date indefinite.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is no use arguing with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] because he is determined to be wrong and he is making a good job of it. I would like to read, if I may, from the President's budget message:

> I have recommended that the war-excise-tax rates due to expire July 1, 1947, be continued.

The gentleman from Massachusetts will see that we on the Republican side are giving the Commander in Chief better support than he is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not the gentleman read the rest of it?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will read it:

> When the time comes for excise-tax revision, the Congress should review the entire group of excise taxes, rather than concentrate attention on those that were imposed or increased during the war.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman has not read all of it; because, what the President said——

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not have time to read all of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. One of the recommendations is that Congress take early action to continue throughout the next fiscal year the war-excise-tax rates.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. If we were to do that which the President recommends, and fix another dead line on June 30, 1948, we would be only establishing for ourselves another headache, having people sit around waiting for that day, 17 months hence, before they would buy their fur coats and other luxury items affected by this resolution.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to the fact that he had better consult Noah Webster's dictionary on what the word "indefinite" means. He will find that it does not mean "permanent."

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does the gentleman realize that some of the members of his committee, when they intimated they would wipe out the excise taxes, ruined and killed the markets of many businessmen?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed.

As I have said before, the amount involved is $1,130,000,000. Slightly more than half of the amount of revenue comes from the sale of beer, wine, and liquor, including imported perfumes containing distilled spirits.

At this point I include a table prepared by the Treasury Department showing the present rates of these taxes, also the new rates that would become effective July 1, 1947, by the President's proclamation, and in the absence of the passage of H. R. 1030:

Rates effective by Presidential proclamation

Description of tax	Present war-tax rates	New rates	Fiscal 1948 loss in revenue
			Millions
Admissions	1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof	
Permanent use or lease of boxes or seats	20 percent	11 percent	111.2
Sales of tickets outside of box office	do	do	
Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	do	5 percent	32.9
Dues or membership fees	do	11 percent	7.9
Initiation fees			
Jewelry	do	10 percent	82.7
Furs	do	do	35.2
Toilet preparations	do	do	33.1
Distilled spirits	$9 per gallon	$6 per gallon	474.7
Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits	do	do	
Still wines:			
(1) Not over 14 percent of alcohol	15 cents per gallon	10 cents per gallon	
(2) Over 14 percent and not over 21 percent of alcohol	60 cents per gallon	40 cents per gallon	
(3) Over 21 percent and not over 24 percent of alcohol	$2 per gallon	$1 per gallon	
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials:			25.2
(1) Champagne or sparkling wine	45 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	
(2) Artificially carbonated wine	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	5 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	
(3) Liqueurs, cordials, etc	do	do	
Fermented malt liquors	$8 per barrel	$7 per barrel	79.7
Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys	$20 per year per table; $20 per year per alley	$10 per year per table; $10 per year per alley	2.3
Electric-light bulbs and tubes	20 percent	5 percent	16.0
Telephone, long-distance	25 percent	20 percent	
Domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	do	15 percent	56.5
Leased wires, etc	do	do	
Wire and equipment service	8 percent	5 percent	
Local telephone service	15 percent	10 percent	53.8
Transportation of persons: Seats, berths, etc	do	do	59.4
Luggage	20 percent of retail sales price	10 percent of manufacturers' sales prices	59.7
Total			1,130.0

The above loss in revenue is figured as the actual loss for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.
Because of some lag in collections, this does not reflect the entire loss on account of the proclamation.
It is also believed that some additional loss will be incurred for the fiscal year 1947 due to purchases being held up prior to July 1, 1947.
The amount of additional loss is roughly estimated at around $170,000,000.

There is a great deal of argument going around as to whether debt reduction or tax relief should take precedence, and as to what form and in what amount any tax relief should be. But whichever theory you adhere to, I believe you can all support, with me, the pending resolution.

Our legislative budget committee is presently meeting to fix a ceiling for our legislative budget. That committee holds the key to the whole question of debt reduction and tax relief. The country expects real economy and not mere lip service in our Federal expenditures. The country expects and the country must have a balanced budget; substantial payments on the national debt, and tax relief as well. If our individuals are to have tax relief, and the country is to have a balanced budget, together with a substantial payment on our national debt, then there seems no other alternative except to continue these present war-excise taxes on so-called luxury items in effect, at least until such time as the Congress has an opportunity to consider the whole budget picture.

I hope you will support this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill under consideration by the committee provides for the indefinite maintenance of the wartime excise taxes which were superimposed upon an already burdened list of select items. There was never any justification, to my mind, in singling out an item here and another there for discriminatory taxing purposes, but there was even less excuse for the additional "superduper" sales taxes which were levied upon these same items as a war emergency revenue measure.

I have always opposed the imposition of excises upon goods or services, and I am now opposed to the principle involved. In committee I waged combat relentlessly against imposts of this kind, and when I could not prevent the levy, I then sought to limit the amount or aimed to designate the level or the source at which the tax was to be collected, whichever was lower. Success crowned my efforts with regard to the imposition on automobiles, tires, and accessories in that they were held to 7 percent. My motion to block additional cigarette taxes and to prevent the nuisance bank-check tax prevailed, but all in all the limited sales-tax list has grown to produce a swollen and disproportionate amount of revenue which is exacted from certain industries in addition to the income tax. This practice or policy is as unfair as it is unwarranted, if it is intended to be indefinitely continued.

There is neither rhyme nor reason for the continued tax upon the products of the automobile industry. The automobile in the life of the average American citizen is indispensable. America lives and advances upon wheels. To tax the product of this industry which has been the bellwether of our peerless industrial prosperity is to paralyze profits and progress. Many items taxed as luxuries are in fact essentials to the consumer. Some have been singled out for punitive reasons, I suspect; and if we do not fulfill our promise to the American people as contained in the report at the time of adoption to the effect that these super-sales taxes would be terminated 6 months after cessation of hostilities, we will break faith with the taxpayers and the industries which will suffer in the coming normally competitive market. Do not tax the product lest you retard production; tax the profits. No profit, no tax, is the only sound basis for taxation.

The responsibility for these taxes is not mine. In his message, the President recommended a year's extension. In 1943 I initiated the move to terminate the nuisance 6 months after the war and had that assurance put into the report. Following this, the committee and the House acted favorably upon my move to fulfill the pledge when the last tax bill was presented in the Seventy-ninth session; but in spite of my views in conference, excepting the repeal of auto-use tax, it was bartered away for the full and immediate repeal of excess-profits tax, favoring corporations.

The fur industry, including trapper, cutter, and merchant, seems to me, could better stand the uncertainty of 6 months than the harassment of permanent tax discrimination. The workingman's dream of a 5-cent glass of beer can never be realized under the present excise-tax schedule. The tax on beer must be reduced real soon. The user of cosmetics, the patron of the night club, and the bowler or billiard player is not going to supinely submit to mistreatment without recourse—and the responsibility is yours of the Republican majority. You have grown to maturity. It was one thing to snipe at the Democrats all these years, to shoot from cover, hit and run, and disavow any responsibility, placing the blame upon the Democrats; but you cannot get away with that now. From this day on you are at fault for the maintenance of the discriminatory "superduper" select sales taxes until they are repealed; and if you calculate that I am going along with you upon the premise that the excises will pave the

way for your frosty sham of a horizontal income-tax cut of 20 percent, you are mistaken.

Frankly, I believe that there should be no tax cut for 1947; that all surplus revenues following a balanced budget should be applied to the reduction of the public debt, and thus to bolster the Nation's credit. Your reckless Republican campaign pledges, used as election bait, cannot be fulfilled without dire consequences to millions of small American investors who hold billions of dollars in Government bonds. You need only to harken back to March of 1933 to recall that the Treasury of the United States was an empty cavern and that postal savings could not have been redeemed if the public made a concerted demand.

The press quoted Chairman KNUTSON as saying that retention of excises makes easy the proposed 20-percent horizontal income-tax cut. So that is the plan to penalize the consumer for the high-bracket income-tax payer. I want to serve notice now that when the time comes for tax relief I will insist upon the raising of exemptions for dependents from $500 to $1,000 and the increase of exemptions for married couples from $1,000 to $2,000. If the budget is trimmed with sanity and safety to our Government services and armed forces so that neither will be impaired and the savings justify further relief, I will insist upon following the established precedent of the Democrats in the last tax bill of 1945 by striking off the tax rolls with one stroke several million more of the small taxpayers at the bottom of the column, for they are the least able to carry the burden.

Comparison of estimated receipts in the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, including and excluding wartime tax rates [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated receipts				Increase or decrease (—) estimated receipts excluding wartime tax rates over estimated receipts including wartime tax rates	
	Fiscal year 1947		Fiscal year 1948			
	Including wartime tax rates	Excluding wartime tax rates	Including wartime tax rates	Excluding wartime tax rates	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948
Miscellaneous internal revenue:						
Estate tax	678.0	678.0	679.0	679.0		
Gift tax	52.0	52.0	50.0	50.0		
Liquor taxes:						
Distilled spirits (domestic and imported) (excise tax) [2]	1,777.0	1,752.1	1,580.0	1,105.3	—24.9	—474.7
Fermented malt liquors	669.0	669.0	715.0	635.3		—79.7
Rectification tax [2]	55.0	55.0	50.0	50.0		
Wines (domestic and imported) (excise tax) [2]	84.0	81.9	86.0	60.8	—2.1	—25.2
Special taxes in connection with liquor occupations	11.6	11.6	12.0	12.0		
Container stamps	14.5	14.5	13.0	13.0		
All other	.9	.9	1.0	1.0		
Total liquor taxes	2,612.0	2,585.0	2,457.0	1,877.4	—27.0	—579.6
Tobacco taxes:						
Cigarettes (small)	1,126.0	1,126.0	1,112.0	1,112.0		
Tobacco (chewing and smoking)	40.2	40.2	39.0	39.0		
Cigars (large)	52.5	52.5	57.0	57.0		
Snuff	7.2	7.2	7.1	7.1		
Cigarette papers and tubes	1.0	1.0	.8	.8		
All other	.1	.1	.1	.1		
Total tobacco taxes	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,216.0	1,216.0		
Stamp taxes:						
Issues of securities, bond transfers, and deeds of conveyance	41.0	41.0	45.0	45.0		
Stock transfers	26.0	26.0	29.0	29.0		
Playing cards	9.2	9.2	8.8	8.8		
Silver bullion sales or transfers	.8	.8	.2	.2		
Total, stamp taxes	77.0	77.0	83.0	83.0		
Manufacturers' excise taxes:						
Gasoline	444.0	444.0	486.0	486.0		
Lubricating oils	81.5	81.5	89.0	89.0		
Passenger automobiles and motorcycles	188.0	188.0	271.0	271.0		
Automobile trucks, busses, and trailers	52.0	52.0	59.0	59.0		
Parts and accessories for automobiles	88.0	88.0	78.0	78.0		
Tires and inner tubes	176.0	176.0	162.0	162.0		
Electrical energy	61.5	61.5	65.0	65.0		
Electric, gas, and oil appliances	64.0	64.0	79.0	79.0		
Electric-light bulbs	22.0	21.4	14.0	8.0	—.6	—16.0
Radio receiving sets, phonographs, phonograph records, and musical instruments	65.0	65.0	66.0	66.1		.1
Refrigerators, refrigerating apparatus, and air-conditioners	40.5	40.5	59.0	59.0		
Business and store machines	26.5	26.5	33.0	33.0		
Photographic apparatus	38.5	38.5	44.0	44.0		
Luggage				7.2		7.2
Matches	8.5	8.5	8.0	8.0		
Sporting goods	16.5	16.5	18.0	18.0		
Firearms, shells, pistols, and revolvers	7.5	7.5	8.0	8.2		.2
Total, manufacturers' excise taxes	1,380.0	1,379.4	1,549.0	1,540.5	—.6	—8.5
Retailers' excise taxes:						
Jewelry, etc	236.0	232.6	213.0	130.3	—3.4	—82.7
Furs	101.0	99.0	84.0	48.8	—2.0	—35.2
Toilet preparations	93.0	91.5	79.0	45.9	—1.5	—33.1
Luggage, handbags, wallets, etc	89.0	86.8	76.0	9.1	—2.2	—66.9
Total retailers' excise taxes	519.0	509.9	452.0	234.1	—9.1	—217.9
Miscellaneous taxes:						
Telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities, leased wires, etc	253.0	253.0	255.0	198.5		—56.5
Local telephone service	178.0	178.0	200.0	146.2		—53.8
Transportation of oil by pipe line	15.5	15.5	15.9	15.9		
Transportation of persons	247.0	247.0	215.0	155.6		—59.4
Transportation of property	250.0	250.0	270.0	270.0		
Admissions, exclusive of cabarets, roof gardens, etc	362.0	362.0	327.0	215.8		—111.2
Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	62.0	62.0	53.0	20.1		—32.9
Club dues and initiation fees	22.0	22.0	20.0	12.1		—7.9
Leases of safe deposit boxes	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1		
Coconut and other vegetable oils processed [2]	14.9	14.9	20.5	20.5		
Oleomargarine, etc., including special taxes and adulterated butter	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3		

[1] Wartime tax rates in effect through June 30, 1947.
[2] Collections for credit to trust funds are not included.

Comparison of estimated receipts in the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, including and excluding wartime tax rates [1]—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimated receipts				Increase or decrease (—) estimated receipts excluding wartime tax rates over estimated receipts including wartime tax rates	
	Fiscal year 1947		Fiscal year 1948			
	Including wartime tax rates	Excluding wartime tax rates	Including wartime tax rates	Excluding wartime tax rates	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948
Miscellaneous internal revenue—Continued						
Miscellaneous taxes—Continued						
Sugar tax	60.0	60.0	75.0	75.0		
Coin-operated amusement and gaming devices	21.5	21.5	21.5	21.5		
Bowling alleys, and billiard and pool tables	4.6	4.3	4.7	2.4	—.3	—2.3
All other, including repealed taxes [3]	1.7	1.7	1.0	1.0		
Total miscellaneous taxes	1,505.0	1,504.7	1,491.0	1,167.0	—0.3	—324.0
Total miscellaneous internal revenue (collection basis)	8,050.0	8,013.0	7,977.0	6,847.0	—37.0	—1,130.0
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis						
Total miscellaneous internal revenue (daily Treasury statement basis)	8,050.0	8,013.0	7,977.0	6,847.0	—37.0	—1,130.0

[1] Wartime tax rates in effect through June 30, 1947.

[3] Includes collections from taxes on narcotics, taxes imposed under the National Firearms Act, and the tax on hydraulic mining, all of which are effective currently. In addition, includes collections from excise taxes repealed or suspended prior to and including the Revenue Act of 1945 (consisting primarily of rubber articles, electric signs, optical equipment, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and manufacturers' tax on luggage); collections from the liquor, tobacco, matches, tires, and tubes floor-stocks taxes imposed by the Revenue Acts of 1941, 1942, and 1943; collections from the tax under the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 which expired Aug. 24, 1943; collections from the capital-stock tax repealed with respect to years ending after June 30, 1945; and collections from the use tax on motor vehicles and boats repealed by the Revenue Act of 1945 with respect to the period after June 30, 1946.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Jan. 2, 1947.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to remind the gentleman that I made those recommendations a year ago, and so did a good many other Republicans.

Mr. DINGELL. I made the recommendation in the report filed in 1943, I may say to the gentleman and, further, since the gentleman raises the question, I will say that I made the motion in committee in connection with the tax bill of 1945 which passed here in the House and, as I state in my remarks, that action of the House was bartered away in conference for the excess-profits-tax repeal.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I am wondering if our good friend from Pennsylvania is now assuring us that when the Democrats make the proposal just referred to by the gentleman from Michigan we can count on his vote, or has he changed his mind?

Mr. DINGELL. I am not prepared to answer for the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Despite what my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said to the contrary in an effort to put a different construction on the word "indefinite" from a legislative angle the fact remains that the bill now before the House calls for the fixing of these wartime excise taxes permanently. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. DINGELL. I take it to be that.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the only way they can be repealed or reduced is by affirmative action on the part of the Congress?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any legislation passed by the Congress without termination date is what we call permanent legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Despite all of the efforts of my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], to camouflage to the contrary, the fact is that "indefinite" and "permanent" in the sense of legislation are synonymous and the same?

Mr. DINGELL. Identical, and we so discussed and understood that in committee. They were made permanent so it was said in order to give assurance to business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, is it not the gentleman's experience on the Ways and Means Committee—it certainly was mine in 10 years' experience on that committee—that when a bill comes up in reference to the lowering of taxes, excise taxes are considered last?

Mr. DINGELL. That is true. There is no question at all about it, and that is the reason I insisted that we stipulate in the report at the time that the "superduper" select sales taxes imposed upon industry and its products stood repealed 6 months after the termination of the war or by the act of Congress. That is, by proclamation of the President or by action of the Congress.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact my good friend from Massachusetts insists upon his definition of what the word "indefinite" means from a legislative standpoint, he cannot change the authorities on the meaning of words that have existed for years and "indefinite" never has meant "permanent."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman six additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed that the gentleman from Illinois would make that statement. Any time we pass a law without a termination date it is permanent legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any law without a termination date could be charged to be indefinite, but from a legislative angle it is permanent for all time unless Congress repeals such a law.

Mr. DINGELL. By specific action.

Mr. McCORMACK. By affirmative action on the part of the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The definition of words in Webster's dictionary is one thing, but the definition of words as understood legislatively is something else, and it is something else we are considering now. It is the legislative meaning we are concerned with here.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona. Thus far in the debate there has not been a shred of evidence to point to the arguments of the majority as to what "indefinite" means or that it is only temporary. I assume that permanency is intended by the action of the committee and as prescribed by the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I believe the gentleman made the statement that in 1933, if the holders of postal savings would have demanded full payment, that that demand could not have been met; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. I believe that was quite generally conceded at the time. When we Democrats came in I think it was necessary on March 5th or 6th to meet a certain amount of maturing obligations in interest of about—well, I hesitate to say the amount of the interest, but it was in the millions of dollars, and we did not even have millions of cents

which the Republicans at that time would pass over to us for the Treasury. It was, as I remember, empty.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman not think that the Federal Government still had some borrowing power?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; it had borrowing power and that is what had to be done. The President courageously closed all banks. We took stock and put the country on a firm financial basis where it is today.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where what is today?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, your bonds are worth 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. KNUTSON. Fifty-five-cent dollars.

Mr. DINGELL. Your bonds are worth 100 cents on the dollar, and all your other obligations, including some of the outstanding old Liberties, are a way high, and when the Republicans yielded control to the Democrats in 1932, I believe that the 4-percent Liberties were selling anywhere from ten to twelve dollars under par, and the Wall Streeters were taking them up out of the hands of the poor.

Mr. KNUTSON. When was that?

Mr. DINGELL. That was while the Republicans were in power. The Liberties are now back to full face value and above par.

Mr. KNUTSON. Woodrow Wilson was President when the Liberties went to 82.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; and that is when the Republicans rigged the market and bought the bonds that the poor man had to let go.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, that is what always happens when the Democrats are in power.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that I expect to vote for this bill, but since you have given the Committee on Ways and Means the right to offer amendments and denied that right to the rest of us, I certainly hope that there will be a softening of the heart so far as light bulbs are concerned. I hate to see them perpetuate this tax when we are striving every way possible to put electric lights in every farm home in America. That amendment certainly would be adopted, if offered by the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. I know the gentleman's leanings and actions in regard to the user of electric power, and I am in entire sympathy with him. But I want to say to my friend from Mississippi that what we will have to do is to strike off these "superduper" taxes all at one and the same time, because if we do not, I will say to my friend, some of the fur trappers down in his State and Louisiana and elsewhere will be handicapped with this tax forever. You cannot take these items out one at a time. The impression of the American public was that they would be terminated 6 months after the war by either proclamation of the President or by action of the Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am just a little surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who served for so many years on the Committee on Ways and Means, should have raised the red herring about the question of indefiniteness or permanence as to this legislation.

Certainly his experience should have informed the gentleman of the fact that when you put a definite termination date on taxes of this character you get a buyers strike for some period in advance of the expiration of the tax. As I understand it, the purpose of the Committee on Ways and Means here is to leave the thing open so that the committee may have an opportunity to consider what should be changed, and if and when, and not tip off their hand to some speculators or others in advance of the termination.

Mr. DINGELL. In the meantime, it is permanent until we take affirmative action.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of the gentleman from Massachusetts was to show that the Republicans had got themselves into a trap and are trying to alibi themselves out of the trap by saying that "indefinite" means something other than "permanent" from a legislative angle.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, all the Republicans are trying to do here is get out of the mess that was created by the President's termination of hostilities without making any provision for the strike situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that the minority has seen fit to drag politics into such an important discussion. We do not come here asking for an extension of these excise taxes with any degree of satisfaction. We are here by necessity. Of course, when the President of the United States submits a budget calling for $37,500,000,000, which is five times as high as any peace budget in all the history of the Republic, we must retain some taxes that we would under ordinary circumstances repeal. These excise taxes are not our children. They were put on while you folks were in control, and they were necessitated by the war that Roosevelt again and again and again said would never happen. We regret exceedingly that it is necessary to extend these excise taxes indefinitely. But let me assure my good friend from Massachusetts, who loves to have his head in the clouds when it suits his purpose, and he is very adroit——

Mr. DINGELL. That is better than in the sand.

Mr. KNUTSON. If he were not so tall he would have his head in the sand.

Mr. DINGELL. He would have to bend over, though.

Mr. RANKIN. Go ahead, points of order are waived.

Mr. KNUTSON. I repeat, it does not give us any satisfaction to ask for the extension of these excise taxes, but I say again to my good friend from Massachusetts that "indefinite" does not mean "permanent." We will go over the whole excise-tax list before long and see if we cannot give relief where needed. The gentleman from Massachusetts was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means when many of these taxes were imposed. They are all New Deal children, you know, all of them.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not see any occasion for getting too excited about this one bill. We have 17 tax bills that were put on the records by the New Deal, and, of course, we want to take them off, but we cannot take them all off at once if we are going to pay anything on the debt.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think what bothers the minority whip is that we are proceeding so expeditiously to carry out the promises we made to the people last fall.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not interested in shadow boxing about the words "permanent" or "indefinite," but I wonder if the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, would support an amendment to eliminate electric light bulbs from the provisions of this bill. I think that ought to be done. They are not luxuries; they are necessities.

Mr. KNUTSON. I grant the gentleman that, but this is only one of many, many taxes that were foisted on the people during the New Deal regime, and we did not have time to correct all the inequities that were inflicted by our predecessors.

Mr. RANKIN. That could be done very easily, though.

Mr. KNUTSON. Therefore we asked for a closed rule which would bar any amendments except those offered by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would suggest to my very good friend that he take it up with the Senate Finance Committee. This bill will go over to the Senate and he can have it amended there. Of course, we are following the good old Democratic policy of bringing the bill to the floor under a gag rule.

Mr. RANKIN. I just thought the gentleman from Minnesota might be willing to go along with us and eliminate that item here in the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would be glad to, but if we open up this Pandora's Box on the floor of the House we may not know where we will stop.

Mr. RANKIN. But only committee amendments can be offered.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, I understand that.

Mr. RANKIN. I think a majority of the committee would go with you and support such an amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman must not forget that there are 25 members on the committee and each one might wish to offer a different amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Minnesota made a statement at the close of his remarks which might have left the impression that any member of the Committee on Ways and Means could offer an amendment. Is that correct or can only committee amendments be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will read the rule I think he will find that those amendments are offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANKIN. And not by an individual member?

Mr. KNUTSON. No.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, for the last several months the country has seen fumbling and stumbling over a tax program the like of which we have never previously witnessed. Each day has brought some new statement from the leaders of the majority party to the effect that taxes would be reduced. The Republicans made this promise before election day and time after time reiterated it after election day. And yet, what do we find today—when the majority party has the opportunity to do something in the way of a reduction of taxes? We find not only are they retaining the taxes which were to expire on June 30, 1947, but they now desire to go even further and make those taxes permanent. This bill, H. R. 1030, goes far beyond what the President urged when he asked that the war excise taxes be extended for another year. He did not ask that they be made permanent.

He said, and I quote:

> One of these recommendations is that the Congress take early action to continue throughout the next fiscal year the war excise rates which under the present law will expire on June 30, 1947.

These taxes were imposed with the distinct understanding that they would terminate 6 months after the termination of hostilities. It is useless for the Republicans to say that they are continuing these taxes at the behest of President Truman. They seek to maintain an outward show of respectability by that statement. They intend to keep these taxes as permanent levies.

The minority members of the Ways and Means Committee realize that there are some war excise taxes that might well be carried over for another year, in view of the stupendous effort being made by President Truman to balance the budget. We realize also, however, that there are some war excise taxes that could properly be scaled down. However, the majority party cuts the pattern and we of the minority must, albeit unwillingly, accept the tax bill with the terms and conditions laid down by the Republicans in the Congress, without amendment, or we must vote against any extension of all war excise taxes without exception and thus deprive the Government of much-needed revenue. We would then be blamed by the Republicans for failing to balance the budget and for failing to reduce the national debt.

How can the position of the Republican Party today be reconciled with the position it took when in the minority? In 1945 the House of Representatives set June 30, 1946, as the termination date of war excise taxes. When the bill went to conference the termination date of June 30, 1946, was stricken from the bill and the termination date was placed as of 6 months after the termination of hostilities. That was on October 30, 1945. On January 18, 1946, the present chairman of the Ways and Means Committee introduced H. R. 5174, which had for its purpose to terminate wartime excise tax rates as of June 30, 1946.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is the date of that bill?

Mr. LYNCH. The date of your bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. The date of the bill is January 18, 1946, just 3 months after you, as a member of the conference committee, voted to strike it out, and brought back a conference report where, instead of June 30, 1946, you said "6 months after final termination of hostilities."

Mr. KNUTSON. That bill was introduced 8 months before the President brought the all-time-high peace budget to Congress.

Mr. LYNCH. I do not care when the President brought the budget. I am talking about when the gentleman from Minnesota introduced a bill, under date of January 6, 1946, to terminate excise taxes on the 30th of June of that year. That was when the Republicans were in the minority. Now when the Republicans are in the majority and despite their constant reiteration that they would reduce taxes, we see them come back with a bill that not only eliminates the termination date, but fixes these excise taxes as permanent levies. In H. R. 5174, introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, when he was ranking minority member in January 1946, there is the provision that the war excise tax on furs should be reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent. On January 3 of this year I introduced H. R. 109, which provides for the reduction of the wartime excise tax from 20 percent to 10 percent on furs costing only up to $1,000, for the reason that, in my opinion, and I think the opinion is well justified, furs up to that amount are in reality necessities. Up in the north country a fur coat on a woman is almost an absolute necessity. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, when he was ranking minority member, introduced the bill to eliminate war excise taxes on furs completely, but now when he is chairman of the committee, when his party is in power and when he has the opportunity of removing the war excise tax on furs, the Republicans come in with a bill that freezes the tax as a permanent levy.

What kind of a tax program is the majority party going to give to the people of this country if when they were not in power they introduced bills which would eliminate war excise taxes and when they are in power, they not only refuse to introduce those bills, but they go even further—they fasten the tax as a permanent levy. The people of the United States must recognize that under this bill, war excise taxes are made permanent levies. I have received dozens of letters from fur manufacturers and retailers in and around New York City who have requested that the war excise tax on furs be immediately removed, for the reason that the consuming public, anticipating that these taxes will be removed by the end of June of this year, are now refusing to buy furs or fur-trimmed garments. I desire to warn these fur manufacturers and retailers and the consuming public that under this bill they are going to have war excise taxes on furs as a permanent diet. The same goes for other items, such as cosmetics, jewelry, luggage, liquor, and the like. The Republicans are fastening a permanent tax upon them by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true in the sense in which the gentleman speaks that all tax rates are permanent?

Mr. LYNCH. It is not true in the sense I speak that all tax rates are permanent. The bill which is now being amended provided a definite time of termination of these excise taxes and that definite time was 6 months after the termination of hostilities. The bill before us today provides no set time of termination, but, as a matter of fact, continues on and on and on, and will in all likelihood continue on and on until the Democrats get back into power in this House.

Mr. KNUTSON. That will be a long, long time.

Mr. LYNCH. Then we will bring the excise taxes back to the 1942 level. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further briefly?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield for another question.

Mr. CURTIS. Undoubtedly it is true that the income tax on individuals and corporations, and most of our taxes, are fixed and there is no date upon which they expire; but we cannot bind this Congress at a later date this session or

next session, we cannot bind future Congresses. It is just folly to suggest that this tax cannot be changed at a later date. It is not permanent.

Mr. LYNCH. I wonder if the gentleman thinks that if under the present tax law nothing were done with respect to the income tax by this present Congress those taxes would continue or cease? There is no question but what those taxes would continue until the House and the Senate pass a bill which either repealed the act or amended it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman favor the reduction of excise taxes on jewelry and furs effective 6 months in the future? Or does he think that when it is repealed or altered it should be made effective at once?

Mr. LYNCH. I feel very badly that the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of my committee, has not read H. R. 109 which provides that there shall be a graduated reduction. Instead of eliminating the fur tax completely I think what should be done should be to eliminate the tax up to a certain ceiling cost or price; the same with jewelry, and the same with cosmetics.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very interesting to me, I may say to the gentleman from New York, to witness the efforts of some of our Republican friends to say that legislation which has no termination date is not permanent within the meaning of legislative intent. This is the first time in 18 years I have ever heard that argument advanced; and it is rather amusing to see our friends, the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, trying to draw a line of distinction now when everybody knows that from a legislative angle when a bill passes without termination date it is permanent legislation.

Mr. LYNCH. Now let us see what the result would be if my bill H. R. 109 had been accepted by the committee. It is estimated that with the present excise taxes on furs the yield to the Government for the fiscal year of 1947 will be $99,000,000, so that, in reality, if my bill to remove the war excise tax on furs costing up to $1,000 had been accepted, it would have meant a decrease in revenue to the Government of approximately $37,000,000 and I have no doubt that the $37,000,000 would be readily recouped in the increased business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the same argument may be offered with respect to such items as jewelry, cosmetics, and luggage, if the war excise tax were removed on these items up to a certain ceiling price. This would have been fair to the consumer and, likewise, would have been fair to the manufacturer, but under the Republican plan one of two things is intended to be done—either that from now on out these taxes are going to be permanent fixtures, or else the Republicans are trying to hide from the consumer the possibility that these taxes might hereafter be removed, so that up to the very last minute the unwary consumer will continue making purchases and paying the tax, so that the business of the manufacturer will not be hurt and the little person—the consumer—will be left holding the bag. The plain and simple fact is that what the Republicans promised before election and, yes, even what they promised since the convening of the Eightieth Congress, they now fail to fulfill.

On October 21, 1946, the following article appeared under a Washington date line in the Christian Science Monitor:

> A statement signed by all Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee sets the GOP fiscal goal in the next Congress as a budget trimmed to between $32,000,000,000 and $33,000,000,000, a $5,000,000,000 reduction in the national debt, a reduction in personal income taxes of 20 percent, and "downward adjustments in Federal excise taxes."

That statement, according to the Christian Science Monitor, was the work of 27 Republican Members of the House, including all Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. That was before election.

That explains why for the first time since I have been in Congress the tax bill has not been introduced by the chairman of the committee, and that explains why for the first time a new member of the committee steps out on the floor and says that the new members of the committee are the shock troops and that the big guns will bring up the rear, but the big guns did not have the nerve to come out on the floor and introduce the bill themselves because of this statement made on October 21, 1946.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Will not the gentleman from New York agree with me that the Republicans who made that statement the gentleman has just quoted, find themselves in the position of the man who has a mouthful of hot potatoes and does not know whether to swallow them or spit them out?

Mr. LYNCH. I would not say that the Republicans had a mouthful of hot potatoes, but I say they are on a hot spot in any event.

On November 7, 1946, 2 days after the election, the following appeared under a Washington date line in the Chicago Daily Tribune, and I call your attention to the fact that the returns had not yet been in because it is shown on the back of this paper that the returns are still coming in in Illinois. Just look at the headline: "Tax cut first GOP move." Then there is the subheadline "KNUTSON asks early action on 20 percent slash. Urges excise levy reduction too." And so there cannot be any mistake as to who it is that made the statement, they print Mr. KNUTSON'S picture in the paper along with the statement.

Now, what does this statement say? Let me read only a part of it. We want to know what the gentleman from Minnesota said only 2 days after election.

> Moreover, KNUTSON said, his committee will open public hearings in February on another bill to save the taxpayers money. Its purpose will be to cut back luxury excise taxes to 1942 levels. It will reduce, and in some cases eliminate, excises on a long list of items that includes jewelry, furs, cosmetics, and liquors. The reductions are to be effective next July 1.

That was 2 days after the election.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. There are the statements of the Republicans both before and after election and the so-called fulfillment of their promise to reduce war excise taxes is found in this bill H. R. 1030, which fastens these levies permanently on the very things on which it was promised there would be a tax reduction. If that is the Republican program with respect to excise taxes, then the public can prepare itself for a similar policy on income taxes, because again promises were made, and already excuses for the nonfulfillment of those promises are being made. No longer are the Republicans boasting about their proposed 20-percent cut across the board, and I might say that on January 6 I introduced H. R. 480, a bill which provided, not for a 20 percent cut across the board for income taxes, but rather an increase of exemptions from $500 to $1,000 for single persons and from $1,000 to $2,000 for husband and wife filing a joint return. I hope that more consideration will be given my bill proposing increased exemptions than was given my bill proposing a reduction of the war excise taxes on furs costing up to $1,000.

The alibi is being prepared by the Republicans for their failure to reduce taxes by placing the blame on labor because of labor's demand for portal-to-portal pay. Labor is to be the scapegoat; let labor remember, and let the consuming public remember that the promises made by the Republicans to reduce the excise taxes, the promises whereby they garnered thousands upon thousands of votes, are not being fulfilled.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a historic occasion. The Republicans are being castigated and chastised for following the recommendation of the President that these taxes be continued, which indicates to me that you are getting ready to heave overboard a political Jonah. I deny that these taxes are being made permanent unless it be true that they will not be repealed until the Democrats again get control of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

THE AMTORG INDUSTRIAL SURVEY BY THE U. S. S. R.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday's morning Times-Herald carried an amazing story with the headline "Manual for bombing and sabotaging United States published by Russians. Data for huge volume gathered while we forged weapons to defend Soviet," with a byline credited to Walter Trohan.

Mr. Chairman, since that story appeared in the Tuesday morning paper, our House Committee on Un-American Activities has been besieged with calls and visitors inquiring as to the background of that story and as to what information, if any, we have on the subject. Since this is the first meeting of the House since the story broke in the newspapers yesterday, I have taken this time this afternoon to share with the Members of the House the background of the information, which our committee has on this very amazing situation.

I have, as a matter of fact, the book here today about which this article is written, so there is no question about the fact that the book exists. This book is written in Russian, but we have had it under the process of translation for some time by Dr. Yacobsen of the Library of Congress, who is able to translate from Russian into English. Unbeknown to us, as we were making our investigation, and as our translations were being made, this story broke in the newspapers, due to the energy and astuteness of Mr. Trohan, who by the way did not get his information from our committee either directly or indirectly. However, since it is now a matter of public knowledge, we feel we have an obligation to share with you and the country the information we have and to quote to you certain passages direct from this book.

I am taking this time now because we have promised to deliver this book this evening to Navy Intelligence, which has been after it, as they are going to photostat and use it for their purposes. Consequently, after today it will no longer be in the hands of our committee.

The book with which Mr. Trohan's story deals is called—I cannot pronounce its Russian title—in the English translation "American Construction." It was published in 1946 by Amtorg Trading Corp., an official agency of the Russian Government. The article in the Times-Herald refers to this as a "target manual" or a "saboteur's guidebook" to the United States. I do not know whether it is or not because I have never seen the requirements for such a utilitarian compilation. I will let you draw your own conclusions as we proceed with what is in the book.

I may say the book is divided into five parts. The first part deals with the industrial construction and transportation system of the United States. The second part deals with housing and public construction, the third part with sanitation, the fourth part with the mechanization and organization of our major buildings, and the fifth with the output of the building supplies made here in the United States. It was prepared by the engineers of the People's Commissariat of Building Industry, who visited the United States officially in connection with the work of the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

I want to emphasize at this point that there is nothing illegal about this book. There is no criticism of Russia to be attached to its publication on that point. These men were simply taking advantage of a situation we made available to them. In my opinion, it is a case of carrying good neighborliness to its illogical extreme. I am not criticizing the Russians for taking advantage of a situation which, as I shall proceed to show, was officially made available to them and which respectable and responsible Americans helped them to utilize most expertly.

I want to quote now directly from some of the pages and paragraphs of this book. On page 15 of the book is pictured the Norris Dam in Tennessee illustrating the use of cheap power and the transportation of energy in this country. On the adjoining page are shown other dams and major power plants of this country, showing their establishment, showing airplane views of them, and describing them in complete detail.

On page 19 of the book is a picture of the Pratt-Whitney Co. at West Hartford, Conn., and in translation some of the details of the airplane engines produced there and where it is located.

On page 18 of the book are some very interesting engineers' sketches, with all the data included in Russian, of the metallurgical plant at Geneva, Utah, showing the general plan of the factory. The text contains an analysis of the plant and deals with the blast furnaces, and shows its strategic location.

In the next picture, No. 18, we are told by our translator, Dr. Yacobsen, of the Library of Congress, about the Kaiser plant in Fontana, Calif., with the general plant description, the description of the blast furnaces, the connecting railroads, and the general output capacity. So it goes on through a series of other major industries of this country. I can read off just a few of them to you without stopping to show you more of these pictures.

On pages 43 to 45, there is shown the Chrysler plant in Detroit, with a general view of the assembly building, the general plan of the factory, the assembly building interior in all its meticulous detail.

On pages 46 and 47 is shown the Ford factory at River Rouge with a general view of the main building.

On pages 48 and 49 is shown the Hamilton Standard Propellor Co. of Hartford, Conn., with the interior of the building.

On pages 56 to 58 is shown the Dodge factory at Detroit with an airplane view of the assembly building, a sketch of the plant, the second floor and the first floor in detail, with the names of the various units in Russian.

On pages 65 to 67 is shown the Bell aircraft factory.

On page 69 is shown the Ford factory at Willow Run, the assembly building interior, the assembly building and so on down the line.

One of the most interesting sections of the book contains very detailed sketches, all of which are capable of being blown up, of course, to sizes a great deal larger than shown in this book, dealing with the construction of all the metallurgical factories in the United States, the author of which is I. I. Kostin. The article contains an unusually detailed description of the Geneva plant building near Salt Lake City, Utah, and the illustrations on the next page, as well as on the following pages, represent various sections of the plant section by section.

Mr. I. I. Kostin is author of a third article in the volume on railroad transportation and the mechanization of freight-handling techniques in the United States and various concentration points of our transportation industry.

Another interesting section deals with bridges. The article on pages 66 and 79 on steel bridges in the United States is contributed by Beliaiev which contains a detailed description of bridges throughout the United States with the description of each individual bridge containing the following items: Location of the bridge, its technical particulars, the date of the opening, its cost, the name of the builders, and the amount of material used on each bridge.

Here you have all the pictures of all the great bridges in the United States, including the Golden Gate Bridge in California, the George Washington Bridge in New York, and a general view of the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge with its various approaches.

I think one of the unusually interesting lay-outs is this one on the TVA. On the next page there is a map of the whole TVA construction program with its power units, together with all the other industries and agencies in the TVA. We do not have to remind anybody, of course, that the TVA is in the vicinity of Oak Ridge, Tenn. It is a very important part of our defense establishment because of its relation to atom bomb manufacturing.

Since I am not a military strategist, I would like to make a few observations in conjunction with this book which, as I say, is going to be photostated, filed, and analyzed by our Intelligence Service.

Our committee was in process of determining what best use to make of this material, as I say, when the story broke in the Times-Herald. Since now the matter is public knowledge, we feel that the Members of Congress are entitled to know these rather significant facts.

In the first place, it seems to me it demonstrates a very great lack of the practice of a program of realistic reciprocity insofar as our friends, the Russians, are concerned. I have taken the pains to make an analysis through the agencies of our Committee on Un-American Activities, for example, of the number of people they have here from Russia at the present time, officially. I am not talking about Communist activities now. I am not talking about subversive activities. These are official guests with visas from the State Department—inspectors and people coming over to analyze defense establishments in America and for other purposes. They

have a grand total of 3,696 visitors officially visaed into the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, of whom 862 were here on so-called temporary business visas. They are the engineers, statisticians, and scientists who made these surveys. I am going to put a break-down into the RECORD of the 3,696. The break-down is as follows:

Nonresident aliens admitted from Russia during fiscal year ending June 30, 1946

Government personnel	823
Temporary business, engineers, scientists, analysts, etc	862
So-called temporary "pleasure visas"—which might mean anything	1,119
In transit	618
Students	28
International organization people, United Nations, etc	58
Nonresident aliens—Russians who have been here, left the country, and again returned with visitors' visas	188
Total Russians officially admitted to the United States last year	3,696

It logically follows, if we are going to permit Russian visitors officially to inspect our plants, to photograph and publish and analyze the defense plants of this country, to map and pin-point our basic economic structures, what kind of reciprocity do we have? How much authority do we have to go around Russia and visit her plants, to collect pictures of them, and so forth? These are logical questions which occur to realistic men. So I have made a check of that. I find we have 250 Americans in Russia.

Of the 250, 210 are with the Government, with the embassies, UNRRA, the Red Cross, the Army, and the Navy, including wives and dependents. That leaves 40 unaccounted for. Of the 40, 18 are members of the press and their wives and children. That leaves 22 unaccounted for. Of those, one is a medical research man. Four of them are fur buyers. Another five or six are with the United Fruit Co. Nine of them have been granted visas as construction engineers as contrasted with perhaps 800 Russians here for the same purpose.

Of the nine, I am advised—and these figures are only approximate because I do not have the exact figures of this date—but of the nine several have returned. So it is a safe conclusion you can count on the fingers of one hand all of the American engineers in Russia today.

It is equally a safe conclusion that you can count on the fingers of one foot all of them who have access to any of the defense establishments in Russia—who have had an opportunity to go behind the Urals and see what is being done over there comparable to what is being done here in the matter of defense establishments. So our reciprocal policy toward Russia—one of fairness, one of dealing across the board—is pretty much a matter of propaganda, promise, and publicity. It is not a matter of reality. It is not being done from the standpoint of an exchange of visas of official visitors between Russia and the United States on a realistic basis of reciprocity.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman was in Russia last year.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. BENDER. How much freedom did the gentleman have as an American citizen? Was he accorded the privilege of going and coming as he chose?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I have no complaint to make about the freedom granted, but we were not there examining defense establishments, taking pictures, or making maps. We were there examining the social conditions, the economic and political conditions. We were not circumscribed in our movements. We were courteously treated. We were accorded unprecedented opportunities to get away from the "vodka banquet circuit" and to really see Russia.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Is the gentleman going to comment upon some of the paid advertisements in that book?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I am just coming to that now.

The second observation I wish to make is to inquire how far we are expected to carry good neighborliness? This book was paid for by the big businessmen of America as a friendly although not altogether unselfish gesture to Russia. It has 175 full pages of advertising, paid for by corporations which profited through purchases made by Amtorg, lend-lease supplies sent to Russia, and so forth, or who hope to profit from future transactions. One hundred and seventy-five pages at $230 a page.

I think it would be an interesting study for the members of the Ways and Means Committee to determine whether or not these advertising costs were taken from the income-tax returns as a cost of doing business. I will bet a last year's South Dakota pheasant-hunting license against an old straw hat that they were. So what do we have? We actually have this huge book of over 950 pages in all paid for largely by American taxpayers, because these big business concerns are practically all in the 90-percent bracket. So we might call this the American taxpayer's gift to the Russian defense program; a sort of a year-end, extra dividend on the lend-lease balances we are not going to collect, or something like that! Because actually the American taxpayer is the man who pays for most of the costs of this great book provided for the Russians.

The third observation I would like to make is this: It seems to me it proves above everything else the need for tightening up on our security in the United States. We have photographs taken of buildings, bridges, and defense establishments, where they would not permit, during the war, a Boy Scout with a Brownie kodak to take a simple snapshot. Somebody certainly is blundering from the standpoint of our security system.

It is interesting to observe the substantial number of advertisements of Americans who made this book possible, who are manufacturers of machine tools, the one thing the Russians need most if they are going to prepare to become a first-class military power today from the standpoint of modern weapons. These people perhaps expect to sell machine tools to Russia through Amtorg, and consequently are advertising for that purpose. This might indicate Congress should give some attention to requiring export permits for certain types of machine tools designed primarily to produce instruments of war. After all, the United States should have learned something from its sad experience in selling oil and scrap iron to Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. The fourth observation—and I must hurry for my time is short—we all sympathize with Baruch, with Barney Baruch and with Warren Austin, and with Secretary of State Byrnes because of the obstinacy that the Russians have displayed at the United Nations conferences from the standpoint of the atom bomb, and the American position insisting on international inspection as a defense against the manufacture of atomic bombs.

Perhaps one of the big reasons the Russians are not interested in arranging for an interchange of inspection is, as is evidenced by this volume I have here in my hand, that Russia is getting all the information it needs about our defenses over here and they are not interested now in making any concessions that might permit America to learn what they are doing over there. They are getting the information they want without the arrangement for inspections by international survey groups. Maybe if we make it more difficult for them to get further information here it will help Secretary of State Marshall, it will help Warren Austin, get an agreement with Russia from the standpoint of controlling the atomic bomb by having an arrangement for internal inspection, thus making atomic warfare impossible since it will put an end to the manufacture of atomic bombs and the development and storehousing of atomic weapons of war.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman tell us how many of the more than 3,000 Russians who are in this country have diplomatic immunity in some form or other in that they are attached in one way or another to the Russian Embassy?

Mr. MUNDT. I will put these figures in the RECORD. It is over 800, over four times as many as we have over there with about a hundred times as many visiting engineers here as we have over there.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that none of us permit ourselves to conclude too much from this book, remarkable as it is. In the first place, I want to emphasize again that it has been done legally, so there is nothing to be gained from the standpoint of criticizing the Russians for doing something which we have made officially available to them.

In the second place, I want to point this out and emphasize the fact that

when Secretary Marshall goes to Moscow he has some important business to do from the standpoint of talking with the leaders of the Soviet, insisting upon a reciprocal policy based on reality, an across-the-board set-up with Russia, saying that they cannot have over here concessions they will not let us have over there. That is fair, that is firm, that is friendly, that is realistic and reciprocal, and that is what they can understand.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Are American people in Russia permitted to take photographs of their important factories?

Mr. MUNDT. Of course not. They are not even permitted to go back behinds the Urals to look at the factories or to visit their underground fabricating areas.

Mr. ROBSION. They are not even permitted to have cameras, are they?

Mr. MUNDT. I suppose they are permitted to have cameras if they do not use them. They certainly are not permitted to take pictures of defense establishments or to prepare manuals of the type I have been discussing here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has said. We are on a subject now that rises high above the scramble for party vantage or the noisy clamor of men for place and power; we are on a plane where all Americans should meet—that is the protection of our country now and for all time to come.

I, too, am a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. You would be alarmed to know the information we are gathering.

Gen. George S. Patton, the greatest soldier of this war, came by to thank me for defending him on this floor—he said, "For defending me when I was on the battlefront and could not defend myself." He asked, "What do you think about this international set-up?"

I said, "General, towers of Babel have been collapsing in a confusion of tongues ever since the days of Genesis."

He threw his head back, laughed, and said, "If I do not remember anything else you have said, I want to remember that."

If he were here today he would tell us to look out for our country's safety.

The American people are not in favor of turning our military secrets over to a foreign power that has its agencies fomenting strife and laying plans for revolution in this country.

I am not at all in sympathy with these international fanatics who wave the red flag in the face of Peron of Argentina and at the same time lick the boots of Stalin.

I am not at all in sympathy with these international fanatics who insist on going into Spain and stirring up a Communist revolution, when Spain carried out her promise to England not to permit the Germans to go across Spanish soil during the war.

I am not at all in sympathy with these international fanatics that vote to intervene in South Africa, and stir up trouble for a people who have had trouble enough maintaining their civilization and their way of life.

I want to see America retain the atomic bomb and maintain the strongest air force on earth until we know that the rest of the world really wants peace. Then they can get it.

I am not in favor of letting down our guard and seeing our people slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands in the spreading flames of the atomic bomb of the future.

Let me appeal to you gentlemen again for American solidarity in this House. The Communists in this country make no bones about stirring up revolution. One of their sneaking movements is pushing certain legislation they want us to pass and have our State legislatures pass. One of these is the FEPC, or so-called fair employment practices bill, with which they tried to fool the people of California in the recent election. They went to California and got this measure placed on the ticket for the people to vote on, and they beat it in every single county in the State. Out of 2,358,343 votes cast on the proposition, there were only 675,697 votes for it, and 1,682,648 votes against it.

Did you know that if that measure were on the statute books of this country, as introduced here from day to day, every person in a key position in America might face the prospect of having a spy at his elbow, a spy in every plant in every key business in America?

It is time that they cut out maligning of northern Republicans and southern Democrats, who have stood up for maintaining our defenses and maintaining our American institutions. I appeal to you to support this Committee on Un-American Activities. We have the greatest job before us that has ever been assigned to a committee of Congress. We know what is going on. We appeal to you as Representatives of the American people to lay aside all political prejudices.

I will battle you on the tariff issue when the time comes, and I will battle you on the income tax, and on the power question, if necessary, but let us stand together when it comes to maintaining the safety of our country and the protection of our people, our children and our children's children for all time to come. Let us surrender nothing that will jeopardize America's safety in the future.

Let us put the safety of our country first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in the naming of General Marshall as Secretary of State the President chose the strongest man that came out of the war. That appointment was received with almost universal applause and for that there are doubtless many reasons, the most important of which in my opinion, is the belief that prevails that General Marshall has the strength, the ability and the will to contend with Motolov and to stop Stalin.

Answering the charge or the assertion that up to the moment it appears that the late war was fought for Russia and for Russia alone is difficult to do, because the record shows that in the appeasement of Stalin we welshed on our solemn commitments, betrayed the weaker powers that we had promised freedom and self-determination and we permitted ourselves to be used to spread Marxism all over the world. The recovery of the ground that we have lost, if not wickedly given away, is a big job. I am anxious to see our new Secretary of State take hold of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I realize that for the last few minutes we have been entertained with some very interesting speeches. When a Member takes his position in this well and talks about patriotism, the dividing line between the two parties vanishes. I am sure that most of us agree completely with these speeches that we have just heard and that they were very timely. But we have another subject before us this afternoon that is not quite so interesting. It is a very important subject, however. It involves the purse strings of millions of our people. Few, if any, families there are who are not directly interested from a financial standpoint in what we are doing here today.

This afternoon we are talking about $1,130,000,000. That is a terrific lot of money. The question is whether we shall proceed to collect that much money next year from excise taxes or whether we shall forgive our people from paying that much money next year. That is the proposition before us. Regardless of how much smoke might be raised on the Democratic side today with reference to the issues in this case, these matters were all resolved before the Committee on Ways and Means, on which committee there are 10 very distinguished Democrats. These 10 distinguished Democrats, without exception, I think, voted unanimously to support this legislation. Therefore there should be no politics in it. There is no politics in it. It is a question, as I have already said, of whether or not we shall forgive $1,130,000,000 or whether we shall proceed to collect that much, and that is a matter which has been determined by the exigencies of the day and by the circumstances of the times. In other words, we have come to the place in our financial economy that we cannot lightly push aside $1,130,000,000 that we need so badly.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I believe my colleague wants to keep the record straight regarding what he said that everybody voted unanimously for this bill. That really is not the fact. There was no opposition to it. There was no one objecting to it, but do not say they voted for it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Let us clarify the matter then. The gentleman is a distinguished member of that committee. Might I be free to ask him how he wants to vote on this? Was he in favor of it or was he against voting it out?

Mr. FORAND. I am telling the gentleman that I am in favor of extending the tax but I do not like the idea of the indefiniteness of it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If that is the gentleman's position, all right. Of course, we have talked a lot about this definite proposition or the indefinite proposition involved in this legislation, but that has nothing to do with the merits of the case. As I said before, the merits are, Are you in favor of collecting this much in taxes or are you in favor of forgiving it? Now, there are many arguments both ways. There are many people who can argue pretty successfully that we should collect some of these excise taxes and that we should forgive some of them.

Let me talk to you about that for just a moment. These excise taxes with which we deal in this bill are not the only excise taxes. There are many excise taxes, and they run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, that are not covered in this legislation today. For instance, here is a tax on transportation. This legislation does not cut the tax on transportation, and that involves $270,000,000 a year. That was included in legislation that has no definite date for termination. This $270,000,000 will continue to be collected as a tax on transportation. There is no termination about that. That was passed with an indefinite date. You do not need to say that because that was passed 2 or 3 years ago, and supported by the Democrats, we can never repeal it. Of course we are going to repeal it, but today it is on the statute books in exactly the same category as this legislation today will be when we have passed it.

Let me ask you again, What other kinds of excise taxes are there on the books that are not covered by the legislation today, and that will run on interminably unless we as a Congress terminate them? Here is one of them: Business and store machines, $133,000,000 a year. Another is coin-operating machines, $21,000,000 a year. Then there are taxes on electric, gas, and oil appliances, $79,000,000 a year. Then there is a tax on musical instruments, about which the high-school bands all over the country have a complaint. Nobody said today that that tax should be taken off. We all know we would like to take that off so the high-school boys and girls will not have to pay that exorbitant tax on musical instruments. That, together with the tax on phonographs and phonograph records, amounts to $66,000,000 a year. I go on now to the tax on refrigerators and the tax on photographic films. Nearly everybody does some photography now. That runs into $44,000,000 a year. So, do not be confused about these excise taxes that are involved in the legislation today. If you are going to allow yourself to become worked up over them, here are the items I have just read to you, amounting to $598,000,000 a year, and those taxes will run on interminably. It is economically necessary that they run on, else how are we going to pay the debt, and how are we going to do these things we ought to do? I am here inserting in the RECORD a table showing in detail the taxes collected by legislation that has no termination date, and which legislation will, no doubt, be modified when the Ways and Means Committee takes up the tax laws for a complete revision.

New taxes imposed during the war which are unaffected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

[Yield in millions of dollars]

Tax	Rate	Yield, fiscal year, June 30, 1948
Transportation of property	3 percent of amount paid	270
Business and store machines	10 percent of manufacturers' price	33
Coin-operated machines:		
Amusement	$10 per machine	21.5
Gambling	$100 per machine	
Electric, gas, and oil appliances	10 percent of manufacturers' price	79
Matches	2 cents per thousand	8
Musical instruments, phonographs and phonograph records	10 percent of manufacturers' price	[1] 66.1
Photographic apparatus	25 percent of manufacturers' price	44
Photographic films and plates unexposed	15 percent of manufacturers' price	
Refrigerating equipment, air-conditioning units, self-contained	10 percent of manufacturers' price	[2] 59
Sporting goods	do	18
Distilled spirits, occupational taxes:		
Withdrawals, not more than 25 proof gallons	$25	
Not more than 50 proof gallons	$50	
More than 50 proof gallons	$100	
Stamp taxes:		
Life and accident policies and annuity contracts	1 cent per dollar or fraction of premium.	
Re insurance policies	do	

[1] Includes radio receiving sets which is a permanent tax.
[2] Includes mechanical refrigerators.

Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Jan. 11, 1947.

The real problem in this legislation is that it would be almost impossible to know where we would stop when we once began to consider what commodities to omit. That is the real reason why we had to bring in a closed rule. We probably ought to take some of these taxes off. We probably should have taken out some of the taxes on cosmetics and we probably should have taken cheap jewelry out. We probably should have taken the tax off furs for the benefit of the people who need cheap furs, but as long as someone advertises a fur coat for $13,000, who is going to get very much excited about taking the tax off furs? Where are you going to draw the line of demarcation there? Where are you going to draw the line of demarcation between cheap jewelry and expensive jewelry? It just cannot be done in a day. It just cannot be done on the floor of this House. I have no right to promise for my party what we will do, but I dare say that I can promise for my party and your party both that before the end of this year we will enact some legislation that will change these excise taxes and change them very materially. But we cannot do it in a hurry. We have to do it scientifically. We have to do it after we hear testimony. We have to consult the conditions of the budget. We cannot now, with the tremendous debt under which we are operating, throw money away just carelessly. We have to collect every cent we can get so that we may at least balance the budget. This business of running behind every year may be all right with a New Deal administration, but the people of the Nation expect more from a Republican administration.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that it is the intention of the committee to make a revision of these excise taxes this year? I think that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I said specifically that I could not commit anybody on our side or the gentleman's side. I am not trying to do that. However, I do say that it is my opinion that before 1947 shall have passed into history we will do something with reference to some of these excise taxes. That is my own opinion. Does the gentleman share it?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to know whether that is the opinion of the majority members of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I said it was my own opinion, but may I ask the gentleman this: Does he agree with me?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have not given it enough thought yet. I cannot say.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have, and I am satisfied we ought to do it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. If the eminent gentleman who now has the floor or anybody else wants to be politi-

cal, could he not turn back to the days when the first apostle of the New Deal said he proposed to reduce the running expenses of this Government 25 percent? He then said, and nobody has ever disputed it, or ever will, that taxes are paid in the sweat of every man that labors. Could we not turn back to that? Could you not say to those gentlemen who are the apostles of the doctrine of tax and tax, and spend and spend, and elect and elect, that they got us into this fix and we are doing our best to get out of it?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I well remember the promises of the high priest of new dealism. I remember how he promised to reduce national expenditures and how he said that nations had been "wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy" and he immediately proceeded to wreck his own country by operating continuously on a deficit from one billion to one hundred billion annually. Not in any year of New Deal administration has the budget been balanced. And if today's performance by my friends on the other side augurs anything as to what we may expect in the future, we will be talking about the merits of these things for a long, long time to come, because it is going to take us 100 years at least to pay off this colossal debt to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do you not think the country is entitled to have some type of program with respect to taxation? That is what the Democratic Party wants the majority party to do. We want the majority party to give the country some idea of a tax program. There is something wrong with the whole business. Every workingman wants an idea of the tax program.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. May I remind the gentleman that his party missed a great opportunity to give us a constructive program in the last 16 years?

Up to this point I have been talking about excise taxes that are not included in the legislation that we are considering today. As I have already stated, the tax that will be produced by the legislation being considered today is estimated to be $1,130,000,000. In other words, if we should pass legislation repealing the excise taxes on the articles included in this tax legislation we would lose revenue to the extent of $1,130,000,000 in the year of 1948. This total is made up of the tax on many commodities. For instance the tax derived from sales of admission tickets reached the colossal sum of $111,000,000 per year. Cabarets and roof gardens pay a tax on their service that amounts to nearly $40,000,000. One would not suppose that the tax on dues paid to clubs and initiation fees paid to lodges and different societies would amount to nearly $8,000,000 a year. The tax on jewelry produces $82,000,000. The tax on furs that we hear so much talk about amounts to $35,000,000. Toilet preparations bring in a total of $33,000,000.

It is from distilled spirits and whiskies including high-priced alcoholic liquors that the greatest amount of revenue is raised in this legislation. The Treasury takes in a total on these commodities of nearly $475,000,000. In spite of these heavy tax items the amount of liquor consumed is not lessened to any appreciable extent. Cocktail parties seem to flourish and to be going as strong as ever.

Then the tax on wines runs up to $25,000,000. The tax on malt liquors which is supposed to be the poor man's drink, runs up to $75,000,000.

The boys who play pool pay a tax which totals about $2,000,000. Then the tax on electric-light bulbs, the propriety of which I have often doubted, brings in $16,000,000. Long-distance telephones pay their share and many people think they pay more than their share when they are taxed at the rate of $56,000,000. The people who ride pullman cars and want to travel de luxe pay for this to the tune of about $60,000,000. These people who flash their fancy luggage and handbags with pride pay for this privilege at the rate of about $60,000,000 a year.

I may have omitted some of these commodities that are included in this tax legislation we are considering today but I think I have mentioned most of them. I am therefore inserting in the RECORD a table showing these taxes set out in detail:

Rates effective by Presidential proclamation

Description of tax	War-tax rates	Prewar rate	Fiscal 1948 loss in revenue
			Millions
Admissions	1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof	$111.2
Permanent use or lease of boxes or seats	20 percent	11 percent	
Sales of tickets outside of box office	do	do	
Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	do	5 percent	32.9
Dues or membership fees	do	11 percent	7.9
Initiation fees			
Jewelry	do	10 percent	82.7
Furs	do	do	35.2
Toilet preparations	do	do	33.1
Distilled spirits	$9 per gallon	$6 per gallon	474.7
Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits	do	do	
Still wines:			
(1) Not over 14 percent of alcohol	15 cents per gallon	10 cents per gallon	25.2
(2) Over 14 percent and not over 21 percent of alcohol	60 cents per gallon	40 cents per gallon	
(3) Over 21 percent and not over 24 percent of alcohol	$2 per gallon	$1 per gallon	
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials:			
(1) Champagne or sparkling wine	15 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	
(2) Artificially carbonated wine	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	5 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	
(3) Liqueurs, cordials, etc	do	do	
Fermented malt liquors	$8 per barrel	$7 per barrel	79.7
Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys	$20 per year per table; $20 per year per alley	$10 per year per table; $10 per year per alley	2.3
Electric-light bulbs and tubes	20 percent	5 percent	16.0
Telephone, long-distance	25 percent	20 percent	56.5
Domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	do	15 percent	
Leased wires, etc	do	do	
Wire and equipment service	8 percent	5 percent	
Local telephone service	15 percent	10 percent	53.8
Transportation of persons: Seats, berths, etc	do	do	59.4
Luggage	20 percent of retail sales price	10 percent of manufacturers' sales price	59.7
Total			1,130.0

The above loss in revenue is figured as the actual loss for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.
Because of some lag in collections, this does not reflect the entire loss on account of the proclamation.
It is also believed that some additional loss will be incurred for the fiscal year 1947, due to purchases being held up prior to July 1, 1947.
The amount of additional loss is roughly estimated at around $170,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for this legislation. If it had been practicable to have gone through this list and taken out those commodities which are very necessary, especially to the great common people, I should have been in favor of doing so, but it is almost impossible to draw the line between costume jewelry such as those articles worn on garments and expensive jewelry. But, as a matter of fact, many articles of costume jewelry are very expensive and are real luxuries. Likewise many cosmetics are practically household necessities and these should be excluded but the high-priced perfumes, most of which are imported into the country, should be taxed.

It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will find time before this Congress adjourns in July to again give consideration to the subject that we might eliminate some of the commodities that are necessities and not luxuries. There is nothing about this legislation, when we have passed it, that will in any way limit the action of Congress in the future. The Ways and Means Committee can with all propriety again study this problem with the hope of remedying some inequalities. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that by refraining from placing a definite expiration date on this legislation we are removing the constant fear of a change in tax rates that is of necessity a great worry to those engaged in the sale of these commodities. The people who comprise what we call the general public are smart buyers and they will refrain from buying a commodity now if they think that commodity will be free from the burden of tax at a later date.

I predict that this legislation will pass this House today by almost a unanimous vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentlemen on the minority side if it would be possible to extend the debate for, let us say, half an hour, or 15 minutes on each side, since I have many more requests for time?

Mr. McCORMACK. May I inform the gentleman from Minnesota that that must be done in the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe that anything can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. DINGELL. Personally I have no objection to it, but we would have to obtain such permission in the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then I recommend a very liberal interpretation with reference to the time.

Mr. FORAND. Is that the way the gentleman wants the rules of the House interpreted?

Mr. KNUTSON. I beg your pardon.

Mr. FORAND. Is that the way the gentleman cares to live under the rules of the House?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not get the point of the gentleman's interrogation.

Mr. FORAND. I am not surprised. That is not unusual. But I will repeat it. Does the gentleman infer that we should violate the rules of the House?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; far be it from me to intimate that we should violate the rules of the House.

Mr. FORAND. That is what the gentleman is asking for.

Mr. McCORMACK. What would the liberal interpretation requested by the gentleman apply to?

Mr. KNUTSON. Several constructions can be placed on the word "liberal." I will say to the gentleman it has been badly abused in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest. There have been some very able remarks and some perhaps that would not fall in that category so far as dealing with an important measure is concerned. After the disclosure made here by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I must confess that it had quite a sobering effect. It made me think in this hour of peril—and I so consider it so far as our international affairs go, and it can become a very serious question of peril here if we are not well grounded in our approach to the tax problem. The story goes that during the war in the Pacific one of our boys was flying at a very high altitude. He thought he saw a speck that might be an enemy plane down below. He immediately turned the nose of the plane down and opened the throttle wide open. Very soon he was heading toward that speck at a terrific rate of speed—200, 300, 400, 500, 600, 700 miles an hour. The varnish on the wings was peeling off. He tried to straighten out the plane but something was wrong with the control machinery and he started praying. He prayed to be released from that peril he was in. As he continued to pray he saw the tops of the trees in the distance. And suddenly the plane straightened out. This young aviator said, "Thank you, God. I will now take over."

I want to call attention to the fact that this country is in peril, and millions of people go down on their knees and pray for the safety of this country. All through this country there are dangerous subversive elements operating. They do not pray. They are Godless. These subversive elements propose to make this country a Godless country. Now, let us not deceive ourselves. The power to tax is the power to destroy. This element knows there are many points of weakness in this Government. Unsound taxation is one method by which they can destroy. Another is tampering with our courts, and another is creating disrespect for this legislative body.

The President of the United States, the same as we, has taken an oath to protect and defend this country. I believe he intends to live up to his oath. He has come before this Congress with a message that he wants these taxes, which we are discussing, continued.

I think every patriotic man in this House, regardless of how he may feel personally about some item, if eliminated, that would please his district, knows that the honest, patriotic thing to do, however, at this time is to do just what we proposed to do under this bill. A tax bill lends itself perhaps more than any other bill to demagoguery. Of course nobobdy in this House would resort to demagoguery, but the subversive elements working on the outside to create confusion and chaos in this country will make all kinds of promises to the point where they would not tax any citizen. The Ways and Means Committee is quite as capable of writing one or two sound tax bills for the good of the country as were those who were in control when 17 New Deal tax bills were reported by the committee and passed from 1933 to 1946. It comes with poor grace and sportsmanship on the part of the New Deal minority to oppose the recommendation of the President and of the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee.

I know what my colleagues desire, and that is accurate information relating to the bill before the House. In order to save the time of the House and to contribute reliable information to the Members of the House, I have prepared a series of tables that tells exactly what this bill does; the taxes that it continues and for how long; and those that were not affected by the President's proclamation and those that were.

I ask unanimous consent to insert those tables in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. JONKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The tables referred to are as follows:)

New taxes imposed during the war which are unaffected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Tax	Rate	Yield fiscal year, June 30, 1948 (millions of dollars)
Transportation of property	3 percent of amount paid	270.0
Business and store machines	10 percent of manufacturers' price	33.0
Coin operated machines:		
Amusement	$10 per machine	21.5
Gambling	$100 per machine	
Electric, gas, and oil appliances	10 percent of manufacturers' price	79.0
Matches	2 cents per M	8.0
Musical instruments, phonographs, and phonograph records	10 percent of manufacturers' price	[1] 66.1
Photographic apparatus	25 percent of manufacturers' price	44.0
Photographic films and plates unexposed	15 percent of manufacturers' price	
Refrigerating equipment, air-conditioning units, self-contained	10 percent of manufacturers' price	[2] 59.0
Sporting goods	do	18.0
Distilled spirits, occupational taxes:		
Withdrawals, not more than 25 proof gallons	$25	
Not more than 50 proof gallons	$50	
More than 50 proof gallons	$100	
Stamp taxes: Life and accident policies and annuity contracts	1 cent per dollar or fraction of premium	
Reinsurance policies	do	

[1] Includes radio receiving sets which is a permanent tax.
[2] Includes mechanical refrigerators.

Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Jan. 11, 1947.

New taxes imposed during the war which are affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Tax	Rate		Loss of revenue due to Presidential proclamation (millions of dollars)	Yield, fiscal year, June 30, 1948, after giving effect to Presidential proclamation (millions of dollars)
	Wartime	Under Presidential proclamation		
Bowling alleys, pool tables, etc.	$20 per unit	$10 per unit	2.3	2.4
Electric-light bulbs	20 percent of manufacturers' sales price	5 percent of manufacturers' sales price	16.0	8.0
Furs	20 percent of retail sales price	10 percent of retail sales price	35.2	48.8
Jewelry	do	do	82.7	130.3
Luggage	2 percent of retail sales price	10 percent of manufacturers' sales price [1]	59.7	9.1
Local telephone service	15 percent	10 percent	53.8	146.2
Transportation of persons	15 percent of amount paid	10 percent of amount paid	59.4	155.6

[1] With base narrowed.

Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Jan. 11, 1947.

Rates increased in permanent taxes during the war, which are not affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Title of tax	Rate				Yield, fiscal year 1948
	Prewar	1940	1941	1942	
TOBACCO TAXES					
Cigarettes:					
Weighing not more than 3 pounds per M, per thousand	$3	$3.25		$3.50	$1,112,000,000
Weighing more than 3 pounds per M, and more than 6½ inches in length, per thousand	$7.80			$8.40	
Weighing more than 3 pounds per M, and more than 6½ inches in length (counting each 2¾ inches (or fraction thereof) of the length of each as 1 cigarette), per thousand.	$3	$3.25		$3.50	
Cigars:					
Weighing more than 3 pound per M, retailing at—					
Not more than 2½ cents each, per thousand	$2			$2.50	57,000,000
More than 2½ cents and not more than 4 cents, per thousand	$2			$3	
More than 4 cents and not more than 5 cents, per thousand	$2			$4	
More than 5 cents and not more than 6 cents, per thousand	$3			$4	
More than 6 cents and not more than 8 cents, per thousand	$3			$7	
More than 8 cents and not more than 15 cents, per thousand	$5			$10	
More than 15 cents and not more than 20 cents, per thousand	$10.50			$15	
More than 20 cents each, per thousand	$13.50			$20	
LIQUOR TAXES					
Special occupational taxes:					
Distilled spirits or wine:					
Wholesale dealers, per year	$100	$110			12,000,000
Retail dealers, per year	$25	$27.50			
Fermented malt liquors:					
Brewers:					
Production less than 500 barrels a year, per brewery	$50	$55			
Production over 500 barrels per year, per brewery	$100	$110			
Wholesalers, per year	$50	$55			
Retailers, per year	$20	$22			
Rectifiers:					
Less than 500 barrels, per year	$100	$110			
500 barrels or more, per year	$200	$220			
Manufacturers of stills, per year	$50	$55			
Stills or worms manufactured for distilling purposes, per still or worm	$20	$22			
STAMP TAXES					
Documentary: Conveyances (deed, instrument, or writing conveying realty):					
Value $100.01 to $500	50 cents	55 cents			74,200,000
Each additional $500 or fraction	do	do			
Foreign insurance policies: Insurance policies other than life and indemnity, fidelity or surety bonds, etc., per dollar or fraction of premium.	3 cents	4 cents			
Issues of bonds, debentures, certificates of indebtedness, etc., per $100 face value or fraction thereof	10 cents	11 cents			
Issues of capital stock, per $100 par or face value, or if without par or face value:					
If actual value is less than $100, on each $20 or fraction	2 cents	3 cents			
If actual value is over $100, on each $100 or fraction	10 cents	11 cents			
Transfers of bonds, per $100 of face value	4 cents	5 cents			
Transfers of capital stock:					
Per $100 par or face value or fraction	4 cents	5 cents			
Without par or face value, per share	do	do			
If selling price is $20 or over, whether with or without par or face value, per share	5 cents	6 cents			
Other: Passage tickets over $10 sold for passage by vessel to a foreign port:					
Costing $10.01 to $30	$1	$1.10			
Costing $30.01 to $60	$3	$3.50			
Over $60	$5	$5.50			
Playing cards, per package of not more than 54	10 cents	11 cents	13 cents		8,800,000
MISCELLANEOUS TAXES					
Automobiles, etc.:					
Automobile bodies, of manufacturers' sales price	3 percent	3½ percent	7 percent		271,000,000
Automobile chassis, of manufacturers' sales price	do	do	do		
Motorcycles, of manufacturers' sales price	do	do	do		
Automobile truck bodies of manufacturers' sales price	2 percent	2½ percent	5 percent		59,000,000
Automobile truck chassis, of manufacturers' sales price	do	do	do		
Tractors, of manufacturers' sales price	do	do	do		
Parts and accessories of manufacturers' sales price	do	do	do		78,000,000
Tires and tubes:					
Inner tubes, per pound	4 cents	4½ cents	9 cents		162,000,000
Rubber tires, per pound	2¼ cents	2½ cents	5 cents		
Electric energy for domestic or commercial consumption, of sale price	3 percent	3½ percent			65,000,000
Firearms, shells, and cartridges, pistols and revolvers, of manufacturers' sales price	10 percent	11 percent			8,200,000

Rates increased in permanent taxes during the war, which are not affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946—Con.

Title of tax	Rate				Yield, fiscal year 1948
	Prewar	1940	1941	1942	
Gasoline and motor fuels, per gallon	1 cent	1½ cents			$486,000,000
Leases of safe deposit boxes, of amount collected	10 percent	11 percent	20 percent		8,100,000
Lubricating oils, domestic, per gallon	4 cents	4½ cents		6 cents	89,000,000
Matches: Wood, per thousand	5 cents	5½ cents			8,000,000
Radios and radio accessories [1] of manufacturers' sales price	5 percent	5½ percent	10 percent		66,100,000
Refrigerating equipment: Refrigerators, mechanical household type of manufacturers' sales price	do	do	do		59,000,000
Telephone, telegraph, radio message, etc.: Cable and radio messages, international	10 cents [2]	10 cents [2]	10 percent [3]	10 percent [3]	198,500,000
Telegraph messages: International, of amount charged	5 percent	do			
Transportation: Oil by pipe line, of amount paid for transportation	4 percent	4½ percent			15,900,000
Transfers to avoid income tax, of the excess of (1) the value of the stock or securities transferred over, (2) its adjusted basis in the hands of the transfer or as determined under sec. 113 of the Revenue Act of 1932.[4]	25 percent	27½ percent			

[1] Includes musical instruments.
[2] Per message.
[3] Of amount charged.
[4] Tax is imposed upon the transfer of stock or securities by a citizen or resident of the United States, or by a domestic corporation, partnership or trust to a foreign corporation as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital, or to a foreign partnership or trust.

Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Jan. 11, 1947

Excise-tax increases made in permanent taxes during the war which were affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Description of tax	War-tax rates	New rates	Loss of revenue due to Presidential proclamation	Yield fiscal year, June 30, 1948, after giving effect to Presidential proclamation
			Millions	*Millions*
Admissions	1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof.	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof.	$111.2	$215.8
Permanent use or lease of boxes or seats	20 percent	11 percent		
Sales of tickets outside of box office	do	do		
Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	do	5 percent	32.6	20.1
Dues or membership fees	do	11 percent	7.9	12.1
Initiation fees	do	10 percent	33.1	45.9
Toilet preparations	$9 per gallon	$6 per gallon	474.7	1,105.3
Distilled spirits	do	do		
Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits				
Still wines:				
(1) Not over 14 percent of alcohol	15 cents per gallon	10 cents per gallon		
(2) Over 14 percent and not over 21 percent of alcohol	60 cents per gallon	40 cents per gallon		
(3) Over 21 percent and not over 24 percent of alcohol	$2 per gallon	$1 per gallon		
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials:			25.2	60.8
(1) Champagne or sparkling wine	15 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof		
(2) Artifically carbonated wine	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof	5 cents per half pint or fraction thereof		
(3) Liqueurs, cordials, etc	do	do		
Fermented malt liquors	$8 per barrel	$7 per barrel	79.7	635.3
Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys	$20 per year per table; $20 per year per alley.	$10 per year per table; $10 per year per alley.	2.3	2.4
Telephone, long distance	25 percent	20 percent		
Domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	do	15 percent	56.5	198.5
Leased wires, etc	do	do		
Wire and equipment service	8 percent	5 percent		
Local telephone service	15 percent	10 percent	53.8	146.2
Total			877.3	2,442.4

The above loss in revenue is figured as the actual loss for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.
Because of some lag in collections, this does not reflect the entire loss on account of the proclamation.
It is also believed that some additional loss will be incurred for the fiscal year 1947, due to purchases being held up prior to July 1, 1947.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, for approximately 2 hours now we have heard a very interesting discussion regarding the bill H. R. 1030. I have for the past few days been trying to analyze the real reason why our friends on the majority were bringing this bill up for a vote. Despite all of their statements, I am not satisfied that I have obtained from them the basic reason. I have come to the conclusion that although statements were made right here a few moments ago by some of the previous speakers that it is necessary to collect all the revenue that we possibly can—and I agree with them on that statement—that the action of the Republicans today in extending the excise taxes to a date indefinite and, as was so well stated by the minority whip, permanently, the reason behind it all is that they are doing what the surgeon does with a patient when he takes him into the hospital. The surgeon has to build up the patient before he operates on him. I believe my good friends are planning an operation, and they are building up the Treasury by continuing the excise taxes in the hope that they may be able to realize, at least in part, the promises they made to the American people that they would reduce income taxes by 20 percent. I do not believe that there is anything else behind this move; personally I do not think this is the proper time to reduce any tax. I am going to vote for this bill despite the fact that the termination date of these several items has been removed. I should have liked to see these taxes continued in effect for a period of a year, as was suggested in the President's message. I realize, however, that we now are in the minority; we have to take it; but I tell you that we do not intend to take it lying down. We will at least be heard.

It must be rather embarrassing for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to bring in a bill today increasing taxes if he recalls that on November 24, 1943, when we were considering the 1943 tax bill, he said this from this well:

> The time has come when we have about reached the bottom of the barrel so far as the possibility of securing additional revenues is concerned. There is a limit to the people's ability to pay taxes, even in time of war. During the past 4 years they have had to absorb particularly drastic increases to meet the staggering war costs, and they have not had time to adjust themselves to one increase before another even greater one has been piled on.

The gentleman himself, of course, was a member of that committee. He has always prided himself on making the statement that his committee was a nonpartisan committee, that Members on both sides serving on the Ways and Means Committee acted as a unit; and that has been more or less true, although

I am not so sure that it is going to be the case in the future, because if I can judge from reports that came to us last week through the newspapermen, already star-chamber sessions have become the fact, beginning on the question of reciprocal trade agreements. Last week the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee met behind closed doors and heard evidence, I do not know from whom. The Democrats were not even invited to attend the session to hear this evidence. I do not like it. I trust that that meeting last week did not set a precedent, but I am rather fearful. I sincerely hope our good chairman will think twice before he adopts that kind of tactics again, because if he does I stand here and tell him very frankly that I will simply pull out the record of the old Smoot-Hawley tariff bill and recite the history of how the Republicans at that time kicked the Democrats out, brought in lobbyists, sat them in the place of the Democrats, and permitted log rolling to the point where these lobbyists practically wrote that tariff bill. I hope we will not have a repetition of that practice in this Congress.

The chairman further said on November 24, and he was speaking for the Republicans:

> We have already given notice that so far as we are concerned we will not give consideration to imposing additional taxes upon the people until, first, all waste and extravagance in Government spending has been abolished and then only if it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that it must be considered necessary for this to be before the House today. I do not believe that the gentleman wants to go back on his word and I do not believe he is bringing this bill to the floor of the House simply to accommodate the President. Under these circumstances I say to you, and I say to the American people, unless and until you bring the necessary pressure you will find that despite what our Republican friends say today that this bill provides for an indefinite rather than a permanent fixing of rates, you are facing a permanent set-up, and do not kid yourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. What is all this talk about "permanent" that the opposition is making here today?

Mr. CURTIS. It is without foundation of fact. There are many wartime taxes, even on necessities, that were enacted without a termination date in the statute. These taxes are not permanent any more than any of the other rates of taxation that prevail are permanent. Congress can change them tomorrow, it can change them 6 months from now or they can be changed by any subsequent Congress.

Mr. Chairman, on one of the last days of 1946, President Truman issued a proclamation, the effect of which would mean a reduction in certain excise taxes from their wartime rate to the old rate that existed prior to the war. The articles affected and the rates involved are as follows:

Description of tax	Old rate	War tax rate
Admissions	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof.	1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof.
Permanent use or lease of boxes or seats	11 percent	20 percent.
Sales of tickets outside box office	do	Do.
Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	5 percent	Do.
Dues or membership fees	11 percent	Do.
Initiation fees	do	Do.
Jewelry	10 percent	Do.
Furs	do	Do.
Toilet preparations	do	Do.
Distilled spirits	$6 per gallon	$9 per gallon.
Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits	do	Do.
Still wines:		
(1) Not over 14 percent of alcohol	10 cents per gallon	15 cents per gallon.
(2) Over 14 percent and not over 21 percent of alcohol	40 cents per gallon	60 cents per gallon.
(3) Over 21 percent and not over 24 percent of alcohol	$1 per gallon	$2 per gallon.
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials:		
(1) Champagne or sparkling wine	10 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.	15 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.
(2) Artificially carbonated wine	5 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.	10 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.
(3) Liqueurs, cordials, etc	do	Do.
Fermented malt liquors	$7 per barrel	$8 per barrel.
Billiard and pool tables	$10 per year per table	$20 per year per table.
Bowling alleys	$10 per year per alley	$20 per year per alley.
Electric light bulbs and tubes	5 percent	20 percent.
Telephone, long distance	20 percent	25 percent.
Domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	15 percent	Do.
Leased wires, etc	do	Do.
Wire and equipment service	5 percent	8 percent.
Local telephone service	10 percent	15 percent.
Transportation of persons	do	Do.
Seats, berths, etc	do	Do.

In addition to the above items, the following item was likewise affected: Luggage, old rate, 10 percent; war tax rate, 20 percent.

The bill before the House today would continue the wartime rates on all of these articles. I am not very happy about this legislation. I would much rather be here today supporting a bill to lower taxes. Some of the rates involved today are definitely deterrents to business. They are slowing down sales. This means that the demand is lessened for manufactured articles, that less jobs are made available and that there is less demand upon the producers of raw products. The United States is going to be faced with a heavy tax program in the years that lie ahead. Our whole tax structure must be studied and examined to determine whether or not it is a tax that is destroying enterprise and jobs and markets. If that be the case, our country cannot afford to continue on with such a tax.

It is my hope that before the first session of the Eightieth Congress adjourns, that there can be a downward revision of taxes. It is well for the country to realize, however, that there are some decisions that must be made in the Congress before taxes can be reduced. If the proclamation of the President were to go into effect without this legislation, the loss in revenue would be $1,130,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

Almost simultaneous with the act of the President to reduce these taxes, the Congress received the budget message from the President asking for appropriations of $37,000,000,000. This budget request is three times the amount of money spent in any peacetime year prior to World War II. The budget has consistently been out of balance throughout the years. Our national debt is at an all-time high.

Before there can be a reduction in taxes, the budget must be balanced and a systematic debt retirement program must be inaugurated. The Federal debt must be reduced now. If we in this year of a high national income are content in paying the carrying charge of the national debt only, how can we pay off the debt when less prosperous times arrive? The only way to reduce the debt is to reduce the debt. America's honor is at stake. If the generation that created this debt fails to pay a portion of it off, how can our voices be raised against a later generation who might choose to repudiate it in toto.

Mr. Chairman, it is anticipated that the budget recommendations of the President will be cut by the Congress. A patriotic effort will be put forth by those charged with the responsibility of preparing our appropriation bills. Their job is not easy. There is no short cut to economy. It calls for long hours of tedious detail work which demands day-to-day diligent effort. Our Government can never establish a sound fiscal policy if the Members of Congress shirk the unpleasant and arduous task of economizing and eliminating waste in all departments and become content with the role of a demagogue by shouting to high heaven about and voting against an appropriation that is to be spent in some other part of the country, even though that appropriation has merit.

In the United States News for January 24 some interesting observations were made in reference to the cost of

government. I wish to call a few of these to your attention:

Before the war, for example, it cost $160,000 to run the White House. Mr. Truman now asks $501,800 for operation and maintenance in the year that begins next July 1. The executive offices cost $196,000 to operate in prewar years. They are down for $1,417,000 in the next fiscal year. * * *

The Budget Bureau itself, which cost $396,000 before the war, will now cost $3,506,000. * * * Congress cost $22,000,000 before the war and is scheduled for $51,809,000 in the next fiscal year. The judiciary cost $9,500,000 before Pearl Harbor, but is to cost $19,000,000 next year. The Department of Commerce struggled along on $20,000,000 in prewar years. It wants $260,814,000 now. Where the Department of Labor managed to operate for $24,000,000 in 1939, it finds that it cannot manage for less than $106,242,000 next year. Diplomats of the Foreign Service after seeing to this country's foreign relations at a cost of $14,000,000 a year before Pearl Harbor want $117,000,000 to do the job. * * * The Navy wants to spend $344,000,000 on new ships in the third year after end of the war, or about half as much as the whole Navy cost before the war. The Interior Department, after getting along on $150,000,000 in prewar years, now asks for $363,000,000. * * * Federal relief is to cost $720,000,000. That's the Federal Government's contribution to States for aid to the aged, to dependent mothers and children, and to the blind. During the last period of comparable prosperity, relief costs were negligible. * * * Public housing cost $19,000,000 in 1940. Next year it is to cost $173,000,000, if Congress goes along with Mr. Truman. * * * Veterans' pensions are to cost $2,492,000,000. The prewar cost of pensions was $417,000,000. Then, businessmen are to get $1,000,000,000 as a subsidy for employing veterans in the on-job training program. Another $1,000,000,000 is allotted for educating veterans in schools and colleges. The sum of $980,000,000 is put down for benefits to jobless veterans. * * * The Army's program is reflected in an $804,000,000 item for supplies such as food, clothing, and medicines. That is more than the entire prewar Army budget. New weapons for a year of peace are to cost $338,000,000. The Signal Corps got along on $6,455,479 in prewar years and now is down for $100,000,000. The Panama Canal gets a budget allowance of $25,526,338. The Canal had $9,000,000 before the war. * * * The total Navy budget amounts to about half the total prewar expenses of the entire Government establishment. * * * War agencies are scheduled to keep operating in the third year of peace. Mr. Truman's budget provides for 1,271,976 civilian employees of war agencies. That includes civilians in the Army and Navy as well as civilians in war agencies that cannot seem to be liquidated. Before the war, only 229,917 persons had similar jobs. * * * Former enemies are turning out to be a peacetime drain on United States taxpayers. The War Department proposes to spend $645,000,000 for the relief of occupied countries. The State Department is down for another $387,000,000 to be spent for foreign relief. And $76,000,000 is budgeted to aid foreign refugees. * * * Atomic research is to cost twice as much next year as this year. The Budget calls for an outlay of $443,244,000 to be spent on the atom.

The task of putting our budget in balance and making a payment on the national debt this year is not going to be easy. It is going to be a difficult one. The President's Budget for $37,000,000,000 was not only a recommendation for a great sum of money, but it was practically a deficit budget. It called for a margin of receipts over expenditures of one-thirteenth of 1 percent. That is pretty close banking business.

It is possible that our appropriations be such that the over-all saving could make our Budget several billion dollars under the President's Budget and we might still go in the red. The fight for preservation of this Government must be carried on several fronts. If the portal-to-portal pay suits now pending and hereafter filed are successful, it is estimated that the Treasury will have to make refunds of upwards of $4,000,000,000. Where are you going to get the money?

In this enormous task of establishing a sound financial basis for our Government, the issue should be made clear to the Congress and to the people. In that regard I have one very definite recommendation. The fiscal year for Government expenditures and the taxable year should be made to coincide. For all individuals and most business concerns the tax year is the calendar year. Rates are raised and lowered and taxes are imposed for the calendar year. Yet the fiscal year runs from July 1 to July 1. It is impossible for the average American under such a system to know how the Government's income compares to its outgo. If you ask a Treasury expert for the answer to that question, he has to transpose his figures and it is doubtful if all the members of the committee working each day with the figures have a common understanding of the figures at all times.

This Congress should, without delay, pass such legislation as will make our year of spending and our year of taxing the same period of time. The transition will not be easy. It will be difficult for the Treasury, it will be burdensome, yes troublesome for many taxpayers. But in the long, hard pull it will still be worth while. If our taxable year should be made to coincide with our spending year, that is from July 1 to July 1, the Ways and Means Committee could more intelligently recommend tax bills to this Congress.

The usual appropriations could be put through Congress by April or May. These appropriations determine how much money will be spent in the year that follows, which begins on July 1. After the spending figures have been established, the Congress could then take appropriate action on taxes. If present rates would provide for a substantial payment on the debt and permit a reduction of taxes, we could reduce taxes. If we by our own acts in appropriating money spend more than is coming in, we should have the courage to impose a tax bill.

I am not one of those who oppose a tax reduction for the sake of continuing a big government. Taxes are too high; they are destroying the goose that lays the golden egg. They must be reduced, but the way to reduce taxes is to reduce spending. I believe that we can balance the budget, make a substantial payment on the debt, and still reduce taxes. Unless we reduce taxes new ventures will not be undertaken, business will not thrive, and jobs will not be provided. Again I say, we must reduce taxes. When the hand of the Treasury of the United States reaches out into the channels of trade for taxes its effect on our economic system is like taking blood from the human body for the purposes of a transfusion. There is a limit as to how far you can go and maintain health. If you stay within limits, the body lives to give blood another day. In my opinion, some of the taxes that we are continuing today are destructive taxes and I would like to see them reduced later on in this session of Congress.

It must be remembered that waste cannot be eliminated in government without the cooperation of the executive departments. The will to reduce expenditures must be in the mind and heart of every Government employee and every department. If a husband or the head of a business finds his budget reduced, he immediately eliminates those expenditures which are the least necessary. When a budget for a Government bureau is cut, too often they pick out that activity that is most needed and most popular and announce to the world that it will have to be eliminated. This means is used to create a public demand for Congress to restore the cut. The future financial welfare of this country rests not only in the hands of the Congress but in the hands of the Executive as well. There must be a will for less Government expenditures.

I would remind you again that the establishment of a sound financial basis for this country of ours is a difficult task. It affects the pocketbook of every American and what is more, it affects the future of our children and our children's children. We have just finished a great war where thousands gave their all for the preservation of this Republic. Is it expecting too much that we the living make the necessary sacrifice to preserve the financial integrity of this Government?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, time is running short. It occurred to me it was somewhat a mistake to permit persons to speak out of order when we have only 3 hours of debate on a measure of this importance. I wonder whether or not the heat of this debate was not somewhat uncomfortable for the majority members of the committee, so that they sought to divert attention from the issue, and therefore suggested that someone speak out of order.

The remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] reminded me of a football game some years ago, when there was a fumble and one of the leading ball carriers of one of the teams got hold of the ball and started to go and go and go, with a war whoop, to the goal post. He heard some murmurs from the sidelines and a roar from the multitude, and he suddenly discovered he was going in the wrong direction. That is just about what happened with respect to these excise taxes. The leader of the

opposition, meaning those who have the ball, began to cry before the election and immediately afterward that they were going to wipe out all excise taxes, but the people and those with wiser heads made them decide to change their minds, and now they are carrying the ball in the opposite direction.

Mr. Chairman, this change of direction on the part of the leaders of the majority only came about, may I remind you, after tremendous harm had been done to the business interests of this country, not only to the wholesalers but to the small merchants who had on hand much merchandise, such as jewelers, furriers, and clothing men, who had clothing on hand together with furs on which they had to pay taxes. The buyers went on a strike. It is the small merchant who suffered most. He suffered because of the statements put out by the majority and the leaders of the majority that those taxes were going to be immediately repealed. I understand that some firms have nearly gone into bankruptcy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this point will the gentleman insert in the RECORD his authority and where we can find those statements by the majority that these taxes would be repealed? I call on the gentleman to put that in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will certainly do that. May I remind the gentleman that the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota which were quoted in the newspapers and in the Chicago Tribune were to the effect that you were immediately going to wipe out or eliminate the war excise taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Nothing was said about excise taxes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And the gentleman made no objection to that quotation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Nothing was said about excise taxes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I certainly will get the clipping and insert the clipping in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON. I hope the gentleman will do so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD the articles which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] quoted.

Mr. KNUTSON. I hope no one will object.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In which article the gentleman from Minnesota was quoted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I also call attention to the news items in the press of the country the other day and which also appeared in the Washington Post purporting to be a quotation of a statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. If it is not a true statement, the gentleman from Minnesota ought to deny it for his own sake. It is purported to be a quotation of his statement that the reason that they reported out this extension of the excise taxes and in making them permanent or indefinite—as they say, although there is no difference because they are permanent—as I say, the reason was to make it easy to put through their windfall tax for the big taxpayers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am very glad that the gentleman has called that to our attention. I want the Members of the House and the people of the country to keep this particular excise-tax experience in mind because we have all been listening to the promises that have been shouted from the housetops, particularly with respect to the income-tax reduction which they propose to make of 20 percent across the board. During my visit back home to my district last week, many, many people—business people and wage earners—asked me about that. They are looking forward to this 20 percent tax reduction across the board. I said to them, "Well, my friends, I am very doubtful whether that can be accomplished." Let me tell you how it will work. I happen to have some figures here. The man who is receiving a net income before personal exemption of $2,500, under the bill, H. R. 1, introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], would get a reduction in taxes of $19 or eight-tenths of 1 percent under the present laws. But the person receiving a net income before personal exemption of $5,000 would receive a reduction of $118 or 2.4 percent. A person receiving a net income of $10,000 would get a reduction of $372 or 3.7 percent. I am citing these figures because I want you to follow them as they show that those in the higher brackets definitely and positively, according to unimpeachable figures, get a higher percentage of tax reduction than those in the lower income-tax brackets. A $25,000 income would get a reduction of 6.8 percent. A $50,000 income would get a reduction of 9.6 percent, and a $100,000 income would get a reduction of 12½ percent. A $250,000 income would get a reduction of 15.2 percent.

So, Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1, which the country has been promised, definitely takes care of the income tax, to a greater degree, of those who have the higher incomes. These figures are indisputable. I hope the country, and especially those who are depending upon a 20-percent reduction, will see a change of pace by the leaders who are carrying the ball, see them turn around and go in the reverse direction and give relief to those who are entitled to relief and who should have relief. In that way something could be done to stop this inflation, and this demand for higher wages on the part of those who are having a hard time taking care of their families, on the high prices prevailing now. Do not give a reduction, under the Knutson plan, where the man with a $250,000 income gets a 15, or higher percentage reduction, while the man with a $2,500 income gets less than 1 percent reduction.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact also that based on 1944 figures 25,000,000 of the 45,000,000 income taxpayers will save less than 83 cents a month under the Knutson plan?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think those figures are correct. I do not happen to have checked that particular angle of it.

Now, these matters of taxation are important. I think it is wrong to hold out to the public and the business people of this country the hope of a plan of reduction of taxes of 20 percent across the board. I want everybody to know who will really get tax relief under the Knutson plan. It will be true, if that bill becomes law, it will be relief for the greedy and not relief for the needy.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if one who has been paying 50 times as much taxes in amount as another during the years would not be entitled to have 50 times as much relief.

Mr. EBERHARTER. He may be entitled to 50 times as much relief but not 50 times the amount of taxes paid. I will give the gentleman some figures, under the Knutson plan.

A man who had an income of between thirty-two and thirty-eight thousand dollars would receive a percentage-point decrease in rates of 12.35 percent, whereas the man with an income of between 2,000 and 4,000 dollars would receive a reduction under the Knutson bill of only 4.18 percent. That is not fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a man receiving an income of $2,500 would get $19 relief, whereas, a man receiving an income of $100,000 would get $12,460 relief. A man with an income of $250,000 would get $38,095 relief. Would that be in accordance with the principle of ability to pay? Does this Congress want to do something to help the economy of the country or do you just want to give these people who have plenty of money now more relief? Do you want to keep the taxes of those who are struggling to keep their families on a scale which is absolutely necessary in order to give them proper food, housing, and clothing at just about the same level it is today? It sounds very nice to say 20 percent across the board, but you should study the figures.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two tables from which I have just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The tables referred to are as follows:)

Comparison of individual income taxes under present law [1] and under H. R. 1,[2] for specified amounts of net income

MARRIED PERSON [3]—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax		Effective rates		Decrease compared with present law		Decrease as a percentage of—	
	Present law	H. R. 1 [4]	Present law	H. R. 1 [4]	Amounts	Effective rates	Present law tax	Net income after present law tax
			Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,500	$95	$76	3.8	3.0	$19	0.8	20.0	0.8
$3,000	190	152	6.3	5.1	38	1.3	20.0	1.4
$4,000	380	304	9.5	7.6	76	1.9	20.0	2.1
$5,000	589	471	11.8	9.4	118	2.4	20.0	2.7
$6,000	798	638	13.3	10.6	160	2.7	20.0	3.1
$8,000	1,292	1,034	16.2	12.9	258	3.2	20.0	3.8
$10,000	1,862	1,490	18.6	14.9	372	3.7	20.0	4.6
$15,000	3,639	2,911	24.3	19.4	728	4.9	20.0	6.4
$20,000	5,890	4,712	29.5	23.6	1,178	5.9	20.0	8.3
$25,000	8,522	6,818	34.1	27.3	1,704	6.8	20.0	10.3
$50,000	24,111	19,289	48.2	38.6	4,822	9.6	20.0	18.6
$75,000	42,323	33,858	56.4	45.1	8,465	11.3	20.0	25.9
$100,000	62,301	49,841	62.3	49.8	12,460	12.5	20.0	33.1
$250,000	190,475	152,380	76.2	61.0	38,095	15.2	20.0	64.0
$304,396 [5]	237,500	190,000	78.0	62.4	47,500	15.6	20.0	71.0
$350,000	276,925	225,275	79.1	64.4	51,650	14.8	18.7	70.7
$500,000	406,600	341,300	81.3	68.3	65,300	13.1	16.1	69.9
$750,000	622,725	534,675	83.0	71.3	88,050	11.7	14.1	69.2
$1,000,000	838,850	728,050	83.9	72.8	110,800	11.1	13.2	68.8
$2,000,000	1,703,350	1,501,550	85.2	75.1	201,800	10.1	11.8	68.0
$3,000,000	[6] 2,565,000	2,275,050	85.5	75.8	289,950	9.7	11.3	66.7
$4,000,000	[6] 3,420,000	3,048,550	85.5	76.2	371,450	9.3	10.9	64.0
$5,000,000	[6] 4,275,000	3,822,050	85.5	76.4	452,950	9.1	10.6	62.5
$6,000,000	[6] 5,130,000	[7] 4,590,000	85.5	76.5	540,000	9.0	10.5	62.1

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[4] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[5] Point at which 15-percent reduction of present law tentative tax takes effect under H. R. 1.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[7] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.
Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research.

Comparison of combined normal tax and surtax rates under present law [1] and under H. R. 1 [2]

Surtax net income		Combined normal tax and surtax rates			Percentage-point decrease in rates compared with present law
		Present law		H. R. 1	
Exceeding—	Not exceeding—	Tentative rates	Rates after 5-percent reduction		
		Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
0	$2,000	20	19.00	15.20	3.80
$2,000	4,000	22	20.90	16.72	4.18
$4,000	6,000	26	24.70	19.76	4.94
$6,000	8,000	30	28.50	22.80	5.70
$8,000	10,000	34	32.30	25.84	6.46
$10,000	12,000	38	36.10	28.88	7.22
$12,000	14,000	43	40.85	32.68	8.17
$14,000	16,000	47	44.65	35.72	8.93
$16,000	18,000	50	47.50	38.00	9.50
$18,000	20,000	53	50.35	40.28	10.07
$20,000	22,000	56	53.20	42.56	10.64
$22,000	26,000	59	56.05	44.84	11.21
$26,000	32,000	62	58.90	47.12	11.78
$32,000	38,000	65	61.75	49.40	12.35
$38,000	44,000	69	65.55	52.44	13.11
$44,000	50,000	72	68.40	54.72	13.68
$50,000	60,000	75	71.25	57.00	14.25
$60,000	70,000	78	74.10	59.28	14.82
$70,000	80,000	81	76.95	61.56	15.39
$80,000	90,000	84	79.80	63.84	15.96
$90,000	100,000	87	82.65	66.12	16.53
$100,000	150,000	89	84.55	67.64	16.91
$150,000	200,000	90	85.50	68.40	17.10
$200,000	302,396	91	[3] 86.45	69.16	17.29
$302,396 and over				[4] 77.35	9.10

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Jan. 27, 1947.
[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] A bill introduced on Jan. 3, 1947, in the House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] Subject to a maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[4] Subject to a maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the greatest danger that can happen to business during these times is the uttering of irresponsible statements by persons who are presumed to be in responsible positions. One of the members on the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee stated it was the intention to revise these excise taxes during this year. When questioned, he said that was his own desire and not the desire of the committee.

It is important to my mind to adopt a program insofar as taxation is concerned under which the businessmen of the country and the wage earners can do some long-range planning. The wage earner should know how much is going to be taken out of his weekly pay. Then he can plan as to whether he is going to have some new furniture, some new rugs, a Frigidaire, or an automobile; but with all these contradictory statements, these impossible promises, I submit it is very discouraging to both business and the workingman.

[From the Chicago Tribune of November 7, 1946]

TAX CUT FIRST GOP MOVE—KNUTSON ASKS EARLY ACTION ON 20-PERCENT SLASH—URGES EXCISE LEVY REDUCTION, TOO

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 6.—Republicans moved today to cut 1947 personal income taxes 20 percent, making good their campaign promises immediately following the GOP election landslide.

Representative KNUTSON (Republican, Minnesota), who will be chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, which initiates tax legislation, announced he will introduce a bill to obtain the reduction on the day the new Congress convenes, January 5. KNUTSON's reelection in yesterday's voting was confirmed today with a final tabulation that gave him 50,634 votes to 39,090 for J. Edward Anderson, Democratic Farmer-Labor nominee.

KNUTSON told the Tribune in a statement telephoned from his home at Wadena, Minn., that the new Republican-controlled Congress will pass the bill immediately and save taxpayers $3,000,000,000 despite President Truman's insistence that taxes can't be lowered.

PLAN ANOTHER BILL

Moreover, KNUTSON said, his committee will open public hearings in February on another bill to save the taxpayers' money. Its purpose will be to cut back luxury excise taxes to 1942 levels. It will reduce, and in some cases eliminate, excises on a long list of items that includes jewelry, furs, cosmetics, and liquors. The reductions are to be effective next July 1.

"It is our plan to balance the budget and reduce Federal expenditures for the next fiscal year to $32,000,000,000 as against nearly forty billion the Democrats figured would be required," KNUTSON said.

"On that basis I estimated we could make a 20 percent cut in income taxes and begin at once reducing the national debt by paying off four or five billion dollars next year."

DISMISSAL OF PAYROLLERS

"Under our program of eliminating all unnecessary expenditures, we will cut off several million needless Government employees and turn down appropriations for bureaus that do not need them vitally. We take the position that no expenditures will be made unless they are absolutely necessary."

KNUTSON is expected to succeed Representative DOUGHTON, 83, Democrat, North Carolina, as chairman of the tax framing House committee. KNUTSON has been the committee's ranking Republican.

DOUGHTON has insisted on a policy of cutting Government expenditures while maintaining tax levels high enough to balance the budget.

KNUTSON observed that the customary way to cut taxes is first to cut appropriations. But New Deal waste and extravagance are so notorious, he said, that Republicans have decided to cut taxes first, and thus halt spending.

HE CITES HISTORY

"History repeats itself," he commented. "After the First World War a Republican controlled Congress balanced the Budget, reduced the national debt 36.5 percent in 10 years and at the same time made for reductions in taxes.

"Our immediate goal will be to cut expenditures, balance the Budget, establish a surplus each year to apply on the national debt and grant as much relief to a tax-burdened Nation as sound fiscal policies under governmental economics will permit.

"A sane level of taxation has a direct relationship to increased Government revenue. This and many other traditionally American approaches to full employment, a high level of business activity and lower prices will again prevail."

But the Republican revenue slicing drive may plunge head-on into a Presidential veto. The Democratic administration is committed to a high tax program, contending that stiff rates are needed to balance the budget and begin payments on the $262,000,000,000 national debt.

A two-thirds vote in both the House and Senate would be necessary to override if President Truman exercises his veto power.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass. of October 21, 1946]

GOP FISCAL POLICY IN HOUSE SET BY TAX STUDY COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, October 21.—A statement signed by all Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee sets the GOP fiscal goal in the next Congress as a budget trimmed to between $32,000,000,000 and $33,000,000,000, a $5,000,000,000 reduction in the national debt, a reduction in personal

income taxes of 20 percent, and downward adjustments in Federal excise taxes.

The statement is the work of 27 House Republican members, including all members of the Ways and Means Committee, and known as the House Republican Postwar Tax Study Committee. It includes Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, the next chairman of the Ways and Means Committee if Republicans control the House.

The statement, forecast in the Christian Science Monitor last Friday, criticizes by name Mariner S. Eccles, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, John T. Steelman, Reconversion Director, and William Wirtz, chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, all of whom have recently argued that tax reduction would be inflationary at present.

TRIO CRITICIZED

The Republican statement criticizes the trio as self-appointed advisers on tax policies in the executive branch of the Government.

It has been learned here that Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, who will become chairman of the House Appropriations Committee if the GOP captures the Chamber, plans to come to Washington promptly in event of Republican victory. He foresees a Federal budget for the 1948 fiscal year of not more than $30,000,000,000. This contrasts with an expected President Truman January estimate of Federal expenditures of $35,000,000,000.

A 20-percent cut in 1947 personal taxes would amount to around $3,500,000,000 or $3,750,000,000, it is estimated. Wartime excise tax elimination, it is calculated, would cut off another $1,250,000,000.

The new congressional streamlining bill directs particular interest to advance discussions of Federal finances, because a new weapon has been given to Congress to make advance budget estimates take effect.

FISCAL COORDINATION

The new law for the first time coordinates taxes and spending. Total Government income will be calculated to start with and spending made dependent on that. Taxing and appropriation committees of both Houses of Congress are required to coordinate their work, first by reporting on expected Federal income and then by setting expenditures accordingly.

If the House is captured by Republicans the fiscal program may be the first big legislative issue after the election and a test of the ability of the two parties to cooperate under a Democratic President.

The four committees involved are the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, Senate Finance, and House Ways and Means Committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the very unfortunate combination of circumstances confronting thousands of trappers and farmer-trappers in Louisiana, and particularly the danger they face to their industry as a result of this bill to restore the 20 percent excise tax on furs after July 1 of this year.

There has been a severe recession in the retail sale of manufactured fur coats. This began in September of last year and has left large stocks in the hands of the manufacturers. The postwar reaction and readjustment can be blamed in part, but the principal reason is the exorbitant wartime tax of 20 percent which attaches to every sale of a muskrat coat. With this increased cost to the buyer, purchase resistance is greater than has ever been experienced in the fur trade, even during the worst years of the depression, and the manufacturers, finding themselves with such large inventories, are not buying raw furs. Consequently, the trapper is now realizing less than 50 percent of the amount he received for his furs in the previous trapping season.

The situation is further aggravated by the fact that the reduction in sales of muskrat coats, because of the heavy tax, has brought about large numbers of bankruptcies among coat manufacturers and their stocks are thus thrown on the market at liquidation prices, reducing drastically the value of skins to the remaining sound firms.

With the trapper's return now averaging about 60 cents for his muskrats, as compared with $1.40 last year, and with the trade situation in such a deplorable state as mentioned above, it is evident that something should and must be done to restore this industry to its rightful position. It is unanimously agreed and publicly stated by the various national organizations of fur dealers, manufacturers, and brokers, and by many large national retail agencies, that the reduction of the tax on furs would be the only step necessary to spur the industry to renew activity and bring added value to the trapper's product.

Weather conditions have contributed to the troubles of the trappers, making it all the more necessary that he be able to secure greater revenue from the skins he sells. An unprecedented period of warm weather has extended from early last fall to the present time, making the season unsatisfactory for trapping purposes. The natural development of muskrats and other furs has been so retarded that the catch has been cut at least in half. Those muskrats being caught are so poor in quality, because of the warm weather, their value has been greatly reduced.

Unless the value of his product can be increased, the trapper will find himself pretty much beyond help. His grocery bills are 50 percent higher than they were last year; traps that cost him $4 a dozen before the war have cost him as much as $20 a dozen this season; boots that were $5 a pair before war days have risen to $12; while lumber and other items required for the building of his camp are about 300 percent higher than the previous year. Against all this, compare the fact that he is receiving even less than prewar figures for his muskrats, and you will realize the plight he is in.

It should be kept in mind that all through the war and even up to August 1946 the national administration, through the Office of Price Administration, took the position that furs made from muskrat skins are cost-of-living items, not luxuries; that the large volume product of the American trapper is the muskrat; and that muskrat coats are purchased by average wage earners. I am not going to make any argument here for the reduction of taxes on Russian sables, mink coats, or fur garments selling for more, for example, than $300. But surely the luxury tax should not be continued on an item that the Government itself says is a cost-of-living article of clothing.

In view of the situation I have outlined, it is only fair and practical that any move to extend the wartime tax on furs be defeated by Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I know that music is forbidden in this Hall, but somehow or other I seem to hear the faint strains of the Gay Little Men on the Flying Trapeze: "They float through the air with the greatest of ease, those gay little men on the flying trapeze." It takes me back many years to when I was a boy and my father took me to the circus. At that time I saw the world's greatest acrobats, the Flying DeMarcos, who did a triple somersault in reverse off the back of an elephant. To think that I should live to see the day when there was a greater act—an elephant, itself, doing three backflips in a space of 5 seconds.

During the discussion of this bill there has been a great deal of loose talk by Members of the majority in referring to the excise taxes as luxury taxes. I think their use of the word "luxury" has been deliberate in an attempt to mislead, because if any Member of this House studies the bill he will find that the greater part of taxes on individual units are upon necessities and not upon luxuries. He will find that it taxes many of the vital necessities of every day life. The things that are necessary that we purchase if we are to live. The majority has been very careful not to state that 85 percent of the excise taxes covered in this measure will come from the pocketbooks of individuals and families earning less than $4,000 a year. The mother going to the drug store to buy baby oil for her child is compelled to pay under the terms of this measure a tax of 20 percent. The same is true of foot powders. Women's handbags which are just as much a necessity to a woman as a hat is to a man are taxed 20 percent regardless of whether they cost 59 cents or $59. Under the terms of this measure a man can go to the race track and approach the parimutuel window and make a bet of $100 or $1,000, either of which I believe to be an absolute luxury, yet he is taxed only 5 percent. But if he goes to the drug store to purchase a lipstick for his wife or an alarm clock then again he is confronted with the 20 percent tax. Luggage, an item which no one buys for home decoration or for the sake of vanity, but which is purchased only as an absolute necessity, has added to its cost an additional 20 percent under the terms of this measure. That is why when this rule was being discussed I asked you to vote the rule down and bring this bill before the House under an open rule so that we could take it up section by section and item by item and know just what we were doing.

I suppose before the debate closes, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has suggested, some reference will be made by the majority to the tax bill known as H. R. 1, sponsored by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. They will, no doubt, tell you that when they take up that measure they will save the working people of this country many, many dollars. Let me tell you, my friends, that H. R. 1 will be of no benefit to any individual who earns less than $10,000 a year. On the other hand, if there is an honest and sincere revision of the excise tax laws, if there is a striking out of taxes on those things which are necessities, if there is a lowering of the rate on those that are semi-necessities, the man with a family receiving $5,000 or under a year will have a greater saving than he would under the so-called Knutson bill.

The eyes of the Nation are upon you. This is really the first official act of the Eightieth Congress. Do not think for a moment that the people of the country are going to be pleased by the passage of an excise tax bill over which they grumbled but forgave during the war years. The bill was passed during the hysteria of war and at a time when our national income and our people's salaries were at the highest. Now the majority intends to put new facets upon this measure and to extend it not for 6 months, not for a year, but for an indefinite period which in legislative life usually means forever.

On January 6 I introduced into this House H. R. 467, the purpose of which was to bring all excise taxes back to their prewar level. I did this for two reasons: First, because I felt that the existing excise-tax laws were unjust and were placing too great a penalty upon the mass of our people; and, second, because the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, had recently said during the months of November and December that his first act upon taking office would be to bring about a revision of the excise-tax law.

The gentleman at that time said that he felt by revising these laws, production and sales would be increased and that the Government tax structure would be strengthened, due to the increased volume. On January 7, one day after the introduction of my bill, the gentleman from Minnesota informed both the Associated and United Press that he was in favor of the legislation and that he would see to it that it was given a hearing. Today, his actions are not in line with his statements of November, December, or January.

It was surprising to me to hear the gentlemen of the majority claiming that they had to take this reversal because of the increased cost of Government. Most of them have been here for many years, and they know that the Government is an expensive thing to run, especially in these hectic postwar times. They further know that the Government cannot be run without taxes. They also knew this during the campaign back in October and November; but with the strong desire that they possessed to be elected and to take control of the Congress, they made promises that their subconscious minds knew could not be kept, and they thought that perhaps they could put off the day of reckoning. Today is the day of judgment. They stand before the Nation in the first days of their administration with a broken promise that will be costly to every man and woman in the Republic.

In conclusion, may I suggest to the Members of the House that this bill be recommitted so that the committee can give it further consideration, so that the committee will have ample time to strike out the unreasonable features and inequities that exist, and so that it may be brought before this House with an open rule where amendments and deletions can be made.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, in 1943 the Congress, at the request of President Roosevelt, passed an act levying certain excise taxes on beverage alcoholic liquors, furs, and on many other so-called luxuries. It was provided in the act that these excise taxes would terminate 6 months after the President or a joint resolution of Congress should declare that hostilities were at an end. The President, on December 31, 1946, issued a Proclamation declaring hostilities at an end and therefore, these levies of excise taxes would terminate June 30, 1947. Many business people and others have urged that this measure be permitted to expire on June 30, 1947, but the President, in his recent annual message to Congress and in his Budget message, urged that these taxes be continued beyond June 30, 1947. The Treasury Department joined in this request. If this Act is repealed it will take away approximately $1,267,000,000 annually in taxes. The Congress is confronted with a condition and not a theory.

The President has informed the Congress that there will be a deficit for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947, of approximately $2,000,000,000. If there is a deficit, then this Nation will have had 17 consecutive years of deficits. For 17 consecutive years our expenditures have been greater than the receipts, and today we are confronted with fixed obligations of the Government amounting to $260,000,000,000 and with many billions of undetermined liabilities and with the highest taxes of any period of this Nation's history. We all agree that the Budget must be balanced if we preserve the financial integrity and the economic stability of this Nation. A substantial sum must be paid to reduce our national debt. This action will create confidence in the stability of our Government and there must be a reduction of taxes. We must cut out all unnecessary expenditures, cut out unnecessary bureaus, commissions, and agencies, and take about a million of unnecessary officeholders off the pay roll. There can be no balancing of the Budget, no payment on the national debt, or reduction of taxes unless and until our expenditures are substantially less than our income. It is a real threat to our country to continue to expend more than we take in.

The new Congress inherited these tremendous obligations and the conditions that now confront the country from those who are today attempting to criticize the Republicans in Congress for not immediately reducing these luxury war taxes.

There are other excise taxes being collected from the people on almost everything they consume. There are heavy individual income taxes. The President urges that the whole subject of excise taxes be thoroughly reviewed by the Congress, and I believe the Congress will review all excise taxes, including those covered by the bill before us, and it will include individual income taxes as well as corporation taxes, and then we shall be able to draft and pass a tax bill that will meet the requirements of our Government and which will be fair to the American people. This measure was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. There was a unanimous and favorable report. While some of our Democrat friends on that great committee now talk long and loud about this measure, not one of them cast his vote against reporting this bill favorably. The Rules Committee, without a dissenting vote, favorably reported a resolution to make this bill in order, and I dare say when the vote is taken this evening or tomorrow that this measure is passed by a vote of 10 or 12 to 1.

I certainly take no pleasure in voting to retain these taxes. The President and the Treasury Department say that we must have these taxes at this time. I am voting for this extension, not as a permanent measure but extending it for a time so that the whole excise-tax structure, as well as our other taxes, may be fully reviewed, and we then can act more intelligently as to what tax and what amounts may be reduced or cut out entirely. I made the prediction years ago that so long as the Democrats remained in power they would increase taxes and increase the national debt. Almost every year while they were in power they brought in and passed a new tax bill, either creating new taxes or increasing other taxes. As usual, the Republicans now must clean up the mess that they have inherited from the Democrats. Of course, we cannot tell exactly what taxes we can reduce and what we can cut out until we find out to what extent we can correct the squandering and spending policy of the present administration.

For the first year of peacetime the President informs us that we will take in taxes from the American people amounting to approximately $40,000,000,000. This is not due to any policy or fault of the Republicans. The administration this same fiscal year will spend approximately $42,000,000,000. That will leave a deficit for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947, of approximately $2,000,000,000. We are spending many more times this year than was ever expended in any year in peacetime since the founding of this Government and we are collecting many

more times in taxes the amount of taxes collected in any peacetime year in the history of this Government. The American people are now reaping the unwise and wasteful policy created since the Democrats took control of the Congress in March 1931, and during which time we had the policy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, but the dance is now over and the American people must pay the fiddler.

I was a Member of Congress beginning March 4, 1919, and we found the same condition after 8 years of the Wilson administration. A Republican Congress did begin reducing taxes and reduced them every year for at least 10 years and paid approximately $10,000,000,000 on our national debt. It is the policy of the present Republican Congress to cut out taxes, reduce taxes and reduce our national debt, encourage private enterprise, and create jobs.

When the roll is called I shall be interested in seeing how many of our Democratic friends who have spoken against this resolution cast their votes in favor of it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, the action we shall take today is really a preliminary report to the Nation on what Congress intends to do to relieve the tax burden on our people. I had hoped that some of the luxury taxes might be abolished at once, particularly since there is a period of uncertainty for both businessmen and consumers. With a date set in the near future for the taking off of certain taxes, it is difficult to see how prudent buyers would make their purchases and pay the tax when by waiting they could avoid the tax. An indefinite extension of luxury taxes at this time will at least have the result of letting everybody concerned know where they stand and what to expect.

This problem, together with the question of a reduction in income taxes, the balancing of the Budget and a start to pay off something on the national debt, is all dependent upon the fundamental problem of cutting down the cost of Government. Unless we show a disposition to attack that fundamental problem with a determination to cut drastically, then there is little hope for any material lessening of the tax burden at this time.

A reduction of the Federal income tax involves careful study and research to see how the reduction may be made to apply most equitably to different income brackets. We should adopt a course calculated to best insure stimulation to business and increasing the income of workers through maximum production.

The situation as to portal-to-portal pay also comes into the picture and must have early attention. I do not see how it is possible to even consider a tax reduction bill while this portal pay is unsettled.

But we inevitably come back again to the problem which underlies all the others—a substantial reduction in the cost of Government. Not only must there be an elimination of waste and extravagance, but also many activities which, though desirable, are not necessary, must be cut out. It will call for real qualities of statesmanship. It will be hard to resist the demands of those who will insist that the particular activity in which they are interested must be let alone. We know what the country is expecting of us. The people want taxes reduced, the budget balanced, and payments started on the national debt. All this can be done without seriously impairing a single essential function of Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, although I am voting for the bill to continue certain war excise tax rates in effect, I want to call attention to the inequities which exist in connection with excise taxes and which must be studied and corrected. For example, fur coats selling for as little as $32.50 carry a 20-percent tax, as pointed out by small retail furriers in my district. Certainly a $32.50 fur coat is not a luxury. But oriental rugs selling for as much as $2,450 each carry no excise tax whatever.

I shall do my utmost to see that the whole field of excise taxes is reviewed, and that people in the middle-income level are treated fairly. We must recognize that even if we bring the budget down drastically, as is now proposed, it will still be huge, in view of the billions we need for veterans' rehabilitation, essential Government services to which we are committed, and an Army and Navy adequate to our position in today's troubled world. To pay these billions and yet to do our utmost to ease the strain of heavy income taxes on people in the middle-income levels, like those in my district, we must review all excise taxes promptly. We must be honest with ourselves and have a sense of responsibility to the Nation, hence the necessity for passing this bill now to keep Government income intact until the budget can be cut and the whole tax structure reviewed to make it fair to people of modest means. I shall do my utmost to bring about this result.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall be compelled to vote against H. R. 1030, a bill to continue in effect the war excise tax rates.

The measure is extended for an indefinite period. I think this is wrong. An expiration date should be fixed. The argument is made that this would place dealers and producers of the articles coming under the excise tax in an uncertain position. I think, however, the failure to provide an expiration date also leaves the trades in an uncertain position. They will not be able to make their commitments ahead any better than if there were an expiration date.

This bill has been brought in here without any hearings—under a gag rule. This means that no amendments can be offered or other changes made in the bill. This is an objectionable feature.

Furthermore, I think there are some gross inconsistencies in the projected tax program. There is just as much reason for reducing or removing some of the taxes that come under the excise-tax provision as there is for reducing the income tax. The excise tax covers many commonly used and necessary articles, such as toilet preparations, substances that go into the formation of medicines, automobile tires, tubes, electric-light bulbs, and many other articles. There is no reason why, in my opinion, sufficient time could not have been given to consideration of these items.

Legislation such as this is somewhat questionable because it singles out special groups. It is doubtful whether this is an equitable taxing procedure.

There is no way of telling how long these excise taxes will remain on the statute books if the bill passes. Furthermore, I can hardly consider the procedure in connection with this measure and some of the provisions in the bill as being in accordance with campaign promises made by my party last fall.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROPHY].

Mr. BROPHY. Mr. Chairman, while we are talking about excise taxes, I believe it is the proper time to call attention of the House to a situation which needs attention.

The district I have the honor to represent, the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, and the adjoining district represented by my colleague the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin, represents one of the largest beer-producing areas in our country.

The beer industry means thousands of jobs in the breweries in Wisconsin and in the Nation.

It is a major industry.

While the beer imports have been small in comparison to our national production, the facts are that these imports do have an effect on the brewery business on the Mexican border, and in cities like Detroit, Buffalo, and other border cities. The imports have for years been double the exports.

There are two important questions that must be answered:

First. If the import duty is $7.75 per barrel with no excise tax added and the domestic excise tax levied by the Bureau of Internal Revenue is continued at $8 per barrel what will be the import situation when normal production is again resumed?

Second. What will be the situation in the brewery business in the United States if the duty is reduced by 50 percent as is now being proposed by the State Department? Will the workers in the breweries in America have more or fewer jobs if the State Department decides to reduce the import duty on beer to $3.87½ per barrel? This is important and should have immediate attention.

The following is from pages 29 and 30 of the Tariff Commission's Digest of the Beer Situation:

Rate reduced to 50 cents per gallon ($11.50 per barrel) under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, effective February 1935, and to 25 cents per gallon ($7.75 per barrel) in trade agreement with Mexico, effective January 1943.

The United States is the world's largest producer of fermented malt liquors. During the calendar years 1937–39 United States production (withdrawals) averaged somewhat less than 55,000,000 barrels (of 31 gallons) annually. During the war, despite many restrictions and regulations, production increased, and in 1945 was 82,000,000 barrels, much the largest quantity ever produced. New York is the largest and Pennsylvania and Wisconsin the second and third producing States; these three States produce nearly 40 percent of the United States total.

During and since the war the imports of beer have been much larger than in the prewar years. Imports in 1944 were 259,000 barrels and in 1945 they were 303,000 barrels. These imports have come chiefly from Mexico and Canada. The imports from Mexico have usually been consumed close to the border; they comprise a significant proportion of the consumption in that area.

Unlike distilled liquors, imported beer is not subject to the internal-revenue tax, and whatever protection is afforded to domestic producers by the duty is to be measured by the difference between the duty and the internal-revenue tax.

The present duty, under the 1943 agreement with Mexico, is one-half that fixed under section 336, and one-fourth of the rate provided by the Tariff Act of 1930. The present rate is somewhat less than the internal-revenue tax, so that the protection to the domestic brewers is negative.

Under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks pages 29 and 30 of the Tariff Commission's Digest of the beer situation:

Malt liquors (beer, stout, ale, etc., (1) in bottles, (2) in other containers)

STATISTICAL IMPORT CLASSES (1939): 177.80, 177.82. UNITED STATES PRODUCTION, EXPORTS, AND IMPORTS, 1937–39 AND 1943

Year	Production [1]	Domestic exports	Imports for consumption from—				
			All countries	Eire	Netherlands	United Kingdom	Germany [2]
	Quantity (1,000 barrels of 31 gallons)						
1937	56,221	27	83	7	7	10	26
1938	51,844	24	68	7	7	6	19
1939	53,190	23	64	8	12	6	15
1943	73,593	84	[3] 118	13	-------	2	-------
	Value (1,000 dollars)						
1937	[4]	821	2,157	406	185	505	508
1938	[4]	466	1,730	359	200	287	386
1939	[4]	446	1,658	391	322	287	259
1943	[4]	1,586	[3] 3,558	660	-------	105	-------

[1] Total withdrawals, tax-paid and tax-free, calendar years.
[2] Includes Austria beginning 1938.
[3] Includes 16,000 barrels, valued at $278,000, free as an act of international courtesy, principally from Canada, also dutiable imports amounting to 59,000 barrels, valued at $1,892,000, were imported from Mexico and 27,000 barrels, valued at $607,000, from Canada.
[4] Not available.

Source: Production from Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, U. S. Treasury Department; exports and imports from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Item	United States tariff				Proposed negotiating country
	Per gallon		Per barrel		
	Act of 1930	1945 rate	Act of 1930	1945 rate	
Par. 805: Ale, porter, stout, beer.	$1	[1] $0.25	$31	[1] $7.75	United Kingdom.

[1] Rate reduced to 50 cents per gallon ($15.50 per barrel) under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, effective February 1935, and to 25 cents per gallon ($7.75 per barrel) in trade agreement with Mexico, effective January 1943.

NOTE.—The ad valorem equivalent of the duty has no significance by reason of the fact that imported malt liquors are not subject to the internal revenue tax; see text.

COMMENT

The United States is the world's largest producer of fermented malt liquors. In this country the industry is on a large scale and is highly mechanized. During the calendar years 1937–39 United States production (withdrawals) averaged somewhat less than 55,000,000 barrels (of 31 gallons) annually. During the war, despite many restrictions and regulations, production increased, and in 1945 was 82,000,000 barrels, much the largest quantity ever produced. Production centers in areas of large population. New York is the largest and Pennsylvania and Wisconsin the second and third producing States; these three States produce nearly 40 percent of the United States total. Other large producing States are Ohio, Missouri, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Michigan.

For the most part beer production and distribution is a localized industry. Beer is bulky, and the costs of bottles, bottling, and delivery are high relative to the cost of manufacturing (more than 60 percent of the beer marketed is sold in bottles). Many breweries have their own marketing and delivery service; only a few of the large producing concerns have a Nation-wide distribution.

Compared with domestic production, imports of malt liquors have always been very small. In the immediate prewar years they constituted about one-fifth of 1 percent of the consumption. At that time imports consisted largely of specialties, including well-known brands of ale, porter, and stout from Eire and the United Kingdom and well-known brands of beer from Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the Netherlands. All the imported malt beverages from the countries mentioned commanded considerably higher prices in the United States than even the highest grades of domestic beer. There were in the prewar period very small imports of ordinary-type beer from Japan, Mexico, and Canada.

During and since the war the imports of beer have been much larger than in the prewar years. Imports in 1944 were 259,000 barrels and in 1945 they were 303,000 barrels. Even so, they amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of the total consumption of the country. These imports have come chiefly from Mexico and Canada and have consisted chiefly of ordinary-type beer. The imports from Mexico have usually been consumed close to the border; though small, they comprise a significant proportion of the consumption in that area.

United States exports of beer have always been very small. In the immediate prewar period they were on the average equal to about one-third of the imports, in quantity, but about one-fourth in value. During the war exports increased considerably but were still much smaller than imports. Prewar exports went largely to the Philippine Islands and the Canal Zone, with smaller quantities to numerous other destinations.

Unlike distilled liquors, imported beer is not subject to the internal revenue tax, and whatever protection is afforded to domestic producers by the duty is to be measured by the difference between the duty and the internal revenue tax. The following table compares the internal revenue tax and the duty in effect at the end of year since the repeal of prohibition, during which a change occurred in either the tax or the duty.

As of Dec. 31—	Dollars per barrel			Cents per gallon		
	Duty	Internal revenue tax	Margin of protection	Duty	Internal revenue tax	Margin of protection
1934	31.00	5.00	26.00	100	16.1	* 83.9
1935	15.50	5.00	10.50	50	16.1	33.9
1940	15.50	6.00	9.50	50	19.4	30.6
1942	15.50	7.00	8.50	50	22.6	27.4
1943	7.75	7.00	.75	25	22.6	2.4
1944	7.75	8.00	−.25	25	25.8	−.8

The present duty, under the 1943 agreement with Mexico, is one-half that fixed under section 336, and one-fourth of the rate provided by the Tariff Act of 1930, which, however, was fixed during the prohibition period and had, therefore, little significance. The present rate is somewhat less than the internal-revenue tax, so that the protection to the domestic brewers is negative. Under present law the internal-revenue tax is to be reduced to $7 per barrel 6 months after the termination of the war is officially proclaimed (not yet proclaimed November 1946); the present duty would exceed that rate of tax by 75 cents per barrel.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the matter of gag rule. I heard that term used a moment ago with reference to the bill before us. Later, I want to explore it a bit, not that I am complaining of bringing this measure in under a gag rule. I understand why it must be done. I am going to look into the history of restrictive rules for revenue measures.

I heard one gentleman say a moment ago that we ought not to vote against this bill because we should not forgive $1,130,000,000 in taxes. I feel compelled to vote for it and I shall vote for this bill today, although I do wish we could have a redefining of luxury taxes. Certainly, I am not in favor of forgiving $1,130,000,000 worth of taxes, considering the financial conditions of our country. I was not in favor of forgiving $7,500,000,000 of taxes 2 years ago under the Ruml plan. Therefore I shall vote for this bill and not forgive these taxes, because we must meet our obligations toward paying the public debt and balancing the Budget. Let me make it clear I will not vote in favor of continuing these excise taxes merely in order to make it possible to have another bill (H. R. 1) brought in here reducing taxes 20 percent across the board. I do not favor such degree of reduction as that now, nor that kind of tax reduction, so I am giving notice beforehand that I shall vote against any such proposal with the same

emphasis that I now vote in favor of continuing these necessary taxes.

With permission to extend my remarks I would like to expand a little bit on the various points I have just raised. This measure does come before us under a restricted rule which is commonly called a "gag rule." As I said I do not disapprove of such restriction on revenue bills of this type, but I do think the country ought to know why we use such a rule for how long the House has been using it. When I first came to Congress under a Democratic majority I heard such limited rules referred to as "gag rules" and at first I was horrified to think that my party was resorting to such. It eased my mind somewhat at that time to learn that earlier a Republican majority had followed the same practice and now today I heard it said that the Republican majority in bringing in such a rule were merely following a practice prevailing under the New Deal. Well, who started this practice anyhow?

As I say I think it is a necessary practice whose origin I would really like to learn. We were told that the great Ohio statesman whose birthday we honor today with the red carnation was a leading Member of Congress in his day and generation. If my memory serves me right, he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee about a half century ago. He may have found it wise at that time to ask for a limited rule in bringing in such bills as the one before us. The point I am trying to make is that some degree of "gag rule" has been found necessary in the consideration of revenue bills no matter what party is in power and I am unable to say which party started the practice.

As I said I shall vote for this bill today although reluctantly because of many inequities in it. I think many things are taxed as luxuries which are not luxuries at all. It is only because we must work toward balancing the budget and taking care of the great national debt that we are obliged to retain these excise taxes for at least the period of prosperity which the country is now enjoying. Talk about forgiving $1,130,000,000 in prospective taxes! Well I would be willing to forgive such taxes on electric light bulbs and other such necessary articles I could name but even if we forgave the whole of these taxes it would be far less unjustified than the thing we were guilty of in 1943–4 when Congress forgave seven and a half billion dollars of due and accrued taxes under the modified Ruml Plan. Forgiving or canceling anticipated revenue is not so bad as forgiving due and accrued taxes.

Much as I regret the necessity of keeping these taxes, at least for a time, I am all the more determined that keeping them shall not furnish an excuse for a later bill such as H. R. 1 which would make a horizontal reduction of 20 percent across the board in individual income taxes. I cannot help who has promised any such 20 percent reduction, I can see no justice in it and I can certainly see no wisdom in it, for it would benefit the rich to a far greater advantage than it would benefit the poor. I doubt the wisdom of any tax reduction during prosperity until we have made arrangements about the budget and about the debt, and when it appears that some reduction can be made through taxation I shall favor such a reduction that will benefit the greatest number of the little people of our Nation. Therefore, I repeat that I shall oppose such a horizontal cut as would continue such inequities as now exists.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Judging by the quality of the remarks we hear on the other side, one would almost think we were on the eve of another election.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot favorably embrace this bill; first, because there is no termination date to these war taxes. The President wisely suggested that these excise taxes be continued for 1 year past their present expiration date, but now these excise taxes will go on forever, like Tennyson's Brook.

I cannot embrace this bill likewise because there is no distinction between necessities and luxuries. Certainly every one of us uses the telegraph, the telephone, the radio, and the cable facilities. The whole Nation uses those facilities. It is highly unwise to continue the tax on such facilities. They are sheer necessities.

By this bill you continue the tax on tires and inner tubes. I defy anyone to say that tubes and tires are not necessities. You tax electrical energy. You continue to tax yourselves every time you go on a railroad, every time you go in an airplane. This Nation is practically on wheels. We are always traveling. Traveling is a necessity, necessary to the national economy, yet you continue the tax on that kind of necessity.

Ask your wife whether she wants you to tax her on her handbags or luggage. Ask her whether she wants you to tax her on toilet soap. Since when is rouge and lipstick not a necessity in this Nation in this day and age? Yes, these necessary articles are taxed—taxed not for 1 year but for all time.

Further, a tax of this sort is very much like a sales tax. It develops sales resistance. Taxes of this sort hit the neediest the hardest. Rich and poor pay alike. It is contrary to the theory that we should tax according to ability to pay. We could stand these taxes in the war emergency, but peace is at hand. That should make a great difference. You will never get out of these taxes $1,130,000,000. Take the fur situation. New York is the greatest fur mart of the world. Furs have tumbled in price. There was recently a very large bankruptcy in New York, the Monty Eitegen Co., and the results and repercussions of that bankruptcy have destroyed all values in furs. Raw furs are down 50 percent.

What is the situation with whisky and liquors? The shelves of all retailers are sagging with liquor because of sales resistance. Now you intensify that sales resistance.

Jewelry has been reduced in price generally from 25 to 50 percent.

While you got over $1,130,000,000 last year on these excise taxes, lay no flattering unction to your souls that you are going to get the same amount or even an amount approaching that the next fiscal year. You just will not get it. Therefore, your well-laid plans of using these excise taxes as a fulcrum to climb on any sort of political bandwagon to reduce the income taxes 20 percent across the board will go glimmering. It just will not happen, because I venture the assertion that you will not raise a half billion dollars with these excise taxes because of deflated prices during the next fiscal year. There should have been a segregation of so-called luxury articles and services. Continue the wartime taxes on cabarets; on billard and pool tables, on pistols and revolvers; on firearms, shells, and cartridges; on spirits; on silver-plated flatware, on jewelry and expensive furs and expensive admissions. Free inexpensive furs and inexpensive admissions of any wartime taxes. Cheap furs are a necessity in the north. Cheap movie seats should bear no wartime tax.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania bandied some figures about with reference to the amount of money which might be saved in certain income-tax brackets which sounded very good to the unthinking. Because of his having made that statement, I feel I should say a few words in answer to his figures.

There have been some suggestions that rather than provide tax relief straight across the board we should graduate the tax reduction so that there will be a larger percentage cut for those in the lower brackets than for those in the medium and higher brackets.

In this connection I ask permission to place in the RECORD at this point certain figures which I have compiled on the cut in spendable income in various tax brackets in the past few years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Net taxable income	1932		1946		1932 to 1946 decline in net spendable income	
	Total Federal taxes	Net spendable income after taxes	Total Federal taxes	Net spendable income after taxes		
						Percent
$2,000	None	$2,000	$190	$1,810	$190	9.50
$5,000	$100	4,900	798	4,202	698	14.24
$10,000	480	9,520	2,185	7,815	1,705	17.91
$25,000	2,520	22,480	9,082	15,918	6,562	29.19
$50,000	8,600	41,400	24,795	25,205	16,195	39.12
$100,000	30,100	69,900	63,127	36,873	33,027	47.25

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, a study of these figures shows that during the war there has been such a great reduction in spendable income for those in the medium and higher brackets that still further discrimination now seems unjust.

It must also be remembered that to a large extent any savings in these brackets will be used for purposes which will mean more production and more employment; therefore, such reduction in the long run will result in little loss of revenue.

I am inclined to agree that the future of our country would be best served at this time by a cut which in general goes across the board.

The present tax structure discourages initiative. There is no possible way that anyone starting from scratch can save enough to provide for his old age. His future lies either in becoming a ward of the Federal Government or a recipient of largesse from some great corporation.

But what of the man who wants to be free, to be independent, to set up his own business?

I do not look forward to a Nation of gigantic corporations with every man an employee. Our country has been built up by the small independent businessman. He should be encouraged, not discouraged.

Any tax structure that stifles initiative and makes it impossible for a man of ability to provide for the future security of himself and his family has in it the seeds of totalitarianism.

Of course, we should never forget the welfare of the common man, but neither should we place too great handicaps on the uncommon man, for we must remember that it is chiefly through his initiative and his imagination that the general well-being is advanced.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill is about to close. Under the rule under which this bill was brought to the floor, only the committee may offer amendments. It is clear that the committee does not intend to offer any amendments. I regret that such is the case.

The raising of fur-bearing animals has become an important industry in my State. Fur farmers have large investments in breeding stock and in their equipment. The tax which this bill continues will, in my opinion, prove disastrous to producers of furs. I am reliably advised that 50 percent of last year's pelt crop is in storage, waiting for a market, and there has been little or no market for most of this year's production. Fur garments for millions of people are a necessity and not a luxury. One in a million might purchase a fur coat costing many thousands of dollars, and, in such a case, it could well be considered a luxury, but, on the other hand, for the millions of people who purchase fur garments costing a few hundred dollars it is an everyday necessity and by no means a luxury. It seems to me that the committee could exempt from the tax garments costing several hundred dollars and within the reach of millions of people.

After the House passes this bill today, it will go over to the other body, and I am hopeful that its Committee on Finance will grant relief to the fur farmers of the country. Without question, their industry is in a deplorable condition. A reduction in the tax, or an exemption on those garments costing less than a reasonable amount, would afford a measure of relief to the people engaged in that industry.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, while I recognize the necessity for continuing taxes in order to reduce the national debt and to balance the budget, I do not think that there is a necessity for making a tax bill inequitable.

The committee brought this bill before the House with a rule which prevented any Member of Congress from offering amendments. It was a case of "take what we offer you or nothing." Too often this same rule has been adhered to on tax measures.

Many of the necessities of life are still burdened with wartime taxes. If they were luxuries, one could have no objection; but here is a bill that does not discriminate. Moreover, this bill continues these taxes indefinitely. Is there to be no relief from taxes for business or the consumer? Is it to be just as this bill says—indefinite? To my mind that means permanent.

A simple reduction in taxes on the necessities of life would go toward reducing the cost of living, which has been mounting since the elimination of price controls. Since there is such an urgent need for reduction in the cost of living, is it not a fair assumption that we should start with Government taxes on the necessities? This bill will continue taxes which were tolerated during the war. It amounts to nothing more than a sales tax. I could not in conscience support such a measure without an opportunity to amend it in order to correct the inequities which exist in it. All this talk by the majority party about reducing taxes—it would be well for them to practice a little justice in the tax bills they do draw up.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. KNUTSON. There are none, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee does now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1030, pursuant to House Resolution 70, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 374, nays 35, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—374

Albert	Deane	Hull
Allen, Calif.	Devitt	Jackson, Calif.
Allen, Ill.	D'Ewart	Jackson, Wash.
Allen, La.	Dingell	Jarman
Almond	Dolliver	Javits
Andersen, H. Carl	Dondero	Jenison
	Donohue	Jenkins, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Dorn	Jenkins, Pa.
Andresen, August H.	Doughton	Jennings
	Drewry	Jensen
Andrews, Ala.	Durham	Johnson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.	Eaton	Johnson, Ill.
Angell	Eberharter	Johnson, Ind.
Arends	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.
Arnold	Ellis	Johnson, Tex.
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Jones, N. C.
Bakewell	Elsaesser	Jones, Ohio
Banta	Elston	Jones, Wash.
Barden	Engel, Mich.	Jonkman
Barrett	Engle, Calif.	Judd
Bates, Ky.	Evins	Karsten, Mo.
Bates, Mass.	Fallon	Kean
Battle	Feighan	Kearney
Beall	Fellows	Kearns
Beckworth	Fenton	Keating
Bell	Fisher	Kee
Bender	Flannagan	Keefe
Bennett, Mich.	Fletcher	Kefauver
Bennett, Mo.	Fogarty	Kennedy
Bishop	Folger	Kerr
Blackney	Foote	Kersten, Wis.
Blatnick	Forand	Kilburn
Boggs, Del.	Fuller	Kilday
Bolton	Fulton	King
Bonner	Gallagher	Knutson
Boykin	Gamble	Kunkel
Bradley, Calif.	Gary	Landis
Bradley, Mich.	Gathings	Lane
Brooks	Gavin	Lanham
Brophy	Gearhart	Latham
Brown, Ga.	Gerlach	Lea
Bryson	Gifford	LeCompte
Buchanan	Gillette	LeFevre
Buck	Gillie	Lemke
Buffett	Goff	Lesinski
Bulwinkle	Goodwin	Lewis
Burke	Gore	Lodge
Burleson	Gorski	Love
Busbey	Gossett	Lucas
Butler	Graham	Lusk
Byrnes, Wis.	Granger	Lyle
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Lynch
Canfield	Grant, Ind.	McConnell
Cannon	Gregory	McCormack
Carroll	Griffiths	McDonough
Case, N. J.	Gross	McDowell
Case, S. Dak.	Gwinn, N. Y.	McGarvey
Chadwick	Gwynne, Iowa	McMahon
Chapman	Hale	McMillan, S. C.
Chelf	Hall, Ewin Arthur	MacKinnon
Chenoweth		Mahon
Chiperfield	Hall, Leonard W.	Maloney
Church		Manasco
Clark	Halleck	Mansfield, Mont.
Clason	Hardy	
Clements	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.
Clevenger	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Clippinger	Harris	Mason
Coffin	Harrison	Mathews
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	Meade, Ky.
Colmer	Hartley	Meade, Md.
Combs	Havenner	Merrow
Cooley	Hays	Meyer
Corbett	Hedrick	Michener
Cotton	Hendricks	Miller, Calif.
Coudert	Herter	Miller, Conn.
Courtney	Heselton	Miller, Md.
Cox	Hess	Miller, Nebr.
Cravens	Hill	Mills
Crawford	Hinshaw	Mitchell
Crosser	Hobbs	Monroney
Crow	Hoeven	Morgan
Cunningham	Hoffman	Morris
Curtis	Holifield	Morton
Dague	Holmes	Muhlenberg
D'Alesandro	Hope	Mundt
Davis, Ga.	Horan	Murdock
Davis, Tenn.	Howell	Murray, Tenn.

Murray, Wis.	Riehlman	Springer
Nixon	Riley	Stanley
Nodar	Rivers	Stefan
Norblad	Rizley	Stevenson
Norman	Robertson	Stigler
Norton	Robsion	Stockman
O'Hara	Rockwell	Sundstrom
O'Konski	Rogers, Fla.	Taber
Owens	Rogers, Mass.	Talle
Pace	Rohrbough	Teague
Passman	Ross	Thomas, N. J.
Patman	Russell	Thomas, Tex.
Patterson	Sadlak	Thomason
Peden	St. George	Tibbott
Peterson	Sanborn	Tollefson
Philbin	Sarbacher	Trimble
Phillips, Calif.	Sasscer	Twyman
Phillips, Tenn.	Schwabe, Mo.	Vail
Pickett	Schwabe, Okla.	Van Zandt
Ploeser	Scoblick	Vinson
Plumley	Scott, Hardie	Vorys
Poage	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Vursell
Potts	Scrivner	Wadsworth
Poulson	Seely-Brown	Walter
Preston	Shafer	Weichel
Price, Fla.	Sheppard	Welch
Price, Ill.	Short	Whittington
Priest	Sikes	Wigglesworth
Rabin	Simpson, Ill.	Williams
Rains	Simpson, Pa.	Wilson, Ind.
Ramey	Smathers	Wilson, Tex.
Rankin	Smith, Kans.	Winstead
Rayburn	Smith, Maine	Wolcott
Redden	Smith, Va.	Wolverton
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Wis.	Wood
Reed, N. Y.	Snyder	Woodruff
Reeves	Spence	Worley
Rich		Youngblood
Richards		Zimmerman

NAYS—35

Abernethy	Kelley	Pfeifer
Bloom	Keogh	Powell
Brehm	Kirwan	Rayfiel
Celler	Klein	Rooney
Dawson, Ill.	Larcade	Sadowski
Dawson, Utah	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Domengeaux	McGregor	Somers
Gordon	Madden	Stratton
Hand	Marcantonio	Towe
Hébert	Morrison	Wheeler
Heffernan	O'Brien	Whitten
Huber	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—22

Bland	Cole, Mo.	Macy
Boggs, La.	Cooper	Norrell
Bramblett	Delaney	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Dirksen	Sabath
Buckley	Douglas	Taylor
Byrne, N. Y.	Fernandez	West
Carson	Hagen	
Cole, Kans.	McMillen, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cole of Missouri for, with Mr. Hagen against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bramblett with Mr. West.

Mr. Carson with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. McMillen of Illinois with Mr. Fernandez.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Mason with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Buckley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include certain tables.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Michael A. Musmanno, of Pittsburgh.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks following the main body of his remarks made in Committee of the Whole by inserting certain pertinent tables.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a statement with reference to the late Senator Marcus Coolidge; second, to include a letter concerning the court martial of one of his constituents; and, third, to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a tribute paid to Charles Augustus Otis last evening by the citizens of Cleveland.

REMOVAL OF TROOPS FROM CHINA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the administration has removed all of our troops from China—which would be fine if it did not endanger the safety of the United States—but it seems to me that this is an extremely serious step to have taken at this time and means just one thing, that is that the administration is leaving the affairs of China and millions of persons to communistic control. I can see no other answer to that and I feel it should be investigated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DIRKSEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. BRAMBLETT, for today, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 22. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars and sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 30, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in executive session on Thursday, January 30, 1947, at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room, No. 356, Old House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

208. A letter from the Superintendent, St. Elizabeths Hospital, transmitting a report to Congress showing in detail the receipts and expenditures for all purposes connected with the hospital for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

209. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

210. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

211. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation

passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

212. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting tabulations submitted by the Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands made during the period from January 1 through December 31, 1946, and the areas embraced in the withdrawals in effect at the end of the period; to the Committee on Public Lands.

213. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

214. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for The Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year 1947, amounting to $9,500 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

215. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of the selective service registrants of inductible age occupationally deferred by the local boards of the system as of January 1, 1947, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

216. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 61. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for expenses of studies and examinations; with amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1353. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1413. A bill to extend to 2 years the time for filing applications for review of claims on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 1414. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit certain officers and employees of county agricultural conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1415. A bill relating to appointments in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 1416. A bill to authorize certain retired officers or employees of the United States to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1417. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the island of Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1418. A bill to amend section 8 (g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1419. A bill authorizing and directing the Public Roads Administration to provide for the improvement of unimproved rural mail routes so as to expedite the rural delivery of United States mail matter; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1420. A bill to provide tax relief on income earned over a period of years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1421. A bill to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal revenue tax on fermented liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1422. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1423. A bill to provide for additional individual income-tax exemption for persons who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1424. A bill to provide promotion of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served as commissioned officers during two wars; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 1425. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1426. A bill to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1427. A bill to provide rights-of-way; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1428. A bill to increase the estate tax specific exemption in the case of estates of members of the armed forces who died during the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 1429. A bill to provide adequate space and office facilities in Veterans' Administration for accredited representatives of recognized organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 1430. A bill to prohibit closed shops, jurisdictional strikes, and secondary boycotts, and to authorize suits to be brought in the district courts of the United States for violations of contracts between employers and labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1431. A bill to provide that the monthly compensation of totally disabled former Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees shall continue so long as they remain totally disabled; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1432. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 1433. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1434. A bill to amend section 11-F of the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1435. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1436. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1437. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1438. A bill to extend the application of title 11 of the Social Security Act, the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employment in nonproprietary hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1439. A bill to relieve from the additional estate tax members of the armed forces dying in active service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1440. A bill to authorize the settlement of certain lawsuits now pending in the courts, and of other disputes, whether suit thereon has been instituted or not, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 1441. A bill to authorize the construction of the western land boundary fence and Rio Grande border fence projects and providing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 1442. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1443. A bill to amend the Internal R venue Code so as to increase the amount of personal e: emption for income-tax purposes with respect to the taxpayer, and to reduce the amount of such exemption with respect to dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1444. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the rporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 1445. A bill to provide relief from tax on income to be paid or permanently set aside or used exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1446. A bill to authorize the payment of premiums on national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance at United States post offices; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 1447. A bill to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment, and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of ublic airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 1448. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1449. A bill to authorize the furnishing of especially equipped automobiles to amputees whose injury was incurred while on active service before World War II and who were not discharged until after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1450. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated after September 8, 1939, by a member of the armed forces who was separated from service by death before September 1, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 1451. A bill to authorize the construction of the western land boundary fence and the Rio Grande fence projects and to provide the necessary authority and money for the construction thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 1452. A bill to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1453. A bill to dispense with the maximum income requirements necessary to establish eligibility for pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 1454. A bill to build a fence along the international border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALMOND:

H. R. 1455. A bill to provide for payment of rental of post-office equipment, fixtures, and lock boxes, owned, leased, or provided by postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 1456. A bill to require the elimination of the so-called pauper clause from Veterans' Administration application forms for hospitalization; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1457. A bill to provide for salary payments to certain individuals who while Members of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress served in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 1458. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1459. A bill to amend Public Law 490, approved July 5, 1946, and to authorize the expenditure out of any unencumbered balance of appropriations to the Department of State for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and the Rio Grande border fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1460. A bill to provide for the construction of an international boundary fence between the United States and Mexico; authorizing the purchase of land for such fence and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1461. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 1462. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated by members of the armed forces before their death in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 1463. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers and former officers of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1464. A bill to provide additional pensions for certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 1465. A bill to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1466. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1467. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1468. A bill to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1469. A bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1470. A bill to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1471. A bill to build a fence along the international border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1472. A bill to provide for increasing the rate of pensions for veterans of the Civil War, and veterans of the war with Spain, who are blind or helpless as to require regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 75. Resolution to establish a free Palestine for homeless people of the Jewish race; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. Res. 76. Resolution authorizing the printing of a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dealing with the preliminary examination and survey of Waimea, Hanapepe, Wailua, and Hanalei Rivers and their tributaries and Kapaa swamp on the island of Kauai, T. H., as a public document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 77. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Donald D. Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Anthoula S. Maskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Angelo Ferrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Helena G. C. Kuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Arthur H. Cooper and Charles E. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Speros Psaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Roy Hesselmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Christ Nick Vans, alias Christos Nick Ventouras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Harry Ben Yorku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Gilda Cowan; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1483. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Hartford (Comes From Above) Bearclaw; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1484. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Andrew White and Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1485. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1486. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1487. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty on Tcp; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Horace W. Bivins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Edward Napier, Jr., non compos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Salvador Luiz Gravito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, co-owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry, and Dry Cleaning Works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Anna Malama Mark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Nellie P. Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1495. A bill continuing in full force and effect patent No. 1,990,645; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1496. A bill continuing in full force and effect patent No. 1,686,983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1499. A bill for the relief of Lillian Taylor (nee Rose Mary Lillian Walker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Victorino Abadia Goita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Herman Trahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Neal E. Will; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Goettmann Printing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Rustom H. Dalal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Toohig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1511. A bill for the relief of Gerald E. Phillips, David C. Watson, and Mrs. Mildred Kobyiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1512. A bill for the relief of Clarence Norfleet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of John C. Garrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1515. A bill for the relief of Julius Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1516. A bill for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Malcomb G. Dickey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Eustratios Phasoulakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1519. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioanou Golias, also known as James John Golias, also known as Demetrios Joana Golias, also known as Demetrios John Golias, also known as Demetrios Golias, also known as Lampros Lampropoulos or Lambros Lampropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Ludmila Buresova, alias Buresh; Kristina Buresova, alias Buresh; and Edward Buresh, alias Eduard Bures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1521. A bill to authorize postponement of deportation order in the case of Demitrios Athanaspulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1522. A bill to authorize postponement of the deportation order in the case of Joseph and Marie Monica Irene (Elba) Duffek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1523. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1524. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Neil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Herluf F. J. Ravn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 1526. A bill for the relief of John Krekovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1527. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1528. A bill for the relief of Jennie Olsen Andersen, widow, and Arthur Andrew Andersen, infant son of Carl Edward Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 1529. A bill for the relief of John Schneider and Mrs. Elizabeth Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1530. A bill for the relief of Edward B. Massie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1531. A bill for the relief of William P. Gillingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 1532. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Ancieto Zacevich or Anciento Zacevich or Ernest Zacevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1533. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of John Lantsas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1534. A bill for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mrs. BOLTON: Petition of citizens in various sections of the United States, urging the removal of all controls over production, distribution, and rationing of sugar (great quantity of petitions, the others being sent direct to committee); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

66. By Mr. DINGELL: Petition of the American Automobile Association in reference to the Federal automotive excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

67. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of a number of members of Christian Church, Pasco, Wash., opposing advertising of any alcoholic beverage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

68. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of D. B. H. Caster and numerous citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging an increase in social-security benefits and the lowering of the age limit to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

69. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, veterans' committee, CIO, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to providing for cash payment for terminal-leave pay and providing for cashing of bonds already received in such payment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

70. Also, petition of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress to enact legislation exempting the territorial and city and county pensioners from paying Federal withholding income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

71. Also, petition of the Northwest Public Power Association, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting appropriation of funds for the construction of the Foster Creek Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Max Raisin, pastor emeritus, B'Nai Jeshurun, Paterson, N. J., offered the following prayer:

We rise to offer prayer to Almighty God as this august lawmaking body is about to resume its labors. We do so with hearts filled with gratitude for the manifold mercies Thou hast shown to our beloved land and the American people. Thou hast prospered our work materially and spiritually, and in the grim struggle through which we have just passed Thou hast strengthened our arms and hast finally blest us with victory. We pray that we may continue to enjoy the favor of Thy guidance and inspiration that these United States may go on from spiritual strength to spiritual strength and from moral triumph to moral triumph.

May we prove ourselves no less strong in peace than in war. May we organize for peace wisely, with stout hearts and unflinching spirits, and may we, as a nation, so live as to set an example of

fair dealing and righteous living, of charity and compassion, to the end that international peace become a permanent condition, and men everywhere will dwell in peace and security, each under his vine and fig tree, with none to make him afraid.

O God, we thank Thee for the new hope kindled in the world that mankind may now look to an era of brotherliness and good will. Let us not, through selfishness or folly, dim the vision for a better and happier world now cherished by countless millions. Teach us to be at peace with ourselves and with one another. Sanctify us through Thy commandments as we perform them day by day, and may we of this blessed land apply ourselves steadfastly to the healing of the wounds and the rebuilding of the shattered lives of our fellow men in less fortunate lands.

Bless the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet. Bless the Senate, this House of Representatives, the judiciary, and all who are connected with the Government. Bless them all with health and strength of body and with wisdom and fortitude of spirit, that they may carry on worthily and fittingly the important tasks of their exalted offices. Through their efforts, may this Government become ever more a government of laws, laws nobly conceived, wisely framed, and affording the largest amount of good to the largest number of people. In Thee we trust, O Father, and may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Indiana give us the program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. As I have discussed with the minority leader, it is our plan to meet Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week. The Committee on the Judiciary is beginning hearings on the portal-to-portal measure on Monday. It is possible, and I express the hope, that the Committee on the Judiciary will have ready for consideration on Thursday of next week legislation to limit the tenure of office of the Presidency to two terms.

The only other matters that I can see that might come before the House in the way of legislation would be that pertaining to certain committee operations; that is, with respect to providing of funds for committees and possibly something in the nature of subpena power for committees and special committees.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on House Administration and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, February 3, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, and in the other a resolution adopted by midwestern Republicans.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter from Rev. Lawrence Kearney.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Salt Lake Telegram relating to the clothing drive.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD a statement on Stick to the Facts, an article appearing in the Bristol Courier of January 28, in reference to tariffs and reciprocal agreements.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes in order to answer the arguments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] in the extension of remarks that he placed in the RECORD yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARENDS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I believe in a short time we are going to find the answer to the question, raised by the report in the daily statement of the United States Treasury that we are in debt $259,000,000,000 or more, as to where we are going to get the money to pay off this great debt. It seems to me now that the effort that is being put forth in getting the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House together with the members of the appropriate committees of the Senate to determine just the amount of money we should spend before we spend it is the only sound, sensible way to do business. In that way we will eventually get a balanced budget. When we get a balanced budget, then we will start to pay off the enormous debt that has been created during the past 15 years. It is about time we realize it is our duty as Members of Congress, and every Member of Congress should do his best, to cut down any unnecessary expenditure of Government funds.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Butte (Mont.) Daily Post of January 11, 1947, having to do with the statehood bids of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mayor O'Dwyer of New York City.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in one to include a newspaper article from the New York Times, in another a newspaper article that appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun of Lawrence, Mass., and in the third a very eloquent article on Rev. Daniel Driscoll that appeared in the Boston Pilot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the press carries the statement that President Truman is considering suggesting to Congress the advisability of legislation which, stripped of technical language, is designed, as I understand it, to call attention to one of the commands chiseled by Moses on the tablets of stone which he gave to the children of Israel.

The Lord's command, as I recall, was a simple one. It was "Thou shalt not steal."

It is not only amazing but disheartening, depressed, and discouraging to learn that the sense of common decency, ordinary honesty, fidelity to public duty of at least one former Cabinet member has sunk so low that attention must be called to the fact that a member of the Cabinet retained in public office by the President took with him when he resigned words, writings, papers prepared in public office and at public expense. With as much propriety might the guest in a hotel take with him the sheets, the pillowcases, the towels, the soap, the silverware and the napkins.

Rumor has it that another Cabinet official, when he by request stepped out, took with him certain papers which it is alleged are the property of Government. In fairness it should be remembered that this rumor has been denied by the former Secretary and that until there is evidence of its truth it should be disregarded.

If those who have gone before us to a better world have knowledge of what is happening today, George Washington, who, it is said, could not tell a lie, must be emerging from his tomb at Mount Vernon to enter his indignant protest; "Honest Abe" must be suffering the tortures of the damned if he realizes how far those in authority in our Federal Government have traveled from the paths of common honesty.

By all means, if ordinary decency will not bring back to the Federal Government things which are rightfully its property, if the conscience of the former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau permits him to retain the material which he as a public official, in a public capacity and at public expense, had in his custody, let us have a law which will reestablish here in America the principle of honesty in public officials.

MERRIMACK VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, today, a bill which shall be known as the Merrimack Valley Authority, designed to utilize to the fullest extent, the water power of the Merrimack River for the production of low-cost hydroelectric energy.

We, in New England, have generously supported, by our votes and our tax contributions, the development of natural resources in other sections of our Nation.

We expect, in return, similar support of our plan to put to work one of the principal rivers of our region—one which runs through the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts—and which, for years, has been shamefully neglected.

Recently, the President of the United States advised us to further the development of our water-power resources in the public interest. Those projects already in operation, offer ample proof that all the people of a river-valley basin are benefited by the efficient production and distribution of hydroelectric power free from monopolistic controls. Industry—and the individual consumer alike—profits, and the whole economy of a region is stimulated.

Originally, the textile industry, which is at the very heart of our industrialization, was built up through the use of water power. A typical New England manufacturing city is characterized by the mills which hug the banks of her rivers.

With the coming of the electrical age, however, industry turned away from the direct use of water power. Coal was imported to generate the new driving force which now turns the machines, and the river was forgotten.

How costly that change has been, the last few years have demonstrated. Every 6 months, our industries, our homes, and stores and schools and hospitals have been forced to curtail their activities because the supply of coal has been artificially interrupted. We have come to realize that our utter dependence on coal has placed us at the mercy of factors beyond our control, and with true American enterprise, we have resolved to do something about this intolerable situation. We are determined to bring to life the sleeping power of our rivers.

The textile industry has already embarked on an extensive course of modernization, but all improvements in machinery and operational methods will mean little unless our basic industry is provided with an abundant supply of low-cost power.

This challenge cannot be met in a piecemeal fashion.

For a river presents a many-sided problem.

In the case of the Merrimack, it is a matter of concern to the hundreds of thousands of people who live and work in the 5,000-square-mile basin, which covers portions of two States.

To properly control the periodic floods, to correct the grave danger presented by river pollution, and to employ the power possibilities of this waterway, we must have a unified, integrated program, involving cooperation among the communities affected, the two States, and the Federal Government.

As an illustrative example, take the problem of pollution. It has reached such proportions that most of the fish life has disappeared. Just below Lawrence it has become so dense that the oxygen content of the water has been reduced to a minimum. At the mouth of the river, where it enters the Atlantic Ocean, all shellfish areas have been condemned.

After studying the problem an investigating commission of the State of Massachusetts has recommended the expenditure of $27,000,000 to purify the river and safeguard the public health. This approach will fail unless New Hampshire, where the river begins, takes similar action.

Meanwhile the Federal Government has an interest in the problems of flood control and power development.

The solution lies, not in separate, unilateral action, but in a plan, legislated in the Congress and approved by the States and communities concerned.

I am happy to report that this is a nonpartisan issue. Republicans and Democrats, as New Englanders who are interested in the economic progress of their regions, are supporting the MVA which I propose in this bill. State and local representatives have already endorsed it.

I trust that the Congress will give to the MVA its prompt and favorable attention.

A PAGE BOY

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the House in this minute, if I can, a sad and true story that involves the House of Representatives. About a month ago a World War soldier, whose wife had died several years ago leaving a little boy who since his mother's death has been living in one room here in Washington with his father, told me that he had just been picked up on the street a couple of weeks before and rushed to the hospital with a bad case of heart trouble. He said to me, "I must go to the hospital again. I have my little boy. I would like it if you could arrange for him to be a page in the House of Representatives." I thought when I saw him that he would never come back from the hospital. He did not come back. A few days ago Mr. ALLEN, the chairman of the patronage committee, called me and said the little boy should have the place. I called the boy's one-room home. The boy answered the telephone himself and when I told him that he could get the position he said, "My father died this morning." After consoling him, I found that the American Legion was taking charge of the funeral arrangements and that the father would be buried in Arlington Cemetery with military honors.

Today I brought the little boy over to the Doorkeeper and had him appointed as a page. So you will see him here in a few days—a boy who has no father or mother. I tell you this story to show how magnanimous and magnificent is the great House of Representatives. It is the branch of the Government that is closest to the people. It is truly of the people, by the people, for the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

WITHDRAWAL OF OUR TROOPS FROM CHINA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution I am introducing making inquiry of the Department of State as to why they have removed our troops from China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution of inquiry asking the administration to tell the House why they have withdrawn our troops from China. I have heard various reasons given. I believe the reason for such action is a matter of such great import that it should be made known to the House of Representatives. It seems to the average person as though the administration has decided to leave China to the fate of the Communist rule there, and millions of Chinese would have to bow to Communistic dictatorship. It would be wonderful if we could take our troops out of China and take our troops out of other places, but we certainly must not take a soldier or a marine out until we know that the safety of the United States will not be jeopardized and that our free form of government is made known to the people of those countries. America is the greatest protection in the world today to countries that are suffering under the yoke of a dictatorship or under Communistic rule which amounts to dictatorship.

My resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession relative to the withdrawal of our troops from China and to give full information in his possession relative to the basis of said decisions and of the withdrawal from the committee of three which was seeking a unified China and cessation of civil war.

JOHN C. PUGH

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I have at this time a very sad duty to perform. Our principal clerk, John Pugh, who has been in governmental service 44 years and on whom we depended to carry a great deal of the load of our committee, a thoroughly competent and able citizen, one who is known to everyone of the old Members of the House, one who is loved by every member of the Committee on Appropriations, has decided to retire. He has done this for personal reasons, and not because he wants to leave us. He has agreed to stay on the rolls and render such service as he can for the next 4 months. It is going to be a very difficult proposition, and we are sometimes going to have to ask the indulgence of the House in our attempt to carry on the enormous job we have to do. I make this announcement because I feel I should, and at the same time to pay a tribute to a man who, more than anyone else, could be of tremendous service in the job of balancing the budget and getting the Government of the United States back on its feet, if he were in a position to remain with us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 77 from the Committee on House Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be read at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE RESOLUTION 77

The Committee on House Administration to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 77) providing funds for conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, which funds are necessary for the payment of expenses incurred in the travel of committee members to and from hearings, travel expenses and fees for witnesses, travel and per diem of investigators, purchase of publications and documents for committee files, photostating of documents and files to be furnished Members of Congress and agencies of the Government upon request, and subscriptions to subversive publications.

The sum of $75,000 was appropriated for the Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1946, and the chairman reports back $49,000 of this amount was turned back as an unexpended balance on January 3, 1947.

The committee having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution do pass.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a regularly constituted committee provided for in the Reorganization Act. This resolution, unanimously reported from the House Administration Committee, authorizes the sum of $50,000 for the activities, investigations, and procedure of the House Committee on Un-American Activities during the year 1947.

In previous years the committee has at times, I think, used more than the sum of $50,000. In 1946 the sum of $75,000 was authorized, but I am told by the

chairman of that committee that almost $50,000 of that unexpended balance was turned back.

The resolutions and the report explain the measure which is before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday many of us wore a red carnation in memory of the birthday of a great American, a citizen of Ohio, who made a great mark as a Member of this House, as Governor of his State, and as President of the United States, and who finally fell by an assassin's bullet.

Today is the sixty-fifth anniversary of the birth of another brilliant American, one of the most thrilling characters that this or any country has ever known. Like Jefferson, he was born into what was known as the landed aristocracy. Thomas Jefferson, in my opinion, became the greatest Democrat who ever lived. I say this, not in the sense of the big "D" or the little "d," but because he believed in people; he believed in their capacity under proper leadership to carry on the work of a great democracy.

As I look the pages of history across, I see the mountain peaks in our history: Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. They appear to me to be the mountain peaks in our history; the men who are still talked about, the men who are still written about. The great Washington at one time when he was in the Presidency cried out when unjust criticism was piled on him that he would rather be in his grave than to be in the Presidency. These men, in their day, were misinterpreted, misjudged, and criticized; and every one of them was hated by some groups and some individuals. Their place in history, however, is safe.

Sixty-five years ago today Franklin D. Roosevelt was born. He was the leader of these people in probably the most dangerous and, I think, the most glorious, period in American history. As a leader of men, he will take his place in history alongside of the great leaders whose names I have already called; and when impartial history is written, when the waves of prejudice and hatred have died from the lips of men and his career and his service to his country and to the world are properly written, he will take his place with these other outstanding men whom I have described as the mountain peaks in American history.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, men and women throughout the civilized world will pause today to pay tribute to the memory of the great world leader of yesterday—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Ruler and subject, king and peasant, capitalist and laborer will offer silent prayers of thanksgiving for the blessings received under the magnificent leadership of the late President of the United States, who, with faith in God and confidence in his fellow man guided our ship of state through turbulent waters of internal difficulties and of external attack.

His death in line of duty during war, while acting as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, prematurely ended his heroic struggle against inconceivable odds for an ideal which, like Excalibur, was torn from the encasing rock of isolationism and carried high for the honor and glory of the United States of America.

That sword, inherited by our able Chief Executive, Harry S. Truman, will ever be the American symbol of our vigilant and dynamic democracy in its timeless, ceaseless war against the forces of subversive reaction, however named or clothed, wherever found, which threatens the religious, economic, or social stability of the world. Our Nation may be divisible into political parties. America is indivisible in its governmental objective—the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. In our search for our goal let us never forget the courage, humanity, and intellectual integrity of him to whom the world looked for guidance from the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1939 by the mad horde of Hitler until that day of sad memory when he was called to his eternal reward.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt assumed the mantle of the office of President of the United States when the power of our Nation was tottering under the devastating blows of financial ruin, social insecurity, and defeatism. The horror of the depression of 1933 seems now but a lurid nightmare of legend. Let us never forget its factuality. Greece and Rome, greater than the great of ancient history, fell from the pinnacles of majesty and splendor because they in their power-numbed national intellectuality forgot to remember that man had natural rights which the state did not create but which the state must safeguard and protect against totalitarian ideologies. Governmental obliviousness of the dignity of man leads but to chaos and anarchism.

On March 4, 1933, America was told in unmistakable terms of truth and candor that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror, which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance." America at that minute arose from the lethargic position of a supine nation. Heartened and encouraged by a leader of frankness and vision, the American people carried the fight to the enemies of social order and triumphed beyond the dreams of optimism, based as they were upon the foundation of hope without faith. The deeds of industry again turned red into black. Farms flourished with new health. The savings of the man in the street were permanently protected against fraudulent speculation and dishonest promoters. We entered upon a new era—security for all our citizenry, irrespective of estate, against the hardship of old age, unexpected or seasonal unemployment, new and old types of criminality, and autocracy in government. Man, recognized as man, not slave, entered the period of reconstruction, revivified in the knowledge that the greatness of our Nation would endure.

The world today is not at peace. Iron curtains darken the horizon of international accord. We heard the clarion call of Franklin Roosevelt in 1933. We conquered every crisis under his guidance, supported as he was by a nation which desired domestic tranquillity, unalloyed by imperialistic ambitions—that and no more. Were he with us today his voice would be raised in unison with that of our Chief Executive in execration of bigotry and intolerance, in exaltation of the glory of democracy, in exhortation that in the observance of the natural law lies national solidarity and grandeur.

We would hear him say "I, a foe without peer of atheistic communism, fear not the power of evil governments who seek to divide and conquer. In your heart, unsullied by irreligion, greed or inhumanity, lies the secret of world peace. Be vigorous in industry, loyal to American idealism in ambition, humane in treatment of fellow man, faithful to God."

Robed in these national virtues, America will never falter, but will always remain the United States of America, the world hearthstone.

The spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the spirit of America, will ever remain to remind the world of his contribution to liberty, equality, and justice under God.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as has just been stated to you by our grand minority leader, today is the sixty-fifth anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest statesmen in the history of our Nation, who was known throughout his lifetime and remembered best by us now as a great humanitarian. It is appropriate that we pause to pay respect and tribute to his memory. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a noble President of the United States during its most critical period and a great and fearless Commander in Chief through its fierce struggle for existence in a world torn with cruelty and war—he was a glorious American devoted to the preservation of his country and for which he finally made the supreme sacrifice. Truly he was a great American beloved by his countrymen and by the peoples of the world.

Throughout his entire public life, starting in 1910, when he was elected a State senator from Duchess County, N. Y., on through his service as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Governor of the great State of New York, and finally in 1932 President of the United States, he served fearlessly and enthusiastically, with devotion to his tasks and to the end that a new and brighter day might dawn upon the world. Even though those hands, those eyes of vision, that voice of determination and encouragement, are stilled, we who remember him can detect the dawn of that new day. May his spirit live on and guide that dawn through the glorious light of day and the

quiet twilight of enduring peace and tranquillity in the world.

His untimely death on April 12, 1945, was a tragedy to peace-loving people the world over; but in the words of Mr. Justice Holmes:

> At the grave of a hero we end, not with sorrow at the inevitable loss, but with the contagion of his courage; and with a kind of desperate joy we go back to the fight.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, if it were possible to give expression to the thoughts that this moment spring from my heart and surge through my mind, I could, perhaps, pay fitting tribute to the great man we honor today.

Translating thoughts into words is a difficult task for most of us. Somehow the tongue, though the best medium of expression we have, is unable to coin the phrases and construct the sentences that give audible expression to our finer thoughts and meditations.

The handicap under which I labor, however, shall not deter me from attempting to pay tribute, though weak and feeble it may be, to the most humane, the most compassionate, the most freedom minded, the most peace loving, the most courageous leader, in the judgment of many, the party I am identified with ever produced, on this his natal day.

Yes, he was the great leader of my party, but he was more; he was the great leader of democracy, of freedom, of peace, not only here in America but everywhere throughout the world.

His vision was not dimmed by territorial limits, his goodness of heart knew no bounds, his desire for freedom included all men, his efforts for peace encompassed the earth, he belonged to the world, and the world recognized its own.

He preached the gospel of freedom, of liberty, of equality, of my brother's keeper, of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, of good will, of peace on earth, that was so closely akin to the teachings of the lowly Nazarene, that his voice commanded a world audience and his pronouncements a respect never before accorded to man.

The yellow man of China, the black man of Africa, the brown man of Asia and the islands of the sea, the white man of the countries of Europe, all trusted him, and looked to him for leadership and guidance, and for deliverance from the accumulated tyrannies and oppressions of the ages.

He had his faults, he was human—one of the most human men I ever knew—and because he was so intensely human, because his humanity had been tempered by affliction, he understood and appreciated the great human problems that have harassed and baffled man over the years, and was able to point the way to the solution of many of them. Had he lived—I hesitate to prophesy.

And, so, when his noble, courageous spirit passed on, a pall fell over America, and men and women mourned as if the family circle had been broken by the passing of one of their loved ones.

Yea, more; a pall fell over all Christendom, and men and women of every land, of every color, of every tongue, of every creed, bowed their heads in grief and wept as little children, because they, too, knew that humanity had lost its greatest champion and friend.

My colleagues, man, born of woman, acts his part on humanity's stage for a brief season and then passes off, and all that is mortal of him goes back to the dust from whence it came, but his influence which is a part of his immortality, lives on. And, be not deceived, the influence of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which today is a mighty force for righteousness, will live on, and, I am persuaded, will widen with the years, penetrate into many of the dismal recesses of the world where millions during the centuries past have been groping in the dark, and there light the torches of democracy, freedom and peace to guide their footsteps in their upward climb to a higher civilization.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet let an opportunity pass to pay my highest respects to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I may explain to you the intenseness of my thought on the contribution he made to the greater life of the people of this world by saying that I buried my constant and theretofore unyielding opposition to the third-term idea and did what I could to bring about the renomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt for President for the third time. I still live in the belief, and indeed to me the close realization, that I do but lift myself a little higher, if in no other way than in my own consciousness, when I recollect the value, as I appraise it, of the great life of this great man, a man of great ability, a man more humanitarian in his attitude toward all men than most people seem to realize. I believe he has made a contribution to the inner life of men that will last as long as time goes on and men read the history of the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Franklin D. Roosevelt answered for me and for everyone the question of what he was and who he was and what he believed in when, having been asked, "Are you a Communist?" his answer was a flat "No." "Are you a Socialist?" His answer was a positive "No." "What is your political philosophy?" "I do not have any." "Then what are you?" "I am a Christian and a democrat."

I rather think that Mr. Roosevelt intended that the word "democrat" should be regarded in the sense of the fellowship, the good-neighbor doctrine and all the things which are encompassed in that word, so grand in its contemplation. Someone in writing and telling about it spelled it with a big "D." I know that Mr. Roosevelt would not apologize for such a spelling, but I am inclined to believe that he said "I am a Christian and a democrat" spelled with a little "d." I revere the memory of this great and good man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short excerpt from an article recently published in the Sojourner.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted in convention by the Steuben Society of America.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Rev. August Bender.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the American Labor Party on the Federal tax program.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIZLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GOLD-STAR LAPEL BUTTONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, to those who sacrificed husband, son, or father on the altar of freedom a grateful nation can never repay in dollars and cents the debt it owes. We can, however, and should remain through the years, ever mindful of that obligation. To most of those who gave so much a continuing recognition of our indebtedness means more than any monetary considerations. If confirmation of the statement be necessary, ask any Gold Star Mother, no matter what her riches, to name the most precious item in her jewel box.

I have today introduced a bill directing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, by joint action, to design what is to be known as a gold-star lapel button to be given to the widow and each parent of one who gave his life in the service of his country in World War II.

The bill is not limited to those killed by enemy action, since, in my opinion, it should be broad enough to include those, oftentimes equally courageous, who may have succumbed to disease in the fever-infested jungles of Burma or New Guinea.

I commend this bill to the favorable consideration of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, the President has not expressed himself on the portal-to-portal pay problem. This is one of the most important questions confronting the United States. I think the President owes it to the citizens to tell them where he stands on this matter, lest his silence be construed as giving his approval to the suits being brought to collect pay for portal-to-portal time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION LAW

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take all the time that has been assigned to me but in view of the fact that many bills have been filed in both Houses of the Congress relative to the problem of presidential succession; in view of the fact that we now have one State in the Union in which there is terrific confusion as to whom is to act as governor; also since the person now serving as President was elected as Vice President and has recommended a change in the presidential succession law; and in view further of the fact that in 1944 in the presidential campaign we had a threat from the electors in the State of Texas and in other Southern States that they would vote for someone other than the candidate of their party; I thought that this would be a very good time to discuss in an informal way our electoral system and also our presidential succession law and proposals for its change.

To begin with, I think we should go back to the creation of the office of President. The first draft of the Constitution, as you all know, had no reference to a President. Finally it was decided that there must be a Chief Executive, so the Constitution provides that all executive power is vested in a President. It is a very strong designation—stronger than if the Constitution had merely said, "There shall be a President of the United States."

Then the matter came up for consideration in the Constitutional Convention as to the name of the Chief Executive. All kinds of names were suggested. It was suggested that he be called "Governor," that he be called "King," but finally the term "President" was agreed upon.

Subsequent to that there was considerable discussion as to how he should be referred to. It was suggested that he be referred to as "His Excellency," "Governor," "His Highness," and finally just as "President of the United States." That was accepted.

There was a great deal of discussion as to the term for which he should be elected. Some members in the Convention proposed that he be elected to serve during good behavior. Other proposals ranged from 3 years to 21 years. Finally it was agreed that his term should be 4 years.

Perhaps the greatest controversy came about the matter of how he should be elected. It was proposed that he should be elected by popular vote. Other proposals were that he be elected by Congress. Another proposal, once approved and later rejected, was that he be elected by the governors of the States. It was finally determined however, in order to avoid the tumult of a popular election and still let the States have a part in it and also the people have a part in his election, that he should be elected by electors who should be chosen in such manner as the legislatures of the various States should determine. This is our so-called electoral system. It is usually thought that electors must be voted on by the people in the various States. That was not the original intent and as a matter of fact, until in the 1860's, South Carolina electors were selected by the legislature.

Immediately after setting up that system many difficulties arose. In the beginning, under the original provision of the Constitution, the electors voted for two people for President. The one who received the largest number of votes would be President and the one who received the next largest number would be Vice President. In 1800 Jefferson and Burr received the same number of votes, which caused our first bitter contest over our election laws in the Congress. It was finally resolved through the influence of Hamilton, although an enemy of Jefferson, and he is credited with having saved the Nation in that controversy.

This led to the adoption in 1804 of the twelfth amendment, which provided that the electors should vote for separate people for President and Vice President. It also provided that the Vice President must have the same qualifications as the President, to wit, he must be 35 years of age; he must be a natural-born citizen. Of course the original provision provided that he must be a natural-born citizen or a citizen who had resided in the United States for 14 years. That was a provision put into the Constitution for the benefit of Alexander Hamilton, who was not born in the United States. It was the original intention of the Constitution makers that the electors would be a select group who would have great wisdom and who would choose a President without regard to any party affiliations. It was provided, for instance, that they should each meet in their respective States on the same day, the idea being that the electors in one State would not know what the electors in the other States had done, and in that way they would arrive at an independent judgment about who should be President.

It soon developed first through caucuses, then through conventions, and then through political parties, that the electors became automatons to represent the will of the party which had elected them. It should be noted, however, that in the beginning of our Government electors were not bound and did not necessarily vote for the party of their choice. Even the first time Jefferson was elected, a Federalist elector in Pennsylvania voted for Jefferson and three other electors voted against the party of their choice; but from that time on, by the growth of political parties, we have had a peculiar and anomalous situation in our electoral college which should be examined. I say it should be examined and the useless formality which we witness every 4 years should be eliminated. Someday the threat of candidates for electors as happened in the State of Texas during the last election may be carried out and the electors vote for someone against the will of their party, against the will of the people who elected them. When that happens, we are going to have distress, dissatisfaction, if not revolution. Since therefore the electoral college is of no real use—it is a formality that is gone through with, but it is still a formality that carries with it a great deal of danger—let us remedy the situation before it causes chaos. Bills were introduced in the last Congress, and again in this Congress, by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] and myself, which would do away with the electoral college. The term "electoral college," incidentally, is not written into the Constitution; it first found an expression in the laws of our Government in 1845.

Under the proposal set forth by the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California, the States would have a certain number of Federal votes, the same number they now have under the electoral system representing the total number of Senators and Representatives from that particular State. The Federal votes, according to their proposals, would be divided between the candidates according to the number of votes cast in that particular State for the various candidates of the political parties. Assuming a State had 20 Federal votes and one-quarter of them were cast for one candidate and three-quarters for another, that State would then have 5 votes for the one and 15 for the other candidate. The argument in favor of this plan is that it would foster the two-party spirit throughout the United States and also it gets away from what has been considered an inequity, that one State because of a mere majority of a thousand or 2,000 votes may cast its entire votes in the electoral college for a certain candidate for President. I believe there is a great deal of merit in this fractional vote proposal and it is certainly one that ought to be considered by the Congress. The electoral college is eliminated in the bills I have referred to. The electoral system is closely related to problems of the succession and for that reason I am discussing them together. The method of electing the President and of the succession has a direct relationship to the electoral system; and also particularly I discuss them together because the resolutions filed by Senator GREEN and Senator SMITH and me provide for a joint committee to consider the defects in the electoral college system and also the problems relating to the succession to the Presidency.

Turning now to the matter of the succession, there is some interesting history that ought to be reviewed at this time. The original Constitution contained a provision to the effect that in the event of the death, removal, disqualification, or inability of the President or Vice President to serve, Congress may determine who will act as President. They left it to the Congress to pass a succession law. In 1792 the Congress in which sat many Members who had served in the Constitutional Convention passed the succession law of that year. They provided for the succession first to the President pro tempore of the Senate, if he had been elected, and, if not elected, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is very peculiar that in that Congress and in the debates, even though they are scantily reported, no question was made as to the constitutionality of having a President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House serve as President. The const'tutional provision I have referred to before says that the Congress may determine what officer may serve. But as time went on various Congresses questioned the constitutionality of that law, saying that there was doubt whether the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House was an officer within the meaning of the Constitution. They supported that argument by an early impeachment which the Senate had before it—that of William Blount, of Tennessee. Mr. Blount had been elected a Member of the United States Senate. The House of Representatives voted articles of impeachment. The Senate decided he was not an officer within the impeachment section of the Constitution, and therefore was not subject to that section for the purposes of impeachment.

Incidentally, that argument was used in the Seventy-ninth Congress against passage of the bill recommended by President Truman when it was presented to the House of Representatives. That is, if the succession came to the Speaker of the House, then the President pro tempore of the Senate, the same argument was made then that was later made against the succession law in 1792. I do think that the argument is valid for the following reasons: In the first place, the original constitutional provision does not say that the officer referred to must be an officer of the executive department of the Government. Certainly the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate are officers, and very high officers, of the legislative branch, and the legislative branch of the Government should have just as much recognition as the executive branch in the matter of succession. Furthermore, even if we admit that the precedent of the William Blount impeachment matter has some basis, it should be borne in mind that Senator Blount, while he was a Member of the Senate, was not an officer of the Senate. He was not President pro tempore of the Senate. But whatever doubt there may have been about the question during the years intervening between 1792 and 1886, when the succession law was amended, was certainly removed by the twentieth amendment, because the twentieth amendment expressly provides that the Congress may determine who should act as President in the event of the death, disqualification, or removal of the President and Vice President. That is, the word "officer" is not used in the twentieth amendment, so, according to the twentieth amendment, the Congress has the right to designate any person, whether he be an officer or a Member, or whomever he may be, to be in line for the succession in the event of the death, disqualification, or removal of both the President and Vice President elected.

I think it would be interesting to consider briefly the succession law of 1886. The original succession law stayed on the books from 1792 to 1886. At that time Cleveland was President and Vice President Hendricks had just died. The President pro tempore of the Senate was a Republican, and in the event of the death of President Cleveland he would have succeeded to the Presidency. That was the situation that led immediately to the passage of the latest succession law.

It provides, of course, that in the event of the death, disability, removal, or inability of the President or Vice President to serve, the Secretary of State, and then on down through the Cabinet, should act as President. It has been argued, and I think with a great deal of force, that it should not be in the power of the Vice President, when serving as President, to name his successor.

Furthermore, it is argued, and I think convincingly, that the Vice President, when serving as President, ought to be enabled to select the Secretary of State, with consideration only to the merits and ability of that person to act as Secretary of State, without having to consider whether he would make a good President in the event that office should fall to him. That, I think, is sound argument.

Also, it seems to me, the Speaker of the House of Representatives comes closer than anyone else in the Government to having a mandate from the people to carry out a particular policy or program. He has been recently elected and elevated to that position by the direct and fresh representatives of the people at the last election. He will certainly be a man of great ability. He will certainly be a man who has the common touch. I think that on the whole that our Speakers, and our present Speaker, have been men quite capable of serving as President in the event that mantle should ever fall to them, whereas the Secretaries of State, be they ever so able, have been selected and appointed not by the representatives of the people or by the Congress, but by one man.

In the last Congress we passed a law providing for the succession of the Speaker and then the President pro tempore, but it failed to pass the other body. I think that we should pass that law again early in this Congress. The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and, I believe, other Members have appropriate bills pending.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are many other difficulties that present themselves in connection with the matter of succession. One is the age-old question of who is to determine when the present President is unable to serve? When does his inability begin and when does it end? Who is to determine that? That is an open question so far as our Constitution and our laws are concerned. Does the Vice President make the determination and takes over? This might lead to a very embarrassing situation some time in our history. Suppose the Vice President is serving as President, who decides when the Secretary of State commences to act as President? It is a question that should be settled.

Also, there is the very important question of whether the Secretary of State in the event he should become President should serve the unexpired term or whether a special election should be called by Congress. Under the succession law he is required to call Congress into extra session within 20 days from the time he comes into office; it does not say for what purpose. There is a great deal of doubt constitutionally as to whether Congress would have the right to call a special election. That matter should be looked into. It should be determined what the policy of our Government is going to be in the event we should come to that situation.

Then there is a third matter which I have especially interested myself in during the past few years, that of preventing us from having in a great and a disastrous way the difficulty they are now having in the State of Georgia, that is, that under our laws as they stand today no provision whatsoever is made for an acting President in the event we should have no President when inauguration day, January 20th, comes around. This may seem a remote possibility, but several very real contingencies might take place to cause that result. Under the Constitution as amended, the term of the President expires at noon of January 20. He has no right to serve after that time. No member of his Cabinet has any right to serve. The succession law of 1886 applies only after a President has qualified. It does not apply to or take care of the hiatus before a President has qualified.

What are the situations that might find us without anyone qualified to act as President? And let me say that it would not take a great imagination to visualize the chaos and the difficulties this Nation and the world would have if we should be without a President even for a very short time. There would be no Executive, no officer in the executive department could be appointed, they could not hold over, there could be no Cabinet members, there would be no head of the Army and Navy. It is even doubtful whether Congress could pass any laws, because the Constitution states that a bill when passed must be presented to the President and then, if not approved by the President, may be passed over his veto. I doubt if you could even pass a law by two-thirds majority over his veto, because there would be no President to present it to. So we would have a most chaotic situation.

These are some of the contingencies that might occur. The State of Georgia, of course, has a provision in its constitution that the old Governor shall hold over until his successor qualifies. We

are even without that protection. Suppose the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should die or become disqualified between the election in November and inauguration day. No provision whatsoever is made for that contingency. Suppose also that a filibuster took place in either the House or the Senate, and the embryonic one in the Senate at the beginning of this Congress is indicative of what might take place. The Constitution states that the House and the Senate must meet in joint session, and the law fixes January 6 as that date, to canvass the vote of the electoral college, and also states that the votes shall be opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate. If there were a filibuster in either House they could not meet in joint session, because one House or the other would not be organized. So if that situation persisted from January 6 until January 20 we might well find ourselves without anyone to act as President.

Further, when in the electoral college no candidate for President has a majority of the votes, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives. That has happened two times. In 1824, for instance, Jackson had more electoral and popular votes than anyone else but John Quincy Adams was elected President by the House of Representatives. As a concession to the smaller States it is provided in the Constitution that when the election is thrown into the House, each State has only one vote, no matter how many Members of the House it may have. New York has one vote and Idaho has one vote. The vote is by States. In almost every Congress there would be some States with one Democratic Representative and one Republican Representative, so such a State would not have any vote. Anyway, the election of a President is the first order of business, and that question is voted on until a President is elected. You can not start voting for the President until you organize the House. In the past it has taken weeks, and in one case more than 2 months, to elect a Speaker. So that you might be in a position where you could not even start voting by the 20th of January. Also it is provided that when the House has to elect a President and when the Senate has to elect a Vice President a constitutional quorum of two-thirds of the Members is required. Therefore, it would be very easy to break a quorum. Those are cases where we might not have anyone to act as President. They are very real. They are particularly real in view of the fact that the twentieth amendment to the Constitution established January 20th as the inauguration date instead of March 4.

Section 3 of the twentieth amendment contemplates that Congress could pass a law to take care of this very problem. The House therefore passed a bill which I introduced and sponsored in 1941 which provided when that situation arose the Speaker of the House should act as President if the Speaker had been elected, and that the President pro tempore of the Senate should act if one had not been elected. That bill went over to the Senate, and I presume that because they wanted their man to come first they did not do anything about the legislation. I think the Speaker of the House of Representatives should come first, but more important than the person who is to succeed is the urgency of plugging this loophole.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] introduced a very splendid resolution providing for a committee to investigate all aspects of the electoral system and matters relating to the Presidential succession. I do not think he has introduced his resolution as yet in the present Congress, but I am sure he will. Also, as I have stated, there are resolutions now pending for the appointment of such a committee, which resolutions have been filed by Senator GREEN and Senator SMITH. I filed one on this side of the Capitol. I hope by appropriate action of the two bodies of Congress, the members of the Judiciary Committees acting as special committees for that purpose, may go into this whole matter and recommend laws to remove the defects, undetermined questions, and loopholes in our electoral system, and also those relating to the matter of Presidential succession.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPRINGER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made in this House Monday by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] relative to the conditions existing in the sale of surplus war property. I would like to add my stamp of approval to the remarks made by that distinguished gentleman, but I would also like to inform him and this House that the current handling of the disposal of surplus real property is just as distressing as the situation involving the sale of surplus personalty.

At the outset of the recent conflagration, 800 or so families were moved away from 41,000 acres of the best farm land in south Mississippi in order to make way for an Army camp, which was to become Camp Van Dorn. These patriotic people acquiesced to the needs of their Government without any utterances of complaint, and left their places, their homes, and their farms and moved to other parts of the State and to other States to temporarily pursue their means of livelihood.

Now that the clouds of war have passed and the Government's need for this land exists no longer, these good people are expressing their desires to purchase these farms back from the Government, to move back on them, and to resume their normal way of life which they so generously forsook during the war.

In an attempt to secure some relief for these people, I have contacted the various offices in charge of the sales of surplus realty. I contacted the War Department, and was referred to the War Assets Administration. I contacted the War Assets Administration, and was referred to the Farm Credit Administration in New Orleans, La. I contacted the Farm Credit Administration in New Orleans, La., and was informed that these lands had never been turned over to them by the War Assets Administration. I then contacted the War Assets Administration again, and was informed by them that these lands had never been turned over to them by the War Department. After having chased the buck from bureau to bureau, I finally managed to pin it down and found that these lands are still in the custody of the War Department.

Camp Van Dorn was deactivated on September 15, 1945, and declared surplus by the War Department on October 1, 1945, 16 months ago. I am told by the War Department that the War Assets Administration refused to accept accountability and custody for resale of these lands in March 1946, pending decontamination of the lands. I am informed further by the War Department that decontamination of these lands would require, at the most, less than 2 months, and would be performed by a squad consisting of one officer and eight men. Today, 16 months after the Army has declared this property to be surplus, this 2 months' process of decontamination has not been completed.

If these lands are not sold back to these people within the next 2 months, they will lose a full crop year, and with the world crying for food and farm produce, I think it a shame that these lands should be left in the hands of the Government to deteriorate in idleness, when, on the other hand, with very little effort on the part of the Government, they could be placed in the hands of the people to produce foodstuff for a hungry world.

Maintenance of this abandoned Army camp is costing the Government lots of money; the Government's retention of these lands is costing the State of Mississippi untold thousands of dollars every year in taxes, is preventing thousands of people from resuming their normal vocational and agricultural pursuits, is preventing veterans from buying farms, is preventing sales of taxable timber to various and sundry sawmills and lumber dealers who are crying for these raw materials, is preventing the leasing of these lands to oil companies for mineral exploration at a time when oil and the products thereof are in great demand, is preventing the productive use of lands capable of production, and generally adding to the dissatisfaction and malcontent of thousands upon thousands of people in south Mississippi and Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse or justification for the existence of this kind of a situation, and I understand from having talked to my colleagues that this is not an isolated case, but that conditions paralleling this prevail generally throughout the South and other sections of the country where temporary Army camps were located. I agree wholeheartedly with the distinguished gentleman from New York in his contention that this Congress would well be justified in trying to unravel the snarl in which we find the disposal of our surplus property.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us have been greatly disturbed of late by the relatively large number of accidents in civil aviation. It is entirely appropriate that various committees of Congress should be, as they are, investigating the question of safety in the air and related questions. Undoubtedly the recent series of tragic air crashes, some involving prominent persons, has served to refocus public attention upon the vital problem of air safety and also diminish the confidence of the public in civil aviation.

This situation can have very serious effects if it remains uncorrected because it threatens the financial stability as well as the development and progress of a great transportation industry which has amazingly obliterated distances over the whole globe and in our own hemisphere and country. That Congress must make a direct frontal attack upon these problems as quickly as possible is unquestionable. If we refuse or fail to take action to promote safety in the air, to compel the inauguration of demonstrated safety devices and equipment, to perfect and develop existing airports, to conquer the hazards of weather, fire, collision, and the imponderable personal equations that enter into successful and safe flying by the public, our entire civil aviation is likely to be stalemated and we are almost certain to lose our leadership in the air to other nations.

Like every Member of the Congress and like all persons interested in aviation, I have been gravely concerned by recent events. It is not understandable to me why our public agencies charged with regulating aviation and controlling air traffic should not have moved long ago to improve conditions that are known to be responsible for many of the serious accidents in the air. Frankly, I am amazed at the indecision, the vaccilation, the lack of over-all policy, and administrative delays that have characterized official governmental activities seeking to deal with these matters.

Congress has vested the CAA with practically full control over the aviation industry. In addition, several commissions, advisory and otherwise, exist to promote and maintain air safety; but it seems to me that there has been a surprising apathy and lack of effectiveness on the part of these agencies to tackle present problems with vigor and dispatch.

I take, for example, by way of illustration, the proposal to adopt the so-called ground-control approach, or GCA system of radar which greatly facilitates the landing of aircraft. During the war this system was used with great success by the armed services. Thousands of safe landings were made under adverse pressure conditions attending the return of mass flights from air raids involving hundreds of planes. By use of this system these aircraft were channeled by this miraculous radar equipment from the skyways into the narrow gateways of landing strips and military airfields. The safety record made by use of this system, which has been available from the files of the Army and Navy, is truly remarkable.

Early this year I urged the CAA to adopt the GCA landing systems and equipment in airports throughout the United States. Previous efforts have been made by others to the same end. Up to the present time I have not had a response to my communication, presumably because of pending investigation of that agency by certain committees of the Congress. About the same time the Army Air Force was kind enough and public-spirited enough to make a substantial number of GCA sets available for installation at civil airports, and I am personally very proud to have taken some part in these arrangements. It is an unfortunate fact, however, that installation has been authorized at but comparatively few airports. Apparently CAA has been willing to adopt safety devices, but, either through timorousness concerning the efficacy of GCA, technical operational objections, or its own budgetary situation, it has not yet cleared the way for the rapid adoption and installation of these tested, proven, and almost miraculous aids to safe landing of aircraft.

In my section, State and district, the problems of air safety are being carefully considered and discussed by the press and public in spite of the fact that we have been relatively free from serious accidents in our area, but largely because we are so intensely interested in the development of the Logan Airport at Boston, which is already one of our great aviation gateways to New England, Canada, the Maritime Provinces, and Europe, and through which we hope a steadily increasing and vital air traffic will flow.

In that connection I am pleased to include as part of my remarks several highly informative and impressive articles by Mr. Robert Sibley, aviation editor of the Boston Traveler. The Massachusetts press in general, particularly the Boston Post, the Worcester Telegram, and other outstanding papers, have evidenced the greatest of interest and have disseminated timely information concerning these problems. They have all urged action by our Government to adopt up-to-date safety devices at airports and in planes.

I could not help but be impressed by the expediting manner in which the Army Air Forces have responded to my appeals for the installation of GCA at Boston. Within 3 days of the time that I brought my request to the attention of General Ankenbrandt, AAF air communications officer, I was able to inform Massachusetts officials that AAF had released a GCA radar set costing $112,000 to the Logan Airport. Unhappily CAA has not been able for some reason or other to join in these efforts for air safety as promptly and as expeditiously as the Army, and I am still trying to get effective and prompt official action and cooperation from that agency. In the light of current delays I think that we can all take notice of a fact often manifest that the wheels of bureaucracy move slowly and painfully even in the face of a great public crisis like the one now confronting our air-transport systems and threatening the future of American aviation.

But the Congress cannot permit itself the luxury of indifference, apathy and inaction in this vital matter. Upon us devolves the duty and obligation to save aviation from further deterioration and retardation, to recoup public confidence which has waned to the point where it is seriously affecting our whole civil aviation program.

I have no desire to belabor the present Administrator of Aeronautics who has rendered cooperation in some of these matters even in the face of current public agitation and particularly in the face of investigation of his agency by Congress. I am fully aware of the magnitude of current problems, his desire to solve them intelligently and his expressed readiness to promote air safety wherever possible. But this matter is urgent and critical. We can afford no further delay in tackling and settling it in the interest of the traveling public and for the benefit of American aviation as a whole.

There are a host of present Federal agencies having to do with air safety and they must be activated at once. The armed services, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the Air Coordinating Committee, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the State Department and the Executive Office of the President through the Bureau of the Budget have set-ups for dealing with various phases of safety in the air. It is clear to me that neither CAA nor any other single Government agency should have the power to regulate this great enterprise and also to investigate its own regulations and actions exclusively. There must be some check independently of the regulatory body to insure that safety provisions and measures will be promptly studied, inaugurated and enforced. Because I am very reluctant to multiply further, or even add to, existing overexpanded bureaucracies which duplicate and overlap each other's functions, I am asking President Truman, who is so profoundly and genuinely interested in aviation and in safeguarding the lives and safety of those who travel on our airways, to activate his Air Coordinating Committee and to direct it to take early specific action to utilize GCA and all other safety devices and equipment that will minimize the possibility of further accidents in American aviation.

I think we should proceed on the theory that there should be no favored

safety devices sponsored by any governmental agency but that all such devices, equipment and systems embodying the most recent and advanced scientific developments shall be utilized to the fullest extent in order to promote safety in the air, restore public confidence and permit the expansion and development of the great and vital flying arm of our transportation system. If financial assistance from Congress is required to insure these results, I have every confidence that it will be forthcoming.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks certain newspaper excerpts and statements on the subject of air safety.

Pertinent letter to Chairman Landis, of CAB, from Robert Sibley dated December 26, 1946:

DECEMBER 26, 1946.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: A fact with which, of course, you are familiar is that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 created a five-man Civil Aeronautics Authority, later renamed the Civil Aeronautics Board, with broad responsibilities for the encouragement and development of United States civil aviation and needed facilities.

I respectfully propose at this time that the Civil Aeronautics Board at once make its own investigation as to why there has been an unexplained, damaging delay against the public policy in the adoption for practical use of ground-controlled approach radar, known in the industry as GCA, the equipment for guiding aircraft to landings in adverse weather, and I cite the following as testimony tending to show that the GCA equipment is now, and has been for much more than a year, practical and usable:

From the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, November 13, 1945: "Ground radar offers an effective weapon in conquering weather, the foe of all air-borne activities. Teamed with early warning systems, radar beacons and other radar sets for the general surveillance of air traffic, GCA can provide widespread ground control of aerial navigation. Such a combination of equipment makes possible the first true all-weather airway."

From the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, December 3, 1945: "With this set (GCA) a controller at an airfield or a landing strip can coach a plane's pilot to a perfect landing, even if flying completely blind due to foul weather."

From Yankee Pilot, February 1946: "MIT says it (GCA) works, and that it has made all-weather aviation possible. That's fine. When does all this go into operation?"

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, February 1946 (in an address at MIT): "Every major airport should have a radar set in order to keep a constant check on all planes in the landing pattern. Planes flying the transcontinental routes should be followed by radar at all times and, in bad weather, be advised if they are off course and in danger."

C. B. Allen, in the Herald Tribune, April 21, 1946 (reporting on a GCA demonstration in Florida): "Press representatives inquired, also, why no representatives of the Army, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Air Transport Association, and the Air Line Pilots Association were present for the demonstration, since all these organizations are vitally interested in the problems of bad-weather flying. In essence, the reply was that these groups had not seemed to be very much interested."

Dr. Edward P. Warner, May 1946: "It is more than 15 years since radio aids to instrument landings were first demonstrated, and since the first completely blind landings were made by way of test. The intervening period has been filled with the contentions of advocates of rival types of equipment. The promise of the new marvel just about to emerge from the laboratory has been always with us. Throughout that period there has not been a single installation of instrument-landing equipment in North America for the routine use by civil transport aircraft in regular service. Europe did better than that by adopting the Lorenz system. Whatever its imperfections, it was put to use. The United States pursued the quest of an ideal system. The situation emphasizes the importance of avoiding a continued wait upon the completion of pending development programs before making decisions."

Army Air Forces, July 11, 1946: "Preference: After having tested 16 pilots, it was decided to ask the remaining pilots which system they preferred after they had completed their runs. This gave them a chance to watch several other pilots' reactions as well as their own. The CAA air carrier pilots were not asked because it would have put them in an embarrassing position in view of verbal orders issued regarding CAA policy. Other CAA personnel picked at random and not on orders that could be traced were asked, and are included. All together 75 pilots were questioned and 70 preferred GCA, 5 SCS–51. It was noticed that a large percentage of the pilots who reached the one-half mile point on the SCS–51 and about 100 feet altitude would suddenly reverse their sensing of the glide-path needle and dive into the ground. At this point the needle is getting rather sensitive and once a full-scale deflection is reached the pilot becomes alarmed and makes a radical change in the attitude to correct it and invariably makes it down."

Associated Press, October 17, 1946: "Every important naval air station in the United States and overseas will be equipped by next June with a radar-controlled landing system that has proven itself accident-free."

War Department (jointly with the Navy and National Aeronautic Association), December 12, 1946: "Use of GCA enables any type of airplane equipped with radio transmitter and receiver and flown by a pilot with blind-flying experience to approach a fog-locked airport and land."

War Department, December 15, 1946: "The Army Air Forces statement that 20,000 successful landings were accomplished by AAF-operated GCA units as of January 1946, is dramatic proof of the practicality and development of this idea. The original model is still being used in England. The 1946 GCA model no longer requires five radar operators, but needs only one trained controller to handle the landings of aircraft."

War Department, December 20, 1946: "The Mark III and IV, the 1946 model (GCA) requires only one controller on a shift."

It now appears that the Civil Aeronautics Administration insists on experimenting belatedly with GCA at a time when, as demonstrated in the foregoing, there is a preponderance of evidence to show that GCA is well beyond the experimental stage; that it is in a state where it can be and should be utilized on a routine basis; that this has been true for a long period of time. The fact that recent plane accidents at Washington, Cleveland, Wyoming, the Burbank area, and elsewhere might have been prevented if GCA had been available and in operation is in itself sufficient to warrant immediate action on this matter by the Civil Aeronautics Board. I respectfully suggest that the CAB take up this matter at once with a view to installing and having operated GCA radar equipment as rapidly as possible on at least 130 airports in the continental United States.

Yours respectfully,

ROBERT B. SIBLEY,
Area Governor,
Aviation Writers' Association.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of December 16, 1946]

ADMIRAL CRITICIZES CAA FOR INDIFFERENCE TO GCA

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

The Civil Aeronautics Administration could have had 130 ground controlled approach radar sets in operation at 130 United States airports some time ago if it had taken action instead of withholding approval of this blind-landing equipment, according to Rear Adm. J. W. Reeves, Jr., commander of the Naval Air Transport Service.

In an address before air-line executives at Los Angeles, Admiral Reeves voiced sharp criticism of the CAA for failure to get GCA into service to safeguard commercial operations during the coming winter, and to speed up landings and avoid delays and cancellations of flights.

The Reeves charge was the second recent development in the controversy over delays in getting instrument-landing equipment into service. Earlier, the Collier trophy, a top honor in aviation, was awarded to Dr. Luis W. Alvarez, formerly of MIT, for development of GCA as the year's "greatest achievement in aviation in America, the value of which has been demonstrated by actual use during the preceding year."

Reeves said the Navy had 20 GCA sets in operation and 30 more in storage, and that the Army has 30 in use and 100 others in storage.

He said the CAA could have borrowed them, had it been so disposed.

Reeves reported that when he offered the Navy's spare GCA equipment to Theodore P. Wright, CAA Administrator, Reeves was informed that "personnel costs would be too great," after which the CAA took no action in regard to the Navy offer.

The admiral estimated that the 20 Navy sets could be operated for $450,000 this winter, which would be a modest figure in comparison to some amounts the air lines have been losing in cancellations and passenger irritations, the latter a long-range consideration.

Reeves said the Veterans' Administration could have produced the skilled personnel needed to operate the GCA equipment, and advised the air-line officials:

"It's about time that some of you pry the CAA off the dime and see if something can't be done about your problems, so that we don't travel 300 miles per hour going some place and not get there because the airport is closed in."

The Navy developed a background of vast experience with both GCA and a glide-path system (SCS–51) favored by the CAA, during the war and since. As a result, a Navy order now in effect says: "GCA equipment is hereby designated as standard for the naval service."

Navy records disclose that between May 1944, and September 1, 1946, some 50,000 landings were made by use of GCA at Navy training bases, and 15,000 at operational bases, with 469 of the latter made under actual instrument conditions with GCA crews on the ground giving the pilot the information he needed.

Both the Army and the Navy are expanding their GCA radar programs and increasing the number of installations. So far, the CAA continues to remain in the "experimental" stage on the equipment.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of December 19, 1946]

HUB TEST OF GCA 6 YEARS AGO RECALLED BY AIR EXPERTS

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

Even in the early stages of its development, back in the fall of 1942, Dr. Luis W. Alvarez' GCA (ground controlled approach)

radar worked in surprisingly successful fashion, and one of the most striking demonstrations was staged at the Boston Airport, and this without benefit of long runways.

Taking part in this Boston test of the equipment were Dr. Alvarez (awarded the Collier trophy this week for development of GCA) and Col. Stuart P. Wright, AAF liaison officer from the Office of Technical Services.

The day they selected for the test turned out to be a poor one, weather-wise, but a good one for a convincing demonstration. The airport was closed in. Colonel Wright took off in a twin-engined Cessna and climbed to 2,000 feet. Then Alvarez began giving instructions to the colonel as to position, heading and rate of descent, tracking the plane by radar and using radio phone for communication.

Alvarez talked Wright down until the plane was within 2 feet of the ground, at which point Dr. Alvarez remarked: "You are now 2 feet high; you will touch down in 3 seconds." Wright counted three, and his wheels were on the field.

"BRING ME IN AGAIN"

Wright pushed the throttles forward, took off again, and called Alvarez: "That was good, Luis, but that was only luck. Bring me in again."

It did not seem to be luck. Wright and Alvarez went through the procedure for a total of 10 landings with the same success and precision each time. A few days later, Maj. Gen. Harold M. McClelland, AAF director of Technical Services, came to Boston, witnessed further tests, and flew one of them himself.

Since that time, there have been various changes and improvements, among them one made by the CAA in the antenna, to avoid precipitation difficulties.

Another change: The AAF now reports that the new models of GCA no longer require five radar operators, but need only one trained controller to handle the landing of aircraft.

The AAF reports that 20,000 successful landings were accomplished by AAF operated GCA units as of January 1946, which is "dramatic proof of the practicality" of the equipment.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 10, 1947]

GCA SYSTEM SAVED PLANE AT GANDER

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

GANDER, NEWFOUNDLAND, January 10.—This is the story of the plane crash which might have happened, but didn't.

GROPING FOR FIELD

Pan-American World Airways has its own GCA system (ground controlled approach radar) at the Gander Airport, crossroads of the North Atlantic airways, and the GCA boys, under emergency bad weather conditions, brought in for a safe landing a foreign air liner which, up to that time, had been groping blindly and unsuccessfully for the field.

This striking demonstration of the effectiveness of GCA, the radar equipment which the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been reluctant to adopt, occurred recently, a few days after Pan American had set up the unit and started test landings to familiarize PAA pilots with its use and capabilities.

A Pan American plane had just landed without difficulty, and the foreign transport following behind, most of its gas gone after an ocean crossing, was getting ready to make its landing.

NEAR ZERO ZERO

Then the weather socked in, with hard-driving snow. Officially the Gander weather went down to a 300-foot ceiling and a quarter of a mile visibility. Actually the GCA crew says it was much nearer to zero zero.

The foreign pilot asked for GCA assistance—asked the GCA ground crew to bring him down.

The GCA controller explained that, under the rules and his company orders, he was not permitted to help—that thus far the equipment was only for tests.

So the pilot started the customary instrument let-down over the range, completed his procedure turn, and started down for the point where he expected to find the runway. (This, incidentally, was the method being followed late last year by the Belgian Sabena pilot who crashed near Gander in bad weather.)

WATCH THROUGH SCOPE

The GCA operators, restricted from taking any part in what was going on, anxiously watched the let-down in their scopes.

They watched the plane start from the range station to the field, and they watched it drift away until there was an error of some 2,000 feet in heading for the runway.

Then the pilot pulled up, leveled off, and again asked for GCA assistance.

Ready, willing, and anxious to help, but bound by the rules, the GCA controller explained his situation to the tower. Then he added: "Of course, we could not refuse to help if this were an emergency."

DECLARES EMERGENCY

Aloft the pilot, who was able to hear this transmission, picked up his microphone and announced, "I declare an emergency."

Immediately the Pan American crew in the GCA trailer beside the runway went into action. They gave the pilot a new heading to fly. They told him when to turn. They told him when to start his descent. They told him when his wheels were about to touch the runway.

And at this moment, out of the blinding snow, at the touchdown end of the runway loomed the plane, lined up squarely with several thousand feet of waiting pavement, safe with its load of passengers.

"Was that pilot a happy man" recalled James E. O'Brien, of 125 West Central Street, Natick, Mass., traffic director of the GCA crew, and veteran of service as a member of the famous first GCA team on Iwo Jima. "He came over to see us afterward and to tell us how grateful he was."

SMITH MAKES DECISION

The advent of the radar-landing system at Gander is the result of a decision by James H. Smith, PAA vice president in charge of the Atlantic division, and himself a former pilot with the Navy. Familiar with the success the Army and Navy have had with the equipment, Smith instructed Philemon R. Dickinson, in charge of all-weather projects for the air line, to get a set from the Army and to round up a crew. Dickinson rounded up some of the best, getting them from several different parts of the country.

And since they went into action with the equipment set up on December 9, they have guided nearly 100 safe and precise landings. They are logged as test landings. All except that one in which they brought in the European plane.

"That was the real thing," the GCA boys point out.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 17, 1947]

BOSTON AIRPORT TO GET GCA UNIT—WAR DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZES LOAN OF SET TO AID IN BAD-WEATHER LANDINGS

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

The War Department has authorized the loan of radar-landing equipment for the Boston Airport, to be installed to aid in bad-weather landings and traffic control as soon as details can be worked out, it was announced today by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

The arrangement by which it becomes possible for Boston to have ground-controlled approach (GCA radar) supplied by the Army Air Forces was a result of lengthy negotiations at Washington by the Clinton Congressman, who added that he had induced the War Department to release 15 or 20 other sets to other cities.

PHILBIN said he was getting in touch immediately with Commissioner Joseph F. Cairnes, of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, which operates the State-owned airport, in order to get some of the details worked out.

The Representative told the Boston Traveler that he had been in touch with Gilfillan Bros., of Los Angeles, manufacturers of the equipment, and that the company had agreed to send engineers to Boston, after the set arrives, in order to complete modifications which will make it possible for a two-man crew to operate the radar-landing equipment, a type used successfully for years by the Army and Navy, and which is now standard Navy equipment.

COST ABOUT $1,000

"It will cost about $1,000 to make the modifications or alterations," said PHILBIN, "and two trained operators will cost about $75 to $80 a week in salaries.

"This is a small price to pay for safeguarding the lives of the hundreds of air passengers coming into a busy airport daily," the Congressman added.

He said the west-coast manufacturer had given assurance that trained radar operators, with long experience in handling such equipment for the Army Air Forces, could be made available.

PHILBIN said it was his understanding that the GCA unit would have to be under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which has charge of all aids to air navigation.

NO FUNDS AVAILABLE

But the CAA has no funds available for operation and maintenance of the set planned for Boston, although it is participating in the installation and operation of similar units at Washington, New York, and Chicago.

"It looks as though the State Department of Public Works might be the logical one to handle the expense," PHILBIN said.

Recently State officials, and the aviation committee of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, took preliminary steps to obtain GCA equipment for Boston. Governor Tobin, as one of his last official acts, went on record as favoring the acquisition.

A catch in the Boston GCA deal, however, is that the presence of the equipment will not immediately change the present system of bad-weather approaches and landings, since the strict CAA minimums and approach procedures will still be in effect.

WILL AID IN EMERGENCIES

It will serve to aid pilots in emergencies, nevertheless, to keep them off obstructions, and prevent such accidents as those at Cleveland, Los Angeles, Washington, Shannon, Eire, and elsewhere.

The CAA has already said it expects to lower the minimums, in time, making landings possible with the ceiling down to 200 feet instead of the present 500.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 17, 1947]

MAGAZINES DENOUNCE LACK OF RADAR FOR AIRPORTS

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

This department has been telling the story of the lack of radar for airports for more than a year, and practically nonstop since November. Now some other voices, which we don't think can be ignored, also are making themselves heard.

Available today is the new issue of Bob Wood's national weekly, Aviation News, raising a number of pertinent pointed questions; among them:

"Why are air liners in distress permitted to wander over the country within range of up-to-date GCA operating units until fuel exhaustion brings on a crash?"

Pointing to "the air lines' and the CAA's timidity in subjecting passengers to GCA," Wood observes:

"We hope the Air Transport Association will explain to the public why air liners are not using GCA equipment within range when there appears every likelihood that a crash landing will be only a matter of time," and "how much longer will commercial transports be denied the safety advantages enjoyed by every Army and Navy aircraft?"

Commenting on the crash landings of two DC-3 transports in the New York area on the night of January 5, Wood points to the fact that there were three GCA units in the vicinity—at Patuxent, Md., Andrews Field, Md., and Floyd Bennett Field.

"Investigation discloses," Wood reports, "that CAA's airways traffic control at no time alerted these stations, which did not know of the planes' difficulties, nor is there any evidence that pilots were informed of the emergency facilities available to them. Instead both passenger-laden transports crashed."

This may be translated to state that in these cases GCA landings might have been made, averting two more crashes.

Noting that 1,300 LaGuardia flights were canceled in one recent 3-day period, Aviation News say the situation "highlighted the ineffectiveness of the current emergency landing techniques and continued failure on the part of airways traffic control to use GCA facilities now available, even in the most serious emergencies."

Time magazine has something to say on the Jones Beach crash landing outside New York, after the plane "tried to make Westover" (where they have GCA). Says Time: "GCA might have saved that one."

Time also remarks: "If used at all large airports, GCA might cut air-line fatalities in half."

Under a heading, "CAA lethargy in air-landing-aids program hit by NATS chief," the authoritative Aviation News quotes Admiral J. W. Reeves, NATS commander, as saying it's time for CAA action on this matter "so that we don't continue to travel 300 miles per hour going some place and then not get there because the airport is closed in."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 18, 1947]

ARMY "TALKS" THREE PLANES TO SAFETY—CAA HELPLESS IN GUIDING CRAFT IN SOUPY WEATHER AT MITCHEL FIELD

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

There is some irony somewhere in the Mitchel Field report which described how Army GCA operators talked their airplanes down to safe landings under a 200-foot ceiling and almost no visibility, Thursday night.

It is ironical that it took the Army to save these three airplanes and the 46 on board. It was the Army—not the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The CAA is the agency which is supposed to have supervision over airways traffic and airways safety.

What was the CAA's airways traffic control division for the New York area doing for these planes at about that time?

Had all three been abandoned to whatever fate was about to catch up with them?

It has been pointed out time and time again that the Civil Aeronautics Administration ought to be ready with Ground Controlled Approach radar, and is not, but is still talking of "experimenting" with equipment which has been proved practical by several years' operation, and is now standard equipment for the Navy. It certainly was proved practical at Mitchel Field Thursday night.

Apparently as far as present civilian facilities for aircraft are concerned, the three planes which were milling around in the soup over New York could have joined the list of recent aircraft disasters.

They didn't because the Army, at least, was equipped and on the job.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 21, 1947]

CAA'S PET LANDING SYSTEM DEVELOPS NEW TROUBLES

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

Belatedly the Civil Aeronautics Administration has discovered that the instrument-landing system it has been favoring not only has all the bugs which pilots encountered earlier, but also has developed a new one.

The instrument-landing system is the glide path and localizer equipment which the CAA had selected as best, while giving the brush-off to ground-controlled-approach radar with the excuse that "radar isn't ready."

FM AFFECTS INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM

The newly discovered trouble with the CAA's instrument-landing-system equipment is this:

It has been found that frequency-modulation signals in the vicinity of an instrument-landing-system installation raise hob with the glide path or localizer. Since FM radio stations and airports, both serving cities, can always be expected to be somewhere near each other, the problem is a serious one.

This situation, which might easily land the CAA's landing program in the junk heap and force an immediate interim use of ground-controlled-approach radar, was discussed behind closed doors at the Civil Aeronautics Administration within the past few days.

One CAA hope seems to be that some added device may cure the troubles instrument-landing system is absorbing from FM radio transmitters. There is no assurance, at the moment, that this can be accomplished.

And meanwhile there is further information indicating that both the Federal Communications Commission and FM station owners are keenly interested in the question of whether, or how much, a CAA instrument-landing-system unit will interfere with FM commercial transmission.

PILOTS COMPLAIN

Even if the FM troubles had not developed, the CAA's instrument-landing-system equipment already was in trouble. Pilots have been complaining it tells them lies at a time when precision is of paramount importance—on final approach.

There have been complaints that instrument-landing system puts out a split signal, is thrown out of line by metal aircraft on the ground and by nearby highway traffic; that it is affected by adjacent terrain, including elevations and water.

The CAA has offered instrument-landing system in preference to ground controlled approach, but may now be close to the point of making some radical change in policy.

One thing which might help to clear the air would be the asking of enough of the right questions by congressional investigators.

One might well be: "Isn't it true that the CAA's instrument-landing system has been found unreliable?"

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 24, 1947]

ILS SYSTEM IS DIFFICULT TO FLY, SIBLEY DECLARES

(By Bob Sibley, Traveler aviation editor)

WILMINGTON, DEL., January 24.—Demonstrations here of the CAA-type instrument landing system and also the ground-controlled approach radar (GCA) at TWA's New Castle training base included demonstrations that:

1. When you install ILS on one runway, establishing that strip as the field's instrument runway, you let yourself in for some cross wind difficulties.

2. That ILS is difficult to fly.

3. That while ILS can line up a plane with only one runway, GCA can be adjusted to permit use of any runway in line whatever wind conditions require.

We took off in a C-54 with a couple of crack TWA pilots up front, to make a GCA approach. The idea was to use the north-south runway, approaching from the south, because it was the instrument runway. The wind was just about a 90-degree cross wind, from the west, 30 to 50 miles per hour with strong gusts.

The GCA test run put us over the head end of the runway, and we went around again to make an ILS approach. It was off, quite a bit, neither of the needles being centered during the last half mile of the approach during which the terrific cross winds batted the four-engine plane this way and that, and everybody agreed it didn't prove anything much because of the wind condition.

That is, excepting that when you install ILS on one runway you sometimes don't have it on the runway you need for landing.

We went over to the Link trainer department.

T. H. Gottshall, a Link instructor, climbed under the hood and was talked down to a perfect simulated GCA landing by Robert L. Woody, a senior Link instructor.

Then another qualified instrument man started a simulated approach with the ILS cross pointers in the Link. On the final approach he was bracketed only occassionally, weaved from one side to the other, and ended up (a) too high, (b) too far to the left, and (c) missed the runway.

Nobody blamed him. The ILS system is difficult to fly, as the AAF has pointedly stated in an official report. The best that can be said for it is that it should be able to help a pilot break out for a landing visually if the ceiling is no lower than 200 feet. On the basis of the Wilmington demonstration and others, it does not appear to be trustworthy for a ceiling lower than 200.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of January 24, 1947]

CAA SEEKS 20 GCA UNITS FOR BUSY AIR TERMINALS

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Convinced at last of the urgent need of getting ground-controlled-approach radar into operation at busy air terminals, including Boston, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is preparing to ask Congress for an emergency supplemental appropriation so that 20 GCA units can be made available immediately.

This was disclosed today by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, Mass., who has been hammering at the CAA for days to get action on GCA installations.

In making the announcement, PHILBIN remarked:

"I think the Boston Traveler's efforts to call attention to the need for GCA has finally borne fruit."

PHILBIN said the CAA decision for an emergency supplemental budget came today in the wake of a long conference attended by Public Works Commissioner Joseph F. Cairnes, of Massachusetts, AAF officials, CAA representatives, air-line spokesmen, and PHILBIN.

EMERGENCY EXISTS

An emergency appropriation became necessary, PHILBIN said, since President Truman had issued instructions earlier because of the economy wave that there were to be no supplemental appropriations unless the situation was an emergency.

"The CAA obviously has come around to the point of deciding that an emergency exists

and that this radar landing aid is needed urgently and that there should be no delay," he said.

The Massachusetts Congressman also explained that the CAA has decided Federal funds should take care of both the modification of the surplus Army sets and their operation and maintenance, thus relieving the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which owns and operates the Boston airport, from added expense for this navigation aid.

"Boston is to get one of the newer sets, requiring only a two-man crew," PHILBIN said. "From all that I can learn, the CAA would not have taken action on GCA until next year had it not been for timely urging by the Boston Traveler."

He said he did not know what cities besides Boston, New York, Washington, and Chicago would get GCA units, but thought Los Angeles and Cleveland, which have had serious air-line crashes during landing attempts, would be included.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post of January 25, 1947]

AIRPORT IN BOSTON TO GET RADAR—ONE OF 20 AIR FORCES' SETS DEFINITELY PROMISED

WASHINGTON, January 24 (AP).—Representative PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, announced today that the Government plans to modernize, install, and operate one of its surplus ground control approach (radar) systems at Boston Airport without cost to the State.

LOAN FROM AIR FORCES

The Congressman disclosed recently that the Army had agreed to loan to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, or directly to public operators, 20 of the air-safety devices u ed during the war and now stored at Dayton, Ohio.

The Army has been conducting experiments with three of the sets at airports in Chicago, New York, and Washington. They cost about $112,000. Modification, modernization, and installation costs about $92,000 for each system. Thus Boston Airport would get a system otherwise unobtainable at a value of about $204,000, plus operating costs.

NEED APPROPRIATION

The loan of the system to Boston and to several other airports would be possible under a proposal disclosed to PHILBIN's office today by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Administration purposes, PHILBIN's aides said, to ask Congress immediately for a supplemental appropriation for the current fiscal year to modernize and install 10 of its 20 systems.

"Boston Airport," PHILBIN's secretary told a reporter, "definitely will get one of these modernized systems."

NEEDED FOR SAFETY

PHILBIN's aide said although President Truman has stated there will be no supplemental appropriation measures offered except in an emergency, the Aeronautics Administration believes that recent airplane crashes and the necessity for immediate safety measures creates such an emergency.

Ground control approach systems (known now as GCA sets) are able to pick up a plane within a radius of 12 miles, no matter what the weather, warn it of mountains, high buildings, or other obstructions, and visually guide it to a safe landing.

PHILBIN's secretary said the Representative will make every effort to expedite delivery and installation of the Boston system.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.]

TOWARD AIR SAFETY

The public should not lose faith in progress toward safe flying. Reports of one accident should not wipe out the monumental record of safety piled up with the use of radar. The crash at Oakland is not yet fully explained, but apparently the pilot, landing with a zero ceiling, failed to follow directions all the way and put down his plane just short of the runway.

The Naval Air Transport Service announced that previous to this crash it had made 76,000 ground-control approach (radar) landings without accident. Indeed, NATS, with a record of 1,400,000,000 passenger-miles without an injury to passengers, has become a synonym for safety. Both the Navy and the Army have been flying when the commercial lines were fogbound, and radar has been their chief secret. With GCA a plane can be "talked in" when the ceiling is zero. Equal results are claimed for the instrument landing (radio beam) system.

Tardily, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has ordered GCA equipment installed at airports in New York, Chicago, and Washington. One reason for delay has been cost. Another has been a controversy over rival methods. Of course, radar is no safety panacea, as the Oakland crash proves. But the record justifies a sharp public demand for more use of available equipment. The cost question can be worked out. Indeed, the air lines might find they could save the cost in uncanceled flights and public confidence.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of January 19, 1947]

ADVOCATES OF TWO CONTROL SYSTEMS FOSTER LIVELY DEBATE AS TO THEIR MERITS

(By Austin Stevens)

GANDER, NEWFOUNDLAND.—Aviation is currently divided by the controversy over which of two instrument-landing systems is better. The Civil Aeronautics Administration favors ILS—instrument landing system—which employs a localizer, a beamed-glide path and radio-marker beacons. With these aids the pilot handles the landing all by himself. Army and Navy aviation favors GCA—ground-controlled approach—in which, with radar, ground crews direct the pilot's maneuvering until the plane is at the head of the runway in position to land.

At the trans-Atlantic air junction at Gander, Pan American Airways is operating, with a picked crew, an Army Air Forces GCA unit, the AAF paying $1 a year for maintenance and for operational reports. GCA crews are "talking down" onto the runways in tests not only Pan American planes but those of American Overseas Airlines and British Overseas Airways Corp., which are sharing the expense.

The moving images of incoming planes are reflected on radar scopes inside a trailer parked by the runways, and the plane's flight is directed from the ground. Since these are tests only, GCA supplements the required range-station approach, but GCA has in effect in recent weeks brought down safely almost 100 planes to within a few feet of the runway.

During a demonstration of GCA here, an incident occurred which is worth repeating for the bearing it has upon the ILS and GCA controversy.

PLANE NEARS THE TOWER

Just after midnight a four-engined plane operated by a foreign line neared the field during a heavy snowstorm. The pilot requested GCA approach from the control tower, but was advised that GCA was available only to those lines which had contracted for it.

Meanwhile, while bringing in a Pan American Clipper, the GCA crew "saw" on their radar scope the foreign plane while still some distance out. The plane called again and was again notified that GCA was a test only, so the pilot started down to the obscured field on a range station instrument approach. Even when he was down to 400 feet over the field the pilot could not locate the runway through the squally snow and he pulled up sharply. On this approach he was wide of the runway by 2,000 feet.

While he was going out for a second pass at the field the weather worsened, visibility dropping to one-quarter of a mile and the ceiling lowering to 300 feet. Thereupon the pilot declared an emergency and GCA went into action. The controller lined up the plane, appearing as a "pip" of light on the radar scopes.

"You have 15 miles before you begin your descent," the controller called over the two-way radio. "Reduce air speed at your own discretion." From there on GCA took over the entire operation, advising the pilot when to descend, when to lock his wheels down, when to check flaps. As the plane veered left or right of the course set by GCA the pilot was corrected. When the plane went above or below the glide path the deviation was relayed to the pilot in feet, so he could correct his path.

At a quarter mile the pilot was told that the center line of the runway was this time dead ahead. "You're on the glide path, fly left, you're on, 25 feet high, now you're right, you're over the end of the runway, take over and land."

GCA AT MILITARY BASES

The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps had done this thousands of times during the war and were still doing it at military fields. GCA is standard equipment at all Navy fields, where it is replacing ILS. Thirty-five Army bases now are being equipped.

Such incidents, though impressive to watch, by no means resolve the GCA-ILS debate. Many pilots like ILS because it keeps the approach in the hands of the plane crew; they argue that GCA is only as good as the ground crew, and some observers think that CAA's relative hesitancy about GCA stems from this fact. Responsibility—and, if anything goes wrong, blame—would rest with the GCA crew, maintained by CAA. The CAA, which is spending $5,000,000 for ILS installations, has explained that a "practical difficulty" of GCA is the high cost of the new-type units and their operation.

Many pilots say they would like to have even the old-style GCA along with ILS, using one to check the other system while landing in bad weather. Air travelers surely would not object to an added safety measure.

As a GCA operator at Gander, a veteran of GCA operation at Iwo Jima, put it, "a lot of those B-29's never heard of this stuff, but they didn't ask questions when we offered to get them out of the weather and onto the top of that rock."

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of January 23, 1947]

AVIATION AGENCIES SCORED AT HEARING—HOUSE INQUIRY ON CRASHES PUTS LANDIS THROUGH QUIZ, SAYS SAFETY IDEAS ARE LACKING

(By Samuel A. Tower)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—Members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee censured Government aeronautical agencies today for what was termed their failure to recommend to Congress measures necessary to promote safety in the air.

James M. Landis, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as the first witness before the committee as it began an investigation into causes of air accidents and the remedies needed, bore the brunt of the criticism, although it was directed at all the agencies handling aviation affairs.

In opening the hearing Representatives CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey, committee chairman, stated that recent declines in air travel were not attributable to a seasonal slump but to a growing "loss of confidence" by the public.

QUESTIONS FIRED AT LANDIS

Following a general review of the problem of air safety by Mr. Landis in a 6,000-word statement, the committee peppered him with questions designed to bring out specific recommendations to foster air safety.

"What specific recommendations would you make for the promotion of air safety?" Mr. WOLVERTON asked the CAB chairman.

Mr. Landis replied that technological development, creation of a special aviation congressional committee, and the hearings of the Commerce Committee were primary steps in that direction.

Mr. WOLVERTON expressed dissatisfaction with this reply as "pats on the back" for the air lines and Congress, but "we need more than those for the committee to take action on the problem."

"What we want to know," he said, "is what additional legislation and what additional appropriations are necessary."

Sharing the views of the committee chairman, Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, of California, said specific recommendations had not been made by the agencies because "Government agencies are loath to take responsibility for anything until they are sure it is perfect."

"This committee, if properly informed," he added, "would be one of the best friends aviation has, but we must be properly informed."

CAB CHIEF CITES NEW DEVICES

Mr. Landis, in his prepared statement, pointed out that the use of modern devices, electronic equipment, and other safety mechanisms was worthy of a definite exploration, adding that such navigation aids were being installed. The installation of such aids, retarded by wartime secrecy and materials shortages, would tangibly promote air safety, he felt.

The CAB chairman emphasized congressional responsibility through control of the national purse strings by asking Congress "to consider the extent to which the Federal Government can appropriately finance the building of a more adequate airway system."

He acknowledged, however, that the CAB had never made specific recommendations or appropriation recommendations to Congress.

Mr. Landis listed also safety steps taken, or under study, by the CAB, including easier flight-duty periods for air-line crews, revised regulations setting up safety standards for nonscheduled carriers, and modification of the rules governing take-offs and landings.

Armed with statistics showing steady reduction in air fatalities per passenger-mile, Mr. Landis declared the air safety situation "shows improvement, marked in some places, not too marked in others."

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of January 24, 1947]

FUTURE AIR SAFETY DEPENDENT ON RADAR

(By Francis T. Fox, Telegram aviation reporter)

The future of air transportation is undeniably tied up with the modern miracle of radar. Isolated and unfortunate accidents like the one which occurred Monday at Oakland, Calif., involving a Navy hospital plane and resulting in one fatality, should not hinder the use of the ground-control approach system. This seeing-eye device for aircraft is as necessary to weather-bound planes as the dog is to a blind man.

The fact that Navy planes had made more than 65,000 safe blind landings using GCA prior to this accident cannot be overlooked.

Last week, when 3 days of fog, sleet, snow, and icing rain closed in the eastern United States, more than 3,000 flights were canceled. Air traffic from Newfoundland to California was fouled up, and scheduled flights all across the country were stalled. What this meant in loss of revenue to the air lines and inconvenience to passengers cannot be determined. But aviation suffered.

These 3 days of landlocked confusion produced some good for the air industry. They spotlighted the ineffectiveness of current emergency landing techniques and laid open to censure the policy of the Civilian Aeronautics Administration, which forbids use of GCA facilities now available even in serious emergencies.

One day last fall when busy Washington National Airport was closed for several hours while a disabled B-25 obstructed the runway in use, all air traffic in the vicinity was diverted to the naval air station at Patuxent, Md. During this period the Navy radar unit at the field brought in to safe landing 27 planes. These ships were guided in with the ceiling less than 200 feet and visibility wavering between zero and 400 yards.

On January 2 the GCA unit at Andrews Field, Md., an Army facility, successfully brought in a four-engine transport with a ceiling of 200 feet and visibility at zero at a time when other airports in the area were closed to similar weather.

During this landing the fog was so thick that control-tower personnel were unable to see the plane until after it landed. This landing operation was witnesses by CAA personnel and is reported to have made a profound impression.

One other outstanding achievement of GCA at Andrews Field occurred within the month. A Fairchild Packet (C-82), carrying 24 military passengers, was guided in to a successful night landing with less than one-half mile visibility after it had nearly exhausted its gas trying to find an open airport.

These instances indicate the excellent work radar is doing for military aviation and argue heavily for its speedy use in civilian flying.

PRESENT FEDERAL AGENCIES HAVING AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN AIR SAFETY AS ENUMERATED IN FOLLOWING STUDY PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY AT REQUEST OF CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN

War Department: Air safety, accident prevention, has concerned the air arm of the United States Army since 1917, and accident reporting has always been a requirement. The earliest studies of accident statistics in the United States were made in 1921 by the Chief of the Medical Division of the Air Service. In 1947, the Army Air Forces, Office of Flying Safety (under the Office of the Air Inspector) is responsible for compiling all AAF accident statistics and making recommendations for increased military air safety.

Navy Department: Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air (flight safety)—same as AAF's Office of Flying Safety but for naval aircraft.

Commerce Department:

Civil Aeronautics Administration—see United States Government Manual, 1947, page 333.

Civil Aeronautics Board—see United States Government Manual, 1947, page 411.

Weather Bureau—see United States Government Manual, 1947, page 330; further, as pertaining to air safety, it is reasoned that by developing weather forecasting methods and systems for codifying weather information the Bureau also promotes air safety.

Treasury Department: United States Coast Guard (Search and Rescue Service Agency): Originally established as the Air-Sea Rescue Agency at the request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Agency studies developments and designs of air-sea rescue equipment and methods of air-sea rescue activities.

Air Coordinating Committee (see Executive Order 981, dated September 19, 1946): There are three main divisions of the ACC—Technical, Economic, and Industrial—with subcommittees under each division. Each subcommittee under the Technical Division is concerned with some aspect of air safety. These subcommittees are: (a) Aids to Air Navigation and Landing, (b) Aviation Meteorology, (c) Airspace, (d) Air Safety, (e) Aeronautical Charts.

Executive Office of the President (Bureau of the Budget): Recently the ACC requested the Bureau of the Budget "to take leadership in developing, with the participation of interested aviation agencies, a comprehensive plan for * * * aviation statistics." On January 21, 1947, a conference of Federal aviation statistics was held. The committee on air navigation will devote itself to statistics which relate directly to air safety, namely, accident statistics, airworthiness, airmen certification, airports, meteorological services, communication services, airways, air-traffic control, and maintenance and fueling services.

State Department: Office of Transportation and Communications, Aviation Division; liaison with CAA, CAB, Navy, AAF—Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, United States Representative to the Interim Council. In the field of air safety PICAO is presently engaged in the following activities: Air navigation, aerodromes, air routes-ground airs, air traffic control, meteorological studies relative to air safety, search and rescue studies, aircraft accident investigation, airworthiness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Beginning at 10:30 a. m., Monday, February 3, 1947, Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on the subject of portal-to-portal pay. The bill and joint resolution are presently before the subcommittee:

H. R. 584, To define the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 91, to prohibit suits for recovery of portal-to-portal pay.

The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A meeting of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, February 4, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

217. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1946, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1946, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration House Resolution 77. Resolution relative to certain expenditures of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1536. A bill to reduce the interest charges on the national debt by refunding outstanding obligations through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds bearing a low rate of interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 1537. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1538. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1539. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a high-school building near Roosevelt, Utah, for the school district comprising Duchesne and Uintah Counties, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1540. A bill to create an independent Air Safety Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1541. A bill to provide for the termination of price control and rationing powers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1542. A bill to increase wartime service-connected death compensation or pension to widows and children of persons who shall have died as the direct result of combat service in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1543. A bill to amend the definition of "dependent" for the purposes of the credits for individual income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1544. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1545. A bill to create a Federal Civilian Retirement Administration and to transfer thereto the functions of the Civil Service Commission pertaining to civil-service-retirement activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1546. A bill to impose a duty of 2 cents per pound on patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups and for other purposes, rice meal, and broken rice, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1547. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEDEN:

H. R. 1548. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1549. A bill to provide for United States post offices at certain places in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 1550. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Philadelphia County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1551. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1552. A bill to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1553. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1554. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1555. A bill to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R 1556. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 1557. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption from $500 to $1,000 and the exemption for dependents from $500 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1558. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1559. A bill to repeal the law permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 1560. A bill to remove for the duration of the war certain limitations upon the appointment and compensation of retired commissioned officers employed in civilian positions by the Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1561. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1562. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEADE of Maryland:

H. R. 1563. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1564. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 1565. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1566. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1567. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 1568. A bill to reduce the age requirements for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60 and, in the case of veterans of World War I or II, to further reduce such age requirements according either to their length of service or to whether they served outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1569. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1570. A bill to establish a Merrimack Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Merrimack River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities, and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to authorize needed appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to institute a study of the economic development of the domestic fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation of plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LUSK:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 79. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, appointed to investigate shortage of food and other agricultural products, relative to the sugar situation and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 80. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to the withdrawal of our troops from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to establish a permanent naval officers' postgraduate school on the Monterey Peninsula, at Monterey, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1571. A bill for the relief of Lazaros Marko Damianopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1572. A bill for the relief of Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1573. A bill for the relief of Wallaston's Manor Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 1574. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1576. A bill for the relief of Pedro Ugalde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1577. A bill for the relief of Juan Llona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1578. A bill for the relief of the Elmore Cooperative Hatchery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1579. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Lavatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1580. A bill for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1581. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1582. A bill for the relief of Santiago Naveran; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Thomas Abadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1584. A bill authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, urging that the Soil Conservation Service be maintained as a separate agency of the United States Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

73. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Recommendations of Kenosha Chamber of Commerce, Kenosha, Wis., concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, creator of all things, giver of every good and perfect gift, hear us this day as we seek Thy blessing upon our deliberations.

We acknowledge before Thee our shortcomings, our selfishness, our smugness, and our pride. Forgive us wherein we have come short of Thy will for us and for our Nation. Create within us clean hearts, and renew right spirits, that we may do better and be better. Forgive us our forgetfulness of the world's sore need and our contentment with things as they are.

Hear us when we pray for all those in places of influence and authority, that they may do right. Guide those who lead us; and touch Thy servants with Thy Holy Spirit, that their faith may be revived, their hope renewed, and their vision made clear and challenging. Give to them the conviction that with Thy help all things are possible—even the most difficult things that baffle us now. God forbid that any of us here should add to the problems of the hour, but rather resolve, by Thy help, to become part of the answer. So help us, God, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 29, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, January 31, 1947, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) relating to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SASSCER members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1030. A bill to continue in effect certain war-excise-tax rates, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1353. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. LUCAS. I also ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] may be excused during the coming week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on the coming Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

PERSONAL STATEMENT—CORRECTION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on January 20 last I made a statement to the Senate and had read from the desk a letter from the Cavalier County Republican, a newspaper published at Langdon, N. Dak. In the letter from Mr. Forkner, of the Cavalier County Republican, it was stated that the Farmers Union Herald, of St. Paul, Minn., was responsible for the advertisement which resulted in the purchase of certain dresses among which was one which had been contributed to a Federal clothing drive by a lady in North Dakota. I have a letter from Mr. R. S. Gilfillan, editor of the Farmers Union Publishing Co., which publishes the Farmers Union Herald, stating that the statement as to the advertisement appearing in that newspaper was erroneous. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter inserted in the RECORD, and I offer my apologies to this publishing concern.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION PUBLISHING CO.,
St. Paul, Minn., January 28, 1947.

United States Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: We naturally have been following the story of the "relief dress" which found its way into commercial channels with interest. We admire the thoroughness with which you have presented the facts to the Senate and as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And of course, we hope that the matter can be followed through to the end and the culprits, if any, punished.

The whole affair is repugnant and it is for that reason that we were disappointed in finding the Farmers Union Herald on record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having been the agency through which the lady in North Dakota had made the purchase. Quoting the RECORD in which a letter from the Cavalier Republican to you states:

"It seems that this lady at Hazelton answered an ad that she saw in the Farmers Union Herald from a Chicago house advertising dresses for 100 at $18—in other words, 18 cents apiece."

Our records indicate the Chicago house mentioned has never advertised in the Herald. Therefore, the North Dakota lady (whom we hope does read the Herald) could never have seen the ad in this publication.

We call this to your attention as, undoubtedly, an unintentional inaccuracy.

Cordially yours,

R. S. GILFILLAN,
Editor.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been informed that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are unable to continue their services on the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Under authority of Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 22, 1947, the Chair now desires to announce the appointment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] the minority members of that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state in connection with the appointment of the minority members of the committee that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] had advised me that, because of other duties incumbent upon them, they did not desire to ask for renewed service on the committee.

I wish to congratulate both of them, and the other members of the committee, for the services which they rendered, and to express the feeling that the Senate as a whole appreciates the devotion which they gave to the work of this committee. I have no doubt that the new members will bring to the performance of their duties an equal devotion to the public welfare.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of Senate Resolution 20, agreed to January 24, 1947, the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], the minority members of the Special Committee To Study the Problem of American Small Business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state, in explanation of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who has rendered able and outstanding service on this committee, was not reappointed, that he advised us that in view of his other important commitments during this session, and other legislative matters in which he is interested, particularly agriculture and one or two other subjects, he did not feel that he could give to this committee any further service; and it is at his request that he is not reappointed.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE AND COAST GUARD ACADEMIES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement for the purposes of the RECORD.

Under the law as it now stands, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has authority to designate two members of the committee to serve on the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and also has authority to appoint two members of the committee to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

In order that there may be Senate record of my action as chairman of the committee, I wish to announce that I name as the two members of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy I name the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the forth report on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INTERIM COUNCIL OF PROVISIONAL INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as United States representative to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his military status and perquisites (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representatives of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth quarterly report of the Office of Contract Settlement covering the period October 1 to December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSMISSION AND SALE OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a complete report and financial statement of the Bonneville Administrator covering the transmission and sale of electric energy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting that, for the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity, no lands were exchanged pursuant to the act of June 14, 1946 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869); to the Committee on Public Lands.

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS REQUESTING DONATIONS FROM NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649 (79th Cong., 2d sess.) approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENTS BY SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of the selective-service registrants of inductible age occupationally deferred by the local boards of the System as of January 1, 1947, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twentieth progress report of that Administration for the period October-December 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 8)

A letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the initial report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of that company for the calendar year 1946, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of that Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Legislative Resolution 1

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase allotments for rural electrification program in Nebraska

"Whereas the rural electrification program is of great importance to Nebraska; and

"Whereas electricity should be brought to every possible Nebraska farm home; and

"Whereas the allotments for rural electrification should be increased to further this program and make it possible for every person desiring electricity for their farm: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixtieth session assembled:

"1. That the Rural Electrification Administration allotments be increased in order to assure every possible Nebraska farm home benefits of electricity.

"2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Director of the Rural Electrification Administration."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Whereas the housewives of America have patiently and patriotically exercised during the period of hostilities and for more than a year since the cessation of hostilities, the strictest economy in the use and consumption of sugar as a part of their contribution to the war effort; and

"Whereas sugar is indispensable for a well-balanced American diet, and housewives cannot prepare satisfactory meals without an adequate supply of sugar; and

"Whereas the waste resulting from the lack of sufficient means of preserving foodstuffs through the scarcity of canning sugar can no longer be justified, since this Nation has not been at war for the past 18 months; and

"Whereas Iowa, in common with other great agricultural States, produces many crops which require sugar for preservation, such as fruits, berries, and vegetables and in the past year losses in these products because of the limited sugar available have been estimated at several millions of dollars; and

"Whereas the absence of sugar for canning purposes has caused thousands of tons of fruit to spoil, thereby depriving American families of a much needed food, and has caused hardships and financial losses in many farming and canning communities; and

"Whereas labor in the food processing industry has been without work because of the sugar shortage; and

"Whereas in 1946 the sugar under the direct control of the United States increased by more than one-half million tons and no portion of this increase was made available to the American people: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to provide by law for an immediate decontrol of sugar for home consumption and for industrial use; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress is respectfully requested to remove all controls from the production, processing, distribution, rationing, sale, and importation of sugar without delay; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.'

A petition of the Citizens Information Bureau of the United States, signed by O. C. Provost, director, relating to atomic energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A memorial of the Citizens Information Bureau of the United States, signed by O. C. Provost, director, remonstrating against the use of the press to further the business of corporate interests by false and untrue statements made by propaganda, disguised as specialists of the medical fraternity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., favoring the transfer to the municipal government of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., that portion of land at hospital grounds belonging to the Federal Government and not now being utilized by the low-cost housing; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PROTEST AGAINST REDUCTION OF IMPORT DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Coffey County Pomona Grange, at Burlington, Kans., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURLINGTON, KANS., *January 23, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our Coffey County Pomona Grange passed the following resolution at a recent meeting:

"Whereas there is talk of making trade agreements with some 28 countries; and

"Whereas the duty on agricultural products is to be lowered: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we go on record opposing the lowering of import duties on agricultural products. And that our secretary notify National Master Goss of our action, also our Senators and our representative Congressmen."

Yours truly,
COFFEY COUNTY POMONA GRANGE,
ROVILLA DOUGLASS, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS REGARDING IMPORTATION OF CATTLE FROM MEXICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter, together with three resolutions which were adopted by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association and the American Live Stock Association. I call special attention to mention in the letter of the importation from Mexico of more than 100,000 cattle during the period October 17 to December 6 last, at which time there was prevalent in Mexico a contagious disease which is commonly referred to as the foot-and-mouth disease. I desire also to call the attention of the Senators present to the fact that a certain number of those cattle got as far north as my own State. I think that my esteemed colleague [Mr. WHERRY], who submitted Senate Resolution 72, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, will be interested in that statement and in the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter and resolutions presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

THE NEBRASKA STOCK
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Alliance, Nebr., January 21, 1947.

HUGH A. BUTLER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: At a meeting of the officers, executive council, advisory board, special committees, and members of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association a short time ago, a number of resolutions were adopted.

You will please find enclosed a resolution regarding our stand on labor policies. I thought you would like to have this called to your attention.

You will also please find enclosed resolutions which were adopted at the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the American National Live Stock Association held at Phoenix, Ariz., January 8–10. I believe these resolutions are important and should be given serious consideration.

It may be of interest to you to know that over 100,000 cattle from Mexico entered this country between October 17 and December 6, 1946, during the period that the border was open. Some of these cattle have found their way into 29 States of this country. Cattlemen everywhere are fearful of foot-and-mouth-disease infection in this country and are determined that nothing be left undone, not only to keep it out of the United States, but to eradicate it in Mexico as soon as it is humanly possible.

You may be interested in knowing that out of a shipment of Brahma bulls imported into Mexico from South America, 18 or 20 head of those Brahma bulls eventually got to Nebraska.

At the present time each State is attempting to locate, inspect, and watch the cattle imported from Mexico for symptoms of foot-and-mouth disease.

We believe that the border quarantine must be rigidly enforced. In spite of quarantine measures, however, the disease may still be spread by birds and wild animals which no fence can keep out.

Another resolution adopted by the American National Live Stock Association was regarding reciprocal trade agreements and tariff reductions. We are opposed to the making of new agreements and any tariff reductions that might in any way affect the livestock industry.

The officers of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association will greatly appreciate any effort of yours to assist in carrying out the intent of the enclosed resolutions.

Yours very truly,
W. A. JOHNSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"The following resolution adopted by those in attendance at the fiftieth annual convention of the American National Live Stock Association held in Phoenix, Ariz., January 8–10, 1947:

"'HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE OUTBREAK IN MEXICO

"'Whereas the recent outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico constitutes the most dangerous threat ever experienced in its history, to the livestock industry of this Nation—our economy, our credit, the normal movements of livestock in the natural processes of production and marketing and the threat to the supplies necessary to properly feed our domestic population; and

"'Whereas the American National Live Stock Association and the various State livestock association members of the American National Live Stock Association have repeatedly brought to the attention of the authorities in Washington the dangers incident to the unrestricted movement of livestock from infested areas to countries bordering on the United States: Now, therefore be it

"'*Resolved,* That this association in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., January 10, 1947, respectively urge that the proper department of Government lend every assistance possible toward effectuating the protection afforded through the following program:

"'1. The Bureau of Animal Industry should be given adequate funds to insure that no

handicap be placed on their work in preventing a spread of this dreaded disease to this country.

"'2. The United States-Mexican border should be patrolled as if it were a prison camp. The present force engaged in that work is merely a skeleton of the former patrol. That force should be multiplied.

"'3. The Government of the United States, acting through the Department of Agriculture and the State Department should prevail upon the Mexican Government to slaughter and bury the suspect bulls from the proximity of the border. This step is highly important and action such as this would breed some confidence in the good faith of the affected Governments.

"'4. The work of eradication of the disease in Mexico should have full cooperation and assistance of the American Government. Regardless of the number of trained men that may be required to render this assistance, they should be supplied promptly and in adequate force.

"'5. Construction of a permanent border fence extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean should be started and rushed to completion.

"'6. By far the most important step from the standpoint of future outbreaks such as now are in evidence is the consummation of a real sanitary treaty with Mexico and Canada. The existing treaty was negotiated several years ago and both of the named countries are parties to it. But the existing treaty has proven to be wholly inadequate. A new treaty with strong and sharp teeth in it should be effected. That will call for quick skillful negotiation with the named countries.'"

To the Committee on Finance:

"RECIPROCAL TRADE

"Whereas the program of writing new trade agreements with sharp reductions in tariff rates, advocated by the State Department, is a distinct threat to the restoration of stable conditions in agriculture, industry, and labor; and

"Whereas many foreign countries are now making bilateral agreements which are directly in opposition to the United States program of multilateral agreements, and will make such program ineffective so far as opportunity for exports from this country are concerned; and

"Whereas it is now impossible to foretell the conditions that will exist in 2 or 3 years when new agreements made now will become fully effective: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we strongly oppose the making of these new agreements and tariff reductions because it is opposed to the national interest and unfair and unequitable to American agriculture, industry, and labor."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"The following resolution adopted unanimously by officers, executive council, advisory board and special committees of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at a called meeting December 19–20, 1946, by President C. J. Abbott:

"'*Resolved*, That we commend President Harry S. Truman and members of his Cabinet for their efforts in curbing the dictatorial powers of John L. Lewis at a time when the strike of soft-coal miners threatened the very foundations of our republican form of government; when industry had been brought to its knees by the arrogance of one man who defied the powers of our Federal courts; when schools, public buildings, hospitals, and other necessary institutions were forced to close for lack of fuel;

"'That we call upon our Nebraska delegations in Congress to introduce or support legislation to stop unlawful and jurisdictional labor disputes and purge organized labor of its communistic leadership while there is yet time;

"'That we urge upon Congress the necessity of purging Federal offices and bureaus of all subversive elements and that positions of trust be delegated only to true Americans and then only after a careful study of their qualifications and patriotism to our form of government has shown them to be capable of assuming this great trust;

"'That we urge upon organized labor the need for greater production and the accompanying lowering of prices as the only means of maintaining our present high standards of living; that ever-increasing demands for higher wages and shorter hours can only result in higher and higher prices that will bring on inflation and create an industrial chaos that will wreck the economy of the United States of America.'"

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1946 (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1946, pursuant to Senate Resolution 224, Seventy-ninth Congress, I submit a final report relating to senatorial campaign contributions and expenditures in the 1946 election.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

REPORT ON USE AND ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LANDS RELATING TO GRAZING SERVICE (S. REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for the past approximately 6 years it has been my privilege to be the chairman of a subcommittee of the old Committee on Public Lands and Surveys investigating the administration of the open public domain. During that time our subcommittee has filed with this body four reports. The time for that committee to operate ceases today, under the resolution submitted during the last session of Congress by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. We have prepared our fifth and final report from that committee bearing on the subject of the resolution under which we have operated.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the report, which I shall shortly request to have printed. It will be found to be most revealing of indiscriminate violations of law in connection with the proper allocation of public funds, and it will be seen that the law is overlooked by the administration of the open public domain, as regards the Grazing Service, in a way that is anything but commendable on the part of a Federal bureau or a Federal service.

Mr. President, I now submit the report, and ask that it be printed. It is the final report of the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the report was received and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I dislike to ask for immediate action on a resolution, but it appears that as to the report which was submitted today by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] the time expires today and the Senator is anxious to make some minor changes in the report before it is printed. Therefore I submit and ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution extending until February 15 the time for submitting the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and continued by subsequent resolutions, relating to an investigation of the administration and use of public lands, is hereby continued until February 15, 1947, inclusive, for the purpose of allowing additional time in which to prepare and submit a final report to the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator, What is this report?

Mr. BUTLER. It was a report which was presented in part this morning by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], covering, as the resolution says, an investigation with reference to grazing service on the public lands of the West.

Mr. HILL. Do I correctly understand that the purpose of this resolution is not to continue the committee for any further activity on its part other than simply to have its complete report in by the 15th of February?

Mr. BUTLER. It is to extend the time for making the report. A partial report was filed this morning, but there will be a few additions to it.

Mr. HILL. Has most of the report been filed?

Mr. BUTLER. There will be no additional expenditures by the committee in the way of traveling or holding investigations.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, there will be no further hearings or investigations; it is merely a matter of completing the writing of the report?

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the resolution has the support of the minority members of the committee as well as the support of the members of the majority.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I cannot help voicing my disapproval of asking unanimous consent for the consideration of legislation when only a handful of Senators are in the Chamber. I assume that it is a matter of some importance, and I assume that many Senators would be interested if they knew about it. Therefore, I suggest that the Senator withhold his request until Monday.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to withhold it until Monday, or until a later session, if the Chair will rule that we have the right to have the time extended after it automatically expires on this date, January 31.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. HILL. If the committee automatically dies at midnight on January 31,

how could it be reinstated in order to enable it to file a report at a later date?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that a resolution can subsequently revive a committee for an extension of time for reporting purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, let me ask whether under that ruling the resolution may be presented on Monday or on some following day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the resolution may be presented and lie over under the rule, and be taken up at the next session of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. That is perfectly agreeable to me, Mr. President, and I submit the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and will lie over under the rule.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS COMMITTEE, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have a similar resolution from a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, which was appointed some months ago and was presided over by former Senator Murdock, of Utah. The subcommittee held its hearings. Almost immediately the stenographer who took the notes of the hearings was sent to the hospital, and he is still there. I should like to have a continuing resolution adopted in order to extend the time for that gentleman to transcribe his notes, and in order to enable the subcommittee to submit its report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Nebraska satisfied to have that resolution go over under the rule?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then that will be done.

The resolution (S. Res. 77) submitted by Mr. BUTLER was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority granted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys under Senate Resolution 315, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to July 30, 1946, relating to studies and investigations of matters referred to such committee, is hereby extended to March 31, 1947, for the purpose of allowing additional time in which to make a report to the Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WHITE (by request) introduced Senate bill 445, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 446. A bill to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish rules and regulations with respect to car service by common carriers by railroad to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 447. A bill to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 448. A bill to provide for the continuance in certain cases of disability compensation and waiver of premiums and disability payments under United States Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 449. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 450. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; and

S. 451. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to provide space to accommodate the needs of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 452. A bill to authorize the transfer without charge to the States, and political subdivisions thereof, of any interest of the United States in public works acquired under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 453. A bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 455. A bill to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 456. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 457. A bill for the relief of Anna Kong Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Doerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 459. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having impaired hearing to positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 460, to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY also introduced Senate bill 461, to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 462. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of public agencies for the damage to their air-navigation aids and air markers caused by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 463. A bill to provide for payment of pension or compensation to certain widows of veterans of any war of the United States, notwithstanding marriage, and for other purposes; and

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Joseph Noel Roberts; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 465. A bill to provide medical care and treatment and hospitalization for dependent members of the family of any veteran of any war of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 466. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to reduce the eligibility age for old-age or survivors benefit payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 467. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 468. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 469. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 470. A bill for the relief of John H. Gradwell; and

S. 471. A bill to provide for the relief of Louis Constantine Mastor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 472, to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 50, proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1030. An act to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF PURE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce a bill amendatory of the Pure Food and Drugs Act and ask that it be appropriately referred. In connection with the bill I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter written by the Federal Security Agency to the President of the Senate explan-

atory and in justification of the bill I have just introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Maine will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter will be published in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 445) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WHITE (by request), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. WHITE is as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, January 22, 1947.

The honorable the PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A situation is arising which in our judgment requires prompt legislative action to protect persons stricken with diseases which will be treated with streptomycin.

This new drug is in some respects similar to penicillin. Its dramatic effects in the treatment of serious and often fatal diseases are overshadowed only by penicillin. Its commercial production, which began only a little more than a year ago, has now reached a substantial volume and is expected to increase materially.

As you know, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains provisions in section 507 and related sections requiring that penicillin and all products containing it be pretested by the Government and certified before interstate distribution. The cost of establishing and maintaining this procedure is borne by the manufacturing industry through the payment of appropriate fees.

The reasons underlying the requirement for certification of penicillin are that it is highly efficacious for many serious infectious diseases suffered by great numbers of our population, that unusual difficulties are inherent in its manufacture of a quality suitable for therapeutic use, that the methods for testing finished lots to determine its safety and efficacy are not yet entirely satisfactory, and that therefore an unusual likelihood exists that lots will appear on the market which are not of the appropriate strength, quality, and purity. To insure that the product is what it should be requires not only the greatest care on the part of the manufacturer but check-testing by a disinterested and competent authority.

Streptomycin is highly effective in a number of serious infections for which neither penicillin nor any other drug now available is efficacious. Among these are meningitis, endocarditis, urinary tract infections, and blood poisoning, when these conditions are due to certain types of organisms. It is a specific in the treatment of tularemia, or rabbit fever. It bears great promise for the therapy of certain types of peritonitis, pneumonia, liver abscesses, and gall gladder infections. While the clinical investigations on tuberculosis have not yet reached an advanced state, the results so far obtained give promise that it may display considerable efficacy in the control of this scourge. It is the first drug that has ever shown definite promise of practical clinical value in the treatment of this disease.

Streptomycin, like penicillin, is a biological product and its manufacture and testing are subject to the same kind of unexplained vagaries that characterize the production of penicillin. In some respects at least, the need for predistribution checking is even greater for streptomycin. Its toxicity, particularly in relation to effective dosage, is much higher than that of penicillin. Underdosage results in the rapid development of highly resistant strains of pathogenic organisms. Its dosage must therefore be much more carefully regulated than that of penicillin, and it is even more important that label declarations of potency be accurate.

The certification procedure we are now recommending for streptomycin has precedent in the terms of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, not only in the penicillin provisions but in the provisions of section 506, requiring certification of insulin, the drug which enables diabetics to live a nearly normal span of life. All three of these drugs—streptomycin, penicillin, and insulin—present problems of a common pattern in the importance of their need for effective control in the interest of public health. They are all highly efficacious for one or more serious diseases; they all present unusual difficulties in the process of manufacture and the methods of testing finished lots, and for this reason are prone to depart from standards of identity, quality, and purity appropriate to insure safety and efficacy of use.

The general provisions of the law applicable to other drugs are quite ineffective in meeting the needs of public protection presented by these articles. There is no authority in these general provisions for testing by the Government before distribution even where the manufacturer desires such testing as an insurance against mistakes. Examinations can be made only after the products are shipped or offered for shipment in interstate commerce. With the sanctions of seizure, criminal prosecution, and injunction contained in the act, and the facilities available for enforcement, only a fraction of the output of any drug can ordinarily be given attention and proceeded against effectively when it fails to meet appropriate standards. Seizure of widely dispersed products is possible in only a relatively small proportion of cases. Criminal prosecution and injunction proceedings do not benefit the patients who have received ineffective or toxic drugs contained in the shipments upon which such actions are instituted.

The extreme rarity with which uncertified insulin or penicillin is introduced into interstate commerce demonstrates that the certification procedure substantially insures that drugs subject to it are what they ought to be when their interstate movement begins. The provision of the act in section 301 (b), which prohibits the adulteration or misbranding of an article while in interstate commerce, tends to safeguard the product during that time. Likewise, the provision of the act in section 301 (k), prohibiting the doing of any act with respect to an article while it is being held for sale after interstate shipment if such act results in the misbranding of the article, tends to extend protection until it is ultimately sold for use. (It will be noted that uncertified insulin and penicillin are defined in section 502 (k) and (l) as misbranded.)

It is probable that as improved techniques in manufacture and better methods of testing are developed, the need for pretesting and certification of streptomycin may no longer exist. That probability with respect to penicillin was recognized in section 507 (c), which directs the Administrator to promulgate regulations exempting the drug from the certification requirements when that procedure is not necessary to insure safety and efficacy of use. This provision would apply equally to streptomycin if the recommended amendment is adopted.

The proposed bill would also amend section 301 (j) of the act, prohibiting governmental agents from revealing information concerning any method or process which is a trade secret entitled to protection, and which is acquired under the authority of the sections providing for the certification of insulin, penicillin, and streptomycin. This was inadvertently omitted when sections 506 and 507 were originally enacted.

This proposed legislation has been discussed with representatives of members of the industry who produce streptomycin or who may be concerned with its production. On the basis of these discussions we are satisfied that there exists no opposition to the proposal.

At the present time samples from each batch of streptomycin produced are being tested by the Food and Drug Administration before they are released for distribution. This service is being carried on through cooperative arrangements with the War and Navy Departments, who have been purchasing most of the output, and under an order by the Civilian Production Administration, operating through the authority of temporary legislation. Since the Civilian Production Administration order is expected to expire in March, it is highly desirable that prompt consideration be given to the bill so that if it meets the approval of Congress there will be no hiatus between the present control and that which would be set up by the terms of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Administrator.

AMENDMENTS OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Attorney General, I introduce two bills to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

I wish my colleagues to understand that, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am simply providing a vehicle for the Attorney General to get before Congress certain bills which he is desirous of having enacted into law.

I wish it understood that it is not my intention to introduce all bills which he deems desirable, nor do I wish to be considered as sponsoring any of the bills which I may choose to introduce at his request. I merely desire to cooperate as far as possible with the Attorney General in matters affecting the judiciary.

The bills introduced by Mr. WILEY were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 460. A bill to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 461. A bill to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I introduce a bill and ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement concerning it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received, and the Senator will be heard.

The bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. TOBEY), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

This bill is substantially the same as the bill which was introduced at the last session by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and myself, and which was recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Education and Labor at that time.

The basic purpose of the bill is to assist the States to provide a minimum education in the poorest districts in the State. The bill proceeds on the theory of merely assisting the State. It is based on the theory that there shall be no interference in any way by the Federal Government with the educational system of the State, either in the curriculum or in the administration, or in any other respect, so that the 48 States may remain completely free to conduct their affairs as they wish to conduct them in this field. It proposes, however, to give them the money necessary to provide a basic minimum education for every child in the United States. The money will go only to States which make an effort in excess of the national effort compared to their own income; and States which, after they make that effort, are unable to provide an education costing at least $40 per child for every child in the State. The only requirement is that when they receive the money every school district in the State, whether it serves white pupils or black pupils, must undertake to see that that school district has $40 per child to spend during the year, from State and Federal sources. That is a low standard; it represents, of course, only the minimum basis in the poorest districts, and we hope that later it may be built up. States spending $40 within the poorest districts will probably average closer to $80 for all the children in the State. It is impossible completely to equalize educational opportunities within each State. The basic purpose is to afford to every American child an opportunity to obtain an education which at least will open up to his view the opportunities that lie before him and will enable him, if he has the ability and the capacity, to go forward in whatever activity he may choose to engage.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Ohio for the introduction of this bill on behalf of himself and the other Senators whose names he has indicated to the Senate, including my own. For a number of years the Committee on Education and Labor, the predecessor of the present Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had under consideration for some time the question of Federal aid for education. Through the years that committee held extended hearings on the question of Federal aid. I think there is no phase of the question concerning Federal aid to education which that committee did not thoroughly explore and on which it did not hear testimony from many witnesses.

The bill which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has introduced was considered for a long period of time at the last session of Congress by a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the then Senator from Delaware, Mr. Tunnell, the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself as chairman of the subcommittee.

Six of the seven members of that subcommittee supported the bill. It was supported by a very substantial majority of the Committee on Education and Labor, and was reported by the full committee. It was only because it was too late in the session that the bill was not considered by the Senate itself.

I very much hope that the bill may receive early action by the committee and be taken up by the Senate and passed. It is an important bill; it is an urgent bill. There is today in the United States a very grave crisis in education which can be adequately met only by the passage of this bill.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution which would specify that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding aliens.

For 25 years I have been attempting to have Congress submit such an amendment to the States. If it is submitted, I venture the prediction that it will receive the necessary approval of three-fourths of the States almost as speedily as the legislatures of that many States meet.

The stop-alien-representation-in-Congress amendment simply provides that representation shall be based upon the whole number of citizens, instead of upon the whole number of persons in each State.

Under the present provision of the Constitution, representation in the House is based upon the whole number of persons in each State, as shown by the latest decennial census preceding the year in which reapportionment is made.

The effect of the present provision is that a State which has 325,000 aliens counted, or a major fraction thereof, is entitled to an extra Representative in Congress, over and beyond the number it would have if only citizens were counted in making the apportionment. Such a State also is entitled to have an extra elector in the electoral college.

The apportionment of Representatives on the basis of the residence of aliens, of course, operates to decrease proportionately the number of Representatives who are apportioned to States with native-born and naturalized populations. This manifestly is unfair to American citizens.

It is more important in the National Legislature than in the States that representation be based upon the number of citizens, instead of upon aliens plus citizens. This is true for the simple reason that the alien populations, when counted in apportioning Representatives in Congress, also give such States a corresponding number of extra electors in electing the President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held public hearings on this proposal on September 25, 1945. On February 15, 1946, the committee made a report to the Senate which was unanimously in favor of the proposal.

The joint resolution as now introduced embodies amendments suggested by the committee in its report to the Senate.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope for early passage of this joint resolution, and subsequent ratification of the amendment.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANDREW J. VOLSTEAD—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on January 23, 1947, the Baltimore Sun printed a fine editorial about the late Congressman Andrew J. Volstead, who was one of the authors of the Capper-Volstead Act. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER VOLSTEAD ACT WHICH IS HIGHLY RESPECTABLE

When former Representative Andrew J. Volstead died the other day, most people thought at once of the Volstead Act—that is, the prohibition statute. That statute didn't work out so well and the whole experiment, perhaps noble in motive but assuredly deplorable in result, was finally abandoned.

But there was another Volstead Act rather less well known but rather more valid and, as it happens, with vivid and explicit meanings for us today in perhaps our most urgent problem. It is the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922, which exempted farm cooperatives from the antitrust laws—except—

Except that "if the Secretary of Agriculture shall have reason to believe that any such

association monopolizes or restrains trade in interstate or foreign commerce to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is unduly enhanced by reason thereof, he shall serve upon such association a complaint stating his charge in that respect [and] * * * requiring the association to show cause why an order should not be made directing it to cease and desist from monopolization or restraint of trade."

In other words, though Mr. Volstead and his colleagues in the Congress of 1922 wanted to give farmers a little leeway under the antitrust laws, they did not immunize farmers altogether. They left the heavy club of Government in the hands of Government to protect the whole people against abuse of the special privileges granted. Farmers could organize for collective bargaining, sure; but the very men who gave them that power were careful to frame remedies for any abuse of that power.

That is just the precaution which the post-1933 friends of labor in Congress and the courts have neglected to provide. The result has been a series of paralyzing strikes which worsened labor's standing with the public infinitely more than would have happened if those who framed our current labor policy had had Messrs. Volstead and CAPPER's simple faith that even among friends law and order pay. In casting about now for cures of intolerable union abuses, the new Congress may well pay special attention to the suggestions available in the Capper-Volstead Act.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA AT SENATOR OVERTON APPRECIATION DINNER

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Senator Overton appreciation dinner at the Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, November 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CLOSED SHOP—DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR WILEY AND MR. FRANK P. FENTON

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a newspaper debate on the subject of the closed shop between Senator WILEY and Mr. Frank P. Fenton, of the American Federation of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—STATEMENT BY JESSE C. SUTER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article in support of national representation for the District of Columbia, written by Jesse C. Suter, and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the last time this bill was called on the calendar I said that I did not wish to object to it, but I requested certain information, which information has not yet been received. Therefore I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL SHRINES PARK COMMISSION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 4 of the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), is amended by deleting therefrom the date "January 3, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 3, 1948."

SMALL BUSINESS AND TRANSPORTATION MONOPOLIES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I like to play fair with my colleagues, and to put them on notice. So, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, and that they may have freedom of mind, I advise them and put them on notice that I shall speak for not to exceed 30 minutes, and if any of them desire to leave and to return after I have concluded, it will be perfectly agreeable to me.

I should also like to say that I am about to speak on a subject which I am sure is very near and dear to the hearts of the members of the majority party, on this side of the aisle. The subject is "Small Business."

Mr. President, on this last day of January it may be useful to recall some of the words and votes in this Chamber during the first month of the Eightieth Congress. While they are still fresh in our memory they may be contrasted with other and contrary words and votes now hovering over the Senate. These other words and votes, perhaps to be spoken on the floor of the Senate in the second month of the Eightieth Congress, are now being borne to us on the wings of the bill pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to undermine the Sherman antitrust law and all antimonopoly laws. I refer to Senate bill 110, the Bulwinkle bill, so-called.

The sharp contrast between the principal performance of the Senate in this month of January—the creation of the two special investigating committees—and the attempt which will be made in the Senate in the second month of this year to break down the antimonopoly statutes, is striking. A discussion of the inconsistency between the two is important. I deem it necessary to bring the matter before the Senate even before the bill is reported to the floor. The contrast with our legislative actions of the present month should be discussed while the votes are still green in our memory.

In this month of January the thesis urged by the leaders of the majority was that special committees are required to redress wrongs done to the American people during the war. This was the theory advanced for continuing the Special Committee for War Investigations, and was made the basis for the Senate's continuation of that committee on January 22. Two days later the Special Committee on Small Business was created, on the stated premise that this was necessary to redress the wrong done to small business during the war.

Those who spoke for the creation of these special committees are soon going to have an opportunity to support their intention of redressing war events and helping small business. The forthcoming vote on the bill (S. 110) now pending in committee, to magnify big business monopoly at the expense of small business, will provide a fortunate and early occasion for a decisive negative vote on their part.

In the debate for the creation of the special committee on small business the majority leaders drove home, time and again, their assurance of the need for the special committee in order to break down the big business monopoly developed during the war years.

The author of Senate Resolution 20, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], indicated that his special committee had to correct "monopoly and centralization questions." He invoked the name and the language of the President of the United States to emphasize the need for this special committee on small business. I repeat the words of the President which the junior Senator from Nebraska quoted and used as the central justification for creating a Special Committee on Small Business:

> The antitrust laws should be implemented and, simultaneously, small business and new enterprise should be encouraged by research and credit programs.

Many of us listened carefully to the earnest address pleading the cause of small business against the big corporations—the address by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] in support of the resolution for a Special Committee on Small Business. I quote from his remarks:

> Why should there be a special committee for that purpose? I would state this as my reason: That during the war it was the big corporations that the Government supported. The Government gave the big corporations any number of millions of dollars to increase their plants. The Government constructed their buildings; it supplied their machinery; everything was channeled through the big corporations of the country to speed war production. Who got hurt? It was the little corporation, the small business, bound up in edicts, and directives, and regulations, and restrictions, and restraints, and rationings. Through the channeling of available material, small business was tangled and strangled.

In his splendid and moving address, the junior Senator from Illinois made the protection of the small businessman a Republican Party issue. He said:

> I say that now is the time for the Republican Party to represent the small business of the Nation. It ill befits the party which has condemned the Republican Party all these years for representing what they call property rights instead of human rights, big business instead of small business, now in effect, say, "No; we do not want to let you Republicans go forward with this work and represent little business * * *."
>
> In the last 15 years, under the Democratic regime, industry has become more concentrated and powerful than at any other time in the history of America. I, for one, Mr.

President, want to assume my full responsibility as a member of the steering committee and as a member of the committee which drafted the Reorganization Act. I hope the special committee shall be permitted to live and to function.

So deep was the appeal to the emotions in these addresses, designed to demonstrate the antimonopoly purposes of the supporters of this special committee and the monopoly leanings of its opponents, that the junior Senator from Nebraska said that the special committee he proposed "is the most important committee in the United States Senate."

In specifying the kind of thing that his special committee would do in order to remove the strangle hold of monopoly from the neck of the small businessman, the junior Senator from Nebraska spoke particularly of railroad freight rates and transportation matters.

That is the stated program of the Republican majority in the Senate. I accept it.

Now the leaders in the Senate of the party to which I have the honor to belong, and their followers in the Senate, mainly on the Republican side but also to some small extent on the Democratic side, are soon to have an opportunity to show the country that they will seize this, the first, opportunity to give full effect, by their rejection of the monopoly bill (S. 110) to the reasons for their vote in January on the subject of special committees.

The bill now in committee, and shortly to be reported to the Senate, gives to the transportation industry immunity from the Sherman antitrust law and immunity from the Clayton Act. The bill legislates out of existence all antitrust laws on our statute books, so far as they deal with any and every transaction involving monopolies, trusts, and restraints on trade, on the following subjects: Rates, fares, charges, charges as between carriers, classifications, divisions, allowances, time schedules, routes, interchange of facilities, settlement of claims, promotion of safety, and operation or service.

No matter how uninformed a person may be on the technical subject matter in the foregoing list of 13 categories which would be exempted by the bill from the antitrust statutes, he will nevertheless see that the proposed exemptions are indeed broad. They are, in fact, far greater than he might realize. Some effects are plain and obvious. No person in this country, and no article of consumption, will be unaffected by the proposal to exempt rate fixing and fare fixing from the antitrust laws.

The breadth of the exemptions may be illustrated by referring to the 13th in the list I have just given. I say now, exactly what the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and I said in our minority views last year.

The fair-seeming phrase "promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service" is so broad as to legalize every monopoly action in the transportation industries. It can be construed to include the financing, construction, and utilization of equipment, safety devices, facilities, stations, and terminals. It would include action to prevent the building of spur tracks or other facilities needed by small shippers, and to forestall new types of services necessary to promote the needs of small business in an advancing economy.

Approval of combinations of such wide scope would legalize private cartels in transportation.

The proposed exemptions from the antitrust laws would promote monopoly of all forms of transportation, not only railroads. It would eliminate competition among trucks, busses, water carriers, freight forwarders, and pipe-line companies, as well as railroads.

This bill (S. 110) proposes to break down the antitrust statutes. It would legalize not only the monopoly strangle hold of railroads on shippers and on trucking and water carriers, but it would intensify the strangle hold of the big railroads on small railroads. Even without legalizing such a monopoly through undermining the antitrust statutes, the big railroads already hold the small railroads in an iron grip.

On this subject we have the most authoritative evidence for which the Senate could ask. We have testimony by railroad presidents themselves. Their testimony was taken before a standing committee of the Senate, the Interstate Commerce Committee. Their testimony was analyzed and reported to the Senate by two Senators whom all Members of this body have for years been zealous to honor. I refer to the then senior Senator from Montana, Mr. Wheeler, who was for years a member of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and for additional years the distinguished chairman of that committee. I refer also to the then junior Senator from Missouri, now the President of the United States, who collaborated closely with the former Senator from Montana, and acquired vast knowledge of the subject matter of transportation. The two Senators were coauthors of the National Transportation Act of 1940.

In their report to the Senate these Senators, in behalf of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, summarized as follows the testimony which had been given to their committee by presidents of midwestern railroads, about the railroad association:

> Machinery for self-regulation has proved of little avail in the vital fields of freight-rate divisions, private-car rates, and Pullman Co. contracts. Railroad executives testified before this subcommittee that not only has nothing been achieved but that it is futile to expect any results from this railroad association, because it is dominated by a few powerful roads which are only working for their own interests and not the interests of the railroads as a whole.

Mr. President, I should like to present examples from their report based upon the testimony of railroad presidents and based upon the files of the railroad association, the Association of American Railroads. These examples fall within the proposed bumper crop of immunities which powerful railroads would reap from the railroad monopoly bill. First, I discuss the division of joint rates between two or more carriers participating in a joint or through haul of freight. The two distinguished Senators reported to the Senate that:

> Mr. Fred W. Sargent and Mr. Patrick H. Joyce, presidents, respectively, of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. and the Chicago Great Western, two roads classed as midwestern trunk lines, testified that they considered the division of rates * * * unfair to the midwestern trunk lines as opposed to the western transcontinental lines.

Why are they unfair? Because of the strangle hold that the powerful railroads have over the smaller railroads in the Middle West and South and Southwest.

Senators Wheeler and Truman pointed out:

> At the time of the subcommittee's hearings, March 1938, there were only two railroads in the midwestern trunk-line territory which were not bankrupt. A very considerable part of the traffic of roads in that territory is transcontinental freight received from connecting carriers, and Mr. Sargent stated that he believed the division situation was one factor contributing to the bankrupt condition of the western roads, while Mr. Joyce thought that a fair rate division would have kept the roads out of receivership at least for a while and possibly could have prevented bankruptcy altogether.

But surely, one would suppose, the small roads can bargain for fair terms. Senators Wheeler and Truman asked that question, and this is what they learned:

> If freight rates are so important and if rate divisions are largely arrived at by negotiated agreements among the railroads themselves, why have not the individual roads challenged the agreements? The answer, according to Mr. Sargent, is that it is a delicate thing to do, because the originating carrier may then take the traffic away from the protesting road.

In other words, small railroads, singly, are even now unable to bargain with powerful roads. Nor can they even get collective bargaining with other middle-sized railroads in their own territory. I read further from the report of the two Senators:

> If an individual road jeopardizes its position by complaining, the question then arises as to whether the western trunk lines can act as a unit in protesting divisions which are equally unfair to them all. But apparently there were also difficulties in that line of action.
>
> The two western trunk-line roads which were not bankrupt were the Illinois Central and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy. The former is controlled by the Union Pacific and the latter by the Great Northern and Northern Pacific, all three companies being western transcontinental lines. * * *
>
> The Illinois Central and the Burlington, being owned financially by the western transcontinental lines, were working in their interests rather than the interests of the midwestern trunk-lines group to which they belonged geographically.

So, first, we find the small railroad is unable to protect itself when it deals alone with the big road—for fear of losing business. Theoretically, it could even today, without any statute, weld into one collective bargaining unit all the smaller roads in its territory. But when it tries to do that it finds, among those roads, a fifth column—companies controlled by the big railroads directly.

One might say there is a national railroad association to which the smaller roads can appeal—the powerful and respected Association of American Railroads, which has machinery for the adjustment of disputes between railroads.

Let us see what happens when the small roads come before the bar of that association. I quote a painful story told by Senators Wheeler and Truman:

Presidents of two of the member roads in the AAR testified on their experience in securing assistance through the machinery of the AAR on rate divisions.

Mr. Sargent, president of the Chicago North Western, said that he had never considered using the Association of American Railroads' arbitration machinery because he believed it would be useless. Most of the directors of the association are connected with the eastern and far western roads. Asking them to readjust the rates at their own expense for the benefit of the middle western roads would be impossible in Mr. Sargent's opinion.

Mr. Sargent, president of the Chicago North Western, believed that not only the directors of the association were opposed to changing the divisions but that the method of voting in the association made it clearly impossible to obtain any satisfaction.

In short, when the president of the small railroad arrives at the national headquarters of the association, he finds the monopoly of the big railroads even more securely entrenched.

I now take up another of the examples of monopoly control presented to the Senate by Senators Wheeler and Truman. There is the important matter of private car lines—special refrigerators and tank cars, whose equipment must be leased by smaller railroads from a few powerful railroad corporations which own these car lines. These big railroads had such a monopoly from the very beginning that they never needed to get a bill in Congress to raise their rentals. I quote from the report of the two Senators:

Many railroad executives have felt that they were being exploited by the private car companies, paying excessive charges while the owners of the cars reap handsome profits. This view was expressed by one railroad president in the following testimony:

"We are paying 2 cents a mile for these cars, loaded and empty, which I believe is too much. There are 387,000 of these cars in the United States, and last year the railroads paid them $90,000,000, an average of $316 per car. Many of the cars are old and antiquated and almost rusted out. That is almost a 15-percent return. The companies that own these cars are making nice, handsome profits, while the railroads are suffering for just enough money to pay their own employees and buy materials and supplies."

These inflated rents conceal waste and inefficiency for which the smaller roads must pay. As one of their railroad presidents said:

There is another terrific waste in this matter, and that is in times of depression these cars are routed all around Robin Hood's barn in order to earn mileage. * * * We ought to have a rule which would provide that we would not pay mileage on these refrigerator cars except for the shortest mileage, and then if they wanted to route them all around the country they would not get this mileage for the long route. They would be paid for the shortest mileage between two given points.

The two Senators told the Senate:

The profits accruing to the private-car companies may be estimated by examining the huge dividends paid by the Pacific Fruit Express, the largest company, operating over one-third of the total private-car mileage in the country. Between 1930 and 1936 the Pacific Fruit Express paid almost $120,000,000 in dividends and the dividend rate reported by the company ranged from 30 percent to 103 percent. These profits, according to the president of the Chicago North Western, were made at the expense of the railroads.

The profit made by this private car line at the expense of the smaller railroads was for the benefit of its owners, two of the most powerful railroads in the country—the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific. As a matter of fact, a large proportion of the income of those two railroads is in the form of profits of the car line they own, profits which are contributed to those two railroads by the smaller railroads that find themselves at the mercy of these powerful monopolistic concerns. In the period investigated by Senators Wheeler and Truman—1930 to 1936—the Pacific Fruit Express Co., the private car line they own, paid to the Southern Pacific dividends totaling $70,000,000 and to the Union Pacific, $45,000,000. These dividends, taken out of the depleted treasuries of the monopoly-gouged smaller railroads, constituted from 13 to 65 percent of the total annual income of the two monopolistic roads. In other words, in some years more than half the income of a big monopolistic railroad came out of the pockets of small railroads—and, I might add, out of the pockets of farmers and small businessmen who used these small roads.

With respect to these private-car rates, also, small roads were unable to get any relief from the monopoly-dominated Association of American Railroads.

The small roads tried the time-honored Government device of having an investigation made—but by their own railroad association. They asked the association to make a study of private-car rates. But such a study would show the extortionate profits exacted from the small railroads by the powerful big ones. The study was spiked by the presidents of the big roads.

A dramatic picture of how the large railroad corporations treat the small railroads, even when the large ones are subject to the antitrust laws, was given to the Senate by Senators Wheeler and Truman, as follows:

The Association of American Railroads repeatedly expressed as its aim self-regulatory methods which would prove that the industry could continue under private ownership on a workable basis. But insofar as the question of private cars was concerned it is doubtful whether the railroads had done more than escape from the Scylla of government regulations to the Charybdis of domination by the Union Pacific and its allies.

So complete is the present monopoly power of a few large railroads over the smaller railroads in the Middle West, the South, and other portions of the United States, that the former can treat the presidents of small railroads as if they did not even exist, despite their attendance at meetings of the presidents of all the railroads in their association. Senators Wheeler and Truman quoted at some length the testimony of one of the smaller railroad presidents, as follows:

I would like to add that this thing has been taken up verbally before the directors of the Association of American Railroads by our Mr. Parsons on two occasions, and, as Mr. Sargent has stated, the people who were on the board were directly concerned about the thing, and they were looking out of the window when we were trying to discuss it with them, and they adjourned the meeting in our faces when we wanted to take it up. * * * I was not feeling very happy, so I did not pay much attention to who was closing the door in my face, and just got out * * * they gave us a chance to talk, but they did not listen. I was talking to myself most of the time.

How did the Senate learn these inside stories? Some of the smaller railroads were in bankruptcy. Their presidents who in all previous years might speak within the association without being heard, and in public had to follow the line of the monopoly corporations, found themselves to be railroad operators for Federal judges. A few of them, taking their subsequent careers in their hands, burst all bounds for once, and revealed innermost secrets of the association to the Senate committee. Whether that can happen again in later times, one cannot say. Normally, officers of small roads must keep silent except to voice the dominant monopoly line.

The pending bill to break down the monopoly statutes gives railroads a monopoly power in their dealings with shippers and consumers, and increases the present monopolistic power of big railroads over small railroads. The bill would also exempt from all the antitrust statutes, first, the bankers who are all-powerful in railroad affairs; second, the manufacturers of equipment, many of whom have close personal ties with railroad bankers and railroad directors, at the expense of the railroads themselves; and third, powerful industrial corporations which are in some instances more powerful than the great railroad corporations.

The proposed exemption from the antitrust laws would set up a "private government" more powerful than any Government agency dealing with transportation.

I repeat what I said last year about the threat to our American system, including small business. Senate bill 110, the railroad monopoly bill, would cartelize the transportation industry. Transportation costs are a major element in determining the prices of goods in other industries. The power to control the cost of transportation is a power which may be used to dictate whether other businesses, particularly small business, shall enjoy competitive success or be stifled to death. Analysis of the bill shows that it would permit the legalization of private controls over the Nation's

economy not only by transportation combinations but, under the broad terms of the bill, by industrial and financial combines working in alliance with combinations in the transportation industry. This proposed legislation sets a pattern for supplanting the American system of competitive enterprise and for the cartelization of the Nation's entire economy.

The farmers and small businessmen and consumers do not have to theorize about the damage the rail monopoly bills would do to them. They, and particularly the farmers and businessmen and consumers in Nebraska and adjoining Midwestern States, already know. In their very midst, in the Federal court in the home State of the junior Senator from Nebraska, the author of the resolution to protect small business, the Federal Government is now trying to stop railroad monopoly. The pending rail monopoly bill would throw that lawsuit and the protection of the small man into the wastebasket.

If enacted into law, the rail monopoly bill would cut the antitrust laws from the heart of our economy—the transportation industry. Such legislation would be an opening wedge in entirely destroying the antitrust laws, designed to guard and preserve the American system of free enterprise. A dangerous precedent would be set, encouraging other powerful groups to seek legislation immunizing them from established laws and from the power of the courts to enforce them.

We are told that S. 110 will place power in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Free enterprise and prohibition of monopolies are matters of high policy, and have been ingrained in our national economic life for many decades. Either Congress says that we stick to that policy or exceptions can be made to it. Do we want any commission to have the power to make inroads on that high policy? That would be an invitation, an incitation, to break down the antitrust policy of our Nation. What would we foresee as the effect of a bill which says "Do not kill your innocent neighbor, unless a commission approves it"? Suppose we were to enact a law forbidding theft, unless a commission approved it. Shall we say that the Ten Commandments are fine, unless a commission grants immunity to powerful persons to violate those Commandments? Are not our antimonopoly laws part of the sacred commandments of our Nation in the economic field?

This is not the first attempt to break down the monopoly statutes for the benefit of special groups. Such an attempt was made only recently, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to assist insurance companies, and particularly property-insurance companies, which have made arrangements, in restraint of trade, extorting excessive insurance premiums from the American consumer and the American businessman, including the small businessman. That effort to break down the monopoly statutes was defeated largely through the single-handed efforts of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, also, there was an attempt to help the railroad corporations to break down the monopoly statutes. That attempt failed. It is now being renewed.

The Republican leadership in the Senate has urged in this Congress that we Republicans are the party opposed to monopoly, and that the Democrats, who were in the majority until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, were promoting monopoly and big business. The attempt to break down antitrust statutes failed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I trust that such attempts will not be permitted to succeed in the Eightieth Congress under the majority control of my party.

Let me make it clear at this point that I have great respect indeed for the stanch integrity and great sincerity of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. He has a wide knowledge of technical railroad matters, not surpassed or even equaled, in my opinion, by that of any other Member of this body. I regret to find myself opposed to him on this subject, but my long-standing opposition to monopoly and my devotion to the antitrust statutes, which are a bulwark of all the people, leaves me no other course.

Let me refer to the present status of Senate bill 110. Unless the railroads change their strategy, Congress will soon have an opportunity to vote on this bill for the entrenchment of monopoly and big corporations.

The word has spread around the Capitol that the big railroads and their association are confident that they can get this bill for the creation and entrenchment of monopolies through the Senate with the greatest of ease.

I trust that this expectation will be defeated by all Senators. I look especially to my colleagues on the Republican side and those on the Democratic side who voted for the resolution to create a special committee for small business. This is their great opportunity to mobilize and speed to the defense of the small businessman. It is a far greater opportunity than any chance they can ever get to help the small businessman, through the functioning of their committee. Investigating committees can only make studies and inquiries. They cannot legislate. Nothing that an investigating committee can do will be more than a drop in the bucket compared with the major flood that will be unloosed against the small businessman by dynamiting all the antitrust statutes that have been in force for half a century or more.

Let not the propaganda dishearten those who want to protect the small businessman and the farmers and the great multitude of consumers in this country. We have a real opportunity to defeat this threat to the public and to our economy of free enterprise. This is shown by the recent votes in this body. I refer to them, not to revive debate on special committees, but to point to our chance for victory now.

In the votes on the creation of the special committees, if we count absent Senators for whom pairs were refused, the resolutions were carried by a margin of only one and two votes, respectively.

Let us assume, however, that the supporters of the rail monopoly bill can muster—as I trust they cannot—a majority in the Senate and the House. They can still be defeated by a veto. A veto can still save small business in America, farmers in America, the workingmen of America, and consumers in America.

I appeal to the President of the United States to make it clear that he will veto the attempt to wreck the antitrust statutes in case the bill for this purpose reaches him. Though he had no opportunity to veto the legislative action on the recent resolutions, he can prevent the undermining of the antitrust statutes if the bill should be squeezed through Congress.

The reports which he submitted to the Senate with reference to the railroad industry have shown that in past years he has been on the side of the people against monopoly. I say to those of my colleagues in this Chamber who are on the same side that we should go forward in this struggle with every confidence that if this bill passes the two branches of Congress it will meet a veto in the White House. Then if we shall have shown sufficient strength in the voting in each Chamber, it will become clear that a veto of this bill cannot be overridden in Congress.

I shall close with one special plea to my Republican colleagues. Our leaders have said on the floor of the Senate in words that I have already quoted that our party is the party of the small businessman, and not the party of big corporations and of monopoly. Let us avail ourselves of the wonderful opportunity which will come to us in all probability in February of this year to demonstrate that no bill to break down the antitrust statutes can pass through Congress while the Republicans hold a majority.

FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES (S. REPT NO. 9)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I file with the Senate the final report of the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources. I shall not now take the time of the Senate to discuss the report at length except to say that, in addition to the committee text, the document contains the concurring views of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who devoted full time to the study conducted by the committee. I make this statement at this time because notice has been given to the press that the report would be filed immediately after the convening of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in filing the report, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there was originally appropriated for the use of the committee, from the contingent funds of the Senate, the sum of

$25,000. Of that sum there was expended during the chairmanship of the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, $12,372.66, leaving a balance, as of February 9, 1945, of $12,627.34.

From February 15, 1945, to April 30, 1946, under the present chairmanship, there was expended the sum of $10,218.12, leaving a balance of $2,409.22. In June 1946, an additional appropriation was made in the sum of $7,500 so that at that time there was available $9,909.22. Since that time the sum of $5,316.98 has been expended, leaving on hand at this moment of the total appropriation of $32,500 a balance of $4,592.24. Unpaid obligations have been incurred in a sum not to exceed $1,000, so that the final unexpended balance to revert to the Senate will be approximately $3,500.

I desire also, Mr. President, to ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the record of distribution of the printed hearings of this committee. The members of the committee are entitled to take considerable satisfaction from the fact that the Superintendent of Documents has sold to the public 7,801 copies of the various issues.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Record of distribution, hearings, Senate Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources

Requisition No.	Title	Cost	Total number furnished Petroleum Committee	Total number distributed by Petroleum Committee	Balance on hand at Petroleum Committee	Ordered by Superintendent of Documents	Sold by Superintendent of Documents	Balance on hand at GPO	Furnished depository libraries by GPO	Furnished other libraries by GPO	Furnished on departmental requisitions by GPO
72852	Foreign Contracts Act	$0.40	1,000	1,000	----------	76	75	1	235	37	280
74741	New Sources of Petroleum in the United States	.75	1,500	1,400	100	1,033	986	47	236	31	173
83452	American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries	1.00	1,400	1,275	125	500	467	33	236	37	173
83511	Petroleum Requirements—Postwar	.25	2,000	1,850	150	636	377	259	236	31	173
80394	Wartime Petroleum Policy Under P. A. W.	1.25	1,400	1,291	109	560	467	93	236	37	119
79361	War Emergency Pipe-line Systems and Other Petroleum Facilities	1.00	1,400	1,299	101	802	564	238	258	37	103
85112	The Independent Petroleum Co	1.00	1,400	1,300	100	4,861	4,728	133	236	37	100
89804	Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior	.10	1,000	847	153	670	137	533	236	37	85
	Total	--------	11,100	10,262	838	9,138	7,801	1,337	1,909	284	1,206

Total number printed		23,637
Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources		11,100
Government Printing Office:		
Superintendent of Documents	9,138	
Depository libraries	1,909	
Other libraries	284	
Departmental requisitions	1,206	
		12,537
Total number distributed		21,462
Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources		10,262
Government Printing Office:		
Superintendent of Documents	7,801	
Depository libraries	1,909	
Other libraries	284	
Departmental requisitions	1,206	
		11,200
Balance		2,175
Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources		838
Government Printing Office		1,337

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter which the chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources received from the chief counsel of the committee, Mr. Henry S. Fraser, resigning from that position. Mr. Fraser was appointed to the staff of the committee when the committee was first organized. He has done a very excellent professional piece of work for the committee, and I feel that the filing of the final report should not be made without notice on the floor of the Senate of the excellent service he has rendered in the conduct of the hearings and the preparation of the report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING
PETROLEUM RESOURCES,
January 24, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Now that the committee's report, containing the recommendations for a national petroleum policy both for the immediate and the more distant future, has been completed and will be submitted by you to the Senate within the next few days, I believe that the time has come for me to resign as the committee's counsel, which I hereby do, effective upon presentation of the report to the Senate.

My association with the members of the committee, and the nature of the important tasks undertaken by the group, have been a source of keen pleasure to me from the outset. It has been an inspiration to work with all of you and to witness the conscientious and patriotic labor bestowed by yourself and your colleagues upon the formulation of a sound petroleum policy for the United States.

I trust that the recommendations of the committee will find general acceptance not only in the Senate but in the country at large. If the recommendations are followed, I venture to predict that, whatever may be the ultimate fate of this Nation, history will not record its demise because of lack of oil.

I also hope that the committee will be continued as a special committee by the Senate, in order that the vital oil questions, both existing and future, and affecting the welfare of the Nation in peace and in war, will receive the immediate, uninterrupted, and expert attention that they merit at the hands of the Senate.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY S. FRASER,
Chief Counsel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the tenor of the remarks which were made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] with respect to the importance of antitrust procedure, I venture to recommend to him and to all the Members of the Senate a reading of this report, because it shows rather graphically, it seems to me, the effect upon world economy of the expansion of business in the hands of great units. I say this without any thought of criticism, but only to call the attention of the Senate to the facts which are set forth in this document.

I believe that the time has come when the Congress and the people of the United States must decide definitely whether they desire to maintain a competitive economy or whether they are willing to drift into authoritarianism. The authoritarian end is inevitable if the drift is not stopped. If the people of the United States actually desire to maintain a free economy, they must realize that our economy is no longer one of individuals operating with their own resources and their own labor, but is a collective economy dominated by giant corporations with sometimes hundreds of thousands of stockholders and hundreds of thousands of employees who constitute indeed collective industrial enterprises.

That fact which confronts us, regardless of how we may think about it, is one of the most important, if not the most important for the consideration of leaders in business and in government throughout the world. Collectivism in business leads inevitably to collectivism in government.

EXEMPTIONS FROM ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in regard to the subject discussed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] a while ago.

During the previous Congress I voted against the Bulwinkle bill in the committee, which then was the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and which is now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not because it involved simply railroads but because I deplored the tendency in the Congress to undertake to forestall decisions of the Supreme Court by legislation taking out of the category of corporations coming under the antitrust laws any group of corporations. An effort of that kind was made in regard to insurance companies. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] contributed in a very constructive and statesmanlike way, as did also the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], to prevent what was attempted

in the first instance to be done in that regard. In my judgment there is no more reason why railroads should be exempt from the antitrust laws than that airplanes or bus lines or any other form of transportation that is charged with a public service should be exempt from those laws. By analogy, we might say that the automobile industry, which certainly is a very major factor today in our transportation system, and is charged with a public duty, ought also to be exempt from the antitrust laws, and that the steel companies, which supply products to transportation companies and manufacturing concerns, by reason of the fact that they are charged with a public interest, ought also to be exempt from the antitrust laws.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let me inquire whether the industries the Senator has named—the automobile industry and the steel industry—are regulated by a public service commission which prescribes their rates and governs them with an iron hand.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the automobile industry and the steel industry are not regulated, in a sense, by a public commission set up by Congress for their regulation. They are regulated by the antitrust laws. Their conduct is regulated. Certainly the air-line transportation companies are regulated by a public commission. The bus lines and the steamboat companies are regulated by a commission created by the Congress of the United States. So I see no reason why the railroads, simply because they are railroads, should be exempted from the application of the antitrust laws.

I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has made a definite contribution to the solution of this problem by the very able address he has delivered. Probably I am induced to say that because his address conforms to my own views, expressed in the last Congress on that subject. I shall vote against the bill again if it is brought forward, but I hope it will not be brought forward, because I do not believe there can be any justification for removing any one type of corporations, no matter what they may be, from the application of the antitrust laws merely because their rates and practices may happen to be regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission which was created by the Congress of the United States.

WISCONSIN CENTENNIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the whole State of Wisconsin is joyously looking forward to the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the Badger State to the Union, which will be celebrated on May 29, 1948. In line with the plans for the commemoration of the centennial, I have just heard from the Acting Postmaster General that he sees no reason why my suggestion for a special Wisconsin centennial stamp should not be adopted. On a similar matter the Librarian of Congress has now advised me of his full and eager cooperation with my suggestion for the holding of a 3- to 4-month exhibition in the Library in commemoration of the centennial. Furthermore, my bill, Senate bill 126, instructing the Director of the Mint to prepare 500,000 50-cent coins in commemoration of the centennial, has been referred to a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and I am hoping for early action on it there.

Appropriately enough, I have just received a very interesting and stimulating poem entitled "Wisconsin" by a poet-priest, Father Henry Stehling. The poem was sent in by a brother cleric, and it reflects the beauties and splendors of my State, which Father Stehling, a native of Wisconsin, knows so well. His 33 years as a priest have been spent primarily in the country amidst the natural splendors of the Badger State. Let me add that a volume of poetry by Father Stehling is soon to be published, and his verses have already received wide renown. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Father Stehling's poem be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN

Its playgrounds, parks, its shrines and homes,
On highways, byways where one roams,
In valley, plain, upon the hills,
Wisconsin always, always thrills.

On fertile hillside, valley deep,
Contented cattle graze with sheep;
Here fancy poultry, hogs one sees,
And splendid fur farms, dogs, and bees.

Its dairy herds in steady stream
Send butter, cheese, and milk and cream
To all the world, the finest grade
That nature, man has ever made.

With agriculture, industry,
In up-to-date diversity,
Produces its commodities
For mankind's joy, necessities.

Religious, tolerant, and kind,
In politics, an open mind,
Progressive in its social rules,
With high ideals in all its schools.

In forests, lakes, the sportsmen wise
Wisconsin find a paradise.
Abundant game in woods is found,
Its streams and lakes with fish abound.

In work, endeavor, sports or play,
In music, mention what you may,
Wisconsin stands out ev'ry way,
The Eden of the U. S. A.

—*H. C. Stehling.*

FORMULA FOR COAL PEACE—STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES M. COX

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, during the coal strike before Christmas the attention of the Nation was largely directed toward a suggestion by a distinguished citizen of the United States, and of the State of Florida, a former Governor of Ohio, Hon. James M. Cox, for handling problems of this character in the future. Governor Cox suggested that Congress should enact legislation enabling the coal industry of the Nation to be organized and operated under an authority in spirit comparable to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senate will do well to study and consider these words of a distinguished American citizen of broad experience in government.

Every Member of this body knows Governor Cox for his record as Governor of Ohio, as the Democratic Presidential nominee in 1920, and for his continued far-sighted, active national citizenship for more than half a century. He has drawn upon his memoirs recently to complete a historical autobiography, and the vast store of knowledge and experience in that volume is valuable in this Nation's current history.

Governor Cox's views on the proper system for handling one of the Nation's vital industries are based upon his broad experience in public affairs, and his concern for labor and industry, particularly as they relate to the general welfare, and we may be sure his recommendations are sincere and unselfish.

Mr. President, I should like not only to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article containing the statement of Governor Cox, but I suggest to the committee or committees considering labor and industrial legislation that his suggestion, and the basic proposal it advances, be considered along with the various bills and proposals which may come before them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMULA FOR COAL PEACE—GOVERNOR COX SUGGESTS TVA SET-UP FOR MINING

DAYTON, OHIO, November 28.—Former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1920, said today that Congress should enact legislation enabling the Nation's coal industry to be "organized and operated under an authority in spirit comparable to" the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"We have allowed control of this prime necessity—coal—to be placed so carelessly that at the behest of one man the industry is in collapse," Cox said. "This situation must be taken in hand firmly as a whole."

Stating that miners "have been left to live in squalor, not knowing how to live themselves or how the rest of the country lives," Cox said, "the miners believe, with some justification, that John L. Lewis has been their only friend.

"With the power over coal now in the hands of one man, there rises a dynasty in coal maintained with the pomp of a kingly throne.

"In my judgment there is one clear answer. The mining industry and the people employed in it must be humanized. To that end the industry must be organized and operated under an authority in spirit comparable to that which is lifting the Tennessee Valley to new heights of happiness, efficiency, and prosperity.

"The conservation of coal, and much more, the conservation of the manhood linked to coal, calls for this approach. Lacking such a measure, the end of this strike will but be the beginning of more such strikes to come.

"This may be called socialistic. I know of no measure for human welfare that has not been denounced at its beginning by some vested interests as socialistic.

"Congress should pass at once an act providing for such an authority and laying out rules to govern it. Congress should further set up at once a committee of inquiry so that the whole country may see the state of things in the mining camps and realize how neglectful we have been."

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS UNEXPENDED BALANCE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. Kurt Borchardt, the counsel of the Surplus Property Subcommittee, setting forth the financial status of the committee. This subcommittee of the old Committee on Military Affairs in the last Congress had, for example, jurisdiction of surplus property. It brought out the legislation on stock piling and the legislation on contract settlements, it cooperated in bringing out the reconversion act, and it covered a large field of activity.

In the report which I have filed, report No. 1021, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, there is a full and detailed statement of the expenditures up to that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY,
January 29, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Senate resolution 236, agreed to March 1946, made available $48,300 for the 12-month period beginning April 1, 1946.

Together with the balance then on hand the total available amounted to $59,730.77.

As of January 31, 1947, the Surplus Property Subcommittee will have on hand an unexpended balance of $31,051.49.

The total amount expended between April 1, 1946, and January 31, 1947, amounts to $28,679.28, of which more than $26,000 were expended for salaries while the balance went for reporting, telephone and telegraph, travel, and miscellaneous office expenses.

Sincerely yours,

KURT BORCHARDT,
Counsel, Surplus Property Subcommittee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the letter of Mr. Borchardt to which I now refer shows that as of this date, January 31, 1947, the date upon which the authority of the committee to make any expenditures expires, there is on hand a balance of $31,051.49, which, of course, reverts to the treasury of the Senate.

Let me add, Mr. President, that Mr. Borchardt has served the committee with conspicuous ability and objectivity.

I wish also to lay on the desk of the Presiding Officer a problem which, as chairman of this expiring committee, I am unable to decide.

The Committee on Armed Services has taken jurisdiction of a resolution which was offered by myself with respect to the disposal of the Big Inch pipe lines. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] a few days ago submitted a resolution asking for an appropriation of $100,000 for the Committee on Executive Expenditures, as I understood, to enable that committee to handle problems relating to surplus property.

The committee of which I was chairman has files and papers which will be of value, but until a decision is made by the Presiding Officer or by the Senate as to which committee will have jurisdiction of surplus property, and of the other matters covered by the files, I am at a loss to know to whom to turn the files over, and I should like to have the advice of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is typical of several questions of reference which are capable of two or even sometimes three different answers, and each case has to be studied by itself. The Chair is not prepared to answer the Senator this afternoon, but will be at the next session of the Senate.

VETERANS' RIGHTS IN THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, month after month veterans in the State of South Dakota have been trying to get access to some surplus property, largely without success. Many of these veterans have tried to purchase articles of various kinds, from trucks to caterpillar tractors, road machines, and so forth, but they do not get anywhere with their applications. The War Assets Administration apparently is indifferent to the applications of the farmer veterans of South Dakota.

In this connection a matter has just been called to my attention which I think should be given consideration by the Special War Investigating Committee. The War Assets Administration advises me this morning that the George A. Fuller Co., located at Salt Lake City, Utah, received a fee of $300,000 for looking after surplus property, and that a company known as the Walsh Construction Co., of New York, received a fee of $25,000 for doing similar work.

Mr. President, from my experience with the farmer veterans of my State who are seeking to obtain some little part of the war surplus property in various places, I think such exorbitant fees collected by these companies, whoever they are or whatever they are, are certainly out of line, and I suggest that the War Investigating Committee give consideration to an investigation of the collection of such fees as those I have mentioned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from South Dakota, I should like to say that, as I recall, it was suggested that the disposal of surplus war assets should be in the hands of the Committee on Armed Services. The chairman of that committee is not present at the moment, and I do not make the statement authoritatively, but if I am correct in what I think he said, he was perfectly willing to have that matter referred to his committee.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of both the House and of the Senate, plan to conduct a joint investigation of the disposal of surplus property. This investigation will not only include disposal by the War Assets Administration but the disposal of surplus property by any other agency of the Government, regardless of where it may be.

We are simply awaiting an appropriation by this body before proceeding with the investigation, which is to be under the direction of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I think no time should be lost in starting the investigation.

What the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has pointed out is merely one thing that is going on.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I realize that.

Mr. AIKEN. I feel that if steps are not taken pretty soon, almost within the next few days, to look into the disposal of surplus war assets, we may face a demoralization of price structure of certain commodities throughout the country. For instance, in one city the War Assets Administration may put up a certain quantity of goods of a certain quality, at a fixed price, and a customer will buy at that price. In another city, they will offer the same quality of goods, perhaps in equal amount or in varying amounts, to the highest bidder. The highest bid may be less than half the amount which the customer in the other city paid as a fixed price. In some instances, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been lost to the Government by this slipshod method of disposal, because purchasers who paid the higher prices have come back and asked for a refund of the difference.

I understand this has now reached such a point that thousands of claims for refunds are being made by persons who have bought surplus property at one price, only to find that their competitors have been able to buy at half the price. The situation demands the immediate attention of Congress. There is no time to be lost.

Our committee is set up, ready to do the work, just as soon as we obtain an appropriation from the Senate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. Certainly, there is no justification for paying a fee of $300,000 to anyone for peddling surplus property.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that, while the committee is investigating the matter to which he has referred, I should like to call its attention to the fact that the Army has not released thousands of jeeps, automobiles, and trucks, which are piled up at Ogden, Utah, and that some steps should be taken to assure their release by the Army. General Hughes himself has said that thousands upon thousands of trucks, jeeps, and automobiles are rusting there, going to waste. I hope the Senator's committee will also investigate that matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that when I first appointed the subcommittee it was to investigate the affairs of the War Assets Administration. I was advised that this authority might not be broad enough to permit investigation into property still held by the War Department or other departments of Government. For that

reason, I am broadening the authority of the subcommittee to authorize them to investigate the disposal of surplus property wherever they may find it, because I do not believe that the War Department, the Navy Department, or any other department of the Government, should be exempted from such investigation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield further, I should like to say that I hope that in the course of the investigation the Senator from Vermont will also find some way to enable small States, such as Montana, North Dakota, and others, to obtain some of this surplus property within their borders, in order that their citizens may not have to travel many hundred miles to locate jeeps, or trucks, or tractors. I think some such provision should be made, and I think the Senator's committee is the proper one to handle the problem.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, just so soon as the money is appropriated, I am sure the subcommittee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], will go into all phases affecting the disposal of surplus property, including the matter just mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota. Many others have spoken to me about that particular matter, indicating that it is impossible for the little fellow to get surplus property. In some instances the distance he is required to travel is too great. He may be required to go first to one city and then to another, and by the time he returns to his home he will have spent for traveling expenses all the money he intended to use in the purchase of surplus property.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Having in mind the comments of the Senator from Vermont, I will say that a farmer in my State, who applied to the War Assets Administration in South Dakota for a scraper, was finally told, after months and months of delay, that he could get one down in Georgia. Imagine sending a farmer from South Dakota to Georgia to buy a scraper.

Mr. AIKEN. And it is entirely possible that when he got to Georgia he would be sent to Galveston or somewhere else, before he found a scraper.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not sure I understood the Senator correctly in regard to the broadening of the scope of his subcommittee. As I understood the Senator, he said that the original scope was to include the disposal of surplus property by the War Assets Administration.

Mr. AIKEN. It covered the War Assets Administration only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I further understand that the Senator now proposes to broaden the scope of the investigation so as to cover surplus property wherever it may exist.

Mr. AIKEN. Wherever it may be found.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, we have had some experience with instances of this kind: An item does not become surplus until declared to be such by either the War or Navy Department; in which case it is turned over to the War Assets Administration. Does the Senator propose that his subcommittee shall have authority to go into supplies that are held by the Army and the Navy, perhaps for strategic purposes, prior to the time they are declared surplus by the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. AIKEN. If the War or Navy Department is holding back hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of supplies which are in a deteriorating condition, which perhaps ought to be declared surplus, I believe that my committee has full authority, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to ascertain the facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, Mr. President, there are two situations. We found a number of instances of the War and Navy Departments having declared to be surplus certain supplies which would be held at an Army or a Navy depot pending actual possession being taken of them by the War Assets Administration. That is one type of situation. Another situation is where the Army and the Navy are keeping for use of the military forces certain supplies which in their judgment are necessary for the national defense program. Is it proposed that this subcommittee—I am merely seeking information for clarification—shall go into that phase of the matter?

Mr. AIKEN. If the property is not needed for use by the armed forces, or if it is being wasted, or is deteriorating, I feel the subcommittee would have full authority to investigate. For instance, I understand the largest naval depot in the Senator's own State has declared as surplus perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property. I do not know that I can pronounce the name of the depot.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is Port Hueneme.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall leave that to the Senator from California. I understand the declaration of surplus at that yard was recently revoked; I do not know why.

I feel, though, that our committee, which is authorized to investigate the operations of the Government at all levels with a view to promoting economy and efficiency, would have every right to inquire and to find out why surplus property is handled in this way—why it is declared surplus, why a declaration is revoked, or whatever else takes place in regard to property, which appears not to be necessary to the armed services.

The armed services, of course, are entitled to keep any property that is necessary. The subcommittee would have no power to force them to dispose of it. But, as I understand the law, we do have the power of investigation to determine whether they are withholding from the market huge quantities of goods which they will never use, the holding of which will result in a real loss to the taxpayers.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I see the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on the floor and I should like to address a query to him. As I understand, the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program held a meeting this morning and heard testimony. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I did not attend the entire meeting of the committee, because I was obliged to attend a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from California tell the Senate why the meeting was held before the minority had announced its membership on the committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the chairman of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, said that he had communicated to the hold-over members from the minority side of the Chamber relative to the proposed meeting, and he also had communicated with those Senators whom he understood were going to be members of the committee representing the minority, the reasons for holding the particular hearing at this time. The witness who appeared before the committee is retiring from the Government service today. He has just been married. He is going on his honeymoon tonight and would not be available for testimony if his testimony had not been heard today. That reason was given by the chairman of the committee to the minority members who were on the committee, and also to those he understood would be placed on the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine, the chairman of the committee, is a very able man and a very farsighted man, but I, myself, did not know until 12 o'clock today who was going to compose the minority membership of this committee, and how the Senator from Maine, even with his great powers of necromancy and clairvoyance should have known in advance who these minority members would be is somewhat beyond me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What was done, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, may demonstrate the investigative capacity of the investigating committee. But I will state further that the chairman guessed correctly as to two of the Senators who were to be members of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the chairman's imagination will not take him as far afield in the matter of war investigation as he heretofore seems to have gone in indulging in prophecy respecting who should be named members of the committee from the minority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that the chairman's investigative capacity seems to be very good, because two of the Senators with whom he communicated turned out to have been named as members of the committee by the minority.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose that to be 50 percent correct is about all we can expect under the circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the only suggestion I desire to make is that it seems to me that the minority members of the committee should also have a right to examine any important witness who appears before the committee. Simply because a witness is going on a honeymoon is not a sufficient reason for denying Senators on this side of the aisle the right to cross examine one who may be a material witness. If he is as important as the majority apparently thinks he is, no meeting should have been held unless minority members of the committee were present. I hope that what has just occurred is not a practice which is going to be followed in the future by the majority in holding meetings of this kind when the minority members are not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished minority whip that there was certainly no endeavor on the part of the investigating committee to show any disrespect to our colleagues on the minority side of the aisle. I call the Senators' attention to the fact, however, that the minority has had more than 10 days in which to make their appointments to the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, and because there are a number of matters of importance pending, the committee did not feel under the circumstances I have outlined, that it could delay indefinitely the holding of hearings.

FURNISHING AUTOMOBILES TO DISABLED VETERANS—REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to a parliamentary situation which is now confronting the Senate. On January 6 the Senator from Illinois introduced Senate bill 54 which relates to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans. The Presiding Officer referred that bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, I presume, did so under paragraphs 16 and 19 relating to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

My colleague the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], on January 27, 1947, also introduced a bill (Senate bill 357), relating to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans. While the substance of the two bills is different, their objective is the same. The latter bill, I will say to the distinguished President pro tempore, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

I have conferred with the Parliamentarian respecting the situation and he advises me that the two bills ought to be in one committee or the other. It is immaterial to the Senator from Illinois to which committee the bills are referred, but I am now merely calling the attention of the Chair to the fact that two committees will be considering bills of similar purport, unless one committee is discharged from further consideration, and the bill is returned to the Senate and referred to the proper committee. I am ready to have that done if the Chair will advise me to which committee he thinks the bill should go.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to take the matter under advisement and make an announcement later.

Mr. LUCAS. That is perfectly satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Illinois for raising the question.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I have raised the question is because of the duplication of effort involved. Obviously the matters will be dealt with more efficiently, before one committee. That is in keeping with the basic principle of the Reorganization Act.

FILES OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] submitted a parliamentary inquiry a few moments ago. It seems to the Chair that under the language of section 140 of the Reorganization Act and within the spirit of the language of section 140 the records to which the Senator from Wyoming referred are noncurrent records and therefore they can appropriately be deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Chair.

REFERENCE OF BILLS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to rule upon the point of order raised by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] a few moments ago. The Senator from Illinois pointed to the fact that Senate bill 357 introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] was referred to the Committee on Finance, and that Senate bill 54, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, although both refer by title to the fact that they are bills relating to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans.

The Senator from Illinois is obviously correct in his belief that both bills should be referred to the same committee. As the Chair indicated at the time, it is typical of some of the difficulties which confront the Chair in making references of bills to committees until the Senate has had a more standardized experience under the Reorganization Act. For instance, in this case, the Reorganization Act clearly gives the Committee on Finance jurisdiction over veterans' measures generally. Obviously both these bills fall within the category of veterans' measures generally. On the other hand, the Reorganization Act gives specific jurisdiction to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans, and readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

In the presence of this conflict of eligible jurisdictions over these two bills, the Chair is required to consult what he considers to be the preponderance of justification. The opinion of the Chair is that both bills should go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which Senate bill 54 was originally referred. Therefore, under this ruling, the Committee on Finance should be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 357 and the bill should be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Unless there is objection, that order will be entered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the order is entered.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 11)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to file and read the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The report is as follows:

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report was established under the terms of section 5 of Public Law 304, approved February 20, 1946. Section 5, as amended by Public Law 601, approved August 2, 1946, reads, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the economic report;

"(2) to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the policy of this act; and

"(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the economic report, not later than February 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947), to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable."

Although the act became a law February 20, 1946, the President did not appoint the Council of Economic Advisers provided for by section 4 of the act until July 25, 1946. This joint committee was not appointed until just before Congress adjourned, and it was not practicable to set up a staff or begin the work during the last Congress. Five members of the committee were not elected to the Eightieth Congress, and it was necessary to reconstitute and reorganize the committee this month. No staff has yet been appointed. The problems to be considered by the committee are the most complex economic problems which the country faces, and it is vitally important that the best possible staff and consultants be procured in order that the best possible studies may be made. The committee is now engaged in canvassing the qualifications of a number of men for this work, but as yet has not selected these men or begun the necessary studies.

The committee has considered the report of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, made in December 1946 (S. Doc. No. 6), and the Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 49). It has particularly considered the recommendations of the President in the short-range program appearing on pages 20, 21, and 22 of his report. The committee agrees with the President that removal of wartime controls and

the return to a freer economy places on business, farmers, labor, management, and consumers the main responsibility for working out price and wage relationships. The committee joins in the President's hope that business will reduce prices; that labor will refrain from excessive wage demands; and that both will bend every effort to increase productivity.

The short-range recommendations of the President calling for congressional action may be summarized as follows:

1. Congress should extend rent control.
2. Congress should extend the coverage and raise the rate of the minimum wage.
3. Congress should extend the coverage and revise the benefits under the social-security system.
4. Congress should enact a long-range, comprehensive housing program.
5. While the tax burden should be reduced as soon as possible, it should not be reduced at this time.
6. Congress should deal with the whole field of labor-management relations in which sound collective bargaining is essential.

All of these six matters are already under consideration by standing committees of Congress, which will make a detailed study of each one of them and submit recommendations to the Congress. Most of them are highly controversial. A recommendation from this committee at this time which could only be casual before our studies are made, would not be helpful to the solution of the problems. The committee will proceed to consider these problems with reference to their effect on the maintenance of a stable economy and continuous employment.

The basic problem which this committee has to consider is the method of preventing depressions so that substantially full employment may be continuously maintained. No problem before the American people is more vital to our welfare, to the very existence of our way of life, and to the peace of the world. It is the most complex and difficult of all the long-range domestic problems we have to face. It involves a study of price levels and wage levels and their relation to each other, a study of methods of preventing monopoly control in industry and labor from distorting prices and wages, a study of spending for consumption and for capital investment, a study of individual and corporate savings, and a study of many other economic forces bearing on a stable economy.

Until we have further studied and analyzed the basic considerations which underlie this problem, we do not feel we should become involved in controversy on current issues which have many aspects besides their effect on the prosperity of the country.

With regard to the President's long-range program, no immediate recommendations are necessary. The committee will proceed to consider his different proposals as rapidly as we can reach them, to determine whether they bear a relation to the principal task of this committee and, if they do, make recommendations to Congress with regard to them.

The committee notes with approval that the report places special emphasis upon an over-all policy directed toward the preservation in agriculture of the family-sized farm (p. 25) and in industry of free competitive enterprise (p. 28). The details of a program to prevent another agricultural depression and of an affirmative program, in the words of the report, "to enlarge the opportunities for efficient and enterprising small businesses" will be among the primary subjects of committee study.

Regardless of the recommendations of the report on which there may or may not be controversy, it is our desire to commend the compilation of statistics and economic facts which are contained in the President's report and furnish a substantial basis for further study.

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman.
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Vice Chairman.
JOSEPH H. BALL.
RALPH E. FLANDERS.
ARTHUR V. WATKINS.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.
FRANCIS J. MYERS.
JOHN SPARKMAN.
GEORGE H. BENDER.
WALTER H. JUDD.
ROBERT F. RICH.
EDWARD J. HART.
WRIGHT PATMAN.
WALTER B. HUBER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to express the feeling of satisfaction which I am sure the members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report have had with the two meetings which have been conducted under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Both those meetings had a full attendance, and the preparation of the report had the attention of all members of the committee. I feel that the filing of the report today is a very good augury for the complete study of the economic base of our society, which is so essential. We now have, created and functioning, a system in which the Executive, through the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Congress, through this joint committee, will for the first time endeavor to study the impact of economic events and legislative action upon the American way of life. I congratulate the Senator from Ohio for his leadership in this matter.

NATIONAL FOOD ALLOTMENT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on January 10, Senate bill 131 was introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is a bill providing, roughly, for the disposition of agricultural surplus commodities through a stamp plan to populations in the cities. It has two aspects, the consumer aspect and the agricultural aspect. At this time I ask that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with the understanding that if the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommends the bill, I may request at that time that it be again referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Ohio for requesting the change of reference of this bill, which relates both to human welfare, in the form of an adequate minimum diet, and also to the disposal of surplus farm commodities. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has previously considered this bill. The Department of Agriculture has done most of the work in reference to defining an adequate minimum diet. Therefore, I feel that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should have first consideration of the bill. If later it appears that other factors enter into the case, it is possible that other committees, including the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, may wish to consider some phases of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none; and without objection the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 131, a bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes, and the bill is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TREATY OF CONCILIATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND PHILIPPINES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive C, Eightieth Congress, First Session, a treaty of conciliation between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines signed at Manila on November 16, 1946. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty of conciliation, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The treaty of conciliation is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a Treaty of Conciliation Between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines signed at Manila on November 16, 1946. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a report on the treaty made to me by the Secretary of State.

The treaty corresponds in its provisions, except as otherwise pointed out in the report by the Secretary of State, to the other bilateral conciliation treaties or conventions which are now in effect between the United States and other countries.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1947.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Treaty of Conciliation With the Republic of the Philippines.]

JANUARY 29, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, for transmission to the Senate with a view to receiving the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of conciliation between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines signed at Manila on November 16, 1946.

The treaty provides for the establishment of a permanent International Commission of Conciliation to which the high contracting parties shall submit any dispute arising which may not be settled through the diplomatic channel and in case the high contracting parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal. In case no definite settlement shall have been reached through the submission of such dispute to the International Commission, the treaty provides that the dispute shall be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and that the high contracting parties shall be bound by the decision of the court.

The provision relating to the submission of disputes to the International Court of Justice has not appeared in earlier treaties of conciliation to which the United States is a party, the Conciliation Treaty With the Republic of the Philippines being the first treaty of its kind concluded since the inception of the court. With the exception of that provision, the provisions of the treaty are similar to those of the bilateral conciliation treaties or conventions between the United States and other countries to which the Senate has heretofore given advice and consent to ratification and which are now in effect.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

TREATY OF CONCILIATION

The United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, being desirous to strengthen the bonds of amity that bind them together and also to advance the cause of general peace, have decided to conclude a treaty of conciliation and for that purpose have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America: His Excellency Paul V. McNutt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines; and

The President of the Republic of the Philippines: His Excellency Elpidio Quirino, Vice President and concurrently Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the High Contracting Parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent International Commission of Conciliation constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding article.

ARTICLE II

The International Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed as follows: One member shall be chosen from each country by the Government thereof; one member shall be chosen by each Government from some third country; the fifth member shall be chosen by common agreement between the two Governments, it being understood that he shall not be a citizen of either country. The expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the two Governments in equal proportions.

The International Commission shall be constituted within six months after the exchange of ratifications of this Treaty; and vacancies shall be filled according to the manner of the original agreement.

ARTICLE III

In case the High Contracting Parties shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods, and they do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, they shall at once refer it to the International Commission for investigation and report. The International Commission may, however, spontaneously by unanimous agreement offer its services to that effect, and in such case it shall notify both Governments and request their cooperation in the investigation.

The High Contracting Parties agree to furnish the International Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The report of the Commission shall be completed within one year after the date on which it shall declare its investigation to have begun, unless the High Contracting Parties shall limit or extend the time by mutual agreement. The report shall be prepared in triplicate; one copy shall be presented to each Government, and the third shall be retained by the Commission for its files.

The International Commission shall, together with its report, submit its recommendations for the settlement of the matter in dispute.

Should no definite settlement be reached, notwithstanding the report and recommendations of the International Commission on the matter in dispute, the High Contracting Parties agree to submit the dispute to the jurisdicion of the International Court of Justice conformably with Article 36 of its Statute, and further agree to be bound without need of special agreement by the decision of the Court.

ARTICLE IV

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with its constitutional laws.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Manila as soon as possible, and the Treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the above-named plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at Manila this 16th day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-six and of the Independence of the Philippines the first.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] PAUL V. MCNUTT.

For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:

[SEAL] ELPIDIO QUIRINO.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact that there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. Perhaps it will be satisfactory to have that nomination stated, as in executive session, by the clerk.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have been advised that if that nomination is brought before the Senate at this time a Senator will ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1947:

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice J. Howard McGrath, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph E. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi, vice Toxey Hall, term expired.

Robert E. Shelton, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Charles E. Dierker, term expired.

J. Charles Dennis, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington. (Mr. Dennis is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 9, 1946.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joseph C. Reing, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice himself.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Albert L. Jones, from the 16th day of December 1941.

William D. Patterson, Jr., from the 3d day of April 1942.

George U. Smith, from the 1st day of May 1942.

Charles R. Metzelaars, from the 18th day of July 1942.

Herbert G. Manning, Jr., from the 1st day of April 1943.

Robert T. Donahue, from the 16th day of August 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of October 1945:

George G. Blair II, a citizen of Illinois.

Kenneth C. Ives, a citizen of Florida.

Arthur G. Patton, a citizen of Virginia.

William A. Whitesell, a citizen of California.

Robert W. Frye, a citizen of Michigan.

Harry A. Spaight, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

Edward B. Keyes, Jr., a citizen of Washington.

Wallace C. Barrett, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Harold R. Mackey, a citizen of Colorado, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of January 1946.

George F. Good III, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of February 1946.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of February 1946:

Lemuel C. Shepherd III, a citizen of California.

Reuel W. Stephens, Jr., a citizen of Texas.

George A. Babe, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Elmer J. Anderson, a citizen of Utah.

Joseph Koler, Jr., a citizen of Washington.

William F. Young, a citizen of California.

Lawrence J. Bradley, a citizen of Maine.

Thomas C. Shanahan, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Elvin R. Coon, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

Donald F. Hillmer, a citizen of Iowa.

Ewald A. Vom Orde, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey.

Philip H. Ronzone, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of February 1946.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 22d day of February 1946:

Robert A. Foyle, a citizen of New York.

William J. Vetter, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey.

Ralph G. Dekle, a citizen of Florida.

Frederic A. Gessner, a citizen of Missouri.

James J. Bozek, a citizen of New Hampshire.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1946:

William M. Van Zuyen, a citizen of California.

Jack M. Lerond, a citizen of California.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of February 1946:

Donald L. Hall, a citizen of New York.

Charles R. Munn, Jr., a citizen of Florida.

Arthur C. Beverly, a citizen of New York.

Michael L. Cannon, a citizen of Michigan, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February 1946.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of February 1946:

Robert J. McNicholas, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Louis Baeriswyl, Jr., a citizen of Ohio.

Michael Lash, Jr., a citizen of New York.

Wilber F. Taylor, a citizen of New Mexico.

Richard D. McClintic, a citizen of Missouri.

William R. Medlock, a citizen of Texas.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we come before the Throne of Grace this day, we would not weary Thee with our constant begging. We would not be like petulant children, seeking diplomas without study, or wages without work. We thank Thee for lessons to learn and for work to do. May we apply ourselves to both. As Thy servants here sincerely seek to do right, make it plain to them. Knowing that criticism will come, help them to take from it what is helpful, and to forgive what is unjust and unkind. Amid all the pressures brought upon them, may they ever hear Thy still small voice, and follow Thy guidance for the good of all the people, that Thy will may be done in this Nation, through these Thy servants. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 31, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee is in executive session with Mr. Baruch, and desires to continue for about 1 hour. On behalf of the Senate members of the joint committee, the Chair asks unanimous consent, as required by the Reorganization Act, that it be permitted to do so. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask leave to be absent from the Senate until about 2:30 o'clock on Wednesday next. I desire to address the Vermont Legislature tomorrow, and I cannot get back in time for the opening of the session on Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Vermont, as requested.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REFUND OF CERTAIN TAXES BY BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing all refunds in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, on account of taxes illegally or erroneously collected (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"To Whom It May Concern:

"This is to certify that the Senate of the State of California on January 23, 1947, adopted the following:

"'Senate Resolution 38

"'Whereas the San Joaquin Experimental Range of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, was established in 1935 in the county of Madera, State of California, for the major purposes of (a) making studies of the proper utilization of natural range through conservation, reseeding, introduction of new species, fertilization, cultivation, and management, and (b) making studies of the proper management of livestock on the range; and

"'Whereas the studies carried on at this station have proved to be and will continue to be of marked benefit to the livestock indutry; and

"'Whereas the studies can be most effectively and efficiently carried out and will best serve the livestock industry by planning full 5-year program: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California,* That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture be memorialized to appropriate additional and adequate funds each 5 years, which funds shall be sufficient for the maintenance of the studies for 5-year periods; and be it further

"'*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.'

"J. A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate,
State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"To Whom It May Concern:

"This is to certify that the Senate of the State of California on January 15, 1947, adopted the following:

"'Senate Resolution 30

"'Whereas the present facilities for the training of naval officers are inadequate to meet the demands of the increased size of the postwar Navy, and to accomplish the postgraduate training program for officers of the United States Navy; and

"'Whereas the acquisition of additional facilities for the further training of naval officers is vital to the fulfillment of the program designed to preserve the position of our naval service as the finest among the navies of the world; and

"'Whereas the Senate of the State of California previously has favored the establishment of a permanent naval academy in this State, and numerous official and unofficial bodies have signified the desirability of having a naval academy located in this State; and

"'Whereas the United States Navy Board has recommended the purchase of the Del Monte site located at Monterey, Calif., because of its unique suitability and all-around adaptability to the aims, purposes, and function of the proposed postgraduate training plan; and

" 'Whereas members of congressional committees, delegated to inspect several proposed sites for the location of such a school, have enthusiastically favored the proposed site at Monterey, Calif., because of its ideal climate, location, proximity to metropolitan areas, and air, sea, and rail transportation facilities, and because the site is superior in every way to other proposed locations: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California,* That the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, be memorialized to enact at this session of Congress legislation to establish a permanent naval officers' postgraduate school on the Monterey peninsula, at Monterey, Calif.; and be it further

" '*Resolved,* That the secretary of the Senate of the State of California is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of California.'

"J. A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

AMNESTY FOR CERTAIN PRISONERS OF WAR—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by over 400 citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying amnesty for certain persons now serving in prison for violation of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. I ask unanimous consent that the petition, without the signatures attached thereto, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On March 6 you said, "Now that we have preserved our freedom of conscience and religion, let us make full use of that freedom."

Some 300 who for reasons of principle refused to comply with the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or were court-martialed for not obeying military orders are still in prison. These include conscientious objectors, Jehovah's Witnesses, Puerto Rican nationalists, Negro objectors to racial segregation and discrimination in the armed forces, Hopi Indians, and other political prisoners.

Amnesties have been granted to political offenders in the past by eight Presidents of the United States. Many other countries have declared amnesties since the war.

A general amnesty for violators of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and war objectors court-martialed by the armed forces is the only possible way to free the men for whom we are concerned and to restore full civil rights to them and to the thousands already released. Continued punishment of these men violates our tradition of freedom of conscience and endangers the civil liberties of all citizens.

We therefore petition you to grant such an amnesty.

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING (S. REPT. NO. 12)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to file the final report of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, which was created under Senate Resolution 102 at the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The report was prepared for filing January 15, 1946. It was withheld at that time, at the earnest insistence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], because he was at that time, as a member of a subcommittee, engaged in further study of the surplus property problem, with especial reference to Government-owned plants.

The report is the same as that which was prepared for filing in January 1946, and I now wish to file it.

I desire to make the further statement that, of the modest sum made available to this committee, there is an unexpended balance in the Treasury of about $4,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of January 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
January 31, 1947.

Mr. CARL A. LOEFFLER,
Secretary of the Senate,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LOEFFLER: I transmit herewith the list of employees of the Senate Small Business Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. The Senate Small Business Committee, however, is reimbursing the agencies who have loaned these employees.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES
FEBRUARY 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

F. Preston Forbes,[1] 502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.; Commerce Department, Washington, D. C.; annual salary, $9,975.

Stella J. Groeper,[1] 1127 Branch Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.; annual salary, $4,674.

L. Evelyn Spicer,[1] 2515 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; annual salary, $3,899.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

[1] These employees were returned to the agencies Jan. 16, 1947.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 473. A bill to provide for limited increases in rent ceilings and to authorize the continuation of rent controls for a limited period of time; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Belk; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 475. A bill for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.; and

S. 476. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Edward Napier, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 477. A bill to establish the method by which the United States must determine the cost, net cost, or lowest rate available to public housing agencies of or for insurance covering low-rent or slum-clearance projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 478. A bill relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 479. A bill to amend the District of Columbia License Act so as to prohibit the issuance of a license for the operation of certain passenger vehicles for hire and to any person employed full-time by the United States or the District of Columbia or otherwise gainfully employed; and

S. 480. A bill authorizing the United States and District of Columbia Governments to pay for water and water services secured from the District of Columbia water system and authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 481. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation, the Territory of Hawaii, and Cooke Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, as receiver for said Trent Trust Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 482. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 483. A bill to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 484. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 485. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Adams Garfield; and

S. 486. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 487. A bill to amend section 289 of the Criminal Code;

S. 488. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940;

S. 489. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of

naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; and

S. 490. A bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 491. A bill relating to the honorable discharge status of flight instructors who as members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserves participated under contracts with the War Department or the Civil Aeronautics Administration during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 492. A bill for the relief of Mary Lomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Br. BUTLER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 51, providing for the establishment of a civilian administration, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, over the Caroline, Marshall, and Marianas Islands and Guam and American Samoa, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on April 13, 1947, as National Courtesy Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution urging the observance of National Security Week February 12–22, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BRIDGES also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 56, to establish a commission to formulate plans for a national memorial to members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine who lost their lives at sea during World War II, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR CERTAIN PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for civil government for the civilian populations of our islands in the Pacific Ocean and transferring jurisdiction over those islands from the Navy Department to the Department of the Interior.

It may not be generally realized that our smaller island possessions in the Pacific, namely Guam and American Samoa, although they have been United States possessions for many years, are still under the absolute control of the Navy Department. The native populations of those islands have no civil or political rights. There are no independent courts. The naval governors are, in effect, executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the government, all rolled into one.

Guam has been under our control since 1898 when we took it from Spain. American Samoa has been an American possession since 1900 when the Samoan chieftains ceded their sovereignty to a representative of our Navy. For almost 50 years the natives of those possessions have therefore lived under the absolute rule of the Navy.

In the case of American Samoa, the only government is a code called the Regulations and Orders for the Government of American Samoa, promulgated by the Navy. It may not be generally realized that the Congress has never passed anything in the nature of an organic act, laying down the principles of government for these small islands. For almost 50 years, Congress has been content to let the Navy rule as it wished.

Mr. President, government of this type would be burdensome even if conducted by a civilian. Certainly it is doubly so when the rule is that of a man trained in military methods—with all that that implies. The Congress of the United States has the final responsibility for the welfare of these people. We cannot dodge that responsibility. We ought to give them a truly American form of government.

The joint resolution I am introducing today is not so ambitious as that. It merely proposes, as a starter, that the islands be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Navy to that of the Interior Department with a civilian governor instead of a naval one. Later on, I hope we may take the opportunity to consider granting the natives some measure of civil and political rights.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) providing for the establishment of a civilian administration under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior over the Caroline, Marshall, and Marianas Islands and Guam and American Samoa, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SHORTAGE OF FERTILIZERS AND FERTILIZER INGREDIENTS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution requesting that the Senate Agriculture Committee conduct an investigation of the shortage of fertilizer and recommend necessary measures to alleviate the shortage. I may say I have discussed this matter with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is also interested in this problem and has made some investigation of it through the committee of which he is chairman. He is perfectly agreeable to my resolution.

Every day I receive letters from farmers and organizations of farmers in my State, pleading desperately for assistance in obtaining needed supplies of fertilizer. The farmers of the Middle West have learned from the experience of the last few years how extremely necessary fertilizer is in obtaining profitable yields. They face the prospect of being unable to obtain the nitrogen they need until sometime next year—too late to do them any good this year. This situation is made all the harder to bear by the knowledge that in my own State, as well as in other States, the Army is engaged in a tremendous program of fertilizer manufacture, but none of that nitrogen will be available to our own farmers. All the Army nitrogen is for shipment to occupied countries abroad.

In its study, I hope the committee will give careful consideration to some of the statements contained in a little 10-page mimeographed statement on the 1946–47 fertilizer program, dated January 1947 and prepared by the Production and Marketing Administration. I believe a careful study of the facts contained in this document must convince anyone that there need not have been a fertilizer shortage in this country. In this document the statement is made that the rated capacity of synthetic nitrogen plants in the United States is in excess of 1,100,000 tons, not including the Army plants, while elsewhere it is admitted that the production program for 1946–47 amounts to only 559,000 tons. The production program for 1946–47 is, in fact, less than production for 1945–46. I believe our farmers deserve an explanation why production should be actually declining at a time when production in every other line of manufacture is booming.

One further fact set forth in this document deserves attention. All production figures given exclude production in Army plants, just as if there were no Army program to manufacture nitrogen. Any figure on anticipated production in Army plants is carefully left out. Yet it is clear that the Army program is a vital part of the whole fertilizer picture.

This is particularly obvious when we realize that the Army borrowed 110,000 tons of fertilizer from the civilian supply last summer and fall. This tonnage to be repaid to civilian use during the coming spring when it will probably be too late to help our own farm economy. In the face of this fact, the PMA publication makes the extraordinary statement that "the Army nitrogen program will have no net effect upon the nitrogen available for domestic use."

It is my hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will find it possible to check into all these matters and be of assistance in assuring adequate supplies of fertilizer to our own agriculture.

The resolution (S. Res. 78), submitted by Mr. BUTLER, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas there exists in the United States a shortage in the supply of fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients available for and essential to crop production; and

Whereas such shortage is causing economic distress to producers of crops and threatens the maintenance of high crop production in the United States; and

Whereas considerable confusion exists with respect to the causes of such shortage and the action which should be taken for the purpose of alleviating it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining the causes of the existing shortage in the supply of fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients available in the United States and the action which should be taken by the Congress or the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of alleviating such shortage and insuring the availability to the people of the United States of an adequate

supply of fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients at all times in the future. The committee or duly authorized subcommittee shall include within the scope of such study and investigation thorough consideration of (1) the relationship to such shortage of the Army program of production and exportation of fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients, (2) the relationship to such shortage of any international agreements or commitments with respect to allocation, importation, and exportation of fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, (3) the possibility and practicality of increasing the production and importation of supplies of nitrogen, phosphates, and potash, and (4) the extent, if any, to which faulty distribution of fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients and lack of facilities for distribution has contributed to the shortage in certain areas.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to formulate plans for a national memorial for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and merchant marine who lost their lives at sea during World War II.

There is nothing more precious to us than the memory of the men and women of America who have given their lives in the cause of world freedom and peace.

It is considered fitting by many that a special memorial should be erected in America as a tribute to those who, in the cause of freedom and peace, gave their lives at sea and were lost or buried in the depths of the seas. In most instances, we are able to place markers at the graves of those who gave their lives on the fields of battle, but it is never possible to mark the hallowed places on the oceans of the world where American men and women made the supreme sacrifice for their country.

The joint resolution would authorize a tangible, lasting tribute to those who, in serving America during World War II on the high seas, gave their lives and now rest beneath waters which are once more free.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) to establish a commission to formulate plans for a national memorial to members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and merchant marine who lost their lives at sea during World War II, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SENATE PERIODICAL PRESS GALLERY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time. Once it is read, I should like to explain it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to reserve the right to object until I know what it is.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 79), as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the base rate of $3,860 per annum for the services of a superintendent of the Senate periodical press gallery.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we now have a radio press gallery, a regular newspaper press gallery, and a periodical press gallery. But the latter has not had space until a room assignment was made recently by the Committee on Rules and Administration. That room assignment was necessary due to the increasing number of periodical correspondents and the crowded conditions in the Senate press gallery. The representatives of the various periodicals of the country will make their headquarters in the room set aside for that purpose, just as newspapermen use the regular press gallery, and the members of the radio press use the radio press room. An attendant is needed for the periodical press room. This resolution is a very simple proposal, that a superintendent for the room be authorized and paid from the contingent fund until the proper appropriation bill is before us. If there is any objection to it, of course, I wish to have it referred to a committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that as a matter of good legislative practice it ought to go to a committee. I have received one or two letters in the last few days in regard to this matter, and it strikes me that the resolution has merit. However, it would take but a day or two for a committee to consider it, and I presume there is no immediate rush. I suggest that the Senator let it go to the appropriate committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. BRIDGES. If there is objection, I shall withdraw it, and ask for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADMINISTRATION AND USE OF PUBLIC LANDS RELATING TO GRAZING SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the first resolution coming over from the previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) submitted by Mr. BUTLER on January 31, 1947, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and continued by subsequent resolutions, relating to an investigation of the administration and use of public lands, is hereby continued until February 15, 1947, inclusive, for the purpose of allowing additional time in which to prepare and submit a final report to the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the author of this resolution whether it provides merely for the continuation of the authority of the committee in order that it may make its final report, or is it proposed that there be further investigation? My question is based upon my premise that all questions pertaining to the public lands now should be investigated by the Committee on Public Lands. I myself see no further need for the continuation of the authority of any special committee unless the committee needs time to make a final report.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the Senator referring to the resolution we tried to have acted upon last Friday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is the same.

Mr. BUTLER. The only purpose in asking for the extension was that the then existing subcommittee might have opportunity to make a report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will that be its final report?

Mr. BUTLER. It will be its final report. In the case of the committee that was referred to by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], he asked that it be extended until February 15, and at the session last Friday he filed most of the report he will make, though he will have a few additions or changes to present between now and the 15th of February.

Mr. BARKLEY. One of the resolutions that comes over asks for an extension to the 15th of this month.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the other until the 31st of March.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. In the case of that report, I will say that the chairman of the subcommittee was the then Senator from Utah, Mr. Murdock. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] were members of the subcommittee. They held a hearing somewhere in the West, I believe it was San Francisco, and it was an important hearing. The stenographer who took the notes went from the hearing room, when the hearing was concluded, to the hospital, and is still in the hospital. It has been estimated by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that it might take until March 15 to get him out of the hospital and have him complete his transcript.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if this were a resolution providing for a further investigation of the public lands I should oppose it, and I should feel it my duty to move that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, but inasmuch as it is merely a resolution asking for extension of authority of a preexisting committee to make its final report, I shall not object.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the situation, and I should like to say, in that connection, that I had a long telegram this morning from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] suggesting that the final report be not filed until his return, and we have agreed to that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Nebraska has said about Resolution 76 may be said with equal truth wtih respect to Resolution 77, that it merely provides additional time in which a final report may be made. It is not contemplated that further studies or further investigation shall be made?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 76.

The resolution was agreed to.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS COMMITTEE, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the second resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 77) submitted by Mr. BUTLER on January 31, 1947, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority granted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys under Senate Resolution 315, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to July 30, 1946, relating to studies and investigations of matters referred to such committee, is hereby extended to March 31, 1947, for the purpose of allowing additional time in which to make a report to the Congress.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that a statement which I issued on Friday of last week, which I had prepared for the press, be published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

I want to add my voice to the Nation-wide appreciation of the character and services of our former Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, who has just retired. Rarely has approval of a statesman been so spontaneous or so unspoiled by partisan notes.

If there are still people abroad who hope to profit from political rivalries in our country, the unanimity of our farewell tribute to Mr. Byrnes—and of our welcome to General Marshall, his successor—should set them straight. They should realize that in the domain of foreign affairs they are dealing neither with Republicans nor with Democrats but with Americans.

Underlying the popular tribute to Mr. Byrnes, I feel sure, there is an awareness of the great handicaps under which he started his term as Secretary. Everyone knows that he inherited a sorry mess of appeasement and political muddling from the war years. Everyone knows, for example, that he had to operate within the onerous terms of what historians will probably call the great American surrender at Yalta.

The popular applause—let's be candid about it—is not for the Secretary who was obliged, in the first stage of his work, to make the best of shabby and shameful bargains at the expense of other peoples' freedom. It is, rather, for the Secretary, aided by the able counsel of our two colleagues, Senator VANDENBERG and Senator CONNALLY, who showed himself firm, persistent, and conscious of principle in the later stages of his work.

When Mr. Byrnes and his associates took over, they were handed a dossier of compromises of the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, the Four Freedoms, and other expressions of war-time idealism.

Their first job was to extricate themselves from the methods and habits of a long-sustained policy of appeasement. They learned once more, the hard way, that totalitarian states, whatever their color, can be bought but will not stay bought; that their appetites grow with gorging; that they construe every gesture of conciliation as a sign of weakness.

It seems to me fair and useful to recall that some of us on the floor of this Senate warned repeatedly against the illusions of appeasers. We insisted that America stand pat on elementary decencies—that America refuse to use small nations and helpless peoples as chips in the poker game of power politics.

I mention the matter in no I-told-you-so spirit but as a wholesome caution for the months and years ahead. Our country started with a huge reservoir of moral prestige among the peoples of this globe. We dissipated that invaluable reserve when we allowed Russia to grab the territories of its neighbors and impose its control on 100,000,000 people through the old familiar strong-arm methods of "quislingism," coercion of the electorate, and outright terrorism.

Fortunately, we still have a chance to restore confidence in American leadership. The job of this restoration has been well started by Mr. Byrnes. It can, and I trust will be, continued effectively by General Marshall.

Both these men, and the country at large, know by now that far from solving anything, each of our compromises on principle, each surrender of national interest, has merely created bigger problems and enlarged the areas of totalitarian infection. For our gifts of appeasement we have been paid off in contempt, broken pledges, calculated delay and confusion—all of this against a backdrop of world-wide anti-American propaganda.

Whatever accomplishments we can claim in recent months, came after we stiffened our policy with an injection of the iron of self-respect.

Let's not forget that our representatives traveled a hard road, a humiliating road, before they reached, at long last, a policy of so-called patience and firmness. There is still a lot more patience than firmness in the amalgam. It was a road marked by disasters for heroic peoples like the Poles and the Chinese, as well as for liberated peoples who in their sufferings had dreamed of a new democratic start.

We have little enough cause for pride in that Via Dolorosa of our diplomacy. Few Americans can look back at its milestones without a sense of futility and a bad conscience. A mangled and enslaved Poland, a cruelly looted and prostrate Manchuria—these are the sad symbols of the "peace" imposed on both sides of the globe.

It will not do to put all the blame on Russia. We can hardly shrug off our share of responsibility.

The least we can do, therefore, is to resolve openly and resolutely that we shall not again compound evil in the name of compromise. We must make it clear to ourselves and the world that we do not propose to retrace our steps on that futile and tragic road of appeasement.

Implicit in the acclaim of Mr. Byrnes is the new American determination to go forward from where he stopped—not backward to where he started.

We have every reason to expect that General Marshall understands this. We sincerely believe he will not shrink from exercising those soldierly qualities that are natural to his character. Frankly, we have had too much of the kind of compromise which, when faced with a proposal for some monstrous crime, settles for half a crime.

We count on Secretary Marshall to resist the efforts of a noisy minority, typified by Henry Wallace and his fellow-traveling entourage, to steer American foreign policy back into the blind alley from which it has only recently emerged. In that resistance, he may be sure, he will have the support of most Americans.

We seek nothing for ourselves—except a climate of freedom and justice in world affairs. We can therefore afford to stand firm; to demand that other nations live up to their commitments; and to retrieve lost ground in the area of principle.

Recently we have been engulfed by great waves of gratitude because Messrs. Stalin, Molotov, and Vishinsky have finally deigned to smile on us; because, after gumming up the peace for a year and a half, after looting many areas of friend and foe alike, the Kremlin has generously consented to negotiate treaties.

I, for one, fail to understand the strange and illogical joy over this fact. Are we so lacking in self-confidence, so incapable of taking diplomatic initiative, that our moods depend on the shifting tactics of Soviet ambition? The American people as a whole fail to understand why we should be so grateful for every sign of Soviet cooperation. It is behavior unworthy of a fourth-rate nation under the shadow of Soviet aggression, let alone the world's greatest representative government.

The plain truth is that for all their supposed softening of attitude, the Russian rulers have given up nothing essential. They hold what they've grabbed and are proceeding at double speed to consolidate the empire they've carved for themselves. Democratic leaders in Hungary, representing the vast majority of the people, are being purged in the familiar Soviet style. Opponents of the quisling regimes in Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, are being terrorized and liquidated.

Our job over the Kremlin's so-called concessions must seem fantastic to the people of Poland, where the comedy of rigged elections has reached its tragic finish. Those free and unfettered elections in east Europe and Balkan countries, morally guaranteed by the United States, have become a laughing-stock throughout the world.

The five peripheral treaties have changed nothing. On the whole, indeed, they have simply confirmed Russia in its dominion over nearly half of Europe. As far as Italy is concerned, the staggering reparations exacted by Moscow reduce the chances of keeping that country on the democratic side of the iron curtain.

Lest we succumb to a false optimism, let's get the picture back into focus. Half of Europe is still cut off from the life of the continent by a picket fence of Soviet bayonets. Three independent republics whose sovereignty is still recognized in Washington—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—have been swallowed whole by the Russian bear. Friendship for America and advocacy of American ideals are still punished as a high crime in countries which we helped to liberate from Hitlerism. Germany, whose economic unity was pledged at Potsdam, has been reduced to a prestering sink of poverty that menaces the health of all Europe largely because of Moscow's deliberate strategy of non-cooperation.

On the other side of the earth the spectacle is no more edifying. Manchuria, the industrial heart of China, has been looted and maimed in a way that will retard the development of China for generations. The great power which stood aside from China's struggle for survival until the very week of Japan's defeat now controls Chinese ports, railroads, and cities.

It was under American pressure that China gave up huge chunks of its soil and its sovereignty. In return Moscow explicitly promised "aid and assistance to the Chinese National Government and its armies" in establishing their control over Manchuria and the rest of the country. America therefore can hardly be indifferent to the fact that Russia has broken its promises and has treated China like a conquered rather than an Allied nation.

We have an opportunity in China that is also a duty. We must pledge our support to the nation which has just adopted a democratic constitution and is making heroic efforts to find the highroad to popular government. Let's not beat around the bush in the matter: We cannot afford to push China into the Soviet orbit. A free, sover-

eign, independent China is vitally important to the future of freedom in any part of the world.

The Communist fifth column in China did its best to prevent the adoption of the democratic constitution and will now exert itself to prevent its application. Meanwhile, it is engaged in a vicious campaign of insults against the United States.

That campaign, be it noted, is part and parcel of a world-wide anti-American drive sparked by Moscow. Whether in Latin America or in Asia, in north Africa or in our own country, the propaganda offensive against the United States derives from a single and centralized source.

That is not a pleasant truth. It cuts through too many lazy illusions. But it is truth we cannot ignore or evade. Our foreign policy will make no sense unless it is conceived and unfolded in full awareness of the whole world picture.

There is no peace-loving nation, large or small, which feels any less secure because our country is strong. On the contrary, whenever America seems minded to fritter away its military might, small nations become alarmed for their own safety and peoples in bondage lose their last hope of ultimate deliverance.

The common people of the whole world thank the general providence that placed the atom bomb in American hands for safekeeping. We shall serve them—and ourselves—badly if we become slipshod or overly trusting in that providential trust. What would happen if the mighty atomic weapon were exclusively in the hands of certain other people? The very thought sends a chill down humanity's spine.

We have shown our willingness to share the atomic secret with the whole world. But why the hysterical eagerness to give it away? Should any nation choose foolishly to provoke an atomic race, it will make the greatest mistake in its history. We have a head start. We can keep the lead under any circumstances.

No one in his senses wants such a race. We have not only invited but pleaded with all other nations to help themselves to our atomic secrets. What greater proof of American good will and pacific intentions?

But we do not propose to carry good will to the extreme of suicidal stupidity. The American people will accept nothing less than an airtight system of inspection and control; nothing less than a system of quick and effective punishment of violators without any veto nonsense. If we who possess the bomb are willing to accept the extreme in safeguards, the reluctance of others to do so is both strange and disquieting.

It seems to me important to underline for American public opinion the special problems presented by inspection in a police state like Russia. No one is naive enough to believe that formal investigation will be enough. Every technique of international intelligence will have to be applied. The stakes are too high for half measures.

Those techniques will guarantee enforcement of the rules in democratic countries. But how can they be applied in a straitjacketed, totalitarian country where no one dares to speak, where every inch of human existence is ruthlessly policed? After all, the keeping of secrets—from their own people and from the rest of the world—has been developed in Russia to the highest degree known in history. Aspects of Soviet life involving millions of victims—like the man-made famine of 1932 or the magnitude of slave labor—are still matters of doubt and dispute.

In the light of these realities we have no alternative but to move slowly and cautiously in the matter of internationalizing atomic knowledge. We must give civilization the benefit of the doubt.

And while on the subject of inspection, how about a little of it to reveal the facts about the millions of German war prisoners in the Soviet Union? Reports have been seeping through that a skeleton German Army is in the making on Russian soil. The free Germany committee set up by the Kremlin is no more—but other such groups under new names are said to be getting intensive military and ideological training.

No one who has followed the course of Soviet policy on Germany can help but think that it aims to turn that country ultimately into a satellite and ally of Russia. There is a telltale continuity about that policy. It was also in Soviet Russia that Germany after the First World War secretly built and trained the core of its new army in defiance of the peace terms.

The Soviet leaders, unlike our own, never succumbed to the self-defeating counsels of vengeance which would turn Germany into an economic, political, and cultural plague spot. From the outset, and repeatedly, Stalin and his spokesmen have not concealed their hopes of restoring Germany and cementing it into the Soviet sphere. Inside that country they have used all the weapons of terror to build up a totalitarian Communist-controlled party and to liquidate democratic-minded opponents of their scheme.

If Moscow succeeds in the great design of merging Russian manpower and German technical discipline, the last chance of saving liberal democratic civilization will be lost. That is why the scheduled Big Power Conference in Moscow is so terribly important. It is there that our new Secretary of State will have his first and most decisive test.

We dare not evade the challenging truth that the dream of one world has resolved into a nightmare of two worlds engaged in a duel of dominance. We cannot afford to lose; even the Russian people—the people, not their masters—will never forgive us if we do. The ideals and the practical purposes for which we risked our best sons in two world wars will be wiped out beyond retrieving if we suffer a loss of nerve at this critical hour.

Does Russia ever hesitate to throw its full moral, political and economic weight into the scales on the side of dictatorship, in support of its satellite governments and fifth columns everywhere? Does it have any scruples about pressing every marginal advantage, whether real or imagined, to expand the frontiers of Communist dominion?

I submit that we should have no more squeamishness about throwing our full weight at all times and everywhere on the side of freedom, democratic aspirations, liberal world trade, and above all, human rights. When we do this—when we put the whole leverage of our prestige, our economic might, our technological strength behind our diplomacy—there can be no doubt as to the outcome.

All the advantages are on our side. All the hopes and prayers of humankind are on our side.

Our duty is clear. Let's have the courage to do it.

REPORT OF ANNUAL MEETING OF KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Jake Mohler, secretary of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, a very interesting report of the Seventy-sixth annual meeting of that organization, held recently in Topeka, Kans. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE SEVENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, JANUARY 8–10, 1947

As the accredited representatives of more than 100,000 Kansas farmers and stockmen, we express our beliefs and recommendations as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

We pledge full support to the United Nations and reiterate our desire that this Nation exert every possible effort and influence to help establish genuine agreement, understanding and confidence among the nations of the world.

NATIONAL UNITY

For a strong America, commensurate with the talents and ideals of her citizenry, we feel it is imperative that all people work together for the common good. We commend organizations to promote the welfare of various groups, so long as they do not seek self-betterment at the expense of others. To avoid this, and to help guide the efforts of all toward general betterment of the entire Nation, we believe a national policy along these lines should be formulated by Congress, to embrace all groups, including industry, labor, and agriculture. We strongly urge such action and pledge our wholehearted cooperation in it.

ARBITRATION

We agree with the proposal for some form of arbitration of industrial disputes that will prevent work stoppages which jeopardize the national economy and safety. We favor early legislation to that end.

FARM PRICE POLICY

For the good of all people, including those in agriculture, we favor farm prices in line with, but neither higher nor lower according than, prices of other commodities and services. Our idea of fair prices would provide farm incomes adequate for a good standard of living on farms and at the same time allow for some expenditure of effort and income on the fundamental task of conserving soils, which serve as the very lifeblood of our civilization. We believe it should be the aim that farm incomes be maintained through fair farm prices, rather than by any combination of prices and subsidies. We believe, likewise, that security for farm people can best be provided by fair prices, rather than by extension of the Federal social-security law to include farmers.

RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

We reaffirm our approval of the proposed development of water resources in the Missouri and Arkansas River basins through existing Federal and State agencies now cooperating in current water and reclamation activities.

WEEDS

We again urge that the United States Department of Agriculture set up a weed office for conducting research and education on weed control in cooperation with the various States. We urge, also, that Congress enact suitable legislation to regulate the interstate transportation and sale of weed-infested material, and to prohibit the importation of weed-infested materials from foreign countries.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We reaffirm our endorsement of rural electrification as a godsend to farm living and to the business of farming. We urge, therefore, that the program of rural electrification be given every possible opportunity for continued expansion.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We commend the work being done under the organized system of soil conservation. We pledge our wholehearted cooperation to this work, which is fundamental not only to agriculture, but to the very existence of mankind.

HOPE-FLANNAGAN ACT

We commend Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE, coauthor of the Hope-Flannagan bill on agricultural research and marketing, for

sponsoring this important measure and securing its enactment at the last session of Congress. The new law offers tremendous possibilities of sound, practical service to the people of Kansas.

TEACHER SALARIES

We cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of school teachers in their influence upon our children during their most impressionable years. We favor, therefore, a general increase in the salaries of Kansas school teachers, and such other measures as may be necessary to attract capable instructors and maintain the dignity of the profession at high levels.

GASOLINE TAX

We adhere to the principle that roads should be paid for by those who use them, and we believe the 1-cent tax on nonhighway gasoline is discriminatory and unfair. We urge, therefore, that the legislature amend the 1-cent provision of this law to increase the tax on highway gasoline and provide exemption for nonhighway gasoline.

STATE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

1. Marketing: Greater attention to the marketing of agricultural products has become a national movement, culminating in the recently enacted Hope-Flannagan law, classed by many as the most significant Federal legislation on agriculture, of this decade. As a service to both producers and consumers, we reiterate our recommendation of past years that the Kansas Legislature establish a State marketing agency. We suggest that this agency be empowered to promote the State's agricultural products, facilitate the marketing of such products by means of a market information service, establish grades and standards, provide inspection and grading services, and cooperate with the United States Department of Agriculture under provisions of the Hope-Flannagan law, and in beneficial agreements with its Bureau of Markets.

2. Weights and measures, coyote control, and agricultural chemicals: We again invite attention to the need of State legislation to provide: a weights-and-measures law adapted to current times and needs; additional means of controlling coyotes and other predatory animals; and a law to protect the users of agricultural chemicals, such as DDT, 2, 4–D, and others.

3. Temple of agriculture: With Kansas embarking on a State office building program, we urge that all State offices pertaining to agriculture be housed together in a temple of agriculture, and that this building also include space for agricultural and livestock conventions, as well as quarters for permanent exhibits illustrating the Kansas agricultural industry.

4. State educational institutions: Recognizing the increased demands upon our State educational institutions, we petition the legislature to give full consideration to their problems, which are of grave concern to the State and its future.

5. Kansas State College: Because of its far-flung service to agriculture and its betterment, we place particular emphasis upon the needs of Kansas State College, where record enrollments are severely overtaxing classroom, teaching, and housing facilities. We especially request increased funds for faculty salaries as the college is suffering serious loss of personnel to higher paying positions elsewhere, and respectfully urge the legislature to provide the college with adequate appropriations to fulfill its obligation to the State of Kansas and its predominant industry, agriculture.

6. Board of agriculture: We respectfully urge that the Kansas Legislature make adequate provisions for the State board of agriculture to carry cut its responsibilities to the people of Kansas as set forth by State laws, and especially to meet the increased demands of the board's work with weeds, dairy, water resources, and statistics.

7. Artificial insemination: Kansas is one of the leading dairy States, yet production per cow is relatively low. The average farmer feels he cannot afford to own a good bull for only a few cows. It is highly desirable that economical means of improvement be provided for the small herds. We urge, therefore, that the legislature provide funds to Kansas State College for the establishment of an artificial insemination service, this being an effective method of improving dairy production in Kansas.

8. Severance tax: In view of the fact that farmers pay not only property, personal, and income taxes, but also taxes on grain and livestock they produce, we feel that other products of the earth should pay their just share. We urge, therefore, that a severance tax be levied on oil, gas, and other minerals, to help meet requirements of the State government for additional revenue. Kansas is one of the few important mineral-producing States not having such a tax.

9. State 4–H camp: Because 4–H Club work is a publicly supported enterprise, receiving Federal, State, and local funds for operation, we feel it is in harmony with established policy that the legislature provide funds requested for basic construction work at the State 4–H Club camp.

CROP IMPROVEMENT

We commend the good work of the Kansas Crop Improvement Association and suggest that even more strict inspections be made to insure high-quality, weed-free, certified seed.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

We urge that the stockmen of Kansas be fully alert to the ever-present threat of foot-and-mouth disease. We advocate wholehearted cooperation with the Kansas livestock sanitary officials in any preventive program or recommendations that may be developed.

COUNTY FARM BUREAUS

Since the work of the Farm Bureau Extension Service is often hampered by inadequate county appropriations, we recommend that the levy be considered outside of the lawful county aggregate tax.

FARM COOPERATIVES

We believe in the principles of farm cooperatives. We, therefore, go on record in support of the present law providing for the creation and protection of cooperatives, and will vigorously oppose any legislation designed to destroy them.

SCHOOL REORGANIZATION

Whereas the present school reorganization law has been used in some instances in this State for the indiscriminate and wholesale elimination of rural elementary schools; and

Whereas the preservation of as many good and substantial rural schools as possible is essential to the continuance of our present rural life and the future prosperity of this great agricultural State: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That–

1. We believe that minimum pupil requirements for rural schools should be retained. If a school district meets the minimum student requirements, it should not be consolidated by compulsory order.

2. In those cases where a rural school district fails to meet minimum student requirements, then it should be disorganized by compulsory order, but the consolidation of such disorganized district should be in accordance with the vote of the legal electors of such district.

3. We oppose the consolidation of rural schools with city schools, where such rural schools have a sufficient student body to justify continuance of school and the majority of legal electors residing within the rural school district wish to retain their school.

4. The five-man reorganization committee should be eliminated and the power of consolidation vested in the County Superintendent of each county, who shall be bound to act by the rules above stated and in accordance with the vote of the people in the school districts affected.

5. *Be it further resolved*, Those who were forced into consolidation without a vote, and, if not satisfied, should have a right to a rehearing.

CAPPER-HOPE

We feel deep pride in the fact that Senator ARTHUR CAPPER is chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE is chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture for this forthcoming session of the United States Congress. These honors are not only fitting tributes to two great Kansas statesmen for their unfailing service to American agriculture but serve also to distinguish the entire State of Kansas, and especially its agriculture.

TRIBUTE

We again pay tribute to Kansas State College, to the farm organizations of Kansas, to vocational agriculture, to the 4–H Clubs, and other youth activities—all of which are rendering valuable service to this State. In commending these groups we extend our wholehearted cooperation.

APPRECIATION

An expression of gratitude is extended to those who have contributed to the success of this meeting. We thank the press and radio for their careful coverage, the city and State officials for their courtesies, the speakers for their excellent contributions, and Secretary Mohler and his staff for efficient planning and management of details.

SENATOR PEPPER'S VIEWS ON SOVIET RUSSIA—INTERVIEWS WITH WALTER DURANTY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles entitled "Walter Duranty Sizes Up CLAUDE PEPPER," published in the Orlando (Fla.) Sunday Sentinel-Star of December 29, 1946, and the Orland Morning Sentinel of December 30, 1946, which appear in the Appendix.]

GEORGE MORGENSTERN'S BOOK ON PEARL HARBOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Times of January 26, 1947, entitled "But Never Surrenders," discussing George Morgenstern's book on Pearl Harbor, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT IS A PRESS MONOPOLY?—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is a Press Monopoly?" published in the New York Times of February 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUTLAW THE COLLECTIVE STRIKE—ARTICLE BY CHARLES HALL DAVIS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Outlaw the Collective Strike" written by Charles Hall Davis, which appears in the Appendix.]

ABOUT THAT HOUSE OF MR. STRAUS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "About That House of Mr. Straus," published in the Washington Daily News of January 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

The clerk will state the only bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 27), to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, was read by its title.

Mr. GREEN. Over.

Mr. WHITE. I have been asked to object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the calendar.

PROTESTS AGAINST IMPOSITIONS UPON TEXAS CITIZENS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Texas Legislature is now in session, and we are beginning to see evidence of protests by many members of that body against some of the skulduggery of the New Deal administration, the bureaucrats in Washington, and the labor leader racketeers. Many members of the legislature resent the impositions upon Texas citizens and the regimentation to which they have been subjected.

As an illustration I should like to read a letter I have received from Marshall O. Bell, a member of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas. He says:

STATE OF TEXAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Austin, January 29, 1947.

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a portion of House Journal of January 16 in which we introduced House Simple Resolution No. 19 denouncing Daniel J. Tobin for his advocating a boycott on cotton and cotton products in order to defeat Members of Congress of the Southern States.

I believe this matter will be of particular interest to you, and if possible, I would like for it to go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am also enclosing two copies of the right-to-work bill which I am today introducing in the house of representatives.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

MARSHALL O. BELL.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a copy of House Simple Resolution No. 19, together with Representative Bell's statement concerning the resolution, and also a copy of his bill which would give to the citizens of Texas their freedom to work and his statement with reference to that bill. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed, as follows:

DENOUNCING CERTAIN PROPOSAL IN REGARD TO THE BOYCOTT OF COTTON

Mr. Bell, of Bexar, offered the following resolution:

"House resolution denouncing certain proposal in regard to the boycott of cotton

"Whereas in the International Teamster, the official magazine of the Brotherhood of Teamsters, in the June 1946 issue the following editorial appeared:

" 'HOW TO CRACK THE COTTON BLOC

" 'The cotton bloc in Congress is responsible for most of our domestic troubles. It is composed of the reactionary southern Democrats who team up with the equally reactionary northern Republicans to destroy the living standards of the American people.

" 'Naturally the Republicans must bear the bulk of the blame because they are more numerous. But without the cotton Senators and Congressmen, they would be only a noisy, dangerous minority.

" 'The cotton bloc supplies the votes the Republicans need to kill legislation promoting full employment, higher wages, social security, and public health.

" 'It also supplies the votes the Republicans need to pass legislation restricting labor, removing price control, and reducing taxes for large corporations. Such legislation reduces living standards by reducing the purchasing power of the workers' wages.

" 'The cotton bloc is interested chiefly in higher prices for cotton, even though that means higher prices for shirts, dresses, underwear, socks, and other articles of wearing apparel.

" 'When Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles restricted speculation in cotton, the southern Congressmen attacked him and the whole price-control program in retaliation. They are demanding inflation in cotton, even if it means inflation in everything.

" 'The public can go naked while warehouses bulge with cotton being hoarded for higher prices, for all the cotton bloc cares.

" 'The southerners in Congress, interested primarily in perpetuating the plantation-slave economy of the South, think that the public is helpless.

" 'But it is not. It can strike back with devastating force. How? By simply boycotting cotton goods.

" 'You can buy rayon underwear, rayon, nylon, silk or wool socks, and shirts. You can reject articles made of cotton, even insisting on automobile tires made with rayon instead of cotton thread. Such tires wear longer and are safer.

" 'If the public becomes cotton conscious and refuses to buy anything made of cotton, the price of cotton will tumble and the power of the cotton bloc in Congress will be broken. Many of them may be defeated for reelection because of the penalty their arrogance brought upon the South.

" 'Labor can do this job by mobilizing its economic strength and diverting its buying power to cotton substitutes with which the market will soon be loaded.

" ' "Patronize your friends," is the key to the success of the union label. And there is no union label on the cotton Congressmen. They are apostles of the open shop.

" 'You can beat them if you make the simple resolution and tell it to your friends:

" 'Don't buy cotton'; and

"Whereas Daniel J. Tobin is both president of the International Teamsters Union and editor in chief of the official magazine; and

"Whereas such editorial has called upon a Nation-wide boycott of cotton and all cotton products so that the price of cotton will tumble and the power of the Representatives of the Southern States in Congress will be broken; and

"Whereas the sole purpose of such a boycott is to starve America's cotton States into economic despair so that many of our Representatives may be defeated for reelection; and

"Whereas such program is calculated to bring distress and starvation to innocent women and children and will cause untold suffering to millions of people who are dependent upon cotton for their livelihood: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas:

"1. We denounce such a boycott as contemptible and unjust since it will bring starvation and distress to innocent women and children and to millions of other persons who are dependent upon cotton and cotton products for their livelihood.

"2. We urge the decent and responsible members of organized labor to disregard such an evil and un-American program and to denounce any false god of labor who advocates such a vicious and wicked program.

"3. We believe that this program is outside the legitimate activities of a labor union and it is suggested by a group utterly disregardful of the public welfare and who are fatally bent upon mischief.

"4. This proposal is an insult to the integrity of the people of Texas and regardless of the results we shall not surrender our vote and heritage to those who would destroy our State and our rights and liberties as freemen."

The resolution was read a second time and was unanimously adopted.

REMARKS OF HON. MARSHALL BELL

On motion of Mr. Bell of DeWitt the following remarks of Mr. Bell of Bexar, addressing the house on House Simple Resolution No. 19, were ordered printed in the Journal:

"Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the house, the resolution which has just been read is important to the Legislature of Texas. You will note in the resolution the suggestion of the International Teamsters Union that a boycott be established against cotton and all cotton products. This proposal is shocking to me and is a reflection upon the integrity and dignity of the people of Texas as well as the members of this legislature.

"From this story you can readily see that this defiant and arrogant overlord of labor has announced a definite program under which he is committed to a plan to starve, if necessary, the innocent women and children of the South in order to attain political and economic power over a prostrate people. Such a ruthless plan is hard to realize but from the past conduct of this particular organization it appears that they are willing to go to any limit in order to achieve their greedy and selfish goals.

"The sole purpose of such a boycott according to the self-appointed tyrant of the Teamsters is to starve America's cotton States into such economic despair that many of our chosen representatives in the legislative branch of our Government may be defeated for reelection because they will not bow their heads nor surrender their vote to those who would destroy our land from within.

"What is particularly significant to every citizen of Texas is the fact that our Nation's pampering and appeasement of professional false gods of labor has reached the point where Tobin has the impertinence to proclaim that we no longer shall be permitted to elect legislative representatives of our own choosing. With haughty contempt he threatens to wreck the economy of 18 cotton-growing States and to boycott into oblivion the Nation's largest single segment of workers (its 9,000,000 cotton farmers) if they insist upon electing members to legislative positions who are faithful to the public welfare rather than subservient to his orders.

"King Cotton is of great importance to the people of Texas. For many generations our State has led all other States in cotton production with an average yearly crop in excess of 4,000,000 bales. It is the crop which has afforded 70 percent of the ready cash for the small farmer and on cotton are dependent thousands of tenant farmers and laborers who Mr. Tobin is ready and willing to sacrifice on his altar of vengeance and greed.

"There is not a person in this legislative hall today who will not be personally affected directly or indirectly by this announced program of Mr. Tobin. Many of us know what it is to grow cotton and all of us realize how dependent we are upon agriculture for our economic success throughout the South. This vicious statement clearly indicates the contempt in which Mr. Tobin and his fellow labor racketeers really hold the people of the South. Yes, the great South which for generations has been the backbone for our great Democratic Party both while it was in office as well as when it was out.

"This International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers have now shown their true color and certainly a new name they have placed upon themselves. It should now be termed the 'International Union of Racketeers and Teamsters' for this announced program can only be classified as a racket of the first order.

"In the 1945 International Teamsters' publication the Honorable Daniel J. Tobin was perfectly willing to let our returning soldiers sell apples and pencils again rather than to give them an even break. This is what he has to say personally:

" 'As to new men who were never members of our union, who are in the service, we do not really know how we can place them, even with payment of an initiation fee, because there will not be work enough to go around for the returning members of our organization now in the service of our country.

" 'We hope and trust there will be, but we are not living in dreams, nor are we going to be deluded by political promises made during campaigns.

" 'We went through the stagnation of business after the last war and we know what happened, and we expect much worse conditions of unemployment to prevail at the ending of this war, at any rate until reorganization of industry has taken place.'

"This is the same union which for years forced the farmers of Maryland and Virginia to pay tribute for each truckload of foodstuff taken into the New York food markets. This practice became so vicious that, at the last session of Congress, President Truman recommended the passage of the Hobbs antiracketeering bill which Congress quickly passed. This bill now outlaws highway robbery and extortion in interstate commerce. Is it little wonder that such an organization with this background now seeks to extend its activities Nation-wide in order to bring the South to political and economic chaos?

"After that unfortunate struggle within our country which we call the Civil War, there descended upon the South a group of human termites and drones who sought to plunder and destroy our fair Southland and to make slaves of a proud and defeated people. Their conduct was so abusive and so unjust that finally Texans and the people of the South rose up and drove these unscrupulous and ruthless carpetbaggers back to the North and East from whence they came. It now appears, my friends, that we have a new variety of these cheap and ruthless carpetbaggers who have been living off the land long enough. I personally do not believe that such labor racketeers should be allowed to hold a State or community for political or economic ransom and that legislation apparently is necessary to protect our State from arrogant union officials who seek to destroy our Government, our liberties, and our heritage. Each member of this legislative body no doubt will be given an opportunity to express himself relative to the matters which I have discussed today.

"When the time comes in our great State that we are forced to surrender our political ideals and our economic independence to a group of ruthless labor racketeers, then death itself becomes more desirable to a liberty-loving people."

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL O. BELL

More than 170 years ago the founders of this Republic, in our Declaration of Independence, declared that all men are entitled to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. For generations Americans lived by and prospered under these fundamental principles of government. However, in the past 15 years new and strange theories of government have been tried on a long-suffering and patient people.

It is evident to most Americans that we, in fact, have been political guinea pigs on whom the long-haired men and short-haired women might try out their planned economy and cradle-to-grave philosophies in order to regiment a free and liberty-loving people.

During this unfortunate period many unwise and unscrupulous labor leaders have risen to power and under the protection of unjust Federal laws have tried to gain control over the economic and political welfare of those who are privileged to labor. Those same labor leaders have demanded power and recognition, but have been unwilling to assume the duties and obligations that accompany leadership. During our war years we experienced over 13,000 strikes and work stoppages involving more than 5,000,000 laborers. In 1946 we observed over 5,000 strikes, all of which have impaired our reconversion program and tended to bring about an economic crisis.

No American should be forced or required to be a member of any organization or group in order to do an honest day's work for the support of his family. Recent polls in our State and Nation clearly indicate that the vast majority of our citizens are opposed to the unreasonable and arbitrary demands of labor unions and favor an open-shop system under which Americans and Texans can work. We Texans believe in the dignity of each person who works and that each individual should be allowed to determine his own destiny and the terms and conditions under which he will labor. To accomplish this purpose I am, therefore, introducing this right-to-work bill, to relieve Texans of the obligation of paying tribute to the Petrillos, the Lewises, the Tobins, and to other well-known characters.

MARSHALL O. BELL.

An act providing that the inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law or by any organization of whatever nature; that no person shall be denied employment because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union; providing that certain types of contracts shall be void and that this act shall not apply to existing contracts; definitions of words; containing a saving clause with respect to constitutional invalidity; and declaring an emergency

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Texas:

SECTION I. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.

SEC. II. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.

SEC. III. Any contract which requires or prescribes that employees or applicants for employment in order to work for an employer shall or shall not be or remain members of a labor union, shall be null and void and against public policy. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any contract or contracts heretofore executed but shall apply to any renewal or extension of any existing contract and to any new agreement or contract executed after the effective date of this act.

SEC. IV. Definitions: By the term "labor union" as used in this act shall mean every association, group, union, lodge, local, branch or subordinate organization of any union of workingmen, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and existing for the purpose of protecting themselves and improving their working conditions, wages, or employment relationships in any manner, but shall not include associations or organizations not commonly regarded as labor unions.

SEC. V. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall for any reason be adjudged to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act and the application thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the portion of the act directly involved in the controversy in which judgment shall have been rendered and to the person or circumstances involved.

SEC. VI. Due to the fact that there have been widespread labor difficulties resulting from the unreasonable demands of labor unions, all of which has delayed the reconversion plan, and there being an urgent need for constructive legislation to protect the public welfare, which need is so found, there exists an emergency and an imperative public necessity that the constitutional rule requiring bills to be read on three several days in each House shall be suspended and the same here now is suspended, and this act shall become effective from and after its passage, and it is so enacted.

PURCHASE BY VETERANS OF SURPLUS GOODS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have a copy of a letter from another member of the Texas Legislature, Hon. Allan Shivers, the lieutenant governor, who presides over the senate at Austin. Gov. Allan Shivers gave up his work to volunteer his services to his country. He served his country with distinction during the war. When he came back from the war he was, in the recent election, elected lieutenant governor by a large majority.

Governor Shivers is protesting against the lack of consideration, or downright disrespect, shown to the veterans by the War Assets Administration, with reference to purchasing goods that are supposed to be offered as surplus property to the veterans. I ask unanimous consent that Lt. Gov. Allan Shivers' letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1947.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Houston, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: I have your memorandum of December 30 with reference to the above subject matter advising me that you were placing same in the inactive file. I certainly have no objection to this procedure.

For your information and for the record, I want to recite the history of this application with the hope that other veterans have not received similar treatment and consideration.

On May 7, 1946, I wrote you that I had seen an ad in the Houston Post which stated that you had some several thousand gallons of OD paint for sale to veterans with the requirement that the veteran must purchase a minimum of 500 gallons. In this letter I

requested that blanks be immediately forwarded to me so that I might purchase this paint, and also stated in the letter that if the red tape could not be completed within the 15 days, which the ad stated the paint would be held for veterans, to please set the minimum amount aside for purchase. I also stated that I wanted this paint for use in repainting agricultural buildings on an East Texas farm. Of course, I did not need that quantity of paint, but at the price of 30 cents per gallon, at which it was offered, I would purchase the minimum quantity which you required a veteran to purchase.

Some time after the expiration of the 15-day limit I received my first communication from you stating that, if I would furnish certain information, my application would be filed and a search made for the items requested. I call your attention to the fact that this statement was made by your office in spite of the fact that you had paid for an ad in the Houston Post offering the very products which I requested for sale. I completed the various forms and supplied you the information requested immediately.

After a lapse of several weeks I received another communication from your office stating that the items that I had requested were not available, but that my application was being placed in your files for future reference.

Periodically I have received additional communications stating that you were still searching for the items which I requested.

Shortly after the expiration of the 15-day limit placed in your paid ad in the Houston Post I was offered these items for sale, and upon investigation found that the paint could be obtained by me, and I suppose most anyone else who desired same, from several industries and dealers, the prices ranging from 75 cents to $1.25 per gallon.

If this is a typical manner in which the applications of veterans to purchase surplus commodities have been handled, I am not surprised at the amount of criticism which the War Assets Administration has received nor am I surprised at the usual disgust that the average veteran has for the Administration.

Yours very truly,

ALLAN SHIVERS.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying appendix, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 750.)

DESTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT FILES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish very briefly to invite the attention of the Senate, and especially the attention of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the eminent chairman of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, to the matter to which I am about to refer.

I hold in my hand a press clipping dated January 31, from the Chicago Tribune. It is an Associated Press dispatch. The article refers to the action of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program in a hearing on Friday of Gen. Maurice Hirsch, who told the committee something about the renegotiation of contracts and something about profits on contracts.

I have no objection whatever to the action of the committee in holding the hearing on Friday in order to hear General Hirsch. Although the minority members of that committee had not at that time been appointed by the Senate, General Hirsch was desirous of leaving the city and was about to leave, and the majority of the committee acted properly in calling him before it and getting some information from him.

What I wish to call attention to, however, was the last paragraph of this article:

BREWSTER told a reporter he has a tip that "one Government department has been destroying papers and files that are of definite interest" to the committee. He declined to identify the agency, but said he has taken the matter up with President Truman.

What I desire to observe—and I am making this as a public statement to the distinguished chairman of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, because of the fact that this newspaper article has been carried as a public release—is that we are to have an organization meeting of the committee this afternoon, when, no doubt, we will have an opportunity to discuss the future policies and actions of the committee.

Obviously the effect of such an article, stimulating and encouraging belief in the minds of the readers that some department in Washington has a sinister purpose in concealing the truth and in going so far as to destroy Government records and files in a furtive attempt to deny the committee an opportunity to ascertain the truth, is contrary to the public interest and contrary to the wishes of the committee and of the Congress, who do not wish to establish unjustified distrust in the Government of the United States.

I simply wish to observe, Mr. President, that since this matter has been made public, if there is any department or agency of the Government which is attempting to thwart the functioning of the committee in making a thorough and full investigation of any matter within its jurisdiction, such agency or department needs to be publicly identified, and if it has been wrongly named, it is entitled to an opportunity to defend itself. As it is now, readers of this article, whether or not it might have been so intended by our able chairman, cannot fail to receive the impression that some agency of Government, which is not identified and which has no opportunity to deny the charge or to invite inquiry as to what the charge is, is guilty of wrongdoing and is trying to conceal something from the committee.

I now invite my able friend from Maine, who is the distinguished chairman of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, to name here in the Senate the agency of the Government which, according to the tip which the Senator has received, has been destroying papers and files which are of interest to the committee. I think it would be just to the department or agency which he has in mind that it be named, so that it may defend itself if it is wrongfully charged or be condemned if it be guilty.

I wish further to say to my distinguished friend from Maine that the statement is made on the basis of what purports to be a "tip." I do not know what the able chairman meant by a "tip." I do not know whether it came from an anonymous source or from a responsible source, or exactly what may be the dignity or the reliability of the "tip."

I wish to suggest in the presence of our colleagues who created the committee that it would probably be better public policy for statements of this sort not to be given out, especially by one whose utterances carry the weight which statements of the chairman of the committee would naturally carry. Such a statement is likely to prejudice the public against their Government unless it has been authenticated by proof that will establish its credibility or reliability.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall yield the floor in a moment.

I have spoken of this matter publicly because the committee referred to has not yet begun to function as a committee, and because the committee is answerable to the Senate for its authority. We shall probably discuss the procedure in the future, but I think it is only appropriate and fair to the Senate and to the Government, Mr. President, to make an observation on the subject and to express not only an invitation to the Senator from Maine to name any agency or department which has been guilty of anything which should be condemned, but also the hope that in the future such statements will not be made public, certainly not by the chairman or any member of the committee, unless the statements have been officially determined by the committee to be authentic.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] regarding the hearing which was held on Friday under the circumstances indicated. I also confirm the fact that that morning, a little after 9 o'clock, I called one of the Members of the Senate who was later designated as a member of the committee, and who appeared likely to be named, to inform him of the situation. I also communicated with the Senator from Florida, but found that his office did not answer telephone calls before 10 o'clock, so I was not able to reach him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator will recall that I said, "Except on one line," and I gave the Senator the number.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator said that he would give me the number.

I also notified two former members of the committee who were in a state of suspended animation. All of the steps possible were taken.

I am sure that the appearance of General Hirsch was informative and helpful, and I deeply appreciate the Senator's approval of our action in that connection, because the situation was somewhat difficult. The committee has been in a transitional state. The Senator called attention to the comment at

the end of the article, while things were in a somwhat undetermined condition.

The matter came to my attention through a report from a subordinate in the department who was profoundly concerned with what was going on, which was intimated to be a wholesale destruction of records which might be of great significance. It was difficult to understand. In compliance with our usual procedure, it did not seem to me that the name of the person or the department should be identified. Why, then, it may well be asked, should any comment be made? Because time was elapsing and because of other rumors of this character that we had heard as to bonfires of records, it seemed to me that there should be no long delay in bringing such a serious matter to the attention of all concerned.

I recall a similar episode in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation relating to certain missing files. It was denied on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that there were records missing, but it later developed that there were serious gaps in the records bearing on certain memoranda.

I accordingly made the statement to which the Senator from Florida has referred, except that my statement was not that I had communicated with President Truman, but that I contemplated so doing. I thought the matter should be taken up with him, and it was my intention, this afternoon, at the meeting of the committee, to report in detail this episode and ask the committee to consider what might be the proper procedure. At that time we were not clear as to how soon the membership of the committee would be complete, as the appointments had not then been made. Following the Hirsch hearing the appointments were announced on the floor of the Senate that afternoon.

I may say, however, that apparently this comment has borne abundant fruitage, as I now have on my desk a statement, signed by an apparently responsible party, quoting a responsible official of a major Government agency, which has been much under discussion for possible investigation by this committee or by other committees, to the effect that orders had been issued to destroy all records over 2 years old. I propose to lay this matter before the committee this afternoon, to ask the committee what action it believes appropriate, and to recommend, so far as I am concerned, that the matter be taken up immediately with the Chief Executive, to ask what are the existing rules and regulations regarding the destruction of public documents. This fits in very well with the currrent discussion regarding the removal of records, which—as we are all informed—is now a matter under discussion between the present and former Secretaries of the Treasury, and seems to supplement it very well.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself have served for 6 years, I believe, as the sole Senate members of the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments; and in carrying out our duties in connection with that committee we have signed a number of documents authorizing the destruction of various papers. That has been done on the recommendation of responsible officials, so the record has been kept clear.

If there is authority and if there is procedure for destroying files without first obtaining clearance of that character, I think it is a matter of very great interest to the Congress and to the country, and I am very hopeful that one of the initial steps of our committee may be to clarify this situation.

Meanwhile I hope that my brief statement, which certainly does not cast reflection on any department or agency, inasmuch as I decline to name the ones involved, may perhaps result in suspending temporarily any destruction which may at this time be proceeding or contemplated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for his statement. Inasmuch as he has already given this matter publicity, I am sorry he has not chosen to name the agency and to let that agency also have access to the public, either to deny the charge or to be convicted for its wrongdoing.

As the matter now stands, no agency is singled out, but the Government of the United States is by the Senator from Maine indicted on a "tip" and charged with having done something which has a suggestion or an environment or atmosphere of odium. If I may say so, and I am saying this in the presence of the Senate, before we inaugurate our procedures in the committee this afternoon, if this matter came to the able chairman only on a "tip" and if he has not yet communicated with the President, as the article said, it seems to me that it would have been far better not to have given out any public statement about it at all, because the effect of the statement, although I am sure it was not so intended by the able chairman, cannot but be to stimulate distrust on the part of the people in their Government and to make the suggestion that someone is trying to conceal or suppress something that the public or this committee is entitled to know.

If any persons have been guilty of that kind of wrongdoing, I invite the Senator from Maine to name the persons or agencies and to condemn them; and if the evidence justifies conviction, our committee will convict them of their wrongdoing. But I respectfully submit that the Government of the United States should not be indicted by the able chairman of the committee on a "tip" without naming the agency or department that is the wrongdoer and without giving it an opportunity publicly to deny the charge which has been hurled against it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Florida as to the care with which we should proceed in any matters of this character. Perhaps the effect is a matter of judgment. However, if even before a particular agency or department is named, the comment which has been made has resulted in preventing the destruction of any papers or files, I shall feel well warranted in having taken this action.

Meanwhile, until we know more as to the details and the responsibility, to name one of the departments is not in accordance with the procedure of our committee or in accordance with what I believe to be sound public practice. Full details regarding this matter will be laid before the committee this afternoon at 3 o'clock, at the committee meeting; and then the committee itself can determine the procedure which it deems wise to adopt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator from Maine understands that there is quite a difference, and would be quite a difference in the public mind, between a routine elimination of records or papers by a department, an elimination which went on regularly from year to year, and a rush to eliminate papers in view of a possible investigation. We all know that there are routine eliminations of papers in the Government files, just as there are in connection with our own files. We go through them and dispose of things which we do not think are any longer necessary. That is not to be criticized, because I think it is a regular matter of routine.

It would be a matter of criticism if any department had rushed to dispose of papers which it thought might be called for by an investigating committee, although in view of the length of time during which the committee has functioned it would be rather strange to me, if now at this late date, after 5 or 6 years, the departments were to become uneasy, in view of the wide latitude the committee has always had in respect to investigating anything which it thought worthy of investigation.

I think the Senator from Maine will agree that in any statement made by anyone or in any information furnished a difference should be drawn between the ordinary, routine elimination of useless papers and an accelerated effort to do that because of the approach or possibility of an investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Kentucky, my senior in service as well as in years——

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Maine is going into that matter, I am willing to make profert in open court, so far as that is concerned, as to our respective ages. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether the elimination of records and files is authorized other than through the procedure of the very distinguished committee on which he and I have served for the past 6 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably it is now an extinguished committee. Of course, on that committee, our function was performed largely through the Archivist.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. He would send to us certain papers which he had decided were no longer of any use; and, ordi-

narily, we concurred in his judgment in the matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether back of that, before he is called upon to act, the departments have any extensive authority to eliminate papers which accumulate in their offices I am not certain, and I would not be able to answer as to that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have asked our counsel to have a report to present at our committee meeting this afternoon, as it seems to me quite appropriate to have that done.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, as bearing on the discussion of a few moments ago between the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and myself, I wish to read from the United States Statutes at Large, chapter 192, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government," Public Law 115, July 7, 1943, the pertinent part of the chapter being as follows:

SEC. 15. The procedures herein prescribed are exclusive and no records of the United States Government shall be alienated or destroyed except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

I thought that would complete the record regarding the act's providing for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government, which are here set out in considerable detail.

TIMBER FROM THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, within the last year or year and a half no subject of national importance has received wider discussion in the Senate and throughout the country than the national housing shortage. It may be interesting to my colleagues and to the people in general to have some information regarding the extent to which the national forests of the United States have contributed to the alleviation of the shortage of building and construction materials. I have requested and have received from the Forest Service certain information on that subject, and I desire to present it at this time.

Of the sixteen hundred billion feet of timber of saw-timber size in the continental United States, 518,000,000,000 feet are on the national forests. Obviously, the management and cutting policy for this 32 percent of the merchantable timber reserves of the Nation is of great concern to both manufacturers and consumers of forest products. The timber-cutting policy for the national forests is to build up the cut, working circle by working circle, to sustained-yield cutting capacity. This statement will review briefly recent progress toward that objective.

For several years prior to the war the cutting from the national forests was approximately 1,250,000,000 feet annually. Beginning in 1941, the rate of cutting increased rapidly to a peak of 3,300,000,000 feet in the fiscal year 1944. During the next 2 years national forest cutting declined in approximately the same proportions as the decline in national lumber production. In the last completed fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, cutting and timber sale receipts were as follows:

	1946	
	Volume, thousand board feet	Value
Timber cut:		
Sales	2,470,050	$10,493,573
Exchanges	259,658	966,745
Total	2,729,708	11,460,318

Progress in building up the cut since July 1, 1946, has been substantial. In the first half of the fiscal year 1947, ending on the 31st of December 1946, 2,173,713,000 feet of timber were cut in sales and exchanges on the national forests, as compared to 1,569,649,000 feet in the corresponding period of the preceding year.

Mr. President, to the average mind those are merely figures. They may be more understandable if we reduce them to concrete measurement. Let me say, then, that the amount of timber cut from the national forests in the last half of 1946, if the lumber produced therefrom were used entirely for the construction of residences, would construct 217,000 frame dwellings of the ordinary five-room type, or practically a quarter of a million small homes.

Receipts to the Treasury from timber sales for this same period have increased in corresponding ratio, being $7,760,637 in the half year ending December 31, 1946, and $5,555,839 in the corresponding period in the preceding year, an increase of $2,204,798, or 40 percent. These increases in the contribution from the national forests toward alleviating shortages of supply of lumber and other forest products, and enlarging receipts to the Federal Treasury, are particularly timely.

The increasing contribution of national forest timber to the supply of forest products is indicated by a comparison of the national forest cut with total lumber production. In the fiscal year 1946 the total lumber cut was 28,565,000,000 feet. The cut from the national forests was 9.5 percent of this amount. For the 6 months ending December 31, 1946, national lumber production was 18,900,000,000 feet, the production for December being estimated. The national forest cut for this period was 11.7 percent of this amount.

The total national forest cut for the fiscal year 1947 is estimated at 3,900,000,000 feet, an increase of 1,200,000,000 feet over the fiscal year 1946, or 44 percent. Receipts to the Treasury for the fiscal year 1947 for timber cutting are estimated to increase by about $4,500,000 to a total of approximately $15,000,000.

An annual rate of cutting of slightly less than 6,000,000,000 feet could be currently maintained on the national forests of the continental United States if cutting on all working circles should b developed to sustained yield capacity. In addition, an annual rate of approximately 1,000,000,000 feet could be supported by the national forests of Alaska if a pulp and paper industry could be established to utilize this volume of timber. These estimates of maximum current cutting capacity are approximate, because it has not yet been possible to take an adequate inventory of the timber stands on all national forests, or to develop management plans to establish accurate sustained yield cutting rates. These estimates of cutting capacity are also subject to upward revision as progress is made in more intensive management of the national forests and betterment of utilization in the areas where cutting operations are conducted.

The key to development of cutting on the national forests to full potentialities is an adequate transportation system. The need for access roads on the national forests is much greater than any other major classification of the Nation's timber lands. Of the 73,000,000 acres of commercial timber lands in the national forests in the continental United States, 53,000,000 acres, or 72 percent, are in the western national forests, and in general are the most rugged and remote commercial timber lands in the United States.

The first major effort to develop adequate timber hauling roads in the national forests was initiated last year. A program involving the expenditure of $19,300,000 got under way about June 1946 by allotment of funds totaling $13,300,000 from the National Housing Agency for the purpose of rapidly expanding the cutting of national forest timber. This program includes 329 projects in all parts of the national forest system and involves 1,554 miles of road construction and 715 miles of road betterment. Around 200,000,000 feet of national forest timber has already been hauled over these access roads, and it is expected that over a billion feet will be hauled over them during each of the calendar years 1947 and 1948.

Today, because of the serious depletion of privately owned timber, coupled with the high level of postwar needs for forest products, development of the national forests to provide maximum rates of cutting allowable under sustained yield management offers the Nation an opportunity to reap the full benefits from its care and conservation of these lands over the last 40 years.

Mr. President, I have also requested and received a statement of the receipts in dollars from national forests for the fiscal year 1946. I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of receipts from national forests, fiscal year 1946

	Net receipts
Alabama	$117,796.55
Alaska	55,691.40
Arizona	667,590.51
Arkansas	581,102.07
California	1,735,882.36
Colorado	586,995.01
Florida	182,526.66
Georgia	136,431.91
Idaho	839,310.36
Illinois	36,949.24
Indiana	2,485.35
Iowa	1,504.39
Kentucky	109,519.03
Louisiana	157,081.46

Statement of receipts from national forests, fiscal year 1946—Continued

	Net receipts
Maine	$7,679.67
Michigan	225,030.83
Minnesota	241,482.11
Mississippi	919,474.23
Missouri	60,195.67
Montana	538,902.85
Nebraska	21,374.62
Nevada	100,270.13
New Hampshire	112,690.71
New Mexico	304,361.43
North Carolina	186,387.71
North Dakota	140.96
Ohio	28,860.68
Oklahoma	46,388.45
Oregon	2,237,121.76
Pennsylvania	96,685.01
Puerto Rico	25,831.54
South Carolina	171,805.63
South Dakota	189,286.07
Tennessee	136,687.20
Texas	439,714.88
Utah	303,487.20
Vermont	59,737.41
Virginia	121,074.78
Washington	1,592,355.15
West Virginia	90,201.42
Wisconsin	110,714.14
Wyoming	296,262.57
Grand total	13,875,071.11

Mr. CORDON. I call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that for the fiscal year 1946 there was received $13,875,071.11 from the sale of national forest timber; that that money came from States throughout the United States where commercial national forests are located, and that of that sum 25 percent is returnable to the States in which the timber is cut, as a payment in lieu of taxes on the timber lands under existing law.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Dal M. Lemmon, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Martin I. Welsh, retired.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harvey Erickson, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington, vice Edward M. Connelly, resigned.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph E. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi, vice Toxey Hall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Calendar.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward M. Curran, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this nomination has been passed over, I think, twice, on the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The Senator from North Dakota personally assured me that he had no intention to ask for further delay, and his office has this morning confirmed the assurance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to take much of the time of the Senate in a discussion which probably may seem somewhat repetitious to many Senators, to the Congress, and to the country at large, but in my opinion the times call again for some statement on the subject to which I am about to refer.

Congress, long since, and over and over again, has expressed itself, and I believe in so doing it has expressed the demand of the American people, in connection with the Palestine problem. Numerous resolutions have been adopted, and both the late President Roosevelt and the present occupant of the White House have made statements concerning it. We always run into the impasse of the British Empire.

I think it is no exaggeration to say that the people of this country, and I am sure of many others, have been profoundly shocked by the recent events which have taken place in Palestine. This is true both on the part of the Jews in America and those who are not adherents of the Jewish faith. I also think it a shocking thing that now, some year and a half after the end of the war, there are hundreds of thousands of its most tragic victims who are still homeless and penniless, many of them living in the same concentration camps where they were imprisoned by their enemies.

It must be, Mr. President, with great irony that these people hear constant references made to the achievements of the Allied Powers in liberating the victims of Nazi oppression. It is true that the Allied Powers are feeding and caring for many of them. But that is far from fulfilling the humanitarian obligations which inevitably accompanied victory in the late war. It is, Mr. President, a shameful thing that with the sole exception of France, the victorious powers have done practically nothing to facilitate the immigration of these victims to places where they can live as decent, normal human beings. France, with great sympathy and understanding, has admitted thousands of refugees to her borders and has, I am happy to say, given them material assistance in their efforts to reestablish the remnants of their families and find an opportunity to rebuild their lives.

My point here, however, is to make it clear that the events in Palestine and the problem of the displaced persons of Europe are closely and directly connected. We hear daily of violence, of conflict, and of strife in Jerusalem, in Haifa, and in Tel Aviv. The British Government protests vigorously and sometimes hysterically against these things. But it is perfectly obvious, Mr. President, that the sole and only reason for the determined resistance of the Hebrew people of Palestine is the white paper policy which Great Britain, in violation of the pledges of the mandate for Palestine, continues to apply. I, along with millions of other Americans, want to see the end of violence in Palestine and, for that matter, any place in the world, because I think violence in any land is an incipient threat to every other country.

I am also greatly disturbed by the repressive measures which the British Government is adopting in Palestine. I do not think the problem there can be solved by restrictions upon the civil liberties of citizens and the curtailment of the right of free speech and press. As an example of how far this policy has been carried, I cite a recent order of the Palestine administration forbidding the mention in the press of the American League for a Free Palestine, a nonsectarian organization of American citizens, of which, Mr. President, I happen to be one of a large number of congressional sponsors.

I am convinced that violence will continue in Palestine until the Mandatory Power reverses its present policy, repudiates the White Paper of 1939, and carries out the terms of the mandate for Palestine. I think, Mr. President, that the Government of the United States should insist, as it legitimately may insist, that these things be done so that peace may come to Palestine.

I believe we cannot afford to wait longer. The British order for the evacuation of English women and children is ominous, but not because English women and children are in any danger by reasons of the activities of the Palestine underground military operations. It is more than slightly ironic that the English wives themselves have made irate protests against this order. They are mindful of the fact that the Palestine underground has conducted its operations with scrupulous concern for the safety and security not only of English women and children, but of all civilians. To be sure, there have been civilian casualties in Palestine. Unhappily, there are civilian casualties in any war, and we are very blind indeed if we do not recognize that there is at the moment actual war in Palestine. The British order for the evacuation of women and children is frightening because it indicates that the scale of military operations in Palestine is to be greatly extended. This will mean

further casualties both among the armed forces and the civilian population on both sides.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I believe the United States cannot afford to delay efforts to bring about a cessation of hostilities and a peaceful solution of this problem. It is perfectly obvious that nothing is to be gained by further appeals to Great Britain. For 18 months the President and the Department of State have attempted to bring about a peaceful solution only to see Great Britain persist with a policy which is alone responsible for the constantly deteriorating situation in Palestine as well as in the displaced-persons camps of Europe. I maintain, therefore, that the time has now come for definitive action to solve both segments of this extremely dangerous problem. I propose that the President of the United States make a forthright public statement in which he will call upon the British Government to revoke immediately all military orders, restore civil administration, and remove all restrictions upon the civil liberties, and at the same time call upon the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Fighters for the Freedom of Israel simultaneously to lay down their arms and suspend all military operations. I propose that the President, in his statement, announce that unless within a stated time large-scale emigration of displaced Hebrews in Europe to Palestine is undertaken, the Government of the United States will itself undertake to transport such persons from Europe to Palestine under the protection of the American flag, as it has every right to do under the Anglo-American Convention of 1924.

Mr. President, this may appear to be drastic action. If it is, I call attention to the fact that the situation which it is designed to correct is one which has already had drastic consequences and which is certain to have consequences which are still more tragic. I am confident that such a statement by our President would result in immediate cessation of hostilities and the consequent saving of human life and that it would pave the way for a correction of the evils which have brought about this serious threat to the peace and safety of the world.

DEATH OF ADMIRAL MARC ANDREW MITSCHER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, Marc Andrew Mitscher, one of our great naval heroes of the Second World War, went on his last mission.

Admiral Mitscher was born on January 26, 1887, in Hillsboro, Wis. He entered the Navy in 1906, and advanced through the grades to vice admiral by 1944. He was in command of the aircraft carrier *Hornet* when that vessel transported Gen. Jimmy Doolittle's bombers within 800 nautical miles of Japan to bomb Tokyo on April 18, 1942. Mitscher's carrier task force participated in virtually every important naval operation in the Pacific war theater in 1944. Mitscher was selected to command Task Force 58, which was described as the most powerful, destructive naval unit in the history of sea warfare. His force participated in the Marshall Islands invasion, the attack on Truk, the Marianas invasion, the battle of the Philippine Sea, the Luzon and Formosa raids, and the battle for Leyte Gulf. In March and April 1945, the carrier planes of Mitscher's task force slashed targets on Japan and the Ryukyus. On May 11, 1945, two Japanese kamikaze planes crashed on the deck of the carrier *Bunker Hill*, Mitscher's flagship, taking the lives of 373 crew members. Mitscher was transferred to another craft. In July 1945, he was made deputy chief of naval operations for air and returned to Washington. On December 4, 1945, he was made commander of the Eighth Fleet in the Atlantic.

Admiral Mitscher's loss will be mourned by all those who wore the Navy uniform during the war and by every American patriot who recognizes the admiral's great contribution to victory. He will be mourned particularly in his home State, Wisconsin.

America knew and loved Marc Mitscher as a forthright, fearless sea chief, who will have a high and lasting place in the annals of the history of our sea arm. He ranks with the Navy immortals—in the company of John Paul Jones and other great naval commanders.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also wish to pay a tribute of profound respect to Admiral Mitscher. The Senator from Wisconsin has well pointed out his great achievements. The country mourns his loss.

I can only add that I knew him well in the Pacific. I served with him on two of the raids which have been mentioned. Not only was he a great naval officer, but I know of no man who was held in greater respect by the sailors who served under him than Admiral Mitscher. He was a sailor's sailor, a great naval strategist, and a man upon whom the Navy learned to rely, and whom it learned to respect all during the long Pacific war. The country has lost a great American, and the Navy a great commander.

PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES (S. REPT. NO. 9)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement. The report of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources was filed last Friday. It is Senate Report No. 9. My office has been deluged with requests for copies. I am informed that the Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office has already received orders for more than 1,200 copies. Some of the Government departments and agencies have also indicated an interest. I make this announcement so that those who may be interested may notify the Superintendent of Documents of their desire for copies, or notify me, and, so far as the Government agencies or departments are concerned, that they may place their orders with the Government Printing Office.

The document is now being prepared for formal publication by the Government Printing Office. I have asked the Superintendent of Documents to notify me what the cost of the document will be, and as soon as I receive the estimate, both for the total cost and the cost per copy, I shall place it in the RECORD.

ALL-AMERICAN FLAG LINE FOR AMERICAN AIR COMMERCE ABROAD

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senate has heard me many times with reference to what is known as the all-American air line for foreign air transportation. I stated on the floor of the Senate during the past Congress, and I shall state in this Congress, that unless America wakes up and takes governmental control over an all-American flag line to carry air commerce abroad, she will find herself very shortly with no commerce to carry, and no opportunity for facilitating or promoting an air line.

Mr. President, I have drawn to the attention of the Senate on numerous occasions, and to the attention of the Committee on Commerce in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, the fact that Great Britain has established an air line supported by the British Government, with all its strength and all its resources—an air line which will have British sanction, British support, and British financial aid, with the intention of taking away from America supremacy in the air, which we have held, and should be holding for years to come. We have been supreme in the air until this hour. We had every right in the world to retain that supremacy. Not only had we every right, but we had every obligation—an obligation to ourselves, that we might attempt to pay off or assist in paying off our national debt by air commerce, and an obligation to assist our citizens in getting their commerce abroad and hold supremacy in the air for the purpose of aviation development.

However, I am sorry to say that the suggestions offered in the all-American air line bill, which was pending during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and is today pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, were not adopted. I do not hesitate to say to the Senate that its defeat in the Seventy-ninth Congress was due to the activity of British agents, who worked night and day to see that the United States should not establish a chosen instrument, so to speak, so that Great Britain might do with us in the air what she has done with us on the waters of the world—practically put us out of business. No matter what we did to build a fleet on the water to carry the commerce of America to the ends of the earth, we found that by some method of jockeying we were relegated not to a secondary place but a third place in the commerce of the world. Unless America awakens very promptly to conditions in the air, we shall find ourselves even in worse condition than we have been on the seas.

Mr. President, in the publication, "American Aviation," in the department entitled "Background and Trends: Significant Developments and Forecasts Based on the Fortnight's Top News," I find this significant little squib:

BRITISH MADE A BID

British South American Airways came close to invading the United States back

yard in Latin America by buying TACA Airways. If Waterman Airlines hadn't stepped in at the right time, the TACA system probably would have gone to BSAA. If nothing else, it would have demonstrated how terrifically obsolete and narrow is the United States policy on international aviation.

I repeat that the bill to establish an all-American air line, so that America may take her place in the forefront of commercial aviation, is pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate. With every ounce of energy and strength I possess, I shall attempt to bring it to the attention of the committee, with the hope that the committee may on this occasion vote favorably on it, so that in this country we may establish an air system which will keep America in the forefront of commercial aviation in the world.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to speak a word of assurance to the Senator from Nevada. As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I appreciate the fact that the proposed legislation is pending before the committee. I believe that I and all the other members of the committee appreciate the tremendous importance to this country of having a vigorous and wise aviation policy. I think there will be unanimity of desire among all members of the committee to explore this subject; and we have the hope that sound judgments will be reached.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, supplementing what my distinguished colleague, Mr. WHITE, has said, within the past week the President expressed publicly and privately his very great concern regarding this situation, and his continuing hope that the Congress, which is presumably the policy-making body of the Government, will give attention to this subject. He stated that the reason for his own action as an executive in formulating and carrying on policy was the vacuum which existed in the formulation of policy.

So I am sure that there is recognition by all concerned with aviation—the Army, the Navy, and commercial air-transport interests—of the profound significance of efficiency in our domestic and overseas air commerce. Perhaps the very dark picture presented as the result of recent crashes may ultimately prove to be a certain measure of compensation in inducing all interests to cooperate in giving to American air commerce the significance which it deserves if America is to be secure. I say that in deference to what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has said and the great interest which he has always shown in the whole subject of air development.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 5, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Herman B. Baruch, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Lawrence Clayton, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term expiring February 1, 1952.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice Edmund J. Brandon, deceased.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1947:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Edward M. Curran to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose heavenly bounty blesses our lives with each succeeding day, Thy providence is a pledge that Thou wilt go with us to the end. In this sublime virtue the humblest, the greatest, and the best of men have walked. With this gift so enrich us that no shadow shall fall between us and our fellow men.

Take all our gifts and make them thine; take our reason that it may ever seek the truth; take our wills and make them free, merging them with the ideals of divine purpose; take our hearts and set them on things pure, knowing that the anchor of a good man is love. O may it hold when at the desk, in the forum, or in the street; and when the day is ended, bless us all with the quieting consciousness that we have been in the presence of our God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 30, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purposes of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress.

MEMBERS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS ON THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 30, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), I have designated Representatives ALBERT J. ENGEL, FRANCIS H. CASE, HARVE TIBBOTT, JOHN H. KERR, and GEORGE H. MAHON, members of the Committee on Appropriations, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy for the Eightieth Congress.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

REPORT FROM THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 12)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

JANUARY 31, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I transmit herewith the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, filed in this office today by the vice chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 304 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next at noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of Montana.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made in Bridgeport, Conn.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEES ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that certain subcommittees may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House throughout this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein certain recommendations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the needs of small business have been of great concern to many Members of this House. It has long been common knowledge that small business employs more men and women than big business. It is the essence of the free enterprise system.

Out in Ohio the legislature created an Ohio small business commission and instructed it to make a very exhaustive study of the situation in the State. This report was submitted to the ninety-seventh general assembly when it convened in January of this year. It is not my intention to include in my remarks the entire report, but there are certain recommendations directed to the Members of Congress on the Federal problems having to do with small business.

Some of these recommendations are as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OHIO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE OHIO SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION RELATIVE TO FEDERAL PROBLEMS

With respect to Federal affairs, it is evident that the province of the commission can only be to present the picture with its recommendations to the Ohio Members of Congress.

First. The OPA was the subject for greatest discussion and complaint. The general feeling was that this agency should be abolished and dissolved as quickly as possible.

Second. Small business lives, and grows, only in an atmosphere of economy. It has been shocked by Government expenditures and hurt by the taxes that accompanied such expenditures.

Small business has been, and is, very critical of both of these items, demanding that:

1. Intense economy must take place in the Federal Government at once.

2. Taxes should be reduced generally, with especial attention to incentive taxes for small business, venture capital and management.

We therefore recommend that the Congress reduce Government personnel and expenses by quickly eliminating war emergency agencies, pruning peacetime departments and agencies, examining all requests and budgets for appropriations, and refusing to spend one unnecessary dollar of the taxpayers' money. Also, to reflect these savings in reduced taxes immediately.

Third. Small business expressed itself to us as dissatisfied with the present employee-employer-public situation and definitely recommended that the Wagner Act be amended to provide equality, justice, and protection for all three of those groups.

Also, it was recommended that strikes be limited to the actual employees and employer directly involved only; that some means of preventing and handling them be devised to prevent the losses always suffered by all three groups—employees, employer, and the public.

Fourth. Small business repeatedly insisted on a minimum of interference with the law of supply and demand.

We recommend that the Congress examine the present Government, its departments, laws, and rules, and eliminate all such interference possible.

Fifth. Small business is very much alarmed, and small business states that it has been actually hurt by the growth of large stores, branches, chain stores. During the past scarcity of goods, many have felt discriminations in favor of these large competitors. However, many feel that the free operation of supply and demand will generally cure this situation, but it will not cure some of the other evils that accompany "bigness" when it tends toward "monopoly."

It is difficult to keep our traditional "freedom of opportunity" and at the same time consider limitations as to size or growth. So our recommendation is that Congress seek the evils or abuses at every level and provide correction in the public interest, which interest, we feel, is also that of small business.

Sixth. Small business corporations feel strongly on the subject of double taxation as being unfair and a hindrance to their development and growth. We feel that this is an inequitable and unjust procedure and recommend to the Ohio delegation and to the Congress that it be eliminated.

Seventh. Certain types of business organizations are legally free of income taxes and are allowed as deductible certain reserves which are not allowed to other forms of business.

We recommend that there should be equity and equality of treatment for all types of business.

Eighth. Small business feels that the least possible amount of authority and government should prevail at the Federal level and that as much as possible should be returned to the State and local levels.

We recommend that the efforts of the Federal Government to centralize and federalize be minimized and instead it make an honest effort to return to the States all possible action, power, and authority.

Small business is the living example of what made America great, the willingness to accept risk in exercising its freedom of choice and to receive a commensurate return. It is individualism and self-reliance. As such, its main desire is to be let alone, seeking and needing a minimum of regulations, regimentation, or interference, and resenting such from any source—Federal, State, local, labor, big business, etc.—demanding protection only from evils beyond its ability to handle.

We recommend that a copy of this report on Federal affairs, as having been brought to the attention of our commission, be sent to each of the Ohio Members of Congress, with a request that they give them consideration and effort.

This report is based on statements made by small businessmen at many hearings over the period of 1945 to November 22, 1946.

CERTAIN ORDERS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that recently the Interstate Commerce Commission and Office of Defense Transportation have issued orders, or directives, to railroad companies to immediately furnish a large number of empty boxcars to the western area for the use of grain transportation. The order is of such nature that it is mandatory for railroad companies to haul the empty cars from the east coast to the western area—and in some instances the boxcars are earmarked for certain points—and not be allowed to stop the cars at any of our midwestern industries that have storerooms completely filled with finished products that are awaiting shipment to the general area, or near area, to which these empty cars are consigned.

This morning I am advised that a large number of industries have been required to close down and their men are being thrown out of work, because of this inconsistent directive.

Mr. Speaker, if other Members of Congress have not already heard objections on this subject, they probably will hear from their workers and their industries, and I hope they will join me in asking the ICC and the ODT to repeal, or at least revise, this order. It certainly would appear that we are wasting transportation.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter I have written this morning to the Chairman of the ICC and the Director of ODT:

Mr. CLYDE AITCHISON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.
Col. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Director, Office of Defense Transportation, Washington, D. C.:

I have learned this morning that you have recently issued a directive compelling railroads to furnish a great number of empty

boxcars to the western area. It is my understanding this order has compelled the railroads to confiscate empty boxcars in the East and haul them empty all the way to the western area. The railroads are not allowed to place these boxcars at any industry en route, although it can plainly and definitely be shown that industries have many carloads of finished products awaiting transportation in the direction in which the empty boxcars are assigned. Even in the face of the knowledge that the lack of boxcars is forcing many industries to close and many men are being forced out of work, this directive still is in effect.

I protest such action and immediately request that this directive be at least amended. I assure you that many, many Members of the House and Senate desire to be heard on this subject at once unless more equitable arrangements can be made immediately.

I will appreciate your giving this letter your prompt attention and advising the writer of the action taken.

Respectfully yours,

J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know of one instance in my district where one employee of an industry counted many trainloads of empty boxcars going West when his plant was being shut down within a few days because they had no available boxcars to load their finished products, and a great percentage of their products were going in the same direction the empty boxcars were going.

It would seem to me this transportation program could be handled more equitably than to force our railroad companies to haul empty cars practically across the country and at the same time force our industries to shut down and men be forced out of work.

This directive issued by the ICC and the ODT to me is a waste of transportation when we need transportation, and I urge the membership of Congress to join me in bringing about an equitable handling of this subject.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday of this week at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] will discuss the very timely subject of the sugar supply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald on February 2, entitled "It's Your Money," by Frank C. Waldrop. I would like to say that if the Members of Congress will read that article and help aid and assist the Committee on Appropriations in cutting down expenditures, we will do this country a great good.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including observations on the current oyster war between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on surplus property by the National Institute of Government Purchasing.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article appearing in the Pennsylvania Bandmasters' Association News Letter.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article published by Mr. Robert F. Klepinger, a very distinguished young lawyer from Washington and Ohio.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, with all due sympathy for the gentleman from Ohio as to the need for boxcars in the Ohio area, I would like to say to my distinguished colleague that out in the Middle West we are having the same shortage problem in the matter of the movement of corn and grain. It happens that in the Middle West this year we have some very high moisture-content corn. If that corn is not moved by the 1st of May the corn is going to spoil. I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that we are having a meeting with the American Association of Railroads and other officials that have to do with the regulation and movement of boxcars on Tuesday of this week. I assure the gentleman the situation is one of the most critical that we have. I am informed that some of our midwestern railroads are operating on about 65 percent car capacity.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's invitation to attend the meeting, and I am certain that the gentleman in his fairness will recognize the fact that these cars can be loaded in the Midwest with products going to the West and it will only delay the actual loading from the West a few minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

CAMP STEWART REFUGEES

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in the interest of 1,000 families of my district who were in 1940 notified that they had become victims of the Federal power of eminent domain and would have to give up their homes and farms in order that their lands might be used for an Army training camp. These lands became known as Camp Stewart, Ga., and these families became refugees of Camp Stewart. They were a brokenhearted lot as they went from place to place seeking a new home. Many of them would not accept the low value placed on their property and while litigation moved slowly toward a determination of the value, these families were without funds to purchase lands to settle upon. In a fashion reminiscent of the early colonial days when the Indians were driven to the West, these families, who are all direct descendants of the first coastal settlers of Georgia, moved one by one into other sections of Georgia. They patiently set about the task of establishing a new home and with a faith in the fairness of their Government, reconciled themselves to a new life, believing that when the United States conquered her foes she would permit them to reclaim their ancestral homes and allow them to move back onto the soil which had provided sustenance for them and their pioneer ancestors.

In the meantime the Army moved onto the 280,000-acre tract, measuring 440 square miles, and proceeded with the removal of all buildings, schools, and churches. In a few months the villages of Willie and Taylors Creek became nonexistent and the only signs of habitation remaining were the tombstones standing as silent reminders of the fact that domestic security and peaceful habitation are oftentimes enjoyed today and only a memory tomorrow.

The war was waged and won. The artillery weapons long used in practice on this vast reservation were silenced. The shaftlike beams of the searchlights so often seen playing acros the sky were seen no more, and on February 30, 1945, the War Department placed this camp on an inactive status. Only a handful of troops were left behind to act as caretakers of the property.

The passage of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 gave new hope to these 1,000 families and many believed that when the camp was closed that their faith in their Government was justified and that soon they would be allowed to purchase their homes back according to the terms of the Surplus Property Act.

But such was not the case. Two long years have passed since Camp Stewart closed. It has not yet been declared surplus by the War Department. It is today under strict guard while thousands of hogs and cattle, now become wild, range the ridges and swamps bearing

the brand and marks of these 1,000 families. Their once well-kept cemeteries are now hidden by shaggy dog fennel. Barracks and other buildings are rotting away.

While structural depreciation is very much in evidence, on the other hand many acres of saplings have grown into tall and stately pine trees ready to be chipped and cupped for turpentine purposes. Millions of trees have reached sawmill size; game, fish, and wildlife have multiplied many times under the enforcement of strict hunting and fishing regulations.

These are some of the inducements that invite the former land owners to rebuild their homes, restore their schools and churches, bring back to life an area that once played such an important part in the affairs of the counties of Bryan, Evans, Liberty, Long, and Tattnall, put into production the fertile soil which once bore such abundant crops and put back on the tax digest of these counties this valuable land, thereby making lighter the tax burden of other property in these affected counties.

Mr. Speaker, it is agreed by all that the cantonment area of this camp where millions were spent should be preserved by the War Department for training purposes or by sale to a suitable municipal agency for the purpose of establishing some productive industry. It is a city within itself and could house a huge assembly plant, including all of its workers. I realize its importance for this purpose, but I appeal for the return of all other lands to the former owners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the Members of the House this startling fact: The War Department, in apparent disregard for the rights of these American citizens, transferred 56,629 acres of this land, lying on the west, north, and northeast perimeter of the camp, to the Forestry Service of the Department of Agriculture. By what right does the Forestry Service come into the possession of this land to the exclusion of the former owners? Yes, they claim a right under the Clark-McNary Act of 1924, but when the provisions of any law contravene the moral rights of citizens the United States Government should be the last one to invoke the law. It is but another example of the blind might of Federal power. The Forestry Service will sell millions of dollars' worth of sawmill timber from this area and show it proudly as a departmental income.

The worst blow was yet to come to these valiant citizens who had been laid upon the sacrificial altar of war. The War Department had a survey made of all available timber and when a report was made on Camp Stewart timber they let contracts to cut the timber on the Camp Stewart Reservation to be used for military purposes only, and I read you a letter which I received January 28 from the War Department:

DEAR MR. PRESTON: Permit me to refer to your recent inquiry concerning the present and future status of Camp Stewart, Ga., and the possibility of former owners reacquiring their property.

This installation was placed on an inactive status on February 30, 1945. The camp is, however, being retained for possible use by the National Guard and for universal military training in the event legislation is enacted for this purpose.

Camp Stewart contains approximately 280,400 acres of Government-owned land. Based on a recent survey of acreage requirements for the possible postwar utilization of this facility, it was determined that four tracts of land, totaling approximately 56,629 acres on the west, north, and northeast perimeter of the camp, were excess to the immediate plans of the Army. The Forestry Service, Department of Agriculture, has requested that this area be made available to them under section IX, Clark-McNary Act of June 7, 1924. In view of this request, the Chief of Engineers was directed to transfer this land to the Forestry Service and to retain maneuver rights to the property.

No property within the boundaries of this installation, other than that indicated above, has been declared surplus to the needs of the War Department. However, if at a later date it should be determined that additional land could be released, ultimate disposal would rest with the War Assets Administration. In this connection, it may be pointed out that former land owners are accorded certain priorities in accordance with the Surplus Property Act of 1944, when such property is declared surplus.

Reference your inquiry concerning timber cutting on the Camp Stewart Reservation, the War Department issued a directive on August 16, 1946, relative to the cutting of timber on military reservations. This directive required that a survey be made of all available timber and report submitted to the Office of the Chief of Engineers. A report was received by the Chief of Engineers concerning Camp Stewart and was forwarded to the division engineer, Atlanta, Ga., for necessary action since, under the directive mentioned above, the division engineer has authority to make a timber cruise of all installations and cut mature timber in accordance with good forestry practice. Therefore, it is believed that after qualified forestry personnel have marked the timber on the Camp Stewart Reservation, contracts will be let by the division engineer for the cutting of the timber which will be used for military activities only.

Your personal interest in Camp Stewart, Ga., has been made a matter of record in this office and it will be a pleasure to advise you of any changes relative to its status and future disposition. In the event you desire more detailed information relative to those tracts of land made available to the Forestry Service and contemplated timber-cutting activities, it is suggested that you communicate with the division engineer, South Atlantic Division, 50 Whitehall Street, Atlanta, Ga., whose office has that information immediately available.

Trusting that the above information will be of assistance to you in advising your constituents, and with assurance that it is a pleasure to be of service to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

NOAH M. BRINSON,
Colonel, GSC, Legislative and Liaison Division.

I ask, Is this a fair attitude for the War Department to take toward private citizens who have no recourse at law? Their only recourse is through a change of policy of the War Department or by suitable congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill directing the War Department to declare this area surplus so that the War Assets Administration might proceed to return it by sale to the former owners. Last Friday they declared Camp Butner, N. C., surplus, containing 40,364 acres. Why not Camp Stewart now?

In conclusion, let me remind you that this area of land is the fourth largest tract of land purchased by the United States Government since the Louisiana Purchase. More American citizens were forced out of their homes in this purchase than ever before in the history of our Nation.

I earnestly solicit your support of this bill.

PIG-IRON SHORTAGE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, for the last several days I have received much information about a pig-iron shortage in my State as well as on the west coast generally. We all know that there is a shortage of pig iron all over, but in this particular area we need this pig iron to assist the agriculturalists. Just last week, while we were trying to get some information from various departments here about having additional pig iron shipped out to the west coast, we found at Los Angeles that there was a ship loaded with 6,000 tons of pig iron en route to Russia. Also waiting to be loaded was 1,500 tons of coal from Utah, yet the people of Utah say they cannot produce pig iron without coal. The following statement was received from Mr. William E. Howe, owner of the Tulare Foundry, in my home town:

Two weeks ago today, on the 16th day of January, the writer had a conference with Mr. Walker Kennedy, manager of Columbia Steel Co., in Los Angeles (controlling Provo, Utah, plant). Mr. Kennedy stated that, due to Government controls, he could offer no assistance in hardship cases. Mr. E. L. Brumley, my supplier of pig iron, and myself, both related to Mr. Kennedy that at the very moment we were conversing a Russian freighter was standing off Los Angeles harbor waiting for a supply of coal before proceeding to Russia with 6,000 tons of pig iron aboard. During Mr. Kennedy's conversation he stated that his company was having trouble securing coal in Utah to produce iron. He was amazed to find out that this particular freighter was loading 1,500 tons of coal (Utah coal) for the trip. Mr. Brumley, in whose office we met, was supplying this freighter with the above-mentioned coal. The authority for the sale of this coal was a telegram from the State Department. Another instance related to Mr. Kennedy was that a foundry in Los Angeles was unloading that very day several carloads of pig iron to manufacture dumbbells. We also related to Mr. Kennedy evidence that pig iron had been shipped to Mexico, and in turn forwarded to Los Angeles to be consumed in one of the larger foundries.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering how much longer we are going to permit these Federal bureaus to operate on this basis?

ORPHAN CHILDREN OF SOLDIERS WHO DIED IN SERVICE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in behalf of the orphaned children of soldiers who were killed in battle or died of service-connected injuries or illness. This bill provides that hereafter the payments of compensation to these orphaned children shall be $40 per month. This sum, $40 per month, will buy no luxuries or nonessentials. If judiciously expended, with the utmost thrift and frugality, it is sufficient to provide only the barest necessities of life in the way of shelter, food, clothing, medicine, school expenses, transportation, and the like.

Under the present law the following is the schedule of compensation payments our Government makes to the widows and orphans of our soldiers and servicemen who gave their lives in the late war:

Widow but no child, $60.

Widow with one child, $78.

Each additional child, $15.60.

No widow but one child, $30.

No widow but two children—each $22.80.

Each additional child $12.

Under this schedule, if a child lives with its widowed mother, the Government pays the pitifully inadequate sum of $18 a month for its support. If there are two children, the second child receives the still smaller sum of $15.60 per month for its support. It is obvious to everyone who will take the trouble to give it a moment's thought, that these payments of $18 and $15.60 per month are not sufficient to keep body and soul together; and the burden and responsibility at present rests upon the shoulders of their widowed mothers to provide the additional money necessary to support these children of our soldiers who gave their lives in our defense. We should regard, and I believe we do regard, their children as our responsibility. Yet the amounts our Government is now providing as compensation will not support them. This means that the mothers of these children must leave the home, find jobs, and work to earn the additional money which is absolutely necessary to support these children of our men who died in our common cause.

This brings us face to face with another problem. These fatherless children, already deprived by war of the earnings, love, and parental control of a father, are then, when the mother leaves the home to work, thus deprived of the care, discipline, and parental control of the other parent. These children, therefore, face the prospect of being reared in a home without any parental control or discipline whatever during the day. The chances are good that they will grow up on the streets, with whatever companions chance or circumstance may throw them. They may become gangsters, thieves, drunkards, or juvenile delinquents in a dozen different ways because of this enforced absence from home of the mother.

Being a circuit judge during the last 13 years I know that we have had a great increase in what we call juvenile delinquency. From my own experience I know that a great percentage of these juvenile delinquents come from homes without parental care and control because one parent was dead or absent, and the other parent worked, leaving the home and children without parental care.

It is pathetic to see the lives of children wrecked without having a chance. It would be pathetic indeed to see in the next 5 to 10 years the children of our dead American heroes coming into our courts branded as juvenile delinquents. Let us now provide enough money for the support of these children so that their mothers may remain in the home with them and keep the home together. Since they cannot have the love, care, and training of a father, the least we can do for them is to make it possible for the mother to be in the home with them, and take the place there as best she can, of both father and mother. We are spending millions of dollars to alleviate human misery and suffering. There is no call upon us that is more worthy or more deserving than the support of the orphaned children of our fighting men who died in service. The cost is small, but the benefits both now and in the future will be beyond the possibility of measuring in dollars and cents.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Ralph B. Douglass before the Fertilizer Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the New Year and the shipping industry, and include an editorial by Mr. Stanley Ferguson of the New York Journal of Commerce.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include press release No. 69 of the State Department, issued on January 28, concerning the Polish Provisional Government.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Robert L. Norton.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ADMIRAL MARC A. MITSCHER

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the passing of a truly great American, Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, the famous commander of the famous Task Force 58. Admiral Mitscher did as much as any one man to turn the tide of defeat to one of victory in the Pacific.

Long years before the test of his great understanding and mastery of naval air warfare came, Admiral Mitscher prepared for the day when a new type of naval warfare would turn the tide for victory for this Nation's arms. Mastery of all phases of naval air warfare was his life's chief interest and ambition. How well this life of interest, study, work, and experimentation served his country is now written in every line of the history of the great war in the Pacific.

Admiral Mitscher was one of the early pioneers of naval air warfare and his contributions to its success were legion. No test was too hard. One of his earliest achievements in flying successfully across the Atlantic for the first mass flight in the world's history was over an ocean with the now famous NC–4.

America has lost a great hero; but in whose passing every citizen can thank God that he was spared long enough to do so much for his Nation in its great test in World War II.

Admiral Mitscher was a citizen of Oklahoma—one of her grand, patriotic, heroic sons. He was appointed to the Naval Academy from Oklahoma City. The family has long resided there. His father was at one time mayor of Oklahoma City. I know the entire Congress joins me in expressing deep regret at the passing of this great, heroic American.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, during the past week I received the following information from four different veterans of World War II. If this information is typical of the attitude of many of the employees in the executive branch of our Government, it might have very disastrous results.

In each of the four cases the story was in substance about the same. The veterans went to a regional office of the Veterans' Administration, in two cases to inquire about the delay in receiving their subsistence checks, and in the other two cases to inquire about the status of their claims for compensation.

In all four cases these veterans were told not to blame the Veterans' Administration for the delays, but to write to their Congressman; that Congress was to blame for cutting the Veterans' Administration's budget.

I want to serve notice now on all employees of the Veterans' Administration, or any other agency of the Federal Government, that they want to be very sure of the truth of their statements before they falsely blame Congress for their own shortcomings.

In the future I intend to ask for the removal of any employee who circulates

false information of the kind referred to by the veterans who contacted me. I intend to devote whatever time is necessary to bring about the removal of those who pass out such misinformation.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, last week in public print there appeared information that 43 federally owned public housing projects in Washington and vicinity would increase their rents as much as $35 per month. At the same time there also appeared in public print information from the State of Kentucky that in that State some of the owners of large residential buildings were threatening either to tear the buildings down or convert them to commercial purposes, unless they were given some relief from increased maintenance costs. The tenants of one of these buildings, sensing that that might be done, joined in a petition unanimously offering to increase their rents 15 percent providing the owner would give them a lease for 2 years. He agreed to it. They sent that proposal here to the OPA, and the OPA turned it down. Why? Because, they said, that the owner of this residential building had some commercial property in other cities and that he could offset the losses he sustained on the residential property by the profit that he made from the commercial buildings. That reasoning is repugnant to every principle on which this Government was founded. It is communistic. Yet some people want rent control continued. There will be no houses built for rent for veterans or anybody else as long as the Government controls rent. Rent control is making the housing shortage more acute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the Reserve Officers of the Naval Service on the subject of unification of the armed forces.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by an eminent economist on the advantages and disadvantages of various proposals to cut taxes.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address.

PAYING THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 1536 which is a bill to reduce the interest charges on the national debt by refunding outstanding obligations through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds bearing a low rate of interest.

Mr. Speaker, the interest on our national debt now amounts to about $5,000,000,000 per year. Under this bill it is proposed to reduce these interest charges by approximately half, which would result in a net saving of two and one-half billion dollars a year. If this amount of interest could be saved each year it would retire our national debt in 100 years by applying our savings to the principal.

Our present national debt is around $259,000,000,000. Let us assume that is two hundred and fifty billion, with the average interest rate at 2 percent. This gives us an annual interest charge of $5,000,000,000 and must be included in the budget each year. Under the terms of my bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue bonds bearing interest at rates not exceeding 1 percent. This would cut our interest charge in half, providing all of the bonds could be refunded, and we would then be paying only $2,500,000,000 a year instead of the five billion as at present. We could apply the difference on the principal of the debt and thus retire the same in 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that it will not be possible for the Secretary to refund all of the outstanding bonds, and that we cannot expect to effect the full amount of the savings possible. However, I am convinced that many of these outstanding bonds and obligations that are now drawing higher rates of interest can be refunded. Whatever we save is affording that much relief to the taxpayers of this country, and will enable us to retire our national debt that much sooner.

The bonds to be issued will be tax-exempt, except for gift, estate, and inheritance taxes. This inducement should enable the Secretary to dispose of these bonds without difficulty. It is believed that insurance companies and others making large investments will be attracted by these bonds. It is also provided that the bonds may be used in payment of any estate or inheritance taxes imposed by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the question of paying off the present national debt is one which demands the prompt attention of the Congress. The proposal I am today discussing will provide for the gradual payment of the debt by reducing our interest charges and applying the savings on the principal. The money received from the sale of these bonds shall be used only for the payment of the national debt which is outstanding at the time the bill is passed.

Under this plan the figures show that the Government will effect a saving of over $52,000,000,000 as between the saving of 1 percent on its interest payments and the amount that could be collected as tax on bonds subject to income tax. At the same time, over a period of 100 years, we can pay off our national debt with the amount of interest saved. I hope this proposal will have the favorable consideration of the Ways and Means Committee, as I believe this plan offers a sound and sensible way to pay our present indebtedness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

PRODUCTION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill providing for Government assistance in the production of strategic and critical materials and particularly nonferrous metals. In discussing Government assistance of this kind, frequently there is reference to whether we are a "have" or "have not" Nation in these essentials to modern industry and modern warfare. In my opinion, the real question is, Can we be assured of a rate of production or availability which will meet the demands of either industry or war? The importance of mineral resources lies in how quickly the metal contained may be made available for use. Mere location in the ground does not mean available for use when needed.

There has been a growing dependency on foreign resources. For example, from 1919 through 1935 only 1.8 percent of our annual zinc consumption was from foreign sources; in 1936 through 1940 this rose to 8 percent; in 1941 through 1945 it was 36 percent. I wish to introduce a graph showing the rate of increase of the use of foreign zinc in this country. Nevertheless, with this increase in use of foreign metal, in October 1946, the latest month for which figures are available, 88.4 percent of the zinc produced in this country could not have been produced without Government assistance in the form of premium payments.

If we eliminate this assistance, we must depend almost wholly on foreign sources for this essential material. Then the question becomes, Should we expect other countries to supply us for every need and every emergency? The January 1947 issue of Engineering and Mining Journal states:

> The United States cannot greatly increase its present dependency on foreign sources of copper, lead, and zinc without foreign reserves being depleted faster than our own.

It is obvious that the present availability of these metals cannot continue without assistance from somewhere.

The purpose of this bill is to keep mines going and, in keeping them going, to help them explore and develop new reserves so as to assure the country of a rate of production which will meet the demand for any emergency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT RATES—THE BATTLE OF THE EMPTY BOXCARS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I have introduced, H. R. 1234.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], I desire to call attention to the fact that the battle of the empty boxcars has just begun.

The bill I have introduced, H. R. 1234, which I am inserting at the end of my remarks, would eliminate the discriminatory one-way freight rates.

For instance, a man in my town, Tupelo, Miss., was doing business with a firm in New England. That firm accidentally sent him a consignment of goods which should have gone to another customer. He discovered the error, and did not even open them. He simply put another label on them and shipped them back. It cost twice as much to ship them back as it did to ship them down there over the same road. The same thing would have occurred had the shipment been to Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, Texas, Missouri, Utah, or any of the other Western or Southern States.

This battle of the empty boxcars has just begun. We are going to have relief from these discriminations for the South and West, or we are going to carry on the fight not only throughout this Congress but throughout all succeeding Congresses.

The bill to which I refer will correct this evil. It reads as follows:

H. R. 1234

A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its charges depending on the point of origin or destination

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any carrier subject to this part to charge or receive, for the transportation of property from any point of origin to any point of destination, compensation which is greater or less than the compensation charged or received by such carrier for the transportation of like kind of property from such point of destination to such point of origin."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 90 days after the date f its enactment.

Pass this bill, give the South and the West a square deal in freight rates, and our railroads will not be burdened with empty cars going either way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the legislative business of the day and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE OPA

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation called to our attention by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is nothing new. He disclosed a situation where, though the tenants and property owners had agreed upon terms of tenancy, the OPA refused to accept their decision because, though the owners were losing money on the present rents, they would not by OPA be permitted to raise rents so as to break even because the owners had other property on which a profit was made. From the very beginning, OPA has assumed and exercised the right, if it is a right—has assumed, let us say, the power of not only limiting profits but to wipe them out. All along the line they have been doing that very thing. It is unlawful and it is unjust. It is an arbitrary procedure. But it is a familiar procedure. Congress found it necessary at one time to amend the act. It expressly denied to OPA authority to take into consideration the question of a profit when issuing its orders. Nevertheless, OPA, in disregard of congressional mandate, has time and again, by rule, order, and directive, thwarted the expressed will of the Congress; put into effect, in direct opposition to the congressional mandate, its own orders, established its own policy. When the law is up for amendment or extension, OPA promises to be good. The ink is hardly dry on congressional amendments before those promises are repudiated. No one is to blame for this situation but Congress itself, because we continue the life of OPA. Those fellows will never administer the law as we write it. They follow their own sweet will. They do just as they please. They are determined that no one shall make an honest, decent profit. OPA should be ended; its administrators should be removed from office. To at least in part bring that about, H. R. 1541 was introduced last week. Let us have action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—SECOND WAR POWERS ACT (H. DOC. NO. 80)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

During the past 18 months the Nation has almost completed its great task of reconverting from all-out wartime production to a peacetime economy. As reconversion has proceeded, we have found it increasingly possible to dispense with many controls that were essential during active hostilities and immediately thereafter. We can now foresee the day when no further use of these powers will be necessary. But it has become apparent that the effective completion of reconversion will, in a few instances, require the continued use of powers granted by the Second War Powers Act after March 31, 1947, the expiration date of this law.

I stated to the Congress in my recent State of the Union Message that after the termination of hostilities was proclaimed on December 31, 1946, there were two groups of temporary laws that still remained, namely, those which were to last during the emergency and those which were to continue until the termination of the war. The study of these two groups of laws is proceeding and I shall submit recommendations on them in the near future.

This present message is directed solely to the Second War Powers Act because the powers existing under such act expire on March 31, 1947.

Since the fighting ceased, it has been my avowed policy to terminate all emergency controls that were no longer necessary or workable. By November 1946, we had removed all manpower and wage controls, and all price ceilings except those on rent, sugar and sirups, and rice. Almost all the priority and allocation regulations based on title III of the Second War Powers Act have been eliminated. As early as last May, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in reporting out the last extension of the Second War Powers Act, made the following findings in this connection:

The record clearly shows that there has been a rapid lifting of the controls which have been exercised over our economy during the war, and a progressive abandonment of the rigid provisions of the original War Powers Act, evidencing what your committee regards as a sincere purpose and intention by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, by the Civilian Production Administration, and by all the other agencies concerned, to return as rapidly as possible to the normal processes of our economy.

The House Committee on the Judiciary in its report also referred favorably to the record of reductions in controls by the Government.

Speedy decontrol under the Second War Powers Act has continued since these reports were made. From a wartime peak of about 700 orders and schedules, the Civilian Production Administration—Office of Temporary Controls—by January 27, 1947, had in effect only 24 orders and 3 schedules, and this number will be still further reduced in the immediate future. The Department of

Agriculture had left by January 27 only 19 war food orders, of which 9 are merely administrative or procedural, and still further reductions are planned by the Department between now and March 31. The Office of Defense Transportation has eliminated all but three transportation orders, and the Office of Price Administration—Office of Temporary Controls—now rations only sugar.

After March 31, 1947, moreover, it will be possible to dispense entirely with the use of the broad powers granted by title III of the Second War Powers Act. Thenceforth only a few controls coming under this title will be needed over a progressively diminishing list of commodities of which the supply is seriously deficient, both domestically and throughout the world, and the affected final products are critically important to industry or the public. Power to allocate under the Second War Powers Act is requested only for the specific cases described in this message and for national emergencies declared by the President.

The few orders that would remain would be limited to clearly manageable controls in an economy freed of most emergency restrictions. They afford positive aids to business and the public which we must not withdraw prematurely, and they assist us in meeting international understandings and obligations.

The first area in which I believe continued authority is essential is in connection with foods still in critically short supply throughout the world. I consider that current import and export controls must be kept after March 31 to assure this country a proportionate share of the commodities in which we are deficient while carrying out our international food allocation arrangements. In a subsequent communication to the Congress I shall state whether there will be any need for continuing the Export Control Act beyond June 30, 1947, its present expiration date. We must also continue some controls on domestic use and distribution of grains and grain products, rice, sugar, and edible molasses.

Grain: World cereal supplies are still far short of essential needs. Stated world import requirements for grain total about 38,000,000 tons. Only about 24,000,000 tons will be available from all exporting countries. This deficit will become most serious in the next few months. The most careful allocation of the available supplies, including those from the United States, which is the largest exporter, will be essential to avoid extreme hardship in the war-devastated countries. The United States has, in addition, a special responsibility in Germany and Japan, where heavy imports are required to maintain food supplies at least at a level sufficient to prevent disease and unrest. If this is not done, our troops would be jeopardized and our policy of encouraging the growth of democracy in these occupied countries would be endangered.

The United States has announced an export goal of at least 10,500,000 short tons of grain and flour. To reach this target, controls may continue necessary after March 31 to insure the movement of the grain to seaboard and to insure economies in the nonfood uses of cereals in this country.

Special controls may also continue to be necessary on rice. World export supplies are even more short than other grains, and the United States has export responsibilities to areas of particular concern to us, such as Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Cuba.

Sugar and related products: Because of our heavy dependence on imports, the world shortage of sugar and related products is of outstanding concern to the United States. Total sugar available for shipment to the United States, Canada, and all western European countries in 1947 is expected to be only about 7,500,000 tons compared with average net imports before the war of about 8,500,000, and 1946 imports of 6,750,000.

The United States will continue to receive its share of these supplies. Our share in past years has been sufficient to permit us to maintain, along with Canada and the United Kingdom, a considerably higher proportion of our prewar consumption than other importing countries. Supplies in 1947 will be larger than in 1946. Nevertheless, 1947 supplies for the United States will still be below prewar per capita supply and even further below the estimated demand.

In this situation, both our domestic and international interests require continuation of domestic and import controls over sugar and edible molasses and sirups and import controls only over other sugar-containing products and inedible molasses.

Domestically, unless current controls are continued, there would be inequitable distribution of the limited supply among various users; much sugar would be held for speculative purposes; and it is probable that sugar would go to a greater extent to industrial users, resulting in a lower proportion for household consumers than they now receive.

The cost of sugar used in the United States during 1947 will exceed $1,000,000,000. Although the extent to which prices would rise under premature decontrol is uncertain, there is grave danger that this cost might multiply several times, with serious results to consumers and sugar-using industries and eventually to sugar producers and refiners similar to those experienced after World War I.

Internationally, decontrol would make it extremely difficult for us to carry out the understanding under which the United States, since 1942, has acted as agent to buy the Cuban export supply for distribution among the importing countries in accordance with the recommendations of the International Emergency Food Council.

Fats and oils: Fats and oils are among the commodities in shortest world supply. World import demand for the current calendar year amounts to about 6,000,000 short tons, which is almost equal to prewar trade in these commodities. However, only about half of this will be available. The production of coconut and palm oils in many parts of the Far East is still far below prewar levels, and the European production of animal fats is also far below levels of prewar years. As a consequence, all importing countries are forced to consumption levels of from 75 to 90 percent of their prewar levels. Only by maintaining careful distribution between countries, therefore, will it be possible to avoid serious inequities.

This situation requires the continuaton of import and export controls to insure that we and other countries receive a proportionate share of this short world supply.

Other foods: There are other agricultural commodities over which continued import controls also appear to be necessary as a result of continuing serious world shortages. These controls are necessary to carry out international understandings. The commodities they cover are: meat and meat products, dairy products, peas and beans, canned fish and protein foods.

Imported industrial materials: At the same time there are other commodities which we import for industrial purposes over which some form of allocation control will be necessary after March 31, 1947. These are cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, rubber, manila (abaca) and agave fiber and cordage, tin and antimony.

Cinchona bark and alkaloids are chiefly supplied by the Netherlands East Indies. Adequate imports from this source are uncertain. The estimated civilian deficiency for the year ending July 1947 is over 3,000,000 ounces of quinine and 70,000 ounces of quinidine. So long as such a shortage continues, the most vital medical uses must be given top priority.

Natural and synthetic rubber: Natural rubber will probably continue in short supply throughout the world in 1947. At the same time, it is important to the national defense that a minimum synthetic-rubber industry be maintained in the United States pending consideration of permanent legislation by the Congress. Consequently, continued allocation control over rubber is necessary.

Manila and other hard-cordage fibers are of basic importance, because from them are made rope, binder, baler, and wrapping twines, paper, and padding. The supply in prospect from all sources for the next 12 months is no more than half our annual requirements. The termination of allocation control over manila would seriously impede agricultural and other essential production.

Tin and antimony are also basic materials which we must import. The supply of tin will not approximate demand until some time in 1948. In the case of antimony, we must wait for resumption of shipments from China, the primary prewar source. Continued allocation of tin, tin plate and other tin products, and antimony is an important positive aid to our domestic industries and in carrying out our international understandings.

DOMESTIC SHORTAGES

Housing: The allocation powers of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act and of the Second War Powers Act were instrumental in increasing the flow of building materials to which the veterans' housing program in large measure owes

its progress to date. This achievement made possible the recent reduction in the number and scope of these controls.

During the balance of 1947 I anticipate a further reduction in the use of these powers, but it will be necessary to continue some limits on construction and to continue assistance to the producers of some bottleneck materials.

I understand that voluntary arrangements are being made with a number of producers to meet the needs of the building materials industries so that the use of allocation powers can be held to a minimum. To the extent that formal action may prove necessary, the Congress has wisely provided that materials and facilities for building construction may be allocated under the Veterans Emergency Housing Act until December 31, 1947. Accordingly, title III need not be extended for the purposes of the housing program.

Freight cars: There is at the present time an extremely serious freight-car shortage. The shortage will increase as the Nation's production increases. The reported average daily freight-car shortage now amounts to approximately 22,000 cars. For a number of months car loadings have been heavier than at any period since 1930, including the war years. The American railroads have about 521,000 fewer cars now than in 1930, and about 31,100 fewer serviceable cars than they had on VJ-day. The number of freight cars being removed from service each month because of their being worn out exceeds on the average the number of new freight cars delivered to the railroads.

The load our railways must carry is growing, while the facilities for handling the load are dwindling. To cope with this problem with any measurable degree of success requires a provident use of rail transportation facilities. Allocation is therefore necessary if we are to use the railway freight cars and other equipment and facilities that we have at all efficiently in this period just ahead.

Other shortages: The only other current domestic shortages sufficiently serious to require continued allocation control beyond March 31 are streptomycin, automobiles, and tractors. Limited distribution of streptomycin for civilian use was begun in September 1946, but it is at present impossible to determine requirements or to plan production of this drug. In the case of automobiles and tractors, it may be necessary for a time to continue to carry out the purpose of the Export Control Act by limiting production in this country of automobiles and tractors designed for export.

Some critical materials and equipment freed from distribution controls will remain short after March 31. In a very few cases this will mean that essential export requirements will not be met unless priorities are used. Priorities assistance should therefore be given, where necessary, to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States, and, upon certification of the Secretaries of State and Commerce, to meet international understandings and responsibilities.

Because of the distortions and uncertainties generated by war conditions, we may encounter a national emergency that we do not now foresee. The extension of title III should provide for allocation authority in a national emergency of this kind, but only if there is a declaration by the President that such a national emergency has arisen. Although I do not anticipate that such an emergency will occur, it is imperative that the Government should have the power, during the remainder of the reconversion period, to deal with major unforeseen contingencies of this character.

RECOMMENDATIONS

When first adopted, the Second War Powers Act had 14 substantive titles, of which 7 have been either enacted into permanent legislation or have been permitted to lapse. Only three of the remaining titles—I, III, and V—will be needed after March 31, 1947. Although some of the programs remaining under these titles can and will be terminated during the next few months, it would be unsafe to act on the assumption that this can be done with all of them. I, therefore, recommend that the Congress extend for 1 year, to March 31, 1948, titles I and V, and, in addition, title III for the limited purposes enumerated in this message.

The necessity for extending title III I have discussed at length. I shall briefly state the reasons for extending titles I and V.

Title I permits the United States Maritime Commission to operate certain shipping lines and the Army and the Navy to supply local transportation to personnel where public facilities are inadequate. This title will be necessary until the Maritime Commission is in a position to settle with companies whose ships they have taken over and operated.

Title V permits the operation of ships under less restrictive rules as to equipment and manning than would otherwise be the case. This title is necessary for troops stationed abroad, both for their demobilization and the transportation of supplies, and in connection with repatriation programs. Its extension is urged by the State, Treasury, War, and Commerce Departments, and by the Maritime Commission. The Navy's vessels are already covered by permanent legislation.

It is unsettling, both for business and for the general public, to be obliged to wait until the last possible moment for decision by the Congress on emergency legislation. I urge the Congress to give immediate and favorable consideration to the limited extension of the Second War Powers Act I have requested.

For ready reference, I attach hereto an appendix setting forth a summary of the titles of the Second War Powers Act, together with a brief comment on each.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1947.*

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF TITLES, SECOND WAR POWERS ACT RECOMMENDED FOR EXTENSION: TITLES I, III, AND V

Title I. Emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission over motor and water carriers: Extended until March 31, 1947. Further extension is recommended.

Title II. Acquisition and disposal of property: Extended until March 31, 1947, only as to the disposal of property. Further extension is not necessary.

Title III. Priorities and allocation powers: Extended until March 31, 1947 (until June 30, 1947, for building materials and related facilities). This title establishes priorities, rationing and allocation powers. Further extension is recommended.

Title IV. Purchase by Federal Reserve banks of Government obligations: Extended until March 31, 1947. The Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department will recommend permanent legislation covering this subject. Hence, further extension is not necessary.

Title V. Waiver of navigation and inspection laws: Extended until March 31, 1947. Further extension is recommended.

Title VI. Power to requisition: This title has expired.

Title VII. Political activity: Extended until March 31, 1947. This title exempts employees serving part time and without compensation or with only nominal compensation from certain restrictions prohibiting participation in political activity (Hatch Act). No recommendation is made for further extension.

Title VIII. Protection of war industries and protection of resources subject to hazards of forest fires: This title has expired.

Title IX. Free postage for soldiers, sailors, and marines: This title has been repealed and replaced by permanent legislation.

Title X. Naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces in the United States during the present war: This title has been made permanent legislation.

Title XI. Acceptance of conditional gifts to further the war program: This title has expired.

Title XII. Coinage of 5-cent pieces: This title has expired.

Title XIII. Inspection and audit of war contracts: This title has been made permanent legislation.

Title XIV. Utilization of war information: Extended until March 31, 1947. Further extension is not necessary.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE STEAGALL AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most—yes—one of the very most important problems to be considered at this time is the Steagall amendment. Why do I say this? First, because if the Steagall amendment is supported without reservation or evasion, the rural people of America will know that the Government keeps its promises and fulfills its legislative commitments. Second, if the legislative commitments of

this Steagall amendment are followed, the economic life of our country will be kept in a healthy condition. Why do I say this? Because if the national farm income is one-seventh of the national income, and if a national income of one hundred and forty to one hundred and seventy-five billions is needed to service the public debt and carry on the necessary function of the Government, it is imperative that we have a twenty to twenty-five billion dollar national farm income. The Steagall amendment if followed will provide this national farm or comparable income. This is the first period following any war that there has not been a collapse of agricultural prices. Why? The Steagall amendment has up to this time prevented this collapse of farm prices. If the Steagall amendment is properly, legally, and sensibly administered and adhered to, its provisions will prevent millions of unemployed and will provide a demand for goods and service which will prevent any great slump in business. It is the key to the agricultural problem, unemployment problem, and to the business problem.

Every American, regardless of party, should feel this responsibility. The American free-enterprise system is on trial. American goods and American labor and agriculture are being called upon this very day to compete with the Government monopoly of England and the dictator nations of the world. These nations do not have labor loss with minimum wages and maximum hours, nor do they have agricultural support prices that legalize both jobs and a guaranty wage. Many of them believe in business that is in keeping with the dictates of the government or the dictator, and we as Americans must think, act, and legislate for the best interests of our people. This is not a Democratic nor is it a Republican problem. No Member should, and no Member would, take the position that would jeopardize our system, or throw sand into the economic gears of this free-enterprise system. Did you ever think that possibly the Moscow broadcast just before the election had other objectives than those that appeared on the surface? Did it ever occur to you that possibly Moscow felt that its way of life would have a more general approval in the United States if the more conservative elements of the American electorate were in control of our Government? Did it ever occur to you that they might feel that the same electorate did not have the ability, the vision, the broad and sincere human understanding necessary to maintain and improve the American way of life? The best way to meet this problem of communism, of course, is to prevent it. It can be prevented by supporting legislation based on the greatest good for the greatest number and legislation for the many and not for the few. That can be prevented by providing legislative set-ups whereby the average man can become a direct and part owner in America in accordance to his diligence and in accordance with his abilities.

The fact still remains that with the two hundred and sixty billion public debt the American system is on trial. It was shown to be the best system in war. It can be shown to be the best system in peace. These are serious days. With this burden of debt every effort must be exercised to keep an abundance of jobs available to American workmen, to keep business in operation, and to keep agriculture in a healthy condition. Labor, business, and agriculture are interwoven in our economic system. No position, no attitude, no single action should be taken by any individual, by any group, or by any political party that will throw any part of this machinery—yes, this interdependent machinery—out of gear. This is not the time for any visionary schemes nor for anyone or any group to be rocking the economic boat. This is the time when each and every one of us should strive for a fair and an equitable set-up that will maintain the present standard of living of our people with hopes of improved standards of living of our people in the days to come.

Regardless of the hundreds of agricultural bills that have been passed during the past 20 years, the fact still remains that the Steagall amendment, if properly adhered to, will give more benefits to a larger number of farmers than all previous legislation. So much of this previous legislation has been for the benefit of a few, but of little benefit to the many. Even the President is cognizant of this situation as shown in his Budget message. The Steagall amendment, I repeat, is the main legislative instrument to be relied upon so far as all agriculture is concerned.

Let us take a look at the situation in 1939 before the influence of the war was felt by our economic system with billions of—yes, billions of dollars poured into this scheme and under that scheme in the name of agriculture. We ended up, according to official statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture for August 1939 with the farmers receiving 5 cents plus for pork, 8 cents plus for cotton, and 54 cents plus for wheat, with an export subsidy of 25 to 30 cents per bushel at that. The agricultural program had bogged down with most farm products selling from 50 to 70 percent of parity. We also had 10,000,000 unemployed. There are 10,000,000 who did not make any gains so far as their labor was concerned.

Once more, let me repeat that the adherence to this Steagall amendment is the main ray of hope for the great bulk of people that live on our land as well as the millions through which jobs can be obtained and business activity can be maintained. If properly administered the Steagall amendment will put an end to sectional crop legislation that has been provided for certain crops. The so-called basic commodities, if you wish to dignify them all by calling them basic, like corn, cotton, wheat, peanuts, rice, tobacco, which under previous legislation, had loan provisions, with price guaranties comparable to the commodities under the Steagall amendment. Commodities under the Steagall amendment include: Hogs, eggs, chickens—certain exceptions—turkeys, milk and butterfat, dried peas, dried edible peas, beans, certain varieties of soybeans for oil, peanuts for oil, and flaxseed for oil, American, Egyptian, and sweetpotatoes. There are in addition some 140 agricultural prices supported but they are not classified as commodities under the Steagall amendment.

At this point I wish to call your attention to the fact that the Steagall amendment provides for a floor not less than 90 percent of parity. The floor price can be above this 90 percent of parity. For example, the flaxseed prices for 1947 are to be supported at $6 per bushel, although 90 percent parity would be but $3.26 per bushel as of December 15, 1946, the latest issue of agricultural prices.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Summing up the factors involved in this legislative situation in regard to the Steagall amendment we have:

First. The Steagall amendment provides for a floor price on most agricultural products of not less than 90 percent of parity for 1947 and 1948.

Second. Regardless of how carefully it is administered many millions of dollars will be required to administer the law. If only domestic products are supported it will take certain millions, but many additional millions will be needed if large imports are invited. These imports can be invited by lowering the duty still further, or by undesirable allocations of the world supply of agricultural products.

Third. If anyone anywhere wishes to repudiate the commitments of the Steagall amendment, or if he wishes to follow a policy of defeating the Steagall amendment by advocating a support price for all the agricultural products of the world with untold billions, that is his responsibility.

Fourth. Anyone familiar with the present wool situation and the fur situation can readily realize what the situation can be for other crops and commodities.

Fifth. A bipartisan support of the Steagall amendment can be expected. If too large amounts of public funds are used, which amounts will be necessary to guarantee 90 percent parity floor price for the crops and agricultural products of the world, a public and a taxpayer resistance can be expected. Note the criticism of the $90,000,000 used in the domestic potato-support program.

Sixth. With 517,000,000 pounds of domestic wool in the warehouses now, how many millions will be added if the duty is reduced by 50 percent at this time?

Seventh. Public disapproval of the support plan can be expected if too large public expenditures are made, and this disapproval can be expected to be louder the more crops and products are supported.

Eighth. To prevent a waste of funds and foods it is necessary to have (a) some control or restrictions on domestic agricultural production. (b) Some control or limitation must be exercised on imports of agricultural products to prevent excessive expenditures of public funds. If the American farmer is compelled to submit to a control program in order to carry on a sensible and appropriate means or method to effectively carry out the provisions of the Steagall

amendment, do you not believe that farmers in other lands or speculators or governments should also be subjected to at least equal controls and restrictions of imports? Do you wish to find yourself in the position of supporting controls for the American farmer but opposed to the same program for food producers of other lands? This is not to be interpreted as the policy of my party. This is my own position, and I am willing to defend this position anytime and anywhere.

Ninth. A duty on wheat of 42 cents per bushel when the parity price was around $1 per bushel is one problem, and a duty on wheat of 21 cents or 10½ cents per bushel when the parity price of wheat is $1.85 is assuredly a different problem. However, so long as this administration keeps the near embargo on wheat in operation we will never, never know.

Tenth. The Steagall support price is based on a parity concept or formula. The duty is based on so many cents per pound or bushel together with the involved ad valorem which is based on the price at the point of origin.

I wish to say that during the winter of 1943 and 1944 I introduced a bill which became law which removed the duty altogether on grains coming into this country. Many millions of bushels of grain were imported as a result of that legislation. I introduced that bill so that the provisions of the Steagall amendment could be more effectively carried out. I say this for the reason that the approach I have today to this problem is as purely nonpartisan as it was at the time I introduced the legislation to which I have referred. I have presented this problem because there is no use shadow boxing; there is no use trying to work both sides of the street; and there is no use trying to deceive ourselves or trying to deceive anyone else. We are faced with the problem of setting up the machinery to make the Steagall amendment really operate. You may ask what the Steagall amendment is. That is an amendment by our former distinguished colleague from Alabama which provided, in the first Price Control Act, that the farmers of this country should be guaranteed 90 percent of parity for a 2-year period following the termination of the war. Several hours could be spent discussing the merits of that legislation. When the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which our former colleague, Mr. Steagall, was chairman, brought that bill out, it provided for a 90-percent-parity floor price and 110-percent-parity ceiling price, which was a fair arrangement. Due to certain forces that were pretty strong in Washington at that time, the complaint was made that the farmers of this country were getting 10 percent more than they deserved. I remember at that time I was sorry to have President Roosevelt make the statement when he called us back in October of 1942 that we had to do something about that or else he would. I felt at that time that the President was not listening to the right people and that we would suffer afterward as a result of that position. What has happened to prices since has surely justified that apprehension.

We just listened to a message from the President of the United States. I do not want to get into a discussion of the tariff issue. If anybody desires to spend his time going before the Committee on Reciprocity and telling how bad the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act is and then wind up by saying he believes all of this but does not want it to include anything grown in his State, he is privileged to take that position. Reciprocity has nothing to do with the Steagall amendment, in itself, except that we are liable to jeopardize the entire provisions of the Steagall amendment. In other words, the State Department may take attitudes and actions that will nullify the provisions of the Steagall amendment. If any person in the State or any Member of this House wants to take the position that we should not follow the provisions of the Steagall amendment, he surely is entitled to take that position. I am sure, however, there is no Member of this House present at this time, who was here at the time that amendment was passed and knows what was behind the Steagall amendment, who wants to be in that position. The purpose of the Steagall amendment was not to try to be particularly friendly to the farmers. The purpose of the Steagall amendment was to stimulate food and fiber production during the war. There was not a legislative act passed by this Congress that did so much to increase production as did the Steagall amendment. You ask why. The reason is they knew they could step up their production without finding themselves down in the cellar. At least they had a place to stop and rest on the first floor anyway. The producers would not lose everything they had in trying to go out and fulfill their commitments so far as the production of food was concerned. That was the real purpose of the Steagall amendment. Now, at this late hour, with all the billions of dollars that have been used to take care of all of the other commitments that have been made during the war, I think every Member of this Congress feels that our responsibility cannot be viewed lightly at this time. I say that because the time to arrange these things is before it is too late.

I would like to mention just one fact at this time. Wheat is the staff of life. At the present time we are faced with a floor price of $1.69 a bushel. That is 90 percent of parity as of today. The last time I checked the world price of wheat it was $1 a bushel. The proposed duty is 21 cents a bushel. How are we going to support wheat at $1.69 a bushel if there is a 48-cent differential between the world price plus the proposed duty, and the Steagall, 90 percent of parity, $1.69 per bushel wheat?

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in 1945, a year ago last spring, secured the information from the Department of Agriculture that showed that practically all major agricultural products will be in the same position if we make any reduction in duties at this time. I mentioned the potato program previously. In fairness to the potato program let me say this, that so far as acreage was concerned they did not have too high a goal.

The reason we had possibly too many potatoes was because we had too good a potato year. The same thing might or might not happen next year. The question as to whether the program should be operated on the basis of acreage or on the basis of bushels also enters into the picture as far as the next year is concerned. But the fact still remains that public funds up to the amount of $80,000,000 or $90,000,000 had to be used to support potato prices this year. This one crop in itself would not be so disturbing, but I should like to know what will be the opinion of the American people if it happens that instead of $80,000,000 or $90,000,000 we spend $500,000,000, or $1,000,000,000 to support agricultural prices during the next 2 years? And, incidentally, I might say that the Committee on Appropriations already has appropriated $500,000,000 for the purpose. I said appropriated, not authorized. There will be public reaction to it. I would like to have someone learned in finance tell us how we are going to take on the responsibility of supporting the agricultural prices of the whole world. I think the time has come when we must stop, look, and listen. We should not get involved in any of the arguments about any form of trade, whether it be reciprocity agreements or something else. They are all incidental, because in 1939, or before the war, reciprocity treaties might have meant one thing, but they mean something very much different today because we have on the statute books of this country the so-called Steagall amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I think he has made an excellent point.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As the gentleman has indicated, if we continue this program of stabilizing prices and then permit foodstuffs from all the world to enter this country the question soon will be, Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That will be a question to answer. I might say that I think the point that has been made so many times in so many papers—and I surely have been here long enough to make it evident to everyone that I am perfectly willing for each person to have his own opinion on any subject, that I do not get into personalities, I just do not like to be deceived by anybody. When they tell me that by my position I am keeping this country from the benefits of a world agricultural market, the statement is absolutely simple and absurd.

Here is a chart. I did not prepare this chart. It was prepared by the Department of Commerce. This chart shows what chance we have of obtaining, in normal times and under normal conditions, any part of the world agricultural market. The only agricultural exports we have that amount to anything are either subsidized by export bounties or are given away. Another instance

was when we had UNRRA. We voted for UNRRA because we felt it would keep human beings from starving to death. This chart in itself shows how ridiculous it is to think our agricultural exports amount to anything under normal times.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman indicates that this chart came from the Department of Commerce. Did it come from the Department of Commerce at the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; the Commerce Department furnished the figures and they kindly made the chart.

Mr. STEFAN. I had a copy of the chart last year. It indicates that we are not producing enough for our own self-sufficiency. Is that correct? Is that the answer? What does the chart indicate? Does the chart show that we have enough agricultural products to export or that we can use them all here in our own country?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, we have a possible surplus. We can take care of ourselves if we want to. But let me read what Mr. G. L. Shores, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, said about this in the Journal of Farm Economics, volume 26, page 404:

We—

Meaning the United States—

were consistently a net exporting Nation in these products—

Meaning food products—

during the period 1912 through 1924 and a net importer during the period 1925 through 1941.

The above comparisons point to the significant but not too widely recognized fact that the United States foreign trade in foodstuffs during the past three decades has been small relative to food production and that except for the two war periods the country—

Meaning the United States—

has been a net importer of foodstuffs.

The only point I wish to make there is that we should not permit the rural people of this country to be deceived into thinking they are going to have a big market somewhere else in the world for their products when we must subsidize them or give them the agricultural products.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further to develop debate on this chart?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has just explained the chart as it was explained by an official of the Department of Agriculture. I noticed the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is addressing the House at this time, sat very attentively when the Clerk read the message from the President of the United States a while ago which referred to the possibility of eliminating more controls. The gentleman will recall, the President said in his message that we are going to have a tremendous world shortage of grains, sugar, and many other agricultural products. The gentleman's speech today is on behalf of the Steagall bill is it not?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman feel that the time has come when we should put a floor under farm prices in the United States? Is that the gentleman's argument?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, we already have the law. We should be announcing the floor prices. We should be looking ahead how to make the floors effective.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman that there should be a floor under agricultural prices. Let me ask the gentleman one more question. The gentleman also realizes that the production of food in the United States on the part of American farmers for consumption all over the world should be an argument for considerable protection for the American producer. The American producer produced a miracle in the way of production during the war and is also doing the same at this time. Much of the land has been depleted; that is, the fertility of the land has been depleted. I am happy that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture is now acting as Speaker pro tempore of the House today. I call attention of both the Speaker pro tempore and the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is now addressing the House, that there is a great need for fertilizer in our country. Defense plants no longer needed for the production of war material in my State are now being used for the manufacture of fertilizer, all of which is being exported to Japan and Germany. This fertilizer is being manufactured at the very doors of the farms where it is badly needed to produce food which the world is clamoring for. Will the gentleman enlighten us as to that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We had that before the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. STEFAN. What are you doing about it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ANTON JOHNSON, was chairman of the fertilizer subcommittee and the report of his committee should be released in a very few days.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that mean that my farmers are going to get some fertilizer so that they can produce this food that the world is clamoring for?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The report will show what the fertilizer situation really is, and what can be expected.

I do not know of a man in this House that does want to support the Steagall amendment, but I know that a lot of us are going to be in deep water if we support the Steagall amendment and we take too much money to support the Steagall amendment because we are going to have the public against us and we are going to have the agricultural people as a group in a very embarrassing position.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We were speaking a while ago about exporting foodstuffs and taking care of the people of foreign countries now in need of the farm products of this country. We are supporting the potato growers, and I am glad we are, but can the gentleman explain to us why we are destroying 200,000,000 bushels of potatoes now rather than shipping them to the foreign countries that need that kind of foodstuffs? Can the gentleman give us the reasons why we destroyed them rather than send them where they are so much needed? It seems to me the custom that was established here in 1932 and 1933 ought to be abolished and that we should eliminate the destruction of foodstuffs.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman's premise is not exactly in keeping with the facts, for we are not destroying 200,000,000 bushels. The chances are we will keep it within 100,000,000 bushels. As I said before, the reason we are in distress and embarrassed, so far as potatoes are concerned, is not on account of the acreage. We could be embarrassed on the other side just as well in another year with the same acreage. We happened to have a wonderful year in 1946 for producing potatoes. That is another thing we ought to realize—that we have had some wonderful years in the last 5 or 6 years in producing these foods, and that we may not always have.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says I am in error as to the number of bushels that will be destroyed. I saw a statement made the other day that 200,000,000 bushels are being destroyed. The gentleman now says 100,000,000 bushels. Why destroy even 1 bushel?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They were not all destroyed. In many cases they were used for animal feed and for other purposes. It sounds good to have them dehydrated and it sounds good to put them in cans, but we have to have tin before we can put them in cans, and we have to have a way of dehydrating them before they can be dehydrated. Those are complications that go along with handling any program.

Mr. BULWINKLE rose.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I just wanted to bring out the fact to one gentleman from Pennsylvania, so I could help him out a little bit, that the dehydration costs so much that it is almost impossible to apply it to potatoes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is not only the dehydration costs but the facilities for dehydrating them so I am advised.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Would not the gentleman from Wisconsin want to add also that there have been several million bushels of potatoes shipped abroad, but they deteriorate so rapidly and the shipping facilities are so inadequate that they have not been able to ship the entire surplus, but they have shipped every potato they could get the shipping facilities to transport?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. A good example of that is this story about the boxcars here today. I presume they could not get them for potatoes any more than they could for all these other commodities they wanted to ship. I did not want to condemn or defend the present set-up as regards potatoes because I have not made it part of my business to investigate. I am willing to listen to both sides of it. But I should like to say that I do not care who the man is that is administering the Steagall amendment, these potatoes are the first indication of the headaches he is going to have.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, because I am a little afraid of him.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman does not need to be afraid of me because I have the highest respect for him not only personally but because of his great knowledge with respect to agricultural matters. He knows I have been coming to him for years for advice. Now I am going to ask him whether or not he has discussed what chance we have of making alcohol out of potatoes. Has that already been discussed today? If it has, I do not want to take the time to discuss it now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want it answered. I want to talk about the Steagall amendment and the machinery we have to have to put the Steagall amendment in operation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I believe the observation that I want to make is directly concerned with the Steagall amendment. During October or November of last year our food-study committee was called up into New Jersey, which is a great potato-producing section. We went to Monmouth County, N. J., where they had hundreds of thousands of bushels of potatoes piled up. I stood on one of those great piles of potatoes which they said would fill 60 boxcars. I could see many such piles of potatoes all around us. The Government agreed to pay those farmers $1.80 a hundred for the potatoes. They were aroused because the Government did not give the money to them. We went up and saw those potatoes and came down and reported it. The Government responded pretty quickly and went up there and got the potatoes. Here is what the Government did with the potatoes: The Government paid the farmers $1.80 a hundred for them, then moved them down to Philadelphia to the distilleries to make alcohol. The Government paid them 15 cents extra. In other words, they did not get enough out of the potatoes to pay for the freight by about 15 cents a hundred. That was a very expensive experiment under the Steagall amendment or some other amendment, which proves exactly what the gentleman is saying—that that is a proposition which needs attention right now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPE). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the January 1947 issue of The Staple Cotton Review by my esteemed friend, Hon. A. H. Stone, chairman of the Mississippi Tax Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article, Defeat in Victory, by Felix Morley.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune of La Crosse, Wis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPE). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE KNUTSON THEORY OF TAX REDUCTION AGAINST THE ENGEL THEORY OF TAX REDUCTION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want the membership of the House to strictly understand that in my remarks today I am not attacking the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. I have a great respect and admiration for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who has done a monumental job as a one-man committee uncovering waste and extravagance in the military affairs of this Government. He is entitled to the thanks of all the American people. But when the gentleman from Michigan enters the forest of taxation, and I call it a forest advisedly, he runs the risk of not only becoming lost and confused but not knowing which direction he is heading. Because of the fact, I am attacking the theory of taxation contained in H. R. 62 introduced by the gentleman from Michigan. I am challenging and want to answer the arguments that he has presented in support of that theory of taxation. It is for that reason I am taking the floor today. I want you to know also at the outset that I have asked for 30 minutes and I expect in my prepared statement to take only about 8 minutes. But I do want to provoke discussions on the theory of taxation as advocated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and the theory of taxation as advocated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. I shall not yield until I am through with my prepared statement and then let come what may.

Mr. Speaker, the three successive Democratic tax bills of 1940, 1941, 1942, added to Uncle Sam's tax list the names of some 45,000,000 American citizens that had never before paid a direct Federal income tax. This was done by lowering the tax exemptions and by imposing the special victory tax. These 45,000,000 new names added to the 5,000,000 taxpayers who had been carrying the load made a tax list of 50,000,000 names. When this was done and pay-roll deductions were put into effect as the easiest method of making collections, these new taxpayers—all American voters—became tax conscious almost overnight. Then these 45,000,000 voters began to howl because they were being assessed to help pay for the Federal squandering that had been going on for a decade, squandering which they had either heretofore approved or had ignored. They now for the first time became interested in such subjects as Government spending, a balanced budget, a reduction in tax rates, and kindred subjects. It is my considered opinion that these millions of voters who had suddenly become tax conscious constituted the balance of power in the election last November. Their votes were cast against deficit spending and for tax reduction, the most important issues of the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, we have had more than a decade of New Deal spending. Every person in America today below 30 years of age has been exposed to, and most of them have become saturated with the something for nothing New Deal philosophy. The average person in America today has a hazy notion that what Uncle Sam spends does not come out of the average person's pocket but comes mostly out of the pockets of the fellows in the upper brackets, so why should he—the average person—worry if Uncle Sam does spend more than he should. This mistaken idea on the part of the majority of American citizens is the real reason that the New Deal's strategy of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect" lasted for a decade.

Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress in its last revision of the Federal income-tax law removed from the tax rolls between ten and twelve million low-income taxpayers. This was approximately 25 percent of our total Federal income-tax payers. That is water over the dam. It is an accomplished fact. I opposed the removal of those taxpayers' names from Uncle Sam's tax list; and today I am opposing the removal of any more names from that list. I am convinced that we must make the American people tax conscious if we ever expect to get public approval for the reduction of Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, the question this Congress faces today is whether we want to remove from the tax rolls 20,000,000 additional taxpayers who are becoming tax conscious and permit them to go back to sleep on tax matters and public spending; or whether we want to retain these 20,000,000 people on the tax rolls and give tax relief to all taxpayers in proportion to the amount they pay in taxes. Let us, therefore, in the face of this question analyze the Engel bill, H. R. 62, and the Knutson bill, H. R. 1, to see how they compare as to soundness, as to justice,

and as to the effect each would have upon the general welfare of the Nation.

If we do as the Engel bill proposes—raise the exemptions of a single man from $500 to $1,000 and the head of a family from $1,000 to $2,000, leaving the exemptions for dependents at $500 each as they now are, we would remove from the Federal tax rolls from eighteen to twenty million people and we would lose in Treasury receipts approximately $5,000,000,000. Do we want to do that?

If we do as the Knutson bill proposes, give a flat 20 percent reduction to all taxpayers who have incomes of $300,000 or less, and a 10.5 percent reduction to all taxpayers with incomes above that amount, we would retain on the Federal tax rolls every name now on the list, and would provide a rebate of $3,500,000,000 to American taxpayers, such rebate to be distributed in proportion to the amount of taxes each pays.

The gentleman from Michigan says the Knutson bill is not fair to the low-income taxpayers. To illustrate the unfairness of the Knutson bill he takes for his example a person earning $11 to $12 per week and says that person now pays 10 cents per week tax or $5.20 in taxes per year, and that under the Knutson bill that person would receive a rebate of only 2 cents per week or $1.04 per year.

The gentleman from Michigan then goes on to say:

> Taking money we call taxes from the low-income groups which should be spent for bread, butter, milk, and food to fill the stomachs of hungry children will not avert inflation. Such a policy can only bring about suffering, crime, immorality, and poor citizenship. No policy of making everyone pay a tax to make people tax conscious can be justified when the tax dollar collected forces the living standards of the taxpayers below a decent level.

Now, of course, these are touching words. They are heart-stirring words. They present the usual exaggerated picture of oppression. But the trouble is the picture is extremely farfetched. In the first place, for practical purposes there is no person working today who earns only $11 to $12 per week. We do have a minimum wage law. In the second place, if there were such a worker and he had hungry children who needed their stomachs filled, he would pay no tax under our present exemptions of $500 for each child. A man today who has two children would have to earn more than $2,000 a year before he would have to pay any taxes under present tax laws. So, the touching picture of tax oppression painted by the gentleman from Michigan loses its force, if it ever had any force. It falls by the weight of its very absurdity. However, I believe we should be interested, deeply interested, in the reasoning of the gentleman from Michigan even if we are not interested in his illustration.

If it is inequitable and unjust to do as the Knutson bill proposes—give tax relief in proportion to the amount paid by the taxpayer—as the gentleman from Michigan contends, then what would he say concerning the following hypothetical parallel case?

We will suppose that the real-estate tax on farm lands in a certain rich agricultural county amounts to $2 per acre.

John Jones owns 10,000 acres and pays a tax of $20,000.

John Smith owns 160 acres and pays a tax of $320.

John Doe owns 10 acres and pays a tax of $20.

A reduction of 20 percent in the real-estate tax in that county is proposed and becomes a reality.

John Jones saves 20 percent of $20,000, on $4,000 on his tax bill.

John Smith saves 20 percent of $320, or $64 on his tax bill.

John Doe saves 20 percent of $20, or $4 on his tax bill.

According to the theory behind the Knutson bill this real-estate tax-reduction program is fair, is just, and is equitable because each taxpayer gets a reduction on his tax bill in proportion to the amount he pays in taxes. According to the theory behind the Engel bill, this real-estate tax-reduction program is not fair; it is not just, it is not equitable because it gives John Jones a tax reduction of $4,000 and gives John Doe a tax reduction of only $4. Under the theory contained in the Engel bill, both John Smith and John Doe would be removed from the tax rolls; they would not be required to pay any taxes on the small amount of acreage they possess; and John Jones and his kind would carry the full tax load.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle: Which theory is right? Which is fair? Which is just? Which is equitable? And you must answer my questions because you will be called upon to support with your votes either the Engel theory of tax reduction or the Knutson theory of tax reduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to intelligently act upon a tax-reduction program we should have before us the essential facts that bear upon the problem of tax reduction, facts that throw light upon the number of people in the different tax brackets.

Treasury experts tell us that if we increase exemptions from $500 per person to $600 person, it will take 3,000,000 people off the tax rolls and will mean a reduction in Treasury receipts of $1,500,000,000. If we increase income-tax exemptions from $500 to $700 per person it will take 10,000,000 people off the tax rolls and will mean a reduction in Treasury receipts of $3,000,000,000. This would practically use up the $3,500,000,000 tax rebate covered in the Knutson bill. Do we want to do that?

The following facts also bear directly upon the problem of tax reduction and should be kept in mind when considering the same:

(a) Sixty-seven percent of all Federal income taxpayers receive $2,500 per year or less. This group pays $4,500,000,000 in Federal taxes each year, and therefore would receive under the Knutson bill a rebate of $900,000,000.

(b) Twenty-eight percent of all Federal income taxpayers receive between $2,500 and $5,000 per year; pay $5,200,000,000 in Federal taxes, and would receive $1,040,000,000 rebate under the Knutson bill. The Federal Treasury books show that about half of the total Federal income-tax receipts come from these two groups, namely taxpayers who receive $5,000 per year or below. We must keep these taxpayers on the tax rolls if we expect to balance the budget.

(c) Under present Federal tax rates and exemptions:

A $1,500-a-year man, with family of two children, pays no Federal income tax.

A $2,500-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $95 Federal income tax.

A $3,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $190 Federal income tax.

A $5,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $589 Federal income tax.

A $10,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $1,862 Federal income tax.

A $50,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $24,111 Federal income tax.

A $500,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $406,600 Federal income tax.

A $1,000,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $838,850 Federal income tax.

And on top of these Federal taxes the taxpayer must pay State income taxes in most States, which further greatly reduces the amount he has left after Uncle Sam gets his.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat and to emphasize the question this House has to decide in connection with income-tax reduction. Do we want to remove from the Federal tax rolls 20,000,000 people who are now paying Federal income taxes, who are now becoming tax conscious for the first time in their lives, and by so doing free them from paying some $5,000,000,000 into the Federal Treasury, as the Engel bill proposes? Or do we want to retain on the Federal tax rolls every taxpayer now on the rolls, lighten his tax load in proportion to the amount he pays in taxes, and give a rebate of $3,500,000,000 to the American taxpayers, such rebate to be given in proportion to their tax bills as the Knutson bill proposes?

Which program of tax reduction, in your opinion, is fair? Which is just? Which is equitable?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I would like to say that the gentleman from Illinois has made a very enlightening speech. I wish that every Member of this House and every Member of the Senate of the United States could have heard it. I hope that those who have not heard it will take the trouble to read it. May I suggest to the gentleman that I think he has made his case very clear, but I think he can still, if he will do so, further enlighten the House by discussing the technical and the over-all differences between the Knutson bill and the Engel bill.

Mr. MASON. In answer to that I wish to say this, that I have analyzed the two bills and have pointed out the difference in a practical manner. But

the theory behind the two bills is the important thing. That is the thing that ought to be discussed and considered, and there is a difference in those theories.

We have two general tax theories in the world today, and only two, I might say. One theory is that a person should pay to support the Government on the basis of the benefits received from the Government. That was the theory that prevailed all through the Middle Ages. That was the theory that said that if I have 10 children going to school and you have 1, I should pay 10 times as much as you. Of course, in those days there were private schools; we did not have public education then. When democracy came into the world they drafted a new theory of taxation, and that is the theory that each person should contribute to the support of the Government on the basis of his ability to pay.

Underlying our real-estate taxes today is the theory of benefits received. That is the theory underlying it. If I have three lots in town and you have one, and I have more benefits of water, light, and paving and all the rest of the improvements on my property, then I pay three times as much as you, and it works mighty well on real-estate property. Now, our whole graduated-income tax is based on the theory of ability to pay. The more ability a man has the more he should pay, and that, too, is a mighty fine theory and that, too, is a good theory as applied to income. But any good, well-balanced tax system is like a good, well-balanced meal.

It has to have a mingling of the different kinds. So we have got to have that mingling of theories, and we have to apply them where they apply the easiest. The minute you do as the Engel bill suggests, remove from the tax rolls eighteen to twenty million people who are now paying $5 a year, as he says, or $10 a year or $40 a year or $100 a year, you are destroying the theory that is behind that tax, and I am opposed to it. I say it should not be done, and I say this House has to consider that very seriously when we propose these tax reductions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman made a statement there with respect to the procedure that might be followed in submitting this very important question to the Congress. He said that the House Members will be called upon to vote upon either one bill or the other. Has the gentleman had any conferences with those in control?

Mr. MASON. No; I have not had any conferences. I did not say we would be called upon to vote on either one bill or the other. I said we would be called upon to vote on the theory in the one bill or the other.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman have any idea as to whether the Committee on Rules will give the House an opportunity to vote on either of those theories, or whether the Committee on Rules might not send out one bill or one theory and say, "Vote that up or down." That is what has happened in the past with respect to tax bills.

Mr. MASON. I refuse to answer for the Committee on Rules. I am not on it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wondered if the gentleman knew.

Mr. MASON. I do not.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Of course we on this side are quite pained at the unity on the Republican side on tax theory. May I project this theory which the gentleman relates as exemplified in his real-estate tax, and inquire into his theory? In the example which he cited the tax rate was the same on all three individuals.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman says that is a good theory. That is the theory embodied in the Knutson bill. Then it would follow, would it not, that the gentleman would reduce the income tax to a point of having the identical rate apply to everyone, which would recognize in no way the ability to pay.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is mistaken. He does not interpret my statement correctly. The theory in the income tax is ability to pay, and that is just the opposite of the theory that applies in the real-estate tax in the illustration I used. The Knutson bill does not have that theory in it.

Mr. GORE. Did I not correctly understand the gentleman to give as an illustration of the differences in the theories, as he pleases to call the differences in these two bills, the real-estate tax?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. GORE. He went further to say that this was the theory of the Knutson bill and that each man would pay the same rate.

Mr. MASON. No; that each man would have a reduction in proportion to the amount of his tax bill.

Mr. GORE. Then the gentleman's example does not apply at all. The gentleman has used an entirely wrong example, because the real-estate tax in the gentleman's county and in mine is levied in identically the same way—the same tax rate applies to everyone.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. Does the Knutson bill do that?

Mr. MASON. The Knutson bill as it was originally drafted and as I approved it, and still approve it, was a flat reduction on all income-tax payers, the same reduction.

Mr. GORE. Then the gentleman's heart does not bleed for these few with incomes over $300,000?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. What the gentleman advocates is that the man who pays $1 of income tax gets 20 cents reduction.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. The man who pays $100 under the Knutson plan would get $20 reduction.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And the man who pays $100,000 in income tax gets a rebate of $20,000.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And the man who pays a million dollars in income taxes gets a tax cut of $200,000.

Mr. MASON. That is exactly right.

Mr. DINGELL. And the gentleman reasons that 20 cents tax cut to the poor devil who pays $1, and that is all he can pay, is all right and that is just, equitable, and right?

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. DINGELL. You think that is just right when it is compared with the man who gets $200,000 cut on $1,000,000?

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; of course.

Mr. MASON. And that is the whole theory of it.

Mr. DINGELL. If you advocate that in your district in the next election, you will stay at home. The gentleman does not know as much about taxes as he knows about the man in the moon.

Mr. MASON. I would not lose much sleep about that.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman has not been on the committee long enough to know what it is all about.

Mr. OWENS. I had intended to ask this question when the gentleman mentioned the situation about the real-estate taxes. Is it not a fact that when a man is paying a real-estate tax he is paying on his capital and he may not have the power to pay without his capital being taken away from him? In other words, If he does not have the wherewithal to pay the tax he may have his real estate taken away from him. But where a man is paying an income tax, he is paying on money that he is receiving whether the money is large or small in amount. He is receiving money and he can pay the income tax out of that money. Is there any reason why one who is paying $500, for instance, as compared to one who is paying $100, should not receive a $100 reduction while the other is receiving a $20 reduction? What is unfair or inequitable about that? It would be unfair or inequitable to take a man's real estate from him when he does not have the ability to pay.

Mr. MASON. Of course, that is the thread of my whole argument. It is fair and just and right to reduce your income-tax bills and your real-estate-tax bills on the basis of the amount that you are required to pay in taxes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine and logical presentation of the tax picture and to the contrasts he has drawn between the two bills. Of course, there is a side to this that has not been developed at all. The gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the very distinguished gentleman from Detroit, referred to the fact that if you advocated this theory you may stay at home. He has been advocating other theories in the 17 bills that he has voted

for and he almost stayed at home this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Oh, no; I did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that while he is here two of his Detroit colleagues, very able gentlemen, and one from the Northern Peninsula, are not here. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] also said that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] followed through on his theory he would not be here. I heard the gentleman's answer that he would not lose any sleep over that and we all know that none of the rest of us will lose any sleep if we stay home because we support and adhere to a just principle. I would like to add further that if the gentleman from Michigan follows through on his theory of advocating special privileges for this, that, and the other one, and especially to the low-income group——

Mr. DINGELL. Who is advocating special privileges?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman from Michigan follows through on his theory of advocating special privileges to this, that, and the other group as he has in the past, and especially to the members of the low-income groups—and, of course, there are more people and more voters in those groups than in any other group—he may remain here by purchasing votes through advocating those special privileges in return for their votes. That has been the policy of the New Deal all along with labor and with every minority and racial group, and you have bought and bought and bought, and taxed and taxed, and finally the New Deal at several elections succeeded in buying a majority of the votes. The national debt piled up until now we are at our wit's end to find money to service it—the country is in a mess. The New Dealers were voted out and Republicans have the job of cleaning house, devising ways and means of reestablishing a sound, safe economic policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE GROWING COPPER SHORTAGE AND WHAT IT MEANS IN MY DISTRICT

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, when I was back home in Naugatuck and Waterbury, Conn., a week ago I talked with scores of my constituents. I found that the problems confronting the people who honored me by sending me to Congress are not unlike those I hear my colleagues discussing every day. Some veteran wants help on his case, and I am glad to talk with him and to be of assistance to him. Someone has a matter pending before a Government department, but has had no report as to what is happening. Some want more immigration, yet others want visas to leave the country, and so it goes.

But, Mr. Speaker, I ran into one problem so serious that the whole Congress must do something about it. One of my constituents has a lot to do with the purchasing of supplies for one of the big brass mills in Waterbury. He told me that commencing in the second quarter of this year it will become almost impossible to buy supplies of copper. I do not have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing more important to continued employment in the Fifth Connecticut District than adequate supplies of copper, for it is absolutely essential to the brass industry and to the dozens of industries which manufacture brass parts, valves and plumbing supplies, to mention only a few of the items produced in my district. These industries employ thousands upon thousands of people. Their wages are the only source of their livelihood. Their purchasing power enters the stream of commerce in the payment of rents, or doctor bills, in the purchase of milk produced on our nearby farms, in the purchase of food supplies and all of the other things required in this highly complex age.

Mr. Speaker, you can imagine my concern for the welfare of the thousands of workers in my district when I heard about this threatened copper shortage. Before I left Waterbury I immediately set about getting together as many of the facts as possible, and since my return to Washington I have pursued the subject more thoroughly. Presently I will introduce a bill, designed to deal with the situation, but before doing so, I want to tell you a little bit more about the problem. During the war it became evident that there was, with the possible exception of petroleum, no more vital and essential commodity than copper. This noncorrosive metal went into shells and cartridges. It went into every plane, every automobile, every ship. Without copper, we could not have won the war. The Government called upon every possible source of domestic production to increase its output. Abandoned mines were pumped out; subsidies were paid to high-cost producers. All supplies and all uses of copper came under Government control. The two-price purchasing plan saved the American people billions of dollars, for there was one price for the low-cost producers and another price, not including subsidies, for the high-cost producers. This device, however, although it produced the maximum possible output within the United States, also stimulated depletion of our reserves and of our copper resources. Besides, before we actually entered the war, we exported tens of thousands of tons of our copper to other nations. Notwithstanding, we could not possibly produce all the copper we required.

So, the Government imported copper from other producing centers. Under one Executive order, copper came in duty-free. In addition, the Metals Reserve Company actually paid a duty of $80 per ton on imported copper and made it available to American consumers. Thus, we were able to get through imports added to our domestic production, an amount sufficient for our wartime needs.

All that has now changed. The only copper coming into the United States now is copper which was purchased by the Metals Reserve Company under contracts entered into before November 10, 1946. The supply of such copper will presently cease. Besides, the Government has drawn upon our stock pile of copper and has permitted its sale to the industry, but before the end of March that stock pile will have completely disappeared.

I do not suppose it is possible for anyone to tell exactly how much copper will be required over the next 3 years. I do not suppose it is possible for anyone to tell exactly how much domestic copper will be produced in the same period. It has reasonably been estimated, however, that our requirements will run around 1,400,000 tons per year, while our production is estimated at about 900,000 tons per year. Obviously, we will be short 500,000 tons per year, and that deficit can only be made up by imports.

Mr. Speaker, you may say, "All right, go ahead and import 500,000 tons of copper per year." Right there is where the Congress becomes concerned. It is a little-known fact that there is an excise tax of 4 cents per pound on imported copper. Four cents per pound per ton produces a levy of $80 per ton, in addition to the cost of the copper. Obviously, an increase in the cost of a vital raw material like copper at the rate of $80 per ton will inevitably be reflected in an increase in prices of all items using the copper. Such an additional inflationary factor at this time can have a most serious impact, for it will run into every home in the United States. A manufacturer, for example, cannot say that this item was made from domestic copper and will bear one price, and then sell the same item at a higher price on the ground that it is made from imported copper. No, Mr. Speaker, the price increase will run to all items.

Moreover, the really big operator will be able to go into the world market and buy copper while the small operator will not be able to get it at all. Resistance to higher prices will also drive many users to seek lower-cost substitutes which, in the long run, might run to a considerable percentage of our ordinary domestic use and thus a partial market, at least, would be lost to our domestic producers.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose we remove the 4-cents-a-pound tariff on imported copper and decrease production in our own country. The gentleman says our production is 900,000 tons. Suppose further we lose another 200,000 tons of production because of foreign imports. This will mean that certain of the copper miners will lose their jobs, because the mine operators cannot continue to pay their wages. Other wages in the industry will be reduced. What is going to happen to the gentleman's industry if they cannot sell their manufactured products to the people of this country?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have taken that into consideration in the rest of my address.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. BELL. Can the gentleman enlighten the House as to the foreign countries from which the copper comes?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; Chile. I would say South America is about the only place where we can get it, for the reason that production in the Belgian Congo and Rhodesia have been tied up by the European countries. There is demand for copper not only in the United States but all over the world. It is quite possible that no one else looks at it the way I do, but one of our first lines of defense is metal and the most important metal in an emergency is copper.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman in the first part of his statement as to the importance of copper in both our domestic and wartime needs. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania particularly that we ought not to wreck the industry in this country by cutting down domestic production. That would not be in the interest of national defense.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman says we are going to wreck a big industry in this country. I say that if we do not get the copper now we will not only wreck one industry but many. For instance, at the present time three companies control 80 percent of the copper here in America. Is that right?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot believe that the 4 cents-a-pound duty is keeping out foreign copper or blocking industry. If 12 pounds of copper are used on an average to build a car, I cannot believe the additional cost of 48 cents will check the building of cars.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman is evading my question. I asked him if it is not a fact that three big corporations today control 80 percent of our copper. The gentleman, among others, advocates that we do something for the GI's. Does the gentleman realize that when you enter the door of a house and turn on the electric light that the electricity which lights that light flows over copper wires and through copper switches?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am from a copper-producing State. I do not want to see the copper mines in this country hurt, as they surely would be if the duty on foreign copper is removed or reduced. I want to help GI's, including GI's in copper camps.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am not criticizing the gentleman's position, but I would like for someone to show me where copper production today is sufficient to make this other step unnecessary. I may say in this connection that I am only taking into consideration one part of the code, section 3425, which goes on to list other articles which are not affected by my bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. We put a maximum 5-cent subsidy on copper during the war and greatly increased production. That shows we can produce it if we get the right price and pay proper wages.

Mr. PATTERSON. Why are they not producing it now?

Mr. MURDOCK. The present shortage is only temporary. I thought the gentleman was going to advocate a plan to increase home production of copper when he started out. I cannot feel that a rate of 4 cents a pound on foreign copper is too high a duty.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman will probably have a chance to vote on that.

If copper cannot be obtained, unemployment will follow, not only in Waterbury, Conn., but in every industrial center, large and small, throughout the United States. For example, for the lack of 20,000 tons of copper, your manufacturer will not produce 1,000,000 automobiles. Differing only in degree, the lack of copper will create a bottleneck in the production of refrigerators, of electric motors, of cable, of wire, of plumbing supplies, and literally of thousands of articles. We need copper for our GI housing program. You can't even enter your own house to turn on an electric light switch without realizing the importance of copper. Again, in the national-defense field, copper will be an absolute prerequisite to any preparedness program for the defense of our Nation, just as it has been in the last war. We need to import copper to assure ourselves of an adequate supply for our own protection.

The Congress, if it chooses to do so, can sit idly by and do nothing to protect American workers, American business, the American economy as a whole, against this serious threat. On the other hand, the Congress can take affirmative action and insure the success of our reconversion program. For example, it can repeal the excise tax of $80 per ton and allow copper to be brought into the United States, at least until such time as domestic consumption levels off in reasonable ratio to American production. It has seemed to me that such a step is the most desirable, particularly because three large American producers produce approximately 80 percent of our American copper output and use most of it themselves. The inevitable result is that all the rest of American industry is bound to bid for the remaining 20 percent of American production. The possibilities of price rigging inherent in such a situation are obvious. As a matter of fact, it may be pertinent to observe that during the war the price of domestic copper was 12 cents a pound. Early in November it went to 14⅜ cents a pound. On November 12 it went to 17½ cents a pound. I notice in the New York Times for January 29 an article which says that the domestic price is now 20½ cents a pound, "the highest price commanded by the red metal since 1929." The New York Times' article also says that "increased prices for raw copper must be passed along by boosting the prices of copper products." The bill which I have prepared is designed to remove the excise tax on imported copper, but my proposed amendment to existing law as set forth in section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code does not affect any other of the items treated in that section.

I intend to ask that my bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. That extremely able committee can then hold hearings and make inquiry into the whole situation. Perhaps it will seem to the committee that an outright repeal is not the answer. Perhaps it will seem that for a period of some 3 or 4 years, the first 400,000 tons of imports in any 1 year can be brought in for consumption, duty free, with the tax to be attached, however, to all imports above that quota. Such a device can easily be administered by our customs authorities. In fact, they are doing this kind of thing every day. Perhaps it will seem to the committee that the application of section 3425 should be suspended for a period, say of 3 years, until the necessary postwar adjustments of consumption and supply can be met. I am not wedded necessarily to any one of these formulas, but it would seem that removal of the $80 per ton barrier will most quickly get us the copper we need.

But this much is certain, Mr. Speaker. We must act, and we must act fast. Both consumers and producers are in complete agreement on this score. Only a few days ago I was reading a brief which was filed before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in behalf of some 16 domestic producers including the Phelps Dodge Corp., which is one of the largest in the United States. These producer companies in their brief announced themselves in favor of taking measures to meet the problem. They said that they felt such measures must be designed to prevent the entry of more foreign copper than is needed to meet the temporary excess of demand. They must assure the domestic producer that he will have his full protection and can proceed in safety to make the most efficient use of his ore resources. They must provide that the quantity of foreign copper admitted shall supplement domestic production and not replace it.

I mention this point only as additional evidence that something must be done.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to insure the continued employment of tens of thousands of workers in our manufacturing industries, we must have copper. To protect more than 3,300 wholesale dealers in electrical supplies, we must have copper. To preserve the business of more than 160,000 electrical appliance dealers, we must have copper. Already production of fractional-horsepower motors is slackening because of inadequate supplies of copper, and there are more than 1,200 different kinds of machines using fractional-horsepower motors. This will give you some idea of the scope of this problem. It is estimated that our returning GI's who have entered the electrical business are now failing at the rate of 5 percent per month for lack of materials to sell which employ copper.

Necessarily, under the rules of the House, my time today has been limited. I have said enough, however, to give my colleagues some insight into this most serious threat to the American economy due to our lack of copper. It will be my purpose to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means and make further presentation of my views on this subject. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I am offering a bill designed to bring the problem

formally before a great committee of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that the language of my bill may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

A bill to maintain continued employment, to provide adequate supplies of copper to assist American industry in the reconversion period, to protect the American people against a new inflationary threat, and to assist in promoting stabilization in the American economy

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3425, title 26 of the United States Code (act of June 6, 1932, ch. 209, sec. 601 (c) (7), 47 Stat. 260) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3425. Articles provided for in paragraphs 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 4 cents per pound on the copper contained therein. All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, in which copper (including copper in alloys) is the component material of chief value, 3 cents per pound. All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, containing 4 percent or more of copper by weight, 3 percent ad valorem or three-fourths of 1 cent per pound, whichever is the lower. The tax on the articles described in this section shall apply only with respect to the importation of such articles. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe all necessary regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this section (53 Stat. 415)."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may be given permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Des Moines Register of Saturday, January 25, 1947.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I preface my remarks here today by saying that I am in favor of labor legislation generally and at the same time I want to do what I can to aid and assist management in getting a 50–50 break in freedom of laws. I am also most vitally interested in the welfare of the general public, so laws must be just to all. That is my duty to this country, as I see it, if we are to preserve the Constitution of the United States and keep our country of liberty-loving people free as we have known it in past years. My feelings are the same as those expressed in a letter dated January 31, which I have received, and in which are suggested the changes that are necessary in our labor laws if we are to have a contented, happy people in this country. The letter is as follows:

CAMP HILL, PA.,
January 31, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing your personal interest in the affairs of industry, with your intimate knowledge of the problems facing it which I think will be making a most helpful contribution to the solving of the problem of labor relations, I am writing you with reference to my company's ideas with which I heartily agree. My company thinks that now is the time for Congress to treat the cause and not the disease of our labor troubles. During the past few years we have seen labor groups and their leaders stifle our existence. Let us see how it happened. How did John L. Lewis gain the power he has? How has one man achieved more power than our Government? Have we by law vested power in labor leaders to strangle the Nation?

With the trend through the years of Federal legislation building up the power of organized labor, the unions have been able to strangle the Nation and substitute coercion for bargaining. Therefore, just as business trusts were broken up, labor monopolies must be broken up. Congress should make industry-wide contracts illegal, and limit labor contracts to each separate company.

Just as employers by law are required to bargain collectively, and when agreements are made, to execute contracts, the labor unions in turn should be made responsible for carrying out these contracts in good faith. Therefore, the Wagner labor law should either be repealed or it should be so modified that it will be fair to both employer and employee—and closed-shop labor contracts which establish a monopoly of labor and take away the worker's right to choose a job should be prohibited by law.

For many years State and Federal Governments have implemented by law the principle that investors in public utilities must give up certain rights of control, to limit the return on their investment, to determine when and under what conditions public service shall be rendered or discontinued. But how long could a public utility maintain its position if the management should demand an increase in rate and announce to the governing authority that unless the increased rate was approved by a certain date it would discontinue service? Yet Congress and State legislatures have not recognized the public obligation of employees who are employed by public utilities. When a man accepts a job with a public utility he does it as willingly as the man who invests his money in that same utility. They both have a public obligation.

We do not need punitive or vindictive legislation. We need a few simple laws which will make all of our citizens, including labor unions and their members, responsible to the law of the land.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE I. METZE.

Mr. Speaker, on January 8, at page 188 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made a speech on this topic and I received numerous letters, some approving and some disapproving my remarks relative to the responsibility of unions as well as of business enterprises. I insert at this point in the RECORD three letters from labor unions in my district in reference to the matter:

LOCAL 12313, U. M. W. OF A.,
DISTRICT 50, NEW YORK AND
PENNSYLVANIA COUNTY WORKERS,
Lock Haven, Pa., January 14, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
Member of United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please be informed that this local union composed of approximately 624 members, and all residing in Clinton County, disagree with views as expressed by a certain constituent and published by you in the Lock Haven Express on January 13, 1947, as a speech which you made in Congress on January 8, 1947.

We further advise you that we are earnestly opposed to any legislation to revoke or modify the union shop, the Wagner Labor Act, or any other legislation which is now on the statute books of the United States of America.

We also request you to use your influence to have this letter published in the Lock Haven Express, since all of the 624 members of this union are also your constituents. This action was taken by unanimous vote of this local union, meeting in regular session and well attended, at Union Hall, 209 East Main Street, Lock Haven, Pa., January 14, 1947.

Trusting you comply with our wishes. We remain,

Very truly yours,

DONALD A. GRIEB,
President.

CHARLES C. EICHENLAUB,
Recording Secretary, Local Union 12313, District 50, United Mine Workers of America.

DYE AND CHEMICAL WORKERS
LOCAL UNION 13059,
DISTRICT 50,
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Lock Haven, Pa., January 28, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICH: Pursuant to action taken by the Dye and Chemical Workers Local Union 13059, District 50, United Mine Workers of America, at the meeting held in the union hall, at 209 East Main Street, Lock Haven, Pa., January 22, 1947.

In view of the stringent labor bills being introduced that are designed to be very harmful to labor and the gains made over a long period of years, it is the desire of this local union membership, that you, our respected and honorable Congressman, take a firm stand against any and all such bills presented.

There appeared in the Lock Haven Express, Monday, January 13, 1947, a letter from one of your constituents with a 10-point program for you to vote for.

This letter represents at least 140 of your constituents requesting you to vote against such points, and it may also be published in the Lock Haven Express.

It is also the desire of these constituents that you keep an eye on appropriation bills for flood control and use your influence in the interests of flood control for this area, where losses due to floods have been very high.

Hoping that you will support and use your influence in these matters, I remain,

Respectfully,

M. C. ORNDORF,
Recording Secretary, Local Union 13059, District 50, UMWA.

LOCAL 628, UNITED ELECTRICAL,
RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Williamsport, Pa., January 18, 1947.

ROBERT RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The 600 members of Local 628, UE-CIO, request that you oppose any anti-labor legislation and amendments to the Wagner Act. We expect you to fight for full hearings on all bills and to oppose all legislation designed to confine labor.

The workers are badly in need of a wage increase to meet the high living costs of today; therefore, we expect all Congressmen, who consider themselves fair to labor, to make an all-out fight against restrictive legislation every step of the way.

Respectfully yours,
S. P. WEAVER,
President, Local 628, UE-CIO.

Mr. Speaker, personally I am against the closed-shop proposition. I have no sympathy for jurisdictional strikes or so-called boycott strikes. I am not in sympathy with the portal-to-portal theory as enunciated in a recent judicial decision. It is my belief that the American workingman should not be compelled to join a union before he can secure a job with Uncle Sam on any kind of a project that the Government wants to construct or any enterprise it might engage which employs labor. A man should be given the privilege of determining within his own mind and conscience whether or not he wants to join and belong to a labor union. In my opinion, we are going far afield when we pass laws and set up and establish a labor board that influences every man in this country to join a union before he may work for the Government. It just does not seem to me that the Constitution of the United States countenances labor laws of that kind in a free country such as ours.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman does not differentiate, does he, as between the man who works for the Government and the man who works for a private employer?

Mr. RICH. I am talking about the contracts which the United States Government made during the war in most every field of enterprise. When the Government awarded contracts the contractors were not permitted to employ labor unless the employee first went to a labor union head or some labor boss, and paid from $50 to $1,300 for the privilege of working on Uncle Sam's job.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is no different than it is with many private employers in this country and the people who work for those employers.

Mr. RICH. That is right; that is exactly the same thing, and that is the thing I am complaining about. I do not think that it is right or just and I do not believe that the average member who belongs to a labor union wants conditions of that kind in this country. If you refer to these letters that I am placing in the RECORD from labor unions in Lock Haven, they say that the whole sum total number of employees in their unions were against that procedure of taking away the rights of the closed shop and the rights of jurisdictional strikes and the rights of sympathetic strikes, and so forth. I want, if possible, to have the newspapers in my county and the individuals who work in those plants, if they think otherwise, correspond with me, and I will keep their names secret, because I would just like to know whether the individual members of the unions in my district are all in favor of such procedure as these union officials who have requested me to keep from changing the Wagner Act.

Now, from other unions in my district I have received requests such as these, and I quote:

First I will state my standing. I am strictly a union man. I have been paying dues all my life, I commend you on your article in the House January 8, page 188, and I agree 100 percent with the letter you inserted from a workman for I am opposed to all those labor rackets that violate our Constitution and the bill of rights.

I believe that the other fellow should have the same right as I have and I fear that unless labor or the Government clear out Communist racketeers, they will take this country over.

Then I received a letter from another individual, and I quote:

I have worked at—

And he gave me the name of the company, but I am not going to reveal it—

for 7 years and I like my work. But it looks like I will have to leave here. The union is trying to get a closed shop, and I refuse to pay tribute to John L. Lewis. I have three boys that enlisted in the service to keep this country free. Try to keep it so. Anyone has a right to work.

Then I received a petition from men in a labor union who were afraid to take it up with their own union, who write me as follows:

We, the undersigned members of Local Union —, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, wish to state that through a closed-shop agreement, negotiated between the above union and our employers, we were forced to join the union in order to keep our jobs.

Believing this to be contrary to the American way of life we are appealing to you, Honorable Sir, to exert your influence in our behalf in the legislation to be proposed in this session of Congress, to make the closed shop unlawful.

That was signed by quite a good many members of the union. So that I get requests for and requests against, and I think that we have gotten to the point in our national life where we have to judge what is best, and we have to vote for legislation that is coming up here from time to time. So, we must consider the fact that this is a free country and we do not want to force anybody to do anything against his own will, and we want to give men rights and give them justice.

There is just one other thing I would like to get into the RECORD at this time, and that is a statement that was made in Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, December 16, 1946, in reference to the closed shop. I only print part of this, however, as it is quite lengthy; see what they say regarding the closed shop:

AMERICA CALLS FOR AN END TO THE CLOSED SHOP

* * * * *

All tyrants come to the same end. Drunk from the collusion of a catering administration that sold the general public down the river, labor unions in their arrogance have not only built up adverse public sentiment but have given foundation to justifiable condemnation that unfortunately is going to deal all organized labor a blow in America, from which it will never recover.

Americans as a people hate bullies. Americans as a people, from the earliest days of our country, rebelled at being told "do it or else." Americans as a people are tolerant to a fault. Americans as a people can be taken for a ride once, maybe twice, or even three times but when they get a fill of anything their righteous indignation usually results in going to the bottom in their clean-up.

The Declaration of Independence says in part: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

The people of the United States are on the eve of issuing another declaration of independence, independence from persecution and oppression within their own ranks by those suffering an obsession that they are bigger than the Government, independence from those who do not get their powers from the consent of the governed but by erecting barriers to God-given freedom and making the victims of their scheming pay toll to their self-appointed keepers.

Collective bargaining is sound in principle and, unselfishly carried out, could be equally beneficial to employer and employee alike. However, seized as a racket and operated as a dictatorship; used as a platform upon which to stand and preach class hatred; manipulated as an arm of subversive, political treachery; organized labor becomes a liability to the very foundation of the liberty for which our forefathers spilled their blood to hand down to us.

The closed shop is slavery and nothing else. Continuation of the closed shop means that the American people have become reconciled to surrendering their liberty and that we are throwing the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States overboard.

In my district we had Communists in unionized labor. That does not mean that all labor is communistic by any stretch of the imagination. But we had a leader of the fur and leather workers, who was secretary of the organization, by the name of George S. Pershing. He lived in Williamsport. For years he has been putting his communistic poison out to the laboring people of my district. Some time last December he came here with 8 or 10 men asking me to vote for such legislation as members of the CIO and PAC were endorsing. In discussing with them those features, right outside of this door, I could not agree that I should support much of that legislation. They wanted to know if they could not see me later on at my home. I said yes. They came to my office in my home town with a committee of 19.

During the time they were outside of the House of Representatives I questioned them as to what they were doing. At that time they said they were on

relief. I asked why they did not get jobs in industry in Williamsport. They said they could not get jobs except for 35 or 40 cents an hour. I said, "That does not seem possible." I took the names of five or six of these gentlemen; and when they went back to the district I wrote back to the labor board and found out that they could get from 65 cents to $1.05 an hour for common labor. I then wrote those men and told them where they could get jobs making forty or fifty dollars a week rather than taking $18 of relief money. I also wrote the secretary of one of those CIO unions, but I never heard a word from any of them.

So when they came to see me at my home and wanted me to support a bill for $25 a week for 26 weeks, I told them they convinced me it was bad legislation. I put that question up to them—why they did not go out and get those jobs and why they lied to me when they were down here. Not one of them answered the question. They would rather draw $18 a week than work for $40 or $50. I was not for giving them $25 a week for loafing.

Finally I got to discussing the fact that we could not run the Government by going in the red, and asked anyone in the audience who thought that was the case to hold up his hand. So this George S. Pershing held his hand up. I listened to him for 4 or 5 minutes, and after I had listened to him that long I had to stop him. I told him I could not take any more time then; that I would talk to him later. I thought he sounded so much like a Communist I came back to Washington and investigated him through several branches of our Government and several of our committees, and I found out that he had been down in North Carolina stirring up trouble and listed as a Communist; that he went out into Oklahoma and stirred up trouble there; then he went up in Detroit, and then he went out to the State of Washington preaching communism. He had a dandy record, and he was the fellow that was telling the labor people up there in my district what they should do—a Communist leading labor astray by his doctrine.

Finally he got into the Army, and he was thrown out with a dishonorable discharge, and when the Army got through with him they gave him 4 years and 9 months at Alcatraz. When I unloosened on him up in my district, 3 weeks before November 5 last, in about 1 week George Pershing resigned his duties as secretary of the fur and leather workers, and he has gotten out of there, so I am informed. He is probably in some of your districts now. You want to watch for him. I want to drive him clear out of this country. I am going to drive every Communist out of this country that I possibly can. Let them go to Russia or some other place with such doctrines.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. We have some more of them up there, so I am informed, and we will get them or they will get us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is what they did with them up in Michigan. They took the president of the CIO, John Gibson, and made him Assistant Secretary of Labor down here.

Mr. RICH. They are not going to do that if I have anything to do with it. We are going to clean them out of the district and out of Washington. We have no place for them in our country. We want to maintain our form of government. We want to see that freedom exists, that men have the right to liberty, as long as they obey the laws that are for the best interests of the American people. That is what I want. I want to help labor. I want to help labor do everything they can to get justice. I am going to do my part to see that they do get justice as long as I am here in Congress. We must be careful in our readjustment of laws, but we must change some laws or we will have a dictator and our Government will be overthrown. Look at the Philadelphia Record strike. The plant closed down yesterday. Dave Stern gone to Atlantic City—the workers out of a job. Also the jurisdictional strike in Philadelphia—employees refusing to unload fruit; the fruit, hundreds of cars, rotting on the siding. Who loses—the worker, the farmer, the public. Higher prices—loss of wages. Do we need to change our labor laws? I will say we do. It is only sensible and most desirable and absolutely necessary. Everybody knows it, so why argue any further. Strikes mean loss of wages, higher prices, and discontent. Let us be sensible and do the right thing—change the Wagner Act and do that which is best for our people and our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. May I say also, Mr. Speaker, that it is a great pleasure to see you in the Speaker's chair today. I think it is a fine tribute to a fine man—one who I honor and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND OUR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in the closing months of 1946 the President expressed a desire to see an early adoption of what he termed "a permanent American military policy." He did not at that time extend his remarks on the subject, nor attempt to define the term, but his position on subsequent legislative proposals relating to the armed forces has made it clear that he had in mind a long-range, realistic military policy, capable of laying the foundations of national security for years to come, and consistent with our obligations as the leading power of the world. Above all, he made it plain that this is to be a policy of strength rather than a policy of weakness.

It is my feeling that the President has properly placed the emphasis in this matter, and that his statement marks out for this Congress a clear goal, and provides an accurate criterion for judging the merits of all bills that may come before it relating to the national security.

For we of the Congress must set for ourselves the task of laying the foundations of a permanent American military policy at the earliest moment; and we must test the validity of each proposed measure by this simple question: Will enactment of this bill contribute to the adequate security of the United States, and to the consequent stability of the world? Already there has been damaging, unjustifiable delay. Prompt, conclusive action is needed.

No other considerations will be valid until the questions of security and stability can be answered with a clear affirmative. And regardless of the means ultimately found best to arrive at it, the goal must never be lost sight of. That goal must be the establishment of a farsighted, realistic policy which will indicate very clearly to any would-be aggressor that a war against the United States would be both futile and disastrous, and which proclaims America's determination to defend the institutions of individual right and human liberty throughout the world.

I stress the need for a long-range and farsighted policy. We are now entered upon a phase of our national life in which, because of our military power, our great economic weight, and our success as a democracy, many new responsibilities have been inescapably thrust upon us. I say inescapably thrust upon us and past events bear me out. Even when we willed it otherwise and hid our heads in the sands of isolation we could not escape our responsibility. Our very bigness, our strategic world position, forced us into the turmoil we might have helped prevent. In such a position, it is imperative that our strength be a known and dependable quantity in order that peaceful nations may be reassured, and potential outlaws not tempted to aggression by our vacillation. It is time that we put an end to the short-term and patch-work legislation that confronts us with a manpower crisis every few months, and causes serious reverberations in every capitol of the world. Let us determine that we shall be strong. Then let us select and forcefully establish the vehicles by which that strength will be maintained.

I emphasize the need for strength and there are compelling reasons to warrant the emphasis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The greatest thing we can do to maintain and manifest that strength is to keep a large amount of atomic bombs on hand, and the strongest air force on earth, and let the world know we are not going to attack anybody, but if any one attacks us we will drop the second bomb and the majority from then on. If we want to protect America that is the way to do it.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to endorse what the gentleman from Mississippi has said.

Twice in our lifetime we have been confronted by the inexorable dilemma to choose temporary peace or war; to fight alongside those nations that cherish the same ideals of human liberty as we, or to stand back and permit western civilization to perish. Both times we chose to fight, realizing with terrible clarity at the last hour, that there was no other choice, unless we were prepared to sacrifice our American institutions and the safety of our homeland.

But each time, we waited until our enemies were vastly superior in arms and strategic position, waited until the world situation had deteriorated to a point where we could save ourselves only by a frenzied and heroic effort. We waited because we were weak; because we had to wait until our military power could put blood and sinew into our correct moral judgments. We knew what was right, knew what we had to do, but we were not ready. We have never been ready for world emergency.

Events forced us into two world wars because we were not strong enough to guide those events into the ways of peace; because we were unwilling and unable to prevent the deterioration of international relations by prompt and vigorous intervention at the inception of the trouble. And I mean diplomatic intervention; but in the eyes of the unsettled world in which we live, diplomacy is measured so very often by the known strength of the nations behind it.

Through our fortunate geographic position and through the valiant stand of our allies, the genius and courage of the American people were twice granted the necessary time to turn disastrous failures into victories, but at a cost in human life and physical destruction from which the world will not recover for generations.

Can anyone, then, mistake the fundamental lesson of the twentieth century, that a weak United States can in no effective and forceful manner contribute to a stable world community; that a weak United States in the atomic age cannot insure even the security and defense of its own homeland? If we as a people would strive to carry forward the ideals of human liberty and justice, upon which this great country was founded, then we must ever be prepared to protect these values against usurpers and outlaws and alien philosophies. Experience, whose teachings come high and should last long, makes clear beyond all doubt that we can achieve this only so long as we remain strong.

This is not to disregard the United Nations, that institution upon which the world has pinned so much hope and which in recent months has given heartening signs of growth. Certainly it is our best long-time guaranty for peace, but our membership in the United Nations provides a further and equally important reason why we as a nation must remain strong. For that yet frail instrument, brought into the world less than 2 years ago and representing the world's best hope for the peaceable reconciliation of sharp international disputes, must be permitted a safe childhood within a framework of world stability if it is to grow to the maturity and strength of our fervent hopes.

If its decisions and its mandates are to have authority, the United Nations must possess the ultimate ability to enforce them. If international law is to be raised once more to a respectable state, from which the leaders of Germany, Italy, and Japan caused it to fall, then the nations willing to abide by an international code of ethics and behavior must have protection against the criminal element that unfortunately resides in every society, regardless of its scope.

For the achievement of these purposes, a strong United States is indispensable. For only as they are backed by strength will the words of our delegates be resonant and effective in the councils of the United Nations. And only as the world knows that this country has strength and will lend it in defense of law will the peoples of the world find any reality in their hopes for a durable peace.

There has been a great deal of talk in this Congress of economy. Much of it is sound and timely. But I earnestly warn against false economy, especially that economy which would be achieved by weakening the national defense. It has been aptly said that, in this twentieth century, the most expensive things in the world are a cheap army and a cheap navy, and who would deny that the first four and a half decades have rendered this statement a self-evident, near-axiomatic truth. In these years we have fought the world's two most widespread and savage wars, at a cost to civilization in blood and treasure that surpasses anything in history. These wars truly represent the cost to us of maintaining a cheap army and a cheap navy. They represent the cost of our weakness and our unpreparedness.

For can anyone seriously question the thesis that, had the United States been prepared, both wars might have been averted, or if not averted, then won at a fraction of the cost? Is it probable that, had this country been militarily strong and diplomatically determined, Hitler would have provoked France and Great Britain to war? Could the Japanese Empire have smashed Pearl Harbor, caused us for a whole year to fear for our very survival, and forced us to fight back from the very fringes of disaster? The answer to these questions is an unequivocal "No."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Had we followed the advice of Gen. Billy Mitchell, instead of destroying him, we would have had a real Air Force, and there would have been no Pearl Harbor. Now, if we are going to destroy our Air Force or reduce it to impotency and turn over the atomic bomb to the very ones who are undermining our country and our civilization, then we are merely heading for disaster.

If we had followed Gen. Billy Mitchell in the twenties when Frank Reid on the other side of the aisle and a few on our side were urging the Congress and the administration to stand by him, we might not have had this war, and we certainly would not have had the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman. I believe he knows of my work in the last session of Congress to secure more adequate recognition for General Mitchell's great work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we have learned anything from our tragic experience, we have learned that our weakness does in no way contribute to a stable and peaceful world, but in reality creates uncertainty and tempts aggression. Let no one doubt that in the present state of the world and in the world of the foreseeable future only the strong can be sure of freedom, and only the strong can insure the freedom of those others who now dimly sense its meaning and who cling desperately to the hope that this Nation will lead the way. We must understand this vital premise to any consideration of the national security. And we must be ready to act upon such an understanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. Horace M. Albright on the subject of the potash industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 1 hour.

REPORT ON CONDITIONS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 1945, I completed an investigation trip, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, with a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, which covered the Far East and the Japanese mandates in the Pacific. During the month of our investigations we stopped at Pearl Harbor, Midway, Wake, Guam, Tokyo, and Yokosuke in Japan; Tsingtao, Tientsin, Peiping, and Shanghai in China; Yonabaru in the Ryukyus; Manila in the Philippines; Pelelieu, Anguar, Koror, and Babelthuap in the Palaus; Moen, Romulun, Dublon, Uman, and Udot in the Truk group; and Kwajalein in the Marshalls.

Every courtesy was extended to us by members of the Army and Navy in these areas and also by officials of the State Department with whom we came in contact in Tokyo, Tsingtao, Tientsin, Peiping, and Shanghai. To all of them personally and as a group I wish to extend my sincere thanks for their cooperation and helpfulness.

My purpose in making this report is to give to the Congress the results of my views on American policy in the areas covered. As many of you know, I undertook a 6-week survey of Burma and China for the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in November and December 1944, and I would like to suggest that you check my remarks now regarding China with the report I made to Congress on January 16, 1945, which can be found in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

On my trip I covered approximately 25,000 miles over a 31-day period. During that time I kept a personal day-to-day diary, interviewed as many people as I could, both in official circles and on the street, and also made use of every bit of information which I thought would

be of value in assessing my views and making them known to the Congress.

There were a number of questions in my mind which I tried to find answers to during the course of my trip, and, while I could reach no definite conclusions on some of them, I will set them down. They are as follows: Where are America's frontiers in the Pacific and the Far East? What are our interests in these areas? What is our present policy toward these areas? Are our present holdings there assets or liabilities? What is the future of Japan's mandates in the Pacific?

I left Washington on November 21 and arrived at Pearl Harbor on November 23 and Midway Island on the morning of the 26th. Midway, an island 1 mile by 1½ miles in area, housed 12,000 men during the war, but its present complement is down to around 800. This includes the personnel of 1 Marine airsquadron of 26 planes. In my opinion, Midway is one of the most important strategic islands in the North Pacific. It is only 1,600 miles from Adak in the Aleutians, 2,400 miles from Tokyo, and 1,500 miles from Pearl Harbor. A constant battle with the sea must be waged to keep the island together. Storms raise havoc with our main air field there, because the constant action of the waves is washing its underpinnings away. No matter what the expense may be, this island should be kept up because of its strategic position and importance. Probably the most decisive naval battle of the Pacific war—the Battle of Midway—was fought off its shores. At the present time Midway has fine airstrips, a good submarine base and harbor, and a roadstead big enough for cruisers and carriers if they draw no more than 28 feet.

Midway belongs to the Leeward Island group of the Hawaiian Archipelago. This group stretches away in a long line for 1,300 miles northwest of the inhabited Hawaiian Islands. All of them are very small and some are merely reefs. The ocean in their vicinity is notorious for uncertain and dangerous currents and for abrupt changes in the depth of the water. They were set aside as a bird reservation in 1909 and are now tenanted by thousands of seabirds of various kinds. Some fishing operations are now being carried on in this group, but they are seldom visited and, with the exception of Midway, have no inhabitants. Incidentally, Midway was discovered and claimed for the United States in 1859 when Hawaii was still an independent country.

From Midway I went to Wake, an atoll occupying an area 4½ by 2 miles. Its 3 islets, separated by shallow water, have a maximum altitude of about 20 feet. I left Wake on Thursday, November 28—Thanksgiving Day—and on our way to Guam we flew low and circled Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the Marianas. These were a part of the former Japanese mandates. Saipan and Tinian were dotted with air strips and concentrations of material.

Guam is the southernmost, largest, and most populous of the 15 islands comprising the Mariana group. It is about 30 miles long, varies in width from 4 to 8 miles, and has a total area of 225 square miles. The island is the top of a great volcanic cone built up from the Pacific Ocean, and its highest elevation is 1,334 feet. Apra, on the west coast, has an excellent harbor, is well protected, and has a large enough anchorage at all seasons for almost all classes of ships.

Guam is an extremely important link in the east-west chain of islands belonging to the United States. On the present airplane route to the Orient the distance from Guam to Wake is 1,310 miles; to Manila, 1,384 miles; to Truk, 555 miles; to Peleliu, 690 miles; and to Kwajalein, 1,550 miles.

The work of the naval government in Guam since the Washington Conference of 1921–22 has resolved itself largely into carrying out a constructive program for the benefit of the Guamanians. During the 250 years that Spain had administered Guam, its population decreased tremendously. Under the Navy, it had become one of the cleanest and most wholesome islands in the Tropics. The population has more than doubled since 1898, proper sanitary and medical care has been provided, and a free public educational system has been instituted.

The loyalty and gratitude of the Guamanians to the United States is unquestioned. On a number of occasions they have petitioned for American citizenship—the latest in December 1946, when the Guamanian Congress passed such a resolution—but nothing as yet has been done. They do not want independence as they realize they lack experience and financial resources to continue their government without the support which comes to them directly and indirectly from Federal appropriations and from service personnel on the island.

There is still a small number of Japanese soldiers at large on the island. They live in the jungle and subsist on what nature provides or they can steal. However, the number is gradually being whittled down, and it will not be long before they will all be accounted for. The war trials of a number of captured and accused Japanese are being conducted there, and sentences are being meted out.

I visited the hospital and the school of tropical medicine which has extremely good equipment but very little in the way of personnel to carry on the medical work necessary in Guam and the other Pacific islands now under our control. I believe that it would be a good and necessary policy for us to appropriate sufficient funds to operate this school on a first-class basis, to provide sufficient personnel to man it, and to use it as a training school for native medical practitioners so that they could take care of the health needs in our islands. This has been done very successfully by the British who have established such a training center on Suva in the Fiji Island group and the results have been extremely gratifying. This type of education is necessary due to the fact that civilian American doctors will not go to the islands because of inadequate salaries and because very few of them would be willing to make a career of a life such as this would call for.

Guam, at the present time, is our real western line of defense. At present there are 12,000 Navy and Marine personnel and 18,000 Army personnel on the island. While this large number crowds the island now we had as many as 210,000 service personnel on Guam during the war.

From Guam I went to Tokyo. We had hoped to go to Marcus Island, but did not when we found out it had, in effect, been rolled up and that it had only the one airstrip with a sea-air rescue unit stationed there.

Tokyo is in a very dilapidated state but the Japanese are cooperating very well with the Americans and conditions are, on the whole, good. The economy of Japan is coming back gradually and most of the people seem to like the Americans. During a 3-hour luncheon with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, many pertinent questions were discussed. He stated that the occupation of Japan was going along very well and that in order to keep the situation under control he had about 80,000 American soldiers plus some New Zealanders, Australian, and Sikh troops to assist him. He stated that the Japanese people liked us. When asked about the U. S. S. R., he said that she was trying to make her influence felt in Japan, and that, while she had no troops there, she did have a mission numbering in excess of 500, which was entirely too many for the amount of work it had to do.

MacArthur stated that the Communist Party had little influence in Japan, that it was small but vocal and well-organized, that it had only 6 members in the Diet. Women have 38 of their sex as representatives in the Diet.

He pointed out that Japan will come back economically much sooner than the Philippines because of the way the Japanese will work. Tokyo and other ruined cities in Japan will not be too long getting rebuilt whereas Manila will take much longer.

MacArthur stated that the Japanese are now the world's greatest pacifists. They have gone from one extreme to the other because their aggressive, military system failed them.

In contrast to Germany, MacArthur said that the occupation of Japan has cost nothing to the United States except for the payment of wages to our service personnel and their clothes, medical attention, and food.

When questioned, MacArthur stated our stay in Japan is indeterminate. Much will depend on the action of Congress and the reparations issue. He expressed general agreement with Ed Pauley's report on reparations but was opposed to some of it because it was not based on the fact that Japan had been stripped by bombing of much of her industry and therefore was not in a position to pay what the report would require her to. In his opinion, Japan must be made self-sustaining, or it will cost the United States billions of dollars and millions of lives in the future.

He is introducing land reforms to make it possible for the peasants to buy and own their own farms. He has taken away pensions and honors from all retired Japanese Army and Navy officers,

and he is determined to break the Japanese military caste. About 400 Japanese have already been tried and executed, and about 1,000 still remain to be tried. It is his contention that if he had not jailed the war criminals, the Japanese people would have killed them.

Relations between American service personnel and the Japanese people seem to be good. I am wondering, though, if our boys are not too young for the "police" type of duty which is their main job. While the Japanese women and youngsters seemed friendly, there was a certain surliness on the part of some of the men. The Japanese people look with distaste upon their returned soldiers. Japanese policemen, minus swords, seem to have a difficult time handling Koreans and Formosans who cause much trouble. It has become necessary for the Japanese police to call on American M. P.'s for assistance in some quarters of Tokyo because the Koreans and Formosans are so difficult to handle.

From Tokyo I went to Yokosuke, the great Japanese naval base 40 miles south of the capital. This base was a remarkable one with its floating and stationary cranes, its six large drydocks—one of which can accommodate the biggest ship afloat—its caves dug into the mountains which, as far as can be ascertained, run for more than 20 miles and were honeycombed with machine shops, radar equipment, chartrooms, munitions, etc. These caves are cut into the scapstone and they represent a well-thought-out job. One wonders at the Japanese mentality because I was informed on reliable authority that with the war they inducted their machine-tool operators into the army and replaced them with farmers who had to be forced to work by guards armed with machine guns.

Yokosuka navy yard used to be surrounded by a high fence and no foreigners were ever allowed inside. Seventy thousand Japanese were employed at this base. No American ship had visited Yokosuka—except for a brief stop of an American fleet on a round-the-world tour in 1908—until after VJ-day. It was as much of a secret base as it was humanly possible to achieve. Even today the old navy-yard workers and their townspeople are not too friendly but under the able administration of the United States Navy, much progress is being made and a major base for the repair of American ships in the far Pacific will soon be in the making.

On VJ-day the Japanese did not have a battleship afloat, although the *Nagoya*—riddled in the battle of Leyte—was being repaired. On that date, the Japanese had 3,000 planes left but they did not have the gas necessary to get them off the ground. From 1940 to 1945, Japan built 60,000 planes of all types compared with our yearly production of approximately that same number during each of the war years.

In Japan's schools we are changing the contents of their text books to coincide with our views, but we are doing nothing to further the health of the school children. The schools are cold, the students still wear uniforms, and girls are, even yet, not allowed to go to the universities.

At Hiroshima I saw the results of the first atom bomb—16 months after. The shells or outsides of some ten or twelve modern buildings were left standing and some wooden houses were going up in the devastated city. There was no sign of a garden in the 4-square-mile bombed area. The damage here was unbelievable, and the sight of what man's terrible destructive genius can accomplish is enough to make one shudder.

I believe that Japan must be allowed to maintain a self-sustaining economy; otherwise it will be necessary for us to export foodstuffs to her, and thereby create a kind of dependency which would bring disastrous consequences for us.

It is my strong belief that General MacArthur and his political adviser, George Atcheson, are doing a remarkably efficient job in carrying out the occupation of Japan and administering the affairs of its people. My recommendation is that we follow out their suggestions about policy, and that the Japanese people continue to be informed as to our aims in their behalf.

From Hiroshima I went to Tsingtao in Shantung Province in north China. We do not have a naval base here or anywhere else in China. The Russians have a base at Port Arthur based on the Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1945. Tsingtao is the logical place for the Chinese navy to build itself and we have furnished them with ships and, at present, are supplying them with American naval instructors.

Our policy in China, according to Admiral Cooke, commander of the United States Seventh Fleet, has been to assist the movement of Central Government armies to northwest China; to repatriate Japanese to their homeland; to help move supplies into famine districts; and to help repair damaged Chinese ports.

Our Marine Corps activities have been reduced so that marine guards have been taken off the coal trains from Tientsin to Chinwangtao. Marine personnel is being constantly cut down in numbers and their only duty now is to support executive headquarters in Peiping. Executive headquarters is composed of members of the Kuomintang, the Communists, and the United States Army and its main purpose seems to be to send out truce teams to help bring about a cessation of hostilities between the Kuomintang and the Communists. As a matter of fact, the United States Army is the real executive headquarters and the marines supply the logistics support. The marines have been used to protect the coal mines and the railroads, but these functions have now been taken over by the Nationalist troops.

During my China visit the Chinese National Assembly was in session at Nanking, but the Communists have refused to join it, stating they were not being given enough voice in the Government.

While in Tsingtao I saw some "volunteers" for the Central Government's Army. They were tied together with ropes and being driven to their barracks. This is really nothing new, as China's armies have been getting this type of recruit for many years past.

After leaving Tsingtao I went to Tientsin and Peiping. In the latter city I talked with General Gillam, the American Commissioner at executive headquarters. He stated that while the situation between the Communists and the Kuomintang was tense, that the door was not entirely closed to further negotiations. At that time there were very few truce teams out in the field and negotiations between the two opposing factions had developed into a stalemate.

The Chinese are beginning to indicate their dislike of foreigners of all kinds, and they are showing evidences of an anti-American spirit based, in large part, I believe, on the presence of our service personnel in their country.

In the Chinese cities I visited I noticed the beginnings of youth movements among boys and girls. They wear uniforms, march in step, and have distinctive slogans. These movements can be channeled into democratic lines like our Boy Scouts, or they can become vehicles for dictatorship as the youth movements in Italy and Germany were. Only time will tell what their ultimate effect will be.

From information I gathered in north China, the Russians did a very thorough job of looting Manchuria and pillaging that area and its people. Now, in retaliation, the Chinese are doing the same things to the Russians in the parts of Manchuria they control.

In their dealings with the Central Government the Russians have been, as far as I could find out, scrupulously correct. No Russian material as such is going to the Communists, but the Russians did leave captured Japanese war supplies as they withdrew from Manchuria where it would be convenient for the Chinese Communists to take it over. The Kuomintang armies are well equipped and supplied by us. The Communist armies steal or take whatever they can. The Communists are very anti-American, and they have put out very defamatory posters in Yenan and elsewhere showing American marines in a very unfavorable light.

The bitterness between the Kuomintang and the Communists is great and the groups in between—who do not trust the two main antagonists—are in a very weak position. The Kuomintang is organized from the top down while the Communists have organized the people in their areas from the bottom up. This does not mean that the Communist leadership is more democratic, but it does indicate that they are more aware of China's basic economic ills—high land rates, high taxes, high rates of interest—and are using reform in these lines to further their own interests. It must be borne in mind that the Communist leadership is, and always has been, dominated by the ideal of Marxian Socialism and that this is their ultimate and final goal. The democratic and needed reforms which they have promulgated have strengthened their position in the agrarian areas they occupy.

Secretary of State Marshall made an honest appraisal of the situation in his personal statement before assuming his present position. He pointed out that certain elements within the Kuomintang have counted on American support regardless of their actions and that the Communists, on the other hand, are

counting on economic collapse, guerrilla warfare, and the cutting of communications to achieve their ends. He believes a middle course between these two extremes should be adopted so that a greater representation of the Chinese people in their government could be achieved and thereby a real basis for unity within the country established. He recommends that this be brought about under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, which I agree with, and which I think could be done if the Chinese leaders really set their hearts to it. Unity in China will never be achieved permanently by outside pressures but will have to come from the Chinese themselves.

At the present time our forces have been reduced from a peak of 113,000 men to less than 10,000. As I pointed out earlier in this speech, the tasks for which they had been sent to China have been accomplished and their only excuse for remaining in that country lies in the logistics support they furnish our executive headquarters in Peiping.

With the coming home of Marshall, his Nanking headquarters have been deactivated and executive headquarters are on the basis of the State Department's report, going out of business. The status of the United States Army advisory group at Nanking, numbering 750, is interesting, to say the least. This group has the job of training the Chinese Army and Navy in the use of lend-lease weapons and in modern military tactics. The American advisory group is not performing this service by congressional authorization, and it seems probable that if this is not granted, it likewise will be disbanded.

In view of the State Department's statement on January 29 that we are withdrawing from China, it appears that further negotiations will be carried on at the diplomatic and economic rather than the military level. This, I think, is the wisest procedure. I would suggest also that an international conference of interested powers be called by President Truman to consider some workable arrangement in China's behalf. I have in mind the Washington Conference of 1922, which was called primarily in China's interest, and from which much good resulted. A four-power conference, including the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, and Great Britain could consider the complicated Chinese picture and, perhaps, be able to work out a solution which would both strengthen and unify China and thus help her to assume her position as one of the great powers. The great powers should once again agree—as they did in the Nine Power Pact of 1922—"to respect the sovereignty, independence, and territorial and administrative integrity of China and to provide the fullest opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself a stable government." What we really need is teamwork in our international affairs so that we can discuss our problems with other nations across a conference table and not with our young men across battle lines.

Make no mistake about it, we face a dilemma in China which will have to be solved if the peace of the world is to be maintained. Both President Truman's and Secretary Marshall's statements give assurances that the United States will support Chiang Kai-shek if an agreement can be worked out which will achieve unity and strength for China and give to the Chinese people a voice in their own affairs. As long as we, or any other great power, will underwrite a victory for one side or the other, so long will civil war continue in China and so long will the peace of the world be imperiled.

Our policy in China is one based on national welfare. We want expanding opportunities for trade, we want to prevent China from becoming a political or military satellite of Russia, and we want to see China become the bastion for peace in the Far East.

It is my belief that in Secretary of State Marshall we have a man with profound understanding of the intricacies of the Chinese puzzle. His forthrightness, his honesty, and his lack of bias will give to our foreign affairs a guide steeped in knowledge of this particular situation. His statements and decisions to date bear out the trust and confidence the people of the United States have placed in him. He will—as he has already indicated—appraise the field of foreign affairs realistically and do what he can to achieve practical results in our dealings with other nations.

My greatest desire is to see peace maintained in a troubled world so that nations can live with one another; so that trade can be carried on in a mutually profitable manner; and so that peoples the world over will be able to live, not in fear and misery, but in hope and understanding.

From Peiping I went to Shanghai, and from there to Yonabaru on Okinawa. Okinawa is an island in the Ryukyus 67 miles long by 10 miles wide. Well over 100 ships of all types are beached or on their sides, mute evidence to the effectiveness of the great typhoon of last year.

At present Okinawa is manned by 12,000 American soldiers and around 1,000 sailors. From a naval point of view this base is in the caretaker status and opinion is very divided as to what its future disposition should be. Due to its vulnerability to severe types of weather plus the availability of a big modern base at Yokusuke it would appear that except for its use as an "eye" on our defense perimeter it would not be a worth-while permanent installation.

On December 10 I arrived at Peleliu in the Palaus and immediately went by seaplane to the island of Anguar to look into the disposition of the phosphate deposits there. We have a million tons of this valuable commodity in Anguar and a contract has been let to an American concern—the Pomeroy Co.—to get it out. It is being sent to Japan, in Japanese ships, to help rehabilitate the soil there and thus to make that country become more self-supporting. The natives are being paid 55 cents a day, and Japanese sent from Japan $3.50 a day. The American workers are paid at prevailing stateside wages. The phosphate is to be mined at the rate of 300,000 tons a year.

The phosphate at Anguar is extremely rich and valuable for medicinal purposes as well as for use as fertilizer. This phosphate could be used in Hawaii, where it is needed badly, or by nations like the Philippines and China allied with us in the war. There are approximately 200 American civil employees here and the contract is on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis which could bear looking into. Furthermore, according to the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of December 19, 500,000 tons of Montana-Idaho phosphate have also been scheduled to go to Japan and Korea immediately.

From Anguar I went to Koror which used to be the seat of the Japanese South Seas government and which directly ruled all the Mandated Islands. There was much permanent building done here and all indications pointed to the Japanese being there to stay. In the back of the governor's mansion there was a grass inlaid map of the Palaus which was remarkable for its intricate detail. The Japanese had 35,000 troops on Koror but we never did attempt to take the island.

From Koror I went by boat to Babelthuap the largest island in the group and visited some native villages and schools. In the Palaus the children are being taught English which they have to learn from Japanese characters. They seem to be learning our language fairly rapidly.

We have a lot of surplus equipment in the Palaus which we might as well forget because it is either useless or will be soon. Many of our Pacific island holdings are now Quonset hut affairs. The United States Commercial Co., a subsidiary of the RFC, has a monopoly on trading with the natives in our newly acquired possessions. This organization encourages the native handicrafts and buys what the natives produce and then sends it to the United States for sale. Much that the natives produce is crude, but, with a market, their handicraft can be improved and their subsistence, in part at least, can be taken care of.

The Japanese built up strong defenses, not as complete as those at Truk, but more powerful than those normally built at an outlying base. The Palauan fortifications suffered the first attack when the Eighty-first Army Infantry Division stormed the shores of Anguar about a week previous to the assault on Peleliu by the First Marine Division (reinforced) on September 15, 1944. The Army supported the Peleliu invasion with artillery fire from Anguar during the early stages of the attack, and two weeks later the Army joined the marines on Peleliu to aid in the fight. By November 1944 Peleliu was secured.

No attempt was made to invade the major islands north of Peleliu, but, with the two bases, Peleliu and Anguar, being operated mainly as air bases, our planes were able to keep the other islands in the Palaus constantly harassed and subdued. These islands capitulated after VJ-day.

Palau has great military and commercial importance and has been for years the center of Japanese political control of all her Pacific mandated islands. In this island group the Japanese operated a major military base, a fleet anchorage

and supply base, an airfield, and seaplane bases—near Koror.

Palau's location gives it considerable strategic importance. One thousand miles west of Truk and only 530 miles from Davao in the southern Philippines, it commands the sea and air routes from China and Japan to New Guinea and the western Dutch East Indies. For this reason it was an important transshipment point for movements of enemy ships, troops, planes, and supplies to the southwest Pacific theater of operations.

From the Palaus I went to the Truk group in the eastern Carolines. Our military government headquarters are located on Moen Island. This island—and all the others in this group—are beautiful. Moen has such things as waterfalls, dense vegetation, and a heavy precipitation. I also visited the islands of Romulum, Udot, Dublon, and Uman.

The people here are light brown in appearance, very docile, and easy to handle. We were entertained on all the islands by singing and dancing. There are about 10,000 inhabitants in the Truk group compared to 5,900 in the Palaus. Both the Trukese and the Palauans impressed me as a happy but bewildered people. They do not look upon us with enthusiasm, but only as the successors to the Spaniards, Germans, and Japanese—all of whom have ruled over them in the last 50 years.

The diseases of greatest prevalence in both groups are tuberculosis and intestinal parasites. Due to the use of penicillin, yaws—which used to be quite prevalent—have been cleared up; there is no indication of syphilis and very little gonorrhea. Sanitary habits are being introduced by the Navy and outdoor toilets are much in use.

Neither the Palauans or the Trukese care to work too much as they have all the necessities of life, except tobacco, and in this respect they are rationed at the rate of four cartons a month. The standard rate of pay in both groups is 40 cents a day.

Truk was not the Japanese "Pearl Harbor" which the American public had been led to believe. The Japanese had a battery of eight 8-inch guns on Moen and a system of caves on all the islands similar to those in use in Japan. Dublon Island was their headquarters and from there the movements of their Fourth Fleet and Thirty-first Army Division were directed. Fortifications were of a very weak character and kind. There was no sign of permanency here as was indicated at Koror in the Palaus. Truk lagoon is large enough to take care of the entire United States Fleet, but to make it practicable a great deal of blasting and dredging would be necessary.

From Truk I proceeded to Kwajalein in the Marshalls, where a good job is being done in administering the islands and their people. Here—as elsewhere in the mandates—there is a lack of personnel and of shipping. However, the situation in these respects is better in the Marshalls than elsewhere because of our earlier occupation. Soil conservation and revegetation programs are in effect, medical services are good and more than one-half of all able-bodied Marshallese are working for the military government or the USCC. The natives are a likable and cooperative people who, in time, can again become self-supporting.

A special word should be said about the natives removed from Bikini for the atom bomb tests. They are located on the island of Rongerik, number about 170, and 60 percent of them are women. They are very unhappy in their new location and desire to return to Bikini. Because of the infertility of Rongerik they will very likely have to be moved again to a more fertile island or, as an alternative, we must be prepared to subsidize them indefinitely.

Insofar as my own personal views on the mandates are concerned, I covered them in a speech on the floor of the House on April 18, 1945. I would prefer to have the United States assume complete and undisputed control of the mandates. We need these islands for our future defense, and they should be fortified wherever we deem it necessary. We have no concealed motives because we want these islands for one purpose only and that is national security. Economically they will be a liability, socially they will present problems, and politically we will have to work out a policy of administration. No other nation has any kind of a claim to the mandates. No other nation has paid the price we have. These views of mine are not new nor are they the results only of my recent investigative trip to the Pacific. Rather, my stand has been accentuated by what I have seen and I am more firmly convinced than ever of our great need for control of the mandates.

If, however, it does become necessary to create a trusteeship for these islands, I would favor the proposals made by our State Department and President Truman which would place the mandates under the United Nations with the consideration that they should be cataloged as a strategic area outside the control of the Trusteeship Council. On this basis, supervision would be exercised by the Security Council which has jurisdiction over such strategic areas in the interests of collective security. But, and this is important, the United States has a veto over the Security Council should it ever want to assert effective control.

If the Security Council blocked acceptance of America's terms for taking over the mandates as a strategic area, the islands then would remain under our control. It is worth remembering also, that until a treaty of peace is signed with Japan we have no legal title to the mandates.

The question of government is bound to be an important consideration. For a long time I have studied the possibility of civil government for the mandates, but, desirable though that would be, I have come to the conclusion that the only way they could be governed for the present would be by the Navy on the same basis as Guam and Samoa are administered. Personally, I would rather have a civil administration over the mandates, but, in view of practical and realistic considerations, I am forced to the conclusion that the Navy would be the best administrator. It would have the best and only means of maintaining liaison between the various islands and it would have the only trained personnel to carry out the job of administration. Stanford University, which has the task of training military government men for administration of the islands, has done an outstanding job in this respect, and both it and the Navy are to be complimented for the initiative shown and the progress already made. I should suggest, though, that the Navy give to its military government personnel a special status apart from its regular seagoing personnel so that they could be given the recognition they deserve and so that they could develop the esprit de corps necessary to carry out the functions assigned to them. This, I think, would do away with the dissatisfaction I noted on my trip and give to these specialists the status they are entitled to.

I should like to repeat, in conclusion, that my own personal opinion is that civil administration would be best for the mandates. This, however, is impractical at this time, due to the circumstances mentioned. It is necessary, though, that the eventual change over to civilian control be given a thorough study by the Navy Department so that recommendations can be made at the appropriate time to achieve this goal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the results of an investigation dealing with the present and future status of trusteeships for the mandates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

PRESENT AND FUTURE STATUS OF TRUSTEESHIPS FOR THE MARIANA, CAROLINE, AND MARSHALL ISLANDS

After Japan gave notice in 1933 of her withdrawal from the League of Nations, effective in 1935, she still continued to act as mandatory for all the former German islands north of the equator (the Marshall, Caroline, and Mariana Islands). The Japanese Foreign Minister said on February 22, 1934, "The Japanese Government believes that Japan has acquired the status as mandatory through a decision reached among the principal allied and associated powers and that her status * * * will not be affected in any way by Japan's withdrawal from the League." The last report made by Japan to the Permanent Mandates Commission was for the year 1938. Legally speaking, Japan at the present time is still the mandatory for the islands.[1]

During World War II, however, the mandated islands came under military occupation of the United States, and, as the end of the conflict approached, demands that the United States retain the islands after the war were increasingly raised. The Navy in particular seemed anxious to hold on to the islands for strategic reasons of defense. Since under the Atlantic Charter we had renounced all territorial aggrandizement, annexation seemed out of the question. To solve this problem the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference, convened to draw up the United Nations Charter, sponsored a plan of trusteeship for dependent areas which protected the security interests of the adminis-

[1] G. H. Blakeslee, Japan's Mandated Islands, Department of State Bulletin, December 17, 1944, p. 768.

tering power as well as the welfare of the inhabitants and the interests of world peace.[3]

As finally formulated by the conference, the United Nations trusteeship system had for its purpose the furtherance of international peace, the advancement of the dependent peoples, and respect of their human rights and freedoms. Those territories eligible for trusteeship are former League of Nations mandates, territory detached from enemy states in the recent war, or any other dependent territories voluntarily offered. The placing of any territory under trusteeship is strictly voluntary and is to be agreed upon by the states directly concerned. The General Assembly will ordinarily supervise the execution of the trusteeship by the administering power through the medium of a trusteeship council. Strategic areas may be designated in a trusteeship agreement and these areas will be supervised by the Security Council, which may allow fortification in these areas.[3]

No discussion of specific territories was made at the conference. The implications of the special strategic areas, however, in relation to American desires in the Pacific islands was fairly obvious.

In August 1945 the Subcommittee on Pacific Bases of the House Committee on Naval Affairs made a report on the disposition of the Pacific islands which said, "from a legal viewpoint, Japan has forfeited all rights to her mandated islands by breaching the trust with respect to that mandate. It is our belief that the United States should take outright the Japanese mandated islands * * * there are those who favor trusteeship of these islands. Regardless of which view prevails, the United States should have the dominating control over these islands."[4]

Whether the United States would annex or place under trusteeship the occupied islands was the topic of a Presidential press conference on January 15, 1946. President Truman said that those islands we did not need would be placed under UNO trusteeship, and those that we needed we would keep under individual trusteeship, for which we would have to ask UNO's authority. He also said that some islands would be under individual trusteeships as well as collective trusteeship, but that policy would have to be worked out by the United Nations as it went along. He said that we had not demanded any of the islands we need.[5]

Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson at a press conference on January 22, 1946, gave his interpretation of the trusteeship system and its application to the Pacific islands. First, the nation initiating the trusteeship negotiation decides whether the area is strategic (which can be fortified) or nonstrategic. If the former is decided, then negotiations are conducted with the Security Council, where unanimous agreement of the Big Five is necessary. If the trusteeship negotiation is vetoed, then the situation reverts to what it was, that is, the nation in control of the area in question still retains control. If the negotiation is approved, the arrangement cannot be changed later by the Security Council without the consent of all of the Big Five, including the United States.[6]

This interpretation seemed to guarantee American control, under the terms America would desire, of the Japanese islands, even though placed under trusteeship.

Hanson W. Baldwin reported in the New York Times in September[7] 1946, that the Army and the Navy, speaking through the Joint Chiefs of Staff wanted to retain complete United States sovereignty over the mandated islands, whereas the State Department wanted to place them under a United Nations trusteeship with the United States as sole trustee. A suggested compromise plan, put forward by some State Department advisers, would exclude United Nations authority over, or access to, certain strategic areas in the islands which the United States required for bases.

The United States finally, on November 6 revealed its intentions regarding the Japanese mandated islands. On that date President Truman released the text of a draft strategic area trusteeship agreement for these islands. The President said that the United States was prepared to place under trusteeship not only the Japanese mandated islands but any Japanese islands for which the United States assumed responsibility as a result of World War II. The draft was to be transmitted for information only to the other members of the Security Council of the United Nations (Australia, Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, the U. S. S. R., and the United Kingdom) and to New Zealand and the Philippines. At an early date, the President declared, the plan would be submitted formally to the Security Council for approval.

Since the plan called for a strategic trusteeship rather than an ordinary trusteeship, according to the terms of the charter it would have to be approved and later supervised by the Security Council rather than the General Assembly of the United Nations. In a strategic trusteeship the Security Council might avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations in regard to supervision of political, economic, social, and educational matters.[8]

The main points of the draft plan may be summarized as follows:[9]

1. The United States would be the administering authority of the trust territory consisting of the former Japanese-mandated islands.

2. The territory would be administered as an integral part of the United States.

3. The United States would apply the trusteeship objectives of the UN Charter.

4. The United States would be entitled to have military bases and armed forces in the territory and employ native volunteer forces in carrying out obligations toward the Security Council as well as for purposes of local order and defense.

5. The United States would foster the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the territory toward self-government.

6. The administering authority would guarantee to the inhabitants freedom of speech, press, religion, etc.

7. Nationals and companies of members of the United Nations, except those of the United States, would all be given equally favorable treatment in the territory. Equal treatment was also promised to members of the United Nations in the administration of justice. Air-traffic rights would be subject to special agreement.

8. The United States might incorporate the trust territory into a customs, fiscal, or administrative union with other United States territory.

9. The United States would take the necessary steps to provide the status of citizenship of the trust territory for the inhabitants of the trust territory, and give diplomatic and consular protection to the inhabitants abroad.

10. The United States might, for security reasons, determine the extent of the applicability of those articles of the Charter, relating to the supervisory functions of the Trusteeship Council, in certain specified areas. These areas are sometimes referred to as closed areas.

11. The United States would apply to the trust territory appropriate international conventions.

This plan of the United States, which up to the present is the only strategic-area trusteeship proposed, has been criticized as constituting virtual annexation.[10] Perhaps the most important clause of the plan is that providing for closed areas. By means of it the United States could greatly limit any interference of the United Nations in the trust territory.[11]

At the present time the draft-trusteeship agreement has not formally been presented to the Security Council, nor is it known when it will be. There it will be subject to a veto. However, as John Foster Dulles pointed out to the Trusteeship Committee of the General Assembly on November 7, 1946, if a trusteeship agreement is rejected by the United Nations, the dependent territory still continues under the present controlling power. This would mean that the Pacific islands would still be under direct United States control, even if the Security Council rejected the American draft plan.[12]

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is well qualified to speak on this far-eastern situation. I regret I did not hear all of the gentleman's remarks. I wonder if the gentleman has an opinion as to the advisability of withdrawing our troops from China at this time and if so would he please express that opinion.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I am entirely in accord with General Marshall's policy as it affects China. When I was in China in November and December last year I visited executive headquarters at Peiping and I was informed by General Gillam, the American commissioner, that practically nothing was being done in the way of achieving effective results by the truce teams that were being sent out. These teams were composed of one American officer, one Communist, and one member of the Central Government. There was no reason I could see for the continuation of the approximately 12,000 marines who were there at that time, because all the tasks assigned to them had been completed. There was a great deal of anti-American feeling, which I thought was based primarily on the presence of our service personnel there. As long as they remained, not being able to accomplish anything, neither we nor the Chinese were getting any benefit.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Did their presence, however, not have a consider-

[3] F. M. Brewer, Trusteeship in the Pacific, Editorial Research Reports: News Brief, May 3, 1945. See also Chairman of the United States Delegation, Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference, Washington, 1945, pp. 130–131.

[3] Chairman of the United States Delegation, op. cit., pp. 133–135.

[4] Quoted in W. C. Johnstone, Future of the Japanese Mandated Islands, Foreign Policy Reports, September 15, 1945, p. 195.

[5] Department of State Bulletin, January 27, 1946, p. 113.

[6] Department of State Bulletin, February 3, 1946, pp. 150–151.

[7] September 23, 1946, p. 9.

[8] Article 83 of the UN Charter.

[9] The President's announcement and the draft plan are given in Department of State Bulletin, November 17, 1946, pp. 889–891.

[10] New York Times, November 10, 1946, p. E1.

[11] Ibid., p. E5.

[12] Christian Science Monitor, November 8, 1946, p. 2.

able psychological effect upon the situation? I am thinking in terms of the action that Russia might perhaps take.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I do not think so, because they were so few in number and so scattered. If the gentleman is thinking of the effect that armed might might have as a threat or a potential threat in that part of the world, I would suggest to him that on Okinawa we have approximately 14,000 service personnel of the Army and Navy; that in Japan proper, which is being administered exclusive of Okinawa, we have approximately 80,000 American service personnel; that in Korea we must have around 40,000, and on Guam, our great western bastion in the Pacific, we have approximately 30,000. Those are real concentrations outside of the rim of China itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER DEFERRED

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, because I have a committee in session which I must attend now, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today may be deferred until after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk on next Wednesday, and that at that time I be given 30 minutes to speak on the Republican fiscal and taxation policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during the session of the House on Thursday, this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LIMITED TENURE FOR FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a republic public officers should be compelled, from time to time, to return to the people for acceptance or rejection. Such a practice would be good for the officials, as well as the public. Under democratic processes all elected officials return to their constituents for reelection and it is a good thing for them. Our founding fathers wrote into the Constitution at least one exception to this practice when they provided that "The Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour," and so forth—article III, section 1. This provision has been construed as vesting in Federal judges, upon appointment and confirmation, a life term on the bench, subject to be removed for cause only. Historians have referred to the establishment of the judicial branch, under the Constitution, as "an independent and coequal department of the Government." A reading of the record of the Constitutional Convention clearly shows that it was the intention of framers of the Constitution to make the judges of the Federal courts absolutely independent of the legislative or executive departments. That is the reason for providing that appointees to these courts should hold office during good behavior and that they have a fixed salary which could not be increased or diminished so as to affect the persons actually in office at the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Federal judiciary was designed to be free and independent of the other branches of government. In the past decade, or more, we have seen the intrusion of the executive department in the judicial contrary to the expressed intent of the Constitution. Both the Supreme Court and the inferior courts are packed with New Deal appointees who have furthered the cause of New Deal legislation. To a considerable degree they have assumed legislative functions.

Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that the American people do not realize that these same New Deal appointees will be called upon to decide the legality of laws passed by a Republican Congress. My mail indicates that the people think that economic and political order will flow from the acts of this Congress alone, but as Mr. Dooley would say, "It ain't so," and certainly it is not with the present partisan make-up of these courts. Mr. David Lawrence has well said "the truth is the New Deal lives on in the Supreme Court of the United States, where the justices are appointed for life." Again, Mr. Speaker, I quote Mr. Lawrence from a recent editorial:

> This is the Court which insists on writing legislation by employing the fiction that it is merely interpreting legislation.
>
> This is the Court which has brought upon the Nation an economic crisis by an ambiguously worded and irresponsible decision in the portal-to-portal case.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that one way to cure existing abuses is to fix a definite term of office for each Federal judge. Let us get back to fundamentals. These appointees should be required to return periodically for confirmation by representatives of the people, which is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution and to carry out the ideas expressed herein.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point a copy of my resolution:

> Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:
>
> "ARTICLE III
>
> "SECTION 1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall be appointed for a term of 10 years. The judges shall at stated times receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.
>
> "SEC. 2. The term of each judge holding office on the date of ratification of this article shall expire December 31, 1948, or 10 years after the date of his taking the oath of office, whichever date is the later.
>
> "SEC. 3. Sections 1 and 2 of this article shall not affect the term of any judge retired prior to the date of ratification of this article.
>
> "SEC. 4. Section 1 of this article shall be in lieu of section 1 of article III.
>
> "SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks a pertinent editorial which appeared in one of my fine daily newspapers, the Kenosha Evening News, of January 24, 1947. It covers the subject matter of my resolution and the writer was not aware that my resolution was being prepared.

POWERFUL JUDGES

There is some talk in Washington, stirred up by David Lawrence, of a term limit for Federal judges, including those of the Supreme Court. It is believed by some lawyers and legislators that recent decisions in a few courts reflect an irresponsible spirit which may be laid to the fact that too great a sense of security is felt by the judges, and that the passage of legislation designed to set a definite term, with possible reappointment by the President, might be one way of improving this situation.

It is necessary for the people to have confidence in their courts, and to believe that decisions are governed by a strict interpretation of the law, rather than by political expediency. This is true of all courts, but perhaps it shows more plainly in the case of the highest ones.

The theory of security of tenure is that, by removing from a judge the necessity of running for election he is set free from all considerations save those of interpreting law. But all human institutions need to be reconsidered at intervals. Perhaps people should think about judicial tenure a little.

Mr. Speaker, if my resolution is adopted and the Constitution amended it will result eventually in a strengthened Federal judiciary. Judges are human beings and when called upon for a report of their stewardships will more readily meet the full responsibilities of their offices. Certainly members of these courts realize the value of the human touch. Mr. Justice Brewer once said:

> It is a mistake to suppose that the Supreme Court is either honored or helped by being spoken of as beyond criticism. On the contrary, the life and character of its justices should be the objects of constant watchfulness by all, and its judgments subject to the freest criticism. The time is past in the history of the world when any living man or

body can be set on a pedestal and decorated with a halo. True, criticisms may be, like their authors, devoid of good taste, but better all sorts of criticism than no criticism at all. The moving waters are full of life and health; only in the still waters is stagnation and death.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation expect and demand that our courts be free from prejudice, bias, and political influence. There is need for correction of abuses in our Federal court system. Yes, indeed, "all human institutions need to be reconsidered at intervals." My resolution is a step in that direction.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks a pertinent editorial that appeared in the Washington Post, on last Saturday, February 1, 1947, entitled "To Correct the Court":

TO CORRECT THE COURT

Congress is tearing its hair over the portal-to-portal pay issue without seeming to get much nearer to a solution. One reason, we think, is the indirectness of the approaches about which most of the discussion centers. Congress is trying to find means of overcoming the disastrous effects of a fait accompli instead of challenging the fait accompli itself. Its reason for doing so is the fact that this fait accompli is a decision of the Supreme Court. Ordinarily that would be a sound and conclusive reason. But in the present instance we cannot help thinking that correction of the court's blunder by a simple and direct act of Congress would be justifiable.

The nub of the situation is this: Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act without carefully defining the word "workweek." By a series of decisions, each going further than the previous one, the Court has given "workweek" a ridiculous legal meaning which no Congress at any time would have written into the law. How ridiculous that meaning is may be seen from the proceedings out in Detroit where Judge Picard is trying to apply it to the working hours of the employees of the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. One of the issues with which the judge is wrestling is how many feet a workman can walk in a minute. Another is whether it takes 6, 7, or 8 seconds to put a cot on a finger. Such are the imponderable trivia that the Supreme Court wove into its concept of the "workweek."

This foolish effort to account for every minute that workmen spend in changing their clothes, walking into factories, and otherwise preparing to work, flies in the face of all experience. Such time has not been included in the workweek, as the term has been heretofore understood by both employers and employees, because of the infeasibility of measuring it and of supervising employees before they are actually at their work stations. Assistant Attorney General Sonnett made a telling point when he argued before Judge Picard that "the keeping of records of short periods of time would require close and distasteful surveillance of the activities of workmen," thus creating friction and disrupting industrial peace contrary to the basic purpose of the act. We have only to rely upon common sense to see that if Congress had intended thus to change the meaning of "workweek" it would have said so specifically.

The obvious remedy, then, is to give "workweek," as used in the statute, the meaning it originally had in each industry. In the case of industries where employees are organized, "workweek" would mean what the employer and union had agreed upon in their contracts. In the unorganized industries, custom would govern, unless there was evidence that employers were abusing custom as a means of evading the payment of overtime for hours of work in excess of 40 per week. The amazing thing is that the Supreme Court has ignored customs and upset bargained contracts to write its own arbitrary view of "workweek" into the law.

Some have objected to this direct remedy on the ground that it retroactively undercuts claims for back pay that have already accrued. But those claims exist only in the minds of judges who have made a travesty of the law. Certainly those claims had no prior reality in the minds of employees, for the avalanche of suits for back pay was unloosed only after the Court embodied its reckless pronouncement in the Mount Clemens opinion. Incidentally, that far-fetched pronouncement was not necessary to support the actual decision handed down.

Must Congress accept this distorted view of its language as the last word? It seems to us that reason and justice leave to Congress an undeniable right to say for itself what it meant by "workweek" in the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Supreme Court made a bad guess. Congress can correct that guess. It could not do so, of course, if a constitutional issue were at stake. But this is simply a question of carrying out the will of Congress, and on that question we think Congress itself is the best authority.

It is true that the Court might hold an act of correcting its blunder to be unconstitutional. But any such arbitrary exercise of power would be a further blow to its prestige, and the confusion resulting from such a decision would scarcely be worse than the present mess. We think there would be a moral advantage, moreover, in having the Court's abuse of power rebuked in a direct and forthright fashion. Substitution of judicial policies for the will of Congress has become all too common. If, in this flagrant case, Congress should reassert its original intent, as recognized and stated on the floor of the Senate at the time by Mr. Justice (then Senator) Black, who piloted the bill to enactment, the majority faction in the Court would probably think twice before garbling legislative acts in the future.

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include therein a newspaper editorial and a resolution.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OUR NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last week the Chief of the United States Forest Service issued his annual report, the first few sentences of which read as follows:

Our forests today are not supplying enough timber products. While thousands search desperately for places to live, construction of urgently needed dwellings is hampered by lack of building materials. Lumber is perhaps the No. 1 bottleneck.

The report which began with those words was released January 29. However, released at almost the same time was a statement on the housing program for 1947 issued by Frank R. Creedon, Housing Expediter, and Raymond M. Foley, National Housing Administrator. The last paragraph on page 8 of that statement contains the following:

A balance, near balance, or surplus between over-all supply and demand has been achieved for such materials as lumber, kitchen sinks.

Thus we find two agencies of our gigantic Federal Government making statements on almost the same day which are diametrically opposed to one another. Whose statement shall we accept as the fact?

I question the complete objectivity of both statements because each is made to support a purpose or a point of view. Obviously the Housing Expediter and the head of the National Housing Administration would like the people to feel that things are going well in the field of housing, and that many of the difficulties have been overcome. The motive behind the statement made by the Chief Forester is not quite so obvious, although a careful reading of his annual report leads me to the conclusion that the Forester would frighten us into placing in the hands of the Forest Service the complete regulation of all growing trees, whether they stand on privately owned lands, or in the public domain. The two statements I have just quoted are plain and simple statements. Neither is surrounded by any qualifying language. One says lumber supply has reached or exceeded the demand for lumber. The other statement says the shortage of lumber is number one bottleneck in the housing program. Therefore, one statement must be correct, and the other one incorrect.

The question of lumber supply is of considerable national interest right now. The question is also of immediate concern to me, since I represent a district in which the lumber manufacturing business is our most important industry. I have therefore devoted some study to the question and I have reached the conclusion that the statements made by Mr. Creedon and Mr. Foley are correct, and that the statement of Mr. Lyle Watts, Chief Forester, is incorrect. Lumber production is apparently in adequate volume. Such shortages as still exist are chargeable to the recent severe car shortages and strikes in the shipping industry.

Having discovered what I consider an inaccuracy in the very beginning of the Chief Forester's annual report, I then did some checking on his further statement that—

Sufficient manpower, equipment, and sawmill capacity, no doubt, will be available in the next few years for a much larger output of lumber, but the increasing scarcity of good timber will continue to limit the level of production.

Supporting that statement, he says:

In 36 years the Nation's woodpile has been reduced by 44 percent.

To arrive at that figure, Mr. Watts uses an estimate made by the Bureau of Corporations, in 1909, that the total inventory of standing timber in the United States at that time was 2,826,000,000,000 board feet. I find, however, that there were several other authoritative timber-inventory estimates made along about that time. The Bureau of the Census in 1900 estimated the timber supply at 1,390,000,000,000 board feet. The American Lumberman, the national magazine devoted to the lumber industry, estimated the total standing supply as being 1,970,000,000,000 board feet in 1905. Perhaps the best and most reasonable estimate made shortly after the turn of the century was that by a forest authority by the name of Fernow, in 1902, who placed the

standing timber supply at 2,000,000,000,000 board feet. Had the Chief Forester used one of those estimates, the percentage figure would have been much smaller, and the case in support of his premise, that our forests are rapidly vanishing, would have been very much weaker.

As a matter of fact, if we use Forest Service figures alone, we find that the Nation's supply of standing sawtimber has been steadily increasing for the past 13 years in every region of the United States except the far West, where losses in overmature, virgin timber have largely offset new growth. In the well-known Copeland report submitted to the Seventy-third Congress, we have the following Forest Service estimates of our standing sawtimber, which I have compared with the basic forest statistics released by the Forest Service in July 1946. The 1946 report shows the status on January 1, 1945:

Region	Saw-timber volume, million board feet, 1933	Saw-timber volume, million board feet, 1945
New England	57,875	58,197
Middle Atlantic	26,150	62,045
Lake	35,887	50,710
Central	34,662	43,747
Plains		5,780
South	199,297	337,987
West coast	1,041,628	858,459
North Rocky Mountains	146,388	127,229
South Rocky Mountains	125,956	56,868
Total	1,667,803	1,600,972

These figures certainly do not bear out the contention of the Forest Service that our saw-timber supply is being depleted rapidly. As a matter of fact, if I were to use the Forest Service figures for 1936, the picture would be even more confusing.

At that time the Forest Service said we had 1,763,651,000,000 board feet—95,848,000,000 feet more than in 1923.

A third of a century ago, the then Chief Forester of the United States, referring to the relatively short time that this well-forested continent had been occupied by our people, asserted:

> We have all but reached the end of these forests * * *. We have reached the point where the growth of our forests is but one-third of the annual cut, while we have in store timber enough for only 20 or 30 years at our present rate of use.

On the basis of such premises, he prophesied an inevitable timber famine which would touch every man.

Again, as recently as 1920, a Senate select committee, with the advice of the United States Forest Service, published a prophecy of exhaustion of the southern pineries within 15 or 20 years. The years themselves have been fulfilled, but not these visions of necessity and want. In fact, the South is contributing to the Nation's urgent needs today a greater total volume of lumber and timber products than is any other region of the United States, and there is no indication that the South will ever cease to be a major source of supply of forest products.

I expect in the not-too-distant future to see a national saw-timber growth in this country which will substantially exceed the present prevailing national saw-timber use. In the last 10 years, by Forest Service estimate, it has increased from 32,033,000,000,000 board feet to 35,301,000,000,000 board-feet annually. Cubic foot growth and drain are already nearly in balance. I expect to see a substantial reduction in our excessive losses of forests by fire, insects, and disease; and a gradual restoration and improvement of our so-called forest capital; and I expect to see this accomplished in the woods, and not in Congress. This expectation, if realized, will be the result of more effective forest protection and improved forest practices, sustained by the production of an adequate supply of forest products. A prospect of the beneficent cycle of increasing production and increasing use is in sharp contrast with the old and stagnant doctrine of retrenchment and conservation by nonuse of forest products. To a generation instructed in agricultural conservation to be achieved by benefit payments for nonproduction or nonuse, conservation through liberal production and liberal use may seem paradoxical.

My faith in this prophecy is supported on the one hand by the constant flow of new uses for wood and cellulose, to supplement, rather than supplant, present uses; and on the other hand by the safe assumption that, given a reasonable chance, trees will grow, will reproduce themselves, and need only simple and inexpensive encouragement to provide continuous timber crops.

As long as this Nation had vast uncut forests into which man had scarcely penetrated, there was little chance for the small wood-lot owner to market his logs with profit. Today that situation has changed. The small wood-lot owner is becoming a major source for our forest products.

Twenty years ago, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to point out to such owners that there was money in growing trees. Consequently, most of the spasmodic educational programs that have been attempted have talked much about national and social values in growing trees. They have been strong on generalities, but weak on appealing to the profit motive that lies deep in every one of us.

Today we can teach practical forestry by telling landowners, truthfully, that here is an opportunity for them. There is money to be made by growing a tree crop. Today there is this personal motive which will give point and purpose to mass education in forest practices. Indeed, something new has been added. That something new is the product of economics, not of coercion.

There are strong forces in industry and in agriculture which support this point of view. I am glad to note that the Chief Forester's report offers some proof of it. The influence and resources of our Government should support a major program to see to it that every woodland owner learns of this opportunity, and how best to take advantage of it.

We will never have unified action in solving our forest problems if we constantly have the specter of Federal regulation dividing our strength. Industry is opposed to regulation. So, I am convinced, is agriculture. So is the majority of all private woodland owners. They need, and should have, the understanding assistance of our splendid Forest Service.

As I have said, the forces of economics are with us, while yesterday they were against us. We have at last come upon a time when the forests of this country may be operated as they should always have been operated, as a continuous and perpetual national resource of our 140,000,000 people. We can now make common effort between public and private ownership in a program that will benefit both the private timber owner and operator and all the people who may be said to be the owners of that timber, title to which is in the Government. Cooperative effort is the watchword of today in forestry and forest management.

I am not in accord with the proposition that it is necessary for the Government of the United States to assume a domination, regulation, and control over the privately owned timberlands which in the last analysis is tantamount to ownership. I believe it is unnecessary.

But we can have cooperative effort. There is no reason today why we should not have it. We have it out in my State of Oregon to a great degree at the present time. We have out there today two contending agencies of the Government, and they get along pretty well. We have the Interior Department on one side and the Department of Agriculture on the other. And, in all truth, I am strongly inclined to believe that a little competition in government is just as valuable as a little competition in private industry. I do not like monopoly anywhere; and that goes for inside of government as well as outside. With continuing departmental competition out there, and with big ownership and little ownership, State ownership and county ownership, we are doing a pretty good job of working out our problems of cooperative management in the field of fire prevention and suppression, in the field of sustained yield, although, as elsewhere, those words have not yet wholly become reality.

We do have, however, the first major requisite. We have a public opinion that believes in sustained-yield management. And we have Government officials who believe in it and seek to practice it, and we have private forest owners and operators who join wholeheartedly in that belief. You cannot beat that kind of an aggregation, and you can leave the problem where it belongs, in the cooperative hands of all.

I hope that in the days to come there will be a more intense study of the problems incident to forest growing, cutting, and regrowing; a more intensive study of how to control that great enemy, the fire demon. I hope, as studies progress, there will be a free exchange of opinions and conclusions and experience. That is a field where we must not be selfish.

I like to think that our States are still sovereign units of this country. I like to believe that self-government can remain a fact and that it need not be by remote control. I like to think that the

people of this country are, each of them, independent entities, and that they can understand and do understand what is best for themselves. And I like to think that the problems arising within a State can be solved within that State, by the people thereof.

Even if that solution be perhaps not quite as coldly efficient as it would be if we had one general Federal law, I still believe that the welfare of the people as a whole will be better served by that kind of a solution. It means that the people are doing the governing themselves. I would rather see mistakes made by the people governing themselves than to have them submit to the control of those who have set themselves up as being the guardians of, and the thinkers for, the people under that "savior complex" that we find abroad today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of Congress well know, the hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information are ended.

Agriculture, business, and labor have been given a final chance, a death-bed opportunity, to voice their protest against certain contemplated cuts in tariff duties. These cuts may be deep, as great as 50 percent of the tariff standards as of this day.

It was all a part of the mumbo-jumbo of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program.

Beautiful word, "reciprocity." But it doesn't mean what the public has been deceived into thinking it does. It now means, under State Department interpretations, that we grant concessions to the fifty-odd nations of the world and none of them grant us anything in return, save one—and from that one hardly anything, since it gets nothing from us it does not have to share with all of the rest of the world.

So these international covenants are really give-away agreements. That is what they really should be called. In the 27 or 28 agreements now in effect, our State Department has consistently cut tariffs for everybody—without compensating cuts in our favor from any other nation save one. Silly, you say, but it is nevertheless true.

In view of this anomalous situation, a peek at the inner workings of this absurd tariff-slashing procedure is in order. Let us pull the curtain aside and take a look at that which is there occurring, or rather at what has just occurred, in the hearing rooms of the so-called Committee on Reciprocity Information.

And what we see there is, indeed, a melancholy march of nearly 1,000 representatives of American agriculture, business, and labor—a pitiful parade of the condemned. For these good American citizens, it was a sort of a "last mile."

But it is not in Washington where the ax will finally fall. It is at Geneva, Switzerland, where, later on in the year, the actual guillotining will occur. These preceding hearings constitute but a scenery-setting preliminary. That these people, and the hundreds of thousands of Americans they represent, march so docilely to slaughter is proof positive of what a carefully planned 13-year propaganda build-up can accomplish; a propaganda build-up which has misled millions of American people into believing that there is something magically good, incomprehensively wonderful, about it all.

I intend to ask for a sweeping investigation of this propaganda, for, indeed, the American people are entitled to know the truth.

This propaganda emanates from the State Department and it is intended to be and is the cover-up of the entire give-away trade-agreements program. To date, it has succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of those who contrived it.

These artful architects of manufactured opinion have built a towering edifice, a monument to their propaganda methods. But no structure can be sounder than the foundation upon which it is builded—and the foundation of this one is false and the superstructure is spurious.

When the truth is told and the facts become known, the trade-agreements program will be revealed as something more than a sham and a failure; it is no less than a plot to merge American economy with that of the world. This, despite an inevitable destruction of our standard of living, our high wage scales, and our most favorable working conditions, in all of which is inextricably involved the American way of life.

This monstrosity of managed propaganda is a threat to the welfare and prosperity of every man, woman, and child in America. Its effectiveness must be checked—or this magnificent American economy which we have spent 150 years in building may be destroyed in a day.

No wonder that fear was the prevailing emotion of the representatives of agriculture, business, and labor as they shuffled in and out of the subcommittee hearing rooms of this so-called Committee for Reciprocity Information, committeemen who "front" for smarter men who do not bother to attend.

Now that these highly dramatized so-called hearings of the Committee on Reciprocity Information are over, a heavy velvet curtain has descended upon the State Department's conference rooms to shield from public gaze the feverish activity which is now being carried on there in preparation for the Geneva Convention.

The American people will not know what is to be dished out to them until these masters of the cuisine ring the dinner bell. Labor and business and agriculture will learn the worst—only after the die has been cast.

And the worst can happen at Geneva when "the boys" of our State Department sit down with representatives of some 18 other nations and begin to barter—in secrecy—the economy of these United States, cloaked, as they hope to be, in their pursuit of their planned objectives by the most successfully designed blackout of public information the world has ever known.

Are we going to stand idly by and permit this cunningly conceived, super-duper propaganda campaign to achieve its objective—the lulling of the American people into quiescence as the last vestige of the American protective-tariff system is wiped from our statute books?

Congress should be fully informed in respect to the scope and intensity, yes, the deceit and duplicity of this 13-year propaganda build-up by the State Department.

The countless press releases.

The officially arranged speeches.

The cleverly contrived radio broadcasts, over Nation-wide hook-ups and local stations.

The pamphlets and booklets, reprints of speeches, "canned" editorials, radio platters, and transcriptions.

All these are but a part of a master plan to sanctify a program, the full implications of which are as yet unknown to the American public.

So successful has all this been that today, to question an aspect of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is, in the estimation of thousands, a sacrilege, no less.

Thus have we witnessed the creation of a cult, the doctrinaires of which, secure behind their facade of propaganda, think they are effectively insulated against what is a rapidly rising tide of protesting opinion.

Because the public must be informed of what is going on—as well as of what may happen—it is our duty to dispel the clouds of propaganda and reveal the truth.

When the full truth is made manifest, it will be revealed that the fundamental issue which has been successfully obscured to date is that of free trade versus protectionism, an issue which the people have never been permitted to pass on since the enactment of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The danger at Geneva is in a reckless disregard of America's welfare, a disposition to ignore American public opinion, a determination to substitute international control for domestic control of the flow of goods into and out of the United States.

This threat is imminent and real.

I submit that the economy of the United States is too vital a matter to be permitted to rest in the unrestrained hands of officials who are wedded to such ideas.

That the Department's Economic Division has grown by leaps and bounds in preparation for its jaunt to Geneva is no secret. Scores of economists have been recruited from other governmental agencies and divisions, which, as a result of partial postwar diminution of activities, are reducing personnel. The Economic Division has become a cherished haven of refuge for those who should be headed for private life.

Business and labor and agriculture have every reason for their fears, for the Federal Government in the so-called Reciprocity Information Committee hearings has, in effect, said to them: "All right, Mr. Businessman, or Mr. Farmer, or Mr. Worker, you and your organization have had a chance to file a brief and we have given you a few additional minutes to orally supplement that brief, but from now on we do not need you any more. Go on home now, and we will do the rest."

That is the papa-knows-best doctrine at its worst.

Secrecy always begets fear. Why should there be any secrecy in respect to things that have to do with the bread and butter of life? Why should this sense of impending disaster be permitted to develop in the hearts of the job makers and the job holders of America, the active partners in the building of our American way of life?

The American people are alarmed when they see all of America's eggs in one basket and that basket in hands alien to the plow, hands uncalloused by toil at the workbench, hands which were never held to foreheads that throb with pay-roll obligations and production responsibilities.

Yet those are the types of hands which have wrought the greatness which is America's. Those are the hands which have created the highest standard of living in the world, paid the highest wages the world has ever known, developed the best working conditions on this earth.

Those hands and the good commonsense minds that actuate them are no longer important in the calculations of the State Department's tariff slashers. Theirs is the larger, the bigger world viewpoint. It gives no consideration to the little factory in Wichita, the little shop in Keokuk, or the rose-clad motel in Merced, the farm in Fresno, the orchards in Oregon.

Only an incredible bureaucracy could conceive such a plan of action as this gigantic trade-agreements operation and dare to carry it into execution—yet it is an international control of the flow of goods into and out of the United States of which they continue to dream.

No wonder the toilers and builders of these United States constituted a melancholy procession as they passed in review before these subcommittees, grasping at the final few minutes which were doled out to them, as drowning men grasp at straws.

They see the welfare of the American people hanging in the balance, yet the people themselves remain quite ignorant of the peril that is theirs. Lulled into a false sense of security by this pitiless propaganda, the American people pursue their mirth and their employments quite unmindful of the disaster which stalks them.

But the American agriculturist, businessman, and worker—the melancholy marchers—visualize the departure—Geneva bound—of a boatload—maybe many boatloads—of smug diplomats, allwise economists, of experts, theorists, specialists, and what-nots, sailing gayly from our shores to barter away our economy, not in the interest of American prosperity, our standard of living, the welfare of our people, but in the interest of world uplift, of international "do-gooding," of something quite different from anything we have ever known before.

I do not like the atmosphere of this kind of international conference. I fear their objectives. I do not trust the ones who are to represent us there. There is too much secrecy and intrigue. If there is any good in it, why cannot it be done in sight of all—in recognition of the principle of the open covenant openly arrived at.

I do not want the welfare of America to be bartered away on foreign soil in between a round of cocktail parties, diplomatic receptions, teas, and state dinners. The power of the pen may be mightier than the sword—but the napkin at a state dinner puts them both to shame.

Many Members of this Congress remember how, after World War I, when we were caught with our tariff guards down, American markets were flooded with foreign goods. We called it dumping then. Unemployment and idleness resulted with such swiftness that the President was compelled to call a special session of Congress to enact an emergency tariff law. Only by this and the enactment of antidumping acts were we able to preserve the American standard of living and protect our economy against the then threatened disaster.

Yet today—and this is a fact and not a bit of fancy—the cumulative effect of the existing trade agreements has been to reduce our present-day tariffs to levels lower than those of the Underwood tariff-for-revenue-only act of 1913. And, let it be remembered, it was the low-tariff schedules of the Underwood Act which produced the disastrous economic conditions following World War I which I have just recalled to you.

With these lessons before us, should we rush to cut our tariffs an additional 50 percent—without waiting to see what the effect of the cuts already made is to be when normal international trading is again the vogue? Does not simple common sense require us to take a look before we cut again?

Let us suspend this orgy of tariff slashing which this silk-hatted diplomatic brigade of the State Department hopes to accomplish at Geneva until we can ascertain what is going to happen in America under our already badly battered down tariff laws when the world gets back into its production stride.

Now, as a part of this present propaganda build-up, a most alluring picture of an international trade organization, painted in the most brilliant of colors, is held up for us to gaze upon—as the answer to all of that which we fear. If it is to an international organization, in the counsels of which we will be accorded but one vote, to which we must turn for protection against dumping and kindred trade evils, the price, the sacrifice of the domestic control over imports, is too great.

No international organization, in which the United States would have but one vote, can be expected to react quickly enough to save us from the consequences of our folly as our economic house comes crashing down upon us.

Neither could we be sure that a majority of such a council would be deeply concerned over any economic disaster which might overtake us. The risk would be too great.

No, I want the American producers—the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, and the worker—to know what is going on.

I want him present, either personally or by representation, at any conference where his fate is at stake. I want him in the confidence of his Government, not held at arm's length. I want him continuously at hand to give constant counsel and advice. I want him free, untrammeled and vocal to tell the rest of us about it if he thinks anything is being done which may result in harm to him, to the American people of whom he is a part, for, indeed is this not his Government? His country?

I want an end to secrecy.

I want the American people to know the facts so that the truth can make them free.

COPPER

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the afternoon when the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] was addressing the House, I raised a few questions concerning the bill which the gentleman said he was introducing. His time was limited and he was unable to give a full explanation of the plans he had to relieve the copper shortage in our country. I was distressed when he suggested that a repeal of the 4-cents-per-pound duty on copper would be one of the solutions he would offer. I regret very much to see that offered as a solution and certainly would greatly regret to see that step taken.

I found myself agreeing with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] in the opening sentences of his remarks today, wherein he indicated the importance of copper, both in our war and peacetime economy. He has certainly appraised this strategically important metal correctly. I can well understand what it means to his district and to all the manufacturing East. I was alarmed, however, to hear the one solution to our present copper shortage problem which the gentleman had time to announce on the floor. When I questioned him, thus helping to deprive him of the time necessary to complete his speech, he said he had another solution to offer, which will be contained in the extension of his remarks. I might possibly agree with him in that other solution, if I knew precisely what it is.

Yes; I am aware that there is a shortage of copper right now of home production, and I am willing to take some steps to relieve the situation, but not the extreme measure of repealing the 4-cents-per-pound duty which the gentleman from Connecticut proposes. When asked whether he had considered what the removal of the 4-cents-per-pound duty on copper would mean to the copper camps of the West, he said he had taken that into consideration. I wonder if he has taken it fully into consideration?

Arizona has a copper star in the heart of the State flag. Arizona leads all the States of the Union in the production of

the red metal. Arizona strained her mineral resources to the limit and produced for war, not only the recent war but the First World War, and let it be remembered that all the great volume of copper produced in Arizona for World War II, which equaled in volume the pre-war production, cost Uncle Sam only 12 cents per pound, as that was the pegged price of copper during the war period. Oh, yes, I know—there was a copper subsidy paid during the war ranging from 1 to 5 cents per pound, but the great bulk of the war copper cost the Government only 12 cents a pound. That was the copper that won the war.

There was not quite enough of the 12 cents per pound copper to serve the war, so a production subsidy of as much as 5 cents extra per pound brought out additional supplies of copper from our high-cost mines. I had hoped the gentleman might propose relieving the domestic shortage in somewhat the same way we relieved the wartime shortage, and I hope that such is that alternate plan of which we have not had explanation. There is a way to do it without his drastic proposal.

I have lived in the State of Arizona a third of a century. I know to what great extent the economy and the prosperity of that State depends upon our copper production, which in turn depends upon the price of copper. During the 35 years of statehood for the youngest State in the Union, Arizona's revenues for State and local government have been derived largely from the mining industry, of which copper is the chief. Wages of copper miners have been in general fairly good, but relatively not so good now. Mining wages vary according to the price of copper, by a sliding scale. As the price of copper goes up, wages are increased accordingly. If the price of copper drops, wages fall correspondingly. I traveled over the State of Arizona during the first half of the thirties—during the depression—and my heart was saddened by the ghost towns to be seen on every hand, which towns had been prosperous mining camps a few years earlier. Almost the entire population of some of those mining camps were on relief about 1932 and 1933. The cost to this Government for supporting those populations was enormous. Such is one reason why I never want to see that happen again.

As I explained to the gentleman from Connecticut very briefly, I believe that the removal of the 4-cents-per-pound duty on copper would close every copper camp in America, for I know none that can produce copper as cheaply as it can be produced in South America with peon labor. That 4-cents-per-pound duty marks the difference between prosperous western cities buying eagerly every manufactured article and stagnant communities with people on relief.

The gentleman speaks touchingly of furnishing employment to GI's. Yes; I am interested in furnishing employment to GI's in mining camps of the West and manufacturing centers of the East.

In a strong brief submitted by the Arizona Copper Tariff Board opposing any reduction in the existing 4-cents-per-pound excise tax on foreign copper, the opposing argument was summarized as follows:

1. We oppose any reduction in the existing import duty on copper for the same basic reasons that impelled Congress to impose the excise tax in 1932, and thereafter to extend its effective period several times (in 1933, 1935, 1937, 1939).

The same facts which were presented to the Seventy-sixth Congress on this subject are pertinent today, plus the additional and very grave ones we have learned from World War II.

2. The Nation must not be without an adequate metal supply. Copper is the most vital of such metals because of its inherent properties and varied uses. Secretary of War Patterson has stated:

"An army without copper would be an army without speed, maneuverability, fire power or communications. It would not last a day in battle."

3. To assure national security and safety is the paramount duty of every Government official. It is also the concern of every citizen.

World War II has taught us that the nation best fitted to survive in this machine age is the one best supplied with metals.

4. To a great degree World War II was a metal war. Metals in enormous quantities were an absolute necessity. Copper played a very vital role, particularly in electrically controlled mechanisms, in communications, in the manufacture of shells, etc.

5. We can supply our own domestic copper requirements if the price permits:

A. Full operation of our mines.

B. Development of new ore bodies.

(NOTE.—Within the past year the existence of a new copper-ore body in this State has been proved by drilling to contain upwards of 100,000,000 tons of recoverable ore.)

C. Mining of fringe or marginal ores.

D. Production of copper from ores of below-average grade through advanced mining and metallurgical practices.

(NOTE.—B, C, D, above, not possible during the war.)

6. Copper production is a primary industry in Arizona. That industry cannot exist in this State, nor, indeed, in the United States, if the tariff on foreign copper is removed because of:

A. Much lower production costs abroad resulting from:

(a) Higher-grade ores.

(b) Greater ore reserves.

(c) Low-cost peon labor.

(d) Lower taxes and overhead.

(e) Less workmen's compensation, social security, etc.

(f) Lower standards of living.

7. No injury is done our Nation by development of its mineral resources, and the steady employment of American workmen, especially when the commodity (copper) is absolutely indispensable in wartimes—and vitally important in peace.

8. The Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act directs the stock-pile board to purchase, where possible, "to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States * * *" and "it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of this act to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials within the United States."

Obviously, this mandate cannot be followed if the excise tax is removed because:

A. Recent wage increases, plus higher materials costs, have added about 6 cents per pound to production costs of copper in Arizona.

B. Any reduction in the tariff will have the effect of further increases in costs.

C, A and B above, plus lower efficiency of the scarce mining labor, will result in prohibitive costs with their resultant shut-down of copper properties.

9. Practically all of Arizona's copper-producing communities are one-industry towns. They are solely dependent upon copper mining. The shut-down of the mines means disaster, not only to the miners and businessmen of the community, but in varying degrees to the State and Nation.

10. Duty-free copper means curtailed domestic production. This, in turn, retards recovery and reconversion, and endangers our national security.

11. Excise tax does not necessarily increase copper prices.

12. Excise tax is not a barrier to reciprocal trade.

13. It is our understanding that the Trade Agreement Act requires a positive finding of fact that the existing duty is unduly burdensome upon, or restricts the foreign trade of the United States. We submit that no such finding can in good conscience be made with respect to the excise tax on imported copper.

14. The United States is completely self-contained with respect to its copper resources, production and needs, provided its own copper mines are safeguarded from ruinous undercutting of prices through the duty-free importation of cheap-labor copper.

15. Finally, to whom do we owe assistance or allegiance, foreign governments and peoples, or our own Nation and the returned veterans?

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Wednesday, February 5, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands on Tuesday, February 4, at 10 a. m., in suite 1324, New House Office Building, to consider reclamation matters, and such other business as may come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will meet in executive session on Tuesday, February 4, 1947, at 2:30 p. m., in room 1301, New House Office Building, for organizational purposes.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Committee on Education and Labor will begin hearings on Wednesday, February 5, 1947, in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m.

The purpose of the hearings will be to receive testimony relative to the Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935, with a view to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the act.

The following bills will be considered by the committee:

H. R. 8, by Mr. SMITH of Virginia;
H. R. 85, by Mr. HOFFMAN;
H. R. 86, by Mr. HOFFMAN;
H. R. 87, by Mr. HOFFMAN;
H. R. 90, by Mr. HOFFMAN;
H. R. 122, by Mr. HOFFMAN;
H. R. 266, by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska;
H. R. 267, by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska;
H. R. 268, by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska;
H. R. 725, by Mr. CASE of South Dakota;
H. R. 880, by Mr. HOFFMAN;
H. R. 1095, by Mr. LANDIS;
H. R. 1096, by Mr. LANDIS; and
H. R. 1430, by Mr. WOOD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

218. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 9, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Estero River, Imperial River, Corkscrew River (Horse Creek), Gordon River, Rock Creek, Hendry Creek, Mulock Creek, and Six Mile Cypress Slough, Fla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

219. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Bayou Meto Basin, a tributary of the Arkansas River in the State of Arkansas, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

220. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 21, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sebastian Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 8, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

221. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 31, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Windmill Point Creek, Va., with a view to determining if the improvement of Deep Hole Creek is advisable at the present time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 24, 1942; to the Committee on Public Works.

222. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 12, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Keyport Harbor, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Public Works.

223. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 18, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Blind Brook and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

224. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 21, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 23, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

225. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 8, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of Apple River, Jo Daviess County, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on January 21, 1944, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

226. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 16, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Woods Hole and Little Woods Hole Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 6, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

227. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on and preliminary examination and survey of Little Miami River, Ohio, including Cowan Creek, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 28, 1937, and authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

228. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 8, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Walnut Creek, Love and Carter Counties, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

229. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 11, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Tar River, N. C., with a view to determining if improvements in the interest of navigation and flood control are advisable in Tar River and in the following tributaries: Fishing Creek, Otter Creek, Swift Creek, and Town Creek, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 1, 1939, and authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Works.

230. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 11, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pearl River, Miss., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

231. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 25, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Ogeechee River, Ga., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Works.

232. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 1, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bronx River and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

233. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 6, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Garden Creek, Mathews County, Va., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

234. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Bay Shore Harbor, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

235. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 22, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Miller Bay, Lake Winnebago, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

236. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 28, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of that portion of the project for the lower Mississippi River (adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended) on the east bank of that river extending from Vicksburg, Miss., southward for a distance of 15 to 20 miles, or to the Big Black River, with a view to determining the feasibility and practicability of protecting, by means of a levee line, such lands now subject to overflow as might be used for the expansion industrially or otherwise of the city of Vicksburg, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on April 26, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

237. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 18, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Sandusky River, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Works.

238. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 17, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Susquehanna River and tributaries, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, for flood-control improvements on Newtown (Newton) Creek, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 13, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

239. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 27, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Arroyo Grande Creek in the County of San Luis Obispo, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

240. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report, in duplicate, listing all refunds in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, on account of taxes illegally or erroneously collected; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

241. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supple-

mental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $2,250,000 for the Department of the Interior, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

242. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $55,588 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

243. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $25,100 for the Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

244. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $695,700 for the National Labor Relations Board (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

245. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting two proposed provisions pertaining to the 1945 and 1947 appropriations of the Securities and Exchange Commission (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

246. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 for the Selective Service System (H. Doc. 79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

247. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $5,600 for the judiciary, United States Supreme Court (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

248. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,169,114,500 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

249. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1948 in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

250. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

251. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

252. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

253. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

254. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 289 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

255. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the initial report of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

256. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report as Director for the fiscal year 1946, including the report of the 1946 meeting of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

257. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

258. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 5, 1945, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, Cocodrie, and Courtableau, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

259. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

260. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the United States and District of Columbia Governments to pay for water and water services secured from the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

261. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report for the period October–December 1946 of the War Assets Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

262. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fourth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

263. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a complete report and financial statement of the Bonneville Administrator covering the transmission and sale of electric energy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

264. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the tenth quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

265. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the information that no exchanges of lands were consummated during the calendar year of 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

266. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

267. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

268. A letter from the President, Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

269. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

270. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

271. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), a report that there were 873,978 men on active duty on December 31, 1946, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

273. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill making it a petty offense to enter any national forest land while it is closed to the public; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report pursuant to section 5 (a) Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 1587. A bill to eliminate discrimination against substitute post-office employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1588. A bill to amend part VIII of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to liberalize the payment of subsistence allowances, the standards pertaining to training on the job, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1589. A bill to extend the benefits of the pension laws to certain male nurses who served under contract with the United States between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1590. A bill to increase the pensions of certain helpless adult children of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1591. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1592. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations and production-credit associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1593. A bill for the relief of owners of crops damaged or destroyed by migratory birds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 1594. A bill to change the time of the appointment of presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1595. A bill to equalize competitive opportunity in the markets of the United States for articles of American manufacture or production, and like or similar competitive articles of foreign manufacture or production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1596. A bill to amend an act known as an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 (Public, No. 316, 73d Cong.), approved June 12, 1934, as extended by Public Resolution No. 10, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved March 1, 1937, by withdrawing from the President power to decrease existing rates of duty or transferring any article from the dutiable to free lists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1597. A bill to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1598. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1599. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Roosevelt River (Bull Frog Creek), Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 1600. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crime and Criminal Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1601. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1602. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1603. A bill to establish the Medical Associated Sciences Corps in the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1604. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381), as amended, so as to extend the monthly family allowance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1605. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 1606. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1607. A bill to permit former members of the armed forces restored to positions in the classified civil service to receive retired pay from the Army or Navy without regard to existing limitations on the amount thereof; to the Committee on Armed Forces.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1608. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1609. A bill to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to provide for the exercise of zoning power in town sites on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1611. A bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1612. A bill to amend the laws providing for compensation to children of certain deceased veterans whose death was service connected, so as to increase such compensation to $40 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1613. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1614. A bill to exempt from exise tax musical instruments sold to religious institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1615. A bill to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1616. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1617. A bill to increase the subsistence allowances to veterans receiving education or training pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1618. A bill to amend the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 so as to authorize appointment of navigators and observers as commissioned officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1619. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1620. A bill to permit veterans in certain cases to receive readjustment allowances for unemployment due to stoppages of work which exist because of labor disputes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for the rate of payment of compensatory time by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, approved July 6, 1946, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1623. A bill to reestablish the original Eleventh and Twelfth Federal Home Loan Bank districts and to reestablish the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1624. A bill to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 1625. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps, who during World War II participated in the War, Navy, or Civil Aeronautics Administration training programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1626. A bill to maintain continued employment, to provide adequate supplies of copper to assist American industry in the reconversion period, to protect the American people against a new inflationary threat, and to assist in promoting stabilization in the American economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1627. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War and the War Assets Administrator to take such action as may be necessary to return certain real property at Camp Stewart, Ga., to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1628. A bill relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1629. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1630. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1631. A bill relating to the compensation in first-, second-, and third-class post offices of postmasters and other officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 1632. A bill to amend and reenact section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1633. A bill to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life in-

surance in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1634. A bill to amend section 1 and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1635. A bill to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 1636. A bill to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to the application of such section to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1637. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to provide cash settlement for certain discharged members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1638. A bill relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1639. A bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1640. A bill to impose a tax on Angora rabbit wool and yarn imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1641. A bill to amend title 11 of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act for military service, by providing for adjustment of benefits received under such title in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLIPPINGER:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint Resolution, a bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent Resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the conduct of the recent elections in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 89. Resolution providing for the payment of $600 out of contingent fund of the House to H. Ralph Burton, for legal services rendered the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 90. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) (h) of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments); to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson concerning the disposition of an overproduction of potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide by law for an immediate decontrol of sugar for home consumption and for industrial use; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase allotments for rural electrification program in Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate additional and adequate funds each 5 years, which funds shall be sufficient for the maintenance of studies for 5-year periods; (a) making studies of the proper utilization of natural range through conservation, reseeding, introduction of new species, fertilization, cultivation, and management, and (b) making studies of the proper management of livestock on the range; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Freda Wahler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1644. A bill for the relief of Harold Paikin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM (by request):

H. R. 1646. A bill for the relief of John Fleckstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1647. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mary Margaret Grant, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Stuart Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1652. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel, Yugoslav fliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Bigger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1654. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1655. A bill for the relief of Benjamin R. Gorgas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1656. A bill for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1657. A bill for the relief of Willie Howard Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1658. A bill for the relief of Norman Thoreson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1660. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Masao Hayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Leszek Banaszkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1662. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Fiorentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1663. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Keizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Altezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1666. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, and Cooke Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, as receiver for said Trent Trust Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ecaterinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Walter Tyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

74. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting War Assets Administration to set up more efficient methods of purchasing, and especially for the inspection of, surplus materials, etc., offered for sale by that Federal agency; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

75. By Mr. RICH: Resolution adopted at the regular meeting Tuesday, January 21, 1947, of Howard W. Kahler Post, No. 844, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Williamsport, Pa., requesting that a thorough investigation be made of the activities of the War Assets Administration since its inception by authority of Congress, and report of such investigation be released to the press by the vested investigators; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

76. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 24 residents of Portersville, Butler County, Pa., protesting law providing five dams in North Dakota as unjust to Indians of Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, in the midst of the complicated situations of life and the unsolved problems of the world, deliver Thy servants from any sense of futility. Let them feel the support of the prayers of hosts of true patriots throughout this land and, above all, the uplift of the everlasting arms. Cause them to understand that God's power has never been obstructed by difficulties, nor His love limited by the confusion of human plans. May the very failure of man's best resources impel us toward the resources of God Cleanse our hearts of selfishness. Grant that all questions immediately before us may be made so plain that we shall have no forebodings as we make our decision, nor vain regrets after it is made. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 3, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Michigan will unavoidably be obliged to be absent from the Senate on Friday next, and asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that he may be absent on that day.

Without objection, the request is granted.

The Chair announces that the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate at Friday's session will be the junior Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate beginning next Monday because of the fact that I find it necessary to go to a hospital for an operation upon my knee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on the coming Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate Friday of this week and all of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Connecticut.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON NUMBER OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of men on active duty on December 31, 1946, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORITY TO GRANT EASEMENTS IN LANDS TO ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the executive boards of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the entry into the United States of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

Petitions of sundry citizens and property owners in Ashtabula County, Ohio, praying that necessary steps be taken to eliminate beach erosion in Ashtabula County; to the Committee on Public Works.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition from members of the Mountrail Electric Cooperative, Inc., relating to the rural electrification program.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have doubtless read the recent statements of Congressman TABER with regard to the rural electrification program. He is quoted as saying the REA program has been getting three or four times too much money, that it ought to be put on a "business basis," and that he sees no need for continuing the Government agency.

This project has 420 miles of line under construction, which will serve approximately 700 members. We have 1,300 applicants who want service at once. With the least encouragement we could have 1,600 applicants, for we will ultimately serve some 2,000 farm families. All farmers now want electric service.

REA is cutting down our loan applications because of insufficient loan authorizations. Our request for an allotment for 1947 has not yet been approved. We have never had too much money. There is always a lag between the time you vote the authorization and the time we get it spent, but we can't turn a tap until we get the authorization.

As to the program being put on a business basis, less than one-half of 1 percent of all REA loans are delinquent, and they are paid ahead several million dollars. The Government is making enough clear profit on the money loaned to us over cost to the Government to more than cover the cost of administration. What could be a better "business basis"?

Barely half of the American farms have electricity today. If the agency were eliminated, the program would be wrecked. The biggest bottleneck today is the lack of enough REA personnel to keep the accelerated work moving.

One more thing. We don't want the right of the projects to generate and transmit their own power destroyed. This right helps us get better rates. Also, where power is available from the dams, we want the lines built to deliver it to us and others.

We extend to you an invitation to come out and visit us at your earliest convenience and see our problems first-hand.

We thank you for the splendid support you have given REA in the past, and we are going to count on you more than ever before to take the lead in carrying our program forward.

Yours truly,

Mountrail Electric Cooperative, Inc.,
Forreuf N. Peterson, M. B. Bien,
E. L. Dekker, Selmer M. Gandrud,
Henry Strobeck, Leonard Texel,
Harold J. Nahr, Edna Hermanson.

RESOLUTIONS OF SENIOR CITIZENS PENSION LEAGUE OF IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to two resolutions which have been adopted and addressed to this body by the Senior Citizens Pension League of Idaho. They have been transmitted to me by Mr. C. E. Page, of Boise, Idaho, an official of that league. The resolutions are very brief, and I shall read them. They consist of one sentence each.

No. 1. We respectfully ask both the House and the Senate to pass a law to tax unearned income.

No. 2. We respectfully ask the Senate to establish a luncheon period so the Senate Members will not miss important legislation by being absent in the dining room.

Mr. President, I recall that on various occasions different Members of this body have mentioned the question of a luncheon period, and it would seem to me that when, as the result of discussion, a group in Boise, Idaho—and, I assure my colleagues, without any urging from me—have seen fit to address a resolution to the Senate asking that arrangements be made for a luncheon period, it is a matter of concern, and must be, throughout the country generally.

I subscribe to the idea, Mr. President, that arrangements should be made for a definite luncheon period, with the Senate possibly convening earlier in the morning, and having a definite time to eat, so that Senators may not be necessarily absent from the floor for that purpose.

Matters which come before this body are of too grave a nature to receive the consideration of only a small number of

the Senators, as is too often the case during the period from 12 o'clock to 1:30.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; with an amendment (Rept. No. 13);

S. 221. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 14);

S. 231. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 16);

S. 235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; without amendment (Rept. No. 17); and

S. 276. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 18).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 493, to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 494. A bill to provide for the termination on April 30, 1947, of the effective periods of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and to authorize the transfer to State officials of records and other information relating to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Zia Uddin Mustafahassan Qadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 496. A bill relating to appointments in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 497. A bill authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to make loans to institutions for the purpose of financing the construction of domiciliary facilities for the aged and the blind; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 498. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell as expeditiously as possible lands acquired or being administered under the provisions of said title III to private persons for purposes not inconsistent with the provisions of the said title III, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 499. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear; and

S. 500. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Anna Soucek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 502. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB) introduced Senate bill 503, to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 504. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and for other purposes; and

S. 505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. KILGORE):

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Jacob Reder and Erna Marcelina Frenkel Reder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 507. A bill to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. MOORE):

S. 508. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 509. A bill to place certain noncommissioned officers on the retired list in the first grade; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 510. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 512. A bill to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 513. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army officers retired due to lack of funds, and to promote retired officers who served during a major war and to confer upon Army officers rights already granted Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 514. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 515. A bill relating to investment of trust funds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 516. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 517. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 518. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946; and

S. 519. A bill for the relief of T. A. Connelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 520. A bill to provide for the furnishing of necessary fixtures and equipment by the Post Office Department at post offices of the third and fourth classes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 521. A bill to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 522. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 523. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans' Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the State of Arkansas as a community property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming introduced Senate Joint Resolution 58, to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 59, authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

TECHNOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business. I ask unanimous consent that a joint release by myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) will

be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the joint release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The joint release presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) is as follows:

Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT and GEORGE D. AIKEN today introduced a bill providing for the orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, particularly to small enterprise. It provides a peacetime charter for a businessmen's clearinghouse of technical information, by authorizing the Department of Commerce to continue certain services which have been tested by wartime and postwar experience and found to be needed and demanded by American business.

More than ever before, leadership in industry and business depends upon leadership in technology and, with rising prices, the preservation of the American standards of living depends upon the ability of industry to reduce its cost through the application of technological development, and the development of new techniques. Yet, perhaps, never has it been so difficult as now for the average small manufacturer to keep pace with technology. The bill is designed to meet this situation, molding existing Government facilities into a technical service to business, and providing small business in particular with access to the latest technological developments.

Through channels which the businessman has long used in securing data on foreign and domestic markets, he will obtain, with minimum effort and confusion, technical information originating in all Government departments. In addition to providing for utilization of current Government-sponsored technology, the bill authorizes the continued coordination and dissemination of the backlog of information concerning wartime developments both at home and abroad, as military security permits. Despite the relatively insignificant research directed toward civilian industrial problems, all phases of governmental research, including purely military development, have resulted in products and processes which should be made readily available to industry, bringing about wider public use with fuller commercial exploitation. Especially during the war, Government commitments for research increased rapidly and unless some means is found to effect a broad dissemination of such technical knowledge as can be released to the public this wealth of technological data will be lost, the average businessman denied the opportunity to use the results of research for which he pays the bill as a taxpayer.

Other sections of the bill provide for basic technical aids and services to businessmen and inventors, extends the present authorization of certain funds for research and development, and establishes regulations whereby activities under the bill should be self-sustaining, at least in part. The bill, however, contains adequate safeguards against Government competition with private enterprise, and provides that authority under the act "shall generally be exercised in a manner which will foster the development of scientific and technical services by private persons and by State and local institutions."

The basic purpose of the bill is to bring Government-sponsored research and development to contemplated projects where Government assistance or participation is essential to speedily bridging the gap between previous development and widespread public benefit.

A similar measure was introduced in the last Congress by Senator Fulbright (S. 1248). Invitations to testify or comment on the provisions of the bill at that time were submitted to interested research and trade associations, publications, patent attorneys, chambers of commerce, and other business, farm, and veterans' organizations. The testimony was generally favorable as regards both the bill's general objectives and its special provisions as incorporated by the committee after hearings. The bill was reported to the Senate during the last Congress by a unanimous vote (Senate Report 908). The bill has been further revised to conform to existing practices within the Department of Commerce with a view to utilizing all available technical information and coordinate agency activities in a program for the benefit of American industry.

CREATION OR CHARTERING OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a congressional policy with respect to the creation or chartering of a private corporation by act of Congress, and to provide for the effectuation of the policy so established.

Corporations wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, are specifically exempt from the operation of the bill.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on this matter during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and upon a favorable report by the subcommittee, the full committee made an intensive study of the purposes of the bill, and reported it favorably to the Senate, with the result that it passed the Senate unanimously on June 14, 1946. Since that was so near the close of the session, the House of Representatives was unable to take any action.

The similar bill on which hearings were held in the Seventy-ninth Congress was introduced by the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. KILGORE]. I had hoped that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] would be on the floor at this time so I could ask him to join in the introduction of the bill. I think it is important that the bill I now introduce be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary at this time.

The bill (S. 503) to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to permit the extension of sugar rationing and allocations until March 31, 1948.

I do not have to tell the Senate that I am as anxious as anyone to see the end of all controls—particularly on foodstuff—and I am satisfied when there is a normal supply that a continuation of controls is harmful and definitely a restraint to trade. However, in the case of sugar it is different.

In World War I when controls were taken off, the price of sugar increased four times the normal amount, and this high price brought in great shipments of sugar from all over the world. But today, this cannot happen, and there is no comparison between our present sugar situation and the events I have just mentioned. Today there is no sugar anywhere in the world that is not already earmarked, allocated, and sold. No matter how high the price of sugar might go, it would not bring us any more sugar because there is no more sugar to come into this country from any place in the world. Lack of Government control would only cause higher prices and great confusion with the small users losing.

The joint resolution I am introducing continues the control of allocating and pricing of sugar until March 31, 1948, under the Secretary of Agriculture, who, however, has the privilege of taking off any part or all of these controls at any time in his judgment when the supplies of sugar are sufficient to provide for orderly marketing.

This resolution does away with all OPA and executive department controls, placing the responsibility in the Department of Agriculture without creating any new positions or employees.

In a few weeks the War Control Acts will expire and this legislation must be passed quickly to prevent the confusion I have indicated. It is my sincere hope that the controls on sugar can be taken off before the end of 1947, but in the meantime, I believe the legislation I am now proposing is absolutely necessary.

Practically all elements in the sugar field are favoring this extension.

Unless some such legislation as this is enacted, sugar rationing will end with the termination of the Second War Powers Act on March 31, 1947. With the existing world shortage, which cannot be relieved until another sugar crop is harvested, the housewife would have to bid competitively for her sugar against all industrial consumers as well as other nations of the world, and prices might well rise to very great heights.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD TO THE LATE LT. GEN. ROY STANLEY GEIGER

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I also introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution request-

ing that the President issue posthumously to the late Lt. Gen. Roy S. Geiger, of the Marine Corps, a commission as general.

General Geiger, who had served for approximately 40 years in the Marine Corps, died 2 weeks ago—7 days before he would have been placed on the retired list. Being placed on the retired list would have advanced this fine marine officer to the rank of full general under existing law which requires such advance for having been commended in combat with the enemy.

General Geiger was a career aviator in the Marine Corps, being the fourth marine officer designated as an aviator. He actively commanded an aviation group in France in World War I and commanded aviation forces on Guadalcanal and other areas in the Pacific during World War II. Later General Geiger commanded ground forces and after the death, in action, of Lieutenant General Buckner of the Army on Okinawa, General Geiger took command of the Tenth Army and completed the conquest of the island.

Few men, even in the glorious history of the fighting Marine Corps, can equal the splendid combat record of this grand old fighter.

His record through the years has been a shining example to young and old alike of this Nation, and his untimely death has been mourned in every branch of the service.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that, if made, the advancement requested in this joint resolution would involve no additional expense to the Government.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59), authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted an amendment proposing an amendment to section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Senator from Nebraska submitted the amendment at the request of myself and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. The amendment is very brief. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, and that following it there may be printed a joint statement prepared by the junior Senator from Wisconsin and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. WHERRY for Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY is as follows:

Amendment submitted by Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on furs), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'and articles of which such fur is the component material comprising more than 80 percent of the value.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act."

The joint statement presented by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY) is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY MR. WILEY AND MR. M'CARTHY

Section 2401 of the Revenue Act of 1941 as amended by the Revenue Act of 1943, has brought about a discrimination against the use of better quality furs for trimming of cloth garments. This factor is forcing a liquidation of the fur-farming industry.

Our high-quality furs are produced on fur farms, our main products being silver fox and mink. The entire production of silver fox and 70 percent of all mink are raised on farms. The market for these articles is confined to two sources. Approximately 65 percent of all silver foxes and 20 percent of all mink are only suitable for use as trimming on cloth garments. The balance is used in the manufacture of fur garments.

The discriminatory provision of the present tax against the use of better quality fur for trimming purposes has closed this market for our product.

Evidence of the critical condition the fur-farming industry is in today is substantiated by the fact that a large part of the 1945 crop and all of the 1946 crop is unsold. Besides the cost of production, stored furs depreciate very rapidly. Financial losses to fur farmers are far above any previous year, and our industry is operating on a credit basis.

Something can be done to correct the discrimination in the present excise taxes.

Briefly, here is what is taking place: Section 2401 of the Revenue Act of 1941 reads as follows:

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold; articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value."

Section 1650 of the Revenue Act increased the rate to 20 percent. Interpretation by the Treasury Department, Office of Internal Revenue, as set forth in their regulation for determining the taxability of fur-trimmed garments is as follows:

"The material components of fur-trimmed garments recognized for tax purposes by the Treasury Department are the fur set, the cloth shell, the lining shell, and the findings. Since the cost of the cloth shell is greater than that of the lining shell or of the findings, the taxability of a fur-trimmed garment will be determined by a comparison of the cost of the fur with the cost of the cloth shell. When the cost of the fur set exceeds the cost of the cloth shell, the garment is taxable, and conversely when the cost of the cloth shell is greater, the garment is not taxable."

In actual practice and operation, here is how it works (the example used represents one of the largest fur trim volume lines on the market today. The cloth used is the finest material obtainable):

Manufacturer to consumer

	Fur-trimmed coat	
	Tax-free	Subject to tax
Material value:		
Cloth shell	$20	$20.00
Lining shell	7	7.00
Findings	3	3.00
Fur set	19	24.00
Cost of materials	49	54.00
Labor, overhead, and manufacturers' mark-up	41	42.00
Wholesale price paid by retailer	90	96.00
Retailers' mark-up, average 33⅓ percent	30	32.00
Retail price paid by consumer	120	128.00
Plus 20 percent tax	------	25.60
Price paid by consumer, including tax	------	153.60

Here we have exactly the same cost, except for a $5 better fur set costing the consumer $33.60 more. In fact, the tax amounts to more than the cost of the fur set. It is obvious why the consumers are not interested in this article.

But that is not the only discriminatory factor. By reason of the tax differential, the retailer is taking a higher mark-up on untaxable garments, and therefore is not interested in buying or handling taxable merchandise.

The net result of the excise tax on fur-trimmed coats is:

(a) The consumer is paying more for a cheap article.

(b) The Government is collecting little, if any tax.

(c) The fur farmer has no market for a large percent of his product and is being forced to liquidate his business.

The reason something must be done at once is very obvious. Fur-trimmed coats are seasonable articles. Manufacturers are now beginning to make new designs and styles for manufacture during the summer months to go on the market next fall and winter. The matter cannot be left to be corrected by later legislation.

The proposed amendment will correct the situation without any effect on other articles or establishing a precedent or reason for further amendments to the bill.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON THE SURVIVAL OF A FREE, COMPETITIVE PRESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution for which I had intended to ask immediate consideration. However, after discussion with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who heads the new Small Business Committee, I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The resolution provides for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the report submitted by the chairman of the

Senate Small Business Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], on Survival of a Free, Competitive Press—The Small Newspaper: Democracy's Grassroots. The resolution is offered because of the exhaustion of the limited supply of 2,000 provided the committee and the demand for copies coming into my own office and the offices of other Senators.

This report is amongst the last acts performed by the retiring chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. It is in keeping with the high standard of work he had done on important and timely problems during the 6 years of his leadership on this Senate committee in behalf of independent business. It focuses attention on one of the most serious threats to our domestic prosperity and democratic institutions, the weakening or disappearance of independent newspapers all over the country. As the Senator from Montana well says in the report: "With each disappearance of a competitive local newspaper some vital part of democracy is lost."

The report gives figures showing that a tenth of all our newspapers have gone out of business during the past 15 years and that the crisis in newsprint is reducing to a mere trickle the supply available to small newspapers still in existence.

The Murray report directly concerns every one of our local newspapers. There are some 15,000 of them scattered over this broad country, playing their vital role in the formation of public opinion, disseminating news, assisting in the sale and distribution of goods, and developing civic welfare in their communities. Nothing is more important than that they know the results of this unbiased, carefully prepared report, for much of it is based on an analysis of the very problems they brought to the attention of the chairman.

Speaking for myself—and I am sure for other Senators as well—I wish to place a copy of this invaluable report in the hands of every publisher in my State. No better use could be made of the taxpayers' money than to bring to light the problems now threatening the very life of our American free press as a first step in their solution. This report of the former chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee does just that, and for that reason I urge approval of my resolution for the printing of additional copies.

The report submitted by the Senator from Montana analyzes the newsprint situation as it affects the small newspapers of the country. They are having a worse time now getting newsprint than they had during the period of rationing while the war was in progress. I think it is important that the country know this, and that additional copies of this report be printed. As I have said, the report is indicative of the excellent work done by the former distinguished chairman of the committee. The new chairman, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, is somewhat familiar with the situation, but I think perhaps the committee should review the subject in the light of the report. I hope the resolution can be taken up and considered by the Senate on Friday or Monday.

The resolution (S. Res. 80), submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Committee Print No. 17, Eightieth Congress, first session, being the report entitled "Survival of a Free, Competitive Press," which was printed for the use of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Document Room.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, let me say that I am not objecting, as chairman of the Small Business Committee, to the printing of additional copies of the report. However, because an expenditure is involved, the resolution should be considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am simply asking that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee and that that committee consider the resolution. Of course, if the resolution meets with the approval of the committee, additional copies of the report will be printed. Instead of granting unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, I am merely asking that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I will guarantee, as a member of the committee, that it will be acted upon immediately, and that the committee will decide what to do about the printing of additional copies of the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to have it understood that the Senator from Nebraska is objecting to the printing of additional copies of the report. He merely wishes to follow the proper procedure.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN DATA RELATING TO FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on January 23 the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and gave valuable information relative to the Department's farm program for the next 2 years, 1947 and 1948.

A portion of the Secretary's statement was in explanation of the Agriculture Department's program for price supports.

Inasmuch as all farmers are interested in the price-support program it is well to make such information available to them. I have, therefore, selected certain data relative to the Government's farm price-support program and ask unanimous consent that the data thus compiled be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter presented by the Senator from Kansas will be printed as a Senate document.

DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS BY THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the New York Times of yesterday published the text of the Declaration of Human Rights submitted by the National Catholic Welfare Conference to the United Nations Committee on Human Rights. The statement, I understand, was drafted by a committee comprising bishops, priests, theologians, and laymen chosen by the conference. The statement, according to the New York Times, was intended to give expression on Catholic policy in America for the hierarchy.

The declaration is one of the most integrated and comprehensive, although concise, statements of the principles and objectives of a truly humanistic and democratic program that I have seen in recent years. It should serve as a framework for all progressive-minded people regardless of their religious faith. I congratulate the National Catholic Welfare Conference for its statesmanlike declaration, and I recommend its perusal, especially by all Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the declaration be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

GENERAL PREAMBLE

God, the Creator of the human race, has charged man with obligations arising from his personal dignity, from his immortal destiny, and from his relationships as a social being. These obligations are in reference to the Creator, to himself, to his family and fellow men, to the state, and to the community of states. For the fulfillment of these obligations man is endowed with certain natural, inalienable rights. These obligations and rights form the substance of the natural moral law which can be known by reason.

Obligations and rights are correlative. At all times the obligation to respect the rights of others operates against the arbitrary use of rights.

Suitable opportunity to discharge fundamental obligations in the various and separate situations of life is a right which cannot be justly denied. For man's use God has provided the basic resources of this world.

The unity of the human race under God is not broken by geographical distance or by diversity of civilization, culture, and economy, and the adequate use of the world's resources by all peoples is not to be denied because of these factors.

Weakness resulting from conquest or imperfection in governmental organization should not be used as a pretext to reject the fundamental rights of man or to impede their legitimate exercise.

The order of rights outlined below progresses through the individual, the family, the state, and the community of states.

PART I. THE RIGHTS OF THE HUMAN PERSON

The dignity of man, created in the image of God, obligates him to live in accordance with law imposed by God. Consequently, he is endowed as an individual and as a member of society with rights which are inalienable.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to life and bodily integrity from the moment of conception, regardless

of physical or mental condition, except in just punishment for crime.

2. The right to serve and worship God in private and in public.

3. The right to religious formation through education and association.

4. The right to personal liberty under just law.

5. The right to the equal protection of just law regardless of sex, nationality, color, or creed.

6. The right to freedom of expression, of information, and of communication in accordance with truth and justice.

7. The right to choose and freely to maintain a state of life, married or single, lay or religious.

8. The right to education suitable for the maintenance and development of man's dignity as a human person.

9. The right to petition the government for redress of grievances.

10. The right to a nationality.

11. The right of access to the means of livelihood by migration when necessary.

12. The right of association and peaceable assembly.

13. The right to work and choose one's occupation.

14. The right to personal ownership, use, and disposal of property subject to the rights of others and to limitations in the interest of the general welfare.

15. The right to a living wage.

16. The right to collective bargaining.

17. The right to associate by industries and professions to obtain economic justice and the general welfare.

18. The right to assistance from society, if necessary from the state, in distress of person or family.

PART II. THE RIGHTS PERTAINING TO THE FAMILY

The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights antecedent to all positive law. The family does not exist for the state, but on the other hand is not independent.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to marry, to establish a home and beget children.

2. The right to economic security sufficient for the stability and independence of the family.

3. The right to the protection of maternity.

4. The right to educate the children.

5. The right to maintain, if necessary by public protection and assistance, adequate standards of child welfare within the family circle.

6. The right to assistance, through community services in the education and care of the children.

7. The right to housing adapted to the needs and functions of family life.

8. The right to immunity of the home from search and trespass.

9. The right to protection against immoral conditions in the community.

PART III. THE DOMESTIC RIGHTS OF STATES

Political authority is entrusted by God to nations, which are endowed with rights and charged with the obligation of establishing justice, of promoting the general welfare of their citizens, and of cooperating with other nations in furthering the universal welfare of mankind.

It is the right of all peoples that are capable of self-government to organize politically and to function as states upon equal terms with other states.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to enact just laws binding in conscience.

2. The right to establish courts of justice and to enforce the observance of law with adequate sanctions.

3. The right to demand of its citizens respect for the rights of minorities.

4. The rights to tax by adequate and equitable means in order to carry out its proper functions.

5. The right to exercise eminent domain when demanded by the common welfare.

6. The right to require that its people receive an education suitable for citizenship.

7. The right to defend itself against domestic violence.

8. The right to watch over, stimulate, restrain, and order the private activities of individuals and groups in the degree that is necessary for the common good.

9. The right to regulate operations of international economic groups functioning within its own boundaries.

10. The right to adopt in time of emergency special measures necessary for the common good.

PART IV. THE RIGHTS OF STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

The human family constitutes an organic unity or a world society.

The states of the world have the right and the duty to associate and to organize in the international community for their common welfare.

The indispensable foundation of all peaceful intercourse among nations and an essential condition of juridical relations among them are common trust and respect for the plighted word. Treaties and agreements must not be considered subject to arbitrary unilateral repudiation.

Every state has certain fundamental rights in the international community.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to exist as a member of the international community and to be protected in its national life and integrity against acts of aggression by any other state or states.

2. The right to independence in the determination of its own domestic and foreign policies in accordance with the principles of morality, and subject to the obligations of international law.

3. The right to juridical equality with other states in the family of nations.

4. The right to membership in the organized international community and to the benefit of international cooperation.

5. The right to the assistance of the international community in securing the fulfillment of the terms of a just treaty or agreement

6. The right to obtain from the international community redress of grievances arising from unjust treaties imposed by force.

7. The right to the revision of treaties which are no longer in accord with fundamental justice.

8. The right to recourse to the procedures of pacific settlement established by the international community for disputes which diplomatic negotiations have failed to settle.

9. The right to maintain political, economic, and social intercourse with other States upon equal terms.

10. The right of access, upon equal terms, to the markets and raw materials of the world necessary for its own life as a people.

11. The right to protect its own natural resources and economic life from unjust exploitation.

12. The right to the assistance of the international community in time of economic or social distress.

13. The right to grant asylum to refugees from injustice.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS ON PROPOSED REDUCTION OF TAXES

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Can Taxes Be Reduced?" delivered by Senator LUCAS on January 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHALLENGE TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR McCORD, OF TENNESSEE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge to the State Employment Service," delivered by Hon. Jim McCord, Governor of Tennessee, at the Governors' Conference, Miami, Fla., December 6, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND NATIONAL REPUTATION—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "National Defense and National Reputation," delivered by Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Twenty-first Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C., January 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARKANSAS STATE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Founding a State Orchestra," published in the Musical Courier, December 1946 issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT ON THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL FOR 1946

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial for 1946, prepared by A. E. Demaray, director and executive agent for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR PROBLEMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK POST

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "From Truce to Peace," published in the New York Post of January 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPAGANDA BUDGET OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTUPERS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article, NAM Plans $4,700,000 Fund for Propaganda in 1947, appearing in the Farmers Union Herald of South St. Paul, Minn., of January 17, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PARTY HOPE—LETTER PUBLISHED IN WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Post of February 5, 1947, under the heading "Democratic Party hope," which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT ON ACTIVITIES OF UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 803.)

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which

was read and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 5, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate pro tempore, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 19, 1945, I sent a message to the Congress of the United States suggesting that the Congress should give its consideration to the question of the Presidential succession.

In that message, it was pointed out that under the existing statute governing the succession to the office of President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President. It was further pointed out that, in effect, the present law gives to me the power to nominate my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

I said then, and I repeat now, that in a democracy, this power should not rest with the Chief Executive. I believe that, insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer.

In the message of June 19, 1945, I recommended that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession, and if there were no Speaker, or if he failed to qualify, that the President pro tempore of the Senate should act until a duly qualified Speaker was elected.

A bill (H. R. 3587) providing for this succession was introduced in the House of Representatives and was passed by the House on June 29, 1945. It failed, however, to pass the Senate.

The same need, for a revision of the law of succession, that existed when I sent the message to the Congress on June 19, 1945, still exists today.

I see no reason to change or amend the suggestion which I previously made to the Congress, but if the Congress is not disposed to pass the type of bill previously passed by the House, then I recommend that some other plan of succession be devised so that the office of the President would be filled by an officer who holds his position as a result of the expression of the will of the voters of this country.

It is my belief that the present line of succession as provided by the existing statute, which was enacted in 1886, is not in accord with our basic concept of government by elected representatives of the people.

I again urge the Congress to give its attention to this subject.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

NOMINATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission is so important that not only the American Government's very existence as a nation but that of the American people as individuals depends upon the secret and careful use and unhampered American development of atomic energy. It is vital, therefore, that those appointed as members of the Commission be the safest, wisest, and most genuine Americans in the Nation, wholly unaffected with any foreign likes or dislikes, and uninfluenced by any sympathy for any foreign government or foreign ideas or ideals. I firmly urge that if any Senator, certainly any member of the committee who has heard the evidence in the case, has any doubt regarding the fitness of any individual appointed to the Commission, and objects to his appointment, then the person so appointed must not be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, the appointments to membership on this Commission are probably the most important that have come to the Senate of the United States at any time in its history. If Senators have a doubt as to the Americanism or the good faith or the sincerity or patriotism of anyone appointed to be a member of the Commission, he should not be confirmed.

I should like to have Senators give these thoughts most careful consideration in deliberating on the membership of this Commission.

It seems to me that every Senator ought to realize that involved in this matter is a fight between Russian communism on one side and pure, unadulterated Americanism on the other. Those who believe in Russian communism over pure Americanism will no doubt vote for these nominees. Those of us who believe that any of these nominees are tinctured with communism will vote against the confirmation of such nominees.

REVENUE ESTIMATES UNDER TAX-REDUCTION PROPOSALS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that tax reduction may become an issue at this session of the Congress, I have requested Mr. Stam, chief of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, to furnish certain information, and I ask that his letter may be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

I invite attention to the following information contained in the letter:

In accordance with your recent request, I am submitting the following revenue estimates as to various tax plans:

Increase per capita exemptions from $500 to $600.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 2,917,000.

Loss in revenue, $1,500,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from $500 to $700.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,860,000.

Loss in revenue, $3,000,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from $500 to $800.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 10,000,000.

Loss in revenue, $3,900,000,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Married persons from $1,000 to $2,000.

Single persons from $500 to $1,000.

Leave dependency credit at $500.

Loss in revenue, $5,022,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from the rolls, 18,319,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Single persons, $750.

Married persons, $750.

Dependents, $375.

Loss in revenue, $3,084,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,000,000.

Mr. President, it may be recalled that at the time of the passage of the 1945 act, which actually occurred early in 1946, there were on the rolls more than 50,000,000 taxpayers. Twelve million were removed from the rolls by that act. At the present time the number of taxpayers on the rolls is roughly 45,000,000. So if any one of the methods discussed by Mr. Stam in his letter should be used, it is easy to see to what extent the tax base would be narrowed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, January 29, 1947.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In accordance with your recent request, I am submitting the following revenue estimates as to various tax plans:

Increase per capita exemptions from $500 to $600.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 2,917,000.

Loss in revenue, $1,500,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from $500 to $700.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,860,000.

Loss in revenue, $3,000,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from $500 to $800.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 10,000,000.

Loss in revenue, $3,900,000,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Married persons from $1,000 to $2,000.

Single persons from $500 to $1,000.

Leave dependency credit at $500.

Loss in revenue, $5,022,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from the rolls, 18,319,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Single persons, $750.

Married persons, $750.

Dependents, $375.

Loss in revenue, $3,084,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,000,000.

Aside from the revenue problems involved, any change from the per capita system would necessarily complicate the forms, instructions, and the withholding tables. With the continuation of a broad base, which is now around 45,000,000 taxpayers, it is necessary that the tax computations be made simple, and, under the present law, the taxes of the wage earners in the lower groups are computed by the collector. Under any new system, the collector would be required to check the exemption values to see whether proper values were assigned single persons, married persons, or dependents. Additional computations would also be required of the taxpayer with greater possibility of error. Now, that the taxpayer has become familiar with the per capita system, and the system in the collectors' offices is now geared to that system, it would cause added confusion to change over to another system.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

THE CLOSED SHOP—EDITORIAL FROM MEDFORD (OREG.) MAIL-TRIBUNE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks—because I wish to be associated with the contents of the editorial—an editorial entitled "More About the Closed Shop" published in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of January 29, 1947. The editorial is written by a distinguished editor, Robert W. Ruhl.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE ABOUT THE CLOSED SHOP

In a very long and thoughtful editorial regarding the closed shop the Portland Oregonian concludes, among other things, that it cannot—we quote:

"With good moral or political conscience endorse the principle of the closed shop, for it believes that the right to work is at least as sacred as the right to strike * * *. The closed shop is morally incompatible with a system of government which guarantees the freedom of the individual."

Well, that is a pretty strong argument against the closed shop, and from the standpoint of theory might be termed quite convincing.

But just what does it add up to from a practical, coldly realistic standpoint?

Is it really true, for example, that, under conditions as they exist today, the right of the individual to work is denied by the closed shop? We think not.

He can't work in a closed shop unless he joins the union. But he can work in an open shop. And according to the latest statistics, there is not a trade in existence which is 100 percent unionized.

So that statement that the right of work is denied is not factually correct.

As long as there are "closed" and "open" shops operating in this country—as long as the former is not mandatory and the latter not prohibited—it can't truthfully be said an individual has to join a union to get work.

There are over 50,000,000 workers in the United States today, and almost all of them are now employed. Yet only a comparatively small percentage belong to unions. Which means literally millions of nonunion men and women must be gainfully employed today.

That is the situation as it actually exists.

We don't deny labor leaders want all the workers and shops unionized, and are striving toward that end. But until that is accomplished it can't be claimed the sacred right to work for those who wish to work is denied. It may be harder for a nonunion worker to get work, but it certainly is not impossible.

Now as to the freedom of the individual.

Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, John Doe takes a job and buys a suburban lot at the same time. For the latter he gives money; for the former, skill and training.

Soon after he takes the job he is asked to join the union and pay dues; and about the same time his suburban lot is taken into the city, and he is asked to pay city taxes and perhaps certain special assessments for improvements.

There is no doubt of this.

The union has raised the standards of labor immeasurably, the benefits that labor enjoys, and therefore the value of the job John Doe has taken.

There is also no doubt the improvements involved in becoming a part of the city—sewer, paving, lights, fire and police protection, etc.—have greatly increased the value of John's suburban property.

But let us assume further that John Doe doesn't like either idea.

He is, let us say, a rugged individualist. He wants to preserve his sacred freedom both as far as joining a union and paying city taxes are concerned. Why should he be forced to join a union and pay union dues if he doesn't wish to? Why, by the same token, should he be forced to become a city resident and pay city taxes, if he doesn't wish to?

Well, the answer in both instances is he can't be.

No city can force a property owner to pay taxes, no union can force a worker to join a union and pay dues.

But in both instances John can't have his cake and eat it, too. He can't enjoy the benefits of union membership, nor the benefits of a city residence unless he shares the expenses and responsibilities of them.

If he wants neither, then he will have to find a place to work outside of a union and a place to live—or hold property—outside of a city.

We are not trying, however, to uphold the "closed shop" on principle. We are merely trying to give a picture of this problem as we see it today rather than as it is so often portrayed by those who oppose it.

As far as the Mail-Tribune is concerned—as has been stated before—we are against both prohibition and compulsion as far as the closed shop is concerned. When labor and management want a closed shop we believe there should be no law preventing it. And when they both want an open shop there should be no law preventing that.

Until some system of labor courts are established there should be no compulsory or prohibitory labor laws whatever.

Labor and management should be entirely free to bargain as they wish and select any system of shop control they may consider mutually satisfactory.

When, however, in a vital industry where the welfare of the country becomes involved, just what management or just what labor prefers should not then we believe be the first consideration.

The first consideration should be the public welfare, and maintaining it.

And there should be some authority—we don't care precisely how it might be organized or what it might be called—but some authority which could step in when the two interested parties cannot agree, and a tie-up is threatened, and tell both sides what to do, so that the vital industry may continue to function and the people of the country need not suffer.

R. W. R.

ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM — EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Witch Hunt or Inquiry?" published in the New York Times of February 3, 1947. The editorial deals with the activities of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITCH HUNT OR INQUIRY?

The Senate War Investigating Committee, reconstituted by an almost solid party vote, is settling down for what promises to be a prolonged inquiry into excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency, in the home-front conduct of the Second World War. Its first session, in Washington on Friday, emphasized its partisan character. Its Republican majority on that day met and heard the first witness nearly an hour before floor leader BARKLEY, according to his own statement, knew "who was going to compose the minority membership of the committee." There was an explanation. The witness in question, Brig. Gen. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, was in a hurry. He was retiring from the Army Friday night and going on a honeymoon trip. Still, this was not an auspicious beginning for an inquiry which can be of value only if it is judicial.

The Republican majority did not go out of its way even to seem judicial. If it had followed the spirit, if not the letter, of the Congressional Reorganization Act, it would have referred the investigation to the regular Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, chairman of this committee, voted with three other Republicans that this be done. But Senator AIKEN is apparently under suspicion as being almost too judicial. Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, who seems not to be similarly suspect, is the chairman of the special committee.

The Democrats may be pardoned if they fear that this investigation has some connection with next year's Presidential campaign. It will have such a connection, no matter what happens. But if the Republicans wish to make political capital with fair-minded people they will not go on a witch hunt; they will conduct a scrupulously fair-minded inquiry.

DISPLACED PERSONS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "DP's," published in the Washington Post of February 4, 1947. I urge Members of the Senate to read the editorial. It very largely confirms my own observations during the months of November and December of a number of DP camps in Germany.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DP'S

Secretary Marshall has told the Jewish Labor Committee that he has a special concern for the million displaced persons in the western zones of Germany. It is no reflection upon our new Secretary of State to say that these people have been almost buried in such sentiments. Action has become the only test of special concern. By the end of June UNRRA will be withdrawn from the job of supervising the DP camps. In its place there will be the new International Refugee Organization set up 3 months ago by the United Nations Assembly. But the task of getting the IRO under way is proceeding at a snail's pace. Even Great Britain, which has been in the van in championing the cause of the refugee, has not yet seen fit to sign the IRO constitution. To be sure, there are enough signers to enable the United Nations to set up an interim organization, but the laggardliness of some of the nations does not augur well for the success of the undertaking.

The displaced persons in Germany are of all nationalities, including even American. In numerical strength the Balts and the Poles are first and second, respectively. The Jews, with almost 200,000, are third. A misconception to which Secretary Marshall unwittingly lent countenance when he expressed his special concern to the Jewish Labor Committee is that the DP's are all Jews. The only common denominator among them is their objection to life under totalitarian rule, Fascist or Communist. All they ask is that they may be permitted to start life anew in a free country. It was out of this material that the New World was created. Surely this love of freedom should warm our hearts to these unfortunate folk.

It is untrue to suggest that they all want to come to America. None of the Jews have any such desire. They all want to go to Palestine, and 100,000 of them could have been accommodated if the British had accepted, without the fatal equivocation that encouraged the Arabs, the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine set up at the instance of the British Government. The others are ready to go anywhere except to despot lands.

It is a sign of moral decline that the conscience that these people display is regarded with suspicion. The fear is that maybe they would turn out to be agitators. No investigation warrants any feeling that agitation is their stock in trade. The fact is that in

these displaced camps all the skills and crafts in the calendar are represented. If a new country wants doctors and dentists, it will find them among these folk. If an old country is lacking farm workers and miners, the camps are a source of supply. And they are all eager to work. If, of course, they are left idle for too long a period, they may turn out to be unemployable, though we doubt this in the case of these sturdy and independent people, for the camps (as we have seen for ourselves) are run by the DP's themselves, and the first rule is that no drones are tolerated. It is one of the ironies of the times that Britain and other countries of western Europe are complaining of a labor shortage when there is this reservoir of labor at hand in the DP camps.

The special concern of the United States should be expressed in action in conformity with our traditions and our necessities. This is still the land of the free, where men have built a great country on the ideals that these DP's cherish. This land of ours is short of certain types of labor. Nobody asks that we abolish our restrictions on immigration in helping to solve the DP problem. But we could so adjust the quotas as to see they are all used up and that refugees are included. The existing law would permit an annual immigration of 153,879, yet we are now receiving quota immigrants at the rate of about 80,000 a year. The President has indicated his wholehearted support of such an adjustment as would enable us to give hospitality to 39,000 refugees a year. But only a sixth of that number had been received in the year just ended. It would be a demonstration of our special concern if we stopped viewing the refugee problem as merely an abstraction in a vacuum and eased the way for at least the handful that the President had in mind.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY—NOMINATION OF DILLON S. MYER

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business has been concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. And has the Senator from Florida been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida was recognized and yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency. The nomination was favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday. In view of the delay which has occurred with respect to this nomination I now ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority be immediately considered, and the nomination confirmed forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, this nomination had previously been placed on the calendar, and had then been recommitted to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY. I will explain the matter if the Senator will permit.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I ask for an explanation.

Mr. TOBEY. The nomination of Mr. Dillon S. Myer was submitted by the President 2 weeks ago or more. It came to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which considered the nomination, after having held a hearing on it for an hour and a half. Then on motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] the nomination was reported unanimously by the committee.

Subsequent thereto some gentlemen appeared at the office of the Senator from Indiana and told him they wanted to object to the nomination and to present certain charges to the committee. He brought them to my office. They spent an hour and a half with me a week ago Saturday. They asked for an opportunity to appear before the committee and give their evidence as to the nomination of Mr. Myer. Yesterday was the day on which they were to appear before the committee. Before the committee convened they withdrew their opposition and did not appear. There was no testimony presented in opposition to Mr. Myer. Two committee members, however, voted against reporting his nomination favorably. Eight committee members voted to report the nomination favorably.

Mr. President, in view of the delay in making the appointment and in view of the fact that Mr. Myer's nomination was overwhelmingly voted out of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and in justice to him, I ask unanimous consent that his nomination be considered immediately and that he be confirmed forthwith, instead of the nomination having to go to the calendar and action upon it wait until Friday next when I cannot be present.

I renew my request for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

TREND OF FOREIGN POLICY UNDER REPUBLICAN AUSPICES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, upon the very eve of the all-important Foreign Ministers' Conference at Moscow, to determine the future of Germany and therefore, in the light of history, the future of war in the world, we have from Mr. John Foster Dulles, famed Republican adviser on foreign policy, speaking to the National Publishers' Association on the 17th day of January past, the latest declaration of Republican policy on Germany and the forces making for peace or war.

I rise to discuss this important pronouncement of Republican foreign policy by Mr. Dulles not in the mechanical terms of a soft peace or a hard peace for Germany. My concern is a just peace, and a lasting peace, a peace that will insure that the next generation of Americans will not have to slog through the muddy fields of another Flanders, as did their grandfathers in 1918, or dive into the same foxholes in Normandy which sheltered their fathers in 1944.

It is then from the standpoint of a just and lasting peace that I must take issue with this new proposal of Mr. Dulles, which so clearly and unmistakably would smash the terms of the Potsdam agreement and replace it with the dangerous and discredited doctrine of a western bloc and the rebuilding of a powerful Germany.

This statement from Mr. Dulles comes on the heels of a series of declarations by Republican leaders on the political and economic aspects of our foreign policy. The able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, speaking recently at Cleveland, ignored the announced recommendation of General Marshall and threw his full weight, without qualification or reservation, behind the Chinese faction which General Marshall had found corrupt, incompetent, and, in a large measure, antidemocratic.

In the same Cleveland address the Senator from Michigan would have us lead our sister American Republics into a common hemispheric defense pact with Argentina, in the face of the stern declaration by the then Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, that Argentina had not purged itself of its fifth column of Nazis or its Nazi confederates.

Within the past few weeks leading Republican House Members have introduced legislation to suspend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and on this floor the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has denounced the Trade Agreements Act as a gigantic hoax, provoking the New York Times to inquire in a recent editorial, "Which way for Republicans?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the editorial referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Nebraska said that he spoke for himself, but at the same time, according to the press, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other leading Republicans advised the Under Secretary of State, Mr. William L. Clayton—and I quote their words—"not to go too far"; that is, not to exercise his full authority under the Trade Agreements Act.

During the past week, Republican Senators HICKENLOOPER, KNOWLAND, and

VANDENBERG insisted, in hearings on the confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, that the military be allowed to sit in on every session of the Commission in such a way that it would virtually become an integral part of the Commission. Their insistence suggests the reversal of the decision duly made by the President and the Congress that, true to the traditions of our Government, the civil authority shall always be superior to the military. Such suggestions moved the Washington Post, in a recent editorial, to say:

It is an issue which ought never to have arisen in a free society. The very consideration of it suggests a condition of panic. For the subordination of the military to civil authority is the cornerstone of the concept of government by consent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial referred to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PEPPER. So now, in the short space of a few weeks, in a series of declarations supporting reaction in China and Argentina, trying to reverse our trade-agreements program for international economic collaboration, and repudiating Potsdam, the Republican Party has emerged from the cloak of a bipartisan foreign policy and is causing more and more concern to people who ask whether it is the same Republican Party with the same policy which undermined the foundations of peace and prosperity after the First World War.

Mr. Dulles, its chief spokesman, speaking on the 25th of January to a Republican women's organization, has served notice on the people of the United States and of the world in unmistakable words that the only bipartisan foreign policy his party will agree to must be their policy. I quote from his address, as reported in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 26, 1947:

A Democratic President and his Secretary of State can propose, but a Republican Congress can dispose. Foreign diplomats know that, and they suspect what we know—that 2 years from now, a Republican will be in the White House. So these foreign governments will not take very seriously American proposals which are backed only by the Democratic Party.

Like many other Americans, I have sensed a steady and growing Republican pressure to force our foreign policy away from the policy of firm international collaboration for peace so carefully built by President Roosevelt. At times I have felt that the administration has been called upon to pay too high a price, under those circumstances, for bipartisanship in our foreign policy.

But now, in his speech of January 17, which goes to the very core of the peace problem, the chief Republican spokesman on foreign policy, Mr. Dulles, so completely ignores the Potsdam agreement, solemnly entered into by this Government, and all that has been done under it, including territorial changes and the moving of millions of people from or to distant homes, that I wonder if he is meaning to suggest not only that the Republican Party will be decisive in all future agreements entered into by this Government but also that any agreements entered into in the past without Republican representation are not to be regarded by the world as binding. Surely those powers which have been concerned that the United States has already been whittling away at the integrity of the Potsdam agreement, solemnly entered into by our Government, will not have their confidence in the integrity of the Potsdam agreement enhanced by any such declaration on the part of so eminent a Republican spokesman as Mr. Dulles, especially when he presumes to speak with the authority of both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the titular head of the Republican Party. For in his address Mr. Dulles declared that he had cleared his speech with the Senator from Michigan and Governor Dewey.

In order to understand clearly how far Mr. Dulles and the Republican Party propose to thrust this Nation and the world along a new path in foreign policy by subverting the Potsdam agreement—and lest it be obscured by those cunning interpreters who seek to obliterate great differences by small words—let us examine what Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States sought to accomplish at Potsdam. It was the industrial and military disarmament of Germany, the sterilization of Germany as a war-making power which they sought at Potsdam. The problem the Allies faced at Potsdam and the importance of the solution were brilliantly formulated by America's distinguished elder statesman, Mr. Bernard Baruch, in his testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee:

No more important question ever will come before you than this one—of how to prevent the revival of Germany's war-making might. It is the heart of the making of the peace; it is the heart of the keeping of the peace. What is done with Germany holds the key to whether Russia, Britain, and the United States can continue to get along. It will affect profoundly the jobs and livelihoods of everyone, everywhere, for none of the economic problems of the peace can be solved except in the light of German reparations policy and the measures taken to demilitarize Germany's traditional war economy.

It was against the Prussian-dominated, conquest-mad, inhumanly savage Germany, which had made criminal war upon France three times and upon Europe and the world twice in 70 years, that the agreement was drawn at Potsdam in the summer of 1945, by the nations that had borne the anguish of Germany's two wars of conquest in a quarter of a century. Churchill, Attlee, Stalin, Roosevelt, Truman, Byrnes, Marshall, Harriman, and many more helped fashion the instrument to remove the claws from this war maker.

The Potsdam agreement, hailed throughout the world not as the savage, but as the solemn, resolve of her victims at long last to stop Germany's war making, strove relentlessly to cut out the very war-making organs from the German body. It provided for the prosecution of German war criminals of all kinds; for getting the Nazis out of any sphere of leadership in German life; for the eradication of Germany's military machine, including the general staff; for the industrial disarmament of Germany by the removal of the industrial equipment with which Germany prepared for and waged war, and such tight control over the German economy that while it would produce for the German people a standard of living equal to the average of European nations it would provide no margin for war making. Under the agreement, a dual purpose was served in the detachment from Germany of a portion of her eastern territory, namely, the partial compensation of Poland for territory awarded to the Soviet Union in line with the Curzon Commission award, and putting Polish and Soviet power in those areas, notably Prussia, where in the past German offensives have been conceived, mounted, and launched.

Potsdam did not destroy the German Nation or the German people, nor did it condemn the German people to poverty. On the contrary, let me repeat that it allowed the German people a level of living equal to the average living level of their neighbors in Europe. It contemplated that they could and would enjoy the blessings of democratic government and continued unity as a nation and people. But, if carried out, Potsdam did mean that Germany would never again be able to wage war upon the world, and Potsdam did mean that Germany should continue to be the common concern of those nations who had been her major victims, and not the shameless ally of any of her victims against the others in any future plans or any future war. I declare that nothing has been said by President Truman or Secretary Byrnes or, so far as I know, until Mr. Dulles spoke, by any American representative for foreign affairs which has altered this basic concept of our duty to American dead who lie all over the world today, victims of criminal German wars.

The architects of Potsdam knew the German and the European economies. They knew that Germany's war weapons were forged in the German industrial areas of the Ruhr and the Rhineland, and that in this area lay not only the threat of another war but the cruel mastery of the whole European economic system as well. Rather than rely upon the cooperation of many hands to restrain a new German giant in the future, the men at Potsdam wisely chose to keep Germany from becoming a giant again. In short, they proposed by the removal of industrial equipment from the Ruhr and the Rhineland, along with the alienation of the industrial area of Upper Silesia, to shear the hair of the German industrial Samson and to keep it shorn. German war-making plants were to be removed to countries in western and eastern Europe which had been the victims of the German war, as partial reparations for the devastation wrought.

Now Mr. Dulles, making a major foreign-policy speech dealing with the future of Germany—a speech which he says has the approval of Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Dewey—upon the very eve of the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, turns his back upon the Potsdam agreement. What does Mr. Dulles propose in its place?

First. He proposes that the Rhineland and the Ruhr, with their vast industrial resources, shall not be industrially disarmed, but that instead their power be revived—a power whose only justification in the past was warfare, military and economic.

Second. Mr. Dulles proposes that this revived industrial heart of Europe be integrated in some unspecified fashion into the economy of three western European countries—France, Belgium, and Holland.

Third. He proposes a federal form of government for Germany.

Using the loose analogy of the American form of government, Mr. Dulles says that—

> Such precedents suggest that it is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany.

I deliberately emphasize the last words, for these are the heart of his proposals.

Mr. Dulles obviously proposes to nullify the spirit and letter of the Potsdam agreement. His proposals would restore to Germany the power to wage war upon the United States and the world and to dominate the economies of western and eastern Europe, all of necessity, of course, with American capital. They would continue the rule of cartels in world trade; they would create a blood clot in the arteries of the United Nations by setting up a western bloc based upon a restored Germany and directed against the assumed threat of eastern Europe. Here is a blind repetition of the criminal folly committed after the last war, when Germany was rearmed, allegedly against eastern Europe; but in fact a monster was created, destined to devour tens of millions of men, women, and children of the world, including half a million Americans.

To see more clearly the threat to the peace of the United States and of the world contained in Mr. Dulles' proposal to rearm Germany industrially and to create a western bloc, let us go back to the tragic era between the last two wars. France, bled and battered by two German invasions in 44 years, protested to the limit of her ability against adding strength to a Germany which, though defeated, emerged from World War I potentially the strongest nation in Europe. But the powers did not heed France's entreaty. Ostensibly frightened by the bogey of the new Soviet Union, the powers, step by step, restored and rearmed Germany; yes, they even armed Hitler.

Mr. Dulles himself, in his book, War, Peace, and Change, published in 1939, justifies this policy. Said he:

> Far from being sacred, it would be iniquitous, even if it were practicable, to put shackles on the dynamic peoples (the new Fascist regimes) and condemn them forever to acceptance of conditions which might become intolerable.

Even as late as 1939, Mr. Dulles could not see a rearmed, Nazi, Hitler-led Germany as any threat to us, for he said:

> Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplates war upon us.

To build her war weapons, with which she nearly conquered the world, Germany had steadily altered and expanded her economy until nearly 50 percent of it was directly devoted to war-making purposes. In building up that economy, she had designedly, but deviously, come to dominate the trade of the nations of Europe. It was this German economy, organized and expanded as it was, which was the real war-making power of Germany. Its coming to fruition was the death sentence, Mr. President, to 50,000,000 men, women, and children, including nearly half a million Americans, in the space of 6 years.

It was the unspeakable crime which this Germany perpetrated upon mankind which moved Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, testifying before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on June 22, 1945, to warn:

> Economically, this settlement (referring to the peace settlement) must break once and for all Germany's dominance of Europe. Her war-making potential must be eliminated; many of her plants and factories shifted east and west to friendly countries; all other heavy industry destroyed; the Junkers estates broken up; her exports and imports strictly controlled; German assets and business organizations all over the world routed out.

Those who studied Germany, after the end of the war, discovered that all the damage inflicted upon Germany during the war had not destroyed her war-making power. In December 1945, the Foreign Economic Administration of our Government stated:

> Although today Germany is militarily defeated, and its economic life is temporarily at a standstill, the industrial base of its aggression—the base which it built up over the last 25 years, and which enabled it nearly to conquer the world—is virtually untouched. With industrial capacity, technological and scientific organization, and economic assets owned outside Germany, and an integrated control of a highly centralized economy, Germany is still a potential threat to the safety of the world.

It is known that neither the German people nor the German economy suffered so much in the war as did their victim neighbors in Europe. In fact, it was a calculated part of Hitler's sinister strategy that if Germany should lose the war, it would still win it by emerging stronger than its neighbors whom he, with fiendish design and efficiency, murdered, tortured, diseased, starved, and plundered. Five million Jews alone in Europe he butchered. Generations cannot repair the strength of the peoples of Europe which he sapped, and for decades Europe will suffer from the economic debility and chaos into which he thrust it.

Perhaps the peace of the world would better be served if the newspapers were to publish each day a small box on their front pages showing the diets and standards of living of the countries of Europe. Let me read you from a New York Times story of Monday last, headed, "World Food Survey Shows Where Aid Still Is Needed. War's Hunger Aftermath Hitting Hardest at China, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia. End of UNRRA a Blow." The story is a round-up from New York Times correspondents all over the world. The story from Belgium is headed "Belgium's status good"—and points out that the basic ration in Belgium provides 1,503 calories. The story from Germany, on the other hand, is headed, "Germans pull in belts"—and what is the basic ration in Germany? It is higher than the basic ration in Belgium—1,550 daily calory ration—and the authorities are planning to raise it to 1,800 calories. So powerful is the reactionary propaganda today looking to the rebuilding of Germany that the higher rations of the aggressor are bewailed, while the lower rations of the nation she overran are considered good. I had not expected to see international policy based on the maudlin sentiment of those who weep over the sad plight of the convicted criminal while ignoring the victims he maimed or killed.

To realize the full force of Mr. Dulles' proposals to rebuild Germany, let us contrast them for a moment with Mr. Baruch's advice on the eve of Potsdam:

Mr. Baruch says: "Economically, this [German] settlement must break once and for all Germany's domination of Europe." But Mr. Dulles would restore Germany's domination of Europe.

Mr. Baruch warns: "[Germany's] war-making potential must be eliminated." But Mr. Dulles would rebuild that war-making potential.

Mr. Baruch says the method of disarming must be removal—"Many of [Germany's] plants and factories shifted east and west to friendly countries." But Mr. Dulles would halt the transfer of German plants and factories—few would go to the west, and none to the east.

Mr. Baruch says, "All other [German] heavy industry must be destroyed." But Mr. Dulles would keep German heavy industry working at high levels. He would destroy none of the heavy industries that provide the sinews of war, and would even rebuild those that are destroyed or damaged.

Now this proposal of Mr. Dulles is not basically new, although it wears a new guise. It is the dangerous doctrine of all those who have been seeking for almost 30 years to pit west against east, to use Germany as the industrial and military wedge to split the world in two. It was the doctrine that motivated the loan of billions of dollars for rebuilding Germany after World War I. It is the doctrine which animated Tory appeasement of Germany under Baldwin and Chamberlain. It was the doctrine that brought the closest collaboration of British, French, and American monopolists with their German counterparts. And it was the doctrine of Churchill's Fulton, Mo., speech, which the American people generally repudiated. It is a doctrine not of the millions of American voters who supported the Republican Party but rather of a handful of American monopolists, bankers, and banker-generals, who have dominated its policies since the War Between the States.

Mr. Dulles knows that his proposal would nullify the spirit and purpose of the Potsdam agreement. He knows that the restoration of the industrial strength of the Ruhr and the Rhineland under German ownership in alliance with a western bloc will deprive the nations in other parts of Europe of the benefits of German production; will keep the econ-

omies of other nations in Europe hobbled in relation to Germany; will keep eastern Europe, which needs industrialization more than any other part of Europe, a continued prey to German domination; will retain Germany's economic mastery over Europe; will lead, of necessity, to demand for American capital to restore the industrial capacity he envisages; will lead inevitably to new cartel agreements to fit Germany into world trade; and, finally, that it means that Germany is again prepared for war, not only upon eastern Europe, but upon western Europe, the United States, and the world.

Mr. Dulles knows that his plan is designed to ally a reborn Germany with the west of Europe against the east of Europe. He knows the effect of such a proposal is permanently to divide the wartime allies, to give provocation to those forces in east and west who are already disposed to distrust each other.

Mr. Dulles knows that what has moved him in drawing his plan is his hatred for the Soviet Union and that, in the hope that Germany would use it again against eastern Europe and especially the Soviet Union, he has been willing to propose to put in Germany's hands another sword like unto that with which she was armed by the short-sighted such a few years ago and with which she has drawn rivers of blood from suffering mankind not only in the Soviet Union but in America and over the world.

I declare, Mr. President, that Mr. Dulles by proposing to rearm Germany for any reason threatens war to his own country and his own kind. He is opening again the shameless doors of another Munich leading to what will be the world's worst war.

It must be a matter of great concern not only to the powers of eastern Europe and the Balkans, but no less to France, Belgium, and Holland, as well as the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries, to hear Mr. Dulles' proposal for the restoration of Germany's industrial war-making power. Let me emphasize that France does not propose control of the Rhineland exclusively by the Western powers. Those nations, I believe, have learned from sad experience—which in some cases has brought back to them the harvest of their own tragic errors—a lesson Mr. Dulles appears not to have learned, namely, that Germany, by history written in blood, is public enemy No. 1 among the nations and peoples of the world.

I say such a proposal coming from Mr. Dulles must be of great concern to all the nations of Europe because of Mr. Dulles' known position and his announcement that he speaks with the approval of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the titular head of the Republican Party, dominant in the American Congress.

I will not anticipate what will be the influence of Mr. Dulles' declaration, so authenticated, upon the course of Secretary Marshall at Moscow.

For my part, I can only hope and believe that Secretary Marshall—having personally fought German militarism in two wars, and knowing the price of both victories, having been at Potsdam and being sustained by the President, and by the people of this country who fight and pay the price of wars—will go on in the spirit of Potsdam, and, before God and mankind, solemnly covenant and cooperate with all peace-loving nations to save the world from another war.

I believe and hope:

That we shall speed up the prosecution of war criminals in Germany, whether militarists, industrialists, or officials;

That we shall continue the purge of Nazis from all leadership in German life;

That we shall stamp out all forms of militarism in Germany, and particularly the devilish German staff, which has thrice fomented German war;

That we shall effectively disarm Germany industrially so that she shall not have the power to wage war, removing as reparations for the countries which suffered from German devastation all the German plant capacity not necessary to maintain an average European level of living for the German people.

Mr. President, we may have different opinions in America about the policy of Generalissimo Joseph Stalin, but I believe all Americans generally will agree with one remark he made to me in an interview in Moscow in 1945, when, with the utmost solemnity, he pressed his fist against the table and said, "Never again must Germany and Japan be permitted to become able to wage war upon the world."

Mr. President, further I believe and hope:

That German exports and imports shall be properly controlled;

That neither German militarists nor industrialists shall be allowed to plan another war or to conceal their war-making power in any part of the world, including Spain and Argentina;

That German education and German life will be infused with democracy and that only democratic elements, parties, and forces, in Germany will be recognized or assisted by any of the Allied Powers;

That the program shall be administered by an international authority based on the Big Three and the other countries most concerned.

Such a policy, Mr. President, can and will, I submit, lead the world to peace through the United Nations. Such a policy will avoid the road to war through the gates of a cartel internationale to the strains of a hymn of hate.

I shall say no more in criticism of Mr. Dulles' proposal, but since Mr. Dulles is chairman of an honored church committee, speaks inevitably with the prestige conferred by that high office, I shall leave it to an organ of the Episcopal Church to sum up the case against Mr. Dulles' proposal. In its issue of January 30, the weekly magazine, the Witness, on whose board of editors sit some of the most influential clergymen of that church, we find the following judgment:

> It is the obligation of the people of those churches to inquire whether his (Mr. Dulles') proposal moves in the direction of the just and durable peace they have commissioned him to seek, also whether it is in harmony with the principles set forth in what is popularly called the social creed of the churches. * * *
>
> What pagan logic of geopolitics is it that wants "to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe * * *"? Does the sacredness of personality stop at that line? Are the people of eastern Europe to be denied the equal rights to all available opportunities for development, which has been a basic principle in all versions of the church's social creed from the first draft? * * *
>
> The road to moral influence is the same as the road to peace. It is the cooperative use of economic power for the development of all the peoples of the earth according to those principles which were set forth by our churches long before they were ever embodied in the Atlantic and United Nations Charters.
>
> Since Mr. Dulles' plan is contrary to these principles, he should be asked to resign as chairman of the commission of a just and durable peace of the Federal Council of Churches and from his positions of leadership in the World Council of Churches.

Mr. President, while Mr. Dulles works to rebuild the industrial mastery enjoyed by western Germany, other Republicans complete the tragic picture by urging the return to eastern Germany of those provinces now occupied by Poland under the Potsdam agreement. I shall not argue the historical and ethnic claims of Poland to that territory, valid as they are. I point now only to the incalculable mischief such a proposal involves—the deepening of distrust and suspicion between East and West, the encouragement of the always dangerous German supernationalism, the misery, privation, and despair of millions of Poles who are now permanently settled—at least they believe so—in those provinces. A Polish industry has been painfully built up there; Polish farms are now beginning to flourish there; and historic Polish institutions of learning, having been laboriously transplanted from the East to Silesia, hundreds of miles, are now creating a new Polish culture in those very same provinces which once gave birth to that culture.

In the light of the recent Republican declarations with respect to China, Argentina, the reciprocal-trade agreements program, and the military control of atomic energy and now capped by the open repudiation of Potsdam, as many believe, and the proposal to set up a western bloc incorporating an industrially rearmed Germany—I say, Mr. President, in the light of these pronouncements, let us ask the question which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] once asked about the policy of one of our allies: What is the Republican Party up to?

We cannot tell, after 1 month of Republican domination in the Congress what will be the ultimate destination of the party, but we are beginning to be able to tell at least the direction in which it is going. Enough points put down in sequence will begin to form a line.

If what has been said by Republican leaders is a clear indication of the direction of the Republican Party, it only remains to determine how far the line will

reach and with what speed it will be continued. The Republican Party is convicted before history of leading this country in the period between two wars through the gates of alleged collaboration to the treacherous path of isolation in the political and economic affairs of the world. In that period this policy of isolation generally took the negative form. It kept us out of the League of Nations, the World Court, and economic collaboration. But it gave us also in world politics and world economics the strategy of dollar diplomacy. The Government was not used on behalf of the people for peace, but, too often, on behalf of the corporations for profit.

We saw American policy under Republican leadership relieve Germany from paying her due reparations, and instead, American loans, billions of dollars of them, were given to Germany, making us, knowing or unknowing, collaborators in the policy embraced by some European nations of building up a strong Germany as a buffer state against eastern Europe.

We saw a majority of the Republican Party prior to the war oppose the effort of the Government first to throw its weight against Hitler aggression; second, to rearm this country for its own security; and third, to assist the victims of Hitler's aggression, even with economic aid. We know now how dangerously near the brink of disaster those policies brought America and the rest of the world. I will add with pleasure that with the outbreak of war, and through the war, and in many instances since the war, the Republican Party, acting through the able senior Senator from Michigan, reversed its old policy and rendered a valuable contribution not only in winning the war but in laying the foundations of a stable peace in an orderly world.

But, Mr. President, what many people of America feared when the Republican Party came to power after the last war was whether it would carry through with its promised collaboration. It did not do so last time. Many voters in the election of 1920 considered the Republican Party the best vehicle to achieve United States entry into the League of Nations, and many Republican leaders of great stature, such as Ex-President Taft and Mr. Elihu Root, campaigned upon such a platform, but after his election President Harding declared, "The League is dead."

The question today in the minds of every nation in the world—yes, the question in the minds of the ordinary man and woman in America who wants peace through international working together, is, Will America this time move forward upon a high course or will it go back to the tragic road it followed after the last war? It was the Republican Party which gave America direction at the end of the last war and took us down into the abyss that led eventually to depression and war. The Republican Party is again in control of Congress. Again it must assume the responsibility of giving direction to America's course in the world. If the Republican Party fails America it will make America fail the world again.

If these statements of Republican leaders—and they are not all I could name—are any sign, if they are a sign in the political sky, even though no larger than a man's hand, of the direction of the Republican Party, the course it is following is ominous to the future of America and to the future of the world.

That is the reason, Mr. President, I now call attention to it, with the candor and directness which the gravity of the situation warrants. I raise this issue that this question as to where we are headed can be asked of their party by the rank and file Republicans of this country—by all people who want peace, who want international prosperity, with full employment and well-being at home. It is in the early stages of a disease when care and treatment may prevent long illness or death itself.

If these declarations of responsible Republican leaders are not in the direction that the rank and file of the Republican Party and, indeed, the rank and file of the American people want and so earnestly pray for, it is time that the leaders reexamine their declarations and their steps and, before it is too late, turn about to the course which will be in accord with the ancient democratic, nonimperialistic traditions of America, which will bring us into cooperation with the truly democratic forces and peoples of the world, which will make American leadership the way to, not of war and poverty, but of peace and plenty for mankind.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1947]

WHICH WAY FOR REPUBLICANS?

In his attack on the Hull reciprocal-trade-agreement program as "a gigantic hoax on the American people," Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, says that he is speaking for himself alone and not for the new Republican majority in Congress. We hope that on this issue he will continue to speak for himself alone, or at most for a small company of like-minded colleagues, and that this first blast in the new Senate against the Hull program does not forecast a breaking (on economic grounds) of the present bipartisan front on questions of foreign policy and a return by the Senate Republicans to their prewar position of economic isolation.

What is this gigantic hoax about which Mr. BUTLER is aroused? It is a 12-year-old plan, carefully worked out in theory and in practice, to reduce tariff rates moderately and gradually, in return for equivalent reductions by other nations, in order to widen the area within which goods can be profitably exchanged. The plan is strongly supported, on the basis of experience, by many of our most important, and certainly our most far-sighted business, financial, and farm interests. Its advantages are many-sided. It opens markets for American products. It brings foreign products within reach of the American consumer, who is precisely the same person as the American producer, and thereby serves as a check on an inflationary rise of prices. It strengthens the economy of those nations which believe with us in the merits of the free-enterprise system. It strengthens the free-enterprise system here at home, because it encourages the expansion of production; and the alternative to an expansion of production, as we have seen from fairly recent experience, is curtailment of crops and industrial output on the Government's initiative (AAA and NRA) and an inevitable increase of that very governmental regimentation which the Republicans themselves profess to abhor. Finally, this Hull program corresponds with the realities of our creditor position as a nation.

Here is the United States, with about $11,000,000,000 of its privately owned capital invested abroad and with more billions of public funds outstanding in foreign countries in the form of the lend-lease settlements, the new credit to Britain and constantly increasing loans (for essential and commendable purposes) being made by the Export-Import Bank from day to day. How are interest and principal on this huge public and private investment to be paid? It cannot be paid in gold, for we have already cornered most of the world's monetary gold and we could not put any more gold to good use even if we got it. It cannot be paid in silver, for we have enough silver mines of our own. It cannot be paid in foreign paper money, for we will not accept paper money in such transactions, and the paper would be of no value to us if we did, unless we converted it into foreign goods. Foreign goods, in short—goods we need and can use and will buy if they become available without the penalty of too high tariffs—provide the only medium through which international obligations can be settled. Any proposal to increase the difficulties in the way of such settlement is sheer folly from the point of view of a creditor nation like the United States.

There is an immensely practical political consideration in all this, as well as the considerations which arise from a sound view of public policy. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the Republican Party has benefited greatly, in a political way, from the broad bipartisan agreement which has been achieved on such questions as the United Nations, on Russia, and on the atomic bomb. The existence of this broad agreement on foreign policy has made it possible for the Republican Party to rid itself, in the eyes of the independent voters of the country, of much of the old and unfortunately well-earned charge of prewar isolationism, and enabled it to focus the attention of the voters, and particularly of the independent voters, on the domestic, and more vulnerable, record of the Democratic Party during the long period of its present ascendancy in Washington. This advantage will be lost, and the Republican Party will find itself once more in the position of having to convince the independent voters that it is not the party of isolation, if Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, is permitted to lead a Republican crusade against the Hull trade program.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post of January 29, 1947]

ATOMIC HEARINGS

The old issue of civilian versus military control of atomic energy, threshed out and seemingly settled in the long debate last summer over establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission, has been raised again in Senate hearings on the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal. It is an issue which ought never to have arisen in a free society. The very consideration of it suggests a condition of panic. For the subordination of the military to civil authority is a cornerstone of the concept of government by consent. It is astounding to find this principle called into question by men of Senator VANDENBERG's or Senator MILLIKIN's caliber.

Senator MILLIKIN asked Mr. Lilienthal on Monday: "Why shouldn't the military liaison board sit in on all Atomic Energy Commission meetings? What would be the difficulty?" It is a testimonial, we think, to Mr. Lilienthal's self-control and tact that he was able to treat this query as a rational one. The answer, of course, is that this would put the Army precisely in the position from which the Senate with so much difficulty ousted it last summer—on the Commission itself. The long contention between the House and Senate, between the May-Johnson bill and the

McMahon bill, was whether the military, as such, should have Commission membership. Senator VANDENBERG, out of a regard, we suppose, for the principle of civilian supremacy, was one of the sponsors of a settlement which denied membership to the military while providing for a due recognition of their interest and importance through a military liaison board. It is indeed paradoxical to find him now "underscoring" a proposal that would put the Army back in the saddle.

Still more strange is the fantasy entertained by Senator KNOWLAND that all meetings of the Atomic Energy Commission should be attended by members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. This would amount, patently, to a direct violation of the separation of powers enjoined by the Constitution. It is not the business of the legislature in our political system to engage in the day-to-day details of administration. Senator KNOWLAND'S proposal, also "underscored" by Senator VANDENBERG, would leave the development of atomic energy to a committee of Congress instead of to the Atomic Energy Commission created by Congress for this express purpose. Nothing like such an invasion of the executive domain has been suggested since Civil War days when Ben Wade and some of his congressional colleagues sought to take over from President Lincoln and his Cabinet the management of the war effort. And, in their behalf, it could at least be said that they were trying to prevent, not to promote, military domination.

In the present position of international relations, it cannot be doubted that the military aspects of atomic energy are of prime importance. David Lilienthal understands this as well as any Senator. He can be counted upon to be as zealous as any general for the maintenance of American superiority in the atomic field. Patriotism is not an attribute peculiar to men in uniform. And nothing, indeed, could be more inimical to the safety of the Nation than the idea, born of hysteria, that only the Army can keep a secret, only the Army can shape policies for our defense. The Army has already demonstrated its incompetence in the development of atomic energy. In peacetime, scientists will not, because they cannot, work under its sterile domination. From the viewpoint of expediency, therefore, military control is self-defeating. From the viewpoint of principle, it is thoroughly abhorrent.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dal M. Lemmon, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harvey Erickson, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5, 1947:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Clarence Self Ridley (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Henry Conger Pratt, United States Army, retired September 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. James Eugene Chaney (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Joseph Warren Stilwell, United States Army, died October 12, 1946.

Lt. Gen. John Clifford Hodges Lee (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Robert Charlwood Richardson Jr., United States Army, retired October 31, 1946.

Lt. Gen. Oscar Wolverton Griswold (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. William Hood Simpson, United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Lt. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Harold Lee George, United States Army, retired December 31, 1946.

Lt. Gen. Charles Philip Hall (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel, United States Army, retired January 31, 1947.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Maj. Gen. George Fleming Moore (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Harold Lee George, United States Army, appointed major general July 18, 1946.

Maj. Gen. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr. (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, United States Army, resigned July 22, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Walter Melville Robertson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Henry Tacitus Burgin, United States Army, retired August 31, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Archibald Vincent Arnold (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. William Edga. Shedd, United States Army, retired August 31, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Junius Wallace Jones (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. James Lawton Collins, United States Army, retired August 31, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Louis Aleck Craig (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig Gen. Maxwell Murray, United States Army, retired September 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Frank William Milburn (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Thomas Alexander Terry, United States Army, retired September 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. George Jacob Richards (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Fulton Quintus Cincinnatus Gardner, United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Charles Wolcott Ryder (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Edward Postell King, Jr., United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Stafford LeRoy Irwin (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Richard Kerens Sutherland, United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. John William Leonard (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Daniel Isom Sultan, United States Army, died January 14, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Clarence Self Ridley, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Grandison Gardner (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. James Eugene Chaney, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Brig. Gen. Franklin Otis Carroll (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. John Clifford Hodges Lee, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Charles Carl Chauncey (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Oscar Wolverton Griswold, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Michael Powers (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Charles Philip Hall, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, to fill an original vacancy.

Brig. Gen. James Kirk (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the

United States as Assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. Gladeon Marcus Barnes, United States Army, retired.

Brig. Gen. Spencer Ball Akin (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Maj. Gen. Harry Clyde Ingles, United States Army, who retires March 31, 1947.

Brig. Gen. William Herschel Middleswart (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. John Brandon Franks, United States Army, deceased.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 26, 1946:

TO BE PROFESSOR OF ELECTRICITY AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Col. James Wilson Green, Jr., (major, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Orval Ray Cook (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr. (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Malcolm Cummings Grow (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Eugene Martin Foster (lieutenant colonel, Finance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. George Warren Mundy (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Leander Putt (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Maurice Morgan (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps, temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Samuel Robert Brentnall (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Norton Yates (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Craig Stewart (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hubert Don Hoover (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Ernest Marion Brannon (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin Kennedy Wright (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Turner Ashby Sims, Jr. (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Eustace Maduro Peixotto (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Bryant LeMaire Boatner (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James McCormack, Jr. (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. William Henry Draper, Jr. (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Earle Levan Johnson (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS OF THE LINE

Maj. Gen. Sumter de Leon Lowry, Jr., Florida National Guard, to date from September 12, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Norman Everard Hendrickson, Minnesota National Guard, to date from September 15, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Frank Cramer, Connecticut National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Maj. Gen. William Hamilton Sands, Virginia National Guard, to date from October 23, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Charles Christian Haffner, Jr., Illinois National Guard, to date from November 7, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Leo Myron Kreber, Ohio National Guard to date from November 11, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Ray Cook Fountain, Iowa National Guard, to date from November 19, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Jim Dan Hill, Wisconsin National Guard, to date from November 19, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Edward James Stackpole, Jr., Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from November 20, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Arthur Teece, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 29, 1946.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE

Brig. Gen. Winston Weidner Kratz, Missouri National Guard, to date from July 3, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Stanford Willis Gregory, Colorado National Guard, to date from August 6, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Hal Lowndes Muldrow, Jr., Oklahoma National Guard, to date from September 5, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Philip Charles Bettenburg, Minnesota National Guard, to date from September 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Charles Clarence Curtis, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from September 30, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Charles Ralph Fox, West Virginia National Guard, to date from October 10, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Louis Evans Boutwell, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. John Uberto Calkins, Jr., California National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. David Philip Hardy, California National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Chester Arthur Files, Rhode Island National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Harrison Hudelson, California National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Howard Sanford Searle, Kansas National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Roy Washington Kenny, Oklahoma National Guard, to date from October 22, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Elgan Clayton Robertson, Arkansas National Guard, to date from October 22, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Reginald William Buzzell, Vermont National Guard, to date from October 28, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Otto Edward Sandman, California National Guard, to date from October 30, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Edward Clark Rose, New Jersey National Guard, to date from October 31, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Richard Smykal, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 7, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Cooper, Ohio National Guard, to date from November 11, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Cecil Brainard Whitcomb, Ohio National Guard, to date from November 11, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Bursk Strickler, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from November 20, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Harry Lynn Bolen, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 29, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Alexander Gallatin Paxton, Mississippi National Guard, to date from December 2, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Clayton Price Kerr, Texas National Guard, to date from December 13, 1946.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS, ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Brig. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, California National Guard, to date from August 13, 1946.

Brig. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., Massachusetts National Guard, to date from September 30, 1946.

Brig. Gen. George Hilton Butler, Tennessee National Guard, to date from October 4, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Vincent Henry Jacobs, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1947:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dal M. Lemmon to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph E. Brown to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

Harvey Erickson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 5, 1947:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Rilla M. Schaffer to be postmaster at Idanha, in the State of Oregon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. H. Calvin Knock, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Scottsbluff, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the source of knowledge and truth and in Thy hand is the destinw of mankind. Thou hast endowed men with many rights, privi-

leges, and opportunities. Thou hast blest our land abundantly and beyond our comprehension. The freedom we enjoy comes from Thee.

We confess that we have not always been good stewards of these sacred trusts. Our eyes have been blinded by selfishness in our search for truth and our hearts have been enslaved by indifference and prejudice when Thou hast sought to lead us. Liberate us from the shackles which prevent us from doing Thy will.

Each new day is a symbol of Thy eagerness to forgive our shortcomings and our failures and affords us an opportunity to renew our search for the virtues of the Christlike life. Our hearts are filled with gratitude for Thy many blessings.

We ask Thy benediction upon the three branches of our Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. We pray for the citizens of our land that they may realize their responsibilities as loyal members of this Nation. We pray for the people of other nations and lands that they, too, may have the blessings rightfully belonging to them.

In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 3, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present Mr. BOB JONES, the newly elected Representative from Alabama, to take the oath of office and to become a Member of this body.

He was elected on the 28th of January. No contest or question as to his election has been made. His certificate is on the way, although it is not yet available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Thereupon Mr. ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MINORITY VIEWS ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 27

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable RAYMOND SPRINGER, will file a majority report from the Committee on the Judiciary today on House Joint Resolution 27. I ask unanimous consent that the minority, or those of us who care to, may have until midnight to file our minority views, to be incorporated with his report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] on Wednesday next, February 12, be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Abraham Lincoln, the anniversary of whose birthday we celebrate on that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 12, after the address by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Kosciusko, the anniversary of whose birthday is on that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR RULES COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to meet while the House is in session for 1 week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ARNOLD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the Polish elections.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Honorable William S. Bennet, former Member of the House.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two brief editorials.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include newspaper and magazine articles.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include correspondence between the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, and the Chancelor of the British Exchequer relative to the Argentine agreement.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from a constituent and in the other a telegram sent to the President of the United States by the Governor of Nebraska.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator from Connecticut, before the Washington League of Women Voters on February 3, 1947.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER CANCELED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as an example of bureaucratic autocracy at its worst and as showing how defense of large appropriations for clerk hire can be built up, I invite to the attention of the Congress the substance of a letter recently received by the Department of Labor and the consequent action of this Department. Some few days ago it received a letter signed by the national secretary of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, alleging that disputes between the union and employers existed as per an appended list; not as you might reasonably expect at a few plants, but at 1,500 separate establishments. Then the Department of Labor, taking the list as

gospel—which they say is based on a ruling by the former Attorney General—sent out 1,500 letters over the signature of a Bernard Greenberg, docket officer, to 1,500 employers telling them that a dispute existed at their plants and that therefore a 30-day conciliation period was in effect, during which they were expected to adjust the dispute. Yes, 1,500 letters to 1,500 manufacturers telling them that in their plant a dispute existed; which must have been a shock to a lot of them. True or not, and I cannot imagine that 1,500 disputes in one industry—nonbasic steel—suddenly existed—and in the case of my constituent, and certainly many others, it is just not true—can you believe it sound procedure to send out 1,500 letters, at a cost of say, a dollar each, on the say-so of some labor leader without questioning the accuracy of his allegations? But there was no such question in the minds of the Department, action was automatic and instantaneous. Is this merely an example of a silly ruling by the former Attorney General based on a misconception of activities of the business world; and which ought to be changed by an application of common sense; is it on the other hand perhaps a flagrant exhibition of the cowed attitude of one of our bureaus in dealing with an aspect of labor relations; is it merely an example of the automatic service we desire from our clerical help for which we must set up money in our budget, or is it another example of a bureau flushed with power demonstrating their authority over helpless—and sometimes almost hopeless—manufacturers? Was it silly, or was it sinister—and shall we continue such procedure? I ask it, but the Congress must answer it.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 36, Rept. 14), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1947, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 90, Rept. 15), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That rule XI (1) (h) of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) For the purpose of performing such duties the committee, or any subcommittee thereof when authorized by the committee, is authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to employ such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures within the amount authorized or appropriated as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM CHINA

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present herewith a privileged resolution (H. Res. 80) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession relative to the withdrawal of our troops from China and to give full information in his possession relative to the basis of said decisions and of the withdrawal from the committee of three which was seeking a unified China and cessation of civil war.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 80) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to the withdrawal of troops from China, having considered the same, reports thereon without amendment, and recommends that the resolution do not pass.

In making this adverse report on House Resolution 80, the Committee on Foreign Affairs wishes to call attention of the House to action already being taken by the committee. On January 29, 1947, the chairman inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (page A344) the text of a preorganization subcommittee report and a committee resolution outlining the purpose of the committee to make a detailed study of the organization, the personnel, and the policies of the Department of State.

An invitation has already been extended, pursuant to this committee resolution, to the Secretary of State "to cooperate with the committee in such study and to furnish all necessary information" and the committee has agreed "to safeguard such information against any disclosure which is incompatible with the public interest."

Inasmuch as the Committee on Foreign Affairs has received a cordial response from the Secretary of State, and has initiated action to make a detailed study of the policies of the Department of State, including the subject matter of House Resolution 80, it is felt that no useful purpose would be served by its adoption.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I am happy to yield to our former colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is apparently an adverse report from the committee because the committee feels that it is going to take up the subject matter of the resolution which I introduced asking why practically all of our troops were removed from China. Of course, I feel that if the committee does that promptly, and gives us all of the information, which I am sure it will, it will not be incompatible with the public safety. There is really nothing more that I can say. I do urge speed upon the committee. I remember when General Marshall was Chief of Staff he was very eager to have the War Department answer every possible question asked it by a Member of Congress, pledging himself to secrecy, if necessary. So I have confidence that General Marshall and the Committee on Foreign Affairs will give us the information. And may I ask the gentleman if they will act promptly upon the withdrawal of troops from China?

Mr. VORYS. Answering the question of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, as the report shows, the committee has already launched upon a study of this and other matters and has received assurance of full cooperation from General Marshall. I think we all know how pressed the general himself is for time now. But the committee, making due allowance for that situation, is going forward with the study immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be helpful to have General Marshall's recent statement on the Chinese situation appear in full at this point in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, I shall not, I assume the Committee on Foreign Affairs expects to get all the information that is in the public interest but not make public any that it is not in the public interest to make known.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is perfectly correct in his assumption.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if a request has been made in another body for the same information?

Mr. VORYS. I do not know the facts as to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY GENERAL MARSHALL, JANUARY 7, 1947

The following is a personal statement by General Marshall on the situation in China:

"The President has recently given a summary of the developments in China during the past year and the position of the American Government toward China. Circumstances now dictate that I should supplement this with impressions gained at first hand.

"In this intricate and confused situation, I shall merely endeavor here to touch on some of the more important considerations—as they appeared to me—during my connection with the negotiations to bring about peace in China and a stable democratic form of government.

"In the first place, the greatest obstacle to peace has been the complete, almost over-

whelming suspicion with which the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang regard each other.

"On the one hand, the leaders of the government are strongly opposed to a communistic form of government. On the other, the Communists frankly state that they are Marxists and intend to work toward establishing a communistic form of government in China, though first advancing through the medium of a democratic form of government of the American or British type.

"The leaders of the government are convinced in their minds that the Communist-expressed desire to participate in a government of the type endorsed by the political consultative conference last January had for its purpose only a destructive intention. The Communists felt, I believe, that the government was insincere in its apparent acceptance of the PCC resolutions for the formation of the new government and intended by coercion of military force and the action of secret police to obliterate the Communist Party. Combined with this mutual deep distrust was the conspicuous error by both parties of ignoring the effect of the fears and suspicions of the other party in estimating the reason for proposals or opposition regarding the settlement of various matters under negotiation. They each sought only to take counsel of their own fears. They both, therefore, to that extent, took a rather lopsided view of each situation and were susceptible to every evil suggestion or possibility. This complication was exaggerated to an explosive degree by the confused reports of fighting on the distant and tremendous fronts of hostile military contact. Patrol clashes were deliberately magnified into large offensive actions. The distortion of the facts was utilized by both sides to heap condemnation on the other. It was only through the reports of American officers in the field teams from executive headquarters that I could get even a partial idea of what was actually happening and the incidents were too numerous and the distances too great for the American personnel to cover all of the ground. I must comment here on the superb courage of the officers of our Army and marines in struggling against almost insurmountable and maddening obstacles to bring some measure of peace to China.

"I think the most important factors involved in the recent break-down of negotiations are these: On the side of the National Government, which is in effect the Kuomintang Party, there is a dominant group of reactionaries who have been opposed, in my opinion, to almost every effort I have made to influence the formation of a genuine coalition government. This has usually been under the cover of political or party action, but since the party was the government, this action, though subtle or indirect, has been devastating in its effect. They were quite frank in publicly stating their belief that cooperation by the Chinese Communist Party in the government was inconceivable and that only a policy of force could definitely settle the issue. This group includes military as well as political leaders.

"On the side of the Chinese Communist Party there are, I believe, liberals as well as radicals, though this view is vigorously opposed by many who believe that the Chinese Communist Party discipline is too rigidly enforced to admit of such differences of viewpoint. Nevertheless, it has appeared to me that there is a definite liberal group among the Communists, especially of young men who have turned to the Communists in disgust at the corruption evident in the local governments—men who would put the interest of the Chinese people above ruthless measures to establish a Communist ideology in the immediate future. The dyed-in-the-wool Communists do not hesitate at the most drastic measures to gain their end as, for instance, the destruction of communications in order to wreck the economy of China and produce a situation that would facilitate the overthrow or collapse of the government, without any regard to the immediate suffering of the people involved. They completely distrust the leaders of the Kuomintang Party and appear convinced that every government proposal is designed to crush the Chinese Communist Party. I must say that the quite evidently inspired mob actions of last February and March, some within a few blocks of where I was then engaged in completing negotiations, gave the Communists good excuse for such suspicions.

"However, a very harmful and immensely provocative phase of the Chinese Communist Party procedure has been in the character of its propaganda. I wish to state to the American people that in the deliberate misrepresentation and abuse of the action, policies, and purposes of our Government, this propaganda has been without regard for the truth, without any regard whatsoever for the facts, and has given plain evidence of a determined purpose to mislead the Chinese people and the world and to arouse a bitter hatred of Americans. It has been difficult to remain silent in the midst of such public abuse and wholesale disregard of facts, but a denial would merely lead to the necessity of daily denials; an intolerable course of action for an American official. In the interest of fairness, I must state that the Nationalist Government publicity agency has made numerous misrepresentations, though not of the vicious nature of the Communist propaganda. Incidentally, the Communist statements regarding the Anping incident which resulted in the death of 3 marines and the wounding of 12 others were almost pure fabrication, deliberately representing a carefully arranged ambuscade of a marine convoy with supplies for the maintenance of executive headquarters and some UNRRA supplies as a defense against a marine assault. The investigation of this incident was a tortuous procedure of delays and maneuvers to disguise the true and privately admitted facts of the case.

"Sincere efforts to achieve settlement have been frustrated time and again by extremist elements of both sides. The agreements reached by the Political Consultative Conference a year ago were a liberal and forward-looking charter which then offered China a basis for peace and reconstruction. However, irreconcilable groups within the Kuomintang Party, interested in the preservation of their own feudal control of China, evidently had no real intention of implementing them. Though I speak as a soldier, I must here also deplore the dominating influence of the military. Their dominance accentuates the weakness of civil government in China. At the same time, in pondering the situation in China, one must have clearly in mind not the workings of small Communist groups or committees to which we are accustomed in America, but, rather, of millions of people and an army of more than a million men.

"I have never been in a position to be certain of the development of attitudes in the innermost Chinese Communist circles. Most certainly, the course which the Chinese Communist Party has pursued in recent months indicated an unwillingness to make a fair compromise. It has been impossible even to get them to sit down at a conference table with Government representatives to discuss given issues. Now the Communists have broken off negotiations by their last offer which demanded the dissolution of the National Assembly and a return to the military positions of January 13 which the Government could not be expected to accept.

"Between this dominant reactionary group in the Government and the irreconcilable Communists who, I must state, did not so appear last February, lies the problem of how peace and well being are to be brought to the long-suffering and presently inarticulate mass of the people of China. The reactionaries in the Government have evidently counted on substantial American support regardless of their actions. The Communists by their unwillingness to compromise in the national interest are evidently counting on an economic collapse to bring about the fall of the Government, accelerated by extensive guerrilla action against the long lines of rail communications—regardless of the cost in suffering to the Chinese people.

"The salvation of the situation, as I see it, would be the assumption of leadership by the liberals in the Government and in the minority parties, a splendid group of men, but who as yet lack the political power to exercise a controlling influence. Successful action on their part under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek would, I believe, lead to unity through good government.

"In fact, the National Assembly has adopted a democratic constitution which in all major respects is in accordance with the principles laid down by the all-party Political Consultative Conference of last January. It is unfortunate that the Communists did not see fit to participate in the assembly, since the constitution that has been adopted seems to include every major point that they wanted.

"Soon the Government in China will undergo major reorganization pending the coming into force of the constitution following elections to be completed before Christmas Day 1947. Now that the form for a Democratic China has been laid down by the newly adopted constitution, practical measures will be the best. It remains to be seen to what extent the Government will give substance to the form by a genuine welcome of all groups actively to share in the responsibility of government.

"The first step will be the reorganization of the state council and the executive branch of government to carry on administration pending the enforcement of the constitution. The manner in which this is done and the amount of representation accorded to Liberals and to non-Kuomintang members will be significant. It is also to be hoped that during this interim period the door will remain open for Communists or other groups to participate if they see fit to assume their share of responsibility for the future of China.

"It has been stated officially and categorically that the period of political tutelage under the Kuomintang is at an end. If the termination of one-party rule is to be a reality, the Kuomintang should cease to receive financial support from the Government.

"I have spoken very frankly because in no other way can I hope to bring the people of the United States to even a partial understanding of this complex problem. I have expressed all these views privately in the course of negotiations; they are well known, I think, to most of the individuals concerned. I express them now publicly, as it is my duty to present my estimate of the situation and its possibilities to the American people who have a deep interest in the development of conditions in the Far East promising an enduring peace in the Pacific."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1915 when the trumpets of war agony were sounding over the earth, Booker Taliaferro Washington died of overwork at the age of 59.

Theodore Roosevelt said of him that more than any person he ever knew, Booker T. Washington lived the faith of Micah to do justice, love, mercy, and walk humbly with God.

Thousands of Tuskegee graduates testify to the vision of Booker Taliaferro Washington and the 100 buildings there are a monument to his zeal. Degrees from Harvard and Dartmouth testify to the beneficence of his work. His amazing progress from slavery to leadership is a shining symbol of hope and assurance. His endeavors in the education field speak eloquently of the rightness of his philosophy to advance his race by instruction in a useful calling.

This work must go forward. No prayer is more effective than the prayer of work. No shrine is more ennobling than one which diffuses knowledge.

The Seventy-ninth Congress authorized the striking of memorial coins in honor of the achievements of Booker T. Washington and his contribution to the Nation. These will be sold at a premium and the proceeds used for the establishment of a school and shrine at the birthplace of this great yet humble man.

How fitting that in the month of February 1947—the month of Lincoln's birth anniversary—a drive should begin to market these coins and provide the funds with which to advance the work of a just man who came up from slavery. Surely this is a worthy cause.

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, last year, as a private citizen, I was opposed to the $3,750,000,000 loan to Great Britain. Most of the people in my section of the country were opposed to it. The GI could not understand why his terminal-leave pay had to be bonds while this loan to England was being passed. With the passage of the Loan Act, we all accepted it with good faith and expected, as we were told, that it would promote free trade and world peace. We still hope that it will be paid back in spite of the fact that England has been notorious in default of its obligations to this country in past years.

The real point I wish to bring to the attention of this Congress and to the American people is the amazing revelation that Great Britain is not adhering to the letter of this agreement. It is my understanding, from reliable sources of the press as carried in our leading papers, that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, wrote Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, last week protesting to him what this country considered a violation of the loan agreement as regards British trade with Argentina. The astounding thing about this revelation is that it is the second note dispatched to England in 4 months protesting a violation of the principles of the loan agreement. All of this coming so soon after the passage of the act, when a large part of the American people were led to believe that England was only interested in adjusting her economy and promoting world trade and better economic relations throughout the world, is disappointing to the people of this country who sympathized with the supposed objectives of this loan.

Under the present trade agreement between Britain and Argentina, in the years during which the British sell more goods to Argentina than they buy from her, Argentina can get part of the money owed her by Britain but can spend it only within the British Empire. This is a violation of the principles of the loan agreement which emphasized a free flow of trade. It is feared that England will pursue this same policy in trade agreements with other countries and lead to a monopolistic and selfish flow of world trade in favor of the British Isles.

I am most sympathetic toward the postwar problems of Great Britain and can fully appreciate her contribution to the Allied cause during World War II, as I served in that country as an enlisted man in our Air Forces.

I wish to remind this Congress of the fact that during the depression of the early 1930's, the United States was hardest hit of all the great world powers. The main cause for such a severe depression in America was the falling off of our export market. After a few years, when our production has filled domestic demands, it will again become necessary for us to export the products of our industry to prevent unemployment and another depression. The Bretton Woods proposals and this recent loan to England were supposed to promote free trade and help forestall another world-wide depression. I believe America should vigorously oppose any violation of the principles of any loan agreement to any foreign country, not only to protect our interest but the interest and economy of all nations. This Congress is the guardian of the tax money of the people, and we should make sure it is not loaned or given around the world to nations that violate the principles of sacred agreements.

The national debt of the United States today is nearly as large as the combined debts of all the nations of the world, and much larger than the combined debt of all the Allied Nations. It might be well for us to bear in mind these facts when considering any future loans to foreign countries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to hear these indirect attacks made upon England because I think I know that in the family of nations England is the only substantial friend we have. I think I also know that if the Empire should go to pieces, we would be in a position most difficult to defend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a magazine article and in the others to include copies of bills he expects to introduce today.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act and to extend his remarks in the RECORD in another instance and to include an article which appeared in the Infantry Journal.

A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER FOR BOSTON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts veterans, seeking advice or help under the GI bill of rights, are often required to trudge to seven separate and scattered buildings in the city of Boston, before they can find a solution to their individual problems.

This is a wasteful and demoralizing state of affairs which can be remedied only by support of the bill which I am introducing, providing for the erection of a Veterans' Administration building in downtown Boston at a cost of $5,000,000.

This will not only insure a consolidation of the present patchwork of veteran agencies making for more efficient and convenient service to the veterans, but will, in fact, be a saving to the Government.

At present, in Boston, we are paying high rentals for seven individual facilities. If this decentralized policy continues much longer, we will have paid out in rentals alone a sum approximately the cost of a permanent Government building.

This is not good service, and it is not good business.

Veterans are confused and disgusted. The physical separateness of the various branches of the Veterans' Administration has resulted in a deplorable lack of coordination. In too many cases, checks for authorized allowances to veterans have been held up for months because an agency in one part of the city does not know what another agency is doing. Under one roof, these dislocations would be minimized.

More than a year and a half ago, 20,000 signatures were forwarded from Boston to Washington, calling for the building of a new Veterans' Administration center for Boston, without any remedial action being taken.

In the meantime, the snarl has become worse, and public opinion is insistent that delay is no longer excusable.

To the proponents of economy, I suggest that favorable action on my bill would not only implement our commitments to the veterans, but would simplify the work of the Veterans' Administration in our area to a noticeable degree.

But, more than that, a new Veterans' Administration building for Boston will convince the veterans that we are doing our share of the job, adequately and efficiently.

They have every right to expect this from us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the legislative program and any other special orders that may have been granted, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. DEANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. I. C. Eaker at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on January 22, at a luncheon given for the members of the Wings Club on the subject A Plan for National Security.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

INCREASED SUGAR ALLOWANCE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of the people from my congressional district are greatly disturbed over the allocation of sugar. The fact is, our housewives do not have enough sugar. They do not have sufficient sugar for table use and for cooking purposes, and they have very little or no sugar for canning. This situation must be remedied. Quite recently I was scanning the sheets of a paper, entitled "Food Topics," of date January 13, 1947, in which a picture appeared of a huge storage plant, at Green Bay, Wis., in which it was stated that "sugar decontrol will release this 6,000,000 pounds of beet sugar, stored at Green Bay." A picture accompanied the article, and sacks of sugar appeared, stored to the ceiling of the huge plant—all there to remain until the sugar decontrol becomes effective.

I urge that the allocation of sugar be liberalized, to the end that our housewives, and our homes, will have more sugar for domestic use.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks an article appearing in Food Topics, of date January 13, 1947, upon this same subject. The article follows:

SEE SUGAR BOOST OF 2 TO 5 CENTS IN 5-POUND LOTS

Sugar prices will jump between 2 and 5 cents on 5-pound lots within a few months, sugar experts advise Food Topics, as the result of an increase in the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index which, under agreement, determines rates paid to Cuban growers. Increased transportation rates also will have an effect.

During the fortnight, numerous other developments on sugar were reported. They are:

1. Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, New Hampshire, will introduce a bill to halt present sugar restrictions.

2. Congressman JENKINS, Republican, Ohio, chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, said that both rationing and price control of sugar can be safely abolished late in 1947.

3. Whether sugar allotments will be increased in the United States depends on how much sugar the International Emergency Food Council permits to be shipped to England, Canada, and other countries.

INDUSTRY MAY GET MORE

4. Clinton P. Anderson said: "Barring unpredictable disaster, there will be enough sugar during the first 3 months of this year to permit giving consumers one additional 5-pound ration stamp by April 1." Industrial users may be permitted 10 percent more than they now are receiving (60 percent of their 1941 base use), Mr. Anderson said.

5. Retail grocers associations have adopted resolutions asking that shipment of sugar to foreign countries be curtailed. Included are the Ohio Retail Food Dealers Association, the Northern Kentucky Independent Food Dealers Association, and the Portland (Maine) Food Dealers Association.

6. Cuba reports 11,000,000 bags are needed to pack sugar. Cuba estimates that five and one-half to five and three-fourths million tons of sugar will be harvested this year.

CUBAN SUGAR PRICE UP

Food price increases in the United States during the third quarter have already increased the price of Cuban sugar. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' food price index for November increased 4 percent over October. If the December index equals the November figure, sugar dealers say that this will hike Cuban sugar to 4.85 cents per pound. The growers now receive 3.675 cents per pound

This increase to Cuban growers, plus an increase in freight rates (effective January 1) amounting to 10 cents per hundred pounds of sugar, is expected soon to reflect in the consumer price.

There is considerable speculation in Washington whether Congress will pass a bill continuing the Second War Powers Act. The act expires March 31. If no action is taken, this will end the present ration controls on sugar. Rice and sirup is also under control.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ascertain what the program is for the next few days. I imagine our majority leader can give it to us. Are we going to meet every other day, and for how long, or what is the program?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit, later on in the day I think perhaps we can make some statement about it. Certainly a statement can be made tomorrow. The gentleman may not have been present, but I received unanimous consent that when the House meets tomorrow it meet at 11 o'clock. We expect to call up the bill just reported from the Committee on the Judiciary limiting the tenure of Presidents to two terms. The Rules Committee has until midnight tonight to file the rule. If that is disposed of on tomorrow, it is the intention to adjourn over until Monday. Then I will be in a position to announce the program.

Mr. REED of New York. Do I understand we are to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

BLUEPRINT PAPER AS A LUXURY

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, our bureaucrats continue to rule without rhyme, reason, or regard for the public interest. Last month the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, reversing a ruling in effect for 5 years, decided that blueprint paper—the paper used for the plans and drawings of all housing and other construction—is a luxury, subject to the 15-percent luxury excise tax on photographic equipment and apparatus. Thus the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has arbitrarily increased the cost of every housing job in the country.

I have today introduced a bill to correct this stupidity and I trust that it may quickly be enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

REPUBLICAN TAX PROGRAM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called compromise tax-reduction program suggested by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] may be the politically expedient thing to do, but it is contrary to an election promise made by our Republican leaders last fall, and it is in direct conflict with a prepared statement issued last week by the Republican Members from Illinois, to which statement the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. ALLEN] subscribed. That statement pledging a 20-percent income-tax reduction went to every newspaper in Illinois only yesterday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if such a compromise program is adopted it will be an open acknowledgment that the income-tax rates of our present tax laws are unjust and inequitable; that they place a heavier tax load upon the man in the lower brackets than his fair share, and therefore this inequity should now be adjusted. I do not agree with that position. I voted for the present tax rates upon incomes, because I believed them fair, just, and equitable; distributing the heavy load of taxation upon the basis of ability to pay. I give credit to the Democratic Party for preparing and passing such an equitable tax measure, and I do not propose to readjust the tax load on the basis of political expediency in lieu of upon the basis of ability to pay. The present much-too-heavy tax load, forced upon the Nation by the New Deal era of squanderlust, is at present adjusted upon the basis of ability to pay, and a 20-percent reduction straight across the board will keep the tax load spread equitably.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities be permitted to sit tomorrow during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 70) to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former life-saving service, which originally was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service be rereferred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I have discussed the matter with the chairman of both committees and there is no objection to the rereference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ADMIRAL MARC MITSCHER

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, today at the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., will be laid to rest with full military honors one of our greatest naval heroes, Admiral Marc Mitscher, whose wartime task force shattered the Japanese air power.

Admiral Mitscher truly gave his life for his country.

Admiral Mitscher grew up in Hillsboro, Wis., in my congressional district. I am proud that he was my constituent. The people of Hillsboro are proud of Admiral Mitscher. The friends and neighbors in the old home town honored their hero in their biggest homecoming celebration in history when Marc Mitscher came back to visit with the home folks and old-time friends in Hillsboro last summer on his return from the greatest naval victory of World War II. The Japanese Navy was totally destroyed by the prowess of Admiral Mitscher's fleet and carrier task force.

Admiral Mitscher was a rugged fighter. He was a pioneer airman. "Pete" Mitscher, as he was affectionately called by his close friends, applied for pilot training shortly after graduating from the Naval Academy, and became one of the first naval officers to win his wings.

Admiral Mitscher conceived the idea of large-scale carrier warfare between fleets out of sight of each other. His pioneer spirit materialized into reality in World War II and was the major cause of the complete defeat of the Japanese Navy. Admiral Marc A. Mitscher and Admiral John S. McCain, who alternately commanded the Pacific Task Force, completely demoralized the Japanese Navy by alternately designating the Pacific Task Force as Task Force 38 and Task Force 58, according to which of them happened to be in command at the time. The Japanese Navy was thus tricked into believing that two major task forces of the United States Navy were roaming the Pacific. The resulting effect on Japanese morale was devastating, and the Japanese Navy was blown out of the Pacific.

Admiral Mitscher credited his air pilots as the best-trained fighters in the world. He knew them to be the best because he trained them and equipped them to be the best. He always maintained that his boys deserved full credit for what they did and insisted that the kids under his command received the military decorations and citations due them.

Admiral Marc Mitscher was loved by all who served him. Our country has lost a great naval hero. The kids who served under him have lost a true friend. Wisconsin is proud of the boy from Hillsboro who became one of the greatest admirals in the American Navy. I am proud to represent the Third District of Wisconsin, where Admiral Mitscher grew to manhood and made his home. The Nation mourns the loss of one of its most valiant heroes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis., entitled "To Avert Waste."

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include printed matter.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include excerpts from letters, newspapers, and magazines.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Albert H. Redles, entitled "A Serious Menace to Smaller Business in America."

Mr. KEAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include three editorials.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 20 minutes following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of Lincoln's birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANCY ACT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act which will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the land contained in what are known as land utilization projects. These projects are located in some 32 States and contain over 7,000,000 acres. Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, is introducing a companion bill in the Senate. I introduced a similar bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress, as I feel very strongly that these lands should be returned to private ownership.

This bill was written by officials of the Soil Conservation Service, which agency is now administering these lands. I have discussed this legislation with these men in the Department of Agriculture, and I believe everyone is now agreed that these lands should be sold. A preference is given to World War II veterans, and there is considerable interest among veterans in this legislation.

It is now costing the Government about a million dollars a year to administer these lands, much of which is leased for grazing and other agricultural purposes.

Most of this land was purchased by the Government more than 10 years ago. The purposes of the law were to retire submarginal lands and those not primarily suitable for cultivation. Much of the land was bought during and immediately after the drought period in the Western States. It was good land, but for several years the owners had not been able to cultivate the same, due to lack of moisture. In the past few years this land has been productive and has been leased by the Government to those owning adjoining lands.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose for which most of this land was purchased has long

since been accomplished. I see no reason for the Government to continue in the land business. This land should go back on the tax rolls in the respective counties and States.

As I mentioned, veterans of World War II are given the preference in buying this land, except where the present user of the land requires the same to make up an economic unit. In such cases the present permittee is given an opportunity to purchase the land at the appraised price and there is no interference with his operations. There is plenty of land available, and in some cases veterans must be allocated a large acreage because of the nature of the land. These details are being left to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I feel confident the program of selling this land can be carried out satisfactorily to all parties concerned.

I hope this bill will be favorably considered and passed by the House at an early date so that this land can be returned to private ownership with the least possible delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to introduce in the RECORD in my extension an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of Washington, January 27, together with six articles appearing in that paper referred to in the editorial with suitable introductory remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article on the foot-and-mouth disease.

EXCISE TAX ON TRAILER HOUSES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, when the Ways and Means Committee and the other affiliated committees of the House come down to the matter of definitely extending excise taxes, I hope it will be the good judgment of those committees to remove excise taxes from trailer houses. All over this country we find fine men and women who are forced to live in trailer houses in order to attend colleges and universities as well as to carry on their industrial duties. It does not seem to me fair to impose excise taxes on house trailers when no excise taxes are imposed on residential property otherwise used. I hope the committee will remove that tax.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS] for today and tomorrow, on account of official business on behalf of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members of this body who are interested in the welfare of the farmer realize that under the administration of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program agricultural tariff schedules have been cut 252 times and, further, to an average of 40 percent of that which they had been under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

As a result of these tariff cuts the importation of competitive agricultural products have increased 57 percent whereas our exports of agricultural products, have fallen off to 30 percent less than they had been in 1934, the year the Trade Agreements Act was enacted.

To those who have been applauding this progressive strangulation of our American protective tariff system this may be good news, but to the average American, the farmer in particular, those of other industries who have been singled out for slaughter, there is very little to cheer about.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to add my tribute to the many commendations that the Boy Scouts of America are receiving during this Scout Anniversary Week. For 37 years this organization, operating under a Federal charter from Congress, has been providing a constructive program for the boys of the Nation. Boys who once followed the trail to their Scout camps and learned their first aid and other skills are now men of affairs. Many of my fellow members in this assembly are former Scouts. I have been impressed by the evidence frequently given by these former Scouts that Scout training has helped them in their later activities, and above all that the lessons of good citizenship and right character that they acquired have been abiding forces through the years. At this time there are a million and a half boys who are getting Scout training. There are nearly 8,000,000 more who want it and need it. They may never receive it unless leadership and the help are forthcoming in their home communities. There is something each of us can do to help these boys, and that is to support the work of the Boy Scouts in an intelligent and forceful manner, as one means of insuring unselfish and patriotic citizens for the future.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 years the Committee on Un-American Activities has been on the trail of those foreign spies circulating through this country trying to get the secrets of the atomic bomb. We have been criticized in Congress, abused by a certain element of the press, and maligned over the radio as "witch hunters" and "hate mongers."

While we did not get the support we deserved in this country, we did get the help of the Canadian Government, which captured some of these spies and punished them.

It is amusing now to hear Mr. Barney Baruch, perhaps America's No. 1 self-advertiser, come out and yell for locking the door now that the horse is gone—or would be gone if it had not been for the Canadian Government.

I want you Members of the House to come down tomorrow and attend our hearing. We are going to have before the Committee on Un-American Activities the chief Communist agent in America.

If you do not know that this country is in danger and being undermined at home and insulted abroad by these elements, just come down and hear the testimony that will be developed before the Committee on Un-American Activities tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CONFUSION IN OUR EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days, I have received shocking new evidence of the incredible confusion which still reigns in some of our executive departments.

Representatives of our Government are scouring the country on purchasing missions seeking to buy sheets, towels, garments, and dozens of other items for the use of our hospitals, prisons, and other Federal institutions. At the same time, our Government agencies charged with the responsibility of disposing of surplus war materials are printing huge catalogs listing these very same articles for sale.

Our Government's right hand is concealing its assets from its left. We are going to incredible expense in a most inefficient method of seeking to sell our surplus goods while we ourselves are paying large sums of money for the very

merchandise we already have on our shelves in another department.

I am certain that this will blow up in a huge scandal when our purchasing agencies suddenly discover that they are about to buy back from private sellers materials which these private sellers themselves bought from our war surplus sales agencies.

There are thousands of khaki garments, towels, bed sheets, and similar items which are not of general sales value being offered for sale with few takers. Those same items ought to be channeled directly to our prisons and hospitals.

Anything less efficient than this is a direct and unconscionable abuse of Federal tax funds.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, while the Committee on Rules was in session passing on a resolution to investigate certain departments and other matters, I understand unanimous consent was given to take up the Presidential term-of-office bill at 11:30. May I call attention to the fact that a rule has not as yet been granted, and after it is granted I think that the chairman of the committee, if it is to be considered tomorrow, should have unanimous consent to file the rule during the day.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. That unanimous consent has already been obtained. The Committee on Rules has until midnight tonight to file the rule.

Mr. SABATH. I am mighty glad to hear that. Not because I am in favor of the resolution, but because in matters of this kind I am always pleased to aid the Republican side in the hope of promoting and bringing about orderly procedure.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Can the gentleman inform the House how many hours' debate have been allotted to this bill?

Mr. SABATH. The Committee on Rules will meet at 2 o'clock today to take up the rule on this resolution, and I am not now in a position to say how much time will be provided for general debate. I hope that Members will have ample opportunity to express their views on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it appears to be the intention of the leadership to bring before the House tomorrow for action a bill which would change the Constitution of the United States in that it would limit the terms of the President of the United States. It seems to me that is a very important measure. I trust that it is not the intention of the leadership to rush that bill through in 1 day, because it is so important a matter. I think we ought to have plenty of general debate on the subject and plenty of time for amendment, and if the Committee on Rules takes that into consideration in granting a rule, I think they will give us a couple of days on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's position. This is probably the most important question we will vote on, and there should be plenty of debate. I do not know what the Committee on Rules is going to do, but certainly it ought to allow plenty of time for the Members to discuss this all-important question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is an important matter, too. That is the reason we are going to do something about it. The measure was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary by a vote of 20 to 6, and I rather suspect the sentiment will be very much along that line.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not the question now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the time allowed should be adequate for Members to discuss this all-important matter. This is the second matter coming before the House. With all the other questions that could come before the House, this one to amend the Constitution is the second. Last week it was announced it would be reported out without hearings. Then hearings were held. It was announced before the subcommittee held hearings that the matter would be considered this week. We can interpret that and the people can interpret it. But one thing is certain, there should not be only 2 hours of debate. There ought to be at least 2 days of debate. In any event, limiting debate to 2 hours would be an unreasonable restriction.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman knows that it is within the province of the Committee on Rules to fix the time of debate, and it will do that this afternoon. The gentleman made a statement before the Committee on the Judiciary, and I take it he will have every opportunity to state the facts tomorrow. The fact of the matter is that the people of this country have been debating and discussing this matter for a long time, and the overwhelming majority clearly favors such action as this.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether or not that is so and whether or not the gentleman's statement is correct, the fact remains that Members with fixed opinions on the question should not be limited to an hour of debate on a constitutional amendment, one of the most important questions Members of the House, in their own conscience and without regard to party, will pass upon. It is unfortunate the leadership of the Republican Party, as far as the newspapers are concerned, have made it a party matter, and will vote on it in this Congress as a party measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT EXPENSES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a number of comments by radio commentators and certain editors and editorial writers who seem to follow the general theme that it is time for the Republicans to fish or cut bait. Some of them seem to indicate that the Republican Party, now in control of the legislative machinery of the Congress, is being utterly slow in cutting the expenditures of Government and driving unnecessary personnel off the pay roll.

I call attention to the fact, and I think every Member is familiar with it, that the Executive Department of the Government is now operating under appropriations that were made under the auspices of the present New Deal executive administration, and that unless we are able to rescind those appropriations they will continue in full force for expenditure until the end of the present fiscal year.

I want to assure the public and the people of America who are interested in economies in Government that the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are busily engaged in the onerous task of surveying the requests for appropriations for the next fiscal year. I assure the Members of Congress and the people of America that when these appropriation bills are reported, providing funds for the next fiscal year, you will see some very decided cuts brought to the attention of the Congress. As chairman of one of the subcommittees that is busily engaged in an effort to reduce the nonessentials

of Government, I hope you will stand behind your subcommittees and your Committee on Appropriations in the effort that will be made, first, to reduce the cost of Government and get rid of unnecessary instrumentalities of Government, and, when we balance the Budget and provide for a reserve, then to provide an equitable tax reduction across the board.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 81)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 I submit herewith my first annual report to the Congress on the activities of the United Nations and the participation of the United States therein.[1]

The Charter of the United Nations came into force as a fundamental law for the peoples of the world on October 24, 1945. The General Assembly convened for the first time in London in January 1946. It elected the Secretary-General and brought into being the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the International Court of Justice.

In December 1946, at the second part of its first session, in New York, the General Assembly completed its main organizational tasks by establishing the Trusteeship Council. Thus all of the principal organs of the United Nations have now been established. All of them, except the Trusteeship Council, have been working on their appointed tasks during most of the past year.

The policy of the United States, as I told the General Assembly in New York on October 23, 1946, is to "support the United Nations with all the resources that we possess * * ** not as a temporary expedient but as a permanent partnership."

That policy—in season and out—in the face of temporary failure as well as in moments of success—has the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. It must continue to have this support if the United States is to fulfill its appointed role in the United Nations, if the United Nations is to fulfill its purposes, and if our land is to be preserved from the disaster of another and far more terrible war.

In the work of the United Nations during the past year the United States has sought constantly to carry out that policy. Our representatives have spoken for the whole Nation. They have been Democrats and Republicans, members of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government, men and women from private life.

[1] On March 19, 1946, I transmitted to the Congress the report submitted to me by the Secretary of State on the first part of the first session of the General Assembly in London.

The work of the United Nations during the past year has been the work of building foundations for the future.

First of all, there have been the structural foundations. The Assembly, the Councils, the Court and the Secretariat have had a vast amount of organizational work to do in order to establish themselves as functioning agencies of the international community. Much of this has been pioneering work. The whole structure of the United Nations is a far more extensive endeavor in international cooperation than the nations have ever before attempted.

The essential parts of this structure include not only the principal organs established by the Charter. They include equally the specialized agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the proposed World Health Organization, and the International Trade Organization and several others. Each of these specialized agencies operates in a specific field under its own constitution. Each is or will be related to the central structure of the United Nations through the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. There is scarcely a field of activity having a common interest for the peoples of the world for which continuing instruments of international cooperation have not been developed during the past year.

Perhaps the most immediately significant development of the past year in this direction was the General Assembly's demonstration of its power to influence the policies of nations and to bring about greater understanding among them. The Assembly possesses few definitive powers. It makes recommendations that can be translated into effective law only by the action of the nations concerned. But the Assembly during its meetings in New York expressed a higher sovereignty of the people's will in a manner which promises much for its development as a dominant power for peace and progress in the world.

The building of the structural foundations of the United Nations during the past year has been accompanied by action over a very broad field toward giving life and meaning to the purposes and principles of the Charter.

There has been progress toward building security from war. Step by step we have advanced the first part of the way toward agreement on the essential principles of a truly effective international system of control over the means of destruction that science has placed in the hands of mankind.

The initiative in the control of atomic energy and other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction was taken by the United States. The resolution creating the Atomic Energy Commission was adopted at the first meeting of the General Assembly in London. The United States presented in the Atomic Energy Commission last June its proposals for international control of atomic energy. The Soviet Union opposed these proposals, but the Commission worked throughout the summer and fall to build the bases for agreement.

In October the Soviet Union introduced in the General Assembly proposals on the general regulation and reduction of armaments that seemed at first far removed from the United States position. Nevertheless, 7 weeks later the Assembly was able to adopt unanimously a resolution reaffirming all the principles of the atomic energy resolution and reflecting for the first time unanimous agreement on the essential principle of a system of international control and inspection established by treaty and not subject to any veto in its operations.

Two and a half weeks later, on December 31, the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted its first report to the Security Council. The report had been adopted by the Commission by a vote of 10 to 0, the Soviet Union and Poland abstaining.

Many months of hard work and difficult negotiation in the Security Council and the Atomic Energy Commission lie ahead. Not all the essential principles have yet been agreed upon. The problem of enforcement must still be resolved. All the principles must be given specific and practical application in treaties and conventions unanimously agreed upon.

This is one of the main tasks before the United Nations in the coming year. To succeed, we must at the same time build the other essential foundations of a general system of collective security. The nations can safely lay aside their arms only insofar as their security is protected by other means.

An essential element of collective security will be the ability of the Security Council to fulfill its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In its consideration of international disputes during its first year the Council demonstrated increasing power to ameliorate situations that otherwise might have become dangerous and to influence the policies of nations in the direction of upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter. This was generally true even when the five permanent members failed to reach the required unanimity for definitive action. The Security Council's application on a continuing basis of the public and peaceful methods of the Council chamber to the settlement of disputes between nations is a new development in international relations, the significance of which gives every promise of becoming more apparent in the year ahead.

Important steps have been taken by the United Nations during the past year toward economic reconstruction and toward establishing the necessary basis for an expanding peacetime trade and employment.

A draft trade charter establishing principles and practices aimed at increasing the volume of world trade and employment by reducing or eliminating artificial trade barriers and restrictions has been proposed by the United States and is now being developed by a preparatory committee of 18 nations. One

of the primary United Nations tasks of the year ahead is the adoption of such a charter and the creation of an international trade organization to carry it out.

The General Assembly has unanimously asked the Economic and Social Council to act on recommendations for the reconstruction and integration of the European economy and establishment of an economic commission for Europe. This commission would unite all the interested countries, including the Soviet Union on the east and the United States on the west, in a common program. Steps toward economic reconstruction and development in the Far East will also be undertaken by the Economic and Social Council this year.

Progress has also been made by the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies during the past year in many other respects. It is not too much to say that the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace will depend in large part upon the ability of the United Nations to carry through to a successful conclusion the work it has begun toward world economic recovery and cooperation.

The promotion and protection of basic human rights for all peoples is a fundamental purpose of the United Nations. Active support for the wider realization of these rights and freedoms has been and should continue to be a primary objective of United States policy in the United Nations.

During the past year our representatives in the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council took the initiative in writing a charter for the International Refugee Organization under which the right to freedom and another chance for a decent life of a million victims of war and racial, political, or religious oppression would be preserved. I shall recommend to the Congress prompt acceptance of the constitution of the IRO and appropriation of our share of the expenses of its program.

The United States believes that freedom of information must be realized on a far wider basis than exists in the world today if the United Nations is to succeed. We have strongly supported the policy of public debate of all issues in the United Nations because this promotes public knowledge and understanding and gives the peoples of the world a more direct opportunity to influence the results. We have also asked for action to break down the barriers to a wider, freer flow of information in the world. Preparations are now going forward for a world conference on freedom of information before the end of this year as one step in this direction.

The provisions of the Charter relating to dependent peoples offer to those hundreds of millions who do not yet govern themselves their best hope for attainment of this and other basic human rights and freedoms. The United States Representatives took a leading part in the General Assembly in bringing about the establishment of the trusteeship system in the face of sharp disagreements and other major difficulties that might have caused indefinite delay. The United States will support further steps during the coming year toward strengthening the trusteeship system.

America has long been a symbol of freedom and democratic progress to peoples less favored than we have been. We must maintain their belief in us by our policies and our acts.

One of the important long-range achievements of the General Assembly's first session was the adoption of resolutions introduced by the United States on the codification and development of international law.

The General Assembly unanimously directed its committee on codification to give first attention to the charter and the decision of the Nuremberg Tribunal, under which aggressive war is a crime against humanity for which individuals as well as states must be punished. The Assembly also agreed that genocide—the deliberate policy of extermination of a race or class or any other human group—was a crime under international law. These developments toward the application of international law to individuals as well as to states are of profound significance to the state. We cannot have lasting peace unless a genuine rule of world law is established and enforced.

The justifiable hope and confidence to which the great progress of the United Nations in the past year has given rise can be betrayed and lost. The difficulties and dangers that lie before us are many and serious. They are strewn across the road that leads to the final peace settlements, to the establishment and maintenance of collective security, to the control of atomic energy and regulation and reduction of other arms, to the attainment of economic recovery and an expanding world economy, and to the wider realization of human rights.

Our policy of supporting the United Nations with all the resources that we possess must be given effective practical application on a genuinely national, bipartisan basis in every activity of the United Nations. This is just as necessary in the economic and social field as it is in the political field. We must pursue without hesitation bipartisan policies of economic cooperation with the rest of the world in such matters as economic reconstruction and development and the expansion of world trade and employment. Because of the interdependence of the economy of nations, it will also be vital to world recovery as well as to our own prosperity that we maintain at home a stable economy of high employment.

The responsibility of the United States is a particularly heavy one because of the power and influence that our history and our material resources have placed in our hands. No nation has a higher stake in the outcome than our own.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 5, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein a letter from the War Department.)

THE GERMAN PRISONER SITUATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, within the past 2 weeks I was the recipient of an invitation from the Secretary of War, along with a number of other newly elected Members, to attend a luncheon at the Pentagon Building. There we met General Eisenhower and the members of his staff. After enjoying a very good luncheon we adjourned to one of the numerous rooms in that building and were shown a motion picture setting forth in detail the work of our Army on foot, on wheels, and in the air. It was very thrilling and inspiring. At times it almost caused feelings of horror.

After that film was shown, another was thrown on the screen depicting the present situation in Germany. It showed our boys and the families of our boys living in Germany. They were given homes where they could live. The wives were furnished servants and also men to work in the gardens. They showed us pictures of the countryside in Germany which appeared to never have been reached by the ravages of war.

Here is what I noticed about that picture: In the home the maid would be speaking to the housewife telling her, we were informed, that it was not Germany's fault that it had entered the war. The gardener also would be speaking to the mistress of the house and telling her that it was not Germany's fault; also the driver of a truck told the same story to a GI who had solicited a ride. Another part of the film showed a young Nazi smoking a cigarette, looking straight out into the eyes of the audience and blowing the smoke right in their faces.

The picture also showed scenes of cities in the American area. They were a shambles, there was devastation on every hand. People were working in the streets removing the debris by hand, by pick and shovel, and wheelbarrow, and by derrick.

The strange thing about it all was that there was not one man working on the streets, they were all women.

Aside from the actors in the drama who were part of the propaganda portion of the film, there was not a man working. There were the athletic performers demonstrating their skill to a large number of German women and children with bicycles and other athletic equipment during the course of the entertainment features that were given to the GI's and their families.

I inquired about this situation, and the War Department very courteously sent over to my office Colonel Pitchford and Lieutenant Colonel Cavanaugh. They also were very courteous and efficient in furnishing the information which I requested. We had a long conversation with respect to conditions in Germany. After they finished giving me the details I asked them if they would send a report to me setting forth the more specific items of information which I was requesting concerning the German prisoners that had been taken. I had already read quite a bit about certain prisoners whom we had turned over to France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, and Belgium; however, this written report which I received just a few days ago gives the details very satisfactorily.

I shall include this report here in the extension of my remarks. I am not going to read it to you because it is rather lengthy. It follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1947.

Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OWENS: This is in reply to your verbal request and our conversation concerning the liberation of German prisoners of war captured during World War II.

In view of the fact that no official releases concerning either the German prisoners of war captured or released by other Allied Governments, the information contained herein must necessarily be confined to the efforts of the United States in this activity. However, unofficial estimated figures of German prisoners of war captured by Allied Governments are as follows:

Russia	3,400,000
Great Britain	2,031,000
France	315,000
The Netherlands	153
Total	5,746,153

This total, together with the approximate figure of 2,889,000 German prisoners captured by the United States forces, makes a grand total of approximately 8,635,153 Germans captured by the Allied forces. Of the 2,889,000 German prisoners of war captured by the United States forces, 674,000 prisoners were transferred to the custody of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg by agreement with the United States for the purpose of assisting in the work of devastated areas in those countries.

The maximum number of prisoners interned in prisoner-of-war camps in the United States were:

Germans	378,898
Italians	51,455
Japanese	5,435
Total	435,788

Of these, approximately 175,000 prisoners were captured by the British forces.

The first large shipments of German prisoners of war were received in the United States during June 1943 and these shipments were completed during the early part of 1944. It is estimated that the average stay of every prisoner of war in the United States was approximately 2 years.

Beginning in November 1945, the United States began the return from this country of prisoners of war interned in the United States prison camps. With the exception of 202 prisoners still in the United States, this shipment of prisoners of war from this country was completed in July 1946. A breakdown of those prisoners remaining in the United States as of January 1, 1947, is as follows:

Penal institutions (113 Germans)	147
In hospitals (1 German)	3
Held as witnesses in capital offenses (all Germans)	14
Held for FBI in harboring cases (2 Germans)	9
In escapee status (22 Germans)	29

All of these prisoners, removed from the United States, were returned to the theaters in which they were captured, for rehabilitation, except the 175,000 British-captured prisoners, who were returned to the British. As of November 30, 1946, there remained in the United States custody in the European theater of operations, 50,700 German prisoners of war, 2,191,089 prisoners having been discharged. It is estimated that the liberation of these remaining prisoners will be completed by the end of this year.

At the recent conferences of Foreign Ministers in Paris, former Secretary of State Byrnes asked France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg for the return of the 674,000 prisoners transferred to their custody, in order that they may be liberated. It is the understanding of the War Department that an agreement was reached which is expected to effect the return and liberation of these prisoners by the end of this year. In this connection you are assured that the War Department is in complete sympathy with the Department of State policy for the early release and repatriation of all German prisoners of war except those held for trial or convicted of war or civil crimes.

Of the 435,788 prisoners of war interned in United States camps, 960 died while in the United States. This is broken down as follows:

Germans	791
Italians	131
Japanese	38

The above amount represents approximately one-tenth of 1 percent deaths per year of internment.

It must be remembered that as late as mid-1946, Germany did not have any of her able-bodied male citizens within her borders. Newspaper accounts have indicated that Germany lost between eight and ten millions of men killed, and an additional eight to nine millions as prisoners of war to the Allies. It is estimated that a large portion of those prisoners of war who have been liberated by the United States forces during recent months, totaling over two million, reside in the Russian, British, and French occupied zones, which represents the most heavily populated area of Germany. Upon being released, these men would naturally migrate to their respective homes. No effort is being made by the United States forces in Germany to keep track of these released prisoners after they are free. This action is precluded by the fact that these men are perfectly free to come and go as they wish upon being liberated, and the administrative burden of trying to keep track of their activities would be prohibitive.

Your considerate interest in this question of handling of prisoners of war is sincerely appreciated and I trust that this information will enable you to advise your constituent in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, GSC, Deputy Chief Legislative and Liaison Division.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about some of the salient facts in that report. The particular thing I was inquiring about was this dearth of manpower in Germany, especially in the American-occupied area. I am informed that the number of men who were killed in Germany was between eight and ten million. I have certain unofficial reports, so far as our allies are concerned, about the prisoners they captured, because neither Great Britain nor Russia would give us official figures. The unofficial figures show that Russia captured approximately three million five hundred thousand prisoners and that England captured in excess of 2,000,000, France a little over 300,000, and the United States 2,900,000 men. Of this number of prisoners about 380,000 were brought to the United States, which included 175,000 that had been turned over to us by England. Those 175,000 were prisoners that had been captured by England. Almost every one of the prisoners in the United States was repatriated. At the present time we have only 202 prisoners, including 137 who are in prison for penal offenses. We liberated 2,000,000 additional men in Europe, making a total of over 2,200,000 whom we have liberated. We turned over to France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg 675,000 prisoners who I am informed were captured in the years 1943 and 1944. They have been held in those countries and have been placed at work supposedly clearing out the devastated areas.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak at length in reference to the situation concerning the 6,000,000 prisoners who were captured by Great Britain and by Russia and of the use being made by those countries of those men, and may I interpolate that we do not receive much information in reference to the prisoners. I could also point out that if we were to follow some of the advice given to us in the very excellent talks by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] about 2 weeks ago, and follow the program that General MacArthur has instituted in Japan, we could probably use that force to help stem the onrush of what Mr. DIRKSEN called "red fascism." But that is not what I want to talk about today primarily. I want to refer to the 675,000 prisoners, and I want to refer to the over 2,000,000 who were liberated. Incidentally, after the 2,000,000 were liberated the explanation is given that they must have returned to the zones occupied by Russia and Great Britain, because those are the zones in which are located much of the manufacturing, industry, and business of Germany. In other words, the Americans have only the scenery over there in Germany. This seemed to be apparent from the report.

The 675,000 men to which I have previously referred appear to be used to replace men in the Netherlands and France so that France may go over to Indochina, wage a war there to reestablish her decadent colonial empire. Great Britain seems to be doing the same thing with reference to the Dutch East Indies, where it is reported that with the aid of their brave Japanese they were able to repulse the attacks of the Indonesians. They have also been able to place an iron heel on Palestine. We in America who live in freedom have abolished slavery and involuntary servitude, yet we are a party to turning over to those nations 675,000 men who, 2 or 3 years after their recapture, and 2 years after the war has ended in Europe, are still slaving in those countries. I am reliably informed that the prisoners working in Corsica for France are skin and bones. They are barely able to raise the hammers to do the work that has been assigned to them. What if we had lost the war and our boys were being held as slaves from returning to their homes. How would we feel? Are we going to follow the biblical adage about an "eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," or are we going to adhere to the

Christian principle, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"?

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of un-American activities, as we have been doing in this House, I say that that activity is un-American; it is not humane; it is not Christian. We should end it. After Secretary of State Byrnes asked that those men be repatriated, those nations made a promise that some of them might be liberated this year. I say that is not enough. Those men should not be liberated this year or next year; they should be liberated now. If France and the Netherlands and those other nations will not accede to our request, then let us take measures and sanctions against them. Let us stop giving them gifts and dowries, and if that is not enough, let us take more appropriate action. It will only be then that our Government will be American; that it will be Christian; that it will be humane. I say that if the State Department does not take some action in regard to that, I shall ask the Congress to take definite action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SUGAR

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to briefly discuss the subject of sugar. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture was appointed to conduct an investigation of shortages of food and other agricultural products. The committee completed its investigation as to sugar supplies last week and filed a report with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, giving an accurate and clear picture of the supply situation of sugar in the world.

The primary purpose of the committee was to secure more sugar for the American people in 1947, and I believe the findings of our committee will warrant a substantial increase in the allowance of direct sugar for the American consumers as well as for industrial and institutional users. I commend a reading of the report to you. A copy of it was sent to each Member of the House last Saturday and additional copies will be available for Members through the House Committee on Agriculture on Thursday afternoon of this week.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to commend the gentleman's committee for putting out this exhaustive report. I have read every word of it, including the supporting tables, and I think every Member of the House should pay some attention to it, especially in view of the fact that these people are so much interested in this subject.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

The report of the committee is not a political document in any manner. It was the unanimous report of the members of the subcommittee. It was our purpose and objective to secure as accurate information as we could on the supply situation. After all, the sugar crop for use in 1947 has either been produced or is now being harvested and refined in the United States, which also includes Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and, I might also say, Cuba, which is not a part of the United States.

As I stated before, our purpose is to secure more sugar in 1947 for the American people. Last year American consumers received 25 pounds each of direct sugar. In 1945 they received 24 pounds each, and in 1944, for some strange or unknown reason, American consumers received 40 pounds each—1944 was an unusual year in American history—and I will not go into the political significances of 1944, because those are still fresh in our minds. But needless to say, we did get more sugar in 1944. As a matter of fact, during that year those in charge of allocating sugar permitted the American people to have up to 50 pounds of sugar on application to ration boards.

Most of this increased allowance came in the last half of the year 1944. You will recall that during that time several additional sugar stamps were made available to the people, and that they were specifically told by the OPA that the stamps would be good indefinitely and that the people who held them could cash them in any time. But lo and behold, after certain events took place in November of 1944, and as a special Christmas present to the American people that year, the OPA and other agencies in charge invalidated all the outstanding sugar stamps. Do you remember? I hope that history will not repeat itself for next year.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I should like to compliment the gentleman and his committee on their report on the sugar investigation they have just made, but I hope he is not going to spoil the effect of that fine report by making a political issue out of it and making a political speech.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can assure my good friend that I have no intention of doing that, but, as I recollect, history repeats itself. Sugar is a commodity that is important to the housewives of this country. I have no disposition to inject a political issue. I am recalling now what took place in 1944, with the hope that we will not have a recurrence of it in 1948. Sugar should not be used as a political football.

A reading of the committee report will disclose that the International Emergency Food Council, consisting of some 30 nations, will shortly be engaged in allocating sugar to its member countries. The main sugar surplus in the world is to be found in the Cuban sugar crop, which is owned by the United States Government. We have purchased the Cuban sugar crop since 1942. The International Emergency Food Council will principally engage itself in making recommendations for the division of the American-owned Cuban sugar.

The committee has recommended an allotment of 35 to 40 pounds of direct sugar for United States consumers in 1947, as compared with 25 pounds in 1946, and an increase for industrial users from the present 60 percent to 80 percent of the 1941 base-period use. This allowance of sugar for American consumers will require approximately 7,200,000 short tons of sugar. Production of sugar in all United States areas, which includes Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, is estimated to be approximately 3,808,000 short tons. To secure the increase in sugar recommended by the committee, it will be necessary to retain approximately 3,300,000 short tons of American-owned Cuban sugar. The Secretary of Agriculture is the official representative of the United States Government on the International Emergency Food Council, and your committee insist that he retain approximately 3,300,000 short tons of American-owned Cuban sugar as a minimum requirement for United States consumer for use in 1947. Larger allowances of sugar should be made for 1947 if production shows an increase above the present conservative estimates. I am attempting to show that we do not produce enough sugar in United States areas to take care of American requirements. We are directly dependent upon our sugar supplies from Cuban production.

Cuba has produced this year, and its crop is in process of being harvested and refined, approximately 5,500,000 tons, or better than a million tons more than they produced in 1946. It has been my contention and that of our committee that this increase in sugar production, as long as the United States Government owns the Cuban sugar crop, should go to the American people rather than be distributed to the other countries in the world where there has been a very substantial increase in sugar production over last year.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Did the gentleman's committee in making its investigation of the situation secure any information as to how much of the sugar we export has been or will be paid for by those who receive the sugar?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The committee report shows exports of Cuban sugar, but it is not possible for me to state how it was paid for. I might call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that a loan has been made to the British of $3,750,000,000, and that the Export-Import Bank has loaned approximately $3,000,000,000 and that there have also been some arrangements made under lend-lease. I know the gentleman is an expert on such matters and his judgment is probably as good as mine as to whether or not any of these loans will be repaid.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman permit another observation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to.

Mr. WOODRUFF. May I say in view of the past experience with our loans to foreign countries it seems to me that we are justified in questioning whether in the future we will have any better luck with our loans than we have had in the past.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is open to question and should be

considered. There are some who feel that we should go further than we have gone. But may I say to the gentleman I recognize that the money we appropriate to lend to other countries must come from the American taxpayers and in the end they will have to pay the bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is correct. I would like to know further whether or not the committee learned that these shipments of sugar and other commodities are being paid for currently?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certain amounts of Cuban sugar are being exported to foreign countries.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRANGER. Aside from what the gentleman may think as to whether or not the distribution is fair to the American people, does he not think that it was wise to at least attempt a reasonable distribution for all people and that we should have bought the Cuban sugar crop?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it was a very wise thing to do. In fact, I was a member of the committee during the last Congress that urged the purchase of the 1946–47 Cuban sugar crop.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the committee report further indicates that there is a tremendous shortage of sugar throughout the world at the present time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I wish to advise my colleague that the sugar situation throughout the world has improved materially since last year.

It is estimated now that sugar production in the entire world is approximately 31,000,000 tons. The normal consumption was approximately 32,500,000 tons.

Mr. GRANGER. It seems to me that a short time ago I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who makes a study of this sugar business, state on this floor that there was a worldwide shortage. He said, "Make no mistake about that."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We are short approximately one and one-half million tons. That is according to the report of this International Emergency Food Council, of which I have a copy, signed by Dr. Fitzgerald, although I may say that the normal production of sugar throughout the world prior to World War II was around 34,500,000 tons. But the consumption, according to Dr. Fitzgerald, was approximately 32,500,000 tons. You will note the sugar situation throughout the world has materially improved.

I might say further to the gentleman that in the areas of Europe which secured sugar from our Cuban supply last year, production of sugar has increased by approximately 34 percent, as against an increase in the United States areas of only 13 percent. With that increase in the European production the committee felt that the American consumer should have a larger share of Cuban sugar, which we own, that we had before, and that there was less need to take as much from the Cuban sugar supply and send to the other countries as we did in 1946.

We have proposed an increase for the American consumers of 10 to 15 pounds for 1947. That would provide between 35 and 40 pounds as against 25 pounds in 1946, and an increase for industrial and institutional users of from 60 to 80 percent of their 1941 base. That is a substantial increase, but it is not a substantial increase when you consider that during 1944 the consumers received direct sugar of 40 pounds and the industrial user received 89 percent of his 1941 base. I am satisfied that the American people want to help the people in other countries of the world with food. They are doing a magnificent job in this respect for the entire world. Facts and figures will show that during the past 2 years we have supplied the people in the destitute countries, where they need food, with four or five billion dollars worth of food, not only through UNRRA and directly, but also through lend-lease and private sources. From July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1947, we will send out between 400 and 500 million bushels of grain to those countries—not as a gift. These and other food supplies will be purchased by foreign countries. We have supplied some of the funds through Export-Import Bank and other loans.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman cited percentages in support of his argument. The gentleman will allow that percentages of increase often do not mean very much. For example, the area in Europe which the gentleman said had produced so much greater percentage of sugar this year than it did 2 or 3 years ago, How little did it produce at that time? For example, suppose that Europe altogether produced a million tons. A 15-percent increase would be 150,000 tons, while a 10-percent increase on 6,000,000 tons in the United States will mean 600,000 tons increase, on a per capita amount which is already infinitely greater than the people in Europe enjoyed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be glad to give the gentleman those figures.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman will concede that the average for 1935 to 1939 was about 8,000,000 tons more than the world average this year, was it not? We are short 8,000,000 tons. That is, the world sugar production is that much short for this year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The figures I have show that the 1945–46 European area crops amounted to 5,494,000 tons as against their present sugar supply of 7,377,000 tons, an increase of 1,883,000 tons.

Mr. DINGELL. What is the per capita difference between European consumption and our American consumption?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is something I want to go into because it is claimed that this sugar should be distributed by the International Emergency Food Council, which is a voluntary organization of approximately 30 nations, on the basis of a tripartite agreement which would take into consideration the per capita consumption in those countries.

Mr. DINGELL. The per capita consumption is what counts, is it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we are taking care of that pretty well; but I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if there is any such agreement we have not been able to find it. The tripartite agreement is an agreement between the United States, Canada, and the British Isles, or the United Kingdom, wherein they agree for the crop year of 1945 and for that time only, on a division of the sugar largely on a per capita basis.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In a minute. Let me point out what the situation was on the per capita consumption of sugar in 1946, and I am referring now to direct sugar. These figures come from the Department of Agriculture, and I therefore have every reason to believe they are correct; if they are not correct then it is not my responsibility. During 1946 the American people for all direct sugar purposes received 25 pounds, which was not enough sugar to take care of canning and other needs. What was the situation in Canada with whom, according to this tripartite agreement, we were to be on an equality basis? It appears that the people of Canada received not 25 pounds but 41 pounds per capita of direct sugar last year.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And notwithstanding that fact, Canada, which produces quite a quantity of beet sugar, does not today have more than one-half of its sugar-producing capacity in operation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be. I am not criticizing Canada, and I am not criticizing the British, but I just want to point out and ask if there is an agreement that there should be equality of consumption why should United States consumers receive 25 pounds, Canadians 41 pounds, and the British, according to the Department of Agriculture, 30½ pounds?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to complete my thought; then I will yield. I am not so sure that the figure for the British is correct, because I have here a letter signed by a British lady. It deals with this very question of sugar. In it she writes this:

> I get half a pound of sugar a week for the baby and a half pound for myself every week, and 1 pound for each of us extra a month instead of preserves, if I wish, and a lot extra every now and then for canning and bottling, and so forth.

When you add up the different amounts a British citizen receives, according to this British housewife, it totals up to around 38 pounds; and in addition to that they get some extra now and then—she does not say when. I notice, however, that the Department of Agriculture reports that the British housewives got a pound and a half extra per capita at Christmas time. That was asked for in behalf of the American people for last Christmas but no additional sugar was forthcoming for the American housewives at Christmas.

I now yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I do not know whether the gentleman is advocating we should reduce the allotment to the industrial users of the United States itself or increase the housewife up to the quantity of the Canadian housewife.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know. The gentleman is probably hinting at the possibility that the Canadians and the British do not use as much industrial sugar as we do.

Mr. PACE. Right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know very much about the situation in the British Isles, but I am reliably informed that about the only industry over there using sugar is that industry which makes beer. There may be something to that. I am not familiar with the situation, never having been over there. The gentleman from Georgia knows that this was brought to the attention of our committee. They may have less ice cream, and less candy and things of that kind involving sugar. That does not apply in Canada. But surely the American housewife likes to have the sugar in hand so that she can use it at home. She wants direct sugar. I say to you there has not been an equality in the distribution of sugar for American consumers as provided in the tripartite agreement, which incidentally is a hard agreement to understand. Let us get that straight. Let us see if the American housewife is entitled to as much sugar as the housewives and the consumers in other countries of the world.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What the gentleman is saying is extremely important because here in the United States among the agricultural people as well as the industrial and town people, they all have buying power and the mother and the housewife insist on having an adequate supply of sugar in her kitchen, thereby making her independent of having to drive into town to buy some industrialized product. This thing cannot and will not be handled satisfactorily by political parties or by any administration until the American housewife can go to town or send the children to the store and buy sugar any time she gets good and ready to buy it. That is the issue that we have to face as Members of Congress. And may I say this for the benefit of the gentleman from Utah: In my remarks the other day I was dealing with not only production and consumption but with the availability of reserve stocks, because you cannot have fair distribution of any basic commodity unless you have an ample reserve stock at all points of distribution, country-wide or world-wide, from which the trade can draw, and those stocks are not in existence today after providing for the per capita consumption specified by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman think, looking forward to the day not too far distant when controls can be removed, that it is of great importance to the American consumers that the pipe lines and the stock piles be built up so that there will not be the likelihood at some time in the future of the sugar supply being short?

Mr. CRAWFORD. But build those stock piles by production, not by denying sugar to the people.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to again urge my colleagues to secure and study the report of the Committee on the Sugar Situation. You will have a better picture of the sugar-supply situation and the requirements of the American people, if you read the report. The committee is determined to secure more sugar for American consumers in 1947. Adequate supplies are available and the sugar should be forthcoming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables and extracts from letters and communications.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, since taking my place in this august body on January 3 I have consulted with many of my colleagues who are wiser and more experienced than I. Invariably they have been courteous. They have given me a great deal of valuable advice. But there is one piece of advice on which they have been unanimous. They have all said, "Do not speak on the floor of the House until you have been in Congress at least 10 years." Mr. Speaker, I am an optimist, but I think it very doubtful that I will be in Congress for 10 years. So many things can happen in this atomic age.

I do want, however, to speak on something that I think is vitally important not only to the people of my district—and I hear from them frequently on the subject—not only to the people of my own Nation, but to the people of the whole world. That matter is the secret of the atomic bomb. The people of our country and of the world are fearful; they do not know exactly what is being done about this secret. They know only vaguely what the potentialities of this weapon are and they do not want to see it given away even under an international commission. Once it has been passed around, once two great nations possess that secret, how do we know that they will not go to war? And, if two such nations go to war it may well mean the end of this planet. We know without a doubt that the secret will be discovered; that the engineers of other countries and the scientists of other nations are working on it day and night. But would it not be well to give ourselves a little time? Would it not be well to keep it here until perhaps, by the grace of God, we may find a defense against it? Every poison has its antidote. Every problem has its solution. Every weapon has its defense. It is merely a question of finding it.

As long as we have this secret here we can maintain peace. It may not be the highest ideal to maintain the peace of the world through such a weapon, but we know that with human nature as it is no one will pick a quarrel with us as long as we possess this weapon. We also know that it still takes and always will take two to make a quarrel.

One week ago today on the floor of this House we saw a book exhibited that had been prepared and written by one of our former allies and a friendly power. In this book we saw pictures of all our dams, of all our roads, of all our bridges, of all our watersheds, and of all our great centers of population and of manufacturing. All this was done surely not simply to have interesting and instructive picture books for the children who are being brought up in Communist nurseries and schools all over the world. Oh, no. This book was there for one purpose and for one purpos- only. It was there so that it could be used in case of war. We cannot afford to be blind in these matters. Again, we do want peace. We surely should, when we know what a future war may bring.

We talk about future legislation. We are doing our best to pass legislation in this House to curtail expenditures, to help our country on the road to progress, but are we not a little bit like children playing on the very verge of an abyss with a shotgun, when we do not yet know what is going to happen to this secret? We must be very careful as representatives of our people that we do not do anything to jeopardize them. This secret is their secret. The $2,000,000,000 that was expended in its discovery and its perfection was their $2,000,000,000. The men and women who are working there, 43,700 of them, are American citizens. We know that this thing now is so far ahead of what it was when it was used on Nagasaki and Hiroshima that it is probably like comparing a model T Ford to the modern automobile.

The people must speak, and the people, I believe, are already speaking, and loudly, through the press and through their own voices. They are saying to us, "Wait. Do not give this thing away. It will be found soon enough. Do not hand it over like everything else on a silver platter."

We have reached the turning point in history, but we may well be writing the last page of history unless we guard this thing, this diabolical thing, that so far we alone possess. We must be careful in watching this Commission that is being appointed and has been appointed. Let us weigh the value of these men. So far, I can see only one real scientist on that whole list of five.

These matters are of grave importance. These matters are something that I feel must be spoken of on the floor of this House before it may be too late and before this planet goes up in smoke and is just another moon, dead on the surface of the sky.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] made a remarkable speech in support of the Knutson income-tax bill. It was remarkable both because of content and because it was publicly commended by members of the majority party highly placed on the tax-writing committee; to wit, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]. But, Mr. Speaker, the most outstanding feature of my distinguished friend's speech was his utter frankness in stating what he understands to be the theory of the Republican Party on taxes, boldly and nakedly.

Of course, this theory of the gentleman's party is not new, only stated more candidly than usual. Neither is Democratic opposition to it new.

It must come as a distinct surprise, however, to many who heard so much about the new Republican liberalism during the election campaign last year to know that the gentleman's party still clings to a pre-World War I philosophy of taxation. As further evidence of this, however, I need but point out the fact that the No. 1 bill of this Republican Congress is H. R. 1, known as the Knutson bill.

I would like to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, some of the exceedingly interesting observations of the learned gentleman from Illinois who has undertaken to expound to us his party's philosophy on taxation. He informed us, for instance, that "we have two general tax theories in the world today, and only two."

It does seem that in economic studies or in writings on problems of taxation, or in debates on revenue bills, or somewhere I have read or heard of a third theory, but surely I must be mistaken because the distinguished gentleman says that there are only two. And he says, "We must choose between the two."

What are the two theories? Well, the able gentleman has favored us with the information. He tells us on page 758 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that:

> One theory is that a person should pay to support the Government on the basis of the benefits received from the Government.

That was the theory, he goes on to tell us—

> That prevailed all through the Middle Ages.

So we will call this the theory of the Middle Ages.

Then about the second theory, the gentleman says:

> When democracy came into the world they drafted a new theory of taxation, and that is the theory that each person should contribute to the support of the Government on the basis of his ability to pay.

So we will call this the theory of democracy.

Fenced in by these two recognized theories—the theory of the Middle Ages and the theory of democracy—the gentleman was coasting with ease and grace on the smooth highway of bliss until suddenly he met the Knutson bill. But was he abashed? Not one whit. No, sir. He was sure it was entirely theoretical and he was for it, theory and all.

The gentleman from Illinois then began to explain the Knutson bill, began for the first time to give his theories practical application.

In order to give us a sense of proportion, the gentleman divided the people into three general income groups or classes and proceeded to tell us how the Knutson bill would affect them, not in theory but in fact. He told us first about the low-income group which comprises about two-thirds of the income taxpayers. The gentleman said that "67 percent of all Federal income taxpayers would receive under the Knutson bill a rebate of $900,000,000." According to my arithmetic, this would be an average tax reduction of about $3 per month for each of the taxpayers falling within this group.

He then examined the beneficent effects of the bill on the middle-income group and came up with the answer. The gentleman said, "Twenty-eight percent of the taxpayers would receive $1,040,000,000 rebate under the Knutson bill."

At this point the gentleman from Illinois must have become skeptical of the practical application of his theory because he did not finish his analysis. He had told us the amount of rebate 67 percent of the taxpayers would get under the Knutson bill and what 28 percent of the taxpayers would get, but 67 percent and 28 percent comprise only 95 percent of the taxpayers. What would the remaining 5 percent receive? I listened, as I am sure you did, Mr. Speaker, but I did not hear him say. The distinguished gentleman who had been so explicit suddenly backed off and failed to tell us how his theory would affect this neglected 5 percent, this most important group in his theoretical Pandora box. When the gentleman did not tell us in his speech, I thought surely he would notice the omission and add it in the revision of his remarks, but I read it carefully, a couple of times. It is not there, that is, unless one is willing to do a little calculation. But if the figures which the gentleman has given us are correct, we can, without great effort, arrive at it. The gentleman said in another place that the Knutson bill would give a tax rebate of $3,500,000,000 to all taxpayers. Now, if 67 percent get $900,000,000 and 28 percent get $1,040,000,000, then there remains for the forgotten 5 percent a total take of $1,560,000,000.

So, using the gentleman's own figures and assuming they are correct, I have made a little chart completing the gentleman's analysis of the Knutson bill:

Under H. R. 1—Knutson bill—5 percent of taxpayers get $1,560,000,000; 28 percent of taxpayers get $1,040,000,000; 67 percent of taxpayers get $900,000,000.

Now, what I want to know is, Does the gentleman advocate this inequity by the theory of the Middle Ages or by the theory of democracy? By no stretch of the imagination could this injustice be the theory of democracy, because the gentleman has said that when democracy came into the world they drafted a new theory of taxation—the theory that each person should contribute on the basis of his ability to pay—and the Knutson bill favors, not those least able to pay but those most able to pay.

So, since we must choose between the two, according to the gentleman's own analysis, the Knutson bill conforms to the other of the two theories—the theory of the Middle Ages.

But, in an effort to be sure and certain as to which of the two recognized theories the Knutson bill conforms, I have worked out another table in terms of take-home pay. Take-home pay is a thoroughly democratic term growing out of the withholding provisions of the income-tax law. It has come to have a household meaning to all income-taxpayers—farmers, workers, housewives. It is what they have left after paying their taxes. Some people call it spendable income. Under the Knutson bill, take-home pay for a single person with a $1,000 income would be increased 2.1 percent. Another man with an income of $10,000 would have his take-home pay increased 6.1 percent. But the person with a $302,000 income would have his take-home pay increased by 72.6 percent. The following table conclusively proves that the Knutson bill would be monstrously unjust to those who need help most.

Under H. R. 1—Knutson income-tax bill:

Single person with income of—	*Percent increase in take-home pay*
$1,000 will receive	2.1
$10,000 will receive	6.1
$100,000 will receive	34.9
$250,000 will receive	65.9
$302,896 will receive	72.6
$1,000,000 will receive	69.4

That lowly million-dollar-income man would receive an increase of only 69.4 percent.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield to my distinguished and able friend from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Is not that in accordance with the old Republican policy of helping the rich and soaking the poor?

Mr. GORE. I am sure the gentleman was quite amused, as I was, to hear that we must choose between the theory of the Middle Ages and the theory of democracy. I thoroughly agree that this is on all fours with the theory of the Middle Ages, a pre-World War I tax philosophy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is barely possible that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] had in mind as constituting the Middle Ages the period from 1929 to 1933.

Mr. GORE. To say the least, the gentleman's party does not seem to have learned anything in that period, judging from the No. 1 bill of the Republican Congress, H. R. 1 of the new Congress.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why did the gentleman use the words "That lowly million-dollar" fellow? Why did the gentleman say "lowly"? That is real sarcasm. What I want to say is that the man who gets the 69 percent will take care of a lot of thousand-dollar men. That is what they do with their money.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Does the gentleman know of any instance where any of them has ever done that?

Mr. GORE. I certainly do not.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do.

Mr. GORE. Just a moment. I think it is quite significant, Mr. Speaker, that the speech of the gentleman from Illinois was applauded and publicly commended by two high-ranking members of the majority on the Ways and Means Committee and is now being defended by another member of the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee. I think we might look into the statement of the author of H. R. 1 and see by which of these two recognized theories he justifies the bill. The statements of the distinguished statesman from Minnesota are rather fulsome and effulgent and I sometimes have difficulty in finding them; but I find one thing: To my surprise he did not justify his bill by either of these two recognized theories. Oh, no, he goes back and takes a tried-and-found-wanting policy from the good old days, right out of the Andrew Mellon primer of special privilege, and what does he say?

Among other excuses for his proposal, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is quoted as saying that:

> It will start the country on the road to complete economic recovery and—
>
> Listen to this—
>
> provide the Treasury with even greater revenue.

It was this economic theory, Mr. Speaker, that worked so well that it brought on the panic of 1929 and the utter defeat of the Republican Party in 1930 and 1932.

Surprising as it may seem, though, Mr. Speaker, if you will analyze the Knutson bill closely you will find that it does not wholly reject the Democratic theory of levying taxes according to ability to pay. Indeed no. You will find a provision in the bill which clearly shows that the gentleman from Minnesota was reminded, even if at the last moment, that the very keystone of our whole income-tax structure is the rising scale of payment by those best able to pay.

Americans cannot sacrifice that principle. It is now as basic in our democracy as the principle of majority rule. It is, therefore, fortunate that the gentleman from Minnesota detected this oversight at the last moment before he introduced his bill. When reminded of this oversight, was the able gentleman stubborn? Did he insist upon his 20-percent across-the-board reduction in all income taxes, democracy or no democracy?

No. The distinguished gentleman, with statesmanlike aplomb, altered his measure to conform with his country's democratic principles. Yes, sir. Let the chips, the blue chips, fall where they may, this new Republican liberalism rose manfully to the defense of the forgotten man—all those ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed Americans earning not more than $302,896 per year.

Mr. LYNCH. That was after election, though.

Mr. GORE. Of course, it was after election.

Mr. LYNCH. That statement was only made a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. GORE. Does not the gentleman feel grateful that he detected the oversight?

Mr. LYNCH. There is something to what you say.

Mr. GORE. We should be grateful, I am sure. In fact, by this deathbed concession to social justice, by this forthrightness, by this magnanimity, by this show of compassion, the people of the country were deeply moved, touched in fact, and they will be touched even more deeply if this Knutson bill becomes law.

Mr. LYNCH. They will be touched more deeply in their pocketbooks.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. What I have in mind is this: Does the gentleman suppose, with the original promises made before election, which were considerably cut down after election so that those in the top brackets get only a 10-percent reduction, there will be any change in the general attitude by reason of the introduction of the tax bill yesterday by the chairman of the Rules Committee instead of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. GORE. I must admit to the gentleman that it is rather difficult for me to fathom what is going on here. This is the second month that the Congress has been in session. We have not abolished one Federal agency, we have not shot one bureaucrat, and we have called the roll but once since the opening day.

Mr. LYNCH. And we have had but one meeting of the Ways and Means Committee, if I remember correctly, during the whole month.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman wants my explanation of the situation I will say that the Republican Party is stuck in the muck of confusion and hung on the hooks of irresponsible promises.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What is this magnanimous concession that the gentleman from Minnesota finally agreed to write into his tax bill, and is this take-home pay figured after his great magnanimous concession?

Mr. GORE. This is because you see from the chart that beyond the $302,896 man there is a small drop in the percentage increase in take-home pay. Of course, this 10½ percent does not apply to that part of the income below $302,-896 per year; only above. That is the line of demarcation made by the gentleman from Minnesota between a poor man and that lowly rich man.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to observe, what a pity it is to spoil a good speech with so much politics. Will the gentleman tell why the boys on that side were defeated last year?

Mr. GORE. I will be delighted to tell the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. You tell them.

Mr. GORE. I will tell the gentleman himself as well as my colleagues why we were defeated. It was because of a campaign of irresponsible promises, because the country was torn with problems inevitably resulting from a war and, my friend, because you are now stuck with those irresponsible promises we will beat you in 1948.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Are not these Knutson promises and Republican promises of the last election on a par with the same Republican trick and philosophy played by the Governor of Kentucky who promised repeal of the income taxes before election and afterward, and before he was inaugurated, he said that it cannot be done?

Mr. GORE. This is not the first time the same story has been told.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it not a parallel case?

Mr. GORE. I am not sufficiently familiar with that as to say, but I have heard that it is.

Now, I want to ask a question.

Where are my Republican friends who before the war were crying out that the size of our public debt was endangering the stability and soundness of our country? Are they the same voices I now hear crying for lower taxes and reduced Government revenue? Has concern for the stability and soundness of the Nation's economy fled from your councils?

What is stability? What is soundness? I am thinking of our entire order, our monetary system, our banking system, our national economy, and asking upon what does it rest.

I hold in my hand a circulation statement of United States money and I see here the total amount is more than $50,000,000,000, mostly paper currency. I called the Treasury a few days ago and asked them to give me the total amount of deposits in all banks and was told that it was more than $160,000,000,000. I asked then for the amount of Government bonds in the hands of the millions of our citizens and I was told that it was nearly $260,000,000,000. Suppose that the millions of the people holding these bonds suddenly became doubtful of the value of their bonds. Suppose then that all these depositors began to want their money from the banks, wanted cash or something material?

I know Treasury experts do not like to have our monetary system referred to as a house of cards and I agree that that term gives a flimsy and inaccurate description because there is something more substantial in the foundation upon

which the structure is built. What is it? It is the people's confidence in the soundness of the Nation's Government, the Nation's economy, and its institutions. Except for that, our whole monetary and banking system would be an inverted pyramid, so top heavy that within a matter of hours it would topple and crash, crushing, depressing, and wreaking havoc upon our economy, our political system, and our society.

Once that confidence in our system is shaken, the Nation and the world would rock with tremors; once destroyed, it would be as if it did not exist at all. That is why I think and why it seems to me that you, Mr. Speaker, should think, why all thinking Americans should think, it utterly imperative that we start immediately a reduction of our public debt. The amount of retirement is not so important as the act and the effort. Indeed, I do not hold it necessary that all the debt ever be retired, but lest we shake the confidence of the millions of bondholders who are watching their Government's every move and whose composite opinions determine the value of not only the bonds which they hold, not only the bonds held by banking and insurance institutions, but determines as well the very integrity and soundness of our system. I think tax reduction, desirable though it is, must be strictly secondary to a reduction of the national debt.

We can no more laugh off our war debt than we could have won the war without incurring it. We must face grim reality. I am not pessimistic but I do think, Mr. Speaker, that instead of evading our responsibility, instead of shunning our obligation, we must shoulder our burden and walk. The future will then be brighter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the gentleman's party ever paid off any of the national debt?

Mr. DINGELL. I can answer that, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. We paid off a considerable amount just before the Wilson administration went out.

Mr. CURTIS. When?

Mr. DINGELL. Just before the Wilson administration went out.

Mr. CURTIS. I am referring to the New Deal Party that took possession of this House following the election of 1930, and I ask the question if you have ever paid $1 on the national debt.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. Let me reply, please, to the gentleman from Nebraska. Of course, the gentleman's question was answered in part by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, but that answer was apparently not satisfactory to the gentleman. He then modified his question and referred to the New Deal Party. If he refers to the control of the Government by the Democratic Party that came into power in 1932, I need but remind the gentleman of the conditions then existing. The conditions, due to the fallacious policies which his party followed during the boom and bust period, made it utterly impossible to do more or less, if this country were to be saved, than to turn the resources of this country to the preservation of our institutions. We were very near chaos and collapse, and if you follow the philosophies in the Knutson bill you will take us right back to the brink of disaster.

Mr. CURTIS. Then the answer is that you have not paid off $1 on the public debt or one dime.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to interpose an observation for the benefit of my friend from Nebraska. He might have forgotten that in Nebraska at that time they were burning corn instead of coal, and they complained about 2-cent hogs and 10-cent corn.

Mr. CURTIS. You did not pay any of the debt, did you? You never redeemed a dime's worth of bonds.

Mr. DINGELL. We made it possible for your farmers to keep from starving to death.

Mr. CURTIS. Since your party gained control of the House in 1930 there has never been $1 reduction of the public debt. You never retired a bond. You took possession of this House following the election of 1930, and there has never been one bond paid by reducing the debt.

Mr. DINGELL. Corn was selling then at 10 cents a bushel.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished friend, the author of H. R. 1, the first bill on the calendar of the Republican Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. When it comes to taxation, it reminds me there are three things that everybody knows more about than those that are engaged in them. I have never yet met a man who did not know more about farming than a farmer. I have never yet met a man who did not know more about running a paper than a publisher does. And there are very few Members of Congress who do not know more about taxation than those who live with it all the time.

The gentleman referred to the depression that existed in the later years of the Republican administration. We all deplore that depression, but it was world-wide, and it was due to the war that you Democrats promised to keep us out of back in 1916.

Mr. DINGELL. It was started by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. After listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota that people who are not on the Ways and Means Committee do not know anything about taxes, I just want to say there is some evidence before the American people that some on the Ways and Means Committee do not know too much about taxes.

Mr. GORE. I think the gentleman from Minnesota may be surprised how many people understand his bill, its practical effect as well as theory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question as to this chart here before us?

Mr. DINGELL. I dislike to have it come out of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if, when he revises his remarks, he will include, in reference to the chart appearing on my left, the mathematical formula showing how the figures in the right-hand column are arrived at?

Mr. DINGELL. I can answer that. I think that is the increase in the amount of take-home pay. He made that clear.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will yield, I will be delighted to supply that information to the gentleman, and I request him to let us know in his extension of remarks how he stands on the Knutson bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to have this information that I requested.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman from Tennessee state which Knutson bill—the one he promised first or the one he introduced, or the Allen bill, or what?

Mr. GORE. The No. 1 bill of the Republican Congress, H. R. 1.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I listened to the prepared speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], freshman member of the taxing Committee on Ways and Means, as he rose girded for combat to defend the indefensible Knutson 20-percent straight-across the board relief-for-the-rich plan. I marveled at his dexterity and verbal fencing as he dueled with the able and progressive gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. At one and the same time he blew hot and cold, said yes and no, agreed and disagreed, went forward and back, but ultimately came around to his own perch to express himself in unmistakable and understandable terms which needed only some graphic illustrations to prove the fallacy of his position. By his own unshaken determination to revitalize the exhumed mummy, known before its disgraceful demise as the Mellon plan, now rechristened the Knutson plan, he alines himself, according to my mind, on the wrong side of a most vital question and against those who in the largest measure deserve tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I will fight every inch of the way this iniquitous attempt to foist upon the American people another,

though even more vicious, Mellon plan under the Knutson label.

My attention was arrested when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] gave unequivocal approval to the original Knutson plan. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 758:

The Knutson bill as it was originally drafted and as I approved it, and still approve it, was a flat reduction on all income taxpayers, the same reduction.

After graciously yielding to me the following dialog in part ensued. It illustrates clearly the lopsided philosophy of the Knutson adherents and their disposition to aid the wealthy while abandoning the millions of poor and middle-class taxpayers. I quote:

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. What the gentleman advocates is that the man who pays $1 of income tax gets 20 cents reduction.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. The man who pays $100 under the Knutson plan would get $20 reduction.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And the man who pays $100,000 in income tax gets a rebate of $20,000.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And the man who pays a million dollars in income taxes gets a tax cut of $200,000.

Mr. MASON. That is exactly right.

Mr. DINGELL. And the gentleman reasons that 20 cents tax cut to the poor devil who pays $1, and that is all he can pay, is all right and that is just, equitable, and right?

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. DINGELL. You think that is just right when it is compared with the man who gets $200,000 cut on $1,000,000?

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; of course.

Mr. MASON. And that is the whole theory of it.

Earlier in his speech as the RECORD will show on page 757, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] argues in support of his theory as being "right," "fair," "just," and "equitable." He cites Treasury expert's figures which I accept without verification or question:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to intelligently act upon a tax-reduction program we should have before us the essential facts that bear upon the problem of tax reduction, facts that throw light upon the number of people in the different tax brackets.

Treasury experts tell us that if we increase exemptions from $500 per person to $600 per person, it will take 3,000,000 people off the tax rolls and will mean a reduction in Treasury receipts of $1,500,000,000. If we increase income-tax exemptions from $500 to $700 per person it will take 10,000,000 people off the tax rolls and will mean a reduction in Treasury receipts of $3,000,000,000. This would practically use up the $3,500,000,000 tax rebate covered in the Knutson bill. Do we want to do that?

The following facts also bear directly upon the problem of tax reduction and should be kept in mind when considering the same:

(a) Sixty-seven percent of all Federal income taxpayers receive $2,500 per year or less. This group pays $4,500,000,000 in Federal taxes each year, and therefore would receive under the Knutson bill a rebate of $900,000,000.

(b) Twenty-eight percent of all Federal income taxpayers receive between $2,500 and $5,000 per year; pay $5,200,000,000 in Federal taxes, and would receive $1,040,000,000 rebate under the Knutson bill. The Federal Treasury books show that about half of the total Federal income-tax receipts come from these two groups; namely, taxpayers who receive $5,000 per year or below. We must keep these taxpayers on the tax rolls if we expect to balance the budget.

(c) Under present Federal tax rates and exemptions:

A $1,500-a-year man, with family of two children, pays no Federal income tax.

A $2,500-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $95 Federal income tax.

A $3,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $190 Federal income tax.

A $5,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $589 Federal income tax.

A $10,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $1,862 Federal income tax.

A $50,000-a-year man with family of two children, pays $24,111 Federal income tax.

A $500,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $406,600 Federal income tax.

A $1,000,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $838,850 Federal income tax.

I advance these figures by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] as the strongest argument illustrative of the essential need for striking from the rolls the largest number of taxpayers in the lowest income brackets by applying the most generous increase in exemptions covering dependents. That is the first and fairest step to take in the direction of tax relief; of course, after we balance the budget and pay substantially upon our national debt. Every taxpayer, rich or poor, will be treated in like manner if dependency is taken into account. One child or nine children rated as dependents will command the same statutory tax exemption of whatever the amount might be under the law and here I want to state it should be a generous amount raised from $500, as at present, to $750 or even more.

Mr. MASON'S figures pertaining to the loss of revenue indicate a figure of $3,000,000,000 and a reduction of 10,000,000 taxpayers with a $700 dependency exemption. I do not dispute these figures. It would be well for us to consider these figures when writing a new tax-reduction bill, for in addition to the tax benefit there would be an additional and a substantial economy in the reduction of the number of Treasury employees needed to service this large number of taxpayers, both in Washington and in the field. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] wants to retain these people on the rolls and desires to give the bulk of the relief to others fewer in number, richer, less deserving, in order to keep the poor, so he argues, tax conscious.

In the tax-relief bill of 1945 we who were then in the majority struck from the rolls approximately 12,000,000 taxpayers and I contend they are still conscious of their responsibility as citizens. In fact, they are taxpayers, Federal and State, whether they pay income taxes or not. They pay directly Federal excise taxes, and State and local taxes, either directly or indirectly. What they need more than anything else to keep them physically, mentally, and morally tax conscious is tax relief. Under the Knutson theory, which the gentleman from Illinois so valiantly champions, they would become physically unconscious of everything about them.

Let us take two simple examples, wide apart, from Mr. MASON'S own table to illustrate where lies the right, fair, just, and equitable in taxation—page 757, RECORD of February 3, 1947. I will leave the decision to you.

A $2,500-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $95 Federal income tax.

At present he has to get by on a balance of $2,405 for the year. His 20 percent cut under the Knutson plan would amount to $19 so next year he would have the munificent sum total of $2,424. Now take—

A $1,000,000-a-year man, with family of two children, pays $838,850 Federal income tax.

At present he has to get by on the remainder or $161,150. Given a 20 percent tax cut under the original Knutson plan for the relief of his distress, he, too, having a wife and two dependent children, his net income after taxes would be increased by only $32,230, increasing his meager exchequer to $193,380 for the following year.

If I am to be stirred to compassion and an inclination toward relief, I shall most certainly cry over and extend relief to the man who, after taxes, has left the amount of $2,405. That is equity and fairness in taxation predicated upon the ability to pay. That is not class legislation but good sound Americanism which will preserve our democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, I very much dislike to question sincerity or lack of knowledge of those with whom I differ so sharply and irreconcilably on the controversial subject of tax reduction. So to be as charitable as possible under the circumstances, I must say that the whole theory and philosophy underlying the issue is without foundation and therefore wrong. It must be since it is unsupported by the principle and the rule of ability to pay. They ignore, too, or forget that taxes are levied on the escalator or graduated basis and therefore should be reduced by employing the same principle and on the same basis.

Perhaps these champions of the Knutson plan of 20 percent tax reduction straight across the board do not know anything about this well-known and time-worn principle. My friends and colleagues of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], who have served on the committee even longer than I—and I am serving my seventh term thereon—should and do know that when we wrote so many of the 17 tax bills mentioned by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] we always, I repeat, always and without fail, graduated the tax increases in accordance with the principle of ability to pay. To illustrate what I mean—to begin with, we put people on the tax rolls who were not there before. Thus they paid 100 percent more than they did before the levy was made. The taxpayers in the lower brackets already on the rolls were increased from as high as 50 to 100 percent and sometimes more. In the next or higher income category they, the taxpayers, might have been increased from 40 to 75 percent and so on by reduced percentages; as the net income grew

larger the percentage of tax increases became less.

In the top brackets where the big incomes are classified for tax purposes and where the percentage of levy is already high the increase while in dollars great, in percentage it was quite small. The illustration is clearly understood when you realize that it tapered off in the highest brackets to limited increases of 5, 4, and even 3 percent, sometimes less.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield briefly.

Mr. LYNCH. Under the Knutson plan, as I understand it, the person who is taxed on $2,500 would receive only 50 cents a week relief, whereas those in the upper brackets would receive well over $1,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. Oh, yes; that is correct; that is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under the Knutson proposal which is a reversion to the putrid Mellon plan, the idea of fairness and applicability of the principle of reducing the tax load in the same manner and ratio as it was increased does not exist. Accordingly, it was pointed out factually by my friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] that a man making a million dollar net income for 1947, following a Knutson cut would pay less taxes than he paid on that amount in 1939. Whereas people in the lower income brackets would be paying five to ten times as much as they paid before the war. All because you take it off faster where you put it on slower, and slower where you put it on faster and heavier. The richer the man the greater the relief and the poorer the man the lesser the tax relief.

My Republican colleague from my own State the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] injecting himself into the discussion charges me with "advocating special privileges for this, that, and the other one, and especially to the low-income group." He charges me further with purchasing the votes of this low-income group. What sophism. You cannot buy this low-income-group vote—but you can get it by doing the right thing. However, votes may possibly have to be purchased if you favor those who need tax relief the least. I will take my chances, come what may, on the philosophy that the poor and the lowly first and the middle class next should get relief ahead of the high bracket income-tax payer. The gentleman from Allegan, Mich., Mr. HOFFMAN, can argue here that the small farmer back home should be satisfied with a $10 income-tax cut as fair and equitable as compared with a $10,000 cut for the other fellow, be he an industrialist or a corporate farmer, but I do not think he will score heavily in his district with such strained reasoning—it is wrong if you do not know any better but it is sinful if deliberately foisted upon the people.

I hold that this subject is the head-on and irreconcilable clash of the same old theories—the Republicans believe that to load the master's table to the breaking point with delicacies which the earth affords and to fill his cup brimful and to overflowing the little man sitting patiently at his feet will reap rich reward for his submissiveness.

The Democrats, however, believe and put into practice the idea that the common man is entitled to his fair share of the worldly goods, yes, even including some of the peacock feathers, leisure, and even of the spotlight if he earns and deserves it, and that because he is numerically so large the Nation's prosperity depends upon his well-being. The theory was proved in the late twenties and early thirties. President Hoover and the Republicans believed that prosperity comes down from above while the Democrats insisted it must come up from the roots. No argument in my mind as to who, and what idea, is just and right.

I stated my position on taxes before the election last fall when I addressed the House on August 2 and again when the Republican majority presented its first tax bill to perpetuate the superduper sales or excise taxes. I restate my position again and briefly.

There should not be any tax cut for the year 1947. After effecting every reasonable economy in government, without reducing veterans' benefits or essential armed services, and balancing the budget, such savings and surplus should then be applied to the reduction of the public debt. The tax bill of late 1947, carefully studied and drafted but applying to the tax for 1948, should provide, first, an additional and substantial payment upon the national debt in order to preserve Uncle Sam's good credit rating and to maintain the value of his notes of indebtedness, or as they are generally known, savings bonds and other outstanding obligations. Next, consideration should be given toward liberalizing the exemptions for dependents, raising the amount from $500 as at present to as high as $1,000 with $2,000 for married couples. Following that, striking off the tax rolls all taxpayers whose income tax amounts to $50 or less. It may be possible, following consultation with staff and Treasury experts, to go even up to $100. This would exempt at the same time and automatically, pensioners drawing modest amounts, yet hardly sufficient in themselves to provide the meager essentials of life. The next step to be considered in tax reduction should apply to all taxpayers on a graduated basis.

The wartime excise taxes borne by the consumer should be reduced at the earliest possible date in accordance with the pledge given the American people upon my motion and insistence at the time of their enactment.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Would it not be well for us to remember that it was from the low-income groups that the most sons and daughters were given in this war to keep us free?

Mr. DINGELL. That might be rather impertinent as a philosophy when called to the attention of the proponents of the Knutson plan. I do not think they took that into account.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, you know, we can take some of this small talk admirably in small doses, but when we suffer through an hour of extravagant conjecture it is just a little too much; and your blood pressure goes up just as the blood pressure of the voters went up last year when the question was asked: "Have you had enough?" They said they had had enough. We have had so many New Deal promises and so little performance from 1932 on that these haranguers become splendidly ineffective. The telephone book here in Washington for 1947 is three times the size it was in 1932.

There are 830 pages in the regular white section of the telephone book, plus a classified section. In my home town of Cleveland, Ohio, a community that has over 300,000 more people than Washington our telephone book contains only 741 pages.

The speech of the gentleman from Tennessee just delivered is an ill-advised and unfortunate attempt to stir up strife. It must be dismissed as moonshine. I think the Republican majority is undertaking to do an excellent, orderly job, and they are doing it in good time; so unlike New Deal procedure. I believe that we will provide a tax relief bill after sufficient study that will be pleasing to all the people in America, and I believe that our Committee on Expenditures, which is now getting under way will show where we can throw some of these papsuckers off the Federal pay roll; and that will be pleasing, too.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I spoke against the Knutson bill.

Mr. BENDER. I understand.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman favor it?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I have not studied all of the Knutson bill. My work is quite heavy here. Of course, I favor a tax-reduction bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Then the gentleman does not oppose my view.

Mr. BENDER. Just a moment. I want to say this: Now the gentleman is not going to pin me down to any particular bill at this stage of the game. We have been in session only about 5 weeks, and they expect us to perform miracles here. While I have been here—and this is my ninth year—I have seen the kind of performance we have had, and it comes with poor grace with the gentlemen on the minority side today to criticize the majority after all the bungling that we have had from them during all these years.

I think the people of the country have got their bellies full, and I am sure that they are going to get the kind of relief from this Republican Congress that they voted for last November. It is a condition created by the New Deal, not a theory which confronts us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I presume that the gentleman has the feeling that the committee should first complete its labors and report a bill to the House before any of us attempt to pass upon legislation that may come to us later.

Mr. BENDER. Exactly.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Who is the chairman of that committee at the present time, I will ask my good friend from Ohio?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will answer.

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that he has long been held up to the public as one of the outstanding tax experts in America, and we are sure that he will be able to convince his colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means that his position is absolutely correct and proper, whatever that position may be.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with the gentleman that that is probably what I will have to do with the present Republican chairman on that committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And if he is as able as I am sure the gentleman thinks he is, I am sure he will be able to convince the whole House that they should go along with his program.

Mr. DINGELL. I have only served on the committee seven terms and I want to say, modestly, that I am just beginning to learn something about taxes.

Mr. BENDER. Now, is that not a confession? Is that not grand?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, now comes the cruel pricking of the bubble—is it not fine that we now hear that the gentleman has been on the committee for seven terms and he is just now beginning to grasp what it is all about, yet here the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] brings in his bill the day before yesterday, or last month, and the gentleman from Michigan expects the bill to be perfection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I think it is the beginning of all wisdom when a man concedes that after seven terms he begins to realize the complexity of taxing and the responsibility imposed upon a man who has to deal with tax matters.

Mr. BENDER. I am very fond of my friend, and he knows it, but I say, for 45 minutes I have heard a lot of belly-aching here because the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is not perfect. The gentleman from Minnesota himself confesses that it is not perfection. Frankly, when we approach these tax issues it is just like singing Onward Christian Soldiers. It says in one verse, "Like a mighty army moves the church of God." We know that is a hope and an aspiration. It is not always moving like a mighty army. Then in another verse it says, "We are not divided, all one body we." Well, that is another fine thing to sing about. We try to do it. Why should we be criticized here after a few weeks' time following 14 years of the worst bungling in government we have ever had in this country? Now a Republican Congress takes over, and here, after a month's work, they wisecrack about us.

Of course, you can take a little of that stuff. It is admirable in small doses. But when you get 45 minutes of it from two such experts, expert New Dealers, I should say, as the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Michigan, rather facetiously on one hand and trying to be serious on the other, in throwing that stuff around here—you know what I am talking about—it is worthy of no credence. In fact it is in bad odor and our tears refuse to flow.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio, my colleague, will join with me in expressing the wish and the hope that if the gentleman from Michigan serves another 14 years on the Ways and Means Committee perhaps his education will be complete, and he will see the Republican viewpoint and embrace it.

Mr. BENDER. I agree. The Bible says "the wrath of man shall praise thee."

Mr. DINGELL. They still have something to learn.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is interesting to note that for seven terms, or 14 long years, no one ever had any experience in reducing taxes. Not until the Republicans come in do we even offer to reduce taxes.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right. The New Deal has been weighed in the balances and found wanting.

Let me say that the gentleman from Michigan confesses that he rode in on the coattails of the New Deal in 1932.

Mr. DINGELL. He never made that confession.

Mr. BENDER. I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to raise a point of personal privilege, because that is a slander. I never made such an admission.

Mr. BENDER. I apologize if I have hurt the gentleman's feelings.

Mr. DINGELL. Do not say things of that kind.

Mr. BENDER. But I say the gentleman was on the New Deal ticket. He was hanging on somebody's coattails.

Mr. DINGELL. Maybe some did, but I did not. The gentleman has some weight on me but he does not have it up here.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure I have not. The gentleman is a very learned and fine person. I am sure, as for intellect, he is a giant.

Mr. DINGELL. I made the admission of being modest about my knowledge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My distinguished friend has referred to the New Deal. As one who was majority leader for the last 6 years, and who has served here 18 years, during which period the gentleman has served here, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman for the many votes he gave in support of New Deal legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I listened with interest this afternoon and I have come to the conclusion that this little sideshow and this performance that we have seen is just an example of the cooperation that President Truman has asked of the Republican Party. This is just one example and, of course, we expect more as time goes on. Is that not right?

Mr. BENDER. That is a proper statement, and I think it is in order.

Regarding the statement of my friend, the former majority leader and now the minority whip of the House, I would say, yes, we voted for many things here as war measures, and since the war many of us have gone along with the administration. In fact, they had many unanimous votes here because of wartime conditions. But the war is now over, and we do not have to go for that stuff today. But may I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that I am sure I would not offend the learned gentleman by saying that he is hanging onto someone else's coattails. That is a figure of speech that is quite frequently used, you know. Many New Dealers were elected because of the voice and charm of the former President, but in any event his chief plank in the 1932 platform was to the following effect. He said:

> I shall approach the problem of carrying out the plain precept of our party, which is to reduce the cost of current Federal Government operations by 25 percent.

That is what he said about the plank in the Democratic New Deal platform in 1932, and you ladies and gentlemen of the House remember what happened. He was indulging in pure political bunkum. We got the business and they rode in on campaign promises that they did not try to keep. This Republican Congress was elected, in my

opinion, because the people had had enough of broken promises, as has been evidenced here. Furthermore, they want the cost of government reduced and they want their taxes reduced. Now there are some things we cannot reduce. We cannot cut the interest on the debt. We cannot cut the expenses of the Veterans' Administration operations. But we can cut the cost of government and we are proceeding in order to do that. We can cut the tax burden. We are not saying we are going to do a 100-percent perfect job, but we are trying. We think our friends are just a little impatient since we have only been in control of the House of Representatives for 5 weeks, after 14 years of bungling on the part of the New Deal. Then they get up here and chastise or leaders for trying to do a good job. They do not cut a very good figure. We have just organized the House and we are ahead of the game. If you compared this Congress with any Congress in the last 14 years, we are way ahead of the game in performance.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Two years ago it was along about February before the House started to function, and the gentleman from Massachusetts rose on the floor of the House and asked unanimous consent every time that when the House adjourned it would go over a day. But what I rose to say was that it took the minority party this time over 2 weeks to pick their committees. Our hands were tied until they submitted the names of their committeemen to us. Is that not true?

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. And we have been hearing a great deal about taxes and one thing and another. All this mess we are in is due to our having gotten into the war that Mr. Roosevelt promised to keep us out of in his Boston speech.

Mr. BENDER. May I say to the gentleman that in 1938, long before the war, when Mr. Roosevelt promised jobs and when he promised to cut the cost of government, in 1938 in the city of Cleveland we had 87,000 people working on the WPA getting $15 a week, and it was not until the war came that they began to get jobs for the people of America. We had 11,000,000 people out of work before the war started in Europe and before we were in it. I say it comes with poor grace from the representatives and the leaders of the opposition, especially with their people in Congress and with the President submitting the kind of budget that he submitted to us to criticize our people for trying to get their feet on the ground and get going in an orderly way. It is worthy of no credence.

The American people know this picture quite as well as the Republican Party. It is saying to us today, "How do you propose to repaint the scene? What do you offer?" We are developing our answers day by day. The solution of these problems cannot be visionary. It must be realistic. It must spring from the bitter experiences through which we have passed in the last decade.

We are not dealing with a partisan issue. We are discussing the future of the Nation in the formulation of our solutions. The day of extensive activity is passed. Our frontiers are no longer beckoning every adventurous son of the Nation. Soils are no longer lying beneath our feet in the first fertility of the nineteenth century. Populations are no longer increasing by the millions annually, demanding new products in never-ending succession. Today we must stimulate, we must encourage. Our economy is changing from extensive to intensive.

The Republican Party is recognizing this basic factor. No return to the era of "Go West, young man" is possible. We have literally millions of men and women whom we must plan for on the theory that they will require assistance for many years ahead. America can take care of them. This Nation can and will retrain many of them for new tasks. It will provide work for all of them. We must not yield to the temptation to pauperize those who cannot be reemployed. And while the process goes on, we shall seek the middle course which has always been the American technique.

There can be no doubt in the mind of every American citizen that the great promise with which the Democratic Party assumed national control in 1933 has gone completely unfulfilled. The more abundant life, the restoration of national prosperity, were glowing visions. They captured the Nation's enthusiasm with the greatest of ease. But the magnitude of our optimism was in direct proportion to the size of our disappointment. We have come down to earth with the usual sickening thud. Nowhere did we see the realization of the New Deal's happy pledges. Not a single major group in our Nation can look upon the activities of the national administration with genuine satisfaction. Capital has watched with growing apprehension as it has recognized the increasing menace of Government in business. Industry has discovered to its deep chagrin that the Federal Government regards businessmen as distinctly antisocial creatures. For the first time in many years the employers of labor have become consistent targets for the scorn of high officials, whipping boys for the national administration. The experience has been novel, and distinctly unpleasant.

Labor, in whose name a host of measures have been sponsored and enacted by the fertile minds of the "brain trust," finds to its dismay that harmony and peace do not necessarily follow in the path of legislation. Nor have the leaders of labor discovered any formula for permanent employment in the multitude of laws hatched by the New Deal. Despite the intensified interest in labor problems, labor relations, and union organization, the working men and women of the Nation, after 14 years of New Dealing, are still lost in the shuffle.

Industry will move out of the doghouse back into the good graces of the Nation, for whose growth it has been so largely responsible. The epoch of name calling, witch hunting, and public hanging will end. Encouragement rather than deterrents will keynote the return of Republican leadership of our National Government.

Farms can still be made to pay in our land. The work of our State and Federal agricultural bureaus makes it evident that there are new crops, new methods, new ideas in farming which may yet restore agricultural prosperity. What we need most is a market. A revived Nation, with industry regaining the confidence it has lost, will build that market up anew. The frantic search for foreign outlets, initiated and promoted by the New Deal, must give way to the sounder economy of an increased American market.

Government will get out of business because it has demonstrated repeatedly that it does not belong there. An institution which seeks to regulate by destroying is either blind or willful.

The multitude of bureaus and agencies created by the Federal Government in the last 14 years will be decimated, retaining only those which can justify their existence through their constructive achievements. Federal expenditures will drop.

But above all else, these specific steps will restore the Nation's confidence in the future. Once the restraint upon private investment has been removed through more equitable tax laws, the millions of dollars now held in the vaults of our banks will be given opportunity to get to work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 6, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Thursday, February 6, 1947, at 10 a. m., in suite 356, Old House Office Building, to consider the questions of subsistence ceilings and on-the-job training.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 6, 1947, in room 213, Old House Office Building, for the purpose of completing organization and general discussion.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings, Thursday, February 6, 1947, in room 346, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

274. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the

fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $12,600 for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

275. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two proposed revisions of rescissions previously recommended as set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

276. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $43,000 for the National Archives (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

277. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed increase in the administrative expense limitation for the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

278. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting changes in estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 for the Navy Department in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

279. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative branch, Library of Congress, fiscal year 1947, in the amount of $668,020 (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

280. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year 1948, in the amount of $25,300 for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

281. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 215 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

282. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

283. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

284. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, by extending that statute to all programs of the Department of Agriculture, and agencies operating under its direction, and in other respects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

285. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the County of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

286. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his recommendations with regard to S. 26, a bill to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

289. A communication from the President of the United States, recommending the revision of the laws as suggested in his message to Congress of June 19, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

290. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a supplemental report of contracts entered into under authority of Public Law 46 for the period beginning April 1, 1945, and ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

292. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the information that Friday, May 9, and Saturday, May 10, have been fixed as the dates for the 1947 visit of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 36. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept No. 14). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 90. Resolution to amend XI (1) (h) of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments); with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 80. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to the withdrawal of our troops from China; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. Part II, report submitting minority views on House Joint Resolution 27, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1327. A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. Senate Joint Resolution 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. Senate Joint Resolution 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1040. A bill to authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 91. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 27, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 70) to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service, and the same was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1671. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1672. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 1673. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1674. A bill to provide that upon discharge temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve be issued certificates of discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1675. A bill to name a dam on the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., and the reservoir created by the same; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1676. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1677. A bill to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1678. A bill to provide for promotion of officers on retired list receiving pay of a higher grade and to give all retired officers benefits already granted by law to the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1679. A bill to provide for Senate ratification of foreign trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1680. A bill to provide a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 1681. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 1682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application of the issuance of said passports; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALMOND:

H. R. 1683. A bill exempting from excise tax musical instruments sold to religious institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1684. A bill to authorize prospecting, locating, developing, mining, and patenting minerals in property acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1947 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013, 50 Stat. 525); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 1685. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1686. A bill providing for the incorporation of La Legion Franco-Americaine des Etats Unis d'Amerique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1687. A bill to increase the monthly rate of service pension payable to certain widows or remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1688. A bill relating to investment of trust funds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1689. A bill to provide for the establishment of a three-platoon system in the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1690. A bill to provide for reducing the costs of government in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 1691. A bill to amend section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1692. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell as expeditiously as possible lands acquired or being administered under the provisions of said title III to private persons for purposes not inconsistent with the provisions of the said title III, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1693. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1694. A bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 1695. A bill to provide for payment of extra compensation for work performed by customs employees on Sundays and holidays during the period between September 29, 1931, and June 2, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1696. A bill to provide compensation for veterans of World War II who have had pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1697. A bill to provide for the appointment of conservators, receivers, and other fiduciary officers to take charge of the affairs of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1698. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1699. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to assure to the United States world leadership in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1700. A bill to provide for daylight saving in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1701. A bill providing for the incorporation of La Legion Franco-Americaine des Etats Unis d'Amerique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1702. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1703. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration regional office building in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1704. A bill to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1705. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 1706. A bill authorizing the United States and District of Columbia governments to pay for water and water services secured from the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1707. A bill for the erection of a public building at McColl, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 1708. A bill to extend veterans' benefits to certain temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve who performed full-time active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1709. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1710. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1711. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide that the minimum annuity of employees retired for disability shall be $50 a month; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1712. A bill relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1714. A bill to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 1715. A bill to include Jewish War Veterans of the United States among the organizations which shall be recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the presentation of claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 1716. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1717. A bill to provide for the regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1718. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1932," approved ———, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 1719. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to Thomas Alva Edison; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1720. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World World I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 1721. A bill to prohibit Federal land banks from reserving mineral or timber rights when they dispose of certain real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 1722. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 1723. A bill for the relief of the city of Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation of plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 81 Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the radio broadcasting of crime programs; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 81; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 83. Resolution to provide for the printing of a documented study and analyses of Fascism in Action as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1724. A bill to legalize the admission to the United States of Sarah Jane Sanford Pansa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Gus Manalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1726. A bill for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1727. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Gertrude Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1729. A bill providing for the renewal of Patent No. 1,481,939, issued January 29, 1924, relating to garages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 1730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Aprea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1732. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Breinig Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of G. C. Hedrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1735. A bill for the relief of Cox Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife, Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually, the estate of Ora H. Hatfield, and Mrs. Kitte B. Hatfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of Owen R. Brewster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1738. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1739. A bill for the relief of Michael Gladych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1740. A bill for the relief of Aron Rosendor, Sara Rosendor, Batia Rosendor, Sammy Rosendor, and Suzanne Rosendor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1741. A bill for the relief of Bartolo Rando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Mary Lomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1743. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Matheos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1744. A bill for the relief of the estate of Curtis Wilson, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Harvey Shields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1746. A bill for the relief of James V. Salerno and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Novick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1748. A bill for the relief of James A. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1749. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Resolution adopted by women veterans of Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., urging that all rights and privileges of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act be extended to veterans of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

78. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of residents of Kermit, Tex., urging abolition of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

79. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6184 passed by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco endorsing the establishment of a United States Navy postgraduate school on the Monterey Peninsula; to the Committee on Armed Services.

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the sixth municipal council, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Congress authorizing the transfer to the municipal government of that portion of land to hospital grounds belonging to the Federal Government and not now being utilized by the low-cost housing; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter, 1946.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1) _____

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2) _____

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3) _____

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4) _____

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5) _____

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6) _____

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1) _____

(2) To whom paid:

(2) _____

(3) For what purposes:

(3) _____

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4) _____

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the fourth calendar quarter 1946, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Self. (2) My own and others who suffered losses as a result of the war, particularly those in the Far East. (3) Until the war damages are paid. (4) Not known. (5) No agreement. (6) None. (7) Not known.

Archer, Glenn L., legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal Relations Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (3) Annual basis. (4) Quarterly salary, $1,104.50. Estimated for legislative service, $110.45, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. (5) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Bailey, Fred, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (2) National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (3) Until terminated. (4) Salary of $4,200 per year (part-time position), which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, most of which consist in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 40 percent of my time. (5) National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (6) $100 per month. (7) Traveling and entertainment expenses.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (2) Same as (1). (3) Whenever needed. (4) $10 per diem. (5) American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (6) Only what expenses amount to. (7) Carfare, taxis, stamps, stationery, etc.

Barrere,[1] Claude, 523–B East Eighty-fifth Street, New York 28, N. Y. (1) National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National St. Lawrence Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $500 monthly. (5) By above association. Funds derived from voluntary contributions. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses while on travel status. (7) None.

Beirne,[1] J. A., 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) National Federation of Telephone Workers. (3) Two-year periods, governed by an election. (4) Receives salary of $12,000 per year as president. No special part of the salary is designated for lobby work. (5) National Federation of Telephone Workers. (6) Actual. (7) Cab fare and other incidentals.

Bell, John Dickinson, editor and publisher of Unveiling the Universe, post-office box 3214, Washington 10, D. C., and post-office box 943, Scranton 3, Pa. (1) True Order PMA for UTU; full title: True Order Perfect Mutual Aid for Unveiling the Universe for Prudent, Moderate Americans, for Perfect Mental Age, for Proud, Modest Americans, for You, Too. (2) For Prudent Moderate Americans, for Perfect Mental Age, for Proud Modest Americans, for You Too. (3) As long as he lives. (4) At the present time only the actual expenses that may be incurred in the work, with no personal compensation whatsoever. (5) By the members of True Order PMA for UTU, and their well wishers. (6) Whatever sums that may be necessary to accomplish the objects in view, but not over $500,000 per year the first year. (7) All expenses that are allowable deductions from income-tax reports.

Bennett, Hugh M., 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (2) Entire jewelry industry of the United States, including retail, wholesale, manufacturing, jobbing, and importing. (3) Indefinite. (4) $150 per day when absent from Columbus, Ohio, and expenses, $100 per day while in Columbus, Ohio, and long-distance tolls and telegrams for actual time devoted to committee work. (5) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel fares, hotel room, meals, local and long-distance telephone tolls, telegrams, taxicabs, miscellaneous tips.

Bodfish, Morton, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) United States Savings & Loan League, an Illinois corporation not for profit, organized in 1892. (2) United States Savings & Loan League, a Nation-wide trade association of savings and loan associations, building and loan associations, cooperative banks, and State and local organizations of such institutions. The membership is approximately 3,700. (3) Employment commenced in spring of 1920 and has been uninterrupted. Registrant is subject to annual election by the executive committee of the organization. (4) The 1947 budget of the organization provides a $5,000 salary to be paid to the registrant for legislative work. (5) The United States Savings & Loan League, of which the registrant is an officer. (Executive vice president for 16 years, now chairman of the executive committee.) (6) There is no general allowance or set amount but registrant is reimbursed for travel and hotel outlays. (7) Expenses have only included rail and air transportation, hotel, and subsistence when in Washington on legislative work.

Boehne,[1] John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, P. O. Box 1034, Milwaukee 1, Wis. (2) Employees of collectors' offices in United States. (3) Indefinite. (4) $300 per month. (5) By the association. (6) $10 to $15 per month (stamps, telegrams, etc.). (7) Stamps, telegrams, etc.

Bowden, Ray B., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Same as above. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,500 (part time). (5 Same as above. (6) Actual reimbursement of expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, newspapers and periodicals, limited amount of entertainments, luncheons, etc.

Brightman, Melvin H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Dairy Industry Committee. (3) Full time as executive secretary of this committee. Time spent on legislative affairs will depend on prospective legislation as it may affect the dairy industry. (4) $10,000 per year as executive secretary. Legislative activities are minor phases of functions and activities of this committee. (5) Dairy Industry Committee. (6) Necessary incidental and travel expenses. (7) Normal incidental and travel.

Brown,[2] Andrew H., 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (2) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (3) As long as may be necessary in any year. (4) $700, which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (6) Any amount required but no set sum, limited, however, to purposes stated in (7). (7) Traveling and subsistence when out of town.

Brown, Edgar G., 1717 Euclid Street NW. (1) National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Anti-discrimination legislation. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) Traveling and printing.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (2) Interest of Seatrain Lines, Inc., a common carrier by water. (3) Calendar year 1947. (4) An annual fee of $7,500 for legislative work is paid by Seatrain Lines, Inc., to Clark & LaRoe, a law partnership consisting of three partners: Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Frederick E. Brown, and Arthur L. Winn, Jr. Each of the partners named shares in this fee under the general partnership agreement. (5) Seatrain Lines, Inc. (6) No amount is specified but it will be merely reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred and will be relatively small. (7) Those incurred for incidental matters, such as telephone, printing taxi fares, postage, travel.

Bryson, Jack, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; residence, Glendale, Calif. (1) Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 28 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Motion-picture industry, as represented by the member companies of Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $27,000 annually for all services, of which about 25 percent is in relation to Federal legislation. (5) Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred in carrying on the employment.

Burger,[1] George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City. (1) I am owner of the Burger Tire Consultant Service. Also owner and publisher of the National Independent, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of independent tire dealers. I am also a director of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., 715 Bond Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Independent tire dealers, and the members of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) my net income from the Burger Tire Consultant Service last year, and from the National Independent last year, was $9,903.24. As a director of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., I have the use of one small room in the Bond Building, Washington, D. C. I have no other compensation. (5) Independent tire dealers subscribe to both my consultant services and to the National Independent. As I have stated above, I just have the use of one small room in the Bond Building, Washington, D. C., in connection with the National Federation of Small Business. I also receive income through the sale of advertisement in the National Independent. (6) I have no allowance for expenses, since both my tire consultant service and publication are operated on the basis of net profit. I receive no allowance whatsoever from any subscribers or from the National Federation of Small Business for entertainment purposes. (7) The cost of operating the Burger Tire Consultant Service and the National Independent last year, 1946, was $18,671.76.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Caldwell,[1] J. B., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 807, Washington, D. C. (1) National Used Car Dealers Association, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 807, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Yearly contract, 30-day mutual cancellation clause. (4) $12,000 annually. (5) Same. (6) Ordinary traveling expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telegraph, telephone, etc.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (3) Retained on monthly basis to represent company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interests. (4) One thousand dollars per month. (5) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (6) No fixed sum, but sufficient to cover items listed under paragraph 7. (7) Telephone, telegraph, postage, transportation, and other expense incidental to employment.

Casey, D. E., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Taxpayers Association, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington D. C. (2) American Taxpayers Association, Inc. (3) One year. (4) $385 per month. (5) American Taxpayers Association, Inc. (6) No fixed amount. (7) None specified.

Castiglioni, Paul M., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Members of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees. (3) Present term expires September 1, 1948. (4) $3,350 per year. (5) National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees. (6) All actual necessary expenses, approximately $50 per week. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, phone, telegrams, rent office space, etc.

Clements, J. C., Carroll Arms Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (3) January 1, 1947, to January 31, 1948, inclusive. (4) $833.33 a month. (5) National Council on Business Mail, Inc. (6) Necessary expenses. (7) Telephone, telegram, and traveling expenses that are necessary.

Cloward,[2] Rev. Donald B., 152 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Council on Christian Social Progress, Northern Baptist Convention, 152 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) Council on Christian Social Progress as the Northern Baptist Convention's agency. (3) Permanent. (4) $5,000. (5) Northern Baptist Convention. (6) $1,200. (7) Travel only.

Cohn,[1] Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (3) Year to year. (4) $375 per year. (5) American Jewish Committee. (6) $450 per year (approximately). (7) Rent, luncheons, travel, dinners, stationery, office supplies, secretary, entertainment, postage, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Colborn,[1] Fern M., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) The same. (3) Permanent. (4) $1,200 annually. (5) The same. (6) Personal expenses refunded, i. e., travel, lodging, food. (7) Travel, lodging, food.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal Relations Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (3) Annual basis. (4) Quarterly salary $1,175.04. Estimated for legislative service $117.50, which covers legislative and non-legislative activities. (5) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Connett, William C., IV, 1630 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis 2, Mo. (1) American Cross Arm & Conduit Co., 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (2) American Cross Arm & Conduit Co. (3) Indefinite until claim is accepted or rejected by Congress. (4) Received $900 on account and 15 percent of proceeds of any claim; expenses to be paid out of $900. (5) American Cross Arm & Conduit Co. (6) So much of the retainer of $900 is to be used to pay expenses, as within the discretion of Mr. Connett. (7) Traveling expenses, telegraph, telephone, etc.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) American Mining Congress. (3) Continuously since 1935. (4) $7,500 per year for this activity. (5) American Mining Congress, Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses, on itemized and approved vouchers therefor. (7) Ordinary expenses incurred for transportation, travel, and other related expenses.

Conroy, Eugene J., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (2) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (3) I am associate general counsel of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, a permanent full-time position. (4) No special payment; activities covered by this declaration will be a minor part of my full-time duties. (5) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (6) Actual. (7) Traveling.

Cooke, Richard C., 120 Boylston Street, Boston 16, Mass. (1) Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., 120 Boylston Street, Boston 16, Mass. (2) Members of the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc. (3) March 1, 1947. (4) $100 weekly. (5) Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc. (6) Necessary traveling expenses. (7) Railroad, automobile mileage, hotel, and meals.

Corlett,[2] Spencer D., 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (2) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (3) As long as may be necessary in any year. (4) $400, which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (6) Any amount required but no set sum, limited however to purposes stated in (7). (7) Traveling, and subsistence when out of town.

Covington,[1] J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (2) American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Amount earned under normal attorney client retainer; the fee will be computed on the basis of time expended. (5) American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (6) Expenses as incurred. (7) Traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Cowling, W. C., 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) National St. Lawrence Association, 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) National St. Lawrence Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) General office; rent, telephone, telegraph, supplies, traveling expenses, stenographic assistance.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Agnes E. Meyer, 1624 Crescent Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not fixed; to be determined on the basis of legal services rendered. (5) Agnes E. Meyer. (6) Not fixed. (7) Normal disbursements only, such as taxis, long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, mimeographing, etc.

Cruse, Donald, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (2) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (3) I am general counsel of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, a permanent full-time position. (4) No special payment. Activities covered by this declaration will be a minor part of my full-time duties. (5) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (6) Actual. (7) Traveling.

Cunniff,[2] Joseph P., 707 Columbia Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (1) District Lodge No. 29 of the International Association of Machinists, 707 Columbia Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; international office, Machinists' Building, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) Membership of the international association employed in the railroad industry. (3) Only when legislation affecting membership is proposed. (4) $350 per month salary. (5) Salary is paid by District Lodge No. 29 of the International Association of Machinists; expenses are paid by the international grand lodge. (6) $9 per day. (7) Hotel, food, cab and trolley fare.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (2) For International Association of Machinists incident to his regular duties as headquarters staff official. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 yearly for his regular duties as staff official; no additional allowance for legislative work. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $5 daily, except Sunday and holidays, to cover incidental expenses, meals, taxi fares, etc.; no allowance for legislative work. (7) None.

Danielian, N. R., 1830 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National St. Lawrence Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,000 monthly retainer for "fostering and increasing trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries, and waterways of the world." (5) By above association. Funds derived from voluntary membership dues. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses while on travel status. (7) General office, rent, telephone, telegraph, supplies, traveling expenses, stenographic assistants, etc.

Daugherty,[2] Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (2) Ohio Chamber of Commerce. (3) Employed continuously since January 1937. (4) $6,250 per annum. (5) Ohio Chamber of Commerce. (6) I expect to be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling and business expenses while away from my office. The amount for any period of time cannot be estimated. (7) Actual and necessary travel and business expense.

Davis,[1] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) Elected annually.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[2] Registration with the secretary only.
[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.
[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

My present term will expire in January of 1948. (4) Salary of $11,000 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consist in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Davis, Laurence W., 633 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Electrical Contractors' Association, 633 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C., a national nonprofit membership association of firms engaged in electrical contracting. (2) The registrant works in the interests of the National Electrical Contractors' Association, which was organized in 1901 to promote the interests of electrical contractors in the installation, servicing, and maintenance of electrical wiring appliances and equipment and to further ethical business practices and to improve products and services. (3) The registrant has been continuously employed since January 1920. (4) The registrant is paid at the rate of $10,800 per year as general manager of National Electrical Contractors' Association, which includes substantial duties and activities that are not covered by this act. (5) The registrant is paid exclusively by the National Electrical Contractors' Association. (6) The registrant is furnished an office, secretarial, telephone, and telegraphic service, but no fixed expense allowance. Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed on itemized vouchers. (7) The holding of meetings, meals, entertainment, taxis, travel out of Washington, D. C., for both activities covered and not covered by this act. No quarterly report filed for quarter ending October 10, since registrant engaged in no activities covered by the act during such quarter.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) American Mining Congress. (3) Continuously since 1930. (4) $5,000 per year for this activity. (5) American Mining Congress, Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses on itemized and approved vouchers therefor. (7) Ordinary expenses incurred for transportation, travel, and other related expenses.

Disbrow,[1] Walter L., 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington 4, D. C. (2) Membership of the Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (3) To January 1, 1948. (4) $4,800 per annum. (5) Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (6) Actual expenses approximately $1,000 per year. (7) Transportation, postage, incidentals.

Dougherty, Robert E., 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,600 per annum, which is paid for all of the services rendered to the association only a part of which have to do with legislation. (5) The National Lumber Manufacturers Association. (6) The amount actually and necessarily expended in behalf of the association, in connection with entire employment, only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred on business of the association including that part which concerns legislation.

Dunton, Arthur C., 407 Westview Street, Philadelphia, Pa., Lee Sheraton Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Donald Scott, president, Western Defense Housing Cos., 1041 East Green Street, Pasadena, Calif. (2) Western Defense Housing Cos., 1041 East Green Street, Pasadena, Calif. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,260 per annum. (5) Western Defense Housing Cos. (6) Out-of-pocket as below. (7) Traveling, hotel, incidental and personal maintenance.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) See No. (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See No. 1. (6) Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Department of Water and Power, city of Los Angeles, box 3669, Terminal Annex, Los Angeles 54, Calif. (2) Same as No. 1. (3) Month to month. (4) $500 to $800 per month, for legal services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, Courts of Claims and other litigation, conferences with Government departments, and such legislative matters, if any, as may develop from time to time incidental to such services. (5) Same as item 1. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket office expenses. (7) Telegraph, telephone, teletype, travel and similar out-of-pocket expenses, but not office overhead.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (2) Same as item 1. (3) Month to month. (4) $500 per month, for legal services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and such departmental conferences and legislative proceedings as the State may instruct us to attend or report upon. (5) Water Project Authority. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket office expenses. (7) Telegraph, telephone, teletype, travel and similar out-of-pocket expenses, but not office overhead.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Imperial irrigation district, El Centro, Calif. (2) Same as No. 1. (3) Month to month. (4) $700 per month, for legal services of this office and in California in negotiations with other water and power users, the Government departments, litigation, and such legislative matters as may relate thereto. (5) Same as No. 1. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Telegraph, telephone, teletype, travel and similar out-of-pocket expenses, but not office overhead.

Farshing, Donald D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Management Planning of Washington, Inc. (2) Management Planning of Washington, Inc., which offers consultative services on administrative and governmental problems. (3) Since January 1, 1944. (4) At the rate of $5,200 per annum. (5) Exclusively by Management Planning of Washington, Inc. (6) Registrant is furnished office space, secretarial service, telephone and telegraph facilities, plus normal out-of-pocket expenses for transportation, etc. (7) Transportation and normal out-of-pocket expenses.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (2) United States Savings & Loan League. (3) Indefinite general employment. (4) Salary for general employment is $7,000 per annum and less than one-half of work is legislation. (5) United States Savings & Loan League. (6) I am reimbursed for amounts actually incurred and paid by me for travel and other incidental expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel bills, and other similar incidental expenses.

Ferguson, John A., Suite 305, 1700 I Street, Washington, D. C. (1) The Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street, Washington, D. C. (2) The Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (3) Full-time employed executive director; principal duties are those of chief administrative officer of the association. (4) As executive director am paid $25,000 per annum and devote all my time to the affairs of the association. A portion of time is required to keep the membership advised of any legislative matters in Congress effecting oil or natural gas. (5) The Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (6) All necessary travel, hotel and expense incident to my employment as executive director of the association. (7) See 6 above.

Fillius, Maurice W., 703 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Registrant is general counsel and United States representative of the Puerto Rico Rum Institute, which is a trade association of the Puerto Rico rum industry whose principal office is at San Juan, P. R. (2) Puerto Rico rum industry. (3) Registrant is paid a retaining fee on an annual basis. His work involves contacts with United States distributors of products of producing members and administrative agencies of the Federal Government. Legislative work primarily of an informational nature is incidentally included. Registrant does not solicit or receive moneys or anything of value for the purpose of influencing legislation. (4) Retaining fee of $10,000 per annum is received by registrant payable quarterly in advance, plus reimbursement for incidental and travel expenses. (5) Puerto Rico Rum Institute, Gonzalez-Padin Building, San Juan, P. R. (6) Reimbursement for incidental and travel expenses, as above. (7) Travel and incidental expenses.

Flinn, W. G., Grand Lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (2) For International Association of Machinists incident to his regular duties as headquarters staff official. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 yearly for his regular duties as staff official, no additional allowance for legislative work. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $5 daily except Sunday and holidays to cover incidental expenses (meals, taxi fares, etc.), no allowance for legislative work. (7) None.

Floyd,[1] William M., 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Regular Veterans Association, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Veterans. (3) Appointment for 1 year subject to reappointment. (4) $3,600 per annum. (5) Regular Veterans Association, address as above. (6) Nothing.

Flynn,[1] M. J., 604 Carpenters Building, Washington, D. C.; 302 American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) America's Wage Earners Protective Conference, International Allied Printing Trades Association. (2) The organizations above named. (3) Indefinite in that elections are held yearly. (4) America's Wage Earners Protective Conference, salary, $5,200; International Allied Printing Trades Association, salary, $3,400. (5) The organizations above named. (6) Such expenses as are necessarily incurred. (7) Expenses incurred in attending and addressing conventions, meetings of executive boards, conferences with officials of International Unions comprising both organizations paid to railroads, hotels, etc., and incidental expenses in Washington.

Forbes, E. F., Room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. (1) Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., Room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. (2) Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (3) Seven-year contract of employment ending March 15, 1953. (4) $20,000 per year and actual expenses when traveling out of San Francisco. (5) Western States Meat

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

Packers Association, Inc. (6) Actual expense incurred. (7) Transportation, communications, room, and meals.

Ford,[1] Tirey L., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Sea Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; (b) Del Monte Properties Co., Del Monte, Calif. (2) (a) Sea Air Legislative Committee; (b) Del Monte Properties Co (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined—dependent upon services rendered and time spent on legislative activities. (5) (a) Sea Air Legislative Committee; (b) Del Monte Properties Co. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Administrative, clerical, travel subsistence, and any other expenses properly attributable to legislative activities.

Gall, John C. (firm of Gall & Lane), Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown 1, Ohio. (2) The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown 1, Ohio. (3) Indefinite. (4) Ordinary attorney-and-client relationship extending over period of some years. Firm receives retainer of $250 per month for legal services and from time to time receives additional fees with respect to specific litigation or other legal services; any legislative work is incidental and occasional. (5) The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown 1, Ohio. (6) Indefinite; customarily does not exceed $600 to $1,000 per year. (7) Travel, long-distance telephone, hotel and miscellaneous expense when traveling on company business.

Giddings, Ernest, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal Relations Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (3) Annual basis. (4) Quarterly salary, $1,125—estimated for legislative service, $112.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. (5) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Glazier, William H., 930 F Street NW., Room 800, Washington 4, D. C. (1) International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 604 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Labor, particularly organized workers in the longshore, warehousing, and sugar industries. (3) Indefinite. (4) $80 per week (only approximately one-third of time is spent on legislative assignments). (5) International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (6) $10 per week for taxi fares and phone calls. (7) Phone calls and taxi fares only.

Gorman,[1] William Henry, 129 Alleghaney Street, Clifton Forge, Va. (1) District No. 66, International Association of Machinists. (2) The employees represented by District No. 66, International Association of Machinists. (3) Election is held every 2 years. (4) $450 per month as general chairman of International Association of Machinists, District No. 66. (5) I receive my regular salary through the organization, no extra compensation for legislation work. (6) $9 per day. (7) Hotel and lodging.

Goss, Albert S., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (2) National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (3) Elected for 2-year term, which expires on November 21, 1947. (4) Salary of $7,500 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, most of which consist in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 20 percent of my time. (5) National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Traveling and entertainment expenses.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registration is engaged in the practice of law, and is retained in connection with pertinent matters pending before the executive departments and the Congress, by the Department of Public Relations, American Osteopathic Association, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Osteopathic Association. (3) Three years. (4) $12,000 per year. This is a general retainer for legal services involving pertinent matters pending before the executive departments and the Congress. (5) American Osteopathic Association. (6) No specified amount. (7) Items such as telegraph, printing, and transportation. Any items incurred jointly with Dr. C. D. Swope, Farragut Medical Building, Washington, D. C., chairman of the department mentioned in (1) above, who is not engaged for pay or for legislative purposes, will be reported jointly.

Greenway, J. Cole, 30 Vesey Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (2) New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (3) Indefinite. (4) No compensation paid. (5) No compensation paid. (6) Reimbursed for expenses incurred in connection with work done for the New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (7) Traveling and other miscellaneous expenses.

Gross,[2] M. Louise (Mrs. Chas. J. Schroeder), 321 Halstead Avenue, Harrison, N. Y. (1) Women's Moderation Union, same address as above. (2) Opposing all prohibition bills, Federal controls, like OPA, and other labor, communistic, and un-American acts. (3) Indefinitely. (4) Nothing. (5) Out of dues and contributions to the Women's Moderation Union. (6) $100. (7) Hotel and car fares.

Haas,[1] Frank E., 204 South Canal Street, Chicago 6, Ill. (1) The Western Association of Railway Executives, Union Station Building, Chicago 6, Ill. (2) The Western Association of Railway Executives and its member roads. (3) Continuing. (4) $600 per month. (5) Western Association of Railway Executives. (6) No specified sum. Reimbursement of actual expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expenses, meals and living quarters while away from home, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenditures incident to the performance of his duties.

Haas, John A., 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Milk producers belonging to cooperative member associations. (3) Permanent employee since April 1944. (4) $6,000 per annum an indeterminate but minor portion of which can be attributed to activities covered by the act. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) Only such out-of-pocket expenses as are accounted for in detailed expense accounts. (7) Carfare, taxicab, and occasional luncheon expense while in Washington, and all out-of-pocket expense while out of city.

Hamlet, Harry G., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. Not maintained for the principal purpose, nor does it solicit, collect or receive funds principally to be used for the purpose of influencing legislative action. (2) Retired Officers Association, Inc., whose membership is retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,400 annually, as executive vice president and treasurer and editor of the Retired Officers Association Bulletin, no part of which is paid or received specifically for attempting to influence legislative action. (5) Retired Officers Association, Inc. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Hansen, Harry, 305 Royal Union Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Home Owners Protective League of Des Moines, Iowa, of which I am a member. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) I am making no charge for my services and have received no compensation. (5) Home Owners Protective League. Expenses only. (6) The actual expense incurred. (7) The actual traveling, living, stenographic, and printing expenses.

Harter,[1] Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (2) The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (3) Calendar year 1947, being a renewal of previous annual retainers. (4) Retained on ordinary attorney-client basis as Washington counsel for the company, $7,500 in 1947. It is impossible to segregate the time which may be consumed upon legislative matters in which the company is interested. (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (6) No amount fixed or determined. (7) Will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses including travel, local transportation, telephone, and telegraph.

Hawkins, Paul M., room 307, Tower Building, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-Seventh Street, New York. (2) American Hotel Association. (3) Indeterminate. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) American Hotel Association. (6) Actual and necessary. (7) Traveling expenses, phones, taxis, etc.

Hays,[1] Joseph H., 204 South Canal Street, Chicago 6, Ill. (1) The Western Association of Railway Executives, Union Station Building, Chicago 6, Ill. (For statement of character of registrant's employment see attached statement.[2]) (2) The Western Association of Railway Executives and its member roads. For further information see attached statement. (3) Continuing. (4) $14,400 per year. (See attached statement.[2]) (5) Western Association of Railway Executives. (6) No specified sum. Reimbursement of actual expense incurred. (7) Traveling expenses, meals, and living quarters while away from his home, clerical assistance, office supplies, postage, telephone and telegraph expense and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenditures incident to the performance of his duties.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York 1, N. Y. (2) National Retail Dry Goods Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $11,000. (5) National Retail Dry Goods Association. (6) No specific sum has been authorized. (7) Actual expenses subject to approval upon itemization.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) I serve without compensation as president of the American Parents Association (52 Vanderbilt Avenue) and also without compensation as chairman of the National Committee Working for the Enactment of the National School Health Services Act (52 Vanderbilt Avenue). I am employed by a business corporation, but my work for this company does not include lobbying. (2) The American Parents Association and the National Committee Working for the Enactment of the National School Health Services Act, both of which organizations are working in the interest of children and youth. (3) Tenure of office in the association and committee named above is for no fixed period. Reelection as president of the association is on an annual basis. The committee is a temporary one, probably, and I shall doubtless be chairman throughout its existence. (4) I am not paid anything by the association or committee. (5) I volunteer my services to the association and the com-

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

mittee. (6) I come to Washington frequently in the interest of my regular employment and do some work for the association and committee while I am there. The expenses of special trips made for either the association or the committee will be reimbursed to me by the American Parents Association. (7) Railroad expenses, hotel expenses, taxicabs, meals, telephones, while on special trips made exclusively in the interest of the association and the committee named above.

Heckendorn,[1] William, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) Until terminated. (4) Salary of $7,500 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consist in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Herrmann, Louis F., 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Milk producers belonging to cooperative member associations. (3) Permanent employee since June 1944. (4) $7,000 per annum an indeterminate but minor portion of which can be attributed to activities covered by the act. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) Only such out-of-pocket expenses as are accounted for in detailed expense accounts. (7) Carfare, taxicab, and occasional luncheon expense while in Washington, and all out-of-pocket expenses while out of city.

Hiss, Donald, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) See No. (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See No. (1), (6) Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Holman, Charles W., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Milk producers belonging to cooperative member associations. (3) Permanent employee since approximately 1919. (4) $12,500 per annum an indeterminate portion of which can be attributed to activities covered by the act. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) Only such out-of-pocket expenses as are accounted for in detailed expense accounts. (7) Carfare, taxicab, and occasional luncheon expense while in Washington, and all out-of-pocket expense while out of city.

Huntington, Morgan G., Fitch Building, Socorro, N. Mex. (1) United Mining & Milling Corp., Fitch Building Socorro, N. Mex. (2) United Mining & Milling Corp. (3) Full-time employment as president and general manager, only a part of which concerns legislation. (4) $12,000 yearly as salary. (5) United Mining & Milling Corp. (6) No fixed amount; whatever necessary incidental to travel and normal business of the corporation, only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred in the business of the corporation, only a part of which concerns legislation.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York 4, N. Y. (1) New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (2) New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing. (5) No compensation received. (6) Reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in connection with work done for the New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (7) Traveling and other miscellaneous expenses.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

Jackson, Robert C., 211 Kellogg Building, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cotton Council of America, 165 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (2) National Cotton Council of America, an organization of cotton producers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers, and cotton textile mills. Sole purpose of organization is to increase consumption of cotton, cottonseed, and the products thereof. (3) Permanent. (4) $9,600 annually. (5) National Cotton Council of America only. (6) Reimbursement for legitimate out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Legitimate out-of-pocket expenses such as: out-of-town travel, telephone and telegram, cab fares, meals for guests, etc.

Johnson,[1] Carroll E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio; State address, Box 194, Mishawaka, Ind. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) This I cannot answer; at this moment do not expect to be in Washington. (4) $60 weekly. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) $30 weekly. (7) Hotel rooms, meals, and transportation.

Johnson,[1] Elmer, president, National Association Retired Federal Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Retired Federal Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Generally, on behalf of all retired employees, and specifically on behalf of those who are members of the Retired Association mentioned. Incidentally, acting in the interest of active employees who later will be retired. As president of the association, is chairman of the executive committee, and is the administrative head of the association, supervising its various functions. (3) Elected to office for 1 year. Present term expires March 1947. (4) The office of president of the association pays $100 per month. (5) National Association Retired Federal Employees. (6) $500. (7) Traveling expenses, maintenance, and incidentals.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Lake Carriers' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $27 per day for work actually performed and reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (5) Lake Carriers' Association. (6) Reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (7) Traveling and other expenses incident thereto when away from home.

Jones,[1] Bascom F., 930 Broadway, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville 3, Tenn. (2) Tennessee Railroad Association and its member roads. For further information see exhibit A.[3] (3) Continuing. (4) Registrant is paid an annual salary of $7,500 in consideration of his performance of the duties indicated on Exhibit A [3] attached. He receives nothing additional but is reimbursed for personal expenses incident to his employment. (5) Tennessee Railroad Association. (6) Reimbursement of personal expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. (7) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred in his employment, such as taxicab fares, use of personal automobile, and other traveling expenses while away from headquarters, including hotel bills, and cost of meals, telephone and telegraph bills, and stenographic expense.

Joyce, T. L. (vice president, Switchmen's Union of North America), 2907 Birney Avenue, Scranton, Pa. (1) Switchmen's Union of North America, 3 Linwood Avenue, Buffalo 2, N. Y. (2) Switchmen's Union of North America. Major portion of work is not related to legislation. Infrequently assigned to Washington to do legislative work for short periods of time. (3) Have been engaged in duties of vice president of Switchmen's Union of North America since September 1946. Will serve in that capacity until June 1947, when the election of officers will be held. (4) Salary at the rate of $7,404 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Switchmen's Union of North America. (6) Incidental personal expenses only, such as stationery, cab fare, pullman fare, etc. (7) Same as above.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Keys, Robert H., 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America (a voluntary association of foremen), 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Elected annually. Next election will be in September 1947. (4) $7,500 per annum as president of association. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual traveling, hotel, meals, and incidental expenses (about $12 per day excluding transportation fares). (7) (See No. 6 above).

Laylin,[1] John G., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (2) American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Amount earned under normal attorney-client retainer. The fee will be computed on the basis of time expended. (5) American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (6) Expenses as incurred. (7) Traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Kimball, Arthur W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Small Business Men's Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (2) National Small Business Men's Association. (3) Registrant has been employed continuously by the same employer since May 1, 1946. (4) $312.50 salary semimonthly less withholding and security tax; expenses. (5, National Small Business Men's Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (6) No specific amount; only amounts expended for such necessary expenses as transportation, taxi fares, hotel bills, occasional lunches, etc. (7) Transportation, taxi fares, telephone and telegraph, hotel bills, occasional lunches, etc.

King, Carol, 220 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y. (1) American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York City. (2) Foreign-born in the United States. (3) Indeterminate. (4) Disbursements. (5) American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born. (6) Disbursements (7) Railroad fares, hotel bills, taxicabs, office expenses.

Kitchen, Clarence W., 2017 S Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (2) United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association. (3) Continuous. (4) $25,000 annually to discharge the duties of executive vice president of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association. (5) United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association. (6) Actual and necessary expenses for discharging the duties of the position occupied. (7) See answer to No. 6 above.

Kline,[1] Robert E., Jr., 703 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Sea Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (b) Del Monte Properties Co., Del Monte, Calif. (2) (a) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (b) Del Monte Properties Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined—dependent upon services rendered and time spent on legislative activities. (5) (a) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (b) Del Monte Properties Co. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Administrative, clerical, travel, subsistence, and any other expenses properly attributable to legislative activities.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (1) Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization devoted to education concerning the advantages of soil and water conservation and the proper uses thereof; 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (2) Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (3) Indefinite. Began January 3, 1947. (4) $250 per month. (5) Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (6) The above-mentioned $250 to cover any and/or all expenses. (7) Same as No. 6 above.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (1) National Patent Council (incorporated), 578 Broadway, Gary, Ind. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 55 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) National Patent Council (incorporated), 578 Broadway, Gary, Ind. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 55 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum from National Patent Council; $4,000 per annum from American Fair Trade Council. (5) National Patent Council (incorporated), 578 Broadway, Gary, Ind. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 55 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (6) When travel away from Washington is required, all necessary traveling expenses plus $25 per day. (7) The per diem allowance when traveling is not for expense but is added compensation. Necessary expenses incurred in travel will be reimbursed in addition.

LaRoe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (2) Interest of Seatrain Lines, Inc., a common carrier by water. (3) Calendar year 1947. (4) An annual fee of $7,500 for legislative work is paid by Seatrain Lines, Inc., to Clark & LaRoe, a law partnership consisting of three partners: Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Frederick E. Brown, and Arthur L. Winn, Jr. Each of the partners named shares in this fee under the general partnership agreement. (5) Seatrain Lines, Inc. (6) No amount is specified but it will be merely reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred and will be relatively small. (7) Those incurred for incidental matters, such as telephone, printing, taxi fares, postage, travel.

Laugherty,[1] R. R. (general representative, Railway Employees' Department, AFL), room 313, 10 Independence Ave. SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Railway Employees' Department, AFL, 936 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (2) Railway Employees' Department, AFL. (3) Appointed as general representative for an indefinite period. (4) Salary at rate of $6,000 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Railway Employees' Department, AFL. (6) $10 per diem. (7) General expenses and incidentals such as hotel expenses, meals, transportation, etc.

Layton, E. M., 809 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Property Owners' Association of Arizona, Inc., 809 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) Property Owners' Association of Arizona, Inc., and the hundreds of members of the association throughout Arizona, who are property owners, or interested in private ownership of property. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary, expense account of $50 per week. (5) Property Owners' Association of Arizona, Inc. (6) $50 per week plus any rail or air transportation expenses. (7) Taxi, telephone, lunch, and similar expenses.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (2) American Transit Association (national association of urban, suburban, and interurban carriers of passengers in mass transportation of passengers). (3) 1 year. (4) $400 per month salary as attorney for American Transit Association. (5) American Transit Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Necessary business expenses.

Libby,[1] Frederick Joseph, 1013 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) September 1921 to date. (4) $4,500 annually. (5) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Transportation, lodging, taxis, telephone calls, porter and other small expenses in connection with speaking trips and field trips.

Liljenquist, L. Blaine, Room 300, 1415 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) E. F. Forbes, president Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. (2) Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,000 per year and expenses. (5) By Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Transportation, communications, and other miscellaneous association expenses.

Lockwood, Maurice H., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Employer as indicated in (1) above. (3) Employed on a year-to-year basis. (4) Maurice H. Lockwood is paid a salary as president of the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such president to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be said to be paid as consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) By the employer as indicated in (1) above. (6) See answer to (4) above. In addition, Maurice H. Lockwood is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense actually to be incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him subject to reimbursement by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. (7) Any such expenses as travel, hotels, meals, taxes, tips, and entertainment are to be included and will be reported when actually incurred by the registrant.

Lodge, F. S., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Employer as indicated in (1) above. (3) Employed on a year-to-year basis. (4) F. S. Lodge is paid a salary as technical assistant of the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such technical assistant to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be said to be paid as consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) By the employer as indicated in (1) above. (6) See answer to (4) above. In addition, F. S. Lodge is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense actually to be incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him subject to reimbursement by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. (7) Any such expenses as travel, hotel, meals, taxis, tips, and entertainment are to be included and will be reported when actually incurred by the registrant.

Lyon,[1] A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (2) Railway Labor Executives' Association, consisting of the chief executive officers of 20 national and international railway labor organizations. Major portion of work is not related to legislation. (3) Have been engaged in duties of executive secretary of association since May 1, 1945. Am elected to position for a term of 3 years. (4) Salary at the rate of $9,000 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Railway Labor Executives' Association. (6) $2,000 per year, plus reimbursement of incidental and personal traveling expenses, which average about $50 per month. (7) General expenses and incidentals, such as local transportation in Washington, and travel expense at other points.

McAvoy,[1] Clifford T., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The members of the UER and MWA-CIO, their families, neighbors, and the communities in which they live. (3) Indefinite—year-around. (4) $80 per week. (5) United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $10 per week. Expenses in field include transportation, hotel, and food. (7) Carfare, dinners downtown, telephone.

McCaskill, J. L., assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal Relations Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (3) Annual basis. (4) Salary: None—on leave of absence during past quarter. (5) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

McElhoes, S. I., 502 Chickasha Avenue, Chickasha, Okla. (1) Public Service Co., of Oklahoma, Tulsa, Okla. Have been employed by this company and a predecessor for over 24 years as attorney, and in various capacities. (2) Public Service Co., of Oklahoma, Tulsa, Okla. (3) July 1, 1946, began partial retirement with no fixed termination. (4) My salary for the part-time employment is $6,000 per year. (5) I am now and have always been a regular employee, receiving my salary through the treasurer, as all other employees do. (6) No limit. (7) Hotel, traveling, living, and incidental expenses.

McGlue, Arthur F., Post Office Building, Lynn, Mass. (1) National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, 525 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Post office custodial employees. (3) February 1946 to September 1947. (4) Salary, none. (5) National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (6) $500 per month. (7) Train fare, hotels, meals, entertainment, taxis, postage, stationery, etc., expenses, $270; expenses executive board meeting, Fort Worth and Dallas, Tex., $350; total expenses, $620.

McGrath,[1] Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, 823 East Main Street, Richmond, Va. (2) Chesapeake & Ohio Railway. (3) Indefinite. (4) Dependent upon time required, maximum $1,000 per month. (5) Chesapeake & Ohio Railway. (6) Unspecified. (7) Travel and incidental expenses.

McGrath,[1] Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass.; National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates and National Coal Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Minimum $250 per month; maximum $1,000 per month from Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, depending on time required. National Coal Association, per diem basis, not to exceed $1,000 per

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

month. (5) Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates and National Coal Association. (6) Unspecified; travel and incidental expenses. (7) Travel and incidental expenses.

McMains, W. H., 1135 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Distilled Spirits Institute, Inc., 1135 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) The above-mentioned organization is a trade association of distillers, and as such is not engaged in legislative activities as defined in Public Law No. 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. As an employee of said organization registrant devotes his time principally to departmental and administrative functions. Legislative matters are incidental to his employment, and mainly for the purpose of keeping association members advised of the status of pending measures. Registrant does not directly or indirectly solicit, collect, or receive money or other things of value to be used in influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. (3) Employed on permanent basis. (4) Annual salary, $8,500 per year plus incidental and travel expenses. (5) Distilled Spirits Institute, Inc. (6) Actual incidental and travel expenses incurred in line of duty. (7) Actual incidental and travel expenses incurred in line of duty.

McMillan, Robert W., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Management Planning of Washington, Inc., which offers consultative services on administrative and governmental problems. (3) Since June 1, 1943. (4) At the rate of $8,400 per annum, which is primarily for services and activities not covered by the act. Less than one-third of the services rendered by and activities of the registrant for Management Planning of Washington, Inc., are such as might possibly be considered as covered by any provision of the act. The remainder are not. (6) Registrant is furnished office space, secretarial service, telephone and telegraph facilities, plus normal out-of-pocket expenses for transportation, etc. (7) Transportation and other reasonable expenses necessary in the performance of duties, less than one-third of which can be allocable to activities which may be considered as covered by any provision of the act.

McNamee,[1] W. Bruce, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Sea Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined; dependent upon services rendered and time spent on legislative activities. (5) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Administrative, clerical, travel, subsistence, and any other expenses properly attributable to legislative activities.

McSparron, Joseph P., general chairman, Machinists, District No. 124, 320 North Hopkins Street, Sayre, Pa. (1) International Association of Machinists, District No. 124. (2) International Association of Machinists. (3) To be determined. (4) $350 per month. (5) District No. 124, International Association of Machinists. (6) $9 per day to be paid by International Association of Machinists. (7) None.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal Relations Division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (3) Annual basis. (4) Quarterly salary, $1,950. Estimated for legislative service, $195, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. (5) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Mason, Walter J., national legislative representative, A. F. of L., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) Labor. (3) Indefinite. (4) $140 per week. (5) American Federation of Labor. (6) As submitted for actual expense. (7) Taxis, messengers, phones when not at office, and other incidentals.

Mecartney, Malcolm, 10 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) Protective Committee for the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. 7 Percent and 6 Percent Preferred Stock, 209 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Preferred-stock holders of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. (3) Registrant has been employed as associate counsel for said protective committee since January 1935, except for the period of his service in the United States Naval Reserve from June 1942 to November 1945; such employment is expected to continue during the reorganization proceedings for such railroad. (4) $75 per week on account of fees, plus actual expenses when absent from Chicago on work of the committee as part of such reasonable aggregate compensation as the financial condition of the committee may ultimately warrant and the committee may allow. (5) Protective Committee for the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. 7 Percent and 6 Percent Preferred Stock. (6) Actual expenses reasonably necessary during absence from Chicago on work of the committee. (7) Travel, living, and incidental expenses while absent from Chicago on work of the committee.

Meeks, E. A., 1110 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) The National League of District Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) Postmasters. (3) Elected for a 3-year term as secretary-representative. (4) Annual salary of $6,000. (5) The National League of District Postmasters of the United States. (6) None. (7) None.

Miles,[2] Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $15,000 per annum, although not more than one-fourth is paid for the principal purpose of influencing legislation as defined in section 307. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., 75 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y., and Newgulf, Tex. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) At will of employers. (4) $18,000 per annum. (5) $6,000 per annum from each of the three employers named in (1) above. (6) An aggregate of approximately $400 to $450 a month, exclusive of occasional traveling expenses. (7) Rental and general office expenses; any additional expenses incurred which come within the purview of the act will be reported on Form C.

Moll,[1] Justus R., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Room 804, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Frisco System Board of Adjustment, 426 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo. (2) Frisco System Board of Adjustment (or any other bona fide labor union), 426 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo. (3) Indeterminate, depending upon trend of legislation. (4) No monetary or other valuable consideration other than the fact that I am the elected honorary vice general chairman of Frisco System Board of Adjustment for the balance of my natural life, with my dues paid by said board from its treasury (at present amounting to $18 per annum). (5) Frisco System Board of Adjustment, as above shown; in addition to said consideration I hope to receive as other consideration mentioned in the statute the continued loyalty and gratitude of the membership of Frisco System Board of Adjustment (or any other bona fide labor union) in return for my efforts. (6) None; I shall receive no payment of expenses; I pay my own. (7) None whatever.

Mooney,[2] William W., 414–415 Eagle Building, Spokane 8, Wash. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (3) Indefinite. (4) Working on commission basis; have been paid on this basis the total sum of $1,197 to cover salary and traveling expenses; all deductible taxes to come out of this amount. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) Expenses to be paid by myself from above amount; no expense allowable other than stated; expenses amounted to $363.75, an average of $28.75 per week for the 13 weeks. (7) All travel expenses, railroad fare, bus fare, auto travel expense, hotel, taxi, meals, and any incidentals while away from home city.

Morgan, Gerald D., and Calhoun, Leonard J., constituting the partnership of Morgan & Calhoun, attorneys, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., care of Voyle C. Scurlock, president, 708 Midwest Building, Oklahoma City 2, Okla. (2) National Rehabilitation Association, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Firm retained as Washington counsel for the association; receives compensation for all legal work at rate of $150 per month. (5) National Rehabilitation Association, Inc. (6) Not paid anything for expenses, but receives reimbursement for out-of-pocket office expenses incurred in connection with performance of legal work for association, such as telephone calls, telegrams, travel, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Morgan, Gerald D., and Calhoun, Leonard J., constituting the partnership of Morgan & Calhoun, attorneys, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (2) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (3) Indefinite. (4) Firm retained as Washington counsel for Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.; receives compensation for all work at the rate of $1,000 per month. (5) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis. (6) Not paid anything for expenses, but will receive reimbursement for out-of-pocket office expenses incurred, if any, such as telephone calls, telegrams, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Morgan, Gerald D., and Calhoun, Leonard J., constituting the partnership of Morgan & Calhoun, attorneys, Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Alaska Transportation Co., Seattle, Wash. (2) Alaska Transportation Co., Seattle, Wash. (3) Indefinite. (4) Firm retained on ordinary attorney-client basis as Washington counsel for company to handle such of the company's legal matters in Washington as are not handled directly by the general counsel of the company. Receives compensation for all such work at rate of $100 per man-day. (5) Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan, attorneys, Seattle, Wash., general counsel for company. (6) Not paid anything for expenses, but do receive reimbursement for out-of-pocket office expenses incurred in connection with performance of legal work for company, such as telephone calls and telegrams to the company and its general counsel in Seattle. (7) See (6) above.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (2) The Glenn

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (3) Regular annual employment. (4) $12,000 regular annual salary. (5) The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (6) Only reimbursement for expenses actually incurred; expenses are expected to be moderate but no accurate estimate thereof can be made. (7) Expenses incident to the above-stated employment, including such items as certain transportation, hotel, and food charges, and the like.

Murph, Daniel S., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Employer as indicated in (1) above. (3) Employed on a year-to-year basis. (4) Daniel S. Murph is paid a salary as secretary and treasurer of the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such secretary and treasurer to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be said to be paid as consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) By the employer as indicated in (1) above. (6) See answer to (4) above. In addition, Daniel S. Murph is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense actually to be incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him subject to reimbursement by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. (7) Any such expenses as travel, hotels, meals, taxis, tips, and entertainment are to be included and will be reported when actually incurred by the registrant.

Myles, James M., Sr., 202 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C.; Hamilton Hotel, temporary residence past 16 years, Yeadon, Pa. (1) I am vice president of the Operative Plasterers' & Cement Finishers' International Association, organized 1864; general office, Cleveland, Ohio. Affiliated with American Federation of Labor since 1881. (2) Humane labor legislation whenever my services are desired by the American Federation of Labor, including housing and other building and construction work under supervision of departments of Government. (3) Elected Montreal, Canada, September 1926, vice president, elected every 4 years, and again at Pittsburgh, September 1945. (4) Salary, $7,120 per year and expenses, since October 1946. Note: I am not a lobbyist. My work is labor and education, mediation, and conciliation between the different departments of Government and our association; construction work. (5) Operative Plasterers' & Cement Finishers' International Association. (6) $70 per week for hotel, etc. (7) No expenses for legislative work, nor will there be any contributions to anyone.

Neal,[1] T. V., 1327 North Alamo, San Antonio, Tex. (1) Am not employed by anyone. (2) San Antonio Property Owners' Association of which I am secretary, serving without pay. (3) No time limit. (4) Nothing. (5) By no one. (6) Necessary traveling expenses and hotel bills as they may occur. (7) Traveling and hotel bills as (6) above.

Nelson, G. W., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) See (1) above. (3) Four years, beginning January 10, 1947. (4) Approximately $8,800 per annum. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses, plus travel allowances, if any.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (2) International Association of Machinists incident to his regular duties as headquarters staff official. (3) Indefinite. (4) $5,000 yearly for his regular duties as staff official; no additional allowance for legislative work. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $5 daily, except Sunday and holidays to cover incidental expenses, meals, taxi fares, etc.; no allowance for legislative work. (7) None.

Nestor, William E.,[2] 6 Wells Street, Hornell, N. Y. (1) District No. 85, International Association of Machinists. (2) International Association of Machinists. (3) September 1, 1948. (4) $400 monthly. (5) District No. 85, International Association of Machinists. (6) $180 a month. (7) Living experises only.

Newton, Wayne R., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. (1) National Association of Cooperatives. 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. (2) National Association of Cooperatives. (3) Month-to-month basis, subject to pleasure of board of directors. (4) At the rate of $10,000 per year. (5) National Association of Cooperatives. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses upon presentation of itemized reports. (7) Ordinary and necessary travel and subsistence expenses when away from home.

Nixon,[2] Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York 22, N. Y. (2) The members of the UER and MWA, CIO, their families and neighbors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $80 per week for all work in Washington office, which includes much activity other than legislative. (5) Unite Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $10 per week for all work in Washington, of which legislative activity is only a fraction. On occasion of visits into the field, rarely for legislative purposes, actual expenses of travel, food, and hotel are covered. (7) Transportation and other incidental expenses in Washington.

Noble, William R., 1024 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo.; and National Retail Hardware Association, 333 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association. (3) Employed since January 1, 1946, on an annual basis. (4) National Retail Farm Equipment Association, $4,500; National Retail Hardware Association, $4,500. (5) National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expense. (7) Travel, cab fares, business luncheons, and similar out-of-pocket expense.

Noffsinger,[1] J. S., 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., a trade association of private business schools. (2) I am the chief executive officer of (a) the National Council of Business Schools; (b) the National Council of Technical Schools; and (c) the National Home Study Council, and as such am responsible for all of the interests of all non-tax-supported schools holding membership in these organizations. Their legislative interests, however, are relatively minor. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day as chief executive officer, which includes all incidental legislative services. (5) National Council of Business Schools. (6) Whatever incidental expenses are necessary. (7) Telephone, taxi, and similar incidental but necessary expenses.

Oakes, Randall V., 1615 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Remington Rand, Inc., 1615 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Same as above. (3) Since May 1944. (4) About $5,000 salary, bonus, and commissions. (5) Same as (1). (6) About $25 per month. (7) Necessary entertainment expense only. None to date for lobbying.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) Arabian American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) A reasonable amount for services rendered. No dollar amount or basis for payment agreed upon. (5) Arabian American Oil Co. (6) No amount fixed. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses for travel, telephone and telegraph, meals, and lodging actually incurred.

O'Neal, Edward A., 58 East Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $15,000 a year. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement for actual expenditures. (7) None, except as noted in No. 6.

Ostergren, Ben F., 541 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 541 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Members of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association. (3) August 17, 1946, to September 1, 1947. (4) No designated amount. (5) National Rural Letter Carriers' Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Transportation.

Patterson, Edwin B., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Permanent (resumed Nov. 1, 1946, after leaving Apr. 24, 1943, for military service). (4) $5,700. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Actual reimbursement of expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, newspapers and periodicals, limited amount of entertainment, luncheons, etc.

Penisch,[1] J. W., Jr., 905 Fifth Street, McKees Rocks, Pa. (1) District No. 84, International Association of Machinists, R. W. Keating, secretary and treasurer, 531 Simpson Place, Peekskill, N. Y. (2) International Association of Machinists, 703 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (3) General chairman on New York Central Railroad & Allied Lines. (4) No extra salary received for this work. Receives an annual salary of $4,800. (5) District No. 84. (6) Receives a set annual expense account to the amount of $250 a month, which is through convention action. (7) None.

Pennington, Maitland S., 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (see attachment[3]). (2) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (3) Continuing. (4) Services for the NFAS cover a wide field such as appearances before public bodies, i. e., the Maritime Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Coast Guard, Navy, Army, and others, for the presentation of the views of the NFAS on matters affecting water transportation; also the preparation and distribution of a weekly legislative history; also certain internal administrative functions, and other duties. For all such services an annual salary of $12,500 is received from the federation. The annual salary is not allocated to various functions or services. For further information, see attachment.[3] (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (6) Actual and incidental expenses necessary to the performance of duties. (7) See above.

Petersen,[1] William J., 119 Monona Avenue, Madison 3, Wis. (1) Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison 3, Wis. (2) Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (3) Indefinite. (4) I receive an annual salary of $10,000 as chief executive officer of the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (5) Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (6) I am to be reimbursed for

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

all expenses incurred in connection with the services rendered. It is impossible to estimate in advance the amount that may be so incurred. (7) Customary traveling expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, and any other expenses that may be reasonably incurred as, for example, telephone tolls, telegrams, etc.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) California Fruit Growers Exchange, California Walnut Growers Association, California Almond Growers Exchange, Northwest Nut Growers, Oregon Nut Growers, Inc. For addresses, see attached statement.[3] (2) In the interest of the above-named agricultural cooperative associations and their farmer members and patrons and in the interest of farmer members and patrons of other agricultural cooperative associations whose interests are the same. (3) Indefinite; see attached statement.[3] (4) Indefinite; see attached statement.[3] (5) By the above named agricultural cooperative associations and perhaps by others, if any, who may hereafter tender employment. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. See attached statement.[3] (7) See attached statement.[3]

Poulton, J. E., Grand Lodge Representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (2) For International Association of Machinists incident to his regular duties as headquarters staff official. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 yearly for his regular duties as staff official; no additional allowance for legislative work. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $5 daily except Sunday and holidays to covers incidental expenses, meals, taxi fares, etc.; no allowance for legislative work. (7) None.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) As an associate attorney with Oliver & Donnally, a law partnership, with offices at 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., and 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) In the interest of (a) the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and (b) the Railroad Security Owners' Association. Oliver & Donnally is general counsel for both associations. (3) Annually. (4) $8,000 per annum. This salary is paid semimonthly to the registrant as compensation for all duties performed as a full-time associate attorney of Oliver & Donnally. Federal legislative matters comprise only a lesser part of the registrant's duties. (5) Oliver & Donnally. (6) The registrant is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses such as travel, hotel, and meals. (7) All necessary expenses of the character indicated above.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) One year. (4) $750 per month. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Printing, mailing, travel, long-distance communication, etc.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee for the Nation's Health. (3) Ending December 31, 1946. (4) For professional services, $3,750. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Printing, mailing, travel, long-distance communications, etc.

Quigley, Frank, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in the interest of the telephone companies of the Bell system. (3) Continuing. (4) $25,000 per annum. (5) American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (6) Out-of-pocket business expenses upon vouchers submitted therefor, covering such items as transportation and travel expense, cost of publications, etc. (7) See answer to question 6 and statement (A) attached[3] hereto and made part hereof.

Raebeck, Helen, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (3) Indefinite, terminable on notice in accordance with union contract. (4) $975 per year. (5) National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (6) $15 per year (approximately); expenses are paid only as incurred for traveling. (7) Travel as authorized and incurred.

Ramspeck, Robert, executive vice president, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The Air Transport Association of America, a nonprofit, unincorporated trade association of scheduled air lines of the United States. (3) Employed as executive vice president of the Air Transport Association of America until December 31, 1948, subject to renewal of the employment agreement at that time. (4) $25,000 per annum, plus the use of office facilities, supplies, and the aid of clerical help for all services rendered and supplied to the Air Transport Association of America as executive vice president thereof, only a small part of which services fall within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (5) The Air Transport Association of America. (6) There is no predetermined amount of the expenses to be paid Mr. Ramspeck. They shall include the amount incurred or expended by the registrant in connection with his duties as executive vice president of the Air Transport Association of America. Only a small part of such duties is within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (7) Such expenses as may be incurred for travel, hotels, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, etc., in the performance of his duties as executive vice president of the Air Transport Association of America. Only a small part of his duties will be, and therefore only a small part of his expenses will be, incurred in activities within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) I am an officer of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. My title is representative of the president. My duties are to maintain contacts with the various governmental administrative agencies and departments, to handle with them or assist other officers of my company in handling matters of concern to my company pending before such agencies and departments, and to furnish to the president and other executives of my company information as to current events relating to the railroad industry. I do not directly or indirectly for any purpose solicit, collect, or receive money or other thing of value from any person other than my company. My principal purpose is that indicated above; legislative activity on my part is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. I register under the Lobbying Act only as a matter of precaution, because I am unable to construe the act with certainty. (2) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. (3) Permanent. (4) Nothing for legislative service. My salary as an officer of my company is $11,199.96 annually. (5) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. (6) No fixed or agreed amount. (7) All expenses necessarily incurred, including hotel room expense.

Reno, Elmer, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Annual elected office—next election September 1947. (4) $6,000 per annum as secretary-treasurer of association. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as No. 6.

Reynolds, Oliver A., 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (2) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (3) As long as may be necessary in any year. (4) $500, which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. (6) Any amount required but no set sum, limited, however, to purposes stated in (7). (7) Traveling, and subsistence when out of town.

Richardson, John Lloyd, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C. (2) National Home and Property Owners' Foundation and the thousands of members of the foundation throughout the United States who are home owners, owners of other real property, or interested in private ownership of property. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,600 a year. (5) National Home and Property Owners' Foundation. (6) No specified amount, to be reimbursed upon claim for legitimate out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi, telephone, lunch, printing, and similar expenses.

Riggle,[1] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) Until terminated. (4) Salary of $7,500 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consist in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Robbins,[1] Paul H., 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Society of Professional Engineers, an organization of registered professional engineers throughout the United States. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,000 per annum. (5) National Society of Professional Engineers. (6) An unspecified sum to cover actual travel, office, and routine expenses. (7) Travel, office expenses, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Roesch, Henry J., 804 Commercial Building, Dayton, Ohio. (1) Foremen's League for Education and Association (a corporation), 804 Commercial Building, Dayton 2, Ohio. (2) Foremen's League for Education and Association. (3) Permanent employee. (4) Salary of $21,000 per annum as executive vice president of the league. (5) Foremen's League for Education and Association. (6) Necessary out-of-pocket expenses. (7) All traveling and living expenses which are necessary.

Rogers, James P., 710 Lewis Building, Portland 4, Oreg. (1) Western Woods Employers, 710 Lewis Building, Portland 4, Oreg. (2) The above employer. (3) Indefinite,

[3] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.

[3] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

full time, only a part of which concerns legislative matters. (4) $833.33 per month, in payment of all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. (5) The employer named above. (6) Amount actually and necessarily expended in behalf of the above employer, only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Necessary business expenses and personal expenses when away from home, including that part which concerns legislation.

Russell, Frank E., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Star Route Mail Carriers Association. (2) Members of the above association. (3) Present term expires August 1948. (4) Actual expenses. (5) National Star Route Mail Carriers Association. (6) All necessary actual expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, and any necessary association expense.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (2) United States Savings and Loan League. (3) Since July 1, 1938. (4) In recent years, a retainer of $9,500 for part time. A minor portion of this compensation is for legislative work and a major portion for general legal work. (5) United States Savings and Loan League. (6) Actual expenses of travel and subsistence while away from home. (7) Actual transportation cost and actual cost of subsistence while away from home.

Ryan, Maurice O., room 307, Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Hotel Association, 227 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (2) American Hotel Association. (3) Indeterminate. (4) $12,000 per year. (5) American Hotel Association. (6) Actual and necessary expenses. (7) Traveling expenses, telephones, taxis, etc.

Sabin, L. C., 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Lake Carriers' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day for work actually performed and reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (5) Lake Carriers' Association. Reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (7) Traveling and other expenses incident thereto when away from home.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) All members of NADA, embracing 30,000 retail automobile dealers throughout the United States. (3) Indeterminate. Either party to agreement may cancel under conditions upon 60 days written notice. (4) For all services as public contacts counsel to executives of NADA, $1,250 per month throughout the year. During congressional sessions he devotes not to exceed one-third of his time to legislative work. (5) National Automobile Dealers Association. (6) Nothing. Agreement states definitely that legislative work is to be wholly informational in character and there shall be no allowances of any sort for entertainment and similar activities (7) See above.

Sanger, Charles D., Jr., Hill Building, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council of Business Schools, a nonprofit corporation, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Council of Business Schools. (3) Indefinite, general counsel, since November 29, 1946. (4) Part time only—$3,600 per year. (5) National Council of Business Schools—a very small part of time will be devoted to legislation. (6) No sum fixed. Office, secretarial, telephone, and telegraph services furnished by council. Registrant will be reimbursed by council for any other necessary expenses on submission of statement. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, incidentals, etc., incurred in course of employment. None filed for quarter ending January 10, 1947, as registrant has not engaged in legislative activities during the period.

Saville, Russell, c/o American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) American Pension Committee, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) Salary has not been appropriated by board of directors. (5) American Pension Committee, Inc. (6) Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Taxi and other transportation, meals, telephone and telegraph, postage, sundries.

Schmidt, Dr. J. Raymond, suite 36, 304 F Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) The National Grand Lodge of International Order of Good Templars. (2) Same as (1). (3) Elected national superintendent of legislative work by the National Grand Lodge of IOGT for a 3-year term. Present term expires June 1948. (4) Receives no salary. (6) National Grand Lodge allows $25 annually for expenses. Connecticut Grand Lodge has voted $50 toward expenses in 1947. (7) Printing, multigraphing, typing, postage, etc.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Mutually, at will. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) All out-of-pocket expenses.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (2) Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (3) Mutually, at will. (4) $100 per day for time actually spent at this work. (5) Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington D. C. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Out-of-pocket costs directly attributable to this work such as travel, telegrams, long-distance phones, etc.

Schwenker,[2] Warren L., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Remington-Rand, Inc., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same as (1). (3) Since January 15, 1928. (4) Salary and commissions aggregating about $15,000 per year in my capacity as assistant branch manager of the Washington, D. C., branch of the tabulating machines division of Remington-Rand, inc. (5) Same as (1). (6) Average about $75 per month for all sales activities. (7) Necessary entertainment expense only—none to date for lobbying.

Scott, Jack Garrett, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. For character of registrant's employment see exhibit A attached hereto.[3] (2) National Association of Motor Bus Operators. (3) Continuing. (4) See exhibit A attached hereto.[3] (5) National Association of Motor Bus Operators. See also exhibit A attached hereto.[3] (6) No specific amount, but only actual amounts expended. (7) Such necessary expenses as transportation, hotel bills when out of Washington, taxicab fares, and the like.

See, Harry, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) See (1) above. (3) Four years, beginning January 1, 1947. (4) Approximately $14,800 per annum. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses, plus travel allowances, if any.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) See No. (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See No. (1). (6) Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Sifton, Paul, 3150 Highland Place NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) 1. National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 2. Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. (2) Same as listed under (1). (3) 1. Two months to March 1, 1947; 2. Indefinite, perhaps for the session started January 3, 1947. (4) 1. At the rate of $6,000 a year; 2. At the rate of $2,400 a year. (5) Organizations listed under (1). (6) 1. Up to $35 a month for out-of-pocket incidentals, such as taxis, phone charges, etc., and for actual travel expenses, as authorized; 2. Up to $10 a month for out-of-pocket incidentals, such as taxis, phone charges, etc., and for actual travel expenses, as authorized. (7) As stated under (6).

Smeltzer,[2] C. W., 408 Wesley Temple Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Since May 1944. (4) Have drawing account of $100 per week. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., (6) No fixed sum. It is included in drawing account, also expense of my deputy organizer. (7) Hotel, restaurant, and transportation.

Smith, Hilda W., 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for the Extension of Labor Education. (3) Employment for lobbying began January 1, 1947, and is on a month-by-month basis. Previously, my time has been given to organizing the committee. (4) $6,400 a year. (5) Committee for the Extension of Labor Education. (6) $35 a month or less. (7) Taxis, telephone calls, etc.

Smith, Robert E., 116 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y. (2) National Conference of Railroad Investors. (3) Indefinite. (4) No compensation being paid at present. Estimate will receive compensation of $500 per month during such future periods as is engaged in activities for above-named association. (5) National Conference of Railroad Investors. (6) To be reimbursed for traveling and miscellaneous expenses for future periods during which he is engaged in activities for above-named association, estimated at $300 per month. (7) Traveling expenses and expenses of business meetings.

Smith, Robert E., 116 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) Life Insurance Policy-Holders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y. (2) Life Insurance Policy-Holders Protective Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) No compensation being paid at present. Estimated will receive compensation of $250 per month during such future periods as is engaged in activities for above-named association. (5) Life Insurance Policy-Holders Protective Association. (6) To be reimbursed for traveling and miscellaneous expenses for future periods during which he is engaged in activities for above-named association, estimated at $200 per month. (7) Traveling expenses and expenses of business meetings.

Smith,[1] Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Farmers Union, James G. Patton, president, and Glenn J. Talbott, chairman, board of direc-

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

tors. (2) The National Farmers Union. (3) Indefinite. (4) $8,400 annually. (5) The National Farmers Union. (6) Varying amounts covering actual expenses only. (7) Travel, purchase of necessary books, magazines, and newspapers, business telephone and telegraph bills.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (2) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (3) I am general solicitor of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, a permanent full-time position. (4) No special payment. Activities covered by this declaration will be a minor part of my full-time duties. (5) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (6) Actual. (7) Traveling.

Spencer, Lyndon, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Lake Carriers' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day for work actually performed and reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (5) Lake Carriers' Association. (6) Reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (7) Traveling and other expenses incident thereto when away from home.

Spofford, Charles M., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) American National Red Cross, Seventeenth and D Streets, Washington 13, D. C. (2) American National Red Cross. (3) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure amendments to the congressional charter of the American National Red Cross (act of January 5, 1905, 33 Stat. 599, 36 U. S. C., secs. 1–9), and the employment is expected to continue until such amendments are secured. (4) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, which firm will receive compensation from the American National Red Cross at the customary rates for professional services charged by that firm. (5) American National Red Cross. (6) The firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) The usual and normal expense items, such as, for example, traveling expenses, telephone, and telegraph charges, printing, overtime stenography, etc.

Stoner,[1] Henry, 363 Bank Street, New London, Conn. (1) Am president of the Connecticut Reapportionment Association, and in that sense I am a self-employed lobbyist, of course seeking funds from righteous Americans who want to see the Constitution enforced. (2) I am an honest American propagandist promoting the very best that is within us, the Constitution of the United States of America. (3) More or less permanent from now on. (4) I expect to use all funds received from my work except necessary deductions for the maintenance of my adherents to my cause. (6) No exact sum; person in simple, monastic living. (5) By to be determined by receipts, but assure you it will be at a minimum. (7) For stamps, for newspaper advertising, for radio appeals, and stationery, for minor traveling expenses.

Stringer,[1] Harry R., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (2) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined—dependent upon services rendered and time spent on legislative activities. (5) Sea Air Legislative Committee. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Administrative, clerical, travel, subsistence, and any other expenses properly attributable to legislative activities.

Strong,[2] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1045 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis 1, Minn. (1) Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota. The corporation is a proponent of full development of the water resources of the upper Mississippi River as it relates to all types of public benefits. (2) Upper Mississippi Waterway Association. (3) Registrant was first employed as secretary of the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association in 1934 and has held said office continuously since. His employment is on a yearly basis, by action of the board of directors at an annual meeting held on the third Wednesday in October of each year. (4) Registrant receives a salary of $275 a month, on a yearly basis. (5) Upper Mississippi Waterway Association. (6) During the last three or four years, registrant's expenses have averaged $2,500 a year. This amount covers registrant's expense of traveling in connection with his duties. (7) Traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions.

Taylor, Margaret K., 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Milk producers belonging to cooperative member associations. (3) Permanent employee since September 1942. (4) $7,000 per annum, an indeterminate portion of which can be attributed to activities covered by the act. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) Only such out-of-pocket expenses as are accounted for in detailed expense accounts. (7) Carfare, taxicab, and occasional luncheon expense while in Washington and all out-of-pocket expense while out of city.

Thompson, Chester C., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (3) Elected and/or appointed upon yearly basis, beginning March 1 of each year. (4) $18,000 per annum. (5) The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses incurred. (7) Reimbursement to include all legitimate expenses.

Turner,[1] Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland 4, Oreg. (1) Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., American Bank Building, Portland 5, Oreg.; Southern Pacific Co., Pacific Building, Portland 4, Oreg.; Union Pacific Railroad Co., Pittock Block, Portland 5, Oreg. (2) The railroad companies named above. (3) The duration of his employment is indefinite (see statement A [3]). (4) He is not paid any stated or determinable amount for services in connection with Federal legislation (see statement A [3]). (5) The railroads named above. (6) He is not paid any stated or determinable amount for expenses incurred in connection with Federal legislation (see statement A [3]). (7) His expenses include only actual expenditures for rent, office supplies, hotel bills, traveling expenses, and the like (see statement A [3]).

Vance, C. W., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (2) Order of Railway Conductors of America of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (3) Assigned by the president of the Order of Railway Conductors to assist at intervals in the handling of legislative work in Washington. (4) $12 per day. (5) Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (6) While in Washington, $6 per day for hotel, plus incidentals such as taxi fare, telegrams, and telephone calls. (7) Such as outlined in Item No. 6.

Virkus, Frederick A., chairman, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Above. (2) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business. (3) March 1945. (4) Yearly salary as chairman of the conference, not as a lobbyist, $12,000 per year. (5) Above, No. 1. (6) Actual expenses for travel and accommodations. (7) Actual expenses as indicated in No. 6.

Walsh,[1] George, 1 Gardner Street, Newton, Mass. (1) World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine. (2) World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine. (3) November 1947. (4) No remuneration. (5) No remuneration. (6) Whatever is required. (7) Traveling and hotels.

Warfel,[1] George L., 112 C Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) The National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) Members of the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers. (3) Present term expires October 15, 1948. (4) $5,000 per year (beginning with October 15, 1946). (5) The National Association of Special Delivery Messengers. (6) All actual necessary expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Watford, Mrs. Lilian K., 1751 N Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Council on Christian Social Progress, Northern Baptist Convention, 152 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) Council on Christian Social Progress, Juvenile Protection Committee. (3) Temporary—6 months. (4) No salary. (5) Council on Christian Social Progress, Juvenile Protection Committee. (6) $200 a month. (7) Contribution to office desk (Legislative Committee, Congregational Church), travel—about $90 a month as partial compensation for help at home while away.

Wheeler,[2] Samuel Robert, 11 Franklin Road SW., Roanoke 11, Va. (1) District No. 30, International Association of Machinists. (2) Members of the International Association of Machinists and Shopcraft Employes of the Norfolk & Western Railway. (3) Elected for a term of 4 years, this term expires December 31, 1949. (4) $300 per month. (5) By the membership of the International Association of Machinists. (6) $8 per day. (7) All expenses except Pullman fare and railroad fare.

White,[2] John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Cotton Shippers Association (see attached [4]). (2) American Cotton Shippers Association. (3) Annual. (4) $5,000 per annum unless otherwise agreed for all services. There is no engagement to influence legislation but such action may be the incidental result of other activities. (5) American Cotton Shippers Association. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Traveling expenses, telephone and telegraphic expenses.

Whyte, Louis E., 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,000 per year. (5) Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (6) Actual expenses incident to his work as news director. (7) See above (6).

Willard, Charles H., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) American National Red Cross, Seventeenth and D Streets, Washington 13, D. C. (2) American National Red Cross. (3) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure amendments to the Congressional Charter of the American National Red Cross (act of January 5, 1905, 33 Stat. 599, 36 U. S. C., secs. 1–9), and the employment is expected to continue until such amendments are secured. (4) Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, and will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm. (5) Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the registrant will be

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.
[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

reimbursed by the American National Red Cross to the firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl. (7) The usual and normal expense items, such as, for example, traveling expenses, telephone and telegraph charges, printing, overtime stenography, etc.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. Not maintained for the principal purpose, nor does it solicit, collect, or receive funds principally to be used for the purpose, of influencing legislative action. (2) Retired Officers Association, Inc., whose membership is retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,200 annually as legal counsel and assistant to the executive vice president and treasurer, no part of which is paid or received specifically for attempting to influence legislative action. (5) Retired Officers Association, Inc. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Williamson, C. J. S. (amended registration), 901 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. Upon registering pursuant to title III of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as a lobbyist, I stated that my remuneration was $6,000 per year, and $150 a month expense allowance. Effective January 1, 1947, I am receiving $6,900 per year.

Wilson, J. B., McKinley, Wyo. (1) Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (2) Wyoming Wool Growers Association, National Wool Growers Association, the wool-growing industry of the United States. (3) Employed on annual basis. Have been secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for 30 years. (4) $6,000 per annum, payable monthly. (5) Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (6) All expenses while away from home on association business. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, entertainment of guests, telephone and telegraph, taxicabs, stenographic work, postage, and miscellaneous.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (2) Interest of Seatrain Lines, Inc., a common carrier by water. (3) Calendar year 1947. (4) An annual fee of $7,500 for legislative work is paid by Seatrain Lines, Inc., to Clark & LaRoe, a law partnership consisting of three partners: Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Frederick E. Brown, and Arthur L. Winn, Jr. Each of the partners named shares in this fee under the general partnership agreement. (5) Seatrain Lines, Inc. (6) No amount is specified but it will be merely reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred and will be relatively small. (7) Those incurred for incidental matters, such as telephone, printing, taxi fares, postage, travel.

Winquest, B. A., 541 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 541 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Members of the National Rural Letters Carriers' Association. (3) August 17, 1946, to September 1, 1947. (4) $4,311. (5) National Rural Letter Carriers' Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Transportation, lodging, taxi.

Wood, Alexander T., 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Lake Carriers' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $21 per day for work actually performed and reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (5) Lake Carriers' Association. (6) Reimbursement for actual traveling expenses incurred. (7) Traveling and other expenses incident thereto when away from home.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president-treasurer, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) The American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (see explanatory letter attached to this form).[3] (2) The American Plant Food Council, Inc., a trade association representing a portion of the fertilizer industry. (3) By the year (year ends June 1947). (4) $36,000 per year. (5) The American Plant Food Council, Inc. (6) Actual traveling expenses when on official business. (7) Same as (6).

Wootton, Edward W., 1039 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Registrant is manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute. Wine Institute is the trade association for the California wine industry, with principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. Wine Institute is not engaged in the activities covered in Public Law 601. (2) California wine industry. (3) Registrant is permanent employee on annual salary. His work primarily involves agencies of the executive branch, but incidentally includes legislative work primarily of an informational nature. Registrant does not solicit or receive moneys or anything of value for the purpose of influencing legislation. (4) Salary $9,900 for all services, plus reimbursement for actual incidental and travel expenses. (5) Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (6) Reimbursement for actual incidental and travel expenses, as above. (7) Reimbursement for actual incidental and travel expenses, as above.

Wright, Frank C., Jr., room 802, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) The Anthracite Institute, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. (2) Producers and shippers of anthracite coal. (3) Since August 1941. (4) Not over $5,000 per annum for this particular work. (5) Anthracite Institute. (6) Estimated $3,000 per annum for this particular work. (7) Rent, telephone, office help, travel and related expenses.

Young,[3] Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the fourth calendar quarter, 1946, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 818) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses).

Akeson, Virgil, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received no money, and expended no money for lobbying activity during the last quarter of 1946. I am no longer employed as a lobbyist. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Albers,[5] Wayne B. 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla. (1) 25 percent of the revenue from the State of Florida, amounting to approximately $40 per week, covering the months of October, November, and December. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Supporting the Townsend National Recovery Plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House Resolution 16.

Alifas, Nels Peter, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) $2,000 salary; no legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Congress not in session; no expenses incurred. (3) Congress not in session; no expenses incurred. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly publication of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Archer, Glenn L., legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary. Expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Avent,[6] I. M., Box 16, Lake Zurich, Ill. (1) Weekly, $100; October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 9 (November 14, advance $50), 16, 23 (November 23, $5.64), 30; December 7, 14, 21, 28, equals $1,303.14. Entire field expense, hotel and travel, personal and family (5) maintenance. (2) Hotels, restaurants, garage, filling station, bus and railroad, house rent, utilities, merchandise, goods and services. (3) Maintenance. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, numbers of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, American Civil Liberties Union, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Baldwin and Mermey,[5] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Retainer from Hershey Corp., $3,000; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $77.49. (2) The $77.49 expended was paid to Pennsylvania Railroad, New York Telephone Co., Western Union, post office, Baldwin and Mermey and Jelinek. (3) Travel, telephone and telegraph, postage, carfares, messenger service, mimeographing, and miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $14.34. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barnett, Arthur R., 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,750.04 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $744.71 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, book stores and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $192.02; hotel and meals, $324.90; book stores and stationers, $44.65; telephone and telegraph, $15; miscellaneous and incidentals, $168.14. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Barrere, Claude, 523-B East Eighty-fifth Street, New York 28, N. Y. (1) Received $1,000 salary only. No money expended by

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.
[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

him. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) An agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Berenson,[5] Anna, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $840; expenses, $1,334.45. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News and Union News Service. (5) All housing and related legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting housing bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing housing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary previously filed, expenses reimbursed by employers, $334.24. Expenditures: $334.24. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC acts.

Bowden, Ray B., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary for months of October, November, and December. All spent for personal living expenses and not related to performance of job. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) Taxicabs, Capital Transit, Washington Hotel, Harrington Hotel, tips, newsdealers. (3) Transportation, luncheons, services such as clothes checking in hotels, etc., purchase of newspapers. (4) None other than newsletters published by the National Grain Trade Council or a member organization. (5) At this date, no specific legislative program has been adopted by his employer. However, the employer—National Grain Trade Council, is generally interested in all types of agricultural legislation and would favor any bills which seek to improve agricultural marketing and oppose those which would handicap grain and feed distribution.

Boyle, James J., 410 Hill Building, Seventeenth and I Streets NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received from employer, United Public Health League, $3,050.74. (2) To undersigned for salary, $2,098.89. To Ralph L. Torreyson for rental and services. To others for stationery, office supplies, etc., and conferences, travel expense of undersigned, $951.85. (3) All moneys received were expended for salary, office maintenance and expense and travel expense and conferences. (4) None. (5) To support any and all legislation calculated to aid the public health, and to oppose such legislation as will injure the public health—no specific measures.

Boyle, Samuel Eugene, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Four months' salary (September–December 1946) paid by Treasurer James S. Tibby, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America total, $1,041.65; travel expenses for journeys taken in interests of the Christian Amendment Movement, paid by J. S. Tibby, treasurer of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, $173.89; additional receipts on attached report.[3] (2) Money received for salary was expended in personal living costs, and is not reported as expenditures here. Money received for travel expenses. (3) See the attached [3] accounting of trips taken. (4) The Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan, Street, Topeka, Kans., and the Christian Patriot, official publication of the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) A proposed amendment to the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States acknowledging Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations. See attached copy of the constitution of the Christian Amendment Movement for the text of proposed amendment. No bill has yet been introduced in the Eightieth Congress.

Brown, Earle Palmer, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $272.54 for expenses. Expended $272.54. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Article entitled "Labor Potential in Building Trades for 1947" in National Real Estate and Building Journal. Also see B attached.[3] (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Bryson, Jack, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $6,280.79. Expended $8,112.63. (See appended statement.[3]) (2) (See appended statement.[3]) (3) For personal and family needs. For expenses incident to business, only a small part of which was incurred in connection with activities covered by the act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion picture industry.

Castiglioni, Paul M., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $838.98 less withholding and social-security taxes. Expenses for quarter $562.75. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor vehicle employees of the Post Office Department. Covering both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) "Rotor" and bulletins named "Motor Vehicle News." (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor vehicle employees.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses reimbursed by employers, $1,256.75. Expenditures, $1,256.75. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received no money, and expended no money for lobbying activity during the last quarter of 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support: All legislation favorable to labor and the general American public, as well as National security and peace. Oppose: All legislation detrimental to foregoing aims.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, and so forth. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Compton, R. T., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary $3,750, expenses reimbursed by employer $703. Expenditures: $703. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investment.

Cone, D. C., room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Connett, William C., 4th, 1630 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis 2, Mo. (1) $900 retainer received from American Cross Arm & Conduit Co. (2) October 18, 1946, $19.38 for round-trip railroad ticket to Chicago. October 19, 1946, $50 expenses in Chicago, 2 days. December 17, 1946, paid long-distance call to Chicago, $1.50. (3) Conferring with officials of American Cross Arm & Conduit Co. concerning employment and nature of claim for relief to be sought. (4) None. (5) To support passage of private claim bill of American Cross Arm & Conduit Co.

Cooke, Richard C., 120 Boylston Street, Boston 16, Mass. (1) Received salary amounting to $1,300. Nothing received in expenses. (2) No payments made. (3) [Blank]. (4) Magazine of Small Business (copies attached). (5) No specific legislation at this writing. In general to support legislation which may benefit smaller business, and to oppose legislation which may be detrimental to the interests of smaller business.

Covington,[5] J. Harry 3d, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received: None. Expended in connection with all matters for client: $48.92. (2) Railroads, $25.70. Telephone Co., $18.42. Taxicab drivers, $4.80. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, transportation to New York, and transportation within District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines of Leadville, Colo.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,205. Received expenses, $1,125.50. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowling, W. C., 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $1,250 (indebtedness of association prior to October 1, 1946). (2) See (1) above. (3) Indebtedness of association prior to October 1, 1946. (4) None. (5) An agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Proposed bill to create a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security, along the lines of S. 2503, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

Cuneo, John C., post-office box 1054, Modesto, Calif. (1) Received from Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, $2,980.81; expended $970.09. (2) See detailed schedule attached.[3] (3) Support of the Townsend national recovery plan (see schedule attached).[3] (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with Clerk only.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danielian, N. R., 1830 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $551.94 received from National St. Lawrence Association for traveling expenses and payment of sundry item expenses; $3,000 received from association for services. (2) $348.41 for traveling expenses (railroads, air lines, hotels, etc.); $62.03 to C. & P. Telephone Co. for telephone and telegrams; $16.50 reimbursement for petty office expenses; Sandoz Co. $125 rent; R. P. Andrews Paper Co. $37.26 for stationery and supplies. Total $551.94. (3) Travel, telephone and telegraph, office expenses, rent, stationery, and supplies. (4) None. (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the National St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, their tributaries and waterways of the world. In connection with this object, respondent supports the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

d'Avila, Sarah H., 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Salary $840. (2) None. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis, Laurence W., 633 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation under consideration.

Dandy, Della J., Route 4, Rogers, Ark. (1) October, November, December 1946, $114.53. (2) [Blank.]. (3) Education, promoting and building new clubs. (4) None. (5) The Townsend recovery plan, a national insurance for everybody and not class legislation just for Senators and Congressmen.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December 1946, $1,030.20; expense account October 1946, $78.68. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) Quarterly retirement news bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the Civil Service retirement laws.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary and $50 a month expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Post Office Department, minor office expenses. (3) Telephone service, postage, and other office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty, John E., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary: $587.70 per month, which is paid for all of the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (2) No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (3) No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Doyle, E. L., room 311, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary paid me as brotherhood representative. No money expended in connection with legislative activities. Personal travel expense and office expense paid by brotherhood. (1) See No. (1). (3) See No. (1). (4) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Railway Journal. (5) That directly and indirectly affecting labor.

DuBois,[5] Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Center, Minn. (1) No collections other than Association dues. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Nothing yet introduced.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 salary; $647.49 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $77.75 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Elliott,[5] John Doyle, 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (1) $1,260 from Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, plus $36 from subrenting of hall at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; total, $1,296. Expenses, $1,084.99. (2) Paid in personal traveling expenses and for operation and maintenance of New York State Townsend plan headquarters at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (3) Traveling to contact Townsend clubs, organizations, and individual citizens, and for maintenance of office for administration pertaining to such work at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y., State headquarters. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session; generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Farnham, Diana, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $715; received expenses, $193.41. (2) George's Radio Co. (office rent), Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., stationers, railroads, cab driver, and Capital Transit Co. (3) Office and travel expenses. (4) CIO News, Office and Professional News, Staff, Technical America. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Fenning, Karl, Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Cash received, $1,826.02; paid for transportation and subsistence, trips to Atlantic City and New York, $114.18; for printing and distributing copies of proposed bill, $32.87. (2) Railways, hotels, and public stenographers. (3) Travel and printing expenses. (4) None. (5) Bill to protect textile designs.

Fernbach, Frank L., 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,025; expenses, $1,183.43. (2) The salary was paid to the undersigned and the expenses to railroads and air lines, to hotels and restaurants. (3) Expenses were paid for transportation, hotels, and meals. (4) I have distributed printed material on the nature of the proposed bill to editors of the labor press generally. (5) In support of a proposed labor extension service bill which will establish a labor extension service division in the United States Department of Labor.

Ferris, Muriel, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received $168.75 salary every 2 weeks. Received and expended carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $241.79. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government action, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1946, attached.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Receipts $3,483.33, as previously reported. Expended, $34.80. (2) Taxicabs, $1.20; telephone, $4.25; postage, $1.75; meals, $2.60. Part-time office help, $25. Various individuals. (3) As indicated in No. 2. (4) The Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation favorable to retired employees.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Forbes,[5] E. F., Room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. (1) Salary for October, $1,666.68; November, $1,666.68; December, $1,666.68; total, $5,000.04; actual expense, $341.29. (2) E. F. Forbes. (3) Carrying on regular work of association. (4) None. (5) Not employed as lobbyist, but as president and general manager of association. May have to appear before committees on legislation affecting meat-packing industry.

Foreman, Clark, 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,000; money expended, plus air travel charged to national office, $447.46; total, $2,447.46. No portion of this total amount was used for lobbying purposes during the last quarter of the calendar year 1946. The above amount is due me, but all of it has not been paid as of this date. (2) Public carriers, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Actual travel and food. (4) World Call and Hampton University Bulletin. Also PM. (5) All legislation to increase the suffrage and improve economic, health, and educational conditions in the South.

Fort, J. Carter, 929 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received nothing except salary for all services rendered the Association of American Railroads as set forth in registration (form B) heretofore filed, none of which was expended in carrying on work. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) As to bills affecting transportation he will present views of members of the Association of American Railroads. (No such bills have yet been introduced so far as he is advised.)

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October, $50; November, $16; December, $190; total, $246. (2) October, $50, miscellaneous; November, $16, miscellaneous; December, $190, miscellaneous. (3) See above (taxis and entertainment). (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

George, Leo E., 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary as president, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, $2,499.99; travel expenses, not connected with the enactment of legislation, October, November, December, 1946, $38.13. (2) Southern Railroad, $38.13. (3) Transportation. (4) The Federation News Service Bulletin, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Giddings, Ernest, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, ——; expenses, ——. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3)

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Glazier,[5] William H., 930 F Street, room 800, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total quarterly salary $1,280, plus expenses of $160. No portion can be allocated to legislative activities; in the fourth quarter of 1946 was engaged solely in economic research. (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone company. (3) Taxis and telephone calls. (4) International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union Dispatcher, semimonthly publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) Support legislation in the interest of longshoremen, warehousemen, and sugar workers particularly and generally legislation in the interest of sound international relations, social security, domestic well-being. Oppose legislation opposed to these objectives.

Glodowski, Agnes, General Delivery, Mitchell, S. Dak. (1) Total money received, $368.70; total expense, $368.70. (2) Received from Townsend National Headquarters, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (3) Paid for organizational work for Townsend movement. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) Townsend bill, H. R. 2229 and 2230.

Gorman, William Henry, 129 Alleghaney Street, Clifton Forge, Va. (1) Received my regular salary of $450 per month as general chairman; have done no lobbying during the past quarter. (2) No money paid out to anyone for any legislative work. (3) All salary used in my support and support of family and no money paid for any legislative work. (4) None. (5) Not employed as a lobbyist; just called in for special work and receive no extra compensation.

Gross,[6] M. Louise (Mrs. Charles J. Schroeder), 321 Halstead Avenue, Harrison, N. Y. (1) Nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) To oppose prohibition bills pertaining to alcoholic beverages, OPA, labor, communistic, and other un-American activities. (4) [Blank.] (5) Same as (3).

Grosscup, Ambler & Stephen,[5] 711 Central Building, Seattle 4, Washington. (1) Firm received fee of $1,500 and expenses covering disbursements of $86.14 on September 5, 1946, for legal work in connection with appearance before House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, holding hearings in Juneau, Alaska, and Seattle, Wash., on Alaska shipping problem. (2) Expense payments were made for hotel, meals, taxi and incidentals. (3) For actual expenses. (4) None. (5) Appearance at request of House Committee to furnish information with respect to Alaska shipping problem. In connection with such presentations we have proposed a bill to meet this problem, copies of which were furnished to the Jackson committee and to the United States Maritime Commission.

Haddock, Hoyt S., 930 F Street NW., room 800. (1) $1,560 in salary and $130 for expenses; no portion can be charged to legislative expenses as none were participated in. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Hallbeck, E. C., 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months from National Federation of Post Office Clerks, $2,323.55; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, October, November, December 1946, $184.73. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to above were a reimbursement for actual expenditures for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Federation's News Service Bulletin, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. Expended—nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $975; expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Hansen,[6] Harry, 305 Royal Union Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) I received $200 from Home Owners Protective League, of Des Moines, Iowa, and have paid out $83.12 of it. (2) I paid $77.17 to the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. and $5.95 to various restaurants and eating places. (3) Railroad fare and living expenses. (4) The Des Moines Register & Tribune Co. (5) The abolishment of rent control.

Hanson,[5] Lawrence V., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: October, November, and December, at $625 per month, $1,875. Expenses: Taxis, lunches, etc., October, $41.60. Expenses: Taxis, lunches, etc., November (check issued January), $26.65. Expenses: Taxis, lunches, etc., December (check issued January), $36.40. Travel expense, $2,025.65. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, etc. (3) Operating expenses in connection with committee work. (4) Same as first report. (5) Same as first report.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $216.67 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $243.55 reimbursement for travel expense during November and December 1946; $8.25 incidental expenses for months of October, November, and December 1946. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $243.55 reimbursement for travel expense to Uniontown, Pa., Indianapolis, Ind. (two trips), and return to Washington, D. C.; $8.25 incidental expenses for months of October, November, and December 1946 (taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals). (4) The American Legion magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense, Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discrimination and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hines, Lewis G., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,820; expenses, $81.60. (2) Taxis and phone calls. (3) As above. (4) None. (5) Affecting organized labor.

Hiss, Donald, 701 Union Trust Building. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporation doing business abroad.

Hollister, R. F., 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended, $12.06. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $10.26; various taxicab drivers, $1.80. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry; the per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $2,614.15 from American Library Association; expended, $739.15. (2) Various. (3) Operation of office; not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) None. (5) None.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1946, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,875 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,427. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses, such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Hudson, Minor, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $2,500 received during 3 months' period ending December 31, 1946, used only for living expenses. (2) Minor Hudson. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve, which Reserve Officers of the Naval Services may decide to support or oppose.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, National Legislative Committee, A. F. of L., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,820; expenses, $94. (2) Taxis, phones, and messengers. (3) As above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting labor.

Johnson, Lee F., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) My salary for the preceding calendar quarter was $2,500. Travel expenses, railroad, food, lodging, $535.28. (2) Lee F. Johnson. (3) Carrying educational work of conference, speaking at several national conventions, editing publication Public Housing. During entire quarter not more than 2 hours spent in direct

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

contact with Members of Congress concerning legislation. (4) Public Housing. (5) A portion of my time is devoted to the support of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill (S. 1592).

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) January 1947, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Kamm,[5] Albert G., 86 Cedar Street, Hartford 6, Conn. (1) $15 weekly. (2) Albert G. Kamm. (3) Hotel, travel, and postage. (4) Hartford Times, Hartford Courant, (5) Legislation for the improvement of social welfare of senior citizens.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes, $94.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Kimball, Arthur W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $312.50 salary semimonthly, less withholding tax and security tax; $417.74 expenses during October, November, and December 1946. (2) Arthur W. Kimball, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. (3) Travel, luncheons, taxis, etc. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5 [Blank.]

King, Joseph T., 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $1,500 salary and $301.65 expenses. (2) Expenses paid to Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, hotels, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business. Business luncheons. (4) National Affairs Report. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation and Second War Powers Act.

King, Willford I., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I have received $150 per week salary during the quarter. (2) I am not a disbursing officer, and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Knowles, Miles H., and Dean,[5] Allen, doing business as Washington Business Services, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received from the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington 5, D. C., $5,900. (2) Stenographic and clerical hire, postage, telephone, telegraph, travel, office stationery and printing, newspapers, and periodicals. (3) For the purpose of research work into problems of the guaranteed annual wage, union demands, and the preparation of a booklet, the Facts About Nonbasic Steel. (4) Furnished material to editors of Fortune magazine for the November 1946 issue on labor. (5) Support legislation to obtain true collective bargaining rights for employers in the light of local conditions and oppose industry-wide bargaining.

Lamb, Robert K., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $2,000 salary; $696.88. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel away from Washington, cab fares in Washington. (4) CIO News, Steel Labor. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $900 received during 3 months' period ending December 31, 1946. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Living expenses, personal. (4) the Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve officers of the naval services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve, which Reserve officers of the naval services may decide to support or oppose.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW. (1) Receipts, $4,447.93; expended, $697.93. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the action of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin,[5] John G., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none. Expended in connection with all matters for client, $48.92. (2) Railroads $25.70, telephone company $18.42, taxicab drivers $4.80. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, transportation to New York and transportation within District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Salary, $7-275.79; expended, $1,525.81. (2) See appended statement I.[3] (3) See appended statement I.[3] (4) See appended statement II.[3] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

Leonard, Richard T., 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,884.68; expenses, $1,681.45. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) For living expenses incident to his work and travel expenses. (4) UAW-CIO publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Levine, Seth, room 800, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary and $130 for expenses. No portion can be attributed to legislative activity as in the fourth quarter of 1946 I was engaged solely in economic research. (2) CIO maritime committee. (3) Research consultant to CIO maritime committee. (4) CIO News, ACA News, NMU Pilot, ILWU Dispatcher, IFAWA Fisherman, the American Marine Engineer, MCS Voice, and CIO Maritime Committee Washington Newsletter. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers, and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Linquist, Earl G., General Delivery, Topeka, Kans. (1) $566.62. (2) $72 miscellaneous expenses. (3) Travel, housing, etc. (4) None. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan.

Louchheim, Joseph H., Committee for the Nation's Health, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,500; received expenses, $132.69; total, $1,632.69. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National Health Insurance.

Lunn,[6] Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) $40.82. (2) [Blank.] (3) Miscellaneous expenses, such as postage, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Townsend national recovery plan.

Lyon, A. E. (executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association), 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary at rate of $9,000 per year. No money expended in connection with legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and to railway labor in particular.

McAvoy,[5] Clifford T., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $900. (2) Railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) To organize legislative and political action committees in the locals of the UER and MWA. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to the general welfare.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,750; expenses, $2,663.66. (2) Various. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) (None.) (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all of the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (2) No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (3) No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McDonald, E. L., Box 534, Cheney, Wash. (1) Received for salary, $318.18. No other moneys from any source. (2) Transportation. (3) Travel. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2229, known as Townsend plan.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) $625 salary. Paid by the Christian Amendment Movement, J. S. Tibby, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., treasurer, $150 travel expenses. (2) Salary was paid to self to support home and family. Travel expenses paid to trains, hotels, etc. (3) For lecturing in behalf of the Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (4) The Christian Patriot tells of my work. Other notices have not been published by my request. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McGlue, Arthur F., Post Office Building, Lynn, Mass. (1) Total expenses: $620; executive board meeting, Fort Worth and Dallas, Tex., $350; train fare, hotels, meals, entertainment, taxis, postage, stationery, etc., $270; total expenses, $620. (2) [Blank]. (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for all postal employees. (4) Post Office Custodial News published by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for Postal Employees.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 Eye Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $165. Misinterpretation of the law will be corrected on notification. Thanks. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To expend as I see fit, which fitness I consider the taxpayers' (Nation's) welfare. (4) Caused to be published for fee—none. Soliciting legislative support, innumerable. (5) It is my aim to run the gamut, pro or con, of congressional legislation.

McGrath, Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $400 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for services; $36.72 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for petty cash expenses. (2) United States post office, Western Union, restaurants, railroads. (3) Postage, telegrams, meals, travel expense. (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project.

Mack, James Edward, 1773 Massachusetts Ave. NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since September 30, 1946, and up to January 1, 1947, I have received (1) the proportionate part of my salary as reported, plus (2) $60.65 being the amount of expenses incurred by me. My expenditures have been only the said amount. (2) Railroad ticket agents, taxi drivers, restaurant cashiers, etc. (3) Travel, luncheons, and other incidental expenses. (4) The Property Owner—regular publication of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

McLaughlin, Robert E., Amvets (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended during the quarter. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National Amvet and Amvet Letter. (5) Legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II.

McLaurin, Joseph H., 837 Investment Building. (1) No money was received by the undersigned except a part of annual salary of $12,000 as president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, which may be allocable to the review, studying, approving and signing an article, prepared by the vice-president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association on December 9, 1946, on labor legislation to be published in the Annual Grocery number of the New York Journal of Commerce in January 1947, to wit, one half hour time or the sum of $3.30. No money was received or paid out by the undersigned as expenses for influencing legislation. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) New York Journal of Commerce, Annual Grocery Review number. (5) No legislation in particular. Any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers.

Macleay, Lachlan, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) Received $1,332.22; expended $1,322.22. (2) Various railroads, airlines, bus lines, hotels, et cetera, as indicated on attached statement. (Some travel by personal automobile.) (3) Travel, hotel and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

McSparron,[5] Joseph P., general chairman, Machinists, District No. 124, 320 North Hopkins Street, Sayre, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) There was none during the last calendar quarter.

Mark, James, Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1946, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,750 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,302. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses, such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Marsh,[5] Benjamin C., Room 31, 810 Fourth Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total receipts (largest contribution $400.84), $3,676.17. Salaries and wages $922.10; printing and bulletin, $1,048; postage, $370.21; rent, $165; withholding tax, A. B. Dick, $33.98; Delaware registration, $50; incidentals, $62.63; social security, etc., $101.66; Marsh trip, $97.30; Jerome Davis expenses, $34.50; total, $2,885.38. (2) Salaries and wages, Benjamin C. Marsh, Arline Ryan, Walter Clyde, Eleanor Hagerman, Marie McEnaney; printing, Graphic Arts; postage, United States post office; rent, J. B. Stein; tax collector, internal revenue, Baltimore, Md.; supplies, A. B. Dick; expenses, Jerome Davis; travel, B. C. Marsh. (3) Salaries, wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) Have sent out and distributed material to hundreds of papers, magazines, etc., but have not caused any to be published, it was intelligence on their part. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Mason, Walter J., national legislative representative, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Mechem, Frank L., 603 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees and the total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses was $708.30. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (5) The formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

Meeks, E. A., 1110 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $1,500 salary for 3 months. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate—editor. (5) Postal legislation pertaining to postmasters and their offices.

Miles,[5] Clarence R., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $1,958.33 from date of registration; expenses, none. Expended, nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miller, Martin H., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total salary for this quarter, $3,060. Previously reported for third quarter, $3,060. No part of salary expended for purposes covered by act. Previous expenses reported, $410.62. No expenses incurred under act. (2) No expenses incurred. (3) No expenses incurred. (4) None. (5) No lobbyist activities during this quarter. This final report of the individual tenure of office ends December 31, 1946.

Mooney, William W., 414–415 Eagle Building, Spokane 8, Wash. (1) Total money received, $1,197, which is based on voluntary contributions from persons or clubs to national office. Cleveland, Ohio, expenses (traveling) and deductible taxes taken out of above amount. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (3) Traveling to different clubs and groups over State to create interest in Townsend national recovery plan bill in Congress. Build morale, increase membership and contributions to national office, Cleveland. (4) Articles sent in at times to Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) Townsend national recovery plan bills now in Congress of the United States.

National Tax Relief Coalition, The, Box 184, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Contributions received October, November, and December 1946, $1,505.50; expended, $1,456.47. (2) Various. (3) Printing, transportation, salary, general expenses, miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Neel,[5] Samuel E., 705 Chandler Building, Washington, 5, D. C. (1) From October 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946: Received $850 per month; total $2,550. Expended, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage-banking industry.

Nelson, George R., Grand Lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nestor,[6] William E., 6 Wells Street, Hornell, N. Y. (1) $1,200 salary; $540 expenses. (2) No money paid to anyone for lobbying purposes. (3) Money spent on regular household expenses and expenses while on the road in connection with my duties as general chairman of the Machinist Craft, District No. 85, International Association of Machinists. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the standard railroad-labor organizations.

Newton, R. Wayne, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. (1) July 15, $354.17, salary; July 31, $354.17, salary; August 14, $354.16, salary. (2) R. Wayne Newton. August 16, $36.13, travel expense; August 30, $354.17, salary; September 4, $39.90, travel expense. (3) September 13, $354.17, salary; September 19, $38.86, travel expense; September 30, $354.17, salary. (4) American Cooperation. (5) Employed to counteract the

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

antifarmer-co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association. (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counsellors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client, (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all National, State, and local small-business or other associations however known which are subsidized from, or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oakes, Randall V., 1615 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any that would effect the rental and/or the sale of Remington Rand tabulating machines.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None received. Expenditures for transportation, meals, lodging, telephone, telegraph, and office expenses, total, $138.11. (2) Railroad company, hotels, restaurants, and taxi, $101.51; telephone and telegraph companies, $15.41; internal office expenses, $21.19. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxation of domestic corporations doing business in foreign countries.

Oliver, John P.,[6] 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1946, $600; November 1946, $600; December 1946, $625. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family; taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development and execution of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Ostergren, B. F., 541 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Rural Letter Carrier. (5) Postal, retirement, highway.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,070; expenses, $1,264.10 (2) Hotels, railroads, transportation, and other incidentals. (3) Personal expenses and traveling. (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Theodor, 654 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. (1) $39.84. (2) Mrs. Theodor Oxholm. (3) Railroad fare, hotel accommodations, meals on trip from New York to Washington, D. C., to attend meetings of National Commission on Children and Youth, December 9, 10, and 11. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting child welfare.

Packard, Fred Mallery, National Parks Association, 1214 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) My compensation during the preceding year was for services not connected with the National Parks Association, except for the period from September 23 to December 31, 1946, during which I expended no money for expenses. (2) No money expended. (3) No money expended. (4) None. (5) The National Parks Association, by constant meetings of the executive committee, considers all legislation introduced which affects national parks. It is my duty to present the committee's views to members at congressional committees.

Patterson, Edwin B., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary for months of November and December, $853.98. All spent for personal living expenses and not related to performance of job. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) Taxicabs, Capital Transit, Washington Hotel, Harrington Hotel, tips, newsdealers. (3) Transportation; luncheons; services, such as clothes-checking in hotels, etc.; purchase of newspapers. (4) None other than news letters published by the National Grain Trade Council or a member organization. (5) At this date no specific legislative program has been adopted by his employer. However, the employer, National Grain Trade Council, is generally interested in all types of agricultural legislation and would favor any bills which seek to improve agricultural marketing and oppose those which would handicap grain and distribution.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received, $238.47; expended, $238.47. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Penisch,[6] J. W., Jr., 905 Fifth Street, McKees Rock, Pa. (1) Monthly salary of $400 per month. Monthly expenses of $250 per month. (2) J. W. Panisch, Jr., for necessary expenses while on the road. (3) Hotel expenses, meals, bus fare, taxi, telephone and telegraph service. Secretary expenses when necessary. (4) None. (5) Any legislation pertaining to labor.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Earle Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,105; expenses, $104.87. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurant, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) To support all legislation favorable to the welfare of the people and oppose legislation that is detrimental.

Pope & Ballard, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill., Pope Ballard & Loos, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Fee of $3,500; $200 per month as counsel, and $144.05 for expenses. (2) See statement attached.[5] (3) See statement attached.[5] (4) None. (5) See statement attached.[5]

Poulton, J. E., Grand Lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Pratt, Edith C., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $810, salary; $399.16, expenses. (2) To hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel away from Washington. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steel workers and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Pratt, Foster J., room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) As president he receives a monthly salary ($600) minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL—Lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Union, AFL. Weekly Federal News Letter and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the Engineering and Architectural Professions.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 quarterly salary paid to the registrant as associate attorney by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) As Congress was not in session during last quarter of 1946, registrant had no activities with regard to Federal legislation. (4) The registrant contributed articles to the October, November, and December issues of the Month's Work, a monthly trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) None.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. (1) From committee for the Nation's health, $4,387.74; for professional services, $3,750; for out-of-pocket expenses, $637.74. (2) Publicity associates for professional services, $3,750; see exhibit A (attached) for details of out-of-pocket expenses totalling, $637.74. (3) Compiling and distributing information. (4) See exhibit B (attached). (5) To support legislation for national health insurance.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. (1) From National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $2,747.76; for professional services, $2,250; for out-of-pocket expenses, $497.76. (2) Publicity Associates, Inc. for professional services, $2,250; see exhibit A (attached) for detail of out-of-pocket expenses totalling, $497.76. (3) Compiling and distributing information. (4) See exhibit B (attached). (5) To support legislation designed to free margarine from unfair taxes and other unfair trade barriers, and to oppose legislation creating such taxes and other trade barriers.

Purves, Edmund R., Director of Public and Professional Relations of the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue, NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Raebeck, Helen, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) $244, pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed of legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills. No activity this quarter.

Read, James M., 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December 1946, $999.97; travel expenses, $203.36. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) The organization sends a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. In addition articles have been contributed to two Friends papers, the Friend, and the Friends Intelligencer. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and no money expended. Registrant does receive an annual salary from Credit Union National Association for his regular duties of field, organization and education work but receives no additional compensation for incidental legislative work. (2) [Blanks.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

Richter,[5] Irving, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $1,134.92. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Various UAW-CIO local papers, CIO papers, Ammunition, and other labor publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills to aid the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Rising, E. W., 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C. (1) From Water Conservation Conference, continuing committee, $350; from Western Beet Growers Association, to be reported under Lobbying Act, none. (2) E. W. Rising. (3) For part of office rent, total rate of $56, $45; for part salary stenographer at rate of $250 per month, $150; to pro rata of air line trip to Portland, Oreg., $50; to pro rata part of office telephone, telegraph, stationery, and miscellaneous expenses, $105; total, $350. (4) None since effective date of act. (5) Legislation affecting water rights established under State law and development and control of natural resources. Legislation affecting domestic sugar beet growers.

Robb, George Mackay, 942 Church Lane, Yeadon, Pa. (1) Received of J. S. Tibby, salary, September 1, 1946, to January 6, 1947, $1,041.65; receipts credited against expense account, $265.94. (2) Expenditure of $1,041.65 salary indicated above, was for personal living expenses, therefore not accounted here. Expenditures for travel and other expenses, $287.31. (3) Expenditures of $287.31 were incurred in lecturing in churches and before civic groups, in interviewing church leaders and civic leaders, in attending meetings of the Christian Amendment Movement to which I am responsible, and in doing research in the Library of the Congress. (4) The Covenanter Witness: D. R. Taggart, editor, 1309 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Patriot: S. E. Boyle, editor, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Beacon: Carl McIntire, editor, Collingswood, N. J. (5) An amendment to the Constitution of the United States so that the Constitution will have added to its preamble the words: "Devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and King of Nations."

Roemer, Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $910; expenses, $176.68. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rose,[5] Mary Ethel, box 176, Cumberland, Md. (1) I received and spent $240 during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) For meals, hotels, and traveling; also clothing and postage, stationery, or any other expenses that may be incurred. (4) None other than local papers for meetings. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan or bill H. R. 16.

Rowe, Roland H., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money received by the undersigned except a part of annual salary of $5,480 as vice president and secretary of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association which may be allocable to the preparation of an article on December 9, 1946, on labor legislation for the president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to be published in the annual grocery review number of the New York Journal of Commerce in January 1947, to wit, 2 hours' time or the sum of approximately $6. No money was received or paid out by the undersigned as expenses for influencing legislation. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) Article for annual grocery review number, New York Journal of Commerce (preparation of the article). (5) No legislation in particular. Any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers.

Rumely, Edward A., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received only my salary and expenses, as reported on Form B. (The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A). (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue press releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Russell, Frank E., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Not on duty during preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Star Carrier. (5) Support of all legislation of benefit to star route carriers.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington 11, D. C. (1) Salary, $7,200 yearly; quarterly, $1,800; expenses $5 day in city; $11 day out of city. Paid to me by Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance and Bartenders International League, AFL. Legislation is only a part of my duties; I am also general organizer. (2) None paid in connection with legislation. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) All labor legislation and social legislation.

Schwenker,[6] Warren L., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) That which would affect the rental and/or sales of Remington Rand tabulating machines.

Scott, John R., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $19.80 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) From October 1 to December 31, 1946—$750 plus $126.32 (expense). (2) Eleanor Krueger, stenographer, $364; rent, Colorado Building, $51; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $21.12; printing, Kirby Litho Co., $23.25; stamps, $18.06; trips, $63; cabs, office supplies, miscellaneous, $29.39; entertainment, $1.95. (3) Correspondence, preparation of, and printing legal opinions; trips (New York City 1), (Philadelphia 1), (Baltimore 2) concerning consumer credit policies and Regulation W. (4) Credit World. (5) As of the date of this report the National Retail Credit Association has not sponsored the introduction of any legislation or supported or sponsored legislation. The work of the Washington counsel of the National Retail Credit Association, affiant, during the period covered by this report was chiefly of a legal and economic nature. A Federal garnishment law may be proposed, however.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building. (1) Re: Arabian American Oil Co. None received and none expended during previous quarter; except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Sifton, Paul, 3150 Highland Place NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) (Not so engaged subsequent to effective date of the act and prior to January 1, 1947. This is my initial registration.) (2) (See statement under (1).) (3) (See statement under (1).) (4) (See statement under (1).) (5) (1) Legislation establishing a permanent FEPC; (2) legislation establishing a labor extension service in the Labor Department.

Smart (Miss), Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington 2, D. C. (1) Expended by me for expenses and reimbursed by National W. C. T. U., $48.40. (2) Post office, $12.45; Tap & Tavern, $3.14; Times-Herald, $2.35; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $22.26; Morrison Paper Co., $4.20; elevator operators, cleaning man (employees of Methodist Building), $4. (3) Post office, for postage; Tap & Tavern, Times-Herald, subscriptions; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telephone service and calls; Morrison Paper Co., office supplies; elevator operators, etc., Christmas gifts. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smeltzer, C. W., 408 Wesley Temple Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) $100 per week, including social security and income-tax deductions; also expense for myself and deputy organizer. (2) Transportation by automobile and hotel and restaurant. Whatever was left was my salary. (3) To take care of State office, and to visit and address clubs and to help organize new clubs. (4) None. (5) To support the Townsend bill.

Smith, Hilda W., 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,599.96; $35 per month allowed for taxi, telephone, etc. No expense money received or expended this quarter. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Leaflet, A Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor; mimeographed news bulletin; occasional articles sent out through labor press associates. (5) Bill for a labor extension service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Purcell L., 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $1,528.64 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation $336.59; hotel and meals $812.51; telephone and telegraph $166.43; miscellaneous and incidentals $213.11. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

Smith, Robert E., as representing Life Insurance Policy-Holders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to the same.

Smith, Robert E., as representative of National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to favorably affect the earnings and/or integrity of railroad securities; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to adversely affect the same.

Snow, William S., room 514, Rupley Building, 815 King Street, Alexandria, Va. (1) American Fisheries Association Cooperative, $2,163.70; California Fish Canners Association, $375; California Sardine Products Institute, $333.34; National Renderers Association, $300. (2) William S. Snow. (3) Fee and retainer. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting fisheries industry and rendering industry.

Snyder, Calvin K., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Expenses paid out of pocket. See attached.[3] (2) See attached.[3] (3) See attached. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Speek, Mrs. Frances Valiant, American Association of University Women, National Headquarters, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received in salary for the calendar quarter: $1,020 (possibly slightly over half of this was for duties in connection with legislative work). (2) None of the money received by me was paid to anyone in connection with legislative work. (3) None. See under (2). (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women. Quarterly. AAUW general director's letter. Issued three or four times a year. Sent to leaders in the American Association of University Women. (5) See attached list[3] as printed in the fall 1946 AAUW Journal, stating in full the legislation supported and opposed.

Spofford, Charles M., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Amendment of the Congressional Charter of the American National Red Cross (act of January 5, 1905).

Stein, Margaret I., Committee for the Nation's Health, 914 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, $61; total, $1,061.02. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National Health Insurance.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $252.87. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946—salary, $812.50; expended, $202.51. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stoner,[5] Henry, 363 Bank Street, New London, Conn. (1) Have just started advertising for funds, no receipts as yet, have spent $3 for stamps and stationery since January 1, 1947, have spent $6 for newspaper advertising since January 1, 1947. (2) Newspaper advertising was with the New London Life, 160 State Street, New London, Conn. (3) Stationery and stamps were for letter-to-editors in various Connecticut and New York, N. Y., newspapers. Newspaper advertising was for solicitation of funds for operation. (4) The New London Life, New London, Conn.; the Hartford Courant, Hartford, Conn.; Eastern Connecticut News, Groton, Conn.; the Sun, New York, N. Y.; New York Daily News, New York, N. Y. (5) I am working for a strict and complete enforcement of section 4, article IV, United States Constitution, and section 2, fourteenth amendment, United States Constitution, within the intent of the framers of said constitutional sections, and which every public official in America takes a solemn oath to enforce and obey.

Sturrock, J. E., general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, 607-609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Travel expenses for October, November, and December 1946—$250.44. (2) Various railroad, air line and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, and lodging. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association Bulletins and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and national, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of the water resources of Texas through existing State and Federal agencies. To oppose all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., assistant director, National Legislative Committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $600 per month, as salary, less withholding and social-security taxes; $146 reimbursement for traveling expenses during September and October 1946. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, assistant director, National Legislative Committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Salary and incidental expenses. (4) The American Legion Magazine, 1 Park Ave., New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans, but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in Civil Service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discrimination and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Sutlive, Carey R., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary $2,000; expenses reimbursed by employer, $657.76; expenditures, $657.76. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investment.

Taylor, Col. John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $417.77 salary, semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $682.16 reimbursement for traveling expenses during October, November, and December 1946; $16.20 incidental expenses for October and November 1946. (2) Col. John Thomas Taylor. (3) $682.16 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trips to San Francisco, Calif., Boston, Mass., Indianapolis, Ind., Columbia, S. C., Lansing, Mich., Indianapolis, Ind., Cleveland, Ohio; $16.20 incidental expenses for October and November 1946, carfare, luncheon. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York, N. Y.; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Tinney, William H., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary: $487.74 per month, which is pay for all of the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (2) No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (3) No expense money was received by me or expended by me for purposes covered in the act during the fourth quarter of 1946. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Virkus, Frederick A., chairman, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Total received as contributions from August 2, 1946, through December 31, 1946, $23,665.88. (2) Office expense and travel. Clerical staff of 10 persons. (3) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business. (4) Only as come within the scope of our membership as affecting small business. (5) See (3).

Warfel, George L., 112 C Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary (gross, withholding and social-security taxes deducted), $1,183.31; expenses, $255.16; total, $1,438.47. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To promote the welfare of the special-delivery messengers of the Post Office Department, covering liaison contacts with administrative Government officials, and legislative work. (4) The Special Messenger, Special News (mimeographed bulletins to membership). (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to special-delivery messengers.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo 4, Ohio. (1) None received yet. (Services falling under act commenced December 11, 1946, and billed quarterly; see statement next quarter). Traveling, hotel and entertainment expenses paid and advanced by undersigned, $260. (2) See above (1). (3) See above (1). (4) None. (5) No specific legislation; interested in sound housing and legislation generally on same basis.

Waterfield, Maynard H., Citizens National Committee, Inc., 2844 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $1,875; expenses; miscellaneous, $50.80. (2) Maynard H. Waterfield. (3) Salary, $1,875; taxis and other incidental expenses, $50.80. (4) Round Washington, weekly publication; Washington Close-Up, monthly publication; Research Reports, occasional publication. (5) Mr. Waterfield is employed by Citizens National Committee, Inc., for legislative research purposes, not to influence legislation.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $80, $1,040; expenses, 13 weeks at $10, $130. (2) Registrant's landlord, grocery stores, clothing stores, drug stores, and other suppliers of living necessities. Also cab drivers, telephone company, and other suppliers of services engaged in performance of registrant's duties. (3) Work in Washington Office of United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, including legislative work and nonlegislative work with Government agencies. (4) UE News. (5) All legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare—support. Legislation detrimental to these objectives—oppose.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) $1,000 salary; no legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Congress not in session; no expenses incurred. (3) Congress not in session; no expenses incurred. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,069.60; expended, $821.32. (2) Propeller Club, Port of Washington D. C.; Hamilton National Bank; Barry-Pate Motor Co.; treasurer, N. U. A. Association; the Tub Thumpers of America, Inc.; Community Chest Federation; Collector of Internal Revenue; National Press Club; various individuals. (3) As indicated in attached schedule,[3] and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) Collier's Yearbook. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Wheeler, Samuel Robert, 11 Franklin Road SW., Roanoke 11, Va. (1) Salary, $900; expenses, $380; salary minus withholding tax and railroad-retirement tax. (2) Home Owners' Loan Corporation; tradesmen dealing in necessities in maintaining a home, except $200 maturity value United States bonds. The expense money was spent in traveling connected with my job. (3) Maintaining a home and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Any labor legislation, especially railroad legislation, if any.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) From Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: fee, $1,250; expenses, $316.72. (2) Telephone and telegraph, $113.08; traveling, $153.14; restaurant, $44; subscription, magazine, $5; notary fee. $1.50; total, $316.72. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Willard, Charles H., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Amendment of the congressional charter of the American National Red Cross (Act of Jan. 5, 1905).

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Received $300. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. Expended, nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses, of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williamson,[5] C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Owing to the fact that Congress was in adjournment during the last quarter of 1946, no portion of my salary or expense allowance was expended under the provisions of Public, 601, second session, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for that reason no statement is filed. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $56.30 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Wilson, E. Raymond, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December 1946, $1,250.06; travel expense, $235.68. (2) Carfare, $168.40; room, $4.63; meals, $26.03; telephone and telegraph, $3.45; miscellaneous, $33.17; October 10 through December 31 total, $235.68. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Winquest, B. A., 541 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Rural Letter Carrier. (5) Postal, retirement, highway.

Woodson,[5] George, Roosevelt Hotel, Lansing, Mich. (1) I received commission amounting, after taxes, to $1,331.54; I paid out as expenses $716.75. (2) I paid to Mrs. Marie West $97 for secretarial work. (3) For secretarial work. (4) None. (5) Townsend bill.

Worley, Harry F., 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington 15, D. C. (1) He received only salary and reimbursement for travel, clerical, office, and incidental expenses; no part of money received for salary or expenses was expended in support of or opposition to any legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) He is editor of the Customs Service News (monthly), which covers the activities of the association, news of prospective and enacted legislation, and personnel news of interest to the membership. (5) Legislative, administrative, or court action affecting the interests of the officers and employees of the United States customs and of the Federal civil service; his appearance before committees of Congress is incidental to other activities and forms a small portion of the aggregate.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $791.49 refund of traveling expenses. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Young,[5] Donald A., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $1,305.54 from date of registration; expenses, $15.15; expended, taxis, $13.65; telephones, $1.50. (2) Various taxi drivers and the phone company. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Portal-to-portal legislation.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Light of the World, Thy wonderful compassion has brought to the gates of our lives the footsteps of One who is the sovereign expression of every human need. Forgive our shallow thinking and break through the twilight of our petty rivalries. With wise understanding, enable us to put to flight every hidden movement that seeks to change the ideals of a free people. O stimulate our souls with the certainties that make for the stability and perpetuity of our Republic.

Our Heavenly Father, we are anxious about Thy church, that its spiritual life may not be smothered by worldliness; we are anxious about our homes, that love and discipline may not sit idly by while the fires of irreverence and indifference burn. Here may the Godly virtues be exemplified, and emulated by children, and the voice of prayer be heard at the rising and the setting sun. Let the people praise Thee, let all the people praise Thee. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. It had been the intention of the Chair not to recognize Members for 1-minute speeches at this time, but, owing to the tragic event which happened in New York and over which the House is profoundly sorrowful, the Chair feels it may be advisable to recognize three Members from the great State of North Carolina to speak briefly. However, there will be no other 1-minute speeches until after the business of the day is disposed of, at which time the Chair will be glad to entertain such requests.

THE LATE HONORABLE O. MAX GARDNER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, every North Carolinian is saddened today by the event which took place in New York this morning, when that great North Carolinian, former Gov. O. Max Gardner, Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, died. I am too stunned to say very much and cannot, under the circumstances, pay the proper tribute to his memory. For forty-odd years he and I have been close friends. All of his friends in North Carolina have followed his career with pride. Member of the General Assembly of North Carolina, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, Under Secretary of the Treasury, he has had a full life. I know of no man in North Carolina and few elsewhere who were his equal. A courageous man, an honest man, a man of the highest character, and a man of outstanding ability: this, in brief, is a very short statement of my friend and constituent. In the last few years Governor Gardner gave of his time and money to the establishment of a college, Gardner-Webb, in North Carolina. If his life had been spared, he would have made a great Ambassador to Great Britain.

I know the House joins with me today in expressing to Mrs. Gardner and the other members of the family our deepest and most sincere sympathy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, like my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, I was greatly shocked and deeply grieved to learn this morning of the sudden and unexpected death of the ex-Governor and Ambassador Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

Governor Gardner was appointed by President Truman on account of his long experience and outstanding ability to this high and exalted position and was unanimously confirmed by the Senate January 13, 1947, soon thereafter taking the oath of office.

Governor Gardner at the time of his death was in New York ready to sail to London to take up his great work.

I am sure that nothing I could say at this time, feeling as I do so deeply the personal loss of a dear friend, would even in a measure be adequate to the wonderful record of Ambassador Gardner to our State and the Nation.

He served as Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, then as Governor, both of which positions he filled with great satisfaction to our people. President Roosevelt recognized Governor Gardner's outstanding ability and frequently advised with him on matters of great national importance. President Truman also early in his administration recognized the great ability of Governor Gardner and appointed him to the important position of Under Secretary of the Treasury. While he only held this office briefly, his ability as a financier and his sound judgment on fiscal affairs were recognized by the entire country. The record of his services, both State and nationally, are indelibly engraved on the public affairs of both.

I shall always cherish as one of the joys of my life that I was privileged to enjoy a close relationship and friendship of Governor Gardner, and ofttimes have I been helped by his wisdom, advice, and counsel.

I entertained for Governor Gardner a very deep personal affection, as well as an exalted admiration. Governor Gardner was not only an outstanding statesman but a most successful businessman—truly a great man because he was a truly good man and a truly useful man.

In deed and in truth I have never known a more devoted champion of all the people, one whose ability, industry, fidelity, and experience qualified him in a higher degree for outstanding public service.

To his widow, children, and each member of the family I express my most deep and profound sympathy in their great sorrow and bereavement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly 1 minute of time that I regret even having the opportunity to take. It is with a heavy heart that I listened to the announcement of the death of the Honorable O. Max Gardner. He was my personal friend. He was a friend of mankind. He was a great American. He loved his country; he served it and its people faithfully and well. In my opinion it was only as a result of great pressure that he continued in the service of this Nation. I, for one, had more real enthusiasm and optimism over what O. Max Gardner would do in Great Britain as Ambassador from this great Nation than I have had for any other man I have known in my life. His personality, his ability, his integrity were such that it would not only impress but almost overwhelm any man with whom he talked. He was eminently qualified for the great task to which he had been assigned. America can ill afford to lose such men in these troublesome times. The people of North Carolina and the Nation regrets his passing. May God rest his soul.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject Pertinent Observations on Tax Reduction and to include therein two short editorials.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence between himself and the Under Secretary of State.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New London Day of February 4, 1947, entitled "Letters to Congressmen."

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, at Canton, Ohio, on January 29, 1947, on the one hundred and fourth birthday anniversary of William McKinley.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a magazine article.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Daily News.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two matters, in the first to include a letter from a constituent and in the other to include a statement on the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the United States Municipal News entitled "Rent Control" and "For the Record."

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Star-Times on the subject of another St. Louis world's fair.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, according to newspaper reports a small group of Republican Members have held another one of their many caucuses—this time with the Republican leaders of the House. This caucus decided, in effect, to open the hunting season on the reciprocal-trade-agreement programs.

I make the observation, Mr. Speaker, particularly for the benefit of Members on the Republican side, that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program was not an issue in the recent congressional campaign; that Members of the majority, by virtue of being elected as Republicans, are not committed as a matter of Republican Party policy to vote to postpone or abrogate this most wise and important policy in foreign affairs.

I hope that the thinking Members will refuse to follow the leadership of a few who would plunge this country into an economic war with practically every other nation, and destroy one of the most effective means of securing a better understanding and more good will throughout the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received unanimous consent to insert certain matter in the CONGRESSIONAL REC-

ORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $278.67, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oberlin Times.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE TERMS OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 91 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

This resolution has but one purpose. That purpose is to submit to the people, by and through their State legislatures, this very important problem of the Presidential tenure of office, and to let the people decide whether or not this limitation should be written into the Constitution.

Heretofore many resolutions have been introduced upon this very question, but for some reason or another they have fallen by the wayside, and no legislation has been passed upon this question, and our Constitution remains without amendment to this date respecting the tenure of the office of President.

Section 1, article II, of the Constitution provides:

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years.

Again, under amendment 20, section 1, of our Constitution, we find, in that amendment, the following language:

The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

By reason of the lack of a positive expression upon the subject of tenure of the office of President, and by reason of a well-defined custom which has arisen in the past that no President should have more than two terms in that office, much public discussion has resulted upon this subject. Hence it is the purpose of this legislation, if passed, to submit this question to the people so they, by and through the recognized processes, may express their views upon this question, and, if they shall so elect, they may amend our Constitution and thereby set at rest this problem.

This is not a political question. The importance of the problem to the people transcends all political implications and considerations. This proposed amendment to our Constitution, if adopted, will continue throughout the future years, unless and until a further amendment may be adopted upon this subject. Therefore, in the face of general public discussions, in the face of the custom which has developed throughout the years, we are here presenting a resolution to submit this basic problem to the people.

When considering House Joint Resolution 27, amending the Constitution to limit tenure of the President to two terms, Congress must decide whether or not the people of the United States should still be permitted to choose the type of government under which they will live. This resolution merely enables our citizens through their State legislatures to express their opinion on this important question. I believe the people should make the decision, and I recommend adoption of this resolution as our expression of faith in their judgment.

When he refused nomination for a third term, George Washington warned the people that they might again be subjected to the tyranny of monarchy if they permitted any individual to become too firmly entrenched as the Chief Executive. This precedent established by our first President made unnecessary constitutional limitation of tenure of Presidency. As the precedent no longer stands to protect them, the people should be given the opportunity to set a limit on the time an individual can serve as Chief Executive. As a President can be elected by the electoral college, even without the popular vote, our citizens now have really little protection against totalitarianism. The question of Presidential tenure has never before been submitted to the people. To protect them from the oppression of dictatorships that have arisen in other countries, I recommend this resolution be adopted, allowing their expression of sovereignty.

THIS UNDEMOCRATIC AND UNWANTED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS BEING RUSHED THROUGH WITH UNSEEMLY HASTE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, the rule has been correctly stated by my colleague, the new chairman of the Committee on Rules, with whom I have had the pleasure of serving for many years. I have always found him to be fair, and consequently I was rather surprised that he should have yielded to the demands for depriving the House of a reasonable time for general debate on this important legislation.

NO OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT SO RESTRICTED IN DEBATE

If I am not mistaken, this is the first time that any resolution amending the Constitution that has served us so well for 170 years has been brought before the House under a rule which permits only two short hours for general debate. O I recollect in days and years gone by that on many occasions the Republicans demanded not 2 but 6 and 8 hours, sometimes even 3 and 4 days, on minor and inconsequential proposals; but on this resolution weighted with such grave importance, proposing to change the Constitution of the United States and to limit the right of the people to choose their own President, they are liberal enough to allow only two measly hours for general debate.

REPUBLICANS IN HURRY TO BI FREE TO ATTEND BANQUET

Of course, I understand that the gentlemen of the majority are anxious to get through with the sad business of passing this resolution in order to be free to attend a Republican feast this evening. Doubtless this pitiful victory over a great man now sleeping on the banks of the Hudson will sharpen their appetites and give zest to their banquet. I know it will be a splendid feast, and I wish that I could be with them to taste the delicious food, which I am sure I should find palatable and digestible enough; but I fear that I could not digest the words which would follow after the feasting.

Yet, still I ask, Why should the Members of this House and the people of America be deprived of the right to know the facts attending the passage of this resolution and of being informed by extended debate? Why should not the people know what this proposed constitutional amendment means? Is a banquet sufficient excuse to cancel out the democratic processes? Such haste seems indecent.

VAST MAJORITY FAVORED ROOSEVELT

I recall that my colleague, the majority leader, the genial gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], stated yesterday

that a vast majority of the American people favor this legislation. Frequently the gentleman from Indiana is right; but this time, I am sorry to say, he is entirely wrong; and I think that he knows in his heart that this unseemly haste is due to the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to this amendment, and the Republican leadership is hurrying to pass it through the Congress before the public clamor grows too loud to be ignored. I know, and the Republican leadership knows, that a vast majority of the American people voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt not just once, or twice, nor even three times, but for four consecutive terms. That shows how the American people stand, and how they loved this great leader.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NO CANDIDATE FOR EVEN A SINGLE TERM

Of course, I realize that my Republican friends have no man that they could possibly elect President for a fourth term, nor even for a third term. In fact, I do not believe they have anyone at this time, or will have in the foreseeable future, who can even be elected for a first term, notwithstanding the fact that they succeeded in misleading sufficient of the American people to gain, in the last election, a temporary majority in and control of this House.

I do not know whether or not all of you know it; but, though I am and have been always a progressive Democrat, I am ready and willing to cooperate with the Republicans whenever they are right. Unfortunately, they are not right very often. In view of the tremendous responsibility which is now theirs, I hope that they will henceforth be right; but they will not be if they follow the tactics they have followed in this case, for certainly the Republican leadership has not indicated by this procedure that it is their aim and intent to deal fairly and justly either with the minority or with the American people.

REPORTED BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ONLY YESTERDAY

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary only day before yesterday. They did not give that committee even time to introduce the amended resolution, nor to print the hearings for the benefit of the House membership. They were obliged to come in with a resolution which will have to be amended in accordance with the majority vote of the Judiciary Committee. I hope that in the future the Republican majority will not act so hastily and so harshly, bringing in legislation of major importance without giving this House and the country an opportunity to become familiar with the bills on which we are acting, and, in this instance, without any effort to explain why they believe the Constitution should be amended.

For 170 years this country has prospered and grown strong under the Constitution, without any amendment deviating from our true course toward more and more democracy, nor from the true principles of representative government laid down by the founding fathers. Today we are enjoying greater prosperity and greater liberty and greater equality than ever before in our history. I hope the Republicans will not be able to do anything to destroy that prosperity, which was brought about by the Democratic Party under the inspired leadership of our greatest President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, during the third and even the first part of the fourth term, until his untimely death, and despite the incalculable burdens of carrying a world-wide war to final victory.

CANNOT FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT BE PERMITTED TO REST IN PEACE?

What hurts most, and what I strongly resent, are statements made by several Republican Members that they "must vote for this anti-Roosevelt resolution." Perhaps, had I not overheard those remarks, I should not have said anything at all here today.

Can we not be fair enough to let rest in peace a man who has done so much for our country and for humanity? I think it is manifestly unfair for anyone to make such remarks. It was a Godsend to the world that we had Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom the people freely chose four times to direct our Government and our destinies, and who served the Nation and all mankind as no other man has ever done before.

Though Franklin Roosevelt now rests in eternal sleep, I trust and I hope that his views and his policies, for which he fought and for which he gave his life, will continue for years to come to shape our national destiny, and that this country will continue in the great material prosperity which he brought about. Most of all, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people of the world can reach his greatest objective—a just and lasting peace—not only for America, but for all people everywhere. That is his dream, and my dream, and the dream of the common people Roosevelt so loved.

STATES WILL NOT RATIFY THIS AMENDMENT

In thus assailing President Roosevelt, and in attempting to besmirch his memory, Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends are overlooking the fact that just as Roosevelt loved the common people, they loved him. I do not believe that three-fourths of the States will ever ratify this amendment, which is by its nature insulting to the memory of our greatest President. I have no doubt but that many of the legislatures even in solidly Republican States will refuse to approve it. Not only do the people remember Roosevelt's magnificent leadership through war to victory; they remember his stirring words in the depths of depression, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." They remember that our living standards, our wage levels, not only in America but the world over, rose steadily under his influence and democratic leadership. They know that he gave his life to his country as truly as did any soldier hero fallen in the battle.

THIS AMENDMENT RESTRICTS THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO FREELY CHOOSE THEIR OWN PRESIDENT

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons why the people will rise up in anger against this proposed constitutional amendment once the facts are known.

Anyone familiar with the history of the formation of the Union and the writing of the Constitution, and with the debates in the Constitutional Convention and the commentaries of the founding fathers after the convention, knows that it was not the purpose of the delegates to that convention, nor of any of those who agreed to the language of the Constitution, to restrict the right of the people to choose their President freely, nor to limit the terms which a President could serve. No such limitation was written into the Constitution, and it would have been placed there had there been a majority sentiment for it. Our Constitution is a noble instrument of human rights, forged by the hammer of human necessity on the anvil of compromise.

We have frequently amended our Constitution, as the need arose, to extend and strengthen the democratic processes on which our Government is solidly built. This amendment goes backward, and limits the right of the majority to choose the President.

But on that score I know that the former majority leader, the great scholar and gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will in his speech bring home the views of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and of others who helped to frame our Constitution; therefore I will not dwell upon it.

REPUBLICANS ARE INCONSISTENT IN ATTACK ON CONSTITUTION

O Mr. Speaker, how well I remember how often my Republican friends have clamored to "stand by the Constitution"—the many statements they have made, the tears they have shed, in its name. I remember how often they have charged that we, the Democrats, were trying to change or ignore the Constitution. And now, lo and behold, today and for the last 2 days, drunk with their temporary power—and by temporary I mean short-lived—they are boldly trying to change that Constitution, and the principles of our democratic form of government, by restricting the right of the American people to decide for themselves who will be their President. This denies the long-standing principle of majority rule; it restricts and dilutes the rights reserved to the people under the Constitution. I cannot and will not concur in such a backward step, and I have confidence that the American people will make their opposition known before the Senate can ever act on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important questions that any Member of this body will have to pass upon and I hope each Member will determine the question in accordance with his conscience. It is not my purpose to discuss politics in connection with the proposed amendment to the Constitution, an amendment which will not have any effect upon you and me of this generation but which might have a very important effect upon generations to come after you and I are dead and gone. If this amendment is incorporated in the Constitution, it will make the Constitution rigid. It ties the hands of fu-

ture generations of Americans and deprives them of the opportunity to meet any problem that might confront them.

Of course, we have lived through the experience ourselves, but I can picture two generations from now, or one or three generations from now, when Americans may be enveloped in a war with their back to the wall. We will not be here. We will have passed on. But we will have imposed this prohibition upon them. They may be with their back to the wall with a President approaching the end of his second term. Let us assume the people of that future generation have complete confidence in their President. I do not know what his party may be. I do not care. That future President will be compelled to terminate his service as President of the United States when he may be the best man qualified to lead the people of our country at that time in meeting the crisis that confronts them. I beg of you as we sit here today to realize just what we are doing. I believe in custom. A custom is one thing, but a rigid prohibition is another thing. If this amendment becomes a part of the Constitution—and you cannot say, "We are sending it to the several State legislatures"; that is not the question; that is not the answer—if this amendment becomes a part of the Constitution, it imposes upon Americans for all time until and unless the Constitution is reamended the rigid hand of a rigid prohibition that no matter what crisis may confront America in the future when a President's second term is drawing to a close they cannot reelect him so that he may continue his service to the Nation which might be vitally necessary at that particular time.

I think it is too great a risk to take. For myself, I do not want to take it. Let us see what some of the eminent men of the past have said on this question. George Washington did not want a first term even. He accepted it reluctantly as a patriotic duty. He expected to serve about 2 years. He reluctantly served a second term because of the conditions abroad. He withdrew voluntarily at the end of his second term. But what did Washington say? This is what he said in a letter to Marquis de Lafayette on April 28, 1788, in relation to the second term. This is probably the only quotation of George Washington in relation to this question which I think can be found. He said in discussing or writing about the limitation of the terms of a President:

> Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public.

What about Thomas Jefferson? Thomas Jefferson, historically, is the father of the two-term custom. There is no question about that. Thomas Jefferson, however, only wanted one term. He served a second term because of the calumnies hurled upon him by the Federalist Party and the effect they were having abroad at the time. He served patriotically. He could have had a third term. As we look back in history, I think we would all agree as to that. Jefferson retired at the end of his second term, but back in the days of the Constitutional Convention he believed in rotation in office. That was the big issue then. But what did Jefferson say about this? Jefferson himself said:

> There is, however, but one circumstance that could engage my acquiescence in another election; to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist. But this circumstance is impossible.

In other words, Jefferson himself recognized an emergency might exist where he would run for a third term, and in those days the emergency was the danger of a division existing that might establish a monarchy in our country. So Jefferson himself definitely saw that there was a distinction between custom and rigid prohibition. He recognized that in case of an emergency he might have been compelled, patriotically, to run for a third term, but he said this circumstance was impossible, because the danger of a monarchy did not exist at that time. But he said if there was such a danger he would have run for a third time.

John Quincy Adams said it should not be incorporated in the Constitution as a rigid prohibition.

Theodore Roosevelt said:

> If, for instance, a tremendous crisis occurred at the end of the second term of a man like Lincoln, as such a crisis occurred at the end of his first term, it would be a veritable calamity if the American people were forbidden to continue to use the services of the one man whom they knew, and did not merely guess, could carry them through the crisis.

He further said:

> While it is well to keep it as a custom, it would be a mark both of weakness and unwisdom for the American people to embody it into a constitutional provision which could not do them good and on some given occasion might work real harm.

James Buchanan, in this very House, when he was a Member of this House, said:

> Shall we pass a decree, as fixed as fate, to bind the American people, and prevent them from ever reelecting such a man? I am not afraid to trust them with this power.

Woodrow Wilson, when he was asked about a 4-year term or one 6-year term with no reelection, made this remark:

> Put the customary limitation of two terms into the Constitution, if you do not trust the people to take care of themselves, but make it two terms (not one, because 4 years is often too long), and give the President a chance to win the full service by proving himself fit for it.

"If you do not trust the people to take care of themselves," you will note he said.

Senator William E. Borah:

> One of the fundamental reasons for opposing the joint resolution is that the people who could be trusted to determine whether or not they desire a President for a second term may also be trusted to determine whether or not they desire a President for a third term.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr.:

> I have no fear that they—

The American people—

> can be fully trusted with the power to say whether a man shall serve a second time or a third time.

General Grant also took the same position. Ulysses S. Grant took the position that we should not impose upon the American people a rigid prohibition that would preclude them for all time of meeting any grave emergency that might arise.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party; this is a question where as we are sitting here we are acting for tomorrow, a tomorrow when you and I in all probability will no longer be alive. What we do today, however, will be operative and binding upon Americans who come after us. Now, we are going to impose the dead hand of the past upon them on some occasion when a grave emergency confronts them, when, as I said, they might be engaged in war, with a President coming to the end of his second term but possessing the confidence of the American people of that day—not the indispensable man, but the best man; there is such a thing as the best man under certain conditions to lead a people—when the best man was the President of the United States approaching the end of his second term, what are they going to do? What can they do? The "law of the jungle" confronts them. Just as people respond to emergency situations that confront them, especially that of self-preservation, so likewise do nations.

They might be compelled to demand that such a President act extra-constitutionally, the very fear some men have in mind now might be the vehicle under certain conditions when grave danger confronts our country for the people to demand of a President: "You should continue; it is your duty to continue until the danger is over." But outside of that, when that situation exists, and it may occur again, our country is likely to be faced with that danger again in the future; it might be even worse than it was in the last war; fighting with our backs to the wall, a President, as I say, nearing the end of his second term, the people wanting him, he being the best man in the country to lead them under those circumstances, and he being a good man, the people cannot follow that which custom dictates they should do because they are met with a rigid prohibition that says that under no conditions can they reelect such a man who is President and whom the country needs, the end of whose second term is drawing near, to continue in office no matter how grave the danger that confronts the country.

O Mr. Speaker, to me it is too great a risk. I am talking not as a Democrat but as an American. I served in World War I. Other Members here served in World War I, and many Members served in World War II. We are all interested in our country no matter which side of the aisle we sit on; we all believe in its fundamentals. We have got to view this from the angle of tomorrow. This amendment will operate upon future generations of Americans. This amendment at a particular time of grave crisis confronting our country in the future might place our country in a strait-jacket and it might be a contributing factor to harmful results.

In no part of the Constitution will you find any limitation, any prohibition except against Congress itself: Congress shall pass no law abridging the right of free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage. You will find limitations in the Constitution, but they are limitations upon Congress; and those limitations were imposed to protect the rights of individuals to assure that the legislative body would not take away the fundamental rights that our people believe in and for which the framers of the Constitution fought. This amendment is a limitation upon the people. This is not a limitation upon the Congress. It is a limitation upon the action of the people of the future, no matter what the danger may be, no matter how urgent it may be that the second-term President continue, he cannot if this amendment becomes a part of the Constitution. O Mr. Speaker, it is too grave a danger to take this step, too grave a danger for us who will be dead at that time in all probability, to impose such a limitation upon future generations of Americans. Let their hands remain unshackled. Let us not put them into a strait-jacket, a strait-jacket that might be the factor resulting in the destruction of our country at some time in the future. Leadership is important. Leadership is the big thing and a President in his second term in the future might be the leader who will bring our people to victory. His going out at such a time might be the difference between victory and defeat. We are tying the hands of Americans in the future from exercising in a grave emergency the judgment which they may deem is for the best interests of our country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, while I do not agree with the burden of the argument just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I have listened with interest to what he had to say. I commend him for his approach, which is clearly one devoid of partisanship. I join with him in the statement that the matter we are discussing today is not one of partisanship but rather of what best to do, be we Democrats or Republicans, looking to the future of this great land of ours. He has pointed out certain things which he says might be dangerous in their effects. Without undertaking to say that there is no force at all to his argument, speaking for myself I think that the dangers that the gentleman envisages, if they may be said to be dangers, are certainly outweighed by the real danger that obtains from the absence of the constitutional amendment as now proposed.

We are discussing here a proposal to perfect our American system of constitutional government. In such a discussion there can be no divisions on mere lines of partisanship, for in this House, Democrats, no less than Republicans, are devoted to our Constitution. We all want to see our system work for the benefit of the entire Nation, and for posterity.

Throughout our entire national history, we have amended the Constitution from time to time as experience appeared to dictate.

The Constitution has served us well. It was once described by the great Gladstone as the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

Yet the Constitution itself clearly provides the methods of amendment, demonstrating that it was never the intention of the founding fathers to regard their work as finished for all time.

These are the reasons why I am happy today to call as our witness for this proposal one of the founders of the Democratic Party, a man who was himself one of the principal architects of the Bill of Rights, so vital a part of our Constitution today—Thomas Jefferson.

Toward the end of Jefferson's second administration, in 1808, there arose an insistent demand among many of his supporters that he stand for reelection.

When the legislatures of 7 of the then 17 States had adopted petitions urging a third term, Jefferson responded:

> That I should lay down my charge at the proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully.
>
> If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for 4 years, will, in fact, become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance.
>
> Believing that a representative government, responsible at short periods by election, is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle; and I should unwillingly be the person, who, disregarding sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office.

Now, we do not need a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret what Thomas Jefferson thought about the principle embodied in the proposal before us today.

If he were here today, in my opinion he would be supporting it.

As history demonstrates, the only reason this matter was not pressed to formal amendment many years ago was the deeply rooted belief of the American people that the principle had been firmly established by usage and broad general acceptance, to such a degree that no legal or constitutional limitation of Presidential tenure was required.

It is, of course, a common thing in American life to omit from the body of the law those things which are accepted as commonplace in the habits, customs, and traditions of the people. Indeed, our whole system of law and government is reared on certain basic assumptions of morality and attitude which are not specifically enumerated in the corpus juris. So it was with the matter of Presidential tenure.

By way of illustrating how deeply the two-term tradition had become imbedded in our legal and political assumptions, let me read to you a plank from the Democratic national platform for 1896. The plank is headed, "Third term." It reads:

> We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our Government, that no man should be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office.

With Thomas Jefferson as his mentor, and with the Democratic national platform of 1896 as his guide, no Democrat in this Congress need experience the slightest qualms of partisan conscience in giving unequivocal patriotic support to the amendment before us.

General Washington, the president of the Constitutional Convention, himself entertained some doubts concerning the failure of the Constitution, in its draft stage, to place a firm limitation upon Presidential tenure. In a letter to the Marquis de Lafayette under date of April 28, 1788, while the Constitution yet was in process of ratification by the States, George Washington said:

> There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will by any practicable intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it—but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity.

It was this view, supported by the tremendous influence and prestige of General Washington, which at length prevailed, and led to the ratification of the Constitution without a specific limitation on Presidential tenure, as had been proposed before the convention by Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, and Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina.

But having so greatly influenced the adoption of the Constitution without that limitation, General Washington was the great author of the two-term tradition, which prevailed as almost the unwritten law of the land for 140 years.

In his historic Farewell Address of September 17, 1796, General Washington sharply warned his fellow countrymen against "that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart."

His experience in the Presidency had confirmed him in "the necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power."

He warned against excessive partisanship, on the ground that such activities often defeated measures of sound progress and enlightened administration. And then he traced the dangers which are the very inspiration of this amendment:

> The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty.

When Washington and Jefferson had, by deed and precept, firmly placed the foundations of the two-term tradition, the matter was at rest for many years, for Thomas Jefferson wrote in his biographical notes, shortly before his death in 1826:

> Though this amendment has not been made in form, yet practice seems to have established it. The example of four Presidents voluntarily retiring at the end of their eighth year, and the progress of public opinion that the principle is salutary, have given it in practice the form of precedent and usage—insomuch that should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election,

I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views.

The House of Representatives supported and confirmed the Washington-Jefferson tradition in a resolution passed on December 15, 1875, in which it was declared to be the judgment of the House that any departure from the two-term tradition would be "unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

At that time the House of the Forty-fourth Congress was composed of 181 Democrats and 107 Republicans. The resolution I have quoted was adopted by a vote of 234 to 18.

That resolution quieted all third-term discussion for a quarter century.

Immediately after his second inauguration in 1901, William McKinley became the focus of much third-term chatter, which he promptly squelched with the declaration:

I will say now, once for all, expressing a long-settled conviction, that I not only am not and will not be a candidate for a third term but would not accept a nomination for it if it were tendered me.

I will not burden the House with a detailed review of the many minor incidents in our political history which reflect the same national sentiment—the same abiding faith of the people—that custom usage, and tradition adequately protected their constitutional system against the occasional ambitions of extended Presidential tenure.

Suffice it to say that at no point in our history has the matter ever been one of partisan decision.

On the contrary, great men of all parties have subscribed to and sustained this unwritten law of America.

Our only task today is to place the matter firmly in the Constitution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the greatest expressions I have ever heard is "just a minute"; wait a little while and cool off a bit.

The gentleman from Indiana said our Constitution has been amended many times. That is true. But since the first 10 amendments were adopted—and they were practically agreed upon before the Constitution was ratified—it was said by men in high office that they would be adopted—I cannot find anywhere in any of the other amendments to the Constitution that a fundamental change has been made in the Constitution. This Government of yours and mine was founded upon the theory that it was to be a representative democracy. It was, it has been, and it is just that. None of the changes made in the fundamental law have ever countenanced a change from that fundamental.

Without putting any partisanship into this thing, and I do not intend to, for it is too big for that, when I say "just a minute" I think it might be well for us to take a little more time, look the situation over, and heed some of the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] when we are away from the third and the fourth terms just a little. This is a representative democracy. For the people to have the privilege of choosing whom they please to be their leader is democracy, real democracy, in action.

Let us not lightly change a document that has served us well and which has been a beacon to people throughout the earth who longed to be free and who wanted to get away from the heavy hand of the few that the people themselves in a free election might choose whom they would to be their leader. I do not know—I do not know, and neither do you know, whether a time may come when one man may be the individual to carry on in an hour of great strain and stress—and danger. I believe it would be well for us to take just a minute more to consider this fundamental change in our fundamental law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in any remarks I may make today a study of what was said about the third term by previous Presidents of the United States, a study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERMS OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 27, with Mr. WOLCOTT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which gave consideration to this resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the matter which is now before the House comes under House Joint Resolution 27, has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

This resolution, which is rather brief, provides for submission to the people of a constitutional amendment fixing the tenure of office of the President of the United States.

At this particular point and at the very outset of what I have to say on this question, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], indicated we were placing shackles upon the people. I cannot subscribe to that statement, because we are merely passing upon the question as to whether or not we will submit to the people a constitutional amendment, and let the people pass upon it and decide that question themselves. I do not believe there is any Member on the floor of this House who opposes submitting to the people this constitutional question, and permitting the people to decide that question themselves and return to us what their decision is.

Let us see what the provisions of this resolution are. While I say it is brief, let us read it together

Section 1, which follows the preamble of the resolution, contains this language:

Any person who has served as President of the United States during all, or portions, of any two terms, shall thereafter be ineligible to hold the office of President; but this article shall not prevent any person who may hold the office of President during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

Section 2 provides for ratification. That is the sole and only question which we are deciding today, as to whether or not we will submit it to your people, to the people of every district in our Nation, and to the people of this Nation, and let them pass upon this question as to whether or not they believe there should be a limitation upon the terms of office of the President of the United States; and this question is not, as my good friend has said, that we are shackling the people. We are simply passing down to the people the right to determine this very highly important and basic question.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I know that my distinguished friend from Indiana does not mean to make a misstatement, but I am afraid he has, because, after all, this question will never be submitted to the people. It is submitted to the legislatures.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, this question goes to the legislatures, and the legislatures are the representatives of the people in the various legislative districts. That has always been construed, and is today construed, as submitting the question to the people themselves.

At the very outset of what I have to say on this question I want to make clear

that this question is not a political question in any sense of the word. I hope that it will not be treated as such by the membership of this great law-making body. The importance of this question, it being the submission of a constitutional amendment, far transcends all political implications and considerations. This proposed amendment to the Constitution, should it be finally adopted, would continue as a basic law of the land for years to come, and until some future amendment is adopted on this same subject. I therefore plead with the Members of the House to approach this problem in the spirit of the sacredness with which this question is enshrouded. We are meeting and facing a problem which will mean the writing of the scroll of our fundamental law, which will endure throughout time and until our words have been erased in the future by other generations.

This resolution has but one purpose. That purpose is to submit to the people of the country by and through their State legislatures the important problem of Presidential tenure, and permit the people through their legislatures to decide whether or not they desire that limitation fixed or to leave the question of Presidential tenure just as it is now set forth in the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does my friend agree with my contention that if in the future our country should be involved in war and the then President were in his second term, that no matter what the emergency, no matter what situation might confront the people at that time, that President must retire if this resolution becomes part of the Constitution?

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand the gentleman's question, and thanks for submitting it. May I say that if our country were involved in any grave emergency in the future, such as war, the President does not fight the war. Our chiefs of staff, our generals, our admirals are the ones who fight our wars. Our President takes advice, of course, and acts in conjunction with them. But where is the President, of whatever political party he may be a member, who would not take that same counsel, that same advice, for the safety and for the protection of our Nation and the people in it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I proceed further? I have but a short time. I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

Mr. Chairman, during the past many resolutions of this kind have been submitted but none have ever been enacted by both Houses of the Congress, and this question has not been submitted to the people. Throughout the years the Constitution has stood as originally written, and may I read just for our own consideration, as we deal with this vitally important problem, section 1 of article II of the Constitution which contains this provision. I know all of you are familiar with it, but let us review it once more:

> The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, who shall hold his office during the term of 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that until the lame-duck amendment to this article, amendment No. 20, there had been no amendment adopted on this question. That amendment provided—

> That the terms of President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January of the year in which such terms should have ended if this article had not been ratified and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call attention to the fact that in 1861 when everyone knew we were on the verge of a war, the Confederate constitutional convention met, at a time when we had one of the greatest soldiers of all time as President of the Confederacy, and they adopted a constitutional provision limiting the Presidency of the Confederacy to 6 years and providing that he could not succeed himself.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, they wanted to protect to some extent against any man perpetuating himself in public office.

Mr. Chairman, I want to recur to the words of Woodrow Wilson. Let us think for a minute what he said on this question. I obtained this interesting statement from his own remarks, now on file in the Congressional Library. This is what Woodrow Wilson said on this subject:

> To change the term to 6 years would be to increase the likelihood of its being too long, without any assurance that it would, in happy cases, be long enough. A fixed constitutional limitation to a single term of office is highly arbitrary and unsatisfactory from every point of view.

He was thinking about the one-term proposal.

> Put the present customary limitation of two terms into the Constitution, if you do not trust the people to take care of themselves, but make it two terms (not one, because 4 years is often too long), and give the President a chance to win the full service by proving himself fit for it.

Before closing I want to quote the words of Abraham Lincoln when he left Springfield, Ill., to come to Washington to assume the Presidency. He came to Indianapolis. He was worried and distressed. He stopped there. A great group of people had assembled. They asked him to speak. He spoke, and in the course of his remarks he said this to the American people:

> Remember, it is not with the President nor the officeholder, nor with the politician, but with the people alone rests the power of determining our policies of government.

Mr. Chairman, we are today proposing to submit this highly important question to the people, just as Lincoln proposed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a number of the members of the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary realize that the Constitution sets no limitation on the number of terms a President may serve. The Members also realize that a tradition was established by Washington, followed by Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Cleveland, McKinley, and Wilson. Now attempts are being made to change the Constitution as to number of terms a President may serve.

These Members feel a change is unnecessary, but if there is to be any change these Members feel it would be preferable to change the Constitution so that a President could serve only 6 years and not be eligible for reelection.

It has always been natural for the incumbent President to have his eyes fixed on reelection, and all the acts of the first term, directly or indirectly, in some measure, are affected by the ambition for a second term. It is only natural for the incumbent President to make appointments even to his Cabinet with due consideration for political repercussions. Even appointments to important judicial positions have been at times tinctured with politics. I make no specific charge against any specific President. I speak generally. The President is one to ask himself and his intimates, "Will the appointment enhance or diminish my prospects for reelection?" You know and I know that even Ambassadors and Ministers have been appointed because of political campaign aid and assistance and in the hope of renewal of that aid at reelection time. If there is no possibility, we feel, for reelection, there is no need for the President and his Cabinet and those associated with him to canvass for delegates at the national convention; no need for the President to placate certain sections of the country that may be hostile; no need to suggest legislation that might mean the garnering of additional votes that might be useful at the national convention.

During the first term the ambition for reelection to a second term and to serve four additional years casts an ominous shadow, in my humble estimation, over all the acts and all the works of the incoming President. I could, but shall not, quote you at length the arguments advanced by numerous Presidents, notably Jackson and Hayes and Taft, in favor of a 6-year term, with no reeligibility, but I will give you the statement made by Grover Cleveland when he accepted the nomination for President. He argued for a 6-year term, with no right to reelection. He said:

> Then an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number to assume for a time a public trust,

instead of his dedication to the profession of politics; when the holders of the ballot, quickened by a sense of duty, shall avenge truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a government by the people will be at hand. And of the means to this end not one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the Constitution disqualifying the President from reelection. When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptations to retain public place once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent when a horde of officeholders, with a zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the President for reelection a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate, and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people.

I could not and you could not put in better language, or express more succinctly or more wisely, the argument for a 6-year term, with no right to reelection. I feel that the desire to be reelected tends to build up, beyond peradventure of a doubt, for the incumbent a dangerous political machine. The attendant political strains and stresses are inconsistent with good government. Too often the President, having his eye on the reelection possibilities, wants to be all things to all people at one time. Too often in our history Presidents in their first term have actually—and I can give you chapter and verse—appeased the bosses and appeased the machines. His efficiency thereby becomes greatly impaired. Not infrequently he has the overweening desire, in order that he may get the renomination, to punish his enemies unduly and to reward his friends too lavishly.

Elections every 4 years are too often, and a great burden of taxation thereby is saddled upon the people. We know that the approach of any election sets the demagogues at work hunting issues and inventing party slogans to stir up the country, and thus the blight of discontent and uncertainty as well as fear descends upon all of us. Business is greatly retarded, and industry is hurt and hampered. That evil should not come upon us too often. It is too often, indeed, to have it come before us twice in 8 years and four times in 16 years.

For that reason, among others, I do believe it would be well for this Committee to vote for an amendment which will be offered, a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the majority of the House Committee on the Judiciary, which substitute amendment would set up a tenure of 6 years, with no right to reelection.

I also believe this: The President's health, with a 6-year limitation, would be better protected. I believe that if President Roosevelt had not run a third and fourth time—I do not say he should or should not, I am addressing myself now to his physical condition—he might have been spared to us and we could use now and use well his prescience, his prophetic wisdom, and his statesmanship.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks, in order that we may become properly oriented, let us remember how many efforts and attempts have been made to amend the Constitution of the United States. Inquiry today of the Congressional Reference Service, available to the Members of this House, reveals that 4,500 attempts have been made to amend the Constitution, of which number 1,300 were made in the first 100 years of the Constitution.

It has been argued here today that we are doing something new, dangerous, and untried.

In those first 100 years of the 1,300 attempts, 125 went to the tenure of office of the President of the United States and in a period of 39 years, from 1899 to 1928, 85 additional attempts were made to affect the tenure of office of the President of the United States. Therefore, all told, in a period of 139 years 210 attempts have been made to fix the tenure of office of the President of the United States. So we are not doing anything new, unusual, or out of the way at this time. We are simply trying to carry out the mandate of the people in order that they may have an expression and voice in the amendment of the Constitution. We must remember that our guide in this question is the Constitutional Convention. When Edmund Randolph appeared in Philadelphia on the 25th day of May 1787, and the Convention finally got down to work on the 29th the seventh ordinance that he had in his propositions was as follows, which I desire to read into the RECORD:

7. *Resolved*, That a National Executive be instituted; to be chosen by the National Legislature for the term of —— years, to receive punctually at stated times a fixed compensation for the services rendered, in which no increase or diminution shall be made so as to affect the Magistracy, existing at the time of increase or diminution, and to be ineligible a second time.

It is true that no time was fixed to limit the debates of that Convention and in the 91 days in which they were engaged, from the 29th day of May until the 12th day of September, you will find that nearly 14 days of the time of the Convention was consumed in fixing the mode of election of the President, the time that he would serve, and the length of his term. After these propositions had been referred to the Committee of the Whole and was first debated on the 1st and 2d and 8th days of June, finally on the 26th day of July the committee made a report and in that report they fixed the term at 7 years and proposed that the incumbent would be ineligible to serve a second term. This carried through until finally the great report came through on the 4th of September under the direction of Judge Brearley, of New Jersey, chairman of the Committee on Postponed Matters. Their report was to this effect: that the term should be 4 years and the ineligibility clause stricken out. Now that is our polestar by which we must be guided today. What did the framers of the Constitution intend and what did they want done? It was known that George Washington would become the first President. Everyone knew that. The great doubt at that time was whether the country would endure for, on the 8th day of August, Nathaniel Gorman, in the Committee of the Whole, addressed George Washington, who was then presiding, and said, "Can it be supposed that 150 years hence this great country, including the western territory, will remain one nation?" Well, 160 years have gone by and Nathaniel Gorman's question has been answered. Incidentally, he was a gentleman from Massachusetts. On that score, when Washington came to the end of his second term, his Farewell Message went out to the people and thereby the precedent was established which grew into tradition which endured down through the years. What was the result of that? A few years ago that tradition was broken. What may be the other effects, if you please? Our founding fathers intended that this should be a great system of checks and balances, that the judiciary should be independent, that the legislative branch should be independent, and that the executive branch should be independent to the extent that the Executive could go ahead and administer laws enacted by the legislative bodies. I read from a statement issued by the Attorney General of the United States that in the period from 1932 down to the present there have been appointed to the United States judiciary 192 Federal judges, both district and circuit court judges, 25 in the Territories, and 14 in the lower courts, a total of 231 judges. Of that number 17 have been Republicans—9 in the United States, 6 in the Territories, and 2 in the District of Columbia. This has now reached the point where the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate has taken this matter up and publicly declared through the press and through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that there must be a different division in the appointment of men to fill these great and high offices of our judiciary.

That is just one illustration of the case of a President having more than two terms and entrusting too much power to one man.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In order to have the record clear, I just want to ask the gentleman if he does not agree that this was the procedure: that the 7-year term, without further eligibility, which was changed to eligibility and then changed back again, was then sent to the Committee of Eleven, after the Committee on Detail had reported it to the Committee of the Whole? Was not that election by the National Legislature?

Mr. GRAHAM. Up to that point the Senate was to have elected the President. At that point the electoral college was brought in.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the 7-year term was election by the National Legislature?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the first matter presented, but afterward it came down to the writing of the Constitution and the formation of the electoral college.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the electoral college came out of the Committee of Eleven?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. But prior to that it was a 7-year term, to be elected by the National Legislature?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

There has been a great lack of emphasis here on the mode of election. That is what those men were principally driving toward at that time, because at the time and in that period the relative number of voters was considerably less than it is today.

In conclusion this is one point I wish to make: Our fathers realized, of course, that the day would come when it would be necessary to amend this Constitution. The great bulk of the American people have been hesitant to touch this charter of Government. The very number of amendments I have cited, nearly 4,500 attempts with only 21 successful, is proof in itself of the strong hold that this great charter of human rights has upon the minds and hearts and consciences of the American people. But by the same token, inasmuch as it has been amended, I quote you in substance the words of James Madison when he submitted the original amendments in the First Congress. This is approximately what he said:

> We never need to fear an executive in this country because he will always be weak. The legislative branch will always be the stronger.

Had Mr. Madison lived within the last two decades he would have reversed that statement. Now we have come face to face with the situation where we have seen the evil of perpetuation of centralization of government, of control through great bureaucracies, appointment of courts and control of our foreign relations, all due to the built-up, accumulated potency and power of one man remaining too long in public office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is extremely important, when an attempt is made to amend the Constitution, to have as the objective something more than what I believe is being attempted here today. It is very important for us to remember in connection with the present resolution that perhaps as much time was devoted in the discussions of the tenure in office of the President as was devoted to any other section of the Constitution. For 18 days the founding fathers labored with the question of whether or not the tenure should be limited, and, significantly enough, the only proposal made toward limiting the time during which the Chief Executive could serve was in connection with one term of either 6 or 7 years. It was not until after this complete debate when, in my judgment at least, the entire committee was worn out and tired, that they did nothing about it. But bear this in mind, that a great deal of thought was given to this particular section of the Constitution. I believe that if we are going to do anything at all we ought to do what the founding fathers almost did, namely, provide for one term of 6 years.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has touched to some extent on the abuses that could follow when there is no limitation on the number of terms. He overlooked, however, the extremely important question of selection of personnel by the Chief Executive. Under present conditions too much attention is given to geography and politics. I could well understand there being two or three very capable men in the State of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Iowa, who could not possibly be considered because of the population of that State compared with States in which there was a much larger number of voters. No man ever occupied the seat in the White House who did not during his first term think of his reelection. It is only human nature. So I repeat, if we are going to take the first step incident to doing something as important as amending the Constitution is, we should advocate a real improvement and only after greater consideration than has been given the proposal now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, the age-old question of the third term for President is before us again. The question arose in the early days of the Republic. In 1787 when our Constitution was first adopted our founding fathers debated the question of tenure of office for the President. First, it was proposed that the President should have one 7-year term. That proposal was adopted and later thrown out. Then a 6-year term was proposed, but rejected. Finally, in its great wisdom, the Convention settled on a 4-year term, with no limit to the number of terms. During the 170 years since the establishment of tenure of office for all our elective Federal officials many proposals have been made to change or limit the length of their service, but no change has ever been made. For many years, some Americans, particularly Republicans, believed that the precedents set by Washington and Jefferson, when they refused to serve three terms, had established an unwritten law that no President should ever serve his country more than 8 years.

In 1940 opponents of Franklin D. Roosevelt called on that unwritten law to help them prevent his election for a third term. But this so-called precedent or tradition proved a poor substitute for the will of the people, who swept the President back into office for a third and a fourth term. To have had a constitutional limitation on the Presidential tenure of office in 1940 and again in 1944 would have been disastrous. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the gross fallacy of such a proposal as we have before us today was proved beyond the shadow of a doubt when in the face of a grave national crisis in 1940 the people of the United States believed it inadvisable to change their Chief Executive; and the utter stupidity of such a proposal was proved in 1944 when the people believed that such a change would have thrown our Nation into chaos and jeopardized our security in the face of the gravest military crisis in our Nation's history.

The proposal before us utterly ignores the possibility of future crises and exigencies which could well make it mandatory that we continue a Chief Magistrate in office beyond an 8-year period.

Before 1940 the precedent for the President's tenure of office had been established by the Presidents themselves, notably Washington and Jefferson. But in 1940 the precedent was established by the people, and that is as it should be. The President is the servant of the people, and each 4 years the people themselves should have the privilege of deciding whether their chief servant is to continue in office or be replaced. President Wilson said, "We singularly belie our own principles by seeking to determine by fixed constitutional provision what the people shall determine for themselves."

If the people believe it unwise to continue a President in office after he has served 8 years, or 4 years, let them make that choice at the ballot box when and if the incumbent President seeks reelection and in the light of the issues involved and in consideration of the relative merits of the parties and their candidates. But in the name of democracy their exercise of free choice of a President should not be limited for all time to come by a constitutional amendment passed with only present partisan political considerations involved. It has been suggested that a constitutional amendment may at any time be repealed in the event the people should at some future time change their minds about the third term. The fallacy of that is obvious, since the President is elected by a mere majority, whereas the passage or repeal of a constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Much has been said about the danger to democracy in allowing a President to remain in office beyond 8 years. There can be no danger to democracy so long as the people themselves may freely exercise the franchise. Parliamentary governments have preserved their democracy with indefinite tenure for their prime ministers.

Manifestly, if the people of the United States can be trusted to elect a President for one term, or two terms, they also can be trusted to determine whether he should be continued in office for a third one.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall favor this resolution. The two-term rule for the position of President is an American tradition which was established by Washington, ratified by

Jefferson in forceful and unambiguous language and likewise ratified expressly or impliedly by every other President until the day of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The tenure of Franklin D. Roosevelt proved that Washington and Jefferson were wise.

I introduced a resolution to the same import as the resolution that we are now considering. I would have voted for my resolution and I shall vote for the one before us today.

My resolution was introduced by me several years ago and has been reintroduced in this session of Congress as House Joint Resolution 36. A copy of that resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 36

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be chosen or serve as President of the United States for any term, or be eligible to hold the office of President during any term, if such person shall have theretofore served as President during the whole or any part of each of any two separate terms; but this article shall not prevent any person who may hold the office of President during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution that I introduced on this same subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 27. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], one or two others, and myself introduced identical resolutions, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of the President to the whole or any part of each of two separate terms; in other words, making ineligible any person who has served as President for a whole or part of two separate terms, and thereby placing a maximum limit of 8 years. No man could serve more than 8 years if this proposed amendment is submitted to the States and ratified by 36 of the 48 States.

I am expressing the view that I have entertained over a long period of years. My experience and observations have strengthened my position on this matter. There has been so much discussion of this subject that I feel that we should at least give the American people, through their respective legislatures, the right to determine whether or not they desire such a limitation.

President George Washington, the Father of Our Country, in his wide experience and great wisdom, declined to be considered for a third term even though there was a universal demand that he do so and at a time when our country was having serious problems with France and other nations. Thomas Jefferson, another one of our very great Americans, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and who had served our country in the highest offices in this country and in foreign countries, certainly believed in representative democracy and in protecting the liberties and freedom of the American people. He had seen at first hand in Europe how free people had lost their freedom, not through parliaments and congresses, but through ambitious heads of the executive branch of the government. Therefore, 2 years before his second term expired, he made the following statement:

The general solicitations I have received to continue another term give me great consolation, but considerations for public as well as personal determine me inflexibly on that measure. That I should lay down my charge at a proper season is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. * * * These changes are necessary, too, for the security of republican government. If some period be not fixed, either by the Constitution or by practice, to the services of the First Magistrate, his office, though nominally elective, will in fact be for life; and that will soon degenerate into an inheritance. I have therefore requested my fellow citizens to think of a successor for me, to whom I shall deliver the public concern with greater joy than I received them.

In this wonderful statement Jefferson reemphasizes the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. He truly believed that the hope of this Nation and the security of our people could only be achieved through our republican form of government. He, too, realized the danger to our freedom in too long a tenure of the powerful office of the President. At the time he made this declaration and 2 years before his term expired we had very serious foreign problems with both Great Britain and France, and it might be said at that time our Nation was weak in numbers, naval and military forces, as well as wealth. We had not yet become thoroughly established. Jefferson might well have said that by reason of the perils that confronted this new Republic there was an emergency and listened to the general solicitation not only of his own political party but many of the opposition party to consider a third term.

James Madison, James Monroe, and Andrew Jackson, all great Americans and popular heroes, declined to be considered for a third term. The first to attempt to override the wise example and admonition of Washington and Jefferson was President Ulysses S. Grant. He was a very popular war hero. Many Americans felt that he had contributed greatly in saving the Union and freeing millions of slaves. Many of his comrades in arms and many and perhaps more influential of his appointees insisted that he seek a third term. His friends made a long and determined fight to secure for him the Republican nomination. Three hundred and six delegates stood out to the end but the Republican Party refused to give to the hero of Appomattox the nomination for a third term. The Republican Party thereby rendered a great service to our country.

Theodore Roosevelt was nominated as the running mate of President McKinley in 1900. They were overwhelmingly elected. President McKinley lost his life at the hands of assassins in September 1901, less than 6 months after his second inauguration and Theodore Roosevelt entered upon his duties of President. He was nominated in 1904 and elected by an overwhelming majority. A host of admirers and friends urged him to seek another term as he had had only one full term.

The records show that 30 of our American Presidents were conscious of this threat to the freedom of the American people and they pointed out that there should be a limitation as to the tenure of the Presidential office and one of them, a great Democrat, favored 4 years, some 6 years, others not more than 8 years. Republican and Democratic National Conventions, from time to time, have declared in favor of a limitation of the tenure of this office.

Whatever may be said of the mental attainments and the winning personality of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he must have impressed the American people that he was an ambitious man. He insisted on having control of not only the executive branch of the Government but control of Congress and control over the courts. He created hundreds and hundreds of bureaus, commissions, and agencies and at one time had more than 4,000,000 Federal civil officeholders in this country and in foreign countries and through these agencies and officials, they attempted and did, to a large degree, control agriculture, industry, labor, and many of the normal activities of the American people. Power feeds power.

When history finally records what transpired in our Nation for the last 14 years, they will likely write that the two-term tradition was broken by these controls and by the expenditure of enormous sums of money and the granting of special favors to blocs and groups.

Soon after the election of President Roosevelt to his fourth term many of his friends and admirers were declaring themselves in favor of a fifth term, and we heard that attitude substantially expressed today by at least one of the able Members of this House, confirming the prophecy of the immortal Jefferson nearly 140 years ago. Jefferson said that there should be a limitation on the tenure of this great office, and that these changes are necessary for the security of our republican form of government, and he also stated that he should lay down his charge at a proper season and that the laying down of his duties of President is as

much a duty as to have performed the duties of this office faithfully.

Who can say that some other great American, Democrat or Republican, could not have handled the affairs of this Nation from 1940 to 1945 equally as well as President Roosevelt? To take any other view we must assume that we have and do produce in this country indispensable men. This idea was only sold to one other man before President Franklin D. Roosevelt and that was President Grant.

My sincere prayer is that we shall never live to see the day when this great Republic becomes so bankrupt of leadership and patriotism that we accept the principle of the indispensable man. I am against the 6-year one term. If we should happen to pick a bad President, 6 years is too long, and if we picked a good President, under this amendment, the American people can elect him for another term. Furthermore, unless we amend the Constitution as to the election of Members of the lower House, there would be great confusion.

The two-term President would be encouraged to select suitable men for high places in our Government and conduct himself in a way that would meet the approval of the American people. Eight years of honest and faithful service is enough to break down the vitality and health of any man. While President Roosevelt won a fourth term, yet the burdens of the office greatly lessened his activities during his fourth term. The Constitution, as written provides that the term of office of the President shall be 4 years. It makes no provision for his reelection. But he set his face against this proposal. He recognized at that time that the two-term principle declared by Washington, Jefferson, and other American Presidents was generally regarded as being embodied in our country's political system.

President Wilson, our great war President, so far as I know, never showed any inclination or desire to seek a third term at the height of his popularity. President Coolidge, as the running mate of President Harding, was swept into office by a landslide in 1920. He and Mr. Harding assumed office on March 4, 1921. President Harding, after less than 3 years' service, died suddenly and Mr. Coolidge assumed the Presidency. He became a very popular President, though he had been in office less than 2 years. He was nominated by almost a unanimous vote in the Republican Convention in 1924 and was triumphantly elected. His administration of the affairs of the Nation was marked by honesty and high purpose. Tremendous pressure was brought to bear to have him seek another full term, but more than a year before the national election in 1928 he made known to the American people that he would not be a candidate. He recognized that the two-term principle was fully embodied in our political system. At the end of his term he would have had less than 6 years of service. Mr. Coolidge recognized that by accepting another full term he would have had more than two terms and violate this political principle.

This is not and must not be made a partisan issue. It is a great policy in the interest of freedom and our republican form of government laid down by the Father of our Country and followed by such great Democrats as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and such outstanding Republicans as Theodore Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge, and in only two instances in all of our history has any serious attempt been made to set aside this great political principle, in the persons of President Grant and President Franklin D. Roosevelt. No doubt, in the days of President Grant, some of his stalwart admirers looked upon him as the indispensable man but that Republican Convention believing, as we strongly believe, that this country has never had an indispensable man, refused to nominate him.

Through the 50 centuries of the world's history, chief executives, emperors, kings, princes, czars, as well as some presidents of the nations of the earth, by their own thinking and by reason of the urging of their appointees, have considered themselves the indispensable man or woman. Some of these have been cruel tyrants, others have been benevolent dictators or rulers, some have sought power and more power to accomplish their own selfish aims and those of a small coterie of favorites surrounding and cooperating with them.

Then, there have been the benevolent group of executives who, with high purposes and motives, through their own thinking and the thinking of their friends and supporters have come to believe that they alone know what is best for the people or country over which they have control, and they regard themselves as indispensable men and women. They seek power and more power to continue what they regard as their benevolent rule over the nation and the people.

As we read history no free people ever lost their liberties through their parliament or congress except in some instances through the influence and power of the executives, the law-making body is whipped into subservency and they abdicate their powers. The real hope of a republic or democracy is in a strong parliament or congress, freely chosen by the people. The parliament or congress has great power, especially in this country, to protect and preserve the rights, freedom, and liberties of the people, but such bodies do not have the power of the sword or the expenditure or disbursement of enormous sums of money, or the appointment of millions of great and small public officials. We have many examples of "yes men" in parliaments and congresses who were made subservient through the tremendous power of the chief executives. Long tenure of the Chief Executive office in this Nation was considered dangerous to the liberties and freedom of the American people, even by our early Presidents. This danger has increased many hundredfold since the days of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson. In those days we had a very small Army and Navy. It was numbered by thousands rather than millions. The appointees were numbered by thousands rather than millions. The expenditures at the disposal of the President were limited to millions rather than tens of billions as it is today. In those days there were few blocs and groups that were demanding special benefits, aids, and hand-outs from the Government. It was generally accepted that the people supported their Government instead of the Government, through special privileges and benefits, supporting the people.

If long tenure of office of the President was a threat to our republican form of government as stated by President Jefferson nearly 140 years ago, with his limited powers, small disbursements, small Army and Navy and a small number of appointees, how much greater must that threat be to our republican form of government and to the liberties of the American people today. The threat to the security of our country with 48 great States and approximately 135,000,000 people with untold wealth could not have been as great as they were to our security from foreign attacks as they were in the days of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, when our country was threatened by the French on one side and the British on the other side and the French and the British had control of the seas and much of our own North American Continent which is now a part of the United States. We have observed that even so-called benevolents, chief executives, can find emergencies and other reasons that appear to them to be good and sufficient.

I cannot believe that President Roosevelt could have or would have been nominated for a third term or even a fourth term but for the use of the Executive powers of himself and supporters to bring about his nomination for a third and fourth term. During that period the number of Federal officeholders increased by leaps and bounds. The billions of dollars of money at the disposal of the President and his subordinates increased by billions from year to year, and with all these extraordinary powers were given to the President, and practically blank checks were voted by a Congress that admittedly was dominated and controlled by the President. Immense sums of money were distributed to various groups. Of course, in each case the American people were told that all of these acts were made necessary by reason of the threat of some emergency.

At one time we reached the point that there was not only control of the executive branch of the Government but a very large control of the legislative branch and, last but not least, control of an overwhelming majority of the members of the Federal courts. All of these things violated the expressed provisions of the Constitution providing for three coordinated branches of our Government. The American people now begin to realize clearly the wisdom of Washington, Jefferson, and other great American Presidents in establishing and holding to the principle that a longer period than two terms was a real threat to our republican form of government.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF.]

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to House Joint Resolu-

tion 27. I voted against it when it came before the full Committee on the Judiciary. I joined in the minority report which sets forth our reasons for our opposition to what, in my opinion, is a legislative abortion—an untimely arrest of democratic process. I shall vote against it today on final passage.

I sincerely believe that this attempt to limit the tenure of office of the President of the United States is unwarranted, unneeded, unwise, undesirable, unthinkable, unbelievable, unconscionable, and that it actually reeks with putrefaction insofar as keeping good faith with our basic precepts of democracy is concerned.

We are considering today a proposal that strikes right at the heart of our form of government. We are considering a proposal which would limit the rights of the American citizens as free people to govern themselves according to their expressed will as guaranteed by the tenets upon which our Nation was founded.

Perhaps one might say I am going far afield in attaching too deep a significance to this proposed amendment to our Constitution, an amendment which would do nothing more than merely limit the term of the President of the United States to two 4-year terms. Indeed, it could sound innocuous enough. Why consider over carefully a proposal that apparently does no more than limit the tenure of office of our President. To my mind, there are several vitally important factors involved which call for careful, deliberate, conscientious and even prayerful consideration.

First and foremost, we are proposing to recommend an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. For 160 years that document has outlined the principles of liberty, justice, and democracy, but it has done more than that because in guaranteeing freedom, it has also indirectly espoused the cause of the teachings of Christianity. Our Constitution has been the beacon light of hope, of faith, of comfort, and of peace to freedom-loving peoples all over the world. I do not mean to say that the founders of our Nation were able to frame an infallible pattern of government for our people throughout the ages. Quite naturally, there must be changes in our methods of operation to meet our governmental needs in a changing world. But I do say that the principles laid down in our Constitution have proved themselves to be remarkably sound, just, and practicable. These principles have proved their roots of fairness and truth in the steady growth of our Nation.

I am informed by constitutional experts that in the 160 years of our existence as a nation, there have been some 3,000 attempts to amend our Constitution. Out of this number, only 21 have proved wise or appealing. When one pauses to consider that 10 of these amendments were the original Bill of Rights which were adopted at the same time as our Constitution itself, there are really only 11 actual amendments which were sound enough to merit favorable consideration and final adoption. Imagine, only 11 changes to our American way of life and its meaning in all of our glorious 160 years of progress and development in which we have arisen from a young, obscure, sprawling country to the greatest Nation on earth today. Incidentally, each of the 11 adopted amendments, in every instance, gave more rights, responsibilities, freedom and power to our people—only 1 of the 11 was later repealed by the people.

Whenever we can amend the Constitution to further democracy and to give a large segment of our country's population broader rights of citizenship, it should be done. For instance, when slavery was abolished, such action strengthened a link in our chain of government. When that segment of our people were given the rights of suffrage irrespective of their race, color, creed, or previous condition of servitude, this, likewise, placed another strong support in our citadel of freedom. When the people were given the right of voting directly for the Members of the Senate, such action brought more securely within the grip of the people, an additional opportunity to govern themselves. When the right of franchise was given to the women of America, that, too, was a step forward in the right direction. The Norris amendment abolishing the lame-duck session of Congress was likewise a healthy contribution. These and other amendments constitute enlargements of the democratic process and with this long history of additional responsibilities being given to the people, I profoundly regret that the majority party has now seen fit to propose this amendment which, in my humble judgment, seeks to impede and curtail the freedom and democratic power of the voter.

Mr. Chairman, we have been in session now for 33 days, and this is the second piece of legislation that has come to our attention; and will you believe it, we have only 2 hours to discuss a constitutional amendment that means so much to the people of this great Nation of ours—2 hours, 1 for the opponents and 1 for the proponents of the measure.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I am sorry, I cannot yield at the moment. I will later.

It has been argued that the American people must be protected from dictatorship by statute or constitutional fiat. But the simple fact remains that nobody can protect the American people from dictatorship because it is a well-known fact, thank God, that dictators are not bred or conceived in free and open elections such as are held in the United States of America.

Yes; only once in all of this magnificent 160 years of achievement and expansion did Americans see fit to elect any one person President for the third and then the fourth term. And as every grade-school child knows, this would never have been done had our Nation not been tottering on the brink of a horrible and ghastly world conflagration. Yes; for the first time in all of our existence as a nation, Americans realized that continuity of service, experience, and leadership were in demand far over, above, and beyond our normal and natural tendencies to restrict, through the medium of the ballot, a President to two terms.

We cannot change the past, for what is past is prologue. Mr. Chairman, future generations are involved in this great decision which we here today must make. Who are we to say that our posterity yet unborn shall not have the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities such as we ourselves have enjoyed and participated in? If we defeat this proposed amendment today, I will make the prediction that in future ages countless thousands will laud and praise our names. We have a golden opportunity today, not only a rendezvous with destiny, but, what is more, we have a rendezvous with the future, because if by our actions we vote down this unconscionable proposal, we of our time will ring down the curtain with such a spectacular performance that the applause and acclaim therefrom shall resound and echo in the ears of grateful generations yet unborn.

The people, at present, by a mere majority vote, have the opportunity of deciding every 4 years whether they want to terminate the services of the President if he stands for reelection. I do not feel that any further limitation is justified. The American people have done nothing to warrant this restriction upon their democratic process. The fact that they saw fit in their wisdom and judgment to elect Franklin Delano Roosevelt for a third and then a fourth term is no offense.

As I see it, the man selected and the number of times he is elected or reelected comes under the heading of the people's business. That is their business. They will know how many times they want to elect a President or any other man. If they want to elect him once, twice, three times, or four times, that is the present right of the people of the United States.

Let us pray that the time may never again come when the United States may be in the throes of another global war with a dangerous enemy, but should this come to pass, by adopting this amendment—I repeat—we assume to speak for the generations to come. We have no crystal ball to gaze into and we cannot anticipate their dilemma; therefore, we should not attempt to tie their hands and require them in the midst of a titanic struggle to change leadership, be he a Republican or a Democrat, and, therefore, invite defeat and destruction of Christianity, democracy, and decency.

Does Congress propose to set itself up as a guardian or curator of the American people? By this amendment we say quite frankly that the people of this great Nation have not sufficient intelligence or judgment to know their own minds, that they cannot think for themselves, and, as a result, their Representatives in Congress must appoint themselves as the peoples' committee in order to protect the people from themselves. Yes; a committee of the people, by the people, and for the people, with malice toward none but with a straitjacket for all.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress has nothing more to do at the present time

than to attempt such legislation which seeks to detract from the rights and privileges of its citizens, then I say to you, sir, that we had better adjourn and return home.

We know we have a job to do here. Much important legislation is being held up. Let us vote this constitutional amendment down and get on with the people's business.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand the gentleman's own State has a limitation of one term for your own Governor; is that correct?

Mr. CHELF. Yes; and I was not alive when that limitation was adopted, I will tell you that. I still believe the people themselves can best judge whether a man should be elected for one or more terms.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this proposal today is self-answering. I do not think anyone in the country denies that ordinarily and reasonably no party should elect a President for more than two terms. I think that is fundamental. I think it is axiomatic in a democracy. I believe the reason that this particular proposition has never been enacted or placed in the Constitution is simply because the people did not know how to make an exception to it, which exception they realize is necessary at times. Six years does not answer it, nor does 8 years answer it, because the necessity will arise suddenly, and in these times will arise more suddenly than ever right out of the clear when the absolute necessity and need for a particular man is imminent, evident, and manifest, and when everybody knows that that particular man is the logical man for that particular spot. By the way, we must not overlook the ladies because there is no question at all but what some of these days, although it may be in the distant future, there is going to be an application to this rule to the women of this country. But we cannot find, and I do not believe Solomon could have found, nor do I believe that my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], in spite of his erudition, can find the exception to the rule. Unless we can find an exception to this rule, we make our Constitution so rigid that it is unworkable. If it is unworkable, then it is not in any sense a proper democratic manifesto. That is the answer to this whole problem today, as I reason it out in my own mind. I do believe that this particular proposal is absolutely invalid because for 158 or 160 years the finest minds in our country have been attempting to find a means by which we could place in the Constitution a regulation for two terms and yet have the exception to that regulation.

They never can give us the exception. There is no question about it. When Jefferson, when Washington, when McKinley, when Cleveland, when Grant, when all of the others, including Coolidge, were looking around for a method by which they could jump the barrier and do it logically and successfully, they found it just could not be done. They found it could not be done. Today we cannot find it any more than we could before, and less readily do we find it today because the exception to the rule in Roosevelt has been proven beyond peradventure. In other words, he goes down in the pages of history unquestionably as the one man up to date who was absolutely essential and necessary at the time he was nominated and at the time he was elected. The results prove the case. In other words, it now becomes an axiom that Roosevelt was correctly placed, correctly selected, correctly elected. If you find the exception to the rule I will be happy to go along with the proponents. Otherwise I go along with the opponents.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman, I know, believes in submitting questions of this kind to the people?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Highly so.

Mr. SPRINGER. And the gentleman certainly has no objection to a matter of this kind coming before the people and letting them determine it?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Unless the people at this time can tell me I am wrong. And I am too conceited to believe they can tell me just at the minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE], has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, it is not to be determined here today that hereafter no President shall serve more than two terms. We are simply giving the people of this country, through the legislatures of the various States, the right to settle that question.

The founding fathers anticipated there might be need, from time to time, to amend the Constitution. They therefore provided a method by which it might be done.

One of the anomalies of human history is that people sacrifice and fight and die for the privilege and right to set up a government to defend themselves against the aggression and oppression of foreign powers and to protect themselves against the fraud and violence of the lawless members of society. Then, having done that, they find it necessary from time to time to protect themselves against encroachments upon their rights and liberties at the hands of their own government.

The framers of our Constitution were speaking and acting for a people who had just fought and won the Revolution to free themselves from the repeated injuries and usurpations inflicted upon them by the King of Great Britain.

The men who wrote the Constitution were familiar with every experiment in government from the dawn of history to their day. They were governmental experts. They thought in terms of government. They themselves had felt the heavy hand of despotism. They resolutely intended to protect the dignity and inviolable personality of man. They set their hands to the task of making workable under government the eternal principles and truths of the Declaration of Independence. And I quote from that immortal document:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—that when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the First Congress on the 25th of September 1789. They were ratified by a sufficient number of States to make them a part of the Constitution within a little more than 2 years thereafter. These 10 amendments are our Bill of Rights. They cover the citizens all over with the armor of the law.

I favor this proposed amendment. Only by its adoption can the people be assured that we shall never have a dictator in this land. Without such a limit on the number of terms a man may serve in the Presidency, the time may come when a man of vaulting ambition becomes President. Such a man, clothed with the vast powers of the Presidency and backed by a subservient Congress, as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, could well have in his hands the two mightiest instrumentalities of governmental power, the sword and the purse. He would have the power to put the Nation into a war without Congress having voice in or control over our going to war. The President by vetoing an act passed by Congress can kill such measure unless two-thirds of the House and Senate vote to override his veto. He appoints the members of his Cabinet, all our representatives to foreign countries, and millions of other Federal officials who have control over the business and daily lives of the people. He appoints all Federal law-enforcement officers and all Federal judges. Such a President could well name to the Supreme Court of the United States men of his political faith and economic thinking, and these men in passing upon and interpreting acts of Congress, acts of the legislatures of the States, and in construing the Constitution of our country would have the power to substitute their economic philosophy for the law of the land. They could thus sweep aside and overthrow the safeguards of the Constitution. They could overrule the settled rules of law that have been declared and recognized for a hundred years. Such a court could legislate by judicial decision. It could transform our form of government.

Such disaster cannot hereafter happen if the proposed amendment is adopted. A vast majority of the American people favor this amendment, and rightly so. Under our constitutional form of government, the American people have made the greatest progress, have enjoyed the widest measure of liberty, and have achieved the deepest intellectual and moral and spiritual growth of any people in the history of the world.

Under the proposed amendment, no President will have the power to perpetuate himself in office, to create a dynasty, and to substitute a succession for an assured rotation in the Presidential office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote "no" on this proposition to deny the people the right to elect whom they please President unless the people specifically vote to deny themselves that right by constitutional limitation. The first three words in the Constitution of the United States are: "We, the people," and the enacting clause is: "We, the people, do ordain and establish this Constitution." As this bill is now written it could be made a part of the Constitution without being specifically voted on by the American people.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the nature of our Government. Of course, it is not a pure democracy. Yes, it is a representative democracy with sovereign power resting in the people. I think our Government is getting more democratic with each passing year. I believe that more and more a greater degree of responsibility is being placed upon the people, exactly where it belongs, because sovereign power resides in the people.

It is true that by our vote here today, if it carries, we are not yet making this proposal a part of the Constitution, as we are merely taking the first step; but it is conceivable that it could be submitted to the States and adopted by the necessary three-quarters of the States and then become a part of the Constitution without being subjected directly to a vote of the people. This is because the members of the State legislatures now in session or in existence were not elected on this specific issue only, they were elected on many other issues. I do not, therefore, take much stock in the argument that we are by our vote today, if this carries, merely submitting it to the vote of the people.

I believe the question of whether a man is to be elected to the Presidency for more than two terms should be left to the American people at those future times, and that we should not try to determine that question today for them or this year, or at any time without their instruction. Whether any President should or should not be elected for a third term should be decided by the people themselves when the necessity arises. I myself do not favor a third term in normal times and under normal conditions, but as the gentleman from Massachusetts, the whip on our side of the House, pointed out, some time in the future the country may be faced with an emergency. We cannot forecast these emergencies. We must not tie the hands of our people thus without their specific vote to do so. This proposed constitutional amendment should not be adopted except by affirmative action by conventions chosen for the purpose in three-fourths of the States. I know there are certain republics in the Western Hemisphere who practice rotation in office, who are apparently afraid of the man on horseback, and so place limits; but I do not believe that the American people need have any such fears nor need to place any such limits to guarantee that the man on horseback shall not appear and make himself supreme.

Each passing decade we have given more power to the people by taking away from the State legislatures the power to elect members of the other body and subjecting Senators to popular election. We have given the ballot to women. I cite these only as illustrations of extending the people's power.

I come from a far-western State that prides itself on extending the principles of democracy to a greater and greater degree. To adopt this measure into the Constitution would reverse the modern trend. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if we should adopt this amendment providing that no man shall have more than two terms of office as President that we will be denying the people of the future the fundamental right American people have always had to select the man whom they pleased even though he has already served two terms. Let our people decide at that time what is their sovereign will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the Presidential tenure of office is not a political question. It is a constitutional question of the highest order. In one form or another it occupied the attention of the Constitutional Convention from the introduction of Mr. Randolph's resolutions on May 29, 1787, until the adoption of the report of the Committee on Style submitted on September 12, 5 days before final adjournment.

In one form or another it has been before the people or the Congress, or both, ever since 1803—more than 140 years—when resolutions introduced after the election of 1800 came before the House of Representatives. Indeed, it has been calculated that between that date and 1889 more than 125 amendments were proposed to change the term of office of the President or to fix the period of eligibility; and it is estimated that almost as many have been introduced since.

It is hardly necessary to remind Members of Congress that when the matter of the Presidency was considered in the Convention the members of that body repeatedly expressed the importance of placing some limitation upon the tenure of the office. That was particularly so when it was contemplated that the Chief Executive was to be chosen by Congress and that long continuance in office would lead to autocracy, intrigue, or cabal. For a long time the sentiment prevailed that the President should be limited to a single term of 7 years. When it became apparent that choice by the legislature would not be adopted, the plan of the electoral college with a provision for a fixed term of 4 years was substituted.

Members of the Constitutional Convention feared autocracy. They feared perpetuation in the Executive Office. They had but emerged from war against a king with unlimited tenure of office. They had seen their State legislatures dissolved by royal governors appointed by a king. And they proposed that there should be no such usurpation of power in the Chief Executive they were about to create. And while they did not expressly prohibit reeligibility, they were not without the belief that the electoral college, as they contemplated its operation, would provide an adequate check against perpetuation in office.

Regardless of the inadequacies of the electoral college, however, the principle of a limitation upon the Presidential tenure came to develop by tradition. Even though it be contended that Mr. Washington's refusal to accept a third term was based upon circumstances other than those intended to establish a precedent, the fact remains that his action was regarded as a precedent by his immediate successors, and the tradition of only two terms of 4 years each became attached to the Presidential office.

Jefferson expressed this sentiment in a letter dated January 1805, in which he wrote:

> My opinion originally was that the President of the United States should have been elected for 7 years, and forever ineligible afterward. I have since become sensible that 7 years is too long to be irremovable, and that there should be a peaceable way of withdrawing a man in midway who is doing wrong. The service for 8 years, with a power to remove at the end of the first four, comes nearly to my principle as corrected by experience; and it is in adherence to that that I determine to withdraw at the end of my second term. The danger is that the indulgence and attachments of the people will keep a man in the chair after he becomes a dotard, that reelection through life shall become habitual, and election for life follow that. General Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after 8 years. I shall follow it. And a few more precedents will oppose the obstacle of habit to anyone after a while who shall endeavor to extend his term. Perhaps it may beget a disposition to establish it by an amendment of the Constitution.

In his first annual message, December 1829, President Jackson said:

> I would therefore recommend such an amendment of the Constitution as may remove all intermediate agency in the election of the President and Vice President. * * * In connection with such an amendment it would seem advisable to limit the service of the Chief Magistrate to a single term of either 4 or 6 years.

And he repeated that recommendation in several succeeding messages.

In his letter of August 18, 1884, accepting the nomination for the Presidency, President Cleveland wrote:

> When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptations to retain public place once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of officeholders, with a zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the President for reelection

a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate, and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people.

And I would recall to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Democratic National Convention, held in Baltimore, Md., in 1912, adopted the following resolution:

We favor a single Presidential term and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection, and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

This historical feeling and tradition against unlimited tenure in the Presidential office, Mr. Chairman, is not based upon idle fear. The power and prestige of the President of the United States has grown constantly and increasingly since the first inauguration of Mr. Washington. Today, the President of the United States is perhaps the most powerful individual in the world. It is within the spirit of democracy that proper constitutional restraints be placed upon his tenure of office.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, it is a paradox that we, who generally speak so glibly of the supremacy of the people and government by the people, would, through this proposal now under consideration, limit that supremacy and power.

The statements of many of our leaders of the past have been quoted today supporting arguments both for and against this resolution. President Wilson, as suggested in last night's Washington Star, more nearly summed up arguments on this matter when he said that the President's fighting power in behalf of the people would be immensely weakened by an anti-third term amendment to the Constitution. Further quoting President Wilson, he said:

We would singularly belie our own principles by seeking to determine by fixed constitutional provision what the people should determine for themselves.

We should not discuss at this time the issue of the number of terms the President of the United States might be privileged to serve, for the question, the unfortunate question, is that of limiting the power of the people in this regard. It perhaps would be in better taste for this body to consider this resolution had the question not been previously presented to the people.

In 1940 the sovereign voters of the United States, many millions strong, expressed themselves upon this issue. Actually, it seemed to be the only issue in the campaign, for as I checked the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering 1 week immediately preceding the 1940 election last night I found that more than 40 Members of the House made speeches similar, yes, almost identical, to the speeches made today predicting disaster to representative government and to this great country of ours if a President should be elected to serve more than two terms. Those predictions were made again in 1944. Both times the people of the United States repudiated the doctrine of this resolution and repudiated it overwhelmingly.

A majority in 38 States in 1940 and a majority of some 36 States in 1944 voted that a man might serve more than two terms as President of the United States.

As a matter of interest, Mr. Chairman, the very county in which the splendid Speaker of this House lives, and then lived, repudiated the theory that a President should serve no more than two terms and voted overwhelmingly for Mr. Roosevelt, as in 1944, did the people of the State of Michigan, home of the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Normally, I would prefer for a new man to be President of the United States after two terms but I have a great deal more confidence and more faith in the fundamental principles of this Government—that the judgment of the people should be supreme—than the judgment of this legislative body or that of any State in this Union. Actually, I think that you have, too.

It must seem strange to the people of this country that the Republican Party is so violent at this time against a third term for the President and in the same breath are asking for a third try to impose a restriction upon the sovereignty of the people. Could it be, perhaps, that they did not like the judgment of the sovereign voters in 1940 and 1944, and have more confidence in the ability of the legislatures?

Most assuredly it is not sound at this time for any man on this floor to say that we are going to give the people an opportunity to pass on this resolution, for by the express terms of the resolution, it shall be submitted to the various legislatures. The Republican majority could have, had it desired, writtten the resolution and presented it for discussion, with the provision that it would be submitted to constitutional conventions in each State. I am not sure why they did not do this. Perhaps it was the memory of the people voting in 1940 and 1944.

I cannot vote for this resolution unless it provides for submission to the people; for I cannot say to them, as you will do if you pass this resolution, "We did not like your judgment in 1940 and 1944, so we are going to sidestep you and submit the question to the legislatures of the various States with the hope that they will have better judgment than you have." And they might add, and perhaps have in their counsels, "It will be relatively easier to put this through in the Republican-dominated legislatures of the several States."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I shall heed the injunction of our former Speaker when he used the words "just a minute," to the extent that I shall speak for just a very short time.

We must not overlook the wisdom of our forefathers, nor should we forget the accumulated experiences during the historic years. Experience is a wonderful teacher. I had this forcibly impressed upon me once. I sat in an old school house in a small town in the State of Maine, and I looked into the sweet face of an old lady with gray hair, and she said this: "Sometimes I think that the school of experience is the only one in which fools can learn anything," and she looked at me when she said it.

I have listened with great interest to the arguments that have been made against this proposed amendment. We have heard our beloved former leader of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, whom everybody respects, speak to this subject. The burden of Mr. MCCORMACK's argument is this: That we may find ourselves with our backs to the wall, a President serving a second term, and that we, being in a crisis, could not find the man who could meet the situation and carry us through safely.

I think I have an answer to that, and I do not think there is any answer to my answer. I think the best answer to that is to point to the living presence of such men as the gentleman himself, who, possessors of such distinguished and preeminent ability in a country of 140,000,000 people, could and would lead us safely through any crisis. What can their reply be to that?

It has been suggested that this proposal is anti-Roosevelt. That is not true. It is not true in any sense of the word. It certainly is not retroactive legislation.

There have been some excellent statements made here but there is no better one to be found than that which appears as the minority views of two distinguished gentlemen, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. I am going to read one paragraph:

Of course, other crises may arise in the course of our history wherein we may long to retain the experienced and able guiding hand that may then be steering the ship of state, beyond the limit of tenure fixed, and regret that we surrendered our ancient heritage of such perfect freedom. But in the exercise of our best, studied judgment we certify our conviction that the advantages of limited tenure far outweigh the disadvantages urged against it, and have confidence that, the certitude of law having removed all question of repudiation, we may count with the utmost assurance upon the patriotic service as lieutenant of every captain who steps down from the bridge.

They, I believe, are in favor of the 6-year term.

I shall vote for this proposal; first, because I believe it should be accepted by the States; and second, we are simply voting to submit this question—permitting the people, through their elected representatives in their States, to vote upon it. And let me say, when the words that inaugurate our great document are referred to, "We the people," that we the people established this system which provides that it shall go to the legislatures.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

WE MUST NOT SHACKLE THE FUTURE—OPPOSED TO PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—LEAVE FUTURE CITIZENS FREE TO MAKE THEIR OWN DECISIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, what the President's term of office should be has been a much debated question through-

out our history as a nation. Even in the Constitutional Convention it was one of the principal controversies. Many different proposals were then advanced, ranging from a single term with ineligibility for reelection to tenure during good behavior or for life.

After much deliberation the constitutional framers wisely fixed the term at 4 years, but refused, by repeated votes, to limit the number of terms to which the people might elect a President.

But there was not then, nor has there ever been, complete satisfaction with this constitutional provision. In fact, a resolution to change it was introduced in the very first Congress, and over the years since, there have been more than 150 proposals to amend the Constitution so as to change the President's tenure of office.

The people have not seen fit to change it. Nevertheless, after all these years of sound democratic government, we are again debating the question today. After all these prideful years of free government and progressive extension of the right of franchise, is it now necessary or expedient to say that the people shall not be trusted to exercise their judgment in electing the man they desire as President at a particular time or any particular emergency?

This proposed amendment would be an impairment of the citizenship of the future, a limited impairment, to be sure, but a definite restriction on the freedom of choice of our children and our children's children. We must not shackle the future.

Let us suppose that in the future some crisis—a crisis even more critical than we have yet experienced—should come to hand, and that the people should consider absolutely necessary the continued service as President of a particular man who had gained their confidence through a demonstration of able patriotic leadership.

Could this question not then safely be submitted to the people, or shall we place a restriction on them because we think, perchance, they may be unable to distinguish between a patriot and a tyrant.

Under certain circumstances the people might think, and rightly so, that there was less danger to their freedom in a third term for one man than in a first term for another who did not seem to them equal to the job of running a nation.

We cannot foresee now what the election issues will be, let us say, in 1980 or whether the President will be a Republican or a Democrat. Why should we prejudge? I want to defend the rights of the American people of 1980 to judge for themselves.

To say that we must now put this restriction upon the right of the people to a free choice is to cast doubt upon the whole theory of popular government. I am one who believes that the perpetuity of government by the people depends, not upon restrictions on the people, but rather in maintaining free and frequent choice and decision by the people. The fewer restrictions on the people we place in the Constitution, the better off we will be in the long run.

We, in America, have a deep-dyed habit of citing the statements and examples of our founding fathers as evidence of the rightness of our course, even though times and circumstances may be materially different. Even so, I want to cite an example and a statement from the Father of Our Nation.

The origin of the two-term tradition is generally ascribed to President George Washington because he declined to be considered as a candidate for a third term. History, however, is abundantly clear that he did so from the standpoint of his own personal choice and not upon political precedent. Washington not only voted against limiting the terms of a president in the Constitutional Convention, but in repeated writings he branded such limitation as both unwise and unnecessary.

For instance, in a letter to General Lafayette, President Washington wrote:

> I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man who in some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public.

This is not a question, though, which should be decided solely upon the beliefs and examples of former statesmen, nor do I believe it is a political weapon, which we can wisely use for temporary political expediency. It is rather a principle which goes to the very heart of democracy—of government by the people, of the people, and for the people.

If I distrusted the free and deliberate judgment of the American people, then no matter who might be President or how short we might limit his term, I would have little faith that a system of self government by freemen could long endure in this or in any other country.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I am frightened. I feel bad, not physically but mentally and spiritually, because this question has been brought up at this time. I do not charge that there is partisanship in the consideration of this resolution; I do not think there is. I do not even charge that there is evident partisanship in the fact that this resolution originated so quickly after the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. But, Mr. Chairman, to my mind this is perhaps the most serious subject we will be called upon to give consideration to while we are in this Congress. It is something that is contrary to all which has obtained for 160 years. In all that time just one man, just one, was elected to a third term as President of the United States.

The election of that man was not partisan in its character, essentially. It happened that he was nominated by the Democratic Convention which met in Chicago in July of 1940. It is a fact there were some then in that convention who thought that it would not be justified in us to nominate a man for a third term, but those were in such minority that out of about a thousand convention votes the man who was in office at that time and who was nominated for a third term received over 900 votes, in the Democratic Convention, which, as far as this action was concerned, was nonpartisan. There could not be any question as between them, whether they were Republican or Democrat. The only reason that man was chosen, who happened not to be Theodore Roosevelt, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, was because it was felt by a great majority of the people of this country that it would be in the best interests of the country and in the interest of the security of the United States of America and all its people in that hour of imminent danger. The man who had been at the helm in the several years prior thereto was not perhaps best qualified inherently but was possessed of the greatest amount of information of any other man in the United States, and while he was not an indispensable man it was the best opportunity we had to fortify ourselves against the approaching war which eventually did come and which shook the foundations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the proposition that we are withholding from the people of the United States the opportunity or privilege of speaking upon this matter. But it is natural to assume that the representatives in the State legislatures may conclude that we are in favor of it. It is yet to be accepted that Congress influences some. We set in motion a dangerous proposal. In the language of the distinguished former Speaker of this House, I would beg you to wait—wait a minute and let us consider this matter further and more seriously. Franklin Roosevelt did not personally desire a third term. The people required it in what they believed was to save our country. I beg you to vote down this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill is not of the greatest importance to the American people. In a democracy we have the right to change our laws to fit the exigencies of the moment. As conditions arise we meet them. Ours is a fluid type of Government, and I am certain at this time the necessity for limiting the tenure of office of the President is not one of great concern to the people.

My opposition to the measure is based on the recent experiences that we have had with this sort of thing. In time of emergency the American people may want to continue their Chief Executive beyond the two terms as set forth in this bill, as they did at the last general election and at the general election preceding that.

Emergencies were on us, one domestic and the other international. The American people in their wisdom saw fit to reelect Franklin Delano Roosevelt for a third and a fourth term as President. His dynamic type of leadership appealed to them and they demanded his retention in office.

Being human it is understandable that those who violently opposed Mr. Roosevelt are taking this opportunity to vent their spleen.

The American people should be left free to exercise the discretionary powers granted them in this democracy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, while I am personally opposed in principle to a third or fourth term for the Presidency of the United States, I am nevertheless opposed to this resolution because it proposes the shackling of ourselves and future generations in the exercise of free will. It restricts the right of franchise guaranteed under the Constitution and makes slaves of free men.

What the proponents ask for is the imposition of a limitation of unrestricted choice, the abolishment of a sacred right which can be and has always heretofore been exercised by the free people of these United States.

There is no such creature as the indispensable man. I have always said that there are more capable and better men who have never held office than there are in office today, or who ever held office for that matter, and it is conceded that in the past intellectually great and saintly men have rendered priceless service to the country and to the people.

Mr. Chairman, the question of limiting tenure of the President of the United States by constitutional amendment has actually been put to the test on two separate occasions—in the campaigns of 1940 and 1944. The sovereign people spoke unmistakably on the subject. As a free people, they could have voted for the opponent of the aspirant for a third term, and again on another occasion the people could have rebuked Mr. Roosevelt when he sought a fourth term, but they did not do so. They established another far-reaching fourth-term precedent. Can anyone fail to understand the temper of the people on that question? Would anybody charge the people with lack of understanding of their prerogative, or worse still, with making an error in judgment? The people, so I hold, right or wrong, are always right. They can elect a man for a third or a fourth term, or they can turn a President out at the end of his first term as was done with Herbert Hoover.

It is the inherent right of a free-born American citizen to vote for whomsoever he chooses and as often as a candidate presents his name, once or 10 times. This right must not be abridged now or in the future. The citizen can limit Presidential tenure; he is the sovereign. He exercises this right freely and wilfully. He need not be shielded by a constitutional amendment. It should be and it is a matter of conscience. No restrictions or impediments should be placed in the path of the American voter. It works well for both the Democrats and the Republicans.

The people may some day desire to elect a Republican President, may reelect, and may in some emergency choose to give him a fourth term if they want to do so. They shall have that right insofar as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that this is a belated and a misguided attempt to head off a third term for the late and beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has gone to his reward, or, reduced to its lowest common denominator, it may be an attempt to besmirch his good name.

In concluding, I ask, Why should we abridge an inherent right of the people by a fixed and irrevocable rule when the individual citizen can exercise that right freely at any time he chooses? I trust the resolution is defeated.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, in regard to House Joint Resolution 27, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the terms of office of the President, I am fully in accord with the idea to limit the terms to two terms of 4 years each.

Eight years is long enough for a good President and 4 years is too long for a bad one.

Much has already been said on the floor today on this subject. The arguments pro and con have been pretty well covered. Of course, the passage of the joint resolution will do nothing more than give the people a chance to settle the question as to whether they desire such limitation.

It is a well-known fact that the tenure of the office of President was one of the most difficult and perplexing problems before the Constitutional Convention 160 years ago. The question was not settled until the closing days of the Convention.

In the light of the breaking of the custom of 160 years to elect a President to only two terms by the four-times elected President in very recent times, it seems quite appropriate to submit the question to the people so they may have a chance to pass on the question after such experience. If this amendment should eventually become a part of the Constitution, it would be a great step toward preventing a dictatorship or some totalitarian form of government from arising in the United States.

I hope the joint resolution will pass.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, the proposed twenty-second amendment to the Constitution presents one of the fundamental issues left unsettled by the founders of the Republic and demands the most careful consideration. The issue, moreover, is one which goes to the very heart of political theory, for the question is whether or not the "indispensable man" theory is compatible with the republican form of government.

When I speak of the "indispensable man" I am not speaking necessarily of the recent Roosevelt era, although I do think that those of us who have lived during the period when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President recognized the dangers of continuing one man in the office of presidency for more than two terms. In lieu of the divine right of kings and the prerogatives of a dictator, we find the problems and emergencies of this or that crisis as a reason or reasons given for the continuation of one man in office.

Almost without exception we have had appointive offices filled by people of the same political philosophy as the late President Roosevelt's. This is not such a problem administratively, but the effect is tremendous so far as the judiciary branch of our Government is concerned. I have heard my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle complain that the test for filling judicial appointments was not whether the individual was a Democrat, but whether he was a particular brand of New Dealer.

There is nothing said or intended by these remarks as derogatory to the late President Roosevelt. The same dangers would exist had President Roosevelt been a Republican instead of a Democrat and I would have felt perhaps even more out-spokenly critical of the violation of the precedent of two terms for the Presidency. As a matter of fact, it was Thomas Jefferson himself who insisted that voluntary retirement was a matter of firm principle, and stated:

> If the principle of rotation be a sound one, as I conscientiously believe it to be with respect to this office, no pretext should ever be permitted to dispense with it, because there never will be a time when real difficulties will not exist, and furnish a plausible pretext for dispensation.

It is my conviction that we should limit the Presidency to two terms. If, in a country of 140,000,000 people there arises occasions where one man, and one man only, is capable of filling the position of the Presidency of the United States, then I say to the advocates of that theory that both democracy and a republican form of government are a failure. However, as we stand here today, I feel that our form of government has been a bulwark against every form of attack because it is a republican form of government and it is our responsibility and our duty to safeguard it. With dictatorships and monarchies crumbling, the people of the world as well as the spirit of our forefathers look to us to preserve our form of government. The proposed constitutional amendment helps to do so, in my opinion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution, and I turn to my files of the Seventy-ninth Congress for some interesting supporting data. On June 4, 1945, I mailed to each Member of the House a questionnaire on this subject of the limitation of the term of the President of the United States. I asked only three questions—whether the Member favored a 6-year limitation; or if he favored a limitation of two terms of 4 years each, and whether the Member thought it was then an opportune time to bring up the question on the floor.

I said I would not quote any Member without his or her permission, with the result that interesting comments were received. I said the Member could sign the reply or send it back unsigned. I did not "key" the questionnaires, except on one point; I could tell which came back from Republicans, and which from

Democrats, but not the individual Members. Even that was unnecessary, as a large majority signed.

Ninety-one signed replies were received from Republicans and 27 unsigned replies. Fifty-one signed replies were received from Democrats, and 17 unsigned. That made a total of 186 replies, or 43 percent of the membership of the House. You could ask, Mr. Chairman, why I never reported the results to this floor. During the tabulation, I discovered that a well-known magazine writer was engaged at that moment in preparing a magazine article on this subject. She asked me to withhold my report to you, until her article was ready. Unfortunately, the magazine, after accepting it, did not use it, presumably pressed for space, and it was then too late for me. I now take out the figures and review them in the light of today's vote.

Sixty-five signed Republicans and 19 unsigned, together with 16 signed Democrats and 3 unsigned, a total of 103, favored a limitation of two terms of 4 years. Only 21 signed Republicans and 6 unsigned, with 4 signed Democrats and 3 unsigned, a total of 34, wanted a limitation of 6 years. Only 4 Republicans disapproved the idea of some limitation. Of these, 1 was considered by his constituents to have voted too closely to New Deal principles and was not returned last November, 1 expressed the somewhat pessimistic thought that such a resolution would somehow benefit the New Deal, 1 recommended care in amending the Constitution on any subject, and 1 gave no reason.

However, 29 signed Democrats and 11 unsigned were opposed to any limitation any time, although I noted this afternoon that 1 distinguished Member of the present minority, who wrote "Never" in a firm hand last June, today voted equally firmly in favor of 2 terms of 4 years each, which indicates that time—and possibly an election—changes all things.

There were 14 Republicans who would have preferred a 6-year limitation, but with apparent resignation accepted the likelihood of two 4-year terms, hoping for any limitation as the primary objective. I included them in the 4-year count. One Republican preferred unwritten to the written law, which causes me to suggest that the position may be academically excellent, but, to quote the first sentence of the unpublished magazine article, already referred to:

When an unwritten law is once broken, should it be replaced by a written law?

Two Republicans were thoughtful enough to raise the question of the partial term. We decided that this afternoon in favor of limitation. If a Vice President serves part of a term, due to the death or removal of a President, he may, under House Joint Resolution 27, be elected only once in his own right. It would affect the present occupant of the White House, were he to run in 1948, and to be elected, and it would have affected Theodore Roosevelt who had finished the term to which McKinley was elected, and who had been elected once in his own right. It could affect a President who had risen from the Vice Presidency only a few months before the end of his President's term, but so far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, if we are to set a limitation, I prefer to go in that direction, rather than the other. I favor House Joint Resolution 27.

One Republican reply brought up the question of longer terms for Representatives, tying it to the limitation on the Presidential term. Of the total replies, 78 signed Republicans and 22 unsigned, together with 13 signed and 5 unsigned Democrats, a total of 118, evidently thought if an idea were good, the sooner we made it a law the better it would be for the country. They were in favor of bringing up the resolution 18 months ago. Eleven Republicans and three Democrats felt that the Congress should wait until the war was over, or until the men had returned from the services. That thought, even if it were the minority opinion at that time, prevailed and it was not until today that the necessary resolution passed the House. The vote has been 285 ayes and 121 noes, which shows a fairly good comparison with the replies to my questionnaires of June 1945.

In the history of the Congress, 160 bills have been introduced to limit the Presidential term; it took the present one, House Joint Resolution 27, to get started on its way to the States, for their approval.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 27 providing for a constitutional amendment limiting the term of President to two 4-year terms.

The action we are taking here today is not final or conclusive. We are submitting to the several States an opportunity to determine for themselves whether they want this proposed amendment to become a permanent part of the Constitution.

Should we deny the States this privilege? Should we refuse the people of the Nation an opportunity to express themselves on this vital and important issue? I say, "No." To deny the people this right would be undemocratic and would be unfair.

If the custom and historic practice of limiting the term of President to two terms had not been broken in 1944, this amendment would not be before us today. Because it was broken and because we found ourselves under the domination of one political party and one man as President for four terms, which terminated only by death, we have this resolution before us today.

What happened under this unprecedented administration under one man is well known. Almost unlimited power grew up in the office of President. This must not happen again and the only practical and logical way to prevent it is to adopt House Joint Resolution 27 and give the people an opportunity to say definitely and finally what they want. If they do not want a limited term for President they will say so. If we do not pass this resolution they will not have the opportunity to say whether they want a limited term or not. I urge the adoption and passage of House Joint Resolution 27.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am against this resolution can be expressed in one sentence: I am against placing in the Constitution a limitation against the people. This never has been done, and I am in hopes never will be done.

All power originally resided in the people, and they still possess all power not specifically granted under the Constitution. And in granting power under the Constitution they only granted those powers that they could not, in the functioning of Government, exercise individually. And in granting powers to others, in order to protect their own rights, the people have ever been careful to place certain prohibitions. Congress, for instance, is prohibited from passing expost facto laws, or laws that would impair the obligation of contract, or laws interfering with freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or religious freedom, and so forth. But, my colleagues, read the Constitution from beginning to end and you will not find a single prohibition against the exercise by the sovereign people of the powers not granted.

One of the powers not granted by the people in the Constitution was the power to change their chosen representatives whenever in their judgment they saw fit. In order for the Government to orderly function, there was no need to grant or restrict, in any way, this power, because in the exercise of the ballot the people can not only limit the terms of the President, but limit the terms of their representatives in the Senate and House as well. And this is as it should be. Certainly the people should not be restricted, in any way, in turning out of office or keeping in office, the representatives they desire.

Amend the resolution by limiting the terms of Senators and Representatives and the resolution would receive but few, if any, favorable votes. The people should enjoy the same freedom in keeping in or turning out of office their President that they enjoy in keeping in or turning out of office their Senators and Representatives.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, as one of the authors of the legislative proposals introduced in this Congress to limit the successive terms which a President of the United States can serve, it goes without saying that I favor the proposed legislation. It was my pleasure to make a statement to the subcommittee which, under the able direction of Congressman SPRINGER, did such expeditious and efficient service in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. I shall consequently not detain you long today in the further amplification of my views.

As has been said here this afternoon many times, this is important and significant legislation. It grows directly

out of the unfortunate experience we had in this country in 1940 and again in 1944 when a President who had entrenched himself in power by use of patronage and the public purse refused to vacate the office at the conclusion of two terms, but used the great powers of the Presidency to perpetuate himself in office.

By the hard lessons of experience, this republic has thus learned how easy it is for a man with a yen for power to use the vast authority of the White House to whiplash convention delegates into abject submission and to mobilize the forces of propaganda to his support. In the Democratic Convention of 1940, when, after creating a long series of emergencies, the then President devoted his best energies to securing the nomination for a third term the newspaper accounts revealed that well over half of the delegates to the Democratic Convention were on the pay roll of the Federal Government as political appointees or they were the relatives thereof. That made the synthetic draft of 1940 an easy matter. Confronted by comparative weak and ineffectual Republican opposition in November, the nomination became almost tantamount to the election.

In 1944 it happened "again and again and again and yet once again." This time, with the war clouds upon us and the President's pious pledge that he would not let this country become embroiled in war ringing in the voters' ears as he dramatized that promise in his Boston speech, the fourth term was almost as easy to win as the third, although the caliber and the character of the Republican opposition had been improved.

While the President found it a bit more difficult to dominate the convention of his own party in the fourth-term ratification meeting—it could scarcely be called a convention—the well-recognized axiom that the fellow in the executive office who controls all the appointments can also control the delegates to the political convention operated with its unerring regularity. So we had a fourth term started. Death ended that term in its infancy and under a new President America now faces the decision as whether its experience in departing from our hallowed no-third-term tradition was successful enough so that it should be repeated or so disastrous that a constitutional barrier should be erected against it. Today this House will express its verdict on that question. If we act favorably and the Senate supports our action, the question will be decided by the various States in time-honored American manner.

Mr. Chairman, the most desperate problems this world faces today have resulted primarily from the fact that too few men have held too much power for too long a time in too many countries. Let us do what we can here today to safeguard America against this disastrous tendency.

By acting affirmatively on this resolution in our votes today we can lift up a great word of encouragement to freedom-loving people everywhere that here in this Republic our people are determined to retain the powers of government in their own hands and to prevent politicians of any stamp or kind from attempting to make the Presidency a personal possession and a position of perpetual privilege.

Only in the United States, today, is legislative government—government by the people—on the upgrade. Only in this Republic do we find the tendency away from government by the executive and toward government by those in the grass roots. Almost all of the rest of the world has slipped away from the foundations of freedom and skidded dangerously close to the shoals of executive domination, one-man rule, dictatorship, and ruthless tyranny. Let us consolidate our gains in self-government by passing this resolution to prevent any President hereafter—Republican or Democratic—from perpetuating himself in office.

In 1945, it was my privilege to visit the battlefields of France and to spend some 6 weeks in France and Great Britain shortly after D-day. One of my vivid memories is of an afternoon, near Cherbourg, France, when I was permitted to enter a prison cage in which Nazi war prisoners were kept and to converse with the prisoners through an Army interpreter. On this occasion I spent some time talking with a prisoner who used to be a city official in Berlin.

This prisoner of war denied he was ever a Nazi and condemned the Nazi ideologies vigorously. When I asked him if many others in Berlin had the same idea, he responded in the affirmative. I then inquired why it was if so many did not like the Nazi creed and had no love for Hitler that Hitler was permitted to rule the country so completely. I shall never forget the true significance of his reply although the young prisoner probably did not recognize it himself. He said, "You see, sir, the people of Germany voted Hitler into power. Then they voted again and increased his majority and added to his power. Each time he got more votes and pretty soon we found that while we had voted Hitler into power we could not vote him out again."

That, my colleagues, is the meat in the coconut. Freedom is present only when citizens can vote out of office those whom they have voted in. Mere ability to elect an official is not freedom in its essence if those who vote do not have the power and the practical, workable, effective means of voting these same officials out again. It was that the Germans lost under Hitler. It is that power which we Americans must ever keep. And by limiting by constitutional amendment the terms of any President to two, we shall have taken a big step to retain forever that precious power and that important authority for the free men and women of America.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, in any consideration of the limitation of Presidential tenure, there is a contemporary situation in military invention that must be taken into fundamental account. This fact is almost self-evident to anyone who appreciates the significance of human history and man's time-binding characteristics.

For over 1,000 years during the Dark and Middle Ages, the ordinary people were held in virtual bondage. The feudal lords and leaders with relatively small numbers of soldiers, through the means of military implements and inventions as then developed, from their castles and moats, could defend themselves and rule the people with an imperious hand. There was small chance of throwing off any tyranny.

Then came the development of gunpowder in the fourteenth century, a very simple product to make, and the development of small firearms and smooth-bore cannon that were of easy manufacture. The feudal lords and leaders gradually became more or less helpless. Their castles and moats were of no avail. The stronger and wealthier rulers survived, and national states began to grow up in self-preservation.

Freedom appeared on the horizon and began to grow in England particularly, and over the centuries flowered in the American and French Revolutions. The period culminated in the so-called victorian era which 100 years will be highlighted in man's history, despite its defects and shortcomings, as one of the golden periods up to that time. Freedom grew to maturity over much of the Western World.

Since World War I, military invention, forgetting for the moment the imminence of atomic energy—we can never forget it—has proceeded to such a point in its development that the ordinary people in this relationship are again in the position they were in the ages of the feudal lords.

Once a dictatorship develops in a country today, there is small chance for the ordinary people to throw off the tyranny. Rescue can come only from the outside. Who would rescue America from such tyranny? A turn-over could come only within the dictatorship. This would only result in the same old thing with new faces in control.

The limitation of Presidential tenure is too serious a matter to be toyed or trifled with politically. It transcends all this. It is conceivable that chaotic and confused conditions could arise in this country where the voice of the people might not be sound.

Our democratic way of life in a republican form of government thrives under a reign of law and an ordered life that can be changed through modification of or even repeal of laws. If we should lose our freedom today, it is gone; it is irretrievable. The Nazis understood this when they said the Third Reich could rule for 1,000 years. Washington and Jefferson foresaw this 100 years in advance of their time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I favor a limited tenure for the President

of the United States. My preference, however, is not for the pending resolution, but for a single 6-year term. If that matter is proposed in Committee of the Whole I shall support it. If it fails I shall support the pending resolution.

There may be an element of political frustration in what we do today, but I predicate my own conviction upon reality. What we are attempting to do today is to repair a shattered political tradition—a tradition that started in 1787 and endured until 1940. It shows how wide Jefferson finally was of the mark, because he said the force of custom and usage after four Presidents had served two terms and no more would make that a rather sacrosanct tradition in American life. But you and I have lived to see it shattered in 1940.

I do not emotionalize over this subject. I start with this premise: The municipal corporation known as the Government of the United States is the biggest business in any time or generation that has existed on the face of the earth. If it is admittedly the biggest business that has ever existed, the man who serves as the Chief Magistrate and pilot of that business has no business to deviate from his responsibility to the people and the Nation for any purpose, political or otherwise. The fact of the matter is, and everybody knows, that when a President has been elected for one term he must, among other things, go about the business of being reelected to another. To that end he uses the Federal pay roll and the appointing power. I think the surveys are conclusive on that point, that it was the Federal pay roll and the possibility of having each one count for four votes that finally made these enormous majorities possible. So, there is in the hands of the Chief Magistrate a tremendous weapon that was unknown in the days of Jefferson and Hamilton and all the rest of the founding fathers. But Andy Jackson knew it and Harrison knew it and Rutherford Hayes knew it and William Howard Taft knew it, because all of them, having had experience in the White House, are on record today in favor of a single 6-year term.

As a matter of fact, a 4-year term is no 4-year term. From 1944 until convention time in June of 1948 is 3½ years. Everybody knows that the occupant of the White House is going to be busy, if he becomes a candidate for reelection, in order to trim his political fences, and will devote some time to politics instead of to statesmanship.

If we had one of our own in the White House the answer would be exactly the same. But when you have 141,000,000 people who are engaged in a business that calls for $37,500,000,000 expenditure in a 365-day period, that man has no business trifling with the destiny and welfare of the people. He should give his time to the business of the people and then step down and out.

That is the crux of the proposal for a single term of 6 years.

Another thing within the compass of time: In one of the recent elections we have noted the intervention of foreign influence. It had been said that Churchill was wondering what he could do in order to influence the political results in the United States. The powers that be, overseas, who are the recipients and the beneficiaries of the largesse of this country through UNRRA, through relief, through lend-lease, not by the millions or hundreds of millions but by the billions of dollars, have suddenly developed a vested interested in what happens politically in the United States of America. It would be far better to have one man, fresh and uncommitted, come into the White House and give entirely of his time to the people and then foreclose any opportunity of a foreign government on the basis of disposition and background and weaknesses and predilections to say, "This is our man and we want him reelected because we are confident that out of the fullness of a sympathetic heart, the dollars and largesse will continue to flow into all corners of the earth." There is only one way to meet it, there is only one way to get rid of it and that, of course, is to make a fresh start every 6 years. Then you get rid of the influence of a tremendous pay roll which at this moment numbers 2,300,000 civilians; you get rid of this foreign influence. There is behind the proposal for a single term of 6 years those who have had the benefit of experience. Twice Andrew Jackson stood before this Congress and in his annual messages gave it as his opinion that the Presidency ought to be a single term of 6 years. William Howard Taft has said exactly the same thing except perhaps not so emphatically. Other Presidents behind whom there is that wealth of experience in the White House have said it is their opinion based upon their experience that a single term of 6 years would be best for the country.

So expressing my own preference I shall offer a substitute, and if that does not prevail I certainly will go along with the committee resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, it seems a shame to me as a new Member of the Congress of the United States that such an important constitutional issue as faces the House today should be converted to one of petty partisan politics by certain members of the minority.

The issue here is whether or not we should give to the people of the United States an opportunity to express themselves on the all-important question of limiting the tenure of Presidents to two terms of 4 years each.

The vote in this body today will not constitute a plebiscite on the merits or demerits on the third or fourth terms of our late venerable President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is not a post mortem political issue. It is a constitutional question which never before has been presented to the American people. Some would say that the people have overwhelmingly expressed themselves in favor of more than two terms by electing President Roosevelt in 1940 and again in 1944 for a third and fourth term. It is submitted that this is not the case. The issue in 1940 was one as to the relative merits of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie. The issue in 1944 was as to the relative merits of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Thomas E. Dewey.

Now, for the first time we have the opportunity to place before the American people the clear-cut issue of limiting the tenure of office. It can be presented to the people not in the midst of a hotly contested political campaign but at a time when cool judgment and sound reasoning can prevail instead of partisan politics and petty bickering. I urge that the American people have the right to express themselves on this issue and that now is the time to permit them to do so.

It is urged by some that to take favorable action on the resolution before us will be to deprive the people of the inherent right to retain a President as long as they choose. It is submitted that exactly the opposite is true. Our affirmative vote on this resolution has the effect of inviting the people in the country to express themselves as to whether or not it is a sound, constitutional principle to limit the tenure of their Chief Executive. They are free to express themselves through their State legislative bodies or State conventions in any manner they see fit. All power of government is vested in the hands of the people. Our favorable vote on this resolution will permit the people to tell us their wishes in the matter. It is, therefore, a far cry to say that we are tieing the hands of the people.

One of the fundamental principles of our constitutional framework is the system of checks and balances. This principle, derived from Locke and Montesquieu, and propagated in this country by Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and others, is a most valuable one. It was early recognized by the constitutional framers of this country that the greatest danger to the republican form of government lay in the concentration of too much power in the hands of one man or one body of men. Accordingly, in the drafting of the Constitution they diffused the power of government among the States and the Nation on the one hand, and among the three departments of government on the other, and so today the framework of our constitutional government is characterized on every hand by the checks which the three departments of government have on each other.

The simple issue which confronts us today is whether or not we shall add one more check to our present system of checks and balances. I urge that it is advisable that we do so. It was not contemplated in the days of the Constitutional Convention that the power of the Chief Executive would grow so extensively as it has grown in recent years. The sprawling settlements of a few million souls spread along the Atlantic seaboard in the 1700's was quite a different country from the expansive Nation of 140,000,000 people with its mammoth government that we have today. A few hundred Federal employees then compares to the two and a half million that we have today. The handful of Government departments then compares with the thousands of departments, boards, commissions, and agencies which exist today. The office of President of the United States, especially when held by what is popularly classified as a "strong

President," presents an opportunity for the exercise of influence all out of proportion to that contemplated by the constitutional founders.

The Constitution is not a static instrument. Time and again the constitutional founders recognized this and said that the Constitution as adopted was only a beginning and that the instrument would require amendment from time to time as the growth of the country required. It is submitted to the Members of the House that now is the time when we can well add to our constitutional framework by inserting one more of our famous "checks and balances" with the end in view of restraining the excess exercise of power which is possible to be exercised by a strong Chief Executive, all to the detriment of a free government and a free people. It is urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that by giving our approval to this resolution, we are legislating for future generations. That is true—what of it? Legislative bodies always legislate for the future. Did not the Sixtieth Congress, for instance, pass laws which bind me today although I was not living at the time of their enactment? Are we not all bound by the present Constitution of the United States although none of us had a hand in its drafting?

Laws are always prospective in their operation, not retroactive.

If, therefore, we are of the mind that a constitutional safeguard should be erected against the possible—even the probable—rise of an executive dictatorship, we should not be deterred from our action because of the spurious argument that we are tying the hands of future generations. We are, to be sure, legislating for them, but they, too, may amend our action as we today seek to amend the action of the constitutional framers.

The resolution under consideration today, therefore, is one which commends itself to us not as a partisan measure, but as a constitutional one. I urge that it be considered on that basis and that the favorable two-thirds vote of this body initiate the machinery by which the people may express themselves on this all-important question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, this debate has been carried on, in my opinion, on a very high level, as befits the importance of the subject, because we are today considering a very important matter. Always the discussion of any constitutional matter evokes that sort of consideration.

Limiting the Presidential tenure by constitutional amendment has a long historical background, a background which has been developed admirably by many of the speakers today. There is one aspect, however, that has not been touched upon and to which I will allude in the brief time allotted me.

Since 1914 when the First World War broke out it has seemed to me that there has been a tendency in this world toward political dictatorship. That tendency has evidenced itself in many of the great countries, as well as many of the lesser countries, of Europe. It is also apparent in the Far East. It has shown itself even in our own country. Even today there have been references to "indispensability" under "emergency."

In the period following the Napoleonic wars until the outbreak of the First World War virtually every new government which was brought into being in the world was based upon the idea of representative self-government on a constitutional basis. In that period new governments were based upon the pattern of the United States. Since 1914 there has been scarcely one such government brought into being. Each and every one of them since 1914, almost without exception, has been based upon the idea of a strong man—a dictator. World War II was brought on this generation by the irresponsible actions of power-maddened tyrants.

Mr. Chairman, today we have an opportunity to demonstrate to the people of the United States and to the people of the world that we oppose this tendency toward dictatorial government. We can show that we desire to go back to constitutional government based upon law and not upon men.

By submitting to the legislatures of the several States this constitutional amendment to limit the tenure of the President to not more than two terms, we say that no man shall be permitted to perpetuate himself in that office by the use of the public purse, or by the patronage of office, or by the power of the sword. Ours shall be, more than ever, a government based not upon the fortuity of one man's life, but upon the sure foundation of an ordered representative republic.

Let us pass this joint resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to state that I favor limiting the Presidential tenure of office, by a constitutional amendment, to two 4-year terms. In my opinion, 8 years in office is not too long for a good President, while 4 years is entirely long enough for a poor one.

The third term is not expressly provided against in our Constitution, but historians tell us that the only reason the restriction was not written into it was because the Convention at Philadelphia was violently divided upon the proper terms of years for Presidential tenure of office. Some Delegates wanted 7, others 6, others a limit of two terms of 4 years, so finally the founders struck off the document without settling this particular question. However, the action of the early Presidents and their writings on the subject make the two-term limitation a virtual postscript to the Constitution.

It remained for Washington to set the precedent at two terms; but Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, established it. Jefferson not only consistently refused to consider a third term, despite the urgings of the legislatures of several States, but on innumerable occasion he expressed himself most forcibly about it.

In 1809 Jefferson said:

> If the principle of rotation in office be a sound one, as I conscientiously believe it to be with respect to this office, no pretext should ever be permitted to dispense with it, because there never will be a time when real difficulties will not arise and furnish a plausible pretext for dispensation.

He also said:

> Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after 8 years. I shall follow it. And a few more precedents will oppose the obstacle of habit to anyone after a while who shall endeavor to extend his term.

I cite Jefferson because he is regarded as the patron saint of his party. Next among the Democratic Presidents comes Andrew Jackson. He maintained the Jeffersonian principle and even went further. In his inaugural message on December 1, 1834, he urged a single term of 4 to 6 years and said, in part:

> Could the office be limited to a single period of either 4 or 6 years, I think our liberties would possess an additional safeguard.

Third on the list of Democratic greats comes Grover Cleveland. Cleveland was prophetic in 1894, when he said:

> When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public office once gained, and more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent when a horde of office-holders with a zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with trained political assistance, we recognize in the eligibility of the President for reelection the most serious danger to that calm, deliberate, and intelligent action which must characterize a government of the people.

And finally we come, in the list of great Democratic Presidents, to Woodrow Wilson, who said in 1913:

> It is the "illicit powers" of the Presidents, not their legitimate influence with the country, that the advocates of a constitutional change—to a term of 6 years—profess to be afraid of and I heartily sympathize with them.

These are the words of four Presidents of whom the Democratic Party is most proud. They were men the greatness of whom everybody acknowledges. They were lovers of liberty and sensed the very danger which I ask the Congress to act against.

I could, of course, cite Republican Presidents who have declared for limitation, including Garfield, McKinley, Hayes, and Taft, but the record of the Republican Party on a third term is clear. No convention has ever approved it.

The last Republican President to express himself on the subject was Calvin Coolidge who, in 1928, disposed of the talk of his candidacy with the laconic six-word phrase, "I do not choose to run."

But in that year the United States Senate decided to take no chances that Coolidge might be drafted by the Republican Convention. Six months after the terse Coolidge statement, the Senate passed the La Follette resolution declaring—

> That the precedents established by Washington and Jefferson and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from the Presi-

dential office after the second term has become, by national concurrence, a part of the republican system of government and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 56 to 26, with the Democratic membership voting in a body for it.

I cite this background of Democratic support for limiting the Presidential tenure of office because a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress will be required to pass this legislation. Unless the Democrats, in goodly numbers, support it, a constitutional amendment is impossible. A division along straight party lines will doom this proposal to defeat.

In conclusion, I call upon all Members of Congress to approach this issue with an open mind; to forget politics; to let their conscience be their guide; to accomplish what our founding fathers intended, and what leaders in both parties have long endorsed, by writing into the Constitution a limitation of Presidential tenure to two 4-year terms.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, at the instructions of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most delightful reports I think that has ever been filed in this body. Three different groups have identically the same object in view. Every one of us is trying to be a statesman and do the job that needs doing with regard to Presidential tenure as he sees it. Therefore, there is no fence to cross. There is no place for animosity. It is a happy situation.

I gladly concede to the majority that their bill in their eyes has great merit. I concede that the minority group, with which I am not affiliated, feels just as righteously that their position is the only one that is consonant with the dignity and honor of a free people. For my part and for those of us who favor the Dirksen substitute, we feel just as conscientious in advancing the proposition of a single-term 6-year tenure.

We know the history which has been repeated here so often on the floor since this debate started. We know that single-term tenure was one of the first resolutions adopted in the great Constitutional Convention after 8 days of debate. We know that they fixed it at one term of 7 years, prohibiting reelection.

To my mind, when we come to consider the emergencies through which we have passed, the argument is sound that it was essential to do what the people of the United States did. Be that as it may, whether you agree or not, it is not pertinent in this debate. The point of this debate is, now that the emergencies have passed and we have an opportunity to consider this matter freed of personalities and everything but a sense of our duty, What should be done? I maintain, and my single emphasis here is, that the welfare of the Republic is the sole criterion to be considered, and that, therefore, inasmuch as all of us deplore political considerations and influences beating upon the White House and its occupant, we should consider everything in the light of the best possible service from the occupant of the White House.

Now, those of us who favor the Dirksen substitute insist that the best way to approximate the ideal of perfect service, plus perfect assistants, minus time-killing politics, is the way first adopted by the founding fathers, a single term with no reelection, so that before any man assumes the crushing weight of the Presidency he knows that all he will have to do is to do his job to the best of his ability, with the leadership of Almighty God, and that there can be nothing further from his thoughts than reelection. It automatically frees him of all political thoughts for his own future. It is his one ambition, his single task to do that job for that one term, the best that divine leadership will enable him to do.

The first thing he will have to do is to consider his Cabinet. Do you mean to tell me that a man who has to be reelected in 4 years and who almost certainly has it within his power to renominate himself, would appoint a man from Idaho to his Cabinet, when there was a man from Ohio a candidate for the same position? You know that to propose such an absurdity is to cause a genuine horselaugh. I would get a bronx cheer if I were to propose such a thing at the White House.

I repeat, the President ought to be saved for his own good, for the good of his soul, and for the good of the Nation, from any possibility of having to consider politics. He ought to and he would, if elected for a single term without the possibility of reelection, select the best possible Cabinet that could be assembled. The same principle would permeate throughout all his other appointments. There would be no political incentive. There could be none. Therefore, I believe that that one fact alone, which was the predominant element in the thinking of the founding fathers and which has been endorsed by no less than five Presidents as they were in service in the White House and four other Presidents——

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I would be so happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know my distinguished friend is a great consitutional lawyer and I know he believes firmly in States' rights. He believes, I am certain, that it is proper to submit to the people a question of this character, to amend the Constitution on the tenure of the office of President.

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do, I would say, however, I do not follow the gentleman in his innuendo. I do not think our job as Congressmen is to submit everything that is proposed. I think our job as Congressmen is to decide honestly, as God gives us to see the light, what should be proposed, and not "pass the buck" on to the States just because we want to be good fellows.

Mr. SPRINGER. Since there has been much public discussion throughout the country on this very question, the tenure of the office of President, does not the gentleman believe it is fair to submit the question to the people, because it is a basic problem in our Nation?

Mr. HOBBS. I said in the beginning we were very fortunate to have the opportunity which has been presented at this time by the turn of events in our history, to study dispassionately and decide what is best to submit, and let nothing persuade us to submit any proposal than the best.

The best is the Dirksen substitute to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The 4-year term of office has never meant 4 years of service. Here, twice four is not eight. It takes a new administration considerable time to get organized. The Eightieth Congress was sworn in on January 3, more than a month ago. Although the Speaker and the leadership were all experienced and skilled in legislative work, and although they have worked faithfully, organization has yet to be completed and only one piece of legislation has been passed, consuming less than 1 day on the floor, and it was merely on extension of a minor, old excise tax bill. The executive department is infinitely more difficult and tedious to organize. Much more of its personnel is new. It has been estimated that it takes a year to organize the executive department and get it to working well.

William Howard Taft, Elihu Root, and many other qualified witnesses have pointed out unanswerably that politics wrecks the efficiency of the last year or two of every 4-year term of the President. Such statements have been quoted in this debate and in the reports on the pending resolution.

Therefore, of the nominal duration of a 4-year term, efficient service is rendered in only half or less.

So, a 6-year term would produce at least 5 years of efficient service, since the last 2 years of the 4-year term now devoted to politics would be saved. And because of better, nonpolitical appointments from the Cabinet down, the quality of that 5 years of efficient service would be improved.

Many other good arguments have been and could be urged in favor of the Dirksen substitute. But my time is too limited to rehearse them. I beg your most statesmanlike consideration.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN].

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the adoption of the resolution that would limit the time of the President to two terms. I believe that the people themselves can determine the limit of the term of office by the exercise of the ballot in a free election. While we have free elections, I trust the judgment of the people. I know some are concerned about the danger of a dictatorship and the abolition of free elections if one were to hold office too long. I do not fear that danger. Hitler became a dictator in less than 8 years, and so did Mussolini. If one is in office for 8 years and in that time does not assume dictatorial powers, it is safe

to assume that he does not aim to be a dictator. We should not tie our hands. We should be free to elect anyone we choose in time of emergency or danger. Again I say, I trust the judgment of the people. Give them the unhampered right to exercise it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have these 1¾ minutes to advise the House that at the appropriate time under the 5-minute rule I shall offer an amendment to the resolution which will provide, if adopted, that the matter will be handled by conventions rather than by the State legislatures. In that way, the one issue can be put up to the people whether they want to adopt that amendment to the Constitution. There will not be any extraneous matters involved. The candidates for delegates to the State conventions will be elected upon that one issue and that one issue alone.

At the proper time, Mr. Chairman, I shall offer the amendment. The Constitution provides that it may be done in either manner.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope no effort will be made to limit debate under the 5-minute rule because it is now only 2 o'clock and this is a very important matter. I do hope that broad latitude will be allowed in connection with the debate under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, let me first assure the distinguished minority whip, who was such an able majority leader, that, so far as I know, there is no intention on the part of the leadership at this time to follow the precedent, used so frequently in the recent past, limiting debate under the 5-minute rule. I feel sure that adequate opportunity will be given to our membership to discuss this resolution.

We have had a real live debate. Every phase of this matter has been covered just as fully as it would be if we talked for 5 days, and every Member with any experience in the House knows it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made his usual good talk, and when he finished there was very little remaining to be said in favor of the position he takes. Much of what has been said since then has been repetition. We can get nowhere by repeating the arguments. The debate has developed that the House membership may be divided into three categories: first, those who are opposed to any limitation on the presidential term; second, those who favor a 6-year term; and, third, those who favor a 4-year term, with the limitation that one cannot possibly serve more than 8 years as President. The opponents of the bill are driving for the 6-year limitation, and when the roll is called, if I do not miss my guess, every Member who is opposed to any limitation, as is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], will vote for the 6-year term. You who are familiar with the procedure here, and are acquainted with strategy of one kind or another to defeat a bill, know that the best way to kill a bill or injure it is to vote for all amendments offered regardless of their merits.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fact that he has never followed that procedure which he accuses all of us of following.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is always generous. He is an astute and able leader. He is a past master at strategy.

What is the difference between a 6-year term and a 4-year term? All the arguments that could possibly be advanced for the 6-year term have been presented. I started out as a 6-year term man myself some years ago, but the more I studied, the more I watched, the more I listened, the more I became convinced that if we want to play safe, 4 years, as determined by the forefathers, is the right period.

If we have 6 years, then we have too long a term for an unfortunate Presidential choice, who can only be removed by impeachment. If we have a 4-year term, a good President will be reelected; if he is not good, the people can replace him. Six years is too long when there is a method whereby the people can pass upon the stewardship before hiring the same President for another term.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] says the President will select a proper decent and right type of Cabinet if he knows he is only going to be there for 6 years, and that he may do otherwise if he knows he is only going to be there 4 years. I do not view it that way at all. I know, as a practical matter, that many Cabinet positions are settled at or before the national convention. I know that the votes cast under the party machinery in a national convention have much weight as far as Cabinet positions are concerned. For my part I had rather take a chance on having a President serve for 4 years, knowing that he could not possibly be reelected by the American people unless he served well and unless he had a decent Cabinet.

Long tenure of the office of President leads to an undue concentration of control of government in one man. Over a period of 12 years a President can secure a firm control over the enormous and powerful machinery of Federal administration, including the so-called independent agencies, thus increasing the natural tendency of bureaucracy to behave in an irresponsible manner. The legislature can be made dependent through the Presidential patronage and the Presidential control of party machinery. Even the independence of the judiciary can be influenced indirectly by the appointment of judges whose attitudes are essentially those of the President. This danger of an overconcentration of powers in the hands of one man by long tenure in the Presidential office is much more serious than in the early years of our history because of the greatly increased centralization of powers in the Federal Government.

Another evil result of long tenure is the growth among the people of too great a dependence on a leader. Political apathy is a menace to democracy, and blind faith in a leader inevitably means an indifference to great issues and problems. Along with public apathy there is a stifling of other leaders, so that the capacity for political leadership is weakened.

To safeguard against these evil effects of too long a tenure of office of the Presidency a constitutional amendment is needed. For 150 years the sanction of tradition proved sufficient. Now that the two-term tradition has been broken, however, a longer tenure may well become the practice unless constitutionally forbidden. The argument that a constitutional limitation on tenure evidences a lack of faith in the people by denying them a free choice in the election of their President is plausible but superficial. The point is that the longer a President remains in office the more difficult it is for the people to remove him. This is largely due to the President's great power of patronage. After 8 years of office almost any President can secure his renomination because the use of patronage will have enabled him to control the party machinery. The majority of the voters of the party may prefer another man, but the nomination process is controlled by the party machinery. It is, therefore, not realistic to argue that the voters have a "free choice" in determining whether or not a President shall have a third term. The choice for those voters of the President's party who do not want a third term is to abstain from voting, vote for the candidate of the other party, or vote for the candidate of their own party in spite of the fact that they oppose a third term. The influence of Presidential patronage further restricts a truly democratic election in that a vast number of voters in our present bureaucracy are dependent on the continuance of the administration for their jobs.

Much has been made of the argument that a constitutional limitation on the tenure of the Presidential office would prevent the continuance in office of an experienced President in time of great emergency. This is, in effect, an argument that a particular man is indispensable, an idea that should be completely alien to a democratic society. Furthermore, a President can create an "emergency," or at least the impression of an emergency, and would always be tempted to do so if his tenure were not limited.

In short, the potential abuses and evils of more than two terms of office so far outweigh any conceivable advantages that the people ought in self-protection to amend their Constitution to limit tenure to two terms.

As has been stated, 18 Presidents, from Washington to Franklin Roosevelt, have expressed views on limiting the Presidential term. Excerpts from these statements have been read in the debate; however, if all of the statements made

by all of these 18 Presidents are considered, one will find the consensus of opinion was that there should be a two 4-year-term limitation. True, some of them felt that this has been, and will be, accomplished by respecting the tradition established by Washington and made permanent by Jefferson. None of them, however, spoke after the tradition which they revered had been broken when Mr. Roosevelt was elected for a third and a fourth term, and died before fifth-term nomination was reached.

Mr. Chairman, it is all very interesting to talk about what the forefathers said. That is helpful, but I am more interested at the moment in what the people in this generation think. Within my memory the public during political campaigns has debated the third-term menace from the time Theodore Roosevelt was a candidate for a third term through the Coolidge tenure, as well as the campaigns of 1940 and 1944.

The only real question before the Congress is: Shall we pass this resolution and permit the States to vote "yes" or "no" on the two-term limitation as here proposed?

There has been no general discussion throughout the country about a 6-year term. However, the people do have definite views on limiting the Presidential term. They have considered two terms of not to exceed 4 years each, and, I believe, are fully prepared to pass judgment now. There should be no partisan politics here. This resolution is not aimed at any individual. No personalities are involved at the moment. The real effect of this constitutional amendment will be to give vitality to a tradition which every speaker today insists should be effective.

Yes, the Constitution itself does bind the people in certain particulars and prevents them from doing certain things which they might do under stress, prejudice, and emotion. To argue that the people should never bind themselves so far as future action is concerned is not in keeping with the spirit and purpose of our Constitution.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment should be submitted at once while many of the State legislatures are in session. If this is done, I am fully persuaded that the people through their State representatives will ratify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under the rule, all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be chosen or serve as President of the United States for any term, or be eligible to hold the office of President during any term, if such person shall have theretofore served as President during the whole or any part of each of any two separate terms; but this article shall not prevent any person who may hold the office of President during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all of lines 9, 10, and 11, and on page 2, strike out all of lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any person who has served as President of the United States during all or portions of any two terms, shall thereafter be ineligible to hold the office of President."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. CELLER:

"On pages 1 and 2, strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 'The President and Vice President shall hold their offices during the term of 6 years. No person shall be eligible to the office of President who has previously held such office, but this article shall not affect the term in progress or to which a President and Vice President have been elected at the time of the ratification of this article, nor the eligibility to the office of the President for such term.' "

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this is the so-called Dirksen amendment, which amendment was praised by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

It would provide, in effect, that the tenure of office of the President shall be 6 years, and 6 years only, with no right to be reelected. It would not have any effect upon the present incumbent of the White House, Mr. Truman. I think many Members on our side of the aisle believe that when you have the possibility of 8 years in the White House there is a tendency to squelch new leadership; when young men tend to get in front and have the klieg lights thrown on them they are tugged back by the incumbent in the White House. The incumbent is usually jealous of his power and discourages any heir apparent. That has been the practice for many, many years, not only when the Democrats were in power but when the Republicans were in power. Successors are not groomed, successors are not encouraged. To my mind, a 6-year term would change all that. I believe the country is hurt when you have a man serving one term of 4 years with an overweening ambition to serve a second term, because at the end of 3 years, just as the President reaches the highest point of efficiency, men in this House and men in the other body, and even men and women outside the Congress, start to hunt and hound him; they seek to snipe at him and embarrass him, and thereby destroy his efficiency.

I believe that 8 years in the White House is also bad for party welfare. Two terms as President makes the President undoubted leader of his party, but his leadership becomes personal. He becomes a great concentration of party power.

It is well to repeat what a great Senator from New York, Elihu Root, once said in the other Chamber:

You cannot separate the attempts to beat the President seeking reelection from the attempt to make inefficient the operations of government which the President is carrying on in accordance with his duty.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I simply want to make an inquiry about the effect of the amendment if adopted. A man becomes President, he is sworn in, and 30 days after he is sworn in resigns, dies, or for some reason the office is vacated. The Vice President then ascends to the Presidency. Is the Vice President who becomes President prohibited from succeeding himself?

Mr. CELLER. He would be prohibited.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words, he could only serve the remainder of that term?

Mr. CELLER. The remainder of that Presidential term.

We all know that the last year and a half of the first term of a President is primarily given over to the coming campaign. No President, it matters not how wise or sagacious he may be, can adequately and successfully conduct a campaign for reelection and act for the welfare of his country as President of the United States. Just as oil will not mix with water, those two functions cannot properly mix. We know also that it is not very edifying for the President to descend to the political arena and to indulge in the mud slinging and in the hurly-burly of a political campaign. The President should be above the rough and tumble of a campaign for reelection. The President would, therefore, do a better job because there would not be the hope of reelection. He would not have to cater to selfish groups. The amendment, I think, would make for more statesmanship, more courage in the Presidency because votes would not be in the balance.

Under the two-term rule, the last 18 months of the first term are primarily given over to the coming campaign. A President cannot do both and do both well; that is, conduct a successful campaign for reelection and at the same time conduct the affairs of the Chief Executive for the good of all.

Six years may be too long for a mediocre President. Remember no plan is perfect. Six years, however, is long enough for even the best President.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I happened to have been on the subcommittee which heard the evidence submitted at the hearings held on this particular piece of legislation. We had before us every theory which is here proposed. We had those who did not believe in any change or the submission of any kind of a proposal to the people. We had further the proposal providing for a 6-year term without any

right of reelection. Then we also had bills which proposed two terms of office of 4 years each.

After hearing all of the evidence and hearing all of the statements of witnesses—and may I say there were 16 or 18 of them who submitted their views upon these questions—we came to a conclusion, and I think that conclusion is borne out entirely by statements made by some of our forefathers in their observations with respect to the tenure of the office of President of the United States. We must remember that the people think in the term that a President is elected for 4 years. They have never thought in terms of a President being elected for 6 years and, as some of our forefathers said—Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and others—if we get a bad man, under the theory of a 6-year term, there is no way in the world you can get rid of him within a shorter term. But under the plan of two terms of 4 years each, at the end of 4 years the people have the right and they have the power at the ballot box to terminate the term of office of that official who has not measured up to the standards.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that what we are doing here today is simply writing into the Constitution, if the States adopt the proposal, the so-called two-term tradition that has grown up in our country throughout the years?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct and I wish to thank him for that observation. We are merely proposing to submit by way of this resolution that which has become a custom in this country.

Mr. HALLECK. I just wish to say further that I trust this amendment will be defeated and that we may proceed with the proposal as submitted by the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. As the gentleman has so well said, there has developed a custom in this Nation of ours. We have heard what these various Presidents have had to say upon this question. Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Grover Cleveland, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Calvin Coolidge all have spoken. It did not make any difference who they were or with what party they were affiliated. They were thinking what was best for our country. As was said by Calvin Coolidge—and that is the most recent expression we have on the subject, and that is nearer our day, when we have reached the period at which we have airplanes, when we have radios and when we have all the modern inventions of the age—

It is difficult to conceive how any one man can successfully serve the country for a term of more than 8 years.

That is all we have before us in this resolution. We are offering to propose this resolution to the legislatures of the several States to determine whether or not they concur in this two-term custom that we have known throughout the years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, referring again to the Constitutional Convention, it is well for us to keep in mind that it was necessary for that august body to determine the relative periods of time of service. They first determined that the Members of the legislative branch should be elected every 2 years. They first held that the term of President should be 7 years and he should be ineligible for reelection. They next fixed the term of United States Senator at 6 years, and that it would be a continuing body with one-third elected every 2 years, divided into classes. When the Committee on Revision of Uncompleted Matters in the Constitution made its report originally on September 4, which was debated through the 6th, 8th, and 12th, and finally, when the Committee on Style wrote up the last draft of the Constitution as we have it today, they then fixed the term at 4 years.

The first question that presents itself is this: Why did they fix 2 years for the House of Representatives? Why did they fix 6 years for the Senate? Why did they fix 4 years for the President? The natural answer is this: The Senate was to represent the States. The House of Representatives was to represent the people. The President, as originally proposed in the electoral college, was elected from the States. Consequently, those men felt that there ought to be a balance all the way and all through this argument there must be kept in mind our system of checks and balances: 2 years, 4 years, and 6 years; so much for that phase of it.

The second thing is this: This matter has been repeatedly presented. Since I first spoke, I have been in touch with the Congressional Library. Since 1929 to date, 60 additional amendments have been offered affecting the tenure of office of the President of the United States. All told, there have been 270 amendments affecting the tenure of office of the President of the United States since the adoption of the Constitution. So it is nothing new. In 1889 it was offered; in 1893, in 1908, in 1909, and 1912. These five amendments were all submitted with the idea of limiting the tenure of the President to a single term. In 1894, William J. Bryan introduced three amendments providing for a single-term President, and another one making the President ineligible to succeed himself.

If you will read James Bryce's American Commonwealth, you will find on page 42 that he states that the two-term tenure of the Presidential office has grown into "an unwritten law." Of course, Mr. Bryce's great volume was written before a certain President came into his ascendency about the year 1932, when this "unwritten law" was broken; nevertheless, what has happened can happen again, and we have seen the evils of it.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated, I am in opposition to this substitute amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the observation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], speaking a few moments ago, made the best argument in favor of limiting the tenure of Presidential office that I have so far heard made during this debate.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was speaking in favor of his amendment of limiting the term to one 6-year period, and in the course of his remarks he stated, in substance, that it was well known to everyone that any President who knew that he would be running for reelection spent at least 18 months of his present term in order to campaign for the next term, and because of that fact that he was inefficient in his capacity as the Chief Executive for a period of 18 months.

In making this statement the gentleman from New York has practically admitted that our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, was inefficient as the President of the United States for at least 4½ years. If it is true, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] stated, that the President then in office which, in this case, was Mr. Roosevelt, is inefficient during the last 18 months of his term in office, then Mr. Roosevelt was inefficient for 18 months at the close of his first term, 18 months at the close of his second term, and 18 months at the close of his third term, making 4½ years in all in which he was inefficient.

Following this line of reasoning, and carried to its ultimate conclusion, one can readily see that if a person was perpetuated in office long enough that it would soon develop that for a good many years we would practically be without a President. I was somewhat surprised to hear the gentleman make the assertion that Mr. Roosevelt was inefficient as the Chief Executive for at least 4½ years of his 12 years and 4 months' tenure.

Therefore, I repeat that the gentleman from New York has offered concrete and substantial evidence as to why the term of office of the President of the United States should be limited.

Based on this same line of reasoning, would not one be safe in saying that a person who is elected to serve two 4-year terms in the White House does in reality only serve 5 years, since 18 months off of each term to campaign equals 3 years in which he is not efficient.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 27 proposing a submission to the people of the question whether there should be an amendment to the Constitution to limit the tenure of the President to two terms, and am opposed to the proposed amendment which has been offered to limit the term to one of 6 years.

If we were legislating in a vacuum, there would be much force and logic behind the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and others, that the voters should have a free and untrammelled choice to name the same man to this high office as often as they might wish. Indeed, it is with some reluctance that I reach the conclusion in my own mind that the threat to our democratic processes from the abuses of autocracy

and, therefore, the consummate evil in permitting complete freedom of choice to designate the same person for this office again and again and again transcends in importance and seriousness what I am also prepared to concede is an evil in limiting the freedom of choice of a free people.

Therefore, I hold the view that some restraint upon the tenure of the President is desirable.

It seems to me that the voters of this country are entitled to express their views as to who shall be its Chief Executive oftener than once in 6 years. The point is made that if a President is elected for 6 years, and knows that he can serve no longer, he will be entirely divorced from "politics" and will be able to serve his country without one eye cocked toward the next Presidential election. This argument is not without force. But it seems to me largely a question of the caliber of the man, not the length of his tenure which will determine whether he puts politics or the welfare of his country first.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it not a fact that this Government of ours is the only Government in the world where the people have created a supreme law to save themselves from themselves?

Mr. KEATING. I think so.

Furthermore, it is submitted that "politics" is a much maligned and misunderstood expression.

If it means that he will keep his ear to the ground, remain ever mindful of the wishes of a majority of the people of this country, and, eschewing blind subservience to such majority opinion, yet always weigh carefully the expressed desires and aspirations of the greatest number in arriving at his final conclusions, then, to my way of thinking, that kind of "politics" is more to be encouraged than condemned.

A President who holds himself aloof in an "ivory tower" for 6 years will not do the best job for the country. It is highly desirable, it seems to me, to require him to go to the people after serving for 4 years, tell them what he has done, and ask them for support for the continuance of those policies for another 4 years.

The distinguished gentleman from Alabama has made the point that one of the most important jobs for any President is to select a Cabinet of capable men to carry on the important duties entrusted to them. He argues that a President is less likely to make selections dictated by political considerations and more likely to name to these high offices men of outstanding ability in their field if he knows that he is serving for one term and cannot serve again.

Here, too, it seems to me, the nub of the problem is not the machinery, but the man. One can conceive of a situation where just the opposite to the picture painted by the gentleman from Alabama would be true, where a President, not actuated by the high motives which should guide him, might feel: "Here is my chance, at long last. I can name my cronies to office and fill my Cabinet with my friends from my own State, and nothing can ever be done about it. I am sitting here for 6 years. At last I have a chance to reward my friends, and nobody can throw me out."

On the other hand, if the President knows that at the end of one term, if he seeks reelection, as seems to be the habit of Presidents, he will have to justify before the bar of public opinion the selection of teammates which he has made, he will be more, not less, apt to name men of high caliber to those positions.

I have one final thought for the serious consideration of this body. Most of us feel, as I have said, that events have demonstrated the need for some limitation of tenure. That seems to me the paramount objective. While I differ with those who favor a single 6-year term, I would shed no tears over that eventual result.

It seems to me there is a very practical consideration here in accomplishing what I have described as "our paramount objective." The 4-year term of President is firmly embedded in the finest traditions of our great country. It is no small task to secure the approval of the legislatures of three-quarters of the States. It is my considered judgment that there is a very much greater likelihood that the people, when they finally pass upon this question through their elected representatives on their home grounds, will support a limitation which retains the 4-year tradition and also gives them a more frequent voice in the selection of their President than is likely to be the case if the 6-year proposition is submitted to them.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think my very able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has just announced the real principle that lies back of this proposed legislation which is being so actively supported by those on his side of the aisle. If I understood him correctly, his pronouncement is that it is sometimes necessary that Congress pass legislation like this in order to help the people to save themselves.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. That was also laid down in the fundamental law, and here we are proposing to let the people decide whether or not they want to save themselves from what they have gone through during the last 12 years.

Mr. THOMASON. I still think I understand what my distinguished friend said, which is, in substance, that the Congress must do something to help the people save themselves from themselves. That is genuine Republican doctrine. I just want to make it plain for the RECORD before it is closed today that that is not my political faith and I do not subscribe to that viewpoint. I believe everybody agrees that one of the greatest men this country ever produced or that the world ever knew was George Washington. I quote verbatim his words when he decided that he did not want to be elected to a third term. He said he "saw no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who in some emergency shall be deemed most capable of serving the public." I believe I can show with facts and figures that the people have spoken very definitely on this very subject. They did it in 1940 and again in 1944. The timing of this legislation is quite interesting and in some respects a little suspicious to me. My friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], new chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary, made some predictions about the ultimate outcome of this bill; so if predictions are in order, I make the prediction that regardless of what form this bill takes when the time comes for a roll call on the bill every man on the Republican side is going to vote for this legislation. The skids are greased and the Republicans will follow their leaders. I make one reservation. If some Member in an unguarded moment should offer an amendment here which would include Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, you will witness more running for cover than ever happened in this historic hall. In that event, I cannot predict the outcome. But I do not anticipate anything like that. I was here in the days of Mr. Hoover; and I remember a good many things that happened in the days of Mr. Harding and Mr. Coolidge.

During the last 14 years under the Democratic administration I have never known or heard of any such enthusiasm for this rush legislation until the convening of this new Congress, of which the Republicans comprise such an overwhelming majority. You have come fresh from the people who in the exercise of their calm, deliberate, political judgment elected you. Yet, you now announce the astounding principle that you cannot trust the people. I am not dealing in personalities, but I remember back in the dark days of 1932, under the Hoover administration, 8,000 banks closed and 15,000,000 people were unemployed. We were on the verge of internal revolution. The people, these same persons you are not now willing to trust, elected a new President. Fear was banished, new hope was inspired, and peace, employment, and prosperity started its slow march back up the hill. The country had a new leader and Commander in Chief in whom they had confidence. In that election Franklin D. Roosevelt received 22,821,837 votes. His opponent, Mr. Hoover, received 15,761,841 votes. Mr. Roosevelt received 472 votes in the electoral college and Mr. Hoover received 59.

In 1933 and 1934 the chaos that had prevailed for 3 or 4 years prior thereto was converted into prosperity and confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, that prosperity and internal peace came back to the country. And in 1936 the same Mr. Roosevelt was reelected and received 27,476,673 votes. And Mr. Landon received 16,679,583 votes. Mr. Roosevelt received 523 votes in the electoral college and Mr. Landon received 8. I repeat 8. That was the people speaking in a free, honest, democratic election. The Republicans have said on this floor today we must have a check on the people lest they destroy themselves. I am one of those who believe in a free democratic government, and I would give the people more rather than less power. I do not fear the majority of the sovereign people, and the votes of a free people cast at an honest election, with an honest count. No person or political party has ever raised any question about the honesty and fairness of our national elections. The proponents of the bill say that they want the people to speak. I contend the people spoke on this very question in no uncertain terms in 1940 and again in 1944. The Republicans say we must send the question back to some logrolling State legislatures. In the election of 1940, when Roosevelt was up for the third term, that was the one big issue of the Republicans and a few Democrats who opposed Roosevelt.

In that election Mr. Roosevelt received 27,243,466 votes and Mr. Willkie received 22,304,755 votes. Mr. Roosevelt received 449 electoral votes and Mr. Willkie received 82.

That is the situation to which George Washington referred away back in the early days of the Republic.

The war clouds were getting lower and lower every day in Europe and the people realized that we had a leader in whom the American people, the common people of this country as well as liberty-loving people of all the world, had confidence. So the people sent Franklin Delano Roosevelt back to the White House. I think, if possible, they might have risen up and demanded his reelection even if this resolution had then been the law. Some of my Republican friends talk as if they fear resurrection.

In 1944, while our boys by the million were scattered all over the world in a war where our very life and liberty were at stake, the people rose up again—not Mr. Roosevelt—but the people rose up again for even a fourth term, and gave him 25,603,152 votes and they gave Mr. Dewey 22,006,616 votes. Mr. Roosevelt received 432 electoral votes and Mr. Dewey 99. An interesting fact is that when you add all of the electoral votes cast in all four of the last elections, all four Republican candidates received 248 electoral votes, which was 18 short of the necessary number for election. That, my friends, is democracy in action. That is a free people exercising their right of franchise.

A great many predictions have been made here today. I will venture one more. In view of the history of that record, where the sovereign people of a free nation were speaking, I venture another prediction—and I thank God no such situation prevailed—but if that terrible World War II were still raging today and Franklin D. Roosevelt were still alive, and in good health, I predict the people of this country would again elect him in 1948. He was a great leader. He had his faults and made his mistakes, but he whipped a depression when our people were in despair and he was our gallant leader in winning the most cruel war in human history.

I join with you in hoping and trusting that no emergency will ever arise in the future that will make necessary either a third or fourth term. We still live in a sick world. Enduring peace is not yet assured. Atomic bombs may get in the hands of potential enemies. If an emergency such as George Washington predicted, or such as we faced in 1941, should ever arise again, I want the President, be he Democrat or Republican, to finish the job if he possesses unusual qualities of leadership. Anyway, I will trust the people more than a politically minded Congress and some meek State legislatures.

Our Constitution has been amended 21 times. It was always to increase and to enlarge the power of the people. With me, the people are sovereign, and can do whatever they wish. They make few mistakes in elections and are quick to correct those they do make. I want them to have more rather than less power.

It is passing strange the haste with which this bill was reported. I understand the committee considered it for 2 days and we can debate it for only 2 hours. It bears all the earmarks of politics. Some people just cannot forget. Some like to nurse grudges even after death. Why not take reasonable time for such an important matter as amending the Constitution? How about some of the promises made last fall to reduce taxes, stop strikes, and shoot the Communists? We have been in session 6 weeks. We have only voted on one bill to retain excise taxes, which the Republicans voted for after their leaders had said they would repeal it.

This resolution ought to be recommitted for careful study, and let us take up some important matters that mean so much for the happiness and prosperity of our people.

I shall vote against the resolution and all amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard many appeals to leave this question to the people. The only way in which the people can express themselves on this subject, is for their representatives in Congress to propose by constitutional means that their representatives in the States vote on whether they want to make the unwritten law of the third term part of the written law of the Constitution. Now, when this can be done as a matter of principle, divorced from personalities and partisan politics. The best way in which the idolators of our late President could insure the special place they feel he should occupy in our history would be to join in breaking the mold that made the third and fourth terms possible and thus have him hold forever a unique place in American history.

Without going into past history, however, which has been so exhaustively brought before this body today, I want to call attention to contemporary world history. All over the world constitutional representative democracy, republican government, is under attack. There are those all over the world who are saying that representative democracy is decadent, that politicians who are elected to public office cannot be trusted to act in the public interest for fear they will be defeated, and who are therefore attempting a perpetuation in power of individual leaders in personal dictatorships. By the two-term proposal which the committee has made we answer these attacks on our form of government that come from all over the world. It is because of this aspect of the two-term proposition that, I who originally supported the 6-year idea, am now opposed to the Celler 6-year amendment. By the proposal made by the committee for one term, with a possibility of reelection to a second term, we say to the world that we do not think that the whole history of America is wrong, and that a President who is a possible candidate for reelection cannot be trusted to act with patriotism, wisdom, or efficiency. Every President since the founding of the Republic has been a possible candidate for reelection. We do not think this sullied the service of every one of them. That is the implication of the single-term proposal. The average tenure of our Presidents has been about 5 years. The type of politics whereby the President continues to be responsive to the views of the people and to public opinion is not a bad thing. We think that part of representative democracy is a good thing.

On the other hand, we recognize the dangers involved in perpetuation in office which finally amounts to personal dictatorship, the sort of perpetuation which Thomas Jefferson described as monocracy. He used that term as something different from monarchy, monocracy being power concentrated in one elected official. We recognize that after 8 years, with the patronage, with the other powers that rest in the hands of a modern President, we may have a tendency toward perpetuation in power of one man. Therefore, the Congress, by this proposal to the people today, does not say that we think that the President and the Members of the two bodies of Congress cannot be trusted to act wisely, if they are candidates to succeed themselves. By this logic if mere candidacy for public office automatically unfits a man to serve in public office, then this vice applies to a new man as well as to an incumbent, and the President and all public officials should be appointed; by whom, would be a puzzle under this logic, as election would automatically unfit anyone for exercising the appointing power. This is the sort of logic that leads to dictatorship, to fascism, to communism. We say that the old way of the Republic is a good way, but we are going to propose that the people through their representatives can put into the Constitution a bar against perpetuation in office which is such a danger to free government all over the world, a danger which has become more increasingly apparent every day.

There is another consideration I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House. The 6-year proposal eliminates automatically many possible candidates for President because of age. If you check on the ages of many of our Presidents and many of our prospective candidates, you will realize that they may be acceptable candidates for a 4-year term, but they would be too old to be considered for a 6-year term. This is a delicate subject. A 6-year term might eliminate certain of our leaders who will be elder statesmen in 1948 and at other times in the future, although they might otherwise be extremely available. I do not believe in indispensable men, but we make more men available by a 4-year term than by a 6-year term.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object at this time, the Members who have been speaking held themselves to the 5-minute rule. There is no desire over here to be unreasonable. The gentleman from Texas had 10 minutes. But we do want to move along as expeditiously as we can. I am not going to object to this request but hereafter I shall have to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman's observation is a fair one except in the case of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. He is a member of the committee and was attending important official duties elsewhere during general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has made two of what he terms strong points in favor of the resolution. Anyway, they are the points upon which he rests his argument. The first is that the only way the people can express themselves on this proposition is by passing the pending resolution and submitting the matter to the legislatures of the various States. We all know there is a difference between people expressing themselves on a matter and the legislatures of the various States passing on the question. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to let the people by a majority vote decide every 4 years whether they want to continue a man in the office of Presidency and not let the legislatures which are not the people decide whether the people should have that right. The Colmer amendment requiring submission to conventions in the States for a vote on the proposal is more democratic than the legislative method.

I certainly believe it is more democratic to let the people of the future generations, in view of the facts submitted to them and with which they may be confronted at that time, decide for themselves whether they want a President to carry on for one term, two terms, or three terms.

The second allegedly strong point the gentleman from Ohio made was that all over the world constitutional democracy is under attack. Well, it is under attack here in the House of Representatives this afternoon also. Throughout the history of our democracy, throughout the history of our Government, we have seen the citizens assume one responsibility after another. The democratic processes have been enlarged, first, by the adoption of the amendment to elect Senators direct instead of through the legislatures. We have even gotten away, for all practical purposes, from the idea in the Constitution that the people have no real choice in the election of the President, that the electors elect the President. So that is another responsibility assumed by the people. Then by appropriate amendments a large section of our population has been given citizenship and the right of franchise. This also is an enlargement of the democratic processes.

Another extension is that we have made it possible to collect tax incomes according to the ability of the people to pay. We have passed the lame-duck amendment, which is still another enlargement of our democratic process. Then, by an appropriate amendment, we gave the right of franchise to the women of this Nation. All of these are enlargements of the democratic process showing that the people of the United States felt that additional people were capable of citizenship and of exercise of the franchise; that they should have a larger hand in the selection of their officials; that more people should have the right to vote. Yet, the gentleman from Ohio says that if we fail to pass this amendment we will be saying to the people of the world that we do not trust the democratic process. I say just the opposite is true.

I regret that the majority party in this Congress as its very first move should show distrust of the majority of the people and of future generations to govern themselves. I regret that they feel that they were bridled and put in a strait-jacket.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of the substitute amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman would read the report he would see that I am not for any of the limitations.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. This proposed amendment could also be initiated by two-thirds of the State legislatures calling a constitutional convention, could it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is quite right. That is one of the ways of proposing an amendment, and I have not heard of any legislature going on record as favoring this one.

Mr. Chairman, it seems very strange to me that during the time that President Grant was considering running for a third time, when the Republican Party was in charge of both Houses of Congress, that no one espoused any constitutional amendment to prohibit the President from serving a third term. After he made his great tour of the world and came back, he came within 50 votes of getting nominated, or of getting enough votes in the Republican Convention to run for a third term.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. On 36 ballots in that convention he received 303 votes. The highest he got was 313, a majority on every ballot, with 378 votes necessary—and the third term was not what defeated him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. Another very interesting thing is that both Houses of Congress were under the control of the Republican Party in 1927 and 1928, when President Coolidge was considering running for a third term. Did the Republican Party at that time espouse any amendment to prevent him from doing so? Let it be said also that President Coolidge would not have supported this amendment. I have here his statement. He said that to prohibit a President from serving a third term, where he served two full terms, might be in the public interest, but that should not apply where he served only one term and a part of another. He was protecting himself. What have the people of America done to all of a sudden cause a majority party in Congress to say that it does not have confidence in the integrity and the wisdom of the people? The only thing they have done is to elect Franklin Roosevelt for a third term. Yet, are you gentlemen going to contend that the people of 45 States were misled and ignorant, that they did not know what they were doing, and that they need your protection from ever again getting the services of a great leader in time of a crisis? You know it is a very strange thing that the majority party is getting away from the idea of its founders. Alexander Hamilton made the strongest arguments against this amendment that I have ever read. He stated in a very straightforward way five good reasons why it should not be adopted.

They have gotten away from the concepts of their leaders. James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris, Roger Sherman, and many other members of the Constitutional Convention had very strong ideas about it. They were opposed to a restriction of tenure. George Washington did not mention the matter once in the debate. He voted for the Constitution and later, in a letter to Lafayette, stated that he did not join those who stated that the nations should not be able to avail themselves of the services of any man no matter for how many terms. So I cannot see any situation that would require the passage of this resolution, unless we want to admit that we do not think the majority of the people have the judgment to steer their own political destiny in the future.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has made an admirable statement showing how during the course of our history we have traveled in the direction of greater democratic control. Would not the adoption of this resolution in any form be a reversal of that trend?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be giving notice to the world that the House of Representatives of the United States feit that the great democratic people of America did not have enough judgment to select the official they wanted in the years to come. I think it would be a reflection. It would be an argument against other nations adopting the democratic process, rather than an argument for it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat perturbed at the distressed way in which my distinguished colleague from Tennessee has stuck in the bark here today and ducked the question. He says that when we vote to submit this proposal to the legislatures of the States we have denied the people the right to determine this question. The opponents of this measure are the men who are afraid of the people. We propose to submit it to the legislatures of the States and let three-fourths of the States, speaking through their legislatures, elected by the people, ratify this amendment. Until then, of course, it is not a part of the Constitution.

We are in the cold, gray dawn of the morning after the night before. We have had four terms of the gentleman around whom this debate revolves. I believe in the resurrection of the dead and the life eternal, but know nothing in anybody's theology that indicates that F. D. R. will ever rise from the dead and run again for President, so it could not be aimed at him.

For a long time the people of this country were told what the New Deal had done for them. They are finally aware of what it has done to them. Our friends are now saying to this Congress and to the people that the New Deal has gotten us into such a heck of a shape that we cannot reduce taxes, we cannot lower the budget, we cannot cut Federal employment, we cannot pay anything on the national debt; we just have to go on and be ground between the upper and the nether millstones from now on. It is to prevent a repetition of that sort of thing, from which the people on November 5, 1946, freed themselves, that this resolution was introduced. It will take a long time to cure this evil.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it should be noted that undoubtedly the people on the other side of the aisle think that in 1948 their candidate will win the Presidency, and on our side of the aisle we have some very high hopes that our candidate will win. We are not looking to the past, we are looking to the future. The adoption of this resolution, if it ultimately is approved by enough of the States to make it effective, is certainly not directed against any one side in any partisan sense at all, but is rather, as I have said before, simply a writing into the Constitution of what has grown up to be in the minds of the people a good practice and tradition. It is not, as I view it, any reflection on anybody, and certainly no reflection on the capacity of the people to undertake to determine for themselves what they want to do.

Mr. JENNINGS. Of course not.

Mr. HALLECK. It will be as effective against a Republican President or a Democratic President who might be in office if the proposal is written into the Constitution.

Mr. JENNINGS. There is no question about that. I was asked this morning about certain elections that took place in my State. The highest tidal wave reached by the New Deal was in 1936. That ought to be known as the great relief year. Down in my State they had relief that ranged all the way from money to grapefruit and hams. There was such an abundance of it that it broke down the warehouses where it was stored. In other words, we had a manifestation of the power of a national administration when it is held together by the cohesive power of public plunder and when they can take the money of the people and finance their campaigns. We do not want that to happen again in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the Seventy-sixth Congress, on Mary 4, 1940, I introduced the first bill limiting the President of the United States to two terms. I took this step 7 years ago because I thought the policy of serving only two terms, which was inaugurated by George Washington, our first President, ought to be set forth in the Constitution. I think so today.

You will recall in 1940, the dictators of Europe were on the march. The war clouds hung low and the world was in turmoil. Abhorring as I always have, the centralization of power, I did not want anyone to assume such authority here in our own land.

I therefore introduced the following resolution which is almost identical to the measure which the committee has brought on the floor today. I urge the Congress to pass it so we can assure the American people that no one man can ever perpetuate himself in the White House forever.

Our Constitution cannot be abided by with concentrated authority in the hands of the executive branch. The natural love for power that men in high places often have is increased the longer they remain at the helm. They tend to shape the destiny of a whole people according to their own single mind if allowed to go unchecked.

For this reason, this Congress should take action now. Let us limit the length of time any President may serve, regardless of party. Let us guarantee America that dictatorship shall never place its yoke on this fair land.

To make my record clear, I will read to you the Hall resolution of 1940. I am so glad the House at this time is to pass one so similar to it.

House Joint Resolution 480

Joint resolution prohibiting payment of compensation for President during his third term of office

Resolved, etc., That no part of any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made shall be available to pay compensation of any President for any period during which he is executing that office during a third term.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I cannot agree with the excited gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] about what was done back in 1936; because at that time we were developing the Tennessee Valley Authority which has done more for that area than anything else that has ever been done by any State or the Federal Government.

But I am delighted to see my Republican friends get around to reading the Confederate Constitution. You know, in 1861 when the Confederate Constitutional Convention met, it was composed of the finest minds in America. At that time we were on the verge of war. At that time we had Jefferson Davis, one of the ablest military men in history as President of the Confederacy. They wrote into the Constitution of the Confederacy a provision that limited the Presidential term to 6 years, and provided that the President could not succeed himself.

At that time there had only been five men who had served 8 years as President—George Washington and four Democrats, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson. Up until today there has been only one Republican President who has ever served 8 years in the history of our country. That was Ulysses S. Grant. You have had two Republicans elected twice and both of them unfortunately were assassinated. They were Lincoln and McKinley. Theodore Roosevelt served out an unexpired term, then was elected for a full term. Calvin Coolidge served out an unexpired term and then was elected for a full term. But we have had, I believe, seven Democrats, including the four I have just mentioned, to serve as President 8 years each. Cleveland served 8 years, not consecutively. Wilson served 8 years consecutively. Roosevelt was elected for 16 years but served a little over 12 years.

I am going to support this amendment providing it is not amended. I believe the American people have a right to pass on this proposition. I cannot see that it involves any partisan politics. I do not agree with these attacks on President Roosevelt at all. We might as well attack Calvin Coolidge and say, "What if he had been elected for a third term?"

This is a matter that involves the future of this country, and I believe the overwhelming majority of the American people would agree to this limitation. I would prefer to see it changed to some extent, but I would rather have it limited to two 4-year terms than to have it one 6-year term. I say that with all deference to those who wrote the Constitution of the Confederacy, which has been pronounced by some of the greatest constitutional students of all times as the greatest document of its kind ever written. It almost paralleled the Constitution of the United States, with this and a few other changes.

I make this statement because it is the only opportunity I have to express my views on it. If the people of the United States do not want to adopt it, that is up to them. But I think under the circumstances, since the matter is before us, it is my duty to vote to submit it to the American people, unless it is altered to the point where I cannot afford to do so.

Therefore, if it is submitted finally in the form in which it came from the committee, I shall vote to submit it to the various States for approval or disapproval. Then the American people will have the right to pass upon it. I do not think it will wreck the Republic whether we pass it or whether we do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

In the situation here today, Mr. Chairman, we have the majority party starting out to limit the term of the President to two 4-year terms. It is strange that this should be the second piece of business before this House. It is evident to me that they are expressing their resentment for a man who has passed. They are permitting their feelings to override their judgment.

One of the previous speakers gave as a point in favor of his argument that in 1936 the people's money was used to win the election. At that time the late Franklin D. Roosevelt had been in office only 4 years. That argument could not be used as a substantial one to support this contention here today.

I am not in favor of a 6-year term, because if a man is not good for a second term why should he be elected for 6 years? It is better to have him go before the people at the end of 4 years and have him meet the public than it is to have him serve out a 6-year term. Therefore, I shall vote against that particular amendment. Sooner or later it may be that the Republicans will have a President who will have served two full terms of 4 years each, and there might be a national emergency and the people of this country might want to call on that Republican to serve them for a third 4-year term. If you put the people in the position of not being able to exercise that prerogative, it would be unfair to this democracy. I say to you that this is not a proposal that will work for the benefit of the people. It is merely a proposal to express resentment because a particular party had not been able to overcome a certain leader in this country.

I hope we will vote down the amendment and vote down the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle in their endeavor to keep the resolution (H. J. Res. 27) now before the House above partisan politics. The attempt has been in vain, in my opinion. We ought to face the facts behind the resolution. As Republicans, it seems to me that we do not want to impose upon our country again one-man government such as we have had for the past 14 years, be he a Republican or a Democrat, be it Roosevelt or somebody else.

Our Democratic friends argue that this resolution is aimed at the late President and, therefore, is loaded with venom toward his work and his memory. Naturally there has been some reference to him because he is the man who held the office and built up such political power during his many administrations. It will be necessary, in the next few years, to dissolve much of the power that he created because it is not to the best interest of our Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the opposition party has stressed the necessity for continued election of an individual in case of a great emergency. We have had enough of man-made emergencies but it is easy to see the reason for the argument. It will require many years to eliminate the blight of new dealism. The idea that one man alone is able to run this Government in any emergency is repugnant to my concept of constitutional government. If we rely on that theory then our Government is in a perilous situation. We do not accept that theory for it is fallacious and contrary to fact. When Mr. Roosevelt died he was succeeded by Harry S. Truman, yet we have carried on, there has been no cessation of government. Woodrow Wilson said in 1912: "There is no indispensable man." And there is not. The great Thomas Jefferson likewise stated with much persuasiveness that no emergency should be permitted to break down the two-term tradition. All of the outstanding Democrats, except Roosevelt, stood by the tradition.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that should be submitted to the people; it involves their welfare. Passage of House Joint Resolution 27 will permit the people to decide. I urge its adoption by this House because it is in the public interest.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for the remaining 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee today will defeat the provision for one term of 6 years. It seems to me that if we are to keep both the Presidency and the legislative form of our Government responsive to the people it is necessary that we have a review of the first 4 years of any Presidential term. I was rather amazed during the remarks of the gentleman from Texas to hear his statement about the demand of this country for the election in the emergency or the nomination in the emergency of the late President Roosevelt for his third term in 1940. I remember quite clearly some of my distinguished Democratic friends coming back from the Democratic Convention in Chicago and advising of the fact that the closest man to Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Harry Hopkins, was in charge of his campaign for the demand for the third term. As I think back to the events during the immediate time when we got into this war I remember there was one particular columnist in whose column I had a great deal of confidence. When I got down to Washington I was very much surprised to find that he was a registered agent for one of the particular foreign powers that was interested very much in getting us into this war.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that Carter Glass, Jim Farley, and Jack Garner all broke with Roosevelt over the third-term issue?

Mr. O'HARA. That is correct. I want to call attention again to what the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said so well, and to call attention to influences that enter into our everyday lives and elections today and yesterday as to who is to be President of the United States. You have all these foreign countries attempting to influence who should be President of the United States. It is not just the people speaking, but many influences from foreign countries—people and factions interested in who is going to be the next President of the United States and in their interests and not of America's. Is it not a protection to the theory and tradition surrounding the Presidency that so far as possible we keep it controlled by the people of the United States and not these foreign influences that will come along and want the continuation of a particular party or particular individual as President? Surely we who are here today live so close to the shattered precedents of the past as to realize that if we lived in England, under English law, as a matter of the common law the President would be limited to two terms. Now, in this country let us do what the people want and pass this bill for this, Mr. Chairman. It is the only practical way the question can go to the people and to the State legislatures. I sincerely hope this resolution will pass as reported by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] for the committee amendment.

The substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the committee amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer on page 1, lines 6 and 7. At what time will that amendment be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. After the committee amendment has been disposed of, the gentleman may submit his amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make reference to the committee amendment. As chairman of the committee I assume I am ethically bound not to oppose the committee amendment which was agreed to by a very narrow margin in committee, but I have a feeling that the members of the committee who voted for that amendment would not vote for it if they had the opportunity to vote again in committee. I make that statement because the language of a constitutional amendment is most important, more so than in the case of ordinary legislation. Every comma, every semicolon, every capital letter, every word means something in a constitutional amendment, and under these circumstances we should not lightly adopt language in a constitutional amendment that has not been thoroughly weighed.

This amendment, and I am divulging nothing, was offered by a member of the committee who wrote it out with a pencil during the reading of the resolution for amendment. Grammatically, I am told by the expert draftsman of this House, the language is not the language that should be embodied in a constitutional amendment. Of course, I did not vote for the amendment, but I did vote to report the bill and I think I may be pardoned for this explanation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that was adopted by the Judiciary Committee, offered, incidentally, by a majority member of the committee, was the only language considered with any care by the committee. Why the distinguished chairman of the committee would state that in the event the members of the committee had an opportunity to vote again the vote would be other than what it was is something I cannot understand.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I want to agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is now saying. We carefully, deliberately, thoughtfully considered the language that we adopted by a majority vote of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is crystal clear. I do not think that the criticism is well founded or that it has any merit whatever.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I have had occasion to examine the amendment. It is simply a change of verbiage which improves the grammar, that is all.

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about that. The gentleman who offered the amendment made a very careful analysis of the language contained in the resolution, then offered this amendment because in his judgment and in the judgment of a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary the language agreed upon improved the language originally proposed.

I do not think the chairman of our great committee ought to come to the floor of the House and state that the committee would not have done what was done in the event it had another opportunity to vote on this particular amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to be misunderstood. We considered the amendment for about 5 minutes, I think the gentleman will agree. It was a penciled memorandum, such as an amendment that is offered on the floor. No attention was given at all to the language, and that is what I meant. I am not saying that the intent of the amendment is not what was intended. I am saying that the language in the resolution was given very careful consideration.

Mr. WALTER. By whom was it given consideration?

Mr. MICHENER. Why, at least, the hearings in the Senate in 1940, the hearings in the House in 1945 and the hearings in the Senate in 1945 were considered. I am not going to oppose it. I just want to be on record, because I am confident that this language as now written in the amendment will not go into the Constitution after some of the people who did support it give it further consideration.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know where the gentleman gets his information from. All I know is that our committee considered this language very carefully and we, by majority vote, concluded that it was an improvement over the language as originally written.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee of the Whole is now in the rather interesting position, as I see it, of this resolution being reported out only yesterday. The chairman of the committee says that if a majority of the committee had another opportunity to vote for this today, they would vote entirely different than they did only yesterday, and if I construe the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], he was in a backhanded way politely suggesting to the Committee of the Whole to defeat the committee amendment and adopt the original verbiage, and my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], at least supports the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now, where does that leave our friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that after this confusion, more or less, it might be a good time to recommit this measure to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. COLMER:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, after the word "by" strike out the words "the legislatures of" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "conventions in."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the words "the legislatures of" and insert the words "conventions in."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, including the 5 minutes to which the gentleman from Mississippi is entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very simple. It is not subject to misconstruction. It simply provides that if the resolution is adopted it will be either ratified or not ratified, as the case may be, by conventions called in the several States for that purpose, rather than by the State legislatures. Of course the objective of the amendment is to give the people of the United States an opportunity to pass upon this momentous question without any extraneous matters entering into the discussion.

Article V of the Constitution provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress.

In other words, it is up to this body to say which method shall be adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. While I have taken a position in opposition to any

limitation, to two terms or to one term of 6 years, this is the nearest approach to having a question of this kind submitted to the people. We have heard continuously during the debate that this is going to be submitted to the people for ratification. This is one way the people can act upon it, and the only way they can act.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This is what we are up against. We know as a matter of common knowledge that the members of the State legislatures are elected upon various issues, upon whether or not, for instance, there shall be a tax on dogs, whether there shall be a better educational system, or what have you. Under this amendment, if adopted, the people would select their delegates to the State conventions upon the one issue of whether they wanted to adopt this amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Is it not true that the eighteenth amendment was submitted in the same manner as is sought to be done in this resolution?

Mr. COLMER. It is my understanding that the eighteenth amendment was handled through conventions rather than the State legislatures.

If you want to give the people who have the right to decide this question the opportunity to decide it, this amendment offers you the machinery to do it. What objection can there be by either those who are for or those who are against the principle of limiting the Presidential tenure to adopting this amendment, thereby giving the people an opportunity to express themselves directly by the election of delegates to the conventions upon the one and only issue involved, namely, whether or not the amendment to the Constitution shall be adopted?

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a very important matter. Our forefathers in framing that great document—the Constitution of the United States—debated the question as to whether or not there should be a limitation upon the number of terms a man could serve as President of this great country. There were those who took the position that there might be those ambitious ones who would desire to perpetuate themselves in office, and that the office of President was too powerful to be held by one man longer than two terms. There were others who took the position that this was a matter that the people could decide upon the merits of the time and the man; that there might come a time when the country was in the midst of a life-and-death battle with a foreign foe and that it might not be wise to change at such time. The result was that no prohibition against a man holding the office for more than a specified time was written into the Constitution. Personally, I am of the opinion that the powers and duties of this important office are of such transcending importance, and the duties of the office itself are so onerous and demanding—always resulting in serious impairment of the health of the occupant—that no man should offer himself for more than two terms. But that is my opinion. There are others who feel that there should be no limitation whatever and that a President should have the right to offer himself as a candidate to the people of the country to succeed himself as often as he desired.

But, Mr. Chairman, this country is fundamentally a democracy, and because I am elected to the National Legislature does not qualify me to pass upon that question. Neither is the representative from my county in the State legislature qualified to pass upon that question. My contention is that the people as a whole are qualified to pass upon the question, and that the best way—and, in fact, in my opinion, the only way—that they can directly pass upon the question under the Constitution is to elect the several delegates from the several States to a convention where the only issue in the selection of these delegates will be whether or not the Presidency should be limited to two terms as provided in the pending resolution. I repeat that we all know as a matter of common knowledge that when a man is elected to the State legislature he is elected not upon this issue alone but upon many and varied issues, or upon his personality. This amendment offers the only vehicle through which we can get a clear-cut and unequivocal decision of the people on the question before the House.

I had been very much in hopes that this matter could be decided upon a bipartisan issue and that party politics would not enter into it. The Republican Party, being the majority party here, is fostering this legislation. If they believe that the people want this resolution passed, then why not adopt this amendment and give the people that opportunity?

Mr. Chairman, I am not laboring under any misapprehension. We might as well be candid and realistic. If the Republican leadership are willing for the people to decide this issue, they will favor this amendment and it will be adopted because those on this side of the aisle will support the amendment. On the other hand, if the Republican leadership opposes this amendment, we all know that they have the votes to defeat it. I want to give the people an opportunity to decide it, and I want to vote for this resolution with this amendment written into it as assurance that the people will have that opportunity to pass upon it. I cannot vote for it otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 74, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few observations about some of the remarks made this afternoon. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] clearly indicated that no President made any contribution to the winning of any war and he referred to a remark made by Madison some years ago that we would always have a weak Executive.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman must have misunderstood what I said. I said that no President had participated in winning a war by leading the armies. I said the Chiefs of Staff, the generals, and admirals are the ones who carry on the war. While they consult with the President, yet the President is not the one who is responsible for the winning of a war in such an emergency.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman then admits by his statement that my interpretation of what he originally said is correct, because certainly you have admitted it now in your own language, unless my powers of interpretation are wrong. You are going in a roundabout way, but you come back to what I understood you to say originally.

Mr. SPRINGER. No; I am not going around Robin Hood's barn. The gentleman is going around Robin Hood's barn in respect to what I said.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are talking about Robin Hood's barn. If you want to get personal, we will do that, too.

Mr. SPRINGER. I can engage in personalities, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am engaging in a discussion and not in personalities. I am giving the gentleman an opportunity to explain if I have made any misunderstanding of his statement. Certainly there is nothing of a personal nature involved in that

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I made the statement that the President himself was not the leader of an army in an emergency, but that the generals, admirals, and Chiefs of Staff, and officers of our Army and Navy are the ones who carry out the war. I said, of course, they consulted with the President and he consults with them, but the President is not the one who is directly responsible for the winning of the war in case of an emergency. That is what I said before and that is what I say now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement eliminates the President as a leader in war and as a contributing factor in the determination of the outcome of a war. Does the gentleman take that position?

Mr. SPRINGER. I did not say that at all. I said he consults with the generals.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman gives sole credit to the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Navy?

Mr. SPRINGER. I said they consulted, and they do consult, but the President does not lead the Army.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the history of our country we have had Presidents who have been strong factors and strong leaders in wartime.

Mr. SPRINGER. Not when they were sitting as President of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course we have.

Mr. SPRINGER. They consulted.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Who was it that stepped up Eisenhower fourteen or fifteen points in order to make him Commander in Chief and win the war? Who was responsible for Marshall being made Chief of Staff?

Mr. McCORMACK. Very well, let us go back to 1861 when a man by the name of Abraham Lincoln was President and a great President. Lincoln did not know whom he could trust of those around him. He did not know what generals he could trust for a number of years until Grant came across the horizon.

According to history, Abraham Lincoln did not know what members of his Cabinet he could trust. Abraham Lincoln was the personality that led our country to victory in the War Between the States. If ever a President during wartime was a leader, not only of our civil government but in time of war, it was Lincoln. It was not until 1863, or thereabouts, that Grant came across the horizon. Prior to that time and during the remainder of the War Between the States it was Lincoln who was the leader of the civil government and also the leader of the armed forces.

When the gentleman makes the statement he does, making it in good faith, I give him back the leadership of Abraham Lincoln during the War Between the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOLCOTT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 25), pursuant to House Resolution 91, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 121, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—285

Allen, Calif.	Andrews, N. Y.	Barrett
Allen, Ill.	Angell	Beall
Allen, La.	Arends	Bell
Andersen, H. Carl	Arnold	Bender
	Auchincloss	Bennett, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Bakewell	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Banta	Bishop
	Barden	Blackney
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Pace
Bolton	Hart	Patterson
Boykin	Hartley	Philbin
Bradley, Calif.	Hedrick	Phillips, Calif.
Bradley, Mich.	Herter	Phillips, Tenn.
Brehm	Heselton	Ploeser
Brooks	Hess	Plumley
Brophy	Hill	Poage
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Poulson
Buck	Hoeven	Ramey
Buffett	Hoffman	Rankin
Burke	Holmes	Redden
Busbey	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Butler	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Howell	Rees
Canfield	Hull	Reeves
Carson	Jackson, Calif.	Rich
Case, N. J.	Jarman	Richards
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Riehlman
Chadwick	Jenison	Riley
Chapman	Jenkins, Ohio	Rivers
Chenoweth	Jenkins, Pa.	Rizley
Chiperfield	Jennings	Robertson
Church	Jensen	Robsion
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Rockwell
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Clippinger	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Mass.
Coffin	Jones, N. C.	Rohrbough
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ohio	Ross
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Russell
Corbett	Jonkman	Sadlak
Cotton	Judd	St. George
Cox	Kean	Sanborn
Crawford	Kearney	Sarbacher
Crow	Kearns	Schwabe, Mo.
Cunningham	Keating	Schwabe, Okla.
Curtis	Keefe	Scoblick
Dague	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Ga.	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Scrivner
Devitt	Kilday	Seely-Brown
D'Ewart	Knutson	Shafer
Dirksen	Kunkel	Short
Dolliver	Landis	Simpson, Ill.
Domengeaux	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Dondero	Latham	Smathers
Dorn	Lea	Smith, Kans.
Doughton	LeCompte	Smith, Maine
Drewry	LeFevre	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Lemke	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lewis	Smith, Wis.
Ellis	Lodge	Snyder
Ellsworth	Love	Springer
Elsaesser	McConnell	Stanley
Elston	McCowen	Stefan
Engel, Mich.	McDonough	Stevenson
Engle, Calif.	McDowell	Stockman
Fellows	McGarvey	Stratton
Fenton	McGregor	Sundstrom
Fisher	McMahon	Taber
Fletcher	McMillen, Ill.	Talle
Foote	MacKinnon	Taylor
Fuller	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Fulton	Maloney	Tibbott
Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.	Tollefson
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	Towe
Gathings	Mason	Twyman
Gavin	Mathews	Vail
Gearhart	Meade, Ky.	Van Zandt
Gerlach	Meade, Md.	Vinson
Gifford	Merrow	Vorys
Gillette	Meyer	Vursell
Gillie	Michener	Wadsworth
Goff	Miller, Conn.	Weichel
Goodwin	Miller, Md.	Welch
Gossett	Miller, Nebr.	West
Graham	Mitchell	Wheeler
Grant, Ind.	Morton	Whittington
Griffiths	Muhlenberg	Wigglesworth
Gross	Mundt	Wilson, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson, Tex.
Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hale	Nixon	Wolverton
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Nodar	Wood
	Norblad	Woodruff
Hall, Leonard W.	Norman	Worley
	O'Hara	Youngblood
Halleck	O'Konski	
Hand	Owens	

NAYS—121

Abernethy	Burleson	Delaney
Albert	Byrne, N. Y.	Dingell
Almond	Camp	Donohue
Andrews, Ala.	Cannon	Douglas
Bates, Ky.	Celler	Durham
Beckworth	Chelf	Eberharter
Bland	Colmer	Evins
Blatnik	Combs	Fallon
Bloom	Cooley	Feighan
Boggs, La.	Courtney	Fernandez
Bonner	Cravens	Flannagan
Brown, Ga.	Crosser	Fogarty
Bryson	D'Alesandro	Folger
Buchanan	Davis, Tenn.	Forand
Bulwinkle	Deane	Gary
Gordon	Lesinski	Pfeifer
Gore	Lucas	Pickett
Granger	Lusk	Powell
Grant, Ala.	Lyle	Price, Fla.
Gregory	Lynch	Price, Ill.
Harless, Ariz.	McCormack	Priest
Harris	McMillan, S. C.	Rabin
Harrison	Madden	Rains
Havenner	Mahon	Rayburn
Hays	Manasco	Rooney
Hendricks	Mansfield, Mont.	Sabath
Hobbs	Marcantonio	Sheppard
Holifield	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Huber	Mills	Somers
Jackson, Wash.	Monroney	Spence
Johnson, Okla.	Morgan	Stigler
Johnson, Tex.	Morris	Teague
Jones, Ala.	Murdock	Thomas, Tex.
Karsten, Mo.	Norton	Thomason
Kee	O'Brien	Trimble
Kefauver	O'Toole	Walter
King	Passman	Whitten
Kirwan	Patman	Williams
Klein	Peden	Winstead
Lane	Peterson	Zimmerman
Lanham		

NOT VOTING—26

Bates, Mass.	Coudert	Kerr
Battle	Dawson, Ill.	Morrison
Bramblett	Gorski	Norrell
Buckley	Hagen	Potts
Carroll	Hardy	Preston
Clark	Hébert	Rayfiel
Clements	Heffernan	Sadowski
Cole, Mo.	Kelley	Sasscer
Cooper	Keogh	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Carroll against.

Mr. Cole of Missouri and Mr. Hagen for, with Mr. Kerr against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Gorski.

Mr. Potts with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Heffernan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which extends the 5-year term life insurance for First World War Veterans and the report which was filed with it.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, can the gentleman give us some idea of what we may expect for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I shall be glad to do that.

It is our plan to call up House Resolution 36 on Monday, which resolution is designed to give the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries the same authority heretofore granted under resolutions heretofore passed in previous Congresses.

Then we expect to call up House Resolution 90, which is a resolution from the Rules Committee, giving to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department the power of subpena and certain other powers, in compliance with the responsibilities devolving upon that committee in the carrying on of its functions under the Reorganization Act. It is my understanding there is no particular controversy about these two matters, and I anticipate they will be expeditiously handled on Monday.

Then it is our plan to adjourn from Monday until Wednesday. On Wednesday, two special orders have already been entered. Wednesday is the anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln and of Kosciusko. Two addresses will be made on Wednesday commemorating those occasions. It is our plan that the House meet on Thursday and then adjourn until the following Monday.

Mr. RAYBURN. No legislative business on Thursday?

Mr. HALLECK. No legislative business on Thursday.

I would like to make this additional statement, if I may: We all know that the committees are steadily working and that committee consideration and committee action is a necessary precedent to action on the floor of the House. The fact that we are not meeting every day gives the committees a better opportunity to complete their work.

I would also like to express the hope that as we go along through the entire session we will be able to determine toward the end of each week, as on this occasion, what the program will be for the following week, so that the committees can govern themselves accordingly and the individual Members can arrange their work. Of course, situations may arise from time to time where it will be necessary for us to deviate from what I may have outlined as the program for the next week, but I sincerely hope we can keep such occasions at a minimum.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I heard the gentleman's observation with respect to the committees functioning. I heard something to the effect that some of the committees of Congress have not yet organized. Does the gentleman know anything about that situation?

Mr. HALLECK. I know of no such situation. I would say I do not believe that is the situation. It may be that a committee or two has not completed its final and ultimate organization, but about that I do not know.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wish the majority leader would look into that situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in reference to a bill he introduced today regarding the rationing of sugar.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the death of the late Honorable O. Max Gardner.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial by David Lawrence entitled "New Dealism Flavor Seen in Tax Battle."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on political rights of women.

VETERANS' EMERGENCY HOUSING BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, housing is the No. 1 problem facing our Nation.

More families are homeless in Los Angeles today than after the San Francisco earthquake or the Johnstown flood.

In Los Angeles 162,000 families are estimated by the National Housing Agency to be existing in tents, garages, stores, cabins, trailers, hotel rooms, or doubled up in one-family dwellings. Over 50,000 of these families are veterans who fought in World War II so we could remain free. What shocking, indecent treatment of these thousands of veterans' families. The effects in disease, crime, misery, family break-up, discouragement, and anger are a danger to the entire community.

This is a permanent crisis as well as an immediate demand for action.

There has always been a shortage of decent housing for low-income families at a price they could afford to pay. But years of underbuilding from depression and war has left a drastic shortage for wide sections of the people, which will not get better unless decisive action is taken.

We must pass the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill in this session. There are many other things we should do. But there still is going to be a no man's land in housing.

The veteran is not a buyer; he is a renter, and he can only pay from $30 to $50 a month. Millions of them are looking for rentals at that price and cannot find them because they do not exist and will not exist under any housing plan now under consideration.

I am introducing a bill today which will help meet this emergency and it will not wait.

We spent $2,200,000,000 alone for cantonments during the war between July 1, 1940, and August 31, 1945.

Do you have to go to war to get a roof over your head?

Can't you get a house when you want to raise a family?

Don't we yet know that bad housing or no housing at all is the greatest cause of divorce and juvenile delinquency in the country?

Don't we know that when the home life of a nation is threatened we strike at the very roots of our democracy?

We must move in this housing crisis which strikes at the heart of family life in America today.

I intend to fight for this bill directly or by amendment to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill which I shall also support with all possible vigor.

Let me make it clear that my bill is no panacea for all housing ills.

It is not a substitute for the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill which passed the Senate last year. That bill is still critically necessary.

It has nothing to do with the urgency of continuing rent controls. Such controls must be continued until the supply of housing is brought into greater balance with the demand for housing.

The deficiency appropriation to finish uncompleted units of veterans' emergency housing is still vital.

We must continue to recognize that it is more important for people to have roofs over their heads than for night clubs, race tracks, and show places to be built. We must therefore continue a rigid limitation on nonresidential construction.

Priority allocations and materials controls should be reestablished and vigorously enforced with respect to any materials still in short supply.

The financial encouragement promised to builders of industrialized housing should be immediately forthcoming.

But no amount of comprehensive housing measures, of rent controls, of deficiency appropriations, of limitation of nonresidential construction, of enforcement of priority allocations, and of encouragement—as opposed to actual delivery—of prefabricated housing can escape the fact that there is a wide and growing gap in the housing demand for which no adequate provision is now being made or contemplated. I refer to the area in the housing market for veterans renting homes where the monthly charge is between $30 and $50. And remember, the Veterans' Administration tells us that 9 out of every 10 veterans are not home builders, but renters.

I need not tell you that few, if any, homes are available for rent to veterans in the $30 to $50 a month charge. It is in this field that the veterans' demand is greatest and, ironically enough, it is in this field where little, if anything, is being done by private enterprise.

What are the alternatives?

Basically there are two:

First. The Federal Government must itself undertake the construction of such homes, or

Second. The Federal Government must participate in a financial method which will insure the construction of such homes.

I dismiss the former alternative as one that should be resorted to only when all other techniques have failed. I hope the time will not come when we shall be forced into direct Federal construction. Nevertheless, I feel, in all candor, compelled to admit that if all other measures fail to provide for this growing, insistent, undeniable demand, we may be forced into this alternative. My bill should make it unnecessary to resort to the alternative of direct Federal construction.

In brief, what the bill does is to authorize the Federal Government to make loans of $1,000,000,000 to local public-housing agencies at a 2½-percent interest rate and for terms extending up to 60 years. To help bridge the gap between the moderate rentals which would have to be charged for the new homes and the operating expenses—including the debt service—the Federal Government would make annual contributions up to 2 percent of the project's development cost. This would mean that with a building program of $1,000,000,000 worth of veterans' housing there will be a maximum annual cost to the Government of $20,000,000. This cost cannot continue over a longer period than 10 years. If we relieve our acute housing shortage quickly the contributions may be needed for only a few years.

Here is what the bill would do:

First. It would provide housing immediately for a large number of veterans requiring moderate-rental housing—which is the largest group of veterans.

Second. It would avoid recourse to direct Federal construction.

Third. It would be applicable only where the President finds that an acute shortage of housing exists which cannot be provided in sufficient quantities by private enterprise.

Fourth. It would confine its benefits to servicemen, veterans and their families, and the families of deceased persons who served in the armed forces.

Fifth. It would be restricted to rental housing.

Sixth. It would use the existing instrumentalities of public housing agencies which, over the past few years, have demonstrated, by their competence, experience, and talent, their capacity to undertake such a program.

Seventh. Because of the low interest rate on the loans and the long amortization period, it would make necessary only small annual contributions to achieve the moderate rents desired.

Eighth. When the President determines that the acute shortage of housing no longer exists, it would require the local public housing agency to dispose of any housing project constructed under this bill.

Ninth. It calls for the utilization of the Federal agency which is accustomed and experienced in this type of Federal aid to localities and therefore one which is geared in personnel and techniques to move immediately.

This measure, as I have said before, is not a substitute for the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. That bill as it passed the Senate last year, desirable as it is, does not contain adequate provisions for the group which would benefit under my bill.

I introduce and intend vigorously to push my bill not because it is a substitute for the General Housing Act but because it is a necessary supplement to meet the insistent demands of the veterans who need homes now.

Veterans' Emergency Housing Bill

A bill to assist in the immediate alleviation of the critical shortage of moderate-rental housing for veterans, to expedite the orderly demobilization of the war effort, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide immediately housing at moderate rentals for veterans and servicemen and their families where such housing is not being built by private enterprise, and to supplement the provisions of the General Housing Act (this act not being in any way a substitute for such act or any part thereof), the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by adding title I after the enacting clause and by adding the following new title II:

TITLE II. MODERATE-RENTAL HOUSING FOR VETERANS

SEC. 201. In those areas or localities where the President shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends and that, because of increased construction costs, permanent housing at moderate rentals cannot be provided in sufficient quantities when needed, the Authority is hereby authorized to exercise all the powers specified in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, together with the additional powers provided herein, to provide housing for veterans and servicemen and their families, who are unable to obtain decent housing facilities at moderate rentals within their ability to pay (as determined by the public-housing agency with the concurrence of the Authority): *Provided,* That any housing constructed under the provisions of this title shall be undertaken as provided herein only where the need for moderate-rental housing cannot be met by private enterprise.

SEC. 202. In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for moderate-rental housing, the Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance under this title with respect to any housing unless the public-housing agency has submitted an analysis of the local housing market demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Authority that there is a need for such housing which cannot be met by private enterprise; and unless the governing body of the locality involved has approved the provision of such housing.

SEC. 203. The Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance pursuant to this title with respect to any housing unless the public housing agency involved agrees:

(1) To fix fair rentals for such housing (which shall be subject to approval by the Authority) within the financial reach of veterans and servicemen and their families.

(2) To make such housing available solely to families whose net income at the time of admission does not exceed six times the rental (including the value or cost to them of heat, light, water, and cooking fuel) of the dwellings to be furnished such families.

(3) To select as tenants veterans and servicemen and their families who are eligible for occupancy under the provisions of this title.

(4) To undertake a program hereunder which will provide housing for the families of veterans and servicemen of different races, colors, and creeds in a volume which will not discriminate against meeting the needs of any such veterans or servicemen.

(5) That upon the determination by the President of the termination of the acute shortage of housing in the locality, the public housing agency shall dispose, as soon as practicable, of any housing project constructed with Federal assistance pursuant to this title at no less than the fair market value of such project, and that the full proceeds of such sale shall be paid to the Authority, such payment to constitute a satisfaction of the balance of any outstanding loan made by the Government.

SEC. 204. The term "veterans" shall include any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and the term "servicemen" shall include any person who is serving in the military or naval forces of the United States. The terms "veterans" and "servicemen" shall also include persons who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States in order to provide housing for their families.

SEC. 205. The term "moderate rental" shall mean rentals which (as determined by the public housing agency, with the concurrence of the Authority) are below the level at which private enterprise is currently building a substantial volume of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings in the locality involved: *Provided,* That in no event shall such rental exceed $50 per month, exclusive of charges for utility services.

SEC. 206. (a) The Authority may make loans to public housing agencies under this title to finance the provision of moderate-rental housing for veterans and servicemen and their families. Such loans shall not exceed the cost of such housing, shall bear

interest at such rate not less than the applicable going Federal rate, shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding 60 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan, as may be deemed advisable by the Authority.

(b) To obtain funds for the loan purposes of this title, the Authority may issue and have outstanding at any one time, obligations in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000,000 in addition to the amount of such bonds heretofore authorized.

SEC. 207. (a) The Authority may make annual contributions to public-housing agencies to assist them in making moderate-rental housing available for veterans and servicemen and their families. The Authority shall embody the provisions for such annual contributions in a contract guaranteeing their payment over a fixed period of years. In no case shall any contract under this title be made for a period exceeding 10 years from the date the first annual contribution is paid. Annual contributions shall be strictly limited to the amounts and periods necessary in the determination of the Authority to assure that the housing will accomplish the purpose of this title: *Provided*, That the fixed contribution payable annually under any contract shall in no case exceed a sum equal to 2 percent upon the development cost of the housing project involved.

(b) For the purposes of this title the Authority is authorized on and after the date of enactment of this title, to enter into contracts which provide for annual contributions aggregating not more than $20,000,000 per annum.

SEC. 208. Financial assistance in the form of loans or annual contributions under this title shall be distributed among the various States with due consideration to the relative number of veterans and servicemen and their families in need of decent housing in each State and with not more than 10 percent of the loan or annual contribution assistance available under this title being extended to any one State.

SEC. 209. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the words "this section" where they appear in section 10 (d) and (e) and substituting in each instance the words "title I and title II of this act." Except as otherwise specifically provided, the provisions of title I of this act shall apply to this title II: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 2 (1) and (2), 9, 10 (a), (b), and (c), 11, 12, and 15, and any other provisions of title I inconsistent herewith, shall not so apply.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a bill on emergency veterans' housing which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, this administration which was successful in providing veterans for foxholes has not been successful in providing these same veterans with houses. If, as Mr. Ickes said—and he should know—"Wars are the result of stupid statesmanship," it is fair to add the consequences of war, such as high taxes, inflation, and lack of shelter, result from the same original stupidity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. BRAMBLETT (at the request of Mr. GEARHART), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Friday, February 7, 1947.

On Friday morning testimony from the following named Members will be received: Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. WOOD, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

On Friday afternoon testimony will be received regarding the Dock Street case, a dispute between the produce dealers of the city of Philadelphia and the teamsters' union of that city.

On Monday morning, February 10, testimony will be received from the Newspaper Guild.

On Monday afternoon, February 10, Mr. J. David Stern, former publisher of the Philadelphia Record and his counsel will present testimony to the committee.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be an open hearing of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Friday, February 7, 1947, at 10 a. m., in suite 356, to consider the question of subsistence ceiling and on-the-job training.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 2, at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, February 7, 1947, will continue hearings on the subject of portal-to-portal pay on the bill and joint resolution presently before the subcommittee, in the Judiciary Committee room, No. 346, House Office Building.

Beginning at 10 a. m. Monday, February 10, 1947, subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the subject of portal-to-portal pay. The following bill and joint resolution are presently before the subcommittee:

H. R. 584, to define the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 91, to prohibit suits for recovery of portal-to-portal pay.

The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The Committee on Ways and Means will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m. in the main committee room, New House Office Building on Friday, February 7, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, February 11, 1947, for the continuation of public hearings on air accidents.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services will meet at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, February 11, 1947, in room 313, Old House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

293. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 for the American Battle Monuments Commission (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

294. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,204,000 for the Railroad Retirement Board (H. Doc. No. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

295. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $611,000 for the Panama Canal, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

296. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1947, and supplemental estimates of appropriation for said fiscal year in the amount of $7,479,000, for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

297. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $489,737,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the War Department for military activities (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947, amounting to $4,850,000 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

299. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

300. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

301. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution granting for income, estate, and gift tax purposes deductions for contributions to the United Nations

(H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

302. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the annual report of the proceedings of the Disabled American Veterans for its last preceding fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, including full and complete report of its receipts and expenditures (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 597. A bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 1750 A bill to assist in the immediate alleviation of the critical shortage of moderate-rental housing for veterans, to expedite the orderly demobilization of the war effort, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 1751. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1752. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1753. A bill relating to the payment of World War veterans' adjusted compensation in certain cases of the veteran's continued absence from home for a period of 15 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1754. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to insure to professional employees full freedom of choice in the selection of bargaining representatives and in joining or refraining from joining labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1755. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1756. A bill to limit grounds for exclusion from the United States in the case of certain classes of honorably discharged veterans who are aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1758. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 1759. A bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1760. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1761. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1762. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 1763. A bill authorizing appropriation for rehabilitating the oyster beds west of the Mississippi River destroyed by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway and by the intrusion of fresh water and blockage of natural passages during the flood of 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1764. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having impaired hearing, or who have lost the power of speech, to positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1765. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act defining the compensation of persons holding positions as deputy clerks and commissioners of United States district courts, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1938; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1766. A bill to restore one of the four freedoms, and to prevent interference with the freedom of speech and a free press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1767. A bill to establish a national natural-resources policy; to create a Natural Resources Council; to provide for a natural-resources inventory; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 1768. A bill for the refund of income taxes paid by members of the armed forces dying while in active service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 1769. A bill to authorize the appointment of a Peace Bell Tower Foundation Commission and fixing its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 1770. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1771. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. R. 1772. A bill to provide for the flow of revenues from Federal reclamation projects into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and to provide that revenues from Federal reclamation projects hereafter financed wholly from general funds of the Treasury shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1773. A bill to correct an inequity existing in the case of holders of adjusted-service certificates who did not accept payment in bonds under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1774. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve components of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1775. A bill to provide additional funds for the fiscal year 1947 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1776. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended; the act of February 2, 1903; and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended; to include domestic animals within their provisions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1777. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1778. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution relative to control of all merchant ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 84. Resolution to change the name of the Committee on Public Lands to Committee on Public Lands, Possessions, and Resources; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 85. Resolution providing for additional compensation to the superintendent of the folding room, Office of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. Res. 86. Resolution providing funds for the continued investigation regarding disposal of surplus property; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate additional and adequate funds each 5 years, which funds shall be sufficient for the maintenance of the studies for 5-year periods, relating to the San Joaquin Experimental Range; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Albert (Jack) Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1784. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to John Wesley Milliken; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1785. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Stanley Rensvold; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DORN:

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Dalton; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of Buster Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Walter See; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Erich Ernst Plohs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Vincent or Vincenzo Tripoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of John P. Reilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of George Dimitri Harocopos, also known as Georgios Demetriou Harokopos or Charokopos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Foti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 1798. A bill for the relief of Anthony Satas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Eva L. Dudley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Mose Altman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of the Stiers Bros. Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of citizens of Quincy, Ill., urging tax-exemption base be set at $2,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

82. By Mr. HEFFERNAN: Petition of Morris Park Council, No. 566, Knights of Columbus, Richmond Hill, N. Y., in protest of trial proceedings in Yugoslavia of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, other clergy, and their associates; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

83. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of a number of citizens of Pasco and Grandview, Wash., opposing advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

84. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of Arthur B. Smith, Camp Hill, Pa., for streamlining and consolidating War Assets Administration operations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

85. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Bronx Unit, No. 24, New York State Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association, Inc., New York City, favoring immediate repeal of the retailer's excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

86. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials at annual meeting held in Los Angeles in December, calling for extension of time for availability of funds under Federal-Aid Act of 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

87. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis J. Reuter, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the case of Air Corps against Francis J. Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

88. Also, petition of the Northwest Public Power Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the McNary Dam site on the Columbia River and the transmission lines of the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forgive us, O God, for all our boasting and our presumptuous sins of pride and arrogance, for these are days that humble us.

By Thy grace, we become more and more aware of our limitations and our weaknesses.

Let us not mistake humility for an inferiority complex, but help us to understand that with the proud and the self-sufficient Thou canst do nothing until Thou hast brought them to their knees.

We need Thy help, our Father, and we seek it humbly. We want to do right, and to be right; so start us in the right way, for Thou knowest that we are very hard to turn. Shed forth Thy grace upon us, O Lord, that each man here may say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." We ask it in His name. Amen.

ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Under the designation made by the President pro tempore on Wednesday, February 5, 1947, Mr. KNOWLAND took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 5, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week because of a death in my family.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Indiana is granted.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask to be absent from the Senate on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Washington is granted.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from the 10th to the 20th of this month.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wyoming is granted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next Monday and Tuesday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 215 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory of the Gorgas Memorial

Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control covering the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Director of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on contracts entered into by that Commission for the period beginning April 1, 1945, and ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INCREASE OF SUGAR SUPPLY FOR DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, for the past month I have been trying to find some way whereby more sugar could be made available to the American people without running counter to our international obligations and interests. On January 10, I addressed a letter to Hon. William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, in which I cited certain figures which indicated the possibility that more sugar might be available in the coming year. I have recently received a reply to my letter. In his reply, Mr. Clayton points out that the prospects are for an increase in the sugar crop in the coming year.

This increase, in his own words, "would give the United States in the neighborhood of 90 pounds of sugar, raw value, per capita, or approximately 87 percent of its normal prewar usage." I may point out, Mr. President, that for the year 1946 the United States had in the neighborhood of 78 pounds of sugar, raw value, per capita. In other words, there is a possibility that there will be an increase of 12 pounds.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Mr. Clayton and his reply to me be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 10, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State
for Economic Affairs,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLAYTON. I have received a great many communications from constituents who, while favoring the relief of human suffering and want in the world, nevertheless feel very strongly that an excessive amount of sugar is now being diverted from American sources for consumption by people abroad. The continuing shortage of sugar is a matter of deep concern to the American people. It is imperative that vigorous and fruitful attempts be made to insure an increased supply of sugar for the people of this country during this coming year.

I am advised that there will be a substantial increase in sugar production in those countries of continental Europe which in 1946 were included in the Combined Food Board's international sugar allocation program. According to the figures which I have seen, there will be approximately 1,600,000 tons more sugar crops produced in those countries and in the British Commonwealth than was the case during the past year.

Inasmuch as this substantial increase of over 60 percent will become available in 1947 to these European countries and to Canada, it appears obvious that these countries will receive a fair share of the total 1947 world supply without requiring as much sugar from Cuba or the United States as they received in 1946. Under these circumstances the retention of the contemplated increase of 1,400,000 tons of United States produced sugar in 1947 will help considerably in easing the present sugar shortage and should insure a more liberal distribution of sugar to the American household as well as to manufacturing and institutional users.

In view of the fact that a possible solution of the sugar shortage problem rests in our economic relationships with foreign nations, I would appreciate your considered views as to the present advisability of retaining American produced sugar for the American consumers.

Very sincerely yours,

H. C. LODGE, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 30, 1947.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Your letter of January 10 requests my views regarding the retention of all American produced sugar in 1947 to meet American requirements. I infer, from your mention of a contemplated increase of 1,400,000 tons in United States production, that you include the Cuban crop in your calculation of domestic production. It is my understanding that 1947 production in the continental United States is not expected to exceed 1946 production by more than 400,000 tons, and that the 1947 crop in Hawaii and Puerto Rico will not be more than 200,000 tons larger than that of last year. No official estimate of the Cuban crop has yet been issued, but if it should reach 5,500,000 tons, as estimated by the trade, it would be approximately a million tons larger than last year.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has contracted with the Cuban Sugar Institute for most of Cuba's exportable surplus of sugar over the past 5 years, and the present contract extends through 1947. However, this Government has never claimed the whole of the Cuban crop for its exclusive use. When quotas imposed under our Sugar Act are in effect, Cuba is permitted to supply only 28.6 percent of United States consumption. During the 5 years just prior to the outbreak of war, 1935–39, Cuba's exports to the United States averaged 1,900,000 short tons, or 65 percent of Cuba's total exports of sugar.

During the war years, largely because of a shortage of shipping, sugar which would normally have moved to European markets came to this country, and replaced to a large extent the sugar which had formerly been supplied by the Philippines. Throughout the war, sugar supplies available to the Allied Governments were shared under allocation recommendations of the Combined Food Board, and with the continuance of the sugar shortage into the postwar period, it has been necessary to continue to allocate sugar. The International Emergency Food Council, successor to the Combined Food Board, anticipates the continuance of a serious sugar shortage until 1947 crops are harvested, and expects to recommend allocations of sugar through the calendar year 1947.

You speak, in your lettter, of an anticipated increase of approximately 1,600,000 tons in the sugar production of the British Empire and those countries of continental Europe which received sugar allocations in 1946. Estimates of 1946–47 production published in the Department of Agriculture's December 16 issue of Foreign Crops and Markets indicate an increase of only 907,000 tons for these countries, as shown in the following tabulation:

Estimated production of sugar

[Thousand tons]

	1945–46	1946–47	Increase
United Kingdom	630	641	
Canada	85	90	
France	508	735	
Belgium	154	220	
Netherlands	66	231	
Yugoslavia	38	75	
Italy	21	293	
Austria	20	50	
Switzerland	31	27	
Finland	6	6	
Total	1,559	2,368	809
British West Indies	701	725	
Australia and Fiji	778	757	
Mauritius	145	300	
South Africa	553	480	
Total	2,177	2,262	85
French West Indies	66	69	
Réunion	25	35	
Total	91	104	13
Grand total	3,827	4,734	907

For Europe as a whole, sugar production in 1946–47 is estimated at 7,400,000 tons, compared with a wartime low of 5,500,000 tons in 1945–46. This is still 3,000,000 tons below the 1935–39 average of 10,400,000 tons, and much of the anticipated increase will be in countries where consumption has been at such extremely low levels since the war that none will be available for export. Italian production, for example, shows an increase of 275,000 tons, but since Italy was allocated only enough sugar in 1946 to permit a consumption of 14 pounds per capita, or 41 percent of prewar usage, all of this year's production increase will be required to bring Italian consumption into line with that of other producing countries. Approximately half of the expected increase will occur in countries such as Russia, Germany, Spain, Hungary, and Poland, which have received no allocations from the IEFC, or only such small quantities as were allocated to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The quantity of sugar available to importing countries is, therefore, still far below requirements. If the United States were to take for domestic consumption all of Cuba's exportable surplus, it would give this country approximately 8,100,000 tons of sugar, assuming a crop of 5,500,000 tons in Cuba, 1,960,000 tons of which would come from domestic production, 1,694,000 from the island territories, and 4,455,000 from Cuba. This would be 120 percent of our average prewar consumption. Supplies available to the other importing countries of the IEFC would amount to only about 3,800,000 tons, or 57 percent of their prewar consumption of 6,600,000 tons. I do not believe that such a distribution would be regarded as equitable by other members of the International Emergency Food Council.

I should like to make clear that we purchased the Cuban crop not only on our own behalf but on behalf of other members of the United Nations. The Cuban crop represents a major portion of the world's supply

of exportable sugar. Other deficit countries stayed out of the Cuban market on the understanding that all sugar procured in Cuba under our exclusive purchase contract would be subject to allocation by the IEFC. While there is no doubt that the United States has a legal claim to all of the sugar which it purchases, a decision to reserve the full quantity, or even a disproportionately large share, for domestic consumption would be regarded by other importing countries as a breach of good faith on the part of this Government.

If the Cuban crop reaches 5,500,000 tons, the exportable surplus will be about 4,500,000 tons, of which we might reasonably expect to retain two-thirds. This would give the United States in the neighborhood of 90 pounds of sugar, raw value, per capita, or approximately 87 percent of its normal prewar usage, and at the same time permit most of the countries of continental Europe to raise their consumption to about 70 percent of their low prewar levels. Such a division would correspond roughly to the prewar distribution of the Cuban crop between the United States and other foreign countries, and although it would permit a considerably higher consumption rate here than in most other importing countries, I believe that it might be acceptable to other members of the IEFC.

If stocks which have been reported to exist in Java should become available for allocation this year the quantities allocated to European claimants out of Cuba could be replaced by Javanese sugar, and the allocation to the United States proportionately increased. I do not think we should assume at this time, however, that any large proportion of the requirements of foreign claimants can be met from this source.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

MR. LILIENTHAL'S CREED OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago in a hearing before the appropriate Senate committee, Mr. David E. Lilienthal uttered certain words which, in my estimation, should and will become immortal in American literature. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a portion of his testimony as printed in the Washington Star of night before last in which he discusses his conceptions and understandings of the relationship between democracy and the individual. I would that every school child in America might study that great statement even as the Gettysburg Address is studied.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LILIENTHAL STATES HIS CREED AS A DEMOCRATIC AMERICAN

(David E. Lilienthal, nominated to be Chairman of this country's Atomic Energy Commission, yesterday gave the Senate Atomic Energy Committee his views of democracy in a fervent statement in which he also made an unequivocal denunciation of communism. Following is the transcript of that portion of his testimony which replies to a question of Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee: "What about your views on communistic doctrine?")

This I do carry in my head, Senator. I will do my best to make it clear. My convictions are not so much concerned with what I am against as what I am for; and that excludes a lot of things automatically.

Traditionally, democracy has been an affirmative doctrine rather than merely a negative one.

I believe—and I so conceive the Constitution of the United States to rest upon—as does religion—the fundamental proposition of the integrity of the individual; and that all government and all private institutions must be designed to promote and to protect and defend the integrity and the dignity of the individual; that that is the essential meaning of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as it is essentially the meaning of religion.

BASIC UNIT OF COMMUNISM

Any form of the government, therefore, and any other institutions which make men means rather than ends; which exalt the state or any other institutions above the importance of men, which place arbitrary power over men as a fundamental tenet of government or any other institutions, are contrary to that conception, and therefore I am deeply opposed to them.

The communistic philosophy as well as the communistic form of government fall within this category, for their fundamental tenet is quite to the contrary. The fundamental tenet of communism is that the state is an end in itself and that, therefore, the powers which the state exercise over the individual are without any ethical standard to limit them.

That I deeply disbelieve.

It is very easy simply to say one is not a Communist. And, of course, if my record requires me to state that very affirmatively, then it is a great disappointment to me. It is very easy to talk about being against communism. It is equally important to believe those things which provide a satisfying and effective alternative. Democracy is that satisfying affirmative alternative.

Its hope in the world is that it is an affirmative belief, rather than being simply a belief against something else and nothing more.

One of the tenets of democracy that grow out of this central core of a belief that the individual comes first, that all men are the children of God, and their personalities are therefore sacred, carries with it a great belief in civil liberties and their protection, and a repugnance to anyone who would steal from a human being that which is most precious to him—his good name—either by impugning things to him by innuendo or by insinuations. And it is especially an unhappy circumstance that occasionally that is done in the name of democracy. This I think can tear our country apart and destroy it if we carry it further.

I deeply believe in the capacity of democracy to surmount any trials that may lie ahead, provided only we practice it in our daily lives. And among the things we must practice is that while we seek fervently to ferret out the subversive and antidemocratic forces in the country, we do not at the same time, by hysteria, by resort to innuendo, and smears, and other unfortunate tactics, besmirch the very cause that we believe in, and cause a separation among our people, cause one group and one individual to hate another based on mere attacks, mere unsubstantiated attacks upon their loyalty.

I want also to add that part of my conviction is based on my training as an Anglo-American common lawyer. It is the very basis and the great heritage of the English peoples to this country which we have maintained, that the strictest rules of credibility of witnesses and of the avoidance of hearsay and gossip shall be excluded in courts of justice.

And that, too, is an essential of our democracy. And whether by administrative agencies acting arbitrarily against business organizations, or whether by investigating activities of the legislative branches, whenever those principles of the protection of an individual and his good name against besmirchment by gossip, hearsay, and the statements of witnesses who are not subject to cross-examination, then, too, we have failed in carrying forward our ideals in respect to democracy. That I deeply believe.

(Senator MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut. Mr. Lilienthal, I want to congratulate you on that statement as a statement of, in my opinion, a very real American.)

Mr. Lilienthal later: There are always witch hunters and people who will gladly defame and assassinate the character of others without responsibility. That is why we have a system of law. And that is why we have courts, and that is why we have rules of evidence. I will be very glad to be lynched if, in the process of that lynching, this lesson about what our history means is learned, and what the history of the common law means in the terms of protection of the individual citizen against irresponsible charges of witch hunters.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at the session of the Senate on last Wednesday, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], according to the RECORD, made this statement:

During the past week, Republican Senators HICKENLOOPER, KNOWLAND, and VANDENBERG insisted, in hearings on the confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, that the military be allowed to sit in on every session of the Commission in such a way that it would virtually become an integral part of the Commission. Their insistence suggests the reversal of the decision duly made by the President and the Congress that, true to the traditions of our Government, the civil authority shall always be superior to the military.

Mr. President, I do not speak in behalf of the other two Senators, who are perfectly able to speak for themselves, but, in the interest of accuracy I may say that that statement with regard to me has no foundation in fact, and the record does not bear it out in any scintilla.

I may also say that it is my definite impression that neither the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] who was mentioned in the statement, nor the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who was likewise mentioned, gave any such final implication in their questioning or in their attitude.

I may say further that I have always supported the civilian control of atomic energy. I shall continue to support the civilian control of atomic energy. I make this statement in the interest of accuracy and truth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we still in the morning hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is still proceeding in the morning hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. I call for the regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order was called for.

The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., relating to

development and control of atomic energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WHITE:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit any increases in rent ceilings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

A resolution adopted by the Indian Hill Local of the McKenzie County (N. Dak.) Farmers' Union, relating to the Rural Electrification Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McMAHON:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, in conference assembled at Chicago, Ill., relating to the development and control of atomic energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REMOVAL OF CONTROLS ON SUGAR

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois relating to the removal of all controls on sugar used for home consumption and for industrial purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Whereas the housewives of America have patiently and patriotically exercised during the period of hostilities and for more than a year since the cessation of hostilities, the strictest economy in the use and consumption of sugar as a part of their contribution to the war effort; and

Whereas sugar is indispensable for a well-balanced American diet, and housewives cannot prepare satisfactory meals without an adequate supply of sugar; and

Whereas the waste resulting from the lack of sufficient means of preserving foodstuffs through the scarcity of canning sugar can no longer be justified, since this Nation has not been at war for the past 18 months; and

Whereas Illinois, in common with other great agricultural States, produces many crops which require sugar for preservation, such as fruits, berries, and vegetables; and

Whereas in the past year losses in these products, because of the limited sugar available, have been estimated at several millions of dollars; and

Whereas the absence of sugar for canning purposes has caused thousands of tons of fruit to spoil, thereby depriving American families of a much-needed food, and has caused hardships and financial losses in many farming and canning communities; and

Whereas labor in the food-processing industry has been without work because of the sugar shortage; and

Whereas in 1946 the sugar under the direct control of the United States increased by more than one-half million tons and no portion of this increase was made available to the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to provide by law for an immediate decontrol of sugar for home consumption, and for industrial use; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress is requested to remove all control from the production, processing, distribution, rationing, sale, and importation of sugar without further delay; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to each of the Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois, and to each of the United States Senators from Illinois, and to the President of the United States.

Adopted by the senate, January 13, 1947.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives, January 28, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SCHICK GENERAL HOSPITAL, CLINTON, IOWA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD House Resolution No. 23, adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relating to the restoration of Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, as a medical institution devoted to assistance of the Nation's war veterans.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 23

Whereas numerous war veterans residing in eastern Iowa and western Illinois are urgently in need of hospitalization; and

Whereas the facilities of the hospitals which the Veterans' Administration now maintains at Hines, Ill., and Des Moines, Iowa, are barely able to take care of applicants from the Chicago and Des Moines areas; and

Whereas there now exists in the city of Clinton, Iowa, a group of buildings which during the war were used as Schick General Hospital; and

Whereas these buildings are admirably equipped to house a modern veterans' hospital; and

Whereas the United States Veterans' Administration has been deaf to the plea that Schick General Hospital be reconverted into a veterans' hospital and has persisted in its policy of building new hospitals in localities where the need is not nearly so great; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has advanced no sound reasons for its failure to remedy this unfortunate situation: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we urge the Congress of the United States to take such immediate action as will cause the Veterans' Administration to reverse its present position and that will insure the prompt restoration of Schick General Hospital as a medical institution devoted to assistance of the Nation's war veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, Gen. Omar Bradley, the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, the Honorable C. WAYLAND BROOKS, and to the 26 Representatives of the State of Illinois in the Eightieth Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives, January 28, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES AND TAXES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Harsha, of Topeka, urging the elimination of unnecessary employees and reduction of superfluous expenditures. I am receiving many letters like this.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 1, 1947.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: According to newspaper and radio reports there seems to be a decided weakening of the Republican position in regard to elimination of unnecessary employees and reduction of the superfluous expenses in order that a real saving may be made in our Government expenditures. We hope that you will use your good offices in securing real economy in our spending to the end of reducing our terrific national debt and reduce our taxes at least 20 percent, as promised in the recent election. Of course, we take it for granted that the Congress will balance the budget, as it is our faith in the Republican Party to accomplish both economy and financial stability.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. E. N. HARSHA.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the instance of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], chairman of the Committee on Finance, and in his name, I report favorably without amendment the following bills:

S. 132. A bill to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 20);

H. R. 1030. A bill to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 21); and

H. R. 1353. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (Rept. No. 22).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reports will be received, and the bills will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO (S. REPT. NO. 19)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have today filed a report on the investigation of international communications by wire and radio. In compliance with the Reorganization Act, which contemplates the cessation of special committees, the report officially winds up the work of a special subcommittee authorized by the Senate 3 years ago. The study of international communications, however, will continue by the new Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as one of its multiple functions.

The report makes several points and recommendations which I desire briefly to call to the attention of the Senate.

In the first place, it recommends that legislation be enacted either removing the present requirement that the Western Union Co. dispose of its cables or

provide for permissive consolidation of international communication companies, so that the Western Union cables may be taken over by such a consolidation.

I should like to explain to the Senate that when the Congress enacted the legislation under which the Postal Telegraph Co. and the Western Union Telegraph Co. were merged it was provided that the merged carrier must divest itself of international operations. In the case of Western Union it meant the divesting of that company's trans-Atlantic cables. As a result, the company has been conducting its international communications from year to year by permission of the Federal Communications Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may interrupt the Senator at this point, the regular order has been called for by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and, in the opinion of the Chair, under the rule, general discussion of the committee report would not be in order in the morning hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understood I could discuss the matter for 5 minutes, and I would certainly conclude within that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 5-minute rule applies only when the calendar is being considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona be permitted to conclude his remarks, inasmuch as he has already begun them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may continue.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

The requirement placed on the Western Union to which I have just adverted has worked a hardship upon that company, for the reason that it could not plan ahead. It does not know whether to proceed and expand its international business and go out after business; it does not know what it can do. It cannot sell its cables, because under the existing situation of uncertainty as to policy there is no customer for them. Meanwhile it is under a legal compulsion to divest itself of its cable business. So this carrier is in the situation I have described, and Congress should do something about it.

The second point is the necessity for legislation removing the present requirement of a 20 percent below normal rate for transmission of Government telegrams. The Western Union is not alone the only private business required to render service to the Government at a discount but also the only communications company left which has to transmit communications at a lesser rate for the Government than for private enterprise. This entails a hardship to the Western Union, which has been experiencing difficult problems. It has competition from the subsidized air mail, and competition from the telephone companies. Last year the Congress removed the special land-grant rate for the railroads, and several years ago the committee recommended that the differential which affects the Western Union Co. be removed. The legislation which permitted the domestic merger provided for the removal of the special rate for Government, but the provision was eliminated in the other House. I personally feel that the financial condition of the Western Union at this time demands that this differential be removed.

A third point which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate relates to what has taken place since the end of the war to the airway communications system, and the superb world-wide communications system generally built up by the Army and the Navy. The report treats of this matter in some detail. I had hoped, and many other members of our committee had hoped, that the Federal Government would establish a policy whereby these communications systems, or a part of them, the part that is not needed for the Army or the Navy, might be utilized by a private company or companies. The fact that our Government has not established an over-all permanent international communications policy has permitted these magnificent communications systems, which, I reiterate, were the best in the world, to disintegrate. It is nothing uncommon to find equipment, valued at several thousand dollars, in China or north Africa being used for a table in a hut, for instance. We turned over much of our communications equipment, as we did other equipment, to foreign governments and what was not turned over was stolen.

I call the attention of the Senate to the recommendation made by the committee that a permanent policy on international communications be established by our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report (S. Rept. 19) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The investigation of international communications by wire and radio was initially authorized by Senate Resolution 187 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to on October 19, 1943, which directed the then Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to carry on such a study and make reports to the Senate. A subcommittee, consisting of Senators Wheeler, Hill, McFarland, White, and Austin, was appointed, under whose authority a staff began to gather pertinent data. The study was continued under authority of Senate Resolution 268 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and Senate Resolution 24 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and membership of the subcommittee was revised and enlarged to include Senators Wheeler, Johnson of Colorado, McFarland, Briggs, White, Austin, Hawkes, and Capehart.

On July 31 (legislative day, July 29), 1946, the committee filed a report (S. Rept. No. 1907) which detailed work that had been done to that time, calling attention to extensive hearings that had been held, the fact that some members of the subcommittee had made on-the-spot surveys of military and nonmilitary communications in Europe, the Near East, and northern Africa, and recommended the adoption by the Government, acting through the State Department, of a comprehensive, over-all Government communications policy as a necessary prerequisite to the formulation of legislation. It is recommended that Senate Report No. 1907 be read in conjunction with this report.

The responsibilities of the Congress, and its cognizant committees, with respect to this international communications problem of the United States is by no means concluded. On the contrary, the end of the war has served only to aggravate the basic problems and they have become complicated by the intrusion of such directly connected communications matters as those involving navigational aids to aviation, in itself a major problem of tremendous proportions if world-wide aviation commerce is to make progress. But the reorganization of Senate committees and the expiration of the authority of the Senate resolution under which your committee carried on this study makes it desirable that the committee file a concluding report with the Senate, summarizing what it has done and detailing such conclusions as are proper at this time.

The committee deems it important to add that neither the filing of this report nor the expiration of the authority of the subcommittee under the Senate resolution means that the problem is solved or the study concluded. It merely signalizes the taking over of this entire problem by the committee as part of its enlarged function.

As a prelude to its report, the committee desires to call particular attention to the following paragraphs from the interim report (S. Rept. No. 1907) submitted on July 31, 1946:

"Senate Resolution 187 was introduced by Senators Wheeler, White, and McFarland. Its introduction and the need for a study of international communications grew directly out of the enactment of the so-called Domestic Merger Act (Public Law 4, 78th Cong.). That act made possible the merger of domestic telegraph companies. During consideration of this legislation members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, who were dealing with the communications problem, became particularly concerned with the situation that faced this country in the field of international communications. The merger of domestic telegraph companies was designed to greatly strengthen and improve communications by wire and radio within the continental United States. The second phase of the problem was to find ways and means of similarly strengthening and improving the service of American communications carriers doing business throughout the world. * * *

"Because little original data was available to the committee, its staff began the task of assembling pertinent information with respect to this problem. The committee learned, during consideration of the legislation which became the Domestic Merger Act, that United States carriers in the international field operated under serious disadvantages in many foreign lands. * * * Because of the requirements that exist in many places in the world of transferring American communications to foreign carriers for ultimate delivery, messages originating within the United States are not always within the complete control of the American carrier from the point of origin to the point of delivery. Such a condition fails to afford American users of international communications the best or most satisfactory service in peacetime; in times of war such conditions are untenable for any sovereign Nation and particularly so for a Nation whose interests have become world-wide in scope.

"The committee, working in close cooperation with several executive departments of the Government on this problem, realized that no final or conclusive action could be taken during the war. While hostilities continued, temporary arrangements of many kinds to implement international communications were set up and carried on. The War Department established a far-flung system of communications which linked together military outposts and air bases all over the earth. This system, established at high cost to the American taxpayer, gave visual and concrete evidence of what a single, well integrated, closely coordinated, and effectively directed international communications enterprise could accomplish. The Navy Department added to its already extensive world-wide communications service and as a result our naval vessels and shore establishments all over the world were also effectively linked together. To these two services was added the expanded and effectively operated facilities of our own American communications carriers engaged in international traffic. It should be noted, however, that all of these services were made effective only because this Nation was engaged in a world-wide war and our allies willingly extended every aid and facility in knitting together such a world-wide communications service. The end of the war modified and changed this idyllic picture. While one international conference has been held looking to improvement in American international communications facilities, the basic problem remains unchanged.

"Following the assembling of a great deal of original data and conferences between members of the committee and representatives of the State, War, and Navy Departments (the three agencies of government most interested in and most concerned with international communications), the committee began hearings on the general subject of international communications. Those hearings covered a period of nearly a month in March and April of 1945. Nine witnesses, all representatives of Government departments, appeared before the committee to present their views and the views of their agencies and departments. These witnesses included Mr. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State; Mr. Francis C. de Wolf, Chief of the Telecommunications Division of the Department of State; the Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Rear Adm. Joseph R. Redman, Director of Naval Communications; Chairman Paul A. Porter, of the Federal Communications Commission; Maj. Gen. Harry C. Ingles, Chief Signal Officer of the War Department; Brig. Gen. H. M. McClelland, air communications officer of the Army Air Forces; and Mr. Charles I. Stanton, Deputy Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The hearings comprise two volumes of 574 pages and together with maps, charts, tables, and other valuable exhibits afford the most current and reliable information on the subject of international communications presently available.

"It should be noted here, however, that these hearings are by no means complete nor do they represent views and opinions of all authoritative sources on this subject. The committee limited the first phase of its hearings to the representatives of the Government departments, desiring to obtain a well-rounded and over-all viewpoint from the Government agencies prior to determining for the record the viewpoints of the representatives of the American carriers in the international field. During the course of the hearings it became obvious that the affected Government departments were not of one mind with respect to the policy that should be laid down by this Government to govern American international communications. There was no disagreement over one fundamental fact—American international communications stood in need of improvement from the standpoint of better, faster, cheaper, and more comprehensive service in the interests of American commercial, diplomatic, and military needs. There was a divergence of opinion among those witnesses who testified as to how this objective could and should be accomplished.

"The lack of a concerted and unified view among the Government departments led to a decision by the committee to continue its investigation and study but to hold in temporary abeyance further hearings until such time as the executive departments had reached a definitive agreement regarding American policy on international communications. Prior to and during the hearings, the executive had constituted an interdepartmental committee to study the problem and make recommendations to the President on this subject. During the hearings the committee learned that this interdepartmental committee had failed to reach complete agreement. The committee was informed that further efforts would be made by the Government departments to arrive at a concerted view which would represent departmental policy on this subject and which would then be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration in evolving legislation affecting the entire problem."

Members of the committee, aware of the extensive, far-flung network of Army and Navy communications, were concerned with what disposition would be made of these installations and systems after the war ended. Those who had studied the situation believed that a way could be found through which these modern and expensive installations could be used to build up an American-owned world-wide communications system in peacetime. A similar belief was held in some military quarters, and it was deemed desirable that the committee see at first hand the extent and scope of American world-wide communications.

A twofold purpose governed the decision to undertake a survey: (1) To see at first hand the equipment needed for, and the operation of, an integrated world-wide communications system completely within the ownership, control, and administration of the United States; and (2) to determine what part, if any, of such an integrated modern system could be fitted into a peacetime international communications system owned and operated by citizens of this country.

In May 1945 the committee was invited by the Secretary of the Navy (Mr. Forrestal), with the approval and active assistance of the War Department, to make a survey of the military communications installations which had been established in Europe, the Near East, and north Africa. Subsequently, a member of the committee (Senator McFARLAND) had an opportunity to make similar surveys of communications installations and operations in key gateway cities within the continental United States as well as throughout the Caribbean area, Alaska, and the entire Pacific, including Hawaii, Johnston Island, Kwajalein, Guam, Tinian, Saipan, Iwo Jima; Tokyo and Japan generally; Shanghai, Tsientsin, Tsingtao, and Peiping, China; Okinawa; Manila; Darwin, Brisbane, and Sydney, Australia; New Caledonia, Fiji, and Canton Islands.

The committee believes it is important to point out that when World War II ended, the United States had under its control a world-girdling wire and radio communications system such as had theretofore been wistfully conceived only in rather imaginative plans. It was the last word in modernity, and it performed superbly under all sorts of conditions. Communication between Washington and the most remote places in India, China, Japan, Africa, the Near East, and in most of Europe was almost instantaneous and teletype conversations could be carried on with the same facility that an American manufacturing plant communicates with its branch offices in the United States. No other nation had, or has, the technique, the equipment, and the know-how to do what the United States did in building and operating that system.

Nor was this vast system valuable alone for ordinary administrative and command communications. The war brought with it an unprecedented and wholly unforeseen rapid development in world-wide aviation. American-built planes, flown by American crews, were flying the world. Personnel and cargo were being carried to every quarter of the globe. Engines and competent crews alone are not enough for scheduled air transport. Safe flying, safe for the passengers and crew, is impossible without adequate navigational aids. These include the communications to get the plane off the ground, weather information, en route information, and the means to find the destination and land there despite weather conditions. The military services, aided by the brains and know-how of the best technical experts in America, developed electronic aids which made world-wide flying reasonably safe in wartime. The United States Government built not only air fields all over the world but likewise installed every modern electronic device available to insure steady, uninterrupted flights.

Thus, at war's end, there existed two vast communications operations: one linking together widely scattered airports and making air transport between them relatively safe; the second a practical commercial communications service operated by the Army Signal Corps, serving our military and diplomatic units all over the world and capable of handling tremendous message loads. Both were built and operated at tremendous cost to the American taxpayer.

What happened to the airways communications? The Army and Navy were demobilized rapidly. Trained personnel, the most critical item which takes longest to procure, returned to civilian life. Airports into which this country had poured millions of dollars in construction were returned to the nations in whose lands they were built, frequently without agreements of any kind for their further maintenance or operation on standards comparable to wartime standards, or even any agreements at all. In some cases, after the war, American-flag-line air transports were not even granted landing privileges on airports which American brains and blood and dollars had built. Valuable communications equipment was declared surplus, stacked in surplus yards, stolen, disappeared, and not infrequently could be found serving as a table or some other household item in a Bedouin's tent in the desert. A large part of the superlative airways communications service in Europe, in north Africa, in the Near East, and particularly in the South Pacific areas, disintegrated, and the existing situation is such that qualified witnesses, for example, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, term flying in the Far East and in the Pacific hazardous or unsafe in comparison with the comparative safety of wartime. Even the transport arms of the Army and Navy are seriously hampered by the present communications situation. And while the accident rate for both commercial and military transport flying has steadily decreased in recent years, the recent upsurge in major accidents is directly traceable to a lack of, or an inadequate number and type of, communication aids to navigation.

This brief summary of the disintegration that has taken place in the communications facilities for airways is being rapidly paralleled in the magnificent communications network operated by the Army Communications Service, which coupled with the Naval Communications Service, makes possible this world-girdling communications network. Brought into being within 18 months after the outbreak of the war, it gave this country for the first time in its history the kind of

communications network that is dreamed about. The brains and ability and know-how of every American communications carrier and communications equipment manufacturer went into the building and maintenance of that system. But, as in the case of airways communications, rapid demobilization of trained personnel, evacuation from bases and areas all over the world where communications equipment was installed and maintained, fiscal retrenchment, and the lessening need by the military for such a world-wide service are the principal factors in the break-up of this network of communications.

It must be remembered, as has been pointed out in earlier reports by the committee, that except for the period of the war, the United States never has had a world-wide communications service available to American patrons which insured the delivery of diplomatic, military, or commercial messages through its own services to every point of destination and at rates as low as those available to nationals of other nations. This is not the fault of American commercial carriers doing business in the international field; in equipment, methods, initiative, and all-around ability they surpass the world. For example, the British communications monopoly, Cables & Wireless, whose major installations and methods of operation the committee surveyed in such key places as London and Malta, by comparison, employs equipment and methods fully a quarter of a century behind those of the major American carriers. But the fact remains that the British combine, through Empire preferences and other arrangements, has been for years, and remains today, a world-circling communications network whose services must be employed to get messages into many, many places in the world. As a single company operating throughout the world and partly owned by the Government (recently it has been nationalized and will be wholly owned by the Government) the British Government has pushed it into a preeminent place in world-wide communications. Moreover, its users anywhere in the British Commonwealth of Nations enjoy a preferential Empire rate against which competition is difficult.

Before World War II, except for Navy ship-shore and to a more limited degree shore-shore, and except for limited Army communications within the continental United States and to certain Territorial possessions, the diplomatic, military, and commercial communications of the United States and its citizens were subject to the economic and political influences of competing governments and their agencies.

This committee had previously expressed the hope (S. Rept. No. 1907, 79th Cong.) before the disintegration of war-built communications had gone too far that the United States acting through the State Department, would have evolved and promulgated an American communications policy for the guidance of American communication companies; it had hoped that the creation of a second interdepartmental committee on communications would lead to unified agreement among the various departments and agencies of Government which have heretofore expressed conflicting opinions before this committee as to what should be American communications policy.

This committee believed that promulgation of such a policy was desirable and necessary so that our own American communications companies could be guided in their future plans, not alone with respect to competition between themselves as against foreign communication services, but likewise with respect to what American users of international communications services may expect in the way of rates and practices which directly affect the freer exchange of news and information between nations.

This committee also had hoped that even before the formulation of such a policy and while our Government still enjoyed the prestige and affection that its contribution toward winning the war had given the United States among the nations of the world, thought would have been given and action taken toward working out mutually satisfactory arrangements or temporary agreements with many foreign powers for the continued maintenance and operation in certain areas, either by us or by them, of both airways communications and commercial communications installations and service.

Unfortunately, this policy was not followed. Instead of seizing opportunities which appeared to have been available, it will now be necessary, in most cases, to begin all over again, relying on our bargaining ability in international conferences. Our record of accomplishments in such conferences in both the communication and aviation spheres has not yet been marked with outstanding success.

The committee has carried out the function assigned it by the Senate. It has surveyed extensive communications installations throughout the world. It has held hearings, which though incomplete from the standpoint of finally evolving a legislative policy, has, nevertheless, brought up to date the most authoritative body of data bearing on the subject of American international communications. In the 3¼ years since the study was authorized by the Senate, the committee has expended $14,555.16 of the $15,000 appropriated for the work, this expenditure including salaries for staff. The surveys of communications installations, the hearings, and the study generally has armed members of the committee with valuable information on the broad general subject of international communications and their importance to the diplomatic, military, and economic welfare of the Nation.

The committee deems it important to point out that the study here reported on grew out of the legislative preparation of the bill which became the Domestic Merger Act, permitting the merger of the Western Union and Postal Telegraph companies. In its original form that legislation, carrying out the recommendations of an earlier report by this committee, would have permitted a similar merger of American carriers operating in the international field, but barred the creation of a single over-all communications carrier operating both in the domestic and international fields. The provision permitting a merger of international carriers was dropped at the specific request of the Navy Department, and other agencies of Government. These agencies, faced at that time with the exigencies of defense preparations, felt they did not have the time to devote to a study of so important a problem, and asked that it be deferred until such time as their views could be worked out.

The removal of the international merger provision has worked an injustice on the Western Union Telegraph Co., the sole remaining domestic carrier which subsequently absorbed the Postal Telegraph Co. The Domestic Merger Act specifically prevented the merged domestic carrier from engaging in international business and conversely, any merged international carrier from engaging in domestic business. Because the law as finally enacted did not permit merger of international carriers, the Western Union Co. has found itself in the anomalous position of not being able to dispose of its extensive trans-Atlantic cables and has continued to operate them under special permit of the Federal Communications Commission, which has been renewed from time to time, until some final solution of the merger question is made by the Congress. It is neither a sound nor a healthy situation for a corporation to operate a phase of its business under a law which provides that it must eventually dispose of that phase of its business, but meanwhile must continue to operate it. Obviously, the corporation does not know whether it should make improvements in its cable lines, aggressively seek new business and attempt to build up its international business, or assume that eventually it must dispose of this operation and do little about it.

Meanwhile the company has faced tremendously increased operating costs, due to retroactive wage decisions and increased wages. It has been granted rate increases by the Federal Communications Commission, but its ability to carry on and furnish a first-class communications service to American users is further hampered by this legislative anomaly.

This company is likewise suffering an additional discrimination in the way of special rates for Government business. The special rate for Government messages was a requirement of the 1866 Post Roads Act, as amended, under which the company was granted certain rights-of-way over public lands. A provision which would have removed the special rate to Government was eliminated from the Domestic Merger Act when that bill was in conference. The committee, however, desires to point out that this company is the only private business in America which is required to furnish service to the Government at a lower rate than to other patrons. The Congress last year eliminated the special land-grant rates for railroad haulage of Government supplies and personnel, and no other communications carrier is required to grant the Government a special rate.

The committee believes that in fairness to the Western Union and in the interest of strengthening this domestic communications company so that it can offer a better service to American users, the Congress should (a) either eliminate from the law the provision which prevents the Western Union Co. from carrying on fully and freely its international business by cable, or expedite legislation providing for merger of international carriers so that the cables may be transferred to such a carrier, and (b) eliminate the prevailing special rate to Government as an incongruity not required of any other private business.

The committee also looks forward with a great deal of anticipation to a report on international communications which is expected from the interdepartmental committee. It recognizes that while the primary duty of laying down a legislative policy in this field devolves upon the Congress, it is of the greatest importance that the Congress have before it the views of the interested and affected Government departments and agencies, and that these views be unified, so that they represent a broad policy determination on this vitally important communications problem. The committee believes that the more than 3 years that have elapsed since this study was undertaken has afforded ample time for the Government agencies concerned to reach agreement on what should be this Nation's international communications policy. The committee itself has made clear, in earlier reports, that permissive consolidation of carriers and careful frequency allocation standards are prime legislative requisites.

The committee believes that with the cooperation and assistance of the agencies of Government concerned with the problem, a permanent solution can be and should be worked out as rapidly as possible. The committee reiterates the final paragraph of its interim report of July 31, 1946:

"The committee trusts that with the advent of the Eightieth Congress it will have the benefit of the Executive's view on American international communications policy and that the policy so presented will have the approval and support of all of the interested Government departments and agencies. With such a recommendation before the Congress, the committee is of the opinion that further hearings, during which the viewpoint of the carrier representatives will be heard, can be expedited and the Congress

presented with a definitive legislative proposal which would strengthen and improve international communications service all over the world, with the object of making cheaper and more readily available American news to all other countries and their news to America; cheapening, speeding, and affording greater and more secure communications to American commercial interests and making more secure and complete American diplomatic and military communications."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 524. A bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to receive contributions from foreign governments to help defray the expenses of its work in cooperating with foreign governments in furthering the interchange of knowledge and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 525, to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT) introduced Senate bill 526, to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 527. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 528. A bill to continue rent control until June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 529. A bill for the relief of Wilma E. Baker; and

S. 530. A bill to provide for reasonable attorneys' fees in the case of any suit by or against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 531. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 532. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 533. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 534, to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 535. A bill for the relief of Adelbert E. Tuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 536. A bill to provide for the holding of a special election by the members of the electoral college to fill vacancies caused by the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 537. A bill for the relief of Earl M. Semingsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 538. A bill for the relief of Carleton Cummings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill creating a National Science Foundation, which is similar to the bill passed by the Senate last year. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Utah will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 525) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL CREATING A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. President, in the last session of Congress the Senate passed a bill creating a National Science Foundation for the purpose of providing Federal assistance on a peacetime basis to fundamental scientific research and training. This bill which had been sponsored by Senators KILGORE, MAGNUSON, SALTONSTALL, FERGUSON, JOHNSON of Colorado, PEPPER, FULBRIGHT, and myself, embodied the results of extensive Senate study and debate, and had the endorsement of the principal educational and scientific groups of the country. Because the House failed to act on this bill the Seventy-ninth Congress did not enact much-needed comprehensive scientific legislation.

Many persons who have followed the development of science in this country and abroad believe that the Eightieth Congress should act promptly to create a National Science Foundation such as that favored by the Senate in the last session of Congress. At the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in Boston this past December the representatives of the principal scientific groups of the country expressed themselves to this effect.

As the former chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee which reported this bill favorably in the last Congress and as a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which I assume will have jurisdiction over this legislation in the new Congress, I am today reintroducing this bill in the form that it passed the Senate on July 3 of last year. It is, of course, clearly understood that I do not consider the bill as now reintroduced a final document, but rather the appropriate starting point for speedy and effective consideration of legislation in the new Congress. I personally feel that support to the social sciences which was dropped from the committee bill by the Senate should be reinstated.

Many other Senators have been interested and, in fact, have worked tirelessly in perfecting this bill. In view of this fact I ask unanimous consent that other Senators may be permitted to officially join in sponsoring this bill and that their names be added upon my submitting them to the Senate. I also ask unanimous consent for a brief extension of my remarks at this point for the purpose of further describing its purposes and status.

The Senate bill—S. 1850—which in the last Congress had been perfected after many months of active study and hearings provided Federal assistance on a peacetime basis for scientific scholarships and fellowships, and for scientific research, including fundamental research generally, and applied research in health and medicine and national defense. These functions were favored by the Senate only after exhaustive evidence provided by its own Military Affairs Committee and the Office of Scientific Research and Development showed that existing Government and private arrangements could not support the needs of an advanced industrial nation like our own.

Another purpose of the bill was the creation of a central Federal scientific agency which would have general oversight over the numerous scientific activities already supported by the Federal Government. It is believed that this coordinating feature would increase the effectiveness of Federal scientific research and either yield an outright financial economy or give us better scientific work for the same money.

At the present time some of the activities contemplated by the National Science Foundation bill are being carried out on a temporary basis while other needed functions are not being met at all. The War and Navy Departments are carrying on vast programs of military research, including the support of fundamental research programs, in the amount of about $100,000,000 annually. The military departments have publicly stated, and it is generally agreed, that these fundamental research projects should be administered on a permanent basis by a civilian agency such as the proposed National Science Foundation. Scientific scholarships and fellowships, financial aid for research in health and medicine, and support for many important types of fundamental research are still not available.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bipartisan bill covering the vitally important subject of research in the fundamental sciences.

In preparing the bill we have considered carefully the debates last year on S. 1850, and we have tried in this bill to meet the objections made to the bill passed by the Senate last year, which was rejected by the House.

We have conferred with many scientists particularly interested in this subject—and, in particular, Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University; Dr. Smyth, of Princeton, the author of the atomic-energy report; and Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was the directing head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

In introducing this bill, we are doing so with the feeling we are taking a right

course in simplifying the procedure and in turning over the whole responsibility of this scientific-research program to a foundation of scientists who will be appointed by the President with confirmation by the Senate.

This foundation of eminent scientists is given a free hand by the bill to develop the policies of scientific research in the United States, and to discover and train promising young scientists, with financial aid from the Federal Government.

I make this brief statement in introducing the bill in order to emphasize its bipartisan character. I also desire to reemphasize that the general approach of the bill, with its emphasis on basic science as contrasted with applied science, has the approval of leading scientists of the country in the fields of both basic and applied science.

If passed, the bill will be known as the National Science Foundation Act of 1947.

The bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TIME ALLOWANCES AND COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN PRISON INMATES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services. The bill has been drafted by the Attorney General of the United States, and I introduce it at his request. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter addressed to me from the Attorney General, dated February 5, 1947.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 534) to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the discretion of the Attorney General and under rules and regulations promulgated by him:

(a) The additional deductions from sentences of prisoners employed in industries or camps authorized by section 8 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391, 18 U. S. C. 744h), may be extended to prisoners performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services in institutional operations; and

(b) The Prison Industries Fund, established by section 4 of the act of June 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 1211, 18 U. S. C. 744–1), may be employed in paying compensation to such prisoners.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to draw your attention to a discriminatory feature of existing law relating to the employment of Federal prisoners.

Under existing law, Federal prisoners may be compensated if they are employed in a Federal prison industry (18 U. S. C. 744f). Such prisoners may also receive reductions in their sentences for such employment (18 U. S. C. 744h). On the other hand, prisoners who are not assigned to industries but who do maintenance work in the Federal institution in which they are incarcerated receive no compensation or recognition in the way of additional time off.

Prisoners who perform meritorious or outstanding services in connection with institutional operations should be allowed, in some instances, similar advantages as are prisoners employed in industries. In many cases such prisoners are just as capable as those assigned to the various industries and contribute just as much to their own welfare and to the operations of the various institutions. Often prisoners who are expert plumbers or steamfitters, as an example, would like to be assigned to an industry but are needed in the institution and, accordingly, are assigned to it. This gives rise to a feeling of discrimination which hampers the primary purpose of employment in prisons, i. e., the rehabilitation of the prisoner.

Accordingly, I suggest that existing law be extended so as to allow, in the discretion of the Attorney General, compensation and extra time deductions to inmates employed in maintaining the various institutions on a similar basis as is extended to prisoners employed in industries. Such advantages should be granted only to a prisoner showing a real attempt to improve his ability for a useful life upon his release.

I suggest, also, that like advantages be extended to prisoners who perform acts of bravery, who protect the lives of civilian employees or other inmates, or who voluntarily accept dangerous assignments. An example of the latter group would be those prisoners who volunteered to submit to the malarial and other research experiments in an effort to aid the armed forces during World War II.

A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate the foregoing purposes is enclosed.

I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of President, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FILING OF ANNUAL STATEMENTS OF INCOME BY SENATORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 33) requiring Senators to file annual statements of income and dealings in securities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF USE OF GOVERNMENT TIME FOR PRIVATE PUBLICATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, I wish to announce the appointment of a subcommittee, of three Senators consisting of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], chairman; the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]; and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] to make a thorough investigation as to whether employees under civil service have been employed on Government time to write autobiographies and newspaper columns, private manuscripts, books, or other documents written for profit or for personal use, during the past 6 years.

At the same time I wish to issue an invitation to any civil service employee who did that character of work for any official in the United States Government to communicate with me, and I will guarantee to protect him in his civil service status.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, that the purpose of appointing this committee is to protect the taxpayers. If it is found that any official, in the past 6 years, used Government employees during working hours, on Government pay, to further that individual's private interest, the Attorney General of the United States will be requested to institute civil action to recover the money wrongfully paid out.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY HON. DWIGHT H. GREEN, GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, delivered at the Lincoln Day banquet in Washington, sponsored by the Republican Members of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hearing We Deserve," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC NATIONALISM — EDITORIAL FROM STAMFORD (CONN.) ADVOCATE

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economic Nationalism," published in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of January 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

THE OPENING OF BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, 37 years ago today an event occurred which few people noted and fewer still applauded,

yet which was destined to affect the lives of over 13,000,000 of our citizens, and through them the lives of millions of others with whom they have associated. This event was the incorporation of the Boy Scouts of America, an organization which was granted a Federal charter by Congress 6 years later on the basis of outstanding service rendered to the Nation.

Since that day 37 years ago, more than 13,000,000 men and boys have experienced the joys and derived the benefits of Scouting. They have had the opportunity to take part in worth-while activities and to extend their horizons by contacts with Scouts in some 73 different lands, representing practically every civilized nation in the world.

Most people know that the Scout program provides wholesome recreation for boys in the out-of-doors. Not everyone understands that the Scout method of training for citizenship is unique, and that it should be a part of the experience of every American boy. Many former Scouts give evidence of the value of this training. This volunteer agency deserves the support of all the American people.

FREEDOM FROM TAX ON GIFTS TO UNITED NATIONS — COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 6, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

An offer of $8,500,000 has been made to the United Nations for acquisition of a headquarters site in the city of New York, on the condition that the gift should be free of Federal gift taxes.

The United Nations desires to take advantage of this generous offer and has requested that the United States comply with the condition attached to this gift.

I heartily recommend that this Government comply with this request. It would appear that the most desirable method by which this gift could be freed from such taxes would be to amend the appropriate sections of the Internal Revenue Code. In addition to accomplishing the purpose of complying with the above offer, the effect of such an amendment would be to encourage other public-spirited citizens to make gifts to the United Nations.

I enclose herewith for your consideration copy of a suggested joint resolution which would accomplish the desired purposes.

I consider that the passage of such a resolution is definitely in the public interest and I suggest that you bring this to the attention of the Congress at your earliest convenience.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT RELATING TO NATURAL AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my recent message to the Congress requesting the extension of certain titles of the Second War Powers Act for continued controls in a few specific areas I pointed out the importance of natural and synthetic rubber to the national security. In that connection I urged the Congress to continue allocation controls over rubber pending consideration of permanent legislation that would insure the maintenance of a minimum synthetic-rubber industry in the United States.

I am sure that the Congress will wish to consider carefully all aspects of the problem before enacting permanent legislation. During the period of such consideration, however, I urge that there be no break in the continuity of policy and administrative action concerning both natural and synthetic rubber. I therefore wish to review, in somewhat fuller detail than was possible in my previous message, the character of this problem and to suggest actions that seem desirable for the Congress to take at this time.

The problem has not been a matter of immediate concern up to the present time, because world supplies of natural rubber have been so critically short that it has been necessary for us to make fullest practicable use of our facilities for producing synthetic rubber. As I stated in my previous message, the world supply of natural rubber is still inadequate to meet world needs. We must, however, recognize that the time is rapidly approaching when this condition will no longer prevail. According to the best evidence that I have been able to obtain, it appears that perhaps in late 1947, and almost certainly by early 1948, natural-rubber production will have increased to the point where it will be possible to satisfy world rubber needs largely from natural rubber. With an adequate world supply of natural rubber and a free choice of materials by industry, the use of synthetic rubber in the United States might fall substantially below the permanent production goals considered to be minimum for the needs of national security. This would be even more likely if at sometime in 1948 the world supply of natural rubber should begin to exceed the total world demand for all rubber.

The Congress has already made provision, by means of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1946, for the accumulation of a stock pile of natural rubber within the borders of the United States. The physical properties of rubber, however, and the necessity of stock-pile rotation, place limits which make the largest feasible Government stock pile of natural rubber inadequate in itself to meet the demands of a national emergency. The stock pile must be supplemented by an assured production of American-made rubber.

Appropriate action should be taken now to assure that adequate facilities for the production of American-made rubber of the highest quality continue to be available. Part of this productive capacity should continue in effective operation, and the techniques required for the efficient processing of synthetic rubber in the manufacture of rubber products should be maintained and improved.

The Congress will recall the extraordinary measures that had to be taken in the early days of the recent war to meet the emergency caused by the sudden unavailability of our normal supplies of rubber. At the direction of President Roosevelt a Rubber Survey Committee was created which outlined vigorous measures to be taken by both industry and Government. We were fortunate in having time to carry out the program outlined by this committee, for the shortage of rubber could have caused the collapse of our war effort and of our domestic economy.

On another occasion we might not be so fortunate. The security of the United States and the essential needs of its citizens must never again be jeopardized by inadequate or uncertain rubber supplies.

In recognition of this fact, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion created an Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber in September 1945. This committee made an exhaustive study of the problem, in cooperation with industry and the executive agencies concerned, and submitted two reports which were transmitted to the Congress on March 8 and July 22, 1946. These reports outline the dimensions of the problem and suggest various methods of meeting it.

The Congress should deal with all aspects of this matter during the present session because of its vital effect upon our national security. Meanwhile, it is imperative that the Congress extend authority to continue controls over rubber under the Second War Powers Act, as I requested in my previous message. Prompt action by the Congress will provide the basis for continuity of operation in rubber controls, and will permit their simplification and orderly relaxation or removal. It will also greatly aid the agencies concerned in planning production in Government-owned synthetic rubber plants and such action will contribute to the disposal of these plants to private industry.

The time will soon arrive when it will no longer be necessary to use these controls to insure equitable distribution of natural rubber or to produce the maximum number of commodities from synthetic rubber. When this time comes, continued controls would be used only for the purpose of insuring the maintenance of a minimum synthetic-rubber industry in the United States. Controls should be used for such maintenance of a synthetic-rubber industry only if specific authority is provided for that purpose.

I therefore recommend that the Senate and the House of Representatives, by joint resolution, make a declaration

of policy to the effect that it is the firm intention of the Government to maintain a synthetic-rubber industry in the United States, adequate to the minimum needs of national security.

I further recommend that the Senate and the House of Representatives act expeditiously in establishing appropriate committee arrangements to consider the problems involved in maintaining a synthetic-rubber industry in the United States and to draft such legislation as is found to be necessary to accomplish this objective.

I repeat my recent recommendation that the authority to continue allocation controls on rubber be continued for 1 year under title III of the Second War Powers Act, in order that the Congress may have an opportunity to consider this problem and to enact such permanent legislation as in its judgment is necessary and appropriate.

The program of action I have outlined has the unanimous and vigorous support of all agencies of Government concerned with this problem. I am instructing these agencies to give all possible assistance to the Congress in its consideration of the problem, and to make available, on request, the statistical material and other information which they have collected.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1947.*

ESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM RENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS

Mr. BUTLER obtained the floor.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a short statement.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, it has been a long-standing practice for many of the executive agencies of Government to override the will of Congress by distorting the law or wholly ignoring it.

It appears that such is the case in the attempted continued establishment of maximum rents by the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls through the facilities of that office. At the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Second War Powers Act was extended and amended expressly to provide that nothing contained in the act, or any other act, shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for housing accommodations, except the officer or agency specified in the Emergency Price Control Act or the Stabilization Act.

Notwithstanding this express prohibition by the Congress, the President, by Executive order, has transferred this function to the Office of Temporary Controls, and the Administrator of that office is now asserting the right to establish maximum rents for housing accommodations. What I say in connection with this matter has nothing to do with the merits of continued Federal rent controls. My personal view is that all wartime controls should be ended promptly; but what I want to bring to the attention of the Senate is a matter I deem to be a flagrant disregard of law by the President and the personnel of an executive agency which has been set up by Executive order.

The principle involved is highly important. The Office of Price Administration was an agency set up by the Congress under the terms of the Emergency Price Control Act. The standards by which it might operate were defined in the statute by the Congress. The Administrator of that office could be appointed by the President only with the advice and consent of the Senate, and thus, control was retained over the identity of the person who was to administer the far-reaching war powers delegated by the law.

It was certainly my intention in offering the amendment to the Second War Powers Act which excluded the authority of any officer or agency of the Government to establish maximum prices or maximum rents except the officer and agency specified in the Emergency Price Control Act or the Stabilization Act, to prevent the precise thing which the President has now done by Executive order.

The Office of Temporary Controls is not a creature of the Congress. The Administrator of that office is appointed by the President without regard to the consent or advice of the Senate, and consequently the right of the Senate to exercise its participation in the selection of the individual who is now administering the wartime controls of establishing maximum prices and maximum rents has been bypassed.

Section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act provides that each outstanding committee of the Senate and the House "shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee."

I have sent to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], a copy of correspondence with the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, and I urge upon that committee that it investigate and consider whether the actions of the Administrator and that agency are in violation of existing law with respect to the establishment of maximum rents; and if so, take such action as they deem appropriate.

Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks copies of correspondence between me and Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, and a statement by me.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1947.

Maj. Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: By Executive Order 9809 of December 12, 1946, the President consolidated various governmental agencies, including OPA, to form the Office of Temporary Controls and transferred the functions of such consolidated agencies to that Office. Pursuant to this action, you, as Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, are continuing the establishment of maximum rents for housing accommodations.

In this connection, I call your attention to section 2, title 15, of the Second War Powers Act, which provides as follows:

"Nothing contained in this act or any other act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations."

You will note that by the express language of the above provision of law no officer or agency of the Government is authorized to establish maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations except as provided by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

Since the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, reposes exclusive jurisdiction in the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to "establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for such accommodations as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act," it seems clear that the function of establishing maximum rents for housing accommodations cannot be transferred to or performed by the Office of Temporary Controls or the Administrator of that agency, and the President is without authority of law to direct or authorize any officer or agency of the Government to perform such function except the officer and the agency specified in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

I am, therefore, requesting that you advise me what provision of law, in your opinion, authorizes you to establish maximum rents for housing accommodations. Your immediate answer in this connection will be greatly appreciated, in view of the legislation concerning rent controls now being considered by the Congress.

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

STATEMENT OF E. H. MOORE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

I have today written Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, as per the attached letter, which is self-explanatory.

It is my opinion that the establishment of maximum rents by the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls is without authority of law and that his acts in this connection are illegal. When the Second War Powers Act was extended at the last session of Congress, I offered an amendment to that law which was adopted by the Congress providing that nothing in that act, or any other act, shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of government of maximum rents for any housing accommodations except the officer or agency named and designated by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

This is important. The Emergency Price Control Act lays down express limitations for establishing maximum rents and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration is appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus Congress has control over the individual who is to administer the Emergency Price Control Act. The Office of Temporary Controls is a creature of the executive department of government created by Executive order.

Its rules and regulations and methods of procedure are not limited by any specific law of Congress. The Administrator of that office is appointed by the President, and the Senate has no authority to approve or disapprove such individual. The reasons for the amendment to the Second War Powers Act above referred to are, therefore, obvious.

Establishment of maximum prices and rents were wartime emergencies. They are the essence of regimentation and will not be tolerated by the American people under our form of government except in time of war and even then only under the express provisions of law enacted by the people's representatives in the Congress.

The action of the President in transferring the functions of the Office of Price Administration to establish maximum rents for housing accommodations to the Office of Temporary Controls is directly in the face of and contrary to the Second War Powers Act, as amended at the last session of Congress. Since the Office of Price Administration has been terminated by its transfer to the Office of Temporary Controls, and since the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, as provided by the Emergency Price Control Act, has resigned, and no Administrator has been appointed or approved by the Senate, it would appear that there has been no authority of law for the establishment of maximum rents since December 12, 1946. In ignoring the law, the President has vitiated the existing legal authority to establish maximum rents.

OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS,
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1947.

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MOORE: This is in answer to your letter of February 3, 1947, inquiring as to the authority of the Temporary Controls Administrator to establish maximum rents for housing accommodations.

The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, authorizes the establishment of maximum rents for any housing accommodations. Under Executive Order 9809, dated December 12, 1946, the Office of Price Administration and certain other agencies, together with their functions, were consolidated to form one agency in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President, to be known as the Office of Temporary Controls. The order also vested in the Temporary Controls Administrator the functions of the Price Administrator.

The order is based, in part, upon title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, which authorizes the President to redistribute functions among agencies, to consolidate agencies, and to transfer duties and powers from one agency to another.

You refer to section 2, title 15, of the Second War Powers Act, which reaffirms that the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is the sole authority for the establishment of maximum rents for any housing accommodations. The section of the Second War Powers Act to which you refer does not—and, indeed, does not purport to—limit or restrict the power of the President to designate which officer or agency of the Government shall exercise the authority contained in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to establish maximum rents for any housing accommodations.

In brief, the Temporary Controls Administrator, having been vested with the functions of the Price Administrator, establishes maximum rents for any housing accommodations solely pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army,
Administrator.

FEBRUARY 6, 1947.

Maj. Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: I have yours of February 6 in answer to my letter of February 3.

It seems clear from your reply that the context of my letter was not studied in connection with existing provisions of law and that the legal issue raised was not understood by you.

I have no doubt that maximum rents are being established by the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls through the facilities of that Office in the manner provided for by the Emergency Price Control Act. That, however, is not the question raised and is wholly beside the point. The point is that the Congress has, by law, said that no act shall be construed to authorize any officer or agency of the Government to established maximum rents except the officer and agency provided for in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, delegates permissive authority to the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, as provided for in that act, to establish maximum rents through the facilities of and in accordance with the Office of Price Administration, as created by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, does not authorize the establishment by any other officer or agency of the Government of maximum rents.

You state that the amendment to the Second War Powers Act does not limit or restrict the power of the President to designate which officer or agency of the Government shall exercise the authority contained in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to establish maximum rents for any housing accommodations. That is exactly what it does do, namely, the amendment provides that nothing contained in the Second War Powers Act, or any other act, except as that provided in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum rents. In other words, maximum rents may be established by the officer and agency of the Government designated and specified by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and no other. That was the express purpose of the legislation.

It should, therefore, be apparent to you that the Office of Temporary Controls, or the Administrator of that Office, is without authority of law to establish maximum rents for any housing accommodations, and that Executive Order 9809 of December 12, 1946, is illegal and void to the extent that it attempts to authorize such agency or its Administrator to do so, and that your continued actions in this regard are illegal and without legal force or effect, and are subject to such penalties as may be judicially determined in the premises.

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has been recognized.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Is not the call of the calendar now the order of business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The call of the calendar under rule VIII is the order of business.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a number of Senators desire to speak, most of them very briefly, but may I not urge on them that they permit the disposition of the calendar, and to defer requesting time to speak on matters not related to bills on the calendar until we have disposed of the calendar? There are only about half a dozen bills on the calendar. They can be very speedily disposed of, and then it will be in order for Senators to speak on subjects concerning which they desire to address the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am very anxious to cooperate with the majority leader and with the Senate. I am anxious to get away from the Senate reasonably early. If by unanimous consent I may have the floor for a short time following the call of the calendar, I will yield the floor.

Mr. WHITE. That is entirely agreeable to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EASEMENT IN CERTAIN LANDS IN VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 220) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment in section 2, on page 3, line 4, after the name "Baltimore City", to strike out "Maryland."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to grant, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. of Virginia, a corporation, an easement for the installation, maintenance, operation, replacement, and removal of underground communication systems consisting of cables, wires, conduits, manholes, drains and splicing boxes, surface testing terminals, repeaters, markers, and other appurtenances as the said corporation may from time to time require (a) upon, under, and across the following parcels of land within the boundaries of the United States Naval Proving Grounds, King George County, Va., the metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department:

(1) a strip of land $16\frac{5}{10}$ feet in width and approximately 5,616 feet in length extending from the westerly boundary of said naval reservation to the Potomac River, north of and adjacent to United States Highway No. 301;

(2) a strip of land $16\frac{5}{10}$ feet in width and approximately 420 feet in length connecting with the aforesaid strip of land and running northeasterly to the Potomac River;

(3) a piece or parcel of land containing approximately $116^{375}/_{1000}$ square feet for an auxiliary repeater station site;

and (b) upon, under, and across the railroad right-of-way of the United States of America between Fredericksburg and Dahlgren, King George County, Va., at station 1450 plus 57 of said railroad station system, the metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to grant, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. of Baltimore City, a corporation, an easement for the purposes contained in section 1 of this act, upon, under, and across the railroad right-of-way of the United States of America between Indian Head and White Plains, Charles County, Md., at a point in said right-of-way 2,431 feet distant along the railroad centerline from the point of switch with the main line of the Pope Creek Branch of the Baltimore & Washington Railroad, the metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 3. The conveyances made pursuant to this act shall be at no cost to the grantee.

EASEMENT IN LANDS IN THE NORFOLK NAVY YARD

The bill (S. 221) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant and convey by quitclaim deed under such conditions as he may approve, to Virginia Electric & Power Co., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, without cost to said corporation, a perpetual easement in two strips of land, each 20 feet in width, and 414 feet in length and 663 feet in length, respectively, containing four hundred and ninety-four one-thousandths of an acre of land, more or less, comprising portions of the salvage yard, and the Public Works storage lot, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., for the construction, maintenance, operation, renewal, replacement, and repair of electric power transmission and distribution lines consisting of poles, wires, cables, and other fixtures and appurtenances incidental thereto, the metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy, in consideration of the transfer to the United States by Virginia Electric & Power Co. title to certain equipment consisting of poles, wires, cross-arms, insulators, and other incidental materials, is further authorized to transfer, under such conditions as he shall approve, to said Virginia Electric & Power Co., without cost to said corporation, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States of America, in two electric cables, each three-conductor, 350,000 circular mills, 11,000-volt, and each 3,910 feet in length, which are installed within two conduits of the United States of America, constructed in and upon a strip of land comprising a part of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va.; and the Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to grant and convey, under such conditions as he may approve, to Virginia Electric & Power Co., without cost to said corporation, a perpetual easement to maintain, operate, renew, replace, and repair the aforesaid electric cables within said conduits, the metes and bounds description of the location of which is on file in the Navy Department.

CAMP GILLESPIE (CALIF.) RIGHT-OF-WAY

The bill (S. 231) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant to the city of San Diego, Calif., upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, a right-of-way for the construction, maintenance, operation, and repair of a water pipe line or lines within a strip of land 50 feet in width and 2,650 feet in length, more or less, which strip traverses land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.

EASEMENT IN LANDS IN BIBB COUNTY, GA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 234) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, at the top of page 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The said conveyance shall be made at no cost to the grantee: *Provided*, That the grantee shall bear the expense of relocating fencing, gates, and power poles now located on the land.

And insert:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy shall require, as a condition precedent to the conveyance herein authorized, payment by the grantee to the United States of a sum equal to the current market value of the easement herein authorized to be conveyed. The grantee shall bear the expense of relocating fencing, gates, and power poles now located on the land.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. a perpetual easement for the installation and operation of a railroad spur track in, over, and across a 50½-foot strip of land at the Naval Ordnance Plant, Macon, Ga., containing approximately thirty-three one-hundredths acre of land, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy shall require, as a condition precedent to the conveyance herein authorized, payment by the grantee to the United States of a sum equal to the current market value of the easement herein authorized to be conveyed. The grantee shall bear the expense of relocating fencing, gates, and power poles now located on the land.

EASEMENT IN LANDS IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The bill (S. 235) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., under such terms and conditions as he may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for the construction, reconstruction, inspection, maintenance, operation, and repair of a storm drain in, under, and along a part of a plot of approximately 15⅝ acres of land located in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and acquired by the United States through condemnation proceeding No. 2044–BH, Civil, in the District Court of the United States for the central division of the Southern District of California, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

MILEAGE AND OTHER TRAVEL ALLOWANCES OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 276) to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY subsequently said: Mr. President, a little while ago, under objection by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], Calendar No. 17, Senate bill 276, was passed over. I have since talked with the Senator from North Dakota and I am sure that he is quite well satisfied that there is nothing in the bill to which he now objects.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. Will the Senator explain the bill for the sake of the record?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, has the bill been referred to the Comptroller General, and has it received his approval?

Mr. GURNEY. The hearings on the bill do not indicate that it was referred to the Comptroller General.

I may say to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from North Dakota that a bill in like language was passed by the Senate last year. A similar provision applies to the Navy.

The bill simply makes the official mileage tables of the War Department apply to enlisted men as they now apply to officers. The purpose of the bill is to make pay vouchers more easily handled. It does nothing more than apply the official mileage tables to enlisted personnel as well as to officers. It would not only assist the War Department, but would bring its procedure into line with that of the Navy Department and make for efficiency in the office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I to understand that the Comptroller General has no objection to the passage of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. I am quite sure of that, although the specific question was not asked of the witness in the hearings held before our committee last Tuesday.

Mr. AIKEN. Was an identical bill in the previous Congress approved by the Comptroller General?

Mr. GURNEY. I would have to ascertain that. I am quite sure that the procedure is approved, because the Navy has had it since 1942. It is now in effect with respect to officers of the Army. The purpose of the bill is merely to bring enlisted men under the provisions of the official mileage tables.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from South Dakota is sure that the Comptroller General has no objection to the bill, I certainly have none.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure that the committee was of that opinion at the time of the hearing.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the bill itself was not submitted to the Comptroller General.

Mr. GURNEY. It was not submitted by the committee to the Comptroller General. If the Senator wishes to have the bill go over until we can ask that specific question, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that the Comptroller General should have an opportunity to state what effect the bill might have on the work of his department and upon the finances of the Government. I have no desire to delay consideration of the bill. On the other hand, I think the Comptroller General's opinion should be given. Would it make any great difference if the bill were to go over until next Monday?

Mr. GURNEY. Only the difference in time. The bill will of course be considered by the House. I am sure that the committee would like to have it passed at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with the assurance of the Senator from South Dakota that he is very certain that the Comptroller General would not object to the passage of the bill, I shall raise no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 276?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 276) to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of all military personnel, when such accounts are authorized to be based on distances between given points, shall be made in accordance with distances established for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 12, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 246; 10 U. S. C. 870).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the bills on the calendar.

DEATH OF HON. O. MAX GARDNER

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it had been my plan, upon the meeting of the Senate today, to speak in commendation and praise of the appointment of O. Max Gardner as Ambassador to Great Britain. This I wanted to do as he traveled toward his post to take up his work as the representative of our country at the Court of St. James's. He was to sail yesterday. We have now received the distressing news that he died a short time before he was to embark upon his trip to England.

Mr. President, I doubt if any appointment made by the President has received more general approval by the people of this country than the appointment of Governor Gardner to be Ambassador to Great Britain. We all know the high importance of the position which he was asked to fill. Those of us who knew him, and who are so much interested in cordial relations between the two nations, were gratified when he was selected. We knew that he could perform his work well, that he would be acceptable to those who were to receive him, and that he would fill the position with honor and credit to his country and to his people.

Mr. Gardner was a member of the Democratic Party, but his nomination received the unanimous approval of the Republican majority of the Senate. His integrity, his fine ability, his experience, and his high sense of fairness lifted him above partisan feelings. He had a distinguished career. He was the Governor of his State and a successful man in his profession and in business. For years he had served in the National Government as adviser to the President, and as Under Secretary of the Treasury. Through his own achievements he gained the esteem and respect of the many who knew him. Death has taken him, and his passing is a very great loss to his country.

I pay my respects, and extend my sympathy to Mrs. Gardner, who through the years has been his faithful and intelligent helper.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, the sudden death early yesterday morning of one of North Carolina's most distinguished sons, Hon. O. Max Gardner, Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, brought real sadness to the people of the State and to his many friends throughout the Nation. For more than 30 years he was an outstanding leader in North Carolina. He made an impressive record as a member of the State senate, as Lieutenant Governor, and as Governor. In recent years he has served his Nation in various capacities with great distinction. His courage, character, ability, and dynamic personality made him a natural leader of men. He loved his country and its people, and he devoted his best talents to the welfare of his State and Nation.

I am sure that Members of the Senate who recently unanimously confirmed his appointment as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's join with me and thousands of others in extending to his family profound sympathy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Senator and every other American citizen, without regard to politics, religion, or geography, was shocked and grieved beyond expression yesterday to learn of the sudden death of Max Gardner. Only last week the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I and one or two other Senators expressed our great pleasure at his appointment as Ambassador to Great Britain. I saw him frequently during the last months when he was preparing himself for the great mission upon which he was about to set out. I never saw him in finer spirits, or apparently in finer health. He looked forward to his new task with great interest and devotion.

It seems an inscrutable tragedy beyond the ability of our finite minds to fathom, that upon the very verge of his departure he should have been fatally stricken, and have passed to the next world.

I had predicted that he would have a brilliant career as Ambassador to Great Britain. I feel that he would have added luster to our diplomatic history, and that in the finest American tradition he would have carried forward the great work of conciliation, construction, and peace, insofar as an outstanding ambassador may contribute to that happy result. His death is a great loss to this country, a loss to its public spirit and to its high standards of public service and private character. All of us feel that loss in the public service. Many—of whom I am one—feel a poignant personal loss in friendship, association, and inspiration.

It had been my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with Max Gardner before he came to Washington, and while he was here, as well as with his charming, gracious, and beautiful wife, and with his family. By reason of that relationship I was brought into intimate association with many of his warm friends. No man ever had truer friends; no man ever enjoyed the friendship of a finer circle; no man ever was the recipient of a greater devotion than was Max Gardner among all his friends and all who knew him. I therefore feel that a great personal loss has come to me because of his sudden, tragic death. He was, in a real sense, not only an American, deep-rooted in America's traditions in his personal life and in his attitude, but he was also an earnest Christian. He was profoundly religious. Public men do not always carry their religion on their sleeves. They do not always proclaim from public places their profound devotion to the religious concepts which are the basis of our civilization. Max Gardner, in the truest sense, was a Christian statesman.

We mourn his loss. We express our deep sympathy to his family. We hope that his great example may be a benediction to those of us who remain.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in paying my respects to a great American—O. Max Gardner.

A week ago on the floor of the Senate we wished him and his wife good health, good luck, and Godspeed. Today we mourn his loss. There is little doubt that the terrific strain which he was under during the past few months hastened the end.

There is little to add to what has already been said today. He deeply appreciated the tributes which were paid to him on the floor of the Senate. What we said then, during his lifetime, we can say tenfold today, now that he is no longer with us. Our thoughts and sympathy are at this time with Mrs. Gardner.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the sentiments which have been spoken in eloquent tribute to O. Max Gardner.

If I may be permitted to make a personal reference, the last act of my wife and myself before retiring on Wednesday evening was to send a telegram to Mr. Gardner and his wife wishing them bon voyage on their trip to England. The shock of the next morning's news was that they never received the telegram, as was the case with many others that were sent to them. He never had an opportunity to depart upon his great mission.

I knew him in his private as well as in his public life. It was impressed upon me that he was one of the most loyal and

devoted of friends. He was one of the great Americans of our time. No appraisal of this generation would be adequate without a tribute to the greatness, the kindness, and the goodness of O. Max Gardner.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have spoken several times in the Senate on the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program and the negotiations soon to be conducted by the State Department at Geneva, Switzerland, with representatives of 18 other countries, looking toward wholesale reduction of our system of tariff protection.

In the past few days several stories have appeared in the newspapers about certain changes in the procedure for handling complaints of injury done under this program. To date, however, no official announcement has been made by the State Department as to these changes, and I am therefore withholding any comment on them for the time being.

Today I wish to touch briefly on the so-called unconditional most-favored-nation feature of that program.

It is very important in considering the tariff question to realize and bear in mind present-day world conditions. When the whole free-trade theory of the economists was first worked out—in fact when the whole low-tariff theory of the Democratic Party was first worked out—we faced a far different economic world from that which we face today. Until the First World War, the usual method of trade regulation for almost all commodities, in almost every country, was a simple system of tariffs. International trade, like domestic trade, was comparatively free from regulation in most countries of the world.

Following the First World War, a great change came over the systems of trade regulation in many countries. During the twenties, many countries added a quota system to their other means of controlling imports. During the thirties, techniques of blocking exchange and permitting particular import shipments only on the basis of exchange licenses were adopted. A system of bilateral agreements came into wide use, particularly in Europe and Latin America. By the terms of such agreements, each of the two countries involved agreed to secure its supplies of a particular commodity from the other party to the agreement. Such agreements obviously leave out in the cold completely any third country which has surpluses which it wishes to market in the export trade. For example, if Britain makes a direct deal with Canada to buy all her wheat from Canada, there will not be much chance to sell any American wheat in the British market. As a side remark at this point, let me say that that is exactly what has happened since the making of the British loan by the United States. I think we are justified in assuming that the wheat producers of the United States are assisting Great Britain and Canada in the disposal of Canadian export wheat.

Another new technique was introduced on a grand scale by Soviet Russia, following the 1917 revolution. This was a program of direct governmental purchase of all commodities to be imported. Starting slowly at first, this technique has gained tremendous momentum. Government buying of an entire quantity of a product to be imported is now one of the principal means of carrying on international trade. In a way, this method may be a natural counterpart of the marked trend toward socialism in many, many countries. No matter what we may think of this trend toward socialism all over the world, we must face it as a fact. It is not likely that we can change it. Great Britain, herself, which used to be considered the home of free international trade conducted by private individuals and corporations, is now one of the leaders in the technique of government mass buying. The commodities which the British Government has been so buying include wool, meat, cocoa, tea, lumber, sugar, eggs, cheese, butter, copper, cotton, and wheat.

This tremendous change in the customary methods of controlling international trade has particular point in connection with the use of the unconditional most-favored-nation policy of the State Department. I shall attempt to explain exactly what this policy means to us here in the United States of America. In each of the trade agreements negotiated or in other trade treaties with the countries concerned, our country guarantees unconditionally to grant to the other nation treatment at least equal to the treatment granted to the most favored nation—the same treatment granted to every other nation, in other words. That is another way of saying that the tariff duties charged on imports shall be the same to every country, except those discriminating against our export trade. Exceptions are made in favor of Cuba and the Philippines, but that is the general policy—namely, the same tariff rate on the same item, no matter what country it may come from.

Mr. President, please observe the effect of this policy in connection with our duty reductions. If we reduce the duty on certain textile items, for example, in an agreement with Great Britain, we must also permit imports of those same items from such countries as Germany, Japan, and Italy to enter our markets at the same low rates of duty. If we reduce duties on items of glassware in an agreement with Belgium, we must permit the same items from Czechoslovakia to enter our markets at the same low rate. The British will receive the concessions that we make to the French, and the French will receive the concessions that we make to the British. Aside from the 18 nations with which we are to negotiate at Geneva in April, there are many other important trading nations, such as Sweden, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and Argentina. All those countries will receive the benefit of any duty reductions we may make, although they make no concessions in return. That is the effect of the State Department's unconditional most-favored-nation policy.

In a practical way, this policy has not worked and will not work for the benefit of our export trade, under present world conditions. We shall have very little chance of getting concessions relative to the export markets of any particular countries if they know they will receive the benefit of our new low tariff rates regardless of any action they may take. To give an obvious example: Argentina will not be inclined to make concessions to our exporters in any subsequent negotiations if she can send us her surpluses of meat, dairy products, grains, and wool at low rates of duty which we may establish in agreements with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. By giving away all our trading stock at Geneva in agreements with these countries, it will probably be forever impossible for us to secure concessions from the Argentine. That is the practical way in which this policy operates.

I know at least some of the arguments that are made for this policy. It is said that we can guarantee our exporters an equal chance in foreign markets with all other countries. Frankly, that statement is not true, and it is not realistic. We cannot guarantee any such thing to our exporters, and the State Department has not been able to make good on its guaranties. Under present systems of quotas, exchange controls, and government buying, it is too easy for the foreign country to discriminate against us in ways that defy proof. As a practical matter, we do not even know whether we are being discriminated against. When Britain contracted to secure most of her wheat from Canada over the next 5 years at a certain fixed price, was Britain discriminating against us? No one can say for sure.

We do know for sure that if Canada supplies this quantity of wheat to Britain, we shall not sell the British very much wheat. I believe that our wheat farmers are much more interested in actually selling wheat than they are in a paper guaranty against discrimination.

This particular deal is of unusual interest because it will be recalled that at the time when the British and Canadian trade agreements with this country were negotiated in 1939, it was widely advertised that American farmers would be able to compete for the British market for wheat on an exactly equal basis with Canada, Australia, and other countries. To obtain that supposedly valuable concession to our wheat farmers, this country made tremendous reductions of duty rates on textiles, leather goods, metal products, and dozens of other items. Although it is obvious that we are not going to sell much wheat to Britain, the concessions that we made still stand. Now we are going to negotiate with Britain again. Are we going to make still more concessions, again to receive a paper promise that we might sell our wheat to Britain?

I have done a lot of merchandising during my 30 years in business before coming to the Senate. I found by experience that the way to sell grain or flour or anything else is to go to the man who has authority to buy and to sell him the idea of buying from me. A definite commitment from the British Government to purchase a certain quantity of our exportable surpluses of cotton and wheat would be worth many times all the

promises of nondiscrimination we have received.

Since I first began to call attention to some of the discrepancies in our present foreign trade policies I have been called all sorts of names. I do not mind that particularly; I am used to it. But I have been charged with trying to wreck our program of reciprocity in trade relations with the rest of the world. I am not opposed to reciprocity. On the contrary, I believe that reciprocity is what we do not have and should have. I believe that if we make valuable concessions which will in fact give foreign countries additional markets, we should gain, in turn, concessions which in fact, not in theory, give our exporters at least equal benefits. I believe that we have enough good traders in America to obtain such concessions, if they are given the opportunity.

The United States has been in existence for quite a while now. We have found it possible to develop the manufacture of almost every type of industrial goods and the production of almost every kind of agricultural product suited to a temperate climate. A system of moderate tariff protection, plus cooperative trade relations with the rest of the world, have helped to make our growth possible. The tremendous wealth of our home market for such things as automobiles has actually made it possible for our motor manufacturers to develop the mass-production methods that have enabled them to expand into the export trade.

Our wealth and our strength have enabled us to provide a market for billions of dollars' worth of goods from abroad. In addition to this market, we have also, during the last few years, provided foreign countries with billions and billions of dollars of loans and gifts—to enable them to stave off starvation and to rebuild their economies.

Mr. President, that is the record of the economic assistance we have already given the rest of the world in recent years. I do not believe anyone can say we have not been generous. Now we are asked to inflict wholesale slashes in the tariff protection on which many domestic industries depend. Such a radical change in our traditional policy deserves, at least, more consideration than it has received to date. I am not opposed to any and all tariff reductions. Reductions, judiciously applied to tariffs on noncompetitive products, could undoubtedly serve a useful purpose in connection with making bargains with other countries. But I am opposed to wiping out, almost at one blow, the system that has made America great. I am opposed to one-sided disarmament on our economic protection, just as I am opposed to one-sided disarmament on the military side.

PROGRAM AFFECTING CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, I feel it my duty reluctantly to bring to the attention of the Senate a situation fraught with very serious and what may prove to be alarming consequences. Far be it from me to criticize any Member of Congress, particularly the chairman of any committee on the House side; and I do not want what I am about to say to be construed as a criticism.

Almost immediately after Congress convened, and upon four different occasions since the convening of Congress, a certain gentleman has, although he is not a member of the House Committee on Civil Service, blazoned to the world that a million civil-service employees are going to lose their jobs. This gentleman has never designated the departments from which these civil-service employees are going to be taken. I do not say that it is a demagogic statement. I do not say that it has been issued for the purpose of securing for him a lot of publicity, as some civil-service workers have alleged. This man may be honest and sincere in his views, but his attitude has already resulted in much demoralization of the civil service.

For 6 years I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Civil Service. During that time, Mr. President, I have seen scores of men and women who have sacrificed thousands and thousands of dollars in order to remain in the public service. For example, I have seen engineers who for years have been getting the low ceiling provided by the laws of this country, when they had been offered salaries as high as $45,000 a year in private industry. Today, Mr. President, there are many employed in the Post Office Department who for years have refused salaries of more than double what they are getting from the Government, offered to them by mail-order houses. We have men and women doctors and nurses scattered from the leper colonies of the warm Pacific to the cold regions of Alaska, who have turned down large salaries because of their love for their country. Practically every person who has made a study of civil service knows that there are thousands of Federal employees who have made Government work their life careers, and that they are proud of what they have accomplished; just as I am proud as I listen to the testimony of some of those who have sacrificed until, from a financial standpoint, it has hurt not only themselves but their families.

Our country won the recent World War because we had the best scientists, the best soldiers, the best know-how in those things that are so essential to victory. We won it because of the loyalty of hundreds of thousands of employees who, time and time and time again, worked long hours regardless of the time and regardless of the fact that for a long time they did not receive overtime compensation in some of the departments. Under civil service, we had men and women who risked their lives in research, just as much as did the soldiers on land or the sailors on the sea. But today, Mr. President, some of these people are being hounded and harassed, and harassed and hounded, because someone may consider it to be popular to say, "We are going to fire a million employees."

The statement is utterly senseless, when it is remembered that we already have upon the statute books the Langer-Byrd amendment and, as a result of the magnificent work of Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, provision for a scientific, graduated, continued reduction. This is evidenced—and it could not be evidenced in any better manner—by the testimony of Mr. Arthur Flemming, the Republican member of the Civil Service Commission, which was given recently before the Senate Committee on Civil Service. At that time, Mr. Flemming stated, in response to a question by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], as follows:

Mr. FLEMMING. Senator THYE, Senator LANGER suggested it might be helpful if I gave a very brief picture to the committee, to bring the committee up to date as far as the Federal Employees' Pay Act is concerned.

First of all, the committee might be interested in having the over-all figure.

We searched the books for the period ending June 30, 1945. At that time—

I should like every Senator to understand the significance of these figures—

we had 3,770,000 on the Federal pay roll, both inside and outside of the continental United States.

We have just received the tentative figures for the period ending December 30, 1946. These figures show we now have on the pay roll, both inside and outside of the continental United States, 2,286,900, or, in other words, a net decrease of 1,483,100.

I thought the committee might like to have that over-all picture.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were most of these decreases?

Mr. FLEMMING. I can give that to you also, Senator LANGER.

For the War Department there has been a decrease from June 30, 1945, down to the present time of 1,244,800.

Senator CHAVEZ. You are talking now of civil personnel?

Mr. FLEMMING. That is right, both inside and outside of continental United States, and both groups paid on an annual basis and hourly employees to which there was reference this morning.

In the Navy Department there has been a decrease of 375,700.

In the Veterans' Administration there has been an increase of 157,000, and for all of these agencies a decrease of 99,700.

That is a rough over-all picture.

The committee might also be interested in knowing, if you take the total employment as of the present time, take the Navy Department, War Department, Post Office Department, and Veterans' Administration, you have 7 percent of the total employment in these four agencies of the Government.

A decrease of 74 percent.

Senator LANGER referred to the personnel ceiling provisions that have been included in the last two pay bills, one known as the pay bill of 1945 and the other of 1946.

It is the latter one that is operative at the present time which the committee will be primarily interested in.

In putting this particular provision in the pay roll in the two pay bills, at the suggestion of both Senator LANGER and Senator BYRD, the Congress said:

"With respect to the departments (other than the Department of War and the Department of the Navy), establishments, and agencies (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch, the Director shall so determine the numbers of full-time civilian employees and the man-months of part-time employment on the basis of the relative needs of such departments, establishments, and agencies for personnel, that the aggregate number of such civilian employees (including the full time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) shall not exceed—

The Congress fixed the limit at that time—

528,975 for the quarter beginning October 1, 1946; 501,771 for the quarter beginning January 1, 1947; 474,567 for the quarter beginning April 1, 1947; and 447,363 after June 30, 1947.

"With respect to the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, the Director shall so determine the numbers of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) that at the earliest date practicable, but in no event later than July 1, 1947, the number shall not exceed 176,000 with respect to the Department of War, or 100,000 with respect to the Department of the Navy.

"The numbers of employees—

The Congress said—

specified in this paragraph shall be regarded as maximum numbers, and nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Director to establish lower aggregate numbers whenever, in his opinion, the numbers, so specified, are in excess of those necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the authorized functions of the departments, establishments, and agencies to which this subsection applies. The procedural provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall be applicable with respect to determinations under this paragraph."

The Congress provided further in the law that it passed:

"No provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted authorizing the employment of personnel by, or appropriating funds for the compensation of personnel of, or conferring additional functions upon, any department, establishment, or agency, shall be construed to authorize the employment of, or payment of compensation to, a greater number of employees subject to this subsection than the number as determined by the Director with respect to such department, establishment, or agency from the provisions of this subsection, and any such employment or payment not so authorized shall be deemed to be a violation of the provisions of section 3679 of the revised statute of the United States."

The law further states:

"The provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose. The provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department or to officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration, but shall apply with respect to officers and employees outside the United States whose compensation is fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and who are not excluded from the provisions of this section by the provision of subsection (f).

"The provisions of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees outside the several States and the District of Columbia."

At that time Congress did not feel it was wise to fix the ceiling on employment in the War and Navy Departments outside of the United States. That is a provision of law that is now in effect and being administered by the Bureau of the Budget.

The committee may be interested in knowing at the time this provision was worked out it was felt this would go up to June 30, 1947, and I will just give you a summary of it.

You will recall the figure for the classified employment of the War Department was 176,000 and the Navy was 100,000 and for all other agencies 447,363. That gives you a ceiling figure of 723,363.

At that time it was estimated that the per diem employees of the War and Navy Departments would be by June 30, 1947, up to 289,307. It was also estimated that the Veterans' Administration would be up to 165,000 by June 30, 1947, and it was likewise estimated that the Post Office Department would be 433,450.

These were the Bureau estimates and represent the best judgment of these agencies of that time.

If you add all of these figures you get a total employment of 1,167,220 and soon after the pay bill was passed that figure was used quite extensively as a goal to which the Government was working.

I would like to call attention to the fact the Veterans' Administration was excluded from the personnel ceilings. The estimate was that the Veterans' Administration would have by June 30, 1947, 165,000. Actually, as of December 31, 1946, the Veterans' Administration has 220,377. So that you can see that that particular estimate, as far as the Veterans' Administration was concerned, was a low estimate.

In addition, there was an estimate of 433,450 for the Post Office Department on December 31, 1946, and the number of employees of the Post Office Department was 457,574, also subsequent to the passage of the Federal Employees' Pay Act ceiling provision. The law stated that all of the agencies were to be considered as being under the ceiling unless specifically exempted.

The War Assets Administration was exempted and later on, and as of December 31, 1946, the War Assets Administration had 56,552 employees, so that is another group.

Mr. President, last year the Senate and the House Committees on Civil Service met together, not one day, but month after month, in the effort to do a scientific job. The personnel of some departments, instead of being lowered, had been increased. I know I speak for every Senator upon this floor when I say that not one of us would want to see the personnel of the Veterans' Administration decreased. Nor is there a Senator upon this floor who would not want a man who has lost an arm or a leg or who is shell-shocked or ill to get the very best treatment in our hospitals. In the case of other departments calm, careful investigation may show their personnel should be increased in order to secure efficiency for the taxpayers of the country. The members of the Bureau of the Budget, heads of various departments, some of the best informed Senators and Representatives have given this matter very careful study and thought. There is no question that the personnel of some departments will be very materially reduced and brought down to prewar figures, and that some war agencies will be entirely eliminated.

But the cry, "We are going to fire a million employees," has frightened thousands of good, loyal, honest, hard-working, and necessary civil-service employees so that they now feel they are not even going to get for themselves and their families the security to which years and years of hard work have entitled them. From all over the country, we have been receiving telephone calls and messages stating that various departments are in danger of losing some of their best personnel and expressing their concern.

I make this statement in order that these men and women may know that there is not going to be any wholesale, indiscriminate firing, but that so far as the Senate Committee on Civil Service is concerned—and I believe so far as the Senate is concerned—the policy adopted by the Langer-Byrd amendment in the Senate and the Dirksen amendment in the House will be continued.

Furthermore, talk about cutting a million employees interferes seriously with the recruiting of outstanding scientists for the Government's important scientific laboratories. If a scientist who is on the staff of a college or university is approached by one of our Government laboratories with an offer, very naturally he says, "Why should I leave a secure job and go to work for the Government, when I may be laid off the day after tomorrow?" In other words, talk of this kind interferes seriously with the staffing of the Government's highly important scientific laboratories.

If the Congress wants to make substantial cuts below the figures provided for in the Langer-Byrd amendment, the thing for it to do is to make a careful examination of the functions of the Government and to say exactly what functions it wants to eliminate. That is the only way in which we can make substantial cuts in the number of persons on the Federal pay roll. We cannot do it by indulging in generalities to the effect that we are going arbitrarily to cut off a million people and yet not touch any of the functions which Congress has told the executive branch to carry out.

Any western Senators who advocate reclamation and find they have a chance to get it through the operation of various projects can have those projects eliminated and abandoned, by having passed legislation to that effect. Personally, I am opposed to it; I am for reclamation and lots of it. If some Senators who are for REA, as I am, and who believe, as I do, that every farm man and woman ought to have light and power upon their farms and in their homes, would rather have some employees fired than for the farmers to have the benefits of REA, they can get rid of some employees, and they can do it now, but I want to serve notice that I shall continue to fight for REA. If some Senators feel that the veterans are getting too good treatment—that a man who has lost an arm or a leg or an eye is having too many nurses—then some of those who are fighting for a million less employees ought to come out in the open and say so. If some Senators want an Army and Navy of the size it was in 1932, 1933, and 1934, they can get rid of hundreds of thousands of employees merely by having passed legislation to cut down the size of the Army and Navy Departments.

Let those who want to dismiss a million civil-service employees list the departments the personnel of which they wish to have reduced. Let us look at this question realistically; instead of indulging in a lot of loose talk, let us get down to brass tacks, face facts, and be fair to the voters of the country respecting measures submitted to the Congress by indicating when the yeas and nays are called in which of the various departments we want the personnel reduced.

Let me make one thing plain. Under the amendments to which I have referred, every useless, nonessential employee will be dispensed with. As reductions take place, those who received employment under the emergency of war will be removed from the civil-service lists first; and true merit and honesty in service of the Government will continue to be recognized. The policy of an honest day's pay for an honest day's work will be continued. That is the theory upon which civil service originally was established, and that is the theory under which it will continue to operate.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON MEMORIAL COIN

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, on behalf of the District of Columbia Booker T. Washington memorial-coin headquarters, I desire to make a brief statement regarding this distinguished American citizen in honor of whom the Seventy-ninth Congress authorized the minting of a commemorative 50-cent coin.

Booker T. Washington was a great American. Theodore Roosevelt has well said of him that—

> For 20 years before his death he had been the most useful, as well as the most distinguished, member of his race in the world, and one of the most useful, as well as the most distinguished, of American citizens of any race.

Both white and Negro owed him much. A firm believer in industrial education for his race, he built virtually by his own endeavor world-famous Tuskegee Institute, which has trained thousands of his race for a useful place in society. His wisdom is never shown better than in the attitude he took as to the part the Negro should play in politics. He said:

> In my opinion, it is a fatal mistake to teach the young black man and the young white man that the dominance of the white race in the South rests upon any other basis than absolute justice to the weaker man. It is a mistake to cultivate in the mind of any individual or group of individuals the feeling and belief that their happiness rests upon the misery of someone else, or their wealth by the poverty of someone else. I do not advocate that the Negro make politics or the holding of office an important thing in his life. I do urge, in the interests of fair play for everybody, that a Negro who prepares himself in property, in intelligence, and in character to cast a ballot, and desires to do so, should have the opportunity.

At Harvard, in 1896, while conferring upon him the first honorary degree conferred by that university on a Negro, President Elliott said, "Teacher, wise helper of his race, good servant of God and country."

The last session of Congress authorized the coining of a new half dollar honoring Booker T. Washington. On February 28 the District of Columbia will celebrate Booker T. Washington Day by launching the sale of these coins. They will be sold for $1, as authorized by law, 50 cents of which will go to the memorial fund to build a specialized industrial training school and shrine on the Washington birthplace in Franklin County, Va.

I hope and urge that many will cooperate in this great and beneficial tribute to a real American.

TAX REDUCTION AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD a letter from a constituent, I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for the speech which he has just made on the floor of the Senate. I trust that the leaders of my party will study the speech with great care because I think my party has the responsibility of drawing a distinction between a tax saving through the elimination of unnecessary waste in government and savings brought about by the elimination of unnecessary services of government and, on the other hand, savings which would be disastrous if we made them at the cost of preventing a continuation of adequate defenses in this country and construction of great wealth-producing projects so sorely needed, if we are to have a stable economy in the years ahead. I refer to such projects as McNary Dam and the great flood-control, electric-power, and reclamation projects of the West.

These are days for Lincoln Day speeches, and many spokesmen in my party will be making them. I heard a couple of them last night in this city, and I regretted to find two great Republican leaders coming out with a blanket endorsement of a straight across-the-board 20 percent tax reduction program as a Republican program. I challenge their right to speak for the rank-and-file Republicans of this country, because I do not believe that the rank-and-file Republicans feel that now is the time for any such tax reduction as that, which some leaders in my party are trying to sell the country at this time. I do not believe that we can have any such tax reduction without doing just the type of damage to the economy of this country of which the Senator from North Dakota has spoken today. I do not know of any formal formulation of a Republican tax reduction program as such. I am at a loss to understand why certain Republican leaders are seeking to give the public the impression that their tax views are the views of the Republican Party. They have received no such mandate either from the Republican Party or the Republican voters of this country.

I think it ought to be made clarion clear that some of the Republicans in the Congress of the United States who are speaking in behalf of a 20-percent devastating tax-reduction program do not speak for all the Republicans in the Congress. I am satisfied that they do not speak for the rank and file of Republican voters, because I believe that the people of this country recognize the great importance of our party; first, making secure the national defense; and second, making secure the stable value of the American dollar.

I am waiting for the specific program of tax reduction to which the Senator from North Dakota referred in his speech, when he challenged these self-appointed spokesmen of the Republican Party on taxes, to tell the American people just what services they propose to cut. I am waiting for the specific program of budget cuts which the tax reducers seek to impose upon the American people. I wish to know what services they propose to dispense with. I wish to know on what items the cuts are to be made.

In my judgment, every American citizen who is thinking in terms of the security of this country had better serve notice on the Republican leaders now that this is no time to make any substantial cut in the national-defense program. It simply would not be safe to do so. I have yet to see any figures which indicate that we can make any such 20-percent tax reduction, as some Republican spokesmen have proposed, without cutting into that defense program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield at this time.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have yet to see any proposal which would produce any such tax reduction and still make it possible for us as a party to fulfill an important obligation to the country, and that is to make a substantial payment on the national debt so that we can protect the value of the American dollar. I will not be a party to any movement within my party which seeks to save tax dollars to the American citizen but at the same time takes out of his pocket much greater sums of money by way of a depreciated dollar. I believe that what we need to do as a party is to make savings in Government wherever we can and apply those savings on the national debt.

One further point, and I shall be through, and then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

I think we also have an obligation as a party in the Congress of the United States to see to it that we go forward with some great wealth-producing projects. The Senator from North Dakota has referred to one of them, such as the REA. I serve notice now that I shall watch with a searching eye any attempt on the part of certain forces in the Congress of the United States to sacrifice the great wealth-producing projects of the West, so sorely needed in the next few years if we are to develop a sound economy for the entire Nation. We must have such projects in the West if we are to have an extension of the industrial frontiers of America made available by the great natural resources of that section of the country and the great potential power resources which can be developed unless the tax reducers who are talking about a 20-percent tax reduction program have their way in cutting the development of just such great wealth-producing projects.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield at the moment.

I think the time has come for those of us in my party who do not believe in the type of fiscal philosophy which we heard enunciated from the platform in this city last night by a great leader of our party—I refer to the Speaker of the House—and by some other Republican spokesmen, to carry this issue to the American people and have them speak very clearly to this party as to whether or not they think we ought to save tax

dollars in the manner proposed by the budget cutters or whether we ought to apply whatever savings we can make to the national debt so that we can have a sound and stable dollar.

We also have some great social responsibilities to our people to perform as a Government. If my party thinks for a moment that on November 5, 1946, it received a mandate to return to a laissez faire economy in this country; if my party thinks that big business got a green light on November 5, and that it can return to its old practices of the laissez faire economy with its exploitation of human beings for profit dollars then I am satisfied that in 1948 the voters of this country will make very clear to the Republican Party that no such mandate was given in 1946.

Mr. President, in these critical times in our Nation's history there is a responsibility of republican government to see to it that the Government protects the economically weak from the exploitation of the economically strong. I have said that many times on the floor of the Senate, and I am going to say it many times again, because I think it is a very vital principle of government. Hence, we do have a responsibility, as a party and as a government, to see to it that some of the great wealth-producing projects that protect the economically weak and give greater comfort to all of our people go forward. The Republican Party does have a responsibility of carrying forward sound social reforms that seek to promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

This particular letter which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks refers to one of those responsibilities, Mr. President. The people want to know what the Congress of the United States intends to do in this session in regard to strengthening the security of the aged. They wish to know what pension program we seek to offer them. Is the answer going to be, "Let them take their chances with old age?" If that is to be our answer, I think we had better be ready to take our chances in 1948.

I, for one, feel that our social-security system needs to be broadened so as to give greater security to those classes of workers of low and moderate income not now covered by it and so as to remove the fear of want in old age from our people. My party must practice as well as profess the four freedoms.

I now ask unanimous consent to have the letter to which I have referred printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 23, 1947.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I see by the Oregonian that the Senators and Congressmen are now drawing their fat pension which was voted them in the last Congress.

There would not be any service men and women if it had not been for their fathers and mothers. How about a national old-age pension for them? Are they not deserving of some consideration?

You know that the social security is no good for the folks in the now-65-year-old brackets. Will there be any hope for a national old-age pension at this session of Congress?

Yours truly,

J. MANN FISHER.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon has been making a very good American speech. In my opinion, he is speaking the language of all of the people of the United States, and I have asked him to yield in order that I might express that opinion.

I have been giving considerable study, I say to the Senator, to the proposal of a flat 20-percent across-the-board reduction in taxation, accompanied by the slashing of X billion dollars from the Budget. I find that it is impossible for anyone to give any consideration to those two proposals without coming to the conclusion that the inevitable result will be the destruction of those very enterprises in the West for which the Senator from Oregon has just so eloquently spoken.

One of the principal objects of this Budget-reduction talk is to put an end to the Rural Electrification Administration and to put an end to public power. If that occurs, the public power which in the great State of Oregon has done so much to build up private enterprise will be cut from under the feet of the people of Oregon and the people of all other Western States.

I think it is tremendously important that the Senator speak as forthrightly and as courageously as he does.

The income-tax reduction of 20 percent across the board would have the effect only of giving a pittance of reduction to the economically oppressed and a tremendous reduction, measured in thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars, to those who least need a reduction. But, more important than all that, it would mean cutting down the ability of this Government to pay off the national debt. With a debt of $260,000,000,000, I say to the Senator that if we do not keep our tax revenues high while the people are capable of paying taxes, we shall endanger the payment of the national debt; and when that danger is brought before us, we shall be endangering the entire system of private property. Capitalism has no defense unless it be defended in the United States of America. Those leaders who talk now about tax reduction, while they pay little attention to the constructive expenditures of Government and to the effect upon the national debt, are poor servants of the principle of capitalism.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I certainly share his views.

I have only one more point, Mr. President, and then I am through.

I think we ought to face the fact that there has never been a time in many years in the history of this country when the people were in a better position through taxes to pay a substantial sum on the national debt. I think we ought to recognize, furthermore—it may not be politic to say it, but what difference does that make, for these are times when we ought to be willing to tell the people what we believe the facts to be, irrespective of political consequences—I think we ought to point out to them that we did not take the profits out of the recent war. Today the United States is saturated with blood-money made out of the war. I think we owe it to the men who actually gave human blood in sacrifice for their country to see to it that a substantial proportion of the profits made out of the war now go by way of reasonable taxes as payments on the national debt. I think that is our job as patriotic Members of the United States Congress. By doing that, I think we shall pay proper tribute to the men who made sacrifices to keep our form of capitalistic economy secure in this country. Further I point out that the business boom we will have for some years in this country will be a direct economic result of the war and the profits derived from it should be taxed at reasonably high rates for payments on the war debt.

I am perfectly willing to meet this tax issue on the ground of whether we are going to use such savings as we can make out of economy in government to reduce the national debt and protect our national security, or whether we are going to take the position that we should return those savings to the pockets of the people who now are best able to pay substantial taxes. We cannot have either a costless war or a priceless peace and we owe it to our people to tell them so. My party should stop playing politics with this tax issue.

I close by saying that I do not know what the Republican tax program is. I know of no Republican who knows what the Republican program is and can speak authoritatively for the party on the subject. I am a little bit at a loss to understand the statements of some Republican leaders who stand up and say that the Republican Party has pledged itself to any 20 percent tax reduction program. It is rather interesting that anyone should appoint himself to speak for the Republican Party and announce what its tax program is. I know of no Republican Party pledged to reduce taxes 20 percent.

I say that as a Congress and as individual Members of the Congress we do have a duty and a responsibility to take the fiscal facts about our Government to the people of this Nation. If we do, I think we shall hear from the country. I think the people of this country will tell us in plain terms, which we cannot dispute, that they want us, first, to keep our Nation secure; second, that they want us to make whatever savings we can in the administration of government; third, that they want us to apply those savings to the national debt, so that as the result we shall have a sound dollar; fourth that they want us to go forward with sound social and economic projects that will promote the greatest good for the greatest number of our people.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his commendation of what I said a few moments ago relative to the arbitrary discharge of 1,000,000 Federal employees. I wish to say that I appreciate his commendation, coming, as

it does, from so distinguished a man who has made such a fine progressive record during the few short years he has been upon this floor.

Personally, I wish to serve notice now that in my opinion when the fight begins for the 20-percent cut in taxes, the distinguished Senator from Oregon will find fighting with him, shoulder to shoulder, upon this floor, many Republicans, especially those from the West; and, I am happy to say, some from the East, who, under his guidance and leadership, will be here to see to it that reclamation projects and the Rural Electrification Administration are not taken out of the life of this Nation.

ACTIVITIES OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in today's Washington Times-Herald there appears an article with the heading "Truman boom made official by Hannegan." In the story, which carries a New York date line of February 6, it is stated that Democratic National Chairman Hannegan, in speaking before a group of civil-service postal employees at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, made the following statement in the course of his remarks:

> We are ready to call upon our President—

To do what, Mr. President? The article states that the call upon our President is for him to seek another White House term in 1948.

The article further states:

> Without any if's or but's, he told a New York gathering of postal supervisors that we are ready to call upon our President again as the man who has proved himself fit for the job.

Mr. President, it seems strange that Mr. Hannegan, who, as the article states, had conferred with Mr. Truman just before he went to New York, would make such "draft Truman" remarks before a dinner in New York of civil-service postal employees who are subject to the provisions of the Hatch Act. In other words, the Truman-Hannegan boom for 1948 is being started with a group of postal civil-service employees who are subject to the Hatch Act and who, by law, should not participate in politics.

Mr. Hannegan, by the way, is also Postmaster General of the United States. Recently, he has been vacationing in Florida for many weeks. In the budget message sent to Congress by the President only a few weeks ago, there appears a statement that there is a prospective $352,000,000 deficit in the postal operations for the fiscal year 1948, more than double the deficit for 1946. In the budget message it was stated that while the volume of mail has expanded enormously, the cost of current operations has increased even more rapidly, and that that is the chief cause of the deficit.

Mr. President, were Mr. Hannegan, the Democratic national chairman and the Postmaster General, to devote himself a little more carefully and studiously to the operation of the Post Office Department, the current operating deficit of that Department might be materially reduced. With a prospective deficit of more than $350,000,000 for 1948, as well as a large deficit for the current year, it looks to me as if, instead of having Hannegan boom Truman for reelection, Truman had better be searching around the country to find a more competent Postmaster General to conduct the Post Office Department. Certainly if the President is beginning a reelection campaign, he should begin it within a civic group in the United States, rather than with civil-service postal employees of the United States Government.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations, which will be referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MEMBERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the nominations of James E. Colliflower, Edward A. Dent, and Richard R. Atkinson as members of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, submitted, pursuant to law, by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Lawrence Clayton, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for a term expiring February 1, 1952.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. Scott Beck, Jr., of Maryland, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Herbert E. Arnold, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, to fill an existing vacancy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Washington care to have the absence of a quorum suggested?

Mr. CAIN. That is not necessary, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall do whatever the Senator from Washington wishes about it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a very short statement in regard to the proposed confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dillon Myer to be Administrator of the Federal Public Housing Authority. I have no possible desire to be disrespectful to any member of the committee having jurisdiction over the nomination, because I have a very high regard for the opinions of the members of the committee. However, out of a deep-seated conviction that the FPHA is today pursuing policies which are detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States, I wish to make it plain and certain that it is not within my power to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Dillon Myer as Administrator of the FPHA.

It goes without saying that there is nothing personal in my opposition to the nomination of Mr. Myer. Until first he came before our committee several weeks ago, I had never met the gentleman in my life. I am, however, critical, and deeply so, of the administration which he heads as Acting Administrator. Until those convictions have been changed, and have been resolved in favor of the FPHA I cannot possibly, as one possessed of any convictions at all, vote for the confirmation of Mr. Myer.

Mr. President, I should like to say that I have no intention of leading a fight in opposition to confirmation by the Senate. In part, I have no intention of doing so for the simple reason that having been here only a few short weeks, I am not presently possessed of sufficient knowledge to lead an important fight. I should like to add that I hope I am wrong in what I think about some of the prevailing policies of the Federal Public Housing Authority. I shall do my very best to prove to myself that I am wrong. If I am able to prove that my contentions are incorrect, I shall, as I advised Mr. Dillon Myer this morning in person, publicly apologize to him, and very freely so, and to every agent of the administration of which he certainly is the Acting Administrator.

So I shall try to do justice to the Administrator and to his staff—namely, I shall try to prove that my assumptions are incorrect and are based upon misinformation or lack of proper information. But, if in trying to prove that I am mistaken, I prove that my charges are correct, I shall most certainly and as rapidly as possible, bring the matters involved to the attention of this magnificent body. I shall do so for the obvious reason that if anything is wrong with any Federal executive agency, the sooner we are aware of those circumstances and facts, the sooner the faults will be corrected and the sooner we shall be able to continue with work of other character that is important to all of us.

Mr. President, I have appreciated the opportunity to voice the convictions of but one Member of the Senate. I desire to repeat, in this connection, that I have a very high regard for the Senators in

both parties who in the committee saw fit to vote so favorably and heavily in opposition to my point of view, which is that Mr. Dillon Myer should not be confirmed as Administrator of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am glad to reciprocate the fair spirit shown by the able Senator from Washington when he paid tribute to his colleagues on the committee and when he stated that he respected them and was sure that they acted in good faith. I wish to say that the Senator from Washington who has just addressed the Senate acted likewise, in my opinion.

In view of the fact that this matter has arisen on the floor of the Senate as we are about to vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Dillon Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency, it seemed to me, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that for the record I should review the steps taken up to the present point. I shall be very brief.

Several weeks ago the President nominated Mr. Dillon Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency. Under the rule, the nomination was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. In the committee it is our custom to have every nominee come before the committee for a personal examination and to submit a statement to the committee. In accordance with that custom, Mr. Myer duly appeared. As I recall, he spent an hour and a half before the committee, at which time he addressed us, and we asked him questions and looked him over. He made a very favorable impression—so much so that when motion was made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that the nomination be reported favorably, the vote in favor of reporting the nomination favorably was unanimous.

Following that vote in the committee, the nomination then, under the rule, went on the Executive Calendar of the Senate, I having reported the nomination for the committee. The nomination reposed on the calendar from that day to the next meeting day, when I supposed it would be confirmed, on a pro forma vote by the Senate, without any controversy, because there had been such a unanimous vote in the committee. I was not in the Chamber when the executive session was held on that day. To my surprise, the next morning the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] telephoned me that the day before he had asked that the nomination go over. I asked him why. He said he had done so because some Legionnaires, 9 or 10 in number, who had made a study of housing in various sections of the country, and particularly of public housing, had said to him that there had been serious mismanagement of the low-cost housing situation, and that many persons with low incomes had been unable to obtain adequate low-cost housing. The Senator from Indiana was opposed to the appointment of the man because these customs had prevailed. He asked that he might come to my office with the eight or nine Legionnaires, which he did, and they spent an hour and an half in my office. They were very thorough in their complaints, and they said they had ample evidence to justify their statements.

The Senator from Indiana asked me if I would see that the nomination went back to the committee, and as a matter of senatorial courtesy of course I acceded, and I advised the Legionnaires that due to the request of the Senator from Indiana the nomination would be taken up the next Tuesday, which would have been a week ago last Tuesday. The gentlemen in the room said, "That will not give us sufficient time to get the data together. We ask for more time." I said, "Very well, we will give you a week," that is to February 4. They said, "We will be on hand, will be there in person," and they left the room.

The nomination came before us on the 4th of February. The night before the 4th of February I was told that the commander of the American Legion had sent word to the clerk of the committee, Mr. Hill, that at his request these Legionnaires would not appear and give any testimony, and that they withdrew from the matter. So they did not appear, and nothing was forthcoming after their statement to the Senator from Indiana and myself.

In the absence of any testimony to the contrary, the committee took the matter up de novo, and in the committee room Mr. Myer again was present and was examined by various committee members, and another vote was taken, and the vote was 8 in favor and 2 votes against.

I came on the Senate floor realizing that in justice to the man the nomination should be taken up as soon as possible, as I should want done if I were a nominee. I came on the floor of the Senate and spoke to the only members of the committee who were on the floor at the time, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who approved my proposed action, and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who also approved, and said he had made his fight and was through. I therefore took the floor and asked that the rule be suspended and that the nominee be confirmed in view of the facts. I had first talked with the Parliamentarian, who confirmed that there was nothing unusual about the procedure. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was in the chair at the time. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] offered objection to the unanimous-consent request, so the nomination again went over.

Today the Committee on Banking and Currency met again to consider the nomination of Mr. Dillon Myer for the third time, and the able Senator from Washington came before us with material which he had received from certain authorities here in Washington, some data and some statements and communications charging bad faith on the part of the nominee in his statements to the committee, and so forth, which made him feel that Mr. Myer was not a desirable appointee.

I listened to the Senator, our colleague and friend from the State of Washington, and then I did what any other Senator would have done: I called for Mr. Myer to come and meet the facts in person, and within 10 minutes' notice he appeared and spent an hour with the committee. There he met the charges of the distinguished Senator from Washington ad seriatim, and at the conclusion of his meeting, the charges and his answers to the examination by the Senator from Washington, the committee again voted, and voted 8 to 1 to confirm the nominee of the President, against the evidence offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

So that we have a nomination now before us which three times has been before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the first time confirmation being voted unanimously, the second time by a vote of 8 to 2, and today by a vote of 8 to 1.

Mr. President, I have seen many men come before committees, and if I am any judge of a fine personality, and of a man who comes in good faith, if I am a judge of character, I pay tribute to Mr. Dillon Myer, the present nominee, as fitting that description. He carried himself forthrightly, as a man; he met every question foursquare, as I think every Senator will testify. In view of the background I have stated, which is conceded, which is in accordance with the truth and the facts, confirmation by the Senate now of the nominee is manifestly in order.

Mr. President, I ask for the question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since probably there will be no record vote on the nomination, I wish to have it stated for the RECORD that I am opposed to the nomination of Mr. Dillon Myer. I blocked his nomination last year, and I rather reluctantly withdrew my objection before the committee, but if I have to vote on the question myself, I am opposed to confirmation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to respond to the Senator from New Hampshire. I think it probably important that the Senate know around which questions the argument concerning Mr. Dillon Myer's appointment revolve. I am satisfied that we are going to hear more about it sooner or later. I think it proper to pose several questions at the moment for the consideration and reflection of all Senators present.

There is an act known as the Lanham Act. It was passed during the early part of the war to make possible the construction of defense houses in those areas where private enterprise was not in a position to build the houses in sufficient numbers to accommodate the demand. That act, like any other act, includes many rules and regulations, some restrictions and some prohibitions and some encouragements to go in different directions, but among other things—and to me this has always been important in connection with the Lanham Act—there is this phrase with reference to the disposition of the houses which were permanently constructed at considerable cost in the early part of the war, namely, that they should be disposed of by sale,

provided that none of these permanent units should be turned over to any public or private agency for low-rent use unless specifically authorized by the Congress.

I had not been too familiar with that prohibition, but in the course of the hearings on Mr. Myer's nomination I was advised from the city from which I came to Washington that an agent of Mr. Myer's, his regional director, having offices in the city of Seattle, had gone to the city of Tacoma, where they had not expected his coming, and he had said with reference to 400 units of permanent housing in that city, built under the Lanham Act, "This is what I want the people of Tacoma to do. I want you to sign a resolution memorializing Congress to make available these 400 permanent units of Lanham Act construction for low-rent use, and, citizens of Tacoma," he said, "if you do not do it, these units will very promptly be sold."

I was interested in that, and I became more interested in Mr. Dillon Myer, and, like anyone else who had not known very much about all this, I set to work to get as much information as I could obtain.

Coming out of that information is a conviction of my own that FPHA, through its regional directors and assistants in every region in America, is doing the very best it can, as rapidly and as effectively as it can, to get as many American communities as possible to resolve in favor of taking over these permanent units for low-rent use.

Mr. President, that doubt in my mind must be resolved. I think it has to be resolved in the minds of many Members of the Senate before very long. I do not know what we are going to do about it. Perhaps we are going to think it is legitimate, but it is not legitimate for the FPHA to call the hand of Congress, particularly the Senate, which, so far as I know, is not remotely aware of the existence of the problem.

My curiosity was aroused, secondly, when there came into my hands certain directives which had been flowing through and around and out of the various regional FPHA offices, telling people who lived within these permanent Lanham Act units all over America that it was much more to be desired that they form a mutual cooperative corporation than for them to consider buying these houses as individuals in the private market.

I was further interested and concerned because of the method of financing. According to Mr. Myer's own testimony, he said there is a difference—a positive difference—and he thought it was quite proper, up until very recent days, if there was a desire on the part of occupants to form a cooperative and get their hands on some of these Lanham Act permanent houses which the act prescribes should be sold at full value, they could do it by this method: The mutual group to put down 5 percent, to pay 3½ percent interest, and have 40 years in which to pay for the houses, the United States Government to be their banker.

But if an individual wanted to buy a Lanham Act house for himself, he did it by this method: He put down 20 percent in cash, he paid from 4 to 5 percent interest, and he had from 15 to 20 years in which to pay it off.

The questions I have asked Mr. Dillon Myer, which were not answered to my satisfaction, were simply these: Are your people throughout America encouraging the disposition of permanent Lanham Act projects for low-rent purposes? Are you unduly stimulating and encouraging the development of mutual and cooperative housing trends in America, with which the Senate of the United States is presently not familiar?

His answers to me on those questions have been a flat "No." He said, "That is not our intention; that is not our purpose."

But, gentlemen, to me, on a basis of the inconclusive, because brief, evidence that I have gotten within a very short period of time, I think that is precisely what is going on.

If the Senate can be saved the trouble, 2, 3, 4, or 5 weeks hence, by doing a piece of corrective work, not tomorrow, but today, I think it ought to be done, and that has been my only interest and concern in this matter.

I think probably it is proper to say that Mr. Myer, in a hearing about 4 days ago, was advised of my feelings about these questions, as an individual Senator, and I used the name of a man whom I know and of whom I think highly as a very able individual, one of Dillon Myer's administrative assistants or regional directors in the city of Seattle. I said, "I think Mr. Epstein is doing this, Mr. Myer, and this, and this, and this." He said, "I do not know that he is doing it. I cannot be responsible for what goes on throughout this country by my agents; but I will find out." Today is 4 days later. We have not had any communications from Mr. Dillon Myer, although he said this morning he was going to make certain to get the facts before very long.

But how, in goodness' name, can anyone who has looked into a case which is so full of doubt and uncertainty, vote to confirm an individual who has been in an acting capacity for quite some time, before the arguments in question are resolved?

This is what is going to happen, I think: Mr. Dillon Myer, in pursuance of his duties, is going to ask his regional director in the city of Seattle to come back here and to say yes or no to these questions that have been posed, not only by myself but by at least one other, and by most of the other Senators, and if, when we get the answers, they confirm my suspicions, I do not want to vote against the man, some time from now, that today in the face of my criticisms I might vote for.

I say that doubts have been cast on an important American problem, and it serves absolutely no good purpose at all to confirm into a permanent position a man who, from my point of view, must bear the responsibility of disproving things which have been clearly developed and maintained in his presence.

I trust that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has not thought me discourteous in again presenting my point of view.

Mr. TOBEY. On the contrary, I would merely add in rebuttal, to sum up—and I say very gladly that I would not impute any discourtesy to the Senator, who I am sure acted from a sense of duty and responsibility as a Senator—that three times the nomination has been before the committee; the first time, after an hour and a half, the vote in favor was unanimous; on the second occasion, after an hour and a half, the vote was 8 to 2, and in the third instance, after an hour, the vote was 8 to 1.

Mr. CAIN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TOBEY. Go ahead, correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. CAIN. Merely in the interest of accuracy; the vote this morning was 6 to 1. We were losing members.

Mr. TOBEY. Since then two Senators, who had to leave the hearing, asked that their votes be recorded.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. As I have stated, three votes have been taken, and I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who was present, would not object to my repeating a statement he made to me. As he left the room, since he was about to leave for Ohio, he came over and said to me, "I want to be recorded for him. I am more in favor of him now than I was the last time." That was the statement of the Senator from Ohio to me, and the vote today was 8 to 1.

I say in all candor, we make mistakes about human nature, of course, but if I know a man, and a forthright one, that man's name is Dillon Myer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dillon S. Myer to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency?

The nomination was confirmed.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1947.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the action that has been taken.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. Under a standing order of the Senate the

President pro tempore of the Senate a few days ago designated the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22. Because of the fact that the Senate will not be in session on that date, it being a Saturday, unless the general program is changed, I make the following unanimous-consent request:

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the order heretofore entered designating the Senator from West Virginia to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22 next, be made applicable to Friday, February 21, 1947.

I may say in explanation that this suggested change from Saturday to Friday has the complete approval of the Senator from West Virginia, who is to read the Farewell Address, and it has also been brought to the attention of the President pro tempore of the Senate, and I believe has his approval.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the final report of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources will go to press at the Government Printing Office within the next few days. The Superintendent of Documents has advised me that this report will be available to the public at 15 cents a copy. I am advised that Government agencies which may desire to obtain copies may order them while the document is on the press, at a cost of about $64.95 per thousand. I make the announcement because there has been considerable demand for copies of the report.

The Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on Rules and Administration has been requested to approve the printing of 3,000 copies; 500 for the Senate document room, 500 for the House document room, and 2,000 to be distributed to the list of those who have already applied to the special committee for copies.

PROGRAM FOR THE COMING WEEK—ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement for the general information of Senators who may want to be absent from the Senate at any time during the coming week. I shall move later that the Senate adjourn until Monday of next week. On Monday we will recess or adjourn until Tuesday. On Tuesday it is my purpose to ask that the Senate stand in recess or adjournment until Friday, February 14. It is my hope that on Friday the 14th no business will be transacted unless by unanimous consent, and that we shall then adjourn until Monday the 17th of February. I make that statement for the general information of the Senate. I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Paul T. Culbertson, of Kansas, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James F. Hodgson, of New York.
Frederick B. Lyon, of Michigan.
Livingston T. Merchant, of New Jersey.

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Frederic P. Bartlett, of New York.
Robert G. Cleveland, of New York.
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr., of Nebraska.
Jack A. McFall, of the District of Columbia.
Andreas G. Ronhovde, of Montana.
E. Paul Tenney, of Washington.

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. Clifford, of Illinois.
Edward T. Lampson, of Connecticut.
Thomas C. Mann, of Texas.
Leslie L. Rood, of New Jersey.
Henry W. Spielman, of Oklahoma.
Murat W. Williams, of Virginia.

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Alfred P. Dennis, of Virginia, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
Richard B. Kline, of New York.
Edward N. McCully, of Texas.
Raymond W. T. Pracht, of Illinois.
Herbert S. Weast, of California.
C. Hoyt Price, of Arkansas.
Robert C. Wysong, of Indiana.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Joseph K. Carson, Jr., of Oregon, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring September 25, 1952.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mark Lansburgh, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years.

George A. Garrett, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 3 years.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE PROFESSOR OF MECHANICS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Col. Kenneth David Nichols (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, Army of the United States.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Victor Emile Bertrandias (major, Air Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Wilson Byron, Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Edward Peck Curtis (major, Air Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. William Joseph Donovan (colonel, Cavalry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Farrell (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Carl Raymond Gray, Jr. (colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Patrick Jay Hurley (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Maxwell Immell (brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Harry Hubbard Johnson (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Frank Edward Lowe (colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Cyrus Rowlett Smith, Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Edward White Smith (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Leif John Sverdrup, Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Donald Bennett Adams (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Wayne Russell Allen, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frayne Baker (colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. F. Trubee Davison (colonel, Staff and Administrative Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edward Arthur Evans (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence George Fritz (captain, Air Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Gene William Hall, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harold Ross Harris, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Rudolph Charles Kuldell, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Timothy James Manning, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Merville Spofford, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Smith Strong, Jr. (colonel, Quartermaster Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. L. Kemper Williams (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Wilbar Wilson (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Bayne Wilson, Army of the United States.

CHEMICAL CORPS RESERVE

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d (lieutenant colonel, Chemical Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT RESERVE

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Arthur Hazelton Carter (colonel, Honorary Reserve), Army of the United States.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT RESERVE

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. William Robert Clayton Morrison (major, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve), Army of the United States.

MEDICAL CORPS RESERVE

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Stanhope Bayne-Jones (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT RESERVE

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Edward Samuel Greenbaum (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department Reserve), Army of the United States.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS RESERVE

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Georges Frederic Doriot (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Bernhard Alfred Johnson (major, Quartermaster Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Reed Kilpatrick (colonel, Cavalry Reserve), Army of the United States.

SIGNAL CORPS RESERVE

To be major general

Maj. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Carroll Owen Bickelhaupt (colonel, Signal Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ephraim Franklin Jeffe, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Eskridge Saltzman (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff (colonel, Signal Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Samuel Morgan Thomas (major, Signal Corps Reserve), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

The following list of officers appointed to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(* Indicated officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Campbell, Douglas M.
*Wood, Sanford B. D.
Hamilton, George H.

LIEUTENANTS

*Davis, Thomas M.
Fitch, Robert A.
*Bellinger, Lorentz D.
*Bon, Francis J.
*Lubelsky, Benjamin L.
*Pooler, Louis G.
Price, Glennon G.
Spangler, Earle S.
*Wallace, Thomas G.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Duncan, Richard L.
*Read, Samuel H. P., Jr.
*Allen, Arthur A.
Arens, Carl E.
*Carnes, James R.
*Chiles, Griffin
*Harrington, William F.
*McCrackin, Otho E.
*Meads, Leo J.
*Veverka, Rudolph E.
Berrey, Julius M.
Bishop, Edward W.
*Concannon, Charles F.
*Hartung, Walter P.
*Adams, John Q.
*Barnwell, John J.
*Burtz, Charles R.
Eastwood, James A.
*Grant, Everett A.
*Halloran, Edward R.
Hewitt, John V.
Hotchkiss, Stuart T.
*Owen, John
*Schafer, William K.
*Smith, Stuart C.
Swenson, Harold R.
*Wardlow, Harold V.
*Evans, Frank W., Jr.
Merrick, Richard C.
Moureau, Ralph H.
*Ogden, Herbert L.
*Seiler, Donald W.
Caffey, Kenneth W.
Condit, James W.
Schmidt, Russell J.

ENSIGNS

Adams, Joseph E., Jr.
Albright, Cletus A.
Ambler, Robert F.
Ashmead, Duffield 3d
Avant, John L.
Baker, Robert W.
Barli, John, Jr.
Barrett, Milton J.
Barton, Lee S.
Baumgartner, James R.
Baxter, Denver F.
Beadle, Marvin L.
Bell, Charles P.
Berger, Eugene B.
Berry, John W.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Bowen, John F.
Briggs, Claude M., 3d
Bright, George L., Jr.
Bryant, Franklin D.
*Burke, Edmund, Jr.
Carter, William H.
Castrichine, Barthalomew
Cefaratti, Donald, Jr.
Chamberlin, Robert
Chambliss, Joe "E"
Cheverton, Robert E.
Christiansen, Arnold R.
Clingan, George M.
Cogshall, James H.
Conerly, Tom B., Jr.
Connelly, James P. F.
Correll, Noble O., Jr.
Cox, Warren M.
Cravens, Harold L.
Debold, Joseph F.
De Veas, Thomas E.
Dickerson, Vincent M.
Dunn, Jack B.
Duquette, Herbert E., Jr.
Eddy, Billy L.
Empey, Robert E.
Emrick, Merwin G.
Ennis, Edward J.
Erickson, Jack L.
Fisher, Hubert W.
Fitzgerald, David R.
Forster, Robert M.
Fosha, Charles E.
Foster, William I., Jr.
Freudenberg, Harold W.
Fromknecht, George W.
Galassi, Mario C.
*Garay, Paul N.
Gill, Ronald E.
Gillette, Keith F.
Gilman, Richard C.
Gimpel, Herbert J.
Glennon, Edmund
Gniady, Edward
Gorden, Oliver A.
Greenway, Victor W. H.
Griffin, Juel, Jr.
Guhse, Donald E.
Hammer, Lloyd A., Jr.
Harden, Charles A.
Harmon, Alfred W.
Hathaway, Marvin F.
Hayek, Paul A.
Hays, Robert C.
Helsel, Kenneth D.
Hennessey, Charles A., Jr.
Holmes, Robert A., 3d
Holmes, Robert E.
Holzrichter, Max A.
Horton, William P.
Howard, Garnett "E"
Ireland, Joe N.
Isen, Forester W.
Iverson, Halvor
Jessee, Jack W.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, Warren E.
Jones, Harry C.
Jorgensen, Cecil M.
Kerr, John W.
King, Herbert T.
Kip, Phelps C.
Klein, Harry J.
Knoblock, Walter W.
Knox, Gordon L.
Koch, Walter M.
Lamberson, Don M.
Larsen, Orrin K.
Lawyer, John W., Jr.
Lear, John R.
Lloyd, Marshall O.
Lowrie, Robert G.
Malley, Francis E.
Maurer, Nelson H.
Mayer, William S.
McCain, Howard G.
McCarthy, Florence W.
McGaw, Donald A.
McGrady, James P., Jr.
McGrath, Donald E.
McGrath, William H.
McIntyre, John J.
McLaughlin, Douglas C.
McNair, Emmett T.
Mencin, Adolph
Meng, Edwin "L", Jr.
Michael, John F.
Michael, Bernard E.
Miller, Clark W.
Mills, Ernest J.
Minnick, Harvey E.
Moore, Oswald M.
Morris, Gene C.
Morrison, James W.
Moyce, Murray A.
Nissen, John C., Jr.
Noble, Lee V.
Offutt, Ray D.
Olvey, Mervin L.
O'Rourke, Frank R.
Pace, Robert D., Jr.
Pahl, Herschel A.
Penney, Willoughby W.
Perry, Eugene R.
Pierucki, Ervin J.
Planton, David N.
*Pollak, Edward G.
Rains, David C.
Reed, William D.
Richter, Alvin F.
Riddle, John W.
Roberts, Levi J., Jr.
Russell, John B.
Salisbury, Harley G.
Scally, Francis W.
Schaefer, William W.
Schatz, Clifford E.
Searcy, John E., Jr.
Seward, Joseph G.
Shaw, Joseph E.
Sheppard, William L.
Sinnott, Myles R.
Skon, Warren A.
Smith, Jack H.
Snider, Harold A.
Snipes, Rodney F.
Spencer, Clyde M.
Stadter, George B.
Stewart, Harold E.
Stuart, Robert L.
Sullivan, Warren, Jr.
Sundt, Robert K.
Swanson, Ray J.
Tanton, Paul W.
Taylor, Halton H.
Taylor, Harry B.
Teague, Marx M.
Thorne, Fred H.
Thornell, Enos
Torbett, Jack
Twomey, Paul P.
Tyler, Claude L.
Wall, Charles G.
Wentz, Charles A.
Wenz, Carl R., Jr.
White, Thomas C.
Whitehouse, William A., Jr.
Wilson, Herbert B.
Adams, Robert E.
Arch, Theodore S. J.
Armstrong, Russell I.
Asbury, David A.
Athow, Robert F.
Atkins, Robert E.
Baird, Harold J.
Barber, Lester W.
Bazler, Paul S., Jr.
Bennett, Francis B.
*Benz, Robert P.
*Berger, Robert S.
Besel, Michael N., Jr.
Bjurback, Stanley N.
Blackburn, James T.
Bowden, Bill
*Bowie, James M.
*Boyle, John J.
Braid, Herbert C.
Brantley, Melvin H.
Brennan, Nicholas I.
Brock, Robert J.
Brown, Errington
Brown, Vernon L.
Burks, Melvin L.
Butler, Arthur P.
Butler, John F.
Byrd, William V.
Baker, William G.
Campbell, Thomas M.
*Carlisle, Geoffrey E.
Challain, Leonard J.
Chalmers, Norman E.
Coll, Charles L.
Cook, William E.
*Cooke, Nelson M.
Cooper, Lloyd F.
*Cox, William R.
Crain, Horace T.
*Criddle, Merdin C.
Crites, Jack O.
Curtis, Charles E., Jr.
Davis, John F.
Davis, Judson C., Jr.
Delcamp, Michael S.
Dempster, John T., Jr.
Deney, Leonard J., Jr.
*DeRoco, Vernon J.
Dooling, David
Downey, Harmon A.
Drehobl, George F.
Dryer, Orville W. J.
Dunkum, Hugh H., Jr.
Dunn, Richard J.
*Ellis, Walter J.
Epps, John H.
Farrell, Ted L.
Fewel, James W.
Finnegan, Paul F.
Foley, John J.
Fontinell, Ernest W.
*Foote, Kenneth C.
*Ford, William R.
Fowler, William E.
Frketic, Louis J.
Gatlin, William A.
Gerhard, Harry "E", Jr.
Gibbons, Hugh E.
Gibbons, James G.
Girault, Norton R.
Greene, William M. A.
Greenwell, Jack
Griesel, Vincent J.
*Griffing, Charles W.
Grubbs, Thomas A., Jr.
Gustaferro, Joseph F.
*Hall, George M.
Hampton, Warren J.
Harlan, James L.
Harper, Charles L.
Harris, David D.
Harris, Ernest C., Jr.
Hebert, Ernest P.
Hemmingsen, Charles J.
*Hendershot, Charles S.
Herms, Ralph R.
*Herr, Donald L.
Hodges, Richard H.
Hoffman, Raymond L.
Hoffner, James H.
Holm, Kenneth C.
Howell, Ralph T.
*Huestis, Gerald S.
*Hughes, Warren R.
*Hogg, James V.
Jenkins, John W.
Johns, James G.
Johnson, Garvis D.
Johnson, Philip W.
Karnes, Austin G.
*Kaul, Fredric H.
Keck, Carroll B.
Keeley, Hugh M.
Keifert, Robert N.
Keller, Robert C.
*Kenny, James P.
Kimzey, John H.
King, John M.
Kozak, Norbert J.
Kozluk, Walter
Krebs, Edward C., Jr.
*Labrum, Willard D.
Lammers, Lorin R.
Lampkin, Kenneth "E", Jr.
La Roe, Edward T.
Lasseter, Joe F., Jr.
Le Breton, Guy J., Jr.
Lee, John W.
Lerew, John W., Jr.
Leute, George M., Jr.
Little, John B.
Lorentson, Adrian V.
Lowry, Allen W.
Lucas, William E., 3d
Ludwig, David W.
*Lyngby, Alfred R.
MacKay, Robert T.
Manring, Alvin B.
Martens, Theodore J.
Mayer, Nicholas J.
McAdams, Lee T.
McCabe, Hugh T., Jr.
*McCarthy, John F.
McCarthy, Thomas S.
McClaugherty, Bernard M.
*McEvoy, John W.
McKee, John N.
McLaughlin, Burton J.
Meek, John P.
Mellem, Ellsworth L.
Miles, Kenneth N.
*Miller, Ashton C.
Miller, George W.
*Miller, Jack N.
Miller, Loel R.
*Miller, Otto C.
*Monteath, Edward B.
Moore, James I.
Moore, John L.
Moore, Thomas H.
Moran, William J.
*Mullane, Leo W.
Nabours, Laverne F.
Nolta, Cornelius V., Jr.
Nolte, Miles H., Jr.
Norville, Robert W.
Nuernberger, Gale W.
Ogle, Robert J.
Oliver, Almon "P"
Olson, Edwin G.
Ostensoe, Omer C.
Ottea, Mathias M., Jr.
*Otto, Clarence E.
Packer, Samuel H.
Page, Robert L.
Paterson, Donald P.
*Pattison, William J.
Patton, Peter G.
Peters, Bruen H.
Paynter, Thomas G.
Phillips, Howard E.

Potter, Robert B.
Pruett, James W.
Ramseyer, William F., Jr.
Randolph, John B.
Ransford, Clyde E.
Rasmussen, Merwin E.
Ray, Charles E.
Read, Robert B.
*Reeves, Carl G.
Richardson, Charles C.
Rink, Victor B.
Robinson, Charles D.
Rogers, Leo J.
Rubinow, Sydney G., Jr.
*Ryan, Richard E.
Ryce, Clarence O.
Sanderson, Harold M.
Schoggen, Phil H.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Sseber, James W.
Severin, Clifford E.
Shakshober, MacLean C.
*Shaver, Robert G.
Sherman, Frank E.
*Sherman, Roger J.
Sherwood, Charles
Shuett, Donald W.
Simmons, Mitchell M.
Smith, Allen M.
Smithey, Thurman E.
Spencer, Frank O.
Stafford, Edward P.
Staiger, Hugh K.
Stanley, Henry T., Jr.
Steinmeyer, Lloyd R.
Stewart, Clifford L.
Strickland, Eugene C.
Sutherland, James W.
Sweet, Robert R.
Swint, George, 3d
Tall, Harold R.
*Tessin, William
Thomas, Robert H.
Thompson, Robert J.
Thompson, William M. Jr.
*Thomson, Fred R.
Thornton, Jack H.
Timmer, Bernard W.
Tobin, Louis J.
Tobin, William F., Jr.
Tracey, Walter
Turnbull, William O.
*Turner, Filo H.
*Van Ohlen, John
*Wadewitz, Walter F.
Walsh, Thomas J.
*Weisenberg, Joseph O.
Welge, Leslie A.
*Wesper, Willis H.
Wessel, Robert L.
White, Rue W.
Whiteman, Stephen J.
*Wicker, Whiting
*Wiederspahn, Willard H.
Wiegand, Robert A.
*Wilburn, William C., Jr.
Willis, "P" "M"
Wilson, Richard J.
Wood, William M.
Wright, Graydon D.
Zangel, Howard C.
Abrams, Robert C.
*Adair, Lallance A.
Arnold, Lemuel H.
Atcheson, George, 3d
*Baird, Lawrence I.
Beaubouef, James A
*Benassi, Dominic A.
Beydler, Warren H.
Bill, Wells R., Jr.
Bivins, William "F"
Blades, Charles P.
Boykin, James O.
Brooks, Bailey F., Jr.
Brown, Robert H., Jr.
Browning, Robert B.
Buescher, Homer V.
*Burns, William L.
Burr, Robert M.
Burton, Lester H.
Butcher, Cecil O.
*Campbell, Donald C.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Chaky, Emil
*Chapman, Arthur S.
*Chesky, Kaz P.
*Chirillo, Louis D.
Clarke, Robert D.
Coad, Richard J.
Condor, Bernard
Cooley, Benjamin C., Jr.
Cos, Grant A.
Cress, Warren D.
Cullen, Patrick O.
Curtis, Theodore E.
Davidson, John R.
Davis, William R.
Delmanowski, Ernest F.
Detamble, Paul A., Jr.
Dew, Donald F.
*Dickman, Robert H.
Dierks, D. J.
Dize, Melvin W.
Doescher, Walter W., Jr.
Edwards, William E.
Emerson, Allan L.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Erickson, Ernest O.
Ernesti, John H.
Faulconer, Douglas "J"
Fleming, William W.
*Ford, James W.
Foster, William G.
Fox, Floyd E.
Frees, Norman W., Jr.
*Furnas, Wendell J.
Garbler, Paul
Gard, John G.
Gillen, Earle C.
Gladstone, William G.
Gladwell, Paul F.
Goddard, Hollis
Gorman, John V.
Granat, Arnold M.
Greenwood, Thomas E.
*Griffin, Harry K., Jr.
Grigsby, Hubert C.
Gross, Seymour G.
Haithcock, June D., Jr.
Halub, Raymond
Handlin, Daniel W.
Hansen, Herman C.
Herb, James W.
Hewitt, Floyd
*Holcomb, John W.
*Jacobus, Neal
Johnson, Frank E.
Jones, Warren M.
Kadel, Frank E.
*Kallfelz, Leo N.
Kalnitzky, Myron R.
Keith, Hugh E.
Kelly, Giles M.
Kest, Harold W.
Kidd, Robert A.
Kirley, Thomas J.
Kleffner, Frank P.
Klockenkemper, Joseph B.
Knueven, William H.
Koberg, Donald R.
Kovanic, Francis "J"
Kruzick, George F.
Landtroop, Joe M.
Langevin, Gerald J.
Largess, Clifton R., Jr.
Leeds, Walter V.
Lindbloom, Nils W.
*Lindquist, Dean H.
*Line, Bryant W.
Lloyd, James F.
Locke, Robert P.
Long, David A.
Loveland, Charles F.
Lowe, Claude O.
MacMurdo, Charles
Marshall, Scott W.
Mayer, Albert J.
Mayhew, Myron A.
Maynard, Vincent D., Jr.
McKeel, Alonza B., Jr.
McNair, William D.
*Meinsler, Edward F., Jr.
Miskill, Donald K.
Murray, Royal C., Jr.
Nelson, James D.
Norrington, William E., Jr.
*Olivari, Louis
Orcutt, Robert E.
*Page, James C.
Pefley, John W.
Pels, John H.
Piatek, John A.
Randell, William D.
Rayner, Donald E.
*Reed, James T.
Remond, Hillary F.
Rice, Lincoln P.
Richards, Floyd D.
Riker, Alden S.
Robinson, Gerald "A"
Robinson, Richard L.
Schall, Rodney F.
Schaumburg, Dale P.
Schlecht, Max A.
Seaman, George H.
Sharp, Wallace E.
Shettler, Walter R.
Simonelli, Orazio
Sims, James H.
Slasinski, Floyd M.
*Smith, Carl T.
Smits, Cornelius J., Jr.
*Sobczyk, Eugene
Spahr, Herman G.
Stamm, Charles C.
Stanczyk, Stanley L.
Stephens, Alvis H.
Stewart, Charles M.
Taneyhill, Paul "A" Jr.
Thelen, Robert H.
Towne, Thomas W.
Trotter, William R.
*Vann, Isaiah M., Jr.
Walker, Jack A.
*Walsh, William J.
Warton, John F.
Weaver, Marvin V., Jr.
Weeks, George R.
Welty, Jack W.
Whittle, Claude B.
Wicker, David A.
Wilcox, Charles E.
Wiles, Alfred B.
Wiskirchen, Richard L.
Woods, Kenneth G.
Woody, Ellis A.
*Wroblewski, Sigmund V.
Young, Lawrence L., Jr.
*Ziegler, George F.
Adler, William C., Jr.
Aichele, Sylvester S.
Aldridge, Ivers F.
Allen, Homer H.
*Allen, Kirke M.
Anderson, Charles O.
Anderson, Lloyd F.
Baldwin, Thomas B., Jr.
*Banister, Montgomery
Beadles, Joseph W.
Bell, William B.
Berg, Leonard J.
*Berquist, Paul
Betz, Merle E.
Beumer, Everett H.
Boland, Thomas G.
*Bradbury, Malcolm J
Brite, Murrel C.
Broman, Clifford G.
*Brooks, Tilden L.
*Brough, James A.
Browning, Benjamin H., Jr.
Bryan, Roland T.
*Burum, Roger L.
*Butler, Thomas E.
Cahill, Joseph H.
Caire, Albert D.
Callahan, George E.
Card, Fred S., Jr.
Carter, Otis D.
Cerstvik, Milan S.
*Clarke, Samuel R.
*Cochran, Elvin P., Jr.
*Collender, Edward H.
*Connolly, Daniel E.
Courtin, Robert E., Jr.
*Cykler, John F.
Davis, Byron E.
Davis, Henry C.
De Benham, Robert W
De Bord, Robert K.
Deering, Harold J.
Deitchman, Vincent
Eaton, John M., Jr.
Edmisten, William H
Edmonson, Edgar T.
*Edwards, Horace L.
*Evans, Henry L.
*Fair, Thomas F., Jr.
Felsberg, Alfred T.
Fielder, Herbert H.
Flory, Edwin B.
*Flynn, Daniel
Forman, Richard E.
Foxworthy, John P.
Friedman, Malcolm C
*Garver, Donald L.
Gaw, Benjamin D.
Geddes, William C.
Green, Maurice "F"
Groesch, John W.
Haisten, Frank D.
Hansen, Dale V.
Hansen, Henry J., Jr.
Hartsell, Harry V., Jr.
Hawley, Maurice V.
*Heagy, Daniel W.
Hedgepeth, Charles H
Heiken, Frederick C.
Hellickson, Aaron J.
Henson, John H.
Heron, James J.
Hess, Paul W.
Higgins, Ethan B.
Higley, Warren A.
*Hitz, Frederick W., Jr.
Hodnett, Richard C.
Hoerath, John R.
Hoffman, Burt A.
Hoke, Robert W.
Hricinak, Michael D.
Hubbard, Edward R.
*Hurd, Ernest L., Jr.
*Hutchison, Earle G.
Jablonski, Felix J.
*Jenkins, James E.
*Johnson, Carl E.
Johnson, Terry J.
Jones, Arthur W.
Karlsven, George J.
*Katz, Saul
*Keatts, John C., Jr.
*Kenney, Paul G.
Kessler, Roy J.
Kilroy, Richard F.
Klym, Charles S.
Koepcke, William W.
Kohman, Robert N.
Kroencke, William H.
*Lagle, Robert D.
Lamar, William W., Jr.
Lang, Donald A.
Larkin, Paul S.
Lawton, Richard C.
Leib, James M.
Lincoln, John L., 4th
Little, James W.
Lobbregt, Robert B.
Lockhart, James A.
Lockwood, Burton G.
Longley, Wilbur E.
Lowe, Grady H.
MacFarlane, Arthur S.
MacKenzie, James B.
Mackey, Wendell C.
Maddox, James W.
Mallonee, Gordon L.
Maltby, Adin J., Jr.
Mark, Robert B.
Martin, Charles E.
McCabe, Robert E.
McCallon, Victor L.
McCormick, Robert W.
McGovern, William
McIntyre, Edward L.
McKillop, Harvey E., Jr.
McKnight, George W.
McMullen, Birton E.
McMurray, Samuel F.
*Mereness, Robert H.
Miles, Ross E., Jr.
Miller, Charles J.
*Miller, Melvin A.
Miller, Ned
Ming, Robert S.
Mitchell, George A.
Moore, Sam H.
Moran, William F.
*Moroney, John D.
Morris, Floyd R.
Morris, James W.
Moyers, Layman D.
Mukhalian, Zaven
Mulholland, William P.
Murphy, Arthur C.
Needham, Theodore P.
*Neeley, William E.
Newman, John R.
Norelius, Roy A.
Oliver, John D.
*Parisian, Richard W.
Parramore, Douglas G.
Partlow, George L.
Parzych, Henry M.
Petersen, Chester L.
Peterson, Robert F.
Phillips, Douglas G.
Pietrowski, Edward L. F.
Powell, Edwin H.
Presson, Herman W.
Pruski, Leonard
Purcell, Charles J.
Purcell, Kenneth E.
Randle, David D.
Randle, Jack
*Rapp, Lawrence B.
Reiland, Ronald R.
Roberts, Lester B.
Roberts, Perry
Robinson, Edward M.
Robison, Charles W.
*Roddy, William T.
Rosegrant, Angelo J., Jr.
*Roth, Richard H.
*Roth, William J., Jr.
Rowe, Harrie J.
Russell, Charles E.
Rust, Dorvan T.
Ryan, George G.
Sackett, Albert M.
Schaer, Frederick D.
Scheer, Lawrence E.
Schirmer, Adolph C.
Schoenfeld, John R.
Schub, Walter J.
*Selman, Richard J.
Setterholm, Ralph G.
Shaw, Arthur E.
Sherwin, Robert W.
Sims, Clifford L., Jr.
*Sisk, Francis J.
Smith, Floyd E.
Smith, Rush S.
Smith, Wallace E.
Smith, Welborn H.
Smith, William K.
Sokoloff, Norman
Solonchak, William
Stack, Martin J.
Stallings, Wilbur L.
Stark, Kenneth J.
Steffen, Edward J.
Steinkellner, Robert H.
Stephenson, Jack L.
Stone, William A.
Stork, Nathan L.
Sullivan, William H. L.
Swagert, Everett D.
Sweet, Clifford D., Jr.
Thielges, James M.
*Thomas, Randolph G.
Thompson, Arthur E.
Thompson, Harry M.
*Toll, John S.
Tomlinson, Orville L.
Toole, Warren K.
Vaa, Norman A.
Vogler, William H., 2d
Wall, James R.
*Wallace, Edwin H.
*Walruff, Charles A.
*Wannamaker, Thomas M.
Weible, Robert C.
Wheeler, Richard F.
White, Robert E.
*Whyte, John E.
Wiggins, Samuel P.
Williams, Carl H.
*Williams, Guy R.
Wilson, Marshall W.
Wood, Harold D.
Wollam, Raymond L.
Achberger, Eldon E.
Ackerman, James D.
Adams, Thomas H.
Bannowsky, Clarence J., Jr.
Barnett, Gene A.
Beatty, John W.
Bennett, William O.
Bernard, Harry, Jr.
Binder, Martin
Bird, Noel V.
Bolger, Robert J., Jr.
Bowman, Millard G.
Brill, Harry K.
Brock, Marvin A.
Brooks, Richard I., Jr.
Burkholder John
Campbell, Kenneth
Canney, Frank C.
Chabot, James V.
Cleland, Henry G., Jr.
Corbett, Marshall J.
Coyle, John J., Jr.
Crawford, Nathan P.
Custer, Robert E.
*Daniel, Charles L.
Danta, Robert C.
*Ditch, William E.
Dodson, Robert B.
Dolan, Owen F.
Doran, George T., Jr.
Dunn, George G.
Dunton, Stanley W.
Easley, David E.
Eberly, Paul A.
Euster, Jerold P.
Everett, Travis E.
Eyring, Joseph R.
Farren, William J.
Finnigan, Robert J.
Foy, George E.
Frank, Irwin W.
Frankiewicz, Edward J.
Garbarino, Andrew W., Jr.
*Gibbons, John P.
Gilbert, Glen W.
Glore, William G.
Graham, Mac A.
Gramling, Alfred S.
Gregory, Lyman E.
Grove, Leo H.
Groves, John G., Jr.

Halwachs, Alois W.
Hargan, George B., Jr.
Harlander, Douglas G.
Hart, Felix E., Jr.
Hatch, Vyrl S.
Hawkins, Rex "E"
Hays, Lyle R.
Heile, Donald H.
Hershey, Kirk
*Heyl, James
Hickman, Marion E.
Hicks, Richard J.
Hiller, Raymond H.
Hudspeth, William L.
Hylind, Kenneth G.
Jacobs, Ralph, Jr.
James, John C.
Jenkins, Glen E.
*Jester, Walter H.
Junk, Winfield H.
Kanapicki, Kasimir
Karch, Ernest J.
Keating, Cornelius F.
*Keller, Wally K.
Kelly, Dean E.
Kelly, Fonville
Kelly, Robert R.
Keyes, Thomas E.
Killian, Ray A.
Kloss, David S.
Korycinski, Victor E.
Langer, Chester R.
Lee, Gerald A.
Levin, Philip
Lewis, Harvey E.
Longley, Thomas B.
Luedtke, Wilbert C.
*Lytle, Arthur C., Jr.
*Markey, Francis X.
Marshall, Paul R.
Masem, Matthew N.
Matross, Jerome R.
May, Herbert A.
McDowell, Joseph R.
McInnis, Alexander N., Jr.
*McLean, George R.
Mellin, Richard G.
Mellor, Fred W., Jr.
*Miller, Winston L.
Moore, Maurice J.
Moore, Warren T.
Mueller, Howard R.
Muller, Reginald T.
*Murphy, Walter J.
Murray, Joseph J., Jr.
*Naczkowski, Bruno R.
Napier, Charles H.
Nichols, Clarence C.
Niles, Robert A.
Noetzel, Ewald R.
Odom, James E., Jr.
O'Reilly, Peter J.
Osborne, Henry H.
*Pace, Joseph J.
Parrish, Eddy J.
Paulsen, William H.
Pincetich, John
Plante, Richard J.
Pruitt, James P.
Pyle, Teddy R.
Rasko, Robert V.
Rathbun, Rex B.
Robinson, Frederick G.
Rolih, Max F., Jr.
Sampson, Courtney H.
Schoenfeld, Louis J.
Schroeder, William
Seymour, Earl P.
Shannon, Milner N.
Shenk, Eugene M.
Sherrin, Marshall B., Jr.
Shinn, Conrad S.
Shuttleworth, Walter G., Jr.
Sigler, Orvis U., Jr.
Sinclair, Thomas L.
Smith, Walter R.
Spann, Willis L.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
*Steffen, Ernest W.
Still, Raymond G.
Storseth, Robert P.
Sullivan, Richard P.
*Sweeny, Wilson J.
Tarrant, Bernerd R.
Taylor, Robert V.
Ternasky, Eugene F.
Thigpen, Francis Y.
Thomas, Charles M., Jr.
Thomas, Robert B.
Thorndike, David M.
Tierney, William J.
*Tollenaere, Lawrence R.
Tuck, Charles W.
Vanderpool, Jay R.
Vantrain, William A., Jr.
Wall, Charles L.
*Watson, Raymond S.
Weaver, Keith T.
Webb, Milton G.
Weir, Saxton A., Jr.
Wesolowski, John M.
Whitehead, John D.
Wilson, Prentis M.
Workman, John C.
Adomian, George
Alleman, Lee E.
Allen, Harry, III
Arntzen, Donald M.
Austin, William R.
Barron, William B., Jr.
Bauer, William M.
Beaman, Darrell H.
Beesley, David L.
*Blankinship, William A.
Blaser, Frederick
Blevins, Fred G.
Blondin, John L.
Boyle, Thomas A., Jr.
Brady, Donald P.
Branum, Rudolph
*Browne, Donald W.
Burch, William L.
Buscher, John R., Jr.
Cashman, George A.
Charles, Robert G.
Cherryman, Rexford R.
Chesler, Daniel E., III
Cockrell, Jack R.
Cole, Don E.
Coset, Albert W.
Cottingham, Donald R.
Coursin, Jack T.
Crevier, Albert W.
*Cunnare, Francis H.
Dallmann, Paul H.
Denham, Robert S., Jr.
Dillard, James P.
Dille, Ralph E.
Dilworth, Robert D.
Dixon, Eugene C.
*Doty, Frederick L.
Dower, William D.
Dudley, Sherman F.
Ebel, Stanley T.
Eckert, George J.
Elchinger, Milton L.
Emme, Louis R.
*Everson, Paul B.
Eyster, George W.
Fericks, Franklin H.
Fleming, Dean G.
Ford, James A.
Gabrielsen, Carl A.
Garwood, Kenneth W.
Gaunt, Richard H.
Gibson, Warren L.
Gray, John
Green, Harold G.
*Griffin, Donald
*Gunther, Thomas M.
Haden, Turner R.
Hagler, Billy E.
Hargrave, William R.
Harvey, James H., Jr.
Herman, William M.
Hesse, Theodore S.
Hines, William M.
Hoeft, Edward G.
Holbrook, James G.
Hollingsworth, Robert J.
Humphrey, George S., Jr.
Johnson, Harold E.
Johnson, Olaf C.
Jones, Harold L.
Keeler, Charles B.
Kempf, Lawrence A.
Kutchera, Dean J.
Laakso, Leslie R.
Landry, Adelard F.
Larue, Wilbur H.
Latch, Herbert
Lawson, Jacob F.
Lindsley, Jack N.
Luke, Norman J.
Macomber, Mark M.
Marks, John L.
Mattox, Redfield H.
May, Stanley F.
Mazur, Anthony J.
McHenry, Carl E.
Merrell, Chandler V.
Metke, Harry D.
Miles, Warren H.
Monroe, Edward C.
*Montgomery, Charles C.
*Moore, Howard N.
Moreland, Herbert A., Jr.
Nelson, Hildry L.
O'Callahan, William T.
Oelerich, John H.
Patterson, William H.
Pein, Edward W.
Phillips, George W., Jr.
Phillips, Rubel L.
Poynter, Lewis L.
Ranzau, Walter W.
Redmayne, Richard B.
Redwine, "W" "J"
Reynolds, Clifford G.
Rhodes, William B.
Riley, Horace, Jr.
*Roberts, John C., Jr.
Rockwell, Kenneth L.
*Root, Thomas B.
Rowe, Donald E.
Rushin, Thomas E.
Russell, George A., Jr.
Ryan, Eugene P.
Ryner, Evan H.
Sally, Aloysius
Schermerhorn, Dale V.
*Schmidt, Herbert T.
Schmieder, Arthur H.
Serrell, Andrew
*Shimp, Robert P.
Shrake, Francis B.
Shumaker, Charles E.
Smith, Hugh W.
Smith, Joseph E., 3d
Smith, Rodney N.
Smolen, Francis E.
Smyth, Robert P.
Sparkman, Homer A., Jr.
Stafford, William G.
Starr, Mark R.
Sternloff, Robert E.
Stiling, David F.
Struthers, Frederick E.
Taylor, James E.
Teevan, Charles L.
Thompson, Lewayne
Van Benshoten, Robert S.
Walker, George T., Jr.
Walker, Robert G.
Walters, Robert G.
Wasson, Frank K.
Waters, Nathan F.
Wear, La Vern G.
Westcott, Malvern P., Jr.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Worley, Carson R.
Yoder, Calvin B.
Zehr, Milton A.
Zook, Lester E.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Veseen, Leslie L.
Adams, John Q.
Brown, Robert B.
English, Glenn G.
Wangelin, Evans H.
Wishengrad, Michael
Bostic, Sam C.
Vorwald, Arthur J.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Bovill, Edwin G.
Carrigan, Paul W.
Clark, Benjamin W.
Guyer, Donald C.
Cavanagh, John R.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Hall, Clifford R.
Nauman, Richard D.
Whitney, Byron V. B.
Wineinger, Gerald E.
Barger, John B.
Bisel, Harry F.
Coffey, Jerome J.
Davis, Colbert S.
Doudna, Calvin T.
Giffin, Herbert M.
Hahne, Leonard J.
Kurzrok, Milton
Levine, Harry S.
Lockwood, James H.
Phillips, Robert A.
Schmid, William A.
Shaper, Aaron A.
Stutz, Malcolm G.
Thomas, Marcel P.
Trachtenberg, William
Wagner, Robert L.
Walker, Granville I., Jr
Collins, Louis A., Jr.
De Wilton, Edward L.
Green, Robert B.
Lehman, Robert C.
Matthews, Walter S., Jr.
Schaffarzick, Ralph W.
Scott, Benjamin F., 3d
Withers, Sydnor T.
Cottrell, Frederick W., Jr.
Mason, Alfred B.
Mayer, Herbert C.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Amdahl, Olaf K.
Crull, Ford R.
Roberts, Thomas C., Jr.
Cates, William E.
Kaufman, Frederick A.
Lee, Andrew W.
Heck, Charles B.
LaBonte, Charles L.
Thompson, Louis A., Jr.
Hill, Robert A.
Ratcliffe, Russell S.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Andersen, Mark E.
Bahl, Donald W.
Brauer, Robert W.
Conard, Melvin L.
Cross, Sydney E.
Davis, Richard M.
Eddleman, John P.
Ewing, Ray S.
Gavey, Harry E.
Gudgeon, Albert G.
Hackett, John J.
Jack, Ralph H.
Kallaus, Alfred R., Jr.
Larocque, Maurice W.
Lemmon, Gerald C.
Littlehale, Willard
Matthews, Charles A., Jr.
McKay, Frank W.
McLean, James P.
Mooring, Edward C.
Morris, William A.
Norcott, William C.
Reardon, David N.
Roberts, William L.
Rodgers, Wallace F.
Rosapepe, James V.
Slaughter, William A.
Sobieralski, Frank B.
Sprague, Raymond E.
Strickler, Kenneth D.
Valliere, Paul J.
Wilson, Wilbur A. G.
York, Edward S.
Adams, John L.
Baker, Robert E.
Bartholomew, Robert L.
Bauer, Wilmer L.
Bergen, Richard
Berry, Harry, Jr.
Bevins, Elwood M.
Blais, George A.
Brickley, George R.
Brittain, Joe T.
Brown, John T.
Burke, Elmer G.
Christy, James L.
Collins, James H.
Cook, William H.
Dalbey, Earle G.
D'Amico, Joseph
Daniel, Charles, Jr.
Daniels, Royce L.
Donaldson, Ivan
Edwards, Samuel M.
Elkins, Robert H.
Fernas, William M., Jr.
Forsberg, John E. K.
Fossum, Earl G.
Freeman, Edmond T.
Freeman, Wilbur S.
Gobel, Carl F.
Griffith, Stephen S. D.
Haberlin, William E.
Helvey, Roy
Hines, James N.
Hysen, Carl L.
Iber, George H.
Jones, Joe L.
Jones, William B.
Josselyn, Allan H., Jr.
Kaempf, Walter H., Jr.
Karchere, William
King, Edward D.
Kirchoff, Donald J.
Kompanek, Andrew "J", Jr.
Leonard, Wilson D.
Lewis, Joseph E.
Lightner, Thomas A. L.
Lillis, James F.
Lundquist, Lawrence E.
Maggard, Talmadge P.
Mandich, Donald R.
Masterson, James E.
Moore, Donald L.
Murphy, Paul J.
Philion, Thomas F.
Phillips, Horace E.
Pollitt, Ernest A.
Pratt, Wilfred A.
Radeke, Waldemar H., Jr.
Renfro, Edward E., 3d
Rice, Robert C.
Rivers, Vernon G.
Schweizer, Earl G.
Severance, Radford H.
Simonson, Eldon D.
Skinner, Raymond E.
Smith, Julian D.
Stabe, Robert W.
Steele, James H.
Stuart, William B.
Stumm, Donald D.
Taylor, Kenneth D.
Theile, Kenneth W.
Thompson, Oscar D.
Thomson, Harvey W.
Toomey, John F.
Vaughan, James M.
Warner, Robert J.
Watson, Raymond A.
Watson, Stanley W., Jr.
Webb, David L.
Wells, Robert A.
Williams, Raleigh J., Jr.
Withrell, Frank
Witkowski, Robert J.
Wright, Jack L.
Yarsky, Kenneth J.
Young, Gilbert S.
Zeigler, Samuel H., Jr.
Abbott, Robert J., Jr.
Acree, Calvin "H"
Allen, Cecil C.
Barber, Gayle E.
Bliss, Harold E.
Brademan, Royce A.
Breen, Owen J., Jr.
Casey, John J.
Clark, Edward H.
Collins, William T.
Cox, John H.
Dunlap, Glen L.
Erath, Douglas J.
Fahrenbach, John E.
Frey, Frank A.
Haag, Russel I.
Hart, James A., Jr.
Harvey, Hobart D.
Hawley, William F.
Herman, Arthur C.
Heurich, Robert G.
Jones, Richard M.

Jones, Russell A.
Klinefelter, Thomas W.
Lucand, Dale C.
MacLaren, Donald C.
Maragides, Harry N.
McMullin, Deloy
Murphy, James P.
Neely, Carroll E.
Neyland, Thomas H., Jr.
Nichols, Paul
Niland, Powell
Owens, Emmet D.
Pawson, Richard P.
Pearce, Frank L., Jr.
Peffley, John F.
Picard, Ernest R.
Price, William H.
Ray, Gilbert L.
Reilly, Frank J., Jr.
Richwine, Alton J.
Ritzen, Charles J.
Rives, George W., Jr.
Rolling, Ralph L.
Romberg, Donald F.
Rye, William A.
Sanders, Joseph E.
Sanford, Edward A., Jr
Shapiro, Nathan E.
Smiley, Creath B.
Smith, Harry O., Jr.
Sullivan, Raymond S.
Swopes, Bart R.
Victor, William V.
Wagner, Paul F.
Welborn, Joseph A.
Wood, Robert P.
Yadon, James D.
Anderson, Vernon H.
Aull, Herbert H.
Baccaro, Michael V.
Bender, Robert W.
Bielski, Walter A.
Breen, Raymond F.
Butterfield, Lloyd G.
Carleson, James W.
Carroll, Claude I.
Chambers, William T.
Clary, James H.
Condon, Thomas P.
Cox, Vernon D., Jr.
Cramer, Richard B.
Cummings, Newell J.
Davis, Wilbur A., Jr.
Delmar, Richard J.
Diggle, Raymond H.
Ewing, Paul C.
Fischer, Carl R., Jr.
Fuss, Arthur E.
Goodall, Leon S.
Graves, Ben B.
Graves, Norman C.
Gray, Robert K.
Gray, Roger W.
Gustafson, Charles R.
Hobbs, Robert C.
Hooker, Arthur R., Jr.
Johnson, Carl P.
Kammerer, John H.
Kessler, Joseph E.
King, Jerome J.
Knobel, Roland J., Jr.
Langsam, Kenneth D.
Lawrence, John M., Jr.
Luchsinger, Walter W., Jr.
Maas, Richard K.
MacMillan, Fredric N.
Magee, Lawrence R.
Mattson, Hilding E.
McCarthy, James R.
McCormack, Charles R., Jr.
McCully, Edward N.
McDaniel, Roy M.
McMahon, James P.
Means, James M.
Miller, Edward J.
Milliren, Howard C.
Minton, Horace L.
Mong, Duane K.
Mueller, Carl C.
Mueller, William G., 3d
Murphy, Francis J.
Nasticky, Emil J.
Nelson, George C.
Nielson, Ross T.
Normile, Walter G.
Oesterich, Lawrence C.
Peppones, Demetrius J.
Ponder, Robert K.
Potts, Stanley W.
Race, William W.
Rawlings, Allan
Scharf, Samuel L., Jr.
Schmeckpeper, William E.
Shaffer, Henry C.
Smith, Stanley N.
Sparks, Wainard H.
Studiale, Salvatore
Tanner, Forest A.
Thomas, Matthew L.
Thomas, Toxie A.
Walker, Charles L., Jr.
Williams, Douglas O.
Wood, Russell K., Jr.
Wulffaert, Armand E.
Zickefoose, Raymond P.
Adams, LeRoy W.
Baker, James J., Jr.
Barnett, Edward B.
Beale, Arthur G.
Bordon, Nathaniel B.
Bray, Walter H.
Brayman, Kenneth W.
Burger, Willis L.
Cherney, Boris "E"
Churchill, Donald J.
Clay, Franklin E.
Clemmer, Robert T.
Curry, Walter F.
Daley, Edward J.
Demers, Frederick
Duncan, Bryan L.
Ehlers, Jerome E.
Goodman, Burt D.
Grunland, Paul A.
Harris, Melvin L.
Haynes, Wade L.
Hoffman, George P.
Holmes, Warren L.
Horgan, John P.
Hull, Robert M.
Jeffrey, Paul W.
Jennings, Fred C.
Johnson, William H.
Kellum, Dallas E.
Kilkenny, William H.
Kiosterud, Viggo H.
Kramer, Wilbur D.
Kurz, George A., Jr.
Land, Vinton T.
Laughlin, Martin J.
Levy, Frank A.
Lotterhos, Augustus, Jr.
McBroom, William M.
McReynolds, Rodney E.
McStay, John J.
Meyer, John P.
Miller, David E.
Miltz, Oscar G.
Murto, Richard B., Jr.
Nelson, Warren F.
Nibecker, Alfred F.
Novak, William A.
O'Connell, Raymond S.
O'Connor, John J.
Olson, Virgil O.
Pence, Lloyd G.
Phelan, John J.
Punch, Willard M.
Raney, William O.
Schmidt, William C.
Seibly, Julius C., Jr.
Shelton, Jack
Short, Llewellyn H.
Siembt, LaVerne L.
Slatinshek, Frank M.
Smith, Donald L.
Spencer, Donald E.
Strange, Roy P., Jr.
Stratton, Roy O.
Taylor, Albert T., Jr.
Van Nest, Donald E.
Wade, John W.
Watt, Robert J.
White, Leonard M.
Anderson, Oscar M., Jr.
Austin, Charles B.
Biggins, George R. O., Jr.
Brown, James W.
Canalejo, Armando, Jr.
Cronin, Eugene J., Jr.
Davidson, Ira R., Jr.
D'Avino, Ralph F.
Dietz, Howard M.
Downs, Maurice K.
Friendlee, George B.
Fruth, Virgil C.
Gaschen, Frederick S.
Gifford, Stanley E., Jr.
Hassenger, William E.
Heinen, Edwin F.
Henker, Donald E.
Hood, Archibald A.
Horngren, Earl W.
Hurst, Gordon F.
Hynes, Edward J.
Jones, Ivor H., Jr.
Joslin, Harry W.
Kamps, John H.
Keller, Richard C.
Kelly, John T., Jr.
Knob, Richard E.
Kuzell, James E.
Laney, James E.
Link, Robert E.
Lundberg, Eugene D.
Manore, Thomas E.
Mansell, Paul L., Jr.
Mansfield, Robert F.
Mercadante, James A.
Metcalf, Wallace W.
Needham, Donald A.
Nicks, Paul B.
Pence, William B., Jr.
Potter, William R.
Rooney, Paul J.
Rost, John R.
Sauer, Charles A.
Schirmer, August A., Jr.
Schreider, Henry E.
Schuster, Victor K.
Smith, Robert L.
Spicer, Robert M.
Stern, Theodore S.
Stewart, John K.
Teichler, Alfred H., Jr.
Thompson, Harold K.
Tylman, Frank J.
Urruela, Charles M.
Walton, Delbert E.
Weihrich, Walter F.
Welch, Glenn Franklin
Woodward, Herbert M., Jr.
Yoakam, Bernard

The following-named officers to the grade and ranks indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bryant, Wylie R.
Ackley, Charles W.
Bagley, Roy I.
Cleaves, Richard D.
Denman, Thomas H.
Dominy, Arthur L.
Edwards, William M.
Hawkins, Elmo M. T.
Herold, Carl A.
Long, John R.
Martineau, Edward R.
McManus, Hugh T.
Meade, Harold E.
Metzger, Ernest W.
Penn, William W.
Uber, Thomas B., 2d
Vierling, Walter J.
Weidler, Edwin R.
Weise, John W.
Pigott, Charles S.
Jones, Robert "Q"
Taylor, William A.
Walsh, William J.
Bryant, Edwin W.
Cusack, Joseph P.
Geary, Joseph M.
Jenkins, Robert E.
Junjunen, Aarne J.
Lahr, Franklin E.
McGrath, James R.
Moore, Gerald T.
Mroczka, Stanely A.
Weber, Oscar

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Coloney, Herndon P.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT

McFarland, Clifton B.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Endebrock, Frank L.
McCaffrey, William T.
Brooks, Boyd S.
Dieth, Charles H.
Gibbons, Earl F.
Gustafson, William M.
Jefferson, Thomas
McGhee, Thomas J.
O'Kane, William H.
Root, Lloyd E.
Shepard, George R.
Sholders, Oliver B.
Stuart, Donald G.
Trummell, Edgar R.
Van Liew, Roscoe E.
Cartelli, Anthony R.
Engram, Robert C.
Flint, John B.
Grahl, Ralph B., Jr.
Herbert, Edgar, Jr.
Nielson, Robert A.
Peterman, Paul H.
Scanlon, Melvin E.
Schneider, Robert J.
Urquhart, James B., Jr.
Walish, Robert C.
Werblow, Joseph M.
Anderson, William C., Jr.
Atkins, Phil H.
Brown, Woodrow M.
Buettell, Roger B., Jr.
Burman, Edward W.
Frederickson, John H., Jr.
Grohs, Conrad E.
Hardin, Fred M.
Hutchins, Xavier S.
Larson, Leif R.
Laughlin, Richard A.
Maloney, Hugh T.
Patrick, Jason M.
Pekarsky, Abraham L.
Porter, Albert S.
Reese, William R., Jr.
Rogers, William R.
Ryckman, Seymour J.
Sharp, Kenneth
Tompkins, Norton, Jr.
Twiss, Francis E.
Pollard, Andrew M.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Coleman, George W.
Briggs, Fred M.
Burfield, James A.
Griffen, Albert D., Jr.
Keller, Charles W. 4th
Phelps, Harold B., Jr.
Snyder, Donald C.
Uber, Paul A.
Whyte, David P.
Burton, George W.
Cole, Marvin L.
Cunning, David P.
Elliott, Joseph K.
Hudson, Richard I.
Rautenberg, Carl N.
Abbott, Allen W.
Dexter, Philip R.
McFarland, Cecil W.
Paul, Edwin C.
Vivoli, Pierre L.
Cushman, Townsend H., Jr.
Gregory, George W., Jr.
Thompson, Keith R.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Di Salvo, Nicholas A.
Wohlleb, DeWayne H.
Yingling, Robert P. B.
Kreager, John E.
Bishop, Ralph M.
Cook, Francis W.
Eddy, Lloyd J.
Joseph, Robert L.
Lang, Paul G.
Patchin, Robert E.
Pires, Mario F.
Rouse, Wilbur H.
Ruff, Henry J.
Salandi, Robert T.
Scherer, George F.
Smith, Edward L.
Wallace, Allan L.
Whetstone, Wendell
Wirth, Norman J.
Young, Lawrence
Barsalou, Leo V.
Caldwell, Warren C., Jr.
Fridley, Harry H.
Peat, Walter H.
Watson, Benjamin M.
Wood, Quentin L.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Alexander, James S.
Allen, Harold G.
Bickerstaff, William L.
Calloway, James E.
Fowler, Elbert W.
Frey, Herman "S"
Furnari, Biagio H.
Gardner, Ned A.
Harroun, Hubert E.
Jenning, Gerald W.
Law, Francis E.
Lefevers, Orville
Parris, Paul O.
Ponciroli, Aquilino L.
Prue, Grant W.
Quinn, Rayburn M.
Reckless, John
Rourk, Charles A.
Smith, Robert B.
Thomas, John H.
Thornton, Albert H.
Verdon, Patrick A. C.
Weiler, George J.
Ancell, Henry W.
Billig, August B.
Lee, Jesse E.
Miller, Roy
Routzahn, Milton M.
Sutton, Joseph C.
Ward, Dale E.
Young, Vincent J.
Van Liere, Robert E.
Wells, George B.
Zint, Ronald C.
Larson, Theodore R.

CHIEF GUNNERS

Calvert, Arthur K.
Dickson, William B.
Hodgson, Paul R.
Kloss, Henry
Koone, Willard
Wallace, James E.
Willhoite, Robert B.
Burris, John P.
Carter, Maynard C.
Culp, James D.
Ham, Jesse W.
Hatfield, Roland B.
Quarles, Frank N.
Weston, Hector R.
Baker, Albert H.
McNaught, Joseph R.
Tutt, Alvin H.
Doebeli, Alfred C.

CHIEF TORPEDOMEN

Bayliss, Thomas I.
Kaski, Carl R.

CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Talbot, Maurice P.
Thompson, Sumner E., Jr.
Barnes, James W.
Carpenter, Emmett W.
Douglas, Ivan H.
Evans, Samuel L.
George, Virgil M.
Hovey, Charles L.
Lefevre, Byron D.
Little, Hermon T.
MacDonald, Robert J.
McKenzie, James R., Jr.
Minniear, Carl W.
Morse, Douglas T.
Osheim, Oscar
Payne, Clarence O.
Rains, Norman M.

Rath, Elmer R.
Seely, Howard W.
Whalen, Bruce R.
Young, William A.
Carozza, Edward
Harris, Lyman C.
Huffman, Gerald E.
Husband, Joseph E.
Jereb, Frank
Kemp, Robert E.
McIntire, Llewellyn H.
Milano, Donato
Misner, Chester C.
Osborne, Bascome K.
Stankiewicz, John J.
Masters, John W.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Beck, James D.
Bosselet, Alfred J.
Boyd, Claude Jr.
Bugg, James E.
Buselmeier, Rudolph M.
Ford, Raymond J.
Lynch, George M.
Parker, William S.
Polk, Lucille O.
Smith, Arthur
Tracey, Don M.
Turnipseed, Truman E.
Atnip, Floyd C.
Boatman, Harold B.
Byrne, Robert H.
Gray, James F.
Johnson, Theodore W.
King, Leslie E.
Miller, Samuel Q.
Rightmyer, Jackson M.
Rolfsness, Edwin
Steele, Robert H.
Strickland, Guy R.
Trumbo, Joseph W.
Viccellio, Lansing A.
Wayland, Russell J.
Williams, Kenneth J.
Dipboye, Jesse J.
Doering, Wallace S.
Layman, Harold E.
Triska, Willard
Beall, Buford E.
Joslin, Harold E.
King, Nathan H.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Carr, Howard W.
Cleveland, Hugh A.
Cox, George E.
Dickinson, Russel C.
Dunn, Harvey G.
Engel, Joseph C.
Erickson, Harold E.
Ezell, Van W.
Frey, Charles T.
Frost, Clayton E.
Griffin, James H.
Hammond, James C.
Harper, William E.
Hemming, Leland A.
Kueter, Hugo E.
Parra, Edward J.
Schwartz, Walter E.
Scott, William M.
Shelton, William E.
Sills, Joseph R.
Smithwick, Robert W.
Waltrip, Furman D.
Wolslegel, Edward S.
Woods, Vernon A.
Ferguson, Paul L.
Glenn, Stuart V.
Nesbit, John W.
Baldwin, Ernest J.
Burnett, Wilburn
Deans, Shelton
Frazier, William L.
Gaddy, George H.
Long, Leonard H.
McRae, Robert D.
Perkins, Leonard J.
Pierce, Carlton E.
Shull, William L.
Smith, Walter C.
Leavitt, Ernest G.
Peterson, Gordon I.
Reifel, Conrad H.
Ross, Donald K.
Runyon, Donald E.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Metzger, Robert M.
Nauenburg, Arthur L.
Wilson, Earnest C.
Beers, John
Bonner, Helmuth R.
Boudolf, Joseph L.
Boyd, George A.
Brown, Leo R.
Cornic, Cleo R.
Crotwell, Luther L.
Denton, Larry V.
Ernst, Clyde L.
Fleming, Shannon E.
Hoover, Rich E.
Humphreys, Robert C.
Masters, Claude D.
Ritchie, David C.
Shaputnic, Walter A.
Shaw, Charles A.
Stout, Doni E.
Stowell, Edward J.
Ward, Donald R.
Callis, Kenneth S.
Chartier, DeWayne J.
Cotter, Joseph J.
Descoteaux, Joseph A. R.
Dorsett, Henry C.
Farnham, Harry L.
Fisher, Daward H.
Gassett, Charles M.
Gaulter, Kenneth W.
Glanz, Conrad
Greathouse, Eugene V.
Hall, Edward J.
Howard, Kenneth R.
Huddleston, Albert E.
Kuzeppa, Andrew
Marsh, William O.
Salassa, Francis A.
Shumate, James B.
Thomas, James C.
Armstrong, Harry R.
Bernhardt, Frank F.
Hollingsworth, Willis S.
Shaw, Franklin B.
Thompson, John F., Jr.

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERKS

Wainscott, Charles H.
Beese, Lawrence L.
Boller, Joseph P.
Broussard, Louis J.
Calkins, William M.
Card, Robert V.
Earnhardt, Elmer H.
Enwright, Thomas L.
Erwin, Paskell A.
Gray, Albert E.
Hansen, Eugene E.
Hookum, Francis R.
House, John R.
Martin, David L.
McDonald, James C., Jr.
McLellen, Jack E.
Nelson, Charles F.
Rider, Russell D.
Sherfey, Samuel W.
Thompson, Lloyd J.
Van Denburgh, Robert W.
Vercher, Joseph W.
Williams, Milo M.
Wren, Chester D.
Boaz, Harold B.
Goldsmith, Harry E.
Nash, Francis T.
Stankiewicz, Joseph F.
Weitz, Herman L.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHERS

Daughtry, Clyde
Carroll, Arthur J.
Wheatley, Bacil C.

CHIEF AEROGRAPHER

Cook, Walter J.

CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Adams, Wilson S.
Allen, Howard E.
Alwin, Charles L.
Anderson, William F.
Ayotte, Orral D.
Baker, Otho M.
Bean, Joshua "S"
Belknap, Floyd H.
Bennett, Paul B.
Bernhardt, James L.
Black, Lawrence E.
Black, Thomas B.
Bond, Leslie E.
Bowdle, Alexander, Jr.
Bradberry, Julian "H"
Brooks, Carter G.
Browdy, Harry
Brown, Harold C.
Bruce, Frank A.
Bryant, James E.
Bryant, Marvin H.
Budjen, George
Burton, Herman H.
Butterworth, Chester
Byrne, William S.
Calhoun, Carl P.
Campbell, Leslie E.
Carter, William O.
Cearley, Arvin
Chapdelaine, Jack A.
Chevrefils, Francis A.
Chilcutt, Booth
Collins, Matthew J.
Comstock, Melvin A.
Conner, Charles S.
Crain, Hubert L.
Crary, Howard
Creech, Roy F.
Creech, William D.
Davis, Ralph C.
Deadwyler, Robert E.
Decious, Warren D.
Donovan, Harold G.
Dote, Theodore K.
Eberhart, Julian F.
Eisen, Oscar E.
Elsasser, Leo J.
Engstrom, Eugene E.
Eslinger, Walter A.
Etheridge, Oscar L.
Evans, Jacob T.
Ferguson, Hugh A.
Ferree, Benjamin F.
Fewell, Earl H.
Findley, Robert A.
Francis, Ermon E.
Freemen, Harold O.
Funke, Harold J.
Gallagher, Matthew F.
Gilmore, William B.
Guibault, Elie A.
Gumber, Harold R.
Hill, Leroy
Hunt, Bernard H.
Huston, Maynard F.
Jackson, Raymond H.
Kelly, William E.
Kelsey, Wilbur H.
Krasney, John A.
Lawrence, Allen
Lesher, William A.
Malang, Charles L.
Malby, Glenn E.
Marcus, Samuel C.
McAfee, Arthur R.
McGehee, William G.
Meek, Burton
Meeks, William "D"
Miles, Thomas J.
Morgan, Guy H.
Moss, Gervais T.
Murphy, Karl P.
Nix, Joe R.
Olsen, John H.
Paddock, Robert H.
Parker, Walter L.
Pauley, Arthur E.
Phillippi, Fred E.
Pierce, Gaylord F.
Potter, Earl L.
Prestridge, Raiford E.
Pryor, Lawrence E.
Pullum, Alvin C.
Ratchford, Fred T.
Replogle, William C.
Rice, Kenneth V.
Richardson, Stuart E.
Roach, John E.
Russell, Joe W.
Sabin, Donald E.
Salter, William S.
Sarsfield, John J.
Scheile, Ottice R.
Scribner, Donald M.
Sessions, Herndon T.
Shaw, Frank K.
Shockley, Lawrence R.
Shurtleff, Edmund J.
Simon, Edwin L.
Smith, Ancil B.
Smith, Charles E.
Spangler, Henry J.
Stankaitis, John J.
Stephens, John W.
Stevens, Eugene
Stigler, Lyle V.
Stovall, Earnest R.
Strok, Alexander
Sylvester, Harold J.
Tack, Oscar C.
Taliaferro, Richard B., Jr.
Tolin, Robert E.
Weinstein, Sidney
Wheeler, Leon F.
Wheelus, Clee O.
Willard, Hugh W.
Williams, Herman C.
Williams, Horace R.
Williamson, Robert E.
Wilson, Donald D.
Wilson, James W.
Wittig, George W.
Wood, Arthur H.
Woods, Samuel A.
Worthen, Chester D.
Yetka, Joseph L.
Zorda, Ralph
Blaylock, James O.
Boyd, Thomas A.
Britt, Thomas B.
Bryant, Lewis A.
Dalton, Lionel B.
Ezell, Louis S.
Gorman, John J.
Graham, Ogden C.
Graham, William A.
Higgins, Guy L.
Horne, Daniel F.
Justyn, George W.
Layman, Leonard M.
Lowell, William J.
Pravecek, Frederick
Rice, Charlie A.
Sauerbier, Francis W.
Schmahl, Vallen R.
Shirley, Jack M.
Smith, Maurice L.
Tabor, John A.
Wannemacher, Charles R.
Wise, Wyman W.
Young, Lee A.
Allen, John W.
De Angelo, Harry P.
Diaz, Anthony "N"
Engstrom, Vernon T.
Hawkins, Henry P.
Hinton, "J" "P"
Lillie, Donald H.
Price, Raymond F.
Short, David T.

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Rowley, Richard G.
Santille, Augustine
Bottorff, Nelson D.
Bruner, Charles R.
Conneli, Raymond K.
Deeming, Clarence
Denton, Durward W.
Dewitt, John S.
Doughty, George P.
Dozier, Walter H.
Edwards, James J.
Eller, Lovelace H., Jr.
Estes, Guy L.
Gertiser, Paul
Goodell, Manford C.
Harke, William F.
Ingram, Charles C.
Jacobson, Everett N.
Jones, Willis B.
Kitzinger, Bernard R.
Knight, Fred S.
Mayo, Joseph A.
McCullough, Robert R.
Montgomery, Cedric A.
Moore, Oliver A.
Myers, Jimmie H.
Palmer, Richard B.
Powell, Vincent N.
Pyron, Josie T.
Rasimas, Alfonso E.
Rice, Harold A.
Runnels, Lloyd R.
Schaub, Marion J.
Schlotter, Robert G.
Stevens, Baxter C.
Stevens, Hubert W.
Thresher, Earl E., Jr.
Troxell, Harry C.
Turner, Berry F.
Wheat, Clyde E.
Wilcox, Marion E.
Willis, Alva C.
Birdwell, Courtland P.
Lunde, Norman C.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William P. Gilbert, Geraldine, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ARKANSAS

Edith L. Roberts, Humphrey, Ark., in place of W. J. Martin, retired.

CALIFORNIA

C. Harold Calef, Saticoy, Calif., in place of C. S. Catlin, retired.

Laurence G. Bornholtz, Walnut Creek, Calif., in place of H. E. Avise, resigned.

Elaine Wood, Weott, Calif., in place of J. E. Johnson, deceased.

COLORADO

Robert L. May, Eckley, Colo., in place of H. W. Riffle, transferred.

GEORGIA

Lena T. Woods, Newington, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Jeane B. Butler, Odum, Ga., in place of G. S. Thompson, transferred.

ILLINOIS

Frank R. Johnson, Geneseo, Ill., in place of F. M. Bradley, deceased.

Orville L. Glasford, Trivoli, Ill., in place of R. A. Swan, resigned.

IOWA

Harold A. Lofgreen, Montezuma, Iowa, in place of R. A. Mortland, retired.

KANSAS

David Mallory Howell, Winfield, Kans., in place of R. T. Henderson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Claud E. Taylor, Balkan, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Frank E. Kline, Jones, Mich., in place of R. L. Schell, retired.

MONTANA

Gerald E. Owen, Whitetail, Mont., in place of E. A. Saunders, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

O. K. Sanders, Willard, N. Mex., in place of L. E. Hanlon, Jr., resigned.

NEW YORK

Ory G. Wagner, Avoca, N. Y., in place of C. E. Shill, deceased.

John F. Kennedy, Corning, N. Y., in place of H. J. Millspaugh, resigned.

Winfield Eberhart, Hall, N. Y., in place of A. G. Prendergast, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Fred E. Sluder, Alexander, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Robert J. Schwing, Cleves, Ohio, in place of M. A. Merrilees, resigned.

Herald W. Mougey, Rittman, Ohio, in place of R. J. Hickin, resigned.

James F. Smith, Wilmington, Ohio, in place of J. H. Landrum, resigned.

OREGON

Sterling Julian May, Sisters, Oreg., in place of L. V. Farleigh, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Otis C. Quinby, Springboro, Pa., in place of O. C. Quinby. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Howard A. Rathburn, Sugargrove, Pa., in place of W. C. Jamieson, deceased.

Albert Howe, Vanport, Pa., in place of J. A. Jones, retired.

TENNESSEE

Hazel S. Wheaton, Allardt, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Lula Lee Amsler, Clarkwood, Tex., in place of C. M. McDonald, resigned.

Maggie F. Bobo, Giddings, Tex., in place of J. R. Folkes, retired.

Noel G. Oates, Midland, Tex., in place of Allen Tolbert, removed.

Arthur C. Black, North Zulch, Tex., in place of L. F. Grissette, resigned.

William Christian Horn, Spring, Tex., in place of L. H. Desmond, retired.

VIRGINIA

Lila M. Critcher, Beach, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles Clagett Wells, Matoaca, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mildred W. Lewis, Stony Creek, Va., in place of J. L. Freeman, resigned.

Zed N. Hale, Swords Creek, Va., in place of E. W. Runyan, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Marion J. Rasmussen, Naselle, Wash., in place of W. W. Moffitt, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

James Galloway, Brandonville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Louis E. Hardy, Squire, W. Va., in place of J. E. Crickmer, resigned.

W. Leslie Warden, Stanaford, W. Va., in place of R. E. Wilson, resigned.

Mimmie S. Lanier, Winfield, W. Va., in place of H. A. Frazier, removed.

Nominations received by the Senate from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (a) of Public Law 592, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (a) of Public Law 592, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, nominate the following-named persons for appointment as members of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

James E. Colliflower, for a term of 4 years.
Edward A. Dent, for a term of 2 years.
Richard R. Atkinson, for a term of 1 year.

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG.
GUY MASON.
GORDON R. YOUNG.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1947:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Dillon S. Myer, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James W. Lauderdale, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1947.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Time is short, and no one of us knows how little time he has left. May we be found using wisely our time, our talents, and our strength. Break to us this day the "bread of life." Our hearts are hungry, as are the hearts of people everywhere. Save us from thinking, even for a moment, that we can feed our souls on things. Save us from the vain delusion that the piling up of wealth or comforts can satisfy. Save these, Thy servants, the chosen of the people, from the tyranny of the nonessential, from the weary round of that which saps strength, frays nerves, shortens life, and adds nothing to their usefulness to Thee and to this Nation. Help them to give themselves to the important, and to recognize the trivial when they see it. Give them the courage to say "No" to everything that makes it more difficult to say "Yes" to Thee. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 7, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RULING ON BILLS PROPOSING CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to submit a point of order to the Senate and particularly calls the attention of the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to what the Chair is about to say.

The Senate will appreciate that we confront under the Reorganization Act a constant necessity of making new rulings for which there is no precedent; indeed, we are now constantly setting a body of new precedents under the amended rules as required by the Reorganization Act. Therefore, each time one of these new points arises, since it is very important that these precedents should be correct, it is the purpose of the Chair to submit his rulings in open session so that the matter may be fully discussed and fully determined as the Senate wishes the determination to be made.

The Senator from North Dakota has submitted a bill for the relief of Thomas A. Ryland, the purpose of which is as follows:

Shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said organization.

The Chair calls the attention of the able Senator from North Dakota to the fact—and the Senator will understand there is nothing personal about this matter; the Chair is simply undertaking to establish the fact—that section 131 of the Reorganization Act provides:

SEC. 131. No private bill or resolution (including so-called omnibus claims or pension bills), and no amendment to any bill or resolution—

Which does any of the following things:

* * * or (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

It seems to the Chair that section 131 intends to put a definite termination to the introduction of private bills for the correction of military records, and it is the opinion of the Chair, which the Chair submits first to the able Senator from North Dakota for his comment and then to the Senate, that the bill proposed by the able Senator cannot be received.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I took this matter up with the legislative counsel. There will be no appeal from the decision of the Chair. There was a desire that there be a determination of this question because of the great importance of a ruling to the particular veteran involved. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with the ruling.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is greatly obliged to the Senator for his statement.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I express my complete approval of the ruling of the Chair with respect to the matter just referred to by him. The denial of the right to introduce such private special bills is one of the great savings of the time and energies and thought of individual Senators, and of the Senate itself, which it was believed would be brought about by the Reorganization Act. It lifted from the Senate a tremendous mass of detail. I approved the principle when it was written into the act, and, as I have indicated, I approve the ruling of the Chair with respect to it.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting

several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL OFFICE OF PUBLIC HEALTH—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive D, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol concerning the Office International d'Hygiène Publique, signed at New York on July 22, 1946. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The protocol is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol concerning the Office International d'Hygiène Publique, signed at New York on July 22, 1946.

The protocol provides for the termination of the Rome Agreement of 1907 (the arrangement for the establishment of the International Office of Public Health signed at Rome on December 9, 1907), and for the transfer of the duties and functions of the International Office of Public Health to the World Health Organization, or its Interim Commission.

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1947.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of the protocol concerning the Office International d'Hygiène Publique, signed at New York on July 22, 1946.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 7, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a protocol concerning the Office International d'Hygiène Publique, signed at New York on July 22, 1946.

The protocol provides for the termination of the Rome Agreement of 1907 (the arrangement for the establishment of the International Office of Public Health signed at Rome on December 9, 1907), and for the transfer of the duties and functions of the International Office of Public Health to the World Health Organization, or its interim commission. The protocol was signed in the English, French, Chinese, Russian, and Spanish languages by plenipotentiaries of the United States of America (with a reservation "subject to approval") and a number of other countries. According to information received by this Government from the Secretary General of the United Nations, the depositary of the present protocol, nine of the countries parties to the Rome Agreement of 1907, have already accepted the protocol, namely: Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, New Zealand, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

In the period between the world wars there existed two official international health agencies of world scope, the Health Organization of the League of Nations, and the International Office of Public Health at Paris. The latter organization was established and maintained in accordance with the arrangement for that purpose signed at Rome on December 9, 1907 (Treaty Series 511). The United States became a party to that arrangement by the deposit of its instrument of ratification with the Italian Government on August 1, 1908. Under the provisions of that arrangement, and those of the International Sanitary Convention, signed at Paris on June 21, 1926 (Treaty Series 762), the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, signed at The Hague on April 12, 1933 (Treaty Series 901), both of which are in force between the United States and a large number of other countries, and certain other international agreements, the International Office of Public Health was responsible for the receipt of epidemiological information and for its distribution to the principal public health authorities of the participating governments, and for certain other administrative duties in relation thereto.

A third organization entered the international health field through the necessities of war. Since the International Office of Public Health could not perform effectively, from its European base, the international exchange of epidemiological information, the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, Modifying the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926 (Treaty Series 991) and the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, Modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of April 12, 1933 (Treaty Series 992) were drawn up and signed by a certain number of countries, members of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), giving that organization the authority and responsibility to carry on this important work. Protocols prolonging the 1944 Conventions were opened for signature on April 23, 1946, and entered into force on April 30, 1946 (Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1551 and 1552). Article II of each of those protocols provided for the continuation of the performance by UNRRA of the duties and functions assigned to it by the 1944 conventions to which the particular protocol related, but only until such time as a new international health organization should be established. In the event a new international health organization had not been formed, or, having been formed, was unable to perform the above duties and functions by the date UNRRA terminated its activities, the duties and functions were to be entrusted to the International Office of Public Health. The United States is a party to both of the 1944 conventions and to protocols prolonging those conventions.

The end of the war found a strong movement under way for the establishment of a new international health organization which would be effective and broad enough in its scope to cover adequately the field of international public health, and particularly to deal with the problems created by the swiftness of modern transportation and the progress of modern scientific knowledge. The desire for the realization of that objective did not mean that there was not clearly realized the importance of the epidemiological work of the International Office of Public Health as well as of that carried on by UNRRA, and the need of continuation of such work without interruption. It was felt, however, that that work should go on as part of the functions of a single international public health organization within the framework of the United Nations.

In 1945 and early 1946 the Department of State and the United States Public Health Service prepared a draft of a constitution for a projected international health organization. The Department of State convened on October 11 and 12, 1945, an advisory health group, composed of national leaders in health and civic affairs, which studied and amended the above-mentioned draft and adopted a resolution strongly urging early action in the establishment of an international health organization. The Senate on December 20, 1945, adopted unanimously Senate Joint Resolution No. 89 requesting the President to urge upon the United Nations the prompt convening of an international health conference and the formation of an international health organization. On February 15, 1946, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for the early formation of a single international health organization of the United Nations and instructing the Secretary-General to convene for that purpose the International Health Conference not later than June 20, 1946.

The International Health Conference met in the city of New York from June 19 to July 22, 1946. At that conference advantage was taken of the opportunity to lay the foundation for a single international health organization, an opportunity which had been missed in an earlier era. The constitution of a World Health Organization was adopted and signed by representatives of 61 nations, and provision was made for continuing the work of existing international health agencies pending their absorption by the World Health Organization. An Interim Commission, consisting of the representatives of 18 governments, was established to carry on necessary international health work pending the acceptance of the constitution by a sufficient number of members of the United Nations to bring into existence the World Health Organization.

In its final act, the International Health Conference incorporated a resolution requesting the United Nations to transfer as soon as possible to the World Health Organization or its Interim Commission the duties and functions of the Health Organization of the League of Nations which had been taken over by the United Nations. Provision was made by the Conference in the arrangement establishing the Interim Commission for that Commission to assume the duties and functions assigned to UNRRA by the International Sanitary Conventions of 1944. Because of its unique status as defined in the Rome agreement of 1907, the dissolution of the International Office of Public Health and the transfer of its functions to the World Health Organization presented a more difficult problem.

Under the terms of article 8 of the Rome Agreement of 1907, each state had the right to withdraw from the Office at the end of each period of 7 years, providing a year's notice is given as set forth in that article. The present 7-year period, however, does not end until November 15, 1950. Also, the functioning of the international health machinery is based on the sanitary conventions which have been accepted by the great majority of countries and which contain important provisions dealing with the role of the International Public Health Office in the application of those conventions. It was of first importance for world public health that the continuous functioning of this system should not be disturbed. It was necessary, therefore, to seek a solution which would permit the rapid establishment of a single world health organization and at the same time would not interrupt the efficient working of the international health services and the flow of epidemiological information.

The Technical Preparatory Committee of the World Health Conference recommended, accordingly, that the Office should be absorbed by the proposed new organization and suggested to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations that invitations to the Conference include a request that states empower their delegates to the Conference to take appropriate action to effect such absorption. As a result the delegations were, in general, empowered to take

such action. A draft protocol designed to accomplish the absorption of the Office by the World Health Organization was presented to the Conference by the United States delegation and, with slight modifications, was adopted by the Conference and signed concurrently with the constitution. It is this protocol of which a certified copy is enclosed herewith.

In article 1 of the protocol the signatory governments agree that, as between themselves, the duties and functions of the Office as defined in the agreement signed at Rome on December 9, 1907, shall be performed by the World Health Organization or its Interim Commission, and that, subject to existing international obligations, they will take the necessary steps to accomplish such purpose.

In article 2 the parties to the protocol further agree that, as between themselves, the duties and functions conferred upon the office by certain international agreements enumerated in an annex to the protocol shall be performed by the organization or its interim commission. Of the conventions and agreements listed in the annex, the United States is a party to those numbered in that annex as 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10.

Article 3 provides that the agreement of 1907 shall be terminated and the office dissolved when all parties to the agreement have agreed to its termination. It is also provided in article 3 that any government party to the agreement of 1907, by becoming a party to the protocol, has agreed to the termination of the agreement of 1907.

Article 4 provides that in the event that all the parties to the agreement of 1907 have not agreed to its termination by November 15, 1949, the parties to the protocol will then, in accordance with article 8 thereof, denounce the agreement of 1907.

Articles 5, 6, and 7 are formal in their character. They relate to acceptance of the protocol, accession thereto, and entry into force. In accordance with the provisions of article 5, any government a party to the agreement of 1907 and not a signatory to this protocol may at any time accept it by sending an instrument of acceptance to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Article 6 provides that governments may become parties to the protocol by (a) signature without reservation as to approval, (b) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance, or (c) acceptance. It is provided in article 7 that the protocol shall come into force when 20 governments parties to the agreement of 1907 become parties to the present protocol.

Respectfully submitted.

G. C. MARSHALL.

PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE OFFICE INTERNATIONAL D'HYGIÈNE PUBLIQUE

ARTICLE 1

The Governments signatories to this protocol agree that, as between themselves, the duties and functions of the Office International d'Hygiéne Publique as defined in the Agreement signed at Rome on 9 December 1907, shall be performed by the World Health Organization or its Interim Commission and that, subject to existing international obligations, they will take the necessary steps to accomplish this purpose.

ARTICLE 2

The parties to this protocol further agree that, as between themselves, from the date when this protocol comes into force, the duties and functions conferred upon the Office by the International agreements listed in Annex 1 shall be performed by the Organization or its Interim Commission.

ARTICLE 3

The Agreement of 1907 shall be terminated and the Office dissolved when all parties to the Agreement have agreed to its termination. It shall be understood that any Government party to the Agreement of 1907, has agreed, by becoming party to this protocol, to the termination of the Agreement of 1907.

ARTICLE 4

The parties to this protocol further agree that, if all the parties to the Agreement of 1907 have not agreed to its termination by 15 November 1949, they will then, in accordance with Article 8 thereof, denounce the Agreement of 1907.

ARTICLE 5

Any Government party to the Agreement of 1907 which is not a signatory to this protocol may at any time accept this protocol by sending an instrument of acceptance to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who will inform all signatory and other Governments which have accepted this protocol of such accession.

ARTICLE 6

Governments may become parties to this protocol by:

(a) signature without reservation as to approval;

(b) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance; or

(c) acceptance.

Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of a formal instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 7

This protocol shall come into force when twenty Governments parties to the Agreement of 1907 have become parties to this protocol.

In faith whereof the duly authorized representatives of their respective Governments have signed the present protocol, which is drawn up in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Authentic copies shall be furnished by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to each of the signatory and accepting Governments and to any other Government which, at the time this protocol is signed, is a party to the Agreement of 1907. The Secretary-General will as soon as possible notify each of the parties to this protocol when it comes into force.

Done in the City of New York this twenty-second day of July 1946.

ANNEX 1

1. International Sanitary Convention of 21 June 1926.

2. Convention Modifying the International Sanitary Convention of 21 June 1926, signed 31 October 1938.

3. International Sanitary Convention, 1944, Modifying the International Sanitary Convention of 21 June 1926.

4. Protocol to Prolong the International Sanitary Convention, 1944 (opened for signature 23 April 1946; in force, 30 April 1946).

5. International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of 12 April 1933.

6. International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, Modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of 12 April 1933.

7. Protocol to Prolong the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944 (opened for signature 23 April 1946; in force, 30 April 1946).

8. International Agreement Relating to Facilities to be Accorded to Merchant Seamen in the Treatment of Venereal Diseases, Brussels, 1 December 1924.

9. Convention on Traffic in Opium and Drugs, Geneva, 19 February 1925.

10. Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, Geneva, 13 July 1931.

11. Convention Relating to the Antidiphtheria Serum, Paris, 1 August 1930.

12. International Convention for Mutual Protection against Dengue Fever, Athens, 25 July 1934.

13. International Agreement for Dispensing with Bills of Health, Paris, 22 December 1934.

14. International Agreement for Dispensing with Consular Visas on Bills of Health, Paris, 22 December 1934.

15. International Agreement Concerning the Transport of Corpses, Berlin, 10 February 1937.

For Argentina (ad referendum):
ALBERTO ZWANCK.

For Australia (subject to approval and acceptance by Government of Commonwealth of Australia):
A. H. TANGE.

For the Kingdom of Belgium (sous réserve de ratification):
Dr. M. DE LAET.

For Bolivia:
LUIS V. SOTELO.

For Brazil (ad referendum):
GERALDO PAULA SOUZA.

For Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
N. EVSTAFIEV.

For Canada (subject to approval):
BROOKE CLAXTON.
BROCK CHISHOLM.

For Chile (ad referendum):
JULIO BUSTOS.

For China:
SHEN J. K.
L. CHIN YUAN.
SZEMING SZE.

For Colombia:
CARLOS URIBE AGUIRRE.

For Costa Rica:
JAIME BENAVIDES.

For Cuba (ad referendum):
Dr. PEDRO NOGUEIRA.
VICTOR SANTAMARINA.

For Czechoslovakia (ad referendum):
Dr. JOSEF CANCÍK.

For Denmark (ad referendum):
J. OERSKOV.

For the Dominican Republic (ad referendum):
Dr. L. F. THOMEN.

For Ecuador (ad referendum):
R. NEVAREZ VÁSQUEZ.

For Egypt (subject to ratification):
Dr. A. T. CHOUCHA,
TAHA ELSAYED NASR BEY,
Royal Counsellor.
M. S. ABAZA.

For El Salvador:
———.

For Ethiopia (subject to ratification):
G. TESEMMA.

For France (ad referendum):
J. PARISOT.

For Greece (ad referendum):
Dr. PHOKION KOPANARIS.

For Guatemala (ad referendum):
G. MORÁN.
J. A. MUÑOZ.

For Haiti (ad referendum):
RULX LEÓN.

For Honduras (ad referendum):
JUAN MANUEL FIALLOS.

For India (subject to ratification; these signatures are appended in agreement with His Majesty's Representative for the exercise of the functions of the Crown in its relations with the Indian States):
C. K. LAKSHMANAN.
C. MANI.

For Iran (subject to ratification by Iranian Parliament (Madjliss)):
GHASSEME GHANI, M. D.
H. HAFEZI.

For Iraq (ad referendum):
S. AL-ZAHAWI.
Dr. IHSAN DOGRAMAJI.

For Lebanon (ad referendum):
GEORGES HAKIM.
Dr. A. MAKHLOUF.
For Liberia (ad referendum):
JOSEPH NAGBE TOGBA, M. D.
JOHN B. WEST.
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg (sous réserve de ratification):
Dr. M. DE LAET.
For Mexico (ad referendum):
MONDRAGÓN.
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands (ad referendum):
C. VAN DEN BERG.
C. BANNING.
W. A. TIMMERMAN.
For New Zealand (ad referendum)
T. R. RITCHIE.
For Nicaragua (ad referendum):
A. SEVILLA-SACASA.
For the Kingdom of Norway (ad referendum):
H. TH. SANDBERG.
For Panama (ad referendum):
J. J. VALLARINO.
For Paraguay (ad referendum):
ANGEL R. GINÉS.
For Peru (ad referendum):
CARLOS ENRIQUE PAZ SOLDÁN.
A. TORANZO.
For the Republic of the Philippines:
H. LARA.
WALFRIDE DE LEON.
For Poland:
EDWARD GRZEGORZEWSKI
For Saudi Arabia:
Dr. YAHIA NASRI.
Dr. MEDHAT CHEIKH-AL-ARDH.
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
L. I. MEDVED.
I. I. KALTCHENKO.
For Turkey:
Z. N. BARKER.
For Syria (subject to ratification):
Dr. C. TREFI.
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
F. G. KROTKOV.
For the Union of South Africa (ad referendum):
H. S. GEAR.
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
MELVILLE D. MACKENZIE.
G. E. YATES.
For the United States of America (subject to approval):
THOMAS PARRAN.
MARTHA M. ELIOT.
FRANK G. BOUDREAU.
For Uruguay (ad referendum):
JOSÉ A. MORA.
R. RIVERO.
CARLOS M. BARBEROUSSE.
For Venezuela (ad referendum):
A. ARREAZA GUZMÁN.
For Yugoslavia (with reservation as to the ratification):
Dr. A. STAMPAR.
For Afghanistan:
——— ———.
For Albania:
T. JAKOVA.
For Austria:
Dr. MARIUS KAISER.
For Bulgaria:
Dr. D. P. ORAHOVATZ.
For Eire (subject to acceptance):
JOHN D. MACCORMACK.
For Finland:
OSMO TURPEINEN.
For Hungary:
——— ———.
For Iceland:
——— ———.
For Italy (subject to ratification):
GIOVANNI ALBERTO CANAPERIA.
For Portugal (subject to ratification):
FRANCISCO C. CAMBOURNAC.
For Roumania:
——— ———.
For Siam:
BUNLIANG TAMTHAI.
For Sweden:
——— ———.
For Switzerland (sous réserve de ratification):
Dr. J. EUGSTER.
A. SAUTER.
For Transjordan (subject to ratification):
Dr. D. P. TUTUNJI.
For Yemen:
——— ———.

The foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol concerning the Office International d'Hygiene Publique, signed in New York, on July 22, 1946, in the Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish languages, the original of which is deposited in the Archives of the United Nations.

For the Secretary-General:
S. IVAN KERNO,
Assistant Secretary-General for Legal Affairs.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL AND CONSOLIDATED FLYING PAY REPORTS

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, supplemental and consolidated reports showing the number of officers above the rank of major during the 6-month period, June 1 to November 30, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during that period (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND RINDERPEST

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRANSFER OF BARGE TO AMERICAN NAVAL CADETS AND MARINE CORPS, INC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting that the Navy Department will endeavor to locate a vessel, which, under authority of section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946, Public Law 649, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, may be transferred to the American Naval Cadets and Marine Corps, Inc., a nonprofit organization incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with national headquarters at Edgewater, N. J., for use by that organization in training boys; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of California, relating to the San Joaquin Experimental Range of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, in Madera County, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate on February 3, 1947, p. 730, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States of America to cause the proposed sale of the town of Dragerton, Utah, to be withdrawn from sale as a unit and to offer it for sale to present occupants, veterans and others in units of one house and lot in each sale

"Whereas the War Assets Administration is advertising and offering for sale as a unit sale the entire town of Dragerton, Utah, consisting of 604 dwellings, 377 acres of land, a dormitory, school house, hospital, church, theater, store buildings, waterworks system, sewer system, and electric lighting system; and

"Whereas the town of Dragerton was built by the Government during the war for the purpose of housing employees of the Geneva mine at a cost of more than $5,000,000; and

"Whereas the sale of this town as a unit sale would permit but few bidders to participate therein; and

"Whereas said sale would preclude people in ordinary circumstances from participating; and

"Whereas the buildings and homes of this town are now occupied by tenants who are employees of the large coal mines in that vicinity and by veterans of World War II; and

"Whereas there is much concern and unrest among the present occupants of the buildings over the proposed sale since it precludes them from purchasing any of the homes and lots; and

"Whereas bids are to be received for the purchase of this entire town as a unit sale on or before 2 p. m., February 14, 1947, at building No. 3, 1710 South Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, Utah: Be it therefore

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein)*, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to withdraw from sale as a single unit the town of Dragerton, Utah, and that all bids received for the purchase of this town as a unit be canceled; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That each house and lot in said town be offered for sale at a fixed price, first, to the present occupants of said home, second, to veterans of World War II and third, to other interested persons; that such sale be made upon the conditions of a reasonable down payment and reasonable terms; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge the President and Congress to give their immediate attention to this matter; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state shall be directed to immediately send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from Utah."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial requesting action to prevent the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease

"*To the President and the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"An outbreak in the States of the Republic of Mexico bordering on the United States not only imperils the cattle industry of that country but constitutes an imminent threat to the widespread cattle industry of the Western States of this country.

"The prevention of the spread of this plague is not only of vital concern to those directly engaged in the growing of cattle but as well to all the people, as it threatens to affect both the health and the economic welfare of the States.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the President and the Congress take such steps as may be necessary, to:

"(a) Appropriate adequate funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry to prevent, control, and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in this country.

"(b) Offer assistance to the Republic of Mexico in locating, diagnosing, and eradicating foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico to the fullest extent permitted by that country.

"(c) Create a joint United States-Mexico commission, empowered to deal with the problem and to control, eradicate, and prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in each of such countries.

"(d) Close the United States-Mexico border to all importations or traffic of whatever kind or nature that may carry the infection of the foot-and-mouth disease into this country.

"(e) Help maintain all quarantine lines established within Mexico north of the infected areas."

A memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting an investigation of the administration of the Office of Price Administration in Arizona

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The administration of the Office of Price Administration in Arizona has occasioned widespread dissatisfaction throughout the State, worked irreparable injury and injustice to many citizens, and particularly with respect to the administration of rent controls, has not only been flagrantly discriminatory, impaired investments, and dealt harshly, unfairly, and unlawfully with owners of rental property, but has adversely and seriously affected the problem of supplying homes to the thousands of returned veterans and their families and other people needing them.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That the Congress of the United States cause an investigation to be made at an early date of the operations of the Arizona Office of Price Administration to the end that the abuses complained of be corrected, and if it be found that they have been caused or contributed to by criminal acts, that the guilty persons be punished."

By Mr. WILSON:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Whereas the housewives of America have patiently and patriotically exercised during the period of hostilities and for more than a year since the cessation of hostilities, the strictest economy in the use and consumption of sugar as a part of their contribution to the war effort; and

"Whereas sugar is indispensable for a well-balanced American diet, and housewives cannot prepare satisfactory meals without an adequate supply of sugar; and

"Whereas the waste resulting from the lack of sufficient means of preserving food stuffs through the scarcity of canning sugar can no longer be justified, since this Nation has not been at war for the past 18 months; and

"Whereas Iowa, in common with other great agricultural States, produces many crops which require sugar for preservation, such as fruits, berries, and vegetables, and in the past year losses in these products, because of the limited sugar available, have been estimated at several millions of dollars; and

"Whereas the absence of sugar for canning purposes has caused thousands of tons of fruit to spoil, thereby depriving American families of a much needed food, and has caused hardships and financial losses in many farming and canning communities; and

"Whereas labor in the food processing industry has been without work because of the sugar shortage; and

"Whereas in 1946 the sugar under the direct control of the United States increased by more than one-half million tons and no portion of this increase was made available to the American people: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to provide by law for an immediate decontrol of sugar for home consumption, and for industrial use; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress is respectfully requested to remove all controls from the production, processing, distribution, rationing, sale, and importation, of sugar without delay; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate, and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas present facilities for caring for all veterans are inadequate; and

"Whereas many patients requiring immediate medical attendance are neglected due to lack of facilities, resulting in undue hardship, suffering, and death; and

"Whereas there are at present existing facilities that can be utilized without further expenditure of public money and use of critical materials; and

"Whereas Schick General Hospital, a $12,000,000 Army hospital located at Clinton, Iowa, is now available for such contemplated uses: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house concurring)*, That the Veterans' Administration is respectfully requested to utilize Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress and Gen. Omar Bradley of the Veterans' Administration."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Bethesda (Md.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the adoption of summer daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A memorial of sundry railroad employees of Baltimore, Md., and vicinity, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Crosser railroad pay-roll deduction bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Resolutions adopted by John Zonik Chapter No. 24, American War Dads, of Chadron, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of legislation granting citizenship to any individual who carried arms, or who worked in any war industry of an enemy nation fighting against the United States or her Allies in World War II, and also against the present admission of 100,000 aliens into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Omaha, Nebr., favoring sufficient appropriations to complete the so-called Garrison project in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Omaha, Nebr., favoring sufficient appropriations to complete the so-called Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROHIBITION AGAINST INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that there may be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce several petitions signed by interested citizens in the State of Minnesota appealing for congressional action prohibiting interstate transportation of liquor advertising such as is provided in my bill, S. 265.

The petitions which I present are but samples of numerous similar appeals coming to me from other sections of Minnesota and from almost every other State in the Union.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from C. H. Conway, Secretary of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota, together with three resolutions adopted by that organization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter and resolutions presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Fargo, N. Dak., February 4, 1947.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The attached resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota in convention assembled January 28, 29, and 30, 1947, in the city of Fargo.

These resolutions, among others adopted by the convention, are expressly addressed to you for your utmost consideration. We believe they deal with the most momentous questions of the day and merit the consideration and action of not only those to whom they are addressed but to all other citizens.

Kindly give the resolutions the merit which, in your judgment, they deserve.

Very truly yours,

C. H. CONAWAY,
Secretary.

"BOXCAR SUPPLY

"Whereas the supply of grain boxcars has been short of actual needs for this territory and this short supply has resulted in a great

financial loss to producers and their country elevators; and

"Whereas our railroads serving this territory have been forced to operate on approximately 50 percent of their own equipment, while many eastern roads have been given 150 percent and more of car supply for less-than-carload freight; and

"Whereas impractical direction of transportation by the Office of Defense Transportation has resulted in discrimination against producers of this section in favor of eastern manufacturers and processors; and

"Whereas the evidence clearly indicates that arbitrary ODT orders have been the cause of maldistribution of available boxcar supply and consequent backing up of food supplies in the country: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this convention of farmers and representatives of country elevators go on record as favoring the removal of all controls over boxcar supply and distribution and that authority be given the various railroad units to govern and allocate their equipment according to the needs of their own patrons in keeping with a normal connecting-line arrangement necessary to the operation of all American railroads.

"It is the desire of this convention that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Association of American Railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Representatives in Congress from North Dakota."

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"WHEAT BONUSES

"Whereas it has been demonstrated time and again that Government ceiling prices have been lifted to the detriment of many producers of agricultural products; and

"Whereas these losses have accrued to the benefit of those persons and companies protected by financial reserves who were able to pay expenses and hold commodities off the market; and

"Whereas irresponsible and inexperienced Government control of OPA regulations have created financial loss and hardship among our farmers; and

"Whereas this evidence of bad faith on the part of the Government will result in lack of interest in production of vital commodities needed in a well-balanced agricultural production program: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the full support of this convention be given to sponsors of bills in Congress providing for bonus payments, denied thousands of farmer producers, paid by the Government for wheat to be shipped for foreign relief; and, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 30 cents per bushel bonus paid by the Department of Agriculture to certain farmers who held their 1945 wheat until well into the 1946 season be made available to all farmers who sold their wheat grown in 1945; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to North Dakota Representatives in Congress and to the Governor of North Dakota, as well as to the speaker of the North Dakota House of Representatives, and the president of the Senate, now in session."

"FLAX BONUS

"Whereas the crying need of the Nation concerns all of us with regard to flax production this coming season, and

"Whereas our farmers have become discouraged and are now showing little or no enthusiasm for flax production at this time, and

"Whereas lifting of flax-ceiling prices by the OPA did result in a $3 per bushel advance in prices after most producers had sold their flax, and

"Whereas no serious effort has been made by the Government to repay those losses: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Congress make some equitable adjustment of these losses to farmer producers who sold their flax under Government pressure and that this adjustment be based on present market prices for flax, allowing for handling charges with a reasonable margin of profit to marketing agencies and processors; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress and to the Governor of North Dakota, the speaker of our State house of representatives and the president of the senate."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) to authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

REPORT OF EXAMINATION OF SENATE DISBURSING OFFICE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to submit to the Senate a statement by the Secretary of the Senate.

When the present Secretary was elected to his position, the Republican personnel committee requested an audit of the Senate Disbursing Office. That audit has been made, and I send to the desk a statement by the Secretary regarding the audit, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, February 4, 1947.

Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
Chairman, Republican Personnel Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BUSHFIELD: Promptly upon my election as Secretary of the Senate, and pursuant to the direction of the Republican personnel committee, I requested Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, to have his office examine the books and accounts of the Senate Disbursing Office and to give me a statement as to their condition.

A copy of the Comptroller General's report, submitted under date of February 4, 1947, made in response to my request, has been received. I have read the same, and, in my opinion, it shows that a very thorough and complete examination of the books and accounts of said office has been made.

It appears therefrom that all funds not disbursed or accounted for as provided by law were found to be on hand or on deposit in the Treasury.

Very respectfully yours,
CARL A. LOEFFLER,
Secretary of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 539. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 540. A bill for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 541. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 542. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ella White Bull; and

S. 543. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 544. A bill to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BALL, and Mr. DONNELL) introduced Senate bill 545, to coordinate the health functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to amend the Public Health Service Act for the following purposes: To expand the activities of the Public Health Service, to promote and encourage medical and dental research in the National Institute of Health and through grants-in-aid to the States, to construct in the National Institute of Health a dental research institute, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

S. 546. A bill providing for the incorporation of La Legion Franco-Americaine des Etats Unis d'Amerique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 547, to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 548. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $5,000 to $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 549. A bill providing for an increase of compensation of postmasters at stated periods; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 550. A bill to provide for recognition of the State of North Dakota as a community property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 551. A bill for the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 552. A bill providing for an additional Naval Academy in the Puget Sound area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 553. A bill for the relief of the Cox Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 554. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

S. 555. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide automobiles or other conveyances for certain disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 557. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and to declare and define the meaning of "work" and "workweek" as meant and intended by the Congress in the enactment of the act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 558. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 559. A bill to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 560. A bill to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Birkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 562. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 61, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to coordinate the health functions of the Federal Government in a single agency, and for various other purposes, about which I may have an opportunity to speak briefly at the end of the morning hour.

The bill (S. 545) to coordinate the health functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to amend the Public Health Service Act for the following purposes: To expand the activities of the Public Health Service; to promote and encourage medical and dental research in the National Institute of Health and through grants-in-aid to the States; to construct in the National Institute of Health a dental research institute, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BALL, and Mr. DONNELL), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ANNUAL SICK LEAVE FOR RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago the Comptroller General gave a decision eliminating Saturdays from annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers. In my opinion that is most unjust and unfair. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to correct that situation.

The bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

BALANCED PEACETIME FEDERAL BUDGET, AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress, I introduced a Senate joint resolution providing for an amendment to the National Constitution which if adopted would provide and bring into being an automatically balanced Federal Budget in peacetime. I have great pleasure in reintroducing the joint resolution today in behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and myself, for such reference as the Chair may see fit to make.

The joint resolution should, I believe, properly be referred to the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, of all amendments to the Federal Constitution. However, in considering the matter it will be necessary to make a great many financial computations, based on the experience of the Appropriations Committee; and I respectfully suggest to the consideration of the Chair that the joint resolution be temporarily referred to the Appropriations Committee, with the understanding that it shall then be referred to the Judiciary Committee for final action; the point being that if we are in a position to make a report showing the construction of the appropriations for the Judiciary Committee's consideration, it will be in a better position to consider the merits of the joint resolution than if the Judiciary Committee takes it ab initio, without a knowledge of the ingredients involved in making appropriations in the Appropriations Committee.

I respectfully suggest to the Chair that he make some exploration as to how we can get the factual information from the Appropriations Committee before this matter goes to the Judiciary Committee, which should have final jurisdiction of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair welcomes the suggestion of the able Senator. The ruling will be held in abeyance until the matter can be studied.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently said: The Chair is now prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whose attention the Chair asks.

The Senator from Maryland asked that a Senate joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to fiscal matters, be referred first to the Committee on Appropriations, because of the obvious fiscal character of the joint resolution, and then subsequently to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In the view of the Chair, because of the clear language of the Reorganization Act, the Chair has no authority to refer the joint resolution anywhere except to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Chair therefore suggests to the able Senator from Maryland that if the other procedure is desired, he submit a unanimous-consent request for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the ruling of the Chair is absolutely correct. In view of the fiscal character of the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that it be referred first to the Committee on Appropriations for preliminary examination and report, and thereafter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for final action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE-TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MILEAGE AND OTHER TRAVEL ALLOWANCES OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, during the call of the calendar on Friday last the Senate considered and passed Senate bill 276, having to do with making the official mileage tables of the War Department apply to enlisted men as well as officers.

At the time of consideration of this bill I was asked by the Senators from North Dakota and Vermont whether the Comptroller General approved the measure, and I could not answer definitely at that time.

I now offer a letter of approval of the bill by the Comptroller General, dated February 7, and I ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks, so that the House of Representatives will know that the bill has been approved by the Comptroller General.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 7, 1947.

HON. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Armed Services, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At your request, I have examined S. 276, Eightieth Congress, entitled "A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel."

As introduced, the language of the bill is identical with that of S. 917 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, as to which, under date of March 21, 1946, I had occasion to furnish an analysis and report thereon to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, the report ending with the statement that I see no objection to the enactment and approval of S. 917. I am of the same opinion with respect to the current bill, S. 276.

Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

DECISION OF JUDGE PICARD IN THE MOUNT CLEMENS PORTAL-PAY CASE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when the decision was handed down by Judge Picard regarding the portal pay case I issued a statement in which, among other things, I said that I thought it important that the legislative branch of the Government should lay down its policy in no uncertain terms. I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

According to the news dispatch, Judge Picard has dismissed the Mount Clemens portal-pay case on the de minimis theory, holding in substance that in this particular case there is no ground for recovery.

According to the news dispatch, the judge says that the industry should not be held liable for payment in suits arising before last June 10. It was then for the first time that the Supreme Court outlined the portal-pay theory. It will be interesting reading to see Judge Picard's complete decision. The case will undoubtedly be appealed to the Supreme Court, where the whole matter will be clarified.

In the meanwhile, it is my personal view that there should be no hesitancy on the part of the legislative branch of government to define its position. Such a definition might well help the Supreme Court in disposing of the whole matter and doing away with the unsettled condition resulting from the Supreme Court's own decision. This unsettled condition does not make for the economic health of the country.

It should be borne in mind that if the lower court's decision stands, it is simply a decision on the facts in this particular case. This is an added reason why the legislature should redefine its position in no uncertain terms on the general issue of portal-to-portal pay.

FORMULA FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATY PROGRAM—JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS VANDENBERG AND MILLIKIN

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a joint statement by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and myself as chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, having to do with the Reciprocal Trade Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, AND BY SENATOR MILLIKIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Because of our mutual interest in the foreign and domestic aspects of the forthcoming trade-agreements negotiations we have held a number of conversations on the subject. These and the discussions later referred to with Under Secretary of State Acheson and Under Secretary of State Clayton have been entirely on our own responsibility and solely for preliminary exploration on the subject. It is understood that the proposals are tentative and subject to revision in the light of developments.

Although we are conscious of differences of opinion between us as to some of the philosophy and procedures of the reciprocal-trade system, we are in accord on the following:

1. Since under existing law the Reciprocal Trade Act, as last extended by the Congress, does not expire until June 12, 1948, important basic changes in the system, if these should be needed, can be made more appropriately by the next session of this Congress. Moreover, pursuant to the authority vested in it by the Reciprocal Trade Act which, as above pointed out, does not expire until June 1948, the State Department has invited 18 nations to bargain with us this coming April for trade agreements; that elaborate plans for the negotiations have been made by the nations involved; that our own domestic hearings have been under way; that from the standpoint of our foreign relations it is undesirable that these plans be abandoned or needlessly postponed.

2. There is considerable sentiment for procedural improvements leading to more certain assurance that our domestic economy will not be imperiled by tariff reductions and concessions. The desire for procedural improvements arises from fears such as the following:

(a) That our proper domestic concern in tariffs adequate to safeguard our domestic economy may be subordinated to extraneous and overvalued diplomatic objectives.

(b) That our domestic interests which require protection against injurious imports or the threat thereof are not given proper hearings on proposed tariff cuts.

(c) That the exact reductions and concessions contemplated are kept secret and it is impossible to make specific defensive arguments against unspecified perils.

(d) That the whole matter is surrounded with unnecessary secrecy.

(e) That responsibility for advice to the President against injurious tariff reductions and concessions is unduly diluted and obscured among too many executive agencies and is not sufficiently focused on those best able to give it.

(f) That we do not get sufficient return benefit from the generalized benefits resulting to other nations from the operation of the unconditional most-favored-nation clauses in our trade agreements.

3. That under the Tariff Act of 1930 and the amending Reciprocal Trade Act there is ample authority for establishment of procedures by the President, without further legislation, that will safeguard the domestic economy without hampering the negotiation of agreements to encourage the essential expansion of our foreign trade.

4. That to the extent such executive safeguards are provided, claims for legislative action are obviated.

5. We believe that the following measures which may be put into effect by the President out of his existing powers would afford improved safeguards and would, without damage to legitimate reciprocal trade negotiations, allay many of the fears that have been mentioned:

(a) The United States Tariff Commission to review all contemplated tariff reductions and concessions in all future trade agreements and to make direct recommendation to the President as to the point beyond which reductions and concessions cannot be made without injury to the domestic economy.

(b) Inclusion of "escape clause" in every trade agreement hereafter entered into or renewed whereby the United States, on the initiative of the President, can withdraw or modify any tariff reduction or concession if in practice it develops that such reduction or concession has imperiled any affected domestic interest.

(c) The Tariff Commission to keep closely and currently informed on the operation of all of our trade agreements and on its own motion or on the request of the President or of the Congress, or of any aggrieved party, to hold public hearings to determine whether in its opinion any particular escape clause should be invoked, and to recommend direct to the President withdrawal or modification of any rate or concession which imperils any affected domestic interest.

(d) Recommendations of Tariff Commission to President for withdrawal or modification of rates or concessions under operation of "escape clause," together with any dissenting opinions of members and nonconfidential supporting data to be open to public inspection.

(e) Efficient procedures and policies to assure that nations which do not make available to us their own tariff reductions and concessions to other nations shall not receive generalized benefits from us resulting from the inclusion in our own trade agreements of the unconditional most-favored-nation clauses except at our option exercised in the public interest.

6. We have discussed these matters with Under Secretary of State Acheson and Under Secretary of State Clayton and are encouraged to hope that improvements by Executive order along the lines suggested will be seriously considered by the President and the State Department.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to endorse enthusiastically the statesmanship of our colleagues, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], in having recently developed in collaboration with the State Department a sound and what I hope may be an entirely acceptable formula for dealing with the subject of reciprocal trade treaties at the coming international Economic Conference.

I have consistently taken the position during my membership in the United States Senate that the United States must take a positive, aggressive position of leadership in all measures that may look toward international collaboration for the preservation of the future peace. And in this connection I have felt the vital necessity, not only of political collaboration, but economic collaboration.

I am aware, Mr. President, that the question of economic collaboration presents many controversial issues, and that there are those in my own party in both House and Senate who are not in entire agreement on this subject; in fact there was danger there might be a real split in our party over the whole matter of the tariff policy and international trade.

It therefore has been most gratifying to me at a moment when I feel we need a united American front in our international approach, and when we should bend every effort to prevent divisiveness, either in our party or the Nation as a whole, that we should have such statesmanship and leadership as has been given by our two distinguished colleagues.

Mr. President, as a part of and following my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD three editorials, as follows: editorial from the New York Times of February 1, entitled "Republicans and Reciprocity"; editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 8, entitled "The New Tariff Formula," and editorial from the Washington Post of February 8, entitled "Trade Treaties."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 1, 1947]

REPUBLICANS AND RECIPROCITY

Concluding the hearings which it has held in recent weeks, the Committee for Reciprocity Information will inform the State Department that the pressure for high tariffs is noticeably less today than it was in 1938, when similar hearings were held. There are various reasons, in our judgment, why this should be true. Since 1938 the United States has come a long way out of its political isolation, and in that process it must have shed some of its economic isolation too. Again, more people certainly know today than knew in 1938 how valuable foreign markets are to us and how inexorably true

it is that we cannot sell in those markets unless we buy in them as well. Finally, the reciprocal trade agreements program itself has been managed so well and so wisely—in its formative stages under the deeply interested personal direction of Cordell Hull—that many business and agricultural interests which originally opposed the plan, or looked upon its possible benefits with skepticism, have been won over to its support.

There is, in fact, a great deal of popular and professional backing for the program which Mr. Hull initiated 12 years ago. The problem is how to demonstrate this fact, and the advantages of the program, to the Republican Members of Congress, a majority of whom voted against the Hull plan when it was first proposed and then voted against it every time it came up subsequently for extension except in the war year 1943.

It is curious that this should be the case, for historically it is the Republicans, and not the Democrats, who are the party of reciprocity. Look at the record. It was a Republican Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, who championed reciprocity as early as 1890 as a means of opening Latin-American markets to United States farm products. The principle of reciprocity was endorsed in national Republican platforms from 1892 to 1904 and was given practical application in the Republican Tariff Acts of 1890 and 1897. In the last speech of his career, a Republican President, William McKinley, declared that "reciprocal trade arrangements with other nations should in liberal spirit be carefully cultivated and promoted." This passage of that long-ago address in Buffalo is as timely today as when it was first spoken:

"A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we shall deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the mutual outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established."

It is only in comparatively recent years, and then apparently for one reason because it was the Democrats who happened to rediscover the idea, that the Republicans have swung over to the role of opposition on this issue. But there is no good reason why they should continue to constitute the opposition and many good reasons why they should return to their earlier role, now that they have taken over authority in Congress. Powerful among the reasons is the necessity of strengthening the economic position of those countries which believe with us in the advantages of the free-enterprise system. Equally powerful is the fact that the Republican Party professes to be the party of expanding production and the enemy of that governmental regimentation which is the logical alternative to an economy of abundance.

One Republican attack in the Senate this week on the Hull trade programs has already done considerable mischief. The country is entitled to look to the responsible Republican leadership of both Houses for assurance that the bipartisan agreement in foreign policy which has been achieved so successfully on political questions will be extended into the economic field as well.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 8, 1947]

THE NEW TARIFF FORMULA

Senators VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and MILLIKIN, of Colorado, appear to us to have made a very practical and, let us hope, effective contribution to the tariff controversy dividing the Republicans in Congress. Senator VANDENBERG has been a consistent supporter of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the legislative father of the so-called Hull treaties. Senator MILLIKIN, on the other hand, has vigorously opposed the Hull program in the past. Yet here they are together proposing a compromise with the object of staving off any drastic changes in the program. It seems to us a statesmanlike move.

Renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act last summer appealed to us at the time as an essential symbol of this country's intention to carry out its pledge to promote multilateral international commerce and thus to discourage the trade wars growing out of embargoes, quotas, and other restrictions which were an important factor in provoking World War II. Today this act still remains, under the circumstances, more of a guaranty of our pledge than a powerful instrument in achieving its purpose. The reasons are obvious. As the postwar world has developed politically we find ourselves one of the few remaining refuges of free enterprise, faced with totalitarian and collectivist economies with authoritarian control of their exports and imports. The interchange of goods with them, therefore, on any basis approaching the free play of supply and demand without injury to our own economy becomes a problem.

Under existing law the State Department, which has the trade treaties in charge, may cut existing tariffs as much as 50 percent in return for concessions from other nations. Thanks to the most-favored-nation clause in these treaties, these cuts extend to the goods of still other nations as well. Messrs. VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN have proposed that on recommendation from the Tariff Commission the President be apprised of "the point beyond which reduction and concession cannot be made without injury to the domestic economy," and that in every future trade agreement he be empowered to withdraw or modify any tariff order "if in practice it develops that such reduction or concession has imperiled any affected domestic interest." A third proposal is that nations which do not offer reciprocal benefits shall not share in those we would otherwise advance them through unconditional interpretation of the most-favored-nation clause.

Let us admit that compromises are rarely an ideal solution of problems and that this one is no exception. One is reminded, for instance, that when Great Britain occupied the position the United States does today, that of the great creditor nation of the world, she prospered mightily on a free-trade policy of her own though surrounded by high-tariff customers. This is no plea that we should emulate this historic example (the international economic picture is a very different one today). Yet the precedent does suggest that, as the greatest market for imports and the greatest source of desperately required exports, we need not be too timid in the assertion of a generous policy even vis-à-vis our collectivist customers.

[From the Washington Post of February 8, 1947]

TRADE TREATIES

We are now witnessing a demonstration of responsibility on the part of two Republican leaders, Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN, who, after consulting with the State Department, have worked out a compromise plan designed to propitiate extremists in their own party who would like to wreck the reciprocal trade program. In our opinion, the procedural changes they suggest would afford protection against possible errors of judgment on the part of representatives of the State Department without hampering the execution of the program itself.

The recommended insertion of a so-called escape clause in trade agreements that would enable either party to withdraw or modify a tariff cut that caused undue hardship is only a reasonable precaution. The further suggestion that the Tariff Commission be directed to review all contemplated reductions and concessions and tell the President which ones cannot be made without injury to the domestic economy is likewise desirable. For it would afford the industries concerned opportunities for airing their grievances before a bipartisan agency of the Government that, unlike the State Department, has no political interest in the outcome of trade negotiations. The recommendation to tighten up procedures so as to deny the general trade benefits accruing to other nations under the most-favored-nation clause to countries that do not fully reciprocate is advice that the State Department cannot afford to ignore.

Some such concessions will have to be made by the State Department in order to save the essential features of its program and enable the United States to play the dominant role assigned to it in the forthcoming world trade conference. Failure of that conference would not only be a retrograde step, economically speaking; it might, and probably would, thwart bipartisan efforts to eliminate causes of international political friction and lay the foundation for world peace. For one, the most formidable causes of political friction among nations grows out of trade obstructions such as high tariffs, restrictive-quota provisions, and discriminatory regulations. Removal of such obstacles to freer trading is quite feasible without sacrifice of legitimate American interests. Moreover, concessions on our part will be reciprocated; our trade program is not a philanthropic plan of action for the bestowal of benefits without a quid pro quo.

In our opinion, therefore, Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN have done a signal service for their party by their efforts to halt the drive against the reciprocal trade program. For if tariff making should ever again become the sport of Congressmen, we can be sure that trade barriers would rise higher and higher as the result of logrolling tactics. We should stand discredited before the world for going back on our professions of liberal trading principles. And Congress itself, and the Republicans in particular, would be rent by internal dissensions that would have repercussions at the next general election.

INTERNATIONAL CARTELS AND ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, this is a time when we are just getting started on our program of control and development of atomic energy through the Atomic Energy Commission. It is a time when this subject is provoking much discussion in the international field. For these reasons I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an important statement which brings up yet another feature of the subject.

It is contained in a book by Mr. Darel McConkey, entitled "Out of Your Pocket: The Story of Cartels," published today.

The book is a synthesis of cartel information which lifts drama and intrigue from the acres of documents and converts them into a readable story. The most ominous section of the book is its closing chapter. The author warns that if ever the technique of world control to stifle individual competition—the cartel—is applied to atomic energy we may as well forget all about democracy.

Because I think that warning is so timely, so awesome, and so significant, I

ask unanimous consent that a short passage from it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that all the Members of this body may study it.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARNING—WATCH OUT FOR AN ATOM CARTEL

It hasn't come out in the open very far yet, but there are unmistakable indications of a desire to form a cartel in atomic power. If that ever comes, God help us.

After World War I the dangers of a cartel in dyestuffs were foreseen and pointed out. Dyestuffs are beneficent materials, except when they are used to make explosives. But the thing slipped out of control, the cartel was formed, and the explosives exploded.

The atom bomb can be tamed and turned into beneficent energy that will benefit everybody. What is going to happen to it?

The Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada are supposed to have "substantial patent control" over atomic power. Yet the UP reports a French scientist in May 1946 asked for the issue of a Swedish patent on it.

German physicists, according to newspaper reports, seem to have evaporated from the occupied homeland. Where are they? What are they up to? Are they in Spain? Are they in Argentina?

The State Department's Blue Book on Argentina says that "the industries essential to warfare in which experimentation in the weapons of future wars may take place and in which prototypes may be developed exist in Argentina and are controlled by Germans."

Here at home it is the big corporations that run the atom plants—du Pont, Monsanto Chemical, Westinghouse, Allis Chalmers, Union Carbide & Carbon, Eastman, Chrysler, General Electric.

Edison Electric Institute, representing the $16,000,000,000 utilities industry, says a newspaper account, "pleaded to be allowed to get in on atomic development."

A representative of General Electric, according to the same source, argues that private industry is "the logical agency to push atomic development."

The National Association of Manufacturers, in a special pleading for "our system of private initiative and free enterprise," has been working to kill off the antimonopoly provisions of the McMahon bill on atomic energy.

If atomic energy is ever turned into a cartel, there will be an immediate alliance between the cartel and the military, exactly as it happened with I. G. and the Nazis. Then we will have "one world" pronto—one world of slavery. The threat of immediate disintegration by atom bomb will hang over the head of any rebel group, no matter how large or small.

Cartels have got to be controlled fast before that can happen here.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG BEFORE MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the addresses delivered by Senator VANDENBERG before the Michigan Republican State Convention at Grand Rapids, Mich., on February 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SETTLEMENT OF UTAH—OFFICIAL CENTENNIAL PICTURE RAMROD

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning the premier of the motion picture Ramrod designated as the official picture of Utah's centennial, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON ARTICLE ENTITLED "THE ARMED FORCES"

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated August 29, 1946, addressed by him to the publisher of Fortune magazine relative to an article entitled "The Armed Forces," published in the September issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESPONSIBILITIES OF RESERVE OFFICERS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the responsibilities of Reserve officers, etc., published in the December issue of the Reserve Officer, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES IN OPPOSITION TO CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him today in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREPARATION FOR EMERGENCIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on February 9, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPPER ON NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement endorsing national representation for the people of the District of Columbia, made by him before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Monday, February 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL STABILITY—ADDRESS BY C. H. KREIENBAUM

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Industrial Stability," delivered by C. H. Kreienbaum, president of the Simpson Logging Co., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S DECLARATION ACCEPTING JURISDICTION OF WORLD COURT—ARTICLE BY MANLEY O. HUDSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The World Court: America's Declaration Accepting Jurisdiction," written by Manley O. Hudson, and published in the December issue of the American Bar Association Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY THE ATROCITIES IN PALESTINE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks by him on the subject Why the Atrocities in Palestine? delivered at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 10, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL TO JEWISH CHILDREN SLAIN IN EUROPE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to a forest in Palestine in memory of Jewish children slain in Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order. The clerk will state the bills on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there has been opposition heretofore voiced to consideration of this particular measure. I know nothing about the matters involved, but, in view of the fact that opposition has heretofore been announced, I think the bill should go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will be passed over.

COLLECTION OF CERTAIN SPECIAL TONNAGE DUTIES

The bill (S. 132) to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no collector of customs shall be held liable to the United States for his failure to collect special tonnage duties provided for in the first sentence of section 4219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 121), nor for his failure in connection therewith to collect light money provided for in section 4225 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 128), in connection with the entry from a foreign port of any foreign vessel prior to October 1, 1940; nor shall any such vessel hereafter be held liable for the payment of any such special tonnage duties or light money in connection with any entry prior to October 1, 1940.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think that measure should go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon requests an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is temporarily absent from the Senate Chamber, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

HEARING BY SENATE SECTION OF JOINT ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has a definite program for today in connection with the hearing on the nominations to the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy now being considered by that committee. Certain witnesses are to appear before us this afternoon, and much as I regret to be obliged to make the request, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate section of the committee may sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

CONFIRMATION OF ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now ask advice of the Senate as to whether there should be incurred the expense of having routine nominations reported from the Armed Services Committee printed in the Executive Calendar.

The cost of printing the list of nominations will be considerable, for it contains 1,850 names, possibly comprising 10 or 12 pages. The only way to avoid printing the list of names in the Executive Calendar, at a cost of from $600 to $800, is to have the nominations confirmed by the Senate on the day on which they are reported from the committee, which is not in accord with the rule of the Senate. In other words, under the Senate rule, the nominations should be reported and placed on the calendar, and not acted upon by the Senate before the following day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire of the Senator what is the top grade in the list of nominations?

Mr. GURNEY. The nominations are those of majors, captains, and lieutenants. The present list, 1,850 in number, is part of the 25,000 Regular Army officers who were authorized last year. The nominations have been approved unanimously by the committee, after having been held in committee for thorough consideration for a period, I believe, of about 2 weeks. As in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I now report favorably the nominations, and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota that the rule be suspended, so that there may be immediate consideration by the Senate of a list of nominations for promotion in the Army, in subordinate grades?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object in this particular instance—I think it is important that we should not, through a multiplication of individual waivers of the rules of the Senate, entirely dissipate the effect and purpose—and, I think, the sound purpose—of the rule requiring nominations to lie over for a day. We can carry this procedure so far that matters will move directly from the committees to the floor of the Senate without reaching the calendar at all, and I think that such an evil ought to be avoided. But I voice no objection to a particular request that is made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and, as in executive session, the nominations in the Army today reported favorably from the Committee on Armed Services are confirmed.

FOREIGN SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, about 10 days ago there was filed with the Congress a report on foreign surplus disposal by the office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner of the Department of State. I desire to make a few observations on that report.

About a year ago, I served on a subcommittee of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program together with the then Senator from Delaware, Senator Tunnell, who acted as chairman of the subcommittee. Our assignment was to investigate the operations of various Government agencies overseas. The most outstanding of these, in my judgment, was the matter of the disposal of Government surplus property in foreign areas.

In 37 days the former Senator from Delaware and myself, together with the committee counsel, flew a total of 30,000 miles, conducted 32 public hearings and four executive hearings. We also accumulated a mass of statistical material not only during the course of the hearings but as a result of a letter dispatched in advance to the appropriate officials indicating the subject matter on which we wished to be informed.

Subsequent to that field investigation, the committee conducted hearings both executive and public, in Washington on the matter of surplus-property disposal abroad and also accumulated information through the activities of the staff.

The committee accepted the report of the subcommittee and filed with the Senate Report No. 110, part 5, on March 22, 1946, entitled "Investigations Overseas—Surplus Property Abroad."

In accordance with the committee's practice, the committee continued to follow the disposal of surplus property abroad and has held public hearings and executive hearings and has continued its staff investigation.

Mr. President, from my own personal familiarity with the subject gained as I have indicated, and from my knowledge of the work in this field which has been done by the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, it is my judgment that the report filed by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner to which I have referred, demonstrates concretely the fallacy of accepting documents prepared by executive departments without any independent check by the Congress itself.

Moreover, the presentation of this report, in the light of the limitation imposed upon the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program in Senate Resolution 46, adopted on January 22, 1947, raises in my mind a major question of importance to the public; namely, who will now take the responsibility and perform the duty to the public of ascertaining the truth with respect to the handling of our Government surplus property located in foreign areas and inform the people of America about an important phase of the public business?

Mr. President, I do not propose to consume the time of the Senate by a detailed analysis of the report on foreign surplus disposal submitted by the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner. I will state, however, that the facts known to the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program raised in my mind a very grave doubt of the value of reports to Congress of the character of the one on foreign surplus disposal.

In my judgment this report falls far short of making public the information to which the Congress and the people are entitled. On the other hand, it is so drafted and worded as to conceal the true situation and to present the work of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner in a very favorable light. If public judgments are to be based upon misleading and colored presentations of facts, then how can we expect wise and sound decisions to be made by the people under our democratic form of government?

Excellent as the press of our country is and free as it is from control by Government officials, the press does not possess the power of subpena and cannot administer oaths. Therefore, unless a congressional committee possessing those two important powers is authorized to explore a subject and diligently exercises that authority, the Congress and the people will be confined to the acceptance of statements made by the agencies themselves as to their discharge of the public trust. Human nature being what it is, either in government or out, we cannot expect public officials to report unfavorably on themselves.

The report discloses that $8,800,000,000 worth of United States property had been declared surplus up to the end of last year and that it is expected that approximately $2,000,000,000 more will be declared surplus in the future.

These figures add up to nearly $11,000,000,000 worth of Government property. Even in a day when we speak glibly of billions, this is no mean segment of the public business.

The report claims that out of $6,803,995,000 worth of sales there has been a realization of $1,589,558,000 to the United States.

On the surface, it would appear that up to the end of last year we had disposed of 80 percent of all surplus property which had been so declared abroad, at a return to the United States of approximately 23.3 cents on the dollar of original cost.

Unless we have information on market conditions in the areas where our surplus property was sold, and unless we look more closely at the benefits to the United States, which are lumped under the heading of "Realization," we mignt

be inclined to the conclusion that an excellent job of merchandising had been rapidly accomplished by the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner. It is obviously that impression which the report is designed to convey.

Unless some agency of the Congress takes up where the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program left off on January 22, 1947, that record is likely to stand as the public record of our foreign surplus disposal.

In my judgment, that record is misleading and inaccurate and ought not to be permitted to stand. I merely wish to call attention to two or three specific aspects of this 52-page report on $11,000,000,000 worth of Government property which indicates to me that the Congress will not have discharged its responsibility to the people if it permits this record to go unchallenged.

Appendix I on page 40 of the report indicates that a total of $5,114,000,000 worth of surplus at original cost was sold to 10 foreign governments for a total realization of $958,000,000, a return of 18.73 cents on a dollar of original cost. The same table reveals that the first bulk sale was made to the United Kingdom on December 6, 1945, and totaled $588,000,000 of property at original cost, for a realization of $60,000,000, a return of 10.2 cents on a dollar of original cost.

Because the British bulk sale was the first one, and in the judgment of the committee might constitute a precedent in subsequent bulk sales to foreign governments, the committee explored its terms and the manner in which it was negotiated in some detail. The committee believed that our Government might be charged with discrimination in case it subsequently refused to give other governments as good a deal as we gave the British. Our investigation substantiated this view; and in my judgment the British bulk sale had a very important bearing on subsequent disposals in bulk to other governments.

The committee differed substantially with the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner's office as well as the Secretary of State as to the proper way in which to present the features of the British bulk sale to the public.

The Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, at the committee's hearing held on Friday, February 22, 1946, testified that under the agreement dated December 6, 1945, we were transferring to the British approximately $350,000,000 worth of United States Government surplus property, valued at original cost, in exchange for $60,000,000, representing a return to this Government of slightly less than 17.50 cents on a dollar of original cost.

From the report which I have referred to, it now appears that, instead of $350,000,000 worth of property, we have transferred to the British $588,000,000 worth of property, or $238,000,000 more than was contemplated. It also appears that for this extra $238,000,000 worth of property we have received not one additional cent. The result of this transaction is that we have sold our surplus to the United Kingdom for approximately 10 cents on the dollar.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from California is giving a very pertinent and timely talk about the disposal of war surplus property. I know that he traveled to some extent in foreign countries during the war, as I had the privilege of doing. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that much of the property which the United States owned and which was in foreign countries could not be profitably returned to the United States because of the expense involved and because of the difficulty of finding a market when it was returned. I respectfully suggest to him, without taking issue with his figures, that quite often it was my own experience in traveling around the world last year and looking over Army and Navy establishments and talking with the men in control of those establishments, that after a careful survey it was found that it would cost more to return the property to the United States than could be realized from it if it were returned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I intend to discuss that phase of the situation later.

The committee did not accept the figures given by the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner. One reason for not accepting the figures submitted was because they failed to include any valuation for many items that were to be transferred and which, from the committee's investigation, had provable value. For example, no valuation had been placed upon scrap, of which the Army had theretofore sold on a spot cash basis sufficient amounts for a cash return, paid at once, of nearly $3,000,000. The bulk sale included the transfer of scrap which was estimated by Army authorities to be substantially more than the amounts of scrap which the Army had already sold. If this scrap were valued at the same rate as that which the Army had sold, it should bring a return on a spot cash sale of nearly $12,000,000.

The Foreign Liquidation Commissioner either had given no attention whatever to the value of scrap to be included in the bulk sale, or if he gave it attention, had operated on the assumption that it was of no value, because, according to his testimony before the committee, he placed no valuation upon it in his negotiations.

Mr. President, my question is, Was the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner $238,000,000 off in his estimate of the property that was to be transferred to the United Kingdom; and did he enter into an agreement that whether we transferred $350,000,000 worth of property or twice that amount, the United States was still to receive no more in return?

In my opinion, this instance alone raises a very grave question as to the businesslike handling of foreign surplus disposal and somewhat impairs the impression which would be conveyed by the report received by Congress that our foreign property had been handled expeditiously and in a businesslike manner.

Mr. President, I also believe that the term "realization" or "sales price," as used in this report, should be examined in some detail to see precisely what realization the United States Government has actually received and what it may expect to receive in the future. The impression conveyed is that we have received in cash United States dollars a little more than 23 cents for every dollar's worth of property we have sold abroad. However, in the case of the British sale, the payments are to be made under the terms of the British loan agreement. In other words, the United Kingdom does not start paying until 1951 and will not complete payment until 2001 A. D. The interest rate is 2 percent, with a provision that the interest will be waived in any year if certain conditions exist; and, if waived, it would not accumulate.

In connection with the British bulk sale I was interested in noting on page 18 of the report that the United States has the option of taking up to the equivalent of $50,000,000 of the $60,000,000 the United Kingdom owes us on this sale in pounds sterling, if the option is exercised before December 31, 1951. It seems to me that the Senate would do well to keep itself advised as to whether our executive department officials have any plans for exercising this option, and in the event there is a move in this direction to go into the reasons behind it.

A second example of what is meant by realization is in the bulk sale to China, concerning which the National Defense Committee heard testimony on Friday, September 27, 1946. At that time Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connolly, Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, and Mr. Chester Lane, Deputy Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, described very briefly the bulk sale to China.

In the table set forth in appendix I to the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner's report the sale to China is shown as $837,000,000 worth of surplus at original cost, being sold for $175,000,000 realization or sales price. The testimony before the National Defense Committee disclosed that this $175,000,000 is really not $175,000,000 in United States currency, but is composed of three items: First, a credit of $35,000,000 to be expended by the United States for the purchase of real estate or for defraying United States governmental expenses in China; second, a credit of $20,000,000 for the cultural exchanges provided by the Fulbright Act; third, a $120,000,000 credit against the so-called Yuan debt, which is estimated to be approximately $150,000,000. The remaining $30,000,000 of the Yuan debt is to be paid by the United States through providing twenty-five million cash United States dollars for the purpose of providing transportation and other delivery services in transferring our surplus property from Pacific island bases to China, and five million cash United States dollars for the purpose of defraying fees of an engineering firm to supervise the packing and delivery of the property.

The indebtedness from the United States to China under the so-called Yuan agreement arises principally from

two sources: First, the pay of United States troops located in China which had been paid in Chinese currency furnished by the Chinese Government; and, second, the payment for goods and services provided for the United States by the Chinese Government of the same character as those provided by others of our allies but furnished to us as reverse lend-lease.

For some reason, not fully explained in the committee's hearing, someone in our Government not clearly identified by the witnesses who testified, agreed to treat China in a manner different from the treatment accorded our other allies with respect to lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. Instead of offsetting what China furnished us against the lend-lease which we furnished them, we agreed to pay China in Chinese currency for the value of those services and goods.

At that hearing neither General Connolly nor Mr. Lane was able to give any accurate or reliable valuation of the indebtedness owed China by the United States in accordance with the Yuan agreement. They stated that this uncertainty arose from the fact that the Chinese currency was subject to such fluctuations that the valuation would depend upon the particular day selected to determine the exchange rate between American dollars and Chinese dollars. For example, General Connolly testified as follows in reply to a question by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as to the value of the indebtedness at the time the bulk sale was concluded:

> We figured—that is, the Treasury—we figured it was worth one hundred and fifty million. I have heard some figures that the Chinese claimed it was worth two hundred and fifty million because they applied a different exchange rate than we did. Conservatively, our Treasury thought we owed them one hundred and fifty million.

It is significant to me that neither General Connolly nor Mr. Lane knew enough about the Yuan agreement, as the testimony before our committee discloses, to be able to state how much of the estimated $150,000,000 indebtedness arose from troop pay and how much was for services and supplies of the same character as those furnished to us by others of our allies as reverse lend-lease.

Mr. President, the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program only scratched the surface of the Chinese bulk sale. The committee has also conducted preliminary work in connection with the bulk sale to India, the bulk sale to France, the bulk sale to Italy, and the bulk sale to Belgium. In adddition, instances of sales made to private individuals have been brought to the attention of the committee which appear to have been handled in a very unbusinesslike manner.

On the field inspection trip to which I have referred, the former Senator from Delaware and I saw acres upon acres of construction machinery and equipment and motor vehicles, particularly in the Pacific. As everyone knows, construction machinery and building materials were in great demand in the United States at that time, and are still in great demand. We then urged, in January of 1946, that steps be taken immediately to return to the United States items in critically short civilian supply, for the dual purpose of obtaining dollars in exchange for those surpluses and for the purpose of speeding reconversion.

Our efforts resulted in the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, making some motions toward returning some of this critical material. At that time the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion was Mr. John Snyder, now the Secretary of the Treasury. The steps taken, however, were wholly inadequate and the results obtained were negligible. We thought that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion should order the return of items in critically short supply. Instead of that, the Army and the Navy merely permitted their commanders in the Pacific to return whatever they desired to return, but furnished them with a list of items which were stated by the Civilian Production Administration to be critically needed in this country. We were assured by Mr. Snyder that this, in fact, would produce the desired results.

The committee checked this return of critical materials again in the fall of 1946, after the program had been ordered discontinued in July. The committee held hearings on the west coast and inspected the Lathrop Army engineers depot and the Port Hueneme naval depot in California, and the Mount Rainier and Auburn depots in the State of Washington. These were the locations on the west coast where the material returned from the Pacific was concentrated. The results were just what the committee had feared. Of the material which we needed in this country for our reconversion program, which every State and municipal organization responsible for road construction and every contractor and lumberman in the country wanted returned, very little actually arrived at our shores. Instead, we got old tents and tent poles, machinery from which parts had been removed, boxes containing a hodgepodge of unidentified material, and 25 carloads of impregnated shoes. The Army estimated that only 11 percent in tonnage of the surpluses returned were of items listed as critical in our civilian economy by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. With regard to the item of impregnated shoes, as I recall, on the day we visited the depot, 25 carloads of shoe dubbing were being unloaded—not the shoes themselves, but material used in impregnating shoes. That was borne out further by the fact that we were told that prior to that time more than 400 barrels of the same material, amounting to about 60 tons had been received.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Which, so far as we know, has very little if any essential civilian use.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I wanted the RECORD to show that there were two items.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The former Senator from Delaware, Mr. Tunnell, on April 26, 1946, delivered a speech on the floor of this Chamber, criticizing in no uncertain terms the deficiencies and inadequate performance of our administrative agents in handling this problem of returning critically needed items to this country.

I say that the record has borne out the criticism which the then Senator from Delaware expressed. In my judgment, this chapter of our winding up of the war is one in which the action of our administrative agents is indefensible under any possible theory. The veteran who is unable to buy a tractor or a bulldozer or a truck; the highway department which is unable to get road scrapers and other road machinery; the lumberman whose capacity to produce badly needed lumber for housing is limited because of a lack of tractors and bulldozers; the contractor who is unable to obtain the necessary construction machinery; and the general public who suffers from the lack of housing because of the shortage of construction equipment, all are entitled to know the details concerning this inexcusable failure on the part of our administrative officials in disposing of Government-owned property abroad. If we leave it to the administrative agents to produce the facts, we shall never have them.

I do not wish to discuss at greater length the surplus disposal report of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, nor to labor my point that the report, as drafted, is what I would term a propaganda document which furnishes only some of the facts, in the light of which the agency itself wants the matter to be viewed. Total figures mean nothing unless we go behind them and see what they really stand for.

The Foreign Liquidation Commissioner not only is responsible for the sale of surplus property in the hands of our armed forces abroad, but likewise he is responsible for the sale of unconsumed lend-lease property. As is pointed out in a footnote on page 7 of the report, to which I have made reference, the termination and liquidation of lend-lease operations are reported separately to the Congress. The most recent report on this subject was filed with the Congress on January 3, 1947, and is printed as House Document No. 41. It is entitled "The Twenty-third Report of Lend-Lease Operations Under the Lend-Lease Act." The remarks which I have made with regard to the report on foreign surplus disposal are likewise applicable to the lend-lease report.

I wish to discuss for a few moments specifically some of the figures contained in this lend-lease report, and I desire to call attention to some of the omissions, which, in my judgment, are more significant than the information submitted.

During the war we furnished, under lend-lease to our allies, a total of $50,692,109,000 worth of supplies and services. Under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act and the master agreements with our allies the title to all of this property remained in the United States Government.

In fighting the war, our allies used up a great deal of this lend-leased material. However, a great deal of what we have furnished to our allies on lend-lease was not used and, so far as I can see, remains just as much the property of the United States as the property which is in the hands of our armed forces in foreign areas. The only difference is that it is not in our possession, but is in the hands of our allies. The fact that this is United States property and that we have a right to sell it, as distinguished from the settlement of lend-lease credit balances in our favor, has been recognized in the settlements we have made with lend-lease countries.

For instance, in the lend-lease settlement made with Great Britain, lend-lease articles which had been consumed in fighting the enemy were treated in a different manner from the articles which remained in the hands of the United Kingdom at the end of the war. Testimony before the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program in February of 1946 disclosed that we had furnished a total of approximately $26,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom furnished to us in reverse lend-lease approximately $4,500,000,000 worth of goods and services. According to records furnished to our Government by the United Kingdom, at the end of the war a little over $5,500,000,000 worth of lend-lease articles remained unconsumed in the possession of the United Kingdom.

I think it should be noted parenthetically in passing that it is impossible to check the foregoing against the figures given in the twenty-third lend-lease report for the reason that that report does not give separate figures for the United Kingdom as to lend-lease we furnished, but has combined them with the total for the British Empire, showing $31,392,361,000. I do not charge that this failure to break down the lend-lease furnished to the British Empire, so as to show separately what was furnished to the United Kingdom and what was furnished to the various colonies and subdivisions of the British Empire, was done by design. I merely wish to point out that the information furnished is not such as would be satisfactory to anyone who desired to have more than a surface or cursory knowledge of our operations with respect to lend-lease.

Referring again to the figures furnished the committee a year ago, since they are the only ones we have for this purpose, we find that approximately $16,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies furnished by the United States, in excess of the reverse lend-lease which we received from the United Kingdom was used up in fighting the enemy. The United States canceled this $16,000,000,000 as an indebtedness owing to our Government in exchange for an undertaking on the part of the United Kingdom to enter with other like-minded nations a trade conference designed to remove artificial restrictions on international trade.

The $5,500,000,000 worth of unconsumed lend-lease articles remaining in the possession of the United Kingdom were, for all practical purposes, transferred to the United Kingdom against an agreement on their part to pay us $472,000,000. The committee computed the percentage of cost of this return to be 8½ percent.

The report of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, in stating that $8,000,000,000 worth of surpluses had been declared abroad, does not take into account the unconsumed lend-lease supplies in the hands of our allies, the title to which remains in the United States Government.

Over a considerable period of time, the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program has sought to learn from the agencies responsible for the handling of lend-lease matters the approximate amount of lend-lease supplies in the hands of our allies, which remained unconsumed at the close of the war. The committee was never able to obtain even a good guess, except in the instance of the United Kingdom, where figures were furnished as developed by the British authorities themselves, subject only to the most superficial checking by United States officials. In the twenty-third lend-lease report there are no figures showing total inventory of unconsumed lend-lease articles. I wish to point out that report was filed more than 16 months after the end of the war. I think it is extremely significant that our agents do not seem to know even now how much United States property remains in the hands of our allies.

If we assume that the ratio of remaining unconsumed lend-lease to total lend-lease furnished, in the instance of the United Kingdom, is typical of all of our allies to whom we furnished lend-lease, it would appear that at the close of the war the United States Government owned, as unconsumed lend-lease, supplies in excess of $10,000,000,000 worth, the possession of all of which was in foreign governments.

By combining the total $11,000,000,000 worth of surplus property declared and expected to be declared surplus by our armed forces abroad and the estimated $10,000,000,000 worth of unconsumed supplies and matériel in the hands of our allies, we can see that the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner is responsible for approximately $21,000,000,000 worth of United States Government property located outside the jurisdiction of the United States. This is a sizable public asset, and the Congress and the public are entitled, not simply to total figures and descriptions in general terms, but to know the detailed facts regarding the management and stewardship of this public property. We are entitled to know whether the interests of our Government have been protected in a businesslike manner by the administrative agents in charge of this public responsibility.

Mr. President, lest the foregoing remarks be misconstrued, I desire to make it plain that I do not take any penny-pinching attitude toward the administration of our surplus property, our lend-lease credits, and unconsumed lend-leased United States property located in foreign areas at the end of the war. I do not minimize, nor did the committee, the difficulties involved in the disposal of United States property in foreign areas—the problem of custody and preservation, the problem of maintaining sales forces in foreign lands, the problem of dollar exchanges, and the problem of doing business under the laws of another sovereignty.

I take the position, and it is in full accord with the position taken by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program that we should utilize our foreign surpluses in the accomplishment of programs in the national interest with broad authority in our administrative agents to accept intangible rights and benefits as well as tangible property other than United States dollars in exchange for the transfer of our surplus property.

What I am suggesting at this time is that now that the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program has been prevented from continuing its investigation in this field, the Senate must not permit that task to go undone, but on the other hand, must accept its responsibility to the people and must insist that an appropriate agency of the Senate continue to explore the manner in which our surplus property abroad is being disposed of, and to examine carefully the reports submitted by our administrative agents on that subject.

Mr. President, I do not care to engage in any jurisdictional controversy as to which committee of the Senate should pursue this matter. It appears to me that there are aspects of this subject which are within the field of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. Furthermore, there certainly are aspects of it which touch upon the conduct of our foreign relations and are, therefore, within the purview of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The broad authority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would bring this subject clearly within the scope of inquiry of that committee. There also may be other committees that have an interest in this subject matter.

It is of no importance to me which of these committees or other committees which may claim jurisdiction, or even a special committee, if that should be necessary, shall perform the function of exploring this field and reporting to the Senate and the public. What does concern me is that we must make sure that the Reorganization Act, which I favored originally and which I now favor, is not used as a means of engaging in a jurisdictional controversy between Senate committees, with the result that no one performs a task which, under the circumstances, should be performed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I did not care to interrupt the able Senator from California as he went along in his masterful analysis of the report on foreign surplus property disposal, but I wish to say that in my opinion he has rendered a real service to the Senate and to the people by calling this subject to our attention.

At this time I wish to advise the Senate that the junior Senator from Michigan has been named the chairman of a subcommittee which has been appointed by the chairman of the Committee on

Expenditures in the Executive Departments to look into the question of surplus property, and the disposal of surplus property. I am sure the work that will be done by that subcommittee will not conflict with and I hope will not duplicate, the services of the other committee which may have jurisdiction of the same subject.

I think it is advisable to state at this time that it is the intention of the subcommittee to investigate in detail the entire surplus property problem, because I think it is one which, as the able Senator from California has indicated, deserves the very careful attention of the Senate, and should be analyzed so that in the future we may know exactly what has happened to this property.

The able Senator from California has not called attention to the fact that settlements have not been made as to lend-lease property, a situation which sometimes people forget. As has been ably stated, the title of the property is in the United States, and it seems somewhat strange that we have not pressed for a settlement of our accounts, because, as I view the situation, since the war is over, naturally various departments and agencies will shrink in size, and many of those who have had charge of such accounts will disappear from the Government service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator will bear me out in the statement that the largest item which has not been settled is the lend-lease item of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is our understanding that, though a number of communications have gone from the Government of the United States to the Russian Government, we have not yet had the courtesy of a reply relative to the settlement of the eleven-billion-dollars-plus, lend-lease account. We know however, that there was some additional lend-lease material in the so-called pipe line. The normal interpretation would be that pipe-line items are those which might have been in the course of transit at the time lend-lease was terminated, but we have ascertained that is not the fact. The so-called pipe line includes items which had been in the blueprint stage, so to speak, and have since been manufactured, or even now are in the process of being manufactured. Of the $35,000,000 worth of lend-lease still in the so-called pipe line, approximately $25,000,000 worth is destined to go to the Russian Government, about seven million to the French Government, and the remainder scattered amongst various other governments. This after the American people had believed that lend-lease was terminated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am laboring under the misfortune of having missed the major part of the address of the Senator from California. Was the Senator suggesting that any action be taken by the Senate, or was he merely expressing his views?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had both expressed my views and had called attention to the fact that now that this matter is not under the jurisdiction of the War Investigating Committee some committee of the Senate—the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Foreign Relations Committee, or the Armed Services Committee—should go thoroughly into the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to make an inquiry as to whether this matter, which is essentially within the jurisdiction, I would assume, of the State Department, had been before the State Department, and whether General Marshall, the new Secretary of State, primarily in charge of the conduct of our foreign relations and the maintenance of our foreign policy, had made any recommendation about the subject, or given the Senator or the Senate his advice as to what our action should be. I was thinking that it is a matter relating to the relationship between this and another country, and probably the first opportunity for the expression of opinion and the suggestion of a policy should come from the Secretary of State, in whom we recently expressed such clear and bipartisan confidence, before we do anything in the Senate which might tend to impair the good relations between this and another country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the junior Senator from California had not suggested that the Senate take action at this time, but he believes that the Senate has a responsibility, which it cannot abdicate to any administrative agency of the Government, to gather the full facts, and one of the means of getting the full facts is through the regularly established committees of this body.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Michigan yield again?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Perhaps I am in error, but it has been my assumption that the primary responsibility for getting the facts about matters relating definitely to our foreign policy was vested by the Constitution and the laws of the country in the President and the Secretary of State. I know of no duty on the part of Congress to supersede the action of the President and the Secretary of State in getting information. Of course, if Congress desired to impute neglect to the President or the Secretary of State, and to charge, directly or indirectly, a violation of duty by the President or the Secretary of State, then, of course, the Congress would owe it to the people to undertake an inquiry, but I am wondering whether it is consistent with the bipartisan confidence we recently expressed in the new Secretary of State, who certainly has knowledge of these lend-lease matters, for us to assume to act, or start a Senate inquiry, unless we are willing by that action to impute a neglect of duty by the new Secretary of State.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we might all ponder the report of the able Senator from California in looking for a solution of the difficult problem before us. I think he should be thanked for bringing out many of the facts about the matter. However, I do not think we should leave the subject without making it plain that the contracts which have been the subject of the colloquy between the Senator from California and the Senator from Florida were made by representatives of our State Department in a purely legal manner, that is, they had the authority to make the contracts. Whether the contracts are good or bad, or should have been made, I am not at the moment attempting to argue, but the fact is that the officials did have the authority, under the law, to make the contracts which were made, and the contracts do contain the provision "subject to the action of Congress," or words to that effect. So that nothing has been done, from the time the contracts expired until now, which cannot be undone. I do not think we should leave the impression in the public mind that the contracts were executed without authority of law, and that they did not contain a clause that the Congress might alter them if it saw fit to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to add to what the able junior Senator from Michigan has said, that when I appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which will be headed by the junior Senator from Michigan, I felt that the subcommittee should not only examine or look into the disposal of surplus property but also into the use of all United States property wherever it might be found.

I realize that the Armed Services Committee has every right to examine into the operations abroad of the armed services; that the Foreign Relations Committee has every right to examine into the operations abroad of the State Department; and that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has the right to look into the operations abroad of the Department of Agriculture, if there be any such. Furthermore, there are independent agencies such as the Maritime Commission and others that are doing business abroad into whose operations the Armed Services Committee has every right to examine. But the authority given the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which is being delegated to a subcommittee in this respect, cuts across all agency lines, and would give its subcommittee the right, if the members found it necessary so to do, to go abroad, to look into the manner in which the War Department, the Navy Department, the State Department, or any other department was utilizing the property under its jurisdiction or was expending funds.

I think we have no right to determine the policies of the State Department, or of the War Department; that is entirely outside our jurisdiction; but we do have a right to cut across departmental

lines in examining the manner in which property is being used and in which money is being spent.

For that reason I felt that the able Senator from Michigan, who has had so much experience in the past, both at home and abroad, in investigating surplus property and other matters, as a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, was the ideal person to head this subcommittee. I feel sure that he, with his associates, will do a very effective job.

I simply want to make it clear that this subcommittee is not only expected to investigate the sale of surplus property but also the use of surplus property, determining whether some may be held that ought to be sold, to bring some increment to the United States Treasury.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, since this question has come up in connection with lend-lease, it seems that the able Senator from Florida, for instance, is greatly concerned lest the Senate in some way interfere with the State Department's relation with foreign governments in lend-lease matters; but, after all, be that as it may, I think the Senate of the United States, the body that receives reports from the Secretary of State in relation to lend-lease, should look into the question of what is being done with property belonging to the United States Government.

As I view the act, and as has been pointed out by the able Senator from California, title to that property, after lend-lease is terminated, or at the end of the war, is in the United States. The question whether it will ever become surplus property will depend upon the action of the Army and the Navy and various other agencies of the Government. If they act and declare it to be surplus, then it becomes surplus property, and whether it is to be disposed of by one agency or another concerns the Senate. I think that the Senate is interested in knowing whether our lend-lease accounts have been quickly settled, whether they have been settled by agencies which knew what the lend-lease problems were, or whether they are going to be settled within the memory of men who administered lend-lease both in foreign nations and here, rather than to be dragged out for months and even for years, without our knowing what kind of settlement will be made. So I think the Senate is interested and should understand the matter.

The Senate, through the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, many months ago had under consideration the question of lend-lease and what was meant by the pipe line. When the facts are known I think it will be found, as the able Senator from California has said, that since VJ-day more than a billion dollars' worth of supplies have been furnished on lend-lease that were not within what was generally understood to be the "pipe line," or as constituting property which had already been manufactured. It was in the blueprint stage. So I think that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments owes the duty, if it is to perform its function, of looking into the whole question of surplus property.

For instance, a few weeks ago the able Senator from California raised the question about the sale of certain property in France to a firm in Britain, which property had not been paid for in conformity with the rules and regulations governing lend-lease. I cannot recall the exact day that that point was raised, but I think the discussion on the Senate floor between the Senator from California and the Senator from Michigan brought some results; and I should like to read into the RECORD at this time a reply from the Department of State, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, Washington, D. C., dated January 27, 1947, which was written after the discussion between the Senator from California and the Senator from Michigan took place. The letter reads:

JANUARY 27, 1947.

Mr. GEORGE MEADER,
Chief Counsel, Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. MEADER: This letter is intended to supply the committee with the latest information received in connection with the sales made to the firm of Gaylord Edwards & Co., Ltd.

Mr. Nicol of your committee had made a verbal request for information as to the number of theater shipping orders on the subject contracts which had been retained by OFLC in Paris. These copies totaled four signed and eight unsigned.

On January 15, 1947, Gaylord Edwards & Co., Ltd., and the North Central Waggon & Finance Co. made a payment of $1,200,966.50, representing full settlement at contract price for all tractors and scrapers removed from the United States Army depot in Belgium. It will be noted that this amount differs from the total of the amounts contained in the enclosure to our letter to the committee of January 11, 1947. We have been advised that the difference of $26,763.50 is a result of a duplication of tally-out forms on six tractors.

I trust that these developments will prove to be of interest to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD H. CONNOLLY,
Major General, United States Army,
Foreign Liquidation Commissioner.

So it is not merely the State Department that is involved. A Foreign Liquidation Commissioner is handling surplus property, and since the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program has been limited in its jurisdiction, many questions cannot finally be determined or reported to the Senate by that committee. Some of them will come under the jurisdiction of other committees, and I agree with the able Senator from California that such committees should look into these problems and report on them to the Senate, so that we may have final action by committees of the Senate, and that none of the work heretofore done and money expended in examining into and developing the situation shall have been lost.

I may say—and I know the statement is made with the approval of the able chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—that the committee will not neglect its duty but will pick up these various matters where they may have been left because of cutting off the jurisdiction of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, and will proceed to look into the matters involved and, from time to time, report to the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET PROGRAM THREATENS AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have been advised that the Committee on the Legislative Budget which, under the Congressional Reorganization Act, as the Senate knows, is composed of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, will act next Friday, being the 14th of February, on the legislative budget. This committee, appointed under the terms of the reorganization law, assembled about the middle of January and appointed a subcommittee. No public hearings have been held by that subcommittee. I am given to understand that the subcommittee will meet tomorrow and will then determine what it proposes to do about the legislative budget.

Senators will recall that the Reorganization Act, in section 138 (a), requires the committee to make this report by February 15, and that paragraph (b) of section 138 of the act reads as follows:

> The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

That will be the fiscal year 1948.

> If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $——."

No one, Mr. President, can quarrel with the good sense of the establishment of a legislative budget in advance of action by the Congress upon appropriations and taxes in any fiscal year. It, however, is clear that since the Reorganization Act became effective only during the last Congress, that is to say in 1946, and since this Legislative Budget Committee was not appointed until less than a month ago, it is quite impossible for that committee to give due consideration to the tremendously important task which has been committed to it.

One reads in the daily press reports which indicate that despite the obvious impossibility of thorough study, the subcommittee in all probability will submit a report proposing to cut X billion dollars from the Executive budget, thereby making a limitation upon appropriations so that a tax reduction may be made by the Congress during the next year. We have head a great deal of talk about a 20-percent-across-the-board reduction of income taxes. It has not received, I understand, the complete approbation of all Members of the majority. Indeed, I was very happy to note in the newspapers last Saturday that the president of the Senate majority con-

ference, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], had announced, in effect, that he would not give his approval to any reduction of taxes prior to the 1st of July next. That is an indication of a comprehension of the fact that to reduce taxes now while the debt of the United States remains at the tremendous pinnacle it has reached, involves hazards almost beyond the imagination to our American way of life, as it is generally called.

Last night, Mr. President, I secured a copy of the annual report of the Treasury Department, the latest report. It is House Document No. 4 of the Eightieth Congress, first session. It contains two tables which are of the utmost importance, and I recommend them to the reading of the Members of this body and of the House, and particularly I recommend them to the members of the Committee on the Legislative Budget. They are tables 2 and 24.

Table 2 gives a full account of the receipts and expenditures and, more important, the interest on the public debt for every year from 1789 down through 1946.

Table 24 gives the principal of the public debt outstanding at the end of each fiscal year from 1853 to 1946.

I rise now, Mr. President, to call the attention of the Congress to these figures, because I know that there will be no opportunity for me as a member of the Appropriations Committee to call the attention of the Committee on the Legislative Budget to these facts until next Friday, the day before the legislative budget will be prepared.

MAGNITUDE OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

I venture to assert, Mr. President, that the members of the subcommittee who are reported in the press to be about to bring in a recommendation that the President's budget be cut by about five or six billion dollars so that there may be a reduction of income taxes have not given adequate attention to the public debt or to the interest upon the public debt. This debt was managed so superlatively during the war that few of us realized that the people of the United States today are carrying the heaviest debt that was ever incurred by any nation at any time in all the history of civilization. I say, Mr. President, that unless Congress gives attention to the magnitude of the debt and to the burden of the interest, which must be paid upon it every year, the whole basis of the capitalistic system may be in danger.

That, Mr. President, is not an extravagant statement when we consider the fact that what is going on in the world shows that only the United States of America still believes in the system of private property, that only this country believes that the capitalistic system can be made to work. We talk lightly of maintaining free competitive enterprise, but we absolutely ignore the fact that to maintain free enterprise we must pay the interest on the debt and make some effort to cut it down.

HOW MUCH IS FIVE BILLIONS?

The annual expenditure estimated in the budget to carry the national debt in the next fiscal year, Mr. President, is $5,000,000,000. Does anyone know what $5,000,000,000 is? I should like to measure it in terms of the cost of Congress, the cost of all the Federal courts, the cost of the executive offices of the President. The same budget which is going to be so airily reduced on the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget carries a recommendation of an appropriation for the legislative branch of $68,489,429—millions of dollars, not billions. For all the courts of the United States, all the Federal judiciary, add a total expenditure of $19,194,900; an appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management of $379,730,000; and for general expenditures for the Office of the President of the United States, $6,232,750. Add them all together—the cost of Congress, the cost of the courts, and the cost of the executive offices of the President—and the sum is less than $500,000,000. Again I speak only in millions. The interest upon the national debt will be 10 times that amount. It will be five billions; that is to say five thousand millions.

Mr. President, if the interest upon the national debt is to be measured in terms of what the civil departments and agencies of government spent in the days before the war, it quickly appears that it is more than twice as much as the entire civil cost of government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator would like another comparison. It costs every man, woman, and child in the United States $3 a month merely to pay the interest on the national debt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

THE INTEREST IS AN ANNUAL CHARGE

Mr. President, it seems to me that we are not giving sufficient consideration to the fact that that charge is an annual charge, and that it will be continued year after year unless we reduce the national debt. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to make a reduction of taxes without reducing the national debt, or are we going to say, "We will make a reduction of income taxes which will benefit chiefly those in the higher brackets, who have made great profits out of the war and who are now making greater profits than they ever made before in peacetime, and a token reduction of the debt?"

Senators cannot read the tables found in the report of the Treasury Department without realizing that this country stands upon the brink, as other countries have stood and some have gone over, of totalitarianism or socialism.

I have taken some figures from the report of the Treasury which I think are of such importance that I shall read them into the RECORD. Let me say first that at the end of the First World War, on June 30, 1919, the national debt of the United States was $25,482,034,419. During the closing years of the administration of Woodrow Wilson, that is to say, during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1920, and the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1921—it will be recalled that the administration did not change until the 4th of March, 1921—the World War I debt was reduced from the figure I have just given, $25,482,034,419, to $23,977,450,553. In other words, immediately after the peace treaty was signed the administration of Woodrow Wilson began to give its attention to the reduction of the debt. The same thing has been going on under the administration of President Truman. There has already been a total payment upon the World War II debt of approximately $20,000,000,000. The Treasury statement for February 6, 1947, now on the desk of every Senator, shows that the debt last Thursday was $259,166,241,554.69, as compared with $279,358,941,198.09 on February 6, 1946, a year ago.

The World War II debt almost reached $300,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1946, but by reason of the fact that the administration was applying every dollar of surplus funds it could to the reduction of that debt, the total figure on June 30, 1946, had been reduced to $269,422,099,173. That was a per capita debt of $1,910.97 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

COLD FIGURES ON THE DEBT

It is customary in these discussions of the debt and interest on the debt to speak as though the debt were the result of wasteful and extravagant spending by the Democratic administration. I do not deny that there was waste in the conduct of the war; I do not deny that there was extravagance; I do not deny that if time had been available it might have been possible to do the things that had to be done for less money than they cost; but the expenditures for the war were made with the full support of a unanimous Congress which was seeking to win the war as speedily as possible.

I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to what the cold figures show about the cost of the war in terms of debt, the cost of the depression in terms of debt, and to the debt which was left over when, in the beginning of 1933, there was a change of administration.

On June 30, 1933, about 3½ months after the termination of the administration of President Hoover, the national debt was $22,538,672,560. That was a reduction of $1,438,777,993 from the high point of the debt in 1921, when the Republican administration began. That was the total net reduction of the national debt during the last administration of the Republican Party, when it had complete control of the Congress and of the Executive, and when it followed the policy which is now proposed, of reducing taxes first and the debt afterward. There was a total net reduction of less than $1,500,000,000 between 1921 and 1933, a period of 12 years.

We talk about the private property system; we talk about capitalism; and we talk about a sound administration. There can be no sound fiscal administration unless we are willing to raise the money that is necessary to pay the interest upon the debt and retire some of the principal. If we are not willing, year after year after year, to take out of the earnings of the people $5,000,000,000 annually to pay the interest on the debt

before we reduce taxes, then, Mr. President, beware of what is going to happen, because this Nation cannot again go through such an experience as the one it went through in the last 12 years of Republican administration, when the war debt of World War I was reduced by less than $1,500,000,000.

Let us now consider the cost of the depression in terms of national debt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Wyoming permit the junior Senator from Oregon to point out that during those same 12 years of Republican administration, the American taxpayer also suffered a great money loss by reason of a depreciated dollar resulting from the great inflation that occurred because of the fiscal policies of the Republican Party.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Oregon has mentioned that fact, because it reminds me of another very great loss that was suffered during that same period. The holders of Government bonds suffered a great loss. The war bonds which were sold to individuals at 100 cents on the dollar, were in many instances sold by their owners at 85 cents on the dollar; and the difference between the 85 cents on the dollar which the small bondholder obtained and the par value was received by those with large incomes, whose taxes were reduced by a favorable administration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Wyoming is making an outstanding contribution to the discussion of the fiscal affairs of the Government. Let me call his attention to the fact that in 1925, in Italy, shortly after Mussolini came into power, the Royal Italian Government, which was organized 66 years before, had for two-thirds of its existence operated the Italian Government with an unbalanced budget—in short, on borrowed money. The day of payment of the Italian debt was postponed by every succeeding administration which was elected by the people, until finally it became more and more difficult to borrow money because of the practice which was being followed. Finally, when the Government had to impose heavy taxes out of all proportion to the wealth of that nation, the Italian people awakened to the fact that they were the most heavily taxed people on the face of the earth; and it was the chaos, the barricades in the streets, and the economic confusion which resulted from that long-term unbalanced-budget policy, more than any other cause, which brought Mr. Mussolini to be the dictator over all the people of Italy. When we consider recent history in relation to that financial picture, we see what a terrific price the Italian people have paid, because of a condition which had its primary roots in the policy of operating the Government on borrowed money and not keeping its budget in balance in peacetime.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator for having made that comparison. It is absolutely sound, and it points clearly to what will happen here unless we avoid the errors which were committed in Germany, in Italy, and in other countries; indeed, unless we avoid the error committed in the last Republican administration.

We cannot hope to maintain the capitalistic system, the system of private property and private competitive enterprise, unless we follow a policy deliberately calculated to maintain the Government bonds we have sold to the people.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able Senator from Wyoming. I wonder whether he is really worried that the tax program as sponsored by Representative KNUTSON could pass the Senate. My own observation is that only a few Republican members here would subscribe to a straight 20-percent-tax reduction program.

ATTITUDE OF SENATORS ENCOURAGING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have observed with a great deal of encouragement the fact that a number of Senators like the distinguished Senator who has interrupted me and his colleague from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], have already indicated that they will have no part of the program of "cutting a melon" for the "big boys" at the top and letting the little fellows at the bottom bear the expense, while endangering the fiscal structure of our Government. I know that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] will not give his support to such a program. I am speaking now only because I know that many other Senators on the other side of the aisle and many Members of the House of Representatives view this matter just as the Senator from North Dakota and I view it. I desire to call the attention of the Members of this body and the attention of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the cold facts—facts which are being neglected and overlooked solely because the debt was managed in a superlatively excellent manner during and since the war.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it is necessary first to exercise every economy in forthcoming appropriations, so as to make possible a substantial payment on the national debt. If then we can reduce the income tax, that will be the time to do it, but not at this time. When income-tax reductions are possible, first consideration should be given to the low-income groups. I commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his able and timely tax discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator's statement as to what should be done. Of course we should exercise every possible economy. Of course we should make recovery of every possible dollar that may be recovered in the sale of surplus property, for example, and in other fiscal matters. We should avoid waste and we should avoid extravagance. The danger we confront, I say to the Senator from North Dakota, is that the reductions of the budget will be made to fall upon those expenditures which although productive of income and of business, nevertheless are objected to by those who would be the beneficiaries of the tax-reduction program now being proposed.

There is, for example, the program of rural electrification to which the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] referred the other day. There is the program of public power in the Northwest to which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] referred. There is the program of reclamation in the West to which I have referred over and over again.

Mr. President, a reading of the list of the reclamation projects of the West will disclose that without exception they have created income because they have created business. They have been sound expenditures by the Federal Government and they have been productive of income to the Federal Government, as well as of repayment of the charges which have been levied against the farmers who settled upon the irrigation projects.

Mr. President, I was speaking of the costs of the depression in terms of debt.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry I have not heard all the Senator's remarks. It seemed to me when I entered the Chamber that the Senator was giving the comparative figures regarding the debt when the Republicans came into power in 1921 and the debt when President Roosevelt took over. However, I believe that in that connection the Senator did not present the corresponding data, as I recall them, for the period between 1921 and 1929. As I recall, there was a period of 9 or 10 years when the debt was diminished to the tune of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, so that at the beginning of the depression the national indebtedness had been reduced about $10,000,000,000. Am I correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is not quite correct. I was about to present those figures for the RECORD. I have them before me. They are as follows: On the 30th of June 1921, just after the change of administration, which occurred on the 4th of March 1921, the national debt was $23,977,450,553. As I pointed out a little while ago, it had been reduced by $1,504,000,000 by the previous Democratic administration. The low point on the national debt during the Republican regime was reached on the 30th of June 1930, when it was $16,185,309,831. If we subtract the debt on the 30th of June 1930, the lowest point of the debt under the Republican administration, from the debt which the Republican administration inherited from the Democrats in 1921, we find that the maximum reduc-

tion was $7,792,140,722. So I am happy that the Senator from Wisconsin has called attention to that fact, because it points to precisely what I wish to drive home, namely, that it was the policy of serving the big fellow instead of the small fellow that brought about the depression and caused the deficit expenditures of the closing years of the last Republican administration. The fiscal policies of that administration which some of the present Republican leaders want this Congress to imitate did not pay off the debt or bring prosperity.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is it not also a fact that during that period the taxes imposed upon the people were reduced, by means of a reduction in the tax rates?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and I am warning against doing it again, until the national debt is paid off or reasonably reduced.

Mr. WILEY. I understand the warning of the Senator from Wyoming; but a moment ago he made a statement to the effect that the depression was caused by the reduction of taxes and the reduction of the national debt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, well, it was one of the causes.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad the Senator qualifies it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say that what helped to cause that depression was the fact that we followed policies which were adopted without regard to the vital necessity, in a country governed by the people, of taking care of the people first, before taking care of those who are in the upper tax brackets and who are the controllers of our economic destiny.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. Is it not also a fact that before the depression, although taxes were reduced, in many of those years revenues increased?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not examined the figures for the tax receipts during those years. However, I have no doubt that the revenues did increase. On the other hand, tax revenues decreased sharply after the crash in 1929. They did so without any reduction of tax rates at all. They decreased because the policies which were being followed were destroying the ability of the people to earn money; they were destroying the ability of the farmers to earn a living. They were the policies which brought about the agricultural crash; they were the policies which brought about the crash in industry, as well.

THE DEPRESSION DEBT

Mr. President, I have been endeavoring to show the figures with respect to the cost of the depression in terms of debt, as compared with the cost of the war. In terms of debt, the cost of the depression may be obtained by comparing the debt on the 30th of June 1941, before we actually entered the war, although after we were incurring war expenditures, with the amount of the debt at the end of the fiscal year 1933, which was the amount inherited at the beginning of the Democratic administration under President Roosevelt. On the 30th of June 1941 the debt was $48,961,443,536. On the 30th of June 1933 the debt was $22,538,672,560. By subtracting the debt as of 1933 from the debt as of 1941, we find that the cost of the depression, in terms of national debt, was the difference, or $26,422,770,976.

Mr. President, on the 30th of June last, after billions of dollars had been paid on the debt by the administration of President Truman, the national debt amounted to $269,422,099,173. If we subtract the debt as of June 30, 1941, namely, $48,961,000,000, from the $269,422,000,000, we find that the cost of the war in terms of debt amounts approximately to $221,000,000,000. That is the cost of the war in terms of debt. That is the debt which carries the interest payment of $5,000,000,000 every year. World War II in terms of debt cost 10 times World War I. Surely we cannot take any more chances.

During this week, while the subcommittee is making up its mind about how to wield the ax in the dark and how many billions of dollars it will cut from the President's budget, in order that it may make up its mind how many billions of dollars it will cut off the tax revenues, no doubt in many speeches which will be made at Lincoln Day banquets the budget which President Truman recently sent to Congress will be compared with some budget of 1938 or 1939, before the war. O Mr. President, our friends who make such a comparison are forgetting the fact that in 1939 there was no $5,000,000,000 in interest payment on the debt, there was no $7,000,000,000 payment for veterans, there was no $2,750,000,000 payment for tax refunds under a tax bill which was lobbied through the Senate and the House of Representatives a year ago by big business, just as big business now is short-sightedly trying to lobby through the Senate and the House of Representatives a tax-reduction program.

A few days ago I made a check upon the famous pay-as-you-go tax bill, which requires the taxpayers to file an estimated return for each year on the 15th of March, and to file a final return later in the year or at the beginning of the next year, a system under which the taxpayer is entitled to a refund, if he has overpaid. I found a condition which struck me as being very amazing. For the last year for which the accounts have been compiled—as I recall it was 1944—some 42,000,000 taxpaying returns were filed with the Treasury Department. I wonder if Senators know how many refunds are being granted. The number is in excess of 30,000,000. Under this efficient tax system, this pay-as-you-go system, we have established an income-tax department which has to take the money from estimated returns and for refunds when the final return is filed.

There is talk about extra employees. There is talk about employees who should be dropped from the pay roll. Mr. President, how many thousand clerks are on the pay roll of the Internal Revenue Bureau to make the refunds brought about under a bill which was lobbied through the Congress by the big-business interests of the country? They said, "We want a sound tax system, a pay-as-you-go system." That was a wonderful slogan. And now they say, "Why balance the budget." They say, "Let us reduce taxes, let us cut expenditures."

Mr. President, when we begin to cut expenditures we are not going to begin with expenditures for the veterans, which are in excess of $7,000,000,000. We are not going to take it out of the interest on the public debt, which is $5,000,000,000. That makes $12,000,000,000. We are not going to take it out of the refunds which have been authorized by law, which amount to another $3,000,000,000, or nearly that. That makes $15,000,000,000. Surely we are not going to take it out of national defense, which requires another $11,000,000,000. Those are new and inescapable charges. Who said there were any such charges as that in the Budget of 1939, or 1938, or 1937, or of any previous year?

ECONOMIC PEACE ESSENTIAL TO MILITARY PEACE

O Mr. President, I see that the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate is now presiding over this body. I am happy he is, because I am glad to make comment upon the fact that he has shown a patriotic disposition to work for the peace of the world, and that he recognizes, and has so stated on many platforms, that military peace and economic peace are parts of the same objective, and that we cannot hope to win permanent peace for the nations of the world, we cannot hope to win permanent peace for ourselves, unless we win economic peace.

Mr. President, until we attain a realization of the fact that it is better to spend a little money to preserve economic peace than to spend a lot of money to wage a war, we will be headed down the road which is being marked out by some of the distinguished leaders in the House of Representatives who are talking about budget reduction to the extent of $5,000,000,000 and tax reduction to the tune of three or four billion dollars.

Mr. President, let us follow a policy which will declare that while the people are earning money, while they are capable of paying the tax, we shall levy the tax, and if there is anything left over after we have eliminated waste and extravagance, and after we have paid the appropriations which are necessary to maintain the economy of the country, we shall apply it on the debt, and not on tax reduction.

We are dealing with the preservation of the system of private property, and we cannot preserve that system by repeating now the errors which were made after World War I, when the pattern was laid down by a Republican administration, for the Republican policy which some of the leaders, thank God not all of them, are now trying to force upon the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared on the

national debt, as well as parts of the tables dealing with the period since 1919 to date, appearing in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table and portions of tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National debt for two world wars and depression

Item	Date	Amount	Remarks
1	June 30, 1919	$25,482,034,419	Peak of World War I.
2	June 30, 1921	23,977,450,553	Debt inherited by Republican administration beginning Mar. 4, 1921.
	Item 1 minus item 2	1,504,583,866	Paid off by Democratic administration.
3	June 30, 1930	16,185,309,831	Lowest point of debt during Republican administration.
	Item 2 minus item 3	7,792,040,722	Maximum reduction of debt under Republican administration.
4	June 30, 1933	22,538,672,560	Debt inherited by Democratic administration beginning Mar. 4, 1933. Includes unpaid World War I debt and 1929 depression debt.
	Item 2 minus item 4	1,438,777,993	Net debt reduction under Republican administration.
5	June 30, 1941	48,961,443,536	Debt before Pearl Harbor, including unpaid World War I and depression.
6	Item 5 minus item 4	26,422,770,976	Debt under Democratic administration due to depression.
7	June 30, 1946	269,422,099,173	Debt of World War I and II plus depression.
8	Item 7 minus item 5	220,460,655,637	Debt due to World War II.
9	Feb. 6, 1946	279,358,941,198	Total debt as shown in Treasury statement.
10	Feb. 6, 1947	259,166,241,554	Total debt as shown in current statement.
11	Item 9 minus item 10	20,192,699,644	Total debt reduction since VJ-day.

Interest on the public debt

1919	$619,215,569	1933	$689,365,106
1920	1,020,251,622	1934	756,617,127
1921	999,144,731	1935	820,926,353
1922	991,000,759	1936	749,396,802
1923	1,055,923,690	1937	866,384,331
1924	940,602,913	1938	926,280,714
1925	881,806,662	1939	940,539,764
1926	831,937,700	1940	1,040,935,697
1927	787,019,578	1941	1,110,692,812
1928	731,764,476	1942	1,260,085,336
1929	678,330,400	1943	1,808,160,396
1930	658,347,613	1944	2,608,979,806
1931	611,559,704	1945	3,616,686,048
1932	599,276,631	1946	4,721,957,683

Principal of the public debt outstanding at the end of each fiscal year from 1917 through 1946

June 30—	Interest-bearing	Matured	Noninterest-bearing	Total gross debt	Gross debt per capita
1917	$2,712,549,477	$14,232,230	$248,836,878	$2,975,618,585	$28.77
1918	11,985,882,436	20,242,550	237,503,733	12,243,628,719	117.11
1919	25,234,496,274	11,109,370	236,428,775	25,482,034,419	242.54
1920	24,062,500,285	6,745,237	230,075,945	24,299,321,467	228.23
1921	23,738,900,085	10,688,160	227,862,308	23,977,450,553	220.91
1922	22,710,338,105	25,250,880	227,792,723	22,963,381,708	208.65
1923	22,007,043,612	98,738,910	243,924,844	22,349,707,365	199.64
1924	20,981,242,042	30,278,200	239,292,747	21,250,812,989	186.23
1925	20,210,906,915	30,258,980	275,027,993	20,516,193,888	177.12
1926	19,383,770,860	13,359,900	246,085,555	19,643,216,315	167.32
1927	18,252,664,666	14,718,585	244,523,681	18,511,906,932	155.51
1928	17,317,694,182	45,335,060	241,263,959	17,604,293,201	146.09
1929	16,638,941,379	50,749,199	241,397,905	16,931,088,484	139.04
1930	15,921,892,350	31,716,870	231,700,611	16,185,309,831	131.51
1931	16,519,588,640	51,819,095	229,873,756	16,801,281,492	135.45
1932	19,161,273,540	60,079,385	265,649,519	19,487,002,444	156.10
1933	22,157,643,120	65,911,170	315,118,270	22,538,672,560	179.48
1934	26,480,487,870	54,266,830	518,386,714	27,053,141,414	214.07
1935	27,645,241,089	230,662,155	824,989,381	28,700,892,625	225.55
1936	32,988,790,135	169,363,395	620,389,964	33,778,543,494	263.79
1937	35,800,109,418	118,529,815	505,974,499	36,424,613,732	282.75
1938	36,575,925,880	141,362,460	447,451,975	37,164,740,315	286.27
1939	39,885,969,732	142,283,140	411,279,539	40,439,532,411	308.98
1940	42,376,495,928	204,591,190	386,443,919	42,967,531,038	325.62
1941	48,387,399,539	204,999,860	369,044,137	48,961,443,536	367.97
1942	71,968,418,098	98,299,730	355,727,288	72,422,445,116	541.39
1943	135,380,305,795	140,500,090	1,175,284,445	136,696,090,330	1,020.38
1944	199,543,355,301	200,851,160	1,259,180,760	201,003,387,221	1,455.67
1945	256,356,615,818	268,667,135	2,056,904,457	258,682,187,410	1,852.74
1946	268,110,872,218	376,406,860	934,820,095	269,422,099,173	1,910.97

ANSWER BY SENATOR STEWART TO ATTACK BY MARQUIS CHILDS ON SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I take notice at this time of the column by Mr. Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post on February 8, and in other newspapers throughout the Nation, I presume, on or about the same date. This column is well known. It is entitled "Washington Calling." Under that headline the particular column to which I am now adverting is entitled "Dishonorable Performance," and speaks in very ugly terms of my distinguished and honorable colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. President, this is one of the most abusive and one of the ugliest expressions of hate and malice I have ever seen. It is a complete picture of a perfect conniption.

Mr. Childs begins his article by stating:

> In the long history of the United States Senate there have been scoundrels and fools as well as great men. There have been vainglorious egotists and chattering pygmies as well as statesmen and heroes.
>
> But it is just possible that, in the long history of the Senate, there has never been any performance so dishonorable as that of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, in the case of David Lilienthal. That is the unenviable record he will carry to his grave. It is another black mark in the book of American political history.

So the article continues.

Mr. President, I take notice of this because my colleague, Senator McKELLAR, is not a dishonorable man, and the methods to which he is resorting in exposing to the people of America the public career of a man who is almost tainted with communism do not constitute a dishonorable performance.

Senator McKELLAR has a long and honorable career of service in the Senate, and indeed in the other House of the National Legislature. This is the first time in my acquaintance with Senator McKELLAR that any man has ever called him dishonorable or dishonest; and for me to say what I believe—indeed what I feel sure I know—in reply to Mr. Childs, and call him what I think he is, would be for me simply to descend to the low level which he occupies and from which he is writing at this moment.

I am sorry that this man, whose column is known throughout the country, thus lost his reason and so completely lost control of himself as to cause his hitherto, to some degree at least, well-reasoned articles to decline in the estimation of those who read them.

Certainly this article in Saturday's Post is not an appeal to reason. It merely registers hate and malice, and draws a complete picture of a man who has lost control of himself.

Senator McKELLAR has served the people of Tennessee and of the Nation for more than 30 years in the National Houses of Congress; and even before that time, before he came here, he had already established in his own State of Tennessee a name of integrity and honor. No man can place his finger upon any crooked card that Senator McKELLAR ever turned, and no man of honor and integrity himself will undertake to do so. No public servant has a cleaner and more honorable record.

I am sorry this happened. I am sorry that Mr. Childs abuses the privilege of freedom of speech that is accorded him by the laws of this land, and stoops to a campaign of abuse which only exhibits uncontrolled hatred and malice and is 100 percent untrue.

In the hearings which are proceeding before the Committee on Atomic Energy, a great many witnesses have been examined, and a great deal of evidence of different kinds has been produced; and the fact that 2 years ago there developed within the Tennessee Valley Authority a movement by a group of men who were employed by that Authority, which had for its purpose the development of a communistic group or organization, was proved at these hearings. It was shown that quite a number of men in the employ of the Authority joined this movement and became, as I understand, for a time at least, acknowledged Communists.

This was brought out by my colleague at these hearings, and it was shown that this occurred when Mr. David Lilienthal was Chairman, or at least when he was a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and for a few years, indeed, he was Chairman of that Authority.

I think this fact, having been developed, regardless of what might be the present situation there—and God knows I hope there are no Communists in the Authority now, or employed by the Authority in any capacity—this fact having been brought out, and the further fact that Senator McKELLAR, my colleague, had a great deal to do with it, is a thing for which he should be commended instead of abused. I think Senator McKELLAR has made a contribution to the people of this country. I think he has made a contribution to our Government, by exposing the communistic practices that existed in the Authority at the time when Mr. Lilienthal was a member of it.

Someone said Mr. Lilienthal denied he had anything to do with the employment of these men. It is one thing to deny and another to be actually chargeable with responsibility. Mr. Lilienthal denies that he is a Communist, but it appears to me that he has been flirting with communism or mighty near the fringe of communism; and for Senator McKELLAR to be called a dishonest man because he has brought to the attention of the Nation these conditions is, to say the least of it, very unfortunate.

Mr. President, this article goes on to say:

> Tennessee's delegation in Congress today is well above the average if one excludes McKELLAR. It is largely composed of men of capacity and integrity. But the stain of McKELLAR and, behind him, "Boss" Crump, of Memphis, spreads a long way.

He proceeds then to abuse Mr. Crump, another man whose character he is not capable of criticizing. Mr. Crump and Senator McKELLAR have lived together in the great city of Memphis, located upon the banks of the Father of Waters, in my State of Tennessee, for more than a half century. Together, they have helped to build this great city—indeed, Mr. Crump's contribution to Memphis cannot be described—and with it they have grown until now they have both reached that place in life which we often refer to as the "western slopes." They have reached that point in life where there lies not in front of them the active years which were there a half century ago, when as young men they met and lived in Memphis. But they can look back over those years and be proud of the honest record they have established, each one of them.

They have been assailed before, though no man has ever questioned the honor and the integrity of either one of them as this man Childs has. But they have been assailed by men who fired larger guns than Mr. Childs. So I feel they will survive this assault as they have the others.

I want to commend my colleague for turning the light of publicity upon the activities of these men in the Tennessee Valley Authority who have flirted with communism. When columnists attack men in public life and say mean and nasty and ugly things about them, there is little we can do except to resent it. So long as we allow freedom of speech and so long as we have men who will abuse that freedom, public men—who, God knows, live hard enough lives anyway in the effort to serve their people honestly—will have to continue to endure these attacks; but I suppose that even dogs may bark at kings.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is with reluctance and with a genuine feeling of sorrow that I feel compelled, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most deplorable situation in the Post Office Department of the Government.

So that Senators may know how many postmasters there are, I wish to say that the estimated number for the next year is 2,234 of the first class, 5,712 of the second class, and 14,194 of the third class; all of whom, under the present law, are appointed for life. In addition to that, there are 19,638 of the fourth class.

For the information of Senators I desire to describe how postmasters in the first-, second-, and third-class post offices are appointed.

Appointments to positions of Presidential postmaster of the first, second, and third classes are governed by the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and specifically by the act of June 25, 1938, which brought Presidential postmaster positions under the competitive system.

The act of June 25, 1938, as amended in 1940 and again in 1941, provides for appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters in the civil service, without term, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The law provided that appointments should be made in one of the following ways:

First. By nominating the incumbent postmaster at the time the law was passed, provided that the Civil Service Commission certified that he met the requirements for eligibility;

Second. By promotion from within the postal service after the Civil Service Commission has certified that the person proposed for promotion meets minimum qualifications;

Third. From among the highest three eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission after a competitive examination held by that Commission; or

Fourth. By appointment of a Civil Service Retirement Act annuitant as provided for in the act of January 24, 1942.

In the case of first-class postmasters, the civil-service examination consists primarily of a personal investigation designed to evaluate the business experience, qualifications, and suitability of all applicants.

In the case of second-class postmasters, the examination consists of a written test and a personal investigation.

In the case of third-class postmasters, the examination consists of a written test and an appropriate investigation by correspondence.

After the Civil Service Commission conducts an examination, it sends a list of three eligibles to the Postmaster General.

Under the practice which has been followed since the passage of the act of 1938, the Postmaster General then sends the list certified by the Civil Service Commission to the Democratic Representative for the district in which the particular post office is located. The Democratic Representative then indicates to the Postmaster General which one of the persons on the list he prefers. The name of this person is then sent to the President for nomination by him, to be sent by him to the Senate.

If the congressional district in which the post office is located is not represented by a Democratic Representative, the list supplied by the Civil Service Commission is sent to a Democratic Member of the Senate from the State in which the post office is located. If the State in question is not represented by a Democratic Senator, then the list is submitted to the Democratic State chairman or national committeeman for that State.

The procedure which is followed in referring lists of eligibles furnished by the Civil Service Commission to Representatives of the Democratic Party is, of course, one of the principal reasons why very few, if any, Republicans have been appointed to postmaster positions since the passage of the 1938 act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator from North Dakota any evidence that after examinations have been held and the names of three eligibles placed on the list, such examinations have been declared void and new examinations held so as to make it possible to have placed on the eligible list individuals who will suit a Representative or a Senator, as the case may be?

Mr. LANGER. I may say that a Senator from a State which has no Democratic Representatives or Senators stated that as many as four examinations have been called for, after which no Republican appeared on the list.

Definite allegations have been made that this practice not only results in a Democratic monopoly on these jobs but also results in a violation, at least in the spirit, of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

Under this act, if a veteran is at the head of a list certified by the Civil Service Commission, the Postmaster General cannot pass over the veteran in order to reach a nonveteran without first presenting his reasons to the Civil Service Commission. If the Commission overrules the reasons, the Postmaster General, under the law, can still select a nonveteran. It is the intention of the Civil Service Commission, however, to find out how often the Postmasters General holding office since 1932 have done this, and in so doing have violated the clear intention of the Congress of the United States to grant preference to veterans.

A fact of the matter is that the Veterans' Preference Act specifically states

that it is preference which should be the determining fact in the appointing of postmasters, who are all appointed for life.

As far as the veteran is concerned, the Civil Service Committee intends to do everything within its power to see that there is complete adherence to both the spirit and the letter of the Veterans' Preference Act when it comes to the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters.

Under any sound concept of preference for veterans, a man who has fought for his country is entitled to that preference, irrespective of his party affiliation.

The members of the Senate Civil Service Committee intend to do everything they possibly can to see to it that the civil service operates in such a manner as to insure that veterans will be given the preference of first-, second-, and third-class postmasterships which the Nation wants them to have. I believe this applies to Democratic and Republican members alike.

In view of a resolution which I shall offer, and which I believe will be adopted, the Senate Civil Service Committee will hold up the appointments now pending before it and others which may be sent to the Senate by the President until after this investigation is completed. I particularly wish to call that fact to the attention of the majority leader of the Senate.

Certainly if the charges made are true the people of this country would not want to see a man appointed to a postmastership for life through any conspiracy.

So far as the roughly 500 nominations now pending before the Civil Service Committee are concerned, no action will be taken on any one of them until they have been subjected to the closest possible scrutiny in order to determine whether any of the practices referred to in the resolution I shall offer have been indulged in in connection with them.

That the system outlined above, particularly prior to the passage of the Hatch Act, has been a very lucrative source of revenue for the Democratic political machine can easily be demonstrated.

In North Dakota, there is a little town called Marion, of some 500 population. Some time ago a man by the name of Cleo Flugga was appointed postmaster at Marion, La Moure County, N. Dak., which happens to be the county from which my distinguished colleague comes. Mr. Flugga has long been a capable, efficient, postmaster. Then came the so-called coalition outfit to collect funds. Mr. Flugga is a poor man, and he needed his job. So on the 4th day of June 1936, at the very time when this coalition outfit was shouting over the radio for clean, honest government, he issued his check for the sum of $10 to the treasurer of the State Democratic Party in order, as he believed, to hold his job as postmaster. I have that check in my possession.

On July 1, 1936, he gave the State Democratic Party another check for $10. The man to whom he gave it was one of the campaign managers for the Democratic candidate for governor of North Dakota. I have that check in my possession.

On July 17, 1936, he gave another check for $10, this time to the county chairman of the Democratic Party. I have that check in my possession.

On July 31, 1936, he gave another check for $5, payable to the State Democratic organization.

On August 31, 1936, he gave another check for $5, which I hold in my possession, to the Democratic candidate for governor's assistant manager.

On October 1, 1936, he gave another check, which I hold in my possession, to the Democratic candidate's crowd.

In 1937 he continued to give cash and checks to the Democratic Party of La Moure County.

In 1938 the Democratic candidate for Governor was elected Governor of the State. For some time prior to that, he and the other part of that two-headed machine, the former Republican Representative, were shouting over the radio and upon the platforms for clean government, efficient government, honest government, condemning alleged kick-ins and kick-backs, and shouting to the high heavens how honest they were and what a fine thing the Hatch Act was. On January 1, the county chairman of the Democratic Party of La Moure County took a check for $10 from the postmaster at Marion. I hold that check in my possession.

On January 15, 1938, this postmaster in the little town of Marion, who was receiving an insignificant salary, was asked to contribute $10 to the Jackson Day committee. He and his family being hard up, he said he could not then pay $10, as requested, but that he would give a check for $5 and also a check postdated February 15, 1938, for a like amount. I hold both checks in my possession. But, poor as he was, the coalition gang wanted more money; and so, on March 1, 1938, he issued another check payable to the Democratic State committee. I hold that check in my possession.

In April 1938, it seems the Democratic National Committee needed some money; so on April 15, 1938, he issued a check to the Democratic National Committee, and on the back of the check, which was endorsed by the National Democratic Committee, there appear the following words:

Paid to the Bank of Manhattan Trust Co. for credit to the account of the Democratic National Committee.

On May 2, 1938, this poor man issued another check to the Democratic political manager. On June 2, 1938, he issued another check to the same man.

On July 1, 1938, he issued another check made payable to the State Democratic committee.

On August 1, 1938, he issued another check to the county Democratic committee, and on September 1, 1938, he gave them another check.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that these checks were always dated the 1st of the month. Whenever the 1st of the month arrived, the collector was on hand to collect the money.

On November 3, 1938, this man, confused as to whether he should pay the governor's Democratic Party, the county Democratic Party, or the national Democratic Party, issued his check as follows:

Pay to the order of La Moure County Democratic.

In addition to all these checks, which Senators will note were consistently given on the 1st and the 15th of each month, Mr. Flugga made other payments in cash. When he stopped paying cash, and when he stopped giving checks, there was taken from him his noncompetitive examination privilege, that being given as a reason for not holding him in office as postmaster at Marion, N. Dak. In North Dakota the politicians apparently shook down this postmaster at Marion for 5 percent of his salary. When they tried to remove him I immediately made a speech on the floor of the Senate. I kept him in his job in 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. He is still postmaster at Marion, and I intend to keep him there until the Postmaster General can show definitely that he is not qualified to hold that position.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is showing the so-called abuses which occasionally occur in connection with postmasterships. Let me say that I had the same experience during the Republican administration of Herbert Hoover. That case involved the postmistress at Oxford, Md. Year after year I made speeches on the floor of the Senate, and the lady held her position until she died.

Mr. LANGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator that that may be true. I was not in the Senate at that time. But I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that we passed a Civil Service Act under the administration of the late President Roosevelt. The idea was to take those jobs out of politics, and to obtain the best Republicans or the best Democrats in the various towns to be postmasters. I say that the spirit, if not the letter, of the law has been violated.

The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is now presiding over this body. During the past 14 years, although the Civil Service Act has been in full effect, not a single Republican has been appointed to the office of first-, second-, or third-class postmaster in the State of Michigan.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator any knowledge as to whether this particular postmaster has contributed to any of the Republican campaign funds in La Moure County?

Mr. LANGER. I asked him, and he said he had not.

Mr. TYDINGS. How long has the Senator been keeping him in office?

Mr. LANGER. Since 1941, when I first arrived in the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. And he has not made any contributions to the Senator's knowl-

edge, or has not told the Senator that he has made any contributions, to Republican campaign funds?

Mr. LANGER. He has not contributed one penny, to my knowledge.

The total postmaster pay roll in our State is $710,527.48. Therefore, if all the postmasters, not including the rural-mail carriers, paid the coalition gang at the same rate, it collected more than $35,000 a year. If the same rate of collection took place all over the Nation, the graft amounted to 5 percent of $88,220,000.

In view of the record, is it not proper that before this representative body of the people confirms another postmaster nomination and especially before it throws out of office any persons now holding positions as postmasters, an investigation be held by the Committee on Civil Service to ascertain how general is the practice of soliciting money from postmasters on the part of the Democratic National Committee and the State and county committees?

Other postmasters and rural-mail carriers in North Dakota have told persons in confidence that they have contributed to Democratic organizations. The conduct of the Democratic National Committee and State and county committees to which I have referred is all the more reprehensible in the State of North Dakota where, as I say, Democratic politicians and pseudo Republicans joined together and today are masquerading as honest and decent men. The record shows, however, that at the very time the former Governor of the State said in his inaugural address that he condemned contributions and would investigate assessments, he knew that he was holding office because his organization was the recipient of money from postmasters such as Cleo Flugga, of Marion.

From information which has come to me the passage of the Hatch Act has done very little to remedy this situation. Under the Hatch Act Federal employees are not prohibited from contributing to a political organization. They are prohibited from making such contributions in a Federal building. So, under the Hatch Act we have the Jackson Day dinners, and thousands of letters are addressed to the homes of Democratic postmasters asking them to contribute to the Democratic Party through their Jackson Day dinners. In other words, it is a plain, deliberate circumvention of the intent and purpose of the Hatch Act. This explains another reason for the few Republican postmasters appointed in the past 16 years, because each postmaster appointment opened up a fertile field for additional contributions to the political machine.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the 2,234 postmasters now holding first-class postmasterships will receive total salaries for next year of $10,334,000. The 5,712 who hold second-class postmaster appointments will receive total salaries of $20,768,600. The 14,194 postmasters who hold third-class postmaster appointments will receive salaries totaling $33,845,100. The 19,638 holding fourth-class postmaster appointments will receive a total of $19,492,380.

The majority members of the Senate Civil Service Committee are determined to wipe out this sort of thing—we hope forever—in the United States. I therefore submit the following resolution:

Whereas concrete evidence has been presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee that during the years 1933 to 1947, inclusive, very few if any Republicans have been appointed to the positions of first-, second-, or third-class postmasterships;

Whereas evidence is also presented which warrants a full and complete investigation as to whether the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 has been violated with the result that very few veterans have been appointed to the office of first-, second-, or third-class postmaster and whereas indisputable evidence has been presented that postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay systematic tribute to a group of politicians and whereas approximately 500 appointments to post offices have been made within the last 6 weeks are now pending and whereas within the next few months several hundred more vacancies will likely occur either by resignation, retirement, or death: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Civil Service Committee, which has the jurisdiction over all civil-service matters in connection with the post office, or any duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last 14 years, how many Republicans have been removed and whether any postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians. Also whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying the position of postmaster to violate the Hatch Act and to investigate any and all collateral matters which the testimony may develop.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, which shall not exceed $———— in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) submitted by Mr. LANGER was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lawrence Clayton to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask if this Mr. Clayton is related to William L. Clayton, of the Department of State?

Mr. WHITE. So far as I know, he is not. I have no real knowledge as to that. I have heard from the two Massachusetts Senators that the nomination is acceptable to them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that Mr. Clayton has lately been engaged in business in the State of Massachusetts. I happen to know him personally. For several years during the war he was associated with one of the finance agencies of the Government. I do not think there is any relationship between the two persons mentioned.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert E. Arnold to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would like to have it go over temporarily.

Mr. WHITE. Two or three Senators have asked that it go over, and I think the Senator from Texas was one of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of S. Scott Beck, Jr., to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That concludes the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate with respect to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF NOMINATIONS PREVIOUSLY CONFIRMED

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that earlier in the day several hundred nominations reported by the Committee on Armed Services were confirmed by the Senate, but that no action was taken toward notifying the President of the action of the Senate. I therefore ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations reported from the Committee on Armed Services earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1947:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

The following-named employees of the Patent Office each to be an examiner in chief on the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office:

Pasquale J. Federico, of Ohio.
Eugene W. Geniesse, of Michigan.
Samuel Wolffe, of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1947:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Lawrence Clayton, to be member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term expiring February 1, 1952.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

S. Scott Beck, Jr., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Milton Fischer and 1,863 other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were received by the Senate on January 27, 1947, and which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services on that day, were confirmed by the Senate today.

(NOTE.—A complete list of the nominations referred to above, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 27, 1947, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Milton Fischer appearing on p. 619 and ending with the name of Lynn R. Cheezum appearing on p. 626.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John R. Caton, St. Paul's Church, Vermillion, S. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of all things and ruler of the destinies of men and of nations, we give Thee hearty thanks in that Thou hast added to our lives another day wherein we may do unto Thee true and laudable service. So rule over, we beseech Thee, our hearts and minds and wills that all our consultations and deliberations may have Thy guidance, and that we, by Thy help, may serve Thee and the people of these United States of America and the peoples of the world with righteousness and truth. Grant that all things may be so ordered and settled by our endeavors, upon the surest and best foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among Thy people for all generations. These and all other necessities for us and for all men we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 6, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 220. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone and Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland;

S. 221. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co., a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes;

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 234. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co., an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.;

S. 235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; and

S. 276. An act to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. National Archives.
4. Selective Service System.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, just for a moment I want you to join me in projecting our thoughts into the next century. The year is 2047 and the month is February. Our Nation has grown and prospered and changed. But in some respects it is the same.

Our first national hero is still George Washington. Time has left undiminished his cherished position within the hearts of the American people. And the memory of our second great son of February, Abraham Lincoln, is still as fresh and as revered as it is in this year of 1947.

Yes, I think we can predict with emphatic certainty that there will be no dwindling of the fame of these two great sons of February. By their deeds—Washington as the molder of our Nation and Lincoln as its preserver—these men infused their memories with immortality.

On the other hand, it is highly improbable that time will further enhance the statures of Washington and Lincoln because their niche in the American scene already has been evaluated and cast in immutable molds.

There is, however, a third son of February for whom time's passage undoubtedly will bring increasing recognition and appreciation. His achievements were such that with each passing year new benefits, new conveniences and services, and new potentials of accomplishment flow from the magic of the things he started. It is of this man that I want to speak to you today.

One hundred years ago this third son of February was born. That he belongs in the illustrious company of Washington and Lincoln there can be no question. He was the essential partner of the two great statesmen who preceded him. He was the man who took the Nation that Washington formed, and Lincoln had preserved, and made it function and flower.

February's third son is Thomas A. Edison. Born February 11, 1847. Died October 18, 1931. Inventor of the electric light, the phonograph, the motion picture, and hundreds of other useful products. Holder of 1,097 patents from the United States Government. An exponent of democracy. A disciple of productive creativeness.

It was Edison who demonstrated how high a man could rise in a free economy. In many countries of his day Edison would have been a maker of wooden shingles because that was his father's trade, and in such countries a son could not rise above his father. And he showed how far a man could go under exceptional handicaps. As a boy young Tom was not strong, and because of his physical condition he was kept out of school beyond the usual age. As a matter of fact, his formal schooling totaled only 3 months.

Yet Tom Edison, the same Tom who was considered "addled" by one teacher because his young imagination was beginning to sprout with genius, made inventions and scientific discoveries which even the most conservative statisticians estimate gave birth to new industries with a capital evaluation of $20,000,000,000 and employing more than 4,000,000 men and women.

But the real measure of Edison's stature cannot be stated in terms of dollars and cents. Hundreds of men accumulated more money than did he. Edison considered money only as a means of carrying on his work. No; you must judge him in the increased standards of living, the comforts, the conveniences, and the millions of jobs that grew out of his inventions and discoveries.

Supposing Edison had been satisfied to do nothing more than invent the first practical incandescent electric lamp. Certainly that one thing alone would have been more than ample to guarantee for him not only renown as an inventor, but wealth as well. Fortunately for the world, Edison was not so easily satisfied. He did not stop with the lamp. To make it useful, he devised an entire generating and distributing system for power and light, including dynamos, generators, insulators, conduits, meters, sockets, fuses, and a hundred other allied items. In all, Edison produced three-hundred-and-sixty-odd inventions necessary to the generation and distribution of electric power.

Let us consider for a moment exactly how Edison's launching of the power and light industry fits in with the American pattern of accomplishment. His successful lamp was perfected on October 21, 1879. Remember the date. It is important because it helps to provide a little-known insight into the circumstances leading up to the invention. Almost a full year earlier, on October 25, 1878, to be exact, the Edison Electric Light Co. was organized. But this company had no products and no services to sell. Its only assets consisted of $300,000 put up by 13 men, among them Edison, and of enough faith in his ability to risk what for the times was a large fortune to finance his experiments. Until a few weeks before this company was formed. Edison had given no thought to trying to invent the electric light. In fact, there were at least six other scientists and inventors who already were working on the problem of lighting by electrical incandescence, each of whom could have correctly claimed a greater knowledge of the subject than Edison.

You may well ask: What if he had failed? Well, what if Washington had failed, or Lincoln? But this third son of February did not fail, and in fulfilling the confidence of his associates he wrote a significant chapter in the annals of American business. Their investment of $300,000 may appear inconsequential in these days; actually, it was one of America's first investments in initiative and enterprise. And it paid off.

Edison's career as an inventor neither began nor ended with the lamp. By the time he got around to working on the lamp he already had to his credit a score or more of important inventions which, had he been interested only in profits, would have been thrice the number necessary to make him independently wealthy. In 1877 he had invented the phonograph, and earlier he had completed a dozen or more improvements in telegraphy, including systems for sending multiple messages over the same set of wires and for receiving and sending messages automatically, and he also had invented the electric pen, forerunner of today's mimeograph machine.

Edison's phonograph was one of the world's most original inventions. Prior to Edison's experiments in the summer of 1877, no one had given serious thought to the possibility of recording sound for future release at will. The phonograph, incidentally, was an oddity among inventions because instead of being the result of months and even years of arduous experimentation by one or more persons exploring scientific facts and theories, the phonograph literally popped out of the hat. Edison was experimenting with an automatic telegraph machine when he noticed that a revolving turntable fitted with a perforated paper disc reproduced a musical hum instead of dots and dashes when the turntable operated at high speed. This led him to investigate the possibility of recording the human voice, which he did successfully on August 15, 1877. That first record was a recitation by Edison of "Mary had a little lamb."

We all know the part played by the phonograph today in the entertainment field, as well as in the teaching of language and enunciation, particularly among handicapped children. Edison foresaw the educational potentialities of his invention. As early as 1890 he wrote an article correctly forecasting the educational purposes to which the phonograph would be put.

While on the subject of the phonograph, it is interesting to note that the coin-in-the-slot machine—or jukebox as we now call it—is no modern invention created for the express amusement of bobbysoxers. Edison made coin-in-the-slot phonographs as far back as 1890. The phonograph in those days was such a novelty that phonograph parlors opened up throughout the country where, for the investment of a nickel, one could listen to the latest recordings. These phonograph parlors were forerunners of the nickelodeons which served to introduce the motion picture to the world. Nickelodeon! It is difficult to mention a development in recent years in which Edison did not play a part. Edison also invented the motion-picture camera. The great industry which sprang from this Edison creation today employs more than 300,000 persons and operates some ten thousand theaters in the United States.

It was the phonograph which gave Edison the idea of making motion pictures. He wanted to do for the eye what his phonograph had done for the ear. Others before Edison had experimented with action photography, but none had produced a method whereby the pictures, once taken, could be viewed in motion. Such men as Edward Muybridge had tried to use a series of cameras arranged to take successive shots of an animal or man in motion. Edison, however, realized the inadequacy of such an approach and constructed a camera which would take successive pictures through the same lens on strips of film fed through the camera.

Knowing Edison's versatility, and the fact that his idea for motion pictures had its genesis in the phonograph, it seems appropriate—although nonetheless astonishing—that when Edison first demonstrated his motion-picture machine in 1897 that the picture was a "talkie." He had synchronized his motion-picture apparatus with a phonograph. And, true to his formula of not leaving a job half done, he pioneered in the development of the motion-picture industry.

The first studio was on the grounds of his laboratory at West Orange, N. J., and the first picture to tell a story was the Edison-produced Great Train Robbery. Prior to the Great Train Robbery, motion pictures had been little more than a presentation of vaudeville acts or of comedy interludes and had not dipped into the greater field of story telling.

Thus far I have mentioned Edison's creation of the power-and-light industry, his invention of the phonograph, the motion picture, and a few more of his inventions. But they are only part of the Edison story. He invented the fluoroscope and the first fluorescent electric lamp; he invented and built the first electric railroad in America; he discovered an electrical phenomenon, known as the Edison effect, which led others to the development of radio, radar, television, and other countless miracles of electronics. He invented and patented a system of wireless telegraphy 6 years before Marconi. He invented the carbon transmitter used in the telephone, and for many years Edison's name as well as Bell's appeared on telephone instruments. He made rubber from goldenrod. He invented and developed the business-dictation machine, storage batteries, and a hundred other useful devices.

Perhaps his work is best summed up in the words of Mr. Charles F. Kettering, director of research for the General Motors Corp.:

Every citizen—

He said—

is as much a beneficiary of Mr. Edison as if he had been mentioned in his will. The comparatively small sum of money Edison may have received for his inventions is microscopic in comparison with the public's benefit—yours and mine.

One might suspect that a man who won more than a thousand patents, who unearthed numerous scientific discoveries of world-changing importance, and who personally launched more than a hundred businesses, must have been a cold, humorless individual with no time for fun. But not so Edison. To the contrary, he was warmly human and possessed of a keen sense of humor.

Old associates of Edison say he liked a good joke. Edison employees often avoided the consequence of mistakes or errors by telling Edison some new story or joke.

He had no vanity, no pomposity. Once a delegation from a foreign government called at Edison's laboratory to award him a medal in recognition of his contributions to mankind. Dressed in top hats and formal attire, they were astounded when Edison made his appearance in old work trousers and an

undershirt. He had been too busy working to find time to dress for the occasion.

When Edison died at the age of 84, like so many men he was not through working. He obtained his last patent that same year, and he was in the midst of his experiments to obtain rubber from goldenrod. But he was not left without fitting memorials to his memory. These you can find in every electric light, every phonograph, every motion picture, and every electric train in the world.

Herbert Hoover, then President of the United States, described his loss better than I can. Referring to a suggestion that the electric current of generating plants he turned off in honor of Edison at the time of his funeral, the President said:

On inquiry I find that this would constitute a great peril to life throughout the country because of the many services dependent upon electrical power in the protection from fire, the operation of water supply, sanitation, elevators, operations in hospitals, and the vast number of activities which, if halted for an instant, would result in death somewhere in the country. This demonstration of dependence of the country upon electrical current for the life and health is in itself a monument to Mr. Edison's genius.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein an address I delivered on Thomas A. Edison 7 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] has just said, tomorrow will be the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas A. Edison, the greatest genius this Nation has yet produced; a man who did more for humanity than any other individual, perhaps, in all history.

This will be known as the century of Edison.

Shakespeare says:

Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
Live register'd upon our brazen tombs,
And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
When, spite of cormorant devouring Time,
Th' endeavour of this present breath may buy
That honour which shall bate his scythe's keen edge,
And make us heirs of all eternity.

Thomas A. Edison, one of the most unassuming of men, by his untiring efforts bated the subtle edge of time's keen scythe and made himself heir of all eternity.

An address I delivered a few years ago on Thomas A. Edison has been published in a volume that is being used in public-speaking courses in some of the leading colleges and universities of the country; and for that reason, instead of extending my own remarks, I am merely going to insert the speech I delivered at that time. It reads as follows:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Monday, February 12, 1940)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to the memory of one of America's most illustrious sons.

Yesterday was the ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, our country's greatest contribution to the world's list of scientific men.

He was the foremost inventive genius of the age and one of the leading benefactors of mankind. He was the greatest liberator the world has ever known. By the force of his matchless genius, aided by his tireless energy, he struck the shackles of drudgery from untold millions of human beings and lifted the world into the light of a new civilization, the like of which humanity had scarcely dreamed.

He stands in history among the leaders of the men of genius of all time—Homer, Gilileo, Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Mozart, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Columbus, Jefferson, Newton, and Marconi. Towering amid that great galaxy rises the immortal figure of Edison, in glorified silhouette against the horizon of the ages, sending a glow of radiance down the centuries to come, to stir the hopes and fire the imaginations of toilers of the future who struggle for the betterment of mankind.

It is unnecessary to attempt to magnify his virtues, to minimize his vices, or to clothe him with qualities he did not have. All that is necessary to commend him to the minds and hearts of peoples of all climes is the simple story of this earnest, patient man, toiling through the silent hours of the night to make the world a better place in which to live.

He was the greatest public servant of his day; yet he held no political office, he founded no political party, he advanced no new political creeds. Therefore no array of illustrious speakers volunteer to sing his praise or use his name as a sounding board to further selfish ends.

He was one of the mightiest conquerors this world has ever seen; yet he waged no wars of human destruction, he fought no bloody battles, he stirred no fires of human hate nor pandered to the baser passions of the race. But he conquered the elements, as it were, and gave to humanity the greatest ascendancy over the forces of nature the world has ever known. He brought the dawn of a new civilization—the electric age.

He never intentionally hurt a human being. Therefore no memorial has been erected to him in his country's Capital, no monument dedicated to his name, no blazing epitaph upon these historic walls proclaim his services to the world.

I sometimes wonder if we really appreciate the services of men of genius. They scale the heights and blaze the way to those sublime achievements that mark the milestones in the progress of the race, while men of talent dig in, solidify, and hold the gains and enjoy the progress that genius makes.

Have you ever thought what would happen if we should lose all that men and women of genius have accomplished for the world? What this land would be like? It would be a different world—cold, pulseless, monotonous, and silent. Our transportation system would come to a standstill, the telephone and telegraph wires would become useless obstructions, the lights would go out, the radio would be silenced, and all the machinery of industry, as well as that of commerce would cease to move. As has been well and wisely said, if you take from the world all that genius has given, "all the niches would be empty, all the walls would become naked, meaning and connection would fall from words of poetry and fiction, music would go back to common air, and all the forms of subtle and enchanting art would lose proportion, to become the unmeaning waste and shattered spoil of thoughtless chance."

It would be useless to attempt to enumerate all the things that Edison did for mankind. His greatest contribution was the invention of the electric light—the incandescent lamp. With that one act he did more to change the course of our civilization than has any other man who ever "lived in the tide of time." He not only lighted our halls, our homes, our streets, and our highways, but he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible.

He ushered in the electric age, and the motor age as well. He made possible the automobile, the X-ray, the airplane, the submarine, the moving picture, and the radio. He gave us a new system of overland transportation. taught us to navigate the air, and enabled us to roam with safety on the bottom of the seas. He eliminated time and space and aided us to see through objects that were formerly supposed to exclude all light.

He made possible mass production through new industrial machinery, and gave us that great multiplicity of electrical appliances that add to the comforts and conveniences of every home and every business establishment. He made necessities luxuries, and luxuries necessities, and enabled us to electrify the farm homes of America and to lift from the shoulders of burdened humanity the great weight of drudgery under which farm men and women have struggled since the beginning of time.

He tapped a source of wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda, more valuable than all the oil fields and all the gold and diamond mines of the modern and ancient world—a wealth that is inexhaustible, and one that will last as long as rains fall and rivers flow to the sea.

His monument is in every home that turns an electric switch; his epitaph is written on every heart that beats in gratitude for the services he gave. He needs no pompous memorial to commemorate his life. He needs no monument save the eternal and indestructible substance of his own greatness to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages. His name will live and his fame will reach to the remotest times in which civilized man shall dwell upon the earth.

Someone has said that—

"They are the truly great who, as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding race near to the heart of human love."

Centuries may come and go, empires may flourish and pass away, republics may rise and fall, but the work of Edison will endure.

When the monuments to lesser men shall have perished with the lapse of time, when this Republic shall have run its course and taken its place among the dead nations of the past, when in the distant lapse of ages yet to come, errant wanderers from different lands shall stand before the crumbling columns of this Capitol and look down across the ruins of the District of Columbia, the name of Thomas A. Edison will remain, unscarred by the wreck of ages and undimmed by the floods of time. [Applause.]

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FIRE PREVENTION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the holocaust of fire which recently swept through the Hotel La Salle in Chicago, the Winecoff Hotel in Atlanta, and within the not distant past devastated many others with an appalling loss of life, has served to focus the attention of the American people on the serious problem of fire prevention. The tragic cost in human lives and suffering, the profligate waste of natural and material resources, with their inevitable dislocation of both family and economic life, challenge our attention as never before.

It is gratifying to note that the President of the United States, cognizant of this grave situation, has called a national conference on fire prevention to be held here in Washington on May 6, 7, and 8, and has appointed Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming to act as general chairman.

This conference will be Nation-wide, participated in by officials of States, municipalities, the Federal Government, and representatives of business, professional, civic, and service organizations.

In addition to developing a needed sense of personal responsibility on the part of every citizen to eliminate carelessness, which contributes such a large proportion of our fire destruction, the conference will undoubtedly create a wider recognition by public officials everywhere of the importance of providing more adequate standards relating to building construction, and firm and impartial enforcement of building codes and fire-prevention ordinances.

I express the hope that the President's conference next May will see municipal authorities from every State meeting here in Washington to confer with experienced leaders in the fire-prevention and fire-safety field, and with private and unofficial groups, all dedicated to the solution of this great problem; and that out of their serious deliberations will emerge a practical and workable program which will result in stemming the constantly upward trend of fire deaths and fire waste.

I congratulate the President on calling this conference, an action which I am sure every Member of Congress, regardless of party, will heartily approve. Devastating fires know no partisanship, and adequate remedies brook none.

Irreplaceable homes, factories, churches, and schools, as well as forests, growing crops, and other component parts of our national wealth, but above and beyond these, the thousands of men, women, and little children who each year perish by preventable fire, and the countless others maimed or incapacitated for life, evidence a deplorable disfigurement on our national canvas which, it is fervently hoped, the constructive efforts of this oncoming conference shall obliterate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report to his constituents.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Legislature of the State of Illinois.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Earl Bunting, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, delivered in Wilmington, Del., before the chamber of commerce, on January 30, 1947.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article dealing with the subject of communistic-inspired textbooks in our American schools.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 25 minutes on Wednesday of next week after the disposition of special orders heretofore granted and the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HOLD DOWN THE BUDGET

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman says that his budget for the fiscal year of 1948 of $37,500,000,000 is so tight that it cannot be reduced, hence there can be no reduction of taxes.

Chairman Roswell Magill, former Chief Attorney for the United States Treasury, former Assistant and Under Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Postwar Tax Policy Committee with five of the ablest tax experts in the Nation, after having made a 2-year study of all the financial phases of the Government came out today with a public statement that the budget can and should be reduced to thirty-one to thirty-two billion dollars which would allow a 20 percent tax reduction for everyone, balance the budget and leave $3,600,000,000 to be paid on the national debt.

They also say that the budget in the following year can be reduced to twenty-five billion.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I urged that the Congressional Budgetary Committee fix a ceiling not to exceed $30,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948 and at that time suggested that the budget could be cut an extra $5,000,000,000 for 1949, reducing Government expenses to $25,000,000,000. Naturally, I am rather pleased to note that this committee, which for 2 years has made a study, follow very closely the figures I offered from the floor of the House recently.

The gentleman from New York, Congressman TABER, and the other able members of the Congressional Budget Committee have been making a heroic effort to reduce this budget to $30,000,000,000. They deserve the thanks and the support of every Member of this body. The people we represent are back of them in their effort 100 percent. The people are demanding a reduction of excessive taxes, that the budget be balanced, and that a substantial payment be made on the national debt. Obviously, you cannot cut taxes unless you cut governmental expenses. This committee, in setting this budget, had better err on the side of economy than to err on the side of extravagant expenses and bureaucracy.

There has been a world of propaganda put out by the left-wingers and from the administration to influence this committee against cutting the budget to $30,000,000,000. The people, however, are standing firm for every possible reduction of Government expense. The way to make a bold stand that will receive the thanks of the Nation is to hold this congressional budget down to $30,000,000,000.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain material.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill he introduced today.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address by Hon. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from New York.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier entitled "Tariff Trickery" and "Tariff Legend."

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement which he filed with the United States Engineers of Pittsburgh, Pa., on Friday last, protesting against the proposed construction of the Erie and Ohio Canals.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an editorial, and in the other an article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution.

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what the Senate is going to do with the Lilienthal appointment, but I do know that whoever is entrusted with the atom-bomb secret will hold in his hands the power to destroy the world, and that he should be above suspicion. Mr. Lilienthal is not that man.

I have little knowledge of his alleged and widely believed pro-Russianism, but that TVA was permitted, under his management, to become a hotbed of communism, is an admitted fact. The radical and ultraliberal press are ridiculing Senator MCKELLAR in his effort to stop the appointment, but millions of God-fearing Americans, whose first loyalty is to the flag of the Republic, that flag which floats above the Speaker's head, are praying that he succeed. The rejection of this appointment would fall upon the people like a warm raindrop upon a tired and frightened heart.

Mr. Speaker, may we not here this morning add our prayers that this thing which the Communists of the world so passionately wish be not consummated.

Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Lilienthal was the kind of a man the Chairman of this Atomic Energy Commission ought to be he would ask that his name be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

TENURE OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday a colleague of mine asked on my behalf that unanimous consent be given to my absence from Washington on official business for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member. Such absence from Washington prevented my voting on House Joint Resolution 27, proposing a constitutional amendment to limit the Presidential tenure to two terms. I regret that official business elsewhere prevented my being here last Thursday to vote on the resolution because of my very strong feelings that we must be ever watchful to preserve American democracy.

To the vast numbers of American people perpetuation in office is a necessary concomitant of fascism, communism, and totalitarianism. It seems to me that we here in America who are privileged to enjoy democracy should take all means to assure that no one person can seek perpetuation in office from whence there might result a Fascist, Communist, or totalitarian state to supplant democracy in America.

Mr. Speaker, were it possible for me to have been here last Thursday I would certainly have voted "yea" on the measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Lancaster Intelligence Journal of January 7, 1947, entitled "A Communist Cannot Be an American and an American Cannot Be a Communist."

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner held at the Statler Hotel in the city of Washington on February 6, and also to extend his remarks and include an address delivered on the same occasion by Mabel S. Frazer.

INDIANA AND FEDERAL AID

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana has adopted House Concurrent Resolution 2, which I desire to read:

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington, will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight on its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as "Federal" aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them, to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I intended to write the Governor of Indiana a letter because he was good enough to send me a resolution passed by the general assembly of that State.

I am just wondering how independent Indiana is going to be, whether or not that State wants the Federal Government to withdraw Federal aid to highways in that State, whether or not they want the Federal Government to cease making appropriations for soil conservation and for other matters that directly affect the people of the great agricultural State of Indiana in which, as in the State of Texas, the black lands are washing away.

The question of soil conservation in my opinion, and money expended wisely on it is one of the greatest if not the greatest and most pressing problems of the present day. I am just wondering when these bills come up to help the State in these particulars just where the delegation from Indiana will stand.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

CONGEALED FLORIDA SUNSHINE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida delegation has sent to the cloakrooms on each side of the aisle, some congealed sunshine in the form of oranges from Florida. We hope you will like these delicious oranges. They are full of vitamins and will give you vim, vigor, and pep to carry out the promises you made during the last campaign.

We want to say to the Republicans that because you elected so many, you Republicans are going to have to eat less; but after having eaten these oranges we hope you will pass a resolution that you would rather have fewer Republicans and more to eat.

Let me say to the delegation from California: We hope that after you sample these oranges you will make some suggestions to the citrus growers of California as to how to grow a good orange.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States in his message of February 7 on synthetic rubber said, among other things:

The security of the United States and the essential needs of its citizens must never again be jeopardized by inadequate or uncertain rubber supplies.

The Congress should deal with all aspects of this matter during the present session because of its vital effect upon our national security.

I further recommend that the Senate and House of Representatives act expeditiously in

establishing appropriate committee arrangements to consider the problems involved in maintaining a synthetic-rubber industry in the United States and to draft such legislation as is found to be necessary to accomplish this objective.

Mr. Speaker, the President has pointed out the danger to America if we depend on foreign supplies for rubber. I am sorry that the President did not go farther and recommend a program that would make us self-sufficient in rubber and at the same time provide a market for agricultural products to the end that we would never be plagued with a problem of surpluses.

Now is the time for the Congress to give attention to future farm prices. Should prices for farm products descend to a disastrous low, it would be too late then. Sufficient revenue cannot be secured to meet the Government's obligations unless we have a high national income. A high farm income is very necessary if we are to have prosperity in this country. A farm depression means a Nation-wide depression.

We have the facilities in this country to become self-sufficient in reference to rubber. This Congress ought to enact the necessary legislation to maintain the alcohol rubber industry. Such an industry will provide a market for 400,000,000 bushels of grain.

I arise to ask the question, Are we going to permit this potential industry to be junked in order to reestablish the rubber cartel of the world?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an editorial from the Portland Oregonian and in the other a newspaper article from the same paper.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a bill requested to be passed by Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the Veterans' Administration and a letter sent to the Speaker of the House asking for the passage of said bill.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very thought-inspiring editorial entitled "Just Who Will Benefit From the Income-Tax Cut?"

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon Thursday next at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] should not worry too much about what will happen to the Republicans of Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and the Midwest. If he is correct in his assumption that should Republicans vote to practice a little economy rather than to continue the wasteful spending of the New Deal, Republicans will all be defeated in 1948, that would be all to the good of his party, and you on that side should not worry about that. Let me add it is just as difficult to get the people out of the notion of asking for and receiving with gratitude subsidies as it is to convince a child that taking from it a stick of candy is all for the best, just as easy as it is to pull a sucking calf away from the cow when it does not want to be weaned. It is just as difficult to get the people away from subsidies and benefit payments. I may say to the gentleman from Texas, do not worry overmuch. The folks in Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and the Midwest will get along all right when they have taken off their shoulders the burden of paying taxes in order to build highways, harbors, dams, and TVA and to support and aid the people of the South. We love you all, but please, just because we have the money and pay the bulk of the tax bill, do not ask for too much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit in hearing during the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE BUFORD DAM

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I regret that unfortunately what I have to say comes so close behind the interchange between the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, today, a bill to provide the necessary funds to pay for engineering, planning, and beginning of construction work of a proposed dam on the Chattahoochee River in Georgia, known as the Buford Dam. It is part of the project known as the Appalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla., in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 13, 1946.

The building of the dams provided for in this project has already been approved. The project has the endorsement of the Corps of Army Engineers. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee held a hearing upon this project on May 3, 1946, at which the project was urged by Representatives PACE and COX, of Georgia and ANDREWS of Alabama. At that meeting, Colonel Feringa, of the Army Corps of Engineers, testified at length concerning the project. He designated the Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River, just north of Atlanta, as being a multiple-purpose dam, which would provide power; also water for the city of Atlanta, for water conservation; also provide water to improve the low-water flow in the whole Chattahoochee River below Atlanta, and to also furnish a considerable measure of flood control.

Concerning the electric power feature of the Buford Dam, Colonel Feringa testified that the plans provide for a hydroelectric power plant having an installed capacity of 28,900 kilowatts, which would mean approximately 253,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity annually to be added to our present power supply, for which there is a ready demand and which would be promply absorbed in the power market.

At this same hearing on May 3, 1946, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] testified that the Buford Dam will afford considerable benefits from flood control, and that it is estimated that these flood-control benefits will amount to $100,000 annually. It was testified that the power project would be self-liquidating. Colonel Feringa testified that in his opinion the whole project is self-liquidating because the report shows that the entire project, the benefits to the United States are greater than the costs. In the discussion which occurred between Colonel Feringa, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and members of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee who were considering the project, Colonel Feringa said:

> The flood-control benefits have been figured from an actual study of the flood-control cost, and we know and can assure the committee costs will be exceeded by the benefits in future years. Power benefits are recaptured in dollars and cents which will be turned back to the Treasurer of the United States * * *. Our district engineer states this power will be needed as soon as the project can be constructed.

The facts which were developed at that hearing are based upon a completely unbiased and unprejudiced study of the project, and indicate that it is meritorious. The report shows that the project will benefit the entire area of 73 counties with a population of about 1,624,000 in 1940, which lie wholly and partially within the basin drained by these rivers. Among the cities in Georgia to be benefited by the project, the report points out, are Atlanta, Macon, and Columbus.

The Buford Dam, it is estimated, will produce more electric power than the

dam at Junction. In view of the estimated benefits of $100,000 a year from flood control to be realized from the Buford Dam, and further in view of the much needed electrical power to be produced at the Buford Dam, as well as the benefits to the whole Chattahoochee River from that feature of the Buford Dam which will replenish the low-water flow of the entire river, and particularly because of the benefit to the city of Atlanta and that area by reason of the water-conservation feature of the Buford Dam, I urge that funds be immediately provided to proceed with the erection of this dam. Colonel Feringa, who testified at this hearing, is thoroughly familiar with the details of the entire project. He was district engineer at Savannah, Ga., and has personal knowledge of all these facts, and is very conversant with this part of the country. May I point out that each year this project is delayed means an irretrievable loss not only to Atlanta, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, but to the entire country. The soil which is washed away because of lack of flood control, and the electrical energy which is never utilized because the water flows on to the Gulf of Mexico, are assets which could now day by day be added to the wealth of this country, but which because of its delay, are being lost forever.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Charles G. Bolte, national commander of the American Veterans' Committee.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Crouch.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from his soil-conservation district.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a magazine article on the philosophy of Thomas A. Edison.

GREATER USE OF POTATO FLOUR IN BREAD IS URGED

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to express my appreciation to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, and others in the Department of Agriculture for their ready response to the suggestion which I made in a speech January 14, urging the use of potato flour in the making of bread and other bakery products, as a means of solving America's potato surplus problem.

It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture, at the instance of Secretary Anderson, is at the present time formulating a program to present to the baking industry and consumers groups outlining the desirability of using more culturized potato flour. I am convinced that this program will solve the critical potato surplus problem and save millions of dollars a year of the taxpayers' money now being paid in support of prices by the Government. At the same time, it will give the consumer a better and more tasty bread—the old-fashioned kind that mother used to make—and will increase the sale of baked goods throughout the country.

The day following my original speech on this subject an expert from the Grain Division of the Department of Agriculture called to congratulate me and to tell me the idea of using potato flour in baked goods was sound. Later, I went to the Department of Agriculture for a conference with heads of various divisions and each one agreed that my proposal was worth while and should be undertaken. All indicated their intention of going ahead with the voluntary program designed to help every consumer and every baker in the Nation learn the usefulness of using potato flour in bread and other bakery products.

They emphasize, and of course I agree with them, that the program by the Government ought to be entirely voluntary and not designed to force any baker, consumer or any one else to use any product he does not want to use. They are going to do an educational job and for that job they are to be congratulated.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, since I made my first speech the potato surplus problem has been pointed up in no uncertain terms on the front pages of our newspapers. The Department of Agriculture has had to reinstate its potato surplus buying program to protect growers against disastrous price breaks. Therefore, it can be understood by every American why there is great interest in this subject in every State. My own State of Michigan grows a lot of potatoes but it is not alone in that respect. Maine, Idaho, California, and Pennsylvania all are up front in potato growing. Potatoes are as important to millions of farmers as any other crop.

There are some angles to the use of potato flour that I had not explored when I originally spoke on the subject. One angle that will be of interest to housewives is that if enough potato flour is used to take millions of bushels of low grade potatoes off the market, the average shopper in the average grocery store will be able to buy better potatoes. Potatoes are not graded very carefully in most stores today, mainly because most of the "spuds" are trucked into town and the farmer wants to get rid of all the potatoes he grows whether they are good or bad. If there were a steady market for lower grade potatoes—and they are just as useful as any in making potato flour—the quality of potatoes sold in grocery stores undoubtedly would be much better.

The farmer certainly has a stake in seeing to it that potatoes are used in making flour. Statistics prove that potato consumption in this Nation has dropped from 156 pounds per capita in the 5-year period to 1921, to 125 pounds per capita in 1947. That is a 31-pound decline per person in 23 years or, from another standpoint, a 20 percent loss in market among American housewives for potatoes. Meantime, the acreage devoted to potato growing has declined by about 500,000 acres, but the yield per acre has increased greatly. There are more potatoes each year and fewer potatoes being marketed from the domestic peacetime standpoint. Businessmen know that if such a trend continues, they will lose money in loss of sales to farmers who have depended upon potato money for a livelihood or as a major part of their income.

The addition of potato flour to regular wheat flour, it has been proved conclusively, will add vitamins to the bread that is baked. In addition, the bread will keep much longer than will bread that contains no potato flour. Since bakers throughout the Nation have watched consumption of bread decline regularly they are anxious to find new points to advertise their products. The addition of potato flour to their bread will give them an excellent advertising point and will help the whole baking industry go forward to new sales in this and in coming years.

Only this week experiments in using 3- and 4-percent culturized potato flour in the baking of cakes have been made with excellent results. Because there are so many Members of Congress and their constituents interested in potatoes and potato bread, I want to conclude by announcing that one day soon there will be a potato-peeling contest on Capitol Hill between some nationally known figures from potato-growing States. On that day I shall see to it that my good friend, Jack Schafer, president of the Peter Pan Bakeries of Michigan, shall furnish the House and Senate restaurants with bread made with culturized potato flour so that all Congressmen can see what it is like. Mr. Schafer, who, as I have said before, is no relative of mine, has also promised to furnish cake made with culturized potato flour for dessert.

Mr. Schafer's bakeries in Michigan have produced culturized potato bread for the past few years. He reports that he has increased his sales in the past year alone more than 60 percent over all

previous years. He has proved that consumers like culturized potato bread, and he wants to see the people all over the Nation eating and enjoying it to their benefit, to the baking industry's benefit, and to the benefit of potato growers and the taxpayers.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am glad for the indication that the Congress will shortly have an opportunity to pass upon the so-called portal-to-portal question. I want it distinctly understood that I think that such legislation should be enacted at the earliest possible moment. I make this statement in view of the fact that I have seen quoted a remark which I made only in reference to the value or effect of Judge Picard's decision upon possible portal claims against money that has been recovered by the Government under the renegotiation statute. Having initiated that statute by an amendment to the sixth supplemental defense appropriation bill in 1942, I am interested in seeing that the $10,500,000,000 which the Government has recovered shall not be lost through claims under the so-called portal-to-portal decision of last June.

The ruling of Judge Picard, fixing June 10, 1946, the date of the Supreme Court's ruling in the Mount Clemens case, as a deadline behind which claims could not go, if firm and not upset by review, may relieve the urgency somewhat since wartime procurement was before that date. Reprieve for the Government on its renegotiation recoveries, however, does not do the job that needs to be done.

It does not protect either private industry or the Federal Government against claims against contracts made prior to that date and carried on afterward on the basis in which both parties understood the terms to provide. It does not answer the question asked by the court in *Anuchick* v. *Trans-American Freight Lines, Inc.* (46 F. Supp. 861), quoted by Judge Picard:

> How can we legally or equitably enforce a penalty for failure to conform with a statutory mandate when the nature of one's duty is not disclosed by the act itself?

Only Congress can remedy that situation.

Legislation is still needed; its merit is emphasized by the logic in the judge's dictum that one should be protected for past acts done in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask permission to place in the RECORD correspondence which I have had with Col. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the Price Adjustment Board, on the effect of the original portal-to-portal decision on the recoveries of the Government under the renegotiation statute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WAR CONTRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In response to your recent letter, you will be interested to know that on January 21 I had the privilege of appearing before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in connection with the subcommittee's consideration of possible legislation with reference to the so-called portal-to-portal claims.

I did not then have, nor do I now have, a prepared statement, but my testimony before the subcommittee will, I believe, reflect the opinion of the members of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board with reference to the problems involved in connection with portal-to-portal claims insofar as they may affect the renegotiation activity. I do not have a copy of the testimony, but I am sure that one could be made available to you by the Judiciary Committee.

I do not believe that the finalizing of a renegotiation case would bar the proponent in a portal-to-portal claim as to any right he might have, either on fixed-price or cost-plus-fixed-fee operations, as against the contractor whose renegotiation has been concluded.

In other words, the renegotiation agreement between the Government and the contractor would not affect the portal-to-portal claimant. Nor do I believe that a renegotiation agreement would of itself bar the contractor from recovering from the Government such costs as he might be subjected to in satisfaction of portal-to-portal claims for labor on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

At the same time I feel assured that the very explicit wording of the Renegotiation Act would, in the absence of new legislation, bar the reopening of any closed renegotiation case, and therefore added costs to the contractor for the years as to which renegotiation is closed would not be a basis for the reconsideration of the profit situation of the contractor for the year or years as to which renegotiation of the contractor has been concluded.

However, with reference to fiscal years as to which the renegotiation of a contractor has not been closed, the renegotiating agencies would under the Renegotiation Act be required to allow as costs such costs as they would estimate to be allowable under the Internal Revenue Code, and in the respective years to which for tax purposes such costs would be allocable. If the costs would be deemed under the Internal Revenue Code to accrue after the close of the 1945 year, the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board would have the authority to consider the costs as accruing on the last day of the 1945 year.

Up to the present time the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board has concluded to allow as a cost only those amounts under portal-to-portal claims which are actually crystallized by payment or by final judgment, and only to the extent and in the year in which they are determined to be accrued under the Internal Revenue Code and, of course, only to the degree allocable to the renegotiable business of the contractor for that year.

It is recognized that even this limited recognition given to payments or final judgments on portal-to-portal claims will give an advantage to the contractor who has not completed renegotiation for any year or years as to which for tax purposes any of his portal-to-portal payments will be allocated. Among these contractors are a few who have retarded the closing of their renegotiations because of recalcitrance and purposeful delays in furnishing necessary data. Among those whose renegotiations have not been closed are likewise the comparatively small group of contractors who, from whatever cause, have carried their cases through unilateral determinations into The Tax Court.

In my testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee I attempted to point out what appeared to me to be the inequity of allowing the costs, even to the limited extent as I have before explained, only to those contractors who have for whatever reason not concluded their renegotiations. I likewise attempted to emphasize what I personally regard as an even greater inequity if any relief were given solely to those contractors who have made refunds in renegotiation or who may hereafter be required to make such refunds.

As you know, one of the most important objectives, and perhaps the most important objective, of the renegotiation activity was to influence downward the costs, prices, and resultant profit to contractors in their war production.

Almost 74 percent of the cases reviewed by the renegotiation agencies were canceled or cleared as not showing any excessive profits on renegotiable business under the Renegotiation Act. I realize that many of these contractors probably had no excessive profits because of inefficiency, or for other reasons. But a tremendous number of them, in their desire to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Government, purposely held down their costs to the fullest extent achievable and reduced their prices so that no excessive profits would result. Some contractors actually undertook their entire operations in the production of war matériel with the objective of making no profit whatsoever out of their war effort.

It would seem to me that most careful consideration should be given to any legislation which would utilize refunds of excessive profits exclusively for the protection of those who had accumulated profits prior to renegotiation which required the payment of the excessive portion to the Government, and without providing at least comparable protection to those who would more clearly seem to merit it.

If I can give you any additional information or be of added assistance to you in your consideration of the problem, I should be happy for you to call upon me further. I do not forget what your advocacy meant in the establishment of the renegotiation process, and I am happy to know of what I felt assured would be your continuing interest in the administration of the renegotiation law.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE HIRSCH,
Brigadier General, GSC, Chairman.

WASTE OF POTATOES IS NOT JUSTIFIED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call the attention of the House to a piece of mismanagement on the part of Government officials, with regard to the waste of thousands of bushels of potatoes that have been dumped into piles in various places in the country and used for fertilizer. Last week several thousand bushels of potatoes were hauled in a pile at Grand Forks, N. Dak., to be ground up for fertilizer purposes.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make sense that our Government should spend money to support the raising of a potato crop and then destroy the crop in place of using it for food. It is not right that people in this country do not have sufficient food and people in foreign countries are starving for something to eat, while we destroy food at home.

This is a thing that ought to be looked into. We ought to find out why the Government is permitting the waste of food after it has been produced. Surely there ought to be some way to get this food in the hands of people who can use it. To waste food on the one hand when people are in want on the other hand is not right. It just does not make sense. There is absolutely no excuse for it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

LOOSE AND UNFOUNDED CHARGES MADE AGAINST EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS ARE REFUTED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of answering the unwarranted and unjustifiable attack on Mr. Lilienthal by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]; nor do I rise for the purpose of defending Mr. Lilienthal against the imputations made against his loyalty, his patriotism, and his devotion to democracy, because he needs no defense at my hands.

WILL LEAVE MATTER TO SENATE

I am satisfied to leave that determination to the Senate, whose duty it is to inquire into his fitness and qualifications, and who have heard the testimony of outstanding citizens of Tennessee and of the country. Those witnesses, who included many of the congressional delegation of Tennessee and nationally known scientists and men of affairs, testified to Mr. Lilienthal's fairness, loyalty, and capability. Mr. Lilienthal himself enunciated his creed of democracy in a brilliant extemporaneous statement which can be compared to the Gettysburg Address of Abraham Lincoln without exaggeration.

Against those responsible, reliable, and well-informed witnesses, there were only a perpetual female hanger-on of hearings to whose statements no credibility can be given; two disgruntled former employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, who appeared merely to be venting their spleen; and an ex-investigator dismissed only 6 months ago from the Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee under circumstances seriously reflecting against his integrity. It may be, indeed, that my colleague is relying on statements of this unreliable person. I hope not; but I regret that I do not have immediately on hand the statement made by Mr. Lilienthal before the Senate committee, on the one hand, and a column which appeared in the New York Post a week ago concerning this former investigator. The two taken together would give a clear idea of their relative caliber.

RECENT REPORT REFUTED CHARGES

I recollect having read quite recently a report of a committee which spent many months in the investigation of reckless charges that TVA employees were permeated with Communists and Communist sympathizers. The report stated, as I recall it, that under the most searching scrutiny of the 3,400 employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority they were able to find just three whose past connections showed any pinkish leanings.

OTHER DEPARTMENTS GROUNDLESSLY ATTACKED

And now, Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity of calling attention to the fact that other departments of the Government have been similarly attacked without any show of credibility, and particularly that groundless and fantastic charges were made against the State Department. It was said on one hand that the information program of the State Department was filled with propaganda and competed unfairly with commercial news services; on the other hand, loose and sensational charges were made that the State Department was filled with "Communists" and "Russian sympathizers." These charges were made repeatedly on the floor of this House without any real foundation or justification.

NEWSPAPER EDITORS INVESTIGATED INFORMATION PROGRAM

The charges against the information program of the State Department resulted in the appointment of a special committee of eight outstanding newspaper editors who thoroughly investigated the program and the charges; while I was prompted for my part to write to the then Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, in regard to the charges of Communist leanings.

I inserted the letter to the Secretary and his reply to me in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-ninth Congress; but in view of the many changes in the membership I think it proper that it should be reinserted.

I am also inserting the full text of the report of the committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, so that the whole country can see how flimsy are the charges frequently made on this floor, smearing the executive departments and individuals, by reckless reactionary Members.

DOES NOT ALWAYS AGREE WITH DEPARTMENT

In that connection, I do not wish to give the impression that I have at all times agreed with the State Department. I have even charged here on this floor myself that some of the officials of the State Department ignored the instructions, not only of the Secretary of State, but of the President himself; and that in many instances they have been too much influenced by the shrewed conniving British diplomacy; not that I believe they should be influenced by Communists, if there be such. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I deeply resent the slightest suspicion that there should be any influence in any of our departments except that of wholly American interests. The test, as Secretary Byrnes himself once said, is loyalty to the United States of America. I have never charged, and I regret sincerely that the charge was ever made, that the Department of State is filled with incompetents or with Communist sympathizers or fellow travelers.

PRAISED BY EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

I want to point out that Editor and Publisher, the national trade journal of the publishing business, which had been critical of the information program, gave substantial editorial praise to the special committee report in its own news account. Not only to those directly connected with the State Department's information program, but to every American who believes that the best way to insure understanding abroad of America is to tell America's story by America, the strong endorsement of the program is very gratifying.

Ten months ago the American Society of Newspaper Editors instructed its president, Mr. Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune, to appoint a committee of eight editors to investigate world news distribution, with particular attention to the State Department's information activities.

HAD CRITICIZED DEPARTMENT

This was at a time when the press associations were criticizing the State Department. The following newspaper editors, all from newspapers which had criticized the State Department's information program in their editorial columns, were appointed to the committee: N. R. Howard, chairman, editor, Cleveland News; George Cornish, managing editor, New York Herald Tribune; Oveta Culp Hobby, executive editor, Houston Post; Edwin L. James, managing editor, New York Times; Ben M. McKelway, associate editor, Washington Star; Hamilton Owens, editor, Baltimore Sunpapers; Ben Reece, managing editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Gideon Seymour, executive editor, Minneapolis Star-Journal.

The State Department made available to the committee all its radio scripts, all other information materials, all policy directives, and all future plans.

FOUND NO DISTORTIONS

When the committee made its report on December 13, it said, in part, that it found the present uncertainties in international relations justify an effort by the United States Government to make its activities and policies clear to the people of the world.

As to so-called propaganda, the investigating committee took particular pains to search for that in the departmental information program, and reported that, "so far as it could go the committee did not detect distortion, untruth, or hidden purpose in the activity to date."

I hope every Member of this House will read through the text of this important statement by eight outstanding newspaper editors, and especially the individual comments of members of the committee. The text, from which footnotes have been deleted to save space, follows:

TEXT OF REPORT

During the war, three major American news services furnished news to the Office

of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs for distribution over the world. Last January, the United Press and the Associated Press terminated this service on the grounds that (1) the war was over, (2) their private functions were jeopardized by governmental connection of any kind, and (3) the fundamental American principle of news distribution was private operation.

BACKGROUND

The Office of War Information, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, and several other State Department war-period operations meantime had been united, under Assistant Secretary of State William Benton into the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs which has continued dissemination of news, documents, pictures, statements, and entertainment for which Congress this summer voted an annual appropriation.

Mr. Benton asked the society last April for an exploratory study of the operation, with hopes of enlisting its support. As result of his appearance two resolutions were brought before the executive session of the society membership. Prolonged debate showed there was no majority opinion either for a cordial investigation as proposed by Mr. Benton, or for leaving all news dissemination to private agencies. A resolution finally was voted directing the president of the society to have a committee examine the problem of the world dissemination of news and report back by October 1. Your committee felt it was left to it to channel the more specific survey as a practical matter and points out there would hardly have been time before October 1 to have dealt with every aspect of world dissemination of news.

THE COMMITTEE'S MEETINGS

On June 21 and 22 the Committee met in Washington and interviewed the following: William T. Stone, Director of the Office of International Communication and Cultural Affairs; Charles M. Hulten, Deputy Director; John Howe, special assistant to Mr. Benton; John C. Caldwell, Chief of the China Branch, OIC; Kenneth D. Fry, Chief of International Broadcasting Division, OIC; FitzHugh Granger, Chief of the Latin American Division, OIC; Maurice S. Rice, Chief of the Eastern European Branch, OIC; J. Noel Macy, Chief of International Press and Publications Division, OIC; and John L. Dunning, Assistant Chief of International Press and Publications Division, OIC. The committee enjoyed informal talk also with Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson at a luncheon given by the State Department personnel.

On August 16 and 17 the committee met in New York and interviewed Mr. Benton, who was assisted there by Mr. Hulten, Victor Hunt, policy coordinator, OIC, and Joseph M. Jones, assistant to Mr. Benton; Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press; Lloyd Stratton, assistant general manager; and Alan Gould, executive editor; Earl Johnson, vice president and general news manager of the United Press; and Robert Frye, assistant to the president; and Seymour Berkson, general manager of the International News Service. The chairman had a telephone discussion with Roy Howard, head of the Scripps-Howard operations.

THE GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT

Mr. Benton gave to the committee a 4,000-word statement of OIC purpose and philosophy resembling his speech to the society last April, but adding two passages to be noted here. The first, an over-all declaration guiding the State Department's news and information dissemination:

"OIC's basic assumption is that the United States can no longer afford to be unconcerned about what other peoples think of us. * * * Its second assumption is that greater understanding abroad of this country—of its people, its actions, its institutions, and its policies—will help to improve relations between the United States and the rest of the world and help the cause of peace.

"Its third assumption is that the Government must take positive steps to make the United States more comprehensible abroad in those areas and in those media not adequately covered by private channels of information. * * * After allowing for exceptions, it is clearly desirable to provide other peoples with a steady flow of intelligible, accurate material which will enable them to see our national activities in their context; to see events in relation to national policies, policies in relation to their roots in national life; and our national life in relation to the lives of these other peoples. The more we can keep the background of American life in the foreground of other peoples' minds, the greater are the chances of better understanding and better relations between other peoples and the people of the United States."

The second was a discussion of semantics. Mr. Benton detected in the fullest known definition of the word "propaganda" (Herbert Klein, pamphlet, Propaganda: The War for Men's Minds), an unchangeably evil connotation resting on the will to distort, mislead, or hide the objective truth, wherefore Mr. Benton asked that this committee not apply this word to the OIC activity unless it discovered distortion, untruth, or hidden purpose in the activity. So far as it could go, the committee did not detect distortion, untruth, or hidden purpose in the activity to date, and inclined to Mr. Benton's request—though others interviewed by the committee did not.

THE GOVERNMENT'S OPERATIONS

Mr. Benton and the OIC staff exposed to the committee everything now done to disseminate, transmit, and circulate news, information, and opinion of and from the United States over the rest of the world. A summary of this activity:

To some extent, OIC has continued the pattern of the wartime disseminations by OWI and the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Total employed in the Government's operation on July 1, 1946, was 1,276 in this country and 1,895 abroad of which latter 372 are Americans.

Dissemination takes two physical forms: Through the daily voice of America and American hour broadcast, short-waved through stations leased during the war by the Government, and through distribution in foreign countries by OIC staffs which are part of the diplomatic and consular missions.

A parallel dissemination is carried on by wireless to our embassies daily for the use of the diplomatic and consular staff, some of which information is given to foreign agencies at the discretion of the embassies.

SCOPE OF OPERATIONS

The character of these distributions:

On a sample day, Voice of America was broadcast in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Yugoslav, Hungarian, Austrian, Czechoslovak, Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Portuguese, Chinese, Siamese, Korean, Annamese, Malay, and Dutch. Broken into areas, 43 percent was waved to Latin-America, 33 percent to Europe, and 23 percent to the Orient (this latter known as the American Hour). Most of it is general entertainment and instruction, some of which is picked up from American radio-chain features. The United States news and opinion fraction of this averages 10 minutes per day to any country, or about 25 percent of the average broadcast.

For its news items on these broadcasts, OIC uses New York and Washington newspapers (for matter they originate themselves); International News Service, Reuters, Aneta, and information originating from Government departments. For opinion, it quotes from editorials and columnists appearing in nearly all metropolitan newspapers and magazines in this country. A large part of the so-called news element is in fact represented by these quotations from opinion writings.

MATERIAL CAREFULLY EDITED

OIC freely exposed its editing by selection. Mr. Benton, Mr. Hulten, and Mr. Hunt discussed with the committee at length the system of control of policy with which the entire organization is alerted. In the main, these controls of policy appear to depend on (1) disposition of the State Department to maintain America in its most favorable light; (2) confidential diplomatic information which might expand or qualify the aims of the disseminations; (3) purpose of remedying impressions of America in the minds of people abroad by supplemental information beyond the flow of American news from the private agencies, which the OIC spokesmen maintain must be necessarily piecemeal and therefore occasionally misleading as to the whole story. Examples of topics on which supplemental information has been deemed necessary in various foreign countries: Communist Party support of Mayor O'Dwyer in New York; the lot of the Negro in America; the United States divorce rate; full texts of President Truman's and Secretary Byrnes' statements on international matters.

The committee asked many questions about these controls and were furnished with samples of them as they are circulated in the State Department. One of the committee's hypothetical questions was, Would not a wicked national administration use this form of dissemination of fact and information thus shaped by these controls to a harmful use? The OIC spokesmen replied that any wicked administration would do far more dangerous things on other parts of the diplomatic fronts; and that any virtuous minority in Congress, during wicked administrations, could readily expose such depravity.

FOREIGN STAFFS SERVICED

Through the embassies, OIC furnishes foreign press generally with official United States documents and texts; special articles, both solicited and unsolicited by the foreign consumers, on many phases of American life and government; photographs and mats either to accompany these or to be a separate representation of American affairs; Amerika, a magazine published especially for Russian readers, which has been permitted a circulation of 50,000 by the Soviet Government; documentary films, mainly those produced during the war period by OWI and other Government agencies; selected news reels from commercial production; poster news bulletins for largely illiterate people; and a three-times-a-week English-language newspaper in the Philippines.

The daily wireless information service for the diplomatic and consular staffs includes about 1,500 words of news and editorial opinion.

EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT DISSEMINATION

The committee's inquiries on this point naturally ran into the field of claims and opinion. OIC presented evidence from a field worker that American information bureaus in Belgrade and Bucharest brought into Yugoslavia and Rumania the only public information about America that was true and unwarped, and offered to multiply these examples elsewhere over the world.

Our private news agencies are not in use in the iron-curtain lands and a great deal else of the world, and here OIC underscored the argument that it alone could function behind diplomatic protection and get some public attention for American truth and fact, however small.

Another staff man reported on penetration of interior China by OIC information exclusively.

RECORD IMPRESSIVE

The record was impressive of the usage of United States texts and special articles in

the press of Egypt, England, Italy, France, Sweden, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, China, India, and Indochina—all these furnished by OIC.

Questions as to reception to the Voice of America—American hour broadcasts received answers necessarily based on surmise. It is true that short-wave receiving sets are the popular European type. One statistic was given the committee of 100,000 such sets, in whatever condition, in Yugoslavia, of which 25,000 were in Belgrade. Foreign listeners have advised our diplomatic agencies of their views of the broadcasts, indicating they are listened to. No claims were made for much radio reception in China, save in the seacoast cities.

Private news agency executives expressed skepticism as to net total effectiveness of the Government's activity, and raised the issue, noted further, of normal distrust of governmentally disseminated and branded information by the consumer listener or reader.

COMMERCIAL SERVICE DOES NOT REACH MILLIONS

OIC argued the evident fact that the American private news services do not reach millions in many parts of the world. The OIC spokesman also asserted that the private news flow must be miscellaneous and without national purpose and that therefore (1) the news services do not regularly carry important United States official texts, (2) are frequently too unrelated to local knowledge to be completely comprehensible to the non-American consumer of news, (3) may accomplish disservice to American interests without fully realizing it or its extent.

OIC cited its penetration of the Balkans as the most effective sample of its operation—in the absence, or nearly complete absence, of private United States news services—though actual news dissemination there is necessarily small in numbers attracted.

One rebuttal by the private news agency executives was that, being a Government operation, the OIC procedure in the Balkans and other foreign nations may be or become needlessly irritating to the Government and a large number of the people of those countries.

PRIVATE AGENCIES DO NOT DO JOB

Mr. Benton presented a round-up from 21 United States diplomatic missions, 17 of whose chiefs pronounced themselves dissatisfied with the effectiveness of the private American news services in their particular foreign nations. Principal complaints were two: "Do not present clear picture of American way of life," and "Do not carry sufficient textual material for presenting official American viewpoint.

To the first of these complaints, AP and UP executives retorted that the newspapers of America doubtless did not present too clear an account of the Chinese, British, French, Russian ways of life, either, and hardly considered it their function. As to the texts they reported that there was small usage of those which they had carried to other lands, indicating no great interest by press and broadcasters there.

Mr. Cornish, of the committee, had opportunity this summer to make inquiries in England and France as to effectiveness of OIC disseminations and reported learning of considerable attention to them.

Mr. Berkson, of INS, furnished an informal report on effectiveness of OIC in the opinion of his service's bureaus in Berlin, Frankfurt, Vienna, Madrid, and Rome, cabled to him for this committee's use. These correspondents reported evidences that large numbers in those countries listened to the Voice of America broadcasts with some regularity; also some evidences of listener skepticism and governmental irritation (notably in Spain).

OPPOSITION OF THE PRIVATE NEWS AGENCIES

Reference has been made to skepticism about OIC by the news service executives interviewed. The position of the United Press and the Associated Press in withdrawing their services from State Department use is well known through their public statements. There was little disposition on the part of State Department officials interviewed to reopen consideration of that issue. (OIC, in fact, told the committee that its operation has survived the loss.)

Mr. Cooper, of the AP, and Mr. Johnson, of the UP flatly opposed any Government news dissemination. They regard Government proprietorship as certain to cause any dissemination to be regarded by peoples of the world as propaganda in its full cynical form, and do not believe the Government could possibly fulfill the purposes stated by Mr. Benton. They are equally positive that the tested trust of people everywhere in the factual integrity and lack of nationalistic purpose of the private American press service gives these the only and the traditional opportunity to set the United States squarely, with rugged objectivity, before the rest of the world.

Mr. Howard of Scripps Howard saw no objection to a Government operation making available a report limited to text of official documents and statements for any who might care to call for it at our diplomatic posts, but protested the Government engaging in a "world-wide high-speed distribution of a general news report along the lines of that put out by the American press associations."

Mr. Cooper appealed: "Keep the AP out of world politics as it has been kept out of national politics, and the AP's strength will defend us all. Don't drag the AP into any contest between this country and Russia." He believed the day will come when the Russian people will demand news by tested private agencies known for news integrity.

Mr. Cooper referred to an attempt after the First World War to have the Government's public information activity continued because of the stress of that period, and to President Wilson's decision not to continue it. It was his opinion that the British and French Governments would have been happy to drop their present postwar information disseminations had the United States Government indicated it would do so.

INS POSITION CLARIFIED

Mr. Johnson said: "In our function as a world news service, we can be no more nationalistic about American news that we can be pro-British about British Empire news, pro-Indian about India news, or pro-Russian about Russian news."

Mr. Berkson of INS, which is being sold to OIC, assured the committee this relationship indicated no disagreement with the stands taken by UP and AP and had no more permanence of policy than its 30-day cancellation condition would indicate. INS, said Mr. Berkson, feels as strongly as AP and UP on the subject of Government propaganda and any participation therein by the United States news agencies. "With equal sincerity," he added, "we feel that if [American news] services can continue to be furnished for the time being to foreign governments for practical reasons of expediency or otherwise, there is some merit in considering the emergency confronting the United States Government and in recognizing that it may have special needs of a temporary emergency nature which we have a moral obligation to meet."

The committee is convinced that honest differences of opinion existed among news agencies as to whether they should supply their news reports to the Government for distribution under its auspices. It believes that the United Press and the Associated Press were motivated by a sincere concern for integrity in news dissemination in their declination to continue to supply news to the State Department for this purpose. It is equally convinced that International News Service was similarly motivated in its decision to continue on a temporary emergency basis its service to the Government.

The committee learned that a group in the State Department favors taking the operating responsibility for short wave voice broadcasting out of the Department and setting it up in an independent organization.

NEWS DISSEMINATION BY OTHER GOVERNMENTS

The committee was reminded by State Department officials and others that Russia, England, and France are now engaged in expanded news and propaganda efforts over the world. The Russian news service Tass, a governmental arm, has a near monopoly of the press and broadcast outlets in the Balkans and the Near East, and Russian Information Service has penetrated the United States, Mexico and Latin America. British Information Service now is furnishing 7,000 words of news and comment and a photographic service to South American countries and others. L'Agence Francaise, under the restored French Government, gives news by daily broadcast to Europe and other parts of the world, including South America.

The committee noted the decision of the British Government this summer to maintain British Broadcasting Corp. as a large disseminator of news of English and European origin, tied closely into national policy.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Reese of the committee advances the argument that, agreeing to the necessity that "the American side of the world picture be disseminated as widely as possible," only the National Government has the means to do this in any major operation. "I am convinced," says Mr. Reese, "private enterprise cannot and will not undertake this mission. * * * I am in favor of supporting strongly adequate congressional appropriations for the continuance of the State Department project."

Mr. Cornish, of the committee, believes: "Where they are permitted to operate or where they find it financially possible to operate the private press services can, I think, do a better job of distributing day to day news than could any Government agency, even in these areas. I think our diplomatic agencies can properly distribute texts of documents and background material to newspapers and radio stations. In the vast areas where the press services do not operate, I think the State Department should by all available means present American news."

Mr. Owens, of the committee, says: "The United States Government has not only the right but the obligation to inform the peoples of the world about its official policies. This obligation is strongest in those countries where the news agencies are least effective, for whatever reason. In carrying out this obligation, the Government should entrust this task to the best-equipped men it can find. * * * They should confine themselves as far as possible to the exposition of the exact policies of the Government, giving such background material as may be necessary to make these policies understandable. When the Government goes beyond these limits, it enters a dangerous field."

Mrs. Hobby, of the committee, says: "As strong nationalistic spheres begin to be everywhere apparent, it now seems necessary to portray the beginning and evolution of a self-governing people. If we consider world dissemination of news in the sense of United States news and more specifically the news of a self-governing people, we must admit that

such a step is radical and perhaps dangerous extension of the powers of the United States Government. I cannot recall a problem about which I have had as many conflicting responses. * * * I am compelled to the conclusion that words are weapons in the contest of ideologists. * * * I have arrived at the conclusion that we must use the potentially powerful supplement of self-portrayal and interpretation. I abhor the necessity for it and despise the doing, but if such a program can be effective—or even partly so—it may be a partial peace insurance."

Mr. McKelway, of the committee, says: "It is to be doubted whether a really effective program of this kind—designed to create friendly sentiment toward the United States by people of other lands—can be conducted by a Government agency which at the same time meets the standards in straight news presentation generally demanded in this country. If it is necessary to win friends and influence people abroad by Government broadcasts of news and opinion, let us frankly recognize the Government's program as an experience in propaganda and not confuse that program with the dissemination of untainted news."

Mr. James, of the committee, declaring the Government dissemination proposition "comes nearer a 51–49 proposition than anything I have been up against; I feel I could write a very good brief in defense of either side," adds: "There is something distasteful to me about any program of offsetting the bad with the good, because, when the bad happens one day, that is the day's news, and when the good happens another day, that is that day's new. Insofar as he might explain conditions here in commentaries or by quoting editorials, much could be said for that, but I am far from sure Mr. Benton's news broadcast will be as objective as he indicates.

"No responsible person would object to the libraries of information maintained by the State Department abroad and to its distribution of documentary material through the embassies. The chief argument here is obviously the distribution of spot news—there is no room for argument about much else."

Mr. Seymour, of the committee, says: "All that issues from the United States of America to foreign lands is propaganda, whether it be a farm implement or a motorcar, a motion picture or a package of old clothing, a missionary's toil, or an emigrant's letter home. These have been effective propaganda because they have not been propaganda. Our stature in the world is a measure of our merit and their effectiveness.

"Engagement in deliberate propaganda (in the purest sense) can only weaken our world position; the fact that other nations do it only underscores the point. Certainly our State Department ought effectively to acquaint other peoples with our official policies and significant expositions of them—adequately interpreted. To do more is to engage in propaganda in the sense which Mr. Benton commendably deplores."

The committee is in complete agreement with the State Department's distribution of official texts and operation of the libraries of American books and sources all over the world.

The committee, by unanimous vote, presents this final conclusion:

"The present uncertainties in international relations justify an effort by the United States Government to make its activities and its policies clear to the people of the world through the agency set up in the State Department. Your committee recognizes, however, the dangers inherent in government dissemination of news and suggests that the society appoint a special committee to review at intervals the work of the State Department agency and make its findings available to the membership."

Respectfully,

N. R. Howard, chairman, editor, Cleveland News; George Cornish, managing editor, New York Herald Tribune; Oveta Culp Hobby, executive editor, Houston Post; Edwin L. James, managing editor, New York Times; Ben M. McKelway, associate editor, Washington Star; Hamilton Owens, editor, Baltimore Sun; Ben Reese, managing editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Gideon Seymour, executive editor, Cowles Newspapers, Minneapolis.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I insert the exchange of letters between myself and Secretary Byrnes last summer, together with the introductory matter which accompanied them, just as it appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 12, page A4891:

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there are always a few willing to make any kind of charge, no matter how wild, unfounded, or dangerous in order to gain publicity. Some months ago I heard with concern some very sweeping statements to the effect that the State Department was honeycombed with communistically inclined employees who had pro-Russian sympathies; but I did not see any proof.

Having known the honorable the Secretary of State, Mr. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, for many years, and having known the Honorable Cordell Hull and the Honorable Edward Stettinius, former Secretaries of State, it seemed to me unreasonable to believe that any one of them would permit the employment in the State Department of any person whose fundamental loyalty to the United States could be, in the least degree, questioned.

COULD BE SMOKE SCREEN

It seems to me, in fact, that the loose charges being made might in truth be coming, indirectly, from sources which might be very much interested in throwing up a smoke screen of Red-baiting in order to hide a movement of growing strength to forgive our defeated enemies, the Germans, and to force out of the State Department individuals who would not view with favor the restoration of Nazi power.

To any pro-German groups or individuals who would favor soft treatment for the Nazis any kind of antifascism or antinazism would be assailed as procommunism, for people like that cannot understand nor appreciate the democratic foundations of the American way of life, nor believe in loyalty to America first, last, and always.

ONLY 40 TERMINATED

To ascertain the true facts, therefore, in fairness to all Government employees and to the State Department, I wrote to the Secretary of State making inquiry about these charges, and his reply is so illuminating that I am impelled to place his letter as well as my letter to him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read.

Please note, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary reports that out of 3,000 individuals whose records have been carefully scrutinized, not hundreds, but only 40 have been terminated for security reasons.

For the same security reasons, Mr. Byrnes does not specify the precise nature of the reasons for discharge, but he gives no evidence that anyone was communistically inclined, and as I have said many times, these wild and reckless statements made on the floor and in newspapers are to be regretted. They were made, in my belief, to create prejudice in the public mind, and to discredit the administration; and I have no doubt that many of the cries of Communist infiltration actually came from individuals who had been turned down because of their German Nazi or Fascist connections.

MAY 24, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been charged freely on the floor of the House by some Members that hundreds, if not thousands, of employees have been eliminated from the State Department by the screening committee because of communistic leanings or activities or membership. In the interest of fair play, I most respectfully request that you inform me on these facts:

1. How many employees actually were examined and their records and applications reviewed?

2. How many were separated from service and for what reasons, by categories?

3. Of those separated, how many actually were found to have political disability, and of what nature, strong enough to be the principal basis of their separations?

4. Specifically, how many were found to have Communist or communistic affiliations, and how many Nazi and Fascist affiliations, and was any investigation made of pro-Nazi or pro-Fascist sympathies or allegiances?

5. Who were the members of the screening committee, how were they designated, and, in broad terms, what were their criteria?

I ask this information in the interest of the thousands and thousands of hard-working Government employees in whom I have every trust and confidence, and of whom I believe at least 99 percent are loyal American citizens. Some recent statements that have been made to create resentment and prejudice and reflect against the Department of State have actually had the effect of casting reflections upon the loyalty of employees and former employees most unfairly and unjustly, and I think a full statement of the true facts will correct many general misapprehensions.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 26, 1946.

DEAR ADOLPH: I have yours of May 24 expressing your concern with respect to certain allegations made on the floor of the House to the effect that "hundreds if not thousands of employees have been eliminated from the State Department by the screening committee because of communistic leanings or activities or membership." Such statements are incorrect and do a grave injustice not only to the employees of the Department but to Government employees as a whole, the great majority of whom are loyal American citizens. I therefore welcome this opportunity to answer your specific questions in the order in which they are presented.

(1) Pursuant to Executive order, approximately 4,000 employees have been transferred to the Department of State from various war agencies such as the OSS, FEA, OWI, OIAA, etc. Of these 4,000 employees, the case histories of approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination, as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 285 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

(2) Of the 285 individuals who have been the subject of adverse recommendation as indicated in (1), above, the services of 79 have been terminated.

(3) Of the 79 actually separated from the service, 26 were aliens and therefore under "political disability" with respect to employment in the peacetime operations of the Department. I assume that factor alone could

be considered the principal basis for their separation.

(4) With respect to the 79 thus separated, the following break-down is submitted:

Aliens	26
Failure to comply with foreign-service regulations, such as citizenship, for 15 years prior to foreign assignment and other reasons disqualifying the individual for service abroad	13
Close connections or involvement with foreign governments or their organs, past records indicating a high degree of security risk, etc	40
Total	79

The Department is equally concerned with disclosing subversive activities or associations of all kinds whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, in any employees present or prospective.

(5) Because of the security considerations involved in the mission of the screening committee, I do not feel at liberty to disclose publicly the identity of its membership. This committee, incidentally, has no power or authority to eliminate anyone from employment in the State Department. It simply makes recommendations which the Assistant Secretary for Administration may accept or reject in whole or in part in the light of all the relevant evidence.

I hope what I have said above corrects any misapprehensions which you may have entertained as to the Department's personnel policy. Like any other administrative mechanism, it is not perfect. However, I am entirely clear that it has been fair to the Department's employees in its operation. It is my firm intention to see that it remains fair.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

GERHARD EISLER AND THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I presume these comments might better have been made to the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress and not only to Members of the Eightieth Congress because the majority of those who led the fight last year to handicap, harass, and handcuff the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities were defeated at the polls by the voters last November as they should have been.

I think it is well, however, to call to the attention of the House the highly important hearings held in the Eisler case by the House Committee on Un-American Activities last week. We hope to make them available to every Member of the House by the time you are asked to vote on the citation for contempt proceedings which will be before us at an early date.

The Eisler case clearly demonstrates certain things, but the most important is the tremendous amount of work still to be done in weeding Communists out of positions of importance in this country. I think the facts revealed in the Eisler case alone more than justify ten times over all the expenditures that have been made by the Congress for the maintenance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities ever since Martin Dies originated it some 9 years ago. I urge you to read carefully the dramatic, significant, and tremendously important information in these hearings from the standpoint of the security of this Republic.

Had it not been that the patriotic Members of this House have supported the work of its Committee on Un-American Activities all through the years, Herr Eisler would now be operating in Europe with the important information on atomic warfare and on the other subjects to which he devoted his nefarious espionage activities while in America. Had the enemies of this committee, and those who have trumped up one pretext after another for opposing its works, criticizing its methods, crippling its functions, voting against the contempt citations it has been forced to bring to Congress, and attempting to deny it adequate or effective funds, been successful in their efforts to destroy or defeat the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Communists would now be enjoying an even greater heyday of freedom in and out of this Government than is true today.

Had those who give lip service to the denunciation of communism in this country but who write and work and vote against the only agency of Congress with authority to circumvent communistic activities been able to terminate the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, men like Marzeni would still hold high positions of confidence in the State Department, and Gerhard Eisler, who once served Hitler as an operative in France and now serves Stalin as an international transmission agent for Moscow, directives would still be undeterred in their plots and plans to undermine freedom and democracy. So these remarks are just to say, "Thank you, my colleagues," to those of you—and that means the big majority on both sides of the aisle—who have had courage enough to stand up to be counted when the chips were down and votes were being held which would either support or undermine the important work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It has not always been popular to support this committee but it has always been good Americanism.

We expect to be before you soon for authority to greatly expand our staff of committee investigators and research assistants. If we are to do the job required, we shall need your assistance and cooperation on this matter. I feel confident that this support will be forthcoming from the great majority of Members of the Eightieth Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Morgan L. Fitch, of Chicago, on assuming the presidency of the National Association of Real Estate Boards on January 29, 1947.

LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I did not hear all of the remarks by my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. I did hear the conclusion of his remarks, and I concur in them most heartily. My good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] says he is going to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments by certain editors; I assume New Deal editors whitewashing Mr. Lilienthal. I wish to call attention to the fact that New Deal columnists and commentators during the past few days have had much to say about various events, but not one word against Ger Eisler, the Communist spy, who was before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That was the most important and significant event in this country during the past week. So far as the loyalty or disloyalty of Mr. Lilienthal is concerned, I am not going to dwell on that, but I think it is high time that the Government establish a sound policy in regard to this question of loyalty. The Government should not be put in a position of proving a person disloyal. No one should be given a position of high responsibility in the Federal Government if his loyalty to our Government and Constitution is in question. Any question of doubt should be resolved in favor of the Government.

HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN MEXICO

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all the people in Pennsylvania join with the gentleman from Indiana in wanting to have the Federal Government withdraw from the State—in other words, push it back to Washington where it belongs. While the gentleman from Texas thinks we are wrong, I want to ask him a very pertinent question: Whether he and the other Texas livestock men would not feel much more secure today concerning the hoof-and-mouth disease which is now raging in Mexico if they had the State legislature and the veterinarians of Texas fighting the disease rather than to have the Department of Agriculture from Washington building a wire fence along the border to keep it out, as is being suggested.

Mr. RAYBURN. The trouble is that the State of Texas is not prepared for it and neither the State of Texas nor any other State is going to be prepared to fight this disease.

Mr. GROSS. You will admit that the wire fence which has been suggested by the Government here in Washington will not keep the hoof-and-mouth disease out. I want to be properly understood. I know enough about foot-and-mouth disease, having lived through it, that I want it stamped out in Mexico. But there is only one way to do it, and that is, to do it

right, and a wire fence will not do it. If the Mexican Government wants our help sufficiently that they will cooperate to the extent that they will allow us to manage the program, I believe it can be cleaned out now cheaper than to fight it in our own country later on. As far as soil conservation is concerned, some good has been done. It has been sold to the farmers sufficiently that if they want it they will carry it on if the Federal Government is withdrawn. If it is good for the Federal Government to pay the farmer for digging ditches in his fields and rearranging his fields, it is a better thing for the Federal Government to pay him to paint his buildings, because nothing is better than well-kept buildings to strengthen a farmer's credit and prestige.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington News.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Indiana State Legislature.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to your attention a real emergency that now exists in the Eastern and East Central States. Industries are closing, thousands of workers are being forced to remain idle, and various programs so essential to our economic life are being halted. Especially is the housing program for veterans being penalized.

This emergency is caused by boxcar shortage, a condition which results from a recent mandatory directive issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation, and compels the railroad companies to deliver to the Chicago area a minimum of 1,500 or 1,600 empty boxcars per day for distribution to Western States. A "rob Peter to pay Paul" program. This directive makes it mandatory for the railroad companies to haul boxcars empty from the East through the areas where plants are closed and men are forced to be idle because this order will not allow these cars to be loaded en route, although a large percentage of the products to be loaded in these cars is to be shipped to the general areas where the empty boxcars are going.

Mr. Speaker, because of this emergency, which is growing to larger proportions every day, I respectfully call upon the proper standing committee of the House—which I understand is the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the capable leadership of Hon. CHARLES WOLVERTON—to immediately investigate this directive and the conditions involved, so that a more equitable distribution of the equipment at hand can be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE OSCAR CALLAWAY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, there are a few Members of this body who served with the Honorable Oscar Callaway in the period from 1910 to 1916. You will regret to learn of his death on January 31 last in Comanche, Tex., from where he was elected to Congress in 1910, serving what was then the Twelfth District.

Turning back the pages of the record of this House we find he was a leader in establishing the Federal Reserve Bank System, a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and vigorously opposed certain measures which he believed would draw this country into World War I.

I personally knew Mr. Callaway for more than 20 years and had occasion to see him recently. He was stern in his admonitions, willing and liberal in his compliments, and reflected rugged honesty and deep conviction in his opinions.

I am sure the membership of this House join me in expressions of sympathy to his family and friends, adding the hope that those who are deeply affected by his passing may find solace in realms beyond the touch of human effort.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], in expressing my deep sympathy to the family of the late Oscar Callaway, once a Member of this House.

Oscar Callaway and I graduated in the same class at the University of Texas. I knew him intimately. As a college student he developed a great capacity for leadership. He was a man of fine habits, splendid ability, and high integrity. His courage knew no bounds. Nobody ever had any trouble in knowing how Oscar Callaway stood on any important question. His frankness did not always bring him political success, but he always fought for his convictions. He and I did not always agree on political issues, but I placed a high value on his friendship. He will be missed not only by his family but by his many friends in this House, where he served for several years, and by his countless friends all over Texas.

COMMUNISM IN THE TVA

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel called upon to come to the defense of Mr. Lilienthal. Though I know of no reason why his patriotism should be challenged, he seems fully capable of defending himself. And, besides, that is a question for the Senate to determine.

However, I do regret the remark of my distinguished and able friend from Georgia, whom I love and honor, that the TVA is a hotbed of communism. We people who live in the area and who are served by that agency, know better.

As typical of some of the unfortunate remarks and to show how some people have been hurt by irresponsible charges that have been made, I want to relate to you a thing that happened last week before a committee of another body. One of our colleagues, the distinguished and able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] was testifying. A member of the other body asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] about a boy named Buck Borah. I thought his reply was so impressive that I wrote it down. He said: "Senator, I heard Mr. Clapp say that Borah lost his life in the defense of his country. It looks like his blood might wash away whatever taint there may have been attached to him."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. COX. Permit me to make just this brief observation: I hope the gentleman will not let his doubts of the information upon which my statement was based trouble him. If he wants me to spread the information upon the records of the House I shall be glad to accommodate him.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman has reliable information regarding un-American activities in any Government activity he not only has my wishes that he do so but it is his duty to spread it upon the public record.

I have not heard any charge that any person now employed by the TVA, from elevator operator to members of the board, is now or ever has been a Communist. I take it that in the employment of the several thousands of employees who from time to time have been employed by the TVA some mistakes have been made. It would be most unusual if this were not true.

Some several years ago the so-called Dies committee made an investigation of alleged communism in the agency but the chairman of the subcommittee who made the investigation, our former colleague, the Honorable Joe Starnes, has testified that he was in no way disturbed by the findings. It should be noted that since that time various appropriation bills and legislative proposals regarding the TVA, including the renomination of David Lilienthal to be a member of the

board, has been before the Congress, but the RECORD does not show any reference to communism in the TVA in the consideration of any of these matters. I wonder why there is now so much to do about something which several years ago even the Dies committee thought inconsequential.

I have recently noticed reports that an alleged Communist is to be prosecuted for illegally concealing his identity in order to obtain employment in the Department of State. If true, this was an unfortunate mistake, but I have not heard, and I hope I do not hear anyone attempt to blacken the name of the former great Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, or to besmirch the Department of State because of this error.

All subversive elements in the Government should be expelled; must be rooted out. But, Mr. Speaker, let us be careful lest we besmirch the good name of innocent, patriotic American citizens.

Mr. COX. The statement made that communism flourished under the nose of Mr. Lilienthal is well-advised.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MEXICO AND THE FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE OF CATTLE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, several emergencies have been brought to your attention this morning, but I am bringing to your attention a very important matter and a great emergency—the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

I have this morning introduced a bill to deal with this situation. I also wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that hearings will be held at 4 o'clock this afternoon in the House Agricultural Committee on the current outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

Under the present statutes, the Department of Agriculture has authority to cooperate informally with foreign governments in suppressing outbreaks of this dread disease. Present authority, however, does not extend to engaging in eradication processes on a substantial scale, even when requested to do so by foreign officials. This legislation has been introduced at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission, based on findings of a joint Mexico-United States Veterinary Survey Committee which has just completed a survey in Mexico. Do not forget the time of these hearings—4 p. m. today in Agriculture Committee, room 1310.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express rather an audacious opinion, I presume, but to the House of Representatives comes first the duty of writing a tax bill as well as the consideration of tariff and reciprocal trade agreements.

I am sorry that another body has done such a prodigious amount of meddling on those subjects prematurely.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INDIANA AND FEDERAL AID

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, during the next fiscal year the United States Treasury will pay out for the benefit of and directly to the citizens of the State of Indiana literally hundreds of millions of dollars. It will pay out millions of dollars in old-age assistance, millions of dollars for other social-security benefits to the citizens of Indiana. It will pay out much, much money for flood control; it will pay many, many millions of dollars to the veterans of the Second World War from the State of Indiana.

I wonder how the Indiana delegation and the Indiana Legislature feel about those expenditures out of the Treasury of the United States. It sounds very well to pass a resolution that they do not want any Federal help, but let them get down to the practical basis of refusing that help; then we will know how they really feel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact, and it is a fact because I have kept track of it for over 25 years, that the State of Illinois pays into the Federal Treasury between five and six dollars for every dollar it gets back in every shape, kind, or form, of Federal subsidy and Federal aid. The State of Indiana probably pays in between three and four dollars, the State of Michigan $5, the State of Pennsylvania between eight and ten dollars, and the State of New York some $12 for every dollar it gets back.

It is a mighty good thing for these States to now realize that they better stand on their own feet and pay their own way and keep their dollars at home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I would think that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, would have limited his remarks quite materially because as a member of that great committee he certainly knows that so far as social-security payments are concerned for unemployment compensation, for old age survivors insurance, and for the payment of administration of the employment services in all of the States, every dollar of that money is provided by taxes levied upon the pay rolls produced in those States and funneled into the Federal Treasury. There is a great segment of our economy thinking in this country that believes the time has come when we should permit the States to levy and collect their own taxes for those purposes and to handle and administer those programs as they are doing under existing law.

It seems to me that we should rather be inclined to eliminate the items which I have referred to from the discussion at hand. As to the payment to veterans, that is a Federal responsibility and the Federal Government ought to take care of the veterans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

AMENDING RULE XI (1) (H) OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (RELATING TO THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 90 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That rule XI (1) (h) of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) For the purpose of performing such duties the committee, or any subcommittee thereof when authorized by the committee,

is authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to employ such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures within the amount authorized or appropriated as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "committee," and insert "committee."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

On page 1, line 10, after the word "adjourned", strike out "to employ such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "testimony", strike out the comma and the words "to have such printing and binding done and to make such expenditures within the amount authorized or appropriated."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment I have just sent to the desk, and which you heard read, is to protect the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. As the Members are aware, the Committee on House Administration has jurisdiction over the personnel in the House as well as in committees. In the past it also has had jurisdiction over printing and binding.

By the adoption of this amendment those powers will be kept within the Committee on House Administration where they rightfully belong. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments can go before the Committee on House Administration and obtain this necessary help, stenographic assistants, experts, and so forth, if they can show good reason therefor.

This resolution authorizes the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to appoint subcommittees to investigate Federal policies, personnel needs and practices, and other aspects of the Federal Government as the need arises, or as the committee deems necessary or advisable. It gives the committee power to subpena such papers, documents and books, and to take such testimony as may be necessary to execute the duties with which they are entrusted. This power is obviously necessary for the committee if it is to execute its responsibilities. Both sides of the aisle are interested in promoting increased efficiency in the Federal bureaus, and there should be little opposition to this resolution which is designed to locate and eliminate the bottlenecks that now stymie the effectuation of the laws passed by Congress.

When the Democratic administration assumed office on March 4, 1933, there were approximately 530,000 Federal employees. We have seen that number increase constantly, although the New Deal popularized itself by promising the elimination of superfluous Federal personnel and a 25-percent reduction in governmental expenditures. There are now more than 2,250,000 civilian employees in the Federal Government, and we are told they are all necessary in the operation of the executive departments. Last year salaries for civilian employees in the Federal Government exceeded $6,400,000,000. Unlike New Dealers, the Republicans intend to fulfill their promise to the voters and cut personnel and expenditures to the operating minimum.

The Expenditures Committee, if granted the power, can dig into the policies and the general set-up of various departments, bureaus, and agencies. By eliminating wasteful policies and procedures and overlapping operations the committee can possibly save hundreds of millions of dollars now being spent unnecessarily.

One of the first acts of the committee would be to investigate and attempt to remedy the notorious waste and inefficiency in the War Assets Administration. The run-around given to citizens trying to do business under the lopsided conditions established by special regulations issued by that agency would be remedied. The committee could also hear and act upon complaints of private citizens who have suffered injustices from bureaucrats. As they cannot be removed from office, even by the will of the people, these bureaucrats can now be as high-handed as they wish, without fear of reprisal.

Too many of them ignore the Constitution and the laws passed by Congress and invade the rights of the people. They should be made to understand that they are servants of the people and not their masters. Now is the time for a revaluation of the purposes and limitations of this Government, before the people become so accustomed to governmental confusion, that they regard as normal the regimentation of war and the bureaucratic methods that grew up under the New Deal.

We have given the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments great responsibilities, and we expect them to play a large role in returning this country to a system of sensible government. Now we must give them the power to fulfill the obligations that have been placed upon them. And that is exactly what House Resolution 90 is designed to do. I recommend its passage.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman advise us whether the amendment he just offered is his own amendment or an amendment by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The amendment I just offered was offered as an amendment by the chairman of the Committee on Rules with the approval of the members of the Committee on Rules which I spoke to personally.

Mr. JUDD. So the committee discussed it and approved the amendment which the gentleman just offered.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It was approved by the individual members which I talked to.

Mr. JUDD. But the resolution as reported out by the Committee on Rules did not have that amendment in it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

NO NEW DEAL EDITORS ON COMMITTEE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in the first place I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], on offering the amendment.

Before I speak on the resolution, however, I desire merely to make this observation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], who followed me, or shortly thereafter, tried to make it appear that the report that I asked to be printed as coming from newspaper editors, was prefaced by New Deal editors or leaders. I wish to say that he is in error. This is a report made by independent editors from eight nationally known papers and has met with general approval on the part of the press of the United States which, after reading the report from this independent committee, realized and recognized that the attacks that have been made on the information program of the State Department were not justified; that they were unwarranted; and that the matter should be made clear to the country. This report which I am inserting in the RECORD merely sets out the facts and the findings without change on my part, except to omit footnotes to save space. I have neither amended, strengthened, nor weakened the report. Indeed, it needs no strengthening. The facts and the statements speak for themselves, and I urge all those who so frequently have attacked and assailed the State Department to read it for themselves.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The question of whether editors are independent editors or New Deal editors, is that not a matter of one's own opinion and judgment?

Mr. SABATH. They were not selected by any New Dealers but were appointed by the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Mr. Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune. I doubt that even the gentleman from Illinois would call the New York Herald Tribune, which has been practically an official organ of the Republican Party for many years, a New Deal newspaper. For the benefit of the gentleman, I repeat the names of the eight editors who composed the committee, and of the newspapers which they represented. You will note that only the Houston Post could be called a Democratic newspaper; only the

St. Louis Post-Dispatch a genuinely liberal and independent newspaper, and that none of these newspapers has been a strong supporter of the New Deal, at least in the last 2 years, while all had criticized the State Department's information program.

These are the names of the editors, with their papers:

N. R. Howard, chairman, editor, Cleveland News.

George Cornish, managing editor, New York Herald Tribune.

Oveta Culp Hobby, executive editor, Houston Post.

Edwin L. James, managing editor, New York Times.

Ben M. McKelway, associate editor, Washington Star.

Hamilton Owens, editor, Baltimore Sun papers.

Ben Reece, managing editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Gideon Seymour, executive editor, Minneapolis Star-Journal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In talking about newspapers and what party they support, my recollection is that at least 84 percent of the newspapers of the country are Republican; certainly not Democratic.

Mr. SABATH. There is no question but what the gentleman is right.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would just like to ask if these editors are among the 84 percent that he classifies as Republican?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; most of them are. They represent the big newspapers. The big, moneyed newspapers are all Republican, we know that, and the gentleman knows that because he is a pretty intelligent man and he is in contact with them very often.

Mr. Speaker, as to the resolution, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] in offering the amendment. For the information of the House I wish to say that originally the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] introduced Resolution No. 71 for this purpose, but later on he introduced a resolution embodying the provision for the hiring of experts and employees, and so on, which no doubt would call for tremendous expenditures.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How would the expenditure that the gentleman is talking about compare with the money that was spent at the time he was on that committee?

Mr. SABATH. Oh.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh; I guess so.

Mr. SABATH. Wait a second, for every dollar that committee of mine spent we saved the bondholders of the United States thousands of dollars. There is no question but that it was the most efficient investigation that was ever conducted by a congressional committee. The amount expended was indeed only a small portion of the amount of money that should have been spent and could have been spent if all the facts had been brought before the American people. Nevertheless, we succeeded in passing two acts which have been beneficial to the investors of this country. I regret that we were unable to secure approval in the Senate of the last bill which the House passed, which would have still further restricted the manipulators of stocks and bonds throughout the United States. It was all done in the interest of the investors of our Nation. I do not know how much this would cost, but may I say this to the gentleman from Indiana——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether it is a parliamentary inquiry or not.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield just now. There is no parliamentary question that the gentleman can raise.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois refuses to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. We are entitled to know to whom the gentleman is referring. The gentleman has been talking about the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, I meant to say to the gentleman from Michigan. I beg your pardon. There has been so much said about economy from Indiana that I really made a mistake and unfortunately charged the gentleman to Indiana. I know they would be only too pleased if they could have such an able representative as the gentleman from Michigan in their midst. But I would not want to deprive the State of Michigan of their Representative.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another correction?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I know that the gentleman is mistaken when he claims to have saved so much of the taxpayers' money when he was chairman of the bondholders' committee. The House saw fit to deny the gentleman and his committee additional funds at that time. Do you recall that?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. That was evidence that the people were through with that program.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman wishes me to go into that, I will go into it, by the eternal gods, and I will let the real facts be known as to why no more money was appropriated and why the fight was made against appropriating any more money by my colleagues, so that the committee could not delve deeper into the misdeeds of these bondholders' committees, receivers, trustees, trust companies, and bankers who have robbed and continued robbing the American bondholders and investors of billions of dollars—not millions of dollars—but billions of dollars. But I am not going to get personal with the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. I just wanted to be sure that the gentleman has the correct picture.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that it was a real investigation and a very good investigation. In his own heart the gentleman knows it was a darn good investigation, honest and fearless. It penetrated deeper into the dark financial morasses than any other committee ever has had the courage to go; so much so, in fact, that you were influenced to do your utmost to restrict, yes, and to stop the investigation, and a Missouri gentleman aided you when the committee would not stop the investigation of a certain clique or gang which, with only $13,000 in cash, had gained control of 42 small life-insurance companies with the purpose of destroying them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I was hoping that I could conclude in a short time; but, of course, I cannot resist yielding to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], a fellow member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have been attempting to follow the statements being made by the gentleman and have been trying to decide in my own mind as to just which committee the gentleman is referring. Is that the committee which the gentleman headed which investigated stock and bond sales and various activities in the stock market?

Mr. SABATH. Not activities in the stock market, but mostly the investigation of bond issues and stocks, life-insurance companies, and, later on, railroads, when the committee was authorized for the third time to go into those questions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that the same committee for which the Garsson brothers were investigators?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I just wanted to identify the committee.

Mr. SABATH. I yielded to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, fully expecting that he would, as usual, try to do a little smearing. I could not forbear giving him the pleasure and the opportunity.

May I now say to him, as I have said many times before on this floor, that both these brothers were engaged by the committee of which I had the distinction of being the chairman—the Special Committee To Investigate Bondholders Committees.

Notwithstanding the adverse publicity they have now received, 10 years after they had ended all connection with the committee and with me, I will say to him and to the country again that as investigators they did a mighty good job; a job that few other men would have had the courage, the nerve, and the guts, if you prefer, to do.

But I claim no special credit for their good work. They were not of my choosing. I knew neither of these men until they had been recommended to me by Members from New York. One of those was Judge Culkin, the New York mem-

ber of the committee, respected and honest. Several other New York Members also recommended them.

I was informed then, as I have repeatedly stated here in this House, that they were not Democrats. They were Republicans. One of them was represented to me as being highly valued by the Republican Secretary of Labor under President Hoover, whose name was, I think, Doaks, and who gave Mr. Garsson a very fine recommendation. After the Secretary's death, Mrs. Doaks remarked on the high esteem and confidence the Secretary had in him.

Before either of these brothers was engaged they were approved by the committee. Actually, the appointments were not mine; I have always preferred to appoint qualified Democrats whenever possible. I repeat, they were good investigators, who brought to light many things which rich and powerful people did not want to be brought into the light. They are still suffering, and we are all still suffering, because of our efforts in behalf of thousands and thousands of small investors who had put their life savings into bonds.

I thank the gentleman. I know that the gentleman wanted to bring that out and I am glad he did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That reminds me very much of the old story that it takes a certain type of person to catch a certain other type of person.

Mr. SABATH. That may be true. They were Republicans. They were recommended and approved by the Republican members of the committee and the Republican Members of the State of New York, and I did not know them before at all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was very kind of the gentleman to employ them.

Mr. SABATH. At all times, when I have appointed any individuals to positions within my bestowal, I have tried to follow the recommendations of the Members from the various States, and to the best of my ability to accept their recommendations if the nominees were qualified.

At that time, I did not seek the chairmanship of the investigation, nor the honors and duties and hard work that were mine, but I am proud of the work that was done. Millions and millions of homes were saved and millions upon millions of bondholders' interests were safeguarded. Many of the bonds that were selling then, due to the unfortunate Republican crash, at 3, 5, and 6 cents on the dollar, went up 10, 15, 20, and 50 cents on the dollar as soon as the committee started to investigate, and many were forced to be paid in full.

That was all in the interest of the American people, and especially of the small investors, the estates, the widows, and people who had invested their life savings to provide for themselves in their old age, and on whom these so-called gold bonds were unloaded without sufficient security.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield further. I know you gentleman are very liberal and very kind to me; but I cannot yield. If I should, I would be forced to expose and call attention to the underlying reasons the gentleman from Illinois chose to fight against the continuation of the investigation, which I know would be very unpleasant and embarrassing to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I started to say, I was hopeful, when the Committee on Rules, of which I then had the honor to be chairman, reported the resolution authorizing the reorganization of both Houses, that the law we ultimately passed to that end would bring about economy. But it seems I was mistaken. Instead of bringing about economy, it seems to me, it will ultimately cost the Government much more than heretofore. Surely, we reduced the number of committees. Of course, I have endeavored for years to bring about a reduction of committees which had overlapping jurisdiction by 8 or 10. Under this law, we have reduced the number of committees from 38 to 18, but each and every one of those committees is appointing any number of subcommittees, and the subcommittees desire to have experts and employees. This, notwithstanding that we provided additional help for each committee—giving each committee four experts, I think, at a salary of six, eight, and ten thousand dollars, and six additional employees. I thought, in view of that fact, that no additional employees or experts would be asked for or required. Consequently, as I said before, I congratulate the chairman of the Rules Committee, who has offered the amendment—and I hope it will be adopted—to eliminate the provisions in the resolution, and that the resolution as originally introduced will be passed. I hope this committee will have enough aid to make a thorough investigation of all expenditures in the various departments and in that way bring about economy and greater efficiency. I have no objection to the investigation. I have no objection to the resolution as it has been amended. Indeed, I hope that the committee will bring to light any wrongdoing or any crookedness, and will not merely attempt to smear officials because they are Democrats, especially as the Democrats mostly held only the minor positions, while the major beneficiaries were Republicans. In short, I hope the resolution will pass as amended.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the text of the decision of Judge Frank A. Picard, of the eastern district of Michigan, with regard to the now famous so-called portal-to-portal pay, notwithstanding the fact that the text may exceed the amount prescribed in the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONTINUING INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 36.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1947, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 36 enables the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to continue its investigation to determine whether the programs of the United States Maritime Commission are being executed efficiently, expeditiously, and economically. These investigatory powers were first granted to the committee by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and subsequently continued by action of the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

During hearings before the Rules Committee on this resolution, it was brought out that the General Accounting Office made forced adjustments of more than $8,000,000,000 in balancing accounts for expenditures of $21,000,000,000 by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. It has been estimated that 200 accountants would require 6 months to put the Maritime Commission's books in order for an audit. Although the Merchant Marine Committee's chairman emphasized that he wishes no witch hunt, he points out the taxpayers deserve an accurate accounting, and I agree with him.

It is probably too late to recover any money that might have been improperly expended, but continuation of the investigatory powers of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, as proposed by this resolution, would provide constant and continuing congressional surveillance of the present and future activities, policies, and expenditures of the Maritime Commission, and might prevent a recurrence of that agency's lax accounting methods, which are a perfect cover-up for criminal fraud.

Having been charged by the Congress with disposition of surplus war-built ships, valued at billions of dollars, the Maritime Commission is responsible for the largest individual surplus-property disposal program of any Government

agency. Congress must maintain a constant check to prevent abuses, and correct those that might arise in transactions involving so huge a sum.

In the past, investigations by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have paid for themselves a thousandfold. Its investigations netted the United States Treasury about forty millions of dollars last year alone, by requiring payment of what might have otherwise been charged off as bad debts.

By now it should be obvious to all of us that Congress is the only safeguard against the waste, corruption, and fraud which rises inevitably with bureaucracy. The difficulty of fixing responsibility for malfeasance in such a labyrinth of redundant Government functions is an invitation to unscrupulous Federal officials to commit fraud. It is a sad admission that administration of our Government has degenerated to such a state. Talking, however, will not remedy the situation. We must have legislation. When he appeared before the Committee on Rules, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries promised legislation to remedy any abuses existing in the United States Maritime Commission. I, therefore, recommend the adoption of this resolution.

Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to use any time?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, this resolution provides for an extension of powers which were originally given to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries 5 years ago.

This committee in my opinion has done a fairly good job but they have not completed their entire investigation. I believe they should have additional power and additional time. Many charges have been made as to the squandering of large funds on the part of the War Shipping Administration. Many of the older Members, of course, will remember that for several years I have called attention to the fact that the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission have been reckless in their expenditures, and from time to time I demanded investigations. I hope a real investigation will now be made as to all of these unjustifiable, unwarranted, and reckless expenditures especially on the part of these three agencies. I feel that such investigation should be made so that the country may know the real war profiteers, the officers and officials who were responsible for the reckless use of taxpayers' moneys and the mulcting of millions, yes billions, of dollars of Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am therefore in favor of the adoption of this resolution and any other resolution that will result in the thorough investigation of waste and reckless expenditures on the part of Government agencies and departments.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial passed by the Utah State Legislature.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RUBBER CONTROLS (H. DOC. 111)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my recent message to the Congress requesting the extension of certain titles of the Second War Powers Act for continued controls in a few specific areas, I pointed out the importance of natural and synthetic rubber to the national security. In that connection I urged the Congress to continue allocation controls over rubber pending consideration of permanent legislation that would insure the maintenance of a minimum synthetic rubber industry in the United States.

I am sure that the Congress will wish to consider carefully all aspects of the problem before enacting permanent legislation. During the period of such consideration, however, I urge that there be no break in the continuity of policy and administrative action concerning both natural and synthetic rubber. I, therefore, wish to review, in somewhat fuller detail than was possible in my previous message, the character of this problem, and to suggest actions that seem desirable for the Congress to take at this time.

The problem has not been a matter of immediate concern up to the present time, because world supplies of natural rubber have been so critically short that it has been necessary for us to make fullest practicable use of our facilities for producing synthetic rubber. As I stated in my previous message, the world supply of natural rubber is still inadequate to meet world needs. We must, however, recognize that the time is rapidly approaching when this condition will no longer prevail. According to the best evidence that I have been able to obtain, it appears that perhaps in late 1947, and almost certainly by early 1948, natural rubber production will have increased to the point where it will be possible to satisfy world rubber needs largely from natural rubber. With an adequate world supply of natural rubber and a free choice of materials by industry, the use of synthetic rubber in the United States might fall substantially below the permanent production goals considered to be minimum for the needs of national security. This would be even more likely if at some time in 1948 the world supply of natural rubber should begin to exceed the total world demand for all rubber.

The Congress has already made provision, by means of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1946, for the accumulation of a stock pile of natural rubber within the borders of the United States. The physical properties of rubber, however, and the necessity of stock-pile rotation, place limits which make the largest feasible Government stock pile of natural rubber inadequate in itself to meet the demands of a national emergency. The stock pile must be supplemented by an assured production of American-made rubber.

Appropriate action should be taken now to assure that adequate facilities for the production of American-made rubber of the highest quality continue to be available. Part of this productive capacity should continue in effective operation, and the techniques required for the efficient processing of synthetic rubber in the manufacture of rubber products should be maintained and improved.

The Congress will recall the extraordinary measures that had to be taken in the early days of the recent war to meet the emergency caused by the sudden unavailability of our normal supplies of rubber. At the direction of President Roosevelt a Rubber Survey Committee was created which outlined vigorous measures to be taken by both industry and Government. We were fortunate in having time to carry out the program outlined by this Committee, for the shortage of rubber could have caused the collapse of our war effort and of our domestic economy.

On another occasion we might not be so fortunate. The security of the United States and the essential needs of its citizens must never again be jeopardized by inadequate or uncertain rubber supplies.

In recognition of this fact, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion created an Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber in September 1945. This Committee made an exhaustive study of the problem, in cooperation with industry and the executive agencies concerned, and submitted two reports which were transmitted to the Congress on March 8 and July 22, 1946. These reports outline the dimensions of the problem and suggest various methods of meeting it.

The Congress should deal with all aspects of this matter during the present session because of its vital effect upon our national security. Meanwhile, it is imperative that the Congress extend authority to continue controls over rubber under the Second War Powers Act, as I requested in my previous message. Prompt action by the Congress will provide the basis for continuity of operation in rubber controls, and will permit their simplification and orderly relaxation or removal. It will also greatly aid the agencies concerned in planning production in Government-owned synthetic rubber plants and such action will con-

tribute to the disposal of these plants to private industry.

The time will soon arrive when it will no longer be necessary to use these controls to insure equitable distribution of natural rubber or to produce the maximum number of commodities from synthetic rubber. When this time comes, continued controls would be used only for the purpose of insuring the maintenance of a minimum synthetic rubber industry in the United States. Controls should be used for such maintenance of a synthetic rubber industry only if specific authority is provided for that purpose.

I therefore recommend that the Senate and the House of Representatives, by joint resolution, make a declaration of policy to the effect that it is the firm intention of the Government to maintain a synthetic rubber industry in the United States, adequate to the minimum needs of national security.

I further recommend that the Senate and the House of Representatives act expeditiously in establishing appropriate committee arrangements to consider the problems involved in maintaining a synthetic rubber industry in the United States and to draft such legislation as is found to be necessary to accomplish this objective.

I repeat my recent recommendation that the authority to continue allocation controls on rubber be continued for 1 year under title III of the Second War Powers Act, in order that the Congress may have an opportunity to consider this problem and to enact such permanent legislation as in its judgment is necessary and appropriate.

The program of action I have outlined has the unanimous and vigorous support of all agencies of Government concerned with this problem. I am instructing these agencies to give all possible assistance to the Congress in its consideration of the problem, and to make available, on request, the statistical material and other information which they have collected.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1947.*

PROTECTING AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, HORTICULTURE, LIVESTOCK, AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 597.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide legislation which makes mandatory the proper handling of garbage from transportation facilities, such as ships, railway cars, airplanes, and other forms of transportation by which garbage might be carried. Last year I introduced a similar bill, which passed the House but on account of a typographical error found on the last day of the session in the Senate the bill was held up. I reintroduced this bill in January of this year.

We now have in Mexico the hoof-and-mouth disease, and this bill will go a long way to protect what I believe might be one of the main germ carriers, transportation. Back in 1924 and 1925 we had the hoof-and-mouth disease in the United States. At that time it was brought in by ships from foreign countries. Garbage was dumped in the waters on the west coast near San Francisco, and we lost thousands of head of cattle. We have the disease now in Mexico, and we all know that public carriers are daily coming from Mexico into the United States without proper regulation as to garbage that might be dumped in the United States and bring about this infection and disease. This bill will protect the American horticulture, agriculture, and livestock industry. I would like to see the House adopt this bill, because I think it is urgently needed, particularly at this time. Mexico, our neighboring country, has perhaps as much as half a million head of livestock affected by the hoof-and-mouth disease.

Mr. HOPE. While I made a reservation of objection, I have no intention, of course, of objecting to the bill. It is true, as the gentleman has stated, that the bill passed the House unanimously, as I recall it, in the last session, and it lacked passage only because of a clerical error which resulted in the consideration of the bill being postponed in the Senate. The Committee on Agriculture the other day reported the bill unanimously. I know of no objection to it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is important to bring it up at this time because of the prevalence of the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the measure at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) for the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "garbage" means waste material, such as food scraps, table refuse, galley refuse, and refuse from stores of ships, railway cars, and aircraft, including such waste material in passengers' and crews' quarters, derived, in whole or in part, from fruits, vegetables, or animal products which have originated outside of, and have not previously legally entered, the continental United States.

(2) The term "fruits, vegetables, or animal products" shall not include fruits, vegetables, or animal products, purchased as ships' provisions in Canadian ports on the Great Lakes, unless there is in effect, with respect thereto, a proclamation issued under subsection (b) of this section.

(3) The term "vessel" means every description of craft or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as means of transportation on or in water.

(4) The term "aircraft" means every description of craft or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as means of transportation through the air.

(5) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, company, society, or association, a State or any agency thereof, or a political subdivision of a State or any agency thereof; and such term imports the singular or plural, as the case may be.

(6) The term "United States," when not limited by the adjective "continental," includes all Territories and possessions of the United States, with the exception of the Philippine Islands and the Canal Zone.

(7) The term "continental United States" means that part of the United States located on the continent of North America, including Alaska, but excluding Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "territorial waters of the United States" means all navigable waters of the United States, including all portions of the sea within its jurisdiction.

(9) The term "land" means not only that part of the earth's surface usually connoted by that term, but includes any building, platform, or other structure affixed to the land, whether permanent or temporary, and any pier, dock, wharf, or bridge extending into or across territorial waters of the United States.

(10) The term "authorized representative of the United States" means any employee of the United States Department of Agriculture, any customs, immigration, or public-health officer of the United States, and any commissioned, warrant or petty officer of the United States Coast Guard, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of this act.

(11) The term "authorized garbage collector" means any person holding an unsuspended and unrevoked authorization from the Secretary of Agriculture to collect garbage from vessels, railway cars, aircraft, and other vehicles arriving in the United States.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds that any type or kind of fruit, vegetable, or animal product, purchased as ships' provisions at Canadian ports, is likely to be a source of contagious disease dangerous to humans or animals, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect; and, whenever, after issuing any such proclamation the Secretary finds that such type or kind of fruit, vegetable, or animal product, so purchased, is no longer likely to be a source of contagious disease dangerous to humans or animals he shall by order revoke such proclamation.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of protecting American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health, the following acts are hereby prohibited and made unlawful:

(a) Throwing, discharging, or depositing garbage, or causing, suffering, or procuring garbage to be thrown, discharged, or deposited, from any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle into any territorial waters of the United States unless such garbage has been reduced to fluid form.

(b) Throwing, discharging, carrying, or depositing garbage, or causing, suffering, or procuring garbage to be thrown, discharged, carried, or deposited, from any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle onto land within the United States: *Provided, however,* That garbage may be so carried and deposited in tightly closed containers, for immediate incineration or for delivery to an authorized garbage collector, if arrangements have been made with said collector immediately to receive the same, or it may be otherwise safeguarded in a manner satisfactory to the authorized representative of the United States.

(c) The retention or maintenance of garbage on vessels, railway cars, aircraft, or other vehicles within the United States except in tightly closed containers and under such treatment as may be prescribed by an authorized representative of the United States.

SEC. 3 The presence in a vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle, for consumption therein, of animal products not permitted entry under the sanitary laws of the

United States, or of fresh fruits or vegetables which have originated outside of the continental United States shall constitute prima facie evidence that garbage which has accumulated in the vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle has been derived, in whole or in part, from such animal products, fruits, or vegetables, and, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any such animal products, fruits, or vegetables are being transported in any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle arriving in the United States, any authorized representative of the United States shall have power, without warrant, to inspect any such vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle.

SEC. 4. No customs entry need be filed nor duty paid with respect to any garbage disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. Any authorized garbage collector with whom arrangements to receive garbage have been made by the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle entering the United States, or by any authorized representative of such owner, operator, master, or other person, shall upon receipt of notice that garbage has been carried from such vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle and deposited upon land within the United States, proceed without delay to the place of such deposit and handle and treat the said garbage in accordance with the directions of an authorized representative of the United States.

SEC. 6. (a) The owner or operator, or the master or other person in charge, of any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle, aboard or from which a violation of section 2 of this act occurs, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than $1,000, and the vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle shall be liable for the payment of such penalty and may be proceeded against by way of libel in the district court of any district in which the said vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle may be found: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall have authority to limit or mitigate any such penalty under such terms and conditions as he may deem just and reasonable.

(b) Any authorized garbage collector or any agent or employee of such collector who shall violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may suspend or revoke the authorization of such garbage collector to collect garbage under this act. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed, however, as requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to report for prosecution minor violations of this act (or of the regulations issued thereunder) whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by a suitable notice or warning.

SEC. 7. When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure of any officer, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any individual, corporation, company, society, or association, within the scope of his employment or office, shall in every case be also deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such individual, corporation, company, society, or association, as well as of such officer, agent, or other person.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to prescribe rules and regulations, for administrative purposes only, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for allotment by the Secretary of Agriculture to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture and for transfer to other departments and agencies of the Government which the said Secretary may call upon to assist or cooperate in carrying out such purposes or for services rendered or to be rendered in connection therewith.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. Nothing contained in section 13 of the act of March 13, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 407), shall be construed as forbidding the discharge of fluid garbage into the territorial waters of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 8, line 21, after the word "March" strike out "13" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign last November I repeatedly urged the residents of my district to vote on the basis of facts rather than rumors or propaganda. I believe I made that suggestion in every campaign speech. I further promised that if elected to Congress I would try to keep my district informed as to the activities of their Government.

It was with this in view that I introduced a few days ago a resolution authorizing a special committee to investigate Government public relations and propaganda activities.

So far as I can learn Congress has never in contemporary times obtained an integrated over-all picture of what we are spending on publicity agents and just what those agents do. Various appropriations subcommittees get some of these facts piecemeal as they consider the respective supply bills. But no committee so far as I can ascertain has ever compiled this information in such form that a House Member can learn for himself the costs and functions of Government publicity and propaganda. I feel that some House committee should collect these facts, that thereafter Congress should determine a definite policy with respect to publicity, and that appropriations should be confirmed by this policy.

Let me make it abundantly plain that I am not attacking the theory that Government needs information specialists to help the radio and press get the facts. Nor am I criticizing press and radio for utilizing such services. Beyond any doubt there is a need in Washington for a limited number of such information specialists.

Newspapermen here inform me that some of these press agents right now are performing a number of valuable services. For instance, I am told that public-relations men at the Labor and Interior Departments have evoked an open-door policy. In other words, they encourage Washington correspondents to make inquiries and they help the correspondents to get in touch with the proper officials. That undeniably is a helpful public service.

The press officer at the Justice Department, on the other hand, seems to function more or less as a censor or security officer. I am told by newspapermen that they must channel their inquiries at the Justice Department through the public information director. He in turn releases only such information as he or his superiors may choose. I am sure Congress does not regard that type of public information as desirable.

The State Department is now operating a vast foreign publicity program through its Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. That office now has more than 3,000 employees. I am told that in many cases the Department has taken on young men just out of military service with little or no experience in public relations and little or no actual first-hand knowledge of American social and economic institutions. Yet these young men are being hired at salaries ranging from $6,000 to $7,000 and are being sent all over the world to serve as publicity agents for the United States Government. I am told that these agents are being appointed by the State Department without any examination whatsoever, and are being assured that after some service abroad they will be given a permanent State Department status without qualifying by examinations.

I have here an example of how this organization spends the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. Look magazine recently published reprints of seven paintings purchased by the Government, we are told at a cost of $40,000. These paintings are to be sent around the world as an exhibition of American art and culture. If these paintings represent American art at its best, let us bury them in a deep hole instead of displaying them to our neighbors.

The Federal Reserve Board presents another example of what I regard as a bad practice. It has long been the habit of many Federal agencies to hire publicity agents in the guise of other capacities. Thus their budget allocations are not identified as being for the purpose of public information. At the Federal Reserve Board, for instance, a Mr. Elliott Thurston is listed in the Official Register of the United States as "Assistant to the Chairman." Now as a matter of fact, Mr. Thurston is a former Washington correspondent who is actually public information director for the Board. This is well known by newspapermen here who contact the Board for information. Yet, officially Mr. Thurston has nothing to do with public relations, but is listed as an assistant to the Chairman.

It is my understanding that Mr. Thurston is the highest paid Government public-relations man in Washington.

The Official Register of the United States does not list his salary, but discloses that his salary is paid from assess-

ments levied by the Board upon Federal Reserve banks.

Such disbursements by the banks naturally increase the cost of service to bank patrons. I feel sure that the public and the banks would welcome some revelation by Congress concerning Mr. Thurston's position and duties.

Any Member of the House can get some idea of what this overgrown Federal publicity system is costing the taxpayers by glancing at the 1947 budget requests for the Office of the Secretary of Commerce. Under this office are listed the following publicity agents:

Director of Publications, $10,000 a year salary.

Assistant Director of Publications, $8,479 a year.

Chief, Editorial Section, $8,180 a year.

Chief, Publications Program, $8,180 a year.

Chief of the Field Publications Service, $7,342.

Five information specialists, $29,525.

Four city editors, $23,860.

One information specialist, $4,902.

Head of the Publications Section, $4,902.

Now bear in mind that these press agents are only those found in the office of the Secretary of Commerce. Many of the agencies in the Department have their own public information specialists listed separately.

These figures do not include the salaries of those who grind out the material released.

Just to give the Members of the House some idea of the hand-outs prepared and distributed daily by Government public information men I asked one of the newspapermen to save for me such handouts or press releases received by his office in 1 day. Here they are. You can see they make up a pile about 2 inches thick. Any Member is perfectly welcome to look these over if he wishes.

Here is another phase of Government handouts which I think the House should look into. I hold in my hand a rather beautiful and comprehensive document printed in the Government Printing Office and compiled by the War Assets Administration. It numbers 16 pages printed on very high-grade glossy stock. It is well filled with excellent and costly art.

It is pure undiluted propaganda. There is not one single word of news in it that would be regarded as legitimate copy by a good newspaper or magazine. Its real purpose is to convince Congress and the public that the War Assets Administration has been making a valuable contribution to the Nation by selling war surpluses.

That sort of thing should be stopped.

Here is another example of Government publicity which I think should be given attention by this House. It is laughable, but it is costly.

This is an official Department of Commerce press release setting forth the conclusions of specialists in that Department who studied the establishment and operation of a book store. Here is their conclusion as set forth in this official release. I quote:

> It is more important to be a smart businessman than a bookworm if you are to make a success of running a book store.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a Commerce Department press release edited and broadcast at the taxpayers' expense.

I have here a hand-out which the Veterans' Administration probably will maintain is valuable and indispensable. It is entitled "Fillers." It presents three pages of short two- or three-line paragraphs which the administration hopes newspapers will use to fill in surplus white space. I find it difficult to regard this sort of activity as essential to the press of the Nation.

I hold in my hand the Consumers' Guide, a Department of Agriculture publication printed on good glossy paper with plenty of pictures. How many magazines of this kind do you suppose the Government publishes? I would like to know. We employ thousands of people to furnish material to private publishers. Then we compete with them by publishing and distributing free magazines.

I have here a few press releases for February 8 and 9. These releases used to be sent out on plain inexpensive paper, but now I suppose that we are in the money with a thirty-five billion dollar tax income and the shooting war over. Now we must have colored letterheads. In fact, the Public Relations Division of the War Department now put their releases out with two-color jobs—the old red, white, and blue.

Again, I want to emphasize my object is to obtain the definite facts for Congress. Talk to any Washington newspaperman or radio man and you will get all sorts of reactions and reports on Government public information operations. Nobody seems to know what the program is or is intended to be. I feel the time has come for Congress to lay down a definite policy for Government publicity.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I presume a lot of this excessive and useless mail comes under what is called penalty mail in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It certainly is. There is no postage on any of it.

Mr. VURSELL. Being a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I find that in 1946 that Department stacked up a deficit of something like $300,000,000. The President has called attention to this deficit and has recommended higher postal rates. Of that deficit probably fifty or seventy-five million is on account of the unnecessary and useless mail issued by the various Federal departments, known as penalty mail. I do not know what can be done about it, but I think the gentleman should be commended for bringing this to the attention of the House. Certainly one way to stop this would be to blast out some of this bureaucracy, and put these people, who have nothing to do except to waste Government money, back into civilian life where they might produce something to support the Government, rather than to ride and let their feet drag all the time at the expense of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is exactly what I am trying to do. We have to find out where these people are and under what title we will find them on the pay roll. They will not be down there as publicity experts in many, many cases.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, ever since this Congress convened the first part of January, we have heard a considerable amount of talk about reducing taxes. I do not believe there is any Member of this House or of the Senate either who would not and does not hope that he can with good conscience vote for a reduction in taxes. This, of course, is a most laudable objective, but I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether we have spent enough time talking about how we can accomplish this objective. We spend too much time, I think, talking about formulas and overlooking the most important point: That we can reduce taxes only as we correspondingly reduce expenditures. Mr. Speaker, we must do two very definite things before we can reach the point where we discuss and talk formulas for tax reduction, in my opinion. In the first place, we must balance the budget. We cannot spend the same amount we have been spending in the past and still balance our budget. In order, therefore, to accomplish even the first objective we have got to start cutting, and cutting deep. It amuses me very much, Mr. Speaker, to find gentlemen from the other side of the aisle here entering into the discussion of tax reduction and tax formulas when they themselves are committed to a Presidential budget which under no stretch of the imagination can leave room for any tax reduction. So I believe it would come with much better grace for them to stop talking about formulas for reducing taxes and to start whittling away at their own Presidential and party budget.

Before we talk about tax reductions we must, I believe, make provision for a very substantial payment on the national debt, and we cannot do even that if we are going to accept the Presidential budget of $37,500,000,000. So that I believe the other side of the House might well give consideration to this factor before they inject themselves into the tax-reduction program. When we do this, when we make provision for the balancing of the budget, and when we make provision, Mr. Speaker, for a substantial payment on the national debt, then is the time for making some cut in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that these three objectives are impossible, that they cannot be achieved; in fact, Mr. Speaker, I very firmly believe that under the new controls in the House and in the Senate and under the new philosophy that should pervade as a result of that change that all three of these objectives can and will be accomplished. But I

want to warn the House and I want to warn the American public that those objectives cannot be accomplished and will not be accomplished unless there is a deep-seated desire and a will to actually cut expenditures to the bone. Mr. Speaker, that is what we should concentrate on today. That is what our objective should be. The objectives, as far as the end results are concerned, namely, balancing the budget, making a substantial payment on the national debt, and cutting taxes, are very laudable, and, as I say, I believe they can be accomplished; but, as in the war period, we had an ultimate objective, namely, the winning of the war. Where did we concentrate? We concentrated on a plan of operation as to how to attain that ultimate objective. That is what we have got to do today. We have to draw up a plan of operation in order to cut expenditures so as to make those things possible. This plan of operation, Mr. Speaker, should be to eliminate at least a minimum of $7,500,000,000 from the Presidential budget. We have got to spend more time talking, thinking, acting, and doing something about that. Then we can attain our ultimate objective of cutting taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will agree that everything depends upon how high or how low a ceiling we place on the budget. We will have to start from there.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but I think he has to carry that one step further. Your budget top does not mean anything unless you are going to stick to it, stay with it, and insist on it.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will recall that in the reorganization law it is provided that if the Congress exceeds the ceiling fixed on the budget we will have to amend the War Debt Act to increase the ceiling on the war debt?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct, but there is always that loophole. That is what I am worrying about, and I say that every Member of the House and every citizen of this country should worry about that. They should not forget that you cannot give a dollar in tax reduction until you take that dollar off your expenditures. That is where we have to concentrate.

Mr. KNUTSON. The great danger to the program, as I see it, is that too many Members may listen to false prophets.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is very right in that statement. The reason I think it is necessary to take the floor at this time to try in my little voice to emphasize this necessity for reduction of expenditures is the fact that we have still prevailing in the Congress, in the House of Representatives at least, the theory that we can keep on going and spending on new things or more things, continuing on and still be able to accomplish the three objectives which I have mentioned. I think it is a sad commentary to read an article in the January 31 issue of the United States News. It is a very factual statement, and I want to call it to the attention of the House. Here is what the article states:

> The "gimme" theme still dominates, even in this period of roaring prosperity. Veterans want more billions when already they are receiving $7,000,000,000 a year. Farmers want Government to do more for them, in new price supports, production bonuses, and guaranteed high income. States want the National Treasury to help out with support of their schools. Old people want bigger pensions, bigger subsidies for State pension systems. Then there are costly aviation-development plans, more loans to business, more money asked for subsidies.

I continue further:

> The demand for more money, for bigger spending, is bipartisan, and shows a tendency to grow and not decline with the size of existing payments.

Further on and more or less in conclusion of this article appears the following statement:

> All in all, except for bills calling for investigations of past Democratic administration and for regulation of labor unions, the mass of bills in Congress reflects an apparently deep desire on the part of the American people to get something for nothing. Members of Congress propose a very great range of ideas for pumping dollars out of the United States Treasury and into the pockets of one group or another. At the same time, there is a strong desire to reduce taxes and to lower the national debt. No Member of Congress, however, is offering a formula by which hand-outs and subsidies can be stepped up by additional billions of dollars a year while taxes are being reduced and debt retired.

Yes; we talk on one hand of spending more money and we talk on the other hand of reducing taxes, but the formula is not presented to show how you can possibly do that. It just cannot be done. You have to cut first and then your taxes can be cut, and you cannot increase your expenditures without increasing your taxes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman would not attempt to handicap the rural electrification program, would he, since that money all comes back? It is merely a loan to the farmers to build their own lines, and comes back with interest.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not talking about any specific cut in that connection, but I do say this, that we have got to adopt an attitude that if definite economies can at the present time be made in rural electrification, they must be made, in spite of our individual desire to see a greater expansion made. That is true of all programs, and there is one place, Mr. Speaker, I think, where we are running into difficulty. We are inclined to take the attitude that it is all well and good to cut the other fellow, but "do not cut me," and that is a philosophy that we cannot let continue if there is going to be any cutting at all.

There are several specific things that I think this Government must do, and I would like to just point them out. In the first place, we must shut our eyes and our ears against new proposals for expenditures. We have got to make up our minds that we are going to resist all pressures for increases in Federal expenditures, for new aids to groups or to States or to local units of government; that for the time being, at least until we get our financial house in order, we must close the door to new expenditures.

No. 2. We must cut drastically our present proposed expenditures, and this has to be done in two places: First, in the operation even of necessary governmental activities, and then, second, we must cut out a lot of activities that are not in and of themselves absolutely essential or that cannot be performed by other units of Government.

Let us look for a moment at necessary governmental activities. We know that there is needless and top-heavy personnel and overlapping expenditures, and those must be investigated thoroughly. I know that the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are working hard in examining under a microscope these various departments and other activities to cut out this deadwood and overlapping. They must jump on the necks of every department or employee that spends one needless dollar. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have got to back those subcommittees up because it will not do any good for them to come in with a proposal for a cut and a proposal for economies in departmental activities if the House itself is going to overrule them and say, "No; we have got to keep this or that appropriation up." We have got to stand by the subcommittees of our Committee on Appropriations when they make their cuts.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has made a very careful study of this question, will agree that it is necessary to keep the Federal spending at $32,000,000,000 or less if we are to have any tax reduction.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In fact, I believe we should have a minimum cut of $7,500,000,000, which would bring the budget down to $30,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, there are those who claim that the budget can be cut down to $28,000,000,000; I do not know. But I am satisfied it can be brought down to $32,000,000,000 without in any way impairing the national defense, our obligation to the veterans, and for all needed expenditures for necessary Government activities.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely right. If we have the determination to do it, and the will do it, and I sincerely hope we have, the cuts can be made. But, we must become a little more worried as to whether or not we are going to reach that objective. We must keep it constantly in our minds.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman's fears are well founded because we detect on both sides of the aisle that spreading disease that calls for spending and spending, and taxing and taxing.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right. There are bills proposed in this House every day. I wish an analysis of them could be made. But there are bills and resolutions introduced in this House every day for spending more money to start some new project. Now, you cannot do that on one

hand, and on the other hand say, "We are going to balance the budget, and make a payment on the national debt, and cut taxes." Those things just do not go together.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I recall, there were introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress bills calling for authorizations in excess of $36,000,000,000 for extraneous activities.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will bet that you have come very close to that already this year on new projects.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sure that the gentleman does not intend to leave the impression that these bills to spend a great deal of money are introduced only from one side of the aisle.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have not said that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have not said that either.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I admit that there are Members on my side of the aisle sponsoring such legislation and I do not like to see that. I am lecturing to them right now as much as I am lecturing anybody on either side of the aisle, that is, if it is within my province to lecture anybody, which I doubt, but they are on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that no individual is completely immune to the "gimmies." We have not yet found the serum to cure it, but I think one more election will pretty nearly eradicate it.

Mr. THOMASON. I just wanted to be sure that the RECORD did not show that all these bills calling for the expenditure of untold millions and even billions of dollars come from the Democratic side only because I know that many, many bills are introduced by Republican Members of the House asking for untold sums of money in the way of public expenditures.

Mr. KNUTSON. That just goes to show you how a bad example will infect even this side of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I can appreciate how the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle may be sensitive when we start criticizing new expenditures, because there certainly is no question but what the Congress and the American people were educated by his side of the aisle to look to the Federal Government for hand-out after hand-out. That is the biggest difficulty that the Republican majority will have to overcome. They will have to reeducate the people that the Federal Government is not the great provider and that the people have on some occasions to look after themselves and that local units of government should do something themselves and that the Federal Government is not the first place and the last place to go for every dime, nickel, and million dollars that is spent.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. There was some discussion on the floor earlier in the day about a resolution sent here from the legislature, I believe, of the State of Indiana.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I was going to discuss that if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Mr. THOMASON. I hope the gentleman will in the able speech that he is making discuss the question whether his colleagues are going to vote for or against Federal appropriations, not only for Federal highways but also for soil conservation and rural electrification.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If I may proceed, I am going to cover that point.

But let me get back to this culling of the operations of our necessary governmental expenditures to date. We have to cut them right down to the bone and see that there is not one dollar wasted. This may probably be considered a very petty example of some of the expenses that are incurred by these departments which are absolutely wasted money. I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Connecticut, who preceded me, call the attention of the House to the waste resulting from propaganda that is put out by the departments. Here is another small waste that struck me, as the bobby-soxers would say, as "being out of this world." It was sent to me by a hardware wholesaler and distributor in my district. It is a notice sent out by the Navy Department of a sale of some surplus goods that the Navy Department has. This is a full-page letter with references to the particular procedure, and so forth, which is to be followed in selling these items to the public and opening up the bids. Naturally, this letter had to be prepared by at least a lieutenant in the Navy. It had to be signed by a captain and had to go through a mimeograph machine, and it had to be sent out in the mail. Then, under the procedure, it was to come back and the bids opened and all the rest of the procedure followed. I leave it to your own imagination to guess how much it cost to get out this particular notice of this particular sale. What are they selling? What are they trying to sell? Her it is:

Item No. 1, quantity three wastebaskets, used, good condition.

Item No. 2, quantity two costumers, gray steel, used, good condition.

Item No. 3, quantity, three cuspidors, used, good condition.

That is the extent of the entire sale. The person who sent me this is in the business of handling material like that, and he said he doubts if anybody, under any circumstances, would want to pay more than a dollar for the complete outfit.

Mr. KNUTSON. Are there any chamber appurtenances mentioned there?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is the extent of it. If you are going to have extravagance in little things, you are bound to expect them in the bigger things. We have got to cut right down to the bottom.

I would like to be able to check the long-distance telephone bills of these departments. They will wait for a month or two months before they take action on something, but when they finally do then everything hurries up, and they put in a ten- or fifteen-dollar long-distance telephone call. I do not mind how much money the departments spend if they do an efficient job and the expenditure is necessary. I do not believe in cutting out the absolute necessities. I certainly believe in doing what you have got to do in as economical and efficient a way as possible. This Navy Department deal is not one of them.

Second, Mr. Speaker, other than the present necessity for scrutinizing most carefully these departments and their activities, we should take a long-range view, and I think early consideration should be given to H. R. 775, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], which would appoint a nonpartisan commission to study the executive departments with the idea of promoting economy and efficiency and improving the service and transaction of public business in the various departments, agencies, and bureaus.

That, Mr. Speaker, would be a long-range view for the purpose of at least working constantly in the direction of getting some kind of efficiency and economy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Why impose on the Government another commission? That is what the Members of Congress are here for. Why attempt to delegate that prerogative to an additional commission? They would probably come in and recommend three more commissions.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I suggest that the gentleman read H. R. 775. I do not think he will find it is the general type of commission that we generally find when we set up another bureau or another agency.

Mr. RANKIN. They "think of six and sing seven." I have been watching the creation of these commissions for many years. Instead of cutting down commissions they multiply commissions. That is what the Members of the Congress are here for. It is our duty to make these investigations. We ought not to create another commission. We are commissioned to death now.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I disagree with the gentleman on that score as far as somebody to investigate and bring out an adequate plan for the reorganization of these executive agencies, culling them out and cutting out the overlapping that presently exists, needs a thorough expert examination. I must definitely disagree with my friend from Mississippi on that score.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman recommend any saving on the appropriation that was made during the last Congress for the British loan if Great Britain continues to violate it, as has been reported by the Secretary of the Treasury recently? There is still $1,000,000 of that unused. We might save some of it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I appreciate what the gentleman is driving at. I am inclined to take the position that having committed ourselves there we must go through with it. I do not

believe in going back on the word of the American people. I voted against the British loan. I was not for it in the beginning. But the commitment has been made. Let us confine ourselves to cleaning our house. The cleaning must be done. We must do the things that we know we can do. We can do them in honesty and in good faith. We must do it to keep faith with the American people. It is my belief that the whole scope of Federal activities, in view of the tremendous growth of the National Government in the past 15 years, must be reexamined for the elimination of needless activities and the transfer of the responsibility for certain activities to the smaller units of government.

In relation to the State and local units of government, the Federal Government from a fiscal standpoint exhibits a pattern of spectacular growth in the past 15 years. I would just like to have the membership look at the increase in Federal expenditures during the past years, say from 1913 on to the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments from the fiscal years 1913 to 1947.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments, fiscal years 1913 and 1923–47

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Total	Federal [1]	State [2]	Local [3]
1913	2,656	690	359	1,607
1923	8,284	3,033	1,195	4,056
1924	8,706	2,780	1,388	4,538
1925	9,036	2,671	1,481	4,884
1926	9,287	2,624	1,487	5,176
1927	9,603	2,594	1,591	5,418
1928	10,201	2,677	1,753	5,771
1929	10,794	2,815	1,928	6,051
1930	11,047	3,007	2,155	5,885
1931	11,433	3,305	2,282	5,846
1932	12,175	4,203	2,245	5,727
1933	10,516	3,664	2,054	4,798
1934	12,907	5,870	2,031	5,006
1935	14,279	6,858	2,217	5,204
1936	14,531	6,792	2,419	5,320
1937	15,732	7,513	2,877	5,342
1938	15,660	6,914	3,145	5,601
1939	17,350	8,452	3,322	5,576
1940	17,918	8,693	3,372	5,853
1941	20,830	12,290	3,224	5,316
1942	39,925	31,921	3,281	4,723
1943	85,388	77,665	3,126	[4] 4,597
1944	100,663	92,921	3,169	[4] 4,573
1945	----------	97,044	----------	----------
1946	----------	60,066	----------	----------
1947	----------	[5] 38,239	----------	----------

[1] Excludes refunds and trust-fund transactions.
[2] Excludes unemployment insurance trust fund and benefit payments. Other trust-fund transactions are excluded after 1940. Excludes State-collected, locally shared taxes. Amounts for 1942, 1943, and 1944, are estimated at $297,000,000, $305,000,000, and $325,000,000, respectively.
[3] Amounts for 1913, 1932, and 1942 are from decennial census of governments. Other years are estimates based on these years. Excludes trust-fund and public-service enterprise transactions.
[4] Estimated by Tax Foundation.
[5] Revised budget estimate of Aug. 3, 1946.

NOTE.—Excludes debt retirement. Grants-in-aid are counted as expenditures of the first disbursing unit.

Source: U. S. Treasury Department, U. S. Bureau of the Census, National Industrial Conference Board, and Tax Foundation.

From: Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 1946–47, Tax Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The last Congress, supported by the Members on both sides of the aisle, authorized the expenditure of large sums of money for river and harbor improvements, flood-control projects, and so forth.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the gentleman is going to go into specific and individual projects now, I said they should all be examined. I am going to go into that. They should all be examined from the standpoint of whether these can be done by the local communities, by the local unit. Or is it absolutely necessary that it be done by the Federal Government? If it is necessary that it be done by the Federal Government and that is the best and the most economical way to do it I will be for its continuation; but there are plenty of them, and the gentleman should know it, plenty of Federal expenditures for projects that can be better done by local units.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Since the projects have been authorized by the Congress by votes on both sides of the aisle, does the gentleman believe that the Federal Government should go on and appropriate the money to start them and finish them, or does he believe they should be looked into again or reexamined?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think they should be looked into again; I very definitely do. If the gentleman will go through the books he will find authorizations for appropriations for public buildings and rivers and harbors projects, and other expenditures that would take all our revenue for the next 15 years or more if we appropriated for all of them authorized now. I think they should be reexamined, absolutely, because we have got to cull out everything that possibly can be culled out.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a table showing the percentage distribution of governmental expenditures between the Federal, State, and local governments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Governmental expenditures—Percentage distribution

[Fiscal years 1913 and 1923–44]

Year	Total	Federal	State	Local
1913	100	26.0	13.5	60.5
1923	100	36.6	14.4	49.0
1924	100	31.9	16.0	52.1
1925	100	29.5	16.4	54.1
1926	100	28.3	16.0	55.7
1927	100	27.0	16.6	56.4
1928	100	26.2	17.2	56.6
1929	100	26.1	17.9	56.0
1930	100	27.2	19.5	53.3
1931	100	28.9	20.0	51.1
1932	100	34.5	18.4	47.1
1933	100	34.9	19.5	45.6
1934	100	45.5	15.7	38.8
1935	100	48.0	15.5	36.5
1936	100	46.7	16.7	36.6
1937	100	47.7	18.3	34.0
1938	100	44.1	20.1	35.8
1939	100	48.7	19.2	32.1
1940	100	48.5	18.8	32.7
1941	100	59.0	15.5	25.5
1942	100	80.0	8.2	11.8
1943	100	90.9	3.7	5.4
1944	100	92.3	3.2	4.5

Source: Computations by Tax Foundation.

From Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 1946–47, Tax Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I call the attention of the House to this table. This does not involve the amount of money, it is the percentage distribution, we know the amount has increased but the thing that is interesting and important about this table is that it shows who is spending the tax dollar.

It shows the tragic shift from local expenditures and administration to Federal expenditure and administration.

It can readily be seen from these tables that of late years, especially during the last 15 years, there has been a pronounced shift in governmental expenditures and in tax collections. I think it is important to note that since 1932, excluding the war years, the Federal Government has not only tremendously increased its expenditures, but it has taken the place of local governments as the greatest governmental spender and has taken the place of the local government as the greatest governmental tax collector. These facts cannot be overlooked in any discussion of economy in the Federal Government.

I believe there is one big question facing the Congress and the American people, namely, has not the centralized Federal Government, with all the evils inherent in big government, assumed responsibilities, expenditures, and tax privileges that might better be placed in the hands of the State and local units, and in doing so placed itself in a most dangerous fiscal position. I believe that if we will analyze this question and the answer to it, we will find at least one important step that can be taken in the direction of putting our fiscal house in order.

Let me discuss just one aspect of this question, aids to States. I wonder how many Members appreciate how steadily and spectacularly the increase in aid to States, not including payments to individuals within the States, has been since 1930. In 1930 the total Federal aid to States was $109,000,000. This has steadily increased so that in 1945 the total amount had risen to $849,000,000. The following table shows this increase:

Federal aid to States, by purpose, selected fiscal years

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total	Public assistance	Highways	Education	Agriculture	Other
1915	5.4	-------	-------	2.8	-------	2.6
1919	11.7	-------	-------	4.8	-------	6.9
1925	113.6	-------	92.1	11.8	7.4	2.3
1930	109.8	-------	83.3	11.9	12.8	1.8
1932	217.1	-------	188.5	13.2	12.8	2.6
1937	564.8	155.1	317.4	24.8	21.8	45.7
1938	627.6	215.2	235.0	33.2	23.4	120.8
1939	644.8	248.9	207.8	49.5	24.3	114.3
1940	602.7	286.5	195.3	47.2	24.5	109.2
1941	731.5	331.3	176.4	[1] 94.6	24.1	105.1
1942	786.6	369.4	166.9	[1] 132.0	25.0	93.3
1943	814.9	388.8	163.6	[1] 157.0	28.2	77.4
1944	806.6	415.1	140.7	[1] 110.2	33.0	107.6
1945 [2]	849.1	508.2	95.2	[1] 119.9	38.5	87.3

[1] Includes training of defense workers.
[2] Data are from annual report of Secretary of Treasury and are not strictly comparable with data for previous years.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census.

From: Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 1946–47, Tax Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Just look at 1 year's total of the regular grants, shared revenues, and emergency grants as reported by the Secre-

tary of the Treasury in his 1946 annual report. During the fiscal year 1946 a total of $847,328,443.14 was spent in payment to the States and local units of government. This figure does not include payments to individuals within the States and Territories. If we were to include that amount, we would add another $442,000,000. I think a breakdown of these figures will be of interest to the Members, and I include them at this point in my remarks:

Expenditures made by the Government as direct payments to States under cooperative arrangement and expenditures within States which provided relief and other aid, fiscal year 1946

A. GRANTS TO STATES AND LOCAL UNITS

Department of Agriculture:	
Regular grants:	
Agricultural experiment stations	$7,194,642.69
Agricultural extension work	23,147,198.51
Forest funds, etc	6,273,078.54
Shared revenues:	
Roads and trails (national forest fund)	4,038,840.47
To counties from submarginal-land program	137,278.53
Emergency grants:	
Supply and distribution of farm labor	6,833,500.00
School milk and lunch program	50,050,478.07
Department of Interior:	
Regular grants:	
Federal aid, wildlife restoration, Fish and Wildlife Service	910,653.71
Bureau of Indian Affairs, schcol support, etc	904,016.84
Shared revenues:	
Payments from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act	3,770,382.55
Payments from receipts under Migratory Bird Conservation Act	106,325.02
Payments under certain special funds	2,224,174.75
War Shipping Administration—State marine schools	173,473.00
Payments under Federal Power Act	26,208.57
Veterans' Administration — State homes for disabled veterans	1,243,392.47
Federal Security Agency:	
1. Office of Education:	
Regular grants:	
Colleges for agriculture and mechanical arts	5,030,000.00
Cooperative vocational education	20,012,147.55
Emergency grants: Training of war production workers	2,144,959.15
2. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Regular grants	10,839,002.74
3. Public Health Service: Regular grants (general health, venereal disease, tuberculosis control)	24,891,001.73
4. American Printing House for Blind: Regular grants	125,000.00
A. GRANTS TO STATES AND LOCAL UNITS—CON.	
5. Payments to States under social-security program:	
Old-age assistance	$368,523,948.41
Aid to dependent children	60,126,543.14
Aid to blind	10,481,892.67
Unemployment compensation	54,546,709.18
Department of Labor:	
Regular grants: Social security (maternal and child health services, crippled children, child welfare)	11,485,171.32
Emergency grants: Emergency maternity and infant care	36,070,735.59
Federal Works Agency:	
1. Public Roads Administration:	
Regular grants: Highway construction	41,686,775.82
Emergency grants: highway construction	32,841,748.63
2. Bureau of Community Facilities: Emergency grants	52,560,313.32
3. Liquidation programs: Emergency grants	1,706,676.96
National Housing Agency:	
1. Regular grants: Federal Public Housing Authority annual contributions)	7,136,735.13
War Department: 1. Shared revenues (leases of flood-control lands)	85,438.08
Total payments to States and local units	847,328,443.14

B. FEDERAL-AID PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS, ETC., WITHIN THE STATES, OTHER THAN GRANTS AND LOANS

Department of Agriculture:	
Forest roads and trails	$7,389,882.86
Agricultural adjustment program	356,176,981.32
War housing	49,819.32
Department of the Interior:	
Support and rehabilitation of needy Indians	258,232.30
Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority	3,355,236.00
War Department: National Guard	28,388,000.76
Federal Security Agency:	
Training of nurses	37,423,648.33
Other	2,801,312.52
Federal Works Agency:	
Forest highways	2,271,310.62
Public Buildings Administration	4,664,316.46
Total part B	442,778,740.23
Total part A	847,328,443.14
Total	1,290,107,183.37
Comparative totals:	
1920 [1]	42,598,637.14
1930 [1]	147,394,358.12
1940 [1]	1,478,268,712.03

[1] Exclusive of emergency appropriations.

Source: Annual Report of Secretary of Treasury for fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, tables 102 and 103.

I am thoroughly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that these aids and grants should be thoroughly reexamined. In connection with this reexamination I think we might well ask three questions in connection with every aid and grant that is made. First, is it absolutely essential to the welfare of the Nation; second, if it is not historically and constitutionally a more proper function of the State and local governments rather than the Federal Government; and, third, if the individual States in view of their present financial condition are not better able to assume the entire responsibility for some of these activities.

I, for one, certainly want to commend the Indiana Legislature for the resolution which it adopted and sent to Members of this Congress and which has been referred to today. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] called it to our attention and read the resolution to the House. I would like, however, to repeat some of the words of this resolution:

> We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States. So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalisms. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

A question has been raised as to whether Members on the Republican side of the House believe that various Federal aids should be discontinued. May I make it perfectly clear that when one advocates the return to the several States of the financing of these projects it does not in any way mean that the projects should be discontinued. It does mean that the jurisdiction of the Federal Government should cease and that these projects, or some of them at least, should be controlled by the local units of government and financed by the local units of government. I, personally, am convinced that when this is done the projects not only will be continued but they will be continued in a more efficient and more economical manner.

I do not contend that there are not some of the functions presently falling under the Federal-aid program that should not be continued under the Federal program. Certainly there are some that the Federal Government must continue to play an important part in. But even those cases must be reviewed and scrutinized carefully for waste, confusion, and duplication. I would like to call the attention of the House to an excerpt from a resolution adopted by the board of managers of the Council of State Governments at Miami Beach, Fla., on December 4, 1946. I quote:

> For many years there has been developing a system of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the support of public services.
>
> Most of our major governmental services, such as highways, education, public health, public welfare—are supported to a large extent through the medium of grants-in-aid systems. These systems in the various fields of public services have developed separately and independently without relation to each other, with the result that there is a different policy, different program, and different

administrative procedure with respect to almost every activity. The net result has been and is overlapping, duplication, and confusion which not only result in waste of public funds but also make it extremely difficult for the States to establish and maintain a constructive and economical over-all budget system.

I am preparing and hope to have ready for introduction within the next day or two a resolution instructing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of this House to make a comprehensive study of the grants-in-aid system. I believe such a study is not only important from the fiscal standpoint and for the purpose of showing means whereby Federal expenditures can be reduced, but such a study is equally important from the standpoint of general governmental philosophy. It is my firm conviction that grants-in-aid as a general practice are misleading, dangerous, and uneconomical. In the first place, they tend to make the people and the local units of Government think they are getting something for nothing. In the second place, they are dangerous because they lead to the loss of the rights of States to administer functions which historically and constitutionally belong to the States and local units of Government. And in the third place, such aids are uneconomical because local units which are closer to the people will administer the activities more in accordance with local needs and with more efficiency.

When we have provided for elimination of unnecessary Federal grants and aids and when we have provided for efficiency in administering those aids that are continued we will have made a big step toward economy in the Federal Government.

In conclusion, I would like to state just a few of the suggestions on the whole picture of economy in Government. As I stated in the beginning, if we are ever to accomplish our three-fold objective of a balanced budget, payment of the national debt, and tax reduction, there must be reflected in Congress the real and genuine desire of the people to effect economy. This requires an unselfish attitude by all. Regional and district hand-outs that constitute an unjustified expense should be opposed from the very beginning by the representatives from those regions. When they oppose these unjustifiable expenses, then they are placed in a much better position to oppose unjustifiable expenditures in other regions or districts. We must get rid of the policy of desiring economy for the other fellow but not economy for ourselves. We must desire and insist upon economies that affect ourselves as well as economies that affect others.

If we are to make any real inroads into decreasing Federal expenditures, we must oppose large appropriations to benefit particular classes or groups. At the present time $7,000,000,000 annually is being spent for aid to veterans, and yet it is estimated that bills presently before the Congress provide for aid to veterans of over $26,000,000,000 on top of the $7,000,000,000 now being spent. This is unadulterated pressure. The conscientious veteran, I am convinced, knows that he is not getting anything for nothing, and that it is he who will have to pay the bill for these aids. I am convinced he would prefer a stable economy with the hope of sensible taxes in the future to a more paternalistic hand-out, as is proposed by some of the bills that have been introduced.

States and cities must stop falling into the trap of asking and taking Federal hand-outs. In this connection I would like to cite an incident that took place in Wisconsin: The State of Wisconsin is preparing to celebrate in 1948 its one-hundredth birthday as a State. Last fall I was invited to meet with members of the committee making preparations for this celebration. At the meeting the committee brought out the point that they were contemplating asking the Federal Government for around $200,000 to help defray the cost of the celebration. When I asked them how they justified such an expenditure by the Federal Government they stated, "The Federal Government has been Santa Claus for a long time. Other States got assistance for their celebrations. Why should Wisconsin sit back?" I cannot be too critical of the members of that committee for taking that attitude. After all, the people and the States and local units of government have been educated during the past 15 years to look to the Federal Government for anything they might need or desire. Federal money was being handed out right and left and everyone was educated to try to get as big a piece of the pie as possible.

For the benefit of the Members of this House, in order that they may be sure of my position, I want to say that I told this committee in no uncertain terms that as far as I was concerned I would have no part in requesting the Federal Government to furnish funds in this instance and that if the choice were left to me I would have the State of Wisconsin pay its own bills and stand on its own feet. In taking that attitude I serve warning that I must also oppose any similar appropriations for any other States.

I have consumed a good deal of your time. I have taken it only to attempt in my small way to try and impress upon this House the fact that we have reached the end of the road. That we must not only talk about cutting expenditures, but we must act in cutting expenditures. I have taken the time in order to try and emphasize a fact that should be all too clear to each of us, that decreased expenditures is the only way to get tax relief, and conversely that increased expenditures necessarily means increased taxes.

The most important problem facing the Eightieth Congress is the establishment of a sound fiscal program within the framework of an efficient, progressive, and economical governmental structure. Let us go to work on this No. 1 problem. If we make up our mind to do it, we can and will cut expenditures to the point which will make possible our three objectives of a balanced budget, a substantial payment on the national debt, and a cut in taxes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, deputies appointed by the Big Four foreign ministers are in session in London, laying the groundwork for the Conference of Foreign Ministers that will follow in Moscow for preparation of a treaty with Germany and Austria. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I thought it might be well early in the session to take this time in order that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might contain for reference a résumé of the accomplishments of our peace conferences so far, and of the achievements of the United Nations toward the forging of a permanent and lasting peace. Perhaps the new Members especially would like to have this information readily available.

The following conferences prepared the groundwork for the Paris Peace Conference:

The Tripartite Conference of Berlin—Potsdam, July 17–August 2, 1945.

Allied Control Council for Germany—Berlin, July 30, 1945.

Conference of the Council of Foreign Ministers—London, September 11–October 2, 1945.

Far Eastern Advisory Commission—Washington, October 30–December 16, 1945.

Paris Conference on Reparation from Germany—Paris, November 9–December 21, 1945.

Big Three Foreign Ministers' Conference—Moscow, December 16–26, 1945.

Conference of the Big Four Foreign Ministers—Paris, April 25–May 16, 1946.

Conference of Foreign Ministers—Paris, June 15–July 12, 1946.

In the last of these conferences the divergent views of the Big Five Powers finally harmonized so as to make possible the presentation of tentative drafts of treaties to a peace conference. It was then agreed that, besides the Big Five, the 16 other states which took an active part in the fighting against the European Axis will be represented at the conference. The 16 other states included: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussia—White Russia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Greece, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Union of South Africa, the Ukraine, Yugoslavia. In addition, Albania, Egypt, Luxemburg, and Mexico sent delegations, although they were not invited.

The Conference, beginning on July 29, was held at the Luxemburg Palace in Paris. The principal objective of the Conference was to draw up peace treaties with Italy, Finland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. The Conference continued without any recess for 79 days and ended on October 15 on a sour note with the Yugoslav delegation boycotting the

final session. Despite almost endless wrangling on procedural and substantive matters, the Conference succeeded in attaining the main objective for which it had convened. Draft treaties with Finland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Italy were prepared and approved by the delegates of 21 nations. These draft treaties were now ready for consideration by the Big Four Council of Foreign Ministers, which was to hold its meetings in New York beginning November 4. By the terms of these treaties reparations totaling $1,350,000,000 were assessed against the defeated states: Italy, $325,000,000; Hungary, Rumania, and Finland, $300,000,000 each; and Bulgaria, $125,000,000. Of this Russia is to get $900,000,000; Yugoslavia, $212,000,000; Greece, $162,500,000; Czechoslovakia, $50,000,000; Ethiopia, $25,000,000. The Conference tried to solve the Trieste problem; it also tried to open the Danube River to international navigation and commerce; it failed to find a solution of either of these problems; and when its last meeting adjourned the split between the Soviet and western blocs on almost every major issue seemed more real than before. Secretary of State Byrnes in his report on the Paris Peace Conference—broadcast on October 18—admitted that he was disturbed by the continued if not increasing tension between the United States and Russia. From his report it became clear that the accomplishments of the Conference fell short of its expectations.

From the Potsdam Conference—

Continued Secretary Byrnes—

President Truman and I have worked and we shall continue to work to bring about an understanding with the Soviet Government. * * * No state should assume that it has a monopoly of virtue or of wisdom. No state should ignore or veto the aggregate sentiments of mankind. States must not unilaterally by threats, by pressures, or by force disturb the established rights of other nations. Nor can they arbitrarily resist or refuse to consider changes in the relationships between states and peoples which justice, fair play, and the enlightened sentiments of mankind demand.

On November 4 the Council of Foreign Ministers met in New York and began to consider the drafts of peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Finland. In the course of 33 meetings, held between November 4 and December 12, the Council concluded its session on a note of amity after completing peace treaties for Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland. The Council agreed to begin its meetings in Moscow on March 10, 1947, to work on German and Austrian treaties. Molotov gave assurances that correspondents would be provided the same facilities for reporting the meetings as in Paris and New York. Special deputies were to be appointed, to meet in London beginning January 14, 1947, to study the agenda for the German and Austrian treaty talks. It was agreed that the five treaties already drafted were to be signed in Paris on February 10 of 1947. The Ministers also agreed to place the port of Trieste under the control of an 11-nation commission—representing the Big Four and the nations served by the port—and a director named by the Governor of Trieste from candidates nominated by the Trieste Council of Government.

By the end of 1946 special deputies were appointed by the Big Four Foreign Ministers, and they began their work on January 14 in London. Even at its very inception the task of the deputies was deemed formidable. Mr. Herbert Matthews, of New York Times, reported that their task "bristles with difficulties of the most formidable sort. They must work out the procedure that their foreign ministers will follow at Moscow in March for preparation of the treaty with Germany. In addition, they are to receive the written and, where desired, oral views of the 18 associated powers that fought against Germany and Austria. Finally, the deputies, acting on the Austrian question, must prepare an agreed draft of a full-fledged treaty guaranteeing Austrian independence. For all this the deputies have 6 weeks." And even at the beginning matters of procedure proved to be as much a bugbear as ever. But the real difficulty, as of now, seems to be the role which small powers are allowed to play in the drafting of treaty with Germany. At the end of their first 10 meetings the deputies were unable to resolve this problem, the Australians insisting that they should have some part in the drafting of this treaty while Russian refusal to allow the Australians or any other power except the Big Four anything to do with it has brought matters to a deadlock. This deadlock still continues. After 11 days of work, the deputies, acting on the Austrian question, succeeded in agreeing unanimously on the first clause of the Austrian peace treaty. This merely states that the Allies recognize the reestablishment of Austria as a sovereign and independent state.

The foregoing paragraphs represent the summary of what was done at the Paris Peace Conference and what is being attempted by agencies instituted by that Conference. In short, peace treaties with Italy, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, and Rumania have been drafted, and these are ready for the signature of the plenipotentiaries of the states concerned; work has already begun on the drafting of peace treaties with Germany and Austria by the deputies of the Big Four Foreign Ministers. These treaties have to be drafted; they have to be approved by the Council of Foreign Ministers in their forthcoming session in Moscow; finally, these drafts have to be signed by the states concerned. Peace treaties for Japan will also have to be drafted, duly approved by the Council of Foreign Ministers, and subsequently signed by the respective states concerned. When all this has been done, then these treaties have to be put into force and their provisions will have to be carried out. By that time we will probably be prepared to begin gradual evacuation of occupation forces from occupied countries. All this and perhaps a thousand other problems resulting from World War II still await their solution. What we already have accomplished through peace conferences probably represents a modest share of the herculean task that is facing the statesmen of all nations.

And now a word about the United Nations and its accomplishments to date: Our Committee on Foreign Affairs is especially interested in this organization and fervently hopes, as I know you do, for its success. Our special interest is due to the fact that this committee assisted in laying the ground plans for the organization and has been represented at all the meetings so far held. At the preliminary conference at San Franciso, our former chairman, the Honorable SOL BLOOM, and our present chairman, the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, were members of the United States delegation. They were members, too, of our delegation to the London and the New York meetings. At the last meeting they were joined by the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, also a member of our committee; and by their efforts, counsel, and advice, they were extremely helpful to the deliberations at these conferences.

May I digress here to say a word about the new chairman of our committee Dr. EATON. I had occasion several years ago on the floor of the House, to say that he is one of the ablest Members of the House, and perhaps the best loved by Republicans and Democrats alike. The years have but strengthened that opinion, and, while as a Democrat, I regret that the fortunes of war went against us last November, there is no man in the House under whose chairmanship I would rather serve than his.

THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The United Nations Organization came into existence at the San Francisco Conference on International Organization—April 25–June 26, 1945. By the United Nations Charter, drafted and adopted at that Conference, the new organization is aimed to be rather more inclusive in its functions, more perfect, and more up-to-date to cope with world problems than the already defunct League of Nations. The Charter was originally signed by fifty sovereign states represented at the San Francisco Conference, and since then five more states have been added to that group of fifty.

The United Nations General Assembly held its first session in London in January and February of 1946—January 10–February 15. In conjunction with the General Assembly the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council also held their sessions in London. In this first session most of the work of the Assembly was devoted to matters of organization. The Security Council, however, was given the first opportunity to test its ability and effectiveness in dealing with delicate and embarrassing issues. Such an issue was the withdrawal of Russian forces from Iran—Persia. When Russia refused to withdraw her troops from northern Iran the latter country accused Russia with interfering in its internal affairs, and on January 19, the matter was placed before the Security Council. The Council suggested that an inquiry commission be sent to study the situation on the spot; Russia refused to agree to such a suggestion; finally the Council recommended

direct negotiations between the two parties concerned. This was the first test for the Security Council and in dealing with it that body really felt the heavy weight of the veto. The Council was equally unsuccessful in bringing about the withdrawal of British and French troops from Syria. Here again the Council suggested direct negotiation between the parties concerned; Syria rejected this. Later, however, agreements were signed between Syria and France, and Syria and Great Britain, by the terms of which both countries evacuated their troops from Syria.

Even before the General Assembly and the various councils of the United Nations met in London, other units of the United Nations organization were having their meetings. Thus a conference for the establishment of an educational, scientific, and cultural organization was held during the first half of November in 1945—November 1 to 16. In this conference participating countries, 44 in all, agreed to facilitate the exchange of scientific and cultural information, and a constitution was adopted. This modest achievement in itself was considered an advance step toward international intellectual cooperation.

More ambitious and more comprehensive is the aim and purpose of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations organization. It is aiming to deal with all economic problems of all nations in all parts of the world. The Economic and Social Council, when in full force, will aim to guarantee a large share of the freedoms enumerated in the Atlantic Charter. In addition there is also the Trusteeship Council which is to administer or supervise the administration of areas the inhabitants of which are not deemed capable to govern themselves.

When the General Assembly concluded its sessions in London on February 14, it was decided to have its next session in New York, sometime in the fall. Finally on October 23 the United Nations General Assembly, as well as the Security Council, began its meetings in New York with an address of welcome by President Truman. In this session the General Assembly set up six permanent committees dealing with six principal phases of its activities, namely, the Political and Security Committee, the Economic and Financial Committee, the Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee, the Trusteeship Committee, Administrative and Budgetary Committee, and the Legal Committee. The work of these six committees and the subsequent actions taken on their recommendation by the Assembly will now be translated into action by the standing organizations of the United Nations. Thus it is obvious that the accomplishments of the United Nations may be seen in the future rather than in its past. There has not been enough time to test its usefulness to the needs of postwar world. Its Security Council seems to be hampered in its efforts by the use of the veto; its inability to deal with the control of the atomic bomb is a case in point. The working, or the failure to work, of the various control councils of occupation in occupied countries is directly tied up with the working of the Security Council; if it is not possible to secure unanimity in the one, then it is almost impossible to arrive at a working agreement, say in Control Council for Germany. And if the military commanders in Korea cannot agree as to what is best for the welfare of the Koreans, that, too, reflects on the workings and the effectiveness of the Security Council as well as that of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Because of Council's failure to arrive at some workable understanding on the subject of atomic bomb, the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations has made no progress in its work, and the question of disarmament has not even been placed on the agenda of any meeting.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have listened with much interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee. I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that the fact that our Secretaries of State and the President have seen fit to designate Members of the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, and also Members of the House to serve in representative capacities at the San Francisco Conference and other meetings where the peace structure has been discussed and decided upon, has aided greatly in having the results of those meetings accepted by the American people and by Congress.

Mr. COURTNEY. I quite agree with the gentleman and thank him for his contribution. May I say that I intend to touch upon that very subject a little later in the course of my remarks.

And so we see, Mr. Speaker, that while we move slowly toward that ultimate objective of a permanent and a lasting peace, we are making progress and there is no reason for discouragement. We must remember that it took five long years for war to virtually tear down the pillars of civilization, rend the world asunder, and send the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse galloping to the far corners thereof. It may well be that it will take so long or longer to repair and rebuild the damage that was done and set the mind of mankind everywhere in the ways of peace.

The situation now looks far better than it did at a comparable period after World War I, when by such a time thereafter we had discarded completely President Wilson's plan for a League of Nations. I can readily understand why Wilson's dream did not prevail with and was not acceptable to the Senate and perhaps the country as a whole. At that time it was difficult to keep political differences out of our foreign policy. He virtually forged his own policy, constructive as it may have been, and realized too late that he had not from the beginning of the peace discussions taken the Congress as a whole into his close confidence, and had not sought its advice about matters of plan and procedure. This time our foreign policy is neither Democratic nor Republican. It was forged by the Executive, by and with the aid, counsel, and advice of leaders of both parties, and it is being administered by able representatives chosen from both parties, and so is as nearly a nonpartisan approach as can be attained.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned this personal experience of mine many times in the course of talks along this line, and once, I remember, here on the floor of the House. Perhaps a repetition will be forgiven because it made an impression upon my mind that will follow me to the grave. I was fortunate enough after World War I to be in Paris on detached military service during the Peace Conference. I had the privilege of seeing President Wilson many times, as he moved from group to group assembled there, his face shining with the high ideal and noble purpose of writing the sacrifice of our war dead into a just and eternal peace. I saw him again a few months later when, his plan discarded by the Senate, and when he had been unable, after a desperate personal appeal to the people in a speaking tour about the country, to fully arouse public opinion in his support. I happened to be in Washington then on a visit and, it being my first trip to Washington, my sister who lived here drove me about to see the sights of the city, including the home then occupied by the former President. It so happened that as I passed, he was walking in front of his home, a broken old man, his dream dead, who walked with faltering step and broken body toward his grave. The morning of his death, I remember seeing a cartoon in my local paper, drawn by that great cartoonist Carey Orr, and titled "The Chief Joins His Legions." It depicted Wilson entering the spirit world, and then drawn up in review to meet him were all the hosts of American dead: one spectral face blew upon his bugle; another raised the colors for the dead Commander in Chief, whose dream had come to naught, was taking over command of his legions of dead, whose death had come to naught.

This time, Mr. Speaker, the Executive, the Congress, and the American people are determined that such a thing must not happen again, but that the lives we lost and the treasures we so freely gave shall be written into a permanent and an enduring peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP in the chair). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WHERE NOW, MR. LINCOLN?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today in reverence and in a spirit of thanksgiving, America pays tribute to one of the greatest of her sons. It is not enough to say that Abraham Lincoln, that austere and tragic figure, was a great American. To so limit his breadth of character is to minimize the sacrifices and virtues which set his figure in bold relief on the horizon of our past national history.

For Abraham Lincoln, like the oceans, like human kindness, and like friendship, belongs to all of mankind. His memory is not one around which any people, any creed, or any race can lay lines of partition and say, "This is ours." It is said that during the Nazi invasion of Poland and the Low Countries the patriots of

those lands kept among their few and precious possessions clippings which bore the immortal words of Mr. Lincoln. They were words which could have brought torture and death to the possessor had they been discovered.

Lincoln is legend, although his death has occurred within the memory of living man. He rose from the soil of his beloved land to the highest gift within the power of his people to bestow, yet he remained always the simple man, the sage prophet, the homely philosopher. Like a sudden burst of fire, he rose to meet his destiny, and in dying violently he inscribed his works and his words upon the heart of a saddened world.

This, then is the man to whom we pay tribute in this hour. He was one of the inspirational gifts of a divine power which has always raised a man to meet the challenge of a dark and foreboding era in our national history. There is no rhyme and no reason to these arisings. We can only walk in faith, secure in the knowledge that this land which did produce a man of destiny can yet in honesty and simplicity produce others to the glory of America and the world. There is not and can never be a place in this Nation for "strong" men, as we connote the word to mean tyrannical power and oppression, but there will always be a need for men strong in principle, character, determination, and faith.

In a strictly partisan sense, Abraham Lincoln was a Republican, but in the sense of great and abiding statesmanship, he was first of all an ardent exponent and a lover of all that was good in national and international life. We have a constant need of men of farsighted vision, but fate, perhaps possessed of a frugal nature, projects one upon the earthly plane but seldom.

Lincoln loved freedom—loved freedom not as a generality, but as a living fact. When he sadly set his hand to the Proclamation of Emancipation he wrote one word only—freedom, and signed the document with his own blood. But he could not, and would not, compromise his conviction "that no nation can survive half slave and half free" with any transient opportunism or political expediency. His ears must have already heard the distant rumblings of the guns across the Potomac and his sad, tired eyes must have seen the bloodied fields of a score of Gettysburgs. Still, we can imagine that the hand was steady and the eye clear as he scrawled the familiar A. Lincoln on the fateful page. Here was an intellectual honesty which no organized pressure could swerve, and no puerile argument defeat.

Mr. Lincoln was, with a stroke of his pen, culminating and bringing to fruition the dream of all the ages, the dream which had motived the men and women of all time since man, upright and dignified, had emerged from the dim mists of antiquity 4,000 years before in the Valley of the Nile. Mr. Lincoln realized then, as we must inevitably realize today, that the quest for freedom is a continuing process and that this fragile commodity must be shielded against the forces and elements which would take it from us. We do not enjoy the fruits of liberty as a divine right, but only because of the fact that men and women of all ages were willing to lay down their lives to defend it. We cannot know, but we can surmise with reason that liberty was uppermost in the minds of the slaves who toiled the great blocks of granite down the Nile River and hoisted them into place on the pyramid of Cheops. Liberty was but a flickering spark in the Valley of the Kings, in Babylon, in China and Yucatan, and the great migrations across the plains of Asia stirred it into a weak flame, which was to burst into open fire in the city-state of Athens, 500 years before the birth of Christ.

Here for the first time in the history of man, the individual was conceded a dignity of person and opinion that transcended anything known to that time. The world was preparing a way for the Mr. Lincolns as yet unborn. Here in Athens was the first franchise, here the first studious application to the sciences of humanity and of living. But even in Athens, great as it was, the relationship between men was principally and largely a relationship as between a slave and a master, as between a cringing and torn back and a hand wielding a whiplash. But there were free men in Athens, and the course of liberty was moving onward and upward. Even during the Dark Ages milestones along the highroad to freedom were multiplying and the hand of timeless destiny was drawing closer to a new world and a wilderness cabin of logs. Let those who will proclaim that there is no plan, that things happen in a helter-skelter manner, without direction, without volition. Let those who so contend, trace the course of our liberties.

Magna Carta, with all of its implications for liberty. The enunciations of men firm and united in their quest for personal freedom of action under law. Men, if you please, of initiative and enterprise, prepared to face the obstacles and exigencies of a dangerous life with a smile, so long as their hands, their hearts, and their minds remained unfettered. The moving finger wrote and, having writ, moved on, and men sailed unknown seas armed with only an unconquerable faith that somewhere there existed something greater than the world of their day had ever dreamed.

While all of the centuries were rolling past, men were dying and new civilizations were falling into step to take the place of those which had preceded them. Battles and wars for freedom were fought. Men died on the rack, on the cross, by flogging and torture. All of the forces of tyranny, of oppression—yes, of governmental control—were utilized to stem the predestined force that was leading into the hills of Kentucky. Crowns toppled, and the thrones crumbled into dust, and the frantic incantations of swaying scepters were invoked to deprive the soul of man of his privilege of owning his own soul in fee simple.

Indeed, the path was not always smooth. There were eras when it appeared that the flickering fire would burn out and that the whip was, indeed, to win the eternal struggle with the bared back. But there was always a man to fan the dying spark into new life and to add to the fire with the unquenchable fuel of human faith. In the mountain passes of Greece, in a cave in old Scotland, at Calvary, there was always a man to shield with his living flesh the hopes and the dreams of mankind. The lash had no power to reach these progenitors of our liberties, those who with sword, pen, and parable, built themselves into the very foundation work of what we now enjoy. How great an obligation is laid upon those of us who seek in these dark hours of international and domestic turmoil to hold steady to the straight path of principle and ideals.

There was no Atlantic cable, no skyway of communication to flash the word of the new world. There was only the song of a new day, but the chords spread afar and fell on the incredulous ears of the peasant at work in a feudal field as his fathers had toiled in the same fields for so many centuries. The music of hammer and saw merged with the clanging of the cathedral bells, and the bell ringer heard them. On all of the streets and all of the dark and twisting alleys of an old and tired world men heard the call to freedom. The John Smiths, the Roger Williams, the William Penns heard the call to bring strong hands and stronger hearts to a new order of things, to a hand where any man by merit and character might rise above a caste into which cruel, unthinking fate had plunged him, and where a man might rule his own life without the interference of governmental overseers.

Men came—yes; and women, too—seeking this new earth, seeking the things denied to them in the lands of their birth. Trees were being felled in the Colonies, and there were homes for those who would build them. Perhaps you could not build them on an 8-hour schedule with portal-to-portal pay, but men with a dream did not think in terms—well, let us say they were "rugged individualists," that once virtuous term now smeared with the vitriol of those who hold individualism to be incompatible with the common good. They were men and women who felt a complete interdependence one upon the other, because they were builders and not destroyers, and they early realized that the welfare of a great new land and the people who populated it depended not so much upon the drab and dreamless drones in their society as it depended upon men of vision and determination who could come face to face with the realities of frontier life and wrestle those problems into submission. Was there an onus placed upon the name of a man who built a sawmill to turn out the planed planks for the homes of all? Was there an envy in the hearts of his fellow men and women, that his ability to start from scratch and achieve a position of relative wealth and responsibility in turn gave them all an additional measure of comfort and security? Of course, there was not.

Our forefathers gladly assumed what small part there was for each to play toward building a simple and sound order of things in the interest of their new world. There was virtue to initiative, to enterprise, and to thrift when they lifted the torch of liberty and bore it with them to Philadelphia, to sign

what has been so rightfully called "the greatest document ever struck off by the mind of man." Read it again. And in reading, try to find one single phrase which implies that government is the paternal agency of ultimate appeal, the all-embracing, all-knowing, all-controlling instrumentality of our individual destinies. Thank God there is nothing to imply, nothing to suggest, that this Government of ours was ever intended to be anything but an impartial arbiter of our disputes among ourselves, the provider of just law and our voice in our dealings with the other nations of the earth. The representative republic was never intended to be the guiding spirit in every waking moment of every citizen's life. Mr. Lincoln made this clear in his address to the Congress on July 27, 1848. He said, and I quote:

> We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business.

The bondage exercised by the Government over a free people was strongly opposed by Mr. Lincoln as was the bondage inflicted by one individual over the body and soul of another. There was no middle course to his direct manner of thinking. Freedom was entirely freedom or it was entirely bondage. His concept of the relationship between peoples and their governments was in direct refutation of what we have seen in our day emerge as a parasitic growth upon the classic design of the house of the Republic. Hundreds of thousands of freeborn Americans, completely indoctrinated and saturated with the dangerous delusion that the Government and its agencies can be called upon at any time to support them or to take sides in disputes between races, creeds, colors, and economic groups.

Where now, Mr. Lincoln?

The priceless heritage which is ours to enjoy, to cherish, to maintain, and in turn to pass on to our posterity is changing to ashes in our grip. Again that sacred flame, nourished by the living bodies of our dead, flickers and flutters in the vast winds of our petty discords. There is no fuel on the flame. The incentive to economic success, to the development of new and unusual tools to meet the crying need of a world in distress, the will to succeed, the determination of true achievement, all these have been subordinated by a calculated search to achieve a dull and neutral gray shade of social and economic life in which no great peaks of human achievement, of human wisdom, of human initiative can tower above the morbid plane of governmental control.

Mr. Lincoln was either entirely right or he was entirely wrong when he said—and again I quote:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington, it will become venal and oppressive.

What foresight is evident in these considered and solemn words, spoken long before the Members of this Congress were born. Yet, in spite of the relative antiquity of the phrases, they might have been spoken on the floor of this House during the course of the past several years. The people of America believe that Mr. Lincoln was right. They stamped an approval upon their ballots last November.

This is a decisive hour. This is an hour to stand up and be counted; be counted either as one who believes, as Mr. Lincoln believed—who believe as this House believes, that this land is good, that this system is good, and that the cornerstones of our Representative Republic are still initiative, freedom of enterprise in the lawful conduct of economic affairs, and a just profit on an honest investment. The only alternative to this is chaos and anarchy, and the American public have a right to demand that those who are not prepared to stand in honesty and forthrightness for these principles, step out of offices of authority and yield their places to men and women who believe that the Representative Republican form is the greatest political concept in all history. We must, if we believe in the Washingtons, the Jeffersons, and the Lincolns of our history, believe in freedom of the individual to decide when and where he will work, and under what conditions of employment. We cannot believe it a proper function of Government to coerce either management or labor, except as presently necessary to restore some semblance of balance to a situation in which the dice are loaded and Government is anything in the world but an impartial and fair arbiter. If Government, as such, is to ever regain its rightful position of dignity, and again achieve the respect of the American people, it must cease to be a biased referee, who appears to be constantly beating one or another of the parties to any given argument over the head. If such punitive measures showed any indication of knitting us together as a unit, there might be some argument advanced for the disagreeable practice, but to date, the tactics have served only to set race against race, labor against management, creed against creed, minority against minority, and citizen against citizen.

These are days in which our vision is sometimes obscured, and we see as through a glass darkly. The tempests of passion and controversy which swirl about this House and about our beloved land are confusing and ofttimes depressing. But they are not new. George Washington knew them, and Abraham Lincoln was enveloped by them. It is no moment for recrimination and vilification. It is rather an hour for cautious deliberation, for remedies carefully weighed in the scale of public interest, and then for rapid and certain action. Whatever course we pursue, we must pursue it in the certain knowledge that it will not be universally popular. That philosophy was, more than anything else, the strength of Mr. Lincoln, as it must be the strength of any man who is to be remembered in this House as anything more than a name on a roll call. Popularity purchased at the price of expediency can prosper no man beyond tomorrow's letters and today's telegrams, and the faulty steel of the sword of opportunism has caused more fatalities in the arena of politics than has the steel-pointed pen of principle, wielded with determination and in defense of personal dignity and individual freedom.

Mr. Lincoln believed that what prospered the majority of the American people, prospered the minority, as he believed, and I quote:

> A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority as a permanent arrangement is wholly inadmissible. So that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left. (First inaugural address, March 4, 1861.)

The winds of hatred may be expected to blow, the torrents of criticism may be expected to rain upon our heads, and the raging waters of alien philosophy may be expected to assault anew the very foundations of this great institution, but so long as we keep with us the constant remembrance of the simple and honest dignity of the man to whom we today pay a small measure of tribute, we shall leave these legislative halls with heads high and with conscience clear.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE OF CATTLE IN MEXICO

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that more Members of the agricultural group are not here at this time, because I have a very important message. I wish to speak this afternoon about the foot-and-mouth disease that has gotten into Mexico and at this time is raging over great portions of that republic, in fact, in 10 of her States.

I have just placed an emergency bill in the hopper authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to extend full scientific, technical, and financial cooperation to the Republic of Mexico to combat this epidemic.

Under present Federal statutes, the Department of Agriculture has authority to cooperate informally with foreign governments in suppressing outbreaks of this dread disease. Present authority, however, does not extend to engaging in eradication programs on a substantial scale, even when requested to do so by foreign officials.

My bill removes this limitation and authorizes the United States Government to mobilize its full resources in combating outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in any American country where such outbreaks present a direct threat to our vast livestock industry.

This legislation has been introduced at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission, based on the findings of a joint Mexican-United States veterinary survey committee which has surveyed the situation in Mexico. The

findings and recommendations of this committee will be appended to my remarks, but, in brief, they are as follows:

First. That foot-and-mouth disease has been existent in Mexico for approximately 3 months.

Second. That the disease has invaded at least 9 States and the Federal District, comprising a vast area between Mexico City and Vera Cruz.

Third. That the disease has already become so widespread as to constitute a grave danger to the livestock industry of the United States.

Fourth. That the facilities of Mexico alone are insufficient to successfully cope with the situation.

Fifth. That full cooperation between the Governments of Mexico and the United States is imperative if the disease is to be wiped out, and the threat to American livestock removed.

Mr. Speaker, though known for centuries to be one of the world's most contagious and devastating livestock maladies, foot-and-mouth disease has been curbed in the United States by veterinary science. The United States has repelled eight invasions of this disease, and since 1929 has been entirely free from it. Each outbreak, by prompt work of the Bureau of Animal Industry, in cooperation with the States, has been stamped out as quickly as possible.

Dr. John R. Mohler, for many years Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, has estimated that the entire cost to the livestock industry and to the State and Federal Governments of these eight outbreaks exceeds $200,000,000. The most serious outbreak was in 1914, when it was necessary to slaughter 172,222 head of cattle, hogs, and sheep in 22 States, at a cost of nearly $6,000,000.

The malady is caused by a virus so infective that it will cause the disease in dilutions as great as 1 to 10,000,000. Practically all cloven-footed animals, including deer and other wild animals, are susceptible. In malignant form, foot-and-mouth disease may kill or render valueless fully half the animals in a herd. The disease also permanently impairs the productivity of animals less severely affected. Man is fairly resistant to the infection but sometimes acquires it. He may also carry it on his clothing. Infection, however, has been most commonly traced to affected animals, their fresh meat and milk, unsterilized garbage, and other contaminated products.

There are various methods of eradication, once the disease has gained a foothold, but the slaughter method is accepted as the most effective. It is much wiser to slaughter a few animals than to allow such a costly disease to become permanently established, as it has in most nations of the world.

The United States Department of Agriculture has issued a summary of developments in the Mexican outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, and the following information is based on this report:

The outbreak first occurred in the State of Vera Cruz in east-central Mexico and has spread, since late in 1946, to nine Mexican States and the Federal district—for the most part in a westerly direction.

The area containing the affected herds is under quarantine maintained by Mexican authorities with the aid of troops. About 2,000,000 head of cattle are estimated to be in the quarantined area and about 9,000,000 in other parts of Mexico.

At the invitation of the Mexican authorities, the United States has five veterinarians, all experienced in foot-and-mouth disease control, on the scene of the outbreak to render technical assistance. Another is organizing the border defenses.

Since the outbreak in Mexico no cases of foot-and-mouth disease have appeared in the United States, nor have any appeared in the northern States of Mexico. The nearest affected herd is about 350 miles from the border.

One area of potential danger is in the vicinity of Matamoros, Mexico, near the Texas border close to the Gulf coast, approximately opposite Brownsville, Tex.

As far as can be determined, comparatively few of the affected cattle in Mexico have been slaughtered as a means of control and eradication.

Officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, though lacking in authority to engage in disease eradication work in Mexico, are prepared to take such action immediately if cases of foot-and-mouth disease appear in the United States.

The Bureau already has selected, for the purpose, qualified key veterinarians, and instructed them to be ready for immediate assignment. Much of the equipment already is available.

The origin of the outbreak in Mexico is of particular interest in view of the repeated charges that the sanitary embargo against South American livestock was a smoke screen used by United States livestock interests to avoid competition. The disease came to Mexico through the importation of zebu bulls from Brazil, where foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist. A relatively small shipment of approximately 130 head was received in October 1945. Our Government immediately protested the acceptance of this shipment as being in violation of the sanitary treaty between this country and Mexico. The protests were ignored and after a brief quarantine period on Sacrificios Island adjacent to Vera Cruz, the bulls were allowed to land. Eighteen head were subsequently moved into the southern part of Texas.

There is no record that this first shipment of bulls brought foot-and-mouth disease with them, and the few head now in Texas are under the closest scrutiny.

A strong protest was again made late in March 1946, when information was received that a second and larger shipment was being assembled in Brazil for consignment to Mexico. As the protests were unavailing, the Secretary of Agriculture on May 28, closed the border to Mexican cattle.

At a meeting of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission held in Los Angeles in July, it was agreed that these bulls would either be returned to Brazil or shipped to Europe for relief purposes. However, the Mexican officials permitted these bulls to move from the quarantined island to the mainland, and in September, 327 of them were transferred to a ranch in the state of Vera Cruz not far from the port.

In a very short time after the bulls were moved to this ranch, foot-and-mouth disease broke out among them and among other cattle on this ranch. However, no report of this outbreak was made to the American Government until December 18, and our veterinarians did not definitely diagnose the malady as foot-and-mouth disease until December 26.

The border quarantine, which had been lifted by our Government on October 18—at the height of the meat famine—was, of course, immediately reimposed. A strict quarantine has been in effect since that time.

From December 31 to January 3, representatives of the Department of Agriculture, meeting in Washington, discussed problems of control and eradication with two Mexican officials. It was arranged that the Bureau of Animal Industry would detail four veterinarians to Mexico to join a like number representing that Government to make an intensive survey with a view to determining as nearly as possible the extent, spread, and the various conditions and circumstances that would influence control and eradication measures.

In the meantime a number of bulls from the second importation had been moved to ranches in Mexico, near the Texas border at Brownsville. At the time the Mexican officials were in Washington in early January this was a subject of discussion and Bureau officials were assured that the animals would be removed to south-central Mexico, but the latest information I have is that the bulls have not as yet been moved.

Several conferences on the situation between Mexican and United States officials were held during the month of January, both in Washington and in Mexico City, and certain agreements were reached.

As a result of these conferences, the Secretary of Agriculture directed letters last Friday to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, reporting on the outbreak, pointing out the danger to the American food supply and American livestock and dairy interests, and urging that legislation be enacted which would enable the United States to cooperate with Mexico in stamping out foot-and-mouth disease.

The Secretary's request followed resolutions adopted by the joint Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission recommending immediate and adequate scientific, technical, and financial cooperation between the two countries toward the control and eradication of the disease. The Mexican and United States Governments have exchanged diplomatic notes accepting these recommendations:

The recommendations include:

First. The sending to Mexico promptly of essential equipment and personnel.

Second. The utmost control to prevent the movement of susceptible animals out of Zone 1—the affected area—and to prevent the movement of such animals into Zone 1 except for immediate slaughter.

Third. A methodical disposal of all susceptible animals in newly infected and

directly exposed herds or flocks by immediate destruction on the premises, followed by thorough disinfection of the latter, and an orderly movement, to slaughterhouses within the zone, of animals in herds not yet affected or entirely recovered and which are apparently healthy.

Fourth. The immediate destruction of all wild ruminants and wild swine in this zone and such adjacent areas as may be necessary.

Fifth. That steps be taken immediately to establish, at the earliest possible time, a joint Mexican-United States foot-and-mouth disease research organization, providing within the affected zone the necessary buildings, equipment, funds, and personnel.

Sixth. That whenever foot-and-mouth disease appears outside the presently affected area, designated zone 1, the method of immediate destruction of susceptible animals in affected or directly exposed herds or flocks, as well as wild ruminants and wild swine that may be exposed, be adopted and applied in all instances.

In asking for additional legislation to cope with the Mexican emergency, the Secretary pointed out that Congress has long recognized the serious nature of foot-and-mouth disease by its action to prohibit the importation of livestock from countries where the disease is present.

The Secretary also stated that in the past, Congress has authorized special funds with which to complete successful eradication measures in this country during former foot-and-mouth disease outbreaks.

On January 21, it being apparent that emergency legislation probably would be needed to deal with the situation, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, appointed a special five-man subcommittee to study problems arising from the epidemic in Mexico. Members of this subcommittee, in addition to myself, are Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois; Mr. BRAMBLETT, of California; Mr. WORLEY, of Texas; and Mr. GRANGER, of Utah.

On January 22, our foot-and-mouth subcommittee held informal hearings and received testimony from representatives of several leading farm organizations, including the Texas and Southwest Cattle Raisers Association, the American National Livestock Association, the National Association of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Grange.

All who testified expressed very grave concern and alarm over the outbreak of this disease in Mexico. They expressed the belief that it would inevitably spread to the United States if prompt and effective action were not taken. They pledged their united support to any United States program for combatting the disease, and said that they were unanimously in favor of United States aid to the Mexican Government.

Two immediate protective steps were recommended to our subcommittee:

First. That the United States expedite the construction of a barbed-wire fence along the entire United States-Mexican border.

Second. That funds should be provided to augment the present entirely inadequate force of United States inspectors now assigned to the border.

Livestock leaders asserted that the first attack should be directed against spread of the disease north of the present area of infection, by promptly slaughtering all newly infected cattle in this section. This, they asserted, would give us time to breathe and map plans for wiping out the disease entirely.

Unless the disease is stamped out in Mexico, it was pointed out, it will be a perpetual hazard to United States livestock. The danger zone is not confined to the Mexican border area alone. The disease is just as likely to spread to New York as it is to Texas because it can be carried by human beings, it was said.

Our subcommittee has been in constant contact with officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, including Dr. B. T. Simms, its Chief, and Dr. S. O. Fladness, the assistant chief. Both have participated in conferences with Mexican Government officials concerning the outbreak, and have assisted in mapping plans for joint United States-Mexican action to control and eradicate the disease. I have the utmost confidence in these men, and in their associates. They are capable of putting up a most effective fight against this outbreak if Congress acts promptly to give them the necessary funds and authority.

I would like to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the resolutions of the Animal Industry Subcommittee of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission, which have been approved by both the Mexican and the United States sections of the Commission:

Resolution I

Resolutions of the Animal Industry Subcommittee of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission which have been approved by both the Mexican and the United States sections of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission

Whereas the Animal Industry Subcommission of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission recognizes the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico as reported to it by joint Mexican-United States Veterinary Investigating Committee.

Whereas the disease has already become so widespread as to constitute a grave danger to the livestock industries of Mexico, the United States, and other countries, thus rendering the facilities of Mexico alone insufficient to successfully cope with this disease which constitutes an international problem.

The Animal Industry Subcommission, therefore, recommends:

Immediate and adequate scientific, technical, and financial cooperation between the Governments of Mexico and the United States in all measures looking toward the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

MEXICO, D. F., *January 25, 1947.*

Resolution II

Whereas the Animal Industry Subcommission of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission considers that the most urgent and immediate need in the foot-and-mouth disease situation in Mexico is the establishment and maintenance of an extremely rigid quarantine around the area where the disease presently exists, pending application of further control and eradication measures; and

Whereas much additional equipment and technical personnel are absolutely essential in the establishment and maintenance of such a quarantine, the Animal Industry Subcommission of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission recommends that the Government of the United States, as an initial measure of cooperation in the joint campaign for control and eradication of this disease, secure and dispatch to Mexico at the earliest possible moment, such essential equipment as well as personnel as may be needed.

MEXICO, D. F., *January 27, 1947.*

Resolution III

Considering:

That foot-and-mouth disease has already been existent in Mexico for an approximate period of 3 months.

That the disease has invaded at least eight States, comprising an area vast in extent—designated as zone 1, approximately 250 kilometers from north to south and 500 kilometers from west to east.

That the comparatively low mortality from the disease and the present existence of a large number of recovered animals has caused public interest to relax, thus rendering most necessary a carefully studied program of public education and propaganda, not only among the people of the affected area, but also in the remainder of the Republic.

That the population of zone 1 is almost 6,000,000 people, which represents a little less than one-third of the people in the nation, and that there are estimated to be at least 1,000,000 affected or exposed susceptible domestic animals in zone 1, including at least 650,000 cattle.

That any campaign for eradication of the disease can be expected to seriously upset the economy of this zone and affect that of the entire country.

That the costs involved in any control and eradication campaign must be expected to be enormous.

That extremely variable topographical and climatic conditions present definite obstacles to the ultimate success of a rapid campaign for eradication.

That there exist great limitations in readily available technical personnel, in equipment, and in materials, and finally,

That it will be necessary to carry out a radical destruction of all wild ruminants and wild swine in the zone, which of itself constitutes a formidable undertaking.

The Animal Industry Subcommission of the Mexican and United States Agricultural Commission recommends:

1. The utmost control to prevent the movement of susceptible animals and dangerous products out of zone 1 and to prevent the movement of any such animals into zone 1, except for immediate slaughter.

2. A methodical disposal of all susceptible animals in newly infected and directly exposed herds or flocks by immediate destruction on the premises, followed by thorough disinfection of the latter, and an orderly movement to local slaughterhouses within the zone of animals in herds not yet affected or entirely recovered and which are apparently healthy.

3. The immediate destruction of all wild ruminants and wild swine in this zone and such adjacent areas as may be necessary.

4. That steps be taken immediately to establish at the earliest possible time a joint Mexican-United States foot-and-mouth disease research organization, providing within the affected zone the necessary buildings, equipment, funds, and personnel.

5. That whenever foot-and-mouth disease appears outside the presently affected area, designated zone 1, the method of immediate destruction of susceptible animals in affected or directly exposed herds or flocks, as well as wild ruminants and wild swine, that may be

exposed, followed by the thorough disinfection of the premises involved, be adopted and applied in all instances.

MEXICO, D. F., *January 27, 1947.*

Senate Joint Resolution 2

Joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to control and eradicate and prevent from entrance into this country of the disease of animals known as foot-and-mouth disease (apthous fever) now present among animals of several States of the Republic of Mexico

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has been advised by the United States Embassy in Mexico City, Mexico, that the disastrous livestock disease known as foot-and-mouth disease has appeared and exists widespread in several States of the Republic of Mexico, and diagnosis of the disease has been confirmed by both Mexican and United States Government veterinarians who have conducted extensive field investigations; and

Whereas the United States Government through action of the Secretary of Agriculture on December 30, 1946, added Mexico to the list of countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists and thereby prohibited the importation into the United States from that country of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, and the meat thereof; and

Whereas in accordance with the terms of the Mexico-United States Sanitary Treaty, the United States Department of Agriculture will continue to cooperate with the Mexican authorities in dealing with this serious threat to the livestock industries of the two countries, including the production of meat and milk in the United States; and

Whereas the present outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico apparently has existed there for some time and may be associated with the importation of Zebu bulls from the Republic of Brazil; and

Whereas there have been outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States in the past, including two in the State of California, and these have been eradicated only after great expenditure of public funds and losses to livestock owners; and

Whereas the method of eradication used in previous outbreaks in the United States has been to destroy or burn or deeply bury all animals in affected herds and those directly exposed thereto, the last outbreak in the United States being in 1929; and

Whereas any disruption of our food producing processes would be serious to the public welfare, the disruption of commerce and the adverse effect on the economic life of the people would be disastrous, and the difficulties and expenses that would be entailed in effectively eradicating this disease, should it spread to California, would be tremendous; and

Whereas time is of the essence if this disease is not to be permitted to spread to the United States; and

Whereas it appears that the Government of the Republic of Mexico may need immediately the expert assistance and the financial help of the Government of the United States in curtailing this disease; and

Whereas it is to the immediate interest of all the people of the United States that the disease be controlled and eradicated in the Republic of Mexico before it is permitted to spread to the United States; and

Whereas the full administrative and financial assistance required by the United States to deal with the present outbreak in Mexico may not be included in existing laws, involving expenditures in a foreign country in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary, by legislation or otherwise:

(a) To appropriate adequate funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry to prevent, control, and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in this country;

(b) To provide assistance to the Republic of Mexico in locating, diagnosing, and eradicating foot-and-mouth disease in that country to the fullest extent permitted and requested by the appropriate officials of that country;

(c) To create a joint United States-Mexico commission empowered to deal with this problem and to control, eradicate, and prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in each of said countries;

(d) To close the United States-Mexico border, in addition to the present quarantine regulations, to all importations or traffic of whatever kind or nature that may carry the infection of the foot-and-mouth disease into this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed, forthwith, to send a copy of this joint resolution by telegram and by mail to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in the Congress from the State of California.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. What does the gentleman think of the danger of this disease being brought into the United States by the spring flight of birds from the South to the North?

Mr. GILLIE. The danger, of course, is very, very great. In the first place, you must consider that the foot-and-mouth disease is one of the worst if not the worst disease that we have to contend with in modern history. There are several ways in which this infection can be carried. It is carried by birds, but that is not the principal way in which it is spread. It is carried by the carrion, by the crows and by pigeons. It is carried more by pigeons from one farm to another, from one farm that has it to another farm. It is carried that way. While birds are not so important, probably, the general source of infection is by meat and meat products. It is carried on your clothes, it is carried from one place to another in that way, it is carried by automobiles going from one farm to another, it is carried by corn or grain of any kind going from one farm to another, also by hay and garbage. That is the principal source of spreading the disease.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is to be complimented in bringing to the attention of the Congress a very real threat to the livestock industry and agriculture of this country. This cannot be too forcibly brought home to the Members of Congress and I wish to compliment the gentleman for bringing this before us.

Mr. GILLIE. May I say that I remember very well in 1941 when this epidemic broke in my State of Indiana and my county. We had several herds that were completely destroyed. Along with Government officials I assisted in trying to eradicate the disease and I know from first hand knowledge about the situation. Certainly we do not want to have it in our country under any circumstances and we must do our best at any cost to keep this disease out of the United States. No matter how much it may cost, it is a whole lot better to fight the disease in Mexico than to have it come into this country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to join with my colleague from Montana in complimenting the gentleman and at the same time to offer him my wholehearted support in anything that we can do to keep this disease beyond our borders. It is within 300 miles of the international border now and the livestock people all over the Southwest especially as well as throughout the West, are tremendously apprehensive and crying out to us to do something to stop the spread and ravages of this terrible disease.

Mr. GILLIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein two resolutions, a resolution of the Animal Industry Subcommittee of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission that has been approved by both the Mexican and United States sections of the Commission and also copy of Joint Resolution No. 2 of the California State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—section 138—provides for a joint legislative committee which shall report to the two Houses of Congress, not later than February 15, a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, "including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year," and a recommendation fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for that year, including a reserve for deficiencies if deemed necessary.

The act also provides for a concurrent resolution, subject to action by both Houses, recommending adoption of the joint committee's report and fixing the total to be appropriated for the ensuing year and providing for an increase in the public debt if the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts. If the situation is reversed the report is to

recommend a decrease in debt. The purpose of this legislation is highly desirable.

It is always important and it has always been important—and in our present financial condition it is more important than it has ever been before—to correlate revenue and expenditure and use every effort to reduce expenses, and to make as substantial a payment upon the public debt as the public revenues may warrant. But the joint committee has now been operating for some time, and it becomes increasingly evident that any attempt at this time to fix the over-all totals, of either revenue or expenditures, would be purely speculative. The data are not available. The Committees and the Subcommittees on Appropriations, for example, have had no opportunity to bring in the representatives of the departments or time to make their own investigation and to fix any even tentative figure with any assurance of accuracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this afternoon a joint resolution amending section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to change the date by which the joint committee must make its report from February 15 to April 15, a delay of 2 months.

Three purposes will be effectuated by that delay. In the first place, the committees of the House and the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations will by that time have had opportunity to hold hearings and to correlate essential data, and we will have available some definite factual information upon which to predicate a conclusion as to the total of appropriations needed and a clearer view of the business outlook and the total revenue expectations.

Furthermore, the routine business of the Congress will be expedited. The time of the committees and of the most experienced men on these committees has been diverted for the time being to this futile work of trying to shape conclusions in the absence of necessary factual data when they should have been engaged and should now be engaged in whipping into shape appropriation bills to be reported to the House. Within the experience of the oldest Members here we have never been so far behind as we are today with the preparation of the annual appropriation bills, and if we are to adjourn within the time that has been indicated—somewhere near July 1—it is high time that instead of longer diverting the attention of the key men on these committees to so impractical a task we permit them to turn their attention to the transaction of the regular business of the House in conducting hearings and examining the necessary data and investigating the Government's requirements in detail in order to get the appropriation bills into the House and over to the Senate in time for enactment before the end of the fiscal year.

The third reason is that a very large proportion of these expenditures are in support of the armed services, and for diplomatic and international activities. We will not know until after the Moscow Conference, which convenes in March, just what our international relations and our world responsibilities will be. The determination of the Moscow Conference will aid materially, if not decisively, in determining the amount of money we will require for national defense and for international obligations.

At this time this largest segment of the public expenditure must remain wholly indeterminate until we know what our world commitments are to be, and what will be the requirements for expenditures in international affairs in the next fiscal year. If we would delay this report until April 15 we could, in the meantime, proceed immediately to the routine work of the Congress and get the appropriation on the legislative program of the Congress under way we would have an opportunity to accumulate and evaluate facts upon which to predicate an over-all figure for expenditure and revenue, and so actually proceed to achieve the real and very commendable purpose of the Reorganization Act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread misapprehension as to the purpose and function of the President's budget. A great many seem to have the idea that when the President's budget comes down we are expected to adhere rigidly to the figures written in the budget message. Nothing could be further from actual budgetary procedure. If that were true, it would be unnecessary for the Congress to act at all; it would be left to the President. As a matter of fact, as will be observed from the disposition of the President's budgetary recommendations, ever since the adoption of the budget system, that the President's figures are merely an over-all ceiling above which the Congress is not expected to go.

It has been reported repeatedly in the newspapers and on the radio that members of the Committee on Appropriations or members of the House of Representatives have said that the President's budget could not be cut. Why, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am able to determine no such statement was ever made by any Member of the Congress and certainly not by any member of the Committee on Appropriations. That would be absurd. We have every year cut the President's budget and cut it materially. Of course, when the President sends the budget down to us he expects us to adhere to it as closely as our findings permit. At least expects us not to go above it, but naturally he expects it to be cut as much as the situation will permit and as deeply as changing conditions and further study will justify—not arbitrary cuts arrived at by wishful thinking but any reductions supported by factual findings. The activities of the Government are so numerous and diversified, touch so many sections of the globe, and so many factors of our economic life, that considerations may have changed materially between the time the estimates were prepared and revised and the time they were considered by Congress.

I want to say, too, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the desire of all minority members of the Committee on Appropriations, to cooperate in reducing expenditures of government. It is imperative. It must be effected wherever it will not interfere with the efficiency of the functions of government.

And at the same time national revenues must be maintained. When appropriations are deducted from the national income there must be sufficient funds remaining with which to make substantial reductions in the national debt.

In these prosperous times, with the largest national income in the history of the Republic, we cannot continue to carry undiminished a national debt of such magnitude that annual payments of $5,000,000,000 will not extinguish it for 50 years to come.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as the minority of the committee are concerned, if there should be any variation either one way or the other, we believe we should cut the budget too much rather than not cut it enough, we are now setting a standard which will be remembered for many years to come. If we are to err at all, let us err on the side of rigid retrenchment.

We announced such a program during debate on the last appropriation bill before the House last August. It is our purpose to continue that program of rescission and retrenchment which we so effectively put into operation in the Seventy-ninth Congress. We have in mind the objective laid down by the President in his 1947 budget message in which he looked forward to an ultimate peacetime budget of $25,000,000,000. We shall not be able to attain that objective immediately. We cannot cut off war activities and war expenditures overnight. It took us 3 years to reach the peak of the war effort. Necessarily, the liquidation of wartime agencies likewise requires time. But just as rapidly as it can be effected, we expect to cooperate in the retrenchment of expenditures and, wherever possible, in the reduction of the budget.

There are other requirements. The mail must be delivered. Taxes must be collected. Veterans must be rehabilitated. Farm guaranties must be fulfilled. Our armed forces must be maintained at a strength sufficient to insure national safety and international respect.

These are obligations resting on the Eightieth Congress. Let there be no misapprehension as to our purpose on this side of the aisle to cooperate in every well-considered proposal to discharge them fully and effectively.

We can best effect all these objectives and expedite the work of the Congress by deferring until April 15—until such time as we have information and experience on which to base the determinations required by the Legislative Reorganization Act—the report of the joint committee. The passage of the joint resolution will render it possible to

make this provision of the Reorganization Act a service instead of a mere formality.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GERLACH (at the request of Mr. TIBBOTT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. JACKSON), for 1 week, on account of public business.

To Mr. JACKSON, for 3 days, February 12, 13, and 14, on account of public business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 220. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 221. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co., a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 234. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 276. An act to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 12, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 11, through Friday, February 14, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands will meet at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, February 11, in suite 1324, to hear testimony of representatives of the administrative offices involved in the stockpiling of strategic minerals and metals.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 11, 1947, to continue hearings on air accidents to be followed by executive session at 11:45 a. m. to consider H. R. 1777, by Mr. WOLVERTON, to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act with respect to the term of office of members of the FPC; and H. R. 1778, by Mr. WOLVERTON, to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings on Thursday, February 13, 1947, at 10 a. m. in room 219, Old House Office Building, on a bill to continue the authority for the Maritime Commission to operate ships.

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in open hearings on Tuesday, February 18, at 10 o'clock a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 476) to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered wartime service in the United States merchant marine, and to provide aid for their families.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A meeting of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, February 18, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

303. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

304. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947 in the amount of $1,003,469.34 and proposed authorizations for the expenditure of Indian tribal funds for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

305. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of $1,733.85 and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $1,064,500 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

306. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $38,000, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

307. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation in the amount of $9,583.08 and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $4,242,605, in all, $4,252,188.08, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

308. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed limitation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $269,500 for the Philippine Alien Property Administration, and an increase in the limitation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $40,000 for the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

309. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $50,000 for the United States Soldiers' Home (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

310. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $20,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

311. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the War Department—civil functions (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

312. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $147,916,164 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

313. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,955,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

314. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $3,944,000 and drafts of proposed provisions affecting appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

315. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $82,223,350, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

316. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 6, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Rock River, Ill. and Wis., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1938, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on March 5, 1938, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

317. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting three copies of a report on the audit of the Gorgas

Memorial Laboratory of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the year ending June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

318. A letter from the Director, Federal Security Agency, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, transmitting the Annual Report of the former United States Employees' Compensation Commission covering operations of such Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

319. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting supplemental and consolidated reports showing the number of officers above the rank of major during the 6-month period June 1 to November 30 with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during this period; to the Committee on Armed Services.

320. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 12, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the Delaware River and its tributaries submitted to Congress on August 4, 1941, with a view to determining whether any improvement for flood control on the Lackawaxen River and its tributaries, especially in the vicinity of Honesdale, Hawley, Prompton, and Seelyville, in Wayne County, Pa., is advisable, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

321. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of the proposed transfer of a barge for use by the American Naval Cadets and Marine Corps, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

322. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1803. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 1804. A bill to relieve the estates of certain members of the military and naval forces from the additional estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1805. A bill to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1806. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel-allowance accounts of military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1807. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1808. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1809. A bill to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1810. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to permit certain referees in bankruptcy to prosecute claims against the United States before the Courts and the executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1811. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1812. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service in cooperation with the War Department during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1813. A bill to provide a preliminary examination and survey of the Pantego Creek and Cucklers Creek in the State of North Carolina with a view to control of their floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 1814. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees, to provide for adjusting compensation of clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices, air-mail field transfer offices, and office clerks, and study allowance time credits for certain employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 1815. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1816. A bill to provide that there shall be at least one national cemetery in every State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1817. A bill to provide funds for engineering, planning, and construction of the Buford Dam on the Chatahoochee River, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1818. A bill to provide that in disposing of lands which have been acquired by the United States for national defense or war purposes a preference shall be given to the former owners of such lands or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 1819. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1820. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1821. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1822. A bill to permit former members of the armed forces restored to positions in the classified civil service to receive retired pay from the Army or Navy without regard to existing limitations on the amount thereof; to the Commttee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1823. A bill to create an Enemy Property Commission, to provide for the disposal of certain enemy property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1824. A bill to grant an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees, and to provide a more equitable method of taxing purchased annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1825. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, by extending that statute to all programs of the Department of Agriculture and agencies operating under its direction, and in other respects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1826. A bill making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 1827. A bill to authorize a naval academy in the Puget Sound area of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1828. A bill relating to the unauthorized wearing of the discharge button awarded by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. R. 1829. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1830. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 1831. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1832. A bill to establish and maintain in the Bureau of Land Management a record of title to all lands held by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1833. A bill to repeal an act granting certain public lands situated in Mono County, in the State of California, to the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1834. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1835. A bill to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1836. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1837. A bill for the erection of a public building at Fort Mill, S. C., and appropri-

ating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1838. A bill for the erection of a public building at Pageland, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1839. A bill for the erection of a public building at Great Falls, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1840. A bill for the erection of a public building at Clover, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1841. A bill for the erection of a public building at Blacksburg, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1842. A bill for the erection of a public building at Kershaw, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 1843. A bill to suspend the authority to make further reductions of duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1844. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1845. A bill to amend section 371, title 10, United States Code, military leave for Federal employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1846. A bill to amend further the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 1847. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., on the Fort Wayne Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1848. A bill defining the powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Colorado River under the treaty with Mexico of February 3, 1944; authorizing the construction, acquisition, and administration of works required for performance of said treaty on the Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to change the name of Boulder Dam to Herbert Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to amend section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON (by request):

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 87. Resolution authorizing the expenses of the special committee authorized by House Resolution 36 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 88. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) (g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to the Committee on Education and Labor); to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Res. 92. Resolution providing for the printing of the study entitled "United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly" prepared by the staff of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 93. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 94. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 93; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to cause the proposed sale of the town of Dragerton, Utah, to be withdrawn from sale as a unit and to offer it for sale to present occupants, veterans and others in units of one house and lot in each sale; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to utilize Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting action to prevent the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of Raimundo Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Peter George Ladas and Helen Ladas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jacinta Santos Harn, Dr. Charles S. Harn, Helen Harn, Winifred Mary Harn, and James Harn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Leon H. Watson, doing business as Leon Watson & Associates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Aram Stepan Ajderian, Arsholus Ajderian, and Sona Ajderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Elbert Spivey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Antonios Varlamos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 1857. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach and others for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of Glen G. Wetzel and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1860. A bill for the relief of Shiro Takemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Domenico Recine, formerly known as Giuseppi Magnano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1862. A bill for the relief of William H. Powell and Loretta B. Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Enta Kitajima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 1864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raiford D. Smith, of Fitzgerald, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1865. A bill for the relief of Asa Sheldon Parsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Paul Goodman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Yu Yuen Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

89. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition signed by Taylor B. Light and 72 other citizens of Akron, N. Y., relative to liquor advertisements in newspapers, periodicals, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Clifford G. English, of Somerville, Mass., proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to relieve the distress of the people and the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona: Petition of the State of Arizona, requesting action to prevent the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

92. Also, petition of the State of Arizona, requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

93. Also, petition of the State of Arizona relating to the former prisoner-of-war camp at Florence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

94. Also, petition of the State of Arizona relating to concession stands operated by the blind in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

95. Also, petition of the State of Arizona requesting an investigation of the administration of the Office of Price Administration in Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

96. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, relative to the legislation creating the national social-security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

97. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of the State of Arizona, requesting action to prevent the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

98. Also, petition of the State of Arizona, relating to concession stands operated by the blind in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

99. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1, requesting an investigation of the administration of the Office of Price Administration in Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

100. Also, petition of the State of Arizona, requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

101. Also, petition of the State of Arizona, relating to the former prisoner-of-war camp at Florence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

102. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages at their annual meeting held at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., January 28, 1947, asking that rationing and price controls be retained on sugar until the supply more closely approximates the demand; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

103. Also, resolution adopted by the executive council of Wisconsin Bankers Association at its meeting held in Milwaukee on January 29, 1947, regarding Federal income tax rate schedule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

104. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of employees of the Southern Pacific Railroad urging repeal of Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

105. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Cassius M. McDonald, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. Also, petition of division of social education and action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requested legislation that would alleviate the suffering of the displaced persons in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

107. Also, petition of Friends Committee on National Legislation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to sufficient provision for the resettlement of displaced persons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. Also, petition of the United Home Owners of Illinois, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for legislation permitting property owners to secure a 30 percent increase in price of the rentals now in force; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

109. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

110. Also, petition of Admiral Yates Stirling, Sr., Federal Post, No. 110, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to claims of unfair practices against veterans by the labor board of the New York naval shipyard at New York; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, Almighty God, for the rich heritage of this good land; for the evidences of Thy favor in the past; and for the Hand that hath made and preserved us a nation. We thank Thee for the men and women who, by blood and sweat, by toil and tears, forged on the anvil of their own sacrifice all that we hold dear. May we never lightly esteem what they obtained at a great price. Grateful for rights and privileges, may we be conscious of duties and obligations.

On this day we thank Thee for the inspiration that breathes in the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and we pray that something of the spirit that was his may be ours today. Like him, may we be more concerned that we are on Thy side, than that Thou art on ours. In our hearts may there be, as there was in his, malice toward none and charity for all; that we may, together, with Thy blessing and help, "bind up the Nation's wounds, and do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 10, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF UNITED STATES

A letter from C. WAYLAND BROOKS, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report from the national headquarters of the Navy Club of the United States for the calendar year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTEST AGAINST UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and resolution I have received from Donald B. Cloward, of the Council on Christian Social Progress of the Northern Baptist Convention, stating that this organization has gone on record as opposing universal military training.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL ON CHRISTIAN
SOCIAL PROGRESS OF THE
NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
New York, N. Y., January 30, 1947.

To the Members of the Eightieth Congress.

HONORABLE SIRS: The Northern Baptist Convention, representing 1,500,000 Baptists from Maine to California, is on official record as opposed to universal military training.

I have been asked to forward the Grand Rapids resolution bearing on this vital matter to the Members of the Congress. The resolution speaks for itself and was unanimously endorsed on May 25, 1946 in Grand Rapids, Mich., by the largest gathering of delegates in the history of our convention.

Every major denomination has taken a similar action in recent months, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has also registered its opposition. Protestantism, therefore, is united in its opposition to what is in fact compulsory peacetime conscription.

We earnestly and respectfully urge the Congress to defeat any universal military training bill that may be presented during the present session.

Respectfully yours,
DONALD B. CLOWARD,
Executive Secretary, Council on Christian Social Progress.

NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT GRAND RAPIDS, MAY 25, 1946

III. NATIONAL AFFAIRS

3. (d) Peacetime military conscription:

Whereas to enact peacetime military conscription is a radical departure from the principles and practices of this Nation from the days of its foundation; and

Whereas history and experience have proved again and again that large compulsory military establishments have never succeeded in preventing wars in the past; and

Whereas an enduring peace can only be built on good will and mutual confidence; and

Whereas to build a permanent peacetime army by compulsory peacetime conscription will only arouse the fear and suspicion of other nations; and

Whereas the evil effects of military life would have a harmful influence upon the morals of our youth; and

Whereas the undemocratic practices involved in our Army system fill the enlisted men with disaffection for army life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Northern Baptist Convention, through its council on Christian social progress, express to the Congress of the United States its opposition to compulsory military conscription in time of peace and that local churches and individual members be urged to take similar action; furthermore be it

Resolved, That the Northern Baptist Convention approve the Martin resolution, which calls upon all nations to give up peacetime military conscription.

LETTER FROM BUSINESSMEN OF SALINA, KANS., RELATING TO REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from four businessmen of Salina, Kans., relating to reduction in expenditures, labor laws, rental control, building controls, sugar control, and reduction of taxes be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALINA, KANS., *February 8, 1947.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that Members of the Congress pay some attention to the mail received from their constituents, and that a preponderance of mail for or against an issue is considered.

Based on the above, we wish to go on record on the following:

1. Reduction in expenditure: We think this is axiomatic. If a million of the present employees cannot be dropped this year, strive to lop off a half million; but get started on the way as soon as possible and keep at it until the present oversupply is brought under control.

2. Labor laws: We believe that the present laws should be overhauled with the intent to take away any special privileges now enjoyed by either employer or employee.

3. Rent control: How anyone can defend this law is beyond our comprehension. To us it is the rawest kind of class legislation, and one of the major factors in the present housing shortage.

4. Building controls: Remove all of them as soon as possible thereby helping the veterans to secure living quarters, and at the same time dispensing with a bureau and some bureaucrats.

5. Sugar control: This should be abolished forthwith. Also, allotments of sugar to foreign nations should be investigated by Congress at once.

6. Reduction of taxes: While this is desirable, we think a reduction of the national debt should be kept in mind and a substantial payment made each year.

We thank you.

Yours truly,

FRANK BUSBOOM,
JOE RAUH,
CHAS. G. GRAY,
R. B. DODDS.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an important letter I have received from Will J. Miller, of the Kansas Livestock Association, in regard to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the Southwest.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., February 8, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you know, we are all very much concerned about the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Old Mexico and are informed from Washington that a bill authorizing United States participation in this vital matter is ready for submission in Congress, hearings to start early next week.

Since this disease is such a terrible threat to our livestock industry, we would like you to give every possible support to the bill mentioned and to an appropriation act to implement the bill which is to follow.

We would urge your careful consideration of the entire matter, but feel satisfied that the proposed bill should be enacted and is, perhaps, the best measure possible at this time.

Thanks in advance for your support of this most important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WILL J. MILLER,
Executive Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 563, to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to the receiving of stolen public property, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 564. A bill to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, at the request of officials of the Treasury Department, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills introduced by the Senator from Vermont will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 565. A bill to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to taking trial pieces of coins; and

S. 566. A bill to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 567. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 568. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 569. A bill to authorize the payment of a maintenance allowance to the owner of a bridge over the Columbia River for navigation facilities not required; and

S. 570. A bill to authorize completion of alterations to a bridge over the Columbia River, made necessary by Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 571. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; and

S. 572. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 573. A bill to provide for the establishment of a bee culture laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards;

S. 575. A bill providing for the observance as National Flag Raising Day of the day on which the public schools open each year for the beginning of a new school year;

S. 576. A bill for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 577. A bill for the relief of Chauncey L. Pierce; and

S. 578. A bill for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 579. A bill to reopen the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws;

S. 580. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 581. A bill subjecting to assessment by local drainage districts in the State of Oregon lands acquired by the United States for military purposes and lying within the territorial areas of said districts, and making such assessments liens upon said lands and providing for the payment by the United States of such assessment liens;

S. 582. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of their national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 583. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 584. A bill to provide for the payment of interest on amounts payable under section 501 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 585. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1945 to require that reorganization plans submitted thereunder be accompanied by statements of the economies and increases in efficiency, if any, to result from the taking effect of such plans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 586. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional

naval academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 587. A bill to repeal section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 588. A bill to advance knowledge on the history and culture of the American Indian through the acquisition and preservation of irreplaceable artifacts and relics; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 64, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the 9th of October of each year as Leif Erikson Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE RELATING TO RECEIVING STOLEN PUBLIC PROPERTY.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Attorney General, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to the receiving of stolen public property. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter dated February 10, addressed to me by the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 563) to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to the receiving of stolen public property, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 48 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1098; 18 U. S. C. 101) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 48. Whoever shall receive, conceal, or aid in concealing, or shall have or retain in his possession with intent to convert to his own use or gain, any money, property, record, voucher, or valuable thing whatever, of the moneys, goods, chattels, records, or property of the United States, which has theretofore been embezzled, stolen, or purloined by any other person, knowing the same to have been embezzled, stolen, or purloined, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both; and such person may be tried either before or after the conviction of the principal offender."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Under existing law (18 U. S. C. 101), it is a criminal offense for a person to receive, conceal, aid in concealing, or have in his possession with intent to convert to his own use "any money, property, record, voucher, or valuable thing whatever, of the moneys, goods, chattels, records, or property of the United States, which has theretofore been embezzled, stolen, or purloined by any other person, knowing the same to have been so embezzled, stolen, or purloined."

The provisions of this statute have been construed as requiring proof by the Government that the defendant not only had knowledge of its stolen character but also that he knew it was stolen from the United States. For example, in a prosecution in the district of New Jersey, in which the indictment charged a violation of the above-quoted provision of law, the court directed a verdict for the defendants on the ground that the evidence failed to show that the defendants knew the property was stolen from the United States. This decision was based upon the ruling of the Supreme Court in *Kirby* v. *United States* (174 U. S. 47.) In that case the defendant was charged with feloniously receiving and having in his possession with intent to convert to his own use certain postage stamps which had been stolen from the post office. In the opinion Mr. Justice Harlan held that in order to sustain its charge against Kirby it was incumbent upon the Government to establish beyond a reasonable doubt (1) that the property described in the indictment was, in fact, stolen from the United States; (2) that the defendant received or retained it in his possession with intent to convert it to his own use or gain; and (3) that he received or retained it with knowledge that it had been stolen from the United States.

The necessity of proving that the receiver of stolen Government property knew it was stolen from the United States places an undue burden upon the Government in the enforcement of this statute. By reason of the difficulty encountered in satisfying such requirement, receivers of stolen Government property under some circumstances escape the punishment which should be imposed upon them.

It is, therefore, recommended that the existing law be amended so as to make it sufficient for the prosecution to show that the receiver knew that the property was stolen without being required to prove that he knew that the property had been stolen from the United States. This result may be accomplished by striking out the word "so" immediately preceding the word "embezzled" in the appropriate clause of the statute. A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate the foregoing recommendation is enclosed herewith.

I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

LEIF ERIKSON MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the 9th day of October each year as Leif Erikson Day and calling for appropriate observance of this occasion.

I am grateful to the Leif Erikson Memorial Association of America and its president, Mr. C. A. Hoen, of Edgerton, Wis., for its selection of me to introduce this measure in the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the 9th of October of each year as Leif Erikson Day, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Josiah Marvel, Jr., of Delaware, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Denmark, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Herman B. Baruch, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands;

John A. O'Donnell, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, vice John S. Young; and

Sundry persons to be Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice Edmund J. Brandon, deceased;

Robert E. Shelton, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Charles E. Dierker, term expired; and

J. Charles Dennis to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington.

INVOCATION BY RT. REV. MSGR. ERIC F. MacKENZIE

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an invocation by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Eric F. MacKenzie before the Clover Club of Boston on February 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FEDERAL BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA MORNING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, discussing the Federal Budget, entitled "Rock-Bottom Nonsense," from the Omaha World-Herald of February 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during sessions of the Senate, at 2 o'clock this afternoon, and also at 2 o'clock on Friday, if the Senate should be in session on Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATE SECTION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be privileged to sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session, and also on Friday, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

THE CALENDAR—BILLS PASSED OVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order and the clerk will state the bills on the calendar.

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, ARIZONA

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) to authorize the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this joint resolution will permit the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district to drill some 20 wells for water and to deepen about 30 others on the San Carlos project.

The San Carlos irrigation project, Arizona, comprises 100,000 acres of land, 50,000 acres of which are Indian lands and the remaining 50,000 acres in white ownership. When the original bill authorizing the project was passed and the contracts were executed the white owners were compelled to deed all their rights to underground water to the Secretary of the Interior, with the understanding, of course, that the Secretary of the Interior would develop the water for the benefit of the whole project.

There is now an extreme drought in that region, and because of the urgency of the situation the white people are willing to put up the money for the drilling of some additional wells in order to round out the project and make it more complete, so far as the pumping of the water is concerned.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. From what I have read, and from what I have been told, I understand the joint resolution is a measure primarily of local interest.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I understand also the joint resolution comes before the Senate with a unanimous and favorable report of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire whether there will be any further expense incurred by the Federal Government in connection with the project.

Mr. McFARLAND. The joint resolution provides that the cost of the wells shall be a project charge and shall be repaid in one of two methods. It is estimated the cost will be $380,000, and it will be repaid either by appropriations or, if the Congress does not appropriate the money, the cost will be deducted from future payments due for construction costs of the project.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the total amount involved is something over $350,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. The bill limits the expenditure to $380,000.

Mr. WHERRY. And the reason for the legislation at this time is that there is an emergency?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is a fact. There are only about 12,000 acre-feet of water in the Coolidge Dam; and if the water is not obtained immediately, the farmers will not be able to make a crop this year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) to authorize the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "constructed", to strike out "a certain program" and to insert "an extension of the system"; on line 5, after the word "works", to strike out "as a part"; on line 11, after the word "project", to insert "exclusively"; on line 15, after the word "available", to insert the word "exclusively"; on line 18, after the word "purchase", to strike out "or otherwise acquire" and to insert "with the consent of and under agreement with the owner thereof"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "wells", to insert a comma and the words "exclusively for use as part of the common stored and pumped water supply of said project, equipment, and pumping works herein"; on line 20, after the words "authorized to", to strike out "pay such costs" and to insert "make such reimbursement"; on page 4, line 2, before the words "by the district", to insert "under oath"; on line 8, after the word "funds", to insert the word "so", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be constructed an extension of the system of wells and pumping works of the San Carlos irrigation project, including the enlargement, rehabilitation, and repair of the present pumping and drainage works of the said project, and in order to expedite and assist the accomplishment thereof the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district is hereby authorized, (1) to develop underground water within and without the area of the San Carlos irrigation project exclusively for use as a part of the common stored and pumped water supply of said project; (2) to drill irrigation wells within and without the project area necessary for making underground waters available exclusively for use on all lands of the project, and equip the same with pumping facilities and equipment, including the deepening, replacement, and repair of existing project wells and equipment; and (3) to purchase with the consent of and under agreement with the owner thereof and to develop privately owned wells within or adjacent to the project areas, together with rights-of-way necessary to the operation of such wells: *Provided*, That the cost of the wells, exclusively for use as part of the common stored and pumped water supply of said project, equipment, and pumping works herein authorized to be constructed or acquired shall not exceed the sum of $380,000 and, within that limit, such cost shall be deemed a project charge to be distributed equally per acre over both the Indian lands and the lands in public and private ownership within the San Carlos irrigation project, and shall be repayable to the United States in accordance with existing law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, at the earliest practicable date, enter into an agreement with the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, which agreement shall describe the scope and extent of the work to be done by the district, the plans and specifications therefor, and such other provisions, in conformity herewith, as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the district: *Provided further*, That the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district shall be reimbursed for costs expended by it in the construction and acquisition of such wells, equipment, and pumping works; and the Secretary is hereby authorized to make such reimbursement: First, by releasing the district from the payment of construction charges due the United States annually by the district under the repayment contract executed pursuant to said act of June 7, 1924, as amended, as such charges become due and payable, until the amount of the payments so released shall equal the total amount of the funds certified under oath by the district as having been expended by it for the construction and acquisition of wells and equipment under the terms of the agreement provided for herein, the first of such annual payments so to be released by the Secretary being that due from the district on December 1, 1947; or second, by paying to the district the full amount of the funds so certified as expended by it in the work authorized to be done, or any balance thereof not otherwise paid as hereinabove provided, out of appropriations hereafter made by Congress for this purpose; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $380,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, created pursuant to the provisions of section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, have until midnight Saturday, February 15, to file a report of the joint committee as required by section 138 (a), even though the Senate may not be in session on Saturday, February 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

SAFEGUARDING OF PUBLIC RECORDS AND PAPERS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, recently we witnessed the refreshing spectacle of a government aroused at last over the flagrant abuse of a public trust. I refer to the growing indignation over the pernicious practice whereby public officials carry away public records for their own use and profit.

The practice of removing public records has increased enormously in recent years. The bad example was set by the highest officials charged with the conduct of public business, and it has been followed by many others at the lower levels. Scholars and historians of the future who desire to obtain source material will be compelled to travel to the Roosevelt collection, to the Stimson, Hopkins, Ickes, and Morgenthau collections, and goodness knows how many other collections, although all or a large part of such papers concern official business of the United States and belong in a single place, the Archives of the United States.

The prevalence of this practice compels speculation on the motives for removing these records. Sometimes there is a sinister motive such as the desire to doctor or obliterate embarrassing or incriminating evidence. Those who have lived through the last 14 years know how widespread was the twisting of words and the resort to schemes to color official performances. From my experiences on the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and on the Joint Committee To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack, I know that in innumerable instances a missing file here or an incomplete file there makes a good deal of difference. On many occasions I was informed that efforts were being made to remove or to destroy records because such records might prove embarrassing. One of these concerned the so-called loyalty files of the Civil Service Commission. Another bore upon similar records in the War Department. A third case dealt with certain contract transactions of private firms with the Rubber Reserve Corporation.

Some of these cases rested on nothing more substantial than unfounded rumor, and a simple inquiry disposed of them. In other cases there was good ground to suspect the destruction of files and only our vigilance preserved them. In the main, cases of public records being taken for sinister motives are relatively few; and rarely is this method successful in warding off embarrassment or an accounting for unconscionable transactions.

The greater number of instances of public records being removed are not based on sinister motives. They rest chiefly on a bad rash of hyperegotism which infected the higher levels of official life in the last 14 years.

Many of our officials have become so conceited over their part in the drama of events that they cannot resist the temptation to take all of the scripts with them when they leave the public stage.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator from Michigan suggest that the practice of officials removing what have been considered perhaps in the past as their private papers from governmental offices began only 14 years ago?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I answer by saying that I shall cover that question later on in what I have to say.

The officials who are removing such files want the self-pleasure of telling the "inside story" of historic events, particularly their great part in them. They want to walk in the public spotlight long after they have been otherwise consigned to obscurity. They are intoxicated by the joyful anticipation of making revelations in the "now-it-can-be-told" manner.

Some of them even believe they can gain special prestige by the publication of memoirs if they can spice them with a few tidbits of history salvaged from hitherto unrevealed records. Some of them harbor more grandiose schemes of creating shrines with the public records they remove so that their names will receive perpetual homage from scholars who will be forced to undertake special pilgrimages in order to learn details of the country's history. Others use the public records to blow the horn of self-glorification loud enough to make certain that its echo will reverberate far down the halls of time.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at the present moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. A few consider their public service and the records they take away with them as an investment yielding cash dividends from published articles, books, and collected papers.

Invariably those who abuse the public trust display the common weaknesses of gall and avarice. They grow bolder and bolder until at last one or more of them exceeds the bounds of tolerance in an easy-going government, and a storm of public indignation is aroused.

This is what happened in recent weeks when the former Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., was reported to have removed some 900 volumes of recorded material dealing with public business transacted during the period he held office.

We do not need to know the exact content of this material to reach the simple conclusion that it must contain many public documents and records. The sheer bulk of the haul indicates inclusion of a great deal more than the casual jottings of a busy public official. Some 900 volumes—not pages or papers, but volumes—of memoranda, photostats, correspondence, reports and transcripts of conferences can hardly be classed as fragmentary data ordinarily used to refresh a weak memory. Nor is it possible to conceive how an official so busy with public affairs as was Mr. Morgenthau could find time to accumulate 900 volumes of purely personal data. Even Colonel House, who had plenty of time unburdened by the cares of public office, and who kept a methodical diary for a great many years in the stirring times of Woodrow Wilson, barely squeezed out two volumes of data and reminiscences.

The Morgenthau material, so far as we know, is exceeded only by the boxcars of public papers said to have been removed by Franklin D. Roosevelt to the self-created shrine at Hyde Park. Among the latter are papers over which his secretary, Miss Grace Tully, held the power of final determination as to their relevancy to an inquiry by a congressional committee on the causes of the Pearl Harbor disaster. I thought at the time, and still think, such a situation is a fraud upon the people who have a paramount right to the documentary evidence of their Nation's history. In passing upon this case as well as others, we have been far too lenient with those who appropriate public property, and undoubtedly, the bulk of these records constitutes such property.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Michigan has called attention to the case of the former Secretary of the Treasury. Does the Senator have any information as to whether the files or the documents which were removed were of the nature of public documents?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall have to answer that question by stating, as I have stated before, that up to the present time, I do not have personal knowledge except with respect to the large volume of papers removed, and what has been said in the press and by the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, as to their contents.

Mr. BREWSTER. From the Senator's study of the question up to this time is there a clear distinction between public records, and private records which are the property of the individual?

Mr. FERGUSON. The line of demarcation between what is a personal record and what is a public record is somewhat blurred, it is not clear cut.

Mr. BREWSTER. If any of the records removed were public documents, then was it not clearly a violation of law for any official, however high his position, to remove them? If they were not public records, but simply personal or private records, then it would not be the concern

of the Government or of any official what was done with them. Does that distinction cover the situation?

Mr. FERGUSON. If they were public records there is ample law on the statute books today to take care of the situation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Either as to removal or destruction?

Mr. FERGUSON. Either as to removal or destruction.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the statute providing a fine of $2,000 and imprisonment for 3 years, or both?

Mr. FERGUSON. As I recall, that is the penalty. I shall deal with that subject later.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, of course, what records Mr. Morgenthau removed. It is a little difficult to understand how any man in any busy job could write a diary of 900 volumes.

Mr. FERGUSON. A personal diary, I think the Senator has in mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, a personal diary of 900 volumes. He may, however, have written such a diary. I do not question that at all, because I do not know. It simply strikes me as a good deal of literature to be turned out in the busy life of a man.

It is one thing to keep personal files of personal matters. I suppose, also, there would be no objection to a highly placed official making copies of certain files in his office for his own use later if he wished to use them to write a book about matters which transpired while he was in office. But I cannot conceive that any public officer would remove official files. I do not know whether a letter written to the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Agriculture and a carbon copy of the answer to such letter would always necessarily be regarded as public documents. Probably they would be.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the letters related to the public business they would be public documents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course the same thing might apply to a Senator. What documents in our offices are public documents? We receive letters dealing with all kinds of public matters, legislation, appointments, and other matters, and we answer the letters. Are they public documents or are they personal files which we can remove when we leave the Senate? A good many Senators have written diaries or memoirs, as have many Members of the other House. James G. Blaine, Thomas H. Benton, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, John Quincy Adams, Champ Clark, and the late leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, the Honorable James E. Watson, who I am glad to say is still among us, wrote diaries or books based upon their official records and events and incidents with which they came in contact. It is difficult to draw the line between what is a public document and what is not a public document. I suppose probably the distinction would be more blurred with respect to a Member of the Senate than it would be with respect to a Cabinet officer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it for granted that it would be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Although I dare say a good many files within our own offices are purely public documents in the sense that they may represent some action or some opinion or some correspondence between us and other people in regard to legislation pending in the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly, letters or documents growing out of the work of a committee would be official public documents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I cannot imagine that the Senate would want to clutter up its records with all the correspondence which a Senator receives and replies to, or even all the memoranda he makes in connection with committee work; so it is rather difficult to draw the line.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we have a method of disposing of such files.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. That method, however, and the law itself, may not apply to Members of the Congress as strictly as it does to executive officers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad the Senator from Kentucky made the point he did, as I think the law regarding the removal or destruction of public records applies to the executive departments, and has never been construed as applying to the records of a Senator or a Member of the other House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. Yet from the standpoint of analogy it is within the range of possibility that there might be found in a Senator's office an official record which is just as important, if not more important, than some of the official records to be found in an executive department.

Mr. BREWSTER. An interesting question may be presented upon which I think it would be helpful to have the reaction of the minority leader. Suppose the minority leader had telephoned the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, regarding official business pending in the Senate. It is my understanding that records of most such conversations were kept and constitute some of the records included among those taken away by the former Secretary. I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether such telephone records would be considered in any sense as official or public records. It presents an interesting question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, it does. There is no law requiring that a conversation over the telephone with an executive officer be taken down.

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. And as a matter of fairness to the Member of the Senate or the Member of the House or anyone else, he ought to know that his conversation is being taken down; but I would be willing to wager my head against the hole in a doughnut that not one out of a thousand conversations so held was ever within the knowledge of anyone outside the executive departments known to be taken down or a record being made of it.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Kentucky means that the Senator at one end of the line was not apprised of the fact that the conversation was being taken down?

Mr. BARKLEY. He was not apprised of the fact that his conversation was being taken down. No one but the one at the receiving end of the call knew anything about that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understand the Senator from Kentucky does not approve of that practice?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not. I think it is——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Michigan will indulge me a moment further, let me say that if such a practice is to be indulged in, whether the individual at this end of the line is a Senator or a Member of the House or a private citizen, he ought to be notified as soon as the conversation begins that what he is saying is being taken down so that he will know the fact, and he is entitled to a copy of it if he wants it, after the conversation is concluded.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in reply to that statement, let me say that there is no law on the statute books which provides that public officials must keep records. They can do business out of their hats if they desire. But the law states that after they make records, including records of telephone conversations, such records must be preserved as public records, and not be destroyed except in compliance with law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan this question: Would he construe a typewritten copy of a conversation over the telephone, taken by a stenographer and afterward transcribed, as a public document? Would it be one that the secretary, for instance, would have to keep in the files, or could he fold it up and stick it in his pocket?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should say that it would be a public document and should remain in the files, because it would have to do with public business?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator does not know what type of documents, if any, which could be construed as public documents, were removed by Secretary Morgenthau or any other official?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. But I am going to suggest that we find out what has been removed. There can be no doubt that some of these papers are private. For instance, I read in last night's newspaper that a part of the collection taken from the White House consisted of letters addressed to Fala, the small Scotty, which belonged to the President. I do not think anyone would contend that such letters were public papers, because Fala was not a public official. Some private papers were removed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Fala may not have been a public official, but he was treated by some of the critics and opponents of the late President Roosevelt as though he were a high-ranking officer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. As I remember, another dog was transported in place of certain public officials. We can hardly blame the people for feeling that the dogs were public officials.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is discussing a rather serious question, one which I think our committee is presently taking up, and upon which it will hold an open session.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. It is a matter of concern as to what are public records, and how they should be preserved. Has there been any clear definition of public records, and is the line of demarcation between private documents and public records clearly defined?

Mr. FERGUSON. It has not been. I shall discuss that question, and I believe I can show the Senate what is a public document and what is a private document.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The penal statute referred to by my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] and also by the Senator from Michigan should be in such terms that one could understand what is a crime and what is not a crime. I am interested to know whether there is in any court decision or any statutory language a definition of what constitutes a public record. Or has a penal statute been enacted without an attempt to define the crime?

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me put it this way: A penal statute has been enacted, but apparently never used. That is why we cannot point to decisions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The penal statute itself does not clearly define what a public document or record is.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It does not say what a public record is.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can understand that an entry made in a book at the time a transaction took place, or shortly thereafter, is a record. In some cases it is necessary to make such an entry in order that the action taken may be legal. Such an entry would undoubtedly be a record. No one would have a right to remove it. However, if in connection with some transaction an officer makes a memorandum to refresh his own recollection, or for his own use, I doubt whether that is a public record within the meaning of the law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Take the case in which the War Department had in mind the destruction of all bids except the bids acted upon and pursuant to which contracts were let. It is clear to me that a bid for a contract is a public record. Again, consider the files in the War Department relating to subversive activities. They have been removed from the War Department. They seem to the Senator from Michigan to be public records. They should not be destroyed. They should not be removed from the files by anyone. They should not be destroyed or disposed of except in compliance with the law.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. There has been some discussion here, and I have read considerable in the press, with reference to the so-called diary of a recent Secretary of the Treasury, and whether there may be some public interest in that document. According to the press, the series of volumes contains approximately 60,000,000 words.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are 900 volumes.

Mr. CORDON. The gentleman who wrote the diary would require at least 4 years to dictate it, at the rate of 120 words a minute and on the basis of a 40-hour week. It would require 6 more years for a stenographer to transcribe it. It occurs to me that perhaps the Government might have some slight interest in the subject, if only from the standpoint of cost.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am somewhat at a loss to reconcile the attack which is being made here today by the Senator from Michigan and the remarks relative to the removal of some papers by the late President Roosevelt and by Mr. Morgenthau, with the knowledge that yesterday afternoon the committee resolved, in a proper way, to go into the whole question, to try to find out what the law is, what the facts are, whether any wrong has been done, and, if so, what retribution should be visited upon those who have done wrong. The able Senator from Michigan, a former distinguished jurist, is a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. Knowing that the committee resolved yesterday afternon to take such action, the Senator from Michigan chooses to make a speech on the subject today in the Senate. I wonder if that course is calculated to inspire public confidence in the fairness and impartiality of the investigations of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. I wonder whether this is really an inquiry into what the facts are, and a determination of whether or not the law has been violated, or whether the real design and intent of this inquiry in the Senate is to make political capital of some sort out of Democrats following a practice which was engaged in by Abraham Lincoln. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan intended, when he spoke about the egotism of public officials who remove public records from their offices, to include a reference to the Lincoln papers, which are to be opened this year, and which have not as yet been made public.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Florida for a question. I shall be glad to answer his question.

The jurisdiction of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program has been reduced to the simple question of war contracts. I am not limiting my discussion today to that field. I am discussing the broad question of the wholesale removal of papers from the public records.

I am glad that the able Senator from Florida raised the question with respect to Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln removed no papers from the public files. Lincoln died suddenly while in office, and the papers were removed by his executors and not by Abraham Lincoln. I am glad the Senator from Florida raised the point. We are talking about records which are removed from the public files.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I must decline to yield until I finish what I have to say. Then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves this point will he yield for one question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Michigan has just made a statement about the jurisdiction of the committee. I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. BREWSTER] if he agrees with the statement just made by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I did not mean to imply that my statement was binding upon the chairman. However, the jurisdiction of the committee relates to war contracts. I am sure that nothing I may have said would narrow the jurisdiction of the committee. The point I was trying to make was that the Senate had limited the jurisdiction of the committee. Its jurisdiction certainly would not include the 900 volumes removed by Mr. Morgenthau unless they related in some way to war contracts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine because he may wish to reply.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to reply briefly to the suggestion which has been made. I think I have very much in mind what the Senator from New Mexico means. I assume that the language of the Senator from Maine referring to contracts is sufficiently all-inclusive to cover inefficiency, waste, extravagance, or other questions involved in the system of letting contracts. With that understanding, I think there is no difficulty regarding the terminology he has used. If the documents removed by Secretary Morgenthau related to the Treasury procurement program which operated under lend-lease, that is a subject with which our committee would be very seriously concerned. We are concerned with the general conduct of the program for procurement of war supplies, in the aspects which I have indicated.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to yield for one observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is perhaps a serious difference of opinion in our committee concerning its jurisdiction and concerning the effect of the limitation upon its jurisdiction which was adopted when the life of the committee was extended. I think such a question should be resolved, and I am happy to have expressions from two distinguished members of the committee who belong to the majority party.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the language of the Senator from Michigan certainly is intended to cover the broad field of contracts and everything in relation to the war effort which properly comes within the purview of the resolution.

Mr. President, the logic of the situation, unless clearly disproved by a thorough inspection of the Morgenthau collection, shows that Mr. Morgenthau carried off a large amount of public records. This is all the more reprehensible because, as I shall show later, Mr. Morgenthau is one of the classes of officers in whom discretion and trust is placed to determine what records are to be preserved or destroyed. It makes no difference whether these are original records or systematic reproductions collected with the help of Government personnel and equipment; the breach of public trust for private gain is the same.

This is so obviously the case that two of our highest officials have expressed themselves publicly as a result of the incident. By the way, to those who have suggested that this inquiry may be partisan, I reply that these public officials were members of the Democratic Party.

In an official statement, John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, called upon his predecessor, Mr. Morgenthau, to return to the Treasury Department the voluminous records which Mr. Morgenthau took when he left office.

I have no doubt—

Said Mr. Snyder—

either that the material comprising the diary is in major part, at least, public property or that Mr. Morgenthau will so view the matter on reflection.

Apparently Mr. Morgenthau has not seen fit to reflect, and, up to date, has not returned the property to the Treasury or to the United States Government Archives.

As Secretary of the Treasury Mr. Snyder is well placed to know the character and volume of public papers removed by Mr. Morgenthau. His public request for a return of this material indicates careful consideration of the matter and a conviction that public property has been removed. The people owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Snyder for his courage in moving at this time to put a stop to the private capitalization of public office. The Morgenthau case is no more reprehensible than many other similar cases; it is merely the latest in the pernicious practices of many public officials whose lack of integrity despoils the public archives.

While Mr. Snyder, as Mr. Morgenthau's successor in the Treasury Department, is perhaps an appropriate official to take action in this case, we have further condemnation of this practice from an even higher source. On the day following Mr. Snyder's demand for the return of the Morgenthau material, White House correspondents reported that President Truman was considering methods of safeguarding the integrity of official files and prescribing the uses to which documents are to be put. I hope we shall hear from the President when those who are studying the problem for him are ready to report. Far too often misconduct in public office is quietly shelved after mild censure as the onrush of new events dims the public memory.

Meanwhile there are some observations which a Member of Congress might make from his own experience. I am well aware that history abounds with instances of public officials who have taken papers with them on withdrawal from the public service. Every history text is bolstered with prolific citations to the memoirs and collected papers of public men. Many libraries are the repositories of famous collections of such papers. Whole bibliographies are made up of items identifying these collections, cataloging what they contain, and stating their locations. So the practice we are discussing is by no means new.

But a study of these sources of data reveals some differences between past and current practices. The documentary riches of public men of the past consist mainly of personal recollections of their participation in events appearing in the form of original memoirs written by them. The documentary material back of these memoirs was strictly personal in the true sense of the word. They were really personal diaries, books of account, scribbled notes and memoranda, letter-press copies of personal letters and original replies, and, at the most, some scattered copies of state papers in the public archives. With some exceptions, almost all of it was intimate material and fairly modest in amount. It was not a reproduction of official records, made on Government time, with personnel on public pay rolls, and with Government photographic and recording equipment. It was not carried away in the historical equivalent of trucks and boxcars.

In the proper sense it was not the public records which earlier statesmen took with them on leaving public office, but the personal memorabilia which supplemented and enriched the public records by the added light shed on men and events. Very little of it was used by earlier statesmen in self-glorification or for personal profit. Indeed, such glorification as they achieved has come to most of them posthumously as the patient work of scholars and the passage of time revealed the significance of their lives. Most of the pecuniary profit—what little there was—accrued to their descendants and heirs.

Some modern statesmen seem to have a desire to foreclose their place in history in advance and to cash in before they die, even if it means a breach in the integrity of the public records of the United States of America.

I admit there are occasions where the line between the public business and the private affairs is blurred. The public official himself must often be the judge of where the line should be drawn. But I submit that the distinction between public and private is not so difficult to draw that an official with a high sense of ethics needs make more than a few trivial mistakes. Certainly the mistake will not run to 900 volumes or to an amount of material that would fill a boxcar. Where there is the slightest doubt whether records and papers are public or private, an official of integrity will always resolve it in the public interest, and will declare that they are public records to be preserved for the benefit of the public welfare. He will remind himself that when he voluntarily undertook to serve the people in an official capacity his daily acts became clothed with a public interest, which personal honor and propriety recognize as paramount. What he takes on leaving office—if vanity does not intervene—will be truly personal effects, narrowly construed.

Good public men are aware of the significance of public records. Each one knows that his own life and times are but brief moments in the infinite span of historical time. Each one knows that the present is the inheritor of the rich accumulations of the past. Each one seeks his utmost to light his path with the lamp of experience, which is history. Countless hours are spent in threshing over materials of the past in hope of distilling a drop of wisdom useful in the present. Today's generation is enriched, strengthened, and guided by what it knows of countless generations before it, or impoverished by what has been forever lost because it had been improperly preserved.

Public records make up the backbone of history. All men with a deep sense of the historical know this to be so. Men of integrity are diligent in their efforts to see that the public records are as complete as possible, scrupulously safeguarded, and properly preserved where the people may have ready access to them. That is the real significance of public museums, libraries, and Government archives.

We have had a long succession of laws specifically designed to protect and to preserve official papers. The latest of these is the act concerning the disposal of records, approved July 7, 1943, as amended July 6, 1945 (57 Stat. 380–383; 59 Stat. 434). It dovetails with and complements the act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. p. 1122).

As I examine these laws, I am impressed with their complete command of the subject, and it is difficult for me to look beyond them for new legislation to handle any of the cases we have been discussing. What is sorely needed, in my estimation, is the forthright enforcement of the present laws in the public interest.

The 1943 act defines records to include—and this will help us to determine what are records—

All books, papers, maps, photographs, or other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by any agency of the United States Government in pursuance of Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public

business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the Government or because of the informational value of data contained therein.

While the law does not mention the records made by individuals in the course of the public business, it would be a farcical presumption for us to exclude them, since it is obvious that records do not appear by spirit writing, but at the hands of individuals in charge of Government agencies and conducting the public business.

After defining public records, the law then proceeds to charge the National Archives Council and the Archivist with the duty of preparing regulations for the disposal of records and of carrying out procedures for the preservation of records.

The National Archives Council charged with making such regulations was to be composed of the Secretaries of each of the executive departments or their alternates the chairman of House and Senate Committees on the Library, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States. I hold in my hand a rather elaborate manual for Federal officials on the subject How To Dispose of Records, as promulgated by this Council.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the definition which is contained in that manual, let us consider the case of a Cabinet officer who, following the close of a conference on public business with other Cabinet officers, goes to his office and dictates to a Government employee a record of the conversations carried on and the conclusions reached, whereupon the notes of the dictation are transcribed by the employee on Government time and the transcript is preserved in the Cabinet officer's public office for his future information. Would that be such a record as is outlined in the manual?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no doubt that that would be such a record as is contemplated by the manual to which I have referred, because it would be one of the records upon which the official acted; it would be a part of the policy formulated by the Government. Although the Government officer is not officially required to make such a record, for, as I said before, he could do his business out of his hat, yet when he does make it it is just like the record of a court or the opinion handed down by a judge in a court. I may say that the acts to which I have referred apply to courts as well as to executive agencies. When a judge dictates an opinion it then becomes a part of the official file, and it should remain so.

Otherwise we could not trace the history of the United States; we could not determine what caused a certain Cabinet officer to act as he did. The official record indicates that he acted, for instance, because his fellow Cabinet officers decided upon a certain path, a certain road, and a certain goal.

If the officer were to remove the record and subsequently were to become a witness as to what the record contained, as we all know in court proceedings the destruction of a record always is presumed to indicate that it would speak the truth if it were available, and that a witness' contradition of what was stated in the document should not be considered.

Mr. President, let us consider merely the opening lines of the manual to which I have referred. It declares:

Records produced, received, and maintained in the course of operations of agencies of the Federal Government are the property of the Government and can ordinarily be disposed of only after authorization has been obtained from Congress.

There are exceptions, which I shall cover later. Without going into detail, the procedure for disposing of records is as follows. The agency head submits lists or schedules of records to be disposed of to the Archivist, who is charged with the responsibility of appraising the records. His power in this respect is also defined in the National Archives Act, as follows:

SEC. 3. All archives or records belonging to the Government of the United States (legislative, executive, judicial, and other) shall be under the charge and superintendence of the Archivist to this extent: he shall have full power to inspect personally or by deputy the records of any agency * * * whatsoever and wheresoever located, and shall have the full cooperation of any and all persons in charge of such records in such inspections, and to requisition for transfer to the National Archives Establishment such archives, or records as the National Archives Council * * * shall approve for such transfer.

The head of a Government department or agency may exempt records from inspection or from the disposal process if the material is deemed by him to be confidential, but only for limited periods, and not exceeding in duration his tenure of that office. The law says nothing about his taking records with him.

From time to time, as he deems expedient, the Archivist submits lists of records to a joint committee of Senate and House Members. If after examination the records are found to be without value, they are ordered to be disposed of, and specific methods of disposition are prescribed.

Where certain classes of records have been evaluated and found to be of no value, a general order may be given to the agency head to dispose periodically of all recurring records of the same form. Under this provision records are being disposed of constantly as a simple matter of course, but the process is carefully guarded. Furthermore, in certain kinds of emergencies, as when military necessity or danger to human life or health or property is involved, the Archivist or agency head may take summary action with regard to records, but all such actions must thereafter be reported.

Throughout these laws there are certain grants of discretion to agency heads, to the Archivist and to others, with respect to the disposal of records; but in the final analysis records must either be disposed of in strict conformity with this disposal law or left in the agency indefinitely. There is not the slightest authority to the agency heads to cart away records in any form on their own. Why have this elaborate procedure, why safeguard it so carefully, if an agency head may thwart it merely upon his own caprice? On the contrary, the disposal manual states that "the files of policy-determining officials are of special significance and should always be preserved." I presume this cuts quite close to the papers removed by Mr. Morgenthau, and possibly by Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes, and Mr. Stimson, all of whom were very close to policy making.

We who served on the Pearl Harbor Joint Committee were allowed to have certain parts of Mr. Stimson's diary, and the record showed clearly that at times it was dictated to a dictaphone and transcribed by a stenographer working for the United States Government, but the members of the joint committee of the two Houses were not permitted to see the diary. No; the public official was allowed to remove it, and to this day we have gotten only what that public official wanted to give us.

If records are disposed for waste paper, they "must first be macerated or otherwise treated to destroy their record content or the contract for their sale must include a clause prohibiting their resale as records or documents."

Records may be transferred to certain public or private institutions, where they may serve the general public interest in certain cases.

Mr. President, I say now that when a public official ceases to be a public official he should have no right to the public documents which have accumulated in his office. As is indicated in this manual, if records are sold, the contract must include a clause prohibiting their resale as records or documents. The same rule would apply to a public official the day or the hour or the minute following his retirement from the Government service.

Application must be made for documents sought for institutions where they may serve the general public interest, and the agency concerned may pass upon such an application. But in every case of this kind the records "cannot be transferred without the approval of the Archivist." That regulation is on page 22 of the pamphlet. The regulations further provide "This method of disposal is desirable in rare cases," but it "should not, of course, be employed for records containing confidential information." That refers to what I have heretofore stated, that records may be transferred to certain public or private institutions where they may serve the general public in certain cases.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with the records regarding Secretary Stimson, of which the Senator speaks, and the events transpiring in the month of November before the Pearl Harbor attack, and the discussions with various officials concerning which inquiry was made of the Secretary of War, from the Senator's experience as a judge and as a member

of the committee, how would he evaluate a record made at a particular time by the Cabinet officer regarding the conversations and the conclusion in the conferences, as against the later recollection of the Cabinet officer after a period of 5 years?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should be compelled to say, as the law clearly indicates, that the best evidence is the record made at the time.

Mr. BREWSTER. That, is it not, is a principle well established in law?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it is a principle well established in law.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the official in testifying at the later time elected to take the records to refresh his recollection, but refused to permit the tribunal to examine the records, how would that be considered in any court?

Mr. FERGUSON. The court would cast great doubt on the testimony, and should so charge the jury, if there were a jury.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would not any court necessarily order the production of a document which had been used for purposes of refreshment, and have it presented to the court as an essential document, for cross-examination?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the practice, and the law is that a man cannot give verbally his idea of what is in a record made as of a certain time, because the record itself is the best evidence. We could not apply that rule in the Pearl Harbor hearing because the man who had the record and was testifying was not a plaintiff or a defendant, and it was contended that the disclosure would harm not him but the Government of the United States. That is why the committee had to take what it could get from public officials without recourse to the record itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there not a clearly established doctrine in law referring to what is known as past recollection recorded?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. As distinct from the use of memoranda for refreshment, if they do not take on a character which would sufficiently authenticate them?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. The records made by the Secretary daily following conferences would have a higher responsibility or import, would they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; records taken as of given dates are in law considered as speaking the truth.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, even after the records are authorized for disposal—

> Their transfer will normally be approved except that records will not be approved for transfer (a) if they contain information the revelation of which would be contrary to the public interest or is prohibited by law; (b) to a foreign government unless it has a legitimate interest in them; or (c) to a private individual or business corporation unless they are necessary to the operation of properties transferred by the Government to the individual or corporation.

I cite regulations, page 22.

Now the upshot of all the carefully designed law and regulations is that records not disposed of through these procedures must remain in the department or agency through whose operations the books, papers, maps, photographs, or other documentary material in question came into being. Indeed, the law itself is specific on this point, because in section 15 of the 1943 act it is stated:

> The procedures herein prescribed are exclusive and no records of the United States Government shall be alienated or destroyed except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Federal law goes much further than the mere provisions against alienation contrary to the law for disposal of records. It provides for criminal penalties against anyone disposing of records other than through prescribed channels. The section most applicable to the subject matter under discussion reads:

> Whoever, having custody of any record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing specified in section 234 of this title, shall willfully and unlawfully conceal, remove, mutilate, obliterate, falsify, or destroy any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or thing, shall be fined not more than $2,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both; and shall, moreover, forfeit his office and be forever afterward disqualified from holding any office under the Government of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 234, 235) (35 Stat. 1111–1112, Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, No. 128).

Not only does it provide a penalty, it provides that he shall, moreover, forfeit his office and be forever afterward disqualified from holding any office under the Government of the United States. It is obvious from all this that it is not intended that the United States must stand by helpless while public officials carry away records on the simple assertion that they are "personal files." If such an assertion were the sole criterion, the law would be farcical. It would be possible for every official to despoil the public archives by his own caprice.

When a man takes public office his acts and conduct in the course of his operations in such office are presumed to be those of the public official, not the private individual. The papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records generated by him in that office, with the personnel on the public pay roll, and with Government equipment, are prima facie presumed to be the records and the property of the United States Government.

Mr. President, the burden is on the public official to prove conclusively and specifically to the Archivist of the United States that records he wishes to carry away are in fact his own personal records and do not appertain to the public business.

I do not find that Mr. Morgenthau or any of the other persons who may be involved ever took such records to the Archivist and had him determine, after submission of them to the congressional committees that are authorized to determine such a fact, that they were private papers. No; the papers in question are removed from the office of the retiring official without complying with the law.

The official cannot discharge his duty by the mere assertion that so and so many filing cases, or that some 900 volumes, are "his personal property." I think he has to prove it by calling upon the Archivist to inspect the material and certify to its personal character.

Correspondingly, I contend the Archivist has the power and duty of demanding the return of records removed in any other manner than the one officially prescribed by law. I contend further that the Archivist has the right to call upon the Attorney General of the United States to assist him in making recovery, or in prosecuting individuals who unlawfully remove records from Government agencies and repositories. I think Mr. Snyder acted correctly and properly in first demanding the return of the Morgenthau material, and unless he gets it back promptly, the Archivist and the Attorney General might well take appropriate action.

As I understand, the material is now being examined by a magazine editor or writer to ascertain how it may be used in the future. How can the Members of the Congress and the people of the United States generally know that what may be published presents a true picture of the public records which have been taken rather than a distortion? How can they know that sentences here and there have been used while others have been omitted? The records and papers should be returned to the Archives of the United States, where they are subject to the scrutiny of scholars, historians, and—yes—the Members of the Senate, and of all the people of the United States.

I hope the time is at last at hand when we shall hold public officials to a stricter moral code than has prevailed during the past 14 years. For whether men in public office may play fast and loose with the records and history of the country is above all a moral question. It is common knowledge that loose morals in this respect have been indulged. In a recent column of the New York Times Arthur Krock observed that Mr. Morgenthau "has only been following custom"; and he goes on to say what we have all known:

> Yet the custom grew into estimation as a privilege during the Roosevelt administrations. Not only after they left office, but while still on the public pay roll, members of that administration wrote books and articles for pay, and for the benefit of selected publishers, in which they disclosed facts about public matters acquired only because they were public servants. Favored friends and members of the White House family did very well commercially with similar material, with more to come. (January 30, 1947.)

A sizable bibliography could be compiled merely from these publications by individuals on the public pay roll and presumably devoting themselves to public business. The leading example, in all probability, would be the publication of the public papers and addresses of the former President himself.

I have given considerable study to this question with a view to determining whether or not legislation is needed. In my judgment, at this stage it does not appear that legislation is needed to prevent the removal or destruction of public documents. I have cited the criminal statute which has been on the books for nearly 100 years, and I have cited the statute of 1943 creating a procedure for

the destruction of Government documents.

It is true that both statutes involve the use of broad language, and Congress might do well to define the policy with greater exactness by amendment of these two statutes.

But, Mr. President, we should always try to enforce the laws we have. For the Department of Justice and the administration always to be saying "We need a new law" is utterly absurd. Let us try to make use of the laws already available and determine whether they are or are not adequate before we proceed to clutter up the statute books with more laws.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say that I agree with the Senator respecting the enforcement of existing law; but I ask him if he does not think, from the study he has made, that it might be wise for the Congress itself to clarify the situation by making more clear and certain what is a public record?

Mr. FERGUSON. I doubt whether it would be possible to make it more clear than it has been made in the existing statute. After Congress had more clearly defined the words "public document" or "public record" it would be obliged to depend upon those charged with enforcing the law to examine any documents or records which might be removed. To date the difficulty has been that we have had no supervision over the removal of such material. If disinterested persons had been given the right to examine the papers before they were removed from the Government files I would not be making the statement I am now making.

Let us consider the papers which were in the Archives. We were told during the Pearl Harbor hearings that papers were there in bales. As I understand, a bale represents a great mass of papers. It does not represent simply a drawer full or a filing cabinet full. The Archives contained material brought there from the White House in bales. I am satisfied that all this was not entirely personal material. I can cite some instances. For example, our Government received messages from Mr. Churchill and from the British Government; yet to this day we have never seen replies to those messages. It seems unusual that in the critical days before Pearl Harbor the Government of the United States should receive from the highest official of a foreign government, such as England, a message concerning a very important matter and fail to reply to it. I may say that the committee was never allowed really to ascertain whether such a message received a reply. We had to go to an employee of the executor of the estate of the President and ask her whether a certain paper was in the withdrawn file, and then she would look in the file and determine whether the paper was there.

Mr. President, appropriate language could be added to the two statutes in question only after considerable study of the subject. I, for one, hope the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will ascertain, through an investigation, what papers or records have been removed, and, in order to discover what has been removed, they ought to see the papers for themselves and not simply take the word of those who removed them. In my judgment, the present terms of the statutes are satisfactory if they are sympathetically enforced by the administrative agents responsible for carrying them out.

The language in the criminal statute to which I have referred, which is the critical language, is as follows:

> Filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States or in any public office or with any judicial or public officer of the United States.

It is the interpretation of this phrase by which the line is drawn between personal and private documents of a public officer and public documents, the destruction or removal of which is prohibited by the criminal statute.

Mr. President, we could add nothing to these criminal statutes that would apply to anyone who has removed any public papers, because it would be an ex post facto law, and clearly void. We could look into the future and take care of what may be done in the future. But what I think needs to be done now is to secure the return, through action of the Attorney General and the Archivist, of the papers which have already been removed, and those officials should determine whether the papers in question are private or public papers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the Senator's presentation is not that of the Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, but only the Senator's personal views on the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement which the Senator is making has not been authorized by the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe the committee has ever authorized any member to make a speech upon the floor of the Senate. I am not indicating that I am now speaking for the committee. The committee will go into this question; but the scope of the committee's authority is very much limited in connection with the removal of papers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion on the floor of the Senate about the use of Government facilities in connection with dictating notes and one thing and another, and then Senators making private use of such documents later on. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if the speech he is now delivering was not mimeographed on machines of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it was. Those who mimeographed it are working for the committee and for the Government.

The critical phrase in the act of 1943 is as follows:

> Records * * * that do not appear to have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the Government.

The discretion in interpretation of this phrase is properly, in my judgment, left in the Archivist.

In speaking of legislation which may be needed, however, it should be called to the attention of the Congress that no law exists which requires any public officer to make any record of his doings in the discharge of his public trust. He can do business, as I previously stated, out of his hat if he so desires. Once having created records, however, he becomes subject to the criminal law and the act relating to the disposal of public records which I have previously cited. In my judgment there should be a requirement that public officials make a record of their public acts.

While, as I pointed out in citations of the laws, there are existing legal remedies against the appropriation of public records, and that the crying need is for their enforcement, the questions of ethics involved transcend legal technicalities. Our age seems to be marked with an obvious deterioration of individual moral standards, a flagrant disregard by men on the highest levels for what used to be known by the old-fashioned words of honor and integrity, and I submit that unless we recapture and reinvigorate those simple virtues, our laws will prove ineffectual and the character of all our people will suffer.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the junior Senator from Michigan on the speech he has just delivered. He never rises on the Senate floor but that he brings food for thought to all who listen to him.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1353, to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. I believe the bill is noncontroversial. It passed the House unanimously. It was reported favorably unanimously by the Senate Finance Committee. It has the support of the principal veterans' organizations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no idea at all what is proposed to be done by the bill. I do not know whether there is any objection to it. I have none myself. But I seriously doubt whether unanimous consent should be given to the consideration of legislation when no more Senators are present than there are now. If the request is pressed, I necessarily must make a point of no quorum.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator from New Mexico is adamant in that, I shall withdraw my request for unanimous consent for consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I am, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is withdrawn.

EDISON, LINCOLN, AND WASHINGTON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our people are fortunate indeed to celebrate in this month of February the births of three immortal Americans. Each of these Americans lived at different times in our national existence. Yet, there is between them a golden bond of common devotion to the American ideal of freedom and common sacrifice for that ideal. Each embodied such fundamental American virtues, such personal greatness and inspiring nobility, that each year we return, figuratively speaking, to their shrines and take on new strength, new courage, in the fight that lies before us for the development of the Republic. A eulogy of these men is no mere empty formality; it involves a challenge to us to be worthy of these men whom words of praise cannot adequately commend.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Today is the one hundredth anniversary of "our first February son," Thomas Alva Edison, the electrical wizard of Menlo Park, the holder of 1,097 patents from the United States Government, more than have ever been held by any other individual.

Today we celebrate the birthday of the inventor of the electric light, the phonograph, the silent and talking motion picture, the alkaline storage battery, the carbon telephone transmitter, which made the telephone practical, the improved dynamo, the electric indicator, foundation of modern electronics, and hundreds of other brilliant new devices and processes. We celebrate the birthday of the genius who was described by one teacher as "addled," because of his fierce imagination—a man whose formal schooling totaled only 3 months and yet who gave birth to new industries with a capital evaluation of $20,000,000,000, and employing more than 4,000,000 men and women.

But it is not only as a great inventor that we honor Thomas Alva Edison; it is also as a great man that we do honor to him. Edison was the living proof of the richness of freedom's soil. In America's atmosphere of liberty and equality, of pioneering and self-reliance, he developed the fundamental virtues of industry, energy, independence, which are a part of the American heritage. He was a firm believer in natural order and spent his whole energies proving the fact that man can tap tremendous forces around him if he will but seek to study the universal laws which govern each situation. The force of electricity existed long before Edison harnessed it; it had been waiting for uncounted centuries for a man of his genius and his insight to reach out and control it for human good. Today there are countless spiritual forces which men can tap to achieve for themselves a better world, a higher standard of living, and a more abundant life.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

I have said that there were two other great men whose birthdays are celebrated this month. They are the sixteenth President of the United States, the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we celebrate tomorrow, and the first President of the United States, George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate the Saturday after next. Throughout the length and breadth of this land Americans are hearing this week the story of our Civil War President, the man who preserved the Union, the man who exemplified faith, love of the Republic, humor, and honesty, as fully as did any other man in America's history. More has been written about him, indeed, than about any other figure in the history of mankind, and deservedly so.

Tonight it will be my privilege and pleasure to look back into the life of this great figure and seek therein lessons which we may use in these times. They are lessons of triumph over failure, of perseverance against great odds, of the victory of justice. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of an address which I shall deliver tonight before a Montgomery County Republican group be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LINCOLN HOMECOMING

At this time of year, America is again "coming home"—it is a Lincoln homecoming.

Yes; on the occasion of this great but humble man's birthday, 140,000,000 Americans "come home" again to the presence of Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, sixteenth President of the United States. It is fitting that all of our people should do so, for Lincoln loved the people. It was, of course, he who wisely said, "The Lord must love the common people; He made so many of them."

This year, as every year, we stand, figuratively speaking, before his shrine; our thoughts turn back to his life, to his career, to his unforgettable thoughts and deeds. We feel again the warmth of his homespun humor, the greatness of his love of country.

This is a Lincoln homecoming. From it, we gain new inspiration, new devotion to his principles, new encouragement.

We will think of the man who said these great words which are so meaningful to us after the Second World War:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

MEMORIES OF LINCOLN'S LIFE

Our thoughts go back first to the story of Lincoln's life. We recall his birth in a log cabin in Kentucky in 1809. We remember that both Thomas Lincoln, Abraham's father, and Nancy Hanks, his mother, could not read nor write. Young Abraham himself had but a few good books to read in his early years—the Bible, Robinson Crusoe, Pilgrim's Progress, Aesop's Fables, and a few others. Lincoln had very little formal schooling; in all, he did not attend school for more than 1 year.

He was self-taught, schooled in the university of hard knocks—hard knocks like the loss of his beloved mother when he was only 9. She was the woman of whom he later said, "All that I am and all that I ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Lincoln knew the meaning of work. He became a rail splitter, a storekeeper, a country lawyer. He acted as a village postmaster, as a deputy surveyor. The road was not easy. His was a story of triumph over failure. He lost his sweetheart as he had lost his mother. He entered business, failed, and spent 17 years developing his mind and in paying up the debts of a worthless partner. He always paid his obligations. He tried to get an appointment to the United States Land Office, but failed. He was a candidate for the Vice Presidency, but was defeated. He ran for the Senate, but lost out to Stephen Douglas. But Lincoln never said "quit."

When at last he became President, he was confronted with the most serious crisis America had faced, the secession of the South. He—the man of peace—was to be Commander in Chief of our armed forces in a bloody civil war. The Union forces suffered defeat after defeat. Voices such as Horace Greeley's called to him to let the South go.

But, although his heart was heavy with the tragic loss in human life of Americans on both sides, he would not see the Union destroyed; as he said: "The house divided against itself could not stand," and Lincoln was determined to have that house united forever. How fortunate it was that his decision prevailed, and that, at least, peace came and the Union was restored. Yes, we recall, too, his untimely death in 1865.

LINCOLN'S LEGACY TO AMERICA

In the few, short years of his earthly existence—1809–65—he had left his America an incomparable legacy—a heritage of great thoughts and great deeds unmatched by almost any other American before or since save George Washington.

We might recall now what Lincoln said of our first President, whose birthday we are to celebrate next week.

Lincoln said:

"Washington is the mightiest name of earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation. On that name no eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on."

Thus spoke Lincoln. How true are Lincoln's words not only of Washington but of Lincoln himself. On his name, as on Washington's name, no eulogy is really expected.

This is what Lincoln said about the office of the Presidency itself:

"I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here, as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance * * * that the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthright."

Let us think for a few moments now on the Lincoln legacy. Let us come home to Lincoln's thoughts. Any homecoming is always a source of inspiration, and there are many, many ways in which Lincoln inspires us. Let us take but four of these ways.

1. INSPIRATION FOR PIONEERING

Lincoln first inspires us to be pioneers in blazing new trails in challenging times. Consider how appropriate this is in this atomic age, when America is confronted at every hand by problems which are new and unique. Here is Lincoln's advice, and I read from his words:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

How appropriate, my friends, this thought is for the present.

Yes; it was Lincoln, too, who taught us to respect the traditions of the past while moving ahead in progress. Here are his words:

"I do not mean to say that we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so would be to discard all the lights of current experience, to reject all progress, all improvement. What I do say is that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case we should do so upon evidence so conclusive and argument so clear that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand."

2. INSPIRATION FOR LABOR PEACE

Second, Lincoln inspires us for labor peace. As a man who had worked throughout his life, he knew the problems of labor, but as a builder and sustainer he knew the problems of those who employed labor. This is what he said about the attitude of labor:

"The strongest bond of sympathy, outside the family relation, should be the one uniting all working people; nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owner of property. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself; thus by example assuring himself, his own house will be safe from violence when built."

God grant we all will follow this advice.

3. INSPIRATION FOR SELF-RELIANCE

Third, Lincoln's whole life is proof of the value of independence and self-reliance. He believed in each man using his God-given initiative and talents to work out his own destiny. He did not believe in relying on government or on any other man. This is what he said about government's relation to the individual:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do it all, or cannot do so well in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves the Government ought not to interfere."

What a directive for all of us. Here we find a Lincoln doctrine which merits our serious thought.

For some years now there has been too much interference in State and local fields by the Federal Government—in those fields of activity where the people themselves and not the Government should act. Self-regulation can eliminate much unwarranted interference by the Federal Government. Individuals, groups, business and labor, communities and States—if they fully accept their responsibilities and their obligations—can eliminate much of the necessity for Federal intervention and regulation. Self-reliance—rebirth of American initiative—can do more than anything else to eliminate Federal interference and controls.

4. INSPIRATION FOR FAITH

Fourth, Lincoln had a faith in God, his Maker, in the power greater than mortal man. He believed in prayer and often said, "I have often been driven to my knees in prayer because there was no other place to go." Yes; Lincoln communed with his Maker and gained strength therefrom. He knew God is greater than any of our problems and could, therefore, help us to solve our problems.

He was not ashamed in the midst of his Cabinet meetings to pray. He knew the value of prayer.

Thus Lincoln inspires us in these four ways and countless more. He inspires us to pioneer, to secure labor peace, to be self-reliant, to have faith.

With that faith, we can make sure that, in his words, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

This can be our real Lincoln homecoming—to preserve the Republic as he would preserve it—strong, independent, and to pass it on vital and unimpaired to our children and to our children's children.

LINCOLN IN THE YEAR 1947

Now let us pause and ask ourselves if Lincoln were here in person, as he is in the spirit, how would he meet the challenges of this age?

I am sure that he would insist upon the preservation of our free enterprise and free institutions as the main bulwark against foreignisms and foreign subversive forces.

LABOR PEACE

I am sure he would insist that peace at home is vital; that the public interest demands that labor and capital cease their destructive internecine warfare. I am sure that Lincoln would insist, after our experience during the New Deal years, not in a spirit of revenge but because the national life demands it, that strikes against the Government were not only illegal but would not be tolerated; that jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts must cease; that unions must be made responsible for breach of contract the same as employers; that labor racketeerism must stop.

Of course, Lincoln would say that the right to free collective bargaining, as a two-way street, must continue; that high wages must be paid in order that the national income as well as labor itself would be taken care of, but that wages must not be paid unless there is an equivalent in production. I also think Lincoln would say that war controls must cease as soon as it is practicable for them to cease; that every effort must be made to balance the budget, and that to do so, unproductive seat warmers in Government must be done away with. Lincoln would not hesitate to use the pruning knife in a situation such as we are meeting now. It will be remembered that the Republican administration, after the last World War, cut the debt 40 percent in 10 years and also reduced the people's taxes.

I think that Lincoln would approve the continuance of the so-called Truman Investigating Committee. He never liked fraud and deceit and chiseling. Therefore, he would say that in order to recoup funds and in order that lessons might be learned for the future, it is necessary that an impartial investigation of frauds go on.

In the portal-to-portal matter, I think that Lincoln too would insist that the legislative branch of the Government clear up the mess in no uncertain terms. We all know that the unsettled condition in which industry now finds itself as a result of these suits doesn't make for the economic health of the country. As a lawyer, he would know that the lower court's decision last Saturday is simply a decision on the facts in that particular case and that there is every reason why the legislature should redefine its position with unmistakable clarity in relation to the general issue of portal-to-portal pay to apply to all cases.

WORLD PEACE

I am sure that Lincoln would approve the position that the Republican Party has taken in relation to the matter of world peace. We must go ahead, seeking to make the United Nations an effective organization for the peace af the world, but we must also keep our powder dry. We have not forgotten that after the First World War the League of Nations was organized. Why, we even abolished war with the Kellogg-Briand Pact. But war came. Now folks are talking about outlawing the atomic bomb. But the Republicans say that we had better keep our national police and fire departments ready to go into action instantly for our own safety and our peace. I addressed a letter recently to the President of the United States, calling for total plans against total emergency. I think Lincoln would approve that because he always was a realist, a man who has his feet on the ground.

America has not the conquest bug, but the recent war clearly shows that other nations have.

CONCLUSION

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been a joy for Mrs. Wiley and myself to be here, and I want to congratulate you go-getting Republicans on your success. You have done a great job.

It is for us, the living, as Lincoln said, to be dedicated to the unfinished task that lies before us. It is for us to catch hold of his spirit and dedicate ourselves anew to the preservation of the Republic in this atomic age.

SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish again to invite the attention of the Senate to the serious boxcar situation existing on American railroads. This situation is so serious and acute that it approaches a national scandal comparable in its effect to the catastrophe of the coal crisis in England at the present time. It finds us in the position of having fewer boxcars on American railroads today than we had at the beginning of the war. The situation is so serious that we in the Northwest may not be able to market all our 1946 crop. It is so acute that it prompted Secretary of Agriculture Anderson to tell the Senate Agriculture Committee that our ability to export food for grain to destitute Europe depends largely upon our ability to transport grain to the seaboard. The western railroads have on their tracks only approximately 55 to 65 percent of their ownership cars.

This condition has aggravated our marketing problem in the Northwest for the past 3 or 4 years, to the extent of penalizing farmers continually from 5 to 10 cents a bushel because local elevators cannot obtain boxcars to enable them to take advantage of the cash market.

During this acute boxcar shortage we have been exporting approximately one boxcar for every two placed on American railroads. I understand that this is directly attributable to a program sponsored by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, a very impractical businessman.

In connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very timely and illuminating editorial entitled "Boxcars Again," published in the Fargo Forum, of Fargo, N. Dak., under date of February 8, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOXCARS AGAIN

On the subject of the boxcar shortage, the Fargo Forum recently spoke of the lack of materials which, in large part, has been due to Government policies. It also indicated that the more permanent answer to the shortage might be found in clearing up some of the Government-created uncertainties under which the railroads are operating.

After scanning testimony given before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee this week,

it seems that these viewpoints are much strengthened. True, there was a statement from the Interstate Commerce Commission which said that every effort was being made to get equitable distribution of freight cars throughout the country, but, even so, there have been apparent seasonal inequities.

But the shortage of cars is the chief trouble, according to testimony at the inquiry. That stems, it seems, mainly from Government policies, or the lack of policies, and from the Government-created uncertainties put in the way of the railroads.

We just haven't got enough boxcars, though we are making thousands of boxcars for Europe. Some of the old rolling stock is wearing out, and, since production has not been kept up to the point of taking care of losses through obsolescence, we are getting less rolling stock all the time.

In his testimony Col. J. M. Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, said that the shortage already has become a national scandal. He held that a Government agency had not issued directives for priorities to make effective the priority orders of the White House for building materials for cars. He declared that 300,000 new boxcars need to be built to keep transportation efficiently running.

In reporting the inquiry, one newsman wrote this of the Johnson statement: "The White House orders dated last September 20 called for priorities for building materials to construct 7,000 boxcars per month, Johnson said. The number was ridiculously low, but even so one-third or one-half of that many are now being turned out, he said. Johnson described himself as having been bitterly disappointed by the failure of execution of orders and their lack, therefore, of results. Though it was explained by General Fleming that the controls of materials had terminated in September 1945 the Government still had authority to control the flow of materials by issuing priorities, officials testified."

Be this as it may, even though the testimony is only partly right it indicates either woefully poor Government policy, or no certain policy at all. The ramifications of the problem of boxcar shortages goes further, too, for these have been, and still are, Government-created uncertainties facing the railroads.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning the newspapers carried a story with relation to certain information which was released yesterday by the Department of Commerce, the gist of which was that monthly income payments to individuals for the year 1946 had reached a new all-time high of more than $165,000,000,000. That was $4,000,000,000 more than income payments for 1945; but, more important even than that, it was twice as much as income payments in 1940.

In these circumstances it seems to me that when the Committee on the Legislative Budget meets next Friday to receive the report of the subcommittee and to be told what is to be done about appropriations and the budget during next year, that meeting ought to be open to the public. I see no reason why the Committee on the Legislative Budget should receive the report of the subcommittee in executive session. I hope that the committee will give instructions that the meeting shall be in public.

Mr. President, I rose to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued by the Department of Commerce with respect to income payments to individuals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monthly income payments to individuals in the United States

[Indexes (1935-39=100)]

	December 1946	November 1946	December 1945	12 months		
				1946	1945	1940
Total income payments, seasonally adjusted	260.5	259.2	234.1	245.7	239.3	113.5
Salaries and wages, seasonally adjusted	258.4	256.9	236.1	240.4	258.0	116.3
[Millions of dollars]						
Total income payments	15,895	14,202	14,272	165,067	160,773	76,237
Salaries and wages	9,323	9,210	8,525	105,249	110,193	49,700
Dividends and interest	2,395	587	2,056	13,718	12,223	9,175
Entrepreneurial income and net rents and royalties	3,328	3,549	2,599	34,590	29,737	14,313
Public assistance and other relief	114	110	88	1,181	988	1,098
Other income payments	735	746	1,004	10,329	7,632	1,951

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX RATES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, recently the daily press and other publications have discussed the pros and cons of the proposed reduction of individual income-tax rates. Some Members of the Congress have expressed the opinion that we cannot afford to reduce taxes. Others have expressed doubt, while some have disagreed with the merits of the proposed flat 20 percent cut on incomes up to $302,000 and about 10½ percent on incomes above that amount. The answer to those who oppose an immediate tax reduction, or the proposed method, is to be found in the simple fact that we have reached the point of diminishing returns in the Federal tax program. In other words, the present rate is drying up the source of investments which would create new business enterprises, which would, in turn, produce a greater taxable income. Under existing rates, venture capital, which would otherwise create new business enterprises, more employment, greater taxable income, and increased production, will not take the risk involved for the small rewards remaining after Federal taxes. For example, the Federal tax on a $200,000 income is $156,820. An investment of $2,500,000 yielding 8 percent is required to produce $200,000. After Federal taxes, this is about 1⅘ percent return on the investment. Under such circumstances, what incentive does the investor have to venture his capital in a new enterprise? The result, of course, has been to drive investment money into securities of established industries or Government bonds instead of new productive enterprise. Between 1921 and 1926 we reduced surtax rates from a high of 61 percent to a low of 20 percent, and each successive year produced increased taxable income because of the additional venture money released for new productivity. The time is at hand when we must find the tax level which will satisfy the legitimate needs of Government and at the same time produce the greatest individual prosperity for the taxpayer.

About 70 percent of our national income is represented by individual incomes of $2,000 or less. It is argued that the lower brackets must have a greater reduction than the proposed 20 percent. It must follow that if the tax reduction on this large percentage of our national income is increased over the 20-percent figure, the remainder of the national income must continue to carry a paralyzing burden. New business enterprises, more employment, additional taxable income, and increased production must necessarily come from the higher-income brackets. To relieve one segment of our economy at the expense of another segment is a short-sighted policy. At a later date I expect to discuss at greater length the matter of taxation in relation to our national economy.

Mr. President, a few days ago I received a copy of a statement by Dr. Willford I. King, chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, on this subject, which I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLFORD I. KING, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, FEBRUARY 7, 1947

Is success criminal? The answer to this question ought to be the principal determinant of the action of Congress in setting up income tax schedules for 1947, and future years. If the man who goes into business, and wins, is an enemy of the public, he should be duly punished. A logical form of punishment may be to fine him, in proportion to his winnings. If he succeeds in making $1,000,000 in a year, it may be proper to fine him some $900,000 or $950,000. Use of the moneys thus collected may serve to offset part of the malign effects of his misdeeds.

If success is criminal, the question, of course, arises as to why we should permit our statutes to be so framed as to encourage competition. During most of the past history of the United States, the rules of the game, for business, have been such that a man who had sufficient ingenuity might produce in great abundance things especially wanted by the public, and sell these articles at prices lower than his less efficient competitors could possibly charge. By so doing, he might make millions. Outstanding examples of men who did exactly this are Frank W. Woolworth and Henry Ford. Were these actions antisocial? Did they deserve punishment? If so, the rules are improper, and should be amended promptly.

The Russians have felt that the rules are wrong. That nation operates under an entirely different set. The Russians also have great natural resources. Under their rules, they succeed in producing perhaps one-fifth, perhaps one-fourth, as much per capita as the people of the United States do, under our rules. History shows that those countries which have put fewest restrictions on profit making have been the ones that have forged ahead and become most prosperous. In the light of this fact, is it safe to change the rules and punish the profit makers? Will this help the common man?

THE WELLSPRING OF CAPITAL

During the prewar period in the United States, the total amount of money invested in new issues of stocks and bonds paralleled very closely the aggregate, after-tax income of that relatively small portion of our citizens who receive incomes of $5,000 or more, respectively. The evidence indicates that this group of citizens spent about $3,000,000,000 per year for living expenses, and that, out of what remained, they invested about 74 percent in new issues of securities. Moreover, it appears that they furnished the great bulk of the money invested in such securities.

One does not have to be much of an economist to understand that progress in the United States is dependent primarily upon new capital investment. Our factory workers turn out large quantities of goods because, on the average, each has some $6,000 worth of tools and equipment with which to work. European workers, closely related racially and probably not much less industrious than American workers, because they do not have such good tools and equipment, turn out from one-fifth to one-half as much per man-hour.

During the period 1931 to 1939, heavy taxes cut down seriously the incomes of persons receiving $5,000, or more, each. As a result, little new capital flowed into industry. Was it mere accident that, during this period, our industry stagnated? Do we want to take a chance on having this recur?

The gross value of the product, per factory worker, has gone up as the capital investment, per worker, has increased. The tremendous increase in real hourly wages, which has occurred in the United States, has been roughly proportional to the increase in the average capital supply per worker. Because tools and equipment have improved, American workers today produce in an hour four or five times as much as did their grandfathers, and, hence, they get as much in the way of food and clothing, and furnishings, for an hour, as their grandfathers could obtain for 4 or 5 hours' work. If the income-tax rates now prevailing had been in force all the time during the last century, it seems highly improbable that any such advance in the workingman's scale of living could have occurred.

THE RIGHT TO PROFITS

During most of our history the American philosophy has been that a man had a right to profits honestly won. When a burglar has broken into a man's safe and stolen even a small part of these profits the burglar has been sent to jail for years. Recently, however, our ideas have changed and we have considered it laudable for Federal collectors to take, from the successful businessman, 90 percent, or more, of his profits. Can this procedure be justified on the basis of any system of ethics as fitting in with American ideals? Even if such action is excused during the emergency of war can it be condoned in time of peace?

Apologists for this system of legalized confiscation will of course say that without it it is impossible to raise sufficient revenues to balance the budget. What are the facts?

Unfortunately, the income-tax authorities have not made available recently statistics on the incomes of the various classes of income recipients. However, a rough estimate, made on the basis of the United States Department of Commerce figures, indicates that at the present time, out of the annual income total of $172,000,000,000, some $150,000,000,000 goes to persons in the $5,000 or under brackets and that not more than $8,000,000,000 is received by those having incomes of $20,000 or over. Perhaps the Government secures from this class of taxes around $5,000,000,000. Doubtless, the statisticians of the Bureau of Internal Revenue can, if they desire, produce more accurate estimates.

If the income-tax rates in the upper brackets were reduced to levels reasonable as compared to the rates levied on the middle and lower brackets the probabilities are that the total income tax paid by persons having incomes above $20,000 might be $2,500,000,000. Therefore, the prospective loss of revenue resulting from the abolition of confiscatory taxes would probably not be more than $2,500,000,000, and might be much less. It certainly would not amount to as much as 2 percent of the incomes of persons having incomes of $5,000 or less.

LOSS OF INCENTIVE

These high incomes are, as a rule, received by men of unusual ability as directors of industry. When a man of this type knows that whatever additional income he makes will, mainly, be turned over to the Federal Treasury, unless he is altruistic in the extreme, he can hardly be expected to strive very vigorously to increase output. Much less is he likely to engage in ventures involving material risk, and it is risks of that type which have, in the past, been largely responsible for the spectacular achievements of American industry—which have made our technology so superior to that of other nations—which, indeed, largely accounts for our ability to achieve victory in World War II.

Furthermore, from the purely selfish standpoint of those in the lower income brackets, is the Robin Hood policy of robbing the rich for the benefit of the poor profitable? When Lenin took power, the Russian people felt that by seizing the property of the rich everyone would be made prosperous. The actual result was that shortly thereafter 14,000,000 of the Russian rank and file died of starvation.

In our own country, during the 1930's, by various repressive policies, we kept the prosperous class from accumulating any notable surpluses. As a result, the Nation's capital supply was not augmented. At the same time, the total income of the working class fell to the lowest level in years.

As the income-tax authorities will confirm, it will take but a very small increase in exemptions, or a very small reduction in the basic tax rate, to cut the Federal revenues by more than the $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 now derived by maintaining exorbitant rates on those in the upper brackets. The proportion of the income going to persons receiving less than $5,000 each is so overwhelming that the savings of $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 will not give to the persons in these brackets sufficient relief to be noticeable.

MULTIPLICATION OF WAGES

During the last century, because of the savings of the thrifty, the capital investment per worker has been multiplied by 10. Largely as a result of this investment, the worker's real hourly wage has been multiplied by 5. Does he want to stop this process by cutting his tax bill by only a few dollars per year?

At present, by taxing away those $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 of income in the upper brackets that normally go to furnish the bulk of new capital supply for the Nation, the millions of taxpayers in the lower brackets can save a few dollars each. Is this not, however, a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy, if it hampers seriously the rapid advance in productivity and wages which, experience shows, follows the investment of new capital in industry? Saving a few percent of one's income today and cutting off the possibility of doubling that income in the future is not a policy which will, if he understands it, appeal to the thoughtful American workingman.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—DOMESTIC WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, last Friday the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] made a statement proposing certain changes to be made in the negotiation of future trade agreements—changes they hoped the State Department might agree to in response to criticism of the conduct of the trade-agreements program.

The fact that my two colleagues have recognized the need for improvement in this program is an encouraging sign. It seems clear to me, however, that their proposals do not get at the root of the evil.

I summarize the proposed changes, as follows:

First, the Tariff Commission would have greater authority to study the effects of tariff reductions and to make public recommendations to the President.

Second, the administration would enforce more strictly its most-favored-nation policy, which it claims it has been enforcing all along.

Third, an escape clause would be incorporated in all future agreements, permitting us to cancel unwise concessions.

I shall not take much time on the first two points.

First, the proposal to transfer certain powers from the State Department to the Tariff Commission sounds all right; but for 13 years the appointment of members of the Commission has been under the control of New Deal Presidents. Any man who has been appointed during that period has had to be acceptable to the State Department. During that whole period the Tariff Commission has been used in the furtherance of the trade-agreements program. To transfer authority now to the Tariff Commission is to take power away from Mr. Clayton's right hand and place it in his left hand.

Second, the proposal that the State Department enforce more strictly its own most-favored-nation policy is interesting if only as an indication that my two colleagues recognize that the State Department has not been adhering to its own principles. They ask the Department to promise again to do what it has so often promised to do in the past.

Third, the proposal relating to an escape clause deserves more attention. In order to make the record complete, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point the language of the so-called Mexican escape clause, article XI of the 1942 trade agreement with Mexico, which is as follows:

1. If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article enumerated and described in the schedules annexed to this agreement, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the Government of either country shall be free to withdraw the concession, in whole or in part, or to modify it to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury.

Accordingly, if the President of the United States of America finds as a fact that imports of any article enumerated and described in schedule II or schedule III are entering the United States of America under the circumstances specified in the preceding sentence, he shall determine whether the withdrawal, in whole or in part, of the concession with regard to the article, or any modification of the concession, by the imposition of quantitative regulations or otherwise, is necessary to prevent such injury, and he shall, if he finds that the public interest will be served thereby, proclaim such finding and determination, and on and after the effective date specified in such proclamation, and so long as such proclamation remains in effect, imports of the article into the United States of America shall be subject to the customs treatment so determined to be necessary to prevent such injury. Similarly, if the Government of the United Mexican States finds as a fact that any article enumerated and described in schedule I is being imported into the United Mexican States under the circumstances specified, it may, if it finds that the public interest will be served thereby, withdraw in whole or in part the concession with regard to the article, or modify the concession by the imposition of quantitative regulations or otherwise, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury.

2. Before the Government of either country shall withdraw or modify a concession pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article, it shall give notice in writing to the Government of the other country as far in advance as may be practicable and shall afford such other Government an opportunity to consult with it in respect of the proposed action; and if agreement with respect thereto is not reached the Government which proposes to take such action shall, nevertheless, be free to do so and the other Government shall be free within 30 days after such action is taken to terminate this agreement in whole or in part on 30 days' written notice.

That is the so-called Mexican escape clause. There is nothing wrong with it. It is an excellent clause and should be included in our trade agreements. If it were used effectively undoubtedly it could provide some relief to an injured industry. Unfortunately, there is abundant evidence that our State Department is likely to use it very, very little, if at all. That statement is based on the experience that many industries have had with the State Department under trade agreements already negotiated.

The use of this escape clause is suggested as a new departure which would, for the first time, guarantee relief to domestic producers. As a matter of fact, the idea is not new. It was used more than 4 years ago in the Mexican agreement. But more important, it should be realized that the State Department has always had a legal right to escape from unfavorable agreements or unfavorable concessions.

Most of the agreements now in effect were negotiated during the late thirties and were entered into for an initial period of 3 years. Almost all of them have now run for a 3-year period, but continue automatically under their terms, subject to a right by either party to cancel upon 6 months' notice. In the case of any of these agreements, therefore, at any time during the past 6 or 8 years, it would have been possible for the State Department to reopen the agreement in question, renegotiate its terms, or cancel it entirely on 6 months' notice.

In other words, our State Department has all the time had legal escape rights on almost all the treaties now in effect. The trouble has been that it has refused to make use of those rights, even when a domestic industry has been able to show substantial injury.

No escape clause will be of any value unless the administration is willing to use it.

Today, I should like to tell the Senate briefly the story of one vital American industry which has suffered injury from a trade agreement, which has asked for relief from the State Department, and which has failed to receive the relief to which it was entitled. That industry is the American watch-manufacturing industry. My interest in this industry arises out of the fact that one of the jeweled-watch manufacturers has a plant in my State, at Lincoln, Nebr.

Switzerland is the only other country in the world which is a major producer of timekeeping instruments. The industry in that country controls the timekeeping markets of the world. Since 1930, it has been a Government-controlled and subsidized trust. It has received both direct and indirect financial assistance from the Government. The publications of our own Tariff Commission establish these facts, and these facts are of tremendous importance to us. Should the industry in this country disappear or be rendered impotent, we would be at the mercy of a foreign trust, not only in times of peace but also in times of war. Let us not forget that during much of the late war Switzerland was completely surrounded and cut off from us by our enemies.

The essentiality of this industry in time of war is indicated in a recent Tariff Commission report, from which I quote:

The four domestic manufacturers of jeweled watches of quality not only produced war materials similar to those made by certain manufacturers in other industries but they also made a wide range of war materials which no other class of domestic manufacturers produced or could have produced, at least within as short a period. These four companies were the only ones which had the equipment and the reservoir of skills adequate for large-scale manufacture of certain precision timing devices and other instruments which the armed services required. * * * Some of the products of manufacturers of clock-type watches, especially certain kinds of mechanical timepieces, were similar to those of the domestic manufacturers of jeweled watches of quality. * * * During the war, the armed services were not able to obtain many of the wide range of articles they required as rapidly as they desired them. If, for example, the country's peacetime facilities for producing jeweled watches of quality had been larger than they actually were, the armed services could presumably have obtained certain time instruments and other devices more rapidly and in larger quantity than they did.

Mr. President, let me add that the watch-manufacturing processes and the skill required of employees is such that, once down, the industry can neither be quickly expanded nor recreated. The British realized that lesson during the recent World War, and are now desperately attempting to establish a watch industry by means of government subsidies.

By 1936, when the State Department negotiated its trade agreement with Switzerland, there were only three exclusively American manufacturers of jeweled watches and four manufacturers of nonjeweled watches left in this country. One company in the jeweled-watch field, although predominantly an importer of Swiss movements, was making parts for and assembling some watches in this country. This is still the situation today; and it must necessarily deteriorate, so long as the difference in labor costs here and abroad continues, unless some realistic relief is afforded the industry by the State Department or by the Congress.

Against this kind of a background, and over the protests of the industry, our Government, through the trade agreement of 1936 with Switzerland, reduced the import duties on watches by about 34 percent on the average. I am given to understand that at the time of making the agreement, one of the principal considerations asserted in justification of doing so was the fact that we had debased the value of our dollar in 1934. Yet, Mr. President, a few months after the signing of the agreement, in the fall of 1936, the Swiss devalued their franc by more than 25 percent. By this devaluation, the importers of Swiss watches received a further reduction in landed costs not contemplated when the agreement was entered into. But the State Department did nothing about it.

What has been the effect of the trade agreement on the two segments of the American industry? In the five preagreement years, 1931–35, American-made jeweled watches supplied 53 percent of the American market, and watches with imported movements, the other 47 percent. In the 6 years following, 1936–41, the domestic industry's share of the market fell from 53 to 41 percent, a decline of over one-fifth. These computations include all the foreign-made watches which were competitive with the products of our own jeweled-watch industry, including those containing two to seven jewels. But they exclude the foreign-made watches containing only one or no jewels which were not competitive with American-made jeweled watches. A comparison showing the effect of the agreement on the American nonjeweled watch industry is equally striking. Shipments of domestic nonjeweled watch manufacturers increased from 3,000,000 wrist watches in 1935 to only 3,750,000 in 1941. Imports of competing watches increased during the same period from 740,000 to 1,537,000. Thus the imports of Swiss watches of this type increased more than 100 percent, while the business of the American manufacturers increased only 25 percent. These computations do not include American-made nonjeweled pocket watches.

In short, the American industry was forced out of its dominant position in its own market—directly forced out of a market which it had created many years ago by machine methods later copied by the Swiss. What is worse, the growth of the American industry was stunted

just previous to the most devastating war in history. Then that slow strangulation process was perpetuated by turning the market completely over to the Swiss, not only during the war but also during the reconversion period of the American industry.

This shows how absurd is the statement we hear again and again from the State Department that "no domestic industry has suffered serious injury." Mr. President, does an American industry have to go bankrupt before the State Department will admit that it has suffered serious injury? How can the people of this country expect to call upon this industry in any future emergency if their elected representatives do not guarantee to the industry equality of opportunity against unreasonable foreign competition?

It is customary for the State Department, in dealing with this point, to assemble impressive statistics indicating for the domestic industry in question that sales, profits, and employment have increased between 1934—prior to the trade agreements program—and 1939 or 1940—after the damaging concessions were made. With the watch industry, as with most other American industries, it is possible to show that business was better in 1939 than in 1934. The State Department then blandly accepts full credit for any such improvement in business over the amount of business done during the depths of the depression.

The fallacy of this type of argument is so obvious that it should deceive no one. Naturally, almost any kind of business was in better shape by 1939 or 1940 than it was in 1934. The point here is that the domestic industry certainly lost one-fifth of its preagreement market, and thus failed to regain, even in 1939, 1940, and 1941 the share of the market it formerly held.

Then came the war. The American watch industry, jeweled and nonjeweled, was converted to war work. What American-made watches were sold thereafter and until last year were doled out from stocks on hand in 1942. The Swiss had the market virtually to themselves, and they took full advantage of the situation, as is indicated by the following watch-importation figures:

1942	5,293,000
1943	7,996,000
1944	6,915,000
1945	9,398,000
Total	29,601,000

The annual average is almost seven and one-half million watches.

These annual importations during the war were almost two and one-half times the 3,000,000 watches imported per annum during the 6 years of 1936–41. They were almost 10 times the average imports of 770,000 during the 5 years, 1931–35, preceding the Swiss agreement. The 29,000,000 watches imported during the war filled all the commercial-market demand during that period, and also some of the future demand, since other commodities were not available.

As early as March 1944, the domestic jeweled-watch industry realized that its postwar future was being seriously jeopardized by the heavy importations of Swiss watches during the war. It also realized that there would be no pent-up demand for watches after the war, as in the case of other industries which had no foreign competition. Realizing these facts, one of the jeweled-watch producers, acting with the endorsement of the other two, filed an application for relief with the Committee for Reciprocity Information. A courteous acknowledgment was received, but no hearing was held on that application.

In January 1945, 10 months later, a second application on behalf of the watch manufacturers was filed. A hearing was promptly held on this application. Then, again, for months nothing happened.

Nine months later, in October 1945, the importers and the American Watch Workers Union were given a hearing. Then 6 more months passed while nothing happened.

Finally in April 1946, 25 months—more than 2 years—after the trade agreements organization had first been put on notice of the situation confronting the industry, an agreement with the Swiss Government was announced in the form of an exchange of notes which made certain arrangements intended to give the domestic industry at least some slight measure of assistance.

Three specific points were dealt with in this exchange of notes. The Swiss Government agreed:

First, to limit its future watch shipments to the United States to the highest annual total it had ever been able to achieve—that is, 7,700,000 in 1945. It is to be noted that this is the annual total prewar Swiss imports—3,000,000—plus our entire domestic capacity.

Second, to attempt to prevent the indirect shipment of watches to this country from Switzerland through other countries. During 1945, the number of units entering indirectly in this manner was 1,700,000.

Third, to use its good offices to help American manufacturers obtain from Swiss sources certain types of watchmaking machinery theretofore supplied for 50 years. These machines were already on previously accepted orders with the Swiss machine industry, and were badly needed to replace machinery seriously deteriorated on domestic war work, while the Swiss were taking over 100 percent of the American market.

It will be observed that this exchange of notes would still permit Switzerland to ship watches here at a rate of over 2½ times as heavy as during the very profitable—for the Swiss—years of 1936–41. This was the best the State Department could do for a vital American industry whose prewar business had been adversely affected by the Swiss agreement and whose market had been saturated with wartime commercial business in which it had not been permitted to participate.

It will be observed further that enforcement of this agreement was left entirely to the Swiss, despite the fact that our State Department had the legal right to escape from the original Swiss agreement on 6 months' notice, renegotiating the terms of the agreement if it chose, and place enforcement in the hands of our own customs officials. How well have the Swiss lived up to this latter agreement? Official Department of Commerce figures show imports for the entire year 1946, including both direct and indirect shipments, of 9,654,931 units—over 250,000 more than the record total registered in 1945, and almost 2,000,000 above the 7,700,000 quota for direct shipments which Switzerland promised to observe. Official data are not available to divide this figure of 9,650,000 between direct and indirect shipments for the full year. If, however, these data, when they become available, should indicate that the Swiss have held the direct shipments down to the 7,700,000 figure promised, then it is clear that the 2,000,000 movements sent here through indirect channels represent an actual increase over indirect shipments of the preceding year in spite of the Swiss promise to try to wipe out such indirect shipments.

The other point in the exchange of notes related to securing Swiss machinery for the American industry. The American industry is still waiting for the machinery, but that is not all. Last summer they were advised that if it were to be made available at all, it would not be on a purchase basis, as always before, but on a lease basis, and some of the provisions in the proposed lease are:

1. No subsequent improvements made by the lessor (the Swiss) to be available to the lessee (the Americans), but
2. Subsequent improvements made by the Americans to be given to the Swiss
3. Inspection of the American plants to ascertain whether or not the lease provisions are being adhered to, and
4. Prices charged by the lessee for products made on the machinery to be subject to the approval of the lessor.

Obviously the last provision cannot be agreed to under our laws.

Mr. President, that brings us down to date. It appears from recent evidence that the Swiss watch trust is now ready to attempt to absorb, control, or destroy the last major watch manufacturing industry outside of Switzerland. It is perfectly clear that the Swiss Government has not even lived up to the very conservative concessions it pretended to make in April 1946. Why did the State Department not demand renegotiation of the Swiss agreement on 6 months' notice, and thus place in the hands of our United States customs officials the enforcement of the agreement?

Reciprocity should be recognized as a two-way street. It is worth inquiring what we got from Switzerland in return for the enormous advantage she gained through this 1936 trade agreement. For 5 years immediately preceding the trade agreement, we sold to Switzerland an annual average of $8,500,000 of goods and bought from her an average of $16,000,000.

In 1938, we sold her $10,000,000 and bought from her $23,000,000.

In 1941, we sold her $12,000,000 and bought $28,000,000.

In 1945, the Department of Commerce reports, we exported to Switzerland $60,000,000 and imported $83,000,000. It

would seem that this $60,000,000 of exports was quite a substantial gain from the $8,500,000 prior to 1936, but upon inquiry into the items which make up this figure, I am surprised to learn that the Department of Commerce has included relief to the extent of $29,000,000. That leaves $31,000,000 of real exports and $83,000,000 of real imports for the year 1945, and of these imports $56,000,000 represents watches, cases, and parts. A résumé of these figures discloses:

1935: Imports 200 percent of exports.
1936: Imports 300 percent of exports.
1937: Imports 300 percent of exports.
1938: Imports 220 percent of exports.
1939: Imports 166 percent of exports.
1945: Imports 268 percent of exports.

In 1945 we paid a $52,000,000 bonus for $31,000,000 of export sales. The $50,000,000 is based on f. o. b. Swiss prices, which, when translated into consumer prices in the United States, is at least $150,000,000 required to be paid by the American consumer out of the purchasing power created by this and other American industries. What price exports.

The whole story might be summarized by saying that the domestic watch-manufacturing industry has been hurt by the Swiss agreement. It requested relief from the State Department. The relief promised was inadequate. Even that promise was not lived up to, and the State Department throughout declined to make use of such escape powers as it had. In other words, Mr. President, the State Department's attitude has been that of complete agreement with the Swiss approach to the solution of this problem in disregard of the American watch industry. This is why I place very little confidence in the changes proposed to the State Department.

Mr. President, after the First World War we disarmed our Military and Naval Establishments almost completely. We thought that would contribute to world peace. We discovered our mistake. We are not going to make that mistake a second time.

But our administration leaders have discovered a new solution, a new formula, to save the peace of the world. It is a formula of economic appeasement, a craze to give away our industrial strength to satisfy other nations. I am afraid, Mr. President, that this formula will work no better than the last one did. I am afraid that if we destroy our domestic-watch industry and other vital industries we shall find that these industries are just as essential to our security as ships, planes, and guns. I can only hope that we shall realize this danger before it is too late.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in a moment I propose to move an adjournment, but before I do so I wish to say that the next meeting of the Senate will be on Friday, and I express the very earnest hope that there will be no effort to bring before the Senate at that time any legislative matters except by unanimous consent. It is the desire that the day shall be a free day for Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 11, 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Josiah Marvel, Jr., of Delaware, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all might and Father of all mercies, refresh us with the tides of Thy blessing as to Thy gracious altar we come. Grant that we may hear the whisper of Him by whose teaching we test our lives, as we walk amid life's throng and press.

Almighty God, today we pause in memory of him who sprang from the loins of but common soil, whose glory was not in ranks or titles, and whose ideals challenge the best thoughts of men. As we look down the lanes of the years, we are reminded that Thou didst give him a conscience void of offense, a strength equal to the burden, and a freedom which belongs to the sons of God. O may his fundamental concepts of life and government fill our hearts today, never looking with disdain upon any man, whether ignorant, poor, or black. Open our minds that we may share the spirit of him who preserved us a united people. Through a courageous devotion to our Republic, may we free our land from all teaching of atheism or any fruitage thereof, by whatever name. Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 10, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 121, granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the balance of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

MARGARET L. UNDERDOWN

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 95) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Margaret L. Underdown, widow of Alexander Underdown, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Alexander Underdown.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMILLE R. NEAGLE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Camille R. Neagle, wife of Elmer F. Neagle, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Elmer F. Neagle.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARRIE BELLE TRIMBLE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 53) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Carrie Belle Trimble, widow of South Trimble, late Clerk of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 1 year's salary compensation and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said South Trimble.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL LABORERS, OFFICE OF DOORKEEPER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 96) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1947, until otherwise provided by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the rate of $1,260 each per annum for the employment of three additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL MESSENGERS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1947, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation, to be paid monthly, to three messengers to the Committee on Ways and Means to be appointed by the chairman thereof, as follows:

One senior messenger at the rate of $1,260 per annum.

One junior messenger at the rate of $1,260 per annum.

One messenger (Harry Parker) at the rate of $1,560 per annum; but the authority contained herein for the last-named position of messenger shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs therein after the first appointment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 7 and 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Two messengers at a basic salary of $1,500 each per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO ENABLE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CARRY OUT PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 1775 has been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Inasmuch as this bill provides for a direct appropriation, I ask unanimous consent that it be re-referred to the proper committee, namely, the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to meet while the House is in session for the next 10 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to state at this time that today has been set aside for two anniversary speeches and, under the circumstances, feels that before the Chair will recognize gentlemen for 1-minute speeches or for permission to extend their remarks that this part of the program be carried out. The Chair, therefore, recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] to speak for 30 minutes.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on this, the anniversary of his birth, I rise to speak of Abraham Lincoln, not as the sixteenth President of the United States and the Great Emancipator, but rather as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Thirtieth Congress, where he served 100 years ago for a single term as "the gentleman from the Seventh District of Illinois."

In all humility, and with knowledge of my own inability to find words adequate to express the high regard of the American people for Abraham Lincoln, I wish to devote a few minutes to the consideration of Lincoln, the Member of Congress.

Every American is acquainted with his story—from his humble birth of almost illiterate parents in an obscure log cabin in Kentucky on February 12, 1809, until his tragic death, from an assassin's bullet early on the morning of April 15, 1865, as a martyred President of the United States.

Penniless, and riding into town on a borrowed horse, Lincoln moved to Springfield, Ill., in the spring of 1837, to engage in the practice of law and to become a part of the then thriving city of 1,500 persons. Singularly, this day was April 15, 1837, when he was 28 years old. And 28 years from that very day, he was to breathe his last, in an obscure house across from Ford's Theater, in Washington, D. C.

The city of Springfield has justifiable pride in claiming Lincoln as its own. It was there that he gained his first reputation as a capable lawyer; there that he pursued a political career, even then aborning as a member of the state legislature; it was Springfield which sent him to this Congress, where in a brief 2 years he was to win his first stature of national proportions. It was Springfield that he called home because there was the only house that he ever owned—still standing today at Eighth and Jackson Streets.

It was there that he prepared his famous debates with Stephen A. Douglas on the question of slavery in the United States, eventually winning the Presidency in this Nation's darkest hour of civil division over how that question was to be settled.

And, finally, it has been at Springfield where for the last 82 years amid the beautifully shaded slopes of Oak Ridge Cemetery repose his mortal remains—resting in heavenly silence under a monument erected to him and dedicated to freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

As it has been said by more profound men—men who knew him intimately—Lincoln belongs to the ages.

It is well also to consider the words of Henry Ward Beecher spoken at the time of Lincoln's death:

Not Springfield's, but Illinois'; not Illinois', but the Nation's; not the Nation's, but the world's, is this man.

The gentleman from the Seventh Illinois District was elected on November 3, 1846, being then 37 years of age, over a powerful and skillful adversary named Peter Cartwright. Lincoln came to Congress as one of seven Members from Illinois; he was a Whig, the others were Democrats. His defeat of Cartwright was an accomplishment of considerable proportions because Cartwright was a seasoned campaigner and 24 years older than Lincoln. Cartwright, moreover, had the knack of mixing religion and politics, being an old-time preacher who often harangued his political audiences about sin. During the campaign Lincoln happened to attend one of these frontier meetings. Cartwright saw Lincoln in the audience and decided to make capital of his presence.

"All who desire to lead a new life, to give their hearts to God, and go to heaven, will stand," said Cartwright. Some of the audience stood, but not Lincoln. "All who do not wish to go to hell will stand," commented Cartwright. All stood up except one man. That man was Lincoln.

For further reference to this incident I quote the words of Carl Sandburg, noted Lincoln historian and writer:

"May I inquire of you, Mr. Lincoln," asked Cartwright, "where you are going?" And Lincoln slowly rose and slowly spoke. "I came here as a respectful listener. I did not know that I was to be singled out by Brother Cartwright. I believe in treating religious matters with due solemnity. I admit that the questions propounded by Brother Cartwright are of great importance. I did not feel called upon to answer as the rest did. Brother Cartwright asks me directly where I am going. I desire to reply with equal directness. I am going to Congress."

Cartwright was so uncompromising in his denunciation of Lincoln that he created ill feeling, not for Lincoln, but toward himself, thereby winning sympathy for the very man he was endeavoring to defeat. How many of us here today have not seen the same reaction in contemporary campaigns, where untruthful and vicious smears by the politically untried and unproven react only against themselves.

Then, as now, fabrications were spread in congressional campaigns. In one instance a campaign tale was repeated that Lincoln had a proud and aristocratic family which came often to visit him. To this Lincoln replied: "That sounds strange to me because I did not remember of but one who ever came to see me, and while he was in town he was accused of stealing a jew's-harp."

The Members of this Congress would be interested in this reported incident in connection with the campaign of 1846. His Whig supporters raised $200 for his campaign expenses, but after the election he returned all but 75 cents of it, with this statement:

I did not need the money. I made the canvass on my own horse; my entertainment, being at the houses of friends cost me

nothing; and my only outlay was 75 cents for a barrel of cider, which some farm hands insisted I should treat to.

When the returns were in, Lincoln had polled 6,340 votes, and Cartwright had received 4,829, while a third candidate, an Abolitionist, had been given only 249. In those days, the Seventh District consisted of 11 counties, an area which now is divided among four districts—the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Twentieth, and Twenty-first. Now, 100 years later, the district I am privileged to represent is the Twenty-first Illinois District, which includes the city of Springfield and county of Sangamon.

Although he was elected in November 1846, it was almost a year before Lincoln, together with his wife and family, moved to Washington. They took up residence early in December 1847, in the boarding house of Mrs. Sprigg, in Duff Green's row, near the present site of the Library of Congress.

When the Thirtieth Congress met on December 6, 1847, it is interesting to note that then as now the Speaker of the House of Representatives was from Massachusetts, the honorable Robert C. Winthrop. Mr. Winthrop became Speaker by a majority of one vote and Lincoln's vote thereby represented the margin of his victory.

The first session of that Congress adjourned on August 14, 1848; the second session began on December 4, 1848, and adjourned at 7 a. m. on March 4, 1849, having worked all night to complete its efforts.

The House, then as now, met at noon, although there were occasional evening sessions, starting at 5:30 p. m. There were 30 employees in the House, including the Clerk and Doorkeeper, as well as 14 pages, 31 messengers, and 3 laborers.

The Chamber itself was illuminated by gas fixtures with reflectors, and mention is made of 16 furnaces, although the type of fuel used was not identified.

Keen student that he was, Lincoln made the most of his brief term in Congress by studying the men around him, and these were a historic group, all great men. There was Daniel Webster; Horace Greeley, the editor, who was also a Member of the House; Andrew Johnson, destined to succeed Lincoln in the White House; Jefferson Davis, who was later to become President of the Confederacy; John Quincy Adams, the former President, then a Member of the House; John C. Calhoun; Lewis Cass; Thomas Benton—to name only a few.

It is singular that the Members of that Congress—the Thirtieth—were taken to task by Greeley's paper, the New York Tribune, for their mileage charges. The Tribune duly printed the charges of each Congressman. In Lincoln's case it was shown that the shortest mail-route distance between Springfield, Ill., and Washington, D. C., was 780 miles, but Lincoln had charged the Government $1,300.80. The Tribune estimated that Lincoln had overcharged the Government in the amount of $676.80.

Lincoln's mileage, relates Sandburg, was computed like that of most other Congressmen from the West, who assumed that the way to travel from the frontier sections was to go to Chicago, board a Great Lakes boat and ride on the Great Lakes to Buffalo and then finish the trip by coach or rail.

Lincoln found Congress very similar to the smaller-scale activities of the Illinois State Legislature. He was not long in making friends in the House, where he accustomed himself to a corner seat in the post office, which was a favorite meeting place for Members. There, it is related, he won early recognition as a champion story teller. A newspaperman of that time wrote:

> He never told a story twice, but appeared to have an endless repertoire ready, like the successive charges of a magazine gun.

But all was not storytelling for Lincoln while he was in Congress. He was one of the Members committed to the job of determining how the Federal Government would spend its $60,000,000 annually. At the time he took his oath of office the war between the United States and Mexico was in progress, a war which cost $27,000,000 and the lives of 27,000 soldiers.

Lincoln did not favor that war and openly attacked President Polk for having assertedly provoked it, a position which deeply offended his constituency.

From Springfield came gloomy letters written by his friend and law partner, Herndon, telling him of the ground he was losing and of his growing unpopularity because of his attitude on the Mexican War, and because of his so-called spot resolutions which catechized President Polk and his whole party. The war had been popular in many respects because it had added a great empire in the Southwest to the United States.

Despite his attitude toward the war, Lincoln supported measures to supply the armed forces, but he refused to change his opinion that the conflict was unfair and unjust.

Lincoln was not only a prolific letter writer, but he also was very meticulous about the revision of the speeches he delivered in Congress, carefully editing them before their release for publication in pamphlet form and for distribution among his constituents. Lincoln served on two committees—Post Offices and Post Roads, and Expenditures of the War Department.

From Congress, Lincoln took an active interest in the Presidential campaign of 1848, stumping in New England for Zachary Taylor for President in an effort to keep the Whig Party alive.

On January 10, 1849, Lincoln announced he would introduce a bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. The bill is described as "reasonable and moderate" by Lincoln historians, providing among other things for full-value recompense to owners of slaves freed under its proposals. But John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, issued his famous warning to the southern Members of Congress that the South knew what to expect "if it remained idle." He did not name Lincoln in this appeal, but referred to him as "the gentleman from Illinois."

According to agreement, Lincoln was to give up his seat in Congress at the end of a single term and after attending the Taylor inaugural in March 1849, he returned to Springfield. Back home, Lincoln quickly detected the resentment against him because of his stand on the Mexican War. Even Diller, the druggist, whom he had made postmaster, had deserted him for the Democrats.

Keenly disappointed, Lincoln sought appointment as Commissioner of the General Land Office, but was unsuccessful. Later, the administration offered him the appointment as Governor of the Territory of Oregon, which he was inclined to accept, deferring, however, to Mrs. Lincoln's objections.

Discouraged with politics, Lincoln, then only 40, returned to his impoverished law practice in Springfield and prepared for the greater destiny that fate was to decree for him.

While awaiting that destiny, he inspired the movement which created the Republican Party as the symbol of forthright government guaranteeing equal liberty and opportunity for all. Lincolnism and Republicanism became synonymous then; they remain synonymous today. Just as the people turned to Lincoln and the Republican Party in 1860 to avert internal disaster, so again have the American people in this day turned to the Republican Party and its leaders to direct and guide them as evidenced by the results of the congressional election of 1946.

I would be remiss if I neglected to draw an analogy between the national situation today and that of Lincoln's time by citing some of his more famous quotations. It is amazing how applicable many of them are to the current political scene.

Is it not proper and fitting that we of the Eightieth Congress should study his wisdom and philosophy in shaping the destinies of our beloved Nation today?

The greatest domestic issue in America today lies between labor and management and while we find Lincoln being quoted first by one side then by the other to sustain their position, it would be well for us to examine several expressions in order to determine as nearly as possible Abraham Lincoln's true philosophy.

It will be recalled that Lincoln made a famous reply to a contemporary Senator who was opposed to education for the laboring classes, asserting that cultivated society must rest upon an uneducated laboring class, just as a house rests upon its mud sills.

To this Lincoln replied:

> By the mud-sill theory, it is assumed that labor and education are incompatible, and any practical combination of them is impossible. According to that theory, a blind horse upon a treadmill is a perfect illustration of what a laborer should be—all the better for being blind that he could not kick understandingly. According to that theory, the education of laborers is not only useless but pernicious. In fact, it is in some sort deemed a misfortune that laborers have heads at all. Those same heads are regarded as explosive materials, only to be kept in damp places, as far as possible from that peculiar sort of fire which ignites them. A Yankee who could invent a strong-handed man without a head would receive the everlasting gratitude of the mud-sill advocates.

Thus we have one of his earliest public expressions embodying his broad sympathy and solicitude for the men and women of labor.

Later, in discussing the tariff question in 1847, Lincoln said:

Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor produced them. But it has so happened, in all the ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure each laborer of the whole product of his labor, or as nearly possible, is the worthy subject of any good government.

This expression, though made in connection with the tariff question, was later expanded and clarified by Mr. Lincoln with reference to the right of people to engage in business free from government control and interference.

On July 27, 1848, Lincoln said in Congress:

We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business.

Ten years later in 1858, at Columbus, Ohio, Lincoln said:

We shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it.

Regarding the right and freedom of man to progress through the medium of his own industry and resourcefulness, he said in 1859 at Cincinnati:

The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequently an improvement of condition to all.

Again in 1859, at Cincinnati, Lincoln said:

A man watches his pear tree day after day, impatient for the ripening of the fruit. Let him attempt to force the process and he will spoil both the fruit and tree. But let him patiently wait and the ripe pear at last falls into his lap.

In the same year, at Milwaukee, Wis., Lincoln said:

Property is the fruit of labor. * * * Property is desirable as a positive good in the world. * * * That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.

The next year, in 1860, at New Haven, Conn., he said:

I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to and wish it might prevail everywhere. * * * I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free, to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So while we may not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else.

The obligation of respect for the fruits of the labor of others was clearly stated in 1864 when he said:

Let not him who is homeless pull down the house of another. * * * But let him work diligently and build one for himself. * * * Thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Most important in these times is Lincoln's conception of the proper exercise of Government control over the lives of individuals as well as their businesses as illustrated in this quotation of 1854:

In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere.

His great love for America, and his conception of the responsibility of everyone to preserve it along with its ideals of freedom was disclosed in 1861 when he said:

This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember and overthrow it.

It is possible that this expression had its genesis in another made in 1838 in Springfield, Ill., when, in warning of the possibility of danger from within, he said:

At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction is our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

If the time ever comes in America when a minority can frustrate the will of the majority, the result will be mobocracy upon the one hand or tyranny on the other.

It is not for us to attempt to interpret these expressions of this great man, but rather to hear and consider them in the light of present-day conditions.

Think of the great depth and understanding of this man who, in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, advised his fellow men, as follows:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, and do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

His consideration was for all men and for all nations for all times, and therefore, I can conclude in no better way than to paraphrase Lincoln's own tribute to George Washington by saying:

To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Abraham Lincoln is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe we pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIRKSEN). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting and proper that on this day we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. February 12, however, is the birthday of another apostle of freedom, Thaddeus Kosciusko. Providence works in strange and devious ways. It is more than coincidence that Lincoln and Kosciusko—two outstanding champions of freedom from two different continents, and from two different generations—should be born on the same date.

Hence, while honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln on this day, let us also honor the memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko—the heart, the blood, the spirit, and the inspiration of millions of Poles scattered throughout the globe. Today, more than ever, the name of Kosciusko is dear to the hearts of freedom-loving people the world over. Because today, like during the days of Kosciusko, Poland is the sad victim of betrayal by its friends—the memory of Kosciusko is heavy on all the hearts of Poland.

Providence directed that Lincoln and Kosciusko be born on the same date, even though more than a generation apart. Providence must have directed this because the two had everything in common. To both—freedom was their life work.

Lincoln emancipated the enslaved in America. Yet, long before that time Kosciusko gave of his possessions to buy freedom for the enslaved. It was with funds from Kosciusko's will that there was built the first trade school in America at Newark for Negroes.

Kosciusko came from Poland to America and for 6 years fought to create our Union. Lincoln more than a generation later fought to preserve that Union.

Whenever any nation anywhere in the world was threatened by dismemberment by bigger and corrupt neighbors—Kosciusko was always ready to help the unfortunate victims. Lincoln, as our President, by his force for good had always used his offices to protect the weak and small nations from their greedy and corrupt neighbors. To Lincoln and Kosciusko appeasement was the lowest form of betrayal.

Lincoln is known the world over for his philosophy that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Kosciusko's philosophy went beyond that. His was the belief that a world divided against itself cannot stand. Lincoln believed that if freedom was in danger in one part of our Union, it was in danger all over the Union. Kosciusko believed that if freedom was in danger in one part of the world, it was in danger all over the world.

A close examination of the lives and works of Kosciusko and Lincoln will reveal their likeness and greatness in almost every respect. It is easy to see the hand of providence in that their birthdays come on the same date.

Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence in order that I might briefly review Kosciusko's contribution to the cause of freedom—freedom not only for Poland but our own freedom—and freedom for the world.

When our Union was engaged in the struggle that gave it birth in 1776, there came from a strange and far-away land a young man who gave his fortune and life to our cause. Then, like now, Poland was always a champion of freedom. Polish land, way back at that time, already was drenched with blood in its traditional fight for freedom. When the people of Poland heard of our struggle in 1776 they became gravely concerned. Every heart and every breast of Poland prayed for the Union's success. It was this universal wish among all of the people of Poland that sent Thaddeus Kosciusko to America to help us gain the

freedom for which Poland on many occasions bled and died.

In the beginning things did not go so well in our Union's struggle for freedom. With justified pride Poles regard the role played by Kosciusko in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a battle but France's recognition of our independence. This was one of the turning points of the War for Independence.

In our Union's fight for freedom, the question of the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance. Kosciusko was assigned that responsibility. He chose West Point for its commanding position. Little is now left of the fortifications, but the monument erected to his memory by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciusko, who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

In the summer of 1780, Kosciusko was transferred to the South. Here he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negroes in slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciusko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. When the campaign changed to one of guerrilla warfare, he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell, and on December 14, 1782, the American Army entered the town in a triumphal procession, in which Kosciusko rode with his fellow officers, greeted by the populace with flowers and cries of "Welcome."

Peace soon followed. Our Union was born. Kosciusko helped give our Union its birth. The prayers of the people of Poland were answered. America was free. Poland, a country to whom freedom means more than life, helped make our Nation free.

Kosciusko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. Nathaniel Greene best sums up what the Pole had done for America and what he had been to his brother soldiers:

Colonel Kosciusko belonged—

Wrote Greene—

to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let the opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others.

Congress, in 1783, belatedly conferred upon Kosciusko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service.

In the fall of 1784, Kosciusko returned to his native country. For the next 12 years he remained in Europe—through the infamous partitions of Poland and the many battles fought in connection therewith. It was in 1794 that Kosciusko was seriously wounded in battle and was taken prisoner by Russia, not to be released until 2 years later. Then, like now, Poland became the prey of the Muscovite Bear—while the rest of the world looked the other way. Then, like now, Poland was the pawn of hypocrites and betrayers.

Wounded, sick at heart and body, on the 19th of December 1796, Kosciusko left St. Petersburg to go back to America. In good time he arrived in Stockholm, where he was greeted with enthusiasm. Later, Kosciusko embarked and after a 3 weeks' passage landed in London.

The Gentlemen's Magazine announced: "Kosciusko, the hero of freedom, is here."

The whole of London made haste to visit him. Politicians, men of letters, and the rulers of fashion, all alike thronged to his rooms. To Walter Savage Landor, then a mere youth, the sight of Kosciusko awakened a sympathy for Poland that he never lost, and to which English literature owes one of his Imaginary Conversations. More than half a century later he looked back to the moment in which he spoke to Kosciusko as the happiest of his life. The Whig Club presented Kosciusko with a sword of honor; the Duchess of Devonshire pressed upon him a costly ring, which went the way of most of the gifts that Kosciusko received—he passed them on to his friends. Tokens of admiration had counted for nought in Kosciusko's life. They were the merest baubles to him who had seen his own country fall. In the portrait that without his knowledge Cosway painted, we see him lie with bandaged head in an attitude of deep and sorrowful musing—for his native Poland.

Bristol was at that time the English port for sailing to America and it was there that, after a fortnight's stay in London, Kosciusko betook himself. He found in Bristol old friends of American days, and now was the guest of one of them, at that time United States consul. A guard of honor received him, processions of the townsfolk flocked to catch a glimpse of the hero, a military band played every evening before the consulate, and he received as the gift of the city a handsome silver service. One who visited him here records his impression of a soul unbroken by misfortune, by wounds, poverty, and exile.

The journey down the Avon to where Kosciusko's ship lay at anchor was a triumphal progress. He was accompanied by English officers in full dress, by the American consul, and hosts of well-wishers. All heads were bared as he was carried on board. The whole length of the river handkerchiefs were waved from the banks. Farewell resounded from every rock and promontory, where spectators had crowded to see the last of the Polish hero. Boats shot out from the private dwellings on the waterside, laden with flowers and fruits for the departing guest. Not a few men and women boarded the ship and accompanied Kosciusko for some distance before they could bring themselves to part with him.

The ship had sailed on June 18, 1797. For 2 months Kosciusko and his Polish companions tossed on the Atlantic, on one occasion near shipwreck. Philadelphia, their destination, they reached on August 18, 1797. Claypole's Advertiser for August 19, 1797, reported:

In the ship *Adriana*, Captain Lee, arrived here last evening, from Bristol, came passenger, that illustrious defender of the rights of mankind, the brave but unfortunate Kosciusko, the Polish general. On his landing he was received with three cheers. And, as a further mark of popular respect for this great character, the citizens insisted upon drawing him to his lodgings. The general appears to be in good spirits, but has suffered very materially from his wounds and inhuman imprisonment. We trust, however, he will long live to enjoy in these peaceful shores, that liberty and happiness which he assisted in fighting for, but which he fought in vain to obtain for his native land.

Eight days later Washington, from Mount Vernon, congratulated Kosciusko on his safe arrival and welcomed him to the land whose liberties he had been instrumental in establishing.

No one—

Said Washington—

has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have, and no one more sincerely wished, during your arduous struggle in the cause of liberty in your country, that it might be crowned with success. But the ways of providence are inscrutable and mortals must submit. I pray you to believe that at all times, and under all circumstances, it would make me happy to see you at my last retreat, from which I never expect to be more than 20 miles.

Kosciusko was, however, never able to visit his commander at Mount Vernon.

At this time Kosciusko drew into great intimacy with Thomas Jefferson, at that time Secretary of State. Jefferson wrote to Gates:

I see Kosciusko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known.

Sometime in March 1798 a packet of letters from Europe was handed to Kosciusko. His emotion on reading the contents was so strong that, despite his crippled condition, he sprang from his couch and stepped without a helping hand to the middle of the room. "I must return at once to Europe," he said. At that time he received news that Poland was again being massacred. Before leaving America he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which more than half a century before the Civil War the Polish patriot advanced the cause of emancipation:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that my friend Thomas Jefferson employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

T. KOSCIUSKO,
5th Day of May 1798.

By the end of June or early in July 1798, Kosciusko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy with himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed upon all sides. He negotiated at length with the Government of France for France's help in the restoration of Polish independence. This was promised him many times, but his cautious request for guaranties was never complied with. Then, like now, Poland was betrayed by its friends and used as a pawn to gain temporary peace, expediency, and advantage.

But Kosciusko's intercourse with his American friends did not slacken. In 1800, at Paris, at the request of Gen. William R. Davies, then envoy from the United States to France, Kosciusko prepared in French his Manoeuvres of Horse Artillery, and it was published. General Davies requested the United States Military Philosophical Society at West Point to have the manual translated and published. This was done in the same year, and Colonel Williams, the translator, presented President Jefferson with a copy of this work, the first upon its subject to be published in America and used for many years as a basic text in our country.

Napoleon was now big man of Europe. In 1806, from Berlin, he summoned Kosciusko to assume the leadership of the revolting Poles. But the former Polish commander in chief had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call and remained in Paris. He refused to use Poland as a pawn to promote a dictator. He refused to bargain his honor and the honor of his native Poland. Appeasement hypocrisy was not part of his life.

In May 1815 Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland, just like they did at Yalta. An autonomous Kingdom of Poland was to be formed with the Czar as King, but it would be but a small part of the true Poland. Kosciusko heard these things. In dismay, he wrote to the Czar. In vain he waited for an answer. Kosciusko refused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland—now a puppet of the Czar. He felt that his very presence, even, would lend sanction to the new partition. He despised puppets and quislings. He chose, therefore, a voluntary exile among the Swiss.

In serene communion with nature, among eternal mountains, in unceasing meditation upon the future of Poland, he spent the two last years of his life. And here, on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his fatherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciusko died. Even in his loneliness he was faithful to Poland—her purest soul and the greatest of Poles. And his greatness in that it was not his own personal greatness; merely, it was the greatness of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of Kosciusko is the greatness of Poland. The spirit of Kosciusko has always been the spirit of Poland. Wherever freedom needs a friend there you will always find Poland the first to bleed and suffer. No soil of any nation the world over is so saturated with blood gashed for freedom as it is in Poland. There in that land at all times freedom had a loyal and trusting friend. Kosciusko is dead—but his spirit still guides Poland and its people.

Let us go back just a few years to 1938 and 1939. The whole world was afraid of a little paperhanger from Austria, then the big man of Europe. I remember at that time even in our own country when I denounced the leader of the "master race," I was told I should temper my words because Adolf might get mad at us. Among all the nations of the world there was no voice courageous enough to even call Adolf Schickelgruber a bad name. The leaders of the world licked the boots of the tyrant. They went to Munich. Chamberlain even took an umbrella with him, hoping that he might get the privilege and high honor of protecting the paperhanger from the rain. Shaking in their boots the powers of Europe appeased and fought for the favors of the big man of Europe. Even the mighty Red Bear of Russia embraced the madman of Europe and plotted with him the murder of small and helpless people of small and helpless nations.

In all the world during these tragic years, 1938 and 1939, there was only one nation and one people courageous enough to call the paperhanger's bluff. True to the spirit of Kosciusko, the people of Poland said, "We care not what course other nations take, but as for us we shall stand up and fight. The cause of freedom is at stake. We would rather fight and die for that freedom than lick the boots of any tyrant."

How courageously the people of Poland fought is written in the records of the past 7 years. To the last man, woman, and child they stood up. In the long struggle ahead—6 years—there could not be found in Poland a single quisling. The spirit of Kosciusko was prevalent in the hearts, minds, and breasts of every single Pole—fighting and dying for their freedom, as well as ours.

Meeting the mightiest military power in all history, they fought on. Alone they bore the brunt of the killers of Europe. After 19 days of glorious resistance, they were stabbed in the back by one of Hitler's pals—the bear of Russia. The bank robber of Georgia—not a Russian—and the paperhanger of Austria—not a German—were now butchering and dividing the spoils and carcass of prostrate Poland. Now Poland was attacked from both sides by two of the mightiest powers the world had ever known. Still they fought on. Still the spirit of Kosciusko urged them on. Never in the history of mankind has there been such an exhibition of glorious courage and resistance. Poland did not get lend-lease to spur on their courage. The spirit of Kosciusko was all the inspiration these people needed.

As Members of Congress we know the story full well. Poland was not a warring nation. All they had to offer was courage, life and blood. But that was not enough to stop the bank robber of Georgia and the paperhanger from Austria. Poland was overrun and destroyed. The paperhanger enslaved the Poles in the west in labor and concentration camps and the bank robber from Georgia took the Poles from the east and sent them to Siberia.

But it takes more than murder to destroy the spirit of Poland which is the spirit of Kosciusko. Enslaved and betrayed by the rest of the world Poland still fought on. They fought harder and longer than any of the Allies of this war. A few months after Poland fell, a Polish Army was fighting in France in the Maginot line. When mighty France folded up, the Poles were the last to lay down their arms in the Maginot line. From there the Poles went to England. Six months after Poland fell 12,000 Polish boys were flying in the British Royal Air Force. They shot down one out of every five planes during the London blitz. One of the Polish squadrons was name the Kosciusko Squadron.

The only help the Allies sent Norway was a small contingent of Polish boys and what was left of the Polish Navy. All this after Poland was destroyed and overtaken by the Red and Brown Fascists of Europe. By now Hitler was running wild in Africa. It was a group of Polish boys that gave Hitler his first defeat at Tobruk. This after Poland had been overrun. This Polish Air Force helped in the evacuation at Dunkerque. So did what was left of the Polish Navy. The spirit of Kosciusko will never be destroyed, nor will the spirit of Poland.

What American is there who does not remember the deadly battle of Monte Cassino Hill? It was a Polish general and a Polish Army that captured that murderous fortification and paved the road for the Allies on their march to Rome. Nor did Poland refuse to play a part in the invasion of Normandy. Side by side with the Allies Polish forces marched through France, Holland, Belgium into Germany. Never in the annals of history have so few done so much for the cause of freedom and humanity. Wherever there was a fight there you found Poland. The first to resist—the first to be destroyed—yet out of the ashes of that destruction Poland contributed manpower for the air forces exceeded only by the United States and England. The first to resist and the first to be destroyed—yet Poland provided fighting troops in an amount larger than all the nations combined outside the United States, the British Empire, and Russia.

If all this were all it would be more than enough. But the people who stayed in Poland—what part did they play? True to the spirit of Kosciusko the people of Poland organized the largest and most effective underground in Europe. Every Polish man, woman, and child was a part of that underground. The Polish underground was the most effective weapon the Allies had in their march through Europe. In one uprising—the Warsaw uprising—alone, in August of 1944, 250,000 Polish men, women, and children laid down their lives. Even though betrayed by its own allies, the underground fought on. With true Kosciusko spirit they had faith in Almighty God.

The courage and the sacrifice by Poland in this last war has no parallel in the annals of history. More than 8,000,000 of her people gave their lives. That comprises almost one-fourth of her population. When in the annals of man has any nation paid so high a price for freedom? If Kosciusko were alive today he would be proud of his native land and its people, to whom freedom means more than life, and to whom freedom is so priceless that it can never be compromised.

But I am sad to say that there is one thing Kosciusko would not be proud of. I might also say that there is one thing Lincoln would not be proud of. I might add that there is one thing that decent people the world over are not proud of. It is the shameful and unprecedented betrayal of a brave and a gallant people by its own allies.

Poland has had a sad history. It was dismembered time and again. Three times before the nineteenth century—the fourth time by a bank robber and a paperhanger in fateful September 1939. But these partitions were by enemies. That is to be expected and endured. If you, as a person, are robbed by your enemies, it is sad but understandable. However, when you get robbed by your own brother or sister, that is hard to understand, let alone endure. Yet that is what happened to Poland. It was partitioned by its brothers and enslaved by its brothers, as a result of the crime of Yalta. What a shameful reward to a brave and gallant people—a people that gave us a Kosciusko and a people who gave 8,000,000 dead for the same cause for which we gave more than 300,000 dead:

Oh feeble statesmen,
Oh ignominious times
That lick the tyrants' feet,
And smile upon his crimes.

Shame on us! Shame on Britain! Shame upon the world for such cowardly appeasement. Shades of Munich! Shades of Chamberlain! But Munich is a Sunday-school picnic compared to Yalta, and Chamberlain a Sunday-school teacher compared to the big men of Yalta. I say Yalta will go down in history as worse than Munich and its conspirators worse than Chamberlains.

What did Poland ask for its sacrifice? Did they ask for four or seven billion dollars from American taxpayers? No! Did they ask for the atom bomb? No! Did they ask for us to ever bail them out and rebuild Poland? No! Poland did not even ask for bread.

Then what did Poland ask? They merely asked for their own land and their own government. In the name of truth, mercy, and freedom Poland had a right to expect that simple and honorable request to be fulfilled. But the answer Poland received from one of the White House "palace guards" was, "You Poles are just like the Irish; you are never satisfied."

So lo and behold—all this gallant blood of Poland was gashed in vain—because Poland by the acts of greedy and power-hungry men of Yalta—lies prostrate again. But mark you fellow countrymen—Poland is not this sad drama's closing act. It's tragic curtain will rise anew again and again. On Poland's gashed breast today the beast of Red Fascism plants his hunger and consults what nation's breast shall next be gored. This is just the beginning. There will be more and more stupendous slaughters of the free.

To gallant Poland we can well say—as other nations fall one by one—then and only then will they know what it means to be betrayed like Poland was betrayed. When these nations fall one by one they will miss Poland. As they fall one by one and plead for mercy on bended knee—then and only then will they understand the glory that belongs to Poland.

To you Members of Congress—the elected custodians of America—I wish to warn that the fall of the Polish eagle, caused by betrayal, is big with fate to man. If the new world is to begin by a broken word, it would be better not to be born. Our own strife is coming. You cannot sell out the freedom of your friends and neighbors and keep your own secure. The beast of red fascism from the ashes and blood-soaked soil of betrayed Poland shall forge the fetters and fate of our sons yet unborn. It will not be a kind fate. It will be a hideous, murderous, and shrieking fate. Today its Poland—tomorrow it will be another—after that another, one by one, and us, too. It is nearer than you think. Someday and soon the world will understand the words, "Poland's setting star is the world's disaster-rising morn."

In conclusion, Poland, the world will someday mind how you bore the brunt of fate and how you bled for humankind. Poland, so hallowedly have you played your part that freedom-loving people everywhere have your name written on their heart. Poland, your sorrow in nobility transcends. Your conquerors' and betrayers' joy make their own cheeks blush. But shame never has and never will tinge the cheeks of Poland. Thank God that Poland never has and never will change her conscience, cause, and name for all the wealth and all that goes with a felon fame.

EXTEMPORE

Poland might be dead for a while. Poland has died before. But the spirit of Poland has never died and never will die. Because Poland is the spirit of Kosciusko—even after suffering defeat in victory—the spirit of Kosciusko shall make Poland rise again and live again as it has before. Why do I say that?

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people have a patriot's spirit, an unconquerable spirit. Just a few days ago, for instance, 50 young Polish orphans left India for the United States to seek haven in various convents in America. When they boarded the ship in India, in unison they sang, "Jescie Polska nie Zginela," which means Poland is not yet lost. All the orphans of Poland, morning, noon, and night sing in their hearts "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 250,000 Polish troops who bled all over the world for their freedom and ours. They are now in the beet fields of Canada and in the mines of England, but morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 12,000 gallant Polish airmen scattered over the four corners of the world without a country and without a home, and morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 6,000,000 Poles in America, proud and happy citizens of our own native land, yet morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 25,000,000 Polish people being tortured under the heel of Red fascism in Europe, but morning, noon, and night in their hearts and minds are the words of the immortal Polish song "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." That is the spirit of Poland; that is the spirit of Kosciusko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

I say that Poland will arise and live again, because they have a profound affection for their native land. I might mention that it is an old custom in Poland that when a citizen leaves that country, his last deed is to pick up a bit of Polish soil to take with him so that it can be buried with him in case he never returns to Poland. Such profound affection for a native land is unique among all people of the world.

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people everywhere have an abounding faith in Almighty God. You can steal their country and the Poles will be sad, but they will sing and pray "There is a God." You can murder their loved ones, but the Poles will sing and pray "There is a God." You can destroy every last segment of their nation, and the Poles will pray and sing "There is a God."

With the immortal spirit of Kosciusko, with profound and everlasting love for their country, and with an abounding faith in Almighty God, Poland will arise again, and live again, and be forever free.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, America today joins with the friends of a free Poland in paying tribute to Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, Polish soldier and patriot, gallant American officer, and friend of true freedom. His name will ever remain a symbol of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression.

Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State, wrote of him:

> I see Kosciusko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you that I have ever known; the kind of liberty which extends to all—not only the rich.

His ideals are perhaps most effectively set forth in the Constitution of Poland, adopted on May 3, 1791. The principles therein contained are comparable to those of the Magna Carta and our own Declaration of Independence. They are more than a rule of action for the Poland of that day. The constitutional ideals set up in the document have almost an exact counterpart in the rules of political action defined in the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of our land.

Kosciusko believed in the dignity of his fellow man and fought throughout his life for tolerance and humanitarianism.

The four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter may well have been the ideals of this great Polish leader. Rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and freedom of religion are fundamental

truths upon which democracy rests. The life of Kosciusko exemplified that principle enunciated in the Constitution of Poland, adopted as it was a few short years after his return to his native land from America—the Nation he had served with distinction for 6 years, won the rank of brigadier general, and was voted the thanks of Congress:

The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors. We, therefore, owe to all people of whatever persuasion peace in matters of faith and protection of government; consequently we assure to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country in all dominions of the republic.

The present plight of Poland would have saddened the heart and soul of the great Polish patriot whose memory we honor today. Suffering immeasurable material destruction because of the unwillingness of the people of Poland to bow their heads before the forces of oppression and tyranny, Poland today operates under a government which it tolerates and wherein the ordinary citizen cannot say he is the captain of his soul. A nation is as great as her individual citizens are untrammeled and free from despotic interference and totalitarian rule. Freedom of speech, supplemented by the exercise of the natural right of every man under a democratic form of government to choose his leader at a secret election, without undue or unfair influence which makes impossible a true expression of the will of the people, is a condition precedent to national greatness.

At Yalta 2 years ago it was agreed that the people of Poland, once liberated, must have a chance to choose their own government in a free election. Last month Poland had its election. Reportedly, any resemblance to a free and democratic election was absent. Foreign correspondents have written that terrorism was so transparent that the result was never in doubt. The Communist Party demanded that its adherents display their ballots. Few voters had courage to express free choice in the face of such intimidation. Our Government has protested that Poland failed to carry out its solemn pledge of a free election. So did Great Britain. Russia remained silent.

President Harry S. Truman uniquely and justifiably made known to the new Ambassador from the present Republic of Poland that broken promises are as indefensible in international relationships as in everyday dealings in the social and economic life of the individual. International pledges are made to be fulfilled. Double dealing by any member of the family of nations with any other member is contrary to every true principle of democracy. Our great President has expressed in his rebuke the thought of millions of Americans. We believe in free elections, untrammeled by undemocratic leaders and undominated by the enemies of those principles of democratic conduct which are necessary for the peace of the world.

Kosciusko gave his life for the freedom and happiness of man. His teachings never wavered from his belief that the dignity of man would prevail over the forces of tryanny.

It is perhaps coincidence that America today also celebrates the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, great American, great humanitarian, who, as Kosciusko, believed in human liberty. "With malice toward none, with charity for all" he too followed the star of freedom and justice for all men, however great, however small, in the realization that peace and happiness can never exist in a world where slavery exists. As Kosciusko, his life was dedicated to the cause of liberty for man, irrespective of race, creed, or color. They both followed the pathway that leads to human brotherhood, convinced that all men are created equal. Lincoln gave the world a democratic concept of the dignity of man. Kosciusko, with an enduring faith that right makes might, lived according to the light of justice, as he understood it.

The glory of Kosciusko was the glory of Poland. The valor of his spirit is the courage of her struggle through the centuries. America will never forget the heroic efforts of this great Polish warrior in the battle of this country for freedom. His life, dedicated as it was against bitterness and hatreds, sought but one reward "to plant the flower of freedom where he thought the flower would grow, and to live to pluck the fragrant blossoms of liberty for God and his fellow man."

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, there could hardly be a more fitting occasion for reviewing the moral obligations of the American people toward the people of Poland than the birthday anniversary of Thaddeus Kosciusko, who symbolizes in the mind of every American the magnificent fulfillment of every moral obligation every people on the earth has toward every freedom-loving people.

Thaddeus Kosciusko came to these shores in order to help our revolutionary leaders to establish freedom and independence of the American people. He succeeded in his endeavor but he did not succeed in an effort to free his own people from the Russian yoke. He was defeated by an overwhelming force, but he fought in his own country for the same ideals he fought for in our country. There was no difference at that time, as there is no difference now, between what the peoples of the United States and of Poland are striving for. Freedom—and by that I mean both freedom for individuals and freedom for a nation—is what the Poles want as much as we do.

While this last unprecedented war was being fought, the war which started in Poland and for Poland's freedom, while our soldiers were dying in foreign lands alongside their comrades in arms of the Polish Army—words of praise and encouragement were heaped on the Polish nation from all quarters. Pledges were made and in this country the name of Thaddeus Kosciusko was always mentioned whenever we pledged our support for the fighting nation of Poland.

The Polish Nation took our pledges very much to their hearts. They believed and they kept on fighting, suffering, and dying. The nation first to fight paid most dearly, and, as you all know, the numbers of war casualties, victims of persecution, deportations, and mass starvation are unbelievably high as far as Poland is concerned.

When the war was finished, however, when victory crowned our efforts and sacrifices, when our boys could return home to live in peace in a free country, when we proclaimed that antidemocratic, totalitarian forces were defeated, when we declared that we put an end to willful imperialism and oppression—the Poles had to find out that they emerged from the war a defeated nation, despite the fact that they were throughout the war the most praised and most faithful member of a victorious team.

I want to commend our State Department for having courageously admitted that the elections held in Poland recently were nothing else but a shameless fake. I want to commend our President for the way he received the mock ambassador of Poland, sent to Washington by usurpers of Poland's sovereignty and oppressors of the Polish Nation. But I cannot think for a moment that after having indicted the so-called Polish Government of breach of faith and violation of treaties, we will rest the case. I am sure that this is not the intention of our State Department and that the Polish case, temporarily closed at Yalta and Potsdam, will be reopened soon in its entirety.

We have a powerful new institution, a parliament of the world—and by that I mean the United Nations—where the case of Poland, with all its implications, including the conduct of Soviet Russia and the role played by Soviet Russia in the recent developments in Poland, should be freely debated. I am sure that the United States Government and the Government of Great Britain, as cosignatories of the now admittedly broken Yalta agreement, will not delay the submission of the case of Poland to the United Nations, with the request for speedy and efficient action. Thus continuing the work that General Kosciusko was striving for in seeking the deliverance and establishing freedom and independence to all peoples of the world.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit in the afternoons during the balance of this week, whether or not the House is in session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIRKSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD at this point a short resolution unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Whereas the President of the United States has urged the entire Nation to join in the

observance of National Security Week, sponsored by the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States during February 12–22; and

Whereas the problem of national security is one in which each Member of this body is vitally concerned and to which each of us must give long, conscientious, and prayerful consideration; and

Whereas the Reserve officers of the armed forces of this Nation are seeking to emphasize the importance of questions relating to national security, militarily and otherwise, and in so doing are assuming leadership in the public forum in peacetime with the same measure of patriotism which characterized their service at home and abroad, on the battlefield, and off, during wartime: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That we give cognizance to National Security Week and, being aware of the past services and continued patriotic readiness of our Reserve officers to serve this Nation, we officially commend the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States in its sponsorship of public discussions of the important questions relating to national security.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a remarkable letter on the question of national security written by Ralph W. Fisher, of Prudenville, Mich.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which he has written to a constituent expressing his views on the subject of reduction of taxes.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Will L. Krietenstein entitled "The Hardships of Abraham Lincoln in His Boyhood Days."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the opinion in the now famous so-called portal-to-portal pay suit upon which I have received an estimate from the Public Printer, which exceeds the amount prescribed under the rule, amounting to $284. Previously a consent request had been granted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include articles in each.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LEA (at the request of Mr. COX) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief resolution of the National Petroleum Council.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the statement he made on the subject Can Labor Legislation Bring Industrial Peace?

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the commemoration of Kosciusko and Lincoln birthdays.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birthdays of two great men, Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko. These two great leaders need no eulogies from me, as history gives them all the honors they deserve.

As they both fought for the freedom of people, I think it most fitting at this time that once again I call to your attention the deplorable conditions under which Poland exists today.

America must listen to this cry from the core of the hearts of that civilized nation. We cannot close our ears to it. It is a cry for life.

Polish patriots fought that our Constitution might come into existence; now it is proper that we, as a nation, demand that the United Nations Organization restore to Poland its freedom and independence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BREHM (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TWYMAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short magazine article.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Sparta (Wis.) Herald.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun last Sunday.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen, delivered at the annual Kansas Day celebration.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short article appearing in Progress, District Council No. 6, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, a Communist fellow-traveler publication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 20, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations from Abraham Lincoln on labor.

Mr. MACY (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Judge Edgar F. Hazleton, of New York.

Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. KING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Syracuse Post-Standard.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the national president of the Auxiliary to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War urging adoption of a resolution I introduced to name November 19, the anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution he introduced.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a leading magazine.

Mr. SABATH (at the request of Mr. GORDON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on General Kosciusko and President Lincoln.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that he will be absent tomorrow and designates the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] as the Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

EXPORTATION OF SUGAR

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to prohibit the exportation of sugar, such exportation of sugar of the United States to be prohibited after May 1, 1947. The bill provides for a penalty of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for violation of the provisions of this bill, in the event that it becomes law.

I want to call attention to the fact that the exportation of sugar is causing two groups much distress. I refer to the housewives, who are short of sugar throughout the country. There is hardly a section of the country where sugar is not required for canning purposes and already the season is about to open in some parts of the United States, and the season for canning will continue in other parts as the winter recedes.

The other group to which I refer is the small candy manufacturers.

On January 2, 1947, I wrote to the Department of Agriculture, Sugar Division, with reference to the sugar situation as it related to commercial frozen fruits, home canning, and sugar for export. One paragraph of that letter from the Department of Agriculture is typical. I shall read two lines of the paragraph relating to sugar for housewives for canning:

> Unfortunately it did not appear feasible to undertake a special program for supplying sugar to housewives for canning during 1946. As you know, the field staff of the OPA was reduced to such an extent that that agency concluded it could not administer a special program for home canning.

I wish to say that the bill which I am introducing will not interfere with the shipment of sugar required by our Army abroad, nor will it violate any agreements already entered into with reference to foreign shipments of sugar.

It would be interesting to know if the sugar which the Administration is shipping abroad is a part of the candy which we are importing from foreign countries. The figures on importations of candy from abroad are quite startling. For example, in 1941, 1,100,000 pounds of candy were imported—in 1945, 65,575,000 pounds were imported. I for one do not favor the closing down of our candy shops and factories here in order to transfer our domestic trade to the foreign producers of candy.

With the present plan of the administration to lower the duty to let more candy, as well as other competing products, into this country our candy establishments are likely to all close down. The irony of it all is that we deprive our own candy manufacturers of the sugar, and send it abroad to help ruin our domestic industry.

It is my hope that the House will give consideration to this bill to the end that our own people may be treated fairly who wish to process food and thus save it from destruction.

I invite the cooperation of the House in seeing that immediate action is taken on this bill.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, America today pays tribute to two great men, Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko.

Others will review the achievements of Lincoln in addresses throughout our great Nation. I take the floor this afternoon in tribute to Kosciusko, Polish soldier and patriot, who became an officer in America's first Army and aided our founding fathers in their struggle to make the Colonies an independent nation.

Two hundred years have failed to dim the luster of Kosciusko's glory, achieved in the cause of freedom. He brought from his native land of Poland a military skill which he placed at the disposal of General Washington for six long years. He contributed so much to the success of the American Revolution that when his work was done he returned to Poland carrying with him a vote of thanks of Congress.

Kosciusko's name will live forever—symbolic of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression. His name means to the world emancipation from human bondage. It is fitting that on this anniversary of his birth we should think of him—honor the memory of a valiant hero and stanch defender of the ideals of liberty and justice, not only for Poland but for all mankind.

Others came from Poland in those days of trial for the colonists—indicating that over 200 years ago there burned in the hearts of the Polish people that same love for freedom that remains alive today.

The Polish people know oppression—have known it for many centuries. On this anniversary of the birth of one of their great men whose friendship for America helped to relieve her from oppression, it is fitting today to give some thought to the plight of Poland.

America has always befriended the small nations of the world. To Poland we owe a lasting debt of gratitude; first, because it is the land of some of our earliest benefactors; second, because it was brave Poland that first accepted the challenge of Hitler. For her heroism shall Poland be partitioned; shall her government be made the puppet of a stronger nation whose ideologies are so foreign to the Christian beliefs of the Polish people?

We should have some concern for Poland's welfare, just as Kosciusko and other Polish patriots had concern for America. We cannot follow the happenings in Poland today without coming to the very definite realization that the U. S. S. R. is doing some very questionable things. Russia has taken over the economies of all central Europe and America must face the ugly fact that the U. S. S. R., in violation of agreements made with her wartime allies, is spreading the tentacles of sovietism over unprotected and unwilling people.

A great Christian people like the Poles will never accept the Godless political or social philosophy of the Soviet. There can be no peace in Europe, or in the world when one people try to force upon another ideologies in which they have no faith.

Our Government cannot ignore and, of course, it has not ignored the attempts to perpetuate a puppet government in Poland. President Truman only a few days ago delivered to the new Polish Ambassador a scathing denunciation of the manner in which the recent Polish elections were held and made it clear that America does not feel that provisions of the agreement between the war allies has been followed.

America should be unyielding in its protest against the Soviet-influenced election in Poland.

Liberty is slowly bleeding to death in prostrate Poland. Countless thousands of Poles have been victims of political murders or exiled. Through former Secretary of State Byrnes, America has voiced its disapproval of these persecutions.

The fraudulent Polish elections are a warning of eventual Soviet annexation of all Europe by employment of similar methods unless stern and effective measures are adopted by the United Nations.

The flagrant violation of even the meager obligation of holding free elections in Poland, as guaranteed by the Yalta agreement, raises doubt in the United States concerning the sanctity of Russian pledges. These dishonest elections are aimed at the complete enslavement of the Polish nation.

I have repeatedly stated that the future holds no hope for a lasting peace unless the nations of the world can arrive at mutual understanding. How are we to expect such if one of the great powers holds so lightly agreements made in conference? However it is done, the Soviet must be brought to realize that their attempted domination of Europe must be curbed if a way to lasting peace is ever to be found.

Sacred pledges were made by the victorious United Nations at Yalta and at Potsdam guaranteeing freedom and personal security in life and property to all peoples in all lands. Russia was a participant in these conferences. She assumed obligations by agreements concurred in by the United Nations. If the Soviets do not choose to honor these agreements, they leave the world with serious doubt as to their future course.

As a nation dedicated to freedom—recognizing the blessings of liberty as we do—America should continue to exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland and all small nations who were given such hope by the Atlantic Charter. America's great weight must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two amendments to the old-age and survivors insurance section of our social-security law. These amendments, if enacted, will bring old-age and survivor benefits to the self-employed and to State and municipal employees.

This title of the social-security law refers to old-age-retirement and death-benefit provisions of the program. The insured individual has a social-security

number and there is taken from his wages a tax which at the present is 1 percent. A like amount is contributed by his employer. In order for an individual to have an old-age annuity under the social-security program, he must have been under the program for one-half of the time since 1937, or 40 quarters.

For instance, if an individual whose average wage was $100 per month, were covered by the program for 40 quarters, and retired at the age of 65, he would receive a monthly benefit of $27.50 for the rest of his life. When his wife reached the age of 65, even though she was not covered by the program, she would receive a monthly check of $13.75.

If an individual dies, who has been under social security for one-half of the time in the last 12 quarters preceding his death, his survivors would be paid certain benefits. If his average wage was $100 per month, and he left a minor child, that child would receive $13.75 per month until he was 18. During the minority of this child, the mother would be paid $20.63 per month. When the last child reached 18, the widow would receive no more benefits until she reached age 65 and then her payment of $20.63 per month would be resumed.

At the present time, the men and women who are employed by a State or any of its subdivisions such as counties, parishes, towns, cities, school districts, public-power and irrigation districts, drainage districts, or other municipalities, are not included in our Federal social-security program. These employees face the same problems of old age as other citizens. They are performing services as clerks, bookkeepers, typists, janitors, elevator operators, street and highway employees, teachers, librarians, electricians, technicians, policemen, firemen, guards, repairmen, cooks, waiters, attendants, nurses, and doctors. It is the purpose of my proposal to have all these municipal employees treated as other employees in our social-security program.

Upon the passage by Congress of the proposal which I am offering today, any one of the 48 States, or all of them, can extend social security to its employees and to the employees of any or all of its political subdivisions. It authorizes the Federal Security Administrator to enter into compacts with the individual States for the purpose of extending the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance to the employees of such States and subdivisions. Such compacts may provide for all or specified classes of:

First. Employees of the States only; or,

Second. Employees of one or more political subdivisions thereof only; or,

Third. Employees of the State, and employees of one or more political subdivisions thereof.

The compact shall provide:

First. That benefits shall be provided for the employees affected on the same basis as for other employees;

Second. That the State or political subdivision which is the employer, shall pay to the United States amounts equivalent to the excise tax imposed on employers and shall collect and pay the United States the tax imposed on the income of employees under the Social Security Act.

It is estimated that there are about 9,000,000 self-employed people in the United States. These men and women have no social security. Yet these individuals, by making their own jobs, lessen the threat of unemployment in the Nation. Many of these self-employed provide work for others. It is decidedly in the public interest for us to make self-employment as attractive as possible. The more people who are encouraged to go on their own and create jobs the more job opportunities will be available. From this group spring the enterprises that grow and expand and which provide employment for great numbers.

Under my proposal for the self-employed which will be introduced later, the benefits of social security will be extended to them on a voluntary basis. The individual may elect to come into the program. It does not force him to do so. A list of the self-employed would be of great length. It would include the owners of all unincorporated businesses, such as grocers, butchers, blacksmiths, editors, clothiers, cobblers, repairmen, garagemen, lawyers, doctors, bakers, produce buyers, insurance men, dentists, seamstresses, tailors, cleaners, barbers, beauticians, farmers, contractors, lumbermen, builders, auctioneers, filling-station operators, realtors, and countless others.

Many of the self-employed are now paying social-security taxes on their own employees. It will be a simple matter for them to compute their own tax. There are other self-employed persons who may not have the adequate records to determine the base for their tax. Perhaps the man who creates his own job, by going from door to door sharpening knives for housewives, may not have all of the records that would be desirable, but he does face the problems of old age.

A plan of ascertaining the tax base is proposed in my bill. The base would be $500 or the person's income from his trade or business as shown by his income-tax report, whichever is the greater. The maximum base of $3,000 already in the social-security law will, of course, apply to the self-employed group.

In other words, a self-employed person who makes less than $500 would be taxed on the basis of $500 to qualify under the act. If his income-tax return shows that he has made more than $500, the figure taken from his income-tax return would be the base for determining the social-security tax and the benefits that he would draw. Since the old-age benefits to be paid are based on the amount of wages received, the individual making less than $500 would receive greater old-age benefits by treating his earnings as $500.

A troublesome question to be considered in this legislation is, Should the self-employed be required to pay both the employer's tax and the employee's tax? Strong arguments can be made for both propositions. If the owner of an unincorporated grocery store has four employees, the grocery business pays the employer's tax and the employees' portion of the tax is deducted from their wages. Perhaps the boss' social security might be handled in the same way.

On the other hand, so far as the individual employee is concerned, the only amount actually taken from his pay check is the employee's tax. Should the operator of a small repair shop, for instance, pay only the employee's tax or should he pay both? I have struck upon a compromise in this proposed legislation. Perhaps when the legislation is advanced a better formula might be suggested, but I propose the following: On the first $500 the self-employed person should pay the employee's tax only, and on that part of his earnings over $500 he should pay both the employee's tax and the employer's tax.

Under this plan, if a man operating a small business makes $1,100 a year he would pay the employee's tax on $500 and both the employee's and employer's tax on the other $600. If a lady doing sewing makes only $500 she would pay the employee's tax only. If a lawyer's income was $3,000 he would pay the employee's tax only on the first $500 and both taxes on the other $2,500.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the Federal social-security program was adopted there were many strong arguments that could have been made against it. It does make government more costly. It does place more burdens on the individual during his productive years. It does add to the cost of goods. I wish to point out, however, that these added burdens and costs fall on the individual and on the groups not covered by social security just as heavily and perhaps more so than on others. Many of the people not covered now by social security are paying part of the load for the people covered. For instance, when a farmer buys a new machine a great many social-security taxes are included in the price that he pays because this coverage was extended to employees in many of the stages of processing, manufacturing, and distributing that machine. It is all added to the cost.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the conclusion that no social-security plan can be defended that benefits part of the people and excludes millions of others. Old-age and survivors insurance should be made available to our public employees not now covered and to that great army of self-employed who are so essential to our free economy.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation pauses to honor the greatest of immortalized American leaders. Abraham Lincoln's numerous patriotic statements and speeches will pass on through generations to come as an everlasting lesson in liberty, self-government, and human freedom. This generation of Americans and its leaders have learned to love and respect the ideals and utterances of Abraham Lincoln. Each succeeding generation since those dark Civil War days has profited by the example, common sense, and earnestness of this great man.

Today the greatest tribute within our power to Lincoln would be to rededicate

the ideals of liberty, justice, and the inherent right of every man, woman, and child to continue in the enjoyment of American liberty which our forefathers so thoughtfully bestowed upon us through our Constitution.

Throughout every city, village, hamlet, and countryside in America today elders and school children are publicly and privately thinking of the great heritage this man of humble origin gave to our country and to the world. People are asking what would Lincoln do if he were at the head of this great modern America and confronted with the trying problems now presented to the world after the greatest war in all history. I believe if Lincoln were leading us today he would apply the same principles involving the fundamental rights of humanity for individual justice, self-government, and religious freedom. By our present-day leaders emulating the teachings and examples of the great Lincoln, which were fundamental laws for the preservation of free government, our country will continue to enjoy prosperity, contentment, and the American way of life.

It is a remarkable coincidence that this day, February 12, is also the birthday of another great liberty-loving patriot who contributed outstanding service for liberty not only to his native Poland but to the young America of 1776. I refer to Thaddeus Kosciusko. When our country was in its infancy in fighting for freedom and independence, this great Polish patriot came to our shores and devoted his life to the cause which was so dear to the hearts of every American and to the hearts of his native comrades in Poland. Few examples in world history will equal the great sacrifice and service which Kosciusko and his Polish compatriots contributed to American freedom in those dark days.

I again raise my voice to the Congress and ask that our great Government today reciprocate in every possible way by aiding Poland in reestablishing its status as an independent nation. The world knows that the heart and mind of every Pole is today looking forward to the hour when their historic country can again enjoy the rights of self-government, freedom of religion and independent thought which has been the ultimate goal of every patriotic Pole since the day centuries ago when it was the pioneer advocate of liberty and self-government in Europe.

Our country today is the leading Nation of the world and let us not turn our back to the teachings and examples set by the two leaders, Lincoln and Kosciusko, whom we honor on this February 12, 1947.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker our commemoration today of the two hundred and first anniversary of America's great Polish benefactor, Thaddeus Kosciusko, seems to be a fitting occasion for a review of American relations with Poland. When I say Poland, I refer specifically to the so-called Warsaw regime which is now in power by virtue of the farcical elections of January 19.

The Warsaw regime, ladies and gentlemen, has challenged the United States. It has, in fact, thrown down the gauntlet to us. By its contemptuous refusal to heed our repeated protests, it has made it imperative that we accept that challenge or else lose not only our self-respect but our moral standing among the nations of the world.

Let me briefly review the incredible story of our relations with the Warsaw regime during the past 2 years. As you well know, at Yalta the United States, with Soviet Russia and Great Britain, guaranteed the Polish people an opportunity to obtain a representative government through free and unfettered elections. The provisional government was authorized on that condition, but it soon became obvious that the Warsaw regime was doing everything it could to assure that it would remain in power. It purposely delayed the elections, while by terrorism, intimidation, and bloodshed it reduced the political opposition to impotence. You know the whole sordid story. It has been told in detail through the excellent reporting of American correspondents.

A year ago, on the two hundredth anniversary of Kosciusko's birthday, I called attention to the dangerous developments in Poland. I said then on the floor of the House:

> On this two hundredth birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko, we Americans are enjoying the independence for which he so fiercely fought. One may question whether his own native land is enjoying the independence which he vainly fought to gain for it during his eventful life. True, Poland is now free and independent, but disquieting stories of political murders and Communist terrorism continue to leak out of that devastated land. Such is our American debt to Poland, the land of our benefactor's birth, that I strongly urge that we, as a nation, continue to exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland. Under various international agreements we are committed to guarantee free and unfettered elections in the liberated lands. I strongly urge that our State Department follow up Secretary Byrnes' remonstrances on the terrorism existing in Poland, and throw the great weight of America behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

The terrorism to which I referred, and against which Secretary Byrnes remonstrated, continued, and our State Department failed at the very time when strong representations might have stopped it. The United States did not throw its great weight behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

On May 3, the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the 3d of May Constitution of Poland, I renewed my warnings. On that date I said:

> Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to developments which have already occurred and which seem to cast grave doubts upon the good faith of the regime which we propose to further strengthen by our loans and credits. I feel that I am serving the real interests of the Polish people by pointing an emphatic finger at these developments. * * *
>
> It is evident to me, and should be to all the Members of the House, that the developments taking place now in Poland should be watched most carefully. What will it avail to have so-called free and unfettered elections in the fall if no one opposed to Soviet domination remains to vote? The pattern is evident. It has been followed many times before. The opposition is removed by all the various means which the Soviets know so well how to use. Then elections are held and the vote is announced as nearly unanimous * * * If our Government is serious in its desire to see that free and unfettered elections are really held and proposes to use this loan as a means of insuring this objective, then there is one thing that must be done, and be done immediately. Our State Department should demand an investigation of the charges made by the Peasant Party and demand further that the Allied press enjoy full freedom at once to report to the world upon developments in Poland. This is the time—before the elections—which is all important. The whole character of those elections is being determined now. If the Warsaw regime is sincere in giving its assurances in return for the loan, then it should not object to the fullest investigation of the Polish situation from this date to the holding of the elections.

I regret to say that our Government did not act with vigor and determination to assure those free elections. It is true that it sent protests on August 19 and November 22, 1946, but those protests were impudently ignored by the Warsaw regime and that at the very time when the Polish Government was seeking a loan from this country.

Again on January 6, 1947, I called upon the State Department to take more positive action in defense of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements:

> There is still time—

I said—

> for our State Department to redeem itself Until now it has let the Polish situation slide along. As a matter of fact, the British have done far more in the way of remonstrance to vindicate the Yalta and Potsdam agreements than have we. It is time that we assumed our share of the burden which we willingly accepted.
>
> There is still time, I say again, for our Government to exert every force at its disposal to insure that the elections to be held on January 19 are actually free and unfettered. This will, I admit, necessitate immediate action, but such action is imperative if the small nations throughout the world are to have any confidence at all in the promises and pledges of the United States.

On the 7th of January we learned that the State Department had sent identical notes on January 5 to the Soviet Union and to the British Government. In those notes we find that the State Department showed clearly that it understood the seriousness of the situation and what was really involved in it. I quote:

> In the view of my Government, what is involved here is the sanctity of international agreements, a principle upon which depends the establishment and maintenance of peace and the reign of justice under law. * * * Therefore, my Government believes that for any of the parties to this agreement to refrain from the most energetic efforts to see to its proper execution would be to fail in a most solemn obligation.

But what energetic efforts did our Government make? Most lamentably weak and ineffective ones. On January 9 Am-

bassador Arthur Bliss Lane delivered a note to the Polish Foreign Office. Noting the fact that the notes of August 19 and November 22 had not yet been answered, he informed the Warsaw regime of our "continuous concern over its preelection activities." He said that our Government was "especially perturbed," and further that it was "a source of regret to my Government that its previous efforts" had not resulted in any change in the course pursued by the Polish Government. He repeated the high-sounding sentences of the other notes regarding the sanctity of international agreements and ended with this "most energetic effort."

My Government would be failing in its duty if it did not again point out that the continuation of the present policy of suppression, coercion, and intimidation as applied to political opposition in Poland constitutes a violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

This, my dear friends, was the total of our energetic efforts to uphold the Yalta agreements. Thus we fulfilled our most solemn obligation.

Our Government, my dear friends, continues to be faced by that "most solemn obligation" which it referred to in its note to the Soviet Union and to Great Britain. In fact, that obligation has grown since January 19. We cannot evade it. We cannot, as we have done so often in the past, pass off the situation as an accomplished fact about which nothing further can be done. We have an obligation not only to the Polish people but to our own Nation and to the world.

I quite agree with Mr. Sumner Welles that—

The question now is whether the Government of the United States and the governments of the other western democracies will adopt a positive policy in the light of what has taken place in Poland or whether they will continue to limit themselves to pro forma expressions or depreciation. * * *

The need for the American Government to make a basic decision can no longer be evaded. The good faith of the United States is directly involved. For it is a matter of official record that, in addition to the pledges set forth in the Yalta Agreement, the United States during the war years repeatedly and officially assured the Polish people through their representatives that it would never recognize a government "unrepresentative of Poland." Can the United States hope to retain the confidence of the smaller countries and to exercise a constructive influence in world affairs if it disregards pledges of so solemn a character?

It has been rightly observed that the case of the Polish elections involves much more than appears at first sight. It involves the whole question of communistic expansion in Europe. The Polish elections were but the most recent in a series of Soviet moves. Within the past 14 months the provisional Communist-controlled governments of eastern Europe have effected elections in Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

Mr. Welles has rightly declared that:

It is vitally important that the Government of the United States decide whether any peaceful and lasting European order can be created if some of the component peoples are deprived of their right to self-determination and to sovereign liberty and when such international committments as those incorporated in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta agreement are cynically violated.

That is the more fundamental reason why our Government must continue to concern itself with this Polish problem and exert really energetic efforts to rectify the situation before it worsens. Mr. Welles has suggested that—

The United States can now make it clear that in its considered judgment what has occurred in Poland constitutes a violation of the third article of the Atlantic Charter to which every member of the United Nations is committed under the United Nations declaration, as well as a violation of article I of the United Nations Charter, and that this Government will consequently submit the issues thereby raised to the United Nations at the next meeting of its General Assembly.

Mr. Welles has acutely appraised the true importance of the Polish problem, but I do not feel that his proposed remedy goes far enough. Immediate and vigorous action is necessary. The Assembly of the United Nations will not meet until late in the fall. If no action is taken during the next 9 months, the Warsaw regime will have consolidated its position just as the Communist-dominated regime in Rumania has already done. I may say in passing that our Government must not repeat its conduct in regard to Rumania. Since the fantastic elections in that country we have not protested the new government nor the parliament whose members were illegally elected. The result has been tyrannical oppression, economic inflation, and growing integration with the Soviet sphere. We must take action now to insure the collapse of the Warsaw regime. As Dorothy Thompson, recently returned from Warsaw, has said:

It is a Russian-satellite administration based on naked force, holding the Polish people to a solution disregardful of history, tradition, experience, justice, and economics.

Just this Monday she wrote:

Poland is not going through a revolution but through a shameless conquest.

What positive and immediate action can our Government take? We must cut off at once all economic assistance to the Warsaw regime, whether in goods or money. I cannot understand why the Secretary of the Treasury ordered the release, effective January 7, 1947, of Polish assets in the United States, and why the Secretary of State also released the gold and the accounts of the Bank of Poland. Why were these not held until after the election? Poland is asking for $500,000,000 from the International Bank on the claim that it is absolutely essential for the country's recovery. The United States should vote against that loan and do everything possible to prevent the bank from granting it.

It may be objected that such a refusal would work a hardship on the Polish people, but this objection does not take into account the spirit of the Polish people. I do not think I misjudge the spirit of that gallant people, their courage and their self-sacrifice, when I say that they would prefer to continue in their present plight rather than see the oppressive regime now in power consolidated and perpetuated by outside aid.

It is further objected that our refusal to give economic aid to Poland would drive her into the arms of the Soviet Union. But the arms of the Soviet Union are empty. Russia needs all her resources for her own rehabilitation. She could not help Poland substantially without seriously handicapping her own 5-year plans. Of course, this is where our policy must be consistent and integrated. If we should flood Russia with our economic aid we would make it possible for her to assist the Warsaw regime, thus nullifying the effects of our economic sanctions against that government. It is only the most realistic common sense which dictates what we should do with regard to Russia in this situation. No one doubts that the Warsaw regime has been acting with Soviet approval and support. Our economic sanctions must be extended to Russia. Specifically, we should demand the settlement of the $11,000,000,000 lend-lease bill. It passes belief that to date Russia has ignored all our requests for a settlement. Furthermore, we should refuse to send Russia the $25,000,000 of American industrial equipment; and this not only because of the recent revelations that the State Department had actually connived with the Soviets so that they could escape the shipping costs which Congress had demanded. We should refuse any further shipments to Russia until our notes regarding lend-lease settlement are at least answered.

I say nothing about the 95 ships which Russia continues to hold despite our repeated requests for their return. Just a year ago, on February 12, the Maritime Commission asked the State Department to begin immediate steps for the recovery of the vessels and we are told that the Russians have never acknowledged the State Department's communication. We do not need to seek for reasons to halt all economic assistance to people who treat us in such cavalier fashion.

Besides such immediate economic measures, we need to take prompt political action. I cannot agree with Mr. Sumner Welles that we should present the case of the Warsaw regime to the Assembly of the United Nations; and this not only because the Assembly does not meet for almost a year. I submit that the Polish situation is serious enough to warrant immediate action by the Security Council and I strongly urge that our Government immediately call it to the attention of that body.

In his famous speech at the University of Buffalo, on October 5, 1946, Justice Jackson, newly returned from Nuremberg, declared:

The victory has not ended or given promise of ending the oppression and injustice which breed international discords. We conquered a country whose predominant faction was practicing terrorism in most barbaric forms and on a vast scale. But the defeat of one group of oppressors does not end oppression. In many of its aspects persecution of minorities is an internal matter between the government and its citizens. But its disruptive effect on the international order is so direct that tyranny on a sizable scale anywhere is a matter of international concern.

Despite the fact that Poland's first postwar parliament issued a manifesto on January 29 promising the Polish people freedom of speech freedom of press, and the right of public assembly, it is quite obvious that there continues in that unhappy land tyranny on a sizable scale. The eyewitness testimony of such a skilled observer as Dorothy Thompson is sufficient proof of that. Because of that fact, the Polish situation is a matter of international concern. As such it should be brought to the attention of the Security Council.

On January 28, the State Department formally accused the Polish Government of widespread coercion and intimidation. It stated further that the United States Government firmly intended to maintain its interest in the welfare of the Polish people and to retain fully liberty of action to determine its future attitude toward the Polish Government. On February 4, President Truman, using the same words as the State Department, told the new Polish Ambassador that the Government of the United States has not lost interest in the welfare of the Polish people.

I strongly believe that we can no longer show our interest in the welfare of the Polish people, by mere protests and statements. No longer is it enough to utter platitudes in stained-glass attitudes. We must take positive action—the economic and political action I have recommended. Only thus can we hope to regain our self-respect and our moral standing among the peoples of the world.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, at times each of us is prone to become discouraged. We feel we have tasks that lie before us that are very, very difficult to handle. It brings down to my mind that when we get downhearted and downcast we should think of Lincoln. When Abraham Lincoln was a young man, he ran for the Legislature of Illinois and was defeated. He next entered business and failed and was 17 years paying off the debt of a defaulting partner. He became engaged to a beautiful young woman. She died. He tried to get in the United States land office but failed. He was a candidate for Congress and was badly defeated. He ran for the Senate of the United States and was again defeated. When we think of our tough luck, think of Lincoln.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DORN, for February 13, on account of personal business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 13, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 13, and Friday, February 14, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands will meet at 10 a. m. on Thursday, February 13, and at 10 a. m. on Friday, February 14, in suite 1324.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 13, 1947, in room 213, Old House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 1350 and H. R. 1713, and for general discussion.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings on Thursday, February 13, 1947, at 10 a. m. in room 219, Old House Office Building, on a bill to continue the authority for the Maritime Commission to operate ships.

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor will meet in open hearings on Friday, February 14, 1947, at 10 a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

A meeting of the full Budget Committee will be held in the Ways and Means Committee room, House Office Building, Friday, February 14, at 10 a. m.

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in open hearings on Tuesday, February 18, at 10 a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 476) to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered wartime service in the United States merchant marine, and to provide aid for their families.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A meeting of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, February 18, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

323. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to the receiving of stolen public property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

324. A letter from the national commandant, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting reports of proceedings and activities and statement of receipts and expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

325. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

326. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

327. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Twelfth Annual Report for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

328. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

329. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

330. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $1,300,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

331. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,640,000 for the Federal Loan Agency (H. Doc. No. 115); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

332. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $1,430,000 for the judiciary, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 96. Resolution providing for employment of three additional laborers, Office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 42. Resolution providing for compensation for three special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective February 1, 1947; with amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4. A bill to safeguard the admission

of evidence in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1381. A bill to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 95. Resolution for the relief of Margaret L. Underdown, wife of Alexander Underdown; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 13. Resolution for the relief of Camille R. Neagle, wife of Elmer F. Neagle; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 53. Resolution providing 1 year's salary and $250 funeral expenses to Carrie Belle Trimble, widow of South Trimble, late Clerk of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charle E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1869. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1870. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1871. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 1872. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1873. A bill to compensate for certain discriminations against Government employees in the payment of overtime compensation during the period of hostilities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1875. A bill to encourage further development of an agricultural industry by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to impose quota restrictions on the importation of angora rabbit wool, hair, and yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1876. A bill to increase the pay of post-office employees in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1877. A bill for the erection of a public building at Honolulu, T. H., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 1878. A bill to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1879. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in central Alaska; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1880. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in southeastern Alaska; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1881. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to limit the power of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate transactions in exempted securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 1882. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 1883. A bill to regulate rents of business property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1884. A bill to prohibit certain un-American activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1885. A bill to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 1886. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1887. A bill relating to the pension or compensation of certain widows of persons who served in the armed forces in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1888. A bill to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1889. A bill to provide adjusted-service compensation for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and to adjust with respect thereto the monetary benefits received pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1890. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1947), so as to extend such act to all programs of the Department of Agriculture, and agencies operating under its direction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 1891. A bill to provide that, to minimize the danger of loss of life in hotel fires, the Secretary of Commerce shall establish standards for the construction of hotels and the materials used therein, shall prepare proposals for laws and ordinances embodying such standards, and shall issue certificates of compliance to hotels complying with such standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1892. A bill to authorize voluntary compacts for the coverage of employees of States and the political subdivisions thereof under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1893. A bill to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 1894. A bill to authorize the furnishing of especially equipped automobiles and other conveyances to certain additional disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1895. A bill to transfer the work of collecting and compiling statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1896. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1897. A bill relating to services rendered the Mississippi Choctaws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1898. A bill to amend the last proviso of section 5 of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1899. A bill to grant to members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps who are Government employees the same rights to leave of absence from their civilian duties for the period they are ordered to military duty as are now enjoyed by members of the Officers' Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 97. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 98. Resolution supporting creation of a disarmed, democratic, and self-supporting Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 99. Resolution to define communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, advocating a program of debt and expense reduction in advance of tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the renewal of restrictions on the availability of Federal surplus property to educational institutions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 1900. A bill for the relief of Marie Vickers and Irene Outten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Peter Benezis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSON:

H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of George H. White Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Marcus L. Poteet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Belk; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1905. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hiromi Tojo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Anthony Demetrios Pashalis, also known as Antonio Pashalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Tang Sik Pui, his wife, and his five minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of W. P. Dodds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of William A. Heffelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of John A. Dilboy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Elmer E. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Stilian I. Nicholau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Kosta Gruios or Kosta Gruioff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Tony Popovich, also known as Todar (Theodore) Doneff Pappalazaroff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Bogoia Temelco or Begoia Temelco Simeon or Dimitri Elia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Pete Jankowski or Peter John Jankowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1922. A bill for the relief of Christ Vasiloff Yoveff or Krste Vasili Yovis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1923. A bill for the relief of George C. Jimoyjanis or George C. Jimos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1924. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios George Georgiadis or Dimitri George Georgofski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1925. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Pandelis Theodorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1926. A bill for the relief of Christ George Nicoff or Christo George Spanoupulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 1928. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Sibilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan; his wife, Helen Olga Cogan; and his daughter, Isabel Joan Cogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1931. A bill for the relief of the alien, Michael Soldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1932. A bill for the relief of Leonardus A. M. Grevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosario Andrada Studier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seiko Jane Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

111. Mr. LYNCH presented a petition of the international trade section, New York Board of Trade, New York, N. Y., urging retention in New York City of the Customs Statistics, Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MICHENER.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving and patient Father, as Thy sons and daughters, may we see ourselves endowed with dignity and power and eternal life. Grant that we may meet our obligations with honor, taking no counsel with our fears or questioning the might of Thy wisdom.

Thou, our infinite Creator, didst look upon all Thy works and call them good. O move upon the wills of the nations and call them to unity, impressing them that none can stand founded upon injustice and racial hate. O Christ, brood over this wrongdoing world and sound the trumpet call of good will and brotherhood, for Thou alone canst break the fetters which enchain men.

O great Physician, mercifully remember those who are lonely at their cheerless firesides, and those in pain, waiting for the healing hand. O give them the spirit of joy for the spirit of heaviness.

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow.
Praise Him, all creatures here below.
Praise Him above, ye heavenly host.
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after other Members who have special orders have completed their remarks, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the speech which I made before the Milwaukee Association of Commerce on February 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Legislative Budget may have until

midnight Saturday night in which to file a report required by section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention to present reports simultaneously to the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. TABER. I understand so, although there has been no particular talk about that. We probably could not take it up on the floor before Wednesday in any event. I do not know when it could be taken up in the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. But it will be submitted to the respective Houses simultaneously?

Mr. TABER. I would expect so.

Mr. CANNON. There is no prospect of considering a joint resolution to defer the date?

Mr. TABER. Not so far as I know; I have not heard of any such possibility.

Mr. CANNON. Is it the intention to submit this under a special rule from the Rules Committee?

Mr. TABER. I would expect so.

Mr. CANNON. It is not considered as privileged.

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether it is privileged or not. I have not been into that question at all and have not consulted the Parliamentarian on it. I would expect there would be a rule upon it certainly covering the debate and permitting it to come up.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has not considered the nature of the rule, whether it will be a closed rule?

Mr. TABER. No; I have not considered it at all.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we to understand that the full committee on the budget, as it is called, has taken any action whatsoever on this proposition?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. It has been called to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and I hope they will take action at that meeting or at some other time to which they will adjourn so that a report may be filed by Saturday night.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman has considered the possibility that the committee may not act tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; I have felt that the committee would want to discuss the matter somewhat and that they should be given a reasonable opportunity, insofar as it is possible.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just one more question, if the gentleman will permit: Would it be the intention of the leadership of that committee to hold a session on Saturday in case no agreement can be reached on Friday?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the Joint Committee on the Budget have until midnight Saturday night to file a report?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY AND TUESDAY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making a statement with reference to the program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have before the Appropriations Committee a deficiency estimate carrying some items in connection with the Veterans' Administration and the Division of Disbursements of the Treasury Department and one or two other small items that must be provided for by the 22d of the month. We marked the bill up this morning and expect to report it on Monday. We are hoping that the leadership will permit us to take it up on the floor on Tuesday and dispose of it.

The bill also contains a large number of rescissions of appropriations. I just wanted to make this statement in reference to the bill. I have talked with the Acting Speaker, with the acting majority leader, and with the ranking minority member of the committee with reference to the matter.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. It is the intention of the gentleman, then, to call this up; it is a privileged bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Made up largely of emergency items. It is the gentleman's intention to call it up on Tuesday?

Mr. TABER. Yes. I would like also on Monday, if it is possible, to call up and dispose of a couple of short Senate resolutions with reference to the Senate housekeeping and get rid of them so that we may have our schedule clear.

Mr. CANNON. The report on those two resolutions from the House Committee on Appropriations is unanimous, is it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, I think the House will be very much interested if the gentleman will discuss the program for next week.

Mr. ARENDS. I will be glad to do so. For the information of the House, here is the tentative program for next week:

On Monday we will consider House Joint Resolution 114 from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, extending the power of the Maritime Commission to operate ships until July 1.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is under the War Shipping Board?

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is a very necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that has got to be done before February 28?

Mr. ARENDS. That is right. On Tuesday we will consider a contempt citation from the Committee on Un-American Activities. Then there is the matter which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations just mentioned to the House and which I failed to mention to the majority leader. That is the matter of consideration of an urgent deficiency bill.

On Wednesday we have the legislative budget proposal.

On Thursday we will have House Joint Resolution 121 from the Committee on Ways and Means, an abatement of taxes relative to the United Nations gift. Following that, consideration will be given to H. R. 4, which comes from the Committee on the Judiciary, unanimously reported, Report No. 29.

The balance of the week is undetermined thereafter. However, we hope to express to the leadership on the other side what may follow after that.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it understood, then, that the Eisler contempt matter will come up on Tuesday before the matter that the Appropriations Committee is going to bring up?

Mr. ARENDS. It was placed on the agenda first, and we hope to follow that practice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, or any subcommittee thereof, may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF LANDS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the Washington Post of today that the United States Department of Forestry is contemplating the purchase of five tracts of land in four States; namely, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Maybe it is a good thing to purchase this land in Pennsylvania, I do not know, but I do want to point

out here and now that the Federal Government has been buying so much land in the various States during the past 5, 6, or 10 years that in some of the States the Federal Government owns and controls practically the whole State.

The Members of Congress and the American people should and must remember that the more land the Federal Government buys the greater are the expenses of the Government to maintain it. It is not only the original cost of this land but the amount of money that must be appropriated by the Congress every year to maintain the land under Government control, to say nothing of the loss of taxes to the various States by putting these large tracts of land under Government control.

In my opinion, the time has come when we should put a curb on the various governmental agencies going out and buying land and taking it from the control of the States, whether this land is located in Pennsylvania or any other State. We should move rapidly toward decentralization of the National Government. Let the States and the people of the various States conduct and attend to their own business instead of permitting the Federal Government to supervise and look after not only public lands but everything an individual does in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, it is time that we put a stop to this sort of thing and do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from a magazine which may slightly exceed two pages of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a meeting of the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization, an affiliate of the United Nations designed to take over from UNRRA the care of refugees and displaced persons in Europe, is now being held in Geneva.

The plight of these living dead, the walking casualties of World War II, cries out for help to the conscience of the world. Some 1,000,000 refugees and displaced persons are largely under the care of the United States and Great Britain. Four-fifths of them are Poles, White Russians, and Ukrainians, most of whom refuse to be repatriated because of their opposition to the regimes now governing their countries.

It is a popular misconception that most of these displaced persons are Jews but, in fact, only about 25 percent of the aggregate number in Austria, Italy, and Germany are Jews, while 75 percent are Christians. But this 25 percent, the martyred remnant of the Jews of Europe long only for the true opening of the Jewish national home in Palestine.

The United States is now spending an estimated eight to ten million dollars a month to maintain displaced persons in the American zone of occupation in Europe. Our prospective contribution to the International Refugee Organization is $71,030,000, or roughly about 8 months' operation. The best way to spend money is to try to find a solution.

The United States has sent an official of the State department as a delegate to Geneva and, subject to appropriation by Congress, has subscribed 45.75 percent of the operating budget of the new organization. Even Great Britain, despite her own desperate plight, has agreed to subscribe 14.75 percent, her share of this budget. Canada has joined, too, as have France and Norway, the Philippines, Liberia, and Denmark, and three of our sister American Republics, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Guatemala, thus bringing the organization into reality through agreements to subscribe for almost 75 percent of its budget.

Let us pray that with united effort through this International Refugee Organization and through a just solution in Palestine, a ray of light may be introduced in the blackness—which is life—for the displaced persons and refugees in Europe in 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the importance of education becomes more apparent with the passing years. Our qualified teachers are abandoning their teaching profession for more lucrative pursuits, fewer and fewer graduates are coming from the teachers' colleges, there is widespread discontent among those who have continued teaching despite inadequate pay, and there are overcrowded classrooms and other disheartening conditions. Unless present trends are arrested, teaching may become a vanishing profession.

Education is a matter of national concern. It cannot be disputed that we do not have enough teachers and that many of our schools do not have proper and sufficient equipment with which to properly educate those who will direct the next generation.

Education is not an activity that pertains merely to children and school teachers but has a direct bearing on all of us. Wage earners, housewives, farmers, and businessmen all share in the benefits that education affords and each individual should assume certain obligations toward it.

Last year education stood at the foot of the class when the American people spent $7,000,000,000 for liquor; four billion for race tracks, beauty parlors, and cosmetics; and only $2,500,000,000 for education. It is time to invest more in education.

Our educational program must be in the hands of an adequately trained and skilled leadership compensated in conformity with their work. A Federal-aid provision must be enacted for this purpose. It is evident that there is an increasingly popular demand for such a program.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the ranking members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am introducing a Federal-aid bill for education which will give the underpaid teachers of America an increase in salary. Every elementary and high-school teacher will receive an additional $200 for the school year 1947–48. The cost of this program would amount to approximately $185,000,000.

A RESOLUTION TO DEFINE COMMUNISM

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 99 for the purpose of defining communism. In my opinion, it is time that communism is defined so that there will be no question about its insidious influences and the effect it is having on the people of the United States.

I have introduced this resolution for the purpose of establishing a clear definition of communism that can be easily understood. Heretofore there has been no clear definition, and because of this, many people have sympathized with communism and have become influenced to believe in it. Communism, as a political policy, or as a way of life, is inimical to the people of the United States and incompatible with our form of government. It advocates deceit, conspiracy, confusion, subversion, revolution, and the subordination of man to the state. It is not a political policy alone, but is an international conspiracy and an anti-Christian ideology that would destroy the purposes of the American Government as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

It is time the Congress recognizes the truth about communism, and sets forth a clear definition of it for the protection of the people of the United States.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has recently done this Nation a great service by exposing and revealing the activities of Gerhard Eisler, reported to be the top Communist in this country. This committee now under Republican leadership is doing an outstanding job. Communism must be revealed and exposed and stamped out wherever it is found.

The State legislatures of the various States should study and review their statutes and outlaw the Communist Party in their States. Communism is not a political party, and it should not be recognized as such by any State in the Union.

The people of the United States must be aroused to its dangers and the House of Representatives should clearly define it so that the people of the Nation will have no doubt as to its meaning.

Americanism and communism cannot mix. Christian democracy and communism are incompatible. Freedom and liberty as we know them cannot tolerate communism. We must be vigilant and alert to the wiles and insidious influences it is attempting to inflict upon us. In our schools, in the press, through the radio, and our motion pictures, its agents, and in many cases its unsuspecting adherents, are expounding the theories of communism.

It should be defined so that all will be aware of its dangers to our way of life in the United States.

I trust that the Members of the House will read this resolution, and urge its passage in the near future.

House Resolution 99 reads as follows:

Whereas communism as a political policy, or as a way of life, is inimical to the people of the United States; and

Whereas communism advocates deceit, conspiracy, confusion, subversion, revolution, and the subordination of man to the state; and, because of its practice of deceit and confusion, its real purposes and intentions are clouded and misunderstood to the extent that many persons in the United States have been influenced to believe in and sympathize with communism; and

Whereas there is a pressing need for a clear and easily understandable definition of communism in order to protect the people of the United States from its insidious influence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That communism be defined and declared to be not a political policy, but is an international conspiracy and an anti-Christian ideology which advocates and practices deceit, confusion, subversion, revolution, and the subordination of man to the state, and which has for its purpose and intention the overthrow of any democratic form of government by force and violence, if necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That any person, either citizen or alien, adhering to or expounding the purposes and intentions of communism, should be exposed and revealed as an enemy of the United States and dealt with accordingly.

OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of those who do our economic thinking and planning for us down at the old Civilian Production Administration, now the Office of Temporary Controls, certainly passeth all understanding.

Like every other Member of Congress, I have had many, many appeals through my office and directed to this agency for authority to construct buildings of one type or another. At the present time, or rather up until 2 days ago, there were five such cases still pending through my office.

One, an application for an addition for much-needed extra quarters for a bank, was filed last June and is now pending here on its third appeal.

Another, an application for an addition to a garage, was filed last September. Its fate is the same.

Two others are for churches—for places of worship for needy congregations. One, an addition to a church, has been pending since last September. Another congregation has no place of worship at all except the use of an undertaker's parlor on those Sundays when the undertaker does not require the parlor for the conduct of his own business. The people of this congregation had asked their Government only for authority to build a basement of what might later be their church building, but since the first day of last June the Government planners have continued to say, "No; you dare not do it."

Now comes the crowning blow of all. The fifth case was filed in December, less than 2 months ago. It was an application to build a roller-skating rink. Yes; you guessed it. The wise men of the Office of Temporary Controls 2 days ago gave approval for the construction of the roller-skating rink.

Meanwhile, the bank, the garage, and the two church congregations are still waiting for some action by their Government.

You do not have to be crazy to work for the New Deal, but it helps.

RE-REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bills, H. R. 243, H. R. 507, and H. R. 1184, and that they be referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial character sketch of Abraham Lincoln written in 1860. I do this because I think it is a proper follow-up to the magnificent addresses we listened to yesterday on the birthday of two great liberty-loving men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ATOMIC POWER

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the committee of the other body that is considering to whom is to be entrusted the atomic secrets of America will make haste in its decision while there are still some secrets left. Yesterday, the Office of Technical Services of the United States Department of Commerce issued its monthly magazine, Federal Science Progress, in which is contained an article entitled "Uranium," which includes, among other things, several pictures of the mechanics of fission, a complete atomic power plant, and a formula, in technical and scientific language, for the creation of atomic power. It seems to me of the most vital importance that every Member of both Houses of Congress should send down to the Department of Commerce and get one of these magazines. Perhaps we will not need an atomic commission.

REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as one who promised the people of my district during my recent campaign for reelection that I would vote to cut Government expenditures, I want to reiterate now my desire to see us economize in every possible way. There are many bureaus and agencies here in Washington that should be cut down and cut out, and I believe this Congress is going to do it.

However, I listen with some alarm to loud threats to use the ax on the vital spots of our armed forces. Oh, I grant that a lot of money may be going to waste in the Army and the Navy—I realize many millions already have, because war is a costly business and this last one topped them all.

But I want to raise a finger of warning that Congress must proceed with caution when we start reducing military and naval expenses. They should certainly be reduced and there is probably a lot of room in which to reduce them. But where and how? Before we decide that question, I want to hear from our Committee on Armed Services, from our military leaders, our generals and admirals, who ought to know what the score is.

Briefly, we must proceed cautiously and carefully in planning our national defenses. The country's guard must be kept up and this Congress is responsible for retaining it.

Personally I do not feel we are in immediate danger of attack from any source today. But clouds of trouble often gather in a few hours. We must be ready to meet any exigency.

Then, too, we would waste billions already expended if we did not look after and keep in order the vast stock of remaining weapons and equipment we already have. It took several years of titanic effort on the part of the American people to produce this equipment. Some of it we must dispose of, as we have already, but much of it we must save, use, and renovate from time to time. Such action will prevent great future outlays if the time ever comes when war visits us again, which God forbid.

So I say, let us examine our defenses carefully, let us see how sufficient they are, and just how far we dare go in reducing the Army and Navy budgets. I believe these budgets can be reduced, but I am going to scrutinize matters in this regard very closely before I decide on a final limit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

ARMY AND NAVY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the remarks of my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. It is time that we stop, look, and listen, and realize just what faces our country and the rest of the world at this time and the importance of America maintaining its power—a power to be used for good—the power of America as represented by our economic system and, above all, by our Army, our Navy, and our Air Forces. I am very much concerned about what I read in the newspapers of what is proposed to be done in relation to sharply cutting the Army and Navy. The newspapers say $1,750,000,000 to around $2,000,000,000. We have read in the papers the reaction of Secretary Forrestal and Secretary Patterson and of the War and Navy Departments. Certainly we cannot ignore their statements as powerful pieces of evidence, and, furthermore, we ought to know ourselves just what is necessary for the national interest of our country to maintain the power of our Navy, our Army, and our Air Forces. After the last war we took the journey of false economy under the guise of back to normalcy. The next step then was pacifism, and the next step was isolationism. I hope we are not going to take that journey now. I am glad the gentleman from New York made the statement that he did. We will cooperate with you. The responsibility rests with his party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts from an article from the Southern Progressive, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD in another instance and include an address that he recently made.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. GEORGE CARVER MEMORIAL STAMP

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to go to the White House after a few moments at the Post Office Department with a group of very eminent Americans interested in having a memorial stamp struck off for Dr. George Carver, who was born in Missouri and who worked for many years at Tuskegee Institute, of which I have the privilege of being a member of the board. Americans will be forever grateful that Dr. Carver had the urge and the vision to take the small and insignificant gifts of nature and give them greater stature and a recognition of their values as food for both animals and humans. Few men have contributed so much to the simple people while at the same time opening vast new vistas of science. All the world honors him as one of its eminent scientists.

Dr. Patterson, president of Tuskegee Institute, stated briefly the reason for our presence. The President replied most cordially, recalling his interest while in the Senate in collaborating with the gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, in the establishing of a memorial park at Diamond Grove, Mo., Dr. Carver's birthplace, and paying sincere tribute to Dr. Carver, eminent American. Turning to the Postmaster General, he suggested that the idea of striking a memorial stamp would have his interested approval.

I am glad to report to the Congress the happy reception given the suggestion by the President and feel certain that Congress will anticipate prompt action from the Post Office Department.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday night in which to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OR EMASCULATION OF THE WAGNER ACT IS NOT AN ANSWER TO PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY SUITS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was in 1935 that Congress passed the great Wagner National Labor Relations Act which has done so much for the cause of labor and for the Nation, and has clearly demonstrated its benefits in the last decade.

Now I am informed that a serious and dangerous effort will be made to emasculate the Wagner Act by amendment, or to repeal outright this charter of labor's rights, and at all costs to eliminate those sections on which the portal-to-portal pay suits are based.

SORRY TO HEAR WAR-RICH CORPORATIONS AFFECTED BY ACT

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that this remarkable law may be utilized against those unfortunate companies and corporations which made millions during the war, and barely succeeded in accumulating profits, surplus, and reserves amounting to 26 billions of dollars; and I know it would cost them something if that law, which we passed and the Supreme Court upheld, were to remain in force.

CORPORATION PROFITS AT ALL-TIME HIGH

I know, too, Mr. Speaker, that according to the labor-baiters, corporations are suffering terrific losses at the hands of labor, and the corporations will be destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, the facts disprove these claims.

The official estimates for corporation earnings for the coming year of 1947 show that at the expected rate of national production these corporations for which so many tears are shed will have a clear profit after taxes are paid of more than 16 billion dollars, four times the average profit in the prewar period from 1936–39, inclusive.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are the figures as computed from Department of Commerce statistics:

All corporations

[In billions]

Year:	*Profits after taxes*
1936–39 (average)	$3.9
1942–45 (average)	9.5
1946 (estimate)	11.8
1947 (estimate)	16.1

FAR EXCEED PROFITS UNDER REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS

These figures, Mr. Speaker, do not indicate that any corporations are being destroyed by the Wagner Act. On the other hand, they indicate that since the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, which has helped smooth the way to labor peace and increased output per man-hour, profits have climbed and climbed.

In those lush and happy years under Republican administrations for which businessmen are always pining, when the Government was run by and for business, no such manufacturing profits were ever accumulated. Prosperity is created by spending power, properly exercised. When workers are well paid and have a margin above bare existence, they create their own vast markets for the products—and the profits—of industry.

No, Mr. Speaker, business and industry are not being destroyed by labor, nor hurt by the demands of labor; but our prosperity can be wrecked if the demands of business and industry are given in to.

I fully appreciate the fact that the gentlemen who have received consent to address the House later on, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will, in all likelihood and in their usual way, assail this great law and labor generally, with their distortions and misleading statements; and I shall be surprised if they are not joined in their attacks by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who never permit an opportunity to go by to point out what they call the great danger to the country from the "wealth" and "security" labor has accumulated as a result of the continuous reductions in the cost of living by these benevolent and humane and ever-profit-hungry corporations, cartels, and combinations, notwithstanding the fact that living costs continue to go up and up and real wages to go down and down.

REASONS FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY EXPLAINED

Mr. Speaker, I have here a fair and comprehensive discussion and explanation of the operation of the law in regard to portal-to-portal pay, together with some typical provisions for portal-to-portal pay as embodied in union contracts, and I ask unanimous consent that I may insert this statement as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, since the court decisions upholding the principle of claims for portal-to-portal pay, a vast debate has broken out in both Houses of Congress, in the newspapers, and on the radio. The merits of the claims have become hopelessly obscured by the flood of propaganda from both sides.

Dismissal of the Mount Clemens Pottery Co. suit has not, to my mind, in any way impaired the validity of the principle under which that and other civil suits were brought. It is no answer merely to threaten to repeal those portions of the Wagner Act under which the action was initiated, for that does not eliminate a continuing source of bad relations with workers.

PAY CLAIMS COMPARABLE TO MANUFACTURERS' CLAIMS FOR REIMBURSEMENT

The portal-to-portal pay claims are not just for pay for walking in and out of the plant, as some have claimed. They are requests by the men that they be paid for the time they put in before the shift begins setting up their machines and getting ready to operate, and after the shift cleaning up and putting away tools, and other travel in the plant premises necessary to the job.

This is far more justifiable than the millions of dollars paid to war contractors operating under cost-plus contracts for time when they kept hundreds, or even thousands, of men waiting around doing nothing, for which they were fully reimbursed and usually made a profit. It is more justifiable than the payments made to war contractors who did research for peacetime operations, or even set up their machines, and fully reconverted their factories, and charged it all to the Government. The report of the Office of Contract Settlement, United States Treasury, which we have just received, tells some of the story on that.

If you read the financial pages of the newspapers, or the Washington News Letters, or even our Government reports, you will know that business is in pretty good shape. The few manufacturers operating at a loss in the present market are simply inefficient managers. The only exceptions I make are for those few who are genuinely unable to obtain materials because in mistaken zeal they demanded that all controls be removed from the things they needed and those who got there first with the most money cornered the materials.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY RICHARD T. LEONARD, VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW-CIO), TO THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

I am vice president of the international union, UAW-CIO. Our union has assisted its members in the filing of a number of suits against employers for back pay due them under the Fair Labor Standards Act. On behalf of our members who have filed these suits, I desire to register our objection to the numerous proposals now before the Senate to deprive them of their claims even before the courts have had an opportunity to pass upon them.

First, let me clarify the nature of our claims. The impression has been created that the so-called portal-to-portal claims consist only of walking time. Such an impression is completely untrue. A large proportion of the claims represents time necessarily consumed in preparing for work, such as changing into uniforms or special equipment, obtaining tools at the company's tool cribs, and setting up machines. Included in these claims is also time spent in returning tools to the tool crib, changing into street clothes, and cleaning up.

The time so spent is work actually required by the job and not merely to suit the convenience of the employee. Numerous decisions of the courts and rulings of the Wage and Hour Administrator over the years have held that time spent in these activities constitutes working time. There is no reason why an employer should not pay a worker for time so spent.

These claims also include time spent traveling to and from the job on the company premises. Contrary to the impression now sought to be created by employers, the workers have a reasonable and legal basis for claiming that travel time spent on the employers' premises in order to get to and from the job constitutes time worked for which they should be paid. A worker has only his time to sell. Once he enters the employer's premises, his time is no longer his own. It belongs to the employer. He is subject to plant rules and regulations from the time he enters the plant gate until he leaves the factory grounds. He may be discharged or disciplined for acts which his employer holds to be in violation of such rules and regulations, even though he is not actually at work on his job when such acts occur.

The second point I would like to make to this committee is that employers have long known that workers have claimed that travel time spent on the company's premises, and preparation, and clean-up time, are working time and should be paid for as such. As early as 1939 employers were advised by the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, that time spent in preparation for work constituted time worked. In 1944, employers were advised by the United States Supreme Court in the Tennessee Coal and Iron case that travel time would be considered as working time.

Furthermore, in collective bargaining our unions have always taken the position that travel time, preparatory and clean-up time and other similar work should be compensated by the employer. Many employers have agreed to pay for these activities and have included provisions in the contract which provides for their payment. I attach a typical list of such contract clauses.

The employers' claim of surprise is hypocritical and without any basis in fact. It is made only in an effort to influence the courts and Congress against the legitimate right of the workers to have their claims determined fairly by the courts.

Finally I would like to answer some of the hysterical attacks that have been made against workers for daring to file their claims in court. They have been called hijackers and racketeers and many other names. Workers are accustomed to such epithets when they go out on strike. During such strikes, they are usually condemned for having used their economic power instead of going into the courts. They are usually told that justice can be found in the courts rather than on the picket line. Now when they go into court they are called racketeers and hijackers. It doesn't seem to make much difference what the workers do to increase their earnings and better their conditions. If they make any concerted effort in that direction, whether they go into the courts or on the picket lines, they will be condemned. With the workers, it appears to be a case of "damned if you do and damned if you don't."

Only recently the miners went out on strike in an effort to obtain higher wages. When the court issued an injunction prohibiting the strike, the miners were violently condemned for not going back to work and allowing the court to determine the legal questions involved. Today the same employers and the same newspapers who condemned the miners for not going into the courts to have their legal rights determined are condemning the workers for taking their claims for back pay into court.

Apparently industry is unwilling to have the courts decide an issue unless they are reasonably certain the courts will decide in their favor. If the chances are not weighted in advance in their favor, they come to Congress. This jockeying by industry between Congress and the courts to win a decision

against the workers only convinces the workers that they cannot obtain impartial justice. This aspect of the problem is more fundamentally important to our Nation than whether employers will be required to pay the claims of the workers. It undermines the confidence of American workers in the institutions of our Government.

Only last year industry came to Congress and obtained passage of a law which would give industry oil rights in the marginal land of the State of California at a time when the Government was attempting, successfully, to establish the right of the people in this oil by a suit in the courts, and it was by virtue of the veto of the President that the issue remains one which will be determined by the courts on the basis of the law rather than through the pressure of those who seek to use Congress to further their private interests.

Industry bewails the fact that these claims total billions of dollars, which, if collected, will bankrupt it. The amount the workers will finally be awarded by the courts, if they are successful, will undoubtedly be less than is now claimed However, it should be noted that industry has not felt hesitant about asking for and actually obtaining several billion dollars in tax refunds from the Treasury, as disclosed in the President's tax message to Congress.

If industry obtains billions in back tax refunds under the income-tax law from the Treasury, it is viewed as its just right under the law. But when the workers of industry merely file suit to recover back pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act, they are violently attacked as racketeers and hijackers and Congress is asked to leap and rescue industry from the courts.

Why should employers who have sought to avoid full compliance with the law over the past 7 years be relieved of the consequences of their own violations—at the expense of those whom they have deprived of their full compensation? Whether a wage-hour claim is so stale that it should be barred should be determined, as in the case of all other claims, by the applicable statute of limitations as construed by the courts.

If the Supreme Court were to rule that a corporate-tax assessment levied by Congress and paid by the corporations 6 years ago was an unconstitutional exercise of legislative power, would there be any reluctance on the part of the affected corporations to file suit for repayment—in full? And would the press go into convulsions when they did so?

Are the rights of employees to be treated as inferior to the rights of their employers?

TYPICAL PROVISIONS IN UAW-CIO CONTRACTS PROVIDING PAYMENT FOR PREPARATION FOR WORK, CLEAN-UP, PUNCHING-OUT TIME, WALKING TIME, ETC.

Transmission division of Clark Equipment Co. and local 485, Berrien Springs, Mich.: Article VII, section 11: It is agreed between the company and the union that a 5-minute wash-up period before the established lunch period and before the regular quitting time be established without loss of pay. A signal will sound 5 minutes prior to the established lunch period and the regular quitting time. Employees violating this section shall be subject to immediate disciplinary action.

Republic Filters, Inc., and local No. 574, Newark, N. J.: Article IV: I. The company agrees to allow a 5-minute clean-up period before lunch and a 5-minute clean-up period before quitting.

Young Radiator Co. and local No. 37, Racine, Wis.: Article IX, 41: A 5-minute wash-up period shall be granted to all employees before the end of each shift except that the following classes of employees shall receive the following additional time or flat fee per day:

Millwrights and maintenance—Additional 5 minutes extra time.

Testers—Additional 5 minutes which shall be paid at rate of flat 10 cents per day.

Solderers—Additional 5 minutes which shall be paid at rate of flat 10 cents per day.

Bake-oven men and dippers—Additional 5 minutes which shall be paid at rate of flat 10 cents per day.

Painters—Additional 10 minutes which shall be paid at rate of flat 20 cents per day.

Bingham Stamping Co. and local No. 12, Toledo, Ohio: Article VI, section 8: Female employees shall be allowed to ring out at the end of the shifts at the first 5-minute whistle and get paid for the full 8 hours.

Candler Hill Corp. and local No. 174, Detroit, Mich.:

Article VII, section 5: the company agrees that all female employees shall be given a 10-minute rest period during the first 4 hours of their shift and a 10-minute rest period the second 4 hours of their shift. They shall also be permitted to stop work and leave their jobs 5 minutes before lunch time and 5 minutes before quitting time.

The company agrees that all male employees shall be given a 5-minute rest period during the first 4 hours of their shift and a 5-minute rest period during the second 4 hours of their shift. They shall also be permitted to stop work and leave their jobs 5 minutes before lunch time and 5 minutes before quitting time.

Difco Laboratories, Inc., and local No. 246, Detroit, Mich.:

Article VI, section 6: employees shall be allowed a 5-minute wash period before the lunch hour and a 10-minute wash period before the quitting hour.

Conveyor Engineering Co., Inc., and Local No. 935, Detroit, Mich.:

Article XI, section 2: a 10-minute rest period shall be given all employees before and after lunch on all shifts.

Section 3: A 5-minute wash-up period shall be granted all employees before lunch and quitting time.

Ackerman, Blaesser & Fezzey, Inc., and local 157, Detroit, Mich.:

Article VI, section 7: It is agreed that a 5-minute wash-up period shall be allowed for all employees at quitting time.

Section 10: At the end of the day's work, all female employees will be allowed to leave the plant 5 minutes before the whistle blows.

Briggs Manufacturing Co. and local Nos. 212, 265, and 742, Michigan and Indiana:

Article VI, section 1: Employees shall be granted 5 minutes at the end of each shift to return their tools to the cribs and for such other preparations that are essential before leaving the department.

Cadillac motor car division, General Motors Corp. and local No. 114, plant protection: 59. Employees will be paid at their respective rates for four-tenths hour per day, which allowance will be compensation for time prior to post duty for preparation, roll call, post assignment, instruction, and going to post, and for time after post duty for returning from post and turning in daily reports.

THE POSTMASTER'S POLITICAL SPEECH TO FEDERAL WORKERS WAS UNTIMELY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker it seems to me Mr. Hannegan, Postmaster General, followed poor judgment in using his invitation as an honored guest at a dinner given in his honor by a group of Federal workers to announce his candidate for President.

According to press reports, Mr. Hannegan was invited to speak at a dinner meeting at the big Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, where 2,000 postal supervisors and other Government employees were in attendance. Mr. Hannegan is Postmaster General and a member of the President's Cabinet. He is also the national chairman, the highest official, in his political party.

I know full well Mr. Hannegan has a right to announce his candidate for President where he pleases. I do think, however, it shows rather poor taste for him to go there as Postmaster General and then step out of that role and, as chairman of a political party, use Government employees under his Department as a sounding board to announce his candidate for the highest political office in the land. It is unusual that on an occasion of this kind the Postmaster General would devote most of his speech dealing with political matters.

Again, I do not want to be misunderstood. Mr. Hannegan probably had a right to do the thing to which I have called your attention, but I think he used extremely bad taste in taking advantage of his political position to use 2,000 Government workers, at a banquet given in his honor, as a political sounding board.

DR. CARVER

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much delighted to hear the words of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] when she told us there would be a memorial stamp issued in the memory of a great American, one who, though born in Missouri as the gentlewoman stated, did at least the greater part of his fine work for humanity in my State of Alabama. Dr. Carver is regarded by the people of Alabama not only as one of the great citizens of our State, but as one of the great citizens, one of the great scientists, one of the great leaders of all time, of the United States. Hence, it affords me unusual pleasure to join the gentlewoman from Ohio in the very appropriate gratification she expressed that this highly appropriate honor will be paid to this great American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Herbert H. Meyers before the Fertilizer Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune and a statement of my own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN PROMISES

Mr. HOFFMAN. "Stop, look, and listen," said the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] repeated the warning. The argument seems to be that no matter what the request of the Army, the Navy, the One-Worlders, or those who want the American taxpayer to feed, clothe, house, and keep in idleness inhabitants of all the rest of the world, if this Congress attempts to practice economy along any line, it will necessarily deprive the country of adequate defense. That is all nonsense. Everyone wants not only an adequate national defense, but plenty over and above what will give us an adequate defense.

For myself I would make our military might equal to that of any possible combination of armed force which can be brought against us but that is no reason why billions of dollars should be wasted by those in charge of our national defense and I, for one, propose to do my part to prevent needless, wasteful spending, no matter what executive agency attempts to follow that course. Now, it is just too bad that those two gentlemen did not think of that slogan about 10 years ago.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I was not here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that if he was not here then he has certainly by strenuous service made up for it since he came here. If my recollection serves me correctly, the gentleman from New York has always been a great champion of everyone who wanted something or who might appreciate something. I recall his latest thought, just a couple of days ago, when he wanted every American housewife given a bonus of 5 pounds of sugar. I am with him on that if some way to do it can be devised.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Twenty-five pounds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How much?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Twenty-five pounds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am with you on that. I will make it 50. Why not? It is all right to advocate this, that, or the other thing if we do not raise false hopes—it is all very fine, but unfortunately it just cannot be done. Mind you, we would all do all these generous things if we could, but we know those things cannot be done—so why try to fool the home folks? It certainly does step up postal receipts for it makes a lot of people write in to us backing up those wonderful ideas that come to the active and fertile mind of our young and enthusiastic friend. Sure, his wonderful ideas have increased the postal receipts because a lot of folk write us asking us to get behind the many alluring ideas he suggests. No one can accuse him of not presenting pleasing plans. Yes; I am back of the gentleman from New York, but we all know that many of the gifts he advocates cannot be made. The gentleman advocated bringing back the soldiers from Europe when they were overseas. He advocated sending the boys home on furlough at Government expense at Christmastime. We knew it could not be done, but it was a pleasant thought. I would like to have done it, Eddie, I sure would, but you just cannot bring those things about. Unfortunately the plans he proposed raised false hopes in the minds of many of the parents. And I will say that I was kept busy answering requests that we get behind our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. The gentleman from Massachusetts said: "Stop, look, and listen!" Sure, his party has been spending money for the last 10 years until the national debt has been rolled up to where the interest charge alone amounts to $3 per month on every American in the United States. Why did you not think about that when you were advocating that Harry Hopkins' program and all those other wasteful spending programs? It is too late, you know, too late, to remedy that and now along comes the Chicago Tribune, a great newspaper, a newspaper that is probably responsible more than any publication in the United States for the election of Republicans from the Midwest. Another paper down there, the South Bend Tribune, published by our good friend, Mr. Miller, preached along the same line. It did not have quite as large a circulation but it did just as fine work in its territory. Another paper that did as good work as some of the dailies is one published in the little town of Cassopolis every week by William Berkey, week after week preaching the principle of Americanism, preaching the true doctrine of Americanism.

Now comes the Chicago Tribune, and what does it say? I asked the former Speaker of the House, the present minority leader, if he would object if I quoted from this Tribune editorial which I will insert in the RECORD. I will read only a part of it now. It is captioned "Republican promises."

It reads in part:

Sooner or later—

And by the way, I may say that the former Speaker consented that I might read this. He said he had read it. I only wonder that he or some other Democrat did not call it to our attention. I thought I had better do it for certainly we will be reminded of its contents. I read:

Sooner or later the Republican Congress will get around to passing some kind of a tax bill providing some kind of a tax cut. Sooner or later the Republicans will balance the budget with something over for debt reduction. Sooner or later they will revise the labor laws to prevent the abuses that have grown in the shadow of the Norris-LaGuardia and the Wagner Acts and other labor legislation.

All of this we can believe; and we can even hope that the majority one of these days will make its will known in the field of foreign relations.

I will skip a little. Again I read:

What we cannot understand, however, is the miserable failure.

I should have skipped those words.

What we can't understand, however, is the miserable failure of the Republicans to honor their promises on any of these subjects with promptness and decision.

Note that, "promptness and decision."

I drop down to another paragraph:

We have heard the excuses and we don't think much of them. This Congress, it is said, is moving more rapidly than most of its predecessors. No one who remembers how speedily Congress could push through appropriations for war will believe this tale; and even if it were true, what of it?

I will not read the rest of it. I will print it at the end of these observations together with a statement I made on the 8th of the month, just 3 days preceding this editorial.

Mr. RANKIN. Read the rest of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who has secured so much cheap light for constituents through the TVA down in his area, electricity being as cheap as it is, may read it in the RECORD of tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. In the TVA area we have——

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have more farms in Michigan which have electricity from private ownership, twice over, than you have in Mississippi from the TVA.

Mr. RANKIN. You get it from the REA.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I add a word? She said to him, "Did you not promise me you would have eyes and look at no other woman but me?" He said, "Did you not recognize that as a campaign promise?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the sentiment expressed by a great Republican one time when he was referring to certain utterances of a former President, a President who ran on the so-called Democratic ticket, although it was not that at all.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And four times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, what is the purpose of this? Last week I put out a statement which I will insert in the RECORD, entitled "You Are in a Hurry, So Are We. Do Not Be Impatient." I am saying that now to the editors of the Chicago Tribune. I am afraid some people do not realize the sort of a task we have, nor do they realize how habit slows us down. Nor have they the slightest idea of how the people accustomed to getting something for nothing from the New Deal now insist upon more and greater appropriations, while at the same time demanding that we cut the tax bill. The last Congress gave us a reorganization bill. We have been trying to get familiar with the working tools that we have. This, I wrote on the 8th:

Some radio commentators, columnists, certain editors, and New Deal spokesmen who thought the New Deal should last forever, who were not only bitterly disappointed when the returns of the November last election were in but seemed to be thoroughly convinced that the American people neither knew what they were doing nor what was good for them when they registered their protest against wasteful spending, inefficiency, and regimentation are now shouting that the Republican Congress is a do-nothing Congress.

May I say that we might better be a do-nothing Congress than go ahead and

wreck the country as did the New Dealers during the past 10 or 12 years. They did not keep us out of war; they raised heck—get that word "heck," not the other word—with our whole domestic economy; put people under regimentation and bureaucratic control; and gave us, I will admit, a New Deal Supreme Court, which the other day rendered 12 opinions—was it—in 3 cases, or was it just 9? Read them. It will do your heart good, or will it?

Here is the point in the whole thing:

If this Congress, in 6 months, gives the country worth-while labor legislation, ends the abuses which have been, and are being, practiced by some Government agencies, it will have done a real worth-while job.

May I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who is talking about the Wagner Act, that he go over to the hearings now being held in the caucus room by the House Committee on Labor and learn something. The gentleman is clear out of date, way back beyond the "horse and buggy" days. Back with Noah and the Ark. Go over there and hear how the Wagner Act has been and is being used to protect racketeers, how men go out under the shadow of the protection of the Labor Board and shake down the employers; oh, yes; the employees, too, day after day, week after week. That is what is being done. That has been the practice for the past 10 years.

If there is any one thing in this country that needs to be repealed, it is that Wagner Act; the National Labor Relations Act and this committee, unless I mistake its temper, will give us worthwhile, just, equitable labor legislation which, for the first time, will protect not only the union but the individual worker, the man who does the work. It will protect the employer and—something you never on your side thought of during the last 10 years—it will protect the great American public from the racketeering that was built up while the New Deal was in power.

Now, our chairman said last night, I understand from the press, that they were going to wait until the other body got through considering labor legislation and brought out a bill. I want to go along. I am supposed to be, and I am trying, oh, so hard, to be a regular Republican—to go along with the leadership. I am trying hard, and I hope, if I ever slip, as I may, that the boys will forgive me and let me try once more. But, if I had my way, the House Committee on Labor would bring out within a week a labor bill and submit it to the judgment of the House. Everyone who is a Member of this House knows that it took 2 years, two long years, after we passed the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, for the other body to get it out of the dust under which it was buried over there and put it on the books.

This House has a responsibility laid upon it by the people in the November election. We cannot shirk that responsibility by waiting for the other body to act.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COX. The criticism that is implied from the remarks of the gentleman is becoming widespread. I think the country is beginning to feel that there is too much temporizing. It is my view that the gentleman is correct; that this House ought not to wait but go forward in the doing of those things which the country needs so badly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Seldom does a day pass that I do not get from the home folks two or three letters raking me over the coals because our Committee on Labor has not written a bill. Let me read from a letter received from an old friend in the town where I was raised. This letter came in on the 3d and a copy went to Senator TAFT:

The publicity coming from Washington makes me feel a little bit ill. I had looked forward with pleasure to seeing the old gang of New Dealers kicked out of there, but if all the Republicans have to offer is a 10-percent reduction from the thirty-seven billion budget that "Light Horse Harry" proposed, then it shall be my future policy to definitely stay away from the polls.

There is still one thing worse than a financially bankrupt nation, and that one thing is a morally bankrupt nation. Even though a man is a politician there are times when his promises should be kept.

The other day I had a conversation with Art Beesley on the street and Art excused you fellows in Washington, saying there had been commitments made that would prohibit a sizable reduction for the budget beginning next July 1. If the Republicans do not reduce this budget to a reasonable figure, I definitely am not going to vote, because I will have decided there isn't much difference.

We have heard you and the rest of your party members condemn Franklin D. Roosevelt for the lies he told and got away with, and now it seems to me you are following in his footsteps. Probably Mr. Truman cooperated by raising his budget 10 percent over what he had expected to get, and then you fellows come along and shadow box and reduce it 10 percent—so we are no better off than we would have been had control rested with the spendthrifts who were in power last year.

Probably the rank and file of the people do not have enough faith in public opinion to even write to their Representative to bring this matter up, but I am still gullible enough to believe there may still be some hope. You will note I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to Senator ———. Perhaps he will realize that there may be two or three people in every small town (such as myself) who will control a dozen or more votes in 1948, and who may decide it would be just as well to leave Mr. Truman in as it would to put Mr. ——— or some of his would-be nominees up for President.

I don't like to write this kind of letter, but I have been giving it a good deal of thought each week when I pay my helper in the office, and as March 15 draws near, when I will again be called on to write a sizable check to help pay for the money wasted by our bureaucrats (both Republican and Democrat) in Washington.

These remarks are not leveled at you, but, as far as I am concerned, the Republicans are going to catch it in the future just the same as the New Dealers did last fall, and I know a few other people in this community who feel the same way.

That letter was written by a lifelong Republican—it is hard to take.

I realize that the writing of a tax bill is a tremendous task, and as to that legislation I am satisfied to leave it with the Committee on Ways and Means, as nonpartisan a committee as the House could possibly create.

As for the labor legislation, I think it is time that the Labor Committee, if some folks will only let it or encourage it to act, can write a bill which will be just to all parties. We intend to do just that. We intend to take time enough to write a worth-while bill, but it is my hope we will not wait for the Senate—we all know what will happen if we wait for the Labor Committee of that body.

For 12 long years this labor has been building up. It can't be taken apart all at once, or in a few moments. When you wreck a skyscraper you do not blow it up by dynamite, you take it apart piece by piece, beginning at the top, then erect a new—a better structure. That is just what we are doing with the left wing, communistic, New Deal machine.

The New Dealers are in control down there in the departments at the other end of the Avenue, as you gentlemen all know. So I would like to say to the editors of the Chicago Tribune, I sympathize with you, I share your impatience, because from my own folks at home I get the same thought that is expressed in that editorial. But neither the editors nor the folks at home realize the magnitude, the tightness, the power of this machine that exists here in the executive departments in Washington. So I do hope that they will not be impatient with us; that they will give us an opportunity before they bear down too hard. I know, for myself, that this 8-hour day, 40-hour week has no application and I know that many Members on the majority side you will find over here in their offices long before this 9-o'clock dead line in the morning and long after 5 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have as much interest in getting proper legislation, I think, as any Member of the House. I do not agree with the criticism of the present Labor Committee for holding hearings. I think if every Member of this House would go and sit in those labor hearings and hear the things I have heard in the last 3 days they would more thoroughly realize the absolute necessity for some restraint on present conditions. For instance, yesterday I believe you had up the question of the racketeering in the beer industry in the city of Pittsburgh, a terrific thing, practically a state of revolution that exists there, and yet no Members of the House know about that except those who choose to attend these committee hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the Members of this House and the public could

know what is going on in the way of hearings before that committee, they would be better educated to do the job that so vitally needs doing.

You had up the day before, I recall, the question of the fruit and produce dealers in the city of Philadelphia, where the whole business of distributing necessary food to the people of that city, a city of a million and a half people, has been absolutely paralyzed for a period of 6 weeks because of a boycott arrangement. If you gentlemen could hear those things and know them, you would realize that the Committee on Labor is working hard and conscientiously and trying to bring before this body a bill based upon those hearings and so drafted as to give the relief that is so vitally needed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let there be no misunderstanding as to my position. I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman from Virginia has just said. My only thought is that some of these hearings do not give us any new information on the methods and procedure that have been followed for 10 years. For example, this hearing about the Philadelphia Record, that was all very fine, but what it amounted to was that Mr. Stern had taken a group to his heart, and they just chewed and clawed him all up when they got around to it. That is all that hearing demonstrated.

I can cite here the case of Norman Zalezzi down in Indianapolis, where the NLRB, through Dorothy L. Craig, one of their examiners, or agents, went around and asked those who advertised in the paper how much they were paying for advertising, and so sought to drive that paper out of business—a damnable case—and all because the editor ventured to express an opinion in an editorial that the CIO did not like.

I can cite you this hearing over there in the caucus room where we heard about a man who was running a dairy, with 10 employees, mostly his own folks, had a couple of hundred pickets thrown around his place, and they beat up one of the members of the family, or an employee. The places where these things happen are new. The people oppressed and beaten are not the ones who suffered before, but the procedure and the methods are the same—they follow the Communist lines. Those things are all bad. The point is that most of the facts are but a repetition of what has happened in years gone by and continuously been indulged in right down to the present moment. The gentleman from Virginia himself held hearings back in 1940. There are five or six books setting forth what he found, and the situation he brought to light was rotten; and the House twice, by a 2-to-1 vote, passed worth-while legislation. Where was it buried? In the other body—the body whose pleasure we are now asked to wait. I want none of that program. If you will read the testimony taken and the reports filed by the gentleman's committee, you will find the most damnable things detailed there, so unjust one hardly believes them—a record that is a disgrace to any nation which claims to guarantee freedom to its people. That is why I am anxious to get at the real trouble, for example, with these produce men up there in Philadelphia. The union, it is said, stopped the work of distributing produce to the people of Philadelphia.

Tomorrow morning, may I say to the gentleman, we are going to start in another committee, the Committee on Expenditures, and we are going to have in the Department of Justice expert on racketeering. We are going to give him a copy of the testimony taken by the Committee on Labor, not call the same witnesses but give him a copy, and we are going to ask him how come that the provisions of the Hobbs Antiracketeering Act are not enforced, if they have been violated, and if there is now no law to prevent a similar situation being brought about. Then we will offer a bill to give us one. Then we are going to ask him, "If that is a violation, are you going to do anything about it?" Then we are going to ask him, "When are you going to do it?" If he does not do anything, we are going to have him back the next week or the week after and ask him again, until we find out whether there is in these United States of ours any law to protect men who want to work, farmers who ship produce into Philadelphia and other cities. That is what we are after. That is why, when I know that for 10 long years there have been beatings and sluggings and destruction of property, I get a little impatient—a little, just a little impatient—when I learn that a man has been beaten, when I learn that a man has been driven out of business, where the activities are all in violation, plain violation, of the law of the land.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] so well said, we must proceed with deliberation. Perhaps I am mistaken and it is necessary to once more drag across the stage the bloody dead body of American freedom; perhaps we must once more plant in lurid colors a picture of communistic activities being carried on in the industrial world—all designed to create civil strife. Perhaps, in order to arouse this or the other body to the necessity of labor legislation which will protect the right of the American citizen to work, the right of employer to carry on his business, the safety, health, and welfare of the public, we must have this parade of witnesses, this detailing of lawlessness, of violence. If that be necessary, so be it and let the hearings go on.

The overwhelming majority has heard the story so often, know the pattern that is being followed, that majority must realize that a law protecting the right to work, prohibit jurisdictional and secondary strikes, boycotts, outlawing violence, must be enacted by this Congress if it is to fulfill the expectations of the voters who sent it here.

The home folks know the situation. In my judgment, they know what they want. I hope we can give it to them without undue delay. Again, I repeat, I cannot see how anything is to be gained by waiting for the other body. It may, or it may not, put forth what the people want. Our responsibility is direct—we cannot shift it.

Perhaps I am too impatient. I often am. If I am, I know others who are altogether too slow, and if we can hit on a happy medium we might all be happier.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Dave Stern, the former owner of the Philadelphia Record, is not only reaping what he sowed but, according to the statement of the gentleman from Virginia, the people of Philadelphia are reaping what Dave Stern sowed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and so are the farmers all through the country because from California and Florida and Maine, and other States, this produce goes into the market, and when it gets down there this union ties it up and it cannot be sold, but is left to rot, or is sent to other markets. The editorial from the Chicago Tribune and a possible answer written 8 days before the editorial are as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 11, 1947]

REPUBLICAN PROMISES

Sooner or later the Republican Congress will get around to passing some kind of a tax bill providing some kind of a tax cut. Sooner or later the Republicans will balance the budget with something over for debt reduction. Sooner or later they will revise the labor laws to prevent the abuses that have grown in the shadow of the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts and other labor legislation.

All this we can believe; and we can even hope that the majority one of these days will make its will known in the field of foreign relations despite all the nonsense being uttered by influential Members of the House and Senate in the name of a bipartisan foreign policy.

What we can't understand, however, is the miserable failure of the Republicans to honor their promises on any of these subjects with promptness and decision. Nobody can get himself elected to the House or the Senate who hasn't a reasonably well-developed sensitivity to the movement of public opinion. Surely the Congressmen, and we should think especially the new ones, know how grievously the people are disappointed with the record to date. The voters resent, and have a right to resent, the passage of a month and more with nothing accomplished, with every opportunity muffed, with every hope that brought about the great victory in November left unfulfilled.

We have heard the excuses and we don't think much of them. This Congress, it is said, is moving more rapidly than most of its predecessors. No one who remembers how speedily Congress could push through appropriations for war will believe this tale; and even if it were true, what of it? The Republicans have failed to fulfill their promise, particularly in the matter of the tax cut. If they had shaken the lead from their pants, had overcome the normal inertia at the beginning of a new session, and the special difficulties that the congressional reorganization bill is said to have created, the country would know that Republicans honor their word promptly and move with resolution. That would have done more to assure a victory in the national election in 1948 than anything else that is likely to happen in the meanwhile, for first impressions are strong. What the Republicans may eventually get around to do will not be nearly as important in forming a favorable public opinion.

All too many of the men who should be congressional leaders can't bring themselves to realize that they are no longer members of a minority. That was their status for so

many years that they have lost what it takes to assume the initiative. More than that, the New Deal is still immensely powerful in the social life of Washington. The embassy crowd must play up to the New Dealers. All the heads of departments and bureaus are New Dealers. Washington is a city of jobholders intent on holding their jobs. The climate of opinion in the Capital is making Congress sluggish and ineffective.

Precious time has been lost. Factionalism within the Republican Party has been encouraged at a time when prompt action could have established a habit of cooperation and the quick compromise of minor disagreements. The public is disappointed and its feeling will soon be converted into active resentment unless the Republican leadership shakes itself free of its indecision.

YOU ARE IN A HURRY—SO ARE WE

DON'T BE IMPATIENT

Some radio commentators, columnists, some editors and New Deal spokesmen who thought the New Deal should last forever, who not only were bitterly disappointed when the returns of the November election were in, but seemed to be thoroughly convinced that the American people neither knew what they were doing or what was good for them when they registered their protest against wasteful spending, inefficiency, and regimentation, are now shouting that the Republican Congress is a do-nothing Congress. The wish is the father of the statements they make.

If they voiced their thoughts and their desires, we would learn they would be supremely happy if the Eightieth Congress did nothing. Deep down in their hearts they hoped that when the new Members of Congress came to Washington, their home folks would be forgotten. They hoped that social functions and the momentum of the New Deal would continue in force the policies of the last 12 years. Their thought—let the band play on—to heck with the cost.

President Truman was a great disappointment to them. Shrewd politician that he is, he recognized the election for what it was—a demand for a change. Looking for a smoke screen—a red herring—without delay he sanctioned the less effective, less drastic plans of the Republican leaders. He went as far as he could without really hurting his political machine.

DON'T WORRY

The mandate of the people will be carried out by the Eightieth Congress. There will be a reduction in the tax burden. There will be a reduction in Federal bureaus, agencies, and employees in those departments of the Federal Government where economy can be practiced without impairing essential public service. Whether a reduction in expenses or a lessening of the tax burden should come first is an open question. In my humble judgment, we should have both and without any more than the delay necessary to chart the proper course.

The House yesterday, when by more than a two-thirds vote, decided to submit to the people the question of whether Presidential terms should be limited to two, took an effective first step to block a trend which might give us a dictator.

Several committees of the Congress are carrying on quiet, painstaking investigations which in the end will give us worth-while results in the way of exposing reprehensible practices, curtailing needless bureaus, preventing unnecessary expenditures, creating greater and less-costly efficiency. In both Senate and House labor legislation—sound, just, worth-while labor legislation—is being formulated.

If this Congress in 6 months gives the country worth-while labor legislation, ends the abuses which have been and are being practiced by some Government agencies, it will have done a real worth-while job. The House is well on its way to do just that, so—

DON'T BE IMPATIENT

Your Representatives are on the job, and they are working—you have no idea just how continuously, earnestly.

Unless all signs fail, the people will get at least the major portion of what they want, and that right soon.

For 14 long years this thing has been building up. It can't be taken apart all at once, or in a few moments. When you wreck a skyscraper you don't blow it up by dynamite; you take it apart piece by piece, beginning at the top, then erect a new, a better structure. That is just what we are doing with the left-wing, communistic, New Deal machine. The days of borrowing and spending, of giving away America, are, we hope, at an end.

Sincerely,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Your Representative.

FEBRUARY 8, 1947.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. KILBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered at Asheville, N. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ALASKA

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, after the adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs made an official visit to a number of our Pacific military establishments. The committee had a threefold responsibility. It was charged with the study of installations, observation of troop morale, and the investigation of surplus-property disposal. A number of statements on these subjects were issued while our work was in progress and immediately upon our return to this country.

Some of our recommendations were promptly put into effect by the services. All of them were given careful attention and study. At all times we were accorded courtesy and full cooperation by the representatives of our Government, both military and civilian.

It is my desire to speak in detail from time to time regarding specific phases of the committee's findings. I wish to emphasize the fact that I do not speak for the committee. The statements that I make are my own analysis.

Today I beg your indulgence while I talk about Alaska. To me its present-day importance to the defense of this hemisphere has never been adequately stressed.

The continuing development of aircraft is materially altering the basic concepts of American defense. No longer, for instance, do the historic Hawaiians hold the key to our western approaches. The mortar is barely dry in the magnificent post Pearl Harbor fortifications but there is little likelihood that they will ever be subjected to attack by enemy nations.

Alaska and the Aleutians now hold the spotlight. They are the key to the back door of American defense. Who controls Alaska and the Aleutians, controls the north Pacific. But these have no fortifications such as Pearl Harbor inspired in the Hawaiians. They are wide open to attack. And there will not be time to fortify them after the next Pearl Harbor.

To most Americans, Alaska is a vague, faraway land of snow and ice. They know that Seward—or somebody—bought it from the Russians for seven and one-half millions and was roundly criticised for his pains; that fur, fish, and gold made it a paying proposition. That is about as far as it goes.

Most of us do not realize that Alaska is only 7 or 8 hours by air from the United States mainland. Certainly we have failed to grasp the fact that Alaska and the Aleutians are now within bombing range of Tokyo, Vladivostok, Honolulu, San Francisco, or Detroit. Yes, Alaska is within bombing range of Detroit, within reach of the industrial heart of the United States, and this is the day of guided missiles, pilotless planes, and atomic bombs.

There is another factor to consider. Japan and much of the Far East are nearer via Alaska and the Aleutians by several hundreds of miles than the present westward route through the Hawaiians. The great circle air route to the East is already in operation.

Alaska is strange and silent and filled with scenic grandeur. It is spread over an area nearly as large as the continental United States. In that far-flung area are 90,000 souls—over a third of them Eskimos, Indians or Aleuts. Temperatures vary widely. The treeless, windswept Aleutians are seldom colder than 10 above or hotter than 60. But central and northern Alaska have terrific winters which send the thermometer to 60 below and midsummer heat that drives it above 80.

The Territory has magnificent harbors like Whittier which is ice-free all year and can float any ship. But by contrast it has harbors which are ice-bound much of the year. Nome is closed 9 months out of 12, and if you want a real cold-weather port there is Point Barrow whose harbor is open 1 month in the year.

Ice-choked harbors and great distances have produced transportation problems which long held back Alaskan development. But that was before the day of the airplane. Surprising though it may be, winter flying in Alaska no longer offers major difficulties. In fact, it is now but little more hazardous than winter flying in northern United States. Alaska's bush pilots were the real pioneers in Arctic aviation. Some of them flew ski-equipped old crates, and held them together with baling wire, but they flew. They learned Arctic flying the hard way, and many of them did not get through. That was the price for pioneering. When the military brought modern facilities and adequate controls Arctic flying lost much of its danger.

Because Arctic flying no longer presents unusual difficulties and because the Arctic approach is considered tomorrow's logical route to Europe and Asia, the Territory of Alaska has suddenly become the Pacific's most important outpost. The Pacific defenses on which the United

States relied for half a century are now bypassed and outflanked by relatively undefended Alaska.

Aviation's great forward strides appear to have been accentuated rather than lessened since the end of the war. But even during World War II, Alaska bridged the gap from our west coast to northern Europe. The Territory proved to be a natural stop for lend-lease planes bound for Russia. During the war, 9,000 American planes were delivered to the Russians, principally at Fairbanks, and flown by them via Nome and Siberia to the eastern front.

They can come back the same way.

But let us consider tomorrow's war. I am not one of those who anticipates early conflict or who feels that another war is inevitable, but I decry the habit of hiding our heads in the sand and refusing to admit its possibility or its consequences. In tomorrow's war, rockets with a range of 3,000 miles are an admitted probability. Pilotless planes already are here. The time will come when both can be loaded with atomic bombs. Every military power is studying launching sites for radio-controlled weapons, its own launching sites and its neighbors'. Alaska and the Aleutians offer sites as important as any in the world. There are powers which appreciate the importance of these sites. Apparently we are not one of these, for we are doing little or nothing toward their development.

Yes; Alaska is now one of the key points in America's defense, a key point which is thinly held and easily isolated. It may be tomorrow's Pearl Harbor—with far more disastrous consequences.

Take a look at the military picture inside Alaska. There is not a completely modern base in the Territory. But there are three principal military establishments. They are Fort Richardson and Ladd Field on the mainland and Adak in the Aleutians. Fort Richardson is the base of supplies. A glance at the map will show you that the Aleutian chain and the Arctic wastes form the flanks which guard the approach to Alaska.

Ladd Field is a well organized post from which arctic warfare tests are being conducted at the present time. Its communications are now too weak to support a major operation, but they offer fine potentialities for the development of a powerful base. It is the terminus of the Alcan Highway. This 2,600-mile highway is unpaved but if kept open it can support considerable military traffic. It was completed at great cost during the war, and despite the drawback of length, it is a valuable asset. There is a similar highway from Ladd Field to Fort Richardson.

Also highly important is the Alaska Railroad, which joins these points. It is owned and operated by the United States Government. The railroad is worn out, but it is valuable as an alternate link between Ladd Field and its base of supplies. It was built as a pioneer project during the First World War, although not completed until some years later. Except for the barest maintenance it has since been neglected. A mistaken sense of economy has brought it to the point where it can handle but a very few hundreds of tons of freight daily. This capacity is inconsequential in view of the tremendous tonnage requirements of modern warfare. A PWA project to modernize the road at a cost of $12,000,000 was turned down just before World War II. Now it will cost $32,000,000. The road has reached the point that it is nearly worthless, but it is too important to the defense of Alaska to be permitted to close.

There is a pipe line which runs from Ladd Field to Skagway and to the costly Canol project at Norman Wells. No oil went through the pipe line during the war, but the link to the coast is now in use. It is only a 3-inch line, laid along the top of the ground, which means small capacity, added danger of sabotage, and more costly upkeep. But the line helps.

During the war the Army built a road from Haines, ice free port in southeastern Alaska, connecting with the Alcan Highway, something over a hundred miles away. Much of this road runs through Canadian territory. It is of great strategic significance. It should be maintained and improved throughout the entire distance to Fairbanks.

Fort Richardson can be serviced through harbors at Whittier or Seward. The distance to Whittier is only half as great as that to Seward, and the latter route requires much costlier railway installations. This is because of steep mountain passes and it means higher freight rates. In my opinion there is a definite need for early construction of a highway which will connect Seward and Anchorage. Once this highway is completed—much of it is already built—Whittier can be utilized exclusively for railroad traffic and the harbor at Seward will provide an alternate gateway to interior Alaska. This highway would also promote settlement of Kenai Peninsula, an area of great potentialities.

These are the supply lines for the defense of the Alaska mainland. They are barely adequate for comparatively light peacetime requirements. Climatic and geographic obstacles make rapid modernization difficult. Should emergency overloads suddenly be required, the situation would be a very serious one.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. In connection with the Alaskan defenses has the War Department a plan for the defense of Alaska?

Mr. SIKES. There are such plans.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is the gentleman familiar with those plans?

Mr. SIKES. Reasonably so.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman care to enlighten the House on those plans?

Mr. SIKES. Not at this time. I am confident the gentleman realizes it would not be proper to give out information which includes some confidential material of strategic importance. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, however, I will touch on some of the defense needs of Alaska and I judge this to be the information the gentleman actually desires.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. May I ask this question of my colleague from Florida in connection with the projects he has just mentioned: Are they included in the current appropriation?

Mr. SIKES. No, unfortunately most of them are not. They involve expenditures for modernization which the Department is reluctant to request at this time.

Now, to continue my discussion, Mr. Speaker, the Aleutian defenses are more highly developed and communications which are by sea are simpler.

The presence of Jap forces in the Aleutians during the war provided sufficient impetus to insure the construction of first-class bases, but it is doubtful that these meet present-day requirements. Adak was to have been the base of operations for the bombing and invasion of the northern Japanese Islands. All in all, the 1,700-mile Aleutian chain is a powerful weapon and a great military asset. But they must be kept abreast of the developments of modern warfare.

The other flank is thinly held. Extending from Point Barrow eastward, it is almost completely open. Its strength lies in its difficult terrain. In summer it is considered impossible to traverse the vast reaches of tundra and muskeg with large land forces. In winter when the frozen surface would permit mobility the problems of maintaining ground units are greatly magnified. However, no front can now safely be neglected.

That brings up Nome. It is one of the big question marks in Alaskan defense. Nome lies across the Bering Straits from Siberia, and it is virtually undefended. At their narrowest point the Straits are only 30 miles wide. Military strategists say this is unimportant because of the difficulty of maintaining a striking force and exploiting its presence in the Nome area. This may or may not be true. Nome admittedly would be difficult to exploit, but less so than the area farther north.

Study should also be made of the possibilities of developing facilities at Teller, north of Nome. There is located the best harbor on the entire Arctic Coast.

During most of the year the Straits are frozen. Desk generals say it is not feasible for a striking force to attempt a crossing on ice. It has not been tried, so no one really knows. But the Eskimos cross it constantly. Tribes on opposite sides of the Straits exchange visits and intermarry. Alaskan scouts who have operated patrols with dog teams in the frozen north—and officers who have not been tied to a desk too long—say that crossings on the ice are feasible for a dispersed force of 5,000 to 6,000 men. Dispersal would eliminate excessive weight at one point on the ice. Once on the Alaska mainland, the Yukon would provide a frozen highway to the interior. Poor visibility would operate in favor of such forces and they could prove important in supplying and supporting paratroopers.

There is a dangerous hint of complacence in the attitude of many of our military people toward Alaska. Particularly is this true of northern Alaska, where too much confidence is being

placed in natural obstacles which new equipment and new methods can bridge. They are forgetting that determined people find a way to overcome obstacles. For instance, there were those who said that the Japs could not take the Malay Peninsula. They, too, placed their faith in natural obstacles. Military logic showed that the jungle and British sea power would keep invaders out of Singapore, the key to the East Indies. Consequently the peninsular was weakly defended. History reminds us that the Japs were not impressed by British logic. They overran the jungles in a matter of weeks and Singapore fell. The fall of Ladd Field to a force operating from Nome would seriously jeopardize the defense of Alaska, and it might force the evacuation of the Territory.

I mentioned the fact that the Army is conducting cold-weather maneuvers in the frozen northland. Arctic warfare is something we know almost nothing about, and it cannot be learned from textbooks. Men have to live it if they are to understand it. There is a reason for our interest in Arctic warfare. Observers who have kept abreast of the times know that Arctic warfare studies now hold a place in the military spotlight of primary importance.

This is true because it is almost certain that any military threat which may develop for our country during this generation will come across the Arctic regions. What the Army learns in its Arctic warfare tests may help to prevent another Pearl Harbor. But more is required than maneuvers. What we do now about the defense of Alaska may prevent that strategic area from serving as a base of operations against the United States if there should be another Pearl Harbor. And by the same token Alaska when properly fortified, may serve as a strong brake to the military ambitions of the next crop of would-be world dictators.

We shall not seek war. History attests to that. The more significant fact is that we have never been prepared when war came. Each time we have paid dearly in men and money for unpreparedness, but we have had time to get ready.

Warfare today is different. It moves with amazing speed. It strikes with terrifying force. We shall never again have time to prepare after it comes. A strong defense is our only security, and a strong defense can mean that we shall not again be attacked.

If war should come again for us, Alaska may be the first battleground. Changed factors of warfare have made it the new back door of American defense. Today that door is open. Tomorrow such a condition may be fatal to the security of this Nation. A relatively undefended Alaska even in times of world peace and apparent security is an intolerable condition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANGELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain newspaper and magazine articles.)

DANGEROUS REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES MAY RESULT IN WORLD WAR III

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next we will be called upon to vote on one of the most important resolutions I think any Congress of the United States has ever been called upon to consider. Our decision on that resolution may well determine whether or not there will be another world war and, therefore, I think it most important that we not only stop, but read and remember, past history and past actions of the American people and the American Congress in our program and appropriations for national defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we Members of Congress start giving serious consideration to the problems confronting our country. Here of late there has been quite a lot of talk about reducing taxes 20 percent, about balancing the Federal Budget, reducing Government expenditures, and about paying the national debt. I know that all of us would like to reduce taxes at least 20 percent, but I seriously doubt the wisdom of such action at this time.

Let us examine for a moment the possibilities of reducing our taxes 20 percent, at the same time balancing the Budget, and making substantial reductions in the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, I may say it might be a little more difficult for the Government to borrow money at the low rate of interest we are now borrowing it if we have competition from industry and from other borrowers that may raise the interest rate.

Today, most of the war agencies have either been liquidated or are in the process of liquidation, leaving only what we commonly refer to as the old-line departments and the permanent independent agencies. We will have to pay a little over $5,000,000,000 interest annually on the public debt. This year we will pay out, under present authorizations, about $7,500,000,000 in veterans' benefits. The entire appropriation for our old-line agencies and independent establishments, exclusive of commitments resulting from war activities, the Veterans' Administration, and the War and Navy Departments, will amount to about $4,500,000,000. If we were to abolish these old-line agencies and independent establishments, our budget could be reduced little more than $4,500,000,000.

Of course, it is idle fancy to even suggest the abolition of these departments and agencies. The only departments in which any material reduction can be made in the appropriations for the next fiscal year are the appropriations for the War and Navy Departments. All of us would like to be able to abolish forever the necessity of having an Army, Navy, and an Air Force. We had high hopes 2 years ago, when the United Nations was born, that man had at last arrived at a program that would insure lasting peace. We are happy over the progress made by the United Nations Organization, but I feel that this body has a long way to go before it develops to the point where we can assume with some degree of certainty that the machinery set up to keep down aggressors and prevent future wars is sufficiently strong to accomplish this noble purpose.

Until we are convinced that there will never be another war on this or any other continent, we will be practicing foolish economy in reducing the appropriations for our armed forces to the danger point.

I hear many people say that unless we reduce taxes we cannot restore our economy and make progress as we have in the past. Reduction of taxes and failure to appropriate sufficient funds for our Army and our Navy has already cost the American people over $400,000,000,000 to say nothing of the lives of over 350,000 men whose losses cannot be measured in dollars and cents, and to say nothing of the one and one-half million who were wounded in mind and body and whose sacrifices cannot be measured in dollars and cents. It is true another war is not looming over the horizon, but the same thing was true in the 1920's and early thirties.

Many of us recall that after the shooting was over in World War I, the statesmen of all nations had proclaimed far and wide that that was the last war and that machinery would be set up to insure lasting peace. Many proposals were advanced.

The leading proposal was that of the League of Nations, followed by the World Court, world disarmament and so forth. The American people at that time were loaded with a war debt of less than $40,000,000,000. Our people were screaming from the housetops then, as they are now, to reduce taxes and balance the Budget. Taxes were reduced, the Budget was balanced and substantial payments were made on the war debt but at what a tragic cost to the security of our country! Then, as now, the only departments where substantial reductions could be made in our national expenditures were the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces.

I might add at this point that we did one of the greatest favors to the German Nation after World War I that has ever been done to any nation when we scrapped all of their war machines. It made them start out on new research and a new program of rearmament. They did not have the old World War I 75-millimeter guns and machine guns the French had defending the Maginot line in 1941. They had new equipment. And when a lot of us look around the airfields and see all of these B–17's, B–24's, B–29's, P–51's, and P–80's and think that we have the protection that we might need in case of another war, we are lulling ourselves into false security. All those planes today are obsolete; they were obsolescent the day the war ended, and we cannot afford to think that we are adequately prepared at the present time with such outmoded equipment.

We came out of World War I as a leader in world affairs. We were not then ready to assume our newly won leadership and decided to again isolate ourselves from the problems of other peo-

ples, feeling secure that the two oceans separating us from the rest of the world were all the defenses that we needed. We refused to enter the League of Nations.

I doubt now that our entry into the League of Nations would have prevented World War II, but I am firmly convinced that if we had continued to appropriate adequate funds for our Army and our Navy such aggressors as Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, and the war lords of Japan would never have dared attack helpless countries like China, Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Ethiopia, and maybe Pearl Harbor. We now know that our own Civil War could have been prevented if the United States had been prepared.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In my opinion, if we had followed the advice of Gen. "Billy" Mitchell 20 years ago, there would never have been any Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MANASCO. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. RANKIN. We would have had an air force that would have commanded the respect of the world, and the chances are that we might have headed off this last World War entirely.

Mr. MANASCO. That is what I am trying to say. We now know that our own Civil War could have been prevented. We did not have enough Federal troops under arms—and I am a Southerner—to quell what was termed at that time a rebellion. I think we are just as much responsible, due to our failure to assume our responsibilities as world leaders, for the rise to power of these war lords as were the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan. I realize that this is a serious charge to make against the American people, but a careful examination of events following World War I will convince any open-minded person of this responsibility.

America is not now, and I hope never will be, an aggressor nation, but unless we want to assume the responsibility of the rise of another tyrant who may be successful in destroying civilization, we must continue to appropriate sufficient funds to insure the strongest and best-equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force of any country in the world. If we do this, we will insure lasting peace.

Soon after World War I, we were led to believe that unless taxes were drastically reduced, business could not expand sufficiently to take care of the pent-up demands for consumer goods, and that our manufacturers of durable goods could not satisfy domestic demands, let alone secure a fair share of international trade. Taxes were reduced, the budget for the Army and Navy was drastically cut, millions of dollars were invested in Florida real estate, purchased at inflated values, hundreds of apartment houses were constructed, plants were expanded, and a terrific boom in the stock market followed. When the crash came many fortunes were wiped out. The auctioneers foreclosing mortgages on farms, homes, apartments, and factories were about the only people left who were gainfully employed. Plant after plant was closed as a result of saturated markets and then a period of deficit spending followed. We, of course, realize that unless the Federal Government had stepped in in the early thirties to prevent widespread starvation, we would have been faced with a revolution. Our national income dropped to such a dangerous level that it was impossible for us to appropriate sufficient funds at that time to rebuild our armed forces, although all of us must have realized that another war was brewing.

Unless we make substantial reductions in our staggering national debt now while our national income is at a high level, we will be unable to meet the interest payments if and when another depression comes. Since we have no assurance that our country will never again be faced with the threat of war, we must make substantial debt reductions from year to year so that if we are again faced with a crisis we can raise sufficient funds to meet the crisis without having to repudiate our debt. It is a matter of common knowledge that if we ever have to repudiate our debt, our system of free enterprise will be destroyed and all industry and all small business will be nationalized. I wonder if we are willing to run this risk and pay the penalty in years to come that might result in our shortsightedness in reducing taxes?

No one yet has been able to forecast a buyers' strike with any degree of certainty and so far in our history no one has been able to give a satisfactory reason for such a strike after it has occurred. For that reason, we cannot stake our security on the basis of a continued national gross income of near $200,000,000,000 per year for a sufficient length of time to provide a satisfactory, long-term debt-retirement program. Our tremendous debt is a heavy mortgage on every business and industry in this country. Until it is substantially reduced, we cannot hope for a long period of prosperity. Unless we make substantial payments on the debt, unborn generations will be burdened with heavy taxes and sooner or later our country will lose its position as a world power.

I should like to refer now to the February 18, 1947, issue of the magazine World Report, which I think all of us should read every week. It contains very valuable information about some of the cuts that are being proposed now.

In this budget we have $444,000,000 to be spent during the next fiscal year for atomic energy. In view of the fact that thousands of people are employed at Oak Ridge and other plants, I think all of us agree that that program should be carried on. We cannot afford to cut that for the sake of our own security.

Neither can we afford to cut the merchant marine, which is an essential part of our national defense program, although we let it go down to almost nothing after World War I, and it cost between eighteen and twenty billion dollars to rebuild a merchant marine which is largely obsolete today. We have to spend money on a merchant marine unless we want to spend billions of dollars and take thousands of men out of production of other essential war materials in case of another war, to rebuild old Liberty ships, because these will rust out, I hope, before we ever have another war. But we cannot afford to cut that agency's appropriation too much.

We also must spend a large amount of money trying to expand our foreign trade. Unless this is done, the standard of living Americans have will be reduced.

I do not like a lot of the propaganda that is going out of this country to other countries. I think it should be screened. I think we could do a lot toward teaching other people that our country is not the type of country that some of our information bureaus are trying to lead them to believe. I think we can do a great service by telling the people of other countries that we believe in hard work, we believe in saving a little money, and that we cannot continue to pour out billions of dollars to keep the other countries' economy going. We do have a selfish interest in increasing the purchasing power of other countries, for unless we do that it will be impossible for us to be an exporting nation. We are going to have to do a little importing if we expect to export much, because we have about drained all the dollars out of the other countries except those we are lending dollars.

For selfish reasons, for humanitarian reasons, and for world peace, let us keep a strong Army, a strong Air Force, a strong Navy, and an adequate scientific research organization or else let us be frank and assume the responsibility of another war which is sure to come if we reduce our armed forces to an innocuous state.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate the gentleman on his very timely and appropriate address, which in my opinion is a very powerful contribution, particularly at this time when there is so much talk of the Congress sharply reducing the appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces, because at this time we must maintain our power, above all, for our own national interest.

Mr. MANASCO. I am sure there are men in the councils of other countries who are laughing up their sleeves at our proposal to cut our armed forces drastically at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NODAR (at the request of Mr. MASON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from an address I made on this floor in 1945, and also to include some

excerpts from the law of the State of New York on the subject I am about to discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was amused at the address of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and very much interested in what he said. He talked about the slowness with which the leaders of his party proceed in passing labor legislation. I also noticed in the paper that the Senate leaders were going to wait on the House, and the House leaders were going to wait on the Senate.

It reminded me of what I heard over the radio the other night. Somebody was reading the laws of a certain State on traffic regulations which provided that when two cars approach a crossing at right angles they both must come to a dead stop, and each one of them must remain in that position until the other one has passed on. I am just wondering if that is the kind of stalemate we are running into, and if we are going to come to that kind of a dead standstill, with each House remaining in that position until the other one has acted.

But, Mr. Speaker, I arose to discuss a measure introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the recreation of the now defunct FEPC, or the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee.

I believe Mr. DIRKSEN made a speech for such a measure in the last Congress, which reminded me of the colored preacher who told his congregation that he was "goin to preach to you an ole 'postolic injunction, 'Take no heed of what you shall say.'"

It would certainly take a genius to reconcile that speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and this FEPC bill he has introduced with his recent speech against communism, especially since that FEPC is the chief plank in the Communist platform.

It is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened in all its history. I am going to show what it would do to the people of Illinois by pointing out what it is doing to the people of New York, where this vicious measure was written into the laws of that State without consulting the people who are suffering under it.

All these bills contain the same old bunk about making it a crime to discriminate in employment because of "race, creed, color, natural origin, or ancestry," and so forth.

Before Mr. DIRKSEN attempts to ram this monstrosity down the throats of the people of Illinois, and all the other States, I suggest he do as they did in California, let the people of Illinois vote on it. That is what they did in California in the last election, and it was defeated by a majority in every single individual county in California.

Now let us see what such a measure is doing to the people of the State of New York.

A man from New York said to me this morning, "You know this measure is being operated in New York simply by failure to operate it." The other night there were two men from New York in a taxicab here in Washington driven by a man who works here on the Hill. They got into an argument. One of them said, "I told you this FEPC would ruin the State of New York if they ever put it on the statute books." The other one said, "I did not think so. I thought it was a humanitarian measure. But I now see my mistake."

Then the other man said, "Here is what it has done to me. I own a good home," I believe he said "out on Riverside Drive, and I also own a house next to it which I bought for my own protection. I had a friend living in the other house, but his business took him to another section of the country and he had to vacate. Like a fool, I put up a sign 'For rent,' thinking that someone in the community whom I could afford to rent it to would apply. Somebody put a colored fellow up to come and apply for it and the court now says I must let him have it."

I bring this to you for what it is worth. I understand the Communists in New York are demanding that the same rule be applied to rooms or apartments for rent.

But I want to read you some of the regulations that are now being imposed upon the people of the State of New York under this vicious law. Businessmen from New York tell me that the way they are getting around this measure is by operating through employment agencies, because no intelligent businessman would go to a State with that kind of law on its statute books and attempt to establish a new business or a new enterprise, especially with the regulations or rulings under it which I am now going to read to you.

Remember they put this measure on the ticket in California and the people voted on it in the last election; and it lost in every single individual county in California. It was beaten in the entire State by about 3 to 1.

You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.

A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody has in the last 50 years, and the decent law-abiding Negroes know it.

But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed:

"State of New York Executive Department. State Commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are the rulings:

I want to show you some things you cannot ask in the State of New York when you go to employ a man.

Remember that State has no gas, coal, or oil, and very little water power. The rest of the country does not have to go to New York, or to any other State to get what it needs in the years to come. The American people in every section of this country are in a position now to take care of themselves. You put this measure on in one State after another and you will simply penalize those States beyond reason, and when they ask you to pass it for the whole United States and put it on the entire American people, after the fiasco they have made of it here in Washington in the last few years, it is simply unthinkable to a man who knows what he is doing and has the interest of the people of the country at heart.

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise.

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make—

Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative.

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next "unlawful practice":

Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate.

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make—

Inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist.

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization.

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc.

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur.

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make—

Inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment.

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph.

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.

You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers.

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to—

Inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin.

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment.

It is an unlawful practice to make—

Inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment.

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment.

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment.

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make—

Inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919.

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including, organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members.

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

If every Member of Congress would "screw his courage to the sticking place" and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination "when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic."

But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not one out of ten on these rolls is a white Gentile American.

Here is the official list:

Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Here is the Division of Field Operations:

Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that "I am a Republican" or "I am a Democrat."

More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

Here is the list:

Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

LEGAL DIVISION

But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	Attorney	White	4,600
Gordon Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

INFORMATION DIVISION

Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
elson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
	Clerk-stenographer.		1,800

DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentleman from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of

directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

It is a battle to save America for Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion relative to the endorsement of Mr. David Lilienthal, Herbert Marks, Carroll L. Williams for posts on the Atomic Commission raises the entire question of the importance of checking upon the loyalty qualifications of scientific personnel and the political astuteness of such personnel in regard to possible efforts by agents of a foreign power to extract information vital to our security.

For example, I have before me a copy of Federal Science Progress for March 1947, published by the Department of Commerce, under the editorship of Mr. J. C. Green. Included in this issue is a detailed article on uranium, with formulas and elaborate charts showing the construction of uranium-manufacturing plants. I would like to know the value to the United States of making this information public. I would like to know whether the military intelligence services have checked on this information to determine whether its publication is a security risk. I would like to know whether the War Department has not on frequent occasions had considerable friction with the Department of Commerce regarding its publication of unauthorized information of security value.

Your attention is called to the significant fact that the same Mr. J. C. Green, testifying before the Senate radar subcommittee on May 8, 1946, stated that both Russia and France have been given the know-how on former secret Axis war developments, including radar, by the Department of Commerce. Neither country, he admitted, had offered to share any of its war-won secrets with the United States. I would like to know all about the record of Mr. Green, both from the Civil Service Commission and the FBI. I would like to know why he is so abnormally anxious to share information of military importance with the Soviet Union.

I understand that there is an organization known as the National Roster of Scientific and Special Personnel, which is now a part of the United States Employment Service, and is responsible for placing scientific personnel in Government agencies. For a number of years

the head of the national roster was one Benjamin Wermiel, who is listed in Government files as having a definite Communist record. He was a member of the executive committee of the Washington CIO committee to reinstate Helen Miller. Helen Miller was a Labor Department employee who was ousted because of her Communist record and activities. Mr. Wermiel is also a member of record of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which has been active in defending Federal employees with subversive records; the Washington Book Shop, which is the headquarters for Communist literature in the city of Washington; and the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Francis Biddle.

I should like to know what role Mr. Wermiel plays in this set-up. I should like to know whom the national roster has recommended and for what posts.

Just before taking the floor I checked to see if Mr. Benjamin Wermeil was still there, and I am informed that he is placement analyst, operations branch, National Roster of Scientific and Special Personnel, part of the United States Employment Service, room 403, Twelfth and Constitution, temporary U, and is still on the job.

Then we have Mr. John Donald Kingsley, recently appointed as executive secretary of the President's Scientific Research Board, dealing with military information of first-rate importance to this country. Mr. Kingsley is coauthor of a book entitled "Strategy for Democracy," which is a streamlined exposition of communist theory. Government files will show his record as either a communist sympathizer or an actual member of the Communist Party. Certainly he is not a person in whom full confidence could be placed for this most sensitive and strategic post.

I should like to know who has recommended these individuals and I should like to know what the Government is doing to counteract this type of infiltration. Furthermore, I here and now publicly demand an immediate and thorough investigation of the afore-mentioned individuals by the Civil Service Commission and the FBI with a view to determining their fitness for the posts they at present hold.

On January 29 most of the Members of this House were shocked at the disclosure of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] when he displayed a large book that was published in 1946 by the Amtorg Trading Corp., official agency of the Russian Government. The book might properly be referred to as a manual for the bombing and sabotaging of the United States. I think it is high time that some of us start thinking a little bit about the preservation of our own Government.

There has been a great deal of discussion of late regarding the investigation made of employees of the TVA by the Un-American Activities Committee of the House in 1940. For the record, I should like to state that the Un-American Activities Committee has at no time made an investigation of the personnel of the TVA. In 1940 the names of some 9 or 10 individuals were called to their attention, and Mr. Joe Starnes, then a Member of this House and a member of that committee, interviewed these individuals. That was the extent of that investigation.

Land knows what would be discovered if the entire personnel of the TVA had ever been investigated. I make that statement at this time because when Mr. Starnes testified on February 6, 1947, before the Committee on Atomic Energy in the Senate, newspaper accounts left the impression that the personnel of TVA had been investigated and only three Communists were found. I think it would be a good idea if the entire investigation were started all over again from top to bottom and the entire group were screened so that all the facts might be disclosed. This leads me to the conclusion, as I stated on the floor of the House the other day, that wherever there is one iota of doubt as to the loyalty of any employee of the Federal Government, that doubt should be resolved in favor of the Government. There would be nothing against a person's record if a department of the Government chose not to employ him. But under the present circumstances, as soon as a man or woman is relieved of employment in one of the various departments, he or she appeals, as happened in the Carl Marzani case who was indicted by the Department of Justice last month. Mr. Marzani was on my list in 1943 as one of the Communists I thought should be out of the Government. What did he do? He brought four of his fellow employees from the Department of State to testify as to his ability and work in that particular office. Not one of those four knew a thing about his background and past record. On the testimony of these four men working with him, the Civil Service Commission reversed the decision of ineligibility and declared him eligible. I also want to make the charge at this time that the Civil Service Commissioners have been letting the heads of departments of our Government make the decisions for them as to whether a man should be declared eligible or ineligible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman referred to a Benjamin Wermiel as being in the United States Employment Service.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is right.

Mr. CHURCH. And also to a Helen Miller in the Labor Department. Will the gentleman place in the RECORD more exactly where Helen Miller is employed in the Labor Department?

Mr. BUSBEY. Helen Miller was formerly an employee of the Labor Department and since this magazine has just been published I have not had the time to check to see whether Helen Miller is still retained in the Labor Department or not. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois has some information along that line.

Mr. CHURCH. No; the gentleman from Illinois and some of the other Members here listening to the gentleman speaking are members of the Committee on Appropriations and subcommittees thereof that are considering whether or not certain bureaus of the Labor Department shall receive additional funds and additional personnel. The information that the gentleman is giving is very valuable with respect to that subject.

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say to my colleague from Illinois, that I shall be very happy to check on the whereabouts of Helen Miller this afternoon within the next 2 hours and communicate that information to him.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. Does the gentleman from Illinois know that the magazine he is discussing is for sale at 25 cents per copy at the entrance of the Department of Commerce and is available to any person who cares to buy it in any amount?

Mr. BUSBEY. These various publications by the Department of Commerce are available to anyone who wishes them, whether purchased or given to him.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman charge that today there are Communists in the administration of the TVA activities?

Mr. BUSBEY. I did not charge there were Communists at this present time in the TVA. I did say it would be a very healthy condition, I think, if the entire personnel were screened to ascertain if there were Communists in the TVA. I have not gone into the TVA since I have had the honor of returning to this august body.

To my knowledge Mr. David Lilienthal has never done one single thing to ascertain or prevent the infiltration of Communists in the TVA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from ex-Senator Owen relating to the global alphabet.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable HAL HOLMES, delivered at the annual Lincoln Day dinner in Olympia, Wash., February 12.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts and letters.

MRS. NELLIE W. PHILLIPS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain letters and extracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time today to tell my colleagues in Congress and the people of the United States about the patriotic and unselfish work of an outstanding American citizen. This fellow American is Mrs. Nellie W. Phillips, of Northfield, Minn. She is deserving of our praise and commendation. For nearly 5 years, during the entire World War II period, Nellie Phillips carried on a continuous flow of correspondence with nearly 800 men and women in the armed services from the Northfield community. Her cheery and news-filled letters went to all parts of the world to strengthen the morale of our fighting men on all fronts. Nellie Phillips helped win the war, and I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my tribute to her and the contribution which she has made to our country.

On January 21, 1947, the citizens of Northfield, Minn., joined in honoring Mrs. Nellie Phillips for her outstanding service to the young men and women of the Northfield community who served in the armed forces during the late war. The Eugene H. Truax Post, No. 4393, Veterans of Foreign Wars of Northfield, which organization sponsored the community tribute in honor of Mrs. Phillips, presented her with the Veterans of Foreign Wars citizenship medal. This recognition is the highest honor which is within the power of any VFW post to bestow upon any citizen.

Scores of letters were received by Mrs. Phillips from distinguished Americans—a few of which I will include as a part of my remarks—together with an account of the ceremonies in her honor. We raise our voices in tribute to Mrs. Phillips and wish her good health and every happiness for the years to come.

[From the Northfield (Minn.) News of January 3, 1947]

"MOM" NELLIE PHILLIPS RECEIVES VFW GOOD CITIZENSHIP MEDAL FOR LOVING SERVICE TO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Hundreds of returned servicemen, friends, and fellow citizens turned out on the evening of "Mom" Phillips Day, Tuesday, January 21, to honor the woman who throughout World War II worked unsparingly to keep Northfield boys and girls serving in the armed forces in touch with each other and with their home town.

Sponsored by the Eugene H. Truax Post, No. 4393, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the festivities included a dinner at Young's dining room, attended by World War II veterans and their wives and a few other close friends, followed by a large gathering in the Northfield High School auditorium.

With George Zanmiller, Sr., as master of ceremonies, the program got off to a zippy start with a delightful confusion of George and his son George, both of whom served in the South Pacific during World War II.

The program included music by the Northfield High School band and the madrigal singers, under the direction of Paul W. Stoughton; remarks by Arthur H. Crawford, chairman of the committee in charge; address of welcome by Mayor H. B. Kump; greetings by Frank Bernard, adjutant of American Legion Post No. 84; greetings from the Northfield Association by C. C. Heibel; an informal discussion by "Mom" and two of her boys, Erling Larsen and Courtney Cleland, over the famed coffee pot; the presentation to Mrs. Phillips of the VFW Citizenship Medal by Myron Ellingboe, commander of the post; the reading of letters of congratulation from Army, Navy, and Government dignitaries; an address by James A. Murphy, Minnesota State commander of the VFW; and before the playing of the national anthem, a tableau of the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima with a moment in silent memory for Northfield's war casualties.

During the informal coffee-pot discussion Mrs. Phillips was directed to raise the lid and draw out the transportation ticket for a vacation trip to California given her by the Eugene H. Truax Post. She was also given a check to cover the expenses of her vacation. Mr. Cleland announced that arrangements had been made for "Mom's" appearance on Art Linkletter's radio program in Hollywood.

In his address of appreciation Mr. Murphy asserted, "This action demonstrates that the hand of comradeship is not reserved just for those who shared the trial by fire, but is extended in sheer gratitude to those who served on the home front. In honoring Mrs. Phillips I like to feel that the people of Northfield are honoring all those 'who also serve who only wait.'"

Among the veterans and their wives from a distance who attended the dinner and program were Robert Dunlop, of Aberdeen, S. Dak.; William Dunlop, of Owatonna; Mr. and Mrs. William Robinson and John Lysne, of Minneapolis; Mr. and Mrs. Elmer McClintock, of Rochester.

ARMY, NAVY, CONGRESSIONAL, NATIONAL, AND STATE LEADERS SEND GREETINGS AND TRIBUTES TO "MOM" NELLIE PHILLIPS

EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR MRS. PHILLIPS: It seems so very fitting to me that Northfield community and its fine group of veterans are arranging a special recognition of your splendid work that no words from any source could add to this simple and spontaneous gesture of good will and appreciation. However, as one who watched from the Governor's office the work the Northfield's beloved "Mom" did during the war years, I take pleasure in joining the many who are sending greetings and good wishes to you.

"More than any person I know you have exemplified the spirit of the folks at home toward our young men and women in the war service. Your influence has extended far beyond Northfield community, and it will be remembered long into the future. It represents far more than a devoted and patriotic effort typical of you. It is symbolic of the finer things in our common life as Americans.

"You have reason to be proud of your part in a great enterprise, and we are proud of you."

William E. Revier, commissioner, State of Minnesota Department of Veterans' Affairs, St. Paul:

"DEAR MOM: It was with genuine pleasure that I learned of the testimonial in your honor which is being sponsored by the Eugene Truax Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

"I know of nothing that is more deserving or appropriate than an affair such as this, where the people of the Northfield community can get together and express to you their appreciation of a job so well done.

"I am indeed sorry that it is going to be impossible for me to be present on this occasion and ask that I be permitted to use this method of expressing to you my congratulations and appreciation of a wonderful job.

"With best wishes for your continued health and happiness, I am,

"Sincerely,

"BILL."

Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota: "Truly, you have displayed the highest qualities of good citizenship. Your unselfish and conscientious efforts are most deserving of commendation by all citizens of our State. It was such service as yours that lifted the spirits of our young men and women and helped to carry them on to victory. It must be deeply gratifying to you to know that the real reward is the place which you will always hold in the hearts of the young people who will never forget your kindness and friendship."

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

"MY DEAR MRS. PHILLIPS: I regret very much that I will not be able to be in Northfield Tuesday to join with your host of friends in honoring you for your outstanding contribution to your country during the recent war. Your untiring effort in keeping up continuous correspondence over a 5-year period with several hundred servicemen is in itself a remarkable achievement, and I am positive that the veterans of World War II who had the privilege of hearing from you will always gratefully remember their friend, Nellie Phillips.

"Although I cannot be present at the testimonial gathering in your honor, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction in extending a personal greeting from Mrs. Andresen and myself with our good wishes to you on the occasion. As your Representative in Congress, I consider you as the No. 1 American citizen in my district and in the country, and when I receive a full account of the gatherings in your honor, I will see to it that the entire country learns of the patriotic endeavors and outstanding Americanism of Mrs. Nellie Phillips, of Northfield.

"Wishing you the best of health and happiness for many years to come, and with kindest personal regards from Mrs. Andresen and myself."

Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff, War Department, Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR MRS. PHILLIPS: May I extend to you my sincere thanks and congratulations on the outstanding service you rendered during the war years.

"I appreciate the magnitude of your undertaking in corresponding with more than 800 Northfield men and women who were in the service of our country. Letters from the home town with news of friends and loved ones were a prime source of inspiration to fighting men in every theater of operations. The selfless task you performed was undoubtedly reflected in the devotion to duty of Northfield's sons and daughters who served with the armed forces.

"I know the citizens of Northfield, and of all Minnesota, take an intense pride in your patriotic contribution, and I join them in warm greetings and best wishes."

Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR MRS. PHILLIPS: The Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN has brought to my attention your splendid contribution to the morale of our servicemen during World War II.

"Mr. ANDRESEN has informed me of your frequent correspondence with some 800 men and women of our armed forces which, over a period of 5 years, brought them news and encouragement from their home community. The morale value of cheerful letters to service personnel far from home can hardly be overestimated, and it is a tribute to your understanding and unselfishness that you undertook this task which required so much of your time and effort.

"I wish to express to you, on behalf of the War Department, my sincere appreciation for the fine service you have rendered through this activity."

James F. Byrnes, the Secretary of State, Washington:

"DEAR MRS. PHILLIPS: I have been informed that your community is honoring you on January 21 for your outstanding contribution toward the maintenance of the morale of our armed forces.

"I wish to add my word to the praise which will be accorded to you. Your work, which was undertaken solely because of your love for and understanding of the men and women fighting for our country, is an outstanding example of citizenship at its best.

"Please accept my appreciation for your services to our country and my best wishes for the future."

James Forrestal, the Secretary of the Navy, Washington: "An incalculable ingredient of any successful accomplishment, as necessary in winning a war as men and machines, is morale. Your outstanding and patriotic efforts in connection with writing letters to servicemen was an invaluable morale builder, and as such made a definite contribution to our ultimate goal—victory. We, in the Navy, are sincerely grateful for your commendable contribution during the long hard years of the struggle."

William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the White House, Washington, D. C.: "I have been informed by Congressman ANDRESEN of the patriotic services performed by you in maintaining, during the course of the war, correspondence with the men and women of your community serving in the armed forces of our country. Upon the occasion of the testimonial being tendered to you by your friends and neighbors, may I join with them in sincere congratulations and best wishes."

Lewis B. Hershey, major general, United States Army, Director of Selective Service: "Women have always played a most important and indispensable role in supporting fighting men whenever our Nation has needed their services. Your cheerful letters to the fighting men in all parts of the world and your support of the community program for those men who were on duty in this country built morale in these men who were so far from their own home and family. It is an honor and a privilege to join in paying well-deserved tribute to you, Mrs. Phillips, for unusual services outstandingly performed."

Omar N. Bradley, general, United States Army, Veterans' Administration, Washington: "Throughout the war our men valued more than anything else the ties that bound them to their home towns. Citizens like yourself, who devoted their time and their hearts to these men, will always be remembered for the happiness they brought, not only by the servicemen themselves but by the communities which have been enriched by their return."

Letters of greeting were also received from Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington; Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, from Michigan; Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, the Adjutant General, War Department, Washington; Carl Weicht; and others.

A DESCRIPTION OF CITIZENSHIP MEDAL

The Veterans of Foreign Wars Citizenship Medal, awarded to Mrs. Nellie W. Phillips at Tuesday evening's testimonial, constitutes the highest honor which is within the power of any VFW post to bestow upon a citizen.

Honor, loyalty, courage, and leadership are considered requirements for the award. The Northfield VFW Post feels that these are important attributes of good citizenship, and that "Mom" has displayed them in every sense.

A description of the medal, which "Mom" received from Myron Ellingboe, post commander, indicates the manner in which these attributes have been symbolized.

The busts of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington were placed on the medal to represent the fundamentals of Americanism and citizenship for which the Veterans of Foreign Wars stands. The American flag symbolizes all that America means to liberty loving people—the principles of freedom and justice which have been consecrated with the blood of our armed forces.

The wreaths on the lower part of the medal represent victory and achievement, while above is the sun casting the light of understanding and knowledge.

The reverse side, with the VFW Cross of Malta emblem partly within a circle of 13 stars, represents the Original Thirteen Colonies, and recognizes the part played by America's overseas veterans in perpetuating the Nation, its ideals, and institutions.

The words "For American Citizenship" indicate the honor for which the medal is awarded, while the slogan "One Flag, One Country, One Language" denotes the broad definition of Americanism as advanced by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. "Mom" Phillips' name and the date, January 21, 1947, are engraved in the center.

The citizenship medal, as an organizational award, dates from 1935, at which time it was developed by the VFW's national department of Americanism, under the directorship of Victor Devereaux.

[From the Northfield (Minn.) Independent-News of January 21, 1947]

"MOM" IS AWARDED MEDAL BY GROUP OF "HER BOYS"

Mrs. Nellie W. Phillips, known by hundreds of servicemen far from her own home city, but more especially by the boys who saw service from the Northfield community during World War II, who affectionately call her "Mom," this evening will be recipient of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Citizenship Medal, highest honor within the power of Eugene H. Truax Post, No. 4393, to bestow upon a local citizen. Gene Truax was one of the first of Mom's boys to make the supreme sacrifice in this war, and the post is named in his honor. So it is peculiarly fitting that this post bestow upon Mom this honor, one of the first awards by the VFW in the upper Midwest.

The committee in charge: Arthur B. Crawford, chairman; E. Haines Cook; Donald Lindberg; Lyle Wing; Erling Larsen; Willard T. Nelson; Courtney Cleland; Lawrence F. Sanneman; George Zanmiller.

MAYOR'S PROCLAMATION

To the Citizens of the Northfield Community:

The Eugene H. Truax Post, No. 4393, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Northfield, has set Tuesday, January 21, 1947, for the purpose of honoring Mrs. Nellie W. Phillips for her outstanding service to the young men and women of the Northfield community who served in the armed forces during the late war.

This service was of such outstanding character that it has warranted the highest award that may be conferred by the Veterans of Foreign Wars upon a civilian.

In view of the fact that the young men and women in the armed forces enjoyed the splendid influence and the comfort of her unselfish service in their behalf, it merits the gratitude of all the citizens of the Northfield community, many of whom have expressed a desire to join with Eugene H. Truax Post, No. 4393, VFW, in honoring our own "Mom" Phillips;

Therefore, I, as mayor of the city of Northfield, hereby declare and proclaim Tuesday, the 21st day of January 1947, as "Mom" Phillips Day, and urge the entire Northfield community to join with the veterans in appropriate ceremonies to show honor to our distinguished citizen.

HENRY B. KUMP,
Mayor of Northfield.

JANUARY 13, 1947.

COMMUNISTS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since the Eightieth Congress has convened we have been regaled on this floor by continuous attacks on communism. I do not believe any Member of this House, and certainly I can say for myself, believes in the theory of communism. Certainly any Government department that has Communists among its personnel should be examined, and those men removed from the pay roll.

We have just been having the spectacle before a certain committee in the other body, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Legislation, of which I happen to be a member, of an attempt to pillory David E. Lilienthal, who has been appointed as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Regardless of whether you or I believe in the economic beliefs of David E. Lilienthal, I think we can all agree that there has not been one iota of proof produced to indicate that this gentleman is a Communist or has communistic leanings. Certainly the credo of faith which he expressed the other day before that committee, and which was given front-page notice in practically every metropolitan newspaper in the United States, is a democratic creed which will go down in history as one of the great utterances of an individual of real belief in a democratic philosophy, in a real religious and spiritual meaning of what democracy is.

My word of warning, if I may be allowed to make it, is that when Members of Congress rise on this floor and hurl the charge of communism at an individual, or what in my mind is still worse, imply that a certain individual is communistic without any proof; or to question the patriotism of an individual, he should have some evidence to submit to substantiate the accusation. I say that when proof is lacking, the statements are cowardly attempts to besmirch a man's honor; and it is a procedure to which, as far as I am concerned, I will not be a party. As Members of Congress we have an immunity under which we may make statements on the floor of the House that if made in public would be libelous, would carry with them the danger of our being sued for making libelous statements.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I refuse to yield at this time.

I say that if any Member has evidence as to the disloyalty of an individual whether he be in the TVA, the Post Office, or any other Government department, it is entirely within his right to come to this Chamber, make that charge and substantiate it with what he believes to be proof. But I say that you go beyond the rights of a Member of Congress when you impute by inference or question a man's reputation, unless you have proof to lay before the American public. Because every word that is uttered in this

rostrum is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it can be used in public newspapers and prints, it can be reprinted and cause doubt regarding the character of an individual.

I certainly do not stand here to protect communism or fascism. I stand here to protect what I believe is the right of an individual to economic beliefs, political beliefs, and religious beliefs which may be different from mine, and which I may not believe in, but which I say as long as they do not subvert the real principles of American citizenship and American democracy, may be held by that individual. I stand before the bar of public opinion and preserve that right.

I now yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to ask my friend from California if he thinks the statements I just made on the floor of this House come within the category of his remarks?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say this, with no offense to the gentleman, that I will let him be the judge of his own remarks.

Mr. BUSBEY. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from California to the fact that my remarks were very specific, that I gave evidence. I have never made any charge at any time on the floor of this House that was not backed up by evidence.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, and I accept his explanation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

DAVID LILIENTHAL

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that David Lilienthal needs any defense. I have noted, however, the attacks that have been made in this body and in the Senate on his character, his integrity, and his loyalty as an American.

Recently in my city of New Orleans, the Catholic Church, which I believe has been the outstanding enemy of communism not only in the United States but throughout the world, presented David Lilienthal through its committee of the South, with a certificate of appreciation for his magnificent contribution to the advancement of the cause of the people everywhere, and particularly for his contribution to the advancement of the cause of the people of the South. How any committee dominated by the Catholic Church could honor a Communist or a man who had communistic sympathies or leanings is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the attacks made on Mr. Lilienthal are smoke screens. Actually the attacks are directed at the great Tennessee Valley Authority, which is the creature of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], one of the great enemies of communism in this country, and the late distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris. Actually the attacks being made on David Lilienthal's ideas are not whether he be a Communist or not a Communist, because the mere assertion is ridiculous, but they are based on the fact that he has represented an agency that has done more to advance the South and to bring to us a new day than any institution established there in the past generation. I am proud to stand here and make this statement and I am glad to rise in defense of what the great Tennessee Valley has done for our section of the country.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman know that in 1945 the Progressive Farmer, one of the most widely distributed magazines of its type in the South, nominated Mr. David Lilienthal as the man of the year, the man who had contributed more to agriculture than any man in the South during that period?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think that was a very well-deserved tribute.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point I want to make about the irresponsible calling of communism. I think the FEPC is probably the dearest child of the Communists in America. I did not hear all of the remarks of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], on the FEPC and how it works out in practice in the great Empire State of New York, but I have read some of the reports, and they all show how impossible such a scheme is. Nevertheless, I shall be very interested in watching how my brethren on the majority side, who are so vociferous in condemning people with whom they may disagree as being Communists, will vote when the FEPC issue reaches the floor of the House of Representatives. That, Mr. Speaker, will be a real test of whether they, individually or collectively, subscribe to the communistic ideology or the communistic thinking; and I will predict now that in order to gain minority votes they will almost unanimously approve the Communist-sponsored FEPC.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Louisiana this question: Knowing that there were certainly some Communist nuclei within the TVA, does the gentleman know of any time or anything that Mr. David Lilienthal ever did to purge the Communists from the TVA?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think that Mr. David Lilienthal's record speaks for itself, and I do not have to defend it. As a matter of fact, I do not know that it has ever been proven that there were Communists in the TVA. Several members of the old Dies committee specifically denied the charge only recently.

Mr. BUSBEY. For the record, I would like to say that my attack has never been upon the TVA itself.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am glad to know that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. POULSON, for 20 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. on Friday, February 14, 1947.

Business to be considered: Continuation of public hearings on air accidents.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, February 17, 1947.

Business to be considered: Continuation of public hearings on air accidents.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Friday, February 14, 1947.

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Saturday, February 15, 1947.

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Monday, February 17, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands will meet at 10 a. m. on Friday, February 14, in suite 1324.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor will meet in open hearings on Friday, February 14, 1947, at 10 a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

A meeting of the full Budget Committee will be held in the Ways and Means Committee room, House Office Building, Friday, February 14, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor

of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in open hearings on Tuesday, February 18, at 10 a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 476) to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered wartime service in the United States merchant marine, and to provide aid for their families.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A meeting of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, February 18, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

333. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $353,398,633 (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

334. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,200,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 118); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

335. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Education for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

336. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to place the position of Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

337. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a first supplementary report with respect to Government-owned aluminum plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

338. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

339. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning operations under the Federal Airport Act during the year 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

340. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 812 (56 Stat. 1056, sec. 3), his report on all operations under this act for the period July 1 to December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

341. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the United States Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

342. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a year-end report on the completed sales and approved retransfer authorizations of nondemilitarized combat matériel (other than direct lend-lease transfers which are separately reported to Congress) effected by the Department of State in its capacity as foreign surplus and lend-lease disposal agent; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

343. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from October 1, 1946, through December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

344. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of various institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649 (79th Cong., 2d sess.), approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

345. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 8, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Rappahannock River and tributaries, Virginia, for flood control, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 24, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1700. A bill to provide for daylight saving in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 243) to provide for the erection of headstones for certain members of the armed forces buried outside the United States lost at sea or reported missing in the performance of duty; Committee on Armed Services discharged, and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 507) relating to the payment for grave markers and headstones which the Secretary of War is authorized to furnish; Committee on Armed Services discharged, and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1184) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; Committee on Armed Services discharged, and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1936. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 1937. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1938. A bill to authorize the appropriation for expenditure by the International Children's Fund of the United Nations organization of certain amounts received from services of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1939. A bill for the relief of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1940. A bill to provide for the return of amounts deducted from salaries of certain war-service appointees separated from the service after completion of 5 years or more of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1941. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 1942. A bill to promote the general welfare by providing funds to assist the several States and Territories in paying adequate salaries for the school year 1947–48 to elementary and high school teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1943. A bill to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1944. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1945. A bill to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1946. A bill to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1947. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1948. A bill to reduce the age of enlistment in the National Guard from 18 to 17 years in order to conform to the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 1949. A bill to provide for the payment of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to lands acquired by the United States in order to assist in the liquidation of certain bonded indebtednesses; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1950. A bill to provide that veterans pursuing educational and training courses in public institutions shall receive the books, supplies, and other equipment they would receive if they pursued similar courses in private institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation of plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 100. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by (h) (1) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the

United States to consider and act upon proposed Federal legislation related to the Townsend plan, known as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that sufficient and proper appropriations be provided for the reconstruction, repair, and maintenance of that portion of United States Highway No. 191 lying within the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pieter Cornelis van Lier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Enta Kitajima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of John F. Reeves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Robert Hinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT (by request):

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of Frank Victor Norall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Leonard W. Field; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Pandelis Kozmas Georgus, alias Pandil Kozmanoff Georgoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Vasiliou Kotches, alias Dimitri Vasil Kotchoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Simos Mouzitras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Howard Samuel Warnock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Ann Irene Feikema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Theodore Maudrame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Marion N. Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Chester C. Churchwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1967. A bill for the relief of Francisco Araujo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

112. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed by Wisconsin Seed Dealers Association at annual meeting in Wausau, demanding immediate reduction in Federal spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

113. Also, request by war veterans employed by the post engineers in Camp McCoy Fire Department, Camp McCoy, Wis., urging investigation of employment policies at that camp; to the Committee on Armed Services.

114. Also, resolution adopted by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America of the Wisconsin State Council at its twenty-eighth annual convention in November 1946, regarding the removal of the ceilings placed on the amount a veteran can earn while taking advantage of the on-the-job training program provided for under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

115. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition signed by approximately 20 liquid and solid fuel dealers in Bergen County, N. J., on behalf of the passage of House Joint Resolution 2; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Architect of the Universe, whom, by the revelation of Thy Son our Lord, we may address as our Father, help us to understand what that means. As we are now united in our praying, so may we be united in our working, that, as a team, we may be doing together the will of our Father, who is not a God of any one party, of any one nation, or of any one race. Open our eyes that we may discern what God is doing, and our ears that we may hear what God is saying. And then, O God, give us all we need to take due notice and to govern ourselves accordingly. We ask these things in the strong name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 11, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR LODGE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to give notice, if this is an appropriate time, that on Monday next I shall seek recognition in order to make a few brief observations on the subject of universal military training.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SALES TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS OF SURPLUS NONDEMILITARIZED COMBAT MATÉRIEL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a year-end report on the completed sales and approved retransfer authorizations of nondemilitarized combat matériel (other than direct lend-lease transfers which are separately reported to Congress) effected by the Department of State in its capacity as foreign surplus and lend-lease disposal agent (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the anthracite region for investigation of the mining, preparation, and utilization of anthracite, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE RELATING TO OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning operations under the Federal Airport Act during the year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS OF MARITIME COMMISSION UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1946, through December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that Friday, May 9, and Saturday, May 10, 1947, have been fixed as the dates for the 1947 visit of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALUMINUM PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first supplemental report of that Administration with respect to Government-owned aluminum plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the United States Office of Education for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations

from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

INVITATION FOR UNITED STATES SENATE TO VISIT CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a letter from Dr. Juraj Slávik, Ambassador of Czechoslovakia, extending an invitation to the United States Senate to visit the Czechoslovak Republic. Without objection, the letters will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1947.

The Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: There is enclosed herewith a communication dated January 30, 1947, addressed to you by His Excellency Dr. Juraj Slávik, Ambassador of Czechoslovakia, which the Ambassador has requested the Department of State to forward to you.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary.

CZECHOSLOVAK EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1947.

The Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Czechoslovak National Constitutional Assembly unanimously passed a resolution inviting the United States Senate to visit the Czechoslovak Republic. The members of the Czechoslovak National Assembly would welcome such a visit and would be happy to receive and to honor a representative delegation of the United States Senate in Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia. In adopting the resolution the members of the national assembly gratefully acknowledged that it was on the soil of the United States of America where the first two presidents of Czechoslovakia found refuge in the two World Wars and where they were so generously helped both by the Governments and the people of the United States in the struggle for the liberation of the Czechoslovak people and for the reconstitution of their independence. The members of the national assembly stressed, on this occasion, that the history of the United States and that of Czechoslovakia have thus become closely associated with one another for all future as both are filled with examples and symbols of the continued efforts toward the realization of the ideals of freedom and of human progress.

Mr. President, the national assembly hopes that it will be possible for the United States Senate to delegate a group of its Members to undertake this journey in the not distant future to see the efforts which the Czechoslovak Republic is making to repair the ravages of the war and the enemy occupation and to convince themselves that the Czechoslovak people will remain faithful to the ideals of democracy and freedom.

In transmitting this message to you, Mr. President, I would greatly appreciate it if you would bring it to the attention of the honorable Members of the United States Senate and let me know at your pleasure of the action the honorable Members of the United States Senate prefer to take.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. JURAJ SLÁVIK,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring utilization of Schick General Hospital, at Clinton, Iowa, for the permanent care of veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welare.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILSON on February 10, 1947, p. 909, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The petition of the Lowell (Mass.) Board of Real Estate Owners, praying that rent controls be discontinued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the renewal of restrictions on the availability of Federal surplus property to educational institutions

"Whereas both the instructional and plant facilities of California educational institutions are extended to a serious degree as a result of increased enrollment from veteran enrollees and a wartime increase in population; and

"Whereas normal replacements in instructional and plant facilities during the war years were and still are largely precluded by scarcities of labor, material, and high prices; and

"Whereas this critical need could be in large measure, alleviated from Army and Navy surpluses if present statutes and procedures did not restrict and limit the educational institutions in securing such property: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take, in consideration of the benefits which would accrue to education and to the welfare and defense of the United States, such steps as may be necessary to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and the Army and Navy donation statutes so that:

"1. Supplies and other types of personal property, as well as machinery, equipment, and tools might be donated for use by authorized educational institutions.

"2. Property may be donated for maintenance and improvement of facilities of authorized educational institutions, as well as for instructional use.

"3. Property may be donated for use in elementary education, as well as for use in secondary and higher education.

"4. Property may be donated for use in all accredited courses as well as for use in vocational and preinduction training.

"5. Property may be donated to State educational agencies for surplus property for redistribution, as well as directly to individual educational institutions; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives from California."

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Whereas the National Budget has long been unbalanced and the debt has increased the past 14 years to very great proportions; and

"Whereas it seems that national Republican leaders have already applied themselves to the task of making plans to correct fiscal maladministration: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring), That we commend national Republican leaders in advocating a program of debt and expense reduction in advance of tax reduction; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be dispatched to United States Senators CHAN GURNEY and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Congressmen FRANCIS CASE and KARL E. MUNDT, and to United States Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, and Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to grant full rights of citizenship to American Indians who served in the armed forces of the United States of America in time of war

"Whereas numbers of our people who belong to the American Indian race and who served in the armed forces of the United States, have rendered signal service to our Nation; and

"Whereas by their service, their loyalty to our Nation, their fidelity to American ideals, and their devotion to duty they demonstrated their ability and fitness to take a place in the voice of our citizenry; and

"Whereas large numbers of ex-service men and women of this race of people, although justly entitled thereto, do not now enjoy the full status of American citizenship and the benefits and privileges resulting therefrom, but do now live under conditions in which their social, civil, and political activities are restrained and circumscribed by law; and

"Whereas it is the desire of this body as representatives of the people of the State of South Dakota, that these American Indians, ex-service men and women are entitled to and should be accorded a status equal to that of other citizens of our Nation and should be granted full rights and benefits of American citizenship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, in its thirtieth biennial session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America that suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted extending to all ex-service men and women of the American Indian race full rights and privileges of American citizenship; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to United States Senators CHAN

GURNEY and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, to Congressmen FRANCIS CASE and KARL E. MUNDT, and to United States Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President of the Senate, and to Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Whereas the United States Forest Service is, in effect and without sufficient congressional authorization, dictatorially exercising legislative and judicial functions in regard to grazing on the national forests, instead of limiting itself to the administration of the forests; and

"Whereas a general grazing reduction program of from 30 to 50 percent has been announced by forest officials, and if such program is put into effect, it will work a great hardship on and jeopardize the stability of the users of the national forests; and

"Whereas it has been called to the attention of members of this body that the Grazing Service, which is charged with the administration of other Federal grazing lands and which is functioning under a clearly defined law recently enacted by Congress, is exercising a more practical application of conservation and is giving the users a fairer adjudication of grievances and more security of tenure and general stability: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to conduct an investigation of conditions existing in connection with the administration of the national forests, to the end that legislation may be formulated which will remove existing evils and give all areas of Federal land for grazing purposes uniform, reasonable, and just treatment; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, so as to urge their vigorous support in accomplishing the purpose of this memorial."

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and act upon proposed Federal legislation related to the Townsend plan, known as H. R. 16

"Whereas there is now pending, or will be pending, in the current session of the Congress of the United States of America proposed legislation embodying essential principles of the so-called Townsend plan, in which thousands of Wyoming citizens are keenly interested: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring), That the Congress aforesaid be, and it is hereby, memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at said session by its legislative branches as such, and not merely in committee, the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President of said United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, United States Senator E. V. ROBERTSON, and Representative in Congress FRANK A. BARRETT.

"Approved February 7, 1947.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon legislation proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of the President of the United States to two terms

"Whereas prior to 1940 it was the tradition in this Republic that the President of the United States should not serve for more than two terms; and

"Whereas during the 150-year-old tradition no President of the United States prior to 1940 had in fact ever served more than two terms; and

"Whereas many citizens in this country consider that such tradition should be made permanent in our fundamental law in order to preserve the ideals and basic principles upon which our democratic Government was founded; and

"Whereas the precedent set in 1940 may lead in the future to further violations of this time-honored tradition unless restriction is written into the Constitution; and

"Whereas a number of States have already adopted resolutions requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing a constitutional restriction and many other States will no doubt take similar action: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-ninth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to consider and act upon legislation proposing a constitutional amendment limiting the tenure of office for any President of the United States to two terms; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"Approved February 7, 1947.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

EXPANSION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriation in support of the rural-electrification program, and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto.

I fully concur in this resolution, as I know of no project authorized and appropriated for by Congress that has brought greater comfort to the rural population, and has contributed more to their convenience and safety, than has rural electrification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution presented by the Senator from Minnesota will be received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriations in support of the rural-electrification program and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto

"Whereas the rural population of the State of Minnesota is vitally interested in the benefits and conveniences afforded by the Rural Electrification Administration; and

"Whereas there should be sufficient appropriations of the Rural Electrification Administration as approximately only 55 percent of the rural population of Minnesota is served by this program; and

"Whereas the rural population of Minnesota is anticipating the time when rural Minnesota will be 100-percent electrified; and

"Whereas rural electrification has proved a good investment to the Government by reason of the fact that it has met its obligations, both principal and interest, in advance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States shall continue to provide funds for the expansion of rural electrification where such construction is economically feasible and likewise to refrain from passing any legislation adverse to the rural-electrification program; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota."

RENT CONTROL—RESOLUTIONS OF RAPID CITY (S. DAK.) LANDLORDS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Landlords' Association, relating to rent control.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is the opinion of the Rapid City Landlords' Association in Rapid City that rent should be decontrolled, as presently administered, for the reason that decontrol is essential to relieve the critical rental housing situation in Rapid City; and

Whereas there are a large number of housing units in Rapid City which are off the rental market and will remain off the rental market as long as Federal control of rentals in Rapid City, as presently administered, exists; and

Whereas the withdrawal of these rental units from the market is due to the conviction of the landlords that the present administration is unfair, inequitable, and in some cases is persecuting and intimidating; and

Whereas many of the rental units are being rented at an actual financial loss to the landlord owners; and

Whereas it is the belief of the Landlords' Association of Rapid City that within a very short time after decontrol of rents in Rapid City there will be sufficient rental units that are now vacant go back onto the market as to not only relieve the rental shortage in Rapid City but to actually reduce rents in many cases. (It is the belief of the landlords of Rapid City that the decontrol of rents will have the same effect in relieving shortage and reducing rates as the recent decontrol of meat, butter, clothing, and other items and that the present deplorable shortage will continue as long as Federal control, as presently administered, exists): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Rapid City Landlords' Association, That the City Commission of Rapid City be petitioned by this resolution to endorse the same and forward it to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to Mr. Ivan D. Carson, Rent Administrator, Washington, D. C., to the end that decontrol of rents by the Federal Government be speedily consummated in Rapid City: *Provided,* That a local rent-control committee be es-

tablished by appropriate resolution of the city commission, senior and junior chambers of commerce, veterans' organizations, and others in Rapid City, to supervise rents and thereby prevent unreasonable rents, and to maintain local control instead of Federal control; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee shall consist of one landlord and one tenant, to be appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the city commissfon, with additional members to be appointed, one each, by the following organizations: City commission, senior chamber of commerce, junior chamber of commerce, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Disabled Veterans' Association, Business and Professional Women's Club, Central Labor Union, Rapid City Board of Realtors, and such other organizations as the city commission may determine; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee shall organize itself so as to effectuate the purpose of its appointment, shall maintain an office at the chamber of commerce, and shall investigate all complaints of excessive rents, which are submitted to it, and take such action as it shall deem fit, consisting of investigation, persuasion, general publicity of such cases as it shall deem unreasonable, and proceed in any other manner which it deems may be effective.

PROTEST AGAINST CERTAIN LABOR POLICIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter I have received from George C. Hilstad, secretary-treasurer of the Traill County (N. Dak.) Electric, embodying a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Electrical Contractors' Association unalterably opposing the present labor policies of the Federal Government, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
January 27, 1947.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At a recent meeting of the North Dakota Electrical Contractors Association held in Devils Lake a resolution regarding labor legislation was passed.

"*Be it resolved by the North Dakota Electrical Contractors Association*, That we are unalterably opposed to the present labor policies of the United States Government; that we question the application of the Wagner Act and labor domination in the agricultural areas; that we are opposed to the application of closed-shop policies and the wage level proposed by the Garrison Dam project; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary be instructed to communicate this resolution to our representatives in the United States Congress."

Very truly yours,

GEORGE C. HILSTAD.

PROTEST AGAINST ANTILABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from Thomas Sneddon, secretary of the Rock Springs Central Labor Union, Rock Springs, Wyo., enclosing a resolution adopted by the Rock Springs Central Labor Union, protesting against antilabor legislation in any form, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCK SPRINGS CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Rock Springs, Wyo.

Greetings:

Enclosed please find copy of a resolution adopted by the Rock Springs Central Labor Union at their meeting held last week, at which time I was instructed to send copies to the Honorable Senator E. V. ROBERTSON, Hon. Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, and the Honorable Representative FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, and also that copies be sent to every member of the Senate and House Labor Committees.

Approximately 90 percent of the working people here are in various unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and any vicious antilabor legislation would greatly affect them.

We respectfully ask you to give the most serious consideration to any antilabor legislation that may be brought before you.

Respectfully,

THOMAS SNEDDON,
Secretary.

The Rock Springs Central Labor Union is composed of the following American Federation of Labor unions: Local Union, No. 2282, United Mine Workers of America, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 2174, United Mine Workers of America, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 2309, United Mine Workers of America, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 2516, United Mine Workers of America, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 905, United Mine Workers of America, Reliance, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 7362, United Mine Workers of America, Gunn, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 3930, United Mine Workers of America, Winton, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 2328, United Mine Workers of America, Superior, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 7404, United Mine Workers of America, Quealy, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 4376, United Mine Workers of America, Dines, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 205, Meatcutters, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 1170, Painters, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 502, Culinary Workers, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 1620, Carpenters, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 143, Auto Mechanics, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 125, Laundry Workers, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 19, Plumbers, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 884, Electricians, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 408, Bartenders, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 12684, Retail Clerks, Rock Springs, Wyo.; Local Union, No. 470, Musicians, Rock Springs, Wyo.

Whereas the above-named organizations have gone on record as being against any antilabor legislation in any form; and

Whereas slowly but surely labor and management are gradually ironing out their difficulties by arbitration, and have no need for Federal laws to hinder them in their negotiations; and

Whereas an era of good feeling is setting in on the industrial front, and employer and employee are showing confidence in their ability to cope with their mutual problems; and

Whereas such laws would jeopardize immediate prospects of full production, and thereby retard prosperity to the Nation; and

Whereas antilabor legislation is unconstitutional by taking away the workers' rights of free collective bargaining; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rock Springs Central Labor Union, of Rock Creek Springs, Wyo., composed of 21 American Federation of Labor unions, condemns any and all antilabor legislation as unfair and unconstitutional and un-American, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator E. V. ROBERTSON, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, and Representative FRANK BARRETT, of the State of Wyoming, and also that copies be sent to the members of the Senate and House Labor Committees.

THOMAS SNEDDON,
JOHN WISNISKI,
STEVE LUCAS,
Resolution Committee.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I have received on the subject of rent control from Hon. Robert F. Bradford, the Governor of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
State House, Boston, February 11, 1947.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I take the opportunity to express my grave concern at the proposals now pending in Congress to terminate rent control or transfer the program from the Federal Government to the States. It is my considered opinion that either would be a serious mistake.

The housing shortage remains critical. Vigorous action is needed to expedite the construction of many additional housing units. Through the State housing board and the emergency State housing authority, I am seeking to determine how our State government can assist more effectively in the building program. But it is all too evident that, no matter how much more can be done by State or Nation, it will be impossible to eliminate the present serious shortage within the next year. Under these circumstances, it is therefore essential that for that year at least adequate safeguards be retained to prevent exploitation of the shortage by oppressive rents and unrestricted evictions. For this reason rent control must be continued.

But the proposal to transfer rent control to the States would, in my opinion, be unsatisfactory and unwise. The problem is national in scope and, while the Federal rent control administration is open to legitimate criticism in many respects, it is the only agency now functioning. Transfer to the States would require the creation of new, large, temporary State agencies. Months would inevitably elapse before their personnel could work out effective procedures or take up the complex details of administration and enforcement already being performed by a functioning Federal agency. During that period of transition there would be real risk that the whole rent-control program would bog down in the resulting confusion. In addition, the creation and maintenance of the necessary new State agencies would impose a heavy financial burden upon the States.

While I have recommended and our legislature is now considering ways and means of setting up State machinery to be in readiness if Federal control of rents is terminated, I earnestly hope that the Congress will continue the Federal rent control administration for 1 year after its present expiration date.

In this connection may I urge you to oppose any legislation to permit a flat increase in all rents. The two problems are related. Owners of real estate, like everyone else, are seriously affected by increases in costs. However, it seems to me increases in

rent, where needed, can be more fairly allowed by permitting them only where the administrative agency can be satisfied that they are necessary to avoid hardship in any given case.

If Federal rent control can be extended for another year, by the end of that period we should be well on our way toward solving many of the present difficulties contributing to the housing shortage. Until that time, for the reasons indicated, I am convinced rent control should continue without any flat increase in rents, and that the control should remain under Federal administration.

I know that you are fully aware of the serious nature of the housing problem throughout Massachusetts, and I hope that I can count upon your active support.

Sincerely yours,

ROBT. F. BRADFORD.

PROPOSED INCOME-TAX REVISION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter, dated February 7, 1947, addressed to me by Glenn W. Teichmer. I should like to document the Senate's consideration of proposed income-tax revision by this letter from one of my constituents. He presents an example of the effect of an across-the-board 20-percent reduction in income-tax rates. It presents the case so well that I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *February 7, 1947.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: I cannot understand how Congress can consider decreasing income taxes for persons with high incomes and still continue to collect income tax from persons who cannot afford to buy good food.

Under the $500 exemption for each individual which is in effect at the present time and which is apparently going to continue, tax is collected from persons at the expense of their personal well-being. I know of one woman in this city who has heart trouble, and any exertion causes her to faint. She is unable to work, and her only income is $600 per year. Look at the tax table on Form 1040 for the year 1946. She must pay $10 tax. This leaves her less than $50 per month for living expenses. That tax is truly blood money.

Congress apparently feels that revenue collections can safely be reduced, so they plan to reduce her tax by 20 percent and hereafter charge her only $8 per year instead of the present $10.

On the other hand, a person with $50,000 income per year now pays approximately one-half of the amount for Federal income tax, leaving a mere $25,000 to struggle along on. Since he is in such unfortunate circumstances, Congress is going to give him a 20-percent tax reduction also, which means an additional $5,000 for him to keep, when he could not possibly use the $25,000 he is allowed to retain under the present law for ordinary living expenses.

As I see it, and as I hope you and your colleagues will see it, the persons who need relief from income taxes most will be the ones to benefit least by a flat 20 percent reduction in rates.

Please put forth every effort to substitute an increase in the personal exemption for the proposed 20 percent reduction in tax rates.

Respectfully,

GLENN W. TEICHMER.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONNECTICUT FARM BUREAU FEDERATION RELATING TO FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received a copy of resolutions adopted by the Connecticut State Farm Bureau Federation at Hartford, Conn., setting forth what organized agriculture in Connecticut is working for. I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S WHERE YOUR STATE FARM BUREAU STANDS

These resolutions were adopted at the annual meeting of the Connecticut State Farm Bureau Federation at Hartford last month. They form the basis of the Farm Bureau's program for 1947. They represent what organized agriculture in Connecticut is working for.

"FARM LABOR PROGRAM

"We commend the Extension Service for its service to farmers in administering the farm labor program during the critical war years and since.

"Some of the achievements in Connecticut during those years include:

"Over 31,000 full-time and seasonal placements per year.

"A definite improvement in living and working conditions on many farms.

"A definite development and promotion of labor-saving methods.

"Greater cooperation between farmers in sharing labor and equipment.

"The development and promotion of a farm safety program, including transportation of workers.

"The shortage of farm labor remains severe and all indications point to as great or greater need for this program in 1947.

"Therefore, we recommend that this program be continued under the present Public Law 229 as amended, with the following suggestions:

" 'The continuance of a national farm labor program should be a part of and directed by the United States Department of Agriculture. At the Federal level its over-all operation should be under the Agricultural Extension Service.'

"The present labor branch should be retained to direct the foreign-labor program as long as there is need for these workers. This should be in cooperation with the Extension Service the same as at present.

"At the State level there should be a farm labor committee of principal users of farm labor, appointed by the farmers, to act as an advisory group to the Extension Service in carrying out their responsibilities. The Extension Service may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals, and utilize their facilities in carrying out their duties.

"Federal funds appropriated for such a program should be limited to interstate and intrastate recruiting of workers and their families, placement of such workers, gathering and disseminating of statistical information on labor supplies, but in no event should any part of such funds be used for setting wages, or enforcing collective bargaining or union membership.

"The Agricultural Extension Service and/or labor branch should continue the operation of the present farm-labor supply centers with specific time limitations governing their operation, and provided conditions are established for local boards of trustees to determine local policy of each camp for lease and eventual sale of such centers to growers, grower groups, State or local agencies.

"Authority should be granted for the importation, transportation, and such other matters as may be required under treaties providing for importation of foreign workers in the event there is a shortage of domestic farm labor of a type not otherwise available.

"We urge our directors to take appropriate steps to acquaint Connecticut's representatives in Congress of our position in this regard."

PROTECTION OF FARM ECONOMY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an editorial printed by the Bisbee (Ariz.) Review on the subject of protection to the farmers in the change from a war economy to a peace economy, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM OUTPUT SURPLUS

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, who by the seniority rule is * * * chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, can be depended on to weigh all farm bills with the interest of the farmer uppermost in mind. For this reason, his statement on how best to protect the farmer in the transition from a war economy to a peace economy commands attention.

Senator CAPPER will hold to the Federal promise to keep the price of farm commodities at 90 percent of parity for the two years following the war. That is an obligation which the people assumed to encourage farmers to produce all they could during the war years.

But, as Senator CAPPER points out, the taxpayer has a voice in the extent to which the Government should keep the price of farm products up. If the price assurance thus given results in huge surpluses, some of which may have to be unloaded abroad at a heavy loss, the taxpayer will object. Also, if the American price is kept so high that foreign farm products can be imported at a much lower price, the American consumer will have reason to protest.

Obviously, the American market must be kept for the American farmer. Some surplus above the demands of the American market is inevitable. But it may be necessary to limit the surplus if it becomes too large. That would involve production controls, which offend the American system of free enterprise. Orderly transition to a healthy peacetime farm economy may not be smooth.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Milton E. Kettler, chairman, daylight-saving-time committee for the Junior Board of Commerce of Washington, D. C., urging the adoption of permanent daylight-saving time during the summer months for the District of Columbia and the adjacent counties in Maryland and Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUNIOR BOARD OF COMMERCE,

Washington, D. C., February 10, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senate Office Building.

DEAR SIR: The Junior Board of Commerce of Washington, D. C., is sponsoring a campaign for the adoption of permanent daylight-saving time during the summer months for the District of Columbia and the adjacent counties in Maryland and Virginia. The

junior board has formed a special committee, the daylight-saving-time committee, and assigned it the task of organizing a movement in the Washington area, which will culminate in the passage of appropriate legislation authorizing summer daylight-saving time.

The committee takes this opportunity to inform you on some of the results obtained by this program. More than 100 letters were addressed to civic, fraternal, and social organizations in and around Washington, asking them to consider this matter and forward us copies of resolutions, either endorsing the program or opposing it. To date, we have heard from over 50 percent of the organizations solicited, 47 of them endorsed the program and 9 of them opposed it. Many organizations, such as the Washington Board of Trade, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the Board of Education, the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, and 26 citizens' associations, have pledged their support to this movement and more are doing so daily.

It appears from the results so far received that the people in the Washington area, by a great majority, want daylight-saving time. We ask you to give this matter a prominent place on your calendar and request all possible support when the bills, already introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate, are brought up for consideration.

We thank you for your cooperation in this matter. We are prepared to present the results of the campaign of our daylight-saving-time committee to your committee at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON E. KETTLER,
Chairman, Daylight Saving Time Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. BUSHFIELD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 568) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 24) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BUCK introduced Senate bill 590, relating to maximum rents on housing accommodations, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. CONNALLY):

S. 591. A bill to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 592. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 593. A bill to provide for the adjustment of repayment contract, cancellation of irrigation charges, and amendment of certain provisions of the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 464), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and for other purposes, Flathead irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 594. A bill to create a Commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 595. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 597. A bill to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 598. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces; and

S. 599. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Sidney T. Mills; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 600. A bill for the relief of Charles Seraphim Peroulas and George Athanasios Peroulas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 601. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 602. A bill to remove the racial restrictions upon naturalization and to amend the immigration laws, and for other purposes;

S. 603. A bill for the relief of certain Indonesian aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 604. A bill to provide for the disposition of Indian tribal funds deposited in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 605, to consolidate in the Department of Justice the function of furnishing legal advice to Government agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 606. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide automobiles or other conveyances for certain disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. CAIN) introduced Senate bill 607, to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 608. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mr. Growing Four Times; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 609. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 611. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Act by providing for the prescribing and enforcement of safety rules and regulations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BREWSTER (by request):

S. 612. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate Joint Resolution 65, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Labor to make certain studies of the health of school children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill relating to maximum rent on housing accommodations, and at the same time to remove all rental housing from the jurisdiction of OPA. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill (S. 590) relating to maximum rents on housing accommodations, introduced by Mr. BUCK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LEGAL ADVICE BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to consolidate in the Department of Justice the functions of employees in other agencies occupying positions, the incumbents of which are required to be lawyers. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement I have prepared, be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 605) to consolidate in the Department of Justice the function of furnishing legal advice to Government agencies, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all personnel employed by each of the agencies of the Government (other than the Department of Justice) in positions of attorneys or in any other positions requiring the services of persons learned in the law, are hereby transferred from such agencies to the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. After the effective date of this act, no agency of the Government (other than the Department of Justice) shall employ any person in any such position.

SEC. 3. Any personnel transferred under the provisions of the first section of this act in excess of the numbers required by the Attorney General in the exercise of his functions shall be separated from the service, or transferred to positions not requiring the services of persons learned in the law.

SEC. 4. Whenever, after the effective date of this act, any agency of the Government

is in need of legal counsel or advice, the head of such agency shall request the Attorney General to furnish such counsel or advice. The Attorney General shall consider any such request and if the subject matter upon which legal counsel or advice is sought is one upon which it is appropriate to furnish such counsel or advice, he shall provide for furnishing such counsel or advice to such agency. For the purpose of enabling the Attorney General to carry out the provisions of this section efficiently, he is authorized temporarily to assign personnel of the Department of Justice to other agencies of the Government and to establish in the Department of Justice such bureaus, offices, sections, or divisions as he may deem necessary. Any personnel so assigned by the Attorney General to any agency of the Government shall, while so assigned, remain subject to the general supervision of the Attorney General and shall be subject to the supervision of the head of the agency to which assigned only to the extent specified by the Attorney General.

SEC. 5. The President is authorized—

(1) to make such provision for the transfer or other disposition of Government records and property (including office equipment) as he may deem appropriate in view of the transfer of personnel provided for by the first section of this act; and

(2) to make such provision for the transfer or impounding in the Treasury of the unexpended balances of appropriations available for the carrying out of the functions heretofore performed by such personnel as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 6. (a) When used in this act, the term "agency of the Government" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation owned or controlled by the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, authority, or administration, in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) This act shall become effective on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Section 361 of the Revised Statutes, which was derived from the act of June 22, 1870, provided that all services requiring the skill of persons learned in the law and necessary to enable other departments of the Government to carry out their functions should be performed by officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General.

This section reads as follows:

"SEC. 361. The officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, shall give all opinions and render all services requiring the skill of persons learned in the law necessary to enable the President and heads of departments, and the heads of bureaus and other officers in the departments, to discharge their respective duties; and shall, on behalf of the United States, procure the proper evidence for, and conduct, prosecute, or defend all suits and proceedings in the Supreme Court and in the Court of Claims, in which the United States, or any officer thereof, as such officer, is a party or may be interested; and no fees shall be allowed or paid to any other attorney or counselor at law for any service herein required of the officers of the Department of Justice, except in the cases provided by section 363."

The provisions referred to in the first paragraph have been superseded to a great extent by subsequent statutes imposing legal functions upon other agencies of the Government and authorizing the employment of personnel necessary to carry out such functions.

The attached bill would transfer to the Department of Justice all employees in other agencies occupying positions the incumbents of which are required to be lawyers. After such transfer such other agencies would be prohibited from filling such positions, and would be compelled to call upon the Attorney General for such legal assistance as might be required.

The Attorney General would be permitted to assign members of his staff temporarily to other agencies but would retain the control and supervision of attorneys so assigned.

The bill would take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

INCORPORATION OF AMVETS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to incorporate the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II.

This is a companion measure to House bill 1888 in the House of Representatives.

The bill (S. 607) to incorporate the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II—introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. CAIN), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE-TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. WATKINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, simplification of appropriation bills is one of the most-needed reforms in the movement toward retrenchment in governmental expenditures. This is especially true in the present session when Congress is undertaking to reduce the executive budget. At the present time there are 11 regular appropriation bills, each being presented to the House and the Senate at different times, and the 11 do not include supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills.

With the termination of the war, it is vitally necessary to reduce our expenditures as a whole to a peacetime level, plus the new obligations that rest upon our Government due to the war, such as increased cost of the veterans, the increase in interest on the public debt, a stronger and better national defense, and to take care of our international commitments.

The complications in the present methods of appropriating money are so confusing as to make it most difficult to understand clearly the amount of money that is being appropriated for expenditure during any one fiscal year. An example of this is given in the pending budget recommended by the President. This budget recommends an expenditure in the next current year of $37,500,000,000, although, in fact, the actual appropriation budget for the next fiscal year is $32,300,000,000, and out of this appropriation only the sum of $28,600,000,000 is to be expended in the next fiscal year.

So as to simplify and enable a clearer understanding of the appropriation bills, the Senator from Nebraska and I are submitting a concurrent resolution providing for the submission to Congress of one appropriation bill to be considered at one time. This would enable the presentation to the respective Houses of Congress of a consolidated appropriation bill for their consideration. It would give the Congress and the country an opportunity to see the budget picture as a whole and to compare the spending proposals with the revenue estimates. This is not possible under the present system of considering separate appropriation bills over a period ranging up to 6 months.

The concurrent resolution provides for showing in tabular form within the consolidated bill, not only the current appropriation items, but also the expenditures against them, along with expenditures from appropriations made in prior years, and it provides for showing, also, that part of current appropriations to be carried over for expenditure in subsequent years. This provision would apply also to deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills and would conform with the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act, insofar as it shows the budget in terms of expenditures, as well as in terms of appropriations.

In tabular form the appropriation bills would then show not only the appropriation and expenditure figures for each item, but it would show also the totals which could be compared with the legislative limitations as provided in the reorganization bill.

The concurrent resolution provides also that each amendment to the appropriation bill shall show in tabular form the changes in each amount amended, including the totals, and thus act as a constant deterrent to exceeding the expenditure limit set by the joint resolution required under section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

One appropriation bill would have the great value of focusing the attention of Congress and the taxpayers upon the expenditures and receipts. In this period

of retrenchment I think such a plan is essential. Under this plan due notice would, of course, be given by the chairmen of the respective appropriation committees that a consolidated budget would be considered on a certain day, and the necessary time could be devoted by Members of Congress to the consideration of this most vital question, with the result, I am certain, of an increased interest for economy and efficiency. At the same time the people of the country could be better informed as to the total of the expenditures proposed.

I submit a more detailed explanation of the effect of the proposed legislation, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

1. It provides for the consolidation of all the 11 separate general appropriation bills into one complete budget bill for consideration as a whole, at one time, by the respective Houses of Congress.

2. It provides for a tabular presentation of budget items which would show at a glance:

(a) Itemized objects of each appropriation.

(b) Total amounts appropriated by item.

(c) The amount of the appropriation which may be expended in the ensuing fiscal year, by item.

(d) Additional funds from appropriations made in prior years which are available for expenditure for each item in the ensuing year.

(e) The total amount from all appropriations available for expenditure in the ensuing year.

(f) The amount of the current appropriation which would not be expended in the ensuing year, but would be carried over for expenditure in one or more subsequent years.

3. It provides also that the figures in each of the above categories shall be totaled, and that each amendment to the bill shall amend each item and figure affected, including the totals.

ESTABLISHES RULES

This legislative presentation of the budget bill and the procedure just outlined would be accomplished under terms of the resolution by amendment of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to establish rules for the purpose in the respective Houses.

DISTURBS NEITHER SUBCOMMITTEES NOR METHOD OF HANDLING BILL ON THE FLOOR

The proposal need not disturb the present system of subcommittee consideration of budget legislation, for it may be presumed that the consolidated bill would be organized and drawn under titles closely paralleling the subjects of the present 11 bills. It would require that all of the titles, or parts, be consolidated by the full Appropriations Committees of the respective Houses, which would bring the bill to the floor as a complete consolidated bill, and for consideration as such.

Neither would the proposal necessarily preclude the handling of the bill on the floor by the various subcommittee chairmen who conducted the hearings on the various titles under the jurisdiction of their respective subcommittees.

TIME ARGUMENT

It may be contended that consideration of the consolidated bill on the floors of the respective Houses will be time consuming, and that bringing the bill to the floors will be delayed pending completion of hearings on all the titles.

In the first place, the longer the bill can be held back without impairing full consideration, the more requirements for supplemental appropriation bills to furnish money for current legislation will be reduced. This should reduce the time spent by the committees and subcommittees in considering additional bills.

In the second place it is doubtful whether the time required for consideration of one bill on the floors will be greater than the cumulated time consumed in consideration of 11 bills.

In the third place there is little before the Congress which merits more time than the expenditure of thirty to forty billion dollars of public money. Moreover, the budget implements not only all our domestic policies but also our foreign relations, and it deals directly with every Federal operation as well as those of most States and many localities. No amount of time given to consideration of the budget is too much.

ADVANTAGES OF A CONSOLIDATED BILL

1. It brings together in one place at one time the expenditure and appropriation program of the Federal Government, so that all of the items can be weighted and considered in their relative importance one to another. This is impossible under the present system, under which appropriation and spending legislation is considered at 11 different times, in 11 separate and almost unrelated bills which are brought in over a period of up to 6 months.

2. It gives the Congress and the country a chance to see the whole fiscal program of the Federal Government at one time. Moreover, it gives the Appropriations Committees a chance to see the same thing.

3. It gives the Appropriations Committees, the members of the Revenue Committees, the Congress, and the country a chance to see how the spending program compares with the tax program, and this is in the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

ADVANTAGES OF THE TABULAR FORM

1. It enables all interested to see the difference between appropriations and expenditures, and this is necessary under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

2. It gives a clear indication as to the extent to which the Government is committed to long-range spending projects.

3. By amending the totals it gives the Congress definite knowledge as to the effect of each amendment.

4. It provides a constant safeguard—even during actual consideration—against exceeding the expenditure ceilings.

IN CONCLUSION

Together, the consolidated bill, in the proposed tabular form, gives a clear, concise, current presentation not only of the appropriations being made, and the expenditures to be made, but also a running account of the approach to the spending ceiling.

Mr. BYRD. Now Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) Commencing with the Eightieth Congress, all general appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of —— (the blank to be filled in with the calendar year in which the fiscal year for which such appropriations are being made ends). As used in this paragraph the term 'general appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill, and each deficiency or supplemental general appropriation bill, shall show in tabular form by items and totals (A) each item of appropriation, (B) the amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from such appropriation, (C) the amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from all other appropriations made in prior years for the same purpose as the item of appropriation referred to in clause (A) is made, (D) the total amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from such appropriations, and (E) that part of the item of appropriation referred to in clause (A) which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the ensuing fiscal year.

"(3) Amendments to any general appropriation bill which would have the effect of changing any figures required to be shown by paragraph 2 of this subsection, shall contain a provision changing such figures to conform to the proposed amendment.

"(4) No general appropriation bill and no amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House unless it conforms with this rule."

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) submitted by Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF MONOPOLIES AND MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. KILGORE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to—

(a) make a full and complete study and investigation of the extent of monopoly and monopolistic practices in industry, trade, and agriculture, the effect of monopoly and monopolistic practices upon employment, production, and purchasing power and the effectiveness of present Federal functions with respect to preventing, eliminating, or controlling monopoly and monopolistic practices, and the need for such improved Federal functions as may be necessary (1) to develop a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program; (2) to foster competitive private enterprise, prevent the development of monopoly and monopolistic practices, and, where such development has taken place, to work toward the elimination of monopoly and monopolistic practices; and (3) to protect the public interest through effective methods of public control of monopoly and monopolistic practices; and

(b) report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such proposed legislation and other recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods, to employ such technical, clerical, and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which

shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Morning business is now closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE ON PRESS REPRESENTATION AT MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a few days ago, on February 11, Mr. Herbert Bayard Swope, chairman of the Overseas News Agency, made a very strong and forceful statement concerning the representatives of the press attending the Moscow Conference. The subject is of such tremendous interest to all the press of the country and to all the people as well, and the statement so trenchant, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, February 11.—If the Soviet Union is unable to provide facilities for more than 15 to 20 American news and radio men and photographers at the meeting next month at Moscow of the Council of Foreign Ministers, the site of that all-important gathering should be changed, Herbert Bayard Swope, former United States associate representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, advised in a statement issued by him today.

Mr. Swope added that the United States "ought to decline the invitation (to Moscow, where the final German treaty is to be drafted), if the penalty for our acceptance of the Soviet Government's invitation is the rigid restriction of the number of press and radio men permitted to enter Moscow to report the historic Conference to the American people."

Secretary of State George C. Marshall said Friday last that he had been informed by the Soviet Union that, instead of accommodating the 73 American correspondents who have applied for Soviet visas to attend the meeting, facilities would be available for no more than 15 or 20.

Last December, during the meetings here of the Council, Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov promised then Secretary of State James F. Byrnes that American correspondents would be given every facility for reporting the momentous conference, opening in the Soviet capital March 10.

The statement by Mr. Swope, who is chairman of the Overseas News Agency, reads as follows:

"Secretary Marshall has informed the American people that the Government of the U. S. S. R. has found it necessary to restrict to 15 or 20 the number of American news and radio men and photographers to be admitted into the Soviet Union to report the Moscow meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers. There was no restriction on the number of correspondents covering previous sessions of the Council in Paris and New York. More than 500 correspondents are accredited to the United Nations here of whom 300 are Americans.

"The forthcoming meeting in Moscow is the most important of any of the meetings of the foreign ministers yet held for it will consider the question of the terms under which Germany and Austria must live, for years to come. It will in large part determine the shape of things in Europe—and to a great extent, the whole world structure—for a long time.

"The decisions to be taken in Moscow will—insofar as the United States is concerned—have to be ratified or rejected by American public opinion. That opinion will be formed on the basis of the information our newspapers, radio and magazines present to their audiences. On this, the gravest decision the United States has been called upon to make since the cessation of active warfare, the American people must have the widest possible sources of factual information and interpretation.

"There is no need to doubt the legitimacy of the Russian claim that Moscow cannot accommodate or give working facilities to all those who should cover the Conference. The answer, however, is not to restrict the number of reporters admitted. The answer is to change the meeting place of the Conference.

"Diplomatic courtesy is a civilized and necessary attribute of international relations. It cannot be made the excuse for a series of restrictions that hold grave danger to the peace of the world. Believing in the freedom of the press, we should resolutely oppose all efforts to restrict that freedom.

"The American press and radio have been conscious of the Soviet Union's difficulties in the matter of press facilities and have shown their awareness by limiting to a total of 73 the number of their visa applications. I suggest that the Secretary of State make clear to the Soviet Government the American position with regard to the press."

FINAL PAYMENT FOR TIETON IRRIGATION PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the editorial I have in my hand, which comes from the Yakima Republic, whose publisher is Mr. Ted Robertson, and whose editor is Mr. Robert Lucas, relates a story of an achievement which every Senator will find worthy of his interest and concern.

This story began in 1905, 42 years ago, when the Federal Government authorized the construction of the Yakima reclamation project, of which the Tieton irrigation district was a part.

Approximately $3,500,000 of construction cost went into the Tieton irrigation district. Water was first delivered in 1910 over an area of 25,000 acres. This land had been an expanse of sagebrush and desert. Today there is no land anywhere more fruitful or productive.

Over the years more than $160,000,000 of crops have been returned from a reclamation construction cost of $3,500,000.

Today marks the end of the long repayment road for the farmers of the Tieton irrigation district. Today those farmers are happily making the last payment on a Federal obligation incurred 42 years ago. When the Interior Department accepts today in Yakima a final-payment check in the sum of $19,631, it not only importantly means that the farmers of the Tieton irrigation district have paid all their construction bills but it marks the fact that the Tieton irrigation district is the first irrigation district in America to discharge entirely its indebtedness to the United States under the reclamation law.

The people of the Yakima Valley in eastern Washington State are proud of their achievement. All others in Washington State reflect that pride. I think, too, that all Americans who are conscious of the achievement will think it worthy of more than passing approval and applause. In paying their bills, the farmers of the Yakima Valley have established a healthy and proper relationship with their Federal Government. They needed financial assistance, and they got it. But in paying their debts they gave evidence through labor and hard work that they did not expect something for nothing; that they never have and never will seek either a Federal dole or a hand-out.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the Yakima Republic editorial, for it adds further substance to the statement I have made.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forty years ago the United States Government invested $3,500,000 to build an irrigation system for 24,000 acres of land in the Yakima Valley of central Washington State.

Today, Friday, February 14, the farmers of the system, known as the Tieton division, handed Secretary of Interior Krug a check for $19,630.98. This money was the final payment to the Bureau of Reclamation. It will give some 1,300 ranchers, successors and heirs of hard-handed pioneers, the distinction of representing the first Federal irrigation project in the Nation completely to meet its construction obligation.

The glory of the occasion is not, however, in the incident of complete repayment. Though that is unique in the twilight days of Government beneficence, the glory is in the record of productive achievement by hard-working freemen.

The significance of the event is emphasized by the contributory role of Federal Government: helping men help themselves, and making it pay both ways.

During three and one-half decades these 24,000 acres produced crops valued at $160,000,000, or 44 times the Federal Government's investment in construction. Every year during that brief period the cluster of 20-acre farms blooming where sagebrush before had ruled, produced $3,800,000 worth of crops, or more than the total cost of construction.

Many of the earliest settlers were not farmers at all. They were doctors, lawyers, druggists, salesmen, hardware merchants, and school teachers who bought claims on the Tieton as a result of land promotions, particularly in the Middle West and Wisconsin. Those that stuck, those that sweat and froze it out and those that carried on from where others had failed, built value and earning power into the once-arid soil. They remained free and independent men and women—self-sufficient, honorable, and proud of their accomplishment—though the Government itself advanced the loan for their success.

Today the little Tieton is an emerald at the center of a great area of farm wealth in the State of Washington. Nearly a half-million acres laced with the engineered waters of many streams, lay as a living mosaic of a rich and abundant civilization transplanted in wasteland. This is the testimonial to the wisdom of sound Government policy honestly conceived as a service to the people, honorably prosecuted upon principles of investment and obligation of contract, carefully insured against the normal concomitants of governmental paternalism—for

too often the unshakable shadow of Government aid stifles enterprise.

The abundant extent that the United States Government helped the pioneers of central Washington is found in what the pioneers of central Washington were allowed to do for themselves. To such an extent does the Central Government reach its highest form of expression. That is the meat, bone, and sinew of western dry-land reclamation. It is in tribute to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the staying power of people of strong faith that the final payment on the Tieton project has its greatest meaning.

"COMMUNIST" LABEL HELD LIBELOUS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as one who hates communism in all its forms, but who believes that too frequently in America innocent persons are charged with being either Communists or Communist sympathizers, I should like to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an article entitled "'Communist' Label Held Libelous," from the Washington Post of this morning, reading in part, as follows:

The United States circuit court of appeals has ruled that in Illinois "it is libelous per se to write of a man or a corporation that they are Communists or Communist sympathizers."

Mr. President, I think that not only is sound law, but is the acceptance also of the principle of common decency and fair play.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLINOIS RULING—"COMMUNIST" LABEL HELD LIBELOUS

CHICAGO, February 13.—The United States circuit court of appeals has ruled that in Illinois "it is libelous per se (of itself) to write of a man or a corporation that they are Communists or Communist sympathizers."

This, the court stated yesterday, is "because the label of Communist today in the minds of many average and respectable persons places the accused beyond the pale of respectability and makes him a symbol of public hatred, contrary to the statute."

The majority ruling was by Judge Evan A. Evans, with whom Judge Otto Kerner concurred. Judge Walter C. Lindley dissented in part. He agreed with his colleagues that the term "Communist" is actionable in Illinois but that a reading of the publication in the suit before the court did not convince him that the term had been applied definitely to the parties seeking damages.

In its ruling the court of appeals reversed a district court ruling and ordered to trial a $6,000,000 libel suit against Westbrook Pegler, columnist; King Features Syndicate, and the Illinois Publishing & Printing Co., publishers of the Chicago Herald-American.

The suit was brought by A. N. Spanel and the International Latex Corp., of which Spanel is president. It alleged the company and its president were libeled in an article by Pegler printed March 15, 1945.

District Judge Elwyn R. Shaw dismissed the suit at the defense request on the ground that no cause for action had been established by Spanel and his concern. Defense counsel contended the word "Communist" had no definite meaning.

The appeals court, however, declared:

"But there can be no denial that its appearance as a characterization in a newspaper political editorial is sufficient to destroy a person's presumably good reputation with the public.

"And it seems anomalous for defendants to make such a contention (that the term is without definite meaning) because newspaper publishers generally, as molders of public opinion, have created the ogre which defendants here seek to characterize as innocuous."

CONDITIONS IN GERMANY—LETTER TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the wife of an Army officer in Germany discussing in a very interesting and illuminating manner some of the problems she finds existing in Germany. I ask that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD, omitting the name of the writer of the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1947.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Republican Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is my first letter to one of our lawmakers, but I was so overjoyed to read the enclosed article which appeared in last week's Stars and Stripes that I felt I must write you. It was wonderful to know that one visiting Senator to the ETO did not succumb to the VIP treatment (very important persons). It makes some of us worry when we read the glowing reports some of the other visiting Senators, newspapermen, and radio reporters give of their visits over here.

The longer one is here, the more you see and hear, the more distrustful you become of the German people. You are quite right when you say that "the German people would start another war if given a chance." To many of us it appears to be a definite organized movement among them, to stir up distrust and hatred toward the Russians. Sooner or later, every German you contact brings up the subject of the Russians, want to know how you feel about them, and offers the subtle little remark that some day Russia and the United States will be at war. They also hate the Polish guards who police the dependent communities, and try to stir up suspicion toward them.

They put their own interpretation to everything which happens. If one fired a servant for stealing, in 30 minutes' time every servant in the community knows about it, and you never know how it is accomplished. You never see them leave the house, you know they have not used the telephone, but somehow the word gets around. They steal, regardless of how generous you are with them.

Just recently a WAC lieutenant in charge of civilian personnel here at the Ninety-eighth General Hospital, directly in charge of the German employees of the hospital, was transferred to another post. Just a few hours after I heard about it, my maid told me that Lieutenant So-and-So had been sent away because she was so good to the German people. I did some checking among the other dependents in the community and found that their servants had expressed the same views. In this case, their tale was partly true, for the WAC lieutenant and her crackpot mother were forever expressing themselves about the "poor, downtrodden German people who had no part in this awful war." They criticized the Army's methods, and made themselves so obnoxious that it probably had something to do with her transfer, but she was also guilty of gross neglect of her job.

Whenever my husband plans any changes in water lines or construction of any kind he has days of difficulties until he can get it across to his key foremen that the changes are going to be made. The workmen seem to think the Army will be here only a short time, so why change things over to the American way.

The best thing which could happen to America would be to have everyone come over here and live among the Germans for 6 months or a year. There are too many people at home who have not been touched by the war, other than to become more prosperous.

I don't know whether the opinions of my Senator from Indiana coincide with yours on the German question, but I hope they do. I shall certainly give him my opinion when I get home.

Best wishes to you in all your endeavors.

Respectfully,

_____.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER ON RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding suggestions for possible changes in the trade-agreements program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER

Mr. President, within the last few days a number of suggestions of possible changes in the trade-agreements program have been made. Today I should like to present briefly a further suggestion which, it seems to me in all candor, could be accepted by the State Department and which would, at the same time, guarantee adequate relief to American producers who have suffered serious injury from a tariff reduction.

I say that this proposal can be accepted by the State Department in line with its repeated announcement that it has no intention of inflicting serious injury on domestic producers. At the same time, there is no reason why this change would seriously hamper negotiation of future agreements. If we are not all kidding the public, twisting words away from their real meaning to gain popular support for a slogan or a phrase that does not really describe our true aims, my proposal offers a possible basis of agreement.

In order that there may be no doubt as to exactly what I propose, I have had legal language drafted to express my thought. To date, I have seen no public proposal which attempts to define the injury which domestic producers must suffer in order to be entitled to relief. The intent of this language is to establish a standard or definition of injury. Here is the language, submitted with the thought that it may be, in substance, incorporated in the Executive order that has been suggested by others who likewise are interested in this whole problem:

"If any trade organization or industrial, mining, or agricultural group, or substantial section thereof, shall complain to the President that any article or articles are being imported into the United States in substantial quantities or increasing ratio to domestic production of any like or similar competitive domestically produced articles or under such terms or conditions as to render ineffective or seriously to endanger the maintenance of such domestic production or any wage or hour agreement entered into in pursuance of the laws of the United States or any State thereof, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission as a preferred matter, and if, after such public notice and hearing as he shall specify, the President shall find the existence of such facts, he

shall direct that the article or articles concerned shall no longer be admitted to the United States at the rate of duty specified in any reciprocal trade agreement heretofore or hereafter made, pursuant to the authority granted in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and the sale or offer for sale in the United States of such foreign-made article or articles at a wholesale price less than the domestic cost of production delivered in the same market with a reasonable profit shall be presumptive evidence of the serious endangerment to the maintenance of such domestic production."

It is my hope that all who are interested in this problem will take the opportunity to give careful consideration to this suggestion. In my opinion, it is the irreducible minimum that we should be willing to guarantee to domestic producers in order to give them competitive equality in domestic markets. It will not cure all the faults of the present program, but it will, I believe, strike at the primary evil.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 15, 1947, will be the one hundred and twenty-seventh anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony.

In preparation for that occasion the old brick house which stands at 17 Madison Street in Rochester, N. Y., will be open this afternoon for a tea. Miss Anthony for 40 years—from 1866 to her death on March 13, 1906, lived in this home.

The Rochester Federation of Women's Clubs, which Miss Anthony organized in 1898—received articles of incorporation from the State of New York for the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc. Through voluntary contributions this house was bought so that it might become a house of history—a national memorial to Miss Anthony and her associates. The woman's suffrage movement in which Miss Anthony participated has frequently been described as "the mightiest woman's crusade the world has ever known, led by as great generals as ever headed armies and finished fights for victory."

At the tea this afternoon in Miss Anthony's old Rochester home three women in costume will represent the great triumvirate: Miss Anthony, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Mrs. Lucretia Mott, who, as you know, are represented in marble here in the Capitol Building.

Some of the original furniture of Miss Anthony's time has been returned to the house. Other items now in this shrine are her pictures, her Bible, the silk flag used at suffrage conventions, the gavel she used when she presided, and so forth. In the museum room is the mahogany desk which was used by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, who succeeded Miss Anthony as leader, and put through the nineteenth amendment.

At Miss Anthony's funeral Mrs. Catt in her tribute said:

> This woman for a large part of half a century was the chief inspiration, counselor, and guide of our movement. There were great women associated with her from time to time—women of wonderful intellect, of superb power, of grand character, yet she clearly was the greatest of them all, the greatest woman of our century.

To this tribute from Mrs. Catt I would like to add my own word of appreciation by repeating something I said on the floor of the Senate on a similar occasion 2 years ago:

> The month of February has furnished this Nation with the three greatest warriors for liberty in its history—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony. She was truly one of these great ones. She had vision, she had courage—the courage of perseverance, than which there is no greater courage.
>
> George Washington freed this country; Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves; and Miss Anthony freed women.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day speech delivered by him at Louisville, Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S EFFORT FOR WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Nation's Effort for World Peace," delivered by Senator HOLLAND at the fiftieth anniversary banquet of the Charles Broadway Rouss Volunteer Fire Company at Winchester, Va., on February 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FLANDERS BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Senator FLANDERS by Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, at a luncheon given by the Committee for Economic Development at the Waldorf Astoria, New York City, January 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—ADDRESS BY ERIC JOHNSTON

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's foreign economic policy delivered by Eric Johnston before the Chamber of Commerce of Rochester, N. Y., on January 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PALESTINE DECISION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Palestine Decision," published in the Washington Post of February 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Grudge Fight," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of February 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Lilienthal's Training," published in the New York Times of February 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Attack on Lilienthal," published in the New York Times of February 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE WITH BROTHERHOOD—POEM BY JAMES P. McGOVERN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Peace With Brotherhood," written by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES—PROPOSED REDUCTION IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. GURNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to present a matter in the nature of a personal statement which I think will require not more than 7 or 8 minutes, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to present it at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I think it is very important that I proceed with my address now, for the reason that a joint meeting of House and Senate committees is being held today to consider the legislative budget. A session was held this morning, and the meeting will reconvene again at 2 o'clock. Therefore, I hope I may be allowed to proceed without interruption, at least for any great length of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will proceed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the committees in joint session are performing the function assigned to them by the Reorganization Act. The purpose of the joint meeting of the committees is to enable them to report to the two Houses of Congress their suggestion respecting total appropriations and their estimate of tax receipts during the fiscal year 1948.

The subcommittee of the joint committee has made its recommendation that the President's budget be reduced by $6,000,000,000. Motions are now pending before the joint committee to reduce that suggested reduction from $6,000,000,000 to $4,500,000,000. A further amendment has been offered by me which would reduce the reduction from $6,000,000,000 to $4,150,000,000. My purpose in offering that amendment was to make such provision that our Nation could be protected by adequate forces. Furthermore, the amendment would make it mandatory that the Army and Navy take token cuts from the amount suggested in the President's budget message.

Mr. President, during the past several weeks I have made it my duty to study and analyze the War and Navy Departments' budget estimates as submitted to Congress by the President. I say "duty" advisedly, for in the troubled state of the world today it is incumbent on every Member of this body and of the House of Representatives to assure himself beyond the shadow of a doubt that adequate funds will be provided for our national security in the coming fiscal year.

I realize that in the few weeks since we have had a chance to make even a casual first study of the President's budget recommendations, only outstanding facts and general over-all consideration could be given.

It is most unfortunate and very dangerous, in my opinion, that the requirement in the Reorganization Act compels a policy decision on over-all expenditures

for the 1948 fiscal year before the several committees of Congress have had adequate opportunity to go into the requests of all departments carefully and in detail. Yet serious and timely consideration is necessary at this time, and failure of the representatives of the people of the United States to assure themselves now of the adequacy of appropriations for our armed forces is an invitation to national disaster. Certainly if we do not give serious consideration now, Congress must accept responsibility for repudiating the advice of the men who have been responsible for winning the war, and are now responsible, for we have given them the job of winning for us a just and lasting peace.

Today the full committee appointed under the Reorganization Act is sitting in the Ways and Means Committee room of the House—102 Members from both bodies of Congress. This body has for its consideration the recommendation of its subcommittee which met last Tuesday and at that time voted its recommendation to the full committee sitting today that the President's budget recommendation should be reduced by $6,000,000,000. That $6,000,000,000 includes reductions for all executive branches, but primarily it includes a reduction of $1,000,000,000 in Army appropriations; $750,000,000 in Navy appropriations; and $500,000,000 in civil functions of the War Department.

In explanation of the civil-functions appropriation, let me say that $725,000,000 was recommended by the Budget Bureau for relief of starving people overseas in and around occupied areas. Also included in the civil functions is $280,000,000 or thereabout for rivers and harbors work and other public-works projects generally undertaken by the Army engineers.

Therefore, the over-all cut to the armed services because of the recommendation of the subcommittee is $2,250,000,000.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I have been unable to reconcile the advice of the subcommittee with the necessity for expenditures for our own national security. I felt, therefore, that it was my duty to make an analysis of the effect of any reduction in the amount submitted in the President's budget.

After much careful study in the brief time available for such study I am convinced that the War and Navy Departments estimates were conscientiously prepared with all possible attention to considerations of economy; and that they represent the minimum amount required to enable the Army and Navy to perform missions vital to the well being of the United States. I wanted to know the effects of any such reduction in terms of naval strength in 1948; in terms of the needs of General MacArthur, in the Pacific, and Generals Clay and McNarney, in the occupied areas of Europe, and, more particularly, the effects in the critical years immediately ahead.

In the course of making this analysis I discovered that great reductions were made inside the Army and inside the Navy even before the Secretaries presented their requests to the Budget. I found also that even after these great reductions inside the Army and Navy a further cut was made at the President's request by the Bureau of the Budget, and we now have before us the final greatly reduced request, after two drastic cuts have already been made.

Now along comes the request of the subcommittee that the full Budget Committee of Congress make a further cut of more than 20 percent in the moneys allocated in the 1948 fiscal year for our own national security. Personally, I cannot see how Members of Congress could vote for such a cut if they realized, as I think they do, that in the President's budget 46 cents out of each dollar is there to pay for prior wars. In other words, if we had stayed out of World War II and those prior thereto we could now be rolling along on easy street, with a budget only half as large as it presently is, and still appropriate the eleven-odd billion dollars presently requested by the armed forces.

Do Senators think $11,000,000,000 is too much to provide now on the chance that it will save us from World War III, which, God forbid, may ever come; and do they think the retention of $2,250,000,000 for our national security is too much of an insurance premium to pay at this time? Certainly I for one am convinced that to make any such cut as is now proposed and may be adopted this afternoon in the full Budget Committee would impair the efficiency of the Army and Navy to the extent that they could not carry out the tasks which have been assigned to them, not by the Army and Navy but by the Congress of the United States, representing the whole people.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator not feel that such a cut as has been proposed, and against which he is speaking, would result in the most complete unilateral disarmament of this country that was ever undertaken; and that upon the eve of a most important conference at Moscow, to which the former Chief of Staff, now Secretary of State, is about to go?

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I fully agree with him, as will appear later in the statement which I have prepared.

Let us take the Navy Department first and see what we find:

Last year the Navy Department, with the President's approval, placed before the Congress a plan of operation for the fiscal year 1947 which provided for the maintenance of certain naval forces. Roughly, these forces included 662,000 Navy and Marine personnel; 1,232 ships, and 6,190 operational aircraft. The Congress, in carrying out its constitutional responsibility, approved this proposal. This force was considerably smaller than the one the Navy Department would have requested had not our national economy been so drastically hit during the war years.

In drawing up its plans for the fiscal year 1948 the Navy proposed to maintain a force of the general strength and character I have just described. A moderate program of material improvement throughout the fleet and air arm was contemplated. It was proposed to undertake a shipbuilding program comprised of a small number of auxiliaries and minor combatant prototypes. Included also was an amount representing the first increment for construction of permanent facilities to replace temporary wartime structures. Extensive plans for research and development were included. A companion Naval Reserve was provided for. These programs would have assured the naval mastery which the United States gained at great cost during World War II. They would have strengthened the hand of our diplomats at the international conference tables, and would undoubtedly contribute greatly to peace and stability in world affairs.

After these programs were first translated into dollars, weeks of exhaustive study and consultations followed involving all the responsible officers and officials of the Navy Department. The results of these studies were submitted to the Secretary of the Navy. He considered the Navy's responsibility for national security. He attempted to achieve a reasonable compromise between the requirements of national security and the known and desirable objective of true economy. As a result, before submission to the Bureau of the Budget, the original estimates were reduced 33 percent.

The revised program provided for maintaining the same force as originally contemplated, but deferring until later years some of the development, most of the material improvement, and practically all the public works. That is the kind of recommendation which the Navy Department submitted.

Now let me tell the Senate what happened next.

Extensive hearings began in the Bureau of the Budget on September 15 and continued for the following 3 months. It is my understanding that based on the strength and the modified-material program outlined, the Bureau of the Budget felt that the Navy's estimates were fundamentally sound. Nevertheless, within the confines of the Federal Budget for 1948 the Bureau of the Budget determined that no more than $3,654,000,000 could be allocated for naval purposes—and this sum included a transfer of $150,000,000 previously appropriated. This allocation was a reduction of 33 percent of the revised estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Navy. Thus we have two reductions of 33 percent each.

It is obvious that the Navy budget now before us is not the result of poorly conceived plans, carelessly evaluated. All areas of possible reduction and deferment have been so thoroughly explored that the responsibility for the effect of further curtailment must now rest squarely upon the Congress.

We must remember that the Navy and marine personnel have already been reduced 85 percent, from a wartime strength of almost 4,000,000. In comparison with this, at the close of World War I the demobilization of a force one-eighth as large took twice as long. There has

been a reduction of more than 50 percent in civilian personnel, from 753,000 to approximately 360,000, and of these only about 30 percent are in the so-called white-collar group—notwithstanding the fact that in many naval activities civilians now occupy positions which could only be filled with uniformed personnel during the war.

As a part of the demobilization program, almost 4,000 shore stations and activities have been inactivated and all remaining activities have been reduced in size and scope of operations. There has been drastic curtailment of procurement. Both shipbuilding and aircraft production have been curtailed to a point where doubt exists as to the ability of important segments of these industries to survive.

Before we can operate on a normal peacetime basis the Navy must divert thousands of its personnel, both military and civilian, to the task of inactivating ships and stations. This diversion is at the expense of the operating forces, which must be accepted. Once this work is completed the diverted strength can be returned to the active fleet. During this period fleet operations are necessarily curtailed through lack of crews, and repairs are being deferred because much of the civilian force is occupied with inactivation.

I desire to emphasize that the Navy had an orderly plan for demobilization and an operating force plan which it had expected to employ until changes were justified by world conditions. As I said before, this plan was accepted and approved by the Congress for the fiscal year 1947. I am convinced that the Navy believed that the force of the size described to us would be required until conditions changed. Against this background the Navy budget for 1948 was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

In comparison with the force of the size approved by Congress for fiscal 1947, the budget now before us will provide for 91,000 fewer naval and Marine Corps personnel; 12 fewer combatant ships; 398 fewer supporting ships; 60 fewer operating aircraft; and an average reduction of 70,000 persons in civilian employment. The Budget also imposes a further cut in naval research and development, almost completely eliminates material improvement, and provides only a token allocation for public works. That, broadly, speaking, is what can be provided by the $3,654,000,000 appropriation.

Frankly, I feel that the Congress in discharging its responsibility for common defense should be making careful inquiry as to the wisdom of the reductions already made. Instead of pursuing this inquiry I find that there is a considerable body in the Congress who are going in the other direction. They talk about still further reductions.

On Tuesday, February 11, the Subcommittee on the Legislative Budget adopted a motion to reduce the President's expenditure estimate by $6,000,000,000. I opposed this action. My opposition was based on the knowledge that this large reduction could not be obtained without a sizable reduction in the amount allocated to the Navy and the Army.

In my search for information I tried to find out what effect a further cut of $750,000,000 would have on the strength of the Navy. I found that it is impossible on short nctice to secure any quantitative data on the effect of a reduction of this magnitude. It was clear to me that the Navy could not make a hasty evaluation on a matter which has so many implications both domestic and international. Any substantial change in the amounts available for Navy expenditure requires a comprehensive study to assure a balance between operating forces and supporting establishments.

Although the specific details are lacking, investigation discloses that further reduction in the 1948 budget estimates, as furnished to the Congress by the President, would seriously impair the effectiveness of the naval arm of national security not only during the fiscal year 1948 but also for several years to follow. A reduction in the amount of $750,000,000 would raise grave doubt as to the effectiveness of the Navy as an instrument of national policy and would thereby remove a very potent factor in the peace and stability of the world.

A further reduction of $750,000,000 from the President's budget would require reductions in the following areas, and more:

A sizable reduction of Navy and marine personnel strength would be necessary. The effect of the reduction of regular service personnel would be:

First. Immobilization of a considerable portion of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets.

Second. Reduction in the effectiveness of the Marine Corps to support United States policy overseas and of amphibious training and development of techniques for amphibious operations.

Third. Abandonment of the material salvage program, resulting in considerable loss in logistic efficiency.

Fourth. Inability properly to administer and train the Naval Reserves.

Fifth. Further inactivation of advance and continental air and operating bases.

Sixth. Serious curtailment of essential training of pilots; air and general service ratings of all branches.

Seventh. Curtailment of educational commitments to officers transferred from Naval Reserve and enlisted categories to the regular service.

Eighth. Breaching contracts with enlisted personnel by forced separation from the service.

There must be a reduction in Naval Reserve personnel. There is in the Congress a large body of supporters of the Reserve program. Yet we cannot lose sight of the fact that Reserve training will not be effective if limited to assembling reservists in armories for school work. If they are not given an opportunity to fly or to go to sea they cannot develop effectiveness, nor will they long keep their interest. Yet with the active fleet and air squadrons drastically reduced how can we expect the men to receive proper training? The Reserves are an integral part of the Navy. Their training, to be effective, depends entirely on the Regular Navy and its operating establishment. Without facilities to accommodate Reserve training we might well question the wisdom of investing money in the Reserve program.

There would be a crippling reduction in classified civil-service personnel. The effect would be a further reduction of personnel for planning, design, research, contract termination settlement, industrial mobilization planning, and surplus property disposal which is inadequately provided for under present personnel ceilings. Backlogs of work already exist throughout the many activities of the Navy. This would lead to virtual inability to handle veterans' matters such as hospitalization information, and requests for information essential to veterans under the GI bill of rights. It would lead to the separation of many civilian employees of long service and possessing special skills peculiar and valuable to the Navy.

A similar reduction in industrial forces would be required. The effect would be a further reduction in the personnel available for repair and alterations to ships of the active fleet, inactivation of ships, overhaul of aircraft and aircraft engines, care and handling of supplies, materials, and other Government property. The cost of this property to the taxpayers was $46,000,000,000. The present force is barely adequate to prevent abnormal loss and deterioration.

I want to call attention to a tendency to compare prewar with postwar civilian employment. This thought apparently disregards the increased size of the Naval Establishment. As a matter of fact, the present ratio between naval civilian and military personnel is less than in 1939.

Not only will curtailment of programs be required in the areas just mentioned, but research and development of vital concern to all of us will be necessarily retarded; intelligence activities, so important when other factors of national security are shrinking, must be curtailed. Naval communications, including communication intelligence which played a vital role in the recent conflict, will suffer.

Now we come to the naval shore establishment. The Navy has already planned for an orderly reduction in major shore activities such as naval shipyards, air stations, ammunition depots, ordnance plants, supply depots, and hospitals. A further reduction would require a downward revision which might be adverse to the public interest because it would involve the abandonment of Government property and the weakening of logistic support of the active forces.

This brief summary outlines in a general way the basic and desperately important problems which will be created for the Navy Department by this threatened appropriation reduction.

Now let us turn our attention to the other great arm of defense—the Army, which presently has the tremendous occupation job. It is my understanding that the Army accepted a sizable cut in the over-all strength it originally presented to the President as a requirement for the fiscal year 1948. In so doing, General Eisenhower displayed a soldierly spirit of cheerful obedience to his Commander in Chief which does him credit. Even further, it appears to me

that General Eisenhower took a calculated risk, in order to attempt to accomplish the Army's multitudinous missions, which only a most courageous man would assume.

THE OCCUPATION TASK

In occupied areas for which the United States has responsibility, there are approximately 125,000,000 persons whose conduct is being regulated by an Army force of not more than 350,000 men. This is a stupendous task and a grave responsibility. The imminent danger of unrest and disease resulting from the privations of war-torn countries, the hard winter now being experienced, shortages of food, and the fact that there has been little or no opportunity for rehabilitation, all complicate the Army's task of bringing to the conquered peoples domestic tranquility and a realistic concept of democracy, so that the victory of World War II may be made secure. Failure to clinch the victory will squander the efforts made by our people through 4 years of the bitterest war the world has ever known. Yet it is the immediate prospect of such failure that we must face, and face squarely, if further cuts are made in the already dangerously cut military manpower available for the task.

NONEFFECTIVES

We talk of a planned strength of 1,070,000 men. Actually, this strength is not available to the Chief of Staff in carrying out his mission. Drains of strength over which he has no control reduce this figure by possibly as much as 200,000 men. Public Law 704, Seventy-ninth Congress, provides that the Army must carry on its roll all personnel on terminal leave. In the fiscal year 1948, some 40,000 or 50,000 men will be on terminal leave at all times. There will be a large number sick in hospitals who will never return to Army duty. Many will be taking care of surplus property, and there will be thousands in various other categories not of direct value in the tasks of most immediate urgency—the occupation and the provisions of national security.

CIVILIANS OVERSEAS

There are about 190,000 civilians presently overseas, who are paid from funds appropriated for the Military Establishment. The War Department proposes to reduce this number in the fiscal year 1948 to 110,000. Surely, this indicates a full awareness on the part of the Army of the need for economy. Out of this number must come the skilled professional and administrative personnel charged with the implementation of United States political, social, and economic policies among the 125,000,000 people who populate the occupied areas. The multiplicity and complexity of problems involved in the guidance and surveillance of the governmental organizations of Germany, Japan, and Korea which deal with finance, industry, trade, labor, political structure, demilitarization, rationing and price control, information and education, restitution, reparations, and other miscellaneous phases of a national economy, indicate that, quantitatively, the number employed are capable only of directing affairs on broad policy and governmental levels.

Native labor and professional skill are being utilized to the extent that about 500,000 enemy nationals are employed by the United States Army in occupied areas and are paid with their occupied-area currencies. There is a limit to the extent to which foreign nationals can be employed in positions of trust and responsibility, while still maintaining the integrity and security of the occupation and military government organizations. I am convinced we have now reached this limit. Any further steps at this time to replace American civilians with foreign nationals in the interest of economy would be completely incompatible with the interests of national safety.

FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Backing up our overseas forces in their vital mission is a pitifully small force in the continental United States—a force which, in addition to its mission of supporting the occupation, must be prepared to meet any emergency anywhere, at any time. The ground combat elements of this force have been slashed to a point where they are virtually nonexistent. The service elements are strained to their utmost capacity in training the replacements, procuring and handling the supplies, and operating the ports without which our troops overseas would cease to function. So it is on the air defenses of the United States that any further reduction would have to fall. I am reliably informed that after we have provided the minimum air needs of the overseas commanders, our budget, with the slash so lightheartedly proposed, would provide for only three air groups in the continental United States. Think of it, Mr. President, three air groups for the defense of the richest and, shall I say, once the most powerful nation in the world.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

An adequate program of military research and development is vitally necessary to the national defense. To exceed an adequate program of research and development might mean unnecessary expense to the people of the United States; to fall short of an adequate program will inevitably breed disaster. The War Department's program of $235,000,000, as reflected in the estimates before you, represents, in my opinion, another calculated risk which we dare not increase. The estimates provide for a minimum of continued progress along lines of research to which we have already committed considerable money. This is sound. Abandonment of these projects prior to fruition would certainly be inconsistent with the investment already made. We could profitably devote twice as much money to research and development. It paid big dividends in World War II. It will also pay big dividends in the future.

Everyone here can well take to heart the lesson provided by the fall of France. France had what was supposed to be the world's finest army. But it was equipped with matériel which had become hopelessly obsolete in the 20 years of peace following World War I. The Wehrmacht and the Luftwaffe, equipped with the finest products which German science and industry could produce, brought about in a few short weeks the ruin of France's Army, and of France herself. Neglect of our research program will render our matériel and techniques just as hopelessly obsolete in the next 5 or 10 years.

MORALE

All of us saw the sorry state which Army morale reached shortly after VJ-day. The Army and the Congress, together—and I think the Congress can claim its fair share of the credit, by providing decent pay and initiating a program of housing—have now brought Army morale back to where it again reflects credit on a great country and a great institution. Yet, even with this housing program, there now exist permanent housing facilities for only about 200,000 men. The Army needs family quarters, bachelor quarters, and barracks. The most urgent of these needs is for family quarters, of which only 11,500 sets are now available. A total of 6,700 sets of family quarters are now under construction. Thus, the Army expects to have 18,200 sets of family quarters on July 1, 1947, leaving a possible deficit of 100,000 units. After full authorization has been obtained, the War Department intends to submit a supplemental estimate of $225,000,000 for construction. More than half this amount will be applied to the construction of about 4,500 sets of family quarters during fiscal year 1948, a very insignificant number, which cannot in fairness be denied. If we do deny them, we will not only deal a telling blow to morale, but I predict we will see a significant slump in voluntary recruiting. We have a solemn obligation to provide the American soldier with living standards befitting an American citizen.

The distribution of grades within the Army permitted by the funds in their estimate appears to me to offer fewer career opportunities than in our other services. Yet the success the Army will experience in the postwar years is also directly dependent upon the opportunities for a career which the Army can offer the youth of America. A distribution of grades offering opportunities just as attractive as in the other services is essential to the Army's success. Any further cut will result in a failure to obtain the type of soldier without which the Army will inevitably deteriorate.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

Our civilian components—the National Guard and Organized Reserves—made a contribution in World War II without which victory could not have been attained. In 1940, however, our allies provided the time which was essential to the mobilization and further training of our civilian components. But in any future emergency such time will not be available. The initial blow will be directed at us, and our National Guard and Organized Reserves must be prepared to take their places immediately, shoulder to shoulder with our Regular Army. The proposed cut will render them incapable of so doing. Not only would their strengths be reduced by 50 percent from the already low figures provided for in the War Department

estimates, but their training would inevitably fail to reach the standard which would enable them to take their places in the Mobilization-Day Force. The president of the Reserve Officers' Association, representing that group of patriotic and responsible citizen-soldiers, has already found it necessary to bring to the attention of the President the serious consequence of failure to provide adequately for that vital component of our national security.

RATIO OF OFFICERS TO ENLISTED MEN

Criticism has been expressed in some circles concerning the number of officers in our interim Army. I am convinced, however, that the number is in no way excessive. In the first place, the highly technical duties of the Air Corps require a ratio of officers greatly in excess of that needed prior to World War II. Furthermore, the greatly expanded administrative overhead due to world-wide deployment; the occupational and military-government missions; a greatly expanded military-intelligence and military-attaché systems, including military advisory groups to China, Brazil, and the Philippines; an expanded program of research and development; requirements for the care and custody of surplus property; the settlement of claims and contracts; and a greatly expanded program for the civilian components of the Army, impose a personnel requirement upon the Army which fully justifies the need for more officers.

POSTS, CAMPS, AND STATIONS

Prior to presenting its estimates for the coming fiscal year, the War Department had been forced by considerations of economy to close many stations whose retention would be essential to rapid expansion should another emergency arise. It will have only about 450 posts, camps, and stations in the United States during fiscal year 1948, a reduction of about 1,350 from the wartime peak of 1,800. A further reduction in the number of small posts is in immediate prospect. In the matter of depots, a comprehensive plan for consolidation in the mininum number of installations has recently been placed in operation. Any further reduction in the planned number, however, such as would be brought about by the proposed additional cut, cannot fail to damage our defense potential.

RATIO OF BUDGET ESTIMATE TO MILITARY STRENGTH

The military strength of the Army is one, but not the only, important factor in measuring the cost or budget for the Military Establishment. One can so easily be misled in computing the cost of a soldier. It is deceptively simple to divide the number of man-years of military personnel into the total budget estimate, but the resulting figure does not represent the cost of a soldier. It represents only a misleading and erroneous approach to the problem. To analyze correctly the estimate in terms of cost as related to military strength, one must separate direct costs—pay, travel, subsistence, clothing, medical care, and the maintenance of quarters—from those for intelligence, research and development, mobilization planning, disposal of surplus property, and procurement of capital assets—airplanes, gliders, guns, and other equipment. The first group of costs do have a direct relationship to the strength of the Army, A comparative analysis so computed shows that pay, travel, subsistence, clothing, transportation, medical care, and maintenance of quarters cost approximately $2,800 during fiscal year 1946, and will cost approximately $3,150 during fiscal year 1947 and fiscal year 1948. This increase in costs is entirely due to increases in the pay of military personnel as authorized by the Seventy-ninth Congress and to the increase in prices which have taken place—in some cases 100 percent during the last 6 years. The costs directly related to the strength of the Army equal about 55 percent of the 1948 estimate.

The other 45 percent is for intelligence, research and development, mobilization planning, and the capital assets I have mentioned. My colleagues know as well as I do how very important and indispensable are the latter items. The weapons of today and tomorrow cost infinitely more than those of yesterday. Nevertheless, we must adequately support these costs of capital investment to provide the crucial protection which may be needed at once in the next emergency.

ARMY AIR FORCES

Let us return again to the effects of the proposed cut on the Army Air Forces. If I appear to dwell excessively on this subject, I ask Senators to bear with me, for I am convinced that today our Air Force is our first line of defense.

The estimate for the Air Corps has already been reduced by the Bureau of the Budget by approximately 30 percent—from an estimated requirement of $1,600,000,000 to $1,130,000,000, a reduction of $470,000,000. This reduced estimate will not provide the number of airplanes required to initiate effectively the modernization of a minimum peacetime Air Corps. I am informed that it was the considered opinion of the greatest airmen in the world, who, I am proud to say, can be found in the ranks of the United States Air Forces, that a minimum of 1,800 planes of the latest type should be provided. The estimate now before the Congress provides only about 900 airplanes, with necessary emphasis on bombers and jet fighters. And now a further budget cut is advanced which would halve this pitiful number of new planes.

The War Department's own estimate will not provide the minimum number of flying hours accepted as a requirement to maintain the efficiency of the Air Corps personnel. It will permit the Air Corps only to maintain and operate a substantially reduced number of aircraft and provide a minimum of training through reduced flying hours. The end product of this must be decreased safety and increased casualties. Yet certain gentlemen propose even further economies at the expense of the lives of our sons tomorrow and at the risk of the lives and liberties of us all in 5 or 10 years.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, no thinking man can question the wisdom, patriotism, and sincerity of the American who directed our Army's victory in World War II, and who now has accepted the far graver responsibility of leading our country to lasting peace. Secretary of State George Marshall, in the last few days, has warned of the danger of premature disarmament in a world in which peace is only a devout wish rather than an assured reality. Yet it is disarmament which the advocates of further reductions in the Army's budget are proposing; and it is not a planned and orderly disarmament, but a disarmament by an insidious deterioration. I use the word "insidious" advisedly, for it would be accomplished by giving the country a sense of false security—a security which could not possibly exist with the drastic cuts in our forces which would inevitably follow the reduction of two and one-fourth billion dollars which is now proposed. I am proud to state to this body that I can never be a party to such a proposal.

The United States has given practical proof of its desire to rely on law, reason, and justice to resolve international disputes. Until, however, the United Nations is a going concern, able to handle successfully the complex problems of world security, and until the United Nations has sufficient and usable power to compel the acceptance of its decisions, this Nation cannot accept disarmament. While I believe that the future holds promise of successful limitation of armaments, I believe that it is unwise and definitely untimely to effect unilateral disarmament through appropriation action.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to read a statement from the column written by Joseph Alsop in today's Washington Post, in which he adverts to me. I shall not read the entire article because I am not particularly concerned with Alsop's views on other people or matters generally.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator say "Mr. All Slop" or "Mr. Alsop"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is a play on words. It is the same man, in any event. "All Slop" is good descriptio personae in this case.

I shall read only the portion of the statement that refers to me. The statement deals with the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal to be the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. In part, it says:

> It is also significant that one of the two or three Atomic Committee members probably opposed to Lilienthal should be Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, which is about the only remaining State where the power people have a real grip on local politics.

Mr. President, the Washington Post seems to be very much concerned about this nomination. Last evening, when a certain William E. Gold, who is a commentator for the Post, appeared on the airways, he saw fit to repeat this statement and to embellish it somewhat. I shall read from the statement made by Mr. Gold, omitting the names of any

other Senators who may have been mentioned in the context. Mr. Gold said:

> And then Alsop adds that it's significant that another opponent of Lilienthal is Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, inasmuch as Georgia is one of the few remaining States in which the power people retain a real grip on local politics.
>
> The Post columnist says bitterly that, while most of the power industry has learned a great deal in the past 14 years, there is still a strong minority which thinks that "free enterprise" means freedom to behave in the manner of Samuel Insull—and communism is the public-power doctrine of the late and beloved George Norris.

Then the commentator poses the question, Why should these other Senators oppose the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal?

> "The answer," says Alsop, "is twofold. First, the activities of the power lobby, and such men as RUSSELL, who is an avowed enemy of public ownership of power plants."

Mr. President, these statements were made for the unmistakable purpose of creating the false impression that I am a tool of the private power interest, and that the people I am honored to represent here are pawns in the hands of the power interests.

Most of the men and women representing the press and radio whom I have known have been honorable people. They endeavor to discharge the high duty that falls to the fourth estate, of giving the public the facts, or legitimate conclusions drawn therefrom. There is, however, a small group of columnists and commentators who depend upon sensationalism. They have no regard whatever for the truth, if a falsehood will help them to sell their wares. In fact, it would seem that this small group engages in a continuing contest as to which can manufacture the biggest falsehood, as they eagerly vie with each other for the accolade of the world's greatest lie. Alsop and Gold are leaders of this group. They are sadists, so far as facts are concerned. When they see a fact, they are overwhelmed with a sadistic desire to distort it into a falsehood.

These false statements could not have been made through ignorance. My record in all cases where there has been a conflict between the public interest and private power groups is so clear that even a wayfaring man could read it. When I first entered the General Assembly of Georgia, at the age of 22, I happened to be assigned to the committee on constitutional amendments. One of the first measures to come before that committee was a proposal to confer on counties and cities the right of eminent domain, in order that they might own and operate their own power-generating and distribution facilities. I supported that amendment earnestly, and from that day until this I have encountered the opposition of the private power interests in every step of my career. We lost that fight at that time, but I am glad to say that since then such a provision has been written into the organic law of Georgia.

When I became a candidate for speaker of the State house of representatives I was opposed by the representatives of the power interests. They were likewise active in the camp of one of my adversaries when I was a candidate for Governor. When I offered for the Senate of the United States, one of the principal issues on which the campaign was waged was the conflict between the rights of the public and the private power interests. In that campaign I was opposed by all save one of the twenty-odd daily newspapers published in my State. I had little means of publicity, and I lacked the finances to engage radio time; I was therefore compelled to carry my fight to the people of Georgia the hard way—by word of mouth. I made more speeches in the period embraced in that campaign than had ever been made before by any man in any campaign in my State, and I doubt whether over the same period of time there has ever been any man in the United States, who, from the stump, spoke more hours than I did. In every speech I took occasion to denounce the Georgia Power Co. and the Commonwealth & Southern combine.

My opponent in that race was a national figure and a strong, able, and sincere man. But the people whom these mendacious creatures say are held in thralldom by the power interests went to the polls and elected me overwhelmingly. I carried 114 of the 159 counties of the State and received a total majority in excess of 40,000.

Mr. President, my record in the Senate on the power issue is written on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, thank God, it will stand there after this lying columnist and this lying radio commentator have gone to their proper reward. In this effort to lend a pretense of accuracy to the misrepresentation they referred by innuendo to the contrast between what they said was my position and that of the late Senator George W. Norris. I did not agree with Senator Norris in all matters, but it so happens that on this particular issue there is absolutely no difference in any vote that was ever cast by the late Senator from Nebraska and myself. I voted for what I conceived to be the public interest in every vote affecting electric power. I voted for the so-called misnamed but romantically called "death sentence" clause in the utility holding companies act. I have supported every measure which has been presented to the Senate for the public development or distribution of power.

Numerous Senators whom I see here today have doubtless become tired of my discourses in fighting for increased appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. I have been as active as I knew how to be on that battlefield since the first REA measure was introduced.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As a member of the Appropriations Committee who has served for many years with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I should like to give my testimony that in many cases if it had not been for his stout support of the Rural Electrification Administration that agency would not have achieved the success it has enjoyed. The Senator from Georgia has consistently been a supporter of programs to advance public power in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to add my testimony in this discussion. I was associated with the Senator from Georgia for 6 years as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, so far as I know, rural electrification and public power did not have a better friend in the entire Congress than they had in the Senator from Georgia. I do not know how he is going to vote on Mr. Lilienthal's nomination, but I know that if he opposes him it will be for an entirely different reason than the fact that he is doing the bidding of the power companies. I do not question the opposition of the power companies to Mr. Lilienthal, but if the Senator from Georgia votes against Mr. Lilienthal I am sure it will be for some entirely different reason, because he has always been a friend of rural electrification, of TVA, and other projects of that nature.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am grateful for the testimony offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Instead of opposing public power in the last Congress I was coauthor of a bill to create the Savannah Valley Authority on the Savannah River in my State. That was a public power body modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority. If in the future there is ever any hope for the establishment of such public power authorities I shall reintroduce that measure.

In the past few months I have been as active as possible in supporting Government construction of a power dam at Clarks Hill, on the Savannah River, and have opposed openly and vigorously the application for license filed by the Georgia Power Co. to construct and operate a dam on the same site, where we have finally succeeded in directing that the United States engineers shall build the dam.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I desire to add just a word at this point to say that the Senator from Georgia has been very active in the Clarks Hill development, which is now being considered. Only a few days ago we held conferences in regard to that matter. There was a fight on between the Georgia Power Co. and the Clarks Hill development, and the Senator from Georgia did not hesitate a minute to take sides and say that he thought the project ought not to be built by the power companies, because he believed it could be better built by the Clarks Hill development project. So no one, as I see it, can truthfully say that the Senator from Georgia has at any time sold out to any Georgia power company.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I am at a loss to account for this deliberate, willful falsehood unless it can be attributed to the uncontrollable desire of this columnist and this

commentator to win laurels in their respective fields as the greatest liars of 1947.

My relations with newspaper men and women and radio reporters have generally been cordial. I am, however, possibly somewhat peculiar in one respect. I have never believed in the practice of polling the Senate before a measure ever reaches the floor, and during the whole period I have been here I have specifically declined to participate in polls. I think it lowers the dignity of the Senate of the United States to see an article in a newspaper stating that a poll has been taken, and that 50 Senators are going to vote "yea" and 42 are going to vote "nay" on a certain proposition, before the measure or the proposition has ever been submitted to the Senate. Of course, the practice of giving out statements respecting Senators' positions is entirely proper if they feel keenly on a matter or have reached a decision on it; but, as a general rule, so far as polls are concerned, the issue should be determined in the Senate Chamber, and not in the columns of the press or on the radio.

I have refused to answer a number of inquiries as to how I shall vote on the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination. As a member of the Committee on Atomic Energy I feel that that position partakes of the nature of a juryman, and that I should wait until the evidence is in. I realize that views differ on this question. There have been times when I have been astounded to see, within a few hours after an executive meeting of a committee of the Senate, a full statement in the newspapers as to what has occurred. I have been shocked to hear that some Members of Congress have perhaps revealed things which happened in executive session in order that they might curry favor with columnists, or with newspaper writers, or with radio commentators, and thereby receive desirable publicity. I like to receive desirable publicity as much as any other Member of Congress, I suppose, but I do not care to purchase it at that price, and I would never reveal anything that occurred in an executive session, nor will I be bludgeoned into participating in straw ballots on grave issues.

I have not responded to any poll as to how I am going to vote, but I will state here that if before the Lilienthal nomination reaches the floor of the Senate I am convinced that Mr. Lilienthal intimately associates with such individuals as the two I have mentioned, or that he has any respect for them I shall cast my vote against Mr. Lilienthal. No man who is to serve on this all-important agency of government, the Atomic Energy Commission, should be of the type who would consort with or regard highly men who are devoid of any pretense of character and without a single instinct of honor.

Now I desire to give a word of gratuitous advice to the Washington Post. In my opinion, by employing these carrion columnists and commentators, these buzzards, to vomit their putrid falsehood upon all who do not immediately rush in to say that they support them in their position, I think the Washington Post is doing Mr. Lilienthal a great disservice. He might well look at the Washington Post and say "God deliver me from my friends." There is no question that the doubts which are being generated in the minds of some Senators over this nomination are due more to the source of some of Mr. Lilienthal's support and the reckless mendacity employed by those who are supporting him, than they are to any evidence that has been submitted to the Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, such mendacious men as these may cause Members of the Senate temporary embarrassment and considerable irritation. It has been so in my case. However, I know that long after they are forgotten the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will remain. Unscrupulous members of the press and radio have an unconscionable advantage over Members of the Senate who undertake to protect themselves from the floor of the Senate. They control the means of communications and are sure of the last word. We can see, however, that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD preserves the facts, and that there is emblazoned on the pages of the RECORD a true estimate of the character—or lack of character—of those who willfully slander Senators or the people of great States. It is doubtful to me whether this consideration would cause one sunk to such depravity ever to correct an erroneous statement, or the general error of his way, because, Mr. President, such miserable characters, such charlatans of the press, such vermin as these, are like unto that animal that is without any pride of parentage or any hope of decent posterity.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement about the meeting this morning of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget—not that I intend to discuss what happened in that meeting itself, but I do desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the gravity of the issues which are involved.

MINORITY MEMBERS EXCLUDED

For the first time, this morning when I reached my office I received a copy of the report which was filed by the subcommittee and a copy of the resolution which the subcommittee proposes that the full committee adopt. I understand that the subcommittees of the four important committees on appropriations and finance of the two Houses, in preparing this report and drafting this resolution, completely excluded from their conferences members of the minority. There were no public hearings. No opportunity was extended to those who were not members of the majority on the subcommittee to have any part whatsoever in the preparation of the resolution or the consideration of the facts upon which the resolution will be presented to the Congress. Never in my experience in the Senate have I known of a procedure so completely violative of the principles upon which free legislative bodies are based. The very thought that the majority members of a subcommittee to whom the full committee had delegated only a part of the responsibility of preparing this report should undertake their consideration by excluding the members of the minority is almost beyond belief; but that, Mr. President, is what happened.

PUBLIC WILL BE DECEIVED

I hold in my hand a copy of the report and of the resolution. I say to Members of the Senate that the language of this report itself condemns the action which it is proposed to take today as a futile and foolish thing. The country is led to believe that a joint committee of the two Houses, after consideration, is about to impose a ceiling upon appropriations, and is about to name an over-all figure beyond which the budget may not go. We shall go through the form of doing so; but the language of the report itself says that it has no meaning whatsoever. The public will be deceived by the news stories which go out today after the committee has voted favorably—as I have no doubt it will—upon the proposed reduction of $6,000,000,000 from the President's budget, or a lower reduction of $4,500,000,000 from the President's budget, as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, or a reduction of approximately $400,000,000 more, which was proposed by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who only a few moments ago delivered a very cogent and convincing discussion upon the effect that such a reduction would have upon the armed services of the United States.

I desire to read to the Senate this language from page 8 of the resolution as presented to us in the committee this morning:

> Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reduction in specific items contained in the budget. The resolution expresses an over-all objective and its realization depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates individually and collectively.

There is a clear declaration in the language of the resolution itself that the proposed reduction of the budget, the proposed ceiling upon appropriations, is merely talk without substance; that it means nothing; and that those who propose it know that it means nothing.

ABSURD AND FUTILE ACTION

Mr. President, the provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act which directed that a legislative budget be made at the beginning of each legislative session was probably a wise and thoughtful provision; but certainly there was nothing to indicate to the public of the United States that a budget reduction would be made without investigation, without thought, and without study. This joint committee has had no staff. It has had no opportunity to go into the matter. The President's budget was prepared in the Bureau of the Budget after months of study, after careful investigation and examination had been made of every department and agency of the Government. Now, to think that a joint committee of the Congress, without a staff, without hearings, could make an intelligent judgment upon the budget is simply too absurd to mention.

What should have been done is clear. The committee should have done what the Joint Committee on the Economic Report did. That committee was required to make a report by the 1st of February on the economic report of the President. It met; it considered the report; it filed its report on the 31st of January. But in that report it said that it had not created a staff; it had not had an opportunity to study the President's economic message. It said that there were items in that document which it approved, and it promised a diligent and thorough study of the question.

Was anything like that done by the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget? Not at all.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Does the distinguished Senator from Wyoming believe that under the law this committee would be authorized to make what might be termed a progress report? Does not the law itself require that the budget be reported by February 15 and also definitely set out what must be in the budget and what must be in the resolution which accompanies it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The law requires, of course, that a report be made; but the obvious and practical intent of the provision was that such a report would be made as a regular practice after the machinery had been set up. The law does not require the impossible.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. Let me say to the Senator that I am entirely in agreement with his last conclusion. It is utterly impossible for the committee to bring before the Congress any conclusion based upon the adequate study which is absolutely essential really to support a figure for a specific budget. It cannot be done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I am very grateful to him for his statement, because I think the country should be warned with respect to the absurdity and futility of the motions through which the committee is about to go.

Mr AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in understanding that it is the belief of the Senator from Wyoming that the budget recommendations which are to be determined before February 15 will be meaningless in effect and without any force of law behind them, and will merely be recommended objectives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely so. They will be meaningless even as recommendations, because in preparing the recommendations the committee was unable to undertake such a study as should have been conducted.

Mr. AIKEN. The people of the country do not have such an understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am doing my best to advise them. I am using the only megaphone I have; and I am very happy that the Senator has risen to question me, because the more questions that are asked the clearer the matter will become.

Mr. AIKEN. I am only sorry that they were not first advised from this side of the aisle.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator indicated that he was in accord with the view of the Joint Budget Committee that this report is without any legal effect and is nothing but a recommendation. I should like to have the distinguished Senator's views as to his conception of the meaning of the first sentence in paragraph (b) of section 138 of the Reorganization Act, which I read:

> The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget—

If I may interpolate, it is perfectly clear that the budget of necessity must be a set of figures of estimated receipts and estimated expenditures.

I read further:

> and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

Mr. President, as I read that provision, I say, based upon what little knowledge I have of the law, that it is a mandatory provision. It requires that the budget be presented; it requires that a resolution be presented and that the resolution be a command upon the Congress until the Congress itself decides otherwise.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has answered his own question. It is not a mandate which must be obeyed. The only mandate that can be laid upon the Congress is the mandate which is contained in the Constitution. I think the Senator will agree that if Congress passes a law today, tomorrow it may repeal it.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly I agree to that. But does not the Congress necessarily have to take some action before an act which it passes ceases to be operative?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all, because in this respect the view of the parliamentary advisers of both the House and the Senate was taken before this section which I read at the beginning was inserted in the report. I will read it again. This is the view of the parliamentarians, as I understand. It was so stated upon the floor today. It certainly is my view. Let me read it:

> Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reduction in specific items contained in the budget.

If that were not true, Mr. President, the joint committee would be superseding the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House; and that cannot be done under the rules which were adopted by the Senate and by the House when the Reorganization Act was passed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. If we may assume that the law is complied with, and that a resolution is presented by the joint committee and adopted by the Congress, then is not the legal effect of that resolution that its provisions are on the same level as a rule of either House unless the rule itself be modified or other steps be taken in the regular procedure to avoid it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I doubt it very much, because the Reorganization Act adopted certain rules which were specifically set forth as rules. Sections 138 (a) and 138 (b) were adopted, but not as a rule. If the Senator will refer to the very first section of the Reorganization Act—I do not have it before me as I am speaking—he will find that it contains a specific recognition of the power of the two Houses of Congress to change their rules.

Mr. CORDON. I do not question that. I merely ask the Senator if this provision does not occupy the same position and have the same dignity as a rule requiring some affirmative action before it ceases to be effective?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The affirmative action would be the action of the respective Appropriations Committees.

Mr. CORDON. Would such action be subject to a point of order, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think not. I am sure that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will agree with me that his committee will not be bound by the action that is taken today.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator vote for the reorganization bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He did not. He voted against the reorganization bill because he foresaw precisely this sort of difficulty arising.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator recently fight against special committees because he said they would not be in keeping with the spirit of the Reorganization Act?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not recall that the Senator from Wyoming made any speech upon that subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator from Wyoming vote in that way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Most assuredly he did; and the reason he voted the way he did was not because of anything that was contained in the Reorganization Act, but because he had come to the conclusion, from evidence that was satisfactory to him, that the purpose of setting up special committees was not to carry on any particular investigation, not to aid small business, but to create chairmanships for two Members of the Senate who were not included in the regular distribution.

Mr. BRIDGES. I had supposed that the Senator from Wyoming, like many of his colleagues, voted against special committees because he did not think they were in the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am willing to give the Reorganization Act a trial. I am merely calling attention to the resolution which was presented, and I will ask the Senator if he does not agree that

the resolution is quite correct when it says:

If the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reduction in specific items contained in the budget.

Does the Senator agree with that or not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree that we merely set up a framework, a ceiling, within the limits of which the Appropriations Committee can function as it always has. I believe that setting up such a ceiling will have a very salutary effect on keeping down expenditures of Federal funds by way of appropriations. I think the Senator will admit that there is no department of the Federal Government today, or any bureau or division, in which there cannot be some savings made by eliminating waste and doing away with surplus Federal employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no doubt that savings can be accomplished; in my opinion, no member of the exclusively majority-minded subcommittee which passed upon this resolution can take a stand upon this floor or in the committee, when it reassembles this afternoon, and give a bill of particulars as to the reduction which it is proposed to make.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that I could take the stand and give a bill of particulars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. But I shall not do it, because in that way the work of the Appropriations Committee would be prejudged.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for his statement that in that way the work of the Appropriations Committee would be prejudged, because the Senator from New Hampshire knows that the Appropriations Committee—not the joint committee—is the authority. If the Senator from New Hampshire admits my point, that is all I propose to say about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has admitted it, because he has made the statement in the affirmative. I do not know of anything greater than the affirmative. Does the Senator from New Hampshire propose to withdraw his affirmative statement and respond in the negative?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming said that no Senator could rise on this floor or in the committee and give a break-down of what is proposed and show that it is proper.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I further challenge the Senator from New Hampshire to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall not do so because that is not the intent of the law. The intent of the law is to have an overall ceiling provided, and then let the committee work within the framework of such ceiling.

STABBING IN THE DARK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee is making a stab in the dark; it is wielding a broadax without information. Where that ax will fall if the committees follow the recommendations of this report, no one can tell. It is clear from what has been said in the Senate this afternoon and it is clear from what was said in the committee of 102 this morning, that no one is willing to say where reductions will be made.

So, Mr. President, I come back to the conclusion with which I started, namely, that this procedure is a futile and a foolish thing. It is futile because it will not accomplish any objective. It is foolish because it tends to lead the people of the United States to believe that one thing will happen, when actually another thing will follow.

Mr. President, let me say further to the Members of the majority party that when they adopt this resolution proposing a reduction of $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 or $4,100,000,000 in the President's budget, and when subsequently they fail to carry it out, as they most certainly will fail, they will hear from the people.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Mexico was first on his feet, requesting that I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we should not have other interruptions at the moment. The Senator from New Mexico, as I understand, wishes to ask a question.

Mr. HATCH. I thought the Senator from Wyoming had concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. I have been trying to obtain the floor in my own right, and I thought the Senator from Wyoming had finished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President; the Senator from New Mexico misunderstood me. I wish to make a few remarks with respect to the chart now hanging on the wall.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say I think it is most unfair for a distinguished Senator to attempt to prejudge what the Appropriations Committee will do, and then to criticize the majority party by saying that when it reduces the tremendous budget proposed by the present administration, it will fail the people of the United States. I say it is most regrettable that such a statement should come from a Senator who has so vast a knowledge of governmental affairs.

Furthermore, Mr. President, regardless of whether the Senator from Wyoming can tell me whether he is going to split birdseeds insofar as this resolution is concerned, let me say that there is a mandate which we shall have to accept. Every taxpayer in the United States is going to expect both the minority and the majority parties to cut the expenses of the Federal Government and thus reduce taxes and the costs of the various governmental bureaus, which have swollen so greatly under an administration which has remained in power for 14 years. Let me say that I am one who is going to vote to make that cut, regardless of the resolution to which reference has been made.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The occupants of the galleries will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Nebraska for that statement because in a moment I shall show him that if the proposal which he has just made is carried out, the result will be to endanger the American way of life and the free-enterprise system.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Nebraska to pardon me for a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. But will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield in a moment. The Senator from Oregon rose first, and I now yield to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

As one Member of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle, I wish to commend the statement the Senator from Wyoming has made. I agree with every syllable of it. As one Republican Senator, I wish to say that I know of no mandate given by the people of the United States to the Congress of the United States that it shall cut taxes until it first does two things——

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will suspend for a moment. The Chair must state that if further demonstrations are made by the occupants of the galleries the galleries will be cleared.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was saying that the Congress does not have a mandate to cut taxes until it does two things: First, make very clear that we provide for the United States a budget which will be sufficient to enable us to maintain our national security and second, squeeze from that budget every wasted dollar, and apply the savings on the national debt, so that we shall not deceive the people of the United States as I charge that some Republican leaders are deceiving them. They deceive them if they cut the budget and reduce taxes and at the same time so depreciate the value of the United States dollar as to take out of the pockets of the taxpayers many more dollars, because of their depreciated value, than they could save by tax reduction made for political purposes.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to meet the Senator from Nebraska or any other Republican leader in the Senate of the United States on the platforms of America, before the American people, on the issue whether the American people, who know the facts, want the type of tax-reduction program which the Senator from Nebraska is trying to sell to them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to yield for a question, but not to permit the Senator to take part in the debate which he has brought about with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I observe that the Senator from Wyoming believes in cloture, for it is obvious that he is attempting to shut off the answer I would make.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nebraska can make his answer in his own time. I do not wish to stay here all afternoon while the two able Republican Senators debate among themselves.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator yield to me, so as to permit me to ask a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Wyoming admit, if he wishes to be fair about this matter——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I always wish to be fair.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the Senator does, and that is why I prefaced my question with those words, for I wish to direct attention to them. Let me say that I am not quarreling about the language of the resolution. The first time I saw it was in this very Chamber today. Let me say that I voted for the reorganization bill. It seems to me that if the Senator will read the remainder of the paragraph, he will understand the sense of what the committee meant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I read the entire paragraph before the Senator from Nebraska entered the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator read it.

I wish to say that I am as anxious as is the Senator from Wyoming to provide for adequate national defense. I voted for every military appropriation which came before the Senate. I never questioned one of them, and I wish to have the Senator know that. But a genuine interest in national defense does not mean that we cannot make any reduction at all in the number of governmental employees, so as to decrease the number of employees from 2,100,000 to 1,600,000, as Mr. Webb has suggested to the committee in a confidential report. That means that we can cut 500,000 employees from the Federal Government pay roll and never even touch the budget for the Military Establishment. Certainly the Senator from Wyoming does not wish to take the position that the American people should be taxed almost out of existence by continuing to have taken from them $38,000,000,000 annually. I remind the Senator that the time will come when it will be impossible to continue to take such tremendous sums from them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the objective which the Senator states.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will pardon me, but I am going to demonstrate to him now, if he will permit me to illustrate the point——

Mr. WHERRY. I should be glad to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Emotion will not settle this problem. It is going to be settled solely upon a basis of the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire now to invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to the chart in front of the desk, which can very properly be called the fever chart of free enterprise.

NATIONAL DEBT EXCEEDS NATIONAL INCOME

Mr. President, there are three lines upon this chart. They represent the trend of the Federal debt, the national income, and Federal receipts, over the period from 1910 to 1946.

The red line shows that the national debt of the United States today has reached a towering pinnacle, greater than any nation on the face of this earth ever incurred, even in relation to its own resources. And more important than that, it shows that in 1944, for the first time in the history of this Government, the national debt exceeded the national income; and when I speak of national income, I mean the income of the people, of all the people. The national debt today is about $259,000,000,000. We fought World War I with a national debt of about $26,000,000,000.

Senators talk about reducing taxes. I should like to call their attention to the plain facts. Observe the red line representing the Federal debt in the period from 1920 to 1932, showing merely a slight reduction. Five times during that period, the 12-year period from 1920 to 1932, the Congress of the United States passed income-tax-reduction laws, and the result was that, although by about 1926 the Federal debt had reached its lowest level since the peak of World War I, a depression came upon the country which caused the Federal debt to rise, because the last 2 years of the Hoover administration were deficit years.

Income-tax reduction did not pay off the debt. We left World War I with $26,000,000,000 of debt. We entered the Roosevelt administration in March 1933 with a debt of less than $2,000,000,000 below that, and then was added the debt incurred in the effort to fight the depression.

Observe that that debt never reached $50,000,000,000. It was not until we began to prepare for World War II, in 1940, that the debt rose above $50,000,000,000. But all this time the national income was sometimes twice as great as the public debt. Always it was greater. Sometimes it fell a little.

The line on the chart in the year 1932 shows the slip that took place as a result of the depression of 1929. National income dropped, and the national debt rose. National income dropped then without any tax-reduction law, and the Federal revenues, the lowest line on the chart, also dropped without any tax-reduction law, because when the people are not able to work, when factories close, when stores close, and people lose employment, then the national income declines and the tax receipts decline. That cannot be avoided. It is an inevitable result. It follows just as the rising of the sun follows the setting of the sun. The two things are absolutely tied together.

The important thing is to observe that it was not until 1944 that the national debt rose above the national income. But observe how the national income had increased. In 1942 the national income was almost $150,000,000,000. In 1944 it was $150,000,000,000. Then it went above $150,000,000,000. Today the national income is $165,000,000,000, the highest peak ever reached in the history of this or any other country. If we do not pay off the debt while we have the money with which to pay it, if we do not pay off the debt while the national income is at this high level, we will never pay it off.

Observe that our Federal revenues, despite all the heavy taxation, never reached $50,000,000,000 in a single year. We did not fight the war with current revenues; we fought the war with borrowed money, and that borrowed money is a mortgage against the future of every man, woman, and child in America. It is a mortgage on future production.

CARELESS TAX CUTS A THREAT TO FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. President, if we imitate the errors of the period from 1920 to 1930, and reduce taxes without applying the money, first of all, upon the national debt, the result will be the same as that shown on this chart, but because the public debt in World War II is 10 times greater than the public debt in World War I, there will be brought about a crash from it which it is doubtful if the capitalistic system itself could survive.

What is going on in the world, Mr. President? Everywhere we see written across the sky the story of revolution and disaster. We see the free-enterprise system abandoned. We see totalitarian governments arise. We see socialistic governments arise. Only here in the United States are the people defending the system of capitalism.

The Communists tell us, "The capitalists are too greedy to recognize their own welfare. Give them a chance; they will snap at private advantage, they will snap at special privilege. They will not work together to save their enterprise. They will be so greedy that they will make it impossible to pay off the debt."

We can read that in any Communist speech; we can read it in the books of Lenin; we can read it in the Communist propaganda wherever it goes. "Capital," they say, "is too greedy to serve its own purpose. It will wreck itself."

Mr. President, observe the difference shown on this chart. Public debt, $259,000,000,000. Federal revenues, somewhat under $50,000,000,000, a little more than $40,000,000,000, as a matter of fact—but the national income of the people, $165,000,000,000.

The same resolution from which I quoted earlier contains another provision which is tremendously significant. I read this sentence now from page 5.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read this sentence first, and then I shall yield. I

read from page 5 of the committee report:

The committee believes that on the basis of all available information, and on the basis of a continuing national income at substantially present levels, the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1948 will aggregate $39,100,000,000.

"On the basis of the present national income." I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wanted to have the Senator point out that the resolution provides for the very thing for which he is arguing; that is, for paying in the neighborhood of two and one-half billion dollars on the national debt. Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that the objective of those who are sponsoring this movement is to bring about a reduction of two and one-half billion dollars on the national debt.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And a reduction of two and a half billion dollars in the income taxes.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS MEAN LITTLE TO THE RANK AND FILE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the reduction in income taxes, under the proposal that has been presented to the Ways and Means Committee of the House for a 20-percent across-the-board reduction, will result in savings of cents and a few dollars for the rank and file of the people, and savings of tens and twenties and hundreds of thousands of dollars for those in the higher brackets, who have made tremendous profits out of the rise in the national debt.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as I can discover, there is nothing in the resolution about adjusting income taxes straight across the board.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; it is not in the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Then that is beside the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is in the bill which has been introduced.

Mr. WHERRY. But not in this resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; not in the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator from Wyoming has made an able argument——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. And I agree with his theory as to the reduction in the national debt. I submitted in the Senate a year ago a proposal for the sale of surplus property and applying the proceeds on the national debt, and, if I recall correctly, the Senator voted against it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not recall.

Mr. WHERRY. I very distinctly recall. In fact, I think the Senator spoke against it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think the Senator has recently looked at the record.

Mr. WHERRY. There is now pending a proposal advocating what some of us have advocated since 1943.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has never been a time that I have not advocated reducing the national debt. I have been preaching the danger to the American way of life that proceeds from the increasing Federal debt.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; there can be no argument about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That has been my position since before the Senator from Nebraska became a Member of this body.

Mr. WHERRY. There can be no argument on that point; we should reduce the debt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Not only should the debt be reduced but correspondingly the funds necessary to service the debt as well as taxes could be reduced by cutting the budget. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am saying now to the Senator that the result, in my opinion, of the action which he advocates will not be to reduce the debt but to bring about another depression.

The paragraph of the resolution which I just read clearly stated that the recommendation which the Senator is defending is based upon the assumption that the national income will remain substantially at present levels, which is the highest level ever reached.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I want to say to those who are good enough to be listening that if the national income is reduced $10,000,000,000, the inevitable result will be a reduction of $3,000,000,000 in Federal revenue; and it will come about without the benefit of any law reducing income taxes.

We are speaking, I will say to the Senator, from experience. Experience after World War I demonstrated that when we followed the policy of reducing income taxes before reducing the debt, a condition was brought about which plunged the country into a terrible depression.

WAR PROFITS SHOULD HELP PAY WAR DEBTS

If, instead of reducing income taxes during that period, we had insisted that the war profiteers of World War I pay their share of the debt by taking it from them in taxes after the war, the war debt would have been reduced before the election of 1932. I have no doubt that, if it had been reduced, there would not have been the overturn of 1932. The election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 was brought about by the fact that the unsound fiscal policy, which it is now proposed to reenact, brought the American Nation to the verge of destruction.

I say to the Senator that, when we had that narrow escape after World War I, with a debt of only $26,000,000,000, it is quite impossible to imagine what may happen with a debt of $259,000,000,000.

O, Mr. President, more is involved than a political argument for the election of a President in 1948.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator said he would yield before he went to a new subject. The Senator is now on a new subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not say that I would yield before I went to a new subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I am happy to yield to the Senator now.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Senator is taking a constant figure, but he cannot predict, and no one else can predict, what the national budget will be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not even the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WHERRY. No one can predict what taxes will be. For example, the Senator will agree with me that no doubt a reduction in taxes would attract more business, which would become a factor in the picture. The Senator cannot take a constant figure to prove his point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator, who is the chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Small Business, that reducing taxes will not bring new business into the field

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER BREEDS DEPRESSION

That cannot be done until we put a stop to the concentration of economic power, which brought about the conditions which resulted in the depression of 1929, and which will result in another depression unless we take steps now.

I join the Senator in proposing incentive taxes, which will stimulate the investment of private capital; but that is the first step.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator mean he would join me on the Small Business Committee in doing that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Small Business Committee has no legislative powers, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee could suggest a legislative policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would suggest it. I have been preaching it for 10 years. I filed several reports with the Senate urging incentive taxes, to create an incentive for the investment of private capital in private business, so as to put an end to the system which we have had about investment of Federal funds.

FUNDS TO FIGHT FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE MAY BE ENDANGERED

Ah, Mr. President, the Senator comes from the great State of Nebraska, a State which is interested in livestock. He no doubt knows that only this week there was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend Federal

funds to fight the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. Where is the money to be obtained, if we adopt the proposed budget? Where are we to get that money, if we put a ceiling upon appropriations before knowing what the facts are?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. The suggested amount is $600,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is a suggestion, without money to effectuate it.

Mr. WHERRY. What the Senator has in mind happened to be my resolution. At the time of its introduction there was discussion of a sum of about twenty-five million.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that last year the Commodity Credit Corporation spent $143,000,000 to buy the domestic wool crop of the United States, and unless we do that again this year the domestic wool crop will be lost, and the sheep growers of Nebraska, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, and all the West will be liquidated.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Virginia this morning, before the joint committee, stated that the Government-owned corporations which have loaned the money which the borrowers have paid back with interest, have now a surplus in excess of $10,000,000,000, and yet they are coming to the Congress this year and asking for an appropriation of $875,000,000 to continue their operations. A saving can be made of the whole eight hundred and seventy-five million, because they have $10,000,000,000 surplus derived in part from the wool growers of Nebraska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is proving the point I am trying to make, that the conclusions upon which he relies are the statements of Senators, and not the result of any hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the statement to which I referred was made by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is the chairman of the Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and I doubt if there is a man on the floor of the Senate who is more of an authority on expenditures than is the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming two or three questions, based on his discussion, as I understand him.

May I say that I think it is most regrettable that every Member of the Senate is not present to hear the Senator from Wyoming, because I think his is one of the most able presentations of the budgetary problem I have yet heard on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand the Senator from Wyoming, he is pointing out that if we are going to make a saving of some $5,000,000,000 in round numbers in the budget—and I certainly think we should make the saving if we can make it——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

CUT THE DEBT BEFORE CUTTING TAXES

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator from Wyoming does, too; but the major point of the Senator from Wyoming as I understand, is that if we are going to make that saving, then as a preventive of depression we ought to apply the $5,000,000,000 on the national debt rather than half of it on a tax-reduction program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wyoming is making the additional point that unless we do that, we run the danger of a repetition of the fiscal problem that faced us in the 1920's, when we reduced taxes and went into a period of inflation. We cut the value of the American dollar, and millions of our fellow Americans walked the streets unemployed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is danger magnified 10 times, because the debt now is 10 times greater than it was after World War I.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask the Senator a question on one other point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Wyoming agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that as of now the particular income boom that we are having in America—and we certainly are having one—flows primarily from economic dislocations resulting from the war?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unquestionably.

Mr. MORSE. That being true, then the business people and the income earners of America ought to be willing to forego tax reductions and pay on income growing out of the war boom a fair and reasonable income tax, and apply that tax out of patriotic duty to the national debt?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, unless we do that we are courting disaster; we are inviting disaster—nay, I think we are making it inevitable, because it is obvious, when we consider the fact that our revenues now, our receipts now, are well below $50,000,000,000, and our debt is $259,000,000,000, that if we take $2,500,000,000 off the debt, and $2,500,000,000 off the income, then at the rate of more than 5 to 1 we are favoring the income taxpayers. We should not make that disproportional reduction. The total amount that is saved, whatever it may be, should be applied upon reduction of the debt and not upon the taxes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one more question: Am I correct in understanding the Senator from Wyoming to say in connection with the resolution which has been brought before us and the proposal to cut the budget a specific number of billions of dollars that we are not being given any evidence by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee as to where the cuts are going to be made within the budget?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is specifically avoided.

Mr. MORSE. Which leads me to my last question because the Senator, too, represents the great empire of the West, and I think he will agree with me that over the long years the people of our great section of the country have found themselves the victims frequently of exploitation by great financial interests of the East. We have been a rich source for eastern financiers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have been the colonial dependents of concentrated capital in the East, as was once very well stated by an able observer of the economic scene.

Mr. MORSE. We certainly have been so treated. Does the Senator from Wyoming think that it is amiss for the junior Senator from Oregon to raise this question, namely, that certainly those of us representing the great Western States cannot justify voting for any such blanket budget reduction until we first know specifically whether or not it is proposed to cut into the great wealth-creating projects in the West which must be finished if we are going to have any economic stability in that area, and if we do not have it there, we are not going to have it in the Nation, either?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite right.

THREAT TO WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MORSE. I desire, Mr. President, to emphasize that point if I do not emphasize any others. I think we might just as well come to understand each other on the floor of the Senate. I think we ought to work in unity, East and West and North and South. But I think it is perfectly clear that we must be assured that our budget makers see the distinction between eliminating waste in national expenditures and preventing the completion of great wealth-producing projects in the West. I refer to reclamation; I refer to the great dams that must be completed if we are going to supply the power for the industrialization of the West.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator means, does he not, that a very definite war is being waged now against expenditures for public projects for the production of power.

Mr. MORSE. That is true. I close by saying that I think we western Senators must keep that issue clearly before the Senate, and I hope there will be no loss in our membership from the West in that fight. Let me say very clearly to both parties that I think the people of the West will hold them politically responsible for the action they may take on this budget, and have no hesitancy in saying that neither party can win in 1948 without the West.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two tables which deal with the subject we are now discussing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I previously stated that I thought we could make a saving largely outside the armed forces. I wish to place in the RECORD a table prepared by the Committee on Postwar Taxation, which proposes a reduction in the Budget to $31,577,000,000.

I also wish to place in the RECORD a table showing expenditures of the Federal Government by departments and

agencies, comparing the expenditures in the fiscal years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1946, and 1948.

I think the table I first referred to shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that we cannot only reduce the National Budget by $5,000,000,000, but that we can take care of our fixed charges, we can apply upon the debt $2,600,000,000, and we can operate the Government just as efficiently as it is being operated now and yet save the taxpayers a considerable amount toward the 20-percent cut we are speaking of, even if we cannot, to use a slang expression, hit that 20-percent cut right on the nose.

Mr. President, I agree with much of what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said. Certainly I agree with him in toto respecting the question of the reduction of the debt. There is no doubt on that subject. I also agree with him in his statement that we cannot continue to plan our operations on the basis of a national income of $172,000,000,000, which, based on the income for the last quarter of last year would represent the income for that year. But certainly I take the position just as sincerely as the Senator from Wyoming does that the proper thing to do is to reduce the budget and cut Government expenses, but at the same time service the debt, as has been outlined by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two tables I referred to may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Committee on Postwar Taxation—proposed reduction in the Federal Budget*

	Amount allowed by 1948 budget (in millions)	Amount recommended by Postwar Tax Committee (in millions)	Amount of recommended reduction (in millions)
Armed services	$11,587	$10,000	$1,587
Veterans' services, benefits	7,343	7,000	343
International affairs, finance	2,820	2,000	820
Social welfare, health, security	1,654	1,500	154
Housing, community facilities	$225	$158	$67
Education, general research	88	88	0
Agriculture, agricultural resources	1,603	750	853
Natural resources not primarily agricultural	1,090	800	290
Transportation, communication	1,533	1,000	533
Finance, commerce, industry	112	112	0
Labor	118	104	14
General Government	1,427	1,000	427
Interest on public debt	5,000	5,000	0
Refund of receipts	2,065	2,065	0
Total	26,699	31,577	5,097

NOTE.—Committee on Postwar Tax Policy operates under a special grant from the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation. Figures obtained from Washington Post, Feb. 11 1947

TABLE II.—*Expenditures of the Federal Government by departments and agencies*

	Fiscal 1939		Fiscal 1940		Fiscal 1941		Fiscal 1946		Fiscal 1948	
	Millions of dollars	Percent of budget	Millions of dollars	Percent of budget	Millions of dollars	Percent of budget	Millions of dollars	Percent of budget	Millions of dollars	Percent of budget
Legislative	22	0.3	23	0.2	24	0.2	22	(1)	52	0.1
Judiciary	9	.1	11	.1	11	.1	14	(1)	19	(1)
President's Executive Office	841	9.8	938	10.4	963	7.6	7,418	11.2	9,222	25.1
Veterans' Administration	(557)	(6.4)	(857)	(6.2)	(563)	(4.5)	(4,411)	(6.7)	(6,983)	(19.0)
Federal Security Agency	759	8.7	808	8.9	946	7.5	677	1.0	1,015	2.4
Federal Works Agency	2,832	32.3	2,067	22.1	1,697	13.3	214	.3	585	1.3
Agriculture Department	1,182	15.3	1,409	15.6	1,064	8.0	2,624	4.0	1,018	2.4
Commerce	43	.5	68	.7	98	.7	126	.2	261	.7
Interior	212	2.4	209	2.3	193	1.5	211	.3	363	1.0
Justice	49	.6	56	.4	62	.5	106	.2	117	.3
Labor	14	.2	19	.2	23	.2	[2] 130	.2	106	.3
Navy	664	7.8	891	9.9	2,289	18.0	14,503	22.3	4,511	12.3
Post Office	40	.5	41	.4	30	.2	169	.3	356	.9
State	20	.2	24	.2	26	.2	170	.3	612	1.7
Treasury	1,298	14.8	1,313	13.5	1,418	11.0	9,631	14.8	9,142	24.9
War	707	8.7	904	10.0	4,025	31.7	27,315	42.0	8,255	22.5
District of Columbia	5	(1)	6	(1)	6	(1)	6	(1)	8	(1)
Government corporations and credit agencies	86	.9	217	2.4	−75	−.6	690	1.0	1,030	2.8
Reserve										
Total [3]	8,765	103.2	8,998	97.4	12,711	100.2	65,019	98.4	36,699	99.0

[1] Under 0.1.
[2] Includes National Wage Stabilization and U. S. Employment Service.
[3] Figures do not total exactly, because of rounding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, again I say that the proposed resolution which is coming before us was prepared without study, without a presentation of the facts to the full committee. It is action without thought, Mr. President; it is action which ignores the facts; it is action which is bound to bring disaster, because it is common human experience in individual life as well as the life of governing bodies that when one acts without the facts one is inviting disaster.

I rise here today only to protest against doing a futile thing such as this is confessed to be.

Mr. President, I could take the figures which the Senator from Nebraska has just inserted in the RECORD, and analyze them, and I could show also, it seems to me, that it will be impossible to save anything like $6,000,000,000, or even $4,000,000,000. The budget for national defense, as has been shown by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], of some $11,000,000,000, was sent to Congress after the requests of both the War Department and the Navy Department had been severely cut. Recommendations for other items have also been cut. But the figures in the Budget for the armed services are slightly more than $11,000,000,000. Budget recommendations for veterans' services, for taking care of wounded and sick veterans of World War II, as well as World War I, amount to more than $7,000,000,000. As realistic men, we know that no reduction will be made in that item. It will probably be increased. But add $7,000,000,000 to $11,000,000,000, and we have $18,000,000,000. We have not yet taken into consideration interest on the national debt, which is estimated at $5,000,000,000. Call it $4,000,000,000. Adding $4,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000, we have $22,000,000,000.

There is a contractual obligation on the part of the Government to refund taxes which is estimated at approximately two and one-half billion dollars. If we add two and one-half billion dollars to $22,000,000,000, we have twenty-four and one-half billion dollars.

Then consider the obligations for social security. Are we going to repeal that law? Certainly not. Those obligations have increased because of conditions.

By the time we add together the inescapable items, items which every observer takes into consideration—even the National City Bank of New York in its monthly bulletin which came to Senators' desks within the week—and then add comparable items for the ordinary affairs of government for which we appropriated in 1939, we have a budget which almost approximates the $38,000,000,000 budget sent here by the President.

My point is simply this: We are endangering the American way of life by thus acting hastily and without thought. The American way of life will be defended and preserved nowhere if it is not de-

fended and preserved in this Chamber. It cannot be controverted that the profit system and the loss system go hand in hand. We must contemplate the danger of losses. When our national income reaches the pinnacle of $165,000,000,000 and we look back upon our experience, we know that in all probability it will be decreased, and when it is decreased our revenue will fall. If the experience of the 10 years following World War I is any criterion, we shall be headed straight for a depression unless we adopt it as our determined policy not to cut taxes while income is up, but to apply every dollar of surplus revenue to the reduction of the debt.

Mr. President, last night I dictated a statement with respect to this matter. The statement was presented to the committee of 102 this morning. It deals with the same subject that I have discussed. Probably I have said some of the same things. However, I ask unanimous consent that that statement may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROGRAM A TIME BOMB UNDER CAPITALISM

(Statement of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, to the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, February 14, 1947)

Congress cannot afford to make any reduction in the President's budget for the purpose of tax reduction if it desires to preserve the capitalistic system.

It is not too much to say that the $6,000,000,000 budget reduction program now submitted to the Legislative Budget Committee is a time bomb which can easily destroy the American way of life.

For the first time in the history of the United States the national debt reached a point in 1944 in excess of the total income of all the people.

The Civil War and World War I were both followed by depressions, and the depression following World War I was deeper and longer in duration than any in history, but there never was a time during or following any war or any crisis that the national debt became so great as to exceed the income of the people. Now it is approximately $90,000,000,000 greater than the national income, although the national income in 1946 was the greatest on record, greater by $4,000,000,000 than it was in 1945, the previous all-time peak.

The national debt is represented by bonds of the United States held by banks, insurance companies, investors, big business people, little business people, and workers. It is an investment in America because it is a mortgage on all future production.

This mortgage is so great that it requires the people of the United States to pay out of their earnings an annual interest charge of $5,000,000,000. This is where spending should be reduced; $5,000,000,000 is greater by far than any sum ever received by the Government of the United States from individual income-tax payments prior to World War II. It was not until 1942 that receipts from individual income-tax payments aggregated over three billions.

If we adopt a program now of reducing taxes while the people are enjoying the greatest income in history, the inevitable result will be to undermine the ability of the Government to pay the interest on the national debt, and when that is done the value of every United States bond will be impaired.

Business leaders and political leaders who clamor now for a reduction of taxes are playing the game of the Communists because they are confident that capitalism is too greedy to save itself.

A year ago the national debt was a little more than $279,000,000,000. It has now been reduced to a little more than two hundred and fifty-nine billions. That is two hundred and fifty-nine thousand millions, and the national income last year was one hundred and sixty-five billions. If that national income begins to decline while the national debt remains at this dizzy pinnacle, the capitalistic system will be through. The first task of Government, therefore, is to reduce this debt while keeping the economy running so that national income will not fall.

I have a chart here which shows the relation between the national debt, the national income, and Federal revenue. This chart shows how, for the first time in history, the debt exceeded the income in 1944. It shows how, by heavy taxation for purposes of the war, we raised the revenue of the Government until it exceeded $40,000,000,000 in a single year. It shows also that we paid for the war, not out of current revenues, but out of pledging the future earnings of the people of the United States. To reduce Federal revenue now is to invite repudiation.

But it is said the Government is wasting billions. The figures presented on behalf of this $6,000,000,000 reduction program disprove that, because the advocates of this reduction acknowledge themselves that to make the cut they propose, it is necessary to reduce the expenditure for national defense.

We cannot win permanent peace for the world if we strip ourselves now of the ability to defend ourselves. If there should be a third world war, we will not be given the time to prepare as we were in World War I and World War II. We will be the first to bear the brunt of the attack. Cut the Army and Navy appropriations now, and we give notice to the world that once again, even though we know that this is the atomic age, we are attempting to retire into political and economic isolation.

If we do that, we sign the death warrant of the American way of life because there is no people on the face of the globe to preserve the American way of life unless we do it.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT ON THE HATCH ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this week the Supreme Court, with majority, concurring, and dissenting opinions, upheld and sustained the validity of the law enacted several years ago prohibiting certain pernicious political activities by employees of the Federal Government and also those employees of the States who are paid, in whole or in part, with Federal funds. The cases had been pending in the courts for some time. Naturally, those of us who were interested in this legislation had watched the progress of the litigation with interest and some concern.

Because I wanted to express thoughts which I have long entertained and held independent of any argument or decision of the Court, I have refrained from reading the Court's opinions until I could make the brief statement I make at this time, after the cases have been finally decided.

The attack on the law was based in part upon the contention that it was unconstitutional in that it placed undue restrictions and restraints upon the rights of individuals to assemble freely, and denied, in certain respects, freedom of speech. Other grounds may have been urged, but generally, as I understand the contentions, it was seriously argued that the liberties and freedom of the individual employee were restrained and denied by this law. This, indeed, was a grave charge. Such assertion of constitutional rights should always be treated with utmost seriousness and consideration. Questions of personal liberties call for the highest degree of care and solicitude. Within the framework, intent, and purpose of the Constitution every freedom and liberty guaranteed by that great document must be protected and preserved if free government is to survive. It is indeed gratifying that the Court exercised such care and solicitude in deciding these issues of such tremendous importance. By such processes are the rights and liberties of all citizens protected and free government made secure.

The questions presented were not new. They were discussed and considered when the legislation was first conceived. None of those who sponsored the legislation and none who voted for it desired in any way to infringe upon any constitutional right or privilege of any employee of either Federal or State government. The legislation was drawn in the light of long-established law and custom. It was drawn with the firm conviction that the Government not only had the right but the high duty and responsibility to protect itself against insidious and dangerous influences which might eventually operate to the destruction of that greatest of all freedoms, the freedom of the people to have their officials of government chosen and selected in free elections, uninfluenced by those who might seek to perpetuate themselves or their party in power through the means and agencies of government itself.

It is understood by all that it is the constitutional right of every citizen to speak freely, to assemble peacefully, and to participate in every legitimate political activity. When the Congress passed the legislation it recognized all of these rights. It sought to transgress none of them. But, as was declared by Mr. Justice Holmes, when he was a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts, it is true that no person has any constitutional right to be employed by government. The Government does have the right to protect itself against pernicious activities of its own employees. Persons employed in government accept employment with full knowledge that government service is different from ordinary employment; that in accepting the benefits—and they are many—which flow from employment in the Government service, they must necessarily accept the burdens which go with it, provided, of course, that those burdens are not arbitrary, vicious, or capricious. The burden imposed by the law against pernicious political activity are not arbitrary, vicious, or capricious. They do not violate the Constitution. They are wise and proper restraints intended to protect government itself, and are not intended to restrict unduly any constitutional right of the individual.

In making these comments, I am thinking of other matters of far greater importance and of deeper significance than

the case which the Supreme Court has just decided. We live in a world where freedom and liberty are more precious today than they have been for many generations. It is a world in which freedom and liberty seem to be passing out of the minds of men. Save in our own country and perhaps in a few remote places throughout the rest of the world, there is no freedom and there is no liberty.

The theory of government which makes the state all and the individual nothing, whether we call it totalitarian, Communist, or Fascist, has swept and is sweeping today over countries where once brightly flamed the light of individual liberty. Never was it more true than now that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Of this I am so profoundly and deeply convinced that I constantly want to raise my voice in warning that the freedom and liberty we accept as a matter of course may yet go down beneath the rising tide of statism.

Strong as is our Nation, great as are her vast resources, mighty as is her power in men, and sublime as is our faith in her institutions of free government, we dare not forget that we as a nation and a people are still in our youth. Government by the people yet remains in the testing period. We have yet to prove in our generation and in the generations to come whether the people can rule and govern themselves. Free government, even here, is still in its testing period.

To protect government against pernicious influences is our highest duty. In protecting free government, we preserve the individual freedom and liberty of every citizen. In preserving the individual liberties of all the people we promote the freedom of those whose rights may, upon superficial or casual consideration, appear to have been invaded.

The freedom of the individual cannot be greater than the liberty of all. But liberty itself is not an absolute term. Many are its limitations. Liberty, unbridled, loose, and running wild, becomes tyranny. When liberty is license, freedom can become a mockery.

Profound as are these truths, they are not always remembered. We forget that liberties won by strength and arms can be lost by devious methods of many kinds, by treachery, by neglect and by abuse. In her excesses, liberty may become a malignant force, even as an excess of virtue may become a positive vice, as occurred when religious fanatics in our own country burned citizens at the stake under the pretext that they were witches in league with evil spirits from the lower regions of his satanic majesty's kingdom.

True as may be the words I have spoken, it yet remains to make them applicable to specific conditions in current national affairs. It is not enough to speak of liberty and freedom alone. Their connotations are so great, and their ramifications so many, that the deep significance of their meaning may be lost in the sweeping generalities of the terms. It is not enough to say that the excessive exercise of individual rights and liberties may often jeopardize the rights and liberties of the people as a whole. More must be said. There are conditions where selfish actions or interests of groups, individuals, or people can imperil the liberties of all of us if they are continued unrestrained. For instance, the right to engage in business should never be denied. The right to make profits is one of the freedoms under a system of government where free enterprise is one of its essential parts. Yet, in the exercise of these fundamental freedoms, men engaged in business and industry can so build, as they have done, huge monopolistic combines and organizations so strong and powerful in the Nation-wide or even world-wide scope of their enterprise that individuals are completely eliminated from that particular field of business activity and their liberties under free enterprise are absolutely destroyed.

To protect against such abuses of liberties under a system of free enterprise, antitrust laws and similar legislation came into being. They are restraints upon claimed freedoms. Without them the freedom of many could be lost by the undue and excessive operations of a few.

Today there are no more important issues than those affecting labor and management. There was a time when management, exercising its claimed freedoms and liberties, used the lockout, spies, and even gunmen, to enforce its liberties and to destroy the liberties and freedom of the workingmen, and they were destroyed by those methods. To safeguard against the abuse of liberty by management, certain restraints and restrictions had to be imposed and were imposed, in order that the workingman might exercise his own freedom and liberty.

Mr. President, today it is not denied, and cannot be denied, that men have the right to organize into groups, unions, federations, and associations to protect and to promote their own interests. When that is done, vast power can be built up; and such power, when so built, can be used so excessively and can be so abused that it may become a menace to the safety, the liberty, and the security of all. Even those responsible for such organizations can so use the liberties they possess that, if they are abused, in the end they will destroy themselves and their own cause.

Mr. President, I give these instances merely to stress again the truth that liberty and freedom are relative terms, and to warn that even as there is danger in their denial, so also is there danger in their abuse. Powerful agencies for human good, they can become evil forces resulting in their own destruction. With tolerance, forbearance, patience, wisdom, and justice, safeguarded against both denial and abuse, protected even against itself, liberty can live and it can survive, even though it be assailed by alien faiths and beliefs, such as is being done all over the world today. But while properly protected liberty can live and endure, it also can be lost, stolen, and betrayed.

Milton said it better when he wrote:

> Unless that liberty, which is of such a kind as arms can neither procure nor take away, which alone is the fruit of piety, of justice, of temperance, and unadulterated virtue, shall have taken deep root in your minds and hearts, there will not long be wanting one who will snatch from you by treachery what you have acquired by arms. (The Second Defence of the People of England.)

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that against the day when pernicious and evil influences may be paving the way for the treachery of one who would snatch the liberties of all, Congress had the solemn duty to put a mild restraint upon the freedom of its own employees. Such is the decision, this week, of the highest court in the land. It has spoken well. It has decided wisely.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO AND FROM ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution providing for continuation of the authority of the Maritime Commission with respect to Alaskan shipping. I send the joint resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a similar joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives last week and hearings were held on it as late as yesterday in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The House joint resolution has been reported favorably by the unanimous vote of the House committee, and action on the floor of the House probably will be taken on it on Monday. The joint resolution again calls attention to a particular problem affecting the Pacific Northwest and the Territory of Alaska.

At the last session of Congress, on December 12, 1945, and prior thereto in hearings in the Senate committee, I called attention to the deplorable and acute problem facing Alaskan shipping and affecting the people of the Pacific coast and the Territory of Alaska itself. Mr. President, although the situation was bad at that time, today it is growing worse.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the distinguished majority leader, will recall the conferences and discussions on the matter which we had in the committee at that time, as well as the discussions which occurred on the floor of the Senate.

In a nutshell, the situation is as follows: The Alaskan fleet, namely, the private shipping lines which run from Puget Sound to Alaska, is composed entirely of over-age ships, the average age of the ships being approximately 18 years. Those vessels took a severe beating during the war. They have been used constantly by the War Shipping Administration and are still being operated by it. The Alaskan run itself is a run of

no small proportions. The result is that the ships are gradually deteriorating.

During the war a great many vessels were built in the United States; and at the last session of Congress, after lengthy hearings before the then Committee on Commerce, the Congress passed a ship-disposal bill which would help the shippers and operators in every other part of the United States and on every other run by permitting them to purchase from the Maritime Commission, at a reasonable price, available ships to replace vessels which, because of the wear and tear and heavy use during the war, had deteriorated. In this way newer ships could be obtained and the fleets could be operated more economically. However, that measure does not apply to the Alaskan situation. None of the ships available for disposal through the Maritime Commission are adaptable to the Alaskan trade, which requires a peculiar type of ship. In view of the present high construction costs, the Alaskan operators cannot construct such ships without having in the ships a capital investment that would require an increase in rates. Hearings have been held recently on their petition for an increase in the rates to Alaska, which are already excessive. The average Alaskan pays approximately 10 percent of his gross income for freight rates on goods transported to Alaska. So we can see what the situation means to the Alaskans.

In the meantime the Maritime Administration and the War Shipping Administration have been operating the ships plying in the Alaskan trade. The former operators are not anxious to take back the ships, for the sole reason, which they assert with some justice, that they cannot operate them under the present rates. The people of the Territory of Alaska are objecting to any increases in rates, for the present rates are excessive. Of course, in the meantime the ships are becoming older. Not only were nine of them sunk during the war, but several of them ran aground; and in the past 3 weeks two more have gone aground, one of them only last night.

So, Mr. President, when February 28 arrives, at which time the authority of the War Shipping Administration and Maritime Commission to continue to operate these ships will expire, the Alaskans will probably be without any waterborne service to Alaska at all. Such a situation would cause serious suffering and difficulty to the entire Territory of Alaska.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to extend to July 1, 1948, the authority of the Maritime Commission to supply this service to the residents of Alaska. Last year we extended it for a period of time so as to permit the continued operation of the ships. Let me say that the joint resolution is the result of conferences between shippers, residents of Alaska, labor, and the Maritime Commission. All are in agreement that the step proposed by the joint resolution is the only temporary solution of the problem at present available. Due to the fact that on February 28 the authority of the Maritime Commission will expire, of course it is vital that some action on this measure be taken next week by the Senate.

As I have already stated, the House committee has held hearings on a similar joint resolution and has voted unanimously to report it favorably. I am informed by my colleagues in the House of Representatives from the State of Washington that formal action on the joint resolution is expected in the House of Representatives on Monday.

The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I assume will have jurisdiction of the resolution, has set hearings for next Friday on a measure similar to this. I hope immediate action will be taken at that time, because the situation is critical.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the situation to be as the Senator from Washington has informed us. A joint resolution is pending in the House of Representatives. In the House it was referred to the appropriate committee; and I believe the committee has reported it favorably to the House, with the general understanding, although not a unanimous-consent agreement, that it will be taken up for disposition on the coming Monday.

I think I am warranted in saying that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which I assume the joint resolution will be referred, will take it up and will reach some disposition of it next week.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the interest of the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. President, let me say that at the last session, when the Senate had before it this problem, which is sectional in nature, but of course involves a great possession and Territory of the United States, the Senator from Maine took a most sympathetic attitude and helped a great deal in the matter, and I appreciate his interest in it now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for the statement he has just made.

I call attention to the fact that last week Mr. Almon Roth, who is president of the Shipowners' Association of America, testified before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in regard to another matter, but in the course of his testimony he pointed out the dire straits in which the Alaskan segment of the American merchant marine would find itself if no action was taken to enact the joint resolution to which the senior Senator from Washington has eloquently referred. I am sure that if the other Senators from the west coast were present they would join in the point of view the senior Senator from Washington has expressed and which I am sure the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], whom I see present, shares.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Of course, both Senators from Oregon have an interest in this matter, because a great deal of the commerce to Alaska originates in the State of Oregon and the great ports along the Columbia River. I wish to say for the junior Senator from Washington and myself that several representatives of both the shippers and Alaskans have been here; we have had many conferences about this matter, and we think the solution suggested is the only proper one.

I might state to the Senator from Maine that the date is made July 1, 1948, mainly at the instance of the Maritime Commission itself, which thought we should have the act run to that time, so that they might have some historical background for meeting the problem, and meeting it permanently.

Under the agreement decided upon in the joint resolution, whereas the Maritime Commission has been operating the ships at a loss, last year of almost $4,000,000, the Commission will be enabled to charter the ships at a nominal fee to the Alaskan operators. The Commission will share in any profits, but all losses will be assumed by the operators.

If the Maritime Commission cannot operate the ships at a profit, it is legitimate to inquire how the operators can operate them and not absorb a terrific loss?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Washington has now stated some facts in connection with the joint resolution of which I was not informed. I thought the House joint resolution provided for an extension of the operating authority to the Maritime Commission until June 1947. I now understand the Senator to state that it is to be until 1948.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; until 1948. The purpose is, as I stated before, to afford some historical background to the Commission in taking care of the problem.

I may say to the Senator from Maine that the President of the United States in a recent message to Congress suggested that the Congress extend the war powers in title I of the War Powers Act so as to permit the Maritime Commission to operate certain shipping lines, and Army and Navy shipping lines, to supply local transportation, the over-all continuance of the authority of the Maritime Commission to be to July 1, 1947.

The joint resolution contemplates the Alaska situation as a thing apart, and the Commission is hoping it can have some historical background by that time to enable it to solve the problem. Fixing the date as of July 1, 1948, would give the Government time enough, and if it should work out it would be good business for all concerned. Whereas the Government last year lost approximately $4,000,000 in the operation of the ships, under the agreement in the joint resolution the operators will assume any loss, and if there is any profit it will be divided, and the interest charges, insurance, and the like will be paid by the operators.

The operators believe they can operate at a profit, for the simple reason that

the joint resolution would give the Maritime Commission the authority to charter the smaller ships to the Alaskan shippers at a nominal fee; that is, at no cost to the Government, because the ships which can be used on the Alaskan run, and can be adapted in some degree to the Alaskan run, I am informed by the Maritime Commission as a result of conferences, are ships which are tied up anyway. The ships are not what the Maritime Commission calls ships in short supply, they are in long supply; they would not be used anyway; and we think in this way we can get ourselves out of the mess in which we now find ourselves.

I am hoping that we can get quick action in this matter. For the purposes of the record I wish to read what the Maritime Commission said about this subject in its report to Congress dated November 29 of last year. I quote from the report to the Honorable John R. Steelman, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and to the President of the United States:

The Alaskan trade presents many problems which must be solved before the commercial steamship lines can again provide service without Government assistance. Such prewar vessels as still remain in service are very much over-age, and the more modern vessels which are available would require extensive changes to fit them for this trade. Operating costs in the Alaskan trade have always been high because of the seasonal nature of the business, adverse weather conditions, difficult harbor operations, and the many small ports that require regular service. With the large increases in labor and material costs that have been imposed on ship operators during the past year, much higher freight revenues are necessary to produce a profitable commercial operation. However, the citizens of Alaska protest that they cannot stand substantially higher freight rates. Meanwhile, both from the standpoint of providing for the basic commercial needs of the Territory and servicing the various United States military establishments in Alaska, the Maritime Commission is required to provide essential freight and passenger services.

During the past season the three prewar common-carrier lines in the Alaskan trades have been operating 8 combination (passenger and cargo) vessels and 16 to 20 freighters for Commission account, regular services being provided between Seattle and other Puget Sound ports and the principal ports in southeast Alaska, southwest Alaska, Kodiak Island, Cook Inlet, Alaska Peninsula, Aleutian Chain, Bristol Bay, Norton Sound, Kuskokwim Bay, and Kotzebue Sound, the distance from Seattle to Kotzebue in the far north being some 2,600 miles. Steamship services will be curtailed during the winter months, but in 1947 it is anticipated that services at least equal to those furnished this year will be required. Out-of-pocket losses to the Commission amounted to about $380,000 during the summer season (April-October 1946), and it is anticipated losses during the coming winter will approximate $1,630,000 based on the results of last winter's operations. These figures do not include vessel repair costs, which are very substantial in this trade.

The estimates of the Maritime Commission of the loss were not very accurate, because the total over-all cost amounted to approximately $4,000,000.

Mr. President, if we can do what is proposed, if we can all agree on the solution which was decided upon by all concerned, we can save the Government the loss, and if the Government can have the authority to charter nominally these ships to the operators, under the Commission authority, and under Commission contract, and this service can be provided for the citizens of Alaska for the 16 months suggested, we have high hope that out of that experience we can find a solution of this almost eternal Alaskan ship problem. If we do, not only will we do the residents of that great Territory a service, and dispel the yearly fears they have over the operation of ships and transportation to the Territory but in the long run we will save the Government a great deal of money.

Of course, Alaska is going to be one of the permanent military establishments of our country. Alaska is a strategic place. Alaska means a great deal to the welfare of the United States, but the transportation problem is one that has plagued the citizens of Alaska, and those of us to the south, in the States of Washington and Oregon, for many years.

The operation of American ships to Alaska is confronted with foreign competition. Prior to the war one-third of all tonnage hauled to Alaska was hauled in Canadian vessels from the port of Vancouver. During the war the United States Government built, with American money, at Prince Rupert, about midway between Seattle and Alaska, one of the finest of ports, equipped with the best facilities for handling cargo to be found on the whole North American continent. After the war that port was turned over to the Canadian Government.

Unless we can do something for American shipping, I have every reason to believe that, whereas prior to the war one-third the tonnage was hauled to Alaska in Canadian bottoms, all the tonnage will ultimately be hauled in Canadian ships to our own American Territory of Alaska.

Even now eastern suppliers to the Alaskan trade are shipping across Canada on the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railroads to the port of Prince Rupert, now owned by Canada though paid for by American money; they are shipping to that port and then on to Alaska; so it will mean the bypassing of American shipping in the territory of the distinguished Senator from Oregon and my colleague from Washington by people who have been in the business a long time. It will mean the diversion of trade from American ports. It will also mean that Americans who, during the war, used these ships and did their job as well as they knew how, will find themselves, because of that use during the war, without ships. Whereas other lines will have the opportunity to get ships and operate economically, our people will be put completely out of business. I know that no one wants that to happen.

This seems to be a good temporary solution to the problem; it may become the permanent solution. Of course, the Government ought not to operate ships any longer than necessary, but so long as an effort is being made to save money for the Government, and it is necessary, I am sure the Senate will look with favor on our proposal, if the committee headed so ably by the distinguished Senator from Maine shall see fit next week to report the measure.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to add a word of emphasis, and urge the consideration by all Senators of the presentation which has just been made concerning the Alaskan shipping problem by the senior Senator from Washington, and of the supporting arguments which have come from many other western Senators, including the Senator from Oregon.

I think that all Senators from the West will recognize that the problem belongs in a real and primary sense to the West, but we likewise know and are satisfied that it has a tremendous national implication and concern. I know of few present-day problems so imperatively requiring solution. It is for that reason that I join with other Senators in suggesting further serious consideration of this subject as a national as well as a sectional problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I heartily endorse what the junior Senator from Washington has said of the deep national interest in this problem, and I want to add just one thing. This is a constant problem, which has at times become acute. As Alaska is without a vote in the National Congress and without representation in the Senate, it has been suggested at times that probably some of us who have a deep interest in the Territory have not done as much as we should about this matter, or that we are losing our interest in Alaska. I merely want to say for the record, at this time, that Alaska has no better advocates in the United States Senate than the Senators from the Pacific Northwest. We appreciate, we are cognizant of, the vital interest the Pacific Northwest has in Alaska, and we hope our relations will never in any way become strained. This is one of the problems needing solution, and we hope that we may be able jointly to solve it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In line with what the Senator is saying, as I am, I believe, the only member of the Committee on Public Lands present, may I say that, as the Senator knows, under the recent plan of reorganization the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs was combined with the Committee on Public Lands.

The Committee on Public Lands has already appointed a Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, one of whose members has just entered the Chamber, and I am sure that he will join with me in saying that the Senators from the Northwest may assure the people in their region and the people of Alaska that this committee is keenly aware of their many problems and is very anxious to do something really constructive in connection with Alaska, as well as the other Territories.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for the reason that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and some of his colleagues

are presently in a joint meeting in the Ways and Means Committee room and therefore are not able to be present on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska has asked me, if it be proper for me to do so, to request that certain Senators, members of the Public Lands Committee, may b absent from the Senate next week, except on Monday. I ask, as a parliamentary inquiry, whether that is permissible?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is permissible.

Mr. CAIN. The Senators are the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leaves of absence are granted as requested by the Senator from Washington.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago a group of my colleagues and I introduced Senate bill 217, a bill to make credit available to small business enterprise and to continue the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as an agency whose primary function it would be to foster and encourage small business.

Economic studies have shown that the greatest need of small business is for sources of intermediate and long-term capital. Without this assistance small business enterprises often die aborning, or are forced to the wall by the first financial crisis.

Many leading business economists advise us that we are approaching a period of recession. The trade journals and economic tipsters usually refer to it as the shake-out of 1947, and predict that it will occur this spring. They foresee declining prices in soft goods accompanied by falling production and unemployment in certain lines. They do not predict a lengthy depression, because it is generally agreed that there will be a continuing demand at high prices for hard goods. For example, even at the end of 1947 there will probably be a large backlog of orders for automobiles.

But what is significant about all these predictions is that everyone seems agreed that the people who will suffer most will be the small businessmen. Even in the case of some consumer durable goods, such as radios, it is predicted that so-called "off brands" will no longer be in demand, and that their manufacturers will be forced out of business.

Now, what is an "off brand" radio, or any other article, for that matter? Briefly, an off-brand radio, we will say, is a radio which is not made by one of the largest corporations. It is a radio made by a small businessman. It is a radio which is not advertised in the national magazines. It is not necessarily a worse radio nor is it a better radio. I have no doubt that some "off-brand" radios are far superior to the famous name radios which will be at their peak of sales. On the other hand, some may be shoddy and second rate.

In other words, then, small business will suffer merely because it is small business. It will suffer because it cannot afford the large-scale promotion which big business can afford. It will suffer because of a lack of long-term credit.

The economic history of our country shows that in the recurrent cyclical depressions it is always the small businessman who suffers. The small businessman loses his plant through foreclosure, his investments through bankruptcy. In the West it means, in addition, that the land and the buildings and plant and equipment leave the hands of local people and are foreclosed by banks and insurance companies whose headquarters are in the East. Thus depressions contribute to the concentration of wealth and economic power.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we have seen that war also contributes to the concentration of economic power. A report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation shows that during both World Wars the importance of big business rose sharply. War contracts were issued predominantly to the large concerns. They accumulated huge profits and controlled the destinies of great numbers of workers. When the Second World War came along, according to the report, "firms with 1,000 or more employees had 30 percent of the total employment in all trades and industry and 36 percent of the total pay roll. By 1943 these figures had risen to 44 and 53 percent." No less than two-thirds of the total prime contracts went to the top 100 corporations in the country, the report conclusively shows.

Mr President, the American ideal of competitive business, individual initiative, and free enterprise is facing a crisis. Unless we take steps to assist it, small business will be as extinct as the dodo.

One of the most important measures we can take to assist small business is to make it easier for small businessmen to obtain loans. A policy of liberal credit assistance for small business will do much to keep the small businessman afloat in heavy winds; by so doing it will make it possible for him to help maintain full employment and thus help to prevent economic depressions. And it will also aid in maintaining competitive enterprise.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the desirability of maintaining the American system of free private enterprise. It is time that we passed from the word to the deed; it is time that we actually helped small business.

Last month when we were discussing the creation of a new committee, small business had many supporters. But, as the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] pointed out in an eloquent speech last week, we will be better able to measure our devotion to the cause of the little man when we vote on the various bills which weigh the little man's interest against the big man's, such as the various bills which seek to give special exemptions from the antitrust laws to various industries.

This year the mandate of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation expires. The RFC was created under President Hoover to grease the wheels of industry and to maintain full production. It has done its job and it is no longer needed for that purpose. Big business has grown healthy and strong and no longer needs the assistance of RFC loans. But small business is approaching the season of its greatest need and it is a fortunate thing that this great lending agency is a device which lies ready at our hand for the purpose of assisting small business. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and I have therefore introduced Senate bill 217, which would continue the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a period of 5 years, subject to a mandate to assist small business.

In effect, the bill completely reconstitutes the agency on an entirely new basis. Let there be no mistake about that. I recognize that the RFC is now strongly sympathetic to the corporate giants, and lends on traditional banking criteria. Senate bill 217 attempts to change that.

The bill directs and authorizes the Federal Loan Administrator to assist competitive small business enterprise in obtaining intermediate and long-term capital on the basis of the character of the borrower, the potential contribution to the creation and maintenance of employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and the prospect of repayment at interest rates and other terms available to large business enterprises.

One of the greatest advantages of S. 217 is the fact that it utilizes existing institutions instead of setting up a new Government agency.

The plan advanced in the bill places its chief reliance, however, not upon any Government agency, but upon the private banks and financial institutions of the country. In order to facilitate private bank credit to private business, the bill would have the Government guarantee the loans. Let me read section 2 (b) of the bill:

> The Federal Loan Administrator shall discharge the responsibilities set forth in section 1 through—
>
> * * * * *
>
> (b) guaranteeing or insuring the provision of credit by private financial institutions and organizations, corporations established by State or local governments, and local private nonprofit corporations;

Only as a last resort does the bill contemplate direct loans by the RFC. Only when private banking institutions are unable fully to assist the small business enterprises in their communities does the function of making loans devolve upon the Government agency. Let me read the language of the bill in this connection:

> The Federal Loan Administrator shall discharge the responsibilities set forth in section 1—
>
> * * * * *
>
> (c) to the extent that such credit is needed but is not available under (b) hereof—

That is, through private banks—

> providing such credit directly through his local offices.

And even when the RFC does come in, it will be noted that it does so on a completely decentralized basis. Local offices would make it possible for the small businessman to transact his business in his home locality. It would not be necessary for him to make an expensive trip to Washington to thread his way through the long corridors of our public buildings.

I am confident that hearings on this bill will be ordered at an early date, and I am further confident that as a result of these hearings, my colleagues and I on the Banking and Currency Committee will gain a fresher insight into the credit problems of the small businessman. I know that small business has no truer friend than the brilliant and courageous statesman who presides over the committee, and I know that under his chairmanship the hearings will produce many constructive suggestions.

Mr. President, let me reiterate: The bill has two very great values. First, on the positive side, it encourages small business enterprise. Secondly, by doing so it arrests the dangerous march toward concentration and monopoly which is now threatening the very basis of our economic, social, and political way of life.

The bill is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency. On behalf of my cosponsors, the Senators from Oregon, North Dakota, Vermont, Montana, and West Virginia, I invite Senators to study the bill, and to give serious thought to the problem of making credit available to small business enterprises.

In order that those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as many thousands do, may have an opportunity to inform themselves respecting the bill, I have sent out many copies, but it was obviously impossible to distribute the bill very widely. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 217) to make credit available to small business enterprise and to continue the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of effectuating a policy of credit assistance to competitive small business enterprise was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

POLICY MANDATE TO FEDERAL LOAN ADMINISTRATOR

SECTION 1. The Federal Loan Administrator, under the direction and supervision of the President, is hereby authorized and directed to assist—

(a) competitive small business enterprises in obtaining intermediate and long-term capital on the basis of the character of the borrower, the potential contribution to the creation and maintenance of employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and the prospect of repayment, and at interest rates and other terms commensurate with the interest rates and other terms available to large business enterprises, but in no event at an interest rate in excess of 4 percent per annum;

(b) competitive business enterprises, large or small, in obtaining intermediate and long-term capital for the purpose of—

(1) engaging in business activities which promote competition or contribute to the elimination, prevention, or curbing of monopoly or monopolistic practices;

(2) operating, expanding, or improving plants, or parts of plants, or facilities leased or purchased under the Surplus Property Act of 1944;

(3) developing or expanding business activities in underdeveloped areas of the country;

(4) engaging in research or development activities with respect to new products, processes, techniques, or materials;

(c) corporations established by State or local government, or local private nonprofit corporations, in obtaining capital for the purpose of helping to finance local competitive business enterprises;

(d) business enterprises in recovering from floods, hurricanes, and other disasters due to physical causes.

METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. The Federal Loan Administrator shall discharge the responsibilities set forth in section 1 through—

(a) establishing and maintaining local offices which shall be as accessible as practicable both to lending institutions and to business enterprises;

(b) guaranteeing or insuring the provision of credit by private financial institutions and organizations, corporations established by State or local governments, and local private nonprofit corporations; and

(c) to the extent that such credit is needed but is not available under (b) hereof, providing such credit directly through his local offices.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF NEED

SEC. 3. In the preparation of the program called for in section 1, the President shall make, or cause to be made, an annual review of the specific industries and areas in which the availability of long-term and intermediate credit would promote competition with monopoly or contribute to the elimination, prevention, or curbing of monopoly or monopolistic practices; and the Federal Loan Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to make long-term and intermediate credit available for such purposes.

AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 4. The funds, personnel, and facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries shall be available to the Federal Loan Administrator for the purpose of discharging the responsibilities set forth in this act, and the Administrator is hereby authorized to issue such regulations and directives to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries as he may deem desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 5. In January of each year the Federal Loan Administrator shall submit to the President and the Congress a comprehensive report setting forth—

(a) the national need for intermediate and long-term capital under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 1;

(b) the extent to which this need has been and is being met by private and other non-Federal financial institutions and organizations, and by the Federal Loan Administrator, respectively, with special reference to the basis on which loans are being granted, including interest rates, the period of amortization, and other terms;

(c) a full set of whatever regulations and directives have been issued by him since his previous report to Congress;

(d) such recommendations for additional legislation, including recommendations relating to the stimulation of equity capital investment in competitive business enterprises, as he may deem desirable.

CONTINUATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

(b) The first sentence of section 14 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952."

(c) Section 5 (d) of such act, as amended, the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), as amended, and the act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), as amended, are amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" wherever such date appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

TAX REDUCTION AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD of this afternoon may at least be clear as to the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon on the question of the budget, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to the budget situation as I see it.

I do not think it can be said too frequently that the Congress has a great responsibility for scrutinizing the Federal budget very carefully and squeezing out of it every single dollar of presently wasted expenditure that we can possibly eliminate from it. I think there is common agreement in the Senate that we have the responsibility of economizing in governmental expenditures. However, I believe that before we can agree upon any blanket over-all economy budget cut, be it $6,000,000,000, $4,500,000,000, or any other sum, we have the responsibility of first determining where we are to make the savings before we commit ourselves to any blanket budget cut. That, I understand, is one of the main points which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] tried to make clear to the Senate this afternoon, and I think he did so in crystal-clear fashion. Furthermore, I think we owe that duty to the American people.

Why ignore the fact that there is a great deal of politics in this issue, and that politics are being played today over the whole tax issue? I happen to be one who believes that our public trust in the job that we hold in the Senate should dictate to us a recognition of the importance of not playing politics with the dollars of the American people. I think the Senator from Wyoming was trying to make that point clear, and I commend him for it.

Mr. President, usually I am not a prophet of pessimism, but I certainly must admit that today I am quite pessimistic about America, because I do not believe that the American people fully appreciate the great changes which have taken place in the world as a result of the devastating war from which we have just emerged.

If I wanted to play politics over the tax issue, judging from my mail, I would be in favor of a 20-percent cut, because it is only natural for people to be selfish. The human individual seems to be made that way. Further, there is a tendency for all of us to believe what we want to believe. I am afraid there is also a tendency for us not to appreciate or like an attempt on the part of anyone to

force unpleasant facts upon our consciousness. I am afraid that today there are millions of American citizens who would rather not look at the picture of the world, or even look at our domestic scene. They want to believe what they want to believe; and they want to believe that in some way, somehow, we can play politics with the fiscal problems of this country and maintain economic stability.

I do not believe that, Mr. President. In fact, I believe that we are headed for some very serious economic troubles in America if we do not come to grips realistically with the whole problem of a stable currency and a reduced debt. So I am perfectly willing to take the position which I took in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was unpopular then, too. During the summer I gathered much evidence to that effect. It was unpopular then to say to the American people, "You must tighten your belts. You must make a substantial payment on the public debt if you really want to preserve economic stability in this country, if you want to safeguard the value of the dollar, if you want to maintain the private-enterprise system."

I happen to be one who believes that the issue is just that. We, as a people—140,000,000 of us—must decide in the immediate months ahead whether the precious freedoms which we enjoy in America and the private-property economy which has lifted our standard of living above that of any other people in the world are worth saving to the degree of paying for them. I think that is the issue. Politicians in and out of the Congress can beat political tom-toms all they wish. They can appeal to the selfishness of the American taxpayer, who would like to believe that he can have a substantial reduction in his taxes now and save the value of his dollar. But I will never tarnish my record with any such false, buck-passing, deceptive play in the American arena of politics. I think our citizens must be told again and again that with the world on fire as it is this hour, if we are to preserve our system of private enterprise, we must dig down in our pockets and pay substantial taxes for the next few years until we reduce the debt so that we may escape the present danger of another depression. Such a danger will follow a few years of false economic boom produced by the war. It is as certain to follow as the day the night if we now adopt the fiscal pattern which my party foisted upon this Nation in the 1920's.

I happen to be a Republican who believes that, talk as we will, and alibi as some do, no matter what pattern of rationalization we adopt, the Republican Party cannot erase from its political record of the 1920's the chief responsibility for the depression of 1932. During that period of time we saw hourly wages in this country go up but slightly. As that great American, Harold Stassen, stated before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, by 1929 the average hourly wage in factories and plants in America was 59½ cents. Taxes went down. Comparatively speaking, as far as need and sound economics was concerned, we made a very slight payment on the national debt. But the American people were confronted with a price structure so economically unsound that installment buying went up by leaps and bounds until a tremendous economic balloon had been inflated. Then, in 1929, economic realities pricked that balloon and we had a collapse that filled our streets with the unemployed and brought economic disaster to thousands of business firms all over the country. We should have been paying on the debt at a much more rapid rate than we did in the 1920's to avoid that disaster. We should have taxed ourselves out of a substantial part of the war debt.

We should have been forthright enough as leaders of our parties to make the American people understand that they cannot have their cake and eat it too. We cannot have the great governmental services which the American people are constantly demanding—and many of which I certainly think they must have today—and not pay for them. It cannot be done. We can have those things only if we pay for them with cold dollars. There is no other source for those public service payments than the pockets of the American taxpayers. I have noticed that most citizens wish savings made on the other fellow's governmental services but they do not want to sacrifice services which they think they should receive from their Government.

I think we have got to come to grips with this problem. We must make up our minds what services we can dispense with and tell the American people so. We ought to do it, Mr. President, before we use the strategy which is now being used of having Members of Congress commit themselves on a blanket budget reduction when they have not the slightest idea of what is encompassed by that reduction. We should first be told where it is to be made, and what services are to be dispensed with. I cannot be a party to such action as is being proposed by the joint budget committee. I do not think it is fair dealing with the American people.

As I said on the floor the other day, Mr. President—and it must be repeated again many, many times—not only have we the obligation of paying on the national debt so that we can make secure this system that we call the private enterprise system, but the only way it can be made secure and kept so is to have a stable currency.

Do not forget, Mr. President, that we cannot keep that system secure if a trend is started whereby the number of people who have nothing to lose from a change in our economic system is constantly increased. In my judgment, that is a statement of principle involving a combination of sociological and political facts which both our major political parties must keep in mind in the critical years immediately ahead. If we are plummeted into the depths of another depression we shall increase by millions those who will then become fertile minds for the propaganda that they have nothing to lose by a change in our form of economy. Mr. President, I think Senators know me well enough to be sure that then as now, I shall be heard talking and fighting for the economic system which we have, because I know of no other that can give to the individual the dignity and the rights which he enjoys in America today under our private property economy with its partner, a political democracy. But I am afraid that we shall talk to many deaf ears if we now adopt a budgetary policy which will again lay the groundwork for the great mistakes which we made in the twenties.

I wish I could say that my party has learned something from the experience of the 1920's. A great many of its leaders have but many have not. I am satisfied that the great rank and file of Republican voters in this country have learned from the mistakes of the Republican Party in the 1920's and they do not want those mistakes repeated. That is why I have said on public platforms in this country and in this Chamber, and will say again, that I think the approach which is being made to the fiscal problems of this Government at the present time by my party as represented by some of its spokesmen in the Congress of the United States is not in step with the thinking of the great majority of Republican voters. I think they understand that we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We cannot have a huge national debt and a sound dollar for very long. The voters see that tax reduction at the cost of a cheapened dollar is no tax reduction at all. I think what they want is the strictest type of economy in the administration of our Government, to the end of eliminating every wasteful expenditure. I favor that. I think they want a substantial payment on the national debt. I favor that. I have heard no proposal for a cut in the budget that would justify our not taking the entire cut, if we can make it, and applying it on the national debt.

I think it is a great economic fallacy to argue that the present tax structure is an impediment to production. Oh, I know that there are selfish business interests which are making that argument. It is only natural that businessmen should want to make more if they can. But as I said earlier this afternoon, after all, the profits which businessmen are presently making are being made as the result of a wartime dislocation. They are profiting today out of the war itself, as they did during every day of the war. Millions of our people will continue to profit for some years after the war because a considerable period of time will be required to readjust ourselves to a peacetime economy.

I do not believe that a single dollar of the war profits now collected under our present tax structure should be returned to them by a tax reduction. I think they ought to thank their God that they live in a country giving to them the economic advantages and opportunities which ours gives to them to make the profits which they are making. They ought to welcome the opportunity to repay into the Treasury of the United States such a fair share of their profits as are collected from them by way of taxation.

Mr. President, I have talked quite frankly to a number of businessmen. A couple of weeks ago I went back to my own State, and from Tuesday noon until

Saturday night I made 13 speeches in my State. I talked to many business groups and told them quite frankly and, in some speeches, in these words:

> Gentlemen, count me out on any program to reduce taxes in this session of Congress, because I think I serve you best when I tell you that whatever economies we can effectuate in the national budget should go toward payments on the national debt.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. President, that I convinced them all. I want to say to their credit that by the score businessmen in my State told me, as I went over the State: "You are right. Do what you can to help get some economy in the budget, and then apply the savings to the national debt, and we will go along with you."

That is why I said earlier this afternoon that I did not think any Member of Congress was justified in rising on the floor of either the Senate or the House of Representatives and saying with assurance that there is any mandate in connection with the tax-reduction issue. I do not know what businessmen as a whole, workers as a whole, or farmers as a class would say in a referendum on that issue if all the facts were presented to them, but I think it is my obligation as a Member of the Senate of the United States to consider all the economic facts and to reach an honest, independent judgment as to what is best for the economic future of my country, and then vote accordingly. It is my duty to cast such a vote, even if an overwhelming majority of the American people think I should vote the other way. That happens to be a conviction of mine as to what the responsibility of a Member of the Senate is, because I do not share the notion that I should vote in accordance with pressure politics. All of us have seen American public opinion changed overnight, once it came to understand the real issues at stake in a problem. My confidence in the long-time judgment of the American voters is so deep that I believe I can hear them saying to me by the millions, "Vote what you think the facts on this fiscal policy dictate."

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think that in the months immediately ahead the American people are concerned, and will become more greatly concerned, about the entire problem of national defense and its relationship to the budget. Until I have heard the evidence I simply am not going to vote for any proposal which would automatically and by way of prejudgment say that we should squeeze out of the defense budget of the United States any sum of dollars. I think the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made perfectly clear earlier today that our Budget Committee does not know what the evidence is that justifies a reduction in the national-defense budget. Yet it is telling the Nation today, I understand, that a certain sum of billions of dollars should be taken from that budget, without the slightest conception, apparently, of what effect that will have on national security.

Mr. President, I think the issue is rather simple. Either we shall keep America strong and in a position to enforce the peace and the objectives of the San Francisco Conference until such time as the members of the United Nations accustom themselves to the habits of peace, or else we shall have war in another quarter of a century. I am satisfied that is inevitably true.

Mr. President, I am not even sure that Hitler did not win this war. When we look at the intolerance in Europe and here at home, when we look at the development of totalitarianism since VJ-day in various parts of the world, when we take into account the fact that today we are practically surrounded by police states—and, as I have said before, I do not care what label is put upon them, whether they are called Fascist or Communist, the fact is that they are police states in which the individual's liberty and dignity are subordinated to the will of the dictator of the state—I say that no honest realist can look at that type of world and can reach a conclusion that we have won either the war or the peace. Mr. President, they have yet to be won. The peace will not be won by a soft America, by a weak America, by an America that breaks faith with those who made the great sacrifice in this war in the belief that they were fighting to put an end to that type of intolerance and bigotry which gave cause to the war, the type of totalitarianism that runs roughshod over the weak and sacrifices the rights of the individual.

That is why, as a progressive and liberal Republican, Mr. President, I take the position that the best way to preserve the American system for our future generations is for us to remain strong. Certainly the burden of proof is on the budget-cutters to come forward with the specific details of the proposed slashes into the defense budget, before I shall go along with any of those slashes. Certainly I am not going to prejudge or commit myself in advance as to any so-called fixed-sum reduction which the present strategy is seeking to foist upon us.

Mr. President, you know as well as I do how it will work. It will be said—in fact, it was said this afternoon—"It is not binding and final; we can change it." But let us not be naive about it. We also know that once that type of commitment is made, it will be argued, "After all, we agreed to cut so many billions of dollars. Having agreed to do that, we cannot go back on that agreement, for the American people have come to rely upon it. We certainly do not want to put ourselves in such a position that it can be said that we agreed to one thing one month, and then the next month we are of a different mind." Mr. President, you know all the rest of the rationalized arguments that will be used.

The time to stop that strategy is now. The time has come for us to make very clear to those who are seeking to make their recommendations on the Budget cuts that on the issue of national security the burden of proof is upon them. I want to know just where they are proposing to make cuts. Are they going to make the cuts in the funds for our occupation forces in Europe? To our everlasting shame as a nation we have already cut our funds for use over there to such a point that we are not fulfilling the obligations we should fulfill if we mean to win the peace in Europe. I am not going to sell America short. I am not going to sell national defense short. I am not going to play politics with the security of my Nation. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to make a political appeal to the selfishness of the American taxpayer, in trying to make him think that it is in his interest that we give him a substantial tax reduction at this time.

I want to reduce taxes just so soon as we can do so with safety to our economy; but I tell you, Mr. President, that I am going to start with the reduction of taxes in the lower-income groups. I am not going to favor the type of tax reduction which I have heard discussed and proposed by some of the leaders of my party, which would accomplish only one thing, namely, make the rich richer and the poor poorer. When I stand for tax reduction, Mr. President, I shall do so on the basis of ability to pay. I shall urge that when we make our first tax reductions, we make them for the bracket of our population least able to pay. Something tells me that there is going to be much sympathy for that point of view among that great mass of our people who are always conscious of the fact, as Lincoln tried to make our party conscious of the fact years ago, when he pointed out that, after all, one of the objectives of government is to promote the greatest good for the greatest number.

I am sorry to take this much time, Mr. President, and I would not do it if it were not for the fact that I think today there is a great split in the Republican Party across the Nation in regard to what the fiscal program of the Government should be. I am sorry it has developed, but I shall not run away from it. I think those of us within the Republican Party who believe that the fiscal program that is being proposed by some of our leaders is good for neither the party nor for the country are exercising and exhibiting the greatest possible loyalty to the Republican Party when we take issue with our leaders on this issue of tax reduction. I intend to continue to take issue on it because I think it is of critical importance to the security of this Nation—economically, politically, and militarily.

I think it is well that we do it now, because if that becomes an issue in 1948, the American people will decide it in a manner which I am convinced will not maintain the Republican Party in power, and if we follow this unsound fiscal course proposed by the Republicans who favor a 20-percent tax reduction, that should be the answer of the American people.

INVESTIGATION OF MONOPOLIES AND MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

So much for taxes, Mr. President. Now for a few minutes I wish to comment on a resolution which I really rose to discuss. I refer to a resolution I am submitting today in behalf of myself and Senators AIKEN, LANGER, YOUNG, MURRAY, TAYLOR, and KILGORE. It is quite apropos that I presented the resolution following the excellent speech made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. I was not aware that he was going to discuss the monopoly problem which confronts this country, but my resolu-

tion, of which he is one of the sponsors, is directly on that point.

It proposes that the Committee on the Judiciary investigate monopoly and monopolistic practices. I feel that unless Congress makes a full study of the monopoly problem America may awaken one day to find that free competitive enterprise and our cherished political institutions are only an empty shell, and that the heart of the American system has been eaten away by the cancerous growth of monopoly and concentration of private economic power.

The sponsors of this resolution are not asking for a witch hunt of any kind. We want to see the United States Senate conduct a sober, objective, and comprehensive investigation, which will leave no aspect of the problem unconsidered. Above all, we do not want a long, drawn-out series of studies and reports that lead nowhere. We want legislative action to give the Nation a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, and we want it soon. We believe that there is not too much time left. We are convinced that the American people are not aware of the tremendous rise of monopolistic power during the war years, that they are not aware of the fact that one of the tremendous costs of the war to the economy of America was the greatest concentration of financial power in the hands of a few that has been known in all our history. It has to be broken up.

We hear much about small business, the demands of small business to protection from this or that. I am in favor of protecting small business. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have demonstrated a record of cooperating at all times in an endeavor to gain for small business its just rights, but, in my judgment, the best protection we can give to the small businessman is freeing him from the control of monopoly.

Speaking generally, by and large, small businessmen as a group are not the independent entrepreneurs they think they are. They like to think of themselves as men of independent business judgment, but to a marked degree they are the workers for American monopoly as their employers.

If we are to give them the true rights which should accrue to them under a private-property system, then we must take off of them the shackles of monopolistic control. That is why we think this resolution we are submitting today should be speedily effectuated. I am sure that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am not a member, but in whose members I have complete confidence, would conduct the type of investigation which needs to be conducted if the Senate will authorize it by the resolution which I offer.

As the Senator from Idaho in his speech stated, earlier this year we reintroduced a revised antimonopoly bill. In the main it is practically the same bill we introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is a bill which already has aroused a great deal of discussion and debate, and I may also say, much opposition. But the opposition is coming primarily from the sources from which we expected it to come. It is coming from those sources which have much to gain from a continuation of the monopolistic practices, which are reaping such great profits at such great cost to the American people.

The bill, Mr. President, contains provision for a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program and a prohibition of American participation in international cartels. I digress for a moment to say that I know of nothing, other than keeping ourselves nationally strong, which will do more to prevent another war than to outlaw once and for all, and permanently, international economic cartels. I deny that any American business combination has any right whatsoever to enter into economic treaties with powerful business concerns abroad, which history shows inevitably lead to economic war and eventually to military war. I say I deny that right. I take the position that we as a government have not only the right but the duty to say to American business, "You shall not enter into such economic business cartels save and except in accordance with the rules and regulations laid down by the Congress of the United States and administered by the State Department."

If we are to have peace, Mr. President, we shall have to pay for it, and I think one of the prices of peace—and we certainly should be willing to pay for it gladly—is the outlawing of international cartels. That is what our bill proposes to do.

It is said that outlawing international cartels is an assault on the private property enterprise system. It is no such thing. It is a denial to American business monopolies of the right to enter into trade arrangements which are bound to have international economic repercussions, and place us in such a position time and time again, as has been true in the past, that the American flag has to be carried to protect rights which we as a government had nothing to do about vesting in the first instance. I say that before our flag is carried forward in the future to any foreign soil to give protection to any economic rights arising out of an international economic cartel, we must determine in the first instance, through government, whether those rights shall vest.

The bill also has provisions in it for eliminating discriminatory freight rates and preventing or eliminating monopolistic practices with respect to patents. That is a beautiful subject, too, Mr. President. Time does not permit a discussion of it here this afternoon, but in a later discourse I will discuss it. There is need for a thorough overhauling of the patent system of this country. The bill provides further for credit assistance for the small and competitive business enterprises, more adequate and integrated enforcement of the antitrust acts, control of mergers, and, where necessary, effective public control of monopoly and monopolistic practices.

The sponsors of the bill have been endeavoring since we introduced it in the Seventy-ninth Congress to get an objective analysis from the various governmental agencies concerned, of the strengths and the weaknesses of the bill. Let me make this point perfectly clear, Mr. President: We do not claim that this bill is in its final draft. The subject is so complex and so complicated that no group of men in the Senate, in my judgment, can sit down as we did and draft a perfect antimonopoly bill. However, we felt it was important to do the best preliminary job that we could and come forward with the results of our labor; then, through hearings and by way of amendments, to modify the bill in accordance with the evidence that may be advanced during its consideration.

As the author of the bill I stand, as I am sure its cosponsors stand, ready and willing to modify it in any particular whenever a modification can be justified and supported by the evidence advanced in its interest. But we do say, Mr. President, that here is the starting point. We feel that such an investigation as we are calling for today will give us additional information that will be of great help to us in further perfecting the bill, and we are greatly indebted to various agencies of Government that have replied to a letter which we sent to them asking for their analysis and criticisms of the bill.

I shall not take time to read all the suggestions that have been made to us, but for the purposes of the RECORD, I desire to give a sample of two.

The Budget Bureau, for example, sums up its general position on the bill as follows:

> Comprehensive legislation for control of monopoly and monopolistic practices is required. S. 72—

Which is our bill—

> takes several important steps in developing a more effective program for this purpose. Many of the suggested amendments would help to make it even more effective.

Some of which, may I say by way of digression, Mr. President, have been added to the revised bill which we introduced at the beginning of this session of Congress.

The Budget Bureau also refers in specific terms to the provision of the bill directing the President to formulate an over-all antimonopoly program.

> This title—

States the Budget Bureau—

> would help the President in coordinating an aggressive attack on the problem of economic concentration.

The Budget Bureau also comments favorably upon the title authorizing the President to make a regular review of all Federal regulatory activities and issue directives, where necessary, to curtail or correct Federal policies not adequately protecting the public interest against monopolies or monopolistic practices.

Other agency comments—and I summarized a few of them—are as follows:

With respect to the prohibition of cartels, to which I have already referred, the Attorney General reacts favorably to the bill's prohibition of international cartels, and suggests that civil as well as criminal penalties be provided to help enforce the prohibition.

The State Department supports the general purposes of the provisions of the bill prohibiting international cartels. A

number of detailed amendments are suggested in order to improve this provision.

The Secretary of the Treasury expresses the view that specific prohibition of American participation in international cartels would help strengthen our hand in foreign negotiations.

As to patent provisions of the bill, the State Department favors the requirement for filing patent agreements with the United States Patent Office. It believes this provision will strengthen the position of United States representatives in international negotiations to revise the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and will also aid the Government in carrying out the obligations to be undertaken under the proposed International Trade Organization.

The Attorney General endorses these proposals, but suggests modifications in certain penalties provided, and also asks that the bill require that duplicate copies of patent agreements be filed for transmittal to the Attorney General.

The bill contains a provision for loans to small business through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I happen to be one who believes that the RFC is not doing all that it should do in the interests of the general welfare of small business concerns. We have written into the bill a provision which seeks to give them loans through the RFC, with certain specific instructions to the RFC in regard to the making of such loans.

The basic principles of the provision for the small business loans by the RFC are regarded by the Budget Bureau as consistent with the policy and statements contained in the President's recent messages to Congress.

The Acting Federal Loan Administrator suggests several changes in the title, which the sponsors have under consideration.

Then there is a section on control of mergers. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission indicates that the bill's provision as to the control of mergers, which remedies a basic defect in section 7 of the Clayton Act, would be one of the most effective methods of restraining the growth of excessive concentration of economic power.

Thus, I could go through one letter after another and read comments which we have received from responsible Government officials charged with duties in connection with the regulation of American business. The sum and substance of it all is, I think, that by and large they feel that the bill, even in its present form, would be a constructive contribution in solving the problem of controlling monopoly and monopolistic practices.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the communications I have received in relation to the antimonopoly bill from the Bureau of the Budget, the Departments of State, Treasury, Justice, and Commerce, and from the Federal Farm Agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

In closing my remarks, Mr. President, I want to say that I am in this fight for control and regulation of monopolies to the finish. I am in this fight on that issue so long as the people of my State give me the privilege and the trust of serving them in this body. I am in this fight against monopolies and monopolistic practices because I know of nothing in America today that so threatens the continuation of our private-property enterprise system as the tremendous concentration of wealth in monopolies, which is now strangling any hope of the small businessman really to breathe freely the fresh air of a private-enterprise system.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Following your letter of August 1 requesting comments on the proposed antimonopoly bill (S. 2482), I requested the views of the various agencies primarily concerned in this broad program. Detailed comments and suggestions have now been received from the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Federal Loan Agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, and the Federal Trade Commission. Copies of these letters are attached.

Your letter of January 17 requesting comments on the revised bill (S. 72) arrived just as I was preparing to transmit the comments on the earlier version. Since most of the views expressed by the agencies apply equally to the new version, it seems best not to delay my answer any longer.

In reply to both letters, I am enclosing a memorandum prepared by members of my staff discussing various aspects of the proposed legislation. I trust these comments will be of use to you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET SUMMARY AND COMMENTS ON S. 2482, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, AND S. 72, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Title I of both bills authorizes and directs the President to formulate an over-all antimonopoly program, to make annual studies and reports on existing conditions and projected programs, and to submit any reorganization plans necessary to effective administration of the antimonopoly program. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission questions the desirability of removing the provision in the Reorganization Act of 1945, prohibiting transfers of functions from the Federal Trade Commission. He suggests that, since the Commission is already "the nucleus of a coordinated and consistent antimonopoly program," the responsibility for protecting the public interest in the field of monopoly should be concentrated largely in it.

This title would help the President in coordinating an aggressive attack on the problem of economic concentration. The exemption of the Federal Trade Commission from the President's reorganization powers is not believed to be in accord with the President's program to assure maximum effectiveness in the administration of the antimonopoly program.

Title II prohibits participation of American business in international cartels, but permits compliance with international commodity agreements officially entered into by the Government of the United States. The Secretary of State supports the general purposes of the title, but suggests that in its present form it might limit the scope of international negotiations now under way on such topics as international cartels and commodity agreements and the relationship between state trading and private trading. To meet these objections, and to clarify certain ambiguities, he makes numerous detailed suggestions. The Acting Secretary of the Treasury expresses the view that specific prohibition of American participation in international cartels would help strengthen our hand in foreign negotiations. The Attorney General suggests that civil as well as criminal penalties be provided to help enforce the proposed prohibition on agreements between American and foreign business enterprises if the purpose or effect of such agreements is to control production, distribution, markets, use of patents, inventions, or other technology. The general problem of international cartels and restrictive practices is becoming increasingly urgent; it will require much further study.

Title III requires the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish a uniform classification of property and a uniform scale of freight rates in order to encourage development of competitive enterprise in all regions of continental United States. Commissioner Splawn, in behalf of the Commission's legislative committee, suggests the omission of this title from the bill on the grounds that the Commission is already taking action to remedy inequities, that the requirements of the bill are too inflexible and vague, and that the bill applies only to railroads and not to competing carriers. The Attorney General points out that less than 5 percent of the total volume of carload freight now moves under the class rates which would be equalized by this title; he suggests that the bill be amended to include the principle of equalization among the standards to be applied by the Commission in determining the lawfulness of commodity and exception rates applied in lieu of class rates. In view of the considerations advanced by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the 1940 revisions in the statutes designed to meet these problems, and the cases now before the Supreme Court, further consideration of the desirability of including this title in the bill would be justified. Experience argues strongly against such specific prescription of rate-making standards in a legislative enactment.

Title IV amends the Clayton Antitrust Act to permit the Attorney General to intervene in patent suits, to require filing of all patent assignments and agreements with the United States Patent Office, and to declare illegal any patent licensing agreements which limit production, control prices or otherwise further monopolistic purposes. The Secretary of State expresses the view that the filing requirements will strengthen the position of United States representatives in international negotiations to revise the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, and will also aid the Government in carrying out the obligations to be undertaken under the proposed International Trade Organization. The Attorney General endorses these proposals, but suggests modification in certain penalties provided, and also asks that the bill require that duplicate copies of patent agreements be filed for transmittal to the Attorney General. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission likewise supports this title, but proposes that these agreements be filed with the Commission, as previously suggested by the Temporary National Economic Committee. On this minor point the legislation perhaps should be made flexible by permitting the President to designate the agency to serve as repository for these agreements and obviate the necessity for duplicate files.

Title V authorizes and directs the Federal Loan Administrator to use all the funds and facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make intermediate and long-term

capital available to competitive small-business enterprises, wherever possible, through guaranties of private credit, on terms commensurate with those available to large enterprises (with interest in no event in excess of 4 percent), as well as to all competitive business enterprises, and State and local corporations financing local competitive enterprises. It also requires the President to make an annual review of industries and areas where availability of credit would promote competition, and requires the Federal Loan Administrator to submit comprehensive annual progress reports and recommendations to the President and the Congress. The Acting Federal Loan Administrator questions the need for additional legislation on the ground that it would largely duplicate existing authority; in the event that title V is retained, he suggests several changes. The basic principles of this title appear consistent with the policy statements contained in the President's recent messages to the Congress. The substantive changes proposed should, however, be given careful consideration. In the interest of consistency in policy and to avoid duplication, the provisions of this title should be coordinated with the new charter which will shortly be proposed for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Title VI authorizes annual appropriations of $6,000,000 to both the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. Since at present appropriations for these two programs are not limited by specific authorization, the necessity or desirability of the proposed authorizations of annual appropriations of $6,000,000 each is not apparent. In general, indefinite authorizations are preferable for continuing operations. Fixed authorizations in some future year might unduly limit necessary activities.

Title VII of the new bill incorporates the recommendation of the President made in his economic report to the Congress to prohibit all future mergers or acquisitions of corporate units—whether through purchase of stock or through acquisition of assets—whose effect is to lessen competition to the detriment of the public interest. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in his comments on the earlier bill points out the need for correcting the basic defects of section 7 of the Clayton Act and refers to the Commission's numerous previous recommendations for passage of legislation similar to the new title VII. Such a provision would be one of the most effective methods of restraining the growth of excessive concentration of economic power. The provisions of the title requiring advance review by the Commission on proposed mergers and acquisitions are perhaps debatable. The disadvantage of conferring immunity against later Government action under section 7, however, may be offset by the advantage of providing a mechanism for preventive action and by the additional assurance to the parties involved on the legality of the proposed merger.

Title VIII (title VII of S. 2482) provides that, in any antitrust cases at the request of the Attorney General, the court may utilize the Federal Trade Commission as master in chancery to formulate a decree or may refer entire proceedings to the Commission to take evidence, make findings of facts, and draft conclusions of law. It would also authorize the Commission to investigate cases in which State and local laws may interfere with the free flow of interstate commerce. The Attorney General suggests that representatives of the political unit enacting the challenged law be permitted to introduce evidence at the Commission's hearings. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission points out that the court can now utilize the Commission as master in chancery for formulation of decrees without any request from the Attorney General. The Chairman objects to the unlimited court review of the findings of the Commission in other cases referred to it, on the grounds that it would unduly abridge the Commission's administrative powers. He suggests instead a more extensive use of the Commission's remedial functions subject only to limited judicial review. This suggestion involves the important principle of the relation of a court to its own master in chancery, and hence will require careful study.

Title IX (title VIII of S. 2482) would authorize and direct the President to make a regular review of all Federal regulatory activities and issue directives where necessary to curtail or correct policies not adequately protecting the public interest against monopolies or monopolistic activities. Where monopoly or monopolistic practice is not yet subject to effective public control, the President is directed to submit to the Congress a specific program to protect the public interest "through some form of effective public control." The Attorney General points out that "public control" is defined as "any form of regulation or ownership of business enterprise," and suggests that this title be amended to indicate clearly that public ownership should be recommended only if the President determines no other form of control is adequate.

The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission endorses the general objectives of title IX, but enters into a discussion regarding the propriety of the effect of this title and of section 104 (a) in making the Commission directly responsible to the President. The Commission's objections in this respect do not appear to have such validity as would justify the elimination of these provisions from the bill.

Comprehensive legislation for control of monopoly and monopolistic practices is required. S. 72 takes several important steps in developing a more effective program for this purpose. Many of the suggested amendments would help to make it even more effective.

JANUARY 31, 1947.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is in further reply to your communication of August 1, 1946, transmitting a copy of S. 2482, antimonopoly bill of 1947, and requesting the comments of the Department of State on this proposed measure. An examination of the bill leads me to conclude that the major interest of the Department of State relates to title II—Prohibition of American participation in international cartels. My suggestions will, therefore, be related primarily to this section.

I should like, however, to make a general comment in support of the purposes behind the bill which I infer from section 1 and from your explanatory remarks in the Senate on July 26, 1946. Congressional enactment of a measure designed to strengthen and clarify antitrust legislation and to encourage the growth within the United States of independent competitive business enterprises would underline the determination of this Government to sustain a free enterprise system at home and to prevent the participation of American firms in restrictive trade practices abroad.

As you know, the executive branch of the Government, through the interdepartmental Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy and its related subcommittees, for the past several years has examined the problems of eliminating restrictions on international trade. Its suggested program took form in November 1945 in the publication of the United States proposals for the expansion of world trade and employment, with which you are no doubt familiar. It was proposed that an international trade organization be established to promote multilateral trade and to eliminate restrictions on such trade. On July 19, 1946, the ECEFP approved a United States draft of a charter for the proposed organization, which was subsequently made available to the general public. In October 1946, a meeting of experts from 17 nations was held in London where the form of a proposed international trade organization was discussed and a large measure of agreement secured on the text of a Charter of such an organization; by and large, the draft charter drawn up by the United States was closely followed. I enclose a copy of the document setting out the agreements reached in London. I invite your attention particularly to chapter VI of the draft, which deals with restrictive business practices. According to present plans, a further conference of experts will be held in Geneva in April where the few remaining differences will be ironed out. It is hoped that a final conference creating an international trade organization will be held some time late in the year. It is planned that the charter of the proposed organization will be submitted to the Congress for approval after its formulation by the world conference.

In view of the current stage of negotiations for the establishment of the international organization indicated above, you may wish to consider the relationship of that portion of your bill prohibiting participation by United States nationals in international cartels to the forthcoming international trade conference. The present draft Charter contemplates international commodity agreements of various types, but this provision of the Charter, like all the others, may be affected by the give and take of international negotiation. If the Congress should enact the substance of title II of your bill during the course of international considerations of these problems, such legislation would obviously affect the nature of the negotiations which this Government's representatives could undertake on this subject.

Another factor which you may wish to consider in connection with the enactment of title II is the recent expansion of state trading in many parts of the world. It is not yet clear how private trading and state trading can best be made to operate side by side in the international field. Again, the content of title II may determine how far the United States can go in international agreements looking to a modus vivendi between state and private trading.

As long as international negotiations are in progress, it is possible that the Department's policy may be altered to meet changing conditions. However, on the basis of the Department's current understanding of these and related problems, I have a number of suggestions to make regarding title II of your bill.

I would suggest that the heading of title II, "International cartels," be changed to "International restrictive business practices," Although this suggestion may appear to be largely a question of semantics, it may avoid future ambiguities in judicial interpretations of jurisdiction. The Department has taken the position that its primary concern is with the effects of international industrial organization, not with its form. As you know, a cartel is but one of the many mechanisms through which business enterprises may restrict the development of international trade. Another form is the international corporate combine. Still another is unilateral policing of an entire industry by a single firm through exclusive control of raw materials of processing facilities. It is the position of the Department that any practices of commercial enterprises which have the purpose or effect of restricting international trade should be eliminated regardless of the form they take. I should like to see the title of the section such as to avoid the chances of a limiting judicial construction.

I believe it would be desirable to make clear that the phrase "business enterprises" (line 3, p. 5) includes an enterprise owned in whole or in part by a government. In

negotiations leading up to the international trade conference the United States is taking the position that such enterprises should be subject to the same prohibitions relative to restrictive practices in international trade as are those enterprises controlled by nongovernmental interests. If there is congressional enactment on this subject in the near future, I should like to see such enactment support the position presently taken by the executive branch of the Government relative to these problems. This suggestion could be implemented by altering the definition of business enterprise in the section relating to definitions by adding the following words at the end of section 901 (c):

"As used in title II 'business enterprise' shall mean all persons and entities conducting business including such entities which are agencies of government or in which there is a Government interest."

An alternative to this method would be to invert the phrase "no private person or business enterprise" (line 3, p. 5) to read "no business enterprise or private persons." This would reduce the danger that the word "private" might be interpreted as modifying "business enterprise" as well as "person."

I would like to suggest that the phrase "agreement or understanding with business enterprises of other nations" be amended to read "combination, agreement, or other arrangement with commercial enterprises or private persons of other nations." This wording would more nearly parallel that contained in the draft charter. It would have the further advantage of including within the jurisdiction of this section certain intercorporate relations which might not be covered by the words "agreements" or "understanding.".

Another method for insuring that the bill have jurisdiction over intercorporate relationships as well as agreements among enterprises lies in an expansion of the relief provisions of section 202. I would suggest the inclusion in section 202 of all the relief provisions of the antitrust laws, particularly the right of divestiture. The use of divestiture to gain relief from monopolistic arrangements in international trade could only be applied to intercorporate relationships. Thus the congressional intent to include such relationships under the jurisdiction of the bill would be clear.

The extension of prohibitions against agreements to those which have the purpose or effect of restricting or controlling the "use of patents, inventions, or other technology" (line 6, page 6) is open to question. I should suggest the elimination from title II of reference to patents, inventions, and technology. As the bill stands, a reading of title II in conjunction with title IV makes it clear that patents may not be used as a mechanism to limit production, fix prices, or allocate market territory beyond the scope authorized in the patent itself. Thus the reference to this subject in title II is unnecessary, and its inclusion in title II might call into question a large area of patent agreements which heretofore have been considered legitimate and which would continue to be so considered under title IV of your bill.

The proviso permitting United States citizens to comply with the requirements of international commodity agreements entered into by the Government of the United States should, I believe, be broadened to permit compliance by United States nationals with any international agreement officially entered into by the United States Government. Certain agreements requiring compliance by United States commercial firms might not be considered "commodity" agreements, and American business enterprises should be protected in these fields as well as in those covered by commodity agreements.

I have a few suggestions relative to portions of the bill other than title II. In section 1, I would suggest that the development of foreign commerce as well as interstate commerce be included as one of the purposes. This would require the insertion of the words "and foreign" in line 1, page 2, immediately before the word "commerce."

I have the following comment relative to Title IV—Preventing or eliminating monopolistic practices with respect to patents. This section appears to codify and regularize existing judicial interpretations of the patent and antitrust statutes, insofar as they are interrelated. It therefore has the merit of simplifying the presentation of American policy on this subject to foreign nations. Moreover, I believe that the provisions for the filing of patent assignments, licenses, and related agreements will strengthen the position of the United States representative at negotiations which are contemplated for revisions of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property. In my opinion, these provisions will also aid the United States Government in carrying out some of the obligations that it may undertake through membership in the proposed International Trade Organization. However, since this section of the bill is concerned with a complicated legal subject and affects primarily the domestic economy, I will refrain from further detailed comments and defer to the opinions of the Commissioner of Patents and the Attorney General.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the bill. You may be assured that the Department of State will be glad to supply any further technical assistance desired by you or the committee which will consider this bill.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that, while there is no objection to the submission of this report, the Director of the Bureau has sent you copies of proposed reports which he had received from this Department and other departments and agencies.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

OCTOBER 7, 1946.

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET.

DEAR SIR: By your letter of August 29, transmitting a copy of a letter from Senator MORSE, dated August 1, 1946, you invited the comments of this Department on S. 2482, a bill introduced by eight Senators designed to curb monopolies and monopolistic practices.

The specific provisions of the bill affect the responsibilities of the Treasury Department only incidentally. However, the general purposes of the bill have an important relationship to the reconversion of the American economy and its healthy development. I shall therefore take the liberty of making some general observations on the bill, despite the fact that the primary responsibility for the administration of such legislation would lie elsewhere.

This Government has been committed for half a century to the protection of competitive enterprise against monopolies and restraints of trade. Despite the fact that the Sherman antitrust law has been on the statute books since 1890, and has been supplemented from time to time by other legislation directed to the same ends, it remains the general impression with the American public that the concentration of economic power and the concomitant restriction of the field of free competitive enterprise has continued to develop despite all governmental efforts to hold it within bounds. It seems to me peculiarly important that at a time when we look forward to a great expansion of American productivity we should reexamine the effectiveness of our antimonopoly measures and be prepared to adopt new techniques, if necessary, to accomplish the aims sought. The price rigidity, production limitation, and stratification of distribution channels, characteristic of monopoly, would, in my judgment, seriously hamper the attainment of full production and employment which we hope to achieve.

S. 2482 is a comprehensive measure aimed at attacking the monopoly problem from many viewpoints. Title I requires an annual report by the President on the extent of monopoly and plans for its restriction, presumably based on studies of the Council of Economic Advisers. Titles IV, VI, and VII are designed to strengthen the enforcement of the antitrust laws by making new procedures available and by increasing the penalties for violations. These titles affect directly the work of the Department of Justice and of the Federal Trade Commission, and I shall therefore make no specific comments thereon. Titles III and V propose to assist the development of small and competitive enterprises by, respectively, eliminating discriminatory freight rates and providing capital financing. While the matters in question fall directly within the field of activity of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Loan Agency, and the Department of Commerce, I venture to suggest that because of the novelty of the proposals made as an antimonopoly measure, consideration might be given to referring the proposals at this time to the Council of Economic Advisers for their consideration.

The provisions of title II, prohibiting American participation in international cartels, are of somewhat more direct interest to this Department because of the work of the Foreign Funds Control in dealing with problems involving the relationship of American and enemy enterprises, and because of participation by this Department in the formulation of American proposals for an International Trade Organization which seek by international agreement to outlaw cartels and other restrictive business practices. While the provisions of title II are more in the nature of a clarification and particularization of the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law insofar as they affect our foreign commerce, rather than an extension of the law, I am inclined to the view that a specific prohibition on American participation in international cartels at this time would lend considerable strength to our position in an international convention where we seek acquiescence of the other countries of the world in a similar program. The specific language of the bill is no doubt being reviewed by the Department of Justice, and I would prefer not to express an opinion on that score.

Very truly yours,

O. MAX GARDNER,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

DECEMBER 23, 1946

Hon. JAMES E. WEBB,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WEBB: In compliance with the provisions of Bureau of the Budget circular No. A-19, I enclose the proposed report to be submitted by me to Senator MORSE relative to a bill (S. 2482) to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices. My views were requested by the Senator.

I shall appreciate it if you will advise me as to the relationship of the proposed report to the program of the President.

This report will also serve as a reply to your request for my views concerning this measure.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

PROPOSED REPORT TO BE SUBMITTED TO SENATOR MORSE ON S. 2482

This is in response to your request for my views relative to a bill (S. 2482) to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices.

The bill would provide that, in order to contribute to employment opportunities, the promotion of competitive free enterprise and the general welfare, and the development of interstate commerce, it shall be the policy of the Federal Government to develop a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, to foster competitive enterprises, prohibit participation in international cartels, eliminate discriminatory freight rates, prevent monopolistic practices with respect to patents, provide small business enterprises with assistance in obtaining capital, provide for a more adequate enforcement of the antitrust laws, and to protect the public interest through effective control of monopolistic practices (sec. 1).

Title I of the bill would authorize and direct the President of the United States, in consultation with the heads of the various departments and agencies of the Government, to develop a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, and to mobilize the resources of the Government for the administration of such a program (sec. 101). The President would be required in his report to the Congress at the beginning of every session to present a review of monopolistic practices existing in the United States, and to report on the activities of the Government to control such practices (sec. 102). He would be authorized and directed to make an annual study and investigation through the various Federal agencies of the extent to which monopolistic practices exist (sec. 103), and would be authorized and directed to submit such reorganization plans to the Congress as he deems necessary to obtain the most effective administration of the antimonopoly program (sec. 104).

This title is apparently in response to the President's message of January 14, 1946, to the Congress, in which he stated, "We must have an over-all antimonopoly policy which can be applied by all agencies of the Government in exercising the functions assigned to them * * *." (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 144.) With the exception of the provisions removing existing limitations on the President's reorganization powers, the title does not appear to grant him any authority he does not now possess. Its importance would seem to lie in the words "authorized and directed," which would impose a duty on the President to exercise the powers in question. It would seem that the exercise of such powers would produce a consistent Federal policy with respect to an antimonopoly program with all the resources of the Government concentrated upon its accomplishments. Periodic surveys would keep the program current.

Title II would prohibit any private person or business enterprise of the United States from participating or agreeing to participate in any agreement with a foreign business enterprise which has the purpose or effect "of restricting or controlling production, distribution, markets, prices, or use of patents, inventions, or other technology." The title would provide that the prohibitions shall not be construed to prevent compliance with the requirements of any international commodity agreement officially entered into by the United States, or to prevent agreements not designed to reduce competition (sec. 201). The penalties for violating the prohibitions would be those set forth in the antitrust laws as amended by title IV of the bill under consideration (sec. 202). The title would also provide that nothing in it shall be construed to prevent or interfere with the enforcement of the provisions of the antitrust laws or the acts to regulate commerce (sec. 203).

Existing law prohibits international agreements controlling production, distribution, markets, prices, or use of patents, or other technology when their purpose or effect is to restrain interstate or foreign commerce (15 U. S. C. 1).

Title II would extend such prohibitions to agreements or understandings between business enterprises of the United States and those of foreign nations, if the purpose or effect of such agreements would be to control production, distribution, markets, prices, use of patents, inventions, or other technology. While such extension would seem desirable in principle, I wish to point out that effective enforcement would be very difficult. The amendment of section 202 so as to provide civil as well as criminal sanctions with respect to violations of this title, might be helpful in this respect.

Title III would amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to eliminate unjust and unreasonable freight rates for the purpose of encouraging the development of competitive private enterprise (sec. 301). It would add a new section entitled section 15B to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, which would declare it to be in the interest of the United States that there be established a uniform classification and scale of rates for each class of property transported by rail, other than property for which individual commodity rates or exceptions are lawfully applicable. The Interstate Commerce Commission would be authorized and directed to prepare and make public within 9 months of the effective date of the section a proposed uniform classification for the transportation of such property, including rates scales which shall be designed for uniform application throughout the United States. Within 3 months after the publication of such classification and rates, hearings would be held at which any carrier or interested party could submit exceptions or modifications for consideration. After such hearings, the Commission shall issue an order or orders, to become effective not later than 2 years from the commencement of the hearings, requiring the establishment of the classification and rates applicable. This section would take effect 30 days after the date of the approval of the bill.

While the elimination of regional freight-rate inequalities would probably tend to develop new competitive enterprises, such development would depend upon the extent of the equalization of rates. It should be noted that the Interstate Commerce Commission has found that less than 5 percent of the total volume of carload freight traffic now moves under class rates, and that approximately 95 percent moves under commodity rates and exceptions (Interstate Commerce Commission Class Rate Investigation, p. 36, Mimeograph Decision (1946)). In this connection it should be noted that the bill does not provide a standard to guide the Commission in determining to what extent commodity and exception rates should be applicable in lieu of class rates. Accordingly, I suggest that consideration be given to amending the bill so that the principle of equalization be included among the standards to be applied by the Commission in determining the lawfulness of such rates.

Title IV would add four new sections (27 to 30, inclusive) to the Clayton Act.

Under new section 27, whenever the validity, scope, or infringement of any United States patent is involved in litigation, the United States court having jurisdiction thereof, would certify such fact to the Attorney General. The court may permit the United States to intervene in the action, and in so doing shall consider whether the intervention would promote the public interest. Upon intervention, the United States could present facts and law on any question relating to the patents involved including but not limited to questions of validity, scope, and use in violation of new section 29.

While, under existing law, if violations of the antitrust laws are present in a patent litigation, the United States may file its own action, the advantage of intervening in an infringement suit over the filing of a separate action is readily apparent. Under existing law, such intervention is rarely permitted over the objection of the plaintiff. The bill, by placing Government intervention within the discretion of the court, would seem to remove any danger of arbitrary Government partisanship in private litigation.

New section 28 would require that any conveyance, agreement, or assignment relating to patents be embodied in a written instrument to be filed with the United States Patent Office. For each violation of this section the bill would impose a penalty of $500 and a penalty of $25 for each day the violation continued, such penalties to accrue to the United States and be recoverable in a civil action. The penalties would not apply if the United States was a party to the transaction in question and if the transaction was entered into for the exclusive benefit of the United States.

Since the Department of Justice is the agency of the Government most interested in such agreements, I suggest that provision be made for filing in duplicate, the duplicate copy to be transmitted by the United States Patent Office to the Attorney General. This could be accomplished by inserting the following sentence immediately after the period following the word "here" in line 2, page 11, of the bill: "The Commissioner of Patents shall transmit a duplicate copy of each instrument, agreement, transfer, contract, or document filed pursuant to this section, to the Attorney General."

The penalty provision of section 28 would vest no discretion in the court as to the amount of the penalty. It is doubtful whether such a severe penalty should be imposed in all cases for failure to file. Accordingly, I suggest that the words "not more than" be inserted immediately following the word "of" in line 6, page 11, of the bill.

Section 29 would provide that any use of a patent or an interest therein which would extend the monopoly granted by the patent beyond the invention covered by such grant, including but not limited to any use restricting volume, price, use, or geographical area, shall be unlawful. A violation of this section or a conspiracy to violate it would constitute a misdemeanor and subject the offending party to a fine not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or both. The use of any patent in violation of this section would render the patent or patent application null and void.

The changes proposed in existing law by this section would materially contribute to the prevention of patent abuses. In the interest of clarity and to conform with the phraseology recommended by this Department for criminal provisions, I suggest that the last sentence of section 29 be amended to read as follows: "Every person who shall violate this section or who shall engage in any combination or conspiracy to violate this section shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year or both."

Section 30 would provide that in any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws or involving a patent or any interest therein, a party shall be entitled to show the invalidity or limited scope of any patent or patent rights involved.

In litigation involving patents where a violation of the antitrust laws is alleged, there should be no valid objection to legislative affirmation of the rule that local rules

of estoppel and res adjudicata may not be invoked to protect evasions of the antitrust laws through the use of an invalid patent or through abuse of a patent. (*Sola Electric Company* v. *Jefferson Electric Company* (317 U. S. 173).) It would seem that a person should be free to show that the conduct in question does not derive legality from a patent.

Title V would provide that the Federal Loan Administrator, under the direction and supervision of the President, shall assist competitive small business enterprises in obtaining intermediate and long-term capital on terms commensurate with those available to large business enterprises, but in no event at an interest rate in excess of 4 percent per annum. The Administrator would also be authorized to assist competitive business enterprises of any size in obtaining capital for engaging in business activities which would promote competition or contribute to the elimination of monopolistic practices in operating, expanding, or improving plants leased or purchased under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, in developing or expanding business activities with respect to new projects, processes, or techniques. He would also be authorized to assist business enterprises in recovering from disasters due to physical causes (sec. 501). The Administrator would discharge his duties under the bill by guaranteeing credit by private institutions, or by providing credit directly (sec. 502). The President would be authorized to make an annual review of the specific industries and areas in which such credit should be made available (sec. 503). The funds and facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries would be available to the Federal Loan Administrator for the purposes of the bill (sec. 504), and the Administrator would be required to make a quarterly report to the President and the Congress with respect to the matters provided in this title (sec. 505).

I find no objection to title V, but desire to point out that it seems to go further than the proposals of the President in his message to the Congress (92 Cong. Rec. 151).

Title VI would authorize the appropriation of $6,000,000 per annum to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to provide for a more adequate enforcement of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts, and to enable it properly to discharge its duties under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 and the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Both of these acts call for reports and opinions by the Department of Justice.

This title would also amend the definition of the word "person" in section 8 of the Sherman Act so as to include all known forms of business organizations and persons engaged in interstate commerce (sec. 602). It would substitute new definitions of the words "person," "commissioner," "director," "officer," and "antitrust provisions of the Tariff Act of 1913" for those now contained in section 1 of the Clayton Act (sec 604). It would amend section 14 of the Clayton Act by dividing the section into four subsections. Section 14 now provides that whenever a corporation shall violate any of the penal provisions of the antitrust laws, such violation shall be deemed to be also that of the individual directors, officers, or agents of the corporation who authorized, ordered, or did any of the acts constituting in whole or in part such violation. It provides further that the violation is a misdemeanor for which the director, officer, or agent may be fined a sum not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both. New subsection (a) would make the section applicable whenever a company violated any provision of the antitrust laws; that the knowledge of any officer or director of any act constituting in whole or in part the violation complained of would create a presumption that such person ordered or caused the act to be done; that if evidence adequate to rebut the presumption was introduced, the fact of such knowledge shall nevertheless be submitted to the jury or to the Court and to be considered as evidence or authorization.

The proposed amendment, by expanding the provisions of existing law to all antitrust prohibitions and in shifting the burden of proof on an issue where the evidence is peculiarly in the possession of the officer, director, or agent of the organization involved, would materially aid in bringing such persons within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws.

New subsection 14 (b) corresponds with the penal provisions of existing law. New subsection 14 (c) would provide that any officer or director chargeable under section 14 (a) of a violation of the antitrust laws shall forfeit to the United States twice the total compensation received by him from the offending corporation in respect of each month during which the violation occurred. If the penalty is less than $5,000, the Court may fix a sum not in excess of that amount. Such forfeitures would be recoverable by the United States in a civil action. New section 14 (d) would provide that an officer or director chargeable under section 14 (a) may be enjoined permanently or for a period of not less than 90 days from rendering any service to the offending organization, from receiving any compensation from such organization, or from engaging in business as a competitor of such organization. Further, the organization "shall" be enjoined from receiving any services from or paying any compensation to the offending director or officer.

The title further amends the Clayton Act by adding two new sections (14A and 14B). New section 14A would provide that any company violating the antitrust provisions set forth in section 14 (c) shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to twice the net income received by it during the period of violation. If the forfeiture amounted to less than $25,000, the Court may fix the forfeiture at any sum not exceeding that amount. Such a forfeiture would be recoverable in a civil action. In an action tried by a jury, the Court may require a special verdict upon the question of liability, require the offending company to retain at its own expense public accountants, and may utilize the Federal Trade Commission, or an officer thereof, as a master in accordance with the procedure in section 7 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

New section 14B would provide for the consolidation of proceedings against the same parties relating in whole or in part to the same act or acts brought to restrain a violation of the antitrust laws, to recover the forfeitures provided in the bill, or to restrain the employment or payment to an officer of the company. The right to a jury trial would be preserved (sec. 606).

Joinder of civil proceedings relating in whole or in part to the same act or acts and against the same parties would I believe facilitate the enforcement of the antitrust laws without prejudicing the rights of the defendants. The proposed civil penalties would strengthen the antitrust laws under which the gains derived from violations often exceed the maximum penalties which may now be imposed. I suggest, however, that it may be desirable to place some discretion in the courts as to the amount of penalties and, accordingly, suggest that sections 14 (c) and 14A be amended so as to provide a penalty of not less than half or more than double the compensation received by officers and directors and the net income received by corporations during each month of the period of violation. Such an amendment would enable the courts to adjust the penalty with respect to the facts and circumstances of each particular case.

Title VII would amend section 7 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. That section provides that in any antitrust action brought under the direction of the Attorney General the Court may refer the suit to the Federal Trade Commission as a master in chancery to ascertain and report an appropriate form of decree. Such recommendation, however, would not be binding on the Court. The amendment would limit such reference to cases in which it is requested by the Attorney General (sec. 701).

This title would, in addition, add two paragraphs to section 7. The first would provide that in any suit brought under the direction of the Attorney General to invoke remedies provided in the antitrust laws or to enforce the penalties thereof, the Court may, at the request of the Attorney General, refer the entire proceeding or any particular part thereof, to the Commission to take evidence, make findings of fact, draw conclusions of law, and to report these for such further proceedings as the court may direct. The foregoing is limited to cases in which the parties are not entitled to a jury trial or have waived their right to a jury trial.

Apparently the purpose of this amendment is to provide an expeditious, skilled, and uniform tribunal for certain types of civil antitrust cases which involve complicated issues. It appears desirable, and would round out the existing procedures for enforcing the antitrust laws.

The second of the new paragraphs would authorize the Commission either on its own motion or at the request of the Attorney General to investigate any law of a State or other political subdivision to ascertain whether the effect of such law is to interfere with the free flow of interstate commerce. If the investigation reveals such interference, the Commission would be authorized to hold hearings and to make findings of the facts relating to such effect. Such findings would become prima facie evidence in all Federal courts and would be made public by the Commission.

The foregoing amendment is designed to reach a problem which is becoming increasingly serious. It is a necessary element of a well-rounded antimonopoly program. I suggest, however, that the provision be amended so as to provide that representatives of the political unit enacting the challenged law may appear and introduce evidence either as amicus curiae or as intervenor.

Title VIII would authorize and direct the President to make a "regular review" of the operations of the various Government agencies, and if he shall ascertain that any of their policies fail to protect the public interest effectively against monopolistic practices, he shall issue such directives as are necessary to curtail or correct such policies (secs. 801 and 802). If the President determines that effective "public control" of a monopolistic practice is necessary and no such control exists, he shall submit to the Congress a specific program including legislative proposals to effectuate proper control (sec. 803).

It should be noted that "public control" would be defined by the bill as "any form of regulation or ownership of business enterprise" (sec. 901 (d)). Since I believe that public ownership should be recommended only if the President determines that no other form of control is adequate, I suggest that section 803 be amended accordingly.

Title IX contains miscellaneous matter in connection with the bill. Section 901 would define "monopoly," "monopolistic practices," "business enterprises," and "public control." Section 902 would provide that the bill would become effective 30 days after its enactment. Section 903 would provide the usual separability clause, and section 904 would provide that the act may be cited as the Antimonopoly Act of 1947.

I wish to draw your attention to a few typographical errors in the bill.

The word "to" between the words "authorized" and "directed" in line 24, page 12, should be changed to "and."

Line 8, page 14, erroneously refers to section 601. This reference should be to section 501. On the same page, in line 20, a reference is made to section 201. This reference should be to section 101.

Lines 1 and 2, page 25, now read, in part, "and have not waived their rights to such jury trial." Apparently this should read "or have waived their rights to such jury trial."

The foregoing suggestions are submitted to you for your consideration in redrafting the bill for introduction in the Eightieth Congress. This Department will be glad to consider the measure further in whatever form it is introduced.

I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: This is with reference to your letter of August 1, 1946, requesting the views of the Department regarding the antimonopoly bill of 1947, S. 2482. There is attached copy of letter to Mr. F. J. Bailey, Director, Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, setting forth the views of the Department in regard to the antimonopoly bill.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this letter.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, October 31, 1946.

Mr. F. J. BAILEY,
Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: Reference is made to your letters of August 29 and September 18, 1946, requesting an expression of our views regarding S. 2482, a bill to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices.

This is an omnibus bill containing many provisions that have been the subject of separate legislative proposals from time to time. These provisions, which require diverse types of action by various Government agencies, have been presently combined for the purpose of establishing a coordinated antimonopoly program.

In line with its basic objective of promoting high-level production and a stable economy, the Department favors affirmative action to remove monopolistic restraints on production and trade. This is consistent with the Department's program for assisting and promoting business, particularly small business.

We agree with the sponsors of the bill, as so aptly stated by Senator MORSE on the floor of the Senate on Friday, July 26, 1946, that before the bill is shaped into final legislation there should be a careful study and investigation by the appropriate congressional committee into the objectives sought to be accomplished by the various provisions of the bill, and that this study be initiated at an early date. The Department is making a careful study of the bill and its representatives will be prepared to testify in detail as to the substantive provisions of the bill at the appropriate time.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. HARRIMAN,
Secretary of Commerce.

FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY,
Washington, September 9, 1946.

Mr. JAMES E. WEBB,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, State Department Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WEBB: Reference is made to the letter dated August 29, 1946, addressed to me by Mr. F. S. Bailey, requesting my views and suggestions with respect to the provisions of S. 2482, a bill to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices.

The Federal Loan Agency and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are directly affected only by title V, and my comments will be confined to the provisions of that title.

Under the provisions of title V, the Federal Loan Administrator is authorized and directed to assist—

(a) Competitive small business enterprises in obtaining credit on the basis of the considerations set forth in section 501 (a) and at interest rates (not in excess of 4 percent) commensurate with the rates available to large business enterprises.

(b) Competitive business enterprises, large or small, in obtaining credit for the purposes set forth in section 501 (b).

(c) Corporations established by State or local government, or local private nonprofit corporations, in obtaining capital for the purpose of helping to finance local competitive business enterprises.

(d) Business enterprises in recovering from floods, hurricanes, and other disasters due to physical causes.

These responsibilities are to be discharged by guaranteeing loans extended by private banks, corporations established by State or local governments, and local private nonprofit corporations, and, to the extent the needed credit is not thus made available, by making direct loans. The funds and facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are made available to the Federal Loan Administrator for the purpose of discharging his responsibilities under title V.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is already authorized, under existing legislation, to provide credit assistance to business enterprises, the small as well as the large, and it has for some time been performing substantially all of the lending functions contemplated by title V of S. 5482. Through June 28, 1946, the RFC authorized 30,469 loans, aggregating approximately $3,432,000,000 to business enterprises, either directly or in participation with local banks. About 30 percent of the loans authorized were to the small borrower who needed $5,000 or less. Loans of $25,000 or less made up about two-thirds of the total. Nine-tenths of all business loans authorized were under $100,000.

In view of these activities, it is questionable whether additional legislation which would to a large extent duplicate existing authority is necessary or desirable. If it is nevertheless deemed desirable to enact the provisions of title V of S. 2482, the following suggestions are offered:

(1) Since the exercise of lending functions in particular cases must ultimately be left to the sound discretion of the agency charged with the responsibility, the use of mandatory language seems inappropriate. It is, therefore, suggested that "authorized and directed" in sections 501 and 503 be changed to "authorized."

(2) The purposes for which business enterprises, large or small, are to be given credit assistance are set forth in subsection (b) of section 501, but no standards are stated for the granting of loans other than the standards contained in subsection (a) for small business enterprises. In view of the difficulties of administration in the absence of standards, it would seem desirable to include appropriate standards for loans to large business enterprises, particularly the type of loan contemplated by section 501 (b) (4), and subsections (a) and (b) might well be consolidated. In addition, standards should be included for credit assistance under subsection (c) of section 501.

(3) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation maintains 31 loan agencies and 41 branch offices conveniently located throughout the country, which are available to the Federal Loan Administrator. There is, therefore, no need for subsection (a) of section 502.

(4) Part of section 503 seems to overlap with the provisions of section 501. If section 503 is intended to grant to the Federal Loan Administrator additional powers that should be clarified.

(5) The Federal Loan Administrator is already authorized to supervise the administration and coordinate the activities of the RFC and its subsidiaries. There is, therefore, no need for the language contained in lines 7 to 10 on page 15 of the bill.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Acting Federal Loan Administrator.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, September 10, 1946.

Hon. F. J. BAILEY,
Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BAILEY: Your letter of August 29 addressed to the Chairman of the Commission and requesting an expression of views and suggestions concerning S. 2482 (79th Cong. 2d sess.), introduced by Senator MORSE, "to establish a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program, prevent or eliminate monopoly and monopolistic practices, and protect the public interest, wherever necessary, through effective methods of public control over monopoly and monopolistic practices," has been referred to our legislative committee. After careful consideration by that committee I am authorized to submit the following comments in its behalf:

S. 2482 consists of nine separate parts or titles, only one of which, "Title II—Eliminating Discriminating Freight Rates," relates to a subject concerning which we are in a position to offer suggestions. Our comments will therefore be confined to this part of the bill.

Title III, except for the introductory paragraph, is identical with S. 81 (79th Cong., 1st sess.), upon which we reported to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, January 17, 1945, and S. 1124 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), upon which we reported to the same committee June 26, 1943. Copies of both reports were sent to your Bureau at the time of their rendition.

Briefly stated, the purpose of title III is "that there be established a uniform classification of property and a uniform scale of rates for application * * * to the transportation of property by railroad throughout the United States." On May 15, 1945, we issued our report in No. 28300, *Class Rate Investigation, 1939*, 262 I. C. C. 447, in which the railroad classifications of freight for the entire country were found to be unreasonable and unduly prejudicial as a whole and to the extent that they are not uniform. By that decision the railroads were given 90 days in which to signify whether they would undertake to submit for our approval a uniform freight classification for the entire country. Soon afterward the railroads assured us that they would cooperate in this undertaking and they have since actively started work on it. We believe that the work will be completed in a shorter time than would be required under the procedure which would be established if legislation such as that outlined in title III should be enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

In part II of the report above cited we found a permanent scale of class rates for uniform application in all the rate territories covered by the investigation in No. 28300 (embracing the entire country except mountain-Pacific territory), as reasonable, and as not unjustly discriminatory or unduly prejudicial, for application in connection with the uniform freight classification to be established, both intraterritorially and interterritorially within the geographical scope of the proceeding. Hence, so far as the greater part of the country is concerned, a uniform class-rate scale of the kind contemplated in title III has already been prescribed for application in connection with the uniform classification.

It is true that title III would require uniform application of a scale throughout the United States while our findings in No. 28300 did not include rates within or to and from mountain-Pacific territory. It is our purpose to investigate those rates as soon as the development of the new classification permits. Whether the uniform scale before mentioned, which has been prescribed for distances of 2,500 miles and less, will be extended for the greater distances to and from mountain-Pacific territory is a question which cannot be answered at this time. Title III, if read literally, would seem to require that that scale or one like it be so extended since it would require a scale "designed for uniform application throughout the United States." A scale as usually understood is a series of numbers of cents per 100 pounds, each of which is assigned to a block of progressing distances, the blocks each covering some 25 miles at most.

Since we believe that most of the broad objectives of title III will be attained through compliance with our findings in No. 28300, we see no advantage which would result from enactment of legislation of this kind. On the contrary, we see disadvantages because the bill apparently would lay down certain positive requirements to govern the rate structure, removing the flexibility permitted by the Interstate Commerce Act as it now reads, under which this Commission exercises its administrative discretion upon consideration of the facts bearing upon situations as they arise. In many respects the proposed requirements are not clear.

The question would arise whether the rates prescribed under the mandate of title III would be maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum, or precise rates. Presumably they would be the latter. There would also be the question whether the rate between two points over all workable routes could be based on the distance over the most direct route with relief from the long-and-short-haul provision at intermediate points on the circuitous routes.

Another question would be whether railroads would be permitted or could be required to join with water carriers in rail-water rates made differentially lower than those between the same points over all-rail routes, as is now commonly the case. Likewise, it is not clear whether all-rail routes could maintain rates lower than those in the uniform scale in recognition of water competition.

Competition between communities, particularly competing ports, must be considered in this connection. For example, there are now export and import class rates between the Gulf ports and central territory lower than the class rates on domestic traffic to and from the same points. Under this adjustment the export and import class rates between Chicago and New Orleans have been the same as those between Chicago and Baltimore, although New Orleans' distance is 100 miles greater. The question would arise at once whether such departures from uniformity as this would be permissible if this bill were enacted.

By paragraph 3 of the bill the Commission apparently would be required to specify the property for which individual commodity rates or exceptions should be lawfully applicable in lieu of class rates. Since there is no definite standard of differentiation between class-rate and commodity-rate traffic, it seems not unlikely that any attempt to classify the various articles of commerce as uniformly suitable for application of class rates or of commodity rates would produce a major controversy.

The provision in section 6 for exceptions and modifications deemed "necessary to correct inequitable conditions, provide adequate transportation in particular areas or provide adequate revenues for particular railroads" seems likely to give rise to controversy. The expression "inequitable conditions" introduces a new and indefinite concept not now found in the statutes defining the Commission's rate-making powers. Its interpretation and application would undoubtedly prove very troublesome in the absence of a precise congressional standard.

Since title III involves only transportation by railroads, its restrictions on the exercise of the initiative of the carrier in making rates would not apply to other forms of transportation, such as motor carriers and water carriers. Such legislation would strongly tend to impair the ability of the railroads to compete with those carriers as well as with each other, as they do at present. It is difficult to reconcile this probable effect with the general policy stated in section 1 of the bill "to contribute to * * * the promotion of competitive free enterprise" and "to foster competitive private enterprise."

We suggest that if a bill similar to S. 2482 should be introduced in the Eightieth Congress, title III should be omitted.

Very truly yours,

WALTER M. W. SPLAWN,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, February 5, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On January 10, 1947, the Commission transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget a letter addressed to you in which we commented at length on your bill, S. 2482, introduced on July 5, 1946. Such comment would be equally applicable to your bill, S. 72, introduced on January 6, 1947. The Director of the Bureau has forwarded to you by letter of January 24 a copy of our letter above referred to.

He has also informed us that subject to our consideration of the views contained in his letter to you and in a memorandum which accompanied it that "there would be no objection by this office to the presentation to Senator MORSE of such a report" as the Commission may deem appropriate. Accordingly, having considered the views of the Bureau thus expressed and being of the opinion that no change in such comments is called for, the Commission herewith submits to you the same letter of comment with regard to S. 72 that was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on January 10, 1947, with regard to S. 2482, introduced July 5, 1946.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

FEBRUARY 5, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Re S. 2482, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In further response to your letter of August 1 requesting our comment and views on the above bill, the Commission would state as follows:

The need for greater coordination of effort in halting or reversing the trend toward that growing concentration of economic power which is the alter ego of monopoly has been increasingly impressed upon the Commission. The fact that such concentration and monopoly have developed to their present menacing proportions is good evidence that governmental efforts to prevent such development have been lacking, either in the amount of countervailing power applied, in the efficiency and potency of its application, or in both. Otherwise we should have to concede the inherent inability of democratic government to achieve a solution of the problem and thereby to realize its own most fundamental policy. It is gratifying to note the recognition which this bill embodies that no solution can be expected without greater expenditure of governmental effort and money and greater coordination among governmental agencies dealing with the problem. The problem is so complex and so urgent that it seems safe to say it is highly improbable that too much effort and money can be spent on it. There is room, of course, for reasonable differences of opinion concerning the nature of the necessary coordination.

With these preliminary general observations the bill will be discussed title by title.

TITLE I. CONSISTENT AND COORDINATED ANTI-MONOPOLY PROGRAM

The reference in section 102 to the President's economic report to the Congress at the beginning of every session is presumably a reference to the economic report provided for under the act of Congress approved February 20, 1946, and known as the Employment Act of 1946. The proposal that the President report annually as a part of the report provided for under the Employment Act with specific reference to monopolistic conditions and to the measures being taken and projected toward their correction would, if enacted into law, give no more than due prominence to a matter of fundamental importance. It also has a direct and substantial relationship to the problem of full employment with which the Employment Act deals and the solution of which the act requires be sought "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare." The provision of section 103 authorizing and directing the President "to make an annual study and investigation of the extent to which monopoly and monopolistic practices exist in industry, trade, and agriculture" presupposes adequate knowledge of present monopolistic conditions throughout industry, trade, and agriculture, and would necessitate a continuous study in order to keep such knowledge current. The attainment of that goal would involve far-reaching extension of the investigating functions of governmental agencies dealing with the subject. Over a period of many years this Commission has accumulated what is probably the best and largest body of relevant factual information in the hands of any agency, but it falls far short of being such current and comprehensive data as title I contemplates.

To do our part in such a program would involve a rather complete and systematic exercise of the Commission's power to obtain information under the provisions of section 6 of its organic act. It would seem to involve placing much greater emphasis on the Commission's functions of obtaining relevant information on its own initiative under sections 6 (a), 6 (b), 6 (c), 6 (f), 6 (g), and 6 (h) of its organic act, as distinguished from its functions of obtaining such information at the direction of the President or either House of Congress under section 6 (d) or upon request of the Attorney General under section 6 (e). Manifestly such an emphasis and the extensive exercise of such initiative would call for a much larger staff than the Commission has

been able to provide under its quite modest appropriations.

Section 104 (a) of title I would authorize and direct the President, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1945, but not limited by the restrictions and exemptions of such act, to submit such reorganization plans as he deems necessary to obtain the most effective administration of the coordinated antimonopoly program. As a practical matter it is clear that the only agencies to which this proposed coordination of functions would apply are the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. The Commission's views and comments upon this part of the bill are, of course, to be appraised with due regard to the fact that the Commission itself would be directly and probably somewhat adversely affected. But taking as detached and objective a view as possible, the Commission believes that there are cogent reasons for doubting the soundness of this proposal and for suggesting an alternative which it believes would be more in the public interest and which would also provide greater coordination of governmental effort to control monopoly. We start with the proposition that by the laws creating it and defining its powers and duties, the Commission itself has already been made the nucleus of a consistent and coordinated antimonopoly program. It is a program which includes the basic ingredients of thoroughgoing investigation, expert economic and local analysis, and remedial civil process subject to court review, together with advisory reports, for the benefit of Congress, the President and the public. By reason of the Presidential power to appoint the members of the Commission, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and by reason of the judicial review of the Commission's injunctive orders provided by its organic act, the Commission's functions and being already represent a substantial coordination of effort on the part of all three branches of the Government in the control of monopoly and monopolistic practice.

One of the Commission's basic functions has been the institution of formal remedial process against parties violating the laws against unfair, monopolistic, oppressive, and discriminatory practices. These laws were intended to supplement the Sherman Antitrust Act and to reach restraints of trade in their incipiency. It is also clear from the legislative history of these laws that Congress was seeking a remedy for a twofold evil, (a) coercive practices against competitors and (b) voluntary combinations among competitors to exploit the markets. The former were condemned primarily because they were unfair to competitors. By the use of coercive methods individual competitors had been driven out of business or had suffered serious financial loss. The latter were condemned primarily because they were unfair to American consumers, producers, and workmen. Voluntary combinations and conspiracies of this type had eliminated competition and artificially raised prices to the consumer, depressed the prices of agricultural products, and lowered wages.

The Supreme Court's interpretations of the Federal Trade Commission Act and of related statutes have embodied a clear recognition that these acts were aimed at both types of evils. By a line of decisions extending to the Supreme Court over a period of more than 20 years the Commission's jurisdiction has been established over both voluntary and involuntary restraints upon competition. As a result, the statutes administered by the Commission now serve as law against unfair competitive methods used either by individual concerns or in combination against a competitor, and also as law against voluntary or mutual agreements, combinations, and conspiracies designed not to injure a competitor but to suppress competition among competitors. How vigorously and how effectively the Commission has exercised such functions can be seen from the following tabulation:

Number of cases[1] involving trade restraints instituted by Federal Trade Commission between 1915 and 1946, the number of orders to cease and desist in such cases, and the results of court review thereof

	Total cases	Orders issued	Cases dismissed	Cases appealed				
				Pending	Reversed	Modified	Sustained	Total
FTC Act:								
Sec. 5. Price fixing	313	169	144	7	3	9	15	
Other restraints	158	87	71		3	4	10	
Total	471	256	215	7	6	13	25	51
Clayton Act (before Robinson-Patman Act):								
Sec. 2	41	12	29		3			
Sec. 2 (a)	74	53	21	1	1		4	
Sec. 2 (c)	89	87	2	1			5	
Sec. 2 (d)	14	13	1					
Sec. 2 (e)	4	2	2	1				
Sec. 2 (f)	7	7						
Sec. 3	130	59	71	1	12		3	
Sec. 7	57	13	44		5	2	1	
Total	416	246	170	4	22	2	13	51
Sec. 5 and Clayton Act, total	887	502	385	11	28	15	38	92

[1] Where any proceeding involved violations of more than 1 statute each violation was treated as a separate case.

The most striking thing about the above showing is that about 17 percent of all complaints issued by the Commission have been trade restraint cases, that out of the 887 such cases instituted orders to cease and desist were entered in 502, of which number only 92 cases were appealed to the courts and of the 81 such cases decided by the courts the Commission's orders were sustained completely in 38 and with some modification in 15. In more than 400 cases the respondents filed reports of compliance with the Commission's orders to cease and desist and are presumably obeying them. It appears that orders to cease and desist were entered in about 60 percent of the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Act cases as against only about 55 percent in cases brought under the Federal Trade Commission Act, notwithstanding that some 11 percent fewer cases were instituted under the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Acts. Incidentally, it also appears that the Commission dismissed about 45 percent of the tabulated cases instituted under the Federal Trade Commission Act, and about 40 percent of those instituted under the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Acts, a fact that precludes any idea that the Commission prejudges a case when it issues a complaint and that an order to cease and desist is a foregone conclusion thereafter.

An outstanding feature of the Commission's work in this field, and especially in recent years, is that it has made good progress in bridging the theoretical gap that formerly existed between restraints of trade brought about by definite conspiracies and those brought about by concurrent and parallel monopolistic action of ostensibly competing rivals. Having the advantage of being able to proceed on the one hand against restraints of trade in their incipiency and monopolistic practices as such, without the necessity of establishing conspiracy and unlawful concert of action among competitors, and on the other hand being able to proceed against the more tangible conspiracies and combinations as well, the Commission, with the support of the courts, has substantially narrowed the twilight areas between those two classes of cases and has illuminated and bids fair to dissipate the fog under which tacit agreements have operated undisturbed for years. The Commission has convinced the courts that some of the price-fixing devices employed by organized industry, particularly those used to create identity of delivered price quotations among widely scattered sellers, are inherently collusive and therefore inherently unfair methods of competition. It has also convinced the courts that some of such devices are inherently discriminatory under the Clayton Act, as amended, even without proof or a finding of collusive action.

The court decisions which give rise to the above observations are as follows: *A. E. Staley Manufacturing Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 746); *Corn Products Refining Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 726); *Salt Producers Association* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (134 F. (2d) 354); *American Chain & Cable Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (142 F. (2d) 909); *Eugene Dietzgen Company et al* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (142 F. (2d) 321); *United States Maltsters Association* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (152 F. (2d) 161); *Milk & Ice Cream Can Institute* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (152 F. (2d) 478); *Fort Howard Paper Company et al.* (C. C. A. 7, decided July 12, 1946 (unreported)).

The devices referred to fall into the general category widely known as the basing-point system and variants thereof. While the Commission had pioneered in this field by its Pittsburgh Plus order of 1924, the approval and support of the courts in the respects above referred to have been a matter of the last 5 years. Even the war did not preclude the Commission from obtaining such results. Those results would seem to have confirmed the advance opinion of former Attorney General Cummings that the Commission was especially well equipped to deal exclusively with the problem. In his published letter to the President dated April 26, 1937, recommending the appointment of what later became known as the Temporary National Economic Committee, the Attorney General referred back to the Commission its suggestion that he attempt the remedial solution of the basing-point question and stated that "a problem is presented which can be more satisfactorily investigated and dealt with through the more flexible remedies of the Federal Trade Commission," that "the administrative and quasi-judicial remedies" in its hands "may be better adapted to the control of the subject matter" than action by the Attorney General, and that "the machinery of the courts is not geared to the handling of the social and economic factors necessarily involved."

The Commission submits that the foregoing considerations are such as to logically pose the question whether the desirable objective of coordination would not be better served by concentrating in the Commission responsibility for protecting the public interest in the entire problem of monopoly

with the exception of such remedial criminal process as may be necessary and possibly even there to invite the Commission's views on the desirability of criminal prosecution in given cases. We can see no advantage to the public in the absorption of our agency by another and the subordination of its functions to those of another agency. The bipartisan composition of the Commission and its direct responsibility to Congress which is the constitutional repository of the power to regulate commerce, are at odds with any idea of concentrating such regulatory functions under the control of a one-party executive branch of the Government. Taking the platform declarations of the Democratic and Republican Parties against monopoly at their face value and as an expression of coordinated opposition to monopoly, it is more fitting that both parties be represented in applying the remedies which a bipartisan Congress has provided.

In this connection it is relevant to note that section 5 (b) of the Reorganization Act would definitely permit the presentation of a reorganization plan transferring the functions of any agency not named in the section to any agency named therein. Under this provision coordination of effort against monopoly could now be lawfully achieved by transfer to the Federal Trade Commission of other agency functions, rather than by transfer of functions away from the Commission, which the statute now definitely prohibits.

TITLE II. PROHIBITION OF AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CARTELS

The proposal to outlaw participation by American business in international cartels would seem to have everything to commend it and nothing to condemn it. The determination of the conditions on which foreign producers may enter or be prevented from entering our domestic markets should be actually, as it is theoretically, in the hands of Congress and not in the hands of private combinations, as so often it has been as a matter of fact. International cartels which divide the available world markets and especially those which reciprocally protect domestic producers from foreign competition are in restraint of international trade for the same reason that domestic combinations are in restraint of domestic trade. An agreement between American concerns and their competitors from another country that each will refrain from entering the others' home market is manifestly a complete suppression of trade between such countries as to the commodities included in the agreement.

Whether the proposed prohibition should be qualified so as to apply only to American participation in cartels for keeping foreign competitors out of our domestic market or fixing their prices and quotas in such market and to permit participation in cartels which have such effects only in other countries, is from one aspect only a moral or ethical question, but presumably the suppression of international trade anywhere by international cartels would indirectly and pro tanto produce adverse effects on such trade elsewhere. Such effects are somewhat analogous to the untoward effects which frequently appear among the member-beneficiaries of a domestic combination in restraint of trade, such as the necessity of restricting production and the volume of commodities offered for sale in order to maintain prices.

TITLE III. ELIMINATING DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT RATES

This Commission has been given no official jurisdiction over this matter but has had occasion to observe the effect of freight rates upon systems of identical delivered prices of commodities where the freight makes up a large proportion of the delivered cost. Where the cost of freight varies, as among competing shipper-sellers, the only way they can match each other's delivered price quotations is by systematically varying their respective prices f. o. b. factory with the result that their nearby customers pay more and their distant customers pay less after making due allowance for differences in the cost of delivery to them. Frequently this involves collection by the shipper-seller of substantial amounts of "phantom freight," a term which includes a charge for freight when there is no actual freight or a larger charge for freight than is actually incurred. This was held to be unlawful price discrimination in the Staley and Corn Products cases before referred to. Rail freight is usually taken as the basis for calculating the freight factor because rail rates are more stable and are a matter of public record.

In situations where such discriminations in price are superimposed upon discrimination in freight rates the results are doubly serious. Any increase in freight rates from the basing point, even though it is not a discriminatory increase, automatically steps up the amount collected as "phantom freight" by shipper-sellers who are located nearer freightwise to the customer than are shipper-sellers located at the basing point. In the Staley case there was one instance where the freight factor in the delivered price was increased four times the amount of increase in the actual rail freight from the nonbasing point shipper. In the Pittsburgh Plus case the Commission found that Birmingham steel fabricators were greatly handicapped in competition with Pittsburgh fabricators in that the latter could compete readily in Birmingham while the Birmingham fabricators could compete in only part of the area between the two cities. If, as now alleged on respectable authority, there is also a discrimination in freight rates between the sections represented by the two cities, it is not difficult to see how southern industry may be handicapped by such a double discrimination. A similar condition appears to exist in the far West. Steel fabricators on the Pacific coast claim they are handicapped in competing with fabricators farther east by reason of steel prices which are higher by the amount of "phantom freight" from eastern basing points, which amount is included in the price of steel produced on the Pacific coast. This handicap is purportedly enlarged by an alleged discrimination in rail freight rates against Pacific coast fabricators on their shipments to the East.

Although subscribing to the general proposition that discriminatory freight rates should be eliminated and pointing out that price discrimination on a commodity quoted at identical delivered prices may complement and complicate freight-rate discrimination, the Commission does not feel that it is competent to offer suggestions as to the ways and means of eradicating discrimination in freight rates which are provided in title III.

TITLE IV. PREVENTING OR ELIMINATING MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES WITH RESPECT TO PATENTS

This title would amend the Clayton Act by the addition of four new sections to be inserted at the end of the present statute. The proposal to have courts inform the Attorney General whenever the validity, scope, or enforcement of any patent is involved in a case and to permit his intervention where the public interest would be served, would seem to be sound and well-considered legislation. It is entirely fitting that the public interest be directly represented in such suits in order to safeguard the public interest by protecting it, among other things, against the possibility of an agreed private settlement of the suit that might encroach upon the public interest by unfairly extending the patent monopoly.

The proposed requirement that all sales, assignments, and agreements relating to patents and all transfers of patent rights by license or otherwise be in writing, and that they be registered with a public agency, is a logical safeguard against the use of patents to prevent or destroy competition beyond the legitimate scope of the patent monopoly. While the repository of such papers may be only an incident, it may be noted that the TNEC recommended that such papers be filed with the Federal Trade Commission. In view of the fact that the Commission has concurrent jurisdiction over enforcement of those sections of the Clayton Act which relate to restraints of trade and that it has been active in such enforcement, it would appear that coordination of effort would be promoted by following the recommendation of the TNEC. There is a palpable advantage in having the relevant records readily available in the agency which has the remedial jurisdiction rather than in a neutral agency, such as the Patent Office. So far as coordination of effort between the Commission and the Department of Justice is concerned, their concurrent jurisdiction over the Clayton Act which has existed ever since 1914 on a successful cooperative basis would not be adversely affected.

The proposal to prohibit generally extensions of the patent monopoly beyond the invention covered by the grant would manifestly constitute a coordination of effort between the National Legislature and the Federal courts as it would only confirm and expand the more recent principles announced by such courts. To the extent that the more specific prohibitions included under that general prohibition actually fall within those principles, it would seem that the same considerations should govern. There can be little doubt that these various specific prohibitions, such as those relating to the licensor's right to fix the price at which the licensee or assignee may sell or to limit the amount produced and the selling territory covered, are limitations upon competition by their very nature. The only question is whether they are within or beyond the scope of the patent monopoly. This is primarily a question of law and whether the public interest is better served by a strict or liberal construction of the statute which grants a legal monopoly through patents. It is obvious that a strict construction widens the field in which the antitrust policy and program would apply, and a liberal construction correspondingly narrows it. The tendency of the courts is toward a stricter construction than in the past.

TITLE V. CREDIT ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL AND COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE

This title would provide either Government guaranty of private loans or direct Government loans in aid of small competitive business enterprise on terms commensurate with those available to large enterprise but not exceeding 4 percent. Such loans must take into account, among other things, the "potential contribution to the creation and maintenance of employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work and the prospect of repayment." The title would also provide similar loans to either large or small enterprises which need capital "for the purpose of engaging in business activities which promote competition or contribute to the elimination, prevention, or curbing of monopoly or monopolistic practices." As to these latter loans, there is apparently no required relation to employment, maximum interest rates, and prospects of repayment. Assuming, however, that in either case the making of improvident loans is not to be countenanced, the question is one of broad public policy, namely, whether in order to promote such a fundamental public policy as free competitive enterprise and under a situation which by hypothesis demands drastic action, the Government will provide temporary financial assistance as it has frequently done in promoting other broad public policies. The country's history is filled with instances where lavish gifts of public property, loans, direct and indirect sub-

sidies, or other governmental favors have been extended to private parties whose private interests were thought to represent or coincide with the national interest.

However, if such loans are to be made as part of a program to curb monopoly, it is highly important that the exact conditions be laid down in advance as to the nature of the business activities which will be given in return for such loans. Little or nothing is to be gained by the mere enlargement of the number of competitors engaged in a given industry if the publicly subsidized new competitors proceed to correlate their trade practices and policies with those of established concerns in such a way as to frustrate competition in price and in related forms. In that event the chief consideration flowing to the public would have failed, and the Government would then have become only a competitor of private lending institutions. The theory of the proposed program of governmental financial assistance in aid of competitive enterprise is apparently predicated in part upon the belief that private lenders may be averse to promoting competition with established concerns of monopolistic power and influence, to which they may have already made loans, and that this prejudices their judgment in ways having nothing to do with the prospects of repayment or the public interest in promoting competition. The problem is one of proper correlation between and synthesis of the inherent risks of competitive endeavor and the inherent conservatism of those who have lending power over the social accumulation of savings and the power to pledge the future to meet future as well as present needs.

Under section 501 (b), (c), and (d) there is no distinction between large and small enterprises in obtaining loans for the various purposes specified, but only in section 501 (b) (1) is the purpose expressly specified of promoting competition and curbing monopoly and monopolistic practices. It is a matter of inference whether the instances specified in 501 (b) (2), (3), (4), and in (c) and (d) will serve that end. Unless they do so serve their place in an antimonopoly program, is not apparent. Under section 501 (b) (3) it would be necessary for someone to determine what constitutes underdevelopment in any area and to substitute governmental determination of that question for private determination. Section 501 (c) and (d) involve the assumption that existing enterprises should be retained or restored independently of their relation to the promotion of competition or the curbing of monopoly, although (c) is not necessarily limited to existing enterprises. These observations are made merely in order that the implications of the title may be understood. If enacted into law they would be in pari materia with the Employment Act of 1946, regardless of their relation to the problem of monopoly. Insofar as it seeks to ascertain to what extent the need for financing of competitive enterprise is being met by private and other non-Federal financial institutions and organizations, section 505 is quite analogous to the Employment Act. Given a condition in some industry where additional competition is desirable, there will always be a question whether that end is better achieved by providing additional competitors by improving the vigor and quality of competition among existing concerns.

TITLE VI. MORE ADEQUATE ENFORCEMENT OF THE SHERMAN AND CLAYTON ANTITRUST ACTS

The Commission is highly favorable toward the proposed appropriation of $6,000,000 for the work of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. According to the Department's report to the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1940, there were instituted a total of 262 civil proceedings in antitrust cases during the 50 years following the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890, an average of something over five cases per year. The Department obtained consent decrees in 1943 of such cases and won 64 in the trial courts, making a total of 207 victories. Of the 47 cases appealed the Department won 26. There would be every reason to expect an equally good future record in proportion as increased funds are made available, by contrast with the relatively small appropriations of former years.

The $6,000,000 appropriation is for the specific purpose among others, of facilitating development of an orderly and comprehensive program of enforcement of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts." Such a program can hardly be comprehensive unless it comprehends the activities of this Commission which, by statute, has had concurrent civil jurisdiction over the antitrust provisions of the Clayton Act since 1914 and whose jurisdiction since 1927 has been established by the courts on a substantially similar basis with regard to voluntary restraints of trade which also constitute violations of the Sherman Act. The considerations which support the proposed appropriation would also support an increased appropriation for this Commission in order that it might enlarge the exercise of such remedial jurisdiction beyond what is known in the tabulation appearing at page 5 hereof. That record of accomplishment would seem to constitute most substantial grounds for such a suggestion. This, however, again raises the question as to the relative desirability of transferring the Commission's functions to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, as against concentrating in the Commission all civil jurisdiction over the antitrust laws. Concurrent jurisdiction, however, is not necessarily without advantage because it affords perhaps a little wholesome competition in the application of the antitrust laws so as to effectively carry out the public policy embodied in them.

The proposed amendments to the Clayton Act embodied in sections 604 to 607, inclusive, of the bill, have the laudable general objective of strengthening enforcement of the antitrust laws. Among these are proposals for broadening the definition of parties subject to the Clayton Act, of extending responsibility for antitrust violations on the part of corporations to their officers and directors, of making such officers and directors personally liable to fine, imprisonment, or to civil penalties twice the amount of their corporate compensation, of enjoining such individuals from performing services to the corporation, receiving compensation from it, or engaging in competition with it, of enjoining the corporation from receiving services from such individuals or paying for them, and imposing on offending corporations civil penalties equal to twice their net income during the period of violation. Some of the proposals may appear drastic, but are evidently predicated on the belief that existing penalties and sanctions have been proved to be inadequate, a belief which the Commission's experience and observation indicate has substantial foundation.

It is noted that under sections 605 and 606 the various penalties and sanctions above described are applicable specifically to those who violate section 3 or section 7 of the Clayton Act. Sections 3 and 7 of the Clayton Act being specifically within the concurrent remedial jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission under section 11 of the act, this proposal might raise the question whether the Commission's orders to cease and desist from such violations could not logically have the same breadth and scope as the court injunctions provided for, especially since such orders of the Commission are subject to court review. The proposal to revise section 7, however, by enlarging the applicable sanctions, is of little importance so long as the basic defects in the section are permitted to continue. Such defects have been pointed out by the Commission in its annual reports and otherwise on numerous occasions, and a bill correcting some of such defects was reported out by the Judiciary Committee of the House during the last session of Congress. (See H. R. 4810, 79th Cong.)

TITLE VII. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AS MASTER IN CHANCERY

This title would amend section 7 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The present section 7 would be retained without change except that the court could not appoint the Commission as a master in chancery to formulate a decree except "at the request of the Attorney General," whereas at present the court may do this on its own motion. Presumably this change is intended to promote coordination of effort, but since there is nothing in the present section to prevent the Attorney General from making such a request, the proposed change would merely take away some of the discretion now lodged in the court as to whether the Commission should be made a master.

It is proposed further to amend section 7 of the Federal Trade Commission Act by the adoption of two wholly new paragraphs. The first of these would authorize the court at the request of the Attorney General in any antitrust case brought by him where a jury trial is not required, to refer the case or particular issues therein to the Commission "to take testimony and evidence, to make a finding of fact thereon, and to draw conclusions of law therefrom." The Commission would be required to report promptly to the court "its findings and conclusions" and transmit the record, whereupon "such further proceedings shall be had in relation thereto as the court shall direct." In other words, the Commission would follow the same hearing procedure as though it had initiated the proceeding and entered an order disposing of the case under its own present remedial jurisdiction, but would become strictly an advisory fact-finding body and a proposer of tentative legal conclusions. Such findings of fact would not be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence as they are in cases initiated by the Commission and disposed of by its order to cease and desist. The Commission's relation to the court under the proposed amendment would be the same as that of the Commission's trial examiners to the Commission.

We believe that the public interest would be better served by a more extensive exercise of our own remedial functions in similar cases, including the initiation of formal complaints and the making of remedial orders subject to limited judicial review, as against the unlimited court review that this proposal would entail. The theory and genius of administrative law and procedure lies in coordinated governmental effort by combining the functions of investigation, prosecution, decision and enforcement in one body, having due regard for court review and due process. To whatever extent that the Commission's time would be occupied with the proposed function of advising the trial courts on the facts and law, it would be hampered to a corresponding extent in initiating its own remedial orders for review by the appellate courts. Such an abbreviation of the Commission's functions would be not only derogatory of the principle of full administrative agency jurisdiction but destructive of the existing coordination embodied in such jurisdiction.

The second paragraph proposed for addition to section 7 would authorize the Commission to investigate on its own motion or at the request of the Attorney General the operation and effect of State statutes or municipal ordinances as constituting possible interference with or barriers to the free flow of commerce across State lines. Hearings for taking evidence on the subject, such evidence to be presented either by the Attorney General or by the Commission, and

findings of fact by the Commission regarding the operation and effect of such laws on interstate commerce, are provided for. The Commission's findings of fact would be prima facie evidence in all Federal courts in cases where such facts are material or relevant, and shall be made public in all cases by the Commission. How much this adds to the present investigatory powers of the Commission is debatable, but its findings based upon such investigations would be given a definite legal standing that they do not now possess. There may be circumstances under which the making of such investigation and findings would be clearly in the public interest. A coordinated Federal program that does not take into account such barriers to the flow of interstate commerce would be lacking pro tanto in coordination.

TITLE VIII. WHERE NECESSARY, EFFECTIVE PUBLIC CONTROL OF MONOPOLY AND MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

This title is designed to promote coordination of effort in the antimonopoly program by authorizing and directing the President to make regular reviews of the operations of the various regulatory agencies and commissions, to issue such binding directives to them "in conformity with existing law as he may deem necessary to curtail or correct" such of their policies as he ascertains "may fail to protect the public interest effectively against monopoly or monopolistic practices," and to submit to Congress where necessary a legislative program providing for "effective public control of a monopoly or a monopolistic practice."

While the general objectives of this title are beyond criticism, it raises again the question of the correct relationship between Congress, the independent bypartisan regulatory commissions now responsible to Congress, and the executive branch of the Government. Coupled with section 104 (a) of title I, this title would authorize the President to make this Commission directly responsible to him, instead of to Congress. This would involve a reconsideration and reversal of the whole philosophy underlying the creation of bipartisan regulatory commissions, a philosophy which cannot be adequately discussed here. One relevant phase of that philosophy, however, is that it contemplates the restoration and regulation of competition rather than the acceptance and attempted regulation of monopoly.

The phrase "in conformity with existing law" is not clearly limited in its application to law existing before passage of the proposed bill, but could readily be applied to the bill itself if enacted into law. In that case, situations might easily arise involving substantial questions of possible conflict between preexisting law and the Presidential directives. In such event the regulatory agency would have to choose between its responsibility to Congress and to the President, again raising the fundamental question of the correct relationships between the three.

TITLE IX. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

By defining public control in this title as "any form of regulation or ownership of business enterprise," the way would be opened to Presidential recommendations for Government ownership and operation of industry as a part of the coordinated antimonopoly program. Since the President could make such recommendations even without the proposed authority there would seem to be no substantial reason against so providing. There may be situations, as in the case of TVA, where the Government should be able to resort to Government ownership and operation. Indeed, if permanent private monopoly is inescapable, the opposition to public control through public ownership and operation loses much of its force.

The definition of monopoly in section 901 (a) overlaps with the definition of monopolistic practice in 901 (b), since both include combinations and conspiracies and the Supreme Court has held combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade as the equivalent of monopoly (*Standard Oil Company* v. *United States* (221 U.S.1)). A more substantial criticism, however, is that the definition of monopolistic practice is too narrow, because it is confined to contracts, combinations, and conspiracies in restraint of trade. The Commission has proceeded against monopolistic practices which did not take the form of combinations and conspiracies, and in so doing it has been upheld by the courts under both the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act (*Federal Trade Commission* v. *Beech-nut Packing Co.* (257 U. S. 441); *Corn Products Refining Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 726); *A. E. Staley Mfg. Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 746)).

Further development of that line of action against monopoly and monopolistic practices would seem to be the natural nucleus for a coordinated antimonopoly program.

The Commission appreciates the invitation to comment and express its views on the bill as a whole, but pretends to no special experience or competence except as to those parts of the bill which involve industrial monopoly and monopolistic practices, and even there its experience and competence are not the same with regard to all aspects of the subject.

If we can be of further service, do not hesitate to call upon us.

By direction of the Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

(Notation: This letter dated February 5, 1947, is the letter which was sent without being dated to the Bureau of the Budget with letter of transmittal dated January 10, 1947.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of two postmasters, which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Sundry appointments and promotions in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to suggest the holding of an executive session this afternoon. The attendance on the floor at this time does not encourage such a course of action, and I therefore move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON TO BE DENTAL DIRECTOR

Eugene C. Stamm

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE SURGEON

John E. Dunn

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 14, 1947:

POSTMASTERS

Mary E. Vaughan to be postmaster at Jaite in the State of Ohio.

Elmore P. Mudd to be postmaster at Alexandria in the State of Virginia.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of our life, we would know Thee better, that we might love Thee more, and thus be more useful to our fellow men. Make us hungry for Thy spirit and Thy power. Let Thy grace come upon us, that the will of our God may be known to us and done through us.

Let us not break faith with any of yesterday's promises, nor leave unrepaired any of yesterday's wrongs. Show us what we can do to make this world a better place for men to live in, that the down payment made by 300,000 of our men may not have been made in vain.

May the urgency of the world's need remind us that promises do not feed the hungry, nor resolutions give them shelter. May we be willing to act when Thou shalt show us what to do. We join our hearts in this prayer for Thy guidance. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 14, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COMPENSATION OF SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1946, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice" (with an accompanying report); to the

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EXCERPTS FROM STOCK-PILING REPORT BY ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD

A letter from the Army and Navy Munitions Board, signed by the Secretaries of War and Navy, transmitting excerpts from a confidential report dated January 23, 1947, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, pursuant to law, dealing with the activities relative to stock piling (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DONATION OF GUN TO AMERICAN LEGION TROOP I, POST 665, BUFFALO, N. Y.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, the donation by the Navy Department of a 4-inch 50-caliber gun assembly for monumental purposes to the American Legion Troop I, Post 665, of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON UNSOLD ECONOMIC PROJECT FARM UNITS, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unsold economic project farm units and project properties capable of being developed into economic farm units and other unsold project acres as of December 31, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that agency for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper

"To the Congress and the Department of State of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The mining of copper is one of Arizona's chief industries—an industry so great that in point of copper production Arizona leads all of the States of the United States, and, in fact, is responsible for approximately 40 percent of all copper mined in the Nation.

"The copper-mining industry gives employment to many thousands of miners, artisans, mechanics, and craftsmen whose welfare and prosperity is in very large measure dependent upon this major activity—indeed, the economic welfare of the State is vitally affected by the status of the mining industry.

"There are, in addition to the properties now being worked, great areas and bodies of copper ore in the State which are susceptible of development, to the enrichment of the State and the Nation.

"It is, therefore, of major importance that the price of copper be maintained on a basis which will insure normal production, fair profits, steady employment, and a good standard of living for workers in the industry, and continuation of the benefits which accrue to the State's economy by reason of the industry.

"This can only be insured through the medium of an adequate import tax on raw copper to equalize the difference between the cost of producing the metal in this country and in the copper-producing countries of South America, Africa, and elsewhere.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That the protection at present afforded to copper mining in the United States be maintained."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, favoring the enactment of House bill 16, the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY on the 14th instant, p. 1024, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Northwest Public Power Association, Cathlamet, Wash., expressing confidence in the ability of Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Iberville Parish Teachers' Association, Plaquemine, La., favoring Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Memorial to the President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States urging the Congress to enact, and the President to approve, legislation authorizing and directing the Treasury of the United States to coin half dollars in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Mormon pioneers to Salt Lake Valley

"Whereas the State of Utah, during the year 1947, is holding a centennial exposition and celebration in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Mormon pioneers to Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847, and to portray fittingly the natural resources and scenic wonders of Utah, prehistoric culture of the west, the development of irrigation, farming, mining, forestry, transportation, culture and the arts; and

"Whereas the State of Utah has extended to all peoples of the United States and of the world an invitation to visit Utah and to participate with the people of Utah in their centennial celebration; and

"Whereas the State of Utah has provided extensively for entertainment and programs throughout the year 1947 to appropriately carry out the purposes of such centennial observance; and,

"Whereas the occasion is of such great interest and importance to the people of the State of Utah and of the United States as to warrant the coinage of an appropriate memorial United States coin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, That the Legislature of the State of Utah does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to approve, legislation authorizing and directing the Treasury of the United States to coin 200,000 half dollars, having a design appropriate to the commemoration of the centennial observance of the coming of the Mormon pioneers into Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847; that by such legislation to be enacted the United States Treasury be directed to permit the State of Utah, through the Utah Centennial Commission, to purchase all of said coins at their face value and to sell the same at such price as said commission shall determine proper, in furtherance of the Utah Centennial Celebration, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to all members of the congressional delegation from the State of Utah."

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating-oil tax as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the thirtieth legislative session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon, making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon, despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a sales tax on gasoline averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1946 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of $3,000,000, which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

"Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to a 10-percent retail sales tax on such product which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

"Whereas the Federal lubricating-oil tax is 6 cents per gallon, and is likewise an enormous retail sales tax upon a product necessary to the production of food for the country, and is an unfair and unreasonable imposition upon such necessity; and

"Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type which is a necessity to persons engaged in agriculture and producing pursuits; and

"Whereas such gasoline tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating-oil tax at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon their expiration, and should thus leave the field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States highway systems; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing the reenactment or continuance of said taxes; be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation."

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to reclaim and keep in full force and effect all Federal taxes, license fees, and regulatory measures now existing, relating to the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine or butter substitutes

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the thirtieth legislative session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas the State of South Dakota is an agricultural State and the production of butter is one of its major industries; and

"Whereas the manufacture of butter is carried on by hundreds and thousands of individual farmers, and many cooperative associations and other persons, firms, and corporations in every State in the Union while margarine is manufactured mostly by a comparatively few large corporations; and

"Whereas the existing Federal statutes imposing taxes and license fees on the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine, together with the regulations and restrictions contained in said Federal statutes, are now, and have in the past operated effectively and efficiently, in the protection of the public against deception and fraud and in the protection of the butter industry; and

"Whereas the return of normal conditions will again find the Nation flooded with imported fats and oils which are used in the production of margarine and thereby threaten the home markets for butterfat and other domestic fats and oils: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should not eliminate any of said existing Federal taxes, license fees, regulations, or restrictions imposed on the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine or butter substitutes; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing any suggested elimination of any such taxes, license fees, or regulations or restrictions; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation"

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Director of the Federal Housing Administration, requesting the continuance and extension of the access road program for the national forests and that sufficient funds be appropriated and allotted therefor

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Whereas there now exists a serious bottleneck in Montana lumber production of saw timber because of an inadequate supply of logs made available to the small sawmill operators of the State of Montana; most of the useful and accessible timber within the State has been cut, and access to the stands of timber, remaining in the mountains within the boundaries of the national forest, through the building of truck roads is the only way to maintain the log supply for the next 20 or 30 years; and

"Whereas stands of virgin timber within the boundaries of the national forests contain wholly mature and overmature trees, the cutting of which would benefit future growth; all merchantable stands of timber within the national forests should be made accessible by a system of permanent roads in order that there may be frequent cuttings for the sake of increased forest growth; and

"Whereas the continuance of the program for construction of access roads will facilitate the advancement of such worthy projects which will benefit the people of the State of Montana and the public generally, as (1) the protection of the forests from fire, (2) the handling of livestock grazing in the national forests, (3) the use of the forests for recreational purposes, (4) the development of water resources within the forests, and (5) increased production of sawed timber available for housing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate of said assembly concurring, does most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States that the said Congress cause necessary action to be initiated by the various administering departments and make the necessary appropriations to provide for the continuance and extension of the construction of access truck roads to make accessible to the sawmill operators and the people of the State of Montana generally, useful stands of timber within the boundaries of the national forests, for the purposes aforementioned; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Montana be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward copies of this memorial to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture; to the Honorable Raymond Foley, Director of the Federal Housing Administration; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, United States Senators; to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Representatives in Congress for the State of Montana; and to the resolution committee for the annual convention of the Montana Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union.

"Approved February 3, 1947.

"SAM C. FORD, *Governor.*"

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully request and petition as follows, to wit:

"Whereas Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, with the aid of low-cost power, took rapid strides toward industrial development before and during the war and have retained and expanded those advances during the postwar period; and

"Whereas the only source of low-cost power in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest in quantities adequate for their development is the energy in our rivers which can be converted to hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, by numerous acts of Congress, has assumed the responsibility for development of this hydroelectric power through the construction of an integrated system of Federal multiple-purpose projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries; and

"Whereas your memorialists are advised that Congress has under consideration not only curtailment of the construction program for Federal multiple-purpose projects in the Columbia Basin but also an increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration on the grounds that those rates are inadequate to meet the repayments of construction costs required by law; and

"Whereas existing generating capacity in the Pacific Northwest is now fully utilized and reliable estimates of future power requirements of the States of Oregon and Washington indicate that installation within the next 7 years of about 1,500,000 kilowatts of new Federal generating capacity over and above that now ordered is essential to maintain continued industrial, agricultural, and utility development; and

"Whereas official reports of the Bonneville Power Administration and independent audits of its operations by certified public accountants show conclusively that power revenues under existing rate schedules are more than sufficient to meet all repayment obligations required by law in connection with the Bonneville Dam project and the Columbia Basin project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to make on an annual and continuing basis the appropriations necessary for providing urgently needed additional Federal generating capacity in the Columbia Basin and not to require any increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration which would destroy the key of low-cost hydroelectric power needed to unlock other natural resources in Oregon and the great Pacific Northwest, permitting the development of new opportunities and new jobs and the creation of new taxable wealth; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be authorized, and is hereby directed, to forward immediately certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of the congressional delegation from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, and the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of the last three named States."

FARM CROP SURPLUS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from C. E. Darr and Willard Hartley, of Lincoln, Nebr., with reference to the prospects of farm-crop surplus in 1947.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *February 6, 1947.*

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: We hear worry expressed every now and then about the prospects of farm-crop surplus in 1947.

We would think that no surplus possibly resulting from initiating enough of everything to make sure of plenty of everything could possibly produce more (of the relatively nonperishable products) than it would be just as well for the Government to give loans on. In fact, in the light of our experience in World War II, and with military men figuring on our probably being attacked first in another war, it looks as if at least 2 years' crop carry-over is not too much.

Also, it would just about do away with the "corn-hog cycle" though we sense that a graded system of loan prices might be necessary for the last half of the 2 years—something like that practiced by the milk cooperative here before Pearl Harbor.

We write you partly because you have been a grainman and partly because we do not know what committee or authority it would

be sent to. Unless you know that such authorities keep these considerations fully in mind, we hope you will pass this on to them.

Yours respectfully,

C. E. DARR.
WILLARD HARTLEY.

Copies to all Nebraska Congressmen, Lincoln and Omaha papers.

PROTEST AGAINST FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF CERTAIN PAINTINGS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Murray M. Gilkeson, of El Dorado, Kans., in which he protests against the expenditure by the State Department of $41,000 Federal funds for the purchase of a certain group of paintings for display in Europe and Latin America.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL DORADO, KANS., *February 7, 1947.*
The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to a group of pictures on pages 80 and 81 of the Look magazine of February 18, 1947. The article states that the State Department has purchased these pictures for display in Europe and Latin America to give the peoples an idea of the United States.

My letter has a twofold purpose. First, a protest against the expenditure of $41,000 plus costs for transportation and display; and second, if we must display "works of art," to protest against the type of pictures selected as representative of life in the United States.

I realize that in your busy days there are many major items with which you must deal, but this question of "art" indicates that the Congress cannot permit the Department of State to be a government unto itself.

Respectfully yours,

MURRAY M. GILKESON.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 363. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public, No. 534, 79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 26);

S. 487. A bill to amend section 289 of the Criminal Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 28); and

S. 502. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 27).

AUTHORITY FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee has voted to report favorably House Joint Resolution 27, with amendments, and also Senate bill 503, establishing and effectuating a policy with respect to the granting of charters. I ask unanimous consent that I may be authorized to file reports on those two measures during the forthcoming adjournment or recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, such authority is granted.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1947, Mr. BRIDGES, from the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, on Saturday, February 15, submitted, pursuant to section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a report (No. 25) thereon, accompanied by minority views and the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $31,500,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $24,000,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 613. A bill to eliminate the requirement of overseas service for naturalization, under section 701 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, of persons who are unable to establish lawful entry into the United States and to extend the time for applying for naturalization under such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 614. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census); to the Committee on Civil Service; and

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Francisco Irilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 616. A bill to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Richard T. Charett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S 618. A bill to provide that F-1 loans under the regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program shall be deemed to have been made upon the same terms and conditions as F-2 loans under such program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 619. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Clyde Johnson; and

S. 620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 621. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in Valley County, Mont., to Stephen Wagner; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 622. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of all the small streams and their tributaries flowing through the Brazoria-Galveston Soil Conservation District, Texas; to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 623. A bill to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Licurgus Burdett; and

S. 625. A bill for the relief of Roleigh Lee Stubbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 626. A bill to provide for the joint return and taxation of the income of husband and wife; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 627. A bill for the relief of T. H. Allen and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 628. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herbert M. Greene; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. BUCK introduced Senate bill 629, concerning common trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 630. A bill to place the position of Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 631. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to establish a Commission for the study of the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions, based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMON TRUST FUND ACT FOR THE DISTRICT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a Common Trust Fund Act in the District of Columbia. I desire to state that if this bill is enacted into law it will mark a most progressive step in local banking practices for the District of Columbia.

A common trust fund is one in which moneys belonging to various trust accounts are combined for investment purposes, and the income therefrom is distributed in proportion to the share that each of the individual trust accounts bears to the total. It is a vehicle which provides for the investment of small and moderate-sized trust funds to secure diversification of investment which would otherwise be unavailable because of their size. It also permits banking institutions to accept smaller trusts because the cost of their operation is lower. It also permits diversification in investment and provides for closer supervision and a more effective management of investments for smaller trusts.

The present bill has been endorsed by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Bankers' Association. It has also been promulgated by the committee on uniform State laws of the American Bar Association. Similar uniform legislation has been enacted in 8 States, and 17 other States have similar legislation, including my own State of Delaware. The Equitable Trust Co., of Wilmington, Del., has the distinction of being the first bank in the United States to have a common trust fund certified under Federal Reserve regulations, and as an officer of this trust company I can report that the

advantages derived from our common trust fund have been most gratifying.

The bill (S. 629) concerning common trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, introduced by Mr. BUCK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SUBSISTENCE EXPENSE ACT OF 1926—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 544) to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on January 6 last the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] introduced Senate bill 6, to provide for censuses of manufacturers, mineral industries, business and distribution, and transportation. The bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my understanding that under the reorganization act of 1946 all proposed legislation relating to censuses and the collection of statistics generally should be referred to the Committee on Civil Service. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 6 and that it be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the reference suggested by the Senator from Maine is the correct one, and, without further objection, the order for a change of reference is made.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF SENATE BILL 332

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 332, to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The bill was introduced by me at the request of the Attorney General. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explanatory of the request I am now making be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Finance will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 332, the bill will be indefinitely postponed, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON BILL S. 332

A. Origin of bill: My purpose in asking for the withdrawal of the bill is merely a parliamentary one. On January 24, I introduced the bill at the Attorney General's request. The bill had been drafted in the Department of Justice. The Attorney General indicated that he expected the bill to go to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am honored to serve as chairman. But since the measure involved taxation on transfer of firearms, it went instead to the Committee on Finance. In addition, since it was a taxation measure, its initial consideration would have to take place in the House of Representatives anyway. Thus, a representative for the Department of Justice has told me that the Department had erred in referring the bill to my attention originally.

Since the Judiciary Committee has no connection now with the measure, I am withdrawing the bill. I feel that the courtesy of a committee chairman in introducing bills at the request of an agency head need not extend to introducing bills to which the committee chairman may be opposed and which do not even lie within his committee's jurisdiction. It has been suggested, too, that orderly congressional procedure is upset when a committee chairman introduces bills at the request of any agency head which lie within another committee's jurisdiction.

On January 24 I stated that the matter of crime prevention deserved consideration because of its importance to our country. I noted that the law-abiding sportsmen throughout our land are keenly interested in crime prevention, and I asked only that S. 332 be considered. I stated at that time that I was definitely not committed to the bill.

B. Views on bill: From the outset, my fundamental sympathies have actually been opposed to the regimentation and abuses which might arise out of this bill. I am opposed to the building up of any more Government bureaucracy. I am opposed to nuisance restrictions on our citizenry. I am opposed to needless controls on outdoor sports, which are, of course, so wholesome and well loved by countless Americans, and particularly by the scores of thousands of sportsmen in my own State—a hunting paradise.

C. Withdrawal action: In view of these facts, (a) that the parliamentary reason for my introduction of the bill has been eliminated by the referral of the bill to the Finance Committee, (b) that I am opposed to the abuses which might arise out of the bill, I am asking for its withdrawal.

I am still desirous of helping to prevent crime by any legitimate means, but I seriously question whether this bill would accomplish that purpose.

D. Hunting encouragement: I have always sought to help America's great hunting industry rather than to hurt it. Right now I am awaiting a response from the Secretary of Commerce to a letter I addressed to him a short time ago on ways and means by which the Congress might stimulate outdoor sports. As a means of recreation and health, as a means of encouraging qualities of sportsmanship, as a means of tourist attraction, and other purposes, the hunting industry is vital to America as a whole and to innumerable States.

WORLD TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the United States is entering into a period of postwar reconstruction of its channels of foreign trade; and

Whereas the Congress and the people of the United States of America must consider carefully what policies it is necessary to adopt in order best to promote the peace and the prosperity of the United States and of the world through expanding trade; and

Whereas the interests of farmers and of business are vitally concerned in the policies and arrangements affecting agricultural products in foreign trade; and

Whereas comprehensive knowledge of foreign competition with and demand for agricultural products, and of the policies of other governments affecting production and trade in agricultural products, is basic to formulation of policies in this field beneficial to the interests of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to prepare as soon as possible for the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate a study covering the following matter:

1. An analysis of the current proposals for international machinery designed to expand world trade in agricultural products, together with an appraisal of the effect on American agriculture of previous reciprocal trade agreements.

2. A factual statement of the policies and practices of other countries with respect to agricultural production, trade, and consumption, which are significant to the foreign trade of the United States in agricultural products.

3. A statistical report on the world production of and trade in agricultural products in which the United States is significantly interested as importer or exporter.

4. An analysis showing what imports may be expanded to the benefit of the United States farmers without disrupting our domestic economy.

MARY SHEARIN PERRY

Mr. HOEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 84), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary Shearin Perry, widow of John R. Perry, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION OF PROCEDURES IN RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. CORDON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85) which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the procedures followed by the War Department and the Navy Department in the retirement for physical disability, and the determination of the entitlement to retirement pay for physical disability, of commissioned officers of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, and the United States Marine Corps. Such study and investigation shall be conducted for the purpose of determining whether the procedures followed result in any discrimination between the commissioned officers of the regular components of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and the commissioned officers of other components of such services.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the school-lunch program throughout the country is in serious danger of being drastically curtailed and in view of reports that appropriations for the school-lunch program may be greatly reduced, if not eliminated entirely, in the legislative budget program, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress some facts concerning the seriousness of this problem by making available data from the Secretary of Agriculture show-

ing the present status of school-lunch operations, the increase in participation, and the need for the program. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture relating to this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The table submitted by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

TABLE VI.—*Analysis of funds, national school -lunch program, January 1947, as submitted by State educational agencies*

State	Amount of USDA payments for first 2 quarters [1]	This year's allotment for food assistance [2]	Could have spent during year to satisfy total demands	To satisfy total demands, allotment is—		Total Federal cash expenditure for food assistance, 1946 fiscal year	Peak participation, 1946 fiscal year [3]		Estimated 1947 peak participation with sufficient funds	
				Excessive by	Deficient by		Schools	Children	Schools	Children
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Alabama	$880,388	$2,239,552	$2,367,500		$127,948	$1,900,752	1,004	147,843	1,220	242,000
Arizona	162,682	319,922	609,457		289,535	307,630	144	28,083	180	39,950
Arkansas	797,848	1,507,722	1,412,977	$94,745		1,215,018	752	98,398	1,006	182,227
California*	1,343,794	1,821,718	3,805,830		1,984,112	2,001,916	1,029	163,627	2,069	422,870
Colorado	286,021	473,881	610,141		136,260	334,359	253	28,584	381	41,000
Connecticut	181,410	419,609	600,000		180,391	208,335	232	36,775	375	65,000
Delaware	42,771	75,331	207,500		132,169	190,268	80	13,719	89	16,500
District of Columbia	43,361	200,587	98,561	102,026		54,011	84	12,917	85	16,000
Florida	402,218	903,438	1,537,000		633,562	1,099,052	675	87,894	751	123,200
Georgia*	1,304,164	2,145,520	2,818,434		672,914	2,612,228	1,298	202,228	1,435	243,000
Idaho*	147,219	225,755	355,000		129,245	249,301	185	21,590	261	32,100
Illinois	922,361	2,133,451	3,647,002		1,513,551	2,545,483	1,703	259,283	2,344	358,632
Indiana	596,789	1,183,254	1,750,000		566,746	1,104,676	725	100,240	1,050	177,450
Iowa*	549,901	934,019	1,245,875		311,856	849,651	660	81,156	873	118,584
Kansas	295,342	656,667	612,000	44,667		461,841	458	35,078	620	52,400
Kentucky	826,835	1,916,745	2,420,000		503,255	1,329,697	549	78,619	1,150	165,700
Louisiana	638,667	1,477,261	1,910,000		432,739	1,789,424	1,215	142,570	1,378	210,358
Maine*	161,838	329,637	519,471		189,834	236,155	323	29,771	677	78,676
Maryland*	440,571	644,088	720,000		75,912	337,574	233	37,087	479	98,904
Massachusetts	806,323	1,789,294	1,400,000		210,706	987,204	1,406	182,634	1,770	234,706
Michigan	868,906	1,699,152	2,428,000		728,848	1,633,372	1,119	190,406	1,280	270,000
Minnesota*	718,122	1,079,106	2,138,500		1,059,394	1,122,114	950	114,680	1,657	260,440
Mississippi	903,123	2,088,954	2,000,000	88,954		1,174,055	740	87,472	1,250	175,000
Missouri	665,000	1,407,153	1,650,000		242,847	1,438,637	1,095	115,157	1,400	169,400
Montana*	111,914	183,164	315,000		131,836	170,287	125	13,750	200	45,000
Nebraska	228,391	503,866	491,200	12,666		242,437	347	30,682	593	68,797
Nevada	34,513	39,917	82,018		42,101	47,639	35	3,458	50	5,700
New Hampshire	63,027	206,319	131,969	74,350		110,428	223	17,896	265	21,300
New Jersey	698,325	1,066,165	1,455,000		388,835	908,838	812	107,146	1,021	147,240
New Mexico	174,267	380,888	288,188	92,700		217,067	191	19,673	235	30,100
New York*	2,000,000	2,927,450	5,700,000		2,762,550	3,865,585	2,288	426,586	2,479	480,057
North Carolina*	1,293,700	2,633,003	4,117,687		1,484,684	2,805,666	973	215,017	1,250	320,000
North Dakota	76,197	283,712	183,500	100,212		149,170	400	18,382	628	29,490
Ohio*	1,250,765	2,028,502	2,496,690		468,188	2,142,744	1,079	186,800	1,768	285,891
Oklahoma*	853,226	1,174,247	1,781,895		607,648	1,267,324	1,270	96,649	1,683	143,172
Oregon*	175,028	322,617	909,603		586,986	459,103	360	41,613	479	67,535
Pennsylvania	1,125,069	3,363,016	4,000,000		636,984	1,090,234	1,105	127,872	2,200	500,000
Rhode Island	90,382	209,058	268,550	508		168,685	193	24,283	200	22,966
South Carolina	701,269	1,587,400	1,913,914		326,514	1,920,217	1,609	169,620	1,804	175,870
South Dakota	137,721	299,279	301,188		1,909	184,286	180	12,908	220	18,900
Tennessee*	1,204,736	1,798,084	3,552,000		1,755,916	2,146,693	1,311	152,974	2,525	329,192
Texas*	2,008,920	3,308,282	4,498,716		1,190,434	3,391,238	2,297	251,423	2,650	283,728
Utah*	160,730	292,107	1,284,582		992,475	304,021	242	40,282	540	105,293
Vermont	60,000	141,959	185,000		43,041	91,473	138	17,654	354	28,000
Virginia	842,541	1,493,920	1,744,406		250,486	1,179,670	721	101,906	851	152,848
Washington*	394,078	455,760	1,377,700		921,940	779,256	607	79,927	751	133,000
West Virginia	618,023	1,172,867	1,519,000		346,133	1,022,184	1,117	83,399	1,520	165,520
Wisconsin	589,774	1,128,836	1,383,589		254,753	904,712	1,081	115,891	1,501	175,536
Wyoming*	75,318	104,824	175,000		70,176	147,114	111	11,002	140	14,000
Total	29,142,499	54,124,198	76,929,643	$610,768	23,415,413	50,994,824	35,638	4,656,645	49,167	7,477,142

*These States have requested the balance of their allotment for their third quarter grant of funds.

[1] Includes full year's allotment to private schools where handled by PMA State Office.

[2] Includes the direct distribution money in process of transfer ($7,325,000).

[3] Data are for April 1946, the month when total participation was at its peak. (These data include child-care centers.)

ACTING LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a press release issued by the Department of State, announcing the appointment of Mr. Durward V. Sandifer as acting legislative counsel for the Department.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of State announces the appointment of Mr. Durward V. Sandifer as acting legislative counsel for the Department. His office will be attached to that of the Department's legal adviser, Mr. Charles Fahy.

As legislative counsel, Mr. Sandifer will provide legal guidance to various offices and divisions in the Department concerned with legislative action and will assist in the preparation of proposed legislation and coordinate its presentation to the Congress. His office will be responsible within the Department for the coordination of reports, comments, expressions of opinion, and communications to Congress, concerning proposed legislation, treaties, and conventions.

Mr. Sandifer has a long background of private and public experience in the field of international law and relations and international organization. He came to the Department of State in 1934 as assistant to the legal adviser. He was assigned to the Department of State's work on postwar problems early in 1942 as a specialist on international law and organization. Since that time he has been closely associated with the Department's work on international organization, particularly the development and establishment of the United Nations. He has been, since 1944, Chief of the Division of International Organization Affairs.

Mr. Sandifer was technical expert on the United States delegation to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and was secretary-general and chief technical expert of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference on International Organization. He attended the London sessions of the general assembly as an adviser to the United States delegation. He was an adviser at the first and second sessions of the Economic and Social Council. Most recently he has served as delegate to the World Health Conference in New York and as principal adviser of the United States delegation to the general assembly in New York.

Mr. Sandifer is a member of the bar of the District of Columbia and of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

AUTHORITY FOR MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be permitted to sit this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the authority requested is granted.

LIBERTY, EQUALITY, GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Liberty, Equality, Government for the People," delivered by him before West Virginia Republicans at Charleston, W. Va., February 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT E. HANNEGAN AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HIS HONOR

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General of the United States, at a testimonial dinner in his honor given by the postal supervisors of New York at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, on February 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

JIM CAMP—ARTICLE FROM THE SHELBY (N. C.) DAILY STAR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article describing the success of Jim Camp, published in the February 4, 1947, issue of the Shelby (N. C.) Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order. The clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Over, on objection.

The bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The bill (S. 568) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation of the bill is requested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the foot-and-mouth disease has broken out in the Republic of Mexico. The Department of Agriculture, at the request of the Mexican authorities, has been sending technical men to Mexico to assist and cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in an attempt to eradicate it. Already the disease, which has been discovered in Mexico only in the last 40 days, has covered an area of 300 miles by 150 miles. It is extremely important that quick action be taken on the pending bill, and I ask the Senate to pass it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to know what the bill proposes to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have not with me any of the material relating to the bill, but the bill proposes to give our Department of Agriculture authority to cooperate with the Mexican authorities, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, in stamping out the foot-and-mouth disease before it gets into the United States. As the Senator from South Dakota has indicated, the outbreak in Mexico now covers an area of some 45,000 square miles. The Mexican authorities would welcome the cooperation of the technicians of our Department of Agriculture. If this disease once gets into the United States, no one can foretell how many million cattle might have to be slaughtered. At present it is hoped that it can be controlled by cooperation between our technical men and the Mexican authorities. As I understand, the bill carries no appropriation whatsoever, and if any appropriation is needed it will be necessary for the Department to come to Congress and get it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any evidence produced before the committee showing that any cattle having the foot-and-mouth disease have been shipped into this country from Mexico?

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, no evidence of the disease has been found in any of the cattle which have been shipped into this country so far, and at the present time the disease is confined to the lower part of Mexico, and is not present in the States along the United States border.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I am very anxious that the Department of Agriculture do all it can to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico. The area now contaminated is larger than the State of Oregon. I am perfectly willing to go along with the bill, but I do not think it goes nearly far enough. I think we must recognize that the emergency facing the livestock industry of this country is very great.

I have on my desk in my office a report which I have secured regarding this matter. I did not bring it with me this morning because I did not know this bill would come up today. The report is one I received from the War Department in regard to experimentation which was conducted in Germany during the war with the objective of eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease by vaccination. If the report presents an actual picture, the results have been remarkable.

We know what happened in California in 1929 when it became necessary for Government authorities to go into a large California county and kill every cleft-hoofed animal, at tremendous cost to the Government. If the spending of a few million dollars in Mexico by way of a vaccination procedure as a preventive will help stem the spread of this disease, then the agents of the Department of Agriculture should proceed into Mexico with vaccination needles at the earliest possible moment.

I understood it would cost probably $2,000,000 to vaccinate the animals in the affected area in Mexico. My only information as to the efficacy of vaccination is the report to which I have referred, and I do not know how reliable vaccination is as a preventive; but if it will accomplish what we anticipate, then I am for an appropriation to enable the Department of Agriculture to try the vaccination method.

Mr. President, this is a threat we cannot trifle with. Prevention of this disease is so vital to the great livestock industry of this country that we had better forget about the border between Mexico and the United States, insofar as spending American dollars is concerned, and see to it that our Department of Agriculture has available to it whatever funds may be required to stamp out this horrible disease in Mexico before it ever gets over the border. That is the only reason I raise the question.

I merely want to have the RECORD show that I think the passage of this bill alone may not be sufficient—I hope it will be—but I think the Department of Agriculture ought to be given assurance of a great interest on the part of the Senate in this very serious problem which confronts our livestock industry. I, for one, think that an immediate investigation should be made as to the advisability of proceeding with a vaccination program of the herds in Mexico that are affected by this disease. I say that subject to a careful check by the Department of Agriculture into the report on the German vaccination method to which I have referred.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to raise my voice in corroboration of what the Senator from Oregon has just said.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, did I lose the floor by yielding to the Senator from Oregon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I am almost ready to yield the floor, if the Senator from New Mexico, who now has it by recognition of the Chair, is willing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to say a few words more. The Senator from Oregon may be entirely correct in saying that this bill does not go far enough, but in this matter time seems to be of the essence now, and it appears to me that this proposed legislation should be enacted today, whether it goes far enough or not, because it will in effect wipe out the boundary between the United States

and Mexico so far as our technicians are concerned.

I sincerely hope we shall not have to spend huge sums of money in eradicating this disease, but if we have to do it, it is better to spend it in southern Mexico than it is to have to spend a hundred times as much all over the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had merely started to say that there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the foot-and-mouth disease in this country. People have not taken it seriously. They have thought that Senators from the West were raising a question about a matter which was not of serious importance.

I was gratified recently to read a very able article in Life magazine, giving the history of this disease. I wish every Senator would read it.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont that the bill does not go far enough, but I certainly think we should take this one short step today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this bill (S. 568) was introduced by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, as I understand, after investigation through a subcommittee and after conference with the Secretary of Agriculture. I further understand that the bill embodies proposed legislation suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize the Department of Agriculture to enter upon a program of sending technicians into Mexico there making an examination, and cooperating with Mexican authorities in an effort to control and eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease. I should like to say that I think this matter has been taken care of expeditiously by the subcommittee which, I am quite sure, considered the resolution asking for this authority submitted by me some weeks ago. I think the authority granted by the bill is all the Secretary of Agriculture feels he needs now.

The resolution submitted by me to which I have referred is known as Senate Resolution 72, and I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at the end of my remarks. I may say that I for one am perfectly satisfied with the progress that is being made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in this matter, and I am satisfied that when the technicians submit their report they will suggest, if need be, further legislation which I think will be in keeping with the advice and recommendations of the Department of Agriculture and with the efficient and effective handling of this unfortunate situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution referred to by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) submitted by Mr. WHERRY on January 27, 1947, is as follows:

Whereas an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease occurred in Mexico several weeks ago and has already spread to some 10 States in the vicinity of Mexico City and Vera Cruz; and

Whereas if this disease should spread to the large cattle-raising States in northern Mexico, it would not be possible to prevent its further spread to the United States; and

Whereas the rapid spread of the disease makes prompt cooperative action on the part of the United States imperative, if the disease is to be stamped out in Mexico; and

Whereas officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture trained in combating the disease have already conducted a careful study of the situation in Mexico, and their report as to what action should be taken is expected to be submitted within a very few days: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, upon receipt of the forthcoming report of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture concerning the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, (1) to make an immediate study of such report and any recommendations contained therein, (2) to make such further studies as it may deem necessary concerning the subject matter of such report, (3) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am sure that many Senators realize the importance of this measure, and also realize the threat and the danger from the foot-and-mouth disease. In my State we had an experience with an outbreak of this disease a good many years ago. As I now recall the only method on earth of eradicating it is the destruction of the herds, and I think the burning of the bodies or their burial in the earth.

This outbreak in Mexico resulted from the importation of a number of bulls from Brazil. It is prevalent in a number of the states of Mexico in the southern part of the Republic. It is believed, however, that through the assistance of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has, by the way, a very capable staff engaged in combating the diseases of livestock, it can be kept in the southern states of Mexico and not allowed to approach the boundaries of the United States. If it should spread across the Rio Grande, cattlemen in that area would be faced with a very great crisis. They are very much alarmed, and I have many appeals about this matter. I have had a number of consultations with the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is perfectly willing to undertake this work to the extent that Congress may authorize it.

While the pending bill may not be all that is desired, it is still a start in the right direction. I hope and trust that the Senate will not hesitate to pass the measure and give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to cooperate with the Mexican officials so as to stimulate and arouse within them a desire to take the necessary action for the extermination of this disease.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding under rule VIII, which permits a Senator to speak only once, and not longer than 5 minutes. Is there objection to the Senator from South Dakota being recognized in spite of the rule? The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the subcommittee has had several hearings on this very important matter. The Secretary of Agriculture has met with it, and he has asked for an authorization to be granted him to carry out the provisions of this bill. I cannot insist too strongly that time is of the essence in this matter. We must act quickly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I do not really see how we could go any further than we have gone, with the evidence we had before us. Senators must not overlook the problem that we face. In dealing with this situation we are asking that our representative go into a foreign country and seek its aid in combating a disease that is now prevailing within its bounds and which in turn may affect us. We do not know what the attitude of the Mexican Government is going to be. We are very hopeful that it will work with us.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make any expenditures from funds appropriated hereunder, or adopt any method or measure found by him to be required, in accomplishing the purpose of the act. Now what is the purpose of the bill? I quote from it:

The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with any other American country in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest in such country where he deems such control necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States.

If the Secretary of Agriculture should make an agreement with the Department of Agriculture in Mexico, let us say, to destroy affected cattle, or if he attains consent to vaccinate all the cattle in certain areas of Mexico, he is empowered to spend funds for such purposes. Under section 4 of the pending measure the Congress would be bound, as I see it, to appropriate a sufficient sum of money to carry out the program entered into by the Secretary. Section 4 reads, partly, as follows:

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

No, Mr. President; I really believe that the Congress today is going as far as it can reasonably be expected to go and my hope is that it will enact this measure without undue delay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 568) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill as passed is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with any other American country in the control and eradication of emergency outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest in such country where he deems such control or eradication necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make any expenditure from funds appropriated hereunder or adopt any method

or measure found by him to be required in accomplishing the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated hereunder may also be used, without employing the authorization in section 2, for the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, printing and binding without regard to the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the limitation contained in section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. Where necessary to control or eradicate such diseases, the Secretary or his designated representative may authorize employees of the Department of Agriculture to accept from the interested country appointments without compensation or with nominal compensation.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act. The authority contained in this act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 1353, to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago, during the call of the calendar, House bill 1353 was considered and passed. I was not then able to be on the floor of the Senate. I recently had communication with the Army Times with respect to some of the provisions of the bill. In order to clarify some of the points which they raised, I took up the matter with General Bradley; and I have since received his reply. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the passage of House bill 1353, the letter from the Army Times and the reply from General Bradley. His reply explains some of the points covered in the bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY TIMES,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1947.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Finance Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The editors of Army Times respectfully urge your committee to examine with care the provisions of H. R. 1353 which the House of Representatives passed today without debate.

Purporting to extend the time for reinstatement of lapsed GI insurance policies, the bill, in fact, abandons important safeguards given the veteran by Congress in the past.

You will recall that similar hasty and ill-considered action by Congress and the Veterans' Administration last August resulted in enactment of the unjust and unnecessary on-the-job ceiling law—a law which may be repealed by the Eightieth Congress.

Over 10,000 veterans of World War II whose GI insurance has been permitted to lapse will be affected by H. R. 1353.

H. R. 1353 was introduced in Congress by Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts), chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, at the request of the Veterans' Administration. The hasty action was decided upon in a move to beat the existing February 1 dead line for reinstating lapsed policies without physical examination.

However, in their eagerness to approve a bill believed to be of benefit to millions of veterans whose insurance has lapsed, the House Members passed a bill which goes far beyond the original purpose of merely extending the dead line.

Section 3 of the bill repeals subsections (y) (1) and (y) (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. These subsections contain important safeguards for the veteran.

General Bradley requested their repeal in order that the dead-line date for reinstatement could be advanced to August 1, 1947, despite the fact that they contain basic guaranties governing the reinstatement of term insurance, and their repeal will give the Veterans' Administration exclusive authority over future reinstatement provisions.

The Rogers bill, by itself, does not extend the dead-line date for reinstatement. It merely repeals all provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act concerning reinstatement, and gives the Veterans' Administration carte blanche in the future.

Subsection (y) (1) provides that a term policy can be reinstated any time during its term upon the payment of two premiums and submission of evidence of good health. If this subsection is repealed the VA hereafter will be able to require the payment of all premiums in arrears.

Subsection (y) (2) provides that a term policy may be reinstated within 6 months of the date of the enactment of the amendatory act, which is February 1, or within 6 months of the date of the lapse upon a comparative health statement.

General Bradley already has stated that 6 months is too long and that after August 1, 1947, he will require by regulation that NSLI policies be reinstated only within 3 months upon a comparative health statement.

Veterans whose policies lapse after August 1 and are not reinstated within 3 months, under the Rogers bill, could be required to take physical examinations.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD G. STAGG,
Editor.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1947.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In accordance with your request I am glad of the opportunity to submit the following statement in respect to the letter of January 29, 1947, addressed to you by the editor of the Army Times concerning the repeal of (y) (1) and (2) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended.

Prior to the passage on August 1, 1946, of the Insurance Act of 1946 reinstatement of both term and converted national service life insurance was regulated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under the power given him by section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act. The regulations governing term insurance in effect at the time the law was amended were in substance the same as section 602 (y) (1) and (2), except that the delimiting date for reinstatement on a comparative health basis was January 1, 1947, whereas the amendment made it 6 months from the date of the legislation. However, as section (y) (1) and (2) has to do only with term insurance the reinstatement conditions applicable to the permanent plans of insurance continued to be subject to regulation by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under the authority bestowed upon him by section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Since there is even greater need for flexibility in prescribing reinstatement conditions for term insurance than there is for permanent insurance the advisability of providing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with the same authority for regulating the reinstatement of term insurance as he now has in regard to permanent insurance must be readily apparent. The administration of life insurance must remain dynamic if it is to be properly administered since one of its fundamentals is the capitalizing of experience. May I observe that this is demonstrated by the need for now amending the law so as to allow the extending of the February 1 delimiting date. As it is not beyond the realm of possibility that such occasions may arise in the future, I believe it essential that the law provide sufficient authority to meet circumstances as they appear.

The regulations, the essence of which was enacted to apply to term insurance, were not intended to be permanent but rather were promulgated for the specific purpose of meeting an emergency. Following the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, regulations were issued which required as a condition precedent to reinstatement that all back premiums be paid and that the applicant show good health. Later there was introduced a provision which permitted the acceptance of applications made within 3 months immediately following lapse upon a showing that the applicant was in as good health when seeking reinstatement as he was at the time of lapse. As a temporary measure in 1943 the period during which a showing of comparative health would be acceptable was lengthened to 6 months. In 1944, the regulations were further modified so as to require the payment of only two monthly premiums in connection with the reinstatement of term insurance. Such changes, dictated by expediency, were occasioned by the inability of the Veterans' Administration uniformly to supply within a 3-month period information to persons whose policies had lapsed. The cited modifications would seem further to indicate the advantage of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs having jurisdiction over reinstatement requirements so as to meet exigencies.

If H. R. 1353 is enacted into law, I propose to retain the two monthly premium reinstatement provision at least until October 1948, which is the earliest date that any of the term policies expire, and to extend the period for reinstatement on a comparative health basis from February 1, 1947, to August 1, 1947. In the event I should find it necessary thereafter in the interest of the equitable treatment of all policyholders to require the payment of all premiums for reinstatement of term policies, may I point out that those veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, both dates inclusive, have an opportunity under the present law, if in good health, to acquire new insurance without the payment of any back premiums. Moreover, up to January 1, 1950, if the only disability barring their procuring such insurance was caused by active duty, such applications are acceptable provided the applicant is not totally disabled.

The Veterans' Administration is now in the course of conducting an informational program on a Nation-wide basis with the object of informing all veterans of their rights to national service life insurance so that by August 1, 1947, it may be reasonably expected that they will have had an oppor-

tunity of becoming informed as to their privileges in regard to national service life insurance. Also the service rendered veterans on insurance matters is now beginning progressively to improve so that I believe that by August 1, 1947, it should be generally satisfactory. However, should the situation on August 1, 1947, for some unforeseen reason be such that the procedure for notifying veterans as to the lapse of their policies be not operating sufficiently well so as to afford ample opportunity for reinstatement within the 3-month period I would then not hesitate to again move forward the delimiting date for reinstatement upon a comparative health showing. It is contemplated that beyond the proposed delimiting date reinstatement will be approved when application is made within 3 months following the date of lapse and the applicant is shown to be in as good health as on the date of lapse. After the expiration of such 3-month period a showing of good health would be required. In this connection it is to be observed that the 3-month comparative health period is uniquely liberal as compared to the requirements of other insurers, who usually permit reinstatement only upon a showing of insurability in line with their standards for granting insurance initially.

While I am anxious to be liberal in permitting persons to reinstate their national service life insurance I cannot lose sight of the fact that it is mutual insurance and that those insureds who have regularly paid their premiums are entitled to have their interests properly safeguarded since there is at least an implied promise that national service life insurance will be administered in accord with recognized and accepted insurance practices. In fact to so conduct the affairs of national service life insurance I regard as a solemn obligation. Being mutual insurance the singling out of any class for undue favor must be at the expense of the whole group and if any such practice were followed it would inevitably result in the net cost of national service life insurance becoming unduly high to those veterans who have not been advantaged over their fellow policyholders.

While the factual statements contained in Mr. Stagg's letter are self-evident from a casual perusal of the bill, the inferences which he appears to draw from them have no foundation since it is demonstrated the very object of the proposed amendment is to do equity and protect the interests of all the policyholders.

In presenting this proposed legislation to the Congress, I had the concurrence of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Amvets, and the American Veterans Committee.

I assure you that I shall be pleased to furnish you with any additional information you may desire.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am about to read a letter to the Senate. In reading the letter I am particularly calling its contents to the attention of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but that does not prohibit the Senators on the other side of the aisle from listening to it, with what I think will be interest.

The letter came to me this morning. It is an unusual letter; I am told it was written by an unusual man. He comes from the great South, from the State of North Carolina. His name is Clarence Poe, and he is writing as president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, which publishes five editions throughout the South. He is vouched for by the Senator from North Carolina as a man of the highest reputation, and his paper, a representative farm magazine, is held in very high esteem in the South. The letter is as follows:

RALEIGH, N. C., *February 15, 1947.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I am a Democrat—but first of all I am an American.

Hence I put what will help America far, far ahead—infinitely far ahead—of what will merely help the Democratic Party.

For example, if I were thinking of myself only as a Democrat I should right now be praying Almighty God to make the Republicans commit what I sincerely believe would be one of the greatest political blunders they could possibly make as the 1948 campaign begins—defeat David Lilienthal.

The balance of power in the 1948 election will be held by men who at one time or another voted for F. D. R.—and many who earlier followed T. R. himself.

If anyone does not know who that means, I will say it means the immortal Theodore Roosevelt.

They are voters who are normally liberal, or at least not reactionary in spirit and purpose.

I know nothing that would more surely convince the great majority of such voters that the GOP is incurably a party of reaction and that its leaders put party above country than for you to defeat David Lilienthal.

He is a great American, a great administrator, a man whose chief crime is that he refused to make TVA a political grab bag for patronage hunters.

He is not only not a Communist but his brand of sanely progressive liberalism is the one sure way to keep communism out of this country. His policies have the same relationship to communism that vaccination has to smallpox—it just keeps you from getting the real thing.

If you confirm Lilienthal I shall rejoice that you have done a great thing for America. If you defeat him, I hope you will at least not envy me the mean satisfaction of knowing you have done a great thing, a very great thing for the Democratic Party in 1948.

Yours sincerely,

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor of the Progressive Farmer.

To all of which I say "Amen."

ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF LITHUANIA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, February 16, 1947, is the twenty-ninth anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence by the once proud and prosperous country of Lithuania. For years the anniversary of this event was an occasion for annual celebration not only in Lithuania but throughout many parts of the world.

The tragic betrayal of Poland has been frequently presented, and I have always joined in every protest. The American people have been aroused and have constantly manifested their deep concern over Poland's distressing plight.

On this Lithuanian anniversary we are impelled to lay bare another victim of the same ruthless forces. Lithuania at one time had a population of approximately 3,000,000 people. They had their own language, their own culture and customs, and they were sovereign in spirit and in law. Lithuania was a proud member of the once League of Nations and engaged in treaty making with her neighbors, including Russia.

Today Lithuania is no longer an independent state. She is one of the victims of aggressions of Europe and the vacillating appeasing foreign policy of the United States of America.

Russia in violation of a solemn treaty first took over the governmental affairs of Lithuania in 1940. Later the Germans liberated Lithuania from the Russians by invasion. Subsequently, with our help, the Russians liberated Lithuania from the Germans by invasion. Liberation by both Russia and Germany meant looting, rape, murder, deportation, imprisonment, and fear. The people of Lithuania saw little or no difference in the liberation by either country. They want no more liberation—they want only liberty.

These thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian descent are asking about our foreign policy. They read and they believed the Atlantic Charter and the text of the United Nations Organization, and they ask that something be done to carry out the high-sounding principles of both declarations. The Atlantic Charter provided in part:

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights in self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Certainly Lithuania falls within the category of nations who have had their sovereign rights in self-government forcibly deprived of them.

The Atlantic Charter was the result of a conference at sea between the British Prime Minister and the President of the United States in August 1941. The world was informed that Russia adhered to the basic principles of the Charter on September 24, 1941.

I would like to review the fateful events between Russia and Lithuania. Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent sovereign state and solemnly agreed and covenanted that it would respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania. On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression treaty was entered into by the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia. The language of certain articles of said pact is as follows:

ART. 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

ART. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

ART. 5. Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commissions.

This treaty was by its terms to be in effect until December 31, 1945.

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual-assistance pact, article 7 of which reads:

The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state.

Along with this pact, Soviet Russia demanded the right to Russian Army garrisons in Lithuania. Many political observers interpreted this Russian demand as the first step to sovietize Lithuania. On October 31, 1939, Mr. Molotov dismissed these speculations in the following words:

We stand for the conscientious and exact observation of the treaties concluded, on the principle of entire reciprocity, and declare the idle talk about the sovietization of the Baltic States to be profitable only to our common enemies and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs.

However, in June of 1940, Soviet Russia did occupy Lithuania—deposed its Government, and, under the supervision of the Russian Army, an election was held, with ballots containing only one set of names. The results of these so-called elections were announced in London fully 24 hours before the polls closed in Lithuania. The United States denounced the Soviet occupation and elections as being devious processes and predatory activities to deliberately annihilate the independence of the Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

On June 30, 1940, Mr. Molotov explained the Russian position as follows:

It would be unpardonable if the Soviet Union did not seize this opportunity, which may never recur. The leaders of the Soviet Union have decided to incorporate the Baltic States into the family of Soviet Republics.

The United States has never officially acceded to these Soviet claims. The State Department of the United States has continued to recognize and still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. Its position in the matter is that Lithuania should be an independent nation.

Notwithstanding such solemn treaties, it is estimated that at least 200,000 of the people of Lithuania have been put to death, were deported, imprisoned, or are today existing as enforced laborers under the cruel domination of Russia.

In June 1941, Germany invaded Russia.

The Congress of the United States, having passed the Lend-Lease Act to provide munitions and supplies and other military aid to any country whose "defense is determined by the President to be vital to the defense of the United States," the late President dispatched his personal representative, the late Mr. Harry Hopkins, to meet with Generalissimo Stalin in Russia during July 1941. The German Army was moving fast and deep into Russian territory. Russia desperately needed assistance. Mr. Harry Hopkins, representing the President of the United States, promised, and we subsequently sent, tremendous amounts of military aid to help defend Russia, although we were not officially in the war. So far as anyone can learn, not one word was uttered at that meeting about the future liberation of the little country of Lithuania or the other Baltic states that had been so ruthlessly gobbled up by Russia a few months before.

In August 1941 the President and Prime Minister Churchill, meeting in great secrecy at sea, finally announced the laudatory declaration of principles of the Atlantic Charter. Everyone had a right to expect that the beneficiaries of the joint effort of the two great powers would include the little sovereign state of Lithuania, a tragic victim of this war.

In September 1941 Russia was still crying for greater assistance to help her beat back the German attack on Russian soil. Mr. Averell Harriman and Lord Beaverbrook proceeded to meet and confer with Generalissimo Stalin. Again Stalin was demanding tremendous amounts of war supplies from America. Most of his demands were granted and it was announced on September 24, 1941, that Russia, too, adhered to the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter, but, so far as we know, nothing was said about some day freeing these once independent little Baltic states, including Lithuania.

From that time on, supplies began to flow in ever-increasing amounts to aid giant Russia.

In June 1942 Russia was pleading for a second front and more and more supplies. Mr. Molotov, the people's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, came to Washington to confer with the President, and became the President's guest and conferred with him. On the 11th of June the White House released the following statement:

In the course of the conversations full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent task of creating a second front in Europe in 1942. In addition, the measures for increasing and speeding up the supplies of planes, tanks, and other kinds of war materials from the United States to the Soviet Union were discussed. Also discussed were the fundamental problems of cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States in safeguarding peace and security to the freedom-loving peoples after the war. Both sides stated with satisfaction the unity of their views on all these questions.

At the conclusion of the visit the President asked Mr. Molotov to inform Mr. Stalin on his behalf that he feels these conversations have been most useful in establishing a basis for fruitful and closer relations between the two Governments in pursuit of the coming objectives of the United Nations.

The next day the mutual-aid or lend-lease agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was announced and in the text of the agreement we find these words:

And whereas the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as signatories of the declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, have subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration, known as the Atlantic Charter, made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

But again, so far as anyone knows, nothing was said about the future liberation of the little Baltic states, including Lithuania.

In December 1943 President Roosevelt made a long trip to Tehran to meet Joe Stalin and continue to conduct our foreign policy personally. Again military plans were laid to relieve the heavy pressure from Russia. Again the continued announcement of agreements on the basis of high principles gave momentum to the growing impression that Stalin and Russia had reformed and that ultimate independence of Poland and the Baltic states was assured. There were many who felt that there were some secret agreements at the Tehran Conference. The President finally denied these rumors in his report to the Congress on March 5, 1945, following his trip to Yalta, and I quote him:

At Tehran a little over a year ago there were long-range military plans laid by the Chiefs of Staff of the three most powerful nations. Among the civilian leaders at Tehran, however, at that time, there were only exchanges of views and expressions of opinion. No political arrangements were made and none were attempted.

So we see, once more Stalin got what he wanted in the way of help, but nothing was said about the future freedom of Poland or the Baltic states.

Then came the Yalta Conference early in 1945, and this time Joe Stalin and Russia really cashed in. Under lend-lease alone, billions of dollars worth of supplies had already been furnished to Russia, the second front had been opened, and now more plans were made to give Russia more supplies. With our help, the Russian troops had crossed Poland and our air power was reaching out ahead of the American troops to bomb strategic points to aid Russian troops in their advance on Berlin. Once more the declaration of the Conference at Yalta included a solemn affirmation of "faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter," but in the same document they carved up Poland, again to the direct benefit of Russia. In explaining this the President, in his speech to the Congress on March 1, 1945, said:

We met in the Crimea determined to settle this matter of liberated areas and I am happy to confirm to the Congress that we did arrive at a settlement—and incidentally, a unanimous settlement. The three most powerful nations have agreed that the political and economic problems of any area liberated from the Nazi conquest or of any former Nazi satellite are a joint responsibility of all three governments. They will join together during the temporary period of instability after hostilities, to help the people of any liberated area, or of any former satellite state, to solve their own problems through firmly established democratic processes. They will endeavor to see to it that interim governments—the people who carry on the interim governments between the occupation of Germany and the day of true independence—will be as representative as possible of all democratic elements in the population, and that free elections are held as soon as possible thereafter.

And later the President also said:

The new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity will be pledged to holding a free election as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and a secret ballot.

Again, I say this was represented to be a unanimous agreement and a solemn pledge between Russia and our Government. Recently it was reported and outlined in detail to the Members of Congress that our Government has three times since then protested Russia's failure to cooperate in granting free elections in Poland and that they have flagrantly violated their agreement entered into at Yalta. However, again nothing was said at the Yalta Conference about the future freedom and independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

In his report to Congress, however, the President did say:

> There were, of course, a number of smaller things I have not time to go into on which joint agreement was had. We hope things will straighten out.

Later we found that one of the smaller things upon which he had no time to report was the secret agreement entered into at Yalta whereby the President agreed that Russia should get the Kurile Islands from Japan. These islands are off northern Japan and were used by the Japanese as a spring board for their attacks on the Aleutian Islands in the recent war. The secret agreement also had reference to Soviet desires regarding Port Arthur and Dairen. More appeasement of Russia and no demonstration of a willingness to follow out the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

At Potsdam the agreements made at Yalta were continued. Again, more appeasement of Russia and no evidence of the slightest inclination to adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The friends of Lithuania and other little countries continue to ask about our foreign policy. They were informed that Russia had become a member of the United Nations. When these hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian and other Baltic descendency ask where they can turn, they are told that they may properly turn to the United Nations Charter, article XIV, which sets forth a provision that might bring them hope:

> Subject to the provisions of article XII the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations, including situations resulting from the violations of provisions of the present Charter, setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

It will be noted that this states that the General Assembly may recommend these measures, and so some of the members of the Friends of Lithuania addressed an inquiry to Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Her reply follows:

> UNITED STATES DELEGATION
> TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
> OF THE UNITED NATIONS,
> *December 16, 1946.*
>
> Mr. P. J. ZURIS,
> *American Friends of Lithuania,*
> *Lakewood, Ohio.*
>
> DEAR MR. ZURIS: Thank you for your generous words on behalf of the American Friends of Lithuania regarding my position on the question of refugees and displaced persons.
>
> In answer to your request for my comments on the situation in the Baltic states, I am quite willing to express my personal views. It is my opinion that the Soviet Union's primary purpose in maintaining control of these countries is to provide an arsenal for the protection of her own boundaries. As the people in these Baltic countries win Soviet confidence, as the Soviet Union is convinced that they or their allies represent no threat to Soviet security, she will adopt a more friendly attitude toward them. This is a natural reaction among the people of all European nations who live in constant terror of invasion by their neighbors. One possible solution to this problem is to create a fringe of internationalized districts to divide these countries.
>
> I reiterate that the foregoing represents my own thoughts on the subject.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.
> (Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.)

Mr. President, this would clearly indicate that if the American representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations feels that the people of these Baltic countries must win Soviet confidence before the Giant Bear will adopt a more friendly attitude toward them, this is indeed a sad day for Lithuania and all small countries behind Russia's iron curtain.

There was a time when we had much greater influence with a nation like Russia, who understands only brute force and power. That was when the Germans were deep into the lands of Russia. It was when our air power was greater than the combined air power of all the rest of the world. It was when our naval strength was greater than the combined naval strength of all the other countries of the earth. It was when we were geared to the production and prosecution of war. During that time we won our wars throughout the entire earth against the most vicious and highly trained enemies of history. We were successful because all of America was participating. The youth of America, the blood, the flesh, the brain, the brawn, of America, the inventive genius, and the creative productive power, all combined for victory under the high ideals of the Atlantic Charter, but the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter made little or no advance in the world because the foreign policy of our country was kept within the control of one man, who felt that he alone knew how to bring the arrogant leader of Russia to collaborate honestly. It was written of him at the time:

> Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for, has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaborating with the west.

He gambled, and from all the evidence apparent now he lost, and humanity lost, and civilization will pay dearly for years to come. The people of Poland, of Lithuania, and the other Baltic states, and millions more behind the iron curtain will pay dearly. The American people realize now that we sent 350,000 boys to their graves, a million men will live on carrying the effects of their wounds and generations to come will carry the burden of a financial debt because of the help we sent to Russia and other countries who claimed that they would adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The last lend-lease report shows that more than $11,000,000,000 of supplies were sent to Russia alone. The American people will pay the interest on that $11,000,000,000 this year, while Russia, up until a few days ago, had refused or declined to discuss any settlement of that obligation.

As we wrestle with such purely domestic problems as balancing our budget, reducing the cost of Government, reducing taxes, paying something on our national debt, we find that $5,000,000,000 each year must be paid in interest on our national debt and fifty billions of that debt was incurred by sending supplies to these nations who professed to believe in the Atlantic Charter. As we struggle through countless years to come we will pay the obligations incurred in the expenses, past, present, and future, resulting from this war. The tragedy is that representative government and freedom of the people have not been advanced.

This presents a tremendous challenge to our new Secretary of State, Gen. George Marshall, and to his associate, the Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr. Bedell Smith, was Chief of Staff to General Eisenhower. He knows the supplies we sent, the aid we gave, the losses we suffered, to aid Russia, as our forces advanced across France and Germany.

General Marshall knows how many times we sent supplies that were needed by our own men to help the Russians defend their own country. These men, Marshall and Smith, played magnificent roles in the development of military strategy and tactical force that won the war.

Now they have the responsibility of picking up the broken threads of diplomatic failures, to win for people everywhere who love freedom of worship, freedom of speech and press, freedom of choice and action, the real advancement of the principles of the Atlantic Charter for which so many died, so many suffered, so many worked and prayed.

These men must now have the support of the American people and they must stand steadfast for the American ideals and stop the eternal appeasement of the enemies of the liberties we hold so dear.

CONTINUATION OF WAR EXCISE TAX RATES

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House bill 1030, an act to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

MAINTENANCE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in common with every Member of the Senate, I am constantly concerned with the problem of maintaining our armed forces.

The common defense is one of the prime responsibilities placed upon us by the Constitution; and it is utterly vital, not only for American security, but for the peace of the rest of the world, that we maintain armed forces at a sufficient strength effectively to support our foreign policy.

From the standpoint of Congress, the maintenance of armed forces requires that money and manpower be made available. While appropriating money is a serious matter, it is not as difficult as appropriating manpower. The supply of available manpower is strictly limited, and there is only a definite amount to go around for all purposes, civilian and military.

We shall soon confront the problem of making manpower available for our armed forces, and we shall have to decide between a voluntary and a compulsory system. In order to clarify this proposition and to bring some of its salient features into the open, I recently addressed a series of questions to Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training. That committee, as I think the Senate knows, is sitting now, and will report within a few months. I should like to read the text of my letter, because it states in concise form some of the points which I think are crucial in this discussion:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 23, 1947.

Dr. KARL T. COMPTON,
Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. COMPTON: It is well recognized that the maintenance of peace and security and the successful development of the United Nations depend to a large degree on the United States being strong in its armed forces.

The American people are asked to—and must somehow—provide the manpower to set up armed forces to provide national security. From what I read, your Commission is concerning itself primarily with the question of whether a military training system can be set up which will provide effective national security and will also be beneficial to the individual.

The purpose of this letter is to suggest that the Commission primarily investigate the question of whether compulsory military training is necessary at all.

This is the question which is in the minds of American families having sons of military age. Unless it is answered with a conclusive affirmative, no plan for compulsory training or compulsory service can receive their enthusiastic support.

Personal observation leads me to believe that people want to know the answers to the following questions:

1. Is the Government of the United States, acting through its legislative and executive branches, organizing the total human and material resources of the Nation to provide national security against total war?

2. Does the Government of the United States possess conclusions which are at one and the same time authoritative, impartial, comprehensive and up to date regarding the effect of modern science on national security in the light of the facts of the world situation and of the capacity of our economy?

3. Are these conclusions sufficiently firm to enable the American people to tell what are the just demands to be made on their money and their manpower?

4. Do these conclusions include definite information on the following points:

(a) The effect of recent scientific developments and future scientific probabilities on the nature of air, ground, and sea warfare.

(b) The most effective method for allocating manpower as between industry, labor, agriculture, essential scientific research, and other civilian occupations on the one hand, and the armed services on the other.

(c) The method for allocating manpower between air, ground, and sea forces.

(d) The length of service for air, ground, and sea forces.

(e) The most effective way to procure needed manpower.

(f) The probable importance of fifth-column activity and biological warfare in any future war.

(g) The need for underground installations.

5. What is the present ability of the United States?

(a) To hold strategic air, ground, and sea bases.

(b) To provide immediate defense against air and surface attacks.

(c) To undertake counteroffensive action of all types.

(d) To discharge our immediate responsibilities, viz, the occupation of Germany and Japan, the provision of military forces for the United Nations, the support of American foreign policy in north China and Trieste, and the maintenance of communication to overseas bases.

(e) To mobilize rapidly.

(f) To eliminate efficiently the deadwood in the personnel of the regular air, ground, and sea services.

(g) To get quick decisions on matters affecting the air, ground, and sea services.

6. What is the present degree of American supremacy in scientific research and development?

Mr. President, I concluded the letter to Dr. Compton with these words:

I believe that these questions are uppermost in the people's minds when they ask themselves the question: "Is military training necessary?"

I trust that the powers of your Commission are broad enough to embrace all these questions. If not, I am sure a broadening of your directive would receive widespread support both in and out of Congress.

As one whose interest in national security is lifelong, I express the hope that your Commission will try to furnish the answers to these questions. On these answers will largely rest the decision of the American people and their representatives in Congress.

If you have no objection I would like to release this letter and your reply for publication because I believe there is value in having these questions, which are in so many minds, brought out into the open.

Very sincerely yours,

H. C. LODGE, Jr.

I received a reply from Dr. Compton which I should like to read. He said:

THE PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY
COMMISSION ON UNIVERSAL TRAINING,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1947.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I am bringing your exceedingly interesting and stimulating letter of January 23 before our Commission on Universal Training, and take this opportunity to thank you for the constructive thought expressed in that letter. There is, of course, no objection to your release of your letter and of this reply, if you wish to make such a release.

It is, of course, impossible for our Commission at this stage to answer the specific questions which you have raised, because we are still in the process of securing information, evidence, and opinion on the various aspects of the problem. Perhaps I can best answer your questions by describing our Commission's operations and plans.

For some weeks to come we shall still be in the stage of seekng information, suggestions, and advice. We have reviewed the testimony at the previous congressional hearings and have invited individuals and representatives of groups who are informed and seriously concerned about these problems to discuss their views with us. Of course, we have had a large amount of correspondence, most of which expresses an opinion one way or another, but some of which contains really constructive suggestions. Among these witnesses are individuals within or without the Government who are in informed positions in respect to international affairs and in respect to the needs or deficiencies of our own armed services.

Thus far we have carefully refrained from coming to any final conclusions, either individually or as a group. I think this is very important because, whatever may have been the opinions and the degrees of information possessed by any of us at the beginning, we have been learning a great deal in the course of these studies.

More specifically in reply to your questions, I may say that it was immediately evident to us that our directive from the President must be considered on a sufficiently broad basis to cover not only the universal training program per se, but to consider this in relation to all the important related activities and agencies concerned with national security, character development, physical fitness, etc. Unless considered in relation to this environment, the recommendations would, of course, have little weight or value.

Because of this fact we have actually already been considering and attempting to secure authoritative information on most of the specific subjects about which questions are raised in your letter. I think a few of these points probably go somewhat beyond our particular directive, at least insofar as any extensive study is concerned. Most of them, however, are certainly an inherent part of our problem. You have raised so many interesting points that I am bringing your letter up for special consideration by our Commission as it lays its plans for future hearings and study.

To illustrate my own personal approach to the problem when it was first presented to me by the President's invitation to serve on this Commission, I enclose a copy of my letter of November 26 to him. I take it that his request for my service in the light of this letter indicates that he also intended the study to be made on a broad basis. Then when he gave us our directive at the time of our first meeting, which was fully reported in the papers, it was evident that he had in mind an even broader problem than just the military aspect of it.

I am sure you are right in emphasizing the fact that the American people must be convinced of a number of things of the type which you suggest in your letter if they will be willing through Congress to support any type of universal-training program. For this reason it is clear that whatever recommendations we make to the President must be backed up with adequate information and an adequate analysis of the factors involved. This is a really very great undertaking which we have accepted, I assure you, with very great humility. The only thing which I am sure of at the present moment is that we shall try to do our best on this assignment.

With sincere regards,

Very cordially yours,

KARL T. COMPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Dr. Compton's letter to the President be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1946.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In reference to your request that I serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, I feel that I should outline for you my present reaction to this problem in order that you may reconsider my appointment if you so desire. If, in the light of this explanation, you still wish me to serve I shall be glad to do so and will try to be as helpful as possible.

I believe fundamentally in the principle of universal military training to whatever extent this may be necessary for our national security. When the program was first put forward, while we were still at war, I endorsed it wholeheartedly. One reason for this was my belief that the enactment of such legislation at that time would have the wholesome effect of giving notice to the world that our country "meant business" so far as our future national security was concerned, and that we did not intend to fall into the state of unpreparedness which, before World War II, gave encouragement and confidence to the Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese ambitions for world domination.

I regret that we did not promptly enact the universal military training bill because part of the psychological value of such action has been lost. Nevertheless I still feel that it is of utmost importance for our country to take a strong stand in military preparedness and to relax and reduce our armed forces only in a proper relationship to general international disarmament supported by an effective international plan under the United Nations to enforce peace by combined military measures if necessary.

However, I believe that there are other very important aspects of national security in addition to a reservoir of citizens with military training. These include, of course, our Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force, together with the National Guard. I think it is especially important that we establish a highly mobile striking force equipped with the most powerful weapons which can be devised and highly trained on the technical side to use these weapons and prepared on minimum notice to strike any place in the world where aggression against us breaks out.

I also am convinced that our security demands an exceedingly active, forward-looking, and continuing program of research and development on new weapons. If the past war taught us anything about military tactics, it was to the effect that no new war will be fought by the old weapons and devices. Our security demands that we be in the forefront of new-weapon development.

It seems to me that the most important problem of national security is to determine as best we can the relative emphasis which should be devoted to the factors mentioned above in order that our country may have the maximum military strength in return for the amount of money from our national budget which Congress and the country will make available for military security purposes. Therefore, before advocating an all-out program for universal-military training, I think we should have some sound basis on which to judge whether the proposed military training program fits in proper proportion into the larger program. For example, if the money necessary to operate universal military training were so great as to prevent proper strength of our permanent armed forces or prevent the establishment of a mobile striking force, or curtail the program of research and development on new weapons, then I would feel that the universal military training program is an unwise investment of public funds and effort.

If I were to serve on the advisory committee on universal military training, I would have to raise these questions, and my support of any universal military-training program would depend on the place of this program in the larger problem of security subject to the over-all restrictions imposed by the amount of public funds which can and should be devoted to military preparedness.

It may be that this over-all problem has already received adequate consideration and if so I should be much interested to learn the conclusions, but I would not want to back and urge this one aspect of national preparedness without consideration of its effect on the military program as a whole.

If, knowing my feelings and reservations in the matter, you still wish me to serve on this advisory committee I shall accept and do my best to be helpful. If, however, you feel that someone else would serve the purposes of this advisory committee better than I, please have no hesitation in making a substitution.

Very sincerely yours,

KARL T. COMPTON.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to say, in conclusion, that the statement I am now making is an interim one on my part, because I think that the issue is a far-reaching one; it goes to the heart of family life; it touches a great many things we hold dear, and we cannot start too early in our deliberations and in our thinking on it.

I believe that the justification for the step that is contemplated must be on military grounds. If it is argued as a matter of education, or if it is argued as a matter of health, or as a cultural proposition, then I think the argument falls to the ground. It can only be justified on the grounds of stark military necessity, after assurance has been given that the lessons of modern science in the determination of military necessity have been intelligently and thoroughly and conclusively taken to heart.

I now yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. First I wish to have printed in the RECORD 10 articles by Frank C. Waldrop having to do with the Lilienthal case. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE TVA DOINGS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Something very strange about the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority is beginning to disclose itself out of the hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee on whether to confirm Gordon R. Clapp as a member of the TVA Board of Directors.

It has to do with communism and the degree of influence Communists have had in TVA matters.

To begin with, please bear in mind that communism is officially defined by our Department of Justice as having as its aim, purpose, and ambition the bloody overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

That definition was laid down by even so passionate a New Dealer as Attorney General Francis Biddle.

The aim of communism being to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, it is plainly the duty and responsibility of every public official to be more than just passingly vigilant about keeping Communists, communism, and its influence out of Government offices under his jurisdiction.

Especially is it obviously the duty of a responsible official of TVA to show extraordinary vigilance, for not only is the Tennessee Valley today the home of the principal American atom-bomb works but also the TVA has been definitely shown to be a major experiment in American social planning.

TVA was supposed at its outset to be a flood-control and hydroelectric power project. It has grown actually to be a complete and haughtily independent project in remaking the economy of a section of our country.

And as such, financed by the taxpayers of the whole United States, its policy officers have an unmistakable, clear, and inescapable duty to keep TVA more than ordinarily "sanitary," you might say, with respect to communism.

They have had a duty not only to be innocent of fostering people who advocate the bloody overthrow of our Government, but more than that, to show themselves innocent in all possible ways.

The hearings on Mr. Clapp to date, therefore, are going to make some very disappointing reading to friends of TVA who realize how important it is for TVA to keep clear of Communist dirty business.

Mr. Clapp denies that he is a Communist or believes in communism, or is friendly to it. O. K. But he was a responsible officer of TVA, first personnel chief, and then general manager, when communism set up housekeeping in and on the edges of TVA.

What did he do about it? The record make him no hero, citizens.

Let's go back to the early part of 1940. During that time investigators for the House Committee on Un-American Activities discovered what they considered important evidence that communism had got a foothold within the offices of TVA.

They reported their preliminary findings to Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, and then chairman of the committee. Dies was greatly excited and told them to go ahead with their investigation and make a fuller report.

That report was made and subpenas requested for witnesses to appear before a public, full-scale hearing of the Dies committee. Many of the witnesses were to be employees of TVA, and among them Gordon R. Clapp, general manager

The list of subpenaed witnesses and the fact that hearings were to be public got around Washington. The year 1940, remember, was kick-off time for F. D. R.'s term III, and the Dies hearings were set to be heard just about the exact moment Roosevelt was directing a stooge Democratic national convention at Chicago to "force" him to run again.

And so, all of a sudden, the list of witnesses was slashed, and the public hearings of the Dies committee abandoned. Instead, an executive session was held in the offices of House Speaker Bankhead—of all places—in greatest secrecy. Other sessions were held out of Washington. The evidence was completely suppressed, and no sign of its full significance revealed.

Russia at that time was tied up with Germany in joint plundering of Poland and other countries, so communism in TVA

would have been a major vote loser for F. D., who was scared of trouble from Willkie on that matter anyhow.

This writer has just finished reading three volumes of those executive hearings at last available. They are an amazing story of Communist impudence and ridicule of a committee of Congress. For instance, on Friday, July 26, 1940, a subcommittee of the Dies committee consisting of then Representative Joe Starnes, Democrat, of Alabama, convened in executive session in Speaker Bankhead's back office.

Mrs. Muriel S. Williams, at that very time employed by TVA as an obscure clerk and typist—though she was a graduate of Mount Holyoke College, and obviously a woman of far better than average education and training—was put under oath to testify.

She admitted that she had been a member of the Communist Party, but claimed she had since resigned from the party—an unheard of procedure. Communists just do not join and quit at will.

After being asked about her own Communist activities and having given the committee plainly a very handsome run-around, she was asked:

"* * * the Chair instructs you, Mrs. Williams, to name the party members who were present (at Communist meetings) if you know who they were.

"Mrs. WILLIAMS. I just can't answer that question.

"Mr. STARNES. When you say you can't answer that question do you mean to say that you refuse to answer the question?

"Mrs. WILLIAMS. I mean to say that I refuse to answer the question."

There was a flat out, unqualified declaration by a known and admitted Communist employee of TVA who refused to give information to a committee of Congress concerning people who, according to Attorney General Francis Biddle, were aiming at and advocating the bloody overthrow of the Government of the United States.

For your information, though Mrs. Williams was in plain and open contempt of the Dies committee for that action, the committee did not cite her for contempt. Remember 1940 was an election year. Maybe that's why TVA also kept her on the pay roll until after the election. She was not fired until November 13, 10 days after F. D. R. won term III.

MORE ON TVA

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Gordon R. Clapp is scheduled to go on the witness stand again today before the Senate Public Works Committee which is trying to determine whether he is fit to be promoted from general manager to a directorship of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

He should be asked specifically what he has done to stop communism around his jurisdiction.

This is a very important question, for billions of the American people's dollars are tied up in TVA and more than that a tremendous social experiment affecting the lives and property of millions of Americans directly, and all the rest of us indirectly.

TVA was designed in origin as a flood-control and hydroelectric-power project. It has grown, instead, into a many-sided operation by no means clearly understood by all paying for it.

More than that it has grown, in recent years, very upstage and independent toward people who ask questions about it.

There is plenty of evidence to show that TVA's managerial officials have been less than 100 percent vigilant to keep Communists out of their way and that the same Gordon R. Clapp above-mentioned is one of the officials involved.

Mr. Clapp knows the mechanics of TVA operation thoroughly. He has shown that.

But what has he to show in his record about fighting communism?

The Department of Justice has defined the Communists as advocating, teaching, and preparing for the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

That definition was handed down by none other than Francis Biddle, one of TVA's hottest defenders and as Attorney General of the United States, a most whole-hog New Dealer.

If Biddle says the Communists are advocating the overthrow of the Government of our country by force and violence, surely nobody in his right mind would say less.

It must have taken a mountainous weight of evidence to force that admission from Biddle, considering the fellow travelers in his own circle of friends, admirers, and political coattail riders.

And so, therefore, it has obviously been the plain duty of Mr. Gordon R. Clapp to be vigilantly anti-Communist in his various TVA executive jobs, which range from personnel manager to general manager and now, perhaps, director.

How, then, can Mr. Clapp show that he has done his fullest duty about communism when all the records are laid bare?

Consider, for instance, the case of John Marshall Frantz, a junior administrative assistant of the TVA who was secretly questioned by a one-man subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in Chattanooga, Tenn., on July 17, 1940.

That secret testimony is now available in volume III of the executive hearings of the committee, pages 991 to 1012 inclusive. Surely nobody can read it and be satisfied with the way TVA has handled communism.

Frantz was shown to be a boon companion and close associate of Communists both in and hanging around TVA.

His brother, Laurent Brown Frantz, had been arrested in the Communist Party offices in Birmingham, Ala., where he had gone to do some legal research as he defined it, for one Robert Hall, secretary of the Communist Party for Alabama. Laurent Brown Frantz, incidentally, had been a WPA official before doing this work for the Communists that he himself admitted.

Well, both Frantzes denied Communist Party membership. But by any definition they would be classed as intimate fellow travelers.

How did Frantz and his Communist associates get into and around the TVA headquarters? Why were they allowed to stay until the Dies committee found them? Why didn't TVA managers chase these people and all their kind off the place without waiting for somebody else to point out their plain duty? What happened to them thereafter?

These are questions that cannot be laughed off, in view of the Communist spy activity that has been exposed lately in Canada and elsewhere in areas far less important to the United States than the Tennessee Valley, where our main atom bomb works and the Government's biggest hydroelectric power system are spread out.

Mr. Gordon R. Clapp was personnel manager and then general manager of TVA while that Communist cell was operating around TVA.

What did he do about it? The public is entitled to hear from him on that in fullest detail from the witness stand, today.

WHAT'S THE RUSH?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

B. M. Baruch made a bad mistake in his appearance, Monday, before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, if he meant his public testimony to be a weight against hasty decision on the vital issue of the atom bomb.

Mr. Baruch's mistake lay in his failure to say in public what he had been saying in private about the President's choice for head of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal.

And worse, his failure to say in public what he had been saying in private about Lilienthal's choice for general counsel to the Commission, Herbert Marks.

Mr. Baruch's failure to speak out undoubtedly came about not for his lack of courage, since he has shown he has plenty of that time and again, but because of his anxiety not to hurt anybody's feelings or to seem personal in his judgments.

The fact is that Mr. Baruch told a number of friends before he went on the witness stand that he would positively testify against Marks for general counsel.

He also indicated that he did not care for Lilienthal as Chairman of the Commission but would not publicly say so.

His reason for not coming out against Lilienthal, he explained, was that none of the men he had recommended to the President for the Atomic Commission had been willing to serve or was acceptable to the President.

Among these were included Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University; and Mr. Chester Barnard, president of the Bell Telephone Co. of New Jersey.

"I can't very well object to Lilienthal," Baruch told his friends, "and then have to say that I haven't a better man to offer myself, when they ask me for suggestions. Nobody on my list was accepted at the White House. I can't be a dog in the manger about it."

Hence, when his public appearance was made, Monday, Mr. Baruch's testimony was grabbed up by the propagandists for Lilienthal and spread over the Nation as a whole-souled endorsement. And Marks is riding right along on Lilienthal's coattails.

Baruch did go so far as to indicate how he felt about the three key jobs of the atomic commission, chairman, general counsel, and general manager.

They control the show, he said. And he did say that he would have liked to see Maj. Gen. T. F. Farrell as general manager, thus putting the slug on the present nominee, C. E. Wilson.

The main importance of Baruch's failure to speak out frankly in public is that his words of commendation for Lilienthal as a citizen and public official are now being quoted as reasons for rushing the congressional hearings to a close.

The One Worlders and the Give the Bomb Away boys are saying that Baruch, as elder statesman and just-finished chairman of the United States policy-making committee to the United Nations on atomic energy, is the last word on the whole question.

If he signals O. K. on Lilienthal, the thing ends there. Shoot the works and fear nothing.

These are the same people and this is the same spirit that was chattering a year ago to also shoot the works and fear nothing in the matter of giving away our atomic know-how to Russia and the world.

When that nutty notion was sweeping the country nobody outside a very few knew what the Government of Canada had just discovered.

And that turned out to be a Russian spy ring, operated within the Russian Embassy to Canada, which had stolen not only atomic but other vital military secrets all through the war.

One of the confessed members of that spy ring was Dr. Alan May, a professor of Cambridge University, an independently wealthy and important native-born British scientist in the joint United States-British atomic project.

Dr. May was a trusted and high-placed public official. Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, the wartime producer of the atom bomb, said that when Dr. May's acts of betrayal were disclosed to him he was "astounded."

For Dr. May's loyalty and integrity had never been challenged up to that moment. To this day there are people who would like to deny that May was a willing tool and spy for Russia—but they can't because he has confessed his acts in fullest detail and is serving a 10-year term in a British prison. He got off too easy. He should have been shot as the traitor that he is.

Therein lies a lesson and a warning to us all, and it is "Go slow." What we do about atomic power will affect the security of this Nation forever more. Whatever steps we take can never be taken back.

We can't guess. We have to be right the first time. Haste and then regret will be no help after the next Pearl Harbor.

The organization of the United States Atomic Commission as now proposed may be the right thing for the United States of America. Yet there is absolutely no use trying to deny that there is plenty of uneasiness around the country concerning this organization as presently constituted.

That uneasiness is important. For the reputation of Caesar's wife was nothing beside the reputation this Commission must have.

It is no good to say the Commission can be trusted to earn the fullest confidence of the people, in time. It must have that confidence before it starts.

Specifically, with respect to Lilienthal, the Communists definitely and unquestionably formed a cell within the Tennessee Valley Authority while he was in charge there. He can't deny the facts of that. He can only claim he didn't know about it.

Well, they fooled him once. How do we know they won't fool him again?

A rush act for his confirmation as master of the Atomic Commission and for his chosen managerial force is no way to inspire confidence. It is the exact opposite.

The rush act of last year to give away the bomb secrets almost ruined us. Let's not be suckers in the second round, for this game is for keeps.

Why not put the whole Atomic Commission matter aside for 6 months or a year and look it over again in a cooler moment? The Army has been running the atom-bomb works very successfully up to now. Let's not be in such a rush to take it away from them until we know more about what happens next.

BARUCH OFF THE RECORD

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

J. Edgar Hoover and the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may next appear in the joint congressional committee hearings on whether to confirm David E. Lilienthal's appointment as head of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

They certainly will if the committee follows the off-the-record recommendations of B. M. Baruch, given in executive session with the committee a few days ago.

In his public appearance on the Lilienthal case, Baruch was extremely careful not to express any specific criticisms because, as he told friends, he did not want to embarrass the President or be a dog in the manger.

That was because none of his own recommendations for Chairman of the Commission had been accepted.

But when the doors were closed and the chips were down, Baruch's remarks to the committee took a very different tone. First, he said that it was not his place to be the committee's investigating agent.

According to one who was there present, Baruch told the committee:

"You gentlemen have no right to ask me to be your investigating agent. I can give you my opinion, and I think you understand me as to that. But when it comes to supplying you with the evidence on the basis of which to form your own judgments, that is what you're here for.

"Instead of asking me for supporting evidence, why don't you get it your own way?"

Specifically, he suggested that Hoover and the FBI files be summoned for full disclosure concerning communism in and around the Tennessee Valley Authority headquarters at Knoxville.

He also called attention to the War Department's Intelligence (G–2) files, and the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. All these, he pointed out, can give concrete information on matters about which committee members up to now have been simply asking private witnesses to give opinions.

Some of these sources of information are secret. Others are not. Among the public sources of fact about communism in the Tennessee Valley and in and around TVA itself are the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Presidential campaign year of 1940.

Anybody who wants to take the trouble to go up to the Library of Congress and ask can find out just what the committee developed on the subject. For instance, in volume 13 of the first series of hearing records, covering the period April 11 to May 21, 1940, in Washington, D. C.

Or again, in the executive (secret) hearings, volumes 2 and 3, covering the dates March 9, 11, 21, June 3, July 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 26, and August 5, 6, 16, 17, 19, and 20, 1940.

At the time they were held these inquiries were extremely confidential.

The whole committee never sat but instead an off-the-record meeting would be called in the back office of Speaker Bankhead of the House of Representatives, if it were a Washington session.

One or maybe two committee members, a witness, and a couple of committee investigators would be smuggled into the room for a hasty recording of testimony.

Or in various cities around the TVA region a single committee member would hold the same kind of smuggled session.

Plainly the committee was cooperating with the Roosevelt administration to keep the facts out of the newspapers for fear that the Republicans would make the most of the scandal bound to unfold.

But secret or no, the testimony was taken, and now is available for any person concerned to read. Take a look, for instance, at the testimony in volume 2, above mentioned, as given by—

John C. Borden, of Raleigh, N. C.; William B. Green, of Fountain City, Tenn.; W. E. Holbert, of Knoxville, Tenn.; Mrs. George H. Paris, Knoxville, Tenn.; Kenneth B. Talley, Norris, Tenn.; C. L. Wayman, Knoxville, Tenn.; F. C. White, formerly of the TVA.

Or, in volume 3, the testimony of Mabel Abercrombie, of Nashville, Tenn.; J. M. Frantz, Knoxville, Tenn.; Henry C. Hart, Knoxville, Tenn.; David Stone Martin, Knoxville, Tenn.; Hugh W. Urban, Knoxville, Tenn.; I. C. Wiggs, Knoxville, Tenn.; and Mrs. Muriel S. Williams, Knoxville, Tenn.

These give just the outlines, just show how a few simple-minded front men and women got caught with Communist Party cards right on them—employees of TVA who absolutely had no way of denying their communism any longer. Some even claimed to have been enrolled without realizing what they were signing up for, and they probably didn't at that.

But the people who swore them into communism knew, all right.

The hearings show some very nimble work by others who, so timid and scared was the committee at what it was finding out, were able to laugh right in the faces of the investigators and refuse to tell what they admitted they knew.

Their defiance was as flat and positive as that of the Comintern agent, Gerhard Eisler, in his brief show before the House Un-American Activities Committee 2 days ago.

And all this went on while Lilienthal headed TVA. What did he do about it? The record will show.

WHAT'S THE RUSH?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The same people who were all for giving the atom bomb to Russia this time a year ago are now in a flaming hurry to see David E. Lilienthal confirmed as Chairman of the United States Atomic Commission.

What's the big rush?

This game of the atom bomb is for keeps and will be the last big game of power ever played on this earth if all the scientists say about the bomb is true.

We're the only nation with the power to say what shall be done with the bomb. Other nations would certainly like to have that power, other nations some day may have it. But all that is speculation.

The fact is that we have the bomb and the fact is that atomic power so far is strictly military in its uses.

If there is any reasonable speculation to be made about the future, it surely must be that next time atomic power is used on earth it will be used in the same way it was used the first time—to kill people and destroy property—literally to make a hell of earth wherever it is exploded.

Therefore we people of this present generation in the United States have a terrible responsibility not to misplay this one.

Let's take a good, clear look at the case of Lilienthal as calmly as possible. The latest issue of Who's Who reports on him thus:

"Lilienthal, David Eli. Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, lawyer. Born in Morton, Ill., July 8, 1899; son of Leo and Minna (Rosenak) Lilienthal; A. B., DePauw University, 1920; LL. D., 1945; LL. B., Harvard, 1923; m. Helen Marian Lamb, September 4, 1923; children—Nancy Alice, David Eli. Admitted to Illinois bar, 1923; Tennessee bar, 1934; in practice of law, Chicago, 1923–31; member of Wisconsin Public Service Commission, 1931; Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, since 1933; appointed Chairman, 1941; member American Bar Association, Delta Upsilon, Delta Sigma Rho, Sigma Delta Chi, Phi Beta Kappa. Author, TVA, Democracy on the March. Home, 81 Pine Road, Norris, Tenn. Office, New Sprankle Building, Knoxville, Tenn."

This is by no means a complete picture of Lilienthal, though it does provide some very significant clues, the main one of which is that his adult career has been virtually all in the service of Government.

Lilienthal has shown in many ways that he is an extremely competent Government administrator. He knows how to use the power of Government with crushing force and has built within the TVA a machine of lawyers and subadministrators utterly loyal to him.

To give you a familiar parallel, Lilienthal is to the TVA managerial force what Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter was and still is to the New Deal's sharpshooting gang of lawyers and administrators who pulled the power of America into Washington during the 1930's and came within an ace of fixing it here under their monopoly.

Even Lilienthal's worst enemy would have to admit he is far from stupid. He is exactly the contrary, an extremely shrewd, hard-driving, passionate, even fanatic, and opinionated type of human being, smart and able at whatever he undertakes.

In the TVA he roved the organization until he knew it inside out.

It so happened that the Communist Party of the United States formed a nasty and disruptive public cell within the TVA—what else it accomplished can only be imagined, for a full and fair investigation by competent authorities has never been made public if it was made at all.

But the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the first 6 months of 1940 stumbled awkwardly into enough hot stuff to make it plain and clear to anybody that the Reds had their hooks into TVA and had had them in for years.

How did Lilienthal overlook that development? How did his man, Gordon R. Clapp, then personnel manager and now up to succeed Lilienthal as Chairman of the TVA Board, overlook that development?

Lilienthal is being presented to the country as the man to be trusted with the most dangerous and potent force ever discovered on this planet, the atom bomb. Surely it is the will of America that he look after this force in the interest of America, first.

That he cannot do, if Communists get into his organization again as they did once.

Lilienthal's will and competency to keep the Communists out are the essential challenges before Congress.

Everybody knows that. And plenty of people are disturbed about it. Yet not enough people who could help determine the facts are speaking up and telling the world how they feel.

Even so distinguished an elder statesman as B. M. Baruch testified one way in public before the committee last Monday, and entirely another way in executive session.

That's not giving the people of the United States a fair deal in this vital matter. It's not fair to Lilienthal, either.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy has an awful decision to make here and haste, hints, talking from two sides of the mouth and all such evasions of the hard proposition just won't do.

If there was ever a subject to be discussed on the record, it is the subject of communism and its background with respect to TVA and the atom.

Our national future depends on this. Every agency that can throw light on the truth should be called on to produce what it knows.

This includes the Army and Navy intelligence forces, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service and the citizens of the TVA region in general.

This game is for keeps. Haste is criminally dangerous. Let's take a year on the Lilienthal case, and find out all there is to know before going one step farther.

ASK THE FBI

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A proposal to adjourn the Senate hearings on David Lilienthal as head of the United States Atomic Commission is scheduled for consideration today when Lilienthal's partner in the State Department report on the atom, Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, comes on to testify for his friend.

The reason for the adjournment project is that the committee sitting on the Lilienthal case has not the power to subpena documents and testimony of great significance concerning communism in the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which Lilienthal has been head.

This lack of power is only recently discovered and comes about in the following way:

There is now a Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, made up of members of both the House and the Senate. This joint committee has full subpena and investigatory power.

But the hearings now being held are by the Senate members only, who are doing the Senate's preliminary work on whether Lilienthal's appointment to head the atomic commission shall be confirmed.

And as such a committee on confirmation, the Senators involved have no power of subpena or investigation. They can only take testimony of individuals.

Members of the committee have discovered that they can get at secret information in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Civil Service Commission, War and Navy Departments and other sources only through subpena.

Therefore the project to adjourn the Senate operation as such and reconvene as the joint committee in full with power to summon all the witnesses, hear all the testimony and examine all the secret reports they wish, with a view to making a report back to themselves later as a committee sitting on Lilienthal's case.

The burden of the testimony against Lilienthal is that while he was the mainspring of TVA the Communist Party organized right in TVA headquarters and he knew nothing about it until the House Committee on Un-American Activities flashed the facts before his eyes.

The Senators have been considerably more disturbed by the testimony they have heard than is indicated in the newspaper reports of the celebrated McKellar-Lilienthal feud, the campaign of Tennessee's K. D. MCKELLAR for revenge on Lilienthal for personal reasons.

But in order to be sure of their ground in any vote they make on the matter they are demanding better evidence—both ways—than has been shown them to date. The FBI has the answers they want and today starts the project to get these.

As for Acheson, there are a number of sharp questions several Senators want to ask him if they can get MCKELLAR to keep quiet for a while.

Last week while Lilienthal and MCKELLAR were rowing, several Senators sat quietly in their offices and read advance proofs of the latest issue of Plain Talk giving a survey of the Lilienthal-Acheson operations compiled by Isaac Don Levine and entitled "Our Atomic UNRRA—Conspiracy or Blunder?"

Levine charges that the true story of our atomic policy is "woven of the triple webs of atomic espionage, atomic propaganda, and atomic diplomacy."

He goes into a detailed tracing of the performances of Lilienthal, Acheson, their operating lawyer, Herbert Marks, who is scheduled as general counsel of the Atomic Commission if Lilienthal is confirmed, and the preelection buzzing of the CIO-PAC for Lilienthal to head the Commission.

Levine, who is one of the most widely known authorities on Communist organization, describes the Acheson-Lilienthal plan for handling the United States atomic power thus:

"If Moscow had secretly devised and prepared a plan for making the United States set up an atomic UNRRA with the idea of foisting it upon a gullible America through its innumerable 'fronts' it could hardly have differed in this respect from the Acheson-Lilienthal plan."

The committee is also expected to make a detailed investigation of the sworn testimony of Mrs. Muriel Williams, who stated under oath that while she was a Communist and employee of the TVA she attended meetings at which Herbert Marks was present.

Mrs. Williams' disclosures are contained in volume II of the executive hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, pages 1265–1307, inclusive.

In the course of these she was questioned as to Communist and fellow-traveler associates with whom she went to meetings which she identified variously as straight Communist Party operations, union sessions, fund-raising affairs for various Spanish civil war relief projects on the pro-Communist side, etc.

Concerning one of these, the exact character not specified, she testified as follows:

"Question. And Herbert Marks, you know Herbert Marks?"

"Answer. Yes."

"Question. And you attended meetings with Herbert Marks?"

"Answer. Well, you see when you say this meeting business—yes."

The facts were never followed up as Mrs. Williams shortly thereafter refused to give any more information and though she was warned she was in contempt of the committee, the matter was dropped.

She remained on the TVA pay roll until immediately after the 1940 election.

Now the Senate is having to pick up the inquiry nearly 7 years late.

WHAT'S THE RUSH?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now that it is becoming clear that others beside Senator K. D. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, have a word to say about the fitness of David Lilienthal to command the United States atomic power, there is all the more reason for the Joint Atomic Committee of Congress to take more and more time before coming to a decision.

For if there ever was a matter before the United States Congress that calls for being right the first, last, and only time, this is it.

The atom power is declared by all competent authorities who have mentioned it to date to be the biggest fact of life on this planet today.

The United States owns and controls atomic power. What we do with it will decide the fate not just of a political party or a Presidential election, or of even a single nation.

It will decide the fate of the world.

David Lilienthal is asserting himself the man to be trusted with this power, and his friends—the same kind of people who were yelling a year ago for us to give the atomic power to Russia—are yelling today to rush his appointment through and let him loose at his master work.

Such a rush act would be foolhardy and it would be criminal recklessness with the fate of mankind, no less.

It is only common sense that the Senators who have to make the terrible decision on what to do about Lilienthal must have every possible fact before them when they vote.

There is only one sound way to judge what Lilienthal will do, and that is by examining what he has done. Judgment cannot be based on his conversation, or on his declamation, from the witness stand, as to what he believes about so all-embracing a word as "democracy."

Lilienthal made quite a speech the other day about what he believes. But what do the Senators know about what he has done?

For instance, do the Senators know his record with the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, with which he served before going to the Tennessee Valley Authority? Do the Senators really know anything about Lilienthal's performance with the TVA?

Do the Senators know how Lilienthal in his early days instituted and handled suits against the Illinois and Wisconsin telephone companies and what the courts said about the methods for which he bears the responsibility?

Have the Senators investigated Lilienthal's performance with TVA in wartime?

Just as a tip, why not summon J. G. Menut, who is now the War Department's electric power procurement officer, and ask him under oath about his experiences with Lilienthal and Lilienthal's assistants, Gordon R. Clapp and Herbert Marks?

Clapp is now nominated to succeed Lilienthal as head of the TVA and Marks is nominated to be general counsel of the Atomic Commission which Lilienthal would command.

What are all their records of performance?

Another who ought to be summoned for detailed questioning specifically with reference to Marks is Donald Nelson, former head of the War Production Board, to answer about letters Marks prepared for his signature, and what became of them when Nelson had a second look.

Still another to be questioned is Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama.

Mr. HILL, for instance, is one of the most vociferous champions of Lilienthal and Clapp. Behind that fact lie other facts, such as this:

For some years Lilienthal and Clapp have been trying to get authority to build a phosphate plant in Mobile, Ala., with the taxpayers' money as trusted with TVA. Among other things the plant was supposed to have war usefulness.

To achieve this plant in Mobile, the TVA would run a power line straight through the State of Alabama from the Tennessee line to the Gulf coast, an extremely expensive operation.

The Senators looking into Lilienthal's ability as manager of atomic power ought to call the War Department's Chemical Warfare Service to see what its files show on this subject.

For Army officials all through the war and right through the last session of Congress stood in opposition to Lilienthal on that, holding that Mobile was no place to locate the plant for Army purposes, as it was claimed.

Yet Lilienthal has tried every way he could to get it and Senator HILL, his great supporter for atomic power—how does he stand on the TVA proposal to run an expensive power line through Alabama to build a plant Army officials oppose, supposedly to help the Army?

These are just a few of the lesser reasons for delaying action on Lilienthal until all the facts are established about his ability and judgment. But the most important remains:

What did Lilienthal do about communism in the TVA?

Sworn officials show that the Communist Party organized in TVA headquarters right under Lilienthal's nose. He didn't know about it. What did he do when he did learn the facts? Only a full, fair, and public inquiry by committees with subpena power can find the answer.

LOOK AGAIN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Senators responsible for deciding whether to confirm David Lilienthal as master of the atom bomb and his man Gordon Clapp to run the Tennessee Valley Authority, could develop a very interesting background by investigating the facts of communism in the TVA.

These facts are not hard to find and they cannot be misunderstood, once examined. For example, on July 17, 1940, one Henry C. Hart, an employee of the TVA, was called by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

He was asked whether he was a Communist and replied that he had been but had quit being one. He was then asked who had solicited his membership in the party, and Hart replied:

"Mr Wellman, as the representative of the Communist Party and a TVA employee named Katharine Buckles who was a personal friend of mine and introduced me to Wellman."

A little further on, Hart was asked to name other TVA Communists and he said he was the only member so far as he knew.

How to square that with his testimony above that he was solicited to join the Communist Party by TVA employee Katharine Buckles is a question the committee failed to pursue.

Had it done so, Hart would have had to do a considerable amount of explaining.

It would also be interesting to know what Lilienthal and Clapp did about Hart's testimony. As TVA board member and general manager, respectively, they were sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Part of that, obviously, means keeping Communists off the Government pay roll, for Communists are dedicated to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

That definition of communism in the United States of America was laid down by an Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, in the course of a wartime proceeding that any Senator can study if he is interested. It was the case of *United States v. Bridges*, and the Department of Justice today will supply to anybody on demand the facts above stated.

Yet here we have Henry Hart, admitted a Communist, on the TVA pay roll, admitting he was solicited for Communist Party membership by another TVA employee—and what does the record show as to the activities of Lilienthal and Clapp against such matters?

So far, only that Clapp says Hart told him that he, Hart, had resigned the Communist Party and that Hart denied writing a letter to the Communist Party headquarters giving damaging insight into Communist work within the TVA.

Clapp admits that he never pursued the Hart matter beyond merely receiving Hart's general denials. Does anybody think that is a serious-minded and responsible method of protecting the United States Government's interests against communism?

Lilienthal was there all the time, too. What did he do about the leads and evidence developed by the questioning of Hart? Lilienthal says he is the man to be trusted with control of the United States atom power.

How he handled communism in the TVA is a crucial test of how he can be expected to handle the atom, which communism is trying to get at by every means of espionage, blackmail, fraud and misrepresentation at its command.

What Lilienthal did about communism once is a fair test of what he can be expected to do again. Let's see what his record shows.

Incidentally, there is a good deal more to be shown about the interests, associations, and records of other people who have nosed into this Lilienthal-Clapp affair.

On the floor of the House of Representatives day before yesterday, Representative EUGENE COX, Democrat, of Georgia, raised serious doubts about Lilienthal and Clapp. Representative ADOLPH SABATH, Democrat, of Illinois, came to their defense.

Mr. SABATH is a very elderly man. His secretary and thinking guide is one Harold Buckles. And who is he?

Why Harold Buckles happens by oddest chance to be the brother of Katharine Buckles (now Katharine Buckles Schryver), that very same one whom Henry Hart mentioned as shown above.

Katharine Buckles Schryver now is no longer with TVA. Instead she is executive secretary of an organization calling itself the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax—which has been subsidized by the Communist Party.

Harold Buckles, just in passing, may also be remembered as a faculty member of the National Citizens' Political Action Committee's School of Political Action Techniques, which had as its announced aim and object the prevention of this Republican Eightieth Congress' election.

Senators who have to bear the responsibility of voting Clapp into command of the TVA and Clapp's boss, Lilienthal, into control of the atom, can find plenty of factual data on the activity of communism in TVA by doing a very little investigation of the sworn and public record.

It is contained in volume 13 of the first series of hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, April 11–May 21, 1940, and the executive hearings, volumes 2 and 3, covering the period, March 9–August 20, 1940, with special reference to the testimony of:

Robert B. Barker, Laurent Brown Frantz, John C. Borden, William B. Green, W. E. Holbert, Mrs. G. E. Paris, Kenneth B. Talley, C. L. Wayman, Frank C. White, Mabel Abercrombie, John M. Frantz, Henry C. Hart, David S. Martin, Hugh W. Urban, I. C. Wiggs, and Mrs. Muriel S. Williams.

If after that they conclude Lilienthal and Clapp were properly vigilant against communism in the TVA and were on their toes to protect the Constitution of the United States against Communist infiltration, then said Senators must be very new to the ways of the world.

EX-TVA CHAIRMAN HOGGED STEEL NEEDED FOR MUNITIONS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Evidence revealed to the Times-Herald yesterday disclosed a clear conflict between War Department records and the testimony of Secretary of War Patterson to the joint committee of Congress now conducting hearings on whether to confirm David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

One of the documents shown to the Times-Herald was even signed jointly by Patterson and James V. Forrestal at a time they were respectively Under Secretaries of War and Navy.

Patterson appeared before the confirmation committee on Tuesday to endorse Lilienthal, and in the course of his testimony was asked by Senator HICKENLOOPER (Republican), of Iowa, committee chairman, whether there had been any wartime trouble between the War Department and the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which Lilienthal has been Chairman.

Information available to the Times-Herald reflects that:

1. The TVA and Lilienthal directly were in open conflict with the Army Chemical Warfare Service about the building of a phosphate plant in Alabama to such extent that the CWS even changed its formula for camouflage smoke to escape Lilienthal's designs.

2. That Lilienthal forced the diversion to long-range TVA dam building and other projects of heavy steel and other equipment which responsible War Department officials sought for immediate fighting usage.

3. That Herbert Marks, prewar TVA general counsel, but after Pearl Harbor with the Power Division of the War Production Board, undertook a project to prevent the Army-Navy Munitions Board from having a voice in the control of wartime electric power projects.

(It was this undertaking of Marks that resulted in Patterson himself being involved—of which details hereinafter.)

4. That Marks was directly accused during the war of withholding the dispatch of WPB directives involving thousands of tons of steel, until the Bonneville public power project on the west coast had tied these up, though WPB had directed that Bonneville release the steel.

5. That Marks was accused of the same course of obstruction of the Army-Navy Munitions Board in other detailed instances.

Marks is now special assistant to Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, who was private counsel to Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter. Marks is also nominated by Lilienthal as general counsel to the Atomic Commission Lilienthal seeks to head. Acheson and Lilienthal are joint authors of the formula for international use of atomic power that Lilienthal seeks to undertake as soon as the Senate confirms him, if it does.

With respect to No. 3 episode (above), which involves Patterson himself, the background is as follows:

A. On February 16, 1942, Donald M. Nelson, then WPB Chairman, wrote Ferdinand Eberstadt, Chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board, requesting a change in operating procedure so that the Munitions Board and the WPB Power Branch could expedite their decisions.

These decisions were basic to the war effort as they not only involved the use of

tremendous tonnages of critical war materials but also decided the placement and amounts of electric power necessary to drive essential war industrial plants.

B. On February 23, 1942, the Army-Navy Munitions Board designated two officers to accomplish the ends suggested by Nelson. These officers were Lt. Col. J. C. Damon and Lt. Comdr. F. P. Quigley.

C. On March 9, 1942, the WPB's director of industry operations, J. S. Knowlson, replied with a memorandum to Eberstadt setting forth details of how the Army-Navy Munitions Board's agents would be received by the WPB Power Branch. In effect, they were to be permitted to attend proceedings, say what they thought ought to be done, and would then receive in reply the verdicts of WPB. They would have access to no evidence except that offered them by WPB and would have no power in the deliberations on the verdicts.

File copies of this letter were examined and it was found that it was composed by Herbert S. Marks for Knowlson's signature and signed with Knowlson's name.

D. That in reaction to this WPB undertaking Eberstadt prepared a memorandum of advice to Under Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal. Here is the text:

MARCH 16, 1942.

Memorandum to the Under Secretaries of War and Navy.

Subject: Functions of Army and Navy Munitions Board representatives, War Production Board, Power Branch.

1. References made to the attached copy of Mr. Knowlson's letter, March 9, 1942, in which he takes exception to War Department's interpretation of the responsibilities and duties of Colonel Damon and Commander Quigley, the Army and Navy Munitions Board representatives in the War Production Board, Power Branch.

2. The directive of February 23, 1942, copy attached, to these officers specifically stated that they were "designated as the Army and Navy Munitions Board clearance officers to work in cooperation with the War Power Branch of the WPB with respect to projects coming before that Branch."

The directive went on to state that the "principal duty will be to review such projects from the standpoint of essentiality to war production" and that "when the project under consideration is needed to sustain and augment war production and merit the support of the ANMB you will recommend an appropriate rating to be assigned. Projects that are not considered essential will not be supported."

3. I do not believe that these officers have misinterpreted either the letter or the spirit of the directive which was issued to them, as it was clearly the intention of the War and Navy Departments that these officers were to judge projects in the light of each project's importance to the war effort.

4. In reading the four numbered paragraphs of Mr. Knowlson's letter outlining what he and Mr. Krug consider the definitions of responsibilities, it is apparent that he does not wish the War or Navy Department to have access to any information other than what Mr. Krug would make available.

Obviously if the War and Navy Departments are to be restricted as to information upon which to base recommendations concerning projects to only such information as is deemed appropriate by the WPB, the recommendations of the officers will in many cases at least be founded on only partial evidence.

An example of this is the matter of excess use of copper for transmission lines in Texas.

5. The War and Navy Departments have, through over a century, built up in the minds of the citizens of this country a certain feeling of confidence and of integrity in their actions because these Departments are not ordinarily influenced by motives other than those specifically directed toward success in battle.

It is unthinkable of either or both of the armed services to lend themselves to participation in decisions concerning the use of power or its transmission, or the use of materials therefor, for purposes not directly aimed toward winning of the war and therefore, in effect, resulting in a weakened war effort. Consequently, it is necessary in order to prevent this that the ANMB have the continued right of independent access to all available information.

6. The original purpose of having these officers participate in the deliberation of WPB's committee was to effect a saving in time. As was pointed out when this matter first came up, the greatest loss in time in consideration of project applications was in the WPB and not in the ANMB. Power section rating took more than a day or so in the consideration of debatable projects.

Whereas there were instances of projects having lain unacted upon in the War Production Board for many weeks.

I feel that it is possible by having these officers collaborate with the War Production Board to effect a saving in time and this should be done, but it should not result in the loss of independent judgment or the basis for such independent judgment of the War and Navy Departments.

7. In view of the fundamental principle involved in this matter, I suggest that a letter similar to the attached draft be sent to Mr. Knowlson and that such letter be signed by the Under Secretary of War and Navy Departments on the ANMB.

FERDINAND EBERSTADT,
Chairman, Army and Navy Munitions Board.

E. That Patterson and Forrestal on March 21, 1942, sent a letter to Knowlson carrying out the line of Eberstadt's memorandum to them in almost his exact words except to allow that while the War and Navy Departments do not "question the reliability of the information obtained by the power branch of the War Production Board," etc., they still "desire and intend" to be fully informed on all the evidence involved.

They added that the "winning of the war may be adversely affected" by the lack of Army-Navy information as above outlined.

Following the joint Forrestal-Patterson letter to Knowlson, the undertaking attributed to Mr. Marks was "dropped."

GET IT RIGHT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

President Truman hotly declared yesterday that David E. Lilienthal is no Communist. That is very good news and timely, since Mr. Lilienthal is up before the Senate as Mr. Truman's proposed Chairman of the United States Atomic Commission.

But it is not very big news.

Considering that Mr. Truman nominated Mr. Lilienthal for the job, it is unlikely that he would say Lilienthal is a Communist, and for that matter it is more than unlikely that anybody with a responsible mind would say Lilienthal is a Communist, on the basis of any evidence even yet hinted.

The issue that has snarled up Senate proceedings as to Lilienthal is not really whether he is a Communist but whether under his administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority there were any Communists in the TVA, and if so what Lilienthal did about them.

What Lilienthal did to defend TVA against Communist infiltration is of vital concern to everybody, because everybody knows the Communists of the world are using every device in their formidable arsenal of theft, bribery, lying, fraud, and murder to get at the atom bomb.

Is Lilienthal smart and tough enough to stand them off? Has he the will to do it?

That is the real issue and the only intelligent way to make a common-sense guess about it is to examine what Lilienthal has done in the past about Communists and communism.

The best evidence in that field centers on the Tennessee Valley Authority, with which Lilienthal has been a high-placed, trusted, and responsible officer from its beginnings to date.

Conversation is not enough. What are the facts now of record and available?

Here is a sample in that direction from the sworn testimony of Mrs. George H. Paris, of Knoxville, Tenn., taken in 1940 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mrs. Paris stated that she was a member of the American Legion Auxiliary and that she joined the Communist Party in January of 1939 to see what it was doing in and around her community.

She said that she made notes after attending meeting and when she testified, read from the notes to refresh her memory. She specifically said that she attended meetings of a Communist unit at which were present TVA employees and that one of these TVA Communists said:

"With Joseph Swidler up there we can get any information we want and it will be legal and won't cost us anything, because he is so closely associated with us."

Joseph C. Swidler was then solicitor for the TVA, a highly responsible job, and is now general counsel and secretary to a TVA offshoot corporation.

Now surely it is fair to ask Mr. Lilienthal and his man, Swidler, what they did when they learned about such testimony as that above quoted. Not what they thought, but did.

It certainly would be reasonable to expect that they would blow the roof off and find out who had been passing out such allegations, and why.

Mrs. Paris further quoted from her notes: "Mr. Jandry has said we need not fear we will lose our jobs because we are Communists in the TVA."

She identified "Mr. Jandry" as Arthur C. Jandry, now assistant general manager of the TVA.

What did Lilienthal and Jandry do about that testimony? What does the record show?

Another witness before the same committee testified under oath that while sitting in the offices of the TVA personnel division waiting to apply for a job he was told that if he would join the Communist Party "everything would be taken care of."

What did Lilienthal do about that when he heard of it? What does the record show? The witness mentioned was William B. Green of Fountain City, Tenn.

William Edward Holbert of Knoxville, Tenn., also testified under oath in the same hearing that he obtained the Communist Party identification cards of seven TVA employees and turned them over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Knoxville where they were photostated. He said that when the originals were returned to him he burned them.

What do the records of the FBI show about that? What did Lilienthal do about that when he heard of Holbert's testimony?

Surely it is not unreasonable to say that what Lilienthal did about such evidence as above cited will be worth considering as a clue to what he will do the next time Communists cross his trail pursuing the atom bomb.

Anyhow enough people think so that the Senators hearing his case ought to show a little interest in finding out what he did, as compared with what he says.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, some of the newspapers supporting Mr. Lilienthal are claiming that I am smearing him; therefore I want to do something for him. I state to the Senate that I am

informed Mr. Lilienthal now has on his side the Daily Worker, the largest Communist newspaper in the United States. I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Daily Worker, as published in the Knoxville Journal yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Knoxville Journal of Feb. 16, 1947]

THE DAILY WORKER, COMMUNIST PUBLICATION, ENDORSES LILIENTHAL APPOINTMENT

Here is an editorial which appeared in The Daily Worker, a Communist paper in New York, February 12, 1947, under the heading "From Eisler to Lilienthal."

"With the ganging up on David Lilienthal, the country can see a little more clearly what is behind such hysteria-making devices as the 'Eisler case' and 'atom spy' scares.

"Lilienthal is a well-known Roosevelt New Dealer, sponsored for by multimillionaire Bernard Baruch, and even by the colleague of Martin Dies, Joe Starnes, of Alabama.

"But Mr. Lilienthal helped President Roosevelt in the TVA project.

"And for this crime, he will not so easily be forgiven by the rough-riding muscle-men of the GOP gang. They have hated such competition with the power trust.

"Could they slash Lilienthal's reputation to pieces before public opinion because of his TVA achievement? Not so easily. The patronage-greedy Senator MCKELLAR could not confess that his hatred of TVA and Lilienthal was based on lust for graft. The 'red menance' was handier.

"And if the GOP could first drench the Nation in a cloud of poison gas concerning 'Russian spies' and 'Soviet master minds' allegedly hanging around back alleys in New York's family neighborhoods, they then could 'get' Lilienthal easily.

"They only had to mention his name along with the 'spies' and 'Russian appeasers,' and his goose was well on the way to being cooked.

"The 'Lilienthal treatment' grows out of the 'Eisler treatment.'

"The persecution of a German Communist refugee not only leads to, but has for its main purpose, the crucifixion of every American not ready to knuckle down to toryism."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am informed also that last night Drew Pearson, not the Communist but the commonest liar in the world, spoke out for Lilienthal over the radio. Today someone in the CIO came out for him. So, Mr. President, Mr. Lilienthal's real strength in certain quarters is now showing itself.

I am told that last night Drew Pearson told his listeners to bombard their Senators with letters and telegrams urging them to vote for Mr. Lilienthal. I myself did not hear the broadcast, but I am told that that was said, and I suppose Senators on both sides are receiving telegrams along that line.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

CONTINUATION OF WAR EXCISE TAX RATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 1030 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Excise Tax Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) is hereby amended by striking out "and ending on the first day of the month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

SEC. 3. Sections 1654 (termination of retail tax on luggage, etc.) and 1655 (definition of "date of the termination of hostilities in the present war") of such Code are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. Section 1659 of such Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1659. Definition of 'Rate Reduction Date.'

"For the purposes of this chapter the term 'rate reduction date' means such date as the Congress shall by law prescribe."

SEC. 5. Section 302 (b) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1943 (period applicable to increase of tax with respect to billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys) is hereby amended by striking out ", and continuing through June 30 next following the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war (as defined in Chapter 9A of the Internal Revenue Code)."

SEC. 6. Section 309 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1943 (relating to draw-back on distilled spirits) is hereby amended by striking out "and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill now under consideration, reported favorably upon it, without amendment, and unanimously. The purpose of the bill is to continue, without a definite termination date, the war excise-tax rates imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943. The war-tax rates under the present law, with the rates which will become effective when the war-tax rates terminate, are shown in a table, which I shall later ask to have printed in the RECORD.

They include admissions, permanent use or lease of boxes or seats; sales of tickets outside of box office; cabarets, roof gardens, and so forth; dues or membership fees; initiation fees; jewelry; furs; toilet preparations; distilled spirits; imported perfumes containing distilled spirits; still and sparkling wines; fermented malt liquors; billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys; electric-light bulbs and tubes; telephone, long-distance; domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches; leased wires, and so forth; wire and equipment service; local telephone service; transportation of persons; seats, berths, and so forth; and luggage.

The war rates on these items will expire on June 30, 1947. This is due to the fact that under the present law the war-tax rates expire on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the termination of hostilities in the present war. The President proclaimed the termination of hostilities in the present war on December 31, 1946, so that the war-tax rates will expire on June 30, 1947.

The effect of the bill, according to the Treasury, will be to increase the receipts in the fiscal year 1948 by $1,130,000,000. In addition, the receipts for the fiscal year 1947 will be increased by $37,000,000, due to the effect on current consumption. In other words, it is calculated that the enactment of this law will stimulate the now lagging business on the items affected by the bill and result in an increase in revenue in the current fiscal year of $37,000,000.

The receipts for the fiscal year 1949 will be increased by approximately $100,000,000, due to the lag of receipts behind liability to pay. In other words, these taxes run on a month-to-month basis, and the taxes due in the last month of the fiscal year 1948 will lap over for collection into the first month of the fiscal year 1949. These figures do not include the increase in postal receipts, which would result from a restoration of the postal rates affected by the President's proclamation, which for the fiscal year 1948 would amount to approximately $65,000,000. That, I may interject at this point, will, I anticipate, be taken care of by separate legislation.

I shall now give a brief explanation of the bill, section by section.

Section 1 of the bill merely provides that the act may be cited as the Excise Tax Act of 1947.

Section 2 would continue without a definite termination date the war-tax rates on admissions, cabarets, membership fees or dues, jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and the other items which I have mentioned.

The exact war-tax rates and the previous rates have been set forth in a table to which I have referred and which I shall put in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Section 3 in similar fashion continues the retailer's excise tax of 20 percent on luggage, brief cases, toilet cases, purses, billfolds, and so forth, which otherwise would be replaced after June 30, 1947, by the former manufacturer's excise tax of 10 percent on luggage and toilet cases. This section 3 also eliminates the definition of the term "date of termination of hostilities in the present war," which no longer would have any application to the war-excise taxes.

Section 4 is a technical amendment necessary to retain in the internal revenue code the present provisions for the mechanics for making floor stocks refunds on war-tax rates on distilled spirits, wines, and beer, and electric-light bulbs held by retailers and wholesalers, if, and when, such war-tax rates on these items are repealed.

Also retained is the technical provision for reduction of the war-tax rates on communications on a bill-rendered basis, if and when such rates are eliminated.

Section 5 is another technical amendment necessary in connection with the indefinite continuance of the war-tax rates on billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys.

Section 6 is a technical amendment which would continue indefinitely the present rate of draw-back on distilled

spirits used in the manufacture of certain nonbeverage products, mainly, medicinal, at the rate of $6 per gallon, which is necessary in view of the continuance of the war-tax rates on distilled spirits upon which such $6 drawback is based.

A number of reasons suggest themselves why this bill should be passed promptly in its present form. Immediately after the President's proclamation ending hostilities, a sizable buyer's strike developed on the items which I have mentioned. Of course, the customer figured that he would refrain from buying, and pick up the same articles after June 30 without the additional war taxes. As a result a very substantial segment of our economy has been injured, and many complaints have come to the Congress. I suppose every Senator has received such complaints.

Another reason for the prompt passage of this bill is so that we may bring these items into line with others which have no termination date.

It should be understood that the items with which we are concerned here are only a small part of the whole field of items affected by excise taxes. For example, we imposed new taxes during the war, which are unaffected by the President's proclamation, in other words, which have indefinite termination dates, affecting transportation of property, business, and store machines, coin-operated machines, electric, gas, and oil appliances, matches, musical instruments, photographic apparatus, photographic films and plates, refrigerating equipment, sporting goods, stamp taxes. Then there is a large number of excise items for which provision was made prior to the war where the rates were increased during the war, which also are not affected by the Presidential proclamation terminating hostilities. I mention, for example, cigarettes, cigars, some of the distilled spirits, documentary taxes, taxes on insurance policies, taxes on the issue of bonds, capital-stock transfer taxes, playing cards, automobile taxes, taxes on automobile bodies, and the chassis, motorcycles, tires, and tubes, inner tubes, electric energy, firearms, gasoline and motor fuels, lubricating oils, matches, radios and radio accessories, and other items. They produce the bulk of the excise-tax revenues.

It seems to me perfectly apparent that if we are to proceed in orderly fashion we should put all of our excise taxes on an indefinite-term basis, unaffected by the President's proclamation ending hostilities, so that when the time comes—and I hope it will come in the reasonably near future—we can give over-all consideration to the whole field of such taxes without embarrassment by nonuniform termination dates.

Another reason which suggests itself as to why the bill should be passed promptly is the action taken by the Joint Congressional Budget Committee last Friday. That committee in arriving at its figures includes in its report, a copy of which will come before this body in a few days, the following:

> The committee finds that the estimated over-all receipts, assuming enactment of legislation with respect to excise taxes and postal revenues, will be $39,100,000,000, compared with the budget estimate of $38,900,000,000.

Therefore, as the Senate will appreciate, the maintenance of these taxes is an integral part of our budget estimates. Let me add that there was no objection by anyone to that part of the budget report. I emphasize again that we are talking about the maintenance of revenue amounting to about $1,200,000,000.

If we fool with these taxes we either have to dig deeper into the cuts which we may make, whether it be $3,000,000,000, $4,150,000,000, whether it be four and a half billion dollars, whether it be six billion dollars, or whether it be some intermediate figure, or we have to transfer this burden to some other excise taxes or to some other form of existing taxes.

I urge, therefore, the Senate to proceed with expedition to pass the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a number of tables bearing on the subject of excise taxes.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated yield of excises subject to the "war-tax rates" in the fiscal year 1948: A comparison, showing Treasury and Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimates, between the yield under the "war-tax rates" imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 and the rates which will be effective on July 1, 1947 [1]

Tax	Yield using the "war-tax rates"		Yield using the rates in effect July 1, 1947		Estimated loss in revenue in fiscal 1948 due to reduction in rates	
	Treasury estimates	Staff estimates	Treasury estimates	Staff estimates	Treasury estimates	Staff estimates
1. Admissions	327.0	353.9	215.8	209.5	111.2	144.4
2. Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	53.0	60.8	20.1	21.6	32.9	39.2
3. Dues or membership fees and initiation fees	20.0	20.5	12.1	12.2	7.9	8.3
4. Jewelry	213.0	222.0	130.3	135.4	82.7	86.6
5. Furs	84.0	95.0	48.8	55.0	35.2	40.0
6. Toilet preparations	79.0	92.5	45.9	50.5	33.1	42.0
7. Distilled spirits	1,580.0	1,800.0	1,105.3	1,236.0	474.7	564.0
8. Wines	86.0	71.0	60.8	47.0	25.2	24.0
9. Fermented malt liquors	715.0	654.0	635.3	616.7	79.7	37.3
10. Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys	4.7	4.0	2.4	2.0	2.3	2.0
11. Electric-light bulbs and tubes	24.0	21.0	8.0	7.0	16.0	14.0
12. Telephone, long-distance, domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	255.0	280.0	198.5	216.1	56.5	63.9
13. Local telephone service	200.0	198.2	146.2	135.8	53.8	62.4
14. Transportation of persons	215.0	237.1	155.6	165.8	59.4	71.3
15. Luggage	76.0	83.8	16.3	15.3	66.9	68.5
Total	3,931.7	4,193.8	2,801.7	2,925.9	1,130.0	1,267.9

[1] This rate reduction takes place on July 1, 1947, due to the President's proclamation of the termination of hostilities, on Dec. 31, 1946.

New taxes imposed during the war which are affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Tax	Rate		Loss of revenue due to Presidential proclamation	Yield, fiscal year June 30, 1948, after giving effect to Presidential proclamation
	Wartime	Under Presidential proclamation		
			Millions of dollars	*Millions of dollars*
Bowling alleys, pool tables, etc	$20 per unit	$10 per unit	2.3	2.4
Electric light bulbs	20 percent of manufacturers' sales price	5 percent of manufacturers' sales price	16	8
Furs	20 percent of retail sales price	10 percent of retail sales price	35.2	48.8
Jewelry	do	do	82.7	130.3
Luggage	2 percent of retail sales price	10 percent of manufacturers' sales price [1]	59.7	9.1
Local telephone service	15 percent	10 percent	53.8	146.2
Transportation of persons	15 percent of amount paid	10 percent of amount paid	59.4	155.6

[1] With base narrowed.

New taxes imposed during the war which are unaffected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Tax	Rate	Yield fiscal year June 30, 1948 (millions of dollars)
Transportation of property	3 percent of amount paid	270
Business and store machines	10 percent of manufacturers' price	33
Coin-operated machines:		
Amusement	$10 per machine	21.5
Gambling	$100 per machine	
Electric, gas, and oil appliances	10 percent of manufacturers' price	79
Matches	2 cents per thousand	8
Musical instruments, phonographs, and phonograph records	10 percent of manufacturers' price	[1] 66.1
Photographic apparatus	25 percent of manufacturers' price	44
Photographic films and plates unexposed	15 percent of manufacturers' price	
Refrigerating equipment, air-conditioning units, self-contained	10 percent of manufacturers' price	[2] 59
Sporting goods	do	18
Distilled spirits, occupational taxes:		
Withdrawals, not more than 25 proof gallons	$25	
Not more than 50 proof gallons	$50	
More than 50 proof gallons	$100	
Stamp taxes:		
Life and accident policies and annuity contracts	1 cent per dollar or fraction of premium	
Reinsurance policies	do	

[1] Includes radio receiving sets which is a permanent tax.
[2] Includes mechanical refrigerators.

Excise-tax increases made in permanent taxes during the war which were affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Description of tax	War-tax rates	New rates	Loss of revenue due to Presidential proclamation	Yield, fiscal year June 30, 1948, after giving effect to Presidential proclamation
			Millions	*Millions*
Admissions	1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof.	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof.	$111.2	$215.8
Permanent use or lease of boxes or seats	20 percent	11 percent		
Sales of tickets outside of box office	do	do		
Cabarets, roof gardens, etc	do	5 percent	32.9	20.1
Dues or membership fees	do	11 percent	7.9	12.1
Initiation fees	do	11 percent	7.9	12.1
Toilet preparations	do	10 percent	33.1	45.9
Distilled spirits	$9 per gallon	$6 per gallon	474.7	1,105.3
Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits	do	do		
Still wines:				
(1) Not over 14 percent of alcohol	15 cents per gallon	10 cents per gallon		
(2) Over 14 percent and not over 21 percent of alcohol	60 cents per gallon	40 cents per gallon		
(3) Over 21 percent and not over 24 percent of alcohol	$2 per gallon	$1 per gallon		
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials:				
(1) Champagne or sparkling wine	15 cents per half pint or fraction thereof.	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof.	25.1	60.8
(2) Artificially carbonated wine	10 cents per half pint or fraction thereof.	5 cents per half pint or fraction thereof.		
(3) Liqueurs, cordials etc	do	do		
Fermented malt liquors	$8 per barrel	$7 per barrel	79.7	635.3
Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys	$20 per year per table; $20 per year per alley.	$10 per year per table; $10 per year per alley.	2.3	2.4
Telephone, long distance	25 percent	20 percent		
Domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	do	15 percent	56.5	198.5
Leased wires, etc	do	do		
Wire and equipment service	8 percent	5 percent		
Local telephone service	15 percent	10 percent	53.8	146.2
Total			877.3	2,442.4

The above loss in revenue is figured as the actual loss for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.
Because of some lag in collections, this does not reflect the entire loss on account of the proclamation.
It is also believed that some additional loss will be incurred for the fiscal year 1947, due to purchases being held up prior to July 1, 1947.
Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Jan. 13, 1947

Rates increased during the war which are not affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946

Title of tax	Rate				Yield, fiscal year 1948
	Prewar	1940	1941	1942	
TOBACCO TAXES					
Cigarettes:					
Weighing not more than 3 pounds per M, per thousand	$3.00	$3.25		$3.50	$1,112,000,000
Weighing more than 3 pounds per M, and more than 6½ inches in length, per thousand	7.80			8.40	
Weighing more than 3 pounds per M, and more than 6½ inches in length (counting each 2¾ inches (or fraction thereof) of the length of each as one cigarette) per thousand	3.00	3.25		3.50	
Cigars:					
Weighing more than 3 pounds per M, retailing at—					
Not more than 2½ cents each, per thousand	2.00			2.50	57,000,000
More than 2½ cents and not more than 4 cents, per thousand	2.00			3.00	
More than 4 cents and not more than 5 cents, per thousand	2.00			4.00	
More than 5 cents and not more than 6 cents, per thousand	3.00			4.00	
More than 6 cents and not more than 8 cents, per thousand	3.00			7.00	
More than 8 cents and not more than 15 cents, per thousand	5.00			10.00	
More than 15 cents and not more than 20 cents, per thousand	10.50			15.00	
More than 20 cents each, per thousand	13.50			20.00	

Rates increased during the war which are not affected by the Presidential proclamation of Dec. 31, 1946—Continued

Title of tax	Rate				Yield, fiscal year 1948
	Prewar	1940	1941	1942	
LIQUOR TAXES					
Special occupational taxes:					
Distilled spirits or wine:					
Wholesale dealers, per year	$100.00	$110.00			
Retail dealers, per year	25.00	27.50			
Fermented malt liquors:					
Brewers:					
Production less than 500 barrels a year, per brewery	50.00	55.00			
Production over 500 barrels per year, per brewery	100.00	110.00			
Wholesalers, per year	50.00	55.00			$12,000,000
Retailers, per year	20.00	22.00			
Rectifiers:					
Less than 500 barrels, per year	100.00	110.00			
500 barrels or more, per year	200.00	220.00			
Manufacturers of stills, per year	50.00	55.00			
Stills or worms manufactured for distilling purposes, per still or worm	20.00	22.00			
STAMP TAXES					
Documentary:					
Conveyances (deed, instrument, or writing conveying realty):					
Value $100.01 to $500	.50	.55			
Each additional $500 or fraction	.50	.55			
Foreign insurance policies: Insurance policies other than life and indemnity, fidelity, or surety bonds, etc., per dollar or fraction of premium	.03	.04			
Issues of bonds, debentures, certificates of indebtedness, etc., per $100 face value or fraction thereof	.10	.11			
Issues of capital stock, per $100 par or face value, or if without par or face value:					
If actual value is less than $100, on each $20 or fraction	.02	.03			
If actual value is over $100, on each $100 or fraction	.10	.11			
Transfers of bonds, per $100 of face value	.04	.05			74,200,000
Transfers of capital stock:					
Per $100 par or face value or fraction	.04	.05			
Without par or face value, per share	.04	.05			
If selling price is $20 or over, whether with or without par or face value, per share	.05	.06			
Other:					
Passage tickets over $10 sold for passage by vessel to a foreign port:					
Costing $10.01 to $30	1.00	1.10			
Costing $30.01 to $60	3.00	3.50			
Over $60	5.00	5.50			
Playing cards, per package of not more than 54	.10	.11	$0.13		8,800,000
MISCELLANEOUS TAXES					
Automobiles, etc.:					
Automobile bodies, of manufacturers' sales price—percent	3	3½	7		
Automobile chassis, of manufacturers' sales price—do	3	3½	7		271,000,000
Motorcycles, of manufacturers' sales price—do	3	3½	7		
Automobile truck bodies, of manufacturers' sales price—do	2	2½	5		
Automobile truck chassis, of manufacturers' sales price—do	2	2½	5		59,000,000
Tractors, of manufacturers' sales price—do	2	2½	5		
Parts and accessories of manufacturers' sales price—do	2	2½	5		78,000,000
Tires and tubes:					
Inner tubes, per pound—cents	4	4½	9		162,000,000
Rubber tires, per pound—do	2¼	2½	5		
Electric energy for domestic or commercial consumption, of sale price—percent	3	3½			65,000,000
Firearms, shells, and cartridges, pistols and revolvers, of manufacturers' sale price—do	10	11			8,200,000
Gasoline and motor fuels, per gallon—cents	1	1½			486,000,000
Leases of safe deposit boxes, of amount collected—percent	10	11	20		8,100,000
Lubricating oils, domestic, per gallon—cents	4	4½		6	89,000,000
Matches: Wood, per thousand—do	5	5½			8,000,000
Radios and radio accessories,[1] of manufacturers' sales price—percent	5	5½	10		66,100,000
Refrigerating equipment: Refrigerators, mechanical household type of manufacturers' sales price—do	5	5½	10		59,000,000
Telephone, telegraph, radio message, etc.: Cable and radio messages: International	(2)	(2)	(2)	(3)	
Telegraph messages: International, of amount charged—percent	5		10		198,500,000
Transportation: Oil by pipe line, of amount paid for transportation—do	4	4½			15,900,000
Transfers to avoid income tax, of the excess of (1) the value of the stock or securities transferred over (2) its adjusted basis in the hands of the transferor as determined under sec. 113 of the Revenue Act of 1932 [4]—percent	25	27½			

[1] Includes musical instruments.
[2] 10 cents per message.
[3] 10 percent of amount charged.
[4] Tax is imposed upon the transfer of stock or securities by a citizen or resident of the United States, or by a domestic corporation, partnership, or trust to a foreign corporation as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital, or to a foreign partnership or trust.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there are no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Hatch
Baldwin	Connally	Hawkes
Ball	Cooper	Hayden
Barkley	Cordon	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Donnell	Hill
Bricker	Downey	Hoey
Bridges	Dworshak	Holland
Brooks	Eastland	Ives
Buck	Ecton	Jenner
Bushfield	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Flanders	Kem
Cain	George	Kilgore
Capehart	Green	Knowland
Capper	Gurney	Langer
Lodge	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	Myers	Thomas, Utah
McCarthy	O'Conor	Thye
McClellan	O'Daniel	Tobey
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Umstead
McGrath	Overton	Vandenberg
McKellar	Pepper	Watkins
McMahon	Reed	Wherry
Magnuson	Revercomb	White
Malone	Robertson, Va.	Wiley
Martin	Russell	Williams
Maybank	Saltonstall	Wilson
Millikin	Sparkman	Young
Moore	Stewart	
Morse	Taft	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The parliamentary situation is as follows: The Senate has before it House bill 1030, a bill to continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates, and for other purposes. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. Section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or any product having an initial boiling point of more than 200° F. and having an end point of more than 480° F."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, while this amendment may appear somewhat complicated, it can be explained in a very few words. It does not affect in the least the tax income. The law now provides tax exemption for so-called tractor fuel, fuel for agricultural implements used by farmers in their work. The regulations of the Department at the moment provide that the tax shall be collected and then rebated. This amendment simply provides that the tax shall not be collected in the first place. I have attempted to have such provision made in bills which were heretofore considered by the Senate, but I have yielded to the request that I wait until a regular tax bill came before us. I think this is the appropriate occasion for such an amendment, if the chairman of the Committee on Finance is willing to have it considered at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I urge the distinguished Senator not to press his amendment. It seems very clear that one of these days—and as soon as possible—we shall have to make an over-all review of the entire system of excise taxes. At that time it will be appropriate for the Senator's amendment to be considered. At this time, inasmuch as we are dealing with only a small segment of the whole subject, and since it seems to me that his amendment is more appropriate in connection with over-all consideration of the subject, I hope he will not press the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I want to be cooperative. In view of the fact that this amendment does not in any way affect the tax income of the Government, I am hoping that I may have the assurance that the committee will give the proposed amendment serious consideration when the next tax bill involving a general revision comes before the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I can assure the Senator that whenever we come to the general revision of excise taxes his amendment, if then offered, will receive most careful consideration.

Mr. BUTLER. Under the circumstances I think I should withdraw the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator withdraws his amendment.

Are there further amendments?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It directly affects the bill under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. (a) Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out, in the table contained in such section, the matter relating to admissions.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. The proposed amendment very definitely affects the tax income. If Senators will refer to the committee report on the pending bill, and to the table on page 1, they will find that the first item is "Admissions." The war-tax rate is 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof. The old rate was 1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof. The proposed amendment would cancel the wartime rate and leave in effect the rate which was in effect before the wartime rate was adopted. I think it is only fair, in view of the situation, that the tax on admissions should be reduced to the rate which formerly prevailed, which was exactly one-half the present wartime rate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would deprive the Treasury of more than $140,000,000 of revenue. It is a very substantial item. It goes to the whole theory of excise taxes. It covers a species of tax which it seems to me is peculiarly appropriate for consideration when we come to a general review of the whole subject.

The budget which has been decided upon by the Budget Committee, and which will be before us in a few days, contemplates the maintenance of the excise taxes which are affected by the pending bill. I believe that it would be a bad mistake to separate one item which would cause a loss of more than $140,000,000. I can assure the Senator again that when we come to the revision of the excise taxes this will certainly be an item which will receive the most careful consideration. Personally, I shall give the most careful and sympathetic attention to legislation designed at least to ameliorate the rigor of the present taxes. In view of the large amount of money involved, I hope the Senator will not press his amendment at this time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I might readily agree that in view of the fact that very shortly we are to have before us the general consideration of the budget bill, as well as over-all tax proposals, there is sufficient ground for postponing a vote on this amendment at this time. However, I prefer to leave it in this way, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill. I think there is an amendment somewhat similar to this one, proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Because of the possibility that he may want a vote on that particular item, and because in effect his amendment is the same as mine, I shall not call for a vote at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withdraw his amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. May it be left pending, to be acted upon after the other amendments have been disposed of?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot make such disposition of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, I withdraw the amendment for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and myself I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 1. (a) Section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on furs) is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold: Articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is a component material the value of which is greater than three times the value of the component material of chief value without regard to such fur."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators, including myself, submitted an amendment similar to this one. I understand from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] that the language of the new amendment is acceptable to the Bureau of Internal Revenue or to the Treasury Department. Because of that fact I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin to explain why the amendment is offered in this language rather than the language of the other amendment.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, the amendment itself is not acceptable to the Treasury Department. It has suggested, however, that the wording of the pending amendment be adopted in place of the original amendment. It does not change the effect of that amendment. The original amendment read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) Section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on furs), is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence in such section a new sentence as follows: "The tax imposed by this section shall not apply with respect to cloth garments trimmed with fur wherein the value of the fur set does not exceed 75 percent of the combined value of the fur set and the cloth shell."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act.

The Treasury Department has suggested that we use the wording of the amendment which has been offered. In presenting and supporting this amendment I wish to make it clear first, that it has nothing to do with raising, lowering, extending, or terminating the war excise tax rates as passed by the Congress in 1943. Second, it does not involve the question of what is or what is not a luxury item, or whether our economic conditions justify the continuation of war excise taxes. Third, it in no way concerns or affects any other articles covered by excise taxes, nor does it establish a precedent for further amendment to the bill.

In 1941 there was a tax imposed upon furs and upon so-called fur-trimmed cloth garments. The wording of that provision was as follows:

There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail, a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price of: Articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value.

The Treasury Department has interpreted that act in this fashion: It has taken the value, not of the fur, but of the completed fur set; that is, the fur set as it comes from the manufacturer to the man who puts the cloth and the fur together. So there is included the cost of the fur, the cost of the labor involved, and the profit along the line. They have not compared the cost of the fur set with that of all the other articles that enter into the make-up of the garment. They have disregarded the silk lining, the pockets, the buttons, and all the other findings in the garment, but they compare the fur set to the cost of the cloth shell. The effect of this interpretation has been not to produce revenue, but rather to act as a complete prohibition against the use of certain pelts on cloth coats. The fox farmers, mink farmers, and muskrat farmers have been completely deprived of a huge section of their market.

I have gone over this matter in detail with Treasury Department representatives, and one of the objections which they have to the bill is that they feel it will create unfair discrimination against cheap fur coats. Now, there are only two types of furs that I know of which sell under the price range roughly of $150. At present a fur-trimmed garment selling for less than $100 is exempt. Incidentally, if this amendment is adopted it will raise that figure to approximately $142–$150. The only full-fur coats that come below the price of $142 are mouton and coney, the latter being rabbit from Australia.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has been discussing fur-trimmed garments, has he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have any figures, but I have been told that the tax attaches to fur coats made completely of fur regardless of the price at which the coats are sold. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a 20 percent tax on all-fur coats.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What justification is there for putting a tax on a fur coat that sells for $75 and not putting a tax on a whole cloth coat that sells for $75?

Mr. McCARTHY. For this reason: One of the two fur coats that sells below $150 is mouton. Apparently the representatives of the Treasury Department think that there is such an animal as a mouton.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to be advised what it is.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is sheep wool. At the present time we are subsidizing wool, paying a subsidy of 20 cents a pound, while we at the same time tax mouton, or, in other words, sheepskin.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not prepared to debate this question, but I have been told that probably 60 or 70 percent of the fur coats sold in this country are sold at prices around $100, $110, $115, or less.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; that is not correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have seen some rather impressive figures. I do not have them before me. The argument was made that such coats are in direct competition with cloth coats which sell for as high a price as $175 or $200, and that the tax on the fur coat that sells at a lower price is a luxury tax, a completely unfair business tax as compared with the tax on the cloth coat. I should like to have the Senator discuss that point if he is prepared to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have made a very complete survey of this subject and have found that the only fur coats that sell in substantial quantities below $142, below which this amendment would allow an exemption, are mouton and coney. The only reason why I have brought this amendment before the Senate is that our fur farmers, who constitute a very important segment of agriculture, cannot exist unless the amendment is adopted at this time. I say "at this time" because the manufacture of fur-trimmed garments is seasonal. The manufacturers are now manufacturing cloth coats for sale next fall; and unless we remove this prohibition of the use of fur trim on cloth coats—and under the Treasury Department's interpretation of the revenue act there is a prohibition—it will force practically all our fur farmers into bankruptcy, which is what is happening to many of them now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am not hostile to the amendment the Senator proposes, but I fail to see the justice of attempting to give relief in this situation when we still keep the luxury taxes on fur coats which sell in direct price-range competition with cloth coats. I do not know why the tax is not removed from the cheaper fur coats, which, after all, are used to keep people warm and are entirely necessary articles of clothing. It seems to me that the excise taxes should be removed from cheaper fur coats at the same time that such taxes are removed from fur-trimmed cloth coats which are in direct competition with them.

Mr. McCARTHY. The only reason why I have not gone into the question of cheaper fur coats is that there are only two types of fur coats which are in the price range of the cloth coats with fur trim which we are now discussing. One of them is the so-called mouton coat, which never should have been taxed in the first place, if the Department had properly interpreted the act, for such coats are not really fur coats at all, but are wool coats. In its interpretation of the revenue act under which fur-trimmed coats were taxed the Treasury Department should have so determined. After all, wool is not fur. That would remove such coats from classification as "fur coats" for tax purposes.

The only other fur coats which come within this price range are coats made of Australian rabbit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So, in reality, instead of causing a discrimination, the amendment will eliminate a discrimination, because if the amendment is adopted it will be possible for the manufacturers to use fur trim on cloth coats without incurring liability for such excise taxes. In other words, the use of fur trim will not then penalize cloth coats. Is that not so?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Nevertheless, fur coats which are in the same competitive price range with fur-trimmed cloth coats will be penalized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out that there are only two types of such fur coats.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; there are only two sold in any appreciable amount. One is mouton, which is not fur at all, but is wool.

Mr. WHERRY. And if the Treasury Department handles this matter as it was intended to be handled, that will eliminate mouton coats from the fur-coat class.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The only other class is composed of coats made of Australian rabbit. That is true, is it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is entirely true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suppose we could pick up any Washington newspaper and find in it advertisements of fur coats—so-called, at least. I do not know what names are used in advertising such coats; but the newspapers are full of large advertisements of "fur coats," many of them advertised for sale at less than $100. At any rate, they are described in the advertisements as fur coats. Yet I assume that the act requires the imposition of a 20-percent tax or a similar tax as a luxury tax on such coats. In my own mind I simply cannot justify the continuation of such an excise tax, a luxury tax, on a coat selling for perhaps $90, which happens to be fur, and which the wearer uses to keep himself warm and to protect himself from the wind, whereas a fur-trimmed cloth coat which sells for $90 or $95 is free from tax. I

cannot justify that situation in my own mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, apparently I did not make myself clear. My point is that we should accomplish the purpose which the Senate apparently intended to accomplish when it passed the act in 1943.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that, and I understand that the Senator's amendment relates only to fur-trimmed cloth coats. However, I am simply raising the question. I shall not pursue it further.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that during the last war there was an attempt to levy excise taxes on clothing, for instance, shoes and other articles, on the basis of cost. The Treasury Department absolutely objected to such a classification, saying it was opposed to it and could not enforce it, although it seemed to be more logical than any other system. The Treasury Department said it did not want to have a classification based on value, whether retail value or wholesale value. So instead of such a classification, the tax is based on fur. The question is whether a coat is all fur or part fur. If a coat contains more fur than cloth, then it is taxable.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER How will the Treasury Department meet the burden with respect to making such a differentiation?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know; but the Treasury says it can do it and has done it and has been administering the law that way for the past 5 years, and it says it wishes to continue to use that method. The Treasury does not question the use of the percentage system which distinguishes a fur coat from a fur-trimmed cloth coat which is not regarded as a fur coat. The percentage method is the method of differentiation.

It seems to me that at this late date we should not propose a change in the method. I understand that one result of the present method is practically to bar the sale of fur-trimmed coats. The sale of such coats has been cut down to approximately one-third of what it was previously, because of the formula which has been applied by the Treasury. I am not sure whether a change in the formula would cause a decrease in net taxes.

In any event, it seems to me that the adoption of the method proposed will not violate any principle, if there is any principle in respect to excise taxes. As a matter of fact, there is none; and I look forward to the day when we shall eliminate two-thirds of the present excise-tax structure, because such taxes are most illogical and are discriminatory, and sooner or later we should get rid of them. But at the present moment, I think we must continue them, in view of the present budgetary situation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the Senator whether his amendment applies to all coats lined with fur, in which the value of the fur exceeds 75 percent of the total cost of the garment.

Mr. McCARTHY. First, let me correct one point. My amendment does not refer to the value of the entire garment. The Treasury Department has been using a work sheet which compares only the cost of the cloth shell to the cost of the fur set. The cloth shell ordinarily is composed of approximately two and one-half or three yards of cloth. At approximately $4 a yard, which is a high-class cloth, the cloth shell amounts to approximately $12. The labor of putting that cloth shell together amounts to another $8, more or less—in other words, a $20 cloth shell, when assembled. A shell made of such cloth would be used for a high-class fur-trimmed coat.

So the Treasury's interpretation leaves out of consideration the silk lining, the pockets, the buttons, the beads, the labor, and everything else that goes into the production of the coat, other than the fur. The cost of the fur itself is not considered, but consideration is given to the cost of the completed fur set as it is delivered to the manufacturer of cloth coats; and that cost is compared to the cost of the cloth coat shell. I cannot conceive of any reason why that method of computation has been adopted.

Our original thought was to try to clarify the situation in the following manner: We would force the Treasury Department to adopt the interpretation which we think was intended to be adopted when the law was enacted, and make the Treasury compare the cost of the fur at the manufacturer's level with the cost of everything else that goes into the manufacture of such coats—in other words, the cloth shell, the lining, the pockets, and everything else. We took that up with the Treasury Department.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand, but that does not quite answer the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me proceed. I shall endeavor to make the point clear for the Senator. The Treasury Department told us if that were done the cost of administration would be so great that it would offset the additional income they would get from the tax on fur-trimmed coats.

Mr. OVERTON. I notice the amendment provides:

> Articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is a component material the value of which is greater than three times the value of the component material of chief value without regard to such fur.

If such a coat retailed for $2,000, it would not be taxable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Such a coat never will retail for $2,000.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not?

Mr. McCARTHY. For the reason that about the highest priced cloth obtainable costs, roughly, $4 a yard. It takes about three yards of cloth to make the cloth shell. That makes $12. The cost of the manufacture is rather standard, about $8.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the highest price of cloth coats without any fur on them?

Mr. McCARTHY. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. OVERTON. I know it has not, but I say, what is the highest retail price of cloth coats?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the highest retail price of cloth coats trimmed with fur?

Mr. McCARTHY. We are concerned only with coats which run up to about $142, because this amendment will not exempt coats costing much beyond that figure.

Mr. OVERTON. That is not stipulated in the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Considering the manufacturer's method of making the coats, from all information we have from the Department of Agriculture and from the Census Bureau, that definitely appears to be the fact.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's statement is that this amendment then applies only to coats which retail at $142 and under?

Mr. McCARTHY. One department says $142; the other says $150. It is somewhere within that price range. If the price of cloth increases or decreases there may be a variance; but at the present cost of the cloth, it will run about $142.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I am not at all convinced that this amendment if adopted would put any drain upon our revenues. We are seeking additional facts in the matter. I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference, with reservations as to its possible fate there.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the past 3 weeks I have been endeavoring to obtain some assistance from the Treasury Department in sponsoring an amendment to the pending bill which would exempt from the 20 percent tax all fur coats wherein the value of the fur in each coat would not exceed 50 percent of the manufacturer's selling price. I have taken the matter up with several members of the Committee on Finance, and because, I presume, of the fact that the Treasury Department was not favorable to such an amendment, no effort has been made by the committee to report such an amendment to the Senate. On the other hand the argument was made by some members of the committee that if we opened the door in aid of fur dealers no just excuse could be offered not to assist those demanding relief from excise taxes on telephone and telegraph services and other commodities. I can well appreciate their position.

This morning I reluctantly agreed to sponsor the amendment which is now being proposed. That amendment will do very little for the fur industry as a whole. As the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has said, it will affect only the tax on coats made from cloth, but which are trimmed with fur. It will afford an outlet for some of the large raw fur stocks that are now clogging the warehouses of the country. I decided to

go along with the amendment in the hope of affording some measure of relief, no matter how slight.

Mr. President, I am very anxious that the Senate will in the near future enact a measure exempting from all excise taxes fur coats, valued, say, at $250 to $300, from the 20-percent tax. In short, I am very hopeful that all fur coats made from the cheaper variety of furs will be exempted entirely from all excise taxes. Such furs as I have in mind would exempt coats made from mouton, referred to by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, also raccoon, rabbit, skunk, opossum, muskrat, squirrel, and the like.

Coats made from furs of that kind are not luxury items, but they are necessities. As I will demonstrate in a moment, the tax on a coat made from these cheaper varieties of furs is often greater than the entire cost of the raw fur that goes into the making of the coat. Is such a tax just? It amounts to confiscation, in my opinion. Such a high tax has demoralized the sale and distribution of fur coats to such an extent that many fur dealers and manufacturers of fur coats have been put out of business. Many have lost their life's savings.

On the other hand those who catch and ensnare the animals that produce these cheaper grades of furs have likewise lost heavily. Raw furs have piled up in the warehouses all over the country and the prices of this winter's catch have been extremely low. To give an example, muskrats sold for $1.70 per hide last year and today the trapper is selling at less than 75 cents per hide. Not only is the trapper obtaining less for the hides he catches, but his cost of operation has increased. His living costs have increased over 50 percent. Traps that cost from $3.50 to $4 per dozen now cost him from $8 to $15 per dozen. Rubber boots that cost $5 to $6 are now selling from $8 to $12. It can readily be seen that the hundreds of our citizens now engaged in that business cannot survive.

Mr. President, the fur in a mouton coat is of the value of about $12 to $15. The manufacturer's selling price, including the cost of dressing, dye, labor, finishing, overhead, and a reasonable profit is from $40 to $90. Add to that price the profit of the retail distributors and the consumer pays from $60 to $135 for the coat. Now, on top of that we must add the tax which ranges from $12 to $27. Why should a coat whose manufacturing cost is $90, with a retail price of $135 be taxed $27, when the cost of the fur ranges from $12 to $15? Can such a tax be justified? Why, Mr. President, the whole week's work of most of our Government employees is taken in order to pay the tax on a fur coat made from most of our cheaper varieties of furs. These coats, as I pointed out, are not luxuries, but necessities in most parts of the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to point out to the Senator that when a coat with a cloth shell worth $20 and a fur set worth $21 is made into a coat that retails for about $100, the Government would obtain a $20 tax on a $21 piece of fur, that is to say, 100 percent tax on the fur.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly the point. The tax is not only placed on the fur itself, but on everything that goes into the garment. I say that it is really confiscatory. It is a 20-percent tax, as I have just pointed out, on the value of the entire garment, retailing for between about $90 and $100, to which $20 worth of fur has been added.

Mr. President, I repeat, such a tax cannot be justified. This tax, as I have stated, has caused a heavy blow to the fur industry all over the country, particularly to fur producers who deal in, catch, and ensnare the cheaper furs, such as muskrat, opossom, raccoon, squirrel, and the like.

In my own State about six and one-half or seven million muskrats are produced annually, constituting about 50 percent of the entire number of muskrats caught throughout the entire country. That means a heavy tax on the fur industry of my State. To illustrate, when muskrat is used to make a coat, the value of the fur alone ranges from $50 to $65. It means to the fur trappers of any State a tax of from $10 to $13 on each coat. On the coat as a whole, which generally retails for between $250 and $300 when the manufacturer's costs and the retailer's costs are added, the tax aggregates from $50 to $60, which represents the entire cost of the furs used in making the coat. Can such an unconscionable tax be justified? Mr. President I have before me a statement which illustrates the average cost to the manufacturer of fur for one coat made from various kinds of furs. I am certain it can be demonstrated that as to all fur coats made from our cheaper varieties of raw furs, the tax on the retail prices of the coats is as great ,if not greater, in many instances than the entire cost of the raw furs that are used to make up the coats.

I was told by some Treasury official that a study of all excise taxes included in the pending measure is now being made with a view of making recommendations to the Congress for a reduction in some cases and elimination of certain of these taxes in other cases. I am very hopeful that the Committee on Finance will also make a study of this problem and come back to the Senate with a revision of this entire excise-tax schedule to the end that the tax on fur and on many other necessities of life may be repealed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand the Senator would favor an amendment which would exempt from taxation any coat trimmed with fur or made wholly of fur which retails at, say, $300 or less?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not see why the pending amendment is not amended so as to conform to that suggestion.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has been a Member of the Senate now for more than 12 years, and he knows what would happen to such an amendment if it met the opposition of the chairman of the Finance Committee and also the opposition of the Treasury Department. I do not have much doubt that such an amendment would not be adopted. As a matter of fact, I have tried, as I stated earlier, for the past 3 or 4 weeks to obtain help from certain members of the Committee on Finance, and I have also tried to obtain help from the Treasury Department in attempting to draft an amendment that would exempt a fur coat, made entirely out of fur, whose value is between $250 and $300. My pleas fell on deaf ears. The pending amendment, I agree, will not do much good to the fur trade as a whole. It will aid in channeling some of the large fur reserves that we now have on hand.

Mr. OVERTON. I know that what the Senator says is correct, because I offered such an amendment several years ago to a pending revenue bill, and it was defeated. I sought to exempt all fur coats, whether they were made entirely of fur or were merely trimmed with fur, retailing, I think it was, at $200 or less. The amendment was defeated.

But it seems to me that is a logical basis on which to place an amendment of this kind or a provision of this kind in the law. What we want to do is to bring fur coats and fur-trimmed coats within the purchasing power of those who enjoy a very small income, rather than simply to say we will not exempt a fur coat, but that we will exempt a coat that is trimmed with fur.

Why not exempt the whole coat, whether trimmed with fur or made entirely of fur? It is easier of application, if it retails at $300 or less, which is customary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily concur with the Senator from Louisiana on that score. The whole question of fur-coat taxes should be completely examined. I believe at this time, however, we should merely clarify the law and attempt to have the Treasury Department do what Congress originally intended they should do.

The reason I say this is that in many States, fur farming constitutes a very important segment of agriculture. The fur farmers borrowed money during the war years. The banks loaned them the money on the assumption that some day the excise charge would be removed, and that there would be a market for furs. They have been loaned as much as $10 and $15 per pelt for example.

The interpretation by the Treasury Department, to which reference has been made, absolutely prohibits the use of certain furs. The fur-trim market of America has dropped off to the point where it is now almost nonexistent. As a result a large number of our fur farmers will become completely bankrupt. For that reason I think we must take action now.

Mr. OVERTON. I am entirely familiar with the provision and its effect. This amendment may be of service to those who raise fur in the Senator's own section. I do not know that it would be of any benefit at all to the muskrat trap-

pers of Louisiana. I doubt seriously that it would be of any benefit to them at all.

I think that the makers of fur coats must make tremendous profits. They use the tax as an excuse, and I am very happy to see their market fall. It ought to have fallen long ago. It has been too high. They will get the benefit of this.

The farmer and the trapper who raise furs out in the woods and in the swamps and marshes, I apprehend, will get no benefit. Very little benefit comes to the poor working girl who is trying to get a coat to protect her from the wintry winds. She will benefit very little from this proposal. If she wants to get a fur coat, she does not get any benefit at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will repeat to my distinguished colleagues that I realize this amendment will not be of tremendous help to the fur industry, but it will afford an outlet through which much of the fur that is now stored all over the country can be moved. I understand that in the city of New York today there is a whole year's supply of muskrat on hand, aside from this year's catch.

This amendment is going to make it possible for a great deal of that fur to be used in trimming coats, upon which no tax will be imposed. It will afford an outlet, in other words, so that much of the large amount of fur that is now on hand may be used.

Mr. President, I could discuss the subject to greater length, but I understand that it is the desire of the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill for an early vote. I also realize that a further discussion of the subject would not affect the vote on the pending amendment so I will content myself for the time being in asking unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks, a statement which shows the kind of fur used in coats, the average cost to the manufacturer of the fur included in coats made from the different hides, and also the manufacturer's selling price. This statement shows the difference between the manufacturing cost and the cost of the furs that go into the making of each coat. From that statement, one can easily figure the retail price of each coat and then determine the tax on each coat.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Kind of fur	Average cost to manufacturer of fur for 1 coat in the raw state	Manufacturer's selling price (including cost of dressing, dye, labor, finishing, overhead and profit
Mouton	$12- $15	$40- $90
Raccoon	20- 26	100- 150
Rabbit (longhair) (principally of Australian origin)	16- 18	70- 75
Opossum (North America)	26	70- 75
Skunk	70	175
Southern muskrat	50- 65	130- 150
Northern muskrat	75- 90	155- 190
Chinese kidskin	60	135- 140
African kidskin	24- 28	90- 100
Indian kidskin	32	125
Squirrel (principally of Russian origin)	88	200
Persian raw	25- 30	100- 125
Mink (southern)	840	1,350
Mink (average good northern)	1,750	2,700
Russian sable (jacket)	3,400	4,400
Baum marten (jacket)	725- 750	1,200-1,250
Stone marten		
Persian lamb (good quality)	620	1,000
Russian broadtail	1,225	1,800

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have printed at this point a letter addressed to me under date of February 10, 1947, by Steinberg & Co., importers and exporters of raw furs, New Orleans, La. This letter bears out my argument that the tax on fur coats costing less than $300 should be repealed. It also gives interesting data on the subject.

There being no objection, the portions of the letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 10, 1947.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am writing in response to your suggestion that we send you such further information as we think may be helpful to you in pressing passage of an amendment for relief from excise taxes for certain furs.

I note that Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, has introduced an amendment which would take furs entirely out of the excise-tax coverage; however, from all I read in the papers, I assume this will not likely pass. I can say at the outset that the formula mentioned in your first wire, to the effect that an amendment may call for removal of taxes where cost of fur is 50 percent less than entire cost of fur coat, is a most reasonable one. I say this for the reason that it would appear to exempt low-priced cost-of-living fur coats and continue the tax on expensive luxury furs such as mink, sables, Persian lambs, etc.

Illustration of the proof of such a formula to that effect is given in a list which I append hereto, showing the cost of raw fur to the manufacturer and his selling price. In all cases of expensive furs (including even the cheapest mink which is the Louisiana mink) the cost of the raw fur to the manufacturer will appear to exceed 50 percent of his selling price. Wherever low-priced fur coats are involved your formula would seem to exempt the coat from tax.

The situation presented by a tax on lower-priced fur coats now seems both ludicrous and discriminatory. Good cloth coats cannot be purchased today by the consumer for less than $100 and range to $200. Higher quality coats sell over $200. These coats go tax free. On the other hand, some volume-selling fur coats sell below these prices and are taxed 20 percent. The incongruity is further emphasized by the fact that the average fur coat lasts about 4 years—outwearing the cloth coat about two to one and offers far greater utility by giving many times the warmth to the wearer. It should be conclusive that the lower-priced fur garment costing up to $300, both on the basis of utility and money's worth over a period of years is no less of a luxury than the average cloth coat and no more a luxury than a pair of shoes or any other item of clothing. Therefore, adding a tax to the average consumer's cost for this type of fur coat is discrimination against the average American wage earner as well as against the American trapper.

You will recall that the OPA strenuous argument to the contrary notwithstanding, successfully maintained until its last effective days that muskrat, mouton, kidskin, Bombay and Lincoln lamb, marmot, opossum, skunk, pony, and raccoon coats were for practical purposes 100 percent bought by the average American wage earner whose income is $50 to $60 per week—not by rich people or even middle-class people. The OPA and the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that the American housewife and the office stenographer and clerk buy such a fur coat because, at its price today, it is a necessity in almost every one of the 48 States. Incidentally, all these garments are today selling 10 to 20 percent under ceiling prices.

Is it reasonable to require a $50-a-week wage earner, who buys his wife a fur coat for $200, which he expects to last her 4 or 5 years, to pay almost a whole week's salary in excise tax on such a utility garment?

As to the tax return to the Government, I am sure the Treasury can verify that, in dollar volume, 60 percent of the furs sold in the United State are imported; that practically all these furs are upper-bracket furs which would be excluded from exemption by the 50-percent plan to which you refer; that of the domestic furs at least half of the dollar sales to the American consumer is derived from mink and other expensive furs, so that we estimate that at most 20 to 25 percent of the total tax would be lost if the furs contemplated in such an amendment were made tax-free. At present market valuation this would probably mean a loss to the Government of about $20,000,000 at most. I believe total tax last year came to about ninety millions.

A graphic illustration of why this works out this way in practice is shown by calculating the tax on one $12,000 mink coat. The tax on this one coat brings the Treasury $2,400—80 times the tax derived from the sale of a muskrat coat, 150 times the tax from the sale of a mouton coat, and 200 times the tax derived from the sale of an opossum coat.

Very truly yours,

STEINBERG & CO.,
MORRIS STEINBERG.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. There is lying on the desk an amendment which was intended to be proposed by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself. The amendment, however, will not be proposed to the pending bill, but we now serve notice that it will be proposed to the general tax bill, which will come up within 3 or 4 weeks from this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have one amendment which I am suggesting that the chairman of the Committee on Finance take to conference, not as irrevocably binding upon the Senate, but to take it to conference because of a position taken by the State Department. It relates to the tax on transportation sold within the United States but for travel in foreign countries. The Department says it has a very vital interest, of course, in protecting our flag carriers abroad, as well as in the many benefits which flow from an expanding intercourse between other countries and our own. I think it is very generally known that we probably have to make up in certain instances whatever losses may be incurred. I am therefore suggesting that there be taken to conference an amendment as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section reading as follows:

SEC. —. (a) Section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "or without."

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply to amounts paid within the United States on and after the effective date of this act for transportation without the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We shall be very glad to take that amendment to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the amendment which has just been agreed to a letter from Mr. William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am taking the liberty of writing you in connection with one of the provisions of H. R. 1030 which, I understand, is now under your consideration. I understand that it is provided in this bill that the 15-percent tax upon the amount paid within the United States for the transportation of persons within or without the United States is extended indefinitely beyond July 1.

This provision, insofar as it would be applicable to international traffic, has the effect of discouraging such traffic and placing our own carriers at a competitive disadvantage with certain foreign carriers. The Department of State has an important interest in the protection of our flag carriers abroad as well as in the many benefits which flow from an expanding intercourse between other countries and our own.

I urge, therefore, on behalf of the Department of State, that your committee give serious consideration to the possibility of eliminating from H. R. 1030 the provision which imposes a 15-percent tax on transportation sold within this country for foreign travel. In this connection I might add that the full application of this tax would be difficult in that it encourages on the part of travelers the purchase of one-way transportation at home and the purchase of return passage, very possibly on a foreign carrier, in the foreign country. I should think it would also inevitably encourage in general the purchase of transportation on foreign carriers.

I am sending a similar letter to Senator MILLIKIN.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. BARKLEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it may be desirable on the part of some of those who do not agree to the action of the Joint Committee on the President's Budget to file minority views. I therefore ask unanimous consent that those who wish to file or to join in filing minority views may be permitted to do so between now and the hour of meeting of the Senate on Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] I ask permission, on behalf of the Senate members of the Joint Budget Committee, to file the majority report of that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I suggest that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] obtained unanimous consent lask week to file the majority report referred to at any time prior to midnight on Saturday? Under that order I assumed it had been filed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Saturday of last week?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the report was filed Saturday.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not know that. I was merely trying to protect the interest of the Senator from New Hampshire in his absence.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. In view of the fact that the report of the Joint Committee on the Budget was not filed until Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock and that the Senate concurrent resolution accompanying the report does not appear on the calendar today, I wish to ask whether the concurrent resolution is as a matter of fact on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be on the printed calendar in the morning. It was received after the calendar had been printed.

Mr. TAFT. May I say for the information of the majority members of the joint committee that a conference of the majority will be held tomorrow afternoon at 2:30, of which Senators will receive due notice.

COMPARISON OF APPROPRIATIONS BY DEPARTMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENTS, FISCAL YEARS 1946 AND 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a table making a comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947. The comparison shows the great economies we accomplished.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1946 and 1947

Department or establishment	Fiscal year 1946, 79th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.	Fiscal year 1947, 79th Cong., 2d sess.	Increase (+) or decrease (−), 1947, compared with 1946
Legislative branch:			
Regular annual	$55,718,868.46	$55,213,498.16	−$505,370.30
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	54,203.00	54,203.00	
Total, legislative branch	55,773,071.46	55,267,701.16	−505,370.30
The Judiciary: Regular annual	15,855,950.00	16,072,606.00	+216,656.00
Independent offices:			
Regular annual	11,692,955,893.58	11,216,670,749.61	−476,285,143.97
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	21,909,750.00	19,916,000.00	−1,993,750.00
Total, independent offices	11,714,865,643.58	11,236,586,749.61	−478,278,893.97
Agriculture:			
Regular annual	649,226,126.45	600,731,121.00	−48,495,005.45
Permanent and indefinite (general and specia accounts)	124,760,336.08	128,402,347.98	−3,642,011.90
Total, Agriculture	773,986,462.53	729,133,468.98	−44,852,993.55
Commerce: Regular annual	108,463,875.11	194,284,791.86	−85,820,916.75
Interior:			
Regular annual	203,582,654.72	252,302,681.26	+48,720,026.54
War Relocation Authority	25,000,000.00		−25,000,000.00
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	14,311,248.00	12,732,300.00	−1,578,948.00
Total, Interior	242,893,902.72	265,034,981.26	+22,141,078.54
Justice: Regular annual	106,496,423.50	99,752,250.00	−6,744,173.50
Labor: Regular annual	82,288,684.50	140,481,443.00	+58,192,758.50

Comparison of appropriations by departments and establishments, fiscal years 1946 and 1947—Continued

Department or establishment	Fiscal year 1946, 79th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.	Fiscal year 1947, 79th Cong., 2d sess	Increase (+) or decrease (−), 1947, compared with 1946
Military:			
Regular annual	$21,498,117,980.28	$7,263,542,822.64	−$14,234,575,157.64
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	8,000,000.00	6,000,000.00	−2,000,000.00
Total, military	21,506,117,980.28	7,269,542,822.64	−14,236,575,157.64
Navy:			
Regular annual	23,477,591,164.22	4,148,417,440.00	−19,329,173,724.22
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	430,000.00	434,000.00	+4,000.00
Total, Navy	23,478,021,164.22	4,148,851,440.00	−19,329,169,724.22
Post Office (payable from postal revenues to the extent they are sufficient and remainder from the Treasury general funds)	1,391,081,531.75	1,279,580,069.00	−111,501,462.75
State: Regular annual	102,322,191.46	183,077,692.60	+80,755,501.14
Treasury:			
Regular annual	366,783,647.66	558,194,218.54	+191,410,570.88
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	8,045,962,794.00	7,181,632,697.00	−864,330,097.00
Total Treasury	8,412,746,441.66	7,739,826,915.54	−672,919,526.12
War, civil:			
Regular annual	364,410,452.00	333,430,498.00	−30,980,454.00
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	1,035,008.00	1,048,500.00	+12,892.00
Total, War, civil	365,446,500.00	334,478,998.00	−30,967,562.00
District of Columbia (payable from District of Columbia revenues except $8,000,000 for fiscal year 1947 and $6,000,000 for 1946): Regular annual	74,213,010.14	77,246,092.56	+3,033,082.42
Grand total:			
Regular annual	60,214,108,953.83	26,418,597,974.23	−33,795,110,979.60
Permanent and indefinite (general and special accounts)	8,216,463,539.08	7,350,220,047.48	−866,243,891.10
Total	[1] 68,430,572,892.91	33,769,218,022.21	−34,661,354,870.70

[1] Before rescissions were taken out

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say that at the close of the last session of Congress, in view of the fact that I had been a member of the Appropriations Committee during the years involved, I requested this table to be prepared for my information. I may further say in connection with the President's Budget and the talk we hear of decreased taxes and decreased appropriations, that considering the present status of world affairs, it is my belief that our armed forces certainly should not be further reduced. There may be room for economy within the armed forces; I hope such economy may be possible to achieve, but I believe that any savings which may be had within the armed services themselves can well be spent on the Fleet Reserve, on the National Guard and on the Reserve components of the Army, the Coast Guard, and the Navy, and I shall insist that this be done.

Mr. President, I may also say that as a member of the Appropriations Committee in the years gone by, believing as I do in economy, it was my privilege on many occasions to vote for reduced expenditures. While there may be some economy possible this year, and I hope that we may be able to reduce some of the expenditures outside the armed forces, I earnestly hope that whatever reductions we may be able to make will be applied toward redeeming the terminal-leave bonds now owned by the GI's. This will reduce our debt and reduce our interest payments in the future. The officers, of course, were paid in cash. During the last Congress, it was proposed to pay the enlisted men in cash, and nearly every one agreed to the proposal, but because of lack of funds and the recommendations of the Treasury Department, and also because of fear of a Presidential veto, that was not done.

I hope we may be able to economize. I for one will certainly vote for all possible economies, outside the armed forces. I hope such economy will be sufficient to redeem the bonds of the enlisted personnel of the armed forces, who so bravely offered their lives and gave their services for us in time of trouble, with but little remuneration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks certain estimates for 1948 compared with appropriations for the fiscal year 1947.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Estimate, fiscal year 1948	Appropriated, fiscal year 1947	Reduction fiscal year 1948 under fiscal year 1947 (−)
Military Establishment	$5,717,791,700	$7,267,042,400	−$1,549,250,700
Navy Department	3,504,546,300	4,148,813,440	−644,267,140
Total	9,222,337,800	11,415,855,840	−2,193,518,040

Actual appropriations, fiscal year 1947, including permanent appropriations	[1] $32,734,553,120
Budget estimates, fiscal year 1948, including permanents	[1] 31,275,838,104
Decrease 1948 estimates under 1947 appropriations as of Feb. 17, 1947	1,458,715,016

[1] Taken from table 10 of the Budget for the fiscal year 1948.

BUSINESS TRANSACTED IN FIRST MONTH OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement for the general information of Senators. It has to do with the work accomplished during the first month of this Congress.

The volume of Senate business transacted in the first month of the Eightieth Congress compares favorably with accomplishments in corresponding periods of past Congresses.

The record is in truth noteworthy when it is realized that the present Congress had to deal with several problems not presented to previous Congresses. First, there was the change in political control. There had been no such change in late years. With this Congress, the minority of the last 14 years became the majority. In these circumstances and because of the passage of the reorganization bill, the organization and functioning of Congress presented new and difficult problems. It involved important changes in the organization of Congress, in the membership and staffing of committees, in the allocation of rooms to Senators and committees, and in the arrangement of party machinery. Changes such as these are not easy to make, and considerable time was needed to work them out. Yet, the change-over was achieved by both parties with commendable speed and smoothness.

Second, the Senate faced a challenge to the credentials of one of its Members even before it could form and organize itself. Several days passed before the issue could be brought to a temporary settlement, and no business could be transacted until that was done.

Third, this Congress had to vitalize all of the innovations prescribed by the new

Reorganization Act. Those who are not acquainted with the difficult problem of determining chairmanships and assigning Senators to committees cannot appreciate the enormous task faced during January by both parties, and especially by the majority. Thirty-three committees had to be reduced to 15, eliminating 18 former chairmanships and making exceptionally difficult the problem of naming men to head the new committees; but Members on both sides of the aisle are well aware how long and hard has been the labor in setting up the committee machinery so important to our work here. The majority was organized and ready to go at the start of the session. Our friends of the minority met like difficulties without undue delay.

In addition to forming the committees themselves was the obligation to make a start on planning the new staffing of committees, an experiment designed to strengthen Congress and speed its work. This meant the finding of professional experts, competent administrators, and enlarged clerical personnel. It meant the meeting of an enlarged demand for rooms in which to locate the increased staffs. Not all of these problems are settled even now, but they are well along toward settlement and committees are already started on their work.

Fourth, in keeping with the recommendation of the La Follette-Monroney report on the organization of Congress, it was decided to experiment with a new time schedule for the transaction of congressional business. The law itself recommended but did not compel this, although the overwhelming opinion of informed persons supported the need for better time scheduling in the interest of congressional efficiency. With this in view, the floor sessions were reduced to 3 days each week to permit greater uninterrupted time for Members to attend committee meetings and to perform their office work, both important parts of congressional service. I am persuaded that legislative efficiency will be gained in the long run through this division of time, even though the number of floor sessions for the transaction of legislative business has been reduced.

But notwithstanding the problems facing the new Senate, Mr. President, the record of business handled by the Senate in this 1 month is substantial compared with previous Congresses.

In the first month of the present session, the Senate received the unprecedented number of 8,177 Executive nominations. The whole first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, covering an entire year, had only 11,056 Executive nominations compared with this 8,177 in the first month of the Eightieth Congress.

Compared with the first month of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the volume of nominations in the Eightieth Congress and the dispatch in their consideration was unusual. There were 456 such nominations in the first month of the Seventy-ninth and only 1,359 in the corresponding first month of the Seventy-eighth. Of the 8,177 in the present session, none has been rejected; none has been withdrawn by the President; 3,316 were confirmed, and 4,861 awaited action at the end of the month. Considering the vast number of total nominations received and acted upon, this record of performance far exceeds that of the two previous Congresses mentioned.

When we turn to the legislative activity of our first month here, the record is equally imposing.

In the month of January lately ended, 472 Senate bills were introduced and referred to committees. In the main, these are public bills, because the Reorganization Act sets up a new procedure outside of Congress for handling private bills. These 472 bills compare with 426 bills in the corresponding period of the Seventy-ninth Congress and 591 in the first month of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Both of these previous first sessions of the Senate included private bills in their totals, and if such bills were excluded as is now the case, the opening work load of the present session far exceeds that in January of 1945 and 1943. Few bills are passed in the opening days of each Congress because committees have to hold hearings, report, and otherwise lay the foundation for work and consideration and disposition of matters here on the floor. Even in this respect, the present performance is equal to that of these previous sessions I have mentioned, because we passed three bills during the month of January, which is the same amount passed by the Seventy-ninth and Seventy-eighth Congresses in corresponding periods of time.

The Senate received 50 joint resolutions as against 22 in the comparable time in the opening month of the Seventy-ninth and 29 in the Seventy-eighth Congresses. We passed 5 out of these 50 joint resolutions, as against none passed in the same time in the previous 2 Senate sessions.

The number of simple Senate resolutions introduced to date is 77, as against 66 in the Seventy-ninth, and 87 in the same time in the Seventy-eighth Congresses. Of the 77 Senate resolutions, the Senate has passed 33, while the Seventy-ninth passed 40, and the Seventy-eighth passed 58 in comparable periods of time.

Mr. President, the current session of the Eightieth Congress in its first month of activity stands high in comparison with other sessions in recent years. Officers and Members on this side of the aisle could not have handled the public business with such excellent results without the cooperation of Members on the other side of the aisle. For this we are gratified, because it shows that partisan interests need not be and are not inconsistent with efficient dispatch of the public business.

Mr. President, I have two tables showing the work done in the first month of the Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses, and I ask that as a part of my remarks these two tables be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Activity record, Executive nominations, U. S. Senate

	78th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 11 to Feb. 11, 1943	79th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3 to Feb. 3, 1945	80th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3 to Feb. 3, 1947
Total nominations received	1,359	456	8,177
Total rejected	None	None	None
Total withdrawn	1	None	None
Total unconfirmed	739	21	4,861
Total confirmed	620	435	3,316

Activity record, U. S. Senate

	78th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 7–28, 1943	79th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 6–29, 1945	80th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 6–31, 1947
BILLS			
Bills introduced and referred	[1]91	426	472
Bills passed	3	3	3
RESOLUTIONS			
Joint resolutions introduced	29	22	50
Joint resolutions passed	0	0	5
Senate resolutions introduced	87	66	77
Senate resolutions passed	58	40	33

[1] Excludes private bills eliminated by the Congressional Reorganization Act. All previous Congresses included such bills.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that what the Senator is trying to do is to compare the result of the work of the Senate thus far this session with that of the first month of the sessions of the last two Congresses. Do I correctly understand that he compares the work done by the Eightieth Congress, in the first month, favorably with the work done by the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses during that same time? Is it on a par with it, or greater or less; or just what is the Senator trying to explain?

Mr. WHITE. In my opinion, thus far, there has been a greater volume of work in the organization of the Senate, the organization of committees, the introduction of legislation, and the results of committee work in the Eightieth Congress than there was in the Seventy-eighth or Seventy-ninth Congresses. Of course, different interpretations may be put on the figures, but I am giving the Senator my own interpretation.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the figures prove anything at all, I say to my friend; and I do not quite understand why this defense is being made at this particular time.

Mr. WHITE. I am frank to tell the Senator that I have done it because there have been some suggestions that we were laggard in our organization and in the work which we had to do. I think the material I have now put into the RECORD puts us at least on a par with previous Congresses. I think it is, on the whole, a little better record.

Mr. LUCAS. I would with due respect dispute that, of course.

Mr. WHITE. I would expect the Senator from Illinois to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I would do so without knowing any facts on which to base my statement in view of the futile defense which is being made. But I understand that what the Senator says is that the Republican majority has been charged with being laggard in doing its duty, as compared with all the promises made last fall as to what the Republicans would do if they came into power. Now the Senator is trying to defend his party and explain the situation.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is wrong when he says I am replying to charges made against the Republican majority. I am replying to a charge made against the Senate as a whole.

In the brief remarks I have made, I have tried—and I hope I have succeeded—to indicate the character of work and the amount of work which has been done in the first month; and I am glad to include the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator says; but I do not think he is defending the Senate as a whole as much as he is defending the Republican majority that now has the responsibility for action. If I understand the Senator's remarks correctly, he is trying to show what the Senate has done in the Eightieth Congress as compared with what was done in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

Mr. WHITE. I did not mean to go quite that far; but if the Senator presses me, I shall say that I think the first month of the Eightieth Congress shows an amount of work done that is in excess, in volume and character, of that done in a corresponding length of time by previous Congresses.

Mr. LUCAS. I would expect the Senator to say that.

Mr. WHITE. Of course the Senator would.

Mr. LUCAS. I repeat that, in my judgment, the reason the Senator is doing it is because of what has been said throughout the country as to the complete failure of the majority party to do anything constructive during the first 7 weeks of the present Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A part of the credit side of this picture as drawn by the Senator from Maine consists of the reorganization of the Congress, which of course would have taken place no matter which party was in the majority, because it had to be done. The Reorganization Act was passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when the Democrats were in the majority; and I suppose they should be entitled to some credit on that score.

Mr. WHITE. I thought I gave them credit.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Democrats had continued in power, they would have had to do the very thing that has been done by reason of the change in majority; that is, they would have had to reorganize the whole Congress after that act was passed. It had to be done. I do not wish in any way to detract from the credit to which anybody is entitled for the efficient manner in which Congress undertook to reintegrate the Reorganization Act with the work of the new Congress.

So far as legislation is concerned, I think we may, without very much exaggeration, say that the only legislation of any importance has been that which has been passed here today. The Senate has passed the extension of the tax bill, and also the GI insurance bill. Up until now, there has been no very important legislation before the Senate. I am not saying that in order to detract from what has been done. It is a little unusual, this early in a session, to begin to brag about what has been accomplished. Heretofore we have waited until the end of the session to recapitulate what has been done in the entire session.

Are we to expect that every month we are to have a progress report from the majority leader on what has taken place during the previous month, as well as a recapitulation of what has happened from the beginning of the session?

Mr. WHITE. I think that depends a great deal on what cooperation we receive from Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator has no complaint on that score.

Mr. WHITE. I would not complain against the Senator from Kentucky, even if I had reason to.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cooperated on the tax bill which has been passed today, and we did the same with the GI bill and on the Butler bill, which has also been passed. So, thus far no Senator has any right to complain about the amount of cooperation which has been given to the majority.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator will agree that I did not complain about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think the Senator did.

Mr. WHITE. The Senators on the other side of the aisle seem to be disturbed by a recital of the facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. In his reply to me the Senator rather intimated that the report upon the degree of progress made might in future depend upon the amount of cooperation given him. I do not know whether he intended to imply that we are verging upon a noncooperative period, but if that is what the Senator had in mind, I do not think it is justified by the facts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as the committees of which I am a member are concerned, there seems to be cooperation between all the members. Nevertheless, not much action has been taken. The reason for that is that the committees extend to the executive departments the courtesy of looking over the bills in order to give their opinions as to how they may be improved. From the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments 12 or 15 bills have been referred to the various departments, and a report has been received on only one of them. We should wait a reasonable length of time to give the executive departments an opportunity to express an opinion on the bills. The one report which has come back was received since last Friday, and we are holding a hearing on the bill the coming Friday, which is about as fast as we can work. I also realize that when several hundred bills are sent to the executive departments, they cannot have their attorneys go over them and submit reports at once.

It does not seem to me that either the law, the committees, or anybody else are really to blame for the slow speed with which we are passing legislation. I think from now on we are going to pick up rapidly.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator is a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Have all the labor bills which have been introduced been sent to the Department of Labor?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know about that, but every bill has been sent to the executive department the day it was received.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. I had in mind specifically bills referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It seems to me that the most important thing now before the Congress and the country is labor legislation. I am wondering what progress is being made toward presenting to the Congress at an early time some constructive labor legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The work of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is proceeding exactly according to schedule. I think that committee began hearings earlier than any other committee. We have held hearings for 3 weeks, steadily, on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays, and have heard from employers. Tomorrow morning, Mr. William Green will appear, and on the next day Mr. Philip Murray, and this week and next week will be entirely devoted to labor testimony. So many requests have come in that I think we may have to extend the hearings for 1 week, or until March 8. I expect to be able to report a bill by March 15. That is the schedule which was announced some 6 weeks ago, and I think we are adhering closely to it. I do not think that legislation of such tremendous importance and complication should be rushed any faster than that. In order to conform to that schedule we will have to refuse to hear many people who have asked to be heard. We shall have to say to many of them, "You have to file written statements."

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is making speed just as fast as it can properly do so, and I think we shall be able to present a definite proposal to the Senate on or about the 15th of March.

Let me read to the Senate what might be called the tentative calendar, as we see it today.

The budget resolution will come up on Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me inquire whether it is certain to come up on Wednesday. I have heard rumors floating around that it will be put over until next week.

Mr. TAFT. No; it will come up on Wednesday. I have received some requests that votes on the resolution might be postponed. It may be that the votes will not occur on Wednesday, inasmuch as we shall meet on Wednesday and Friday. But the resolution will come up on Wednesday.

After the budget resolution, we hope to have before us next week the portal-to-portal pay bill and the resolution providing for two 4-year terms for the President of the United States. After that, it is likely that we shall have before us the bill providing for extension of the Merchant Marine Act, which must be taken care of before a certain date in March.

By that time, we think, the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal will be before the Senate, and then the bill dealing with sugar control, the bill dealing with rubber control, and perhaps bills dealing with the control of other scarce articles, possibly including wool; and there will be some other matters which will have to be taken care of before the 30th of March, when the Second War Powers Act expires.

Then there probably will be a bill dealing with succession to the Presidency; and, finally, we shall have the bill dealing with the National Science Foundation. That is the tentative list which I handed to the press this morning.

I think from now on the Senate should meet not only on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, but also possibly, after a week or two, on other days. It may be necessary to ask the Senate to sit either on Monday and Wednesday evenings or to hold sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Ohio that there also is a Foreign Relations Committee, and there will be some peace treaties on the floor of the Senate rather shortly.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. President, I may say that the list I have just stated is a partial one, and it will suggest to the chairmen of other committees that they had better become active and had better report to the Senate the measures in which they are interested. But perhaps this list will give the Senator from Illinois something to think of for the time being. The labor bill will certainly take us to the 15th of March, or until the time when the major labor bill will be reported.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Ohio for the statement he has made; but I should like to ask a question with respect to labor legislation, which it seems to me is of tremendous importance to the country. Whether true or not, let me say that a rumor is floating around that after March 31 Mr. Lewis will call for a new contract. This would be in keeping with his previous course. If the contract is not agreed upon, another strike is in the making. I wonder whether the Labor Committee is considering at this time any proposed legislation which might affect that particular contingency in the event it should arise.

Mr. TAFT. I think some of the bills certainly deal with that question. But we have not considered it to be our duty to report a special bill to deal with a particular strike which may or may not occur on the 1st of April. I cannot say that we have done that, but we have some 50 bills before us now, I think; and several features of them would have a material effect on that strike.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with that. I am somewhat familiar with the bills which have been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But assuming that my hypothesis is correct, does not the Senator from Ohio agree with me that there is nothing more important before the Senate today than finding some legislative way to meet an emergency such as the one Mr. Lewis has the power to create?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that personally I have been opposed to a law which would prohibit a strike at the expiration of a contract. Of course, a number of things could be done to discourage it. But if the Senator is suggesting that we must have a compulsory arbitration bill or a seizure bill, I say we have not yet reached that point.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not suggesting either one.

Mr. TAFT. However, the seizure remedy has rather fallen flat, because the Government has already seized the mines and is now in possession of them.

I doubt whether I personally would be in favor of a bill to prohibit a strike when all proper time had been taken and collective bargaining had proceeded and had finally broken down. Regardless of whether in a particular emergency Congress might provide special authorization for the Government to seize plants, put people in jail, call for volunteers, or any other remedy the Senator can think of, certainly the committee is considering that question, as well as any other. But in the ultimate analysis I personally see no satisfactory remedy based on Government seizure.

If the Senator has another suggestion besides compulsory arbitration and Government seizure, I should be glad to consider it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Ohio has said about the complications which are involved in respect to all proposals for labor legislation. However, I cannot escape the fact that the most important thing for the Senate to be considering at the present time, and especially for the Committee on Labor to be considering, is a measure of some kind or character which will aid the Government and the country in preventing a Nation-wide strike which would paralyze the economy of the Nation, as a strike called by John L. Lewis could do.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the question of secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and all other questions which are constantly popping up around the country, so far as the Committee on Labor is concerned, are of secondary importance and are merely peanuts, as compared with the big problem which involves a paralysis of the economy of the Nation—a paralysis which a man like John L. Lewis could bring about under present conditions.

Mr. TAFT. I can only say that the committee is exploring every remedy for the problem, as well as remedies for other problems, and that before that time comes, as I have said, there will be a bill before the Senate. At that time if the Senator from Illinois thinks the remedies we have suggested are ineffective, he will then be free to suggest other remedies; and I personally will consider them with the utmost interest.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I am glad to have the Senator's statement on that question. Nevertheless, it does not satisfy the Senator from Illinois with regard to what the Labor Committee is doing at the present time with this one fundamental issue which seems to me to be the most important question the Labor Committee could consider. It is vital. As I view the situation it should be the No. 1 issue insofar as the Committee on Labor is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that if the Senator from Illinois, after looking over the bills our committee is now considering, does not find one which he thinks hits the nail on the head, then let him prepare one. He prepared one or worked on one last year, so he is familiar with the subject. I suggest that he prepare another one, and we shall give the utmost consideration to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Ohio has made that request and suggestion. I recall very well that last year we had a certain bipartisan group which met from time to time and considered matters dealing with labor. So far as I am concerned, I have not yet seen such cooperation this year with respect to that problem.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Illinois that there has been great cooperation in the Labor Committee. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has been more constant in his attendance on the committee meetings than almost any other member of the committee, even including the Republican members; and both Republican and Democratic members of the committee will participate in all proceedings of the committee. It seems to me that under the La Follette-Monroney Act, Senators should confine their activities to the committees on which they serve, and should not complicate the work of other Senators by inviting them to participate in the work of committees to which they are not assigned.

Mr. LUCAS. I would expect the Senator from Louisiana, who is a member of the committee, to be present, but I recall that last year the Senator from Ohio and other Senators who were vitally interested in the labor question called in Members of the Senate who were not members of the Committee on Education and Labor to try to work out a harmonious program.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion which has just been proceeding, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands I should like to say that this morning we had in our regular meeting 105 bills on our agenda. Reports from the various departments of the Government on all of them are not necessary, of course, but reports are required on most of them. I have personally called the departments, and I have had the assurance, and I am very confident the information is correct, that it is physically impossible to get the reports back as rapidly as the departments would like to submit them with the flood of bills now being passed. Only one report has been received to date. I assure Senators that as soon as the material is available the subcommittees of the Committee on Public Lands will start turning in reports on at least 105 measures which are before the committee at this time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from the session of the Senate on Wednesday so that I may attend the unveiling of a portrait of the former Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, at Columbia, S. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted, and the excuse is excellent.

THE FERTILIZER SHORTAGE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I hope every Member of the Senate will find the opportunity to read the short report by the subcommittee on fertilizer of the House Agriculture Committee entitled "1947 Fertilizer Supplies," issued February 10, 1947. I believe this report should be required reading for everyone interested in helping to meet the critical shortage in fertilizer so desperately needed by our farmers. It is evident that the House committee has done a very thorough job of analyzing the problem, and I want to associate myself with the conclusions and recommendations of that report.

One of the recommendations to which I should like to draw particular attention is that which recommends that the Army immediately repay quantities of fertilizer borrowed from the civilian supply last year, and that such fertilizer be made available to our farmers.

By way of background, the Army last year decided on a program of shipping fertilizer to occupied countries, and laid plans to restore to production some of the plants which had been manufacturing nitrogen for munitions during the war. Until the time when these plants could be gotten into operation, the Army "borrowed" a certain tonnage of nitrogen from the civilian supply, with the understanding that production from the Army plants would be used to restore this quantity to civilian use just as soon as possible after the War Department plants got into production. The production program was a little slow in getting started, but the Army hopes for an output of about 65,000 tons a month very soon. A part of that production will be shipped to occupied countries. The rest is supposedly set aside for civilian use. However, it now appears that even those quantities which are to be restored to the civilian supply will not go to our farmers. On the contrary, it also will be shipped overseas to meet our export commitments in countries outside the occupied areas. In other words, the needs of the American farmer will not be taken care of until after our export commitments are filled.

Mr. President, Nebraska farmers realize that fertilizer needed in March will do them little or no good if they get it in April. I see no reason why they should have to accept a schedule that will give them fertilizer just too late to do them any good. It seems very reasonable to me that the Army might repay its debt to civilian needs, if not immediately, then as fast as Army plants turn out the material. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to me that such repayments should go directly to the American farmer rather than to the export commitments first. This is primarily a question of timing, and no proof was given that overseas needs would suffer from a slight deferment in receiving the quantities that they have been promised.

One other point that seems worth mentioning is the terrific handicap which has been placed in our way by the shortage of boxcars, and particularly high-pressure tank cars. The Senator from Kansas has, of course, had that over-all proposition under consideration for some little time. I am very hopeful that constructive results will be seen from the study of his subcommittee. To me, it is positively shocking that today there are fewer cars on the railroads than there were 1 year ago or 2 years ago. I shall not attempt to assess the blame for that condition at this time. Apparently, the attitude has been that if we wait patiently enough, the railroads, along with other industries, will complete reconversion and rebuilding the production plant in due course. Now we see that just the opposite has been happening. Instead of reconverting, the position of the railroads has been deteriorating. On this point, I am hopeful that the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Kansas will have some helpful suggestions.

PREVENTION OF MONOPOLISTIC MERGERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my excuse for trespassing upon the time of the Senate this afternoon briefly is that tomorrow some of the members of the Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and of the House, in an effort to fulfill their responsibilities with respect to the Federal Territories, are leaving to visit the island of Puerto Rico. During the absence of that delegation a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate will be giving consideration to a bill which I introduced at the beginning of the present session to amend the Clayton Act. The bill is similar to one which I introduced at the last session of the Congress, a companion bill to which was introduced in the House by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. The House Committee on the Judiciary held hearings upon the measure, and in March filed a favorable report recommending its passage.

The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which now has this bill before it for consideration. I have had several conferences with the Senator from North Dakota, and I know that the matter is being given careful consideration. It is a problem of such importance, however, that it seems to be desirable that some of the details of the bill and some explanation of its history, of its purposes, and of the need for it, should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Everybody talks about free enterprise, but precious few do anything about it. Everybody talks about competition and the desirability of maintaining it, but few of us seem to do anything substantial about it. Everybody agrees that the concentration of economic power is a menace to what we popularly call the American way of life, but the concentration of economic power proceeds year by year, month by month, and even day by day. There are appalling facts before us for consideration; yet they seem to make no ripple upon the surface of public attention.

For example, the figures available in the Internal Revenue Bureau, Treasury Department, show that 455 corporations, which constitute less than one-eighth of 1 percent of the total number of corporations in the United States, own 51 percent of the assets of all corporations in the United States.

Mr. President, when that single fact is grasped it becomes clear immediately why cities and States are turning to Washington for Government action. We have permitted to grow up in the United States a condition because of which the States and local communities have practically completely lost all economic independence. They are dependent upon the activities of the few corporations which dominate the economic scene, and as a result they turn to Government for relief, because the State governments seem to be unable to do anything, and, of course, no State government would act with respect to the affairs of a great corporation engaged in interstate and foreign commerce. When the State governments do not act, the result is inevitable that the people turn to the Government at Washington, and it makes no difference what we may be thinking about in terms of idealistic objectives, we do the practical thing, though it may be completely contrary to every principle which we have announced.

There was an example upon the floor of the Senate today, when the Senate passed the bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend money to fight the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. The whole Senate was for it; there was no objection to it; and yet it was an authorization from the Senate of the United States to the Department of Agriculture to spend money for which there has never been a Budget estimate.

We do it—Republicans do it, Democrats do it—yet on Wednesday next we are going to begin to talk about a measure limiting the expenditures of the Federal Government, cutting down the President's budget by $6,000,000,000, and placing a ceiling upon appropriations. How

perfectly absurd, Mr. President, it is to talk about such limitations and such ceilings, when the hard facts of life are continually driving the Federal Government to spend money and driving the Congress of the United States to pass laws giving to the central government more and more power over the affairs of the people.

The Clayton Act, Mr. President, which my bill seeks to amend, was passed in 1914 upon the theory that it should be the purpose of the Federal Government to prevent economic concentration, by making monopolistic mergers illegal. The purpose of that bill was to prevent monopoly rather than merely to punish it after it had taken place. The sad fact, is that if we permit monopoly to establish itself, then all the punishment in the world does no good, because there can be no effective punishment. The jury, it has been commonly said, will not convict a man who appears in the prisoner's box in a Hart, Shaffner and Marx suit; it simply is not done, and when those who are accused of violating the antitrust laws are persons who have at their command great economic means, capable of hiring vast batteries of lawyers, they merely go through the forms. Prosecution after prosecution is made in civil suits, but the result frequently is that great fines are assessed and paid, after which the operation goes on exactly as though nothing ever had happened. It goes on because we are in the grip of forces which are seemingly beyond our control .

The Clayton Act prohibited the acquisition by one company of the stock of a competing company, in the event the Federal Trade Commission found that the merger so to be brought about by the acquisition of such capital stock would substantially lessen competition, or would effect a restraint of trade. That seemed to be a perfectly clear statement of purpose, a statement of purpose that would be difficult to misunderstand, and yet it was misunderstood. This prohibition was contained in what is known as section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Section 11 provided that if stock had been so purchased in violation of the law, then the Federal Trade Commission might order divestiture of the stock. A case arose in which the promoters who were guiding the merger looked at the law and saw that the prohibition ran against the acquisition of stock. The result was that the merger was accomplished, not by the purchase of the stock but by the purchase of the assets. Of course, in effect the real objective was obtained.

There were two very famous cases which rendered the Clayton Act ineffective. They were cases which were decided by 5-to-4 decisions. The first was rendered while the distinguished father of one of the most able Members of this body was Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Mr. Chief Justice William Howard Taft. Mr. Justice Taft was one of the four minority members who dissented from that judgment.

A few years later, in 1935, there was another 5-to-4 decision which completed the emasculation of the Clayton Act. In that decision the then Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Charles Evans Hughes, was one of the four dissenting.

The bill which I have introduced and which is pending before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, of which the senior Senator from North Dakota is chairman, is intended to correct this defect, pointed out by the Supreme Court, in the Clayton Act, by inserting, in effect, the words "assets as well as stock," so as to close the loophole by which mergers have been going on at a perfectly tremendous rate.

To make the story clear, I think it might be well to recall a bit of history. As we all know, when the Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, it was tried in section 2 of that statute to prohibit monopoly. The Supreme Court, in the *Northern Securities* case (193 U. S.), in 1904, ruled that the power of a holding company to suppress competition between two competing railroads was sufficient ground for its dissolution without the necessity of showing abuse of such power.

The remedy of dissolution was again applied by the Supreme Court in 1911, notably in the Standard Oil and the American Tobacco cases.

When Congress passed the Clayton Act of 1914, it accordingly prohibited, in section 7, corporate stock acquisitions, not only where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition in any line of commerce, or tend to create monopoly, but also where the effect "may be to substantially lessen competition between the corporation whose stock is acquired and the corporation making the acquisition."

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION POWERLESS

This in effect meant that if consolidations were consummated by transactions not involving a transfer of "stock or other share capital" a violation of sections 7 could not providently be charged. Thus despite the enormous wave of mergers that occurred after World War I, the Federal Trade Commission was powerless to direct divestiture by an acquiring corporation of the physical property and assets of the acquired corporation. Where it was feasible to lessen or eliminate competition by merely acquiring assets or property, the statute afforded no remedy.

Consequently the Commission proceeded only against firms which sought to lessen competition by purchase of stock. But here, too, by a five-to-four decision of the Supreme Court in 1926, the Commission found itself without power to act.

I desire to call the attention of the Members of the Senate and those who may read the RECORD to these two decisions. They may be found in Two Hundred and Seventy-second United States Reports, pages 559 to 562, and Two Hundred and Ninety-first United States Reports, pages 587 to 608. With Chief Justice Taft and Justices Brandeis, Holmes, and Stone dissenting, the Court ruled (*Swift & Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (272 U. S. 561–562 (1926)); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Western Meat Co.* (272 U. S. 559, 560); and *Thatcher Manufacturing Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (272 U. S. 554, 561)) that the Commission was without authority to require one who has secured actual title and possession of physical property before proceedings were begun against it, to dispose of the same, although secured through an unlawful purchase of stock.

In 1934 in the *Arrow-Hart and Hegeman Electric Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* case (291 U. S. 587–608), with Chief Justice Hughes and Justices Stone, Brandeis, and Cardozo dissenting, the Supreme Court, in effect, declared that the Commission must not only issue its complaint before the stock-acquiring corporation shall have used its voting power to acquire the assets of the acquired corporation—as previously held—but that the Commission in addition must have finished the process of causing the case to be tried, briefed, signed, and decided and must have actually issued its order of divestiture before the stock-acquiring corporation has used its voting power—if the order is not to be improvident.

Little wonder it is that the Federal Trade Commission since 1927 has consistenty recommended in its annual and special reports to Congress the amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act. In its annual reports for recent years, the Commission has again and again called attention to the unanimous endorsement of such recommendations by the Temporary National Economic Committee in its final report. That report was filed in March 1941. The war was hastening on; it sort of rang down the curtain, and nothing was done. The recommendation contained in that report was made after a public hearing at which the Federal Trade Commission appeared with its suggestion, and was subject to cross-examination by the members of the committee, which constituted not only members of the executive departments but also three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House. The recommendation was approved without objection on the part of any member.

TNEC RECOMMENDATIONS

The TNEC recommendations grew out of extensive hearings during which extensive figures were analyzed, compiled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, indicating the extent to which concentration had proceeded. As early as 1935, as shown by the Bureau's records, of all corporations reporting throughout the country, one-tenth of 1 percent of them owned 52 percent of the assets of all of them; less than 5 percent of all reporting corporations owned 87 percent of the assets of all of them; of all reporting corporations, one-tenth of 1 percent of them earned 50 percent of the net income of all of them; and of all manufacturing corporations reporting, less than 4 percent received 84 percent of the net profits of all of them. From 1919 to 1939, inclusive, 95,020 corporations have gone out of industry and commerce by the route of merger. This is at the average rate of more than 450 annually.

Since the report of the TNEC was written the increase in acquisitions has been marked. The rate of acquisitions

has increased until at the present time it is nearly five times the prewar figure and higher than at any time since 1931.

Moreover, the favored form of merger is by acquisition of assets. This is clearly shown by a Department of Commerce survey of some 1,800 recorded corporate acquisitions during the period January 1, 1940, to December 31, 1946. This survey limited solely to the field of manufacturing and mining, does not cover the retail or wholesale trades, service enterprises and other areas where chain stores, supermarkets, and the like have admittedly grown with startling rapidity. Nor does it include the mergers even in manufacturing and mining which for one reason or another failed to be noticed in the press or recorded in standard investment manuals—because relatively small or because their stocks and bonds, if existent, were not traded on the various securities' exchanges. Nevertheless in the reduced sample thus far scrutinized, nearly two-thirds of the mergers were effected by purchase of assets.

LITTLE BUSINESS DISAPPEARING

The characteristic feature of these 1,800 cases was the absorption of little firms by big ones. Indeed, one third were bought out by firms with assets in excess of $50,000,000 and another 40 percent by firms with assets ranging from five million to forty-nine million dollars.

About three-fifths or 60 percent of the acquired firms were engaged in the production of identical articles or products nearly identical and competitive with those of the large concern which gobbled them up. Such instances may be called horizontal mergers.

Some 15 percent were vertical mergers, representing acquisition of assets of firms at an earlier or later stage in the manufacturing process. Such acquisitions, as for example, the swallowing up of 85 percent of the tight cooperage capacity of the country by the Big Four in the liquor industry, often serve to deprive competitors of strategic supplies except at a monopoly price. Such mergers when carried forward to the fabrication of finished products, as for example the absorption in recent years of 87 percent of the steel drum and barrel manufacturing capacity of the country by the seven large basic steel producers, often narrow or deprive competitors of their market, compelling them to dispose of their product at prices monopolistically depressed.

UNRELATED MERGERS

Nearly 25 percent of the 1,800 cases of corporate acquisition represented conglomerate mergers, firms buying apparently unrelated companies, as for example, the Universal Match Co.'s purchase of a number of candy manufacturing companies. Such widespread entry into unrelated lines of manufacture is in part a result of the extraordinary accumulations of liquid capital in corporate treasuries as a result of operations during the war.

The rate at which corporations are being swallowed up in 1946 marks an all-time high during the last 15 years. It is five times that recorded in 1939, the last prewar year. Indeed, the rate of mergers has easily doubled since VJ-day. According to the records now being studied in the Department of Commerce, there were 49 mergers in the first quarter of 1945, 51 in the second, 78 in the third, and 142 in the fourth quarter of 1945. During the first quarter of 1946 there were 95; in the second, 132; in the third, 113; and so far reported in the last 3 months of 1946, a total of 83 mergers. In 1939, by contrast, the number of recorded mergers never exceeded 25 in any 3-month period. In the 2-year period some $4,100,000,000, or close to 5 percent, of a total of $95,000,000,000 of capacity was merged or absorbed.

THE RESULT: MONOPOLY

As a result the monopoly problem in American industry is today more serious and widespread than at any time since the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890. Then mergers were so unusual that each one attracted widespread attention and aroused great public apprehension. Today they have become so commonplace that more than half even fail to be noticed or recorded.

By such mergers, control is achieved over available sources of raw materials, the fructifying flow of technology, research, and know-how is congealed; channels and methods of distribution are restricted; and freedom of enterprise abolished. A handful of dominant firms determine who may enter the market, what shall be produced, how markets shall be divided, and what quantities of products may be bought or sold, to whom, and on what terms.

Among the primary aims of such powerful mergers is the control of dynamic sectors of technology, thereby preventing the emergence of competitive enterprise in such important areas as chemistry, electronics, light metals, pharmaceutical products, and other industries which hold great promise for the creation of new products, new services, and new types of employment and investment.

Mr. President, in the view of these incidents it is perfectly futile to think that there can be any support of little business by Government loans. We turn to the RFC, we turn to the Department of Agriculture, we turn to Government agencies and we try to make these agencies, through dipping into the Federal Treasury, support little business. They support them only for a time, until the money is spent, and then monopoly comes in, the concentration proceeds, and Members of the Senate and Members of the House elected to represent States and districts, find the trade and commerce of their States and districts falling under the control of huge national enterprises which have grown up by virtue of monopolistic merger and which now hold much more than one-half of all the economic assets of the Nation. It is perfectly futile, Mr. President, to think of preserving free enterprise without stopping the cause which is continually undermining free enterprise.

With the relaxation of war price controls the monopoly problem becomes even more accentuated. The antitrust laws are the principal check against unwarranted price increases imposed by monopoly groups. Larger members of many important industries have recently announced simultaneously very substantial price increases. These price rises in many cases are the result of concerted action among the dominant producers. Even in normal times prices are not flexible but are high and inelastic, and the impact of low profits during depressions falls most heavily on small businessmen and wage earners who are least able to withstand a depression.

ANTITHESIS OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Thus concentration is the very antithesis of the free-enterprise system. It leads inevitably to the elimination of small business, the disappearance of competition, the fixing of prices, the restriction of production, and the creation of unemployment. It causes an uneconomic allocation of productive resources and prevents the full utilization of productive capacity. It obstructs adjustment to economic change and contributes to general industrial instability. Concentration blocks the possibility of improving the standard of living by failing fully to develop technological innovations. It attempts to control and limit technical experimentation and to withhold the benefits of increased production from workers and consumers, thus aggravating inequalities in the distribution of income.

THE REMEDY—ENACT S. 104

S. 104 is designed to prevent monopoly by preventing corporate mergers before they occur and before they reach the stage at which the public interest suffers. The public interest obviously suffers through the creation of consolidations of dominant power even before such power shall have been abused because—

First. After the formation of the corporation has been permitted, it is often too late to dissolve it for subsequent misconduct, or if this is still possible it is fraught with very great difficulty.

Second. The very existence of the power to dominate and oppress is generally a sufficient reason for practically helpless competitors to refrain from offering active competition.

Hence the remedy proposed by the bill is one of prevention rather than cure for corporate consolidation.

As already pointed out, the principle of prevention, as distinguished from cure, was originally designed to be the controlling principle in section 7. This was recognized by the Circuit Court of Appeals in *Swift & Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (8 Fed. (2d) 595 (1925)). The Court there said that Congress need not wait to act "only when the child has grown to the stature of a giant," that it may act to "anticipate or prevent any unfortunate situation as well as deal with one that existed," that the section "sought by means which the Congress deemed expedient and effective to prevent a condition which the Sherman law was designed to overcome when once it existed," and that the means adopted were appropriate because "if competing corporations may not consolidate, it naturally follows that it will be difficult

for one corporation ever to monopolize an industry." The proposed bill would be only a return to the principles thus judicially enunciated.

The only protection the public has against unreasonable price increases for industrial commodities is the impersonal regulative effect of competition. When that is gone the next logical step is control of such prices by administrative action—when that happens, free private enterprise will have disappeared. It is, therefore, imperative to preserve whatever competition now exists. S. 104 will help toward that end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the dissenting opinion which was written by Mr. Justice Brandeis in the case of Federal Trade Commission against Western Meat Co., in which Chief Justice Taft concurred.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Justice Brandeis, dissenting in part:

"In my opinion, the purpose of paragraph 7 of the Clayton Act was not, as stated by the Court, merely 'to prevent continued holding of the stock and the peculiar evils incident thereto.' It was also to prevent the peculiar evils resulting therefrom. The institution of a proceeding before the Commission under paragraph 7 does not operate, like an injunction, to restrain a company from acquiring the assets of the controlled corporation by means of the stock held in violation of that section. If, in spite of the commencement of such a proceeding, the company took a transfer of the assets, the Commission could, I assume, require a retransfer of the assets, so as to render effective the order of divestiture of the stock. I see no reason why it should not, likewise, do this although the company succeeded in securing the assets of the controlled corporation before the Commission instituted a proceeding. Support for this conclusion may be found in paragraph 11, which provides for action by the Commission whenever it 'shall have reason to believe that any person is violating or has violated any of the provisions of the earlier sections.'

"I think that the decrees in Nos. 213 and 231 should be affirmed."

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Holmes, and Mr. Justice Stone join in this dissent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of Senate bill 104 as it has been amended.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 104) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 7 and 11 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (U. S. C. Annotated, title 15, sec. 18), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. That no corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission shall acquire the whole or any part of the assets of another corporation engaged also in commerce, where the effect of such acquisition may be (1) to substantially lessen competition between the corporation whose stock is, or whose assets are, so acquired and the corporation making the acquisition, or (2) to restrain such commerce in any section or community, or (3) to tend to create a monopoly of any line of commerce.

"No corporation shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital, or shall acquire the whole or any part of the assets of one or more corporations engaged in commerce, where the effect of such acquisition, of such stocks or assets, or of the use of such stock by the voting or granting of proxies or otherwise, may be (1) to substantially lessen competition (a) between such corporation or corporations or any of them, whose stock or other share capital or assets are so acquired, and any other corporation, engaged in commerce, owned or controlled by the acquiring corporation, or (b) between any two or more of the corporations whose stock or assets are so acquired; or (2) to restrain such commerce in any section or community; or (3) to tend to create a monopoly of any line of commerce.

"This section shall not apply to corporations purchasing such stock solely for investment and not using the same by voting or otherwise to bring about, or in attempting to bring about, the substantial lessening of competition. Nor shall anything contained in this section prevent a corporation engaged in commerce from causing the formation of subsidiary corporations for the actual carrying on of their immediate lawful business, or the natural and legitimate branches or extensions thereof, or from owning and holding all or a part of the stock of such subsidiary corporations, when the effect of such formation is not to substantially lessen competition.

"Nor shall anything herein contained be construed to prohibit any common carrier subject to the laws to regulate commerce from aiding in the construction of branches or short lines so located as to become feeders to the main line of the company so aiding in such construction or from acquiring or owning all or any part of the stock of such branch lines, nor to prevent any such common carrier from acquiring and owning all or any part of the stock of a branch or short line constructed by an independent company where there is no substantial competition between the company owning the branch line so constructed and the company owning the main line acquiring the property or an interest therein, nor to prevent such common carrier from extending any of its lines through the medium of the acquisition of stock or otherwise of any other common carrier where there is no substantial competition between the company extending its lines and the company whose stock, property, or an interest therein is so acquired.

"Nothing contained in this section shall be held to affect or impair any right heretofore legally acquired: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be held or construed to authorize or make lawful anything heretofore prohibited or made illegal by the antitrust laws, nor to exempt any person from the penal provisions thereof or the civil remedies therein provided.

"Nothing contained in this section shall apply to transactions duly consummated pursuant to authority given by the Congress to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Reserve Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, or the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"SEC. 11. That authority to enforce compliance with sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of this act by the persons respectively subject thereto is hereby vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission where applicable to common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; in the Federal Communications Commission where applicable to common carriers engaged in wire or radio communication or radio transmission of energy; in the Civil Aeronautics Authority where applicable to air carriers and foreign air carriers subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; in the Federal Reserve Board where applicable to banks, banking associations, and trust companies; and in the Federal Trade Commission where applicable to all other character of commerce to be exercised as follows:

"Whenever the commission, authority, or board vested with jurisdiction thereof shall have reason to believe that any person is violating or has violated any of the provisions of sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of this act, it shall issue and serve upon such person a complaint stating its charges in that respect, and containing a notice of a hearing upon a day and at a place therein fixed at least 30 days after service of said complaint. The person so complained of shall have the right to appear at the place and time so fixed and show cause why an order should not be entered by the commission, authority, or board requiring such person to cease and desist from the violation of the law so charged in said complaint. Any person may make application, and upon good cause shown may be allowed by the commission, authority, or board, to intervene and appear in said proceeding by counsel or in person. The testimony in any such proceeding shall be reduced to writing and filed in the office of the commission, authority, or board. If upon such hearing the commission, authority, or board, as the case may be, shall be of the opinion that any of the provisions of said sections have been or are being violated, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts, and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such violations, and divest itself of the stock, or other share capital, or assets held, or rid itself of the directors chosen contrary to the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of this act, if any there be, in the manner and within the time fixed by said order. Until a transcript of the record in such hearing shall have been filed in a circuit court of appeals of the United States, as hereinafter provided, the commission, authority, or board may at any time, upon such notice, and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any report or any order made or issued by it under this section.

"If such person fails or neglects to obey such order of the commission, authority, or board while the same is in effect, the commission, authority, or board may apply to the circuit court of appeals of the United States, within any circuit where the violation complained of was or is being committed or where such person resides or carries on business, for the enforcement of its order, and shall certify and file with its application a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all the testimony taken and the report and order of the commission, authority, or board. Upon such filing of the application and transcript the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree affirming, modifying, or setting aside the order of the commission, authority, or board. The findings of the commission, authority, or board as to the facts, if supported by testimony, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the commission, authority, or board, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the commission, authority, or board and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The commission, authority, or board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken,

and it shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by testimony, shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order, with the return of such additional evidence. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code.

"Any party required by such order of the commission, authority, or board to cease and desist from a violation charged may obtain a review of such order in said circuit court of appeals by filing in the court a written petition praying that the order of the commission, authority, or board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the commission, authority, or board, and thereupon the commission, authority, or board forthwith shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record as hereinbefore provided. Upon the filing of the transcript the court shall have the same jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify the order of the commission, authority, or board as in the case of an application by the commission, authority, or board for the enforcement of its order, and the findings of the commission, authority, or board as to the facts, if supported by testimony, shall in like manner be conclusive.

"The jurisdiction of the circuit court of appeals of the United States to enforce, set aside, or modify orders of the commission, authority, or board shall be exclusive.

"Such proceedings in the circuit court of appeals shall be given precedence over other cases pending therein, and shall be in every way expedited. No order of the commission, authority, or board or the judgment of the court to enforce the same shall in anywise relieve or absolve any person from any liability under the antitrust acts.

"Complaints, orders, and other processes of the commission, authority, or board under this section may be served by anyone duly authorized by the commission, authority, or board, either (a) by delivering a copy thereof to the person to be served or to a member of the partnership to be served, or to the president, secretary, or other executive officer or a director of the corporation to be served; or (b) by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of such person; or (c) by registering and mailing a copy thereof addressed to such person at his principal office or place of business. The verified return by the person so serving said complaint, order, or other process setting forth the manner of said service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt for said complaint, order, or other process registered and mailed as aforesaid shall be proof of the service of the same."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frank W. Sommer, of Minnesota, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert E. Arnold to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am obliged again to ask that that nomination be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express the hope that this nomination may be considered and disposed of at the next executive session. The nomination was unanimously reported by the Committee on Finance. As I recall, no one appeared before the full committee or the subcommittee in opposition to the nomination. If it is to be delayed any longer, it seems to me that some legitimate reason should be given for the delay. I hope that when we have another executive session we may dispose of the nomination.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have much sympathy with what the Senator from Kentucky has said. The nomination has been passed over several times. I agree with him that it ought to be brought to a conclusion at some time in the near future, and I shall cooperate in such ways as I can to bring about that result.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John A. O'Donnell to be a member of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask that the nomination of Mr. Herman B. Baruch be again passed over, and I make that request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make the same observations in connection with this nomination that I made in regard to the nomination of Herbert E. Arnold to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas. Continual postponement of action by the Senate on this nomination tends to raise doubt in the minds of the people as to what the reason is. I certainly hope that this nomination will not be delayed any longer than the next session when executive business is transacted.

Mr. WHITE. I share the views expressed by the Senator from Kentucky with respect to the nomination. I hope it will be disposed of at the next session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is a substantial number of appointments in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations under that heading be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. McCarthy to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Shelton to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Charles Dennis to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is a substantial number of what I take to be routine nominations in the Public Health Service. I ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate with respect to nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what was done with the nomination of Mr. Herman B. Baruch.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination was passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Was there any agreement as to when it would be considered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was no such agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I made the observation, when the nomination was called and it went over by request, that it should not be postponed any longer than the next executive session. The majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] expressed sympathy with that viewpoint. I hope it may be disposed of at the next session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly join the Senator from Kentucky. Mr. Baruch is a native of South Carolina, and I hope the nomination will be taken up at the next executive session.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 17, 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Frank W. Sommer, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the District of Minnesota. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17, 1947:

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

John A. O'Donnell to be a member of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 1 AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Paul T. Culbertson

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2 AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James F. Hodgson
Frederick B. Lyon
Livingston T. Merchant

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Frederic P. Bartlett — Jack K. McFall
Robert G. Cleveland — Andreas G. Ronhovde
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr. — E. Paul Tenney

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert L. Clifford — Leslie L. Rood
Edward T. Lampson — Henry W. Spielman
Thomas C. Mann — Murat W. Williams

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5, CONSUL, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William J. Porter

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Alfred P. Dennis

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Joseph J. Jova — Herbert S. Weast
Richard B. Kline — C. Hoyt Price
Edward N. McCully — Robert C. Wysong
Raymond W. T. Pracht

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William T. McCarthy to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

Robert E. Shelton to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma.

J. Charles Dennis to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

To be scientist (major), effective date of oath of office

Joseph M. Bobbitt

To be senior assistant dental surgeon, effective November 18, 1946

David B. Scott

To be assistant dietitian, effective date of oath of office

Engla J. Anderson

To be junior assistant dietitian, effective date of oath of office

Ruth E. Corcoran

To be medical directors, effective date indicated

Calvin C. Applewhite, October 1, 1946.
Frank V. Meriwether, October 1, 1946.
Roy E. Bodet, October 1, 1946.
Walter G. Nelson, October 1, 1946.
Albert E. Russell, October 22, 1946.
Ralph D. Lillie, October 25, 1946.

To be senior surgeons, effective date indicated

William Hendon Gordon, November 1, 1946.
Albert T. Morrison, February 1, 1947.

To be surgeons, effective date indicated

Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1946.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1946.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1946.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1946.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1946.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1946.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1946.
Roger E. Heering, December 3, 1946.
Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1946.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1946.
John W. Cronin, January 1, 1947.
Edgar W. Moreland, January 1, 1947.
Jonathan B. Peebles, January 1, 1947.
Havelock F. Fraser, January 1, 1947.

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

Albert N. Sarwold, July 1, 1943.
Ardell B. Colyar, November 9, 1946.
Isaac M. Zigler, January 1, 1947.
J. Howard Beard, Jr., January 1, 1947.

To be dental surgeon, effective date indicated

Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1946.

To be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Earl C. Hewitt, July 10, 1946.
Ceril S. Scheppegrell, July 11, 1946.

To be sanitary engineers, effective date indicated

Franz J. Maier, January 6, 1945.
Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1946.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective date indicated

Roscoe H. Goeke, February 8, 1946.
Chris A. Hansen, June 28, 1946.
Richard J. Hammerstrom, August 8, 1941.
John R. Thoman, February 15, 1947.

To be temporary medical director, effective date of assumption of duties

Victor H. Vogel

To be temporary medical director, effective date indicated

Ralph B. Snavely, October 21, 1946.

To be temporary senior surgeons, effective date indicated

Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1946.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1946.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1946.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1946.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1946.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1946.
John E. Dunn, December 1, 1946.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1946.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1946.
Robert J. Anderson, December 3, 1946.
Havelock F. Fraser, January 1, 1947.
Edgar W. Moreland, January 1, 1947.
Jonathan B. Peebles, January 1, 1947.

To be temporary surgeons, effective date indicated

David E. Price, October 21, 1946.
Paul W. Lucas, October 16, 1946.
Daniel MacKillop, October 16, 1946.
William J. McAnally, Jr., November 20, 1946.
Harry Leaffer, November 4, 1946.
Nunizo J. Carrozzo, January 1, 1947.
W. Clark Cooper, January 1, 1947.
Clarence Koolker, January 1, 1947.
Roy Hertz, January 1, 1947.
Harold J. Magnuson, January 1, 1947.
Charles C. Shepard, January 1, 1947.
Llewellyn E. Kling, January 1, 1947.
Wayne W. Carpenter, January 1, 1947.
Timothy J. Haley, January 1, 1947.
Linden E. Johnson, January 1, 1947.
Samuel C. Ingraham, January 1, 1947.
Russell I. Pierce, January 1, 1947.
Donald J. Birmingham, January 1, 1947.
Leonard M. Schuman, January 1, 1947.
Robert T. Potter, January 1, 1947.
Roland K. Iverson, January 1, 1947.

To be temporary senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

J. Howard Beard, Jr., July 12, 1946.
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr., January 1, 1947.
Robert L. Morrison, January 1, 1947.
Dean W. Geheber, January 1, 1947.

To be temporary senior dental surgeon, effective date indicated

Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1946.

To be temporary dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Joseph G. Yount, August 27, 1946.
Ceril S. Scheppegrell, October 16, 1946.

To be temporary sanitary engineers, effective date indicated

Russell W. Hart, June 27, 1946.
Paul C. Henderson, June 27, 1946.
Malcolm C. Hope, October 21, 1946.
James G. Terrill, Jr., November 25, 1946.
Richard T. Page, January 1, 1947.
John S. Wiley, January 1, 1947.
August T. Rossano, January 1, 1947.

To be temporary senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective date indicated

Chris A. Hansen, June 27, 1946.
Arthur H. Neill, July 11, 1946.

To be temporary senior pharmacist, effective date indicated

Thomas A. Foster, November 16, 1946.

To be temporary scientists, effective date indicated

Clyde M. Berry, January 1, 1947.
Lewis J. Cralley, January 1, 1947.

To be temporary senior nurse officers, effective date indicated

Rosalie I. Peterson, November 27, 1946.
Florence H. Callahan, December 1, 1946.
Mary D. Forbes, December 2, 1946.
Marion Ferguson, December 6, 1946.
Mary E. Corcoran, December 18, 1946.
Lily C. Hagerman, January 1, 1947.
Rosemary McCann, January 11, 1947.

To be temporary nurse officers, effective date indicated

Elsie T. Berdan, November 13, 1946.
Esther A. Garrison, November 7, 1946.
M. Constance Long, November 6, 1946.
Ruth L. Johnson, November 7, 1946.
Zella Bryant, November 1, 1946.

To be temporary nurse officer, effective date of oath of office

Jane E. Taylor

To be temporary senior assistant nurse officers, effective date indicated

Gladys M. Ray, December 15, 1946.
Loretta C. Parsons, January 1, 1947.
Ruth Henton, January 1, 1947.
Jeanette E. Westlake, January 1, 1947.
Loretta M. Schroll, January 12, 1947.
Madge M. Neill, January 18, 1947.
Gladys C. Guydes, January 19, 1947.
Rose G. Ernsberger, January 20, 1947.
Edna L. Easterday, January 22, 1947.
Josephine T. Lamb, January 22, 1947.
Lucile B. Ross, January 25, 1947.
Mary Raprich, January 27, 1947.
Amy L. Cawley, January 1, 1947.
Viola E. Householder, January 1, 1947.
Edith M. Hettema, January 1, 1947.
Edith K. Davenport, January 1, 1947.
Lena V. Boothe, January 1, 1947.

To be temporary senior assistant dietitian, effective date indicated

Myrtle M. Morris, January 1, 1947.

To be surgeons

John R. Heller, Jr.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr.

To be temporary senior sanitary engineer

Franz J. Maier

To be temporary nurse officer

Louise O. Waagen

To be senior assistant dental surgeon, effective date of oath of office

Maurice S. Rodgers

To be temporary senior nurse officer

Alice L. Rorrison

To be temporary nurse officer

Amy E. Viglione

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble, therefore will we not fear. O Shepherd of Israel who dost neither slumber nor sleep, we praise Thee that we are Thy people. Be Thou our strength and shield beside the still waters, through pastures green, and in the valley where deep shadows lie.

God of our fathers, that we may escape error, enable us to find our shelter in Thy firm and changeless truth that will bear us through the surges of debate. Bestow upon us the confidence of reason and understanding, clinging to that faith which gladdens the solution of our problems. Armed with new hope and courage, unbroken and undivided, sustain our wills and make our hands and feet swift to work and to walk in Thy ways.

Thou who didst say "I will never leave nor forsake thee," we lift our hearts to Thee in gratitude for the dear mother of our President, whose love and faith make light of pain and loss. May she be blest with great comfort, rest of mind and body, and with early recovery. In our Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 13, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. Railroad Retirement Board.
6. United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on the Consent Calendar today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 101) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 101, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers the following Members of the House: Mr. BISHOP, of Illinois, and Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey.

THE LATE FRANK H. FOSS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to have to announce to the House the passing at his home in Fitchburg, Mass., on Saturday, February 15, of the Honorable Frank H. Foss, a former distinguished, outstanding, and beloved Member of this body. Undoubtedly there are many Members who recall his service in the Congress between the years of 1924 and 1935.

Congressman Foss, who was 81 years of age at the time of his death, enjoyed a long and successful career in private business and public life.

Congressman Foss was born in Augusta, Maine, on September 20, 1865, and his illustrious career has paralleled the tremendous growth and development of our Nation since the Civil War. In 1884 he joined with his father in the contracting business of O. F. Foss & Son, and subsequently his firm, under his own management and direction, successfully completed a large number of industrial and public buildings in his adopted city of Fitchburg and other parts of Worcester County. Because of the high esteem and trust in which he was held by his fellow citizens, he was selected for and served as director and trustee of several financial institutions. His fraternal affiliations were numerous, and he achieved high posts of honor and dignity in several of our leading Massachusetts organizations of fraternal, athletic, and civil character.

My respected predecessor as representative of the people of the Third Massachusetts District served in public office for over 28 years, successively holding membership in the Fitchburg City Council, the board of aldermen, board of city water commissioners, and ultimately mayor of Fitchburg. He later served with distinction as chairman of the Massachusetts Republican State Committee and in that capacity was closely associated with our own most esteemed present Speaker of the House. He was a close friend, confidant, and trusted adviser of a great son of Massachusetts, the late President Calvin Coolidge.

Elected to Congress to represent the Third Congressional District in 1924, he served for five full terms, demonstrating throughout his tenure great ability, industry, devotion to duty, and zeal for the public interest.

He was a man of determined convictions and he never permitted himself to be swayed in his judgments by public clamor or expediency. He rendered loyal and faithful service to all his constituents regardless of race, color, or creed; he was friendly and approachable, democratic in his ways, generous in his impulses, and always willing to assist the worthy and the needy in time of trouble and strife. He was beloved by all those who knew him and by his colleagues who served with him in this body. He was a man of character and resolution who served his city, State, and Nation with marked devotion to duty.

His loving and gracious wife, a son, and two daughters survive him and we all join them in mourning the loss of a faithful public servant, a loving husband, and a devoted father. As the one who now is privileged to represent the district which Congressman Foss so ably represented for so many years, moved by a sense of profound regret at his passing, I take this occasion to express my sincere and most heartfelt sympathy—a sympathy shared by all of us in this body—to his family and close friends for the great and irreparable loss which they have suffered. May they find true consolation in his long life and good works and may he, with God's grace, find rest and peace in his heavenly reward.

I ask unanimously consent to include as part of my remarks an excerpt from the Worcester Telegram containing the sorrowful news of his death and a detailed account of his life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

FRANK H. FOSS DIES SUDDENLY IN FITCHBURG—EX-CONGRESSMAN AND FORMER CHAIRMAN OF GOP STATE COMMITTEE

FITCHBURG, Sunday.—Frank H. Foss, 81, of 68 Arlington Street, former Congressman from the Third Massachusetts District, former chairman of the Republican State Committee and a member of Wiley & Foss, building contractors for 54 years, died suddenly last night in his home.

Mr. Foss served in public office for 28 years, retiring from public life on January 1, 1935, when he was succeeded as Congressman by Joseph E. Casey, of Clinton. He was a member of the Fitchburg City Council in 1906–8 and of the board of aldermen from 1909 to 1912.

He served as city water commissioner in 1914 to 1916 in which year he was elected

mayor, defeating John Moran. He was reelected in 1918 over the late Peter F. Ward.

GOP CHAIRMAN

During the 4 years following his terms as mayor, he was chairman of the Republican State Committee. He was first elected to Congress in 1924 and took office the following year. He served five consecutive 2-year terms in that office.

As a Congressman he started the practice of meeting his constituents in their respective cities and towns at least once every year. In addition to that he furnished thousands of pamphlets on farming subjects through the Department of Agriculture.

The former Congressman was highly successful as a builder throughout New England and especially in Worcester County. He first became affiliated with Wiley & Foss in the late 1800's.

In 1884 he became associated with his father in business under the company name of O. F. Foss & Son, masons and contractors. This enterprise continued for 8 years, after which both father and son were induced to locate in Medfield. The former Congressman became foreman for Darling Bros., leading contractors of Worcester and Medfield at that time. The late Walter K. Wiley, who with Mr. Foss headed Wiley & Foss, died 12 years ago.

Among the larger buildings erected by Wiley & Foss were Fitchburg Paper Co. mill No. 1; Crocker Burbank & Co. Association mills Nos. 1 and 8; Shirreff's Worsted Co. weave shed; nurses home at Burbank Hospital; Fidelity Cooperative Bank; Safety Fund National Bank; Worcester County Tuberculosis Hospital at West Boylston; Simonds Manufacturing Co.; Worcester County National Bank here; Leominster Public Library; Doyle works of the DuPont Co. at Leominster; F. A. Whitney Carriage Co., at Leominster, the residence of Bernard W. Doyle in Leominster; and Winchendon Electric Light Co.

Mr. Foss was the son of the late Lorrin F. and Hannah H. Foss. He was born in Augusta, Maine, on September 20, 1865. He obtained his education in the public schools of Maine and at Kents Hill Seminary.

He was a director of the Fidelity Cooperative Bank, and a trustee and a member of the board of investment of the Fitchburg Savings Bank.

AFFILIATIONS

Fraternally he was a member of Aurora Lodge, A. F. and A. M.; Thomas Chapter, R. A. M.; a past commander of Jerusalem Commandery, K. T.; Massachusetts Consistory, Ancient Scottish Rite, in which he held the thirty-second degree; and Aleppo Temple of Shriners in Boston. He also was a member of the former Masonic Club, Fitchburg Lodge of Elks, Boston Athletic Association, Fay Club, Oak Hill Country Club, and was a past noble grand of the Odd Fellows at Livermore Falls, Maine. He attended the First Parish (Universalist-Unitarian) Church.

SURVIVORS

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Sibyl S. (Alden) Foss; a son, Ray A. Foss, of Andover; and two daughters, Mrs. Ruth H. Rieger, of New York City, and Mrs. Dorothy S. Ringquist, of Needham.

Funeral arrangements, in charge of H. L. Sawyer Co., are incomplete.

THE LATE ALLEN T. TREADWAY

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I announce to the House the death of a former Member of this body, Hon. Allen T. Treadway, of Stockbridge, Mass. He died at his home here early yesterday afternoon.

For 16 consecutive terms, Mr. Treadway represented the district I now have the honor of representing, the First Congressional District of Massachusetts. I know that all who had the privilege of serving with him here have learned of his passing with sincere sorrow.

Mr. Treadway was born in Stockbridge, Mass., on September 16, 1867. He was a graduate of Amherst College in the class of 1886, and received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Amherst in 1934.

On October 25, 1893, he married Sylvia Shares, who died on May 22, 1943.

He was a member of both the House of Representatives and of the Senate in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and was president of the senate in 1909, 1910, and 1911.

He was first elected in 1912 to the Sixty-third Congress.

In 1944, during his sixteenth term in this body, he announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. Treadway served with great distinction as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and, at the time of his retirement, he was the ranking minority member of that committee.

He was a loved and respected citizen of Massachusetts. His service to his district, his State, and his Nation marked him as one of Massachusetts' truly great and honored sons. A host of friends mourn his passing.

He is survived by a son, Heaton I. Treadway. I know that this House wishes to express its profound sympathy to him and to join with all Mr. Treadway's friends in this brief tribute to his memory.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that Allen Treadway and I entered the House of Representatives together in the Sixty-third Congress. He was the type of man whom you could trust and whom you could be a friend to. He was in the full sense of the word a gentleman. I deeply mourn his passing, as I always looked upon him as an old, revered, and trusted friend.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the occasion pass without commenting on the passing of two of my old and dear friends. I am now the dean of the Massachusetts delegation. Congressman Allen T. Treadway was dean of our delegation for many years. He served for more than 30 years. I was here with him for some 20 years. The memory of both these men from Massachusetts will long remain with me as a cherished memory. Many of you here present must recall Allen Treadway. How big and strong he was. He strode among us confident and unafraid. He won and merited the esteem of the membership on both sides of the aisle. May the sunset of his life be the beckoning of a glorious dawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I always regret keenly the news of the death of a former Member who has served in this body. It is seldom that Members inform the House on the same day of the death of two former Members, and still more rare is the occasion when Members rise to inform the House of the death of two former Members coming from the same State.

Over the week end, our late colleagues, Frank Foss and Allen Treadway, both of Massachusetts, passed on. I served with both of them. Both were outstanding citizens of Massachusetts, and both were great Americans. I served 10 years on the Committee on Ways and Means with my late beloved friend, Allen Treadway, a man of sincerity, a man noble in character, and of honest, determined convictions, who quickly made and held friends despite honest disagreement between him and others on public questions and legislative matters. Frank Foss was one of the sweetest men I ever met. He was humble, sincere, conscientious, and devoted to his duties. This is a sad day for Massachusetts when in this body there is announced the loss of two such distinguished sons and citizens who, in their day, served so well in this body and who left their imprint upon the legislative pages of our country—an imprint of such favorable nature that it will last forever.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a very sad day for Massachusetts. In fact, for the entire Congress, to have lost two men of such sterling character; men who have been an inspiration for so many years, not only to Members of Congress but to the State and to the Nation.

There are many of us in the House who served with Allen Treadway and with Frank Foss. Their passing is a personal loss. My memory of Allen Treadway goes back to 1912 when he was elected to the Congress of the United States. He and my late husband were elected to the Congress the same year. They were very close and very dear friends. To my husband and to me, he was a wise counselor. He was a great fighter for our State, a great fighter for our Nation. Untiring in his efforts to protect the workers and the industries, they owe much of their progress to him. I never knew of a finer friend anywhere in the world. He was a devoted husband through his wife's long and serious illness. Those of us who served with Mr. Treadway remember his wordy battles with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. They were strong fights, each fighting for his own belief, but always good-natured and friendly. They were very firm friends.

Allen Treadway, kind, generous, he was a splendid host, a great statesman, a great patriot, and a great churchman. What more can one say of anyone?

As for Frank Foss, everybody loved him. He represented every person in his district, from the humblest to the highest. He came to Congress in the Sixty-ninth Congress. He had done countless favors for persons as chairman of the Republican State Committee. He was unfailingly courteous and cooperative. He was a great Republican and a great American.

Massachusetts and the Nation have lost two splendid, loyal citizens.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, all America joins with the great State of Massachusetts today in mourning the passing of two great Americans, Allen T. Treadway and Frank Foss, former Members of this body.

I perhaps knew Mr. Treadway the better because of having served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for 10 years. I might say, parenthetically, that no man has ever served on that committee so long without becoming chairman, but it was altogether due to the natural processes of promotion as they exist in this body. He was in every way equipped for that position. Indeed, he would have made an outstanding presiding officer.

Mr. Treadway was an outstanding American. I like to think of him as being down in the well of the House fighting with that indomitable spirit for the cause in which he was enlisted, in which he always believed. It was a mental treat to the Members of this House when the chairman of the committee, that other great American, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr DOUGHTON] and Mr. Treadway were on opposing sides. I like to think of them as standing up, man to man, each unafraid, each thoroughly convinced of the justice of his cause, neither giving an inch. To me those contests were always inspiring; and I may say that although they had many a hard battle together they remained to the very end the closest of friends. Great men are that way, they do not carry pettiness and grudges.

It is regretted that no member of the Ways and Means Committee will be able to leave his duties here to attend the last services of that great American to be held on Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 at his home in Stockbridge, but the legislative program being what it is we must remain here. I do, however, wish to take this occasion to assure the survivors of both Mr. Treadway and Mr. Foss that we grieve with them in this sad hour and that we shall always cherish the memory of those two great Americans with whom it was a privilege to have served.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a giant oak has fallen. Hon. Allen T. Treadway, a former Member of this House, has passed to his reward. He died yesterday at his home in this city.

It was my privilege to serve with this great man and true American for more than a quarter of a century in the House of Representatives.

No man ever served his constituents and his country in a legislative body with greater fidelity than did Allen Treadway.

He was loved by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle because he was a lovable man. The affection in which he was held in his congressional district was an inspiration to all who ever attended one of the great annual meetings in his district.

Allen Treadway sprang from forebears who not only believed in the fundamentals of liberty but from earliest times fought to maintain these principles.

I want to illustrate the courageous character of the forebears of the congressional district which Allen T. Treadway represented for more than 32 years. It was strikingly demonstrated the extent to which these solid old New England farmers in the early days insisted upon their rights. It was in Berkshire County, where the early residents—farmers chiefly comprising then the whole western part of Massachusetts—would not permit the courts to sit in that county until the people of the State should adopt a constitution prescribing a bill of rights which the courts might enforce. This was the period from 1775 to 1780.

Here is the resolution adopted at that time by the citizens of Pittsfield:

> Every man, by nature, has the seeds of tyranny deeply implanted within him.

Said the memorial of the town of Pittsfield:

> Knowing the strong bias of human nature to tyranny and despotism, we have nothing else in view but to provide for posterity against the wanton exercise of power, which cannot otherwise be done than by the formation of a fundamental constitution. Let it not be said by future posterity that in this great, this noble, this glorious contest, we made no provision against tyranny among ourselves.

Whenever I think of my good friend, Allen Treadway, and his service to his country, I shall recall these words:

> That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country—that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne, crown, and scepter of a nation is not an aristocracy of blood, not an aristocracy of fashion, not an aristocracy of talent only; it is an aristocracy of character. This is the true heraldry of man.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his son and his other surviving relatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if I were to live a thousand years I would never forget Allen Treadway. Someone has said that "an honest man is the noblest work of God." I saw Allen Treadway put to the test in a matter in which I was deeply interested.

As you know, I have led the fight for rural electrification for the last 12 years. I would like to leave as my monument cheap electricity in every farm home in America.

In 1938 we were lagging behind practically every other civilized country in the world in rural electrification. Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified; we had about 10 percent. Germany had 90 percent. Italy and France had 94 percent of their farm homes electrified.

We were passing what we called a spending bill, or relief bill, amounting to billions of dollars, keeping people on the Federal pay roll, many of whom had never even sworn allegiance to this country. Points of order had been waived. I offered an amendment for the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification. Immediately there was terrific opposition from sources I was supprised at. I appealed to Allen Treadway to support me, and he did, although it affected his district very little, if any. When he walked down the line through the tellers he led many members of his own party, some of whom are looking at me now. We won by only 6 votes. If we had lost, rural electrification would have been practically dead.

There are 2,000,000 farm homes throughout the country that tonight will be lighted with electricity that would not have been so lighted, in all probability, if we had lost that crucial fight.

As the gentleman from New York has expressed it, what Allen Treadway took to be right he supported regardless of consequences. I lived to tell him many times of my gratitude. When I saw this morning an account of his passing I said, "There has gone a great American, and I thought of the words of William Cullen Bryant when he said:

> Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
> Hath swallowed up thy form; yet, on my heart
> Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given,
> And shall not soon depart.
>
> He who, from zone to zone,
> Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
> In the long way that I must tread alone,
> Will lead my steps aright.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad occasion for those of us who have the privilege of representing the State of Massachusetts in this House. I am sure it is a sad occasion also for those Members of the House who have had the privilege of serving in the years gone by with our beloved former colleagues who have departed.

Two great public servants, two great Americans, two great friends have left us on the same afternoon and gone to their just reward.

Allen Treadway gave 38 years of his life to the public service, 32 of them here on the floor of the House and as a member of the great Ways and Means Committee. He was a forceful speaker, an able legislator, and a man with human qualities which endeared him to friends on both sides of the aisle.

Frank Foss gave 29 years of his life to the public service, 10 of them here on the floor of this House and as a member

of the great Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. He was a man of experience and wisdom in public affairs, of sound judgment, and beloved by his wide circle of friends.

All those who served with these former colleagues here will recall their high character, their fine ability, and the splendid service which both of them rendered throughout the years to State and Nation.

Both of them were very close friends of mine. I shall miss each of them deeply.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this occasion should not pass without an expression of tributes that rise today from every heart to the stricken State of Massachusetts and its sorrowing delegation. Ever since the Boston Tea Party America has looked to Massachusetts for leadership and has uniformly found it.

Two of such leaders, who served so long and so well in this body, we mourn upon this occasion because of their passing to higher service. We join those two bereaved families in their tears, tinged with pride and gratitude because these two great Americans kept the faith. Thank God we looked to them, and not in vain. Thank God that the proud tradition of leadership and ability and dedication to the public service still obtains. So, we from every other State, joining our worthy colleagues from Massachusetts, bow to pay tribute to both past and present of Massachusetts.

Speaking as a humble Member of this House to the present distinguished Speaker of this body, until recently the minority leader, and to the distinguished minority whip now, formerly the majority leader, we remember again, as we did through the years when they were protagonists in leadership, par excellence, that whenever a Member of the House referred to either he said: "The gentleman from Massachusetts." With those gentlemen from Massachusetts, the distinguished dean of the Massachusetts delegation who is just now presiding, and with every other Member from that great State, all of us join in paying this tribute of love, admiration, and respect to the memory of these two great servants of mankind, and of their great State, and of this great Nation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I can add nothing to what has been said other than to pay my tribute of love and respect to the life and character of these two distinguished men. I knew them both well as my colleagues. I knew Mr. Treadway better. He was not only my colleague, he was more, he was my friend. He was at all times dependable. He was ever courteous. He never yielded when a principle was involved. He was a good Republican, but he had as many good Democratic friends as he had Republican friends. The reason, he was tolerant, fair, and respected the honest views of others. A polished gentleman of the old school he was a credit to the Congress. His passing is the country's loss.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It was my privilege to know Allen Treadway very well, both in this legislative body and outside. I admired, respected, and loved him. I believe he was one of the greatest orators we ever had on the floor of this House. He was one of the most effective and most efficient legislators. His passing grieved me beyond measure, but we can all be glad that such a fine citizen gave such a fruitful life to his country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my high privilege and honor to serve with both these splendid gentlemen. I knew Frank Foss well ever since he was in the House, and I served with Allen Treadway throughout all the 32 years he honored this House with his presence. They were both outstanding Americans, gentlemen, and scholars. They were Republicans, yes, but they were fair-minded, broad-minded, liberal-minded men, and always had the interest of their country at heart. Frequently, because of their fairness, I have regretted that they did not sit on this side of the aisle. Especially have I known Allen Treadway very well; he was a classmate of our late former Speaker, Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, and in that way I came into close contact with him and learned to know him intimately. In the passing of these two Massachusetts legislators who have served so well their State and their Nation, not only the people of Massachusetts but of all our country have lost two faithful and outstanding servants, and I join other Members in expressing to their families our profound sympathy. I regret their passing exceedingly, and I hope that every Member will try to emulate their splendid record in this House, in the interest of their State and in the interest of their country that they served so well.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. I should like to join my colleagues in the very sincere and deep tribute to the memory of two very distinguished and able gentlemen from Massachusetts. Over the last 25 years it has been my privilege to have known both Congressman Frank Foss and Congressman Allen Treadway. I am proud to say that I considered them close personal friends. In the history of Massachusetts many men have given devoted and far-reaching service to the Nation. These two gentlemen stand high in the roster. Both the State of Massachusetts and the Nation owe them a deep debt of gratitude, and their survivors may well feel an intense pride in their memory.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Words cannot adequately express my sorrow at the death of these two outstanding citizens of Massachusetts. When I returned yesterday from a few days' absence from the city, it was a tremendous shock to see two telegrams lying one upon the other, indicating the death of two of my warmest personal friends; two men who had much to do with the shaping of my own political career; two men who through the years had gained my respect and admiration. When I had served 3 years in the Massachusetts Legislature and 3 years in the State senate, I reached a determination to retire from politics and devote my efforts to a business career. For 4 years I was happy in business life. One morning I received a letter from our distinguished former colleague, Mr. Foss, who was then the chairman of the Republican State Committee. He asked me to come down to Boston and call upon him. I did not get around to it, and then 2 months later he telephoned and said, "I wish you would come down at the earliest possible date." At that time I had never seen Mr. Foss. I went to Boston, and he persuaded me to become the director of what was the rather difficult campaign of 1922. I tried to refuse but finally yielded when it was stated that the several factions in Massachusetts were all agreed upon my election.

The interview began a friendship which was never broken. Later we came to Congress together. We shared adjoining suites at the club and for 10 years he was to me like a big brother. He was one of the finest men who ever lived; a man of high integrity and fine character. He never made a promise that he did not keep. His word was as good as his bond. He was a real American in every sense of the word. His passing is a loss not only to Massachusetts, but to our country.

I first came to know Allen Treadway when I came to Congress in 1925. A warm personal friendship developed between us and it extended through the years. He was an able statesman, a student of fiscal affairs, and an expert on tariff and taxes. I have always cherished his loyalty as evidenced by his making the nominating speech when I was elected Republican leader. One cannot think of Allen Treadway without recalling his devotion to his invalid wife. Here his character as a kindly gentleman was remarkably revealed. His wife was for many years an invalid and he was always so tender and solicitous about her as to make a lasting impression. He was never too tired after a hard day's work to take Mrs. Treadway for a little automobile ride. He canceled many worth-while engagements so that he could bring a little comfort and sunshine to her life. Her death several years ago was really the breaking of a strong physique. America needs men like Mr. Treadway and Mr. Foss. They were the type of men who were responsible for the building of this Nation. We do well to pause for a few moments to pay a simple tribute to two great Americans, two splendid former Members of Congress,

two men for whom the world is better for their having lived.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, to few men in public life have come so many high honors as were bestowed upon former Congressman Allen Towner Treadway, of Stockbridge, Mass.

At the age of 19, he was graduated from Amherst College as the youngest member of his class of 1886. While in college, he engaged in athletic sports while maintaining high standing scholastically. His father was engaged in the management of hotels and it was natural that the son should join him in that business. Over a period of many years, Congressman Treadway operated successfully two of the best-known hotels in western Massachusetts. In the family tradition, these hotels are now operated by his only son, Heaton Treadway. To those of us who were fortunate enough to attend one of the many gatherings sponsored by Republican groups, and held more often at Heaton Hall, the memory of Allen Treadway as a wonderful host will always be with us.

He served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1904 and in the Massachusetts Senate from 1908 to 1911. During the last 3 years he was President of the Senate. He was followed to that high office by Calvin Coolidge, later President of the United States. One of the cherished possessions of Congressman Treadway was an autographed photograph from Mr. Coolidge, expressing the hope that he would carry on the duties of that high office of President of the Massachusetts Senate in as able a manner as they were conducted by Mr. Treadway.

Congressman Treadway was elected 16 times and served for 32 years as a Member of Congress. He became ranking minority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means. A man of sound judgment, wide experience and financial background, his speeches on the floor of this House at all times received the closest attention of our Members. To those of us who recall his powerful build and strong, vibrant voice, it is difficult to believe that he has passed away. During the years he served on this great committee, he contributed greatly to the successful conduct of its affairs and to the betterment of our Federal Government.

In private life, he was greatly beloved by all who knew him. He was a thirty-third degree Mason, and a member of many other fraternal and social organizations. His judgment was not only respected in Washington but in his home communities where he was a trustee of the Lee Savings Bank and a director in several insurance companies.

While he gained a high position in the councils of our Nation, he was even better known to the people of his district, the largest by far, in area, in Massachusetts. He was a friendly man. This was brought home to me particularly during a day spent with him campaigning in the Berkshire Hills. We started early in the morning by automobile, carrying a bountifully supplied lunch basket with us. We covered many towns during that day. In each town, we stopped not only at the stores but at the farmhouses. Invariably, the Congressman would call the men and women by their first names and they all addressed him as "Allen." I know of nothing which indicates more clearly the friendliness of Allen Treadway than the host of men and women in his home communities who knew him personally.

Through his death the Nation has lost one of its finest and ablest elder statesmen; Massachusetts, one of its great leaders; and western Massachusetts, its leading citizen.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Allen T. Treadway the country and particularly the great State of Massachusetts, has lost one of its outstanding and most beloved citizens.

The First Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts chose well when they elected Allen Treadway to represent them in the Congress of the United States. His service in this House, dating from March 4, 1913, and for the next succeeding 15 Congresses, speaks more eloquently as to the character of Mr. Treadway than feeble words of mine can express.

He came to Congress 2 years after I became a Member of this House, and when he voluntarily declined renomination to the Seventy-ninth Congress, there remained in the House of Representatives only two who outranked him in length of service, the gentleman from Illinois, the dean of the House, our beloved colleague ADOLPH J. SABATH, and myself. Allen Treadway, in my opinion, had his health permitted, could have continued serving his country, and the First Congressional District of Massachusetts as long as he had desired to do so, and would today be presiding as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means upon which he served for more than 27 years. Prior to his selection as a member of that committee on December 15, 1917, Mr. Treadway served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and also on the Committee on Education.

During his more than 27 years' service as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Treadway participated in and helped formulate more legislation affecting the fiscal affairs of our Government and its citizens than any other public servant in the history of our Government. During this period that committee was called upon to furnish the finances for the prosecution of two World Wars. While Mr. Treadway's service on the committee during the war periods was as a minority member, his intellect, industry, and broad vision contributed immeasurably to the fulfillment of the stupendous task, and his wise counsel was in no small degree responsible for its successful accomplishment.

I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means on January 7, 1925, nearly 7 years after my friend Allen Treadway, and during my many years' service on that committee and during my long service as chairman, I learned to know Allen Treadway's true worth. While we did not always agree on matters of legislation, such disagreements never marred our friendship in the slightest. Mr. Treadway was one of my most cherished friends and he was most helpful to me in many ways. He was a perfect gentleman at all times; his integrity was unsurpassed by any man, and his industry knew no bounds.

His passing is a loss of a true friend, an able statesman, a great American, and one of the most lovable characters I have ever had the privilege to number among the many friendships I have acquired during my long service. It was a great privilege to have known Allen Treadway and a much greater privilege to have enjoyed his friendship.

His passing takes from us a man who was loved, admired, and respected by all, and one whose distinguished public career will ever be an inspiration for those who knew his true worth and greatness.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, many warm and generous words have been spoken in this Chamber today about our departed former colleague, Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts. No one could deserve the praise more than this great public servant, whose dignity and devotion to duty brought him the admiration of the entire House. It was my privilege to know him during the last two terms he served in this body and to inherit from him his seat on the Library Committee. In so doing I found that I not only took the chair he vacated, but the assurance that at any time I might need asistance with any measure coming before the Committee on the Library, he would be delighted to impart what knowledge he had. Time and time again I found myself drawing upon his experience, and at all times he was most courteous and helpful, not only about Library affairs, but also in other legislative matters that may have been occupying our attention at the time. This House lost a valuable Member when Mr. Treadway decided not to return to the Seventy-ninth Congress on account of ill health, and yesterday the Nation lost one of the most competent officers it has known, but the fruit of his labors will continue throughout the coming ages. As my farewell tribute to him—my friend—I give in the words spoken of a great hero in the days gone by: "This was a man." He is alive, not only in the hearts of his family, his friends, and his colleagues, but his influence will ever live in this great America.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with deep regret of the death of Hon. Frank H. Foss, who served in the Sixty-ninth Congress to the Seventy-third Congress, inclusively, as a Representative from the Third District of the State of Massachusetts.

I have always regarded Frank Foss as an exemplary man, typical of the type of legislator usually chosen by the citizens of the State of Massachusetts to represent them.

There is nothing that could show the ability of this man much more conclusively than the many types of enterprises in which he was engaged prior to his coming to Congress.

He brought all of his vast experience gained from his many business activities to bear on legislative problems in the House of Representatives. He was familiar with the contracting business; a student of banking, he had a thorough knowledge of the insurance business; and

had a broad experience in municipal affairs.

I recall distinctly the effectiveness of his speeches bearing on many intricate business problems.

I regret the passing of my good friend, and I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family who have survived him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by John Foster Dulles. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the extension will be in excess of the amount allowed, over $300. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the cost the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include part of an address that he made.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extension will be slightly in excess of the amount allowed. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] who cannot be present on account of official duties, I ask unanimous consent to extend certain remarks of his in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Daily News.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] that he may address the House on Wednesday next for 15 minutes at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted and after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, Calif., in support of the legislation to extend the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to operate shipping in coastwise and intercoastal commerce after the present expiration date, the 28th of February 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain statistics on veterans' activities.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Potter Herald, of East Liverpool, Ohio, relative to tariff practices in order to defend American labor and American industry.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

Mr. RAYBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a telegram from Mr. Paul H. Griffith, national commander of the American Legion.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. Edwin W. Pauley, who is Chairman of our Reparations Commission, delivered before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 12, 1947. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost an additional $177.50. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 15, 1947.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Orleans States.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Summit (Miss.) Sun.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

THE NATIONAL SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES BILL

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House on the National School Health Services bill which I introduced today.

The National School Health Services bill would establish a national policy under which American children should not be permitted to grow up with physical or mental defects which could be prevented or corrected in childhood. With this long-run objective in view, the bill would assist the States to better the health of school children according to individual State requirements.

This bill calls for a Federal grants-in-aid program to assist the 48 States and the Territories to extend and improve their health services to school children between the ages of 5 and 17.

One-half of an initial Federal appropriation—$12,000,000—would be matched by State funds, dollar for dollar. The other half of the Federal funds would be allocated to the States according to their need, to provide pilot programs or demonstrations, training of personnel, and related activities. These funds need not be matched by the States. After the first year the Federal contribution would be increased to $18,000,000. Both Federal and State contributions would be spent to develop services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects among school children.

Federal funds earmarked for each State would:

First. Provide more thorough health examinations for school children. These examinations would determine whether the individual child is gaining weight and would discover defects of the eyes, teeth, ears, heart, lungs, throat, and posture.

Second. Provide children with follow-up medical care to correct defects discovered in such health examinations. Recognizing that not enough money can be made available to correct the health defects of all school children at once, however, the bill would have remedial work begun first in rural areas and areas of severe economic distress, where the need is greatest.

Third. Apply to improvement of the Nation's present inadequate school health services the same general pattern of Federal-State cooperation embodied in title V of the Social Security Act. This has been successful in bettering maternal and child health, services to crippled children, and public child-welfare programs throughout the country.

States providing school health examinations or corrective work or both would be expected to undertake equitable service without regard to race, color, or creed. In developing their services, States would be expected to integrate programs with health activities already under way, and with the health and medical facilities presently available in the communities.

Fourth. Provide for administration of Federal funds by the Federal Security Administration, under a School Health Services Board. This Board would comprise the Chief of the Children's Bureau as Chairman, the United States Commissioner of Education, and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

Fifth. Would establish both State and National advisory boards on which would serve representatives of health, education, child welfare, and the public at large.

Sixth. Provide for joint State planning for school health services by both State health and education authorities, but for administration of the plans by both or either or whatever State agency the State deemed appropriate. There would be no Federal interference whatsoever with the educational systems of the States.

The national school health services program already has a large measure of public support from nationally known organizations headed by Parents' magazine. This is a monthly publication with a circulation of more than 1,000,000, devoted to the welfare of children and their problems.

The publisher of Parents' magazine, George J. Hecht, is serving as chairman of a volunteer committee of public-spirited citizens working for the enactment of the national school health services bill. Members of this committee, representing their organizations, include Leonard W. Mayo, chairman, National Commission on Children and Youth, and president of the Child Welfare League of America; Dr. A. O. DeWeese, executive secretary of the American School Health Association; Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social insurance activities for the American Federation of Labor; Nathan Cowan, legislative director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Russell Smith, legislative secretary, National Farmers Union; Miss Hazel Corbin, R. N., general director, Maternity Center Association; Lester B. Granger, executive secretary, National Urban League; Mrs. Theodore Oxholm, chairman, Spokesman for Children, Inc.; Kenneth D. Widdemer, acting executive director, Health Council of Greater New York; Mrs. Gertrude Folks Zimand, general secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that as this bill is brought to the attention of the American public, as it deserves to be, and now that it is introduced, the proposed national school-health-services program will win the approval of every parent in the United States, and of every organization that is interested in American school children.

Services such as proposed in this bill are long overdue. Approximately 30 percent of the young men, 18 through 37 years of age, examined for military service in the recent war, were rejected for physical or mental defects which made them unfit to serve their country. These were the findings of the Selective Service System made public in December 1946.

The percentage of draft rejections in this war perhaps indicates no real deterioration in the health of our adult male population since the last war. Then approximately 29.6 percent of the draftees were rejected. Differences in standards and policies of draft examinations make it difficult to compare the two periods precisely.

Yet, while there may have been no real deterioration in health, neither can we say, as we ought to be able to, that the health of our young men has improved since the last war, in a country wealthier and more advanced than any other in the world.

Many of the defects which disqualified millions of young men for military service could have been detected and corrected when the men were boys in school. But this preventive work was not done. Although we knew what ought to be done, as a Nation, we failed to take steps to do the job.

A definitive study of the close tie-up between draft rejections and the health of school children was made by the United States Public Health Service in Hagerstown, Md., in 1941. In their analysis the Public Health experts found that relatively large numbers of Hagerstown young men rejected in the draft had given evidence during their childhood at school-health examinations of the very same defects which, uncorrected, 15 years later made them IV-F's in the draft.

Bad teeth, for example, were allowed to grow worse. Men with teeth so poor that they caused rejection in the draft, when boys of 10, already had double the number of decayed, missing, or filled permanent teeth as had the 10-year-olds who 15 years later went into the services instead of into class IV-F.

According to the United States Children's Bureau, which has the most reliable information now available on children's health, at least three-quarters of America's 30,000,000 school children need dental care. Approximately one-third need medical care. Ten million children have defective vision. One million have hearing defects. Half a million children have orthopedic defects or defects which could be corrected by plastic surgery. Approximately 175,000 children have active tuberculosis.

In our schools something can be done to correct most of these defects, and a whole lot can be done to correct many of them. The schools are a good place to begin. For under our laws the schools have contact with more children for longer periods than any other public agency.

Nevertheless, not even half of the school-age children and young people in the United States receive even a health examination, let alone corrective care. Only 1 out of every 10 high-school students receives a physical check-up. Where examinations are given there is rarely any provision for follow-up remedial work. Some States spend as little as 2 cents per child per year for school health services. Only 10 States report school health expenditures of more than $1 per year per pupil, according to the latest available figures of the United States Office of Education.

The national school health services bill which I have introduced today is addressed to this problem. It should not be confused with the large issue of providing health insurance for the whole population, with which my bill has nothing whatever to do. The national school health services bill would go straight to the heart of the Nation's health problem. It would make a modest beginning to start our school children off on the path to health.

The program which this bill would make possible represents the kind of economy which in the long run is a real economy. It would spend a relatively small sum today so that larger sums would not be needed later.

Federal expenditures for the health needs of children have always been small in comparison with appropriations for other purposes, improving the health of farm animals, for example. Nobody ever proposed an atomic-bomb-size Federal fund for children. Yet in the desperate necessity of war the Congress put $2,000,000,000 during a comparatively short period into atomic research.

If we want to have a healthy nation we must start with the children. Physically fit and productive adult citizens are the best investment a nation can have. That is the future dividend to be realized by investing now in the health of America's school children.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the legislative program, if any, and any other special orders, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders today, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SILLY PROTEST FROM RUSSIA—DEAN ACHESON EMINENTLY CORRECT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, before the Senate committee the other day said and said truly that the Russian foreign policy is "an aggressive and expanding one." Apparently that has wounded the sensitivity of some Russians in power, and they have sent a note of protest to the State Department. I believe that note should be thrown into the wastebasket. Only a nonsensical sensitivity could have prompted such a note.

It was probably sent to raise a dust storm pending meeting of foreign ministers at Moscow and to prejudice the cause of the United States. Very likely the note was penned by foolish knaves of knavish fools at the Kremlin. The Politburo politicians changed the word "expanding" that Mr. Acheson used to the word "expansionist" and have complained thereof. I am not an expert on semantics but to my mind those two words mean exactly the same thing; and, indeed, the Russian policy has been expansive: Witness the fact that they have swallowed up the three republics of Esthonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. I believe that Dean Acheson was eminently sound and proper in his criticism. If Russian foreign policy is not expansive and aggressive in Poland, in the Baltic, in the Balkans, I do not know what those words mean. The Governments of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia are mere Russian puppets and are the result of Russian aggression and expansion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a copy of a letter from a constituent. and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Chicago City Council urging that funds be made available to permit continuance of the low-cost luncheon program in the schools of the city of Chicago.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter addressed to the President of the United States by a constituent.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the AAA.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two speeches by the Chief of the Army Engineers, one at the Wallace Lake Dam dedication and the other before the Red River Valley Improvement Association at its annual meeting just held.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday, February 19, following the legislative business of the day and such special orders as may have already been entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday, February 18, 1947, following the special orders heretofore entered for that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would extend the coverage of the Social Security Act so as to include employees in the nonprofit field. These are not included in either the old-age and survivors' insurance plans or the unemployment compensation plans. It is in the form of amendments which would eliminate from the statute those subsections which specifically exclude this type of employee from the benefits of the act. My bill would not affect employees of State-supported educational institutions nor employees of any governmental unit such as municipal firemen, policemen, or any other municipal employee.

There are approximately 1,000,000 employees of nonprofit organizations in the United States which are operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, or educational purposes, and it is universally recognized that these employees are among the poorest paid in our country, despite the recognized social value of the work they perform. Their exclusion from social-security benefits is a great moral wrong and definitely tends to weaken the effectiveness of the social agencies and the religious and educational organizations for whom they work.

This type of employees are greatly concerned over their exclusion, and many of them feel, with some justification, that they are being treated as second-class Americans. Appearing before the Ways and Means Committee of the House last year, the following organizations supported the proposition of including their employees in the Social Security Act: The American Council on Education, the American Association of Social Workers, the American Public Welfare Association, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Church, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the American Hospital Association.

ALASKA'S PLACE IN THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, with all the vigor at my command I desire to warn this House that false notions of economy should not, and, indeed, must not, be allowed to stand in the way of the Alaska defense program. Now as perhaps never before it is essential for us to build in Alaska a mighty fortress capable of withstanding any onslaught which might be made against it. Only in that manner, Mr. Speaker, can we be reasonably sure that the United States can be protected from the horrors of war as it will be in the future.

Last week the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] warned this Nation that we must not neglect Alaska from the military standpoint. His compelling analysis of the situation ought to be read by every American. Alaska can either be the region furnishing protection for our Nation or it can be the region from which an enemy can reach us. The choice is ours. With respect to Alaska we simply cannot be put in the position of saving a few dollars where that saving would result in peril to this country.

Not long since the very able commander of the Alaskan Department, Major General Craig, said that the Territory would be militarily indefensible unless there is a strong civilian economy to back up the Army. So it is necessary that we do more than station troops and warships and build bases there. We must build up industries. We must establish farmers on the soil. We must do these things not at some far-off future time but now. We must build roads. We must improve and at once the Alaska Railroad. We must expand civil aviation and see to it that there is a strong merchant marine.

Few Americans realize what tremendous strides have been made in Soviet Asia in the way of settlement and industrial expansion. Those advances have been made in a country having great similarity to Alaska, and certainly having no greater resources, square mile for square mile, than has Alaska. There are seven cities in the six Soviet Republics in Asia which have populations greater than 100,000. Any one of these cities contains more people than does the entire Territory of Alaska. One of them had in 1944 over 600,000 inhabitants. The rate of population increase during the war years was simply tremendous. In 1929, it is said, this whole area had a population of 8,000,000 people. By 1944 that population had increased to 20,000,000, and the projection for 1994 is 45,000,000 people. We cannot afford to sit idly by and see our northern outpost remaining undeveloped, either militarily or economically. Over the week end I received a radiogram from the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce pointing out the inadvisability of any cut in War Department appropriations for Alaska.

Alaskan defenses are in a sorry plight considering their strategic location—

The radiogram reads—

and a full-scale defense program is absolutely necessary for the protection of American residents and investments in Alaska. The important position of Alaska in case of attack by unfriendly powers must be realized. An excellent defense program has apparently been outlined by the War Department for the defense of Alaska and a slash in appropriations, as considered, could threaten the well-being of the entire country by weakened defense in Alaska.

I subscribe to that statement without reservation. I join with the gentleman from Florida in urging, even imploring, that we expand, not contract, our military program in the Territory of Alaska.

LITHUANIAN ANNIVERSARY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians all over this country and throughout the world remember that February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed free and independent. Many tragic things have happened in these nearly 30 years. Our Lithuanian friends want us to be aware at all times of the injustices done them during these years, but at this particular moment Americans of Lithuanian background ask that we turn our attention for a moment to a form of suffering in which we seem to be playing an unfortunate part. They ask that we familiarize ourselves with the problems created by the methods used in our American zone in Germany for the screening of displaced Lithuanians and other Baltic peoples to determine if they qualify for DP rating with the consequent aid and privileges. They feel justified in asking us to rectify these injustices.

To bring this matter to you I am including in my remarks a letter written to the president of the American Friends of Lithuania, Mr. P. J. Zuris, which gives something of the picture and which I hope you will read. This letter is as follows:

BALTIC DP CAMP, AUGSBURG, HOCHFELD,
SECTION 5, USFET HEADQUARTERS,
Frankfurt, January 10, 1947.

On the basis of your permission to solicit your help in the case that the UNRRA Team 1062 should launch a new political screening, we beg to inform you of the following acts: On January 8, the UNRRA Area Team 1062 has started a new screening at the Baltic DP Camp Hochfeld, in Augsburg. The following facts show that it is not a reexamination of the data supplied by the recent Army screening, but a new screening with far-reaching implications:

1. New questionnaires are being used. These when printed comprise six pages and contain questions that are entirely different from those used in the Army screening.

2. The questions are much more detailed than in any Army questionnaire. The date of entry into American zone (question 32) is asked for, although this cannot have any bearing on the DP status. Addresses of relatives in home countries must be given, although such information, if it leaks out, may endanger such relatives. Some questions (e. g., No. 24: "When were you taken war prisoner by the Germans?") seem to refer to Russian nationals and instill fear in our people. The question, "When did you enter territory occupied by the Germans?" is incomprehensible.

3. All inmates of DP camp over 15 years of age must appear at the screenings. Children are interrogated in the absence of parents about events that took place when they were 8 to 10 years of age. Individual questionings last about 2 hours. We are compelled to undress so that they could examine our naked bodies. How rigid the questioning is can be seen from the fact that for the first 4 days only 35 persons have been examined of each nationality that received summons.

Moreover, we beg to draw your attention to the fact that the screening technicalities are such that no fair nor reliable results can be assured. The questionnaires are filled out not by the party concerned, but by a staff of various nationals, some of whom are ignorant of the Baltic language. Thus a Baltic national must answer questions in Russian, German, or English language—a language he may know superficially or not at all—and the answers thus given are entered in English by writers whose knowledge of English is obviously imperfect. The written answers are not read to them or by the persons under examinations so that no assurance is given that the answers are entered as given. There is a tendency on the part of examiners to favor certain answers, and in several cases it was noted that the answers were entered just the opposite to those given. In general, the entire procedure is such that misstatements and eventual eligibility decisions are subject to grave errors.

The UNRRA Area Team 1062 claims that this eligibility screening has been organized for the purpose of resettlement and emigration. Yet most of the questions asked can have no possible connection with resettlement and emigration. At the same time, the questionnaire used is remarkable for its absence of such questions that would be unavoidable if resettlement or emigration were contemplated—for instance, questions about foreign languages.

In our former writing we pointed out that the "perpetual screening" which now lasted for nearly a year has been a source of mental cruelty. Even the Germans are entrusted with their own denazification, but the Baltic nationals, citizens of neutral countries, are being screened by people who are ignorant of our history and our psychology. The present screening carried out by the UNRRA is such that it fills our people with apprehension.

In view of the above noted conditions, we beseech you, in the name of Christianity and American democracy, the Atlantic Charter, which promises us freedom from fear, to take the necessary steps so that these new screenings would cease immediately. Should the facts herein noted be insufficient for such a step, we beg you to appoint a commission or to come personally to Augsburg and examine the situation. Trusting that in the American sense of justice, we remain,

Respectfully yours.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, many Members are very much interested in finding out just what day the so-called budget matter will be before the House.

Mr. HALLECK. My present information about that is that it will be brought up on Thursday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not before Thursday?

Mr. HALLECK. That is my understanding. We bring it up on Thursday.

Mr. RAYBURN. May I ask the gentleman another question, and if he does not think he can answer it he may so indicate. What kind of a rule does the gentleman think this resolution will be considered under?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say about that at the moment.

Mr. RAYBURN. But the matter will not be brought up before Thursday?

Mr. HALLECK. That is my understanding. The Rules Committee will meet in the morning on the matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AMERICAN CORRESPONDENTS TO MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent and an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to utter a word of protest against the decision of the Soviet Union to limit to 20 the number of American correspondents who will be permitted to report the forthcoming Moscow Conference. Seventy-three have sought leave to go. The agreement to hold this Conference in Moscow was expressly conditioned upon receiving assurances of adequate news coverage. The Russians made no reservation to the effect that they, rather than the countries concerned, would be the judges of such adequacy.

It is to be hoped that our Department of State, with which I understand formal protest has been lodged, will insist upon either the fulfillment of this express commitment or the convening of this conference of such transcendent international interest and importance in a city which will welcome rather than shun the spotlight of world press coverage.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following letter and editorial:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *February 13, 1947.*

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING.

DEAR SIR: May I respectfully ask that you do everything in your power to see that we have adequate news coverage in Russian-occupied countries. Russian newsmen are in this country in great numbers and I feel that we should have the same number of newsmen in their countries.

After all, it is little to ask that they grant us what we are willing to give them. Therefore, I will go so far as to suggest that if they continue to ban our newsmen from Russian-controlled soil, that we revoke all passports or visas of Russian news gatherers in our country.

We cannot control disarmament and atomic science in a world of locked doors. Thus, as a strong weapon of peace I urge you to insist on equal news coverage between ourselves and Russia.

Respectfully yours,

RITA A. TROST
(Miss Rita Trost).

[From the New York Times]

NEWS FROM MOSCOW

Representatives of the principal newspaper, radio, and periodical correspondents' associations in Washington have reported to Secretary of State Marshall that they regard Russia's proposals for American news coverage of the forthcoming Moscow Conference as shockingly inadequate. These are the right words. Because it will deal with the pivotal question of peace with Germany, the Moscow Conference will be by far the most important of all the treaty conferences. Seventy-three American correspondents had sought permission to go. As it now stands, the Russian Government will admit only 20.

The reason given for this is the acute housing shortage now prevailing in Moscow. There is no doubt that living quarters there are as scarce as are all other goods and services. But there is also no doubt, in our own judgment, that makeshift accommodations (Quonset huts, if necessary) could be found for 53 additional American correspondents if the Russian Government really wished to find them, and there is, furthermore, no doubt in our mind that the real reason for the sharp limitation of correspondents is the old familiar Russian wish to keep the iron curtain as tight as possible.

The present decision of the Russian Government could have been foreseen, and was foreseen. Nearly 2 months ago, when the decision to meet in Moscow was first announced, this newspaper urged either that explicit guaranties of absolutely free and unrestricted news coverage be demanded of, and received from, Russia, or that a conference of such great importance to the peace and security of the world be shifted somewhere else. We renew that suggestion now.

REDUCE DEBTS FIRST, THEN CUT TAXES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 of the South Dakota Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, from the emphatically Republican State of South Dakota there has come some wise counsel to the aid of Congress in connection with its fiscal policy. I shall insert as a part of my remarks Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, passed by the Senate of South Dakota, which is 100 percent Republican and concurred in by the house of representatives, in which there are only four Democrats.

I might mention also that South Dakota is a pioneer State. Its people are largely pioneers or the sons and daughters of pioneers, and it is preponderantly an agricultural State. The people of South Dakota, consequently, know that you have to till the land before you plant a crop; you have to plant a crop before you can harvest it; you have to harvest it before you can sell it; and you have to sell the crop before you can pay your debts. South Dakotans know that there must be a logical order to financial and economic transactions if they are to be effective.

Consistent with that policy and program, the State Legislature of South Dakota has memorialized the Congress of the United States, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Whereas the national budget has long been unbalanced and the debt has increased the past 14 years to very great proportions; and

Whereas it seems that national Republican leaders have already applied themselves to the task of making plans to correct fiscal maladministration: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring), That we commend national Republican leaders in advocating a program of debt and expense reduction in advance of tax reduction; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be dispatched to United States Senators CHAN GURNEY and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD; Congressmen FRANCIS CASE and KARL E. MUNDT; and to United States Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate; and Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIOUX K. GRIGSBY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, South Dakota joins Indiana in counseling Congress to practice wisely the three R's of a sound fiscal policy: First, reduce expenditures; second, reduce debts; third, reduce taxes. The order in which we proceed is significant if our results are to be successful.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mallory Browne that appeared in the New York Times yesterday with reference to the situation of the British Empire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

LABOR-INDUSTRIAL AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, when the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States is focused upon industrial relations, it is interesting and encouraging to know that efforts are being made in a constructive manner to improve employer-employee relationships in some parts of the country.

I am glad to call the attention of the House of Representatives to a recently completed annual wage agreement made between the Tobin Packing Co., of Fort Dodge and Estherville, Iowa, and the United Packing House Workers of America, Local 31, and Local 79.

Like every labor-industrial agreement there are many details about which it is not necessary to take the time of the House of Representatives. Suffice it to say that the company is guaranteeing to its employees a minimum of 2,080 hours of work per year. This provision thus at one stroke enables the workingman to rely upon a minimum weekly income in each of the 52 weeks of the year, and in return for this encourage the worker to give the employer cooperation and full production within the terms of the agreement.

It may be that the detailed provisions of this agreement are not entirely satisfactory to either the union or to the management—nevertheless, it seems to be a constructive forward step to bring about peace in the troubled and disordered sphere of industrial relations.

I commend both the Tobin Packing Co. and the United Packing House Workers, Local 31 and Local 79, for their farsightedness and for their industrial statesmanship.

FREE PRESS, COMMUNISM, AND FEPC

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman said about a free press throughout the world. It is about time that some of our diplomats stopped licking the boots of Joe Stalin and begin to stand up for an American free press to tell the world what is really happening behind the "iron curtain." The sooner they do that the better it is going to satisfy the people of the United States.

But, I rose to call your attention to another matter. On last Thursday I took up the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee bill, known as the FEPC, analyzed it and showed that it was put on the ballot in California in the last election and defeated in every single individual county in that State.

Those remarks will be found in the Appendix of the RECORD in the morning. I have gone over them carefully, and I want you Members who represent real Americans to take those facts that are in there contained, together with interruptions, and see just what this communistic FEPC program would do to the American people in every State of this Union.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiences in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 36) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, opportunity will be afforded for discussion of the joint resolution?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the joint resolution read so that we may see what is in it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) in the case of any position under the Senate for which addi-

tional compensation is provided for in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, "so long as the position is held by the present incumbent," the salary provided in such act, including such additional compensation, shall be payable to any incumbent thereof without regard to the above-quoted limitation, in addition to any other compensation authorized by law for such position.

(b) The salaries referred to in the foregoing subsection shall be payable from January 3, 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply provides for the continuation for the present employees of the Senate of those salaries that were fixed for the then incumbents in the last Congress, in the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1947. It has been found that many of these people who have taken over from minority positions would otherwise suffer a decrease in salary. The Senate desires that this resolution be adopted, permitting them to receive the same salaries that were in effect last year.

JOHN C. PUGH

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a notable bill in that it is the first bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations since the retirement of the head of our committee staff, John C. Pugh.

Mr. Pugh served under the Government for just a few years short of half a century, the last 26 years on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. He came to the committee simultaneously with the adoption of the budget system. When the budget system was established in 1920, after several years of consideration and debate, it was found necessary to secure an especially experienced and able man to carry on important phases of the work. The immortal and illustrious Marc Sheild, after a consultation with the members of the committee, Budget officers, and department heads, asked John Pugh to accept the position.

Mr. Pugh, in collaboration with Marc Sheild, established the routine and procedure under which the Committee on Appropriations has discharged its duties in the administration of the budget system with such gratifying success in this last quarter of a century.

Few men have rendered such outstanding service to the Government as that rendered by John Pugh in these 25 years, especially during the last 5 or 6 years, a span of years which might well be termed the most critical period in American history, the Second World War. He was the ranking authority on the fiscal affairs and budgets of the Navy long before the First World War, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin D. Roosevelt always brought him to all congressional hearings. His comprehensive knowledge of the War and Navy Departments and his long and intimate association with Army and Navy personnel rendered him indispensable when the stupendous task of expanding the Army to wartime strength and creating a two-ocean Navy started on its breath-taking race against time in the Second World War.

While serving as chief of the committee staff, he was really the liaison man between the two Departments and the Congress. In that capacity he harbored more explosive military secrets than any other man on the Hill and perhaps any other man in the Government outside of the departmental chiefs and the President. He was not merely the repository of confidential information and programs but he was the spark plug through whom resources were mobilized and funds were provided—and plans of strategy were translated into victorious action.

He was especially effective in the fiscal negotiations supplying funds for the development of the new weapons which won the war. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the matchless valor of our men and the incomparable strategy of our commanders, it was the accomplishments of our scientists in the development of secret appliances such as radar, the proximity fuze, the atomic bomb, and many similar developments, which brought the war to a close long before the time it would otherwise have been concluded. We not only outfought the enemy in both theaters of the war; we not only outgeneraled and outmaneuvered the enemy, but we outthought them. America not only led the world in production, in courage and valor, in military power and strategy, but America led the world in the arts and sciences—and if anyone entertains any doubt on that score they have but to consult the high command of Germany and Japan who are in a position to testify eloquently on that point—if they are in a position to testify at all.

In the provision of funds for these critical projects John Pugh not only handled the hearings and private understandings but he supplied the confidence without which members of the committee would have hesitated to venture out upon these uncharted seas.

That was especially true of the provisions for the atomic bomb. As has been often said, only seven men in the House and four in the Senate, besides John Pugh, had any information on the development of the atomic bomb before it was dropped on Hiroshima. In the 3 years it was under experiment no member of the Military Affairs or Naval Affairs Committees of either House had any inkling of the epoch-making project until they read of it in the newspapers. In the meantime the five men from the Committee on Appropriations took the extraordinary responsibility of authorizing for the project the expenditure of a sum of money in excess of the assessed valuation of some of the States of the Union.

John Pugh was the go-between. He supplied data, conducted the conversations, arranged for the transportation of the subcommittee to Oak Ridge, where the members personally inspected the plant, and on their return took the responsibility of authorizing the expenditure of the last of the funds required. The astronomic appropriations for the purpose had been passed through Congress disguised in other funds, and if the bomb had proved a failure, as most of us had come to believe it would, the denouement, when the inevitable revelation came, would have blown all five out of Congress under a stigma they could never have lived down. In those harrowing days, while the result was being awaited, John Pugh was the only man we dared to counsel with and was a constant source of encouragement and reassurance. When the final history of the war is written there is no man who is entitled to a brighter page in the record of that eventful era than John Pugh.

There are men whose breasts are covered with medals and ribbons won by deeds of heroism written imperishably in blood on crimson battlefields. We delight to do them honor and we express to them on every possible occasion our heartfelt appreciation and gratitude. But, Mr. Speaker—and I say it considerately—there are few men back from the war more entitled to the thanks and gratitude of the Nation, for services nobly performed, than John Pugh, who, working quietly, self-effacingly, unobtrusively, and indefatigably behind the scenes, was, in my opinion, the greatest factor on the Hill in providing the sinews with which we won the war—supplies for our men where needed and when needed, and the certainty every American felt when he went into combat that he was as well or better armed than the enemy in front of him.

But we who know John Pugh are not thinking so much today of what he did as a budget technician. We are thinking of the man, for John Pugh, along with his efficiency and his service to the committee and the country, is a knightly, golden-hearted gentleman. His personality, his courtesy, his never-failing equanimity on all occasions, his devotion to duty, to the committee, and to his friends, are outstanding and will always be remembered and treasured by those who had the privilege of being associated with him here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain all Members of the House join with me in acknowledgment of the great service John Pugh has rendered the Congress and the Nation, and in wishing for him the reward to which he is so richly entitled, many happy sunny years of continued health, happiness, and contentment. In the language of Joe Jefferson's Rip Van Winkle, "May he live long and prosper."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, may I say a word in appreciation of the work of John Pugh, who is retiring as clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations. I measure my words when I say that I know of no more faithful and efficient servant in the United States Government.

The title, "Clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations," does not sound impressive or important. The name of the holder of the job is rarely mentioned on the House floor or in the press. The American people do not know it, but it is true that the clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations is one of the important individuals in our democracy. The job, if capably filled and properly handled, is truly comparable to one of the top positions in our Government.

John Pugh filled that place admirably and well. He had a knack for detail and

a capacity for understanding of Government policy and program which often amazed those who have served here in this Capitol Building with him. The top secrets of the Government have been entrusted to him on numerous occasions and he has never betrayed his trust or failed to measure up to his assignment, regardless of difficulties confronting him. His work brought him into frequent contact with Cabinet officers and department heads. John Pugh has been the confidant, adviser, and assistant to a long list of Members of the House Committee on Appropriations through the years. He himself is perhaps unaware of the major part which he has played in shaping many important Government policies.

I am honored to have the privilege of paying this little tribute to him, and as he takes leave of his official service here, I join with my colleagues in wishing him every success and happiness in the coming days.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF ORGANIZATION OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 24, providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 of the Reorganization Act of 1946, the clerical staffs of standing committees of the Senate shall be organized and compensated in the manner hereinafter provided.

The annual rates of compensation for the clerical staff of each standing committee of the Senate (other than the Appropriations Committee) shall be $2,000 to $8,000 for one chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk; and $2,000 to $3,720 for not to exceed four other clerical assistants.

The annual rates of compensation for the clerical staff of the Appropriations Committee shall be as follows: One chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk at $5,600 to $8,000; such assistant clerks as may be necessary at $3,820 to $5,600; and such other clerical assistants as may be necessary at $2,000 to $3,720.

Such compensation shall be fixed by the chairman of each such committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. TABER. Yes. At this time, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has asked us to consider this resolution. The provisions with reference to staffs in the reorganization bill are so open that the Senate felt the staff should be restricted as far as possible to those who had heretofore been designated. As I understand it, this is the object of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, because it may be assumed that the adoption of this resolution will involve the expenditure of money and because it is reported from the Appropriations Committee, I deem it entirely proper to say a word at this time with respect to the concurrent resolution which, it is expected, will be brought before the Congress on Thursday next.

I take this time because it is very apparent to me that there is a tremendous amount of misinformation abroad concerning what this resolution and its adoption may mean.

It seems to me that the people of America ought to know the facts and the truth and that we should not start our first important legislative action under a cloud of political implications. Let me state clearly what I mean by that. The so-called Reorganization Act contained a provision for the establishment of the Legislative Budget and it is proposed to bring before the Congress a concurrent resolution in compliance with the provisions of that section, section 138, I believe it is, of the legislative reorganization bill.

What does it mean? I have before me the text of that resolution. It reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress based upon presently available information that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000, and that the expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $31,500,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $25,100,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

What does that mean? The people of America have been told that if the Congress adopts such a resolution, by that act they are destroying the Navy and destroying the Army; in fact, the Secretary of the Navy, in a news release, stated that if Congress adopts this resolution the fleet will be immobilized and will not be able to cruise. We are told that dire results will take place if the Congress adopts this sort of resolution.

I have not heard a single commentator make, nor have I read in a single newspaper, what I conceive to be the correct statement as to the effect of the passage of this resolution. I addressed myself to that subject in the committee at some length and found complete agreement that what I stated at that time was in truth and fact the purport and the intent of the passage of this resolution, namely, this resolution expresses a hope to the American people that after an examination of the Budget it may be possible to cut that Budget of expenditures by $6,000,000,000. The American people for the first time are looking to the Congress to carry out that purpose of cutting the Budget.

Does it mean that the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees are bound to any specific sum?

Does this resolution say that the Army shall be cut $1,400,000,000 and the Navy $1,000,000,000 or any other sum?

The best that can be said toward this whole situation is that the Congress has expressed a determination that every Budget estimate submitted, whether it be for the Army, the Navy, or any other department of government, shall be scanned and examined as it never has been in the last 14 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. It means that the Congress has expressed its determination that every single nonessential activity of Government shall be eliminated in the hope that when the committees have finished their work it will result in a gross reduction of public expenditures in the next fiscal year of $6,000,000,000.

Now, then, as to the Army and Navy, how does the appropriation machinery work? Mr. ENGEL's Subcommittee on Appropriations is starting hearings this afternoon on the Army budget. The witnesses are coming before that committee. The members are going to examine every item in that budget exactly as they have done before. The same is true of the Navy budget, the same is true of every other budget estimate submitted by every department—Interior, Post Office, Labor, Federal Security, and so on. The members of that subcommittee are going to examine those estimates with the idea of providing for necessary public services, nothing more; they are going to examine them with the intent and purpose of providing for the Army and Navy the funds that are necessary to provide for adequate national defense, nothing more. People who say that the Army and Navy are so sacred that you should not even examine their budget estimates and you should accept those submitted by the Budget and the President without question just simply do not know the appropriation process.

There is real opportunity for saving, and it is the purpose of the committee and the Congress in passing this resolution not to tie the hands of the committee, nor does the passage of this resolution tie anyone's hands. It simply says, "We are going to work as never before to appropriate the sums that are necessary and only those sums, and we hope from what we can see now that the savings will approximate $6,000,000,000." If they do not approximate $6,000,000,000 and it appears that more money is necessary, this Congress will provide that money when it examines each appropriation item.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. There seems to be an impression around that the Budget

Committee reached up in the air and took out the figure 31.5. My friend from Wisconsin will recall that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] explained to the full committee exactly how that figure was arrived at. May I ask the able gentleman from Wisconsin to inform the House about that?

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that it is not a figure picked out of the air. I can say to the gentleman, if you will read the resolution that accompanies the proposed draft of the concurrent resolution, you will see there set forth exactly what was done and the examination that was made. Certainly this committee could not hold detailed budget hearings in the time available for the entire establishment of the Government. That is the duty and objective of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. They are doing that now, and I want this Congress to know that the political smoke screen that has been raised in an attempt to inject politics into this situation is going to fail because the American people are determined that those expenditures of Government will have to come down. They are not going to think too well of those men on the Appropriations Committee and Ways and Means Committee who have for pure political purposes and no other reason tried to give the impression that this $6,000,000,000 is an item picked out of thin air and binds the Congress of the United States, even though it will not ultimately, perhaps, be possible upon further examination of these budgets to actually cut down that figure.

I say to the people of America and to the press that want to tell the people the facts, let us get the truth abroad. There is not a man or woman on either side of this House who intends to cripple either the Army or the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Air Corps, or the Marine Corps. There is not a man or woman on either side of this House but what intends to see to it, when the appropriation estimates for the Army and the Navy come here, that they will adequately provide for national defense. But on the Republican side, at least, we are going to see to it—and I mean see to it—that there is not going to be $1 appropriated that is not essential and necessary in the public interest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to listen to the gentleman from Wisconson, and if I interpret his remarks correctly—and if not, I hope he will correct me—but if I interpret his remarks correctly he told us, in substance, during his speech, that while the $6,000,000,000 cut is made, while he is going to vote for it, that it means nothing so far as the actual effect is concerned; that on Thursday next there will be a $6,000,000,000 cut, but it means nothing at all so far as future appropriation bills are concerned; that on one hand Congress will be telling the people that if the House adopts it that we are going to cut the various appropriation bills $6,000,000,000 and then on the other hand we are going to tell them that it has no meaning or effect at all; that it is only a joke.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman is attempting to quote me——

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, please! I am placing my interpretation on the gentleman's statement, and I said that if I am incorrect I hope the gentleman will correct me.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that when he uses language and attempts to interpret my remarks as meaning that the action of the Congress is nothing but a joke, the gentleman from Massachusetts well knows, if he has read the proposed concurrent resolution, that such a statement as that coming from him is entirely unjustified, and is not in accord with anything I said.

Mr. McCORMACK. I repeat, if I understood the gentleman's statement correctly, that on Thursday they will vote a $6,000,000,000 reduction, and then in the next breath he says it is not binding upon us; that the Members here are not going to cut the various appropriation bills $6,000,000,000; that so far as the people of the country are concerned, that that position is a legislative joke, and I maintain that position.

Now the gentleman says it is nothing but a hope. I read in yesterdays paper he said it was "a pious hope, a target to shoot at, and nothing more than a pious hope that the Federal appropriations for fiscal year 1948 can be held to a $31,500,000,000 level." The fact is that the Army and the Navy and the armed forces are in fear of this drastic cut, and that that fear is entirely justified.

Knowing the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as I do—and I respect him very much; he is a great legislator; I disagree with the gentleman on occasions, but I respect him—he apparently is rising anticipating asking me to yield, and I will.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield 1 second?

Mr. McCORMACK. But if I know the gentleman well enough——

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I cannot remain to hear the rest of his very distinguished statement, because I have got to go to attend a committee hearing to try and make some of these cuts that you will hear about when we file the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder how you are going to vote for a $6,000,000,000 cut and then later vote for less than six? Then they will catch up with you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Now just wait a while. I was referring to another distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, but the gentleman referred to me as distinguished.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is one of the leaders of the Republican Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; no.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is cne of the leaders

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am just on the outskirts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will come to the gentleman directly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do not make it too long; I have to go to a committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman cannot keep it.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I have it during the remainder of the 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about a quorum?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, the gentleman can make all the points of order he wants to, but he will not right now. I say to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], when this is adopted, unless I misunderstand him, I can see him sitting with the Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations and saying the House has adopted the $6,000,000,000 cut; that you have got to keep within that $6,000,000,000. I can see the gentleman doing that right after the House acts, and if the gentleman did not do it, he would not be living up to the opinion that I have about him.

Now does the gentleman from New York want me to yield to him?

Mr. TABER. I think I should like to have the gentleman yield, for just a moment, if he will. Here is the picture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman going to ask a question or make a speech?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. It is just a flat statement. I think I should make it, under the circumstances. I recognize that legally the $6,000,000,000 cut, if the Congress may be so fortunate as to adopt it, will not be binding upon the Appropriations Committee. On the other hand, it is an expression by the Congress of what the Congress, in advance of the hearings, thinks should be cut. That figure has not been pulled out of the air nor has it been arrived at with any idea of depriving the Army or the Navy of anything they need. But I wonder if folks do not want those things that they do not need taken away from them so that they may be able to operate more efficiently and effectively, and provide better national defense.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just as I said, the gentleman from New York always gives an honest answer. Whether or not you agree with him, you have to respect him. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says that when $6,000,000,000 is cut on Thursday next, it is more than a hope, he is going to try to see that the Appropriations Committee cuts it $6,000,000,000. I ask my distinguished friend from New York if my statement is not correct, that he takes the position that this is the intent of the House and, when finally agreed upon by both branches, whatever the ceiling is, he intends to have appropriations cut to keep within the ceiling.

Mr. TABER. There is no question but what that will be my aim.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I want to give credit where credit is due. The gentleman from New York always speaks his mind, and the gentleman's statement is

not consistent with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said just a few minutes ago. I admire the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] because he takes his position and maintains it. You cannot help but have great respect for men like that, even in disagreement.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that some of us here have watched the operation of government under which tremendous sums of money have been spent on government by his party. We on our side have recognized in the country a demand that the cost of government be cut, and we propose to respond to that demand and to cut the cost of government. If the gentleman from Massachusetts does not want to join with us in that effort, then he will have to take the consequences.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts always takes his consequences. The gentleman from Massachusetts took his consequences before Pearl Harbor, when we had legislation before this body the passage of which was necessary to save our country. The gentleman from Massachusetts was down in this well fighting for the passage of that legislation on many occasions when those who talk now about the Budget were vigorously opposing the passage of that legislation. I remember the one-vote victory on the extension of the selective service. I remember that there were only 21 Republican votes for it.

I remember other legislation when we had very few Republican votes, only 12 to 21 votes, and when we were staggering through legislation necessary to save our country. I assume my responsibility and take the consequences on these and on all of the appropriation bills that were passed during the war and which the gentleman from Indiana himself voted for. Our present debt was incurred to save our country, to win the war. Is the gentleman criticizing by his remarks the very bills that he voted for which were passed during the war to appropriate money necessary to help our country win the war?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I voted for appropriations for national defense before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, you did.

Mr. HALLECK. But it was not my fault that what happened to us did happen at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but did you vote for the extension of selective service? My time being up, I am sorry I do not have time so I can yield to my friend from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts boasts of his votes for appropriation bills; he criticizes some of us because some of us did not vote for all the measures which he advocated. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that perhaps more on the then minority side would have voted for some of those bills had you told us that the President was already engaged in a fighting war long before Pearl Harbor, at a time when he was talking peace while carrying on war. We did not know that. We believed the President might be right when he said that he knew more about foreign affairs than we did and that if we left our dealings with other nations to him, he would keep us out of war. He said our men would not be sent to fight on foreign soil. While he was making that statement about his ability to handle the foreign questions he already had us in a war. He had our ships in the war, but we in Congress did not know it. So do not blame us because some were misled and deceived. Others who opposed his policies were not deceived, and we tried to keep this Nation out of war. With reference to these appropriations for the Army and Navy, as I interpreted the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], while he hopes he can, and expects to, do everything he can to cut appropriations at least $6,000,000,000, if deficiency bills or other bills come in and it is necessary to appropriate more money for guns and ships and for implements of war for our national defense, he would, of course, appropriate that money, as I think all of us on this side would, but we are through, at least, so far as I am concerned, anyway, with making appropriations for things that we have been told are necessary for war but which turn out to be cocktail bars, polo grounds, swimming pools, and places of recreation for officers. We are all through with those fancy things which do not have anything to do with national defense but which just mean spending the people's money for luxuries, amusement, entertainment, and things that the officers want, not for war but to make life in the Army luxurious. Brother, we are through with—at this time—making appropriations for purchasing or making those things which are but extravagance and waste, if we can catch them as they come up. When you hear what my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has to say about requests for unnecessary expenditures, you will find there is plenty of room to cut the requests of the War Department and of the Navy Department without hurting anyone, without hurting the service, and without hurting our national defense. Yes; we will vote for national defense—I will, and the Members on the minority side, I am sure, will—but we are not going to be stampeded into voting for any of this Harry Hopkins funny business, whether it is in the Army or the Navy. You never did frighten some of us, you and the pro-British press will frighten fewer of us. We have the people's verdict of November 5 behind us, and we do not scare worth a darn every time you yell either "wolf" or "Stalin."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Are we not fast approaching the time when we will have to stand up and be counted on whether or not we want to do anything about cutting the cost of the Federal Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly we are. We made certain promises, just as did Mr. Roosevelt in 1932. He got away with disregarding those promises for a long time, but we better not try the same line.

INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the men who voted to extend the draft rather than disband our forces in the face of danger, as one who did everything possible to get our leaders to pursue a course which I thought would keep our country, as well as France and England out of the recent war, as one who tried to save Gen. Billy Mitchell from crucifixion when he was trying to give us an air force that would have prevented the Pearl Harbor disaster, if it had not prevented the war entirely, as one who has led the fight for veterans' legislation, and for adequate pay for the men in the rank and file of our armed forces, as one who has led the fight for the development of our internal waterways, and for rural electrification, I want to caution the Members of this House against cutting down on expenses that are necessary to keep America strong and great.

You have but to look at Great Britain today—a country without gas, oil, or water power—and see the tragic situation there, to realize how foolish it would be for America to stop the great program that we have in the development of our internal waterways.

If it had not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Columbia River development, the chances are this war would have lasted a year or probably 2 years longer, and cost the lives of a million more of our young men.

We have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity running to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. When it passes it is gone for all time. You cannot recall it. Do you know what that amounts to? One kilowatt-hour of electricity is equal to one man working 10 hours. That 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours is equal to 600,000,000 men working 10 hours a day, 300 days a year.

It is enough to fully electrify and heat every home in this country. It is the greatest wealth in America outside of the soil from which we live.

We cannot afford to lag behind other nations in such developments. That money will come back not only with interest, but multiplied many times in the enrichment of our country.

I know some of you will say that we wasted money on the Tennessee Valley Authority. We never spent money more wisely in all the history of the country. As I have said before, the TVA is the greatest development of ancient or modern times.

They will tell you we wasted money on the development of the Columbia River. We never spent money more wisely than it was spent in the development of that great wealth of water power that was formerly going to waste.

I am willing to cut out unnecessary spending, but I am not willing to help paralyze the development of my country, the development of its internal resources, the conservation of its soil, and the building up of the homes throughout the Nation and making it possible for a human being to live on any quarter section of land in the Nation and enjoy the benefits of America's greatest natural resource, outside of her soil, the water power of the Nation.

I shall continue that fight as long as I am in Congress. Just as surely as the sun shines, the American people are going to demand that our internal waterways not only be made navigable, their floods controlled, and our soil conserved, but they are going to demand that we develop the water power of the Nation, extend it to every farm home, and see that the American people are permitted to use it at rates based upon cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised to see the eminent naval authority, "Admiral" KEEFE, from the international seaport of Oshkosh, Wis., set Admiral Nimitz right on the immobilization of the fleet, but I am a little surprised to see him leading this precipitous retreat.

One of the difficulties of the present situation is that men who never saw a battleship want to dictate the disposition of the Navy. And men who do not know how many effectives it takes to make up a regiment want to overrule General Eisenhower on military strategy. Then, Mr. Speaker, this vociferous statement that we are going to cut expenses of the Federal Government. Why, you would think it was a new discovery on which they expect to take out a patent, something that had never been thought of before. Mr. Speaker, we have been cutting the expenses of the Federal Government ever since the war. There was not a bill in the last Congress that was not cut below the Budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. In just a minute. If the gentleman will permit.

In those items in which the House overran the report of the committee against the expenditure of money in the last Congress gentlemen on that side of the aisle led the fight against the committee and for higher appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit.

We have been cutting expenses of the Federal Government and we have been consistently reducing the money available for expenditure and commitment since the war—$64,000,000,000 in the last Congress. Shoot at that mark! And we propose in continuation of that program to cut this year as deep as can be justified. But we would like to know what you propose to cut, where you propose to cut, and how much you propose to cut. You say your total is based on a well-considered estimate but you have given us no opportunity to judge whether the estimate is well considered or not. Let us have the items on which the estimate was founded and the testimony.

The committee will report here tomorrow a bill in which they carry out the recommendation of the President for further rescissions. It is in continuation of the program of rescission and retrenchment which we established in the last Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit me to continue—there is evidently a stampede under way in both Houses to get away from the over-all figure to be taken up in the House on Thursday. The irrelevant speech of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], one of the outstanding leaders in both the committee and the House, was evidently carefully timed to hold in line sober-minded colleagues who do not want to imperil the national defense at this critical time. He assures them that they can vote to cut the Army and Navy and then put it back. The vote to cut is evidently merely tentative—and can be disregarded when the bill is taken up for consideration. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the chairman of the committee, in what is evidently good team play, backs up the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] by further reassuring defense-minded colleagues that the over-all figure is not binding. In other words, it is merely for the day. And tomorrow when the subject is really under consideration, no one is bound by what is done on the resolution reported by the Joint Budgetary Committee. Mr. Speaker, the situation is too obvious to require comment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the bill before us, we have here merely another bill amending the Reorganization Act. No one seems to be interested. There is no demand for time for debate. Apparently amendment of the Reorganization Act has become so commonplace as to cause no ripple of interest when another amendment is proposed.

As a matter of fact we are amending the Reorganization Act twice today; we just amended it a minute ago when we authorized another committee and we propose to amend it a second time by the bill now before the House. Any amendment of the Reorganization Act would, of course, be considered in the nature of an improvement.

Mr. Speaker, as no one else seems to object to changing the act I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may have two additional minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

Mr. CANNON. If I am to have more time, Mr. Speaker, I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. I so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. What I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri—and he should be able to answer in half a minute—is for him to name the departments of government which have reduced their expenditures since the war which was not forced by Republican demand and Republican votes? I would like to have the gentleman please point out to the House and to the country the departments and agencies of government which have reduced their expenditures since the war which reduction was not forced by the Republican minority in the last Congress and the one before.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman is not insisting that the minority was in control of the last Congress. We cut millions of dollars from all the war activities, and it was done by an economy-minded Democratic Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and no other regular department of government reduced their expenditures since the war.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman wish to convey the idea that these reductions were made in response to Republican demands?

Mr. JENSEN. I said that those that were made were made because the Republicans stood up and forced the majority party, the party in power at that time, to make the reductions.

Mr. CANNON. It is a peculiar idea that the minority runs the House. It was a Democratic Congress and all the retrenchments were made by a Democratic Congress. The Democratic Members of this Congress propose to continue that program of reduction on every item that comes before the House.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has not named a single department.

Mr. CANNON. All departments.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman take a few moments to explain those rescission bills? Will he tell us how these $64,000,000,000 were saved?

Mr. CANNON. During the war the Committee on Appropriations reported in deficiency bills a provision which was adopted by the House and the Congress, under which the Budget Bureau was required to make monthly studies and reports on the status of all appropriations so that the minute the war ended we would be in position to recall authorizations and funds not expended or committed. The day announcement was made that Japan had surrendered, members of the Committee were called back and began work on these reports. The President, in cooperation with the committee, froze all funds provided for war purposes in order to hold them subject to the action of the committee. As rapidly as we could we went through

department by department and reclaimed in successive bills, as developments permitted, authorizations and appropriations in excess of $64,000,000,000. It constitutes the greatest salvage, both in amounts and by percentages, ever made by any nation after any war in history. And it was handled more promptly and effectively than any rescission made in the conduct of any American war. It is a record never equaled before—and one which will never be equaled again—at least not in this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JENSEN Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] just mentioned the $57,000,000,000 we recovered last year from amounts previously provided. I have a letter which deals with that matter. This is a letter which was sent to me, as you will note, by the former chief clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. John Pugh, in response to a demand which I had made last August requesting that the Treasury Department give us facts and figures as to the amount of dollars which were still lying around loose in the departments and bureaus of the Government. Here is Mr. Pugh's letter to me of September 16, 1946:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1946.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Exira, Iowa.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: At last I have gotten the final figures from the Treasury Department giving unexpended and unobligated balances carried forward on June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946.

As of June 30, 1945, the figures reflect the following:

Total balance carried forward	$85,547,620,000
Total obligations outstanding to be liquidated out of the foregoing amount	57,817,626,000
Available for obligation after June 30, 1945	23,366,681,000
Not available for obligation	4,363,313,000

As of June 30, 1946, the figures reflect the following:

Total balance carried forward	$33,401,337,000
Total obligations outstanding to be liquidated out of the foregoing amount	20,876,907,000
Available for obligation after June 30, 1946	8,874,831,000
Not available for obligation	3,649,600,000

The amount remaining available for obligation after June 30, 1946 ($8,874,831,000), includes $3,987,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration, $440,000,000 in the National Housing Agency, which is almost entirely veterans' housing funds, $548,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency, and approximately $1,000,000,000 each for the War and Navy Departments. The remainder is distributed in smaller amounts among a number of agencies. The unliquidated obligations on June 30, 1946 ($20,876,907,000), include $10,300,000,000 for the Navy, $5,800,000,000 for the Army, $1,170,000,000 for the War Shipping Administration, and lesser amounts distributed among a number of agencies.

Taking the figures for the two fiscal years and using appropriation, expenditure, and repeal figures, we get this picture:

Balance available for obligation and expenditure after June 30, 1945	$81,184,307,000
New appropriations available after June 30, 1945	66,856,191,000
New appropriations available after June 30, 1946	35,806,919,000
Total available for disbursement for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1947	183,847,417,000
Appropriations repealed	56,897,895,000
Balance	126,949,522,000
Expended, 1946	64,900,000,000
	62,049,000,000
Estimated expenditures, 1947	41,500,000,000
Leaving a facial surplus of	20,549,000,000

The facial surplus includes funds for liquidating long-time obligations which may not mature before the fiscal year 1948, it includes 1947 appropriations which will not be actually disbursed until after June 30, 1947, and there may be some salvage in it flowing from the cancellation of obligations on June 30, 1946 There will be another rescission bill at the next session when the matter of unexpended balances generally will be under review In the meantime, it should be borne in mind that all funds are appropriated for specific or general objects and may not be employed for other purposes than those for which appropriated.

I have discussed this balance with Mr. Lawton, of the Budget Bureau, and he tells me it is under study by the Bureau at this time, but that it may be some little while before the Bureau will conclude its analysis and reach a determination of approximately how much of it will not be required for disbursement.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN PUGH.

In the bill coming before the House tomorrow there are some rescissions, which are a drop in the bucket compared to $20,549,000,000. We will still have left to recover almost $20,000,000,000. It is true that a lot of that money was for commitments we had made for future use in prosecuting the war. Congress will be in session not only this year but next year, and so we have no right to leave almost $20,000,000,000 of the people's money lying around loose for the great spenders to spend at will. We should recover every dollar of this surplus and do it now, Mr. Speaker, and then as the departments of government need money Congress will provide the necessary funds, and no more.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars last Saturday in Boston.

WENDELL BERGE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I learned with much regret from the press of yesterday that Wendell Berge will shortly leave the service of the Government. I know that most Members of the House on both sides of the aisle join me in this expression of regret that he is leaving the Department of Justice.

Wendell Berge is a man of fine capacities. He is a devoted public servant. As head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice he has enforced the antitrust laws without fear or favor and in spite of inadequate legal tools and small appropriations has made much headway in breaking up cartels and monopolies and in preserving free enterprise. The Government can ill afford to lose the services of such able and patriotic men as Wendell Berge. As chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I had many occasions to witness the vigor and effectiveness with which Mr. Berge carried out his difficult assignment. He is truly a man of vision, character, and devotion to the best of our American principles. If he must leave the service of the Government, we, of course, wish him well in his private practice of the law.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the so-called "charitable contribution" deduction) is amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (4) thereof, and by inserting at the end of paragraph (5) the word "or", and by adding after paragraph (5) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(6) the United Nations, but only if such contributions or gifts (A) are to be used exclusively for the acquisition of a site in the city of New York for its headquarters, and (B) are made after December 1, 1946, and before December 2, 1947."

SEC. 2. Section 23 (q) of such code (relating to the so-called "charitable contribution" deduction) is amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (3) the word "or", and by adding after paragraph (3) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(4) the United Nations, but only if such contributions or gifts (A) are to be used exclusively for the acquisition of a site in the city of New York for its headquarters,

and (B) are made after December 1, 1946, and before December 2, 1947."

SEC. 3. Section 1004 (a) (2) of such code (relating to deductions for purposes of gift tax) is amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding after subparagraph (E) a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(F) the United Nations, but only if such gifts (i) are to be used exclusively for the acquisition of a site in the city of New York for its headquarters, and (ii) are made after December 1, 1946, and before December 2, 1947."

SEC. 4. Section 1004 (b) of such code (relating to deductions for purposes of gift tax) is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding after paragraph (6) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(7) the United Nations, but only if such gifts (A) are to be used exclusively for the acquisition of a site in the city of New York for its headquarters, and (B) are made after December 1, 1946, and before December 2, 1947."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 812 (d) and the first sentence of section 861 (a) (3) of such code (relating to transfers for public, etc., uses) are hereby amended by inserting after the words "to influence legislation" a comma and the words: "or to or for the use of the United Nations, but only if such bequests, legacies, devices, or transfers to or for the use of the United Nations are to be used exclusively for the acquisition of a site in the city of New York for its headquarters, and the death of the decedent occurred after December 1, 1946, and before December 2, 1947."

Mr. REED of New York (interrupting the reading of the joint resolution). Mr. Speaker, because this is simply a technical bill involving various phases of the tax question and does not relate to the merits except that the text has to be in this form in order to carry out the idea of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the remainder of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution to take care of the gift by John D. Rockefeller?

Mr. REED of New York. That is it exactly. If a further explanation is desired, I will be glad to give it; if not, I will place a further explanation in the RECORD.

Mr. FORAND. I do not know that it will apply to anyone else, but this relates to the gift of a site for the headquarters of the United Nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a short but clear explanation of this resolution. I am fully in favor of it, but I think the House would like to know whether this would cover anything except gifts to the United Nations.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that by unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress on December 10 and 11, 1945, the United Nations were invited to locate the seat of the organization within the United States.

The General Assembly of the United Nations decided in February 1946 to establish the headquarters of the United Nations in this country. Thus, the United Nations, in deciding to locate its headquarters here, did so at the invitation of the Congress of the United States.

The General Assembly during the second part of its first session, which concluded its deliberations last December 1946 found a site between Forty-second and Forty-eighth Streets on the East River, Manhattan Island, New York City, which, because of its accessibility to hotels and other facilities, seemed to be a suitable site, comprising some 18 acres.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller caused to be obtained from the owners of this property an option on the major part of the site for the benefit of the United Nations. The purchase price specified in the option being $8,500,000, Mr. Rockefeller offered to donate the purchase price of $8,500,000 to the United States on certain conditions.

First. The city of New York must donate that part of the site not covered by Mr. Rockefeller's option, together with the streets which traverse the site; also, the city to give to the United Nations the piers and bulkheads along the East River front between Forty-second and Forty-eighth Streets. The city of New York has agreed to all of these conditions.

Legislation has been introduced in the New York State Legislature to grant exemption from real-estate taxes on property owned by the United Nations. Hon. Thomas E. Dewey has so advised. The gift by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., is contingent also on the condition that he be relieved of the Federal gift tax, estate tax, and income tax to the extent that these taxes may be involved in this transaction.

The gift tax involved will range from $3,700,000 to $4,800,000, depending upon whether any prior gifts have been made. Top gift rate is 57¾ percent. The estate-tax rates are one-fourth percent higher than the gift-tax rate. If the property were to be left to the United Nations by devise, the Federal estate tax would be $6,545,000, provided, however, the entire devise were to be subject to the top-bracket rate, which is 77 percent.

The resolution also allows such gifts to be deducted by the donor for Federal income-tax purposes, subject to the 15-percent limitation under the present law, a gift to the United States or a State for exclusively public purposes, or a gift for charitable or educational purposes, is allowed as a deduction in computing income, subject to the over-all limitation that the deduction for all such gifts combined cannot exceed 15 percent of the taxpayer's income for the taxable year in which the gift is made.

Under the resolution, gifts to the United Nations to facilitate the acquisition of a site in the city of New York are placed in the same category as public and charitable gifts, if made after December 1, 1946, and prior to December 2, 1947.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following correspondence in relation to this matter:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., February 11, 1947.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, the Capitol, Washington, D. C

DEAR MR. KNUTSON: I confirm herewith my telegram to you of even date as per the enclosed copy.

I now enclose herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Estimate of the City of New York on December 13, 1946. You will note that the Board of Estimate of the City of New York agrees to give the United Nations property in the beds of certain streets in the United Nations area, together with other property owned by private parties which will be condemned, and rights to various bulkheads and piers, and resolves that the board of estimate will do everything possible to carry out the provisions of the resolution.

I send this resolution to you to indicate the greater desire of the city of New York that everything possible be done to locate the United Nations in New York City.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor.

[Enclosure.]

FEBRUARY 11, 1947.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

The city of New York urges passage of House Joint Resolution 120, to grant Federal tax exemption for gifts to United Nations. Location of its permanent headquarters in New York City is of great value to the whole United States. The city is cooperating with United Nations by supporting State legislation to grant its property exemption from real-estate taxes and assessments and to permit the city to acquire and deed to it additional land to complete the site. The New York City Board of Estimate adopted a resolution on December 13, 1946, of which I shall send you a copy, approving of such legislation. Exemption from Federal gift tax is essential to the gift of the New York site, and I hope it will be promptly enacted.

WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor, City of New York.

Whereas an offer has been made to the United Nations by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to donate the sum of $8,500,000 for the purpose of making available to the United Nations as a permanent headquarters a site within the Borough of Manhattan, located and bounded by Forty-second Street, Forty-eighth Street, First Avenue, and the East River, and shown upon the map annexed hereto.

Whereas such offer and the conditions upon which it has been made to the United Nations are set forth in a memorandum dated December 10, 1946, addressed to Dr. Eduardo Zuleta Angel, Chairman of Permanent Headquarters Committee, and signed by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., a copy of which is hereto annexed; and

Whereas such conditions require that the city of New York agree to give certain public streets traversing the area to the United Nations upon terms which will permit the United Nations to close such streets or otherwise restrict their use for its own purposes, and that the city agree to give to the United Nations certain other real property within the site area and certain rights to bulkheads and piers along the river frontage between Forty-second and Forty-eighth Streets, all as more particularly set forth in the said memorandum dated December 10, 1946; and

Whereas the United Nations has indicated its wish to accept the said offer if the city will agree to the conditions imposed; and

Whereas the members of the Board of Estimate of the City of New York are unanimously desirous of cooperating fully in accepting the conditions imposed relating to action by the city of New York in order to promote and make possible the acceptance of said offer to make available such permanent headquarters site to the United Nations in the city of New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Estimate of the City of New York, in accordance with the conditions contained in said offer, agrees:

1. To give to the United Nations Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, and Forty-seventh Streets between the east boundary of First Avenue and the west boundary of Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive upon terms which shall permit the United Nations to close any or all thereof to passage and otherwise to use them for its own purposes without restriction or limitation.

2. To acquire and give absolutely to the United Nations all the balance of that city block bounded by First Avenue, Forty-seventh Street, Forty-eighth Street, and Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive not covered by the firm offer of Webb & Knapp, Inc.

3. To give to the United Nations all rights to bulkheads and piers along the river frontage of the East River between Forty-second and Forty-eighth Streets; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of estimate will take all steps and adopt all measures necessary in the exercise of its powers, and will recommend action and legislation by other agencies, if necessary, in order to carry out the provisions herein set forth.

I may say that the reason we are seeking to pass this resolution today is that the options expire on February 28th and there is a great deal of detail to carry out in connection with the options and clearing the title of the property involved in the set-up.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want it made perfectly clear that this resolution applies only to this particular situation, and also that neither the State of New York nor the city of New York will have this property assessed for tax purposes.

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. It means, as it was explained to the committee, Mr. Speaker, that John D. Rockefeller would not make this donation or this gift of $8,500,000 if it were to be subject to the gift tax, which would amount to something like $3,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. And if he were to attempt to pass this over by devise to the United Nations later on, the tax would be over $6,000,000, because, of course, it would be subject to the estate tax.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE MARITIME COMMISSION TO OPERATE VESSELS UNTIL JULY 1, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 114) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947, and I ask that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and that general debate be permitted not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law any temporary authority issued or to be issued by an appropriate Government agency to the United States Maritime Commission to provide service as a carrier by water may be valid for a period not extending beyond July 1, 1947.

SEC. 2. The paragraph under the head "United States Maritime Commission" in title I of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, is hereby amended by striking out "March 1, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all points of order be waived on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this measure comes before the House at the urgent request of the President and of the Maritime Commission and indeed of the entire maritime industry. I do not know of any measure that has come before our committees, in the 8 years I have served on the committee, in which there has been such unanimity of opinion and such a tremendous deluge of telegrams asking that this power for the Maritime Commission be extended from March 1 to the end of the present fiscal year.

I hope there will not be any objection to the passage of the resolution. The report from the committee is very clear. It comes to the floor with unanimous vote of the committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution came before the committee. There were lengthy hearings. Everyone appearing before the committee was favorable to the passage of the resolution. There was no objection to it whatsoever. At the time the resolution was called up for final vote the vote was unanimous that it be reported favorably, and that the chairman of the committee call it up in the House as soon as possible.

At the time it was considered, I may say for the benefit of the House and those who are interested in maritime affairs, it was expressly stated that at the time this continuation expired it was hoped it would not be asked for again.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It was expressly stated to our committee by the Chairman of the Maritime Commission that they would not ask for an extension of the dry cargo operations after July 1. They may have to ask for an extension of time in the operation of tankers to take care of some of the naval requirements.

Mr. BONNER. In addition to that, we advised the Maritime Commission we would go into the tanker subject with them at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. This legislation is necessary if we are going to continue our coastal and intercoastal shipping operations as well as some of our offshore operations. The Maritime Commission needs the time between now and July 1 to try to make some kind of adjustment in the rates as they now affect coastal and intercoastal operations. At the present time these operations are being conducted at a loss, while the offshore operations are bringing a substantial profit. The total over-all profit from Government shipping operations is about $2,000,000 a month.

This resolution does not involve the appropriation of any funds. It is imperative to the continuance of our present shipping operations. I heartily recommend its immediate enactment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert, as a part of my remarks on House Joint Resolution 121, certain communications from State and city officials with reference to the gift.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

RUSSIA AND THE BALTIC PROVINCES

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942, incorporating the principles of the Atlantic Charter, set forth the aims and purposes of World War II in the following words:

Complete victory over our enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in our own lands as well as in other lands.

The Atlantic Charter states:

Article I:

Our countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other:

Article II:

We desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Article III:

We respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and we wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Article VI:

After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, we hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

The foregoing are the principles for which we expended and still are spending billions of dollars; for which we drafted and dispatched to all fronts over 11,000,000 men and women; for which we suffered over 1,000,000 casualties, and lost over 300,000 lives.

True, we destroyed Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. But was our lofty aim achieved? We fought and bled against aggression and tyranny—for liberty and independence for all nations, for human rights and justice in our own land as well as in other lands. Have we attained that? We have defeated three aggressors but we have not defeated aggression and tyranny. Acts of aggression and tyranny have been and are being committed and practiced by our ally and a signatory of the United Nations Declaration and Charter—Soviet Russia. A most flagrant violation of treaties and human rights was committed by Russia in the act of aggression against Lithuania and the other two Baltic states. This act was condemned by the Lithuanian Nation and by our Department of State on July 23, 1940. The statement of the State Department reads as follows:

During these past few days the devicus processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors have been rapidly drawing to a conclusion. * * *.

The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by threat of force. * * * They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any sovereign state, however weak. The United States will continue to stand by these principles.

This statement, it goes without saying, is in complete accord with the stand of the people of the United States. In conformity therewith we have not recognized and do not recognize the illegal and usurpatory acts of Russia in the Baltic states. But is that enough? Not if we are to effectuate our high objectives. Our President and Secretary of State should state plainly and unequivocally that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are victims of aggression and injustice, and that these acts are incompatible with the war aims and pledges, and contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and that the United States will not approve nor justify the act which is now legally—by the Nuremberg Court decision—determined as "the supreme international crime."

Lithuania was a progressive and peace-loving and peace-living country until Hitler and Stalin decided in 1939 to dismember and enslave her in violation of international treaties, agreements, and assurances. The Lithuanian-Soviet Russian Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, explicitly provided that Soviet Russia recognized a free and independent Lithuania within its ethnographic boundaries, and renounced for all time sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

The Lithuanian-Soviet nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, provided that both countries mutually undertake "to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other." Each of the two contracting parties agreed to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party. Lithuania fulfilled the terms of the treaty implicitly—Soviet Russia violated it by invading and occupying Lithuania in June of 1940, and still holds and rules it with tyrannical brutality.

The case of Lithuania is identical with that of Austria and Czechoslovakia under Hitler Germany's occupation and regime. The mode of occupation and hegemony corresponds in every detail.

Austria was the first victim of Hitler's aggression; Lithuania is the first victim of Stalin's aggression. Austria's independence is being restored, Lithuania's independence is undetermined. Why so? Crime is a crime regardless of by whom it is committed.

The aggression against Austria and Czechoslovakia was described by the Nuremberg tribunal as "a premeditated aggressive step in furthering the plan to wage aggressive wars against other countries." The act of Russia versus Lithuania is identical with that of Germany versus Austria and Czechoslovakia with the exception that, in addition to violation of international treaties, agreements, and assurances, there was a conspiracy made by and between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia on August 23 and September 29, 1939. The texts of those agreements read thusly:

1. In the case of a politico-territorial change in the territories belonging to the Baltic states—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—the northern frontier of Lithuania shall form also the demarcation of the spheres of interest between Germany and the U. S. S. R.

For the German Government, J. Ribbentrop.

On behalf of the Government of the U. S. S. R., V. Molotov.

Moscow, 23 August 1939.

Second additional secret protocol.

Point 1 of the secret additional protocol, signed on August 23, 1939, is hereby modified to the effect that the territory of the Lithuanian State becomes part of the sphere of interest of the U. S. S. R. while the Province of Lublin and parts of the Province of Warsaw become part of the sphere of interest of Germany. As soon as the Government of the U. S. S. R. takes special measures on Lithuanian territory for the purpose of safeguarding its interests, the present German-Lithuanian frontier shall be rectified for the purpose of a natural and simple delimitation of the frontier by giving to Germany the Lithuanian territory southwest of the line drawn on the appended map.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the German Government, J. Ribbentrop.

On behalf of the Government of the U. S. S. R., V. Molotov.

Let us rest the criminal case here.

Now, I deem it appropriate to call your attention, gentlemen, to the fact that yesterday, Sunday, February 16, was the anniversary of the independence day of Lithuania, and that today Americans of Lithuanian descent are commemorating that date throughout the United States. Lithuanians in Lithuania, however, will not be privileged to celebrate their "Fourth of July." Such a celebration in Lithuania would mean arrest, imprisonment, and deportation to Siberia or some other remote place in Russia. It is alleged that over 300,000 Lithuanians have already been deported to Soviet Russia. A large number of the deportees have already died in exile because of malnutrition, exposure, and subjection to slave labor. About 100,000 Lithuanians were forced to flee from Lithuania into western Europe—about 40,000 of them are in the American zone in Germany. They dare not return to their homeland because of the foreign occupation and tyranny there.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this the thing that we fought for? Can you or I, or anyone else, call it freedom and the assurance of dwelling in safety and freedom, as provided by the Atlantic Charter, within their own boundaries? Or can you call it the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all human persons and nations, large and small, as provided in the United Nations Charter? It is a mockery of the first degree. It is a blot upon Christian civilization and the principle of justice. It is a blot upon international law and treaty obligations. It is the very thing that we condemned and fought against.

The Soviet scourge and injustice must be called to the attention of the peace-loving world. In the words of the editor of the magazine Destiny:

> We cannot remain silent while the terrible scourge of Soviet oppression afflicts helpless people. While Great Britain and the United States continue their policy of appeasement in an endeavor to placate Russia, we must protest or else by our own silence become a partner in the crimes being committed. Unless Great Britain and the United States rise in righteous indignation and demand justice and freedom for those who are oppressed, the wrath of Almighty God will rest upon our people.

Indeed, if we do not condemn lawlessness by every peaceable means at our command, and if we continue condoning international crimes we shall become accomplices to those crimes, and will lose honor and prestige among peace-loving and peace-living nations, and among upright and law-respecting peoples.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. VAIL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Gary Post-Tribune.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the privilege of working closely with OWI in their broadcasts in psychological warfare during most of World War II. Prior to my participation in that program I made a very careful study of available evidence regarding their purpose and method of operation. From this study I was convinced of the worthiness of their contribution to our war program.

During the late war—and even before the first enemy bomb fell at Pearl Harbor—I was firmly convinced of the important place psychological warfare must occupy in any emergency calling for all-out national defense. My experience throughout the war supported further my conviction of the importance of the program carried out by OWI in this field.

At the end of the shooting war, I learned that a similar activity was planned as a psychological peace-fare and that this program was to be carried out by the State Department in much the same way that the psychological warfare had been carried out by OWI. It has always been a matter of personal ethics to me to examine all available evidence of what an operating agency or department of this Government is actually doing before expressing my considered opinion about such program and whether or not it should receive my support, consequently I withheld any statement of approval or disapproval of the new venture by the State Department into this field as a peacetime measure. I had an open mind on this subject when, during the fall of 1946, as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, I made a tour of certain areas in the Far East which are vital to the defense of this Nation. My experiences during that tour have brought me to the conclusion that psychological peace-fare is as necessary in times of peace—to maintain that peace—as is psychological warfare in times of war, to bring a more speedy end to hostilities.

I know you will be interested in my observations during an extended trip that I made with the Committee on Military Affairs into Japan, China, the Philippines, Siam, and Australia last fall. On that trip I had an opportunity to observe the fine job our State Department representatives are doing in meeting the inroads of communism. Our State Department representatives had only a very small personnel and a very depleted arsenal of information at hand but nevertheless they were doing an outstanding job. I met and talked with these men and women from China to Sydney and I can conservatively report that they are as fine in character and as efficient in their devotion to their manifold duties as any group within the Government today.

I was especially interested in meeting two Iowans engaged in this service whom I have known exceptionally well—Miss Dorothy Ward and Mr. Robert Burlingame. Dorothy Ward, now busily at work in the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs' Library, at Bangkok, Siam, is the daughter of an old friend and associate of mine at the University of Iowa. Mr. Burlingame, now OIC's chief public-affairs officer in Australia, got his start as a reporter on the Eldora (Iowa) Herald-Ledger and was later executive secretary of the Iowa Territorial Centennial Commission. But it is as a welcome voice heard in thousands of Iowa homes—as the ace broadcaster of the Central Broadcasting Co. in Des Moines—that I best remember "Bob." These are capable, alert Federal employees—and their greatest asset is their unquestioned loyalty to our country.

In addition to my long experience with and high appraisal of OWI in their wartime program, the observations I made during my trip through the Orient in August and September 1946, and the meeting of these highly qualified representatives of America, including especially such worthy representatives as Miss Dorothy Ward and Robert Burlingame, have convinced me that our State Department is making a very worthy and worth-while contribution to America's welfare in their new undertaking known as the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUFFETT, for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week, on account of public business.

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. KEFAUVER), for the week of February 17, 1947, on account of official business.

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 1 week, on account of public official business in Puerto Rico.

To Mr. HEDRICK, February 18, 19, 20, 21, on account of official business.

To Mr. ANDREWS of New York (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. BULWINKLE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. ENGLE of California (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California), until March 3, 1947, on account of official business.

To Mr. BUSBEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for February 17 and 18, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 18, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in open hearings on Tuesday, February 18, at 10 a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 476) to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered wartime service in the United States merchant marine, and to provide aid for their families.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A meeting of the committee will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Tuesday, February 18, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the committee room, 356 Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 18, 1947. Executive session at 10 o'clock followed by open session at 11.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 18, 1947.

Business to be considered: Full committee executive session, to be followed by a continuation of public hearings on air accidents.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

346. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

347. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

348. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

349. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, transmitting copies of an unclassified version of a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling, which was submitted with letter of January 20; to the Committee on Armed Services.

350. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a gun and mount assembly to the American Legion, Troop 1, Post 665, of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

351. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report on unsold economic project farm units and project properties capable of being developed into economic farm units and other unsold project acres as of December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

352. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation under the War Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $136,181.52 (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

353. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the War Department for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office covering a judgment rendered by a United States district court amounting to $5,850 (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

354. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts in special cases as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $24,343.59 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 129); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

355. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property in the sum of $34,040.89, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

356. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts amounting to $54,638.24, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

357. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $775,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1947, to remain available until December 31, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

358. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation amounting to $15,834,780.23 to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

359. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $154,130.77 (H. Doc. No. 122); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

360. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $20,509.56 (H. Doc. No. 133); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

361. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of $11,486.32, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 132); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

362. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment amounting to $2,104,796.18 (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

363. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $9,615.60, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

364. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay a claim for damages to privately owned property in the sum of $45.60 (H. Doc. No. 121); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

365. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions in the sum of $742,814.77 (H. Doc. No. 123); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

366. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report on the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 20. Concurrent resolution establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 1968. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1367. A bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1819. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; with amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADLEY of California: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 122. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1969. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act with respect to hours of work for barbers within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1970. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 1971. A bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to remove the discrimination between Regular and Reserve components of the services in the act in regard to transportation of dependents and household effects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 1972. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 1973. A bill to provide certain benefits for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are veterans of World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 1974. A bill to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 1975. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1976. A bill to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1977. A bill to amend and reenact section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1978. A bill to abolish the War Assets Administration, to provide that Government agencies shall dispose of their own surplus property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1979. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that safety standards shall require air carriers to equip their airplanes with parachutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1980. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1981. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1982. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPRINGER (by request):

H. R. 1983. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 1984. A bill to provide for the extension of patents whenever the use of the same has been prevented by war or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE (by request):

H. R. 1985. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Department of the District of Columbia, the American Legion, situated in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1986. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1987. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1988. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1989. A bill to establish a National Security Resources Board as an adjunct of the armed services of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1990. A bill to establish the Army Air Forces as a part of the Military Establishment of the United States within the Department of War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1991. A bill to establish a Joint Chiefs of Staff as a part of the armed services of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1992. A bill to give employees of religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational institutions the benefits of coverage under the Social Security Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and the Federal Insurance Contributions Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1993. A bill to provide for the repeal of subparagraph e, section 124, of the Revenue Act of 1943; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1994. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in the foreign field, to authorize the creation of an Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 1995. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 1996. A bill to establish a Commission on the Legal Status of Women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1997. A bill to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code, relating to the receiving of stolen public property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1999. A bill to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Jeffersonville flood-control district, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 2001. A bill granting to the Imperial Irrigation district certain lands of the United States in the counties of Imperial, Riverside, and San Diego in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2002. A bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2003. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 2004. A bill to provide for changing the time for the appointment of the electors of the President and Vice President and of the time for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2005. A bill to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2006. A bill to provide for joint procurement of certain commodities by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2007. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to declare July 4, 1947, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year; to the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution providing that various titles of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 shall remain in force until the day following the adoption of this resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relative to the legislative budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. Res. 102. Resolution for the relief of Margaret L. Underdown, widow of Alexander Underdown; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting an investigation of the administration of the Office of Price Administration in Arizona; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and lubricating-oil tax and refuse to reenact such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to reclaim and keep in full force and effect all Federal taxes, license fees now existing relating to manufacture, distribution, and sale of butter substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Dr. Charles A. Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 2009. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2010. A bill for the relief of Loucas Roussos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2011. A bill for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2012. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Paul Rintrona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2015. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Garcia y Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2016. A bill for the relief of Anton Waytashek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 2017. A bill to provide for the payment in a lump sum to Montana State College of national service life insurance granted the late Ralph Coldwater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2018. A bill for the relief of Manuel Vaz Querido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2019. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 2020. A bill to provide for the relief of Orlando DiTomasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 2021. A bill for the relief of Archimidis Garbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

116. By Mr. MUNDT: Memorial of the State of South Dakota, recommending repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. Also, memorial of the State of South Dakota, recommending maintenance of taxes and regulations affecting butter substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

118. By Mr. NORBLAD: Joint memorial adopted by the House of Representatives and Senate of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to make on an annual and continuing basis the appropriations necessary for providing urgently needed additional Federal generating capacity in the Columbia Basin and not to require any increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration which would destroy the key of low-cost hydroelectric power needed to unlock other natural resources in Oregon and the great Pacific Northwest, permitting the development of new opportunities and new jobs and the creation of new taxable wealth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

119. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution with respect to national legislation adopted by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

120. Also, resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947, concerning taxation of cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

121. Also, resolution passed by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947, concerning the wage-hour law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

122. Also, resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947, concerning the amendment of the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

123. By the SPEAKER: Petition of board of directors, Northwest Public Power Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing appreciation for valuable assistance given in the entire northwest area in serving the public interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

124. Also, petition of Jessie E. Miller and various veterans of World War II, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request that the Redding office, at Redding, Shasta County, Calif., of the United States Employment Service be instructed to pay them their veterans' readjustment allowances, as required by the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in whom we live, move, and have our being, so fill us with holy confidence that every shaft of temptation and evil shall be splintered on the shield of good upright living. When the sea of life is storm-wrought and tempestuous, we would see Thee coming through the conflict and hear Thy voice saying, "Peace, be still."

Blessed Lord, be with every household across our broad land; may every child be held as a gift from God and be brought up in the way of Thy commandments. O grant unto parents that they may never know the anguish which biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. In these sadly disordered times, O God, so full of folly and irreverence, come and rule over our homes, and may understanding and wise discipline be the triumph of our victories. In the blessed Saviour's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1030. An act to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. BARKLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in one to include a radio address, in another a bill he introduced today, and in the third a further item.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on the St. Lawrence seaway.

WAR EXCISE TAX RATES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, GEARHART, DOUGHTON, and DINGELL.

SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the critical condition of the railroad transportation situation and particularly the need of boxcars in the Corn Belt.

My district in central Illinois is part of the so-called bread basket of the Nation, where millions of bushels of corn cannot be marketed because of the lack of cars—the corn is sorely needed by the processor for the manufacture of feeds and corn products, not only for this country but for commitments to the starving people abroad.

I am receiving many letters and telegrams from constituents.

The purpose of my remarks is to urge the Office of Defense Transportation to increase its efforts to correct this situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions adopted by the Ottumwa (Iowa) Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Andersen, H. Carl	D'Ewart	McGarvey
Anderson, Calif.	Dirksen	Meade, Ky.
Andrews, Ala.	Donohue	Monroney
Andrews, N. Y.	Drewry	Norblad
Barden	Durham	Norrell
Bates, Mass.	Elliott	Norton
Blackney	Elston	O'Hara
Brooks	Engle, Calif.	Peterson
Buckley	Fernandez	Pfeifer
Buffett	Fuller	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Gerlach	Price, Fla.
Busbey	Gorski	Priest
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Rizley
Canfield	Gwinn, N. Y.	Russell
Clason	Hardy	Sanborn
Clements	Hays	Sasscer
Clippinger	Hébert	Scoblick
Cole, N. Y.	Hedrick	Short
Cooley	Hendricks	Sikes
Cooper	Hess	Smith, Maine
Coudert	Jenison	Taylor
Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio	Towe
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Kefauver	Winstead
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Wolcott
Dawson, Utah	Kilday	Woodruff
	Lucas	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SAFEGUARDING ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 105, Rept. No. 40), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NEWSPRINT INVESTIGATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 58, Rept. No. 41), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized to conduct a study and investigation of all matters related to the need for adequate supplies, for use in the United States (including use in time of war), of newsprint, printing and wrapping paper, paper products, paper pulp and pulpwood, and of all matters related to means by which adequate supplies thereof may be produced or secured, with particular reference to—

(1) the short-range and long-range possibilities of increased production thereof in the continental United States (including Alaska);

(2) the short-range and long-range prospects of securing increased supplies thereof from Canada and other sources outside the United States; and

(3) the extent to which agencies or officers of the United States may be able to assist in furthering the objective of securing increased production and supplies thereof.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and as soon as practicable during the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States (including Alaska) or Canada, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

ESTABLISHING CEILING FOR EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 103, Rept. No. 42), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 20, establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948, and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year, and all points of order against said concurrent resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the concurrent resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said concurrent resolution. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO AND FROM ALASKA

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 122, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That committee has directed me to make a recommendation for the passage of House Joint Resolution 122 since current legislation will expire on the 28th of February 1947.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to say I am heartily in favor of the proposed resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the pending bill, House Joint Resolution 122, is cosponsored by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. The resolution authorizes the Maritime Commission to provide interim ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948. It represents a careful study by a special subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, commencing in May of last year. In order to give the Members of the House a better understanding of the urgent need for this legislation, I should like to discuss very briefly the history of this problem.

The people of the Territory of Alaska are completely dependent upon a life line of ships operating between the Pacific Northwest and the Territory, both to supply them with the necessities of life and to enable their products to be brought to market. Prior to the war this service was principally provided by three common carriers. During the war, however, all of their ships were requisitioned by the Government and all operations in the

Alaska trades were handled by the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission for the Government's account.

During these years of Government operation, costs have greatly risen. As a result of this rise in costs, Government operations have been conducted at a substantial loss. For example, I understand that the operating loss for the year 1946 will approximate $4,000,000. Because of this rise in costs and because of the unfortunate recent financial experiences of the Government in this trade, private operators are loath to resume service to and from the Territory.

Conceivably, Government operation at a loss could be continued in order to insure the development of Alaska. But I think that most of us are convinced of the desirability of getting the Government out of the shipping business and returning ship operations to private hands. The Alaska situation, however, is complicated by the fact that private capital is unwilling to assume the necessary risks at this time because of their inability to foresee profitable operations. It is further complicated by the fact that the present authority of the Maritime Commission to operate ships in the Alaska trade expires on February 28, 1947. Even if the Maritime Commission's authority is extended as provided by House Joint Resolution 114, such authority will only continue until June 30, 1947. As a result, some action must now be taken by the Congress to provide a solution for this most difficult Alaska problem.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has had this problem under consideration for over 6 months. Despite this, we are unable to suggest a permanent long-range legislative policy at this time for the Alaska trades. The reason for this is that until we have had some operating experiences under present conditions, it is impossible to determine what service is required and what revenues are required to continue this service. Our committee, therefore, has submitted in House Joint Resolution 122 and House Joint Resolution 123 only an interim solution to the problem. But this solution is one which will perform the two necessary functions of, first, insuring the continuance of service to Alaska and, second, of providing a year's experience under present conditions to serve as a basis for permanent legislative policy.

The plan which has been developed in House Joint Resolution 122 is a simple one. That resolution authorizes the Maritime Commission to enter into contracts with the private operators experienced in this trade, whereby the latter agree to operate such service as the Commission may deem necessary. All possible losses of such operation are borne by the operators. In order to permit them to operate without fear of too great losses, however, the Commission is authorized to charter to them at nominal rates of hire the vessels to be used in this trade. In addition, the Commission is authorized to provide the necessary marine insurance. To protect the Government and the people of Alaska from these operators' making any large profits, however, this resolution further provides that these operators shall receive, as their profit, a maximum of 10 percent of their capital necessarily employed in these trades. After all other expenses of operation have been met, the Maritime Commission would then recover a minimum of 75 percent of the excess, with a maximum additional 25 percent going to the operators.

It seems to me that this legislation is a highly workable solution of an extremely difficult problem. It solves the impasse resulting from the people of Alaska being unable to pay higher freight rates and the operators of vessels in the Alaska trades being unable to operate under the present rate structure. This solution will permit continued operation with a minimum increase in rates. The assistance which the Government furnishes to these operators will result in no out-of-pocket expenses, as the ships which are to be chartered at nominal rates are those already owned by the Government, and which would otherwise be placed in our laid-up fleet. Should the operation be a profitable one, the Government is assured of the recovery of the major portion of all such profits.

Coming from the Pacific Northwest I am well aware of the problems faced by our people of our great Territory to the north. I feel that by enacting this resolution Congress will not only be doing a great service to them, but a greater service to our Nation. It will be remembered that Alaska is our first line of defense. Only if it is adequately developed can it constitute a barrier against invasion from the north. And only if adequate water-borne commerce to and from that Territory is provided, can this development proceed. Accordingly, I strongly urge enactment of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to provide essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of long-range policy with respect to such transportation, the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into appropriate contracts, charters, and other arrangements with American-citizen operators deemed by the Commission to be qualified to supply such service until July 1, 1948. Such contracts or arrangements shall include provisions for making available to such operators Government-owned vessels under the control or jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission for operation during the period ending June 30, 1948. Such provisions may include charter hire at a nominal rate or rates, with necessary marine insurance to be provided by the Commission as to ships made available by the Commission and other ships operated by such operators in the Alaska service under the contracts or arrangements with the Commission. Such provisions may likewise include requirements that the operators shall agree to operate such ships in a manner as determined by the Commission to secure the most economical transportation for the Alaska service. The contracts or other arrangements shall include appropriate provisions for allocation of receipts from the operations of such ships. Such contracts or arrangements shall include, among such other requirements as the Commission may deem appropriate, provision for the application of such receipts to meet the operating costs and overhead expenses of the operator as approved by the Commission and an amount equal to the charter hire paid by the Commission for the use of the privately owned vessels, and amounts in excess thereof to become the property of the operators in amounts not in excess of 10 percent (before taxes) on the value of the assets (other than vessels) contributed to the venture by the operator as determined by the Commission for the purposes hereof and not otherwise. Any amount in excess of such 10 percent shall be applied first to meet the insurance expenses of the Commission, and any balance shall be applied or distributed as may be provided by the terms of the contracts or arrangements, but in no event shall the Commission receive less than 75 percent of such balance, as additional charter hire.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall report to the Congress at intervals of not greater than 90 days all contracts, charters, and other arrangements entered into pursuant to this act and the details and course of all operations which have been conducted thereunder.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST GERHART EISLER

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Un-American Activities as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), caused to be issued a subpena to Gerhart Eisler, of 48–46 Forty-seventh Street, Borough of Queens, New York City, N. Y. The said subpena directed Gerhart Eisler to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947, and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to the said committee; the subpena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon Gerhart Eisler, 48–46 Forty-seventh Street, Borough of Queens, New York, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on February 6, 1947, in room 226, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 23d day of January 1947.

"J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*"

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return made thereon by Louis J. Russell, investigator of the Committee on Un-American Activities, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena, the return of the service by the said Louis J. Russell being endorsed thereon, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Gerhart Eisler, 48–46 Forty-seventh Street, Borough of Queens, New York City, N. Y., to appear before the committee on the 6th day of February 1947, at 10 a. m. Served the within named on January 24, 1947, at 8:30 a. m., at his residence by Louis J. Russell."

The said Gerhart Eisler, pursuant to said subpena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2). The said Gerhart Eisler, after making his appearance in the chambers of the said committee, refused to be sworn by the chairman of the said committee; and as the result of the said Gerhart Eisler's refusal to be sworn as a witness before the committee, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter of inquiry committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon the said Gerhart Eisler. The record of the proceedings before the committee on Thursday, February 6, 1947, during which the said Gerhart Eisler refused to be sworn as a witness and to give testimony is set forth as follows:

"The committee met on Thursday, February 6, 1947, at 10 a. m., the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, presiding. All members of the committee were present; and in addition thereto there was present Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator and examiner for the said committee, and Louis J. Russell, investigator.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Mr. Stripling, do you have all of your witnesses here?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there are two witnesses who did not respond, Mr. Samuel Liptzin and Mr. Leon Josephson. Both have sent telegrams to the committee. I think that the telegrams should be read into the record and that the committee should take some action concerning the matter, for the reason that these are two very necessary witnesses.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Stripling, call your first witness.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Gerhart Eisler, take the stand.

"Mr. EISLER. I am not going to take the stand.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have counsel with you?

"Mr. EISLER. Yes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I suggest that the witness be permitted counsel.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, will you raise your right hand?

"Mr. EISLER. No. Before I take the oath——

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

"Mr. EISLER. I have the floor now.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I think, Mr. Chairman, you should make your preliminary remarks at this time, before Mr. Eisler makes any statement.

"The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, Mr. Eisler.

"Mr. Eisler, you are here before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to a subpena served on you January 25, 1947, which summoned you to appear before this committee this morning. This committee's authority, which is derived from Public Law 601, is authorized to investigate:

"(1) The extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States;

"(2) The diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; and

"(3) All other questions in relation thereto * * *.

"The committee considers the Communist Party of the United States to be a subversive organization, and the testimony or activities of any individual connected with the Communist Party of the United States is considered to be the purview of this committee's authority.

"There has been considerable testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and this committee, its successor, which links you with the activities of the Communst Party.

"The questions which will be asked you this morning will be aimed at determining the facts; and it is, therefore, requested that your answers be responsive and direct. It is not the policy of this committee to permit witnesses to make a statement. After you have completed your testimony, if you desire to make a statement, the committee will permit you to put it in the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

"Now, Mr. Eisler, you will be sworn in. Raise your right hand.

"Mr. EISLER. No

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, in the first place, you want to remember that you are a guest of this Nation.

"Mr. EISLER. I am not treated as a guest.

"The CHAIRMAN. This committee——

"Mr. EISLER. I am a political prisoner in the United States.

"The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Will you please be sworn in?

"Mr. EISLER. You will not swear me in before you hear a few remarks.

"The CHAIRMAN. No; there will be no remarks.

"Mr. EISLER. Then there will be no hearing from me.

"The CHAIRMAN. You refuse to be sworn in? Do you refuse to be sworn in Mr. Eisler?

"Mr. EISLER. I am ready to answer all questions, to tell my side.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is not the question. Do you refuse to be sworn in? All right.

"Mr. EISLER. I am ready to answer all questions.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, call the next witness. The committee will come to order, please. We have strived to put on a witness, Mr. Gerhart Eisler. Mr. Eisler refused to be sworn in.

"Mr. EISLER. I did not refuse to be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is the pleasure of the committee?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I think that the witness should be silent, or take the stand or be removed from the room, one or the other, until this matter is determined.

"Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, suppose you ask him again whether he refuses to be sworn.

"Mr. RANKIN. Not 'sworn in,' but to be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, do you refuse again, to be sworn?

"Mr. EISLER. I have never refused to be sworn in. I came here as a political prisoner. I want to make a few remarks, only 3 minutes, before I be sworn in, and answer your questions, and make my statement. It is 3 minutes.

"The CHAIRMAN. I said that I would permit you to make your statement when the committee was through asking questions. After the committee is through asking questions, and your remarks are pertinent to the investigation, why, it will be agreeable to the committee. But first you have to be sworn.

"Mr. EISLER. That is where you are mistaken. I have to do nothing. A political prisoner has to do nothing.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then you refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. EISLER. I do not refuse to be sworn. I want only 3 minutes. Three minutes to make a statement.

"The CHAIRMAN. We will give you those 3 minutes when you are sworn.

"Mr. EISLER. I want to speak before I am sworn.

"Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the witness be cited for contempt.

"Mr. RANKIN. I second the motion.

"The CHAIRMAN. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying 'aye.' Motion carried. The witness will be cited for contempt.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before the witness leaves I would like to know in whose custody he leaves.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who brought the witness?

"Mr. STRIPLING. These gentlemen. Will you give your name?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Steve Grennman.

"Mr. STRIPLING. And what is your position?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Security officer, Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"Mr. STRIPLING. And your name?

"Mr. BROSMAN. R. J. Brosman.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Your position?

"Mr. BROSMAN. Security officer, Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Did you bring Gerhart Eisler to the committee?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Is he now in your custody?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee where he will be taken?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. To the county jail in Washington.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know where he will go from the county jail?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Back to Ellis Island, I believe.

Miss CAROL KING. May I be heard?

"The CHAIRMAN. Take the witness out.

"Mr. Stripling, put on your next witness."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the right to receive the sworn testimony of the said Gerhart Eisler relative to the subject matter which under Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of the witness to be sworn and to testify as hereinbefore set forth is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared and his willful refusal to be sworn and to testify deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION

"*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Gerhart Eisler to be sworn and to testify before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Gerhart Eisler may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law."

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Gerhart Eisler to be sworn and to testify before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Gerhart Eisler may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, when the Committee on Un-American Activities opened its session at 10 o'clock, it had by previous investigation, tied together the loose ends of one chapter of a foreign-directed conspiracy whose aim and purpose was to undermine and destroy the Government of the United States. The principal character of this conspiracy was Gerhart Eisler, alias Berger, alias Brown, alias Gerhart, alias Edwards, alias Liptzin, alias Eisman, a seasoned agent of the Communist International, who had been shuttling back and forth between Moscow and the United States from as early as 1933, to direct and master mind the political and espionage activities of the Communist Party in the United States.

When Eisler appeared before the committee, he did not come as a grateful political refugee who had enjoyed a safe haven in this country from war-ravaged Europe during the period of World War II; he came instead as an arrogant, defiant enemy of that government and promptly manifested his disrespect by refusing even to be sworn before the committee. His manner and attitude was one of utter contempt.

Two other conspirators and comrades of Eisler, Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzin, who were subpenaed to appear, did not appear; Josephson contended by telegram that 2 days was not sufficient notice for him to come from New York to Washington, and Samuel Liptzin informed the committee by telegram that he could not appear because he was at the bedside of one very dear to him. It is no wonder that Eisler refused to talk and Josephson and Liptzin did not respond to the subpenaes, because the committee, through its own investigators, had obtained documentary evidence which linked these three individuals with several very serious violations of Federal statute.

The committee also had present qualified witnesses who were prepared to unmask the subversive activities of Eisler and his coconspirators.

I think I am safe in announcing to the House that the committee will deal with Mr. Josephson and Mr. Liptzin at a very early date, and that subsequent hearings by the committee will reveal the detailed operations of Gerhart Eisler. There are a number of witnesses scheduled to be heard by the committee on this case.

I should like to read at this time from a report by J. Edgar Hoover on the activities of Gerhart Eisler:

It is of particular significance to note that through the investigation of Gerhart Eisler it has been ascertained that he is identical with an individual previously known as Edwards, who, from approximately 1933 until approximately 1938, was the representative of the Communist International to the Communist Party, U. S. A., by virtue of which position he was responsible for and instrumental in the determination of American Communist policy and the control and the direction of American Communist operations. * * *

Eisler's primary contacts since his arrival in the United States have been important Communist functionaries, many of whom are strongly suspected of involvement in Soviet espionage operations. * * *

The entire pattern of Eisler's activities since his arrival in June 1941, as previously summarized, is one of apparent evasion and duplicity coupled with clandestine but no less important activity. He has been in constant contact with important Communist functionaries and has been frequently in touch with individuals identified as or strongly suspected as being Communist functionaries identified as or strongly suspected as being Soviet espionage agents. In addition, as noted in greater detail above, Eisler was for many years an important representative of the Comintern. During a recent interview, Gerhart Eisler unequivocally denied his activities as outlined above, which denials obviously were false and unfounded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the House some of the facts concerning Eisler. He was born in Leipzig, Germany, February 20, 1897. He started his Communist career in Austria when he helped organize the Communist Party in that country. He then transferred his activities to Germany and shortly thereafter was transferred to Moscow, where he was trained to be an agent of the Communist International, or a "C. I. Rep.," as they are referred to in Communist Party jargon. At the Lenin School in Moscow, he was schooled in revolutionary tactics, in espionage, sabotage, and other methods and tactics which serve the Communist revolutionary program. He was assigned to the American Commission of the Comintern to prepare himself for his future duties in America.

His first assignment as a Comintern agent was in China in 1928, and then in 1933 he was sent to the United States to take over. From 1933 until the late thirties, he was the mysterious but supreme authority on Communist activities in the United States. Because his activities were carried on secretly, it was necessary that he use many aliases. It was also necessary that he return to Moscow at regular intervals to get the latest party line and instructions, and so in 1934, when he needed a passport to return to Moscow, he obtained one through the application which I hold here in my hand. This application has been reproduced and is contained in the committee's hearings, and I suggest that every Member, at his convenience, study it, because it will give you an insight into the fraud and intrigue which is employed by the Communist agents to carry on their work.

Now the handwriting on this application, according to the questioned documents experts of the Treasury Department, is that of Leon Josephson; the name on this application is that of Samuel Liptzin; the picture on this application is that of Gerhart Eisler; the signature of the identifying witness, Bernard A. Hirschfield, is also in the handwriting of Leon Josephson. In fact so far as the committee has been able to determine, there is no such person as Bernard A. Hirschfield. The passport was issued to Eisler in the name of Samuel Liptzin on August 31, 1934. He sailed on the *Berengaria* in 1935 for Moscow on passage which was paid for by the Communist Party of the United States.

He returned to the United States and used this passport again in 1936, when he again went to Moscow. Bear in mind, however, that the passport application made no reference to his going to Russia. Also bear in mind that while Eisler was the keyman on Communist affairs in the United States, he was known only to the top functionaries. The committee produced a number of other documents relating to Eisler's activities during the thirties, and heard considerable testimony to the effect that he was operating in the United States during the thirties. This becomes important when you learn that on June 14, 1941, when Eisler arrived at Ellis Island as a so-called political refugee from France, he swore before a special board of inquiry at Ellis Island that he had never been to the United States before. He swore that he had never been married, although the facts show him to have been married twice before he entered the United States.

When that board asked him the following question "Are you now or have you ever been a member of any Communist organization?" his answer was "No." When he was asked, "Were you ever sympathetic to the Communist cause?" his answer was "No." He even denied under oath that he had a sister, even though that sister was at that time residing in New York. Eisler has been in the United States since June 14, 1941. All during the war period Eisler was the commissar for Communist activities in the United States When he wrote articles he was "Hanns Berger." When he sat in on secret Communist meetings he was "Edwards," and when he traveled he was "Brown." Under the name of Julius Eisman he was being paid regular sums by a Communist-front organization known as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and from other Communist sources.

From the story I have related briefly today we can see the type of man we are dealing with For those members who are interested in looking into the matter further, I recommend a reading of the full transcript of the testimony before the committee.

There is a tendency in some quarters to treat this case as one of a political prisoner, a harmless refugee whom this committee is persecuting because of his political belief, and who is guilty only of the fact that he happens to have a different political faith than the members of this committee For that reason, I believe the story of his activities is important. It is a story replete with criminal acts against the United States, forged documents, perjury, failure to register as an alien agent. It is a story of a man described by his own sister as an arch terrorist of the worst type—a man who was clearly linked by the testimony with members of the Canadian

atom-bomb spy ring, a man whose only reason for being in the United States was to tear down and destroy the Government which furnished him refuge during the war years.

This is the man who showed such contempt for a committee of this House. Unfortunately, the statute of limitations has run on many of the criminal acts of Gerhart Eisler. It seems most pertinent to ask where were the agencies of our Government responsible for enforcing the immigration and naturalization laws when the statute was running on the Eislers, the Josephsons, and the Liptzins.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. I think that every Member of the House is in substantial agreement with the Attorney General in his recent statements on the necessity of rooting out Communist sympathizers from our American institutions. By the same token I believe that we must all agree that now is the time for action as well as words. The Members of this House have probably had experience in dealing with the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. The rules of that Service are extremely strict. For example, I have a specific case in my district, of a teacher of French at Pomona College, California, whose permit has been revoked because she did not report a change of employment to the Service; yet Gerhart Eisler was able to go freely in and out of the United States from 1933 until the present time with relatively no difficulty. It is significant to note that in 1943 the Immigration and Naturalization Service changed his status from that of alien in transit to alien for pleasure. In that status he had the complete run of the country. It would certainly seem that an investigation should be made of the procedures and the personnel responsible for granting such privileges to dangerous aliens of this type. Certainly no stronger case could be made for the proposition that there is no place in the Federal Service in positions so closely related to the security of the United States, for governmental employees who follow the Communist line or any other line which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

It is essential as Members of this House that we defend vigilantly the fundamental rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. But we must bear in mind that the rights of free speech and free press do not carry with them the right to advocate the destruction of the very Government which protects the freedom of an individual to express his views.

The resolution before the House today proposes a very simple and direct question. By adopting the report of our committee concerning an obvious contempt, this House can put Mr. Eisler out of circulation for a sufficient period of time for the Department of Justice to proceed against him on more serious charges.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I recognize there is very little anyone can say here that will at this time dispel the hysteria which has been worked up over this case. However, there are certain fundamental truths which are inescapable and which time and events will bring to bear more and more forcibly on the minds of the American people. The first is that when you tear away all the innuendos, the opinions of personal enemies, as well as the propaganda in certain sections of the press, neither this record, nor any other record, will ever show that at any time has this defendant engaged in any activity aimed at the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. You cannot get away from that. You can say he is a Communist—true. But you cannot say there is any concrete evidence anywhere that he has ever engaged in any activity supporting any action for the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. His only activity has been that of a militant anti-Fascist. Ironically, the anti-Fascist is on trial while pro-Fascists are at liberty to applaud and demand his persecution. If he has violated any statutes with respect to the immigration laws, that is not a matter for us to decide. We are still living in a country of law and order. That is a matter for the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury to pass upon.

I would like to deal at this time with two phases of this question—the first is whether or not there is a willful contempt of the committee. That is a legalistic phase and one which I admit is relatively unimportant. I call to the attention of the Members of the House page 3 of the committee hearings, and I read as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, do you refuse again to be sworn?
>
> Mr. EISLER. I have never refused to be sworn in.
>
> I came here as a political prisoner. I want to make a few remarks, only 3 minutes, before I be sworn in, and answer your questions, and make my statement. It is 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My time is limited, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to add to the gentleman's remarks that that statement that Mr. Eisler wanted to make in 3 minutes consisted of 20 legal-size pages of paper.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Still and all, I do not think that he was guilty of contempt when he offered to answer all questions. The argument between Eisler and the committee was one of procedure. Of course, technically, the committee had the right to establish its own procedure and insist that the witness follow that procedure laid down by the committee. But we are dealing with contempt and we must consider the question of willfulness, to determine whether or not contempt was committed. This was not willful contempt when the witness states, "I want to answer questions but I ask you to permit me to make a statement first and then I will be sworn in and then I will answer questions." Under the circumstances, the committee's insistence on its procedure was unreasonable and this is the decisive factor in this case.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In just a moment. I have only about two more minutes. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker. I want to continue my argument.

So that here we do not have a case of willful withholding of information on the part of a witness. The witness was ready to answer questions. He so stated. He simply asked the right to read a statement. I do not think that witness should be blamed for it. Let us look at the circumstances under which he was brought before the committee. All of the evidence indicates conclusively that the witness was ready and willing to come before the committee and had made arrangements to come before the committee. All of a sudden, at the request of the gentleman from New Jersey, chairman of the committee, this man was picked up and brought before the committee as a prisoner.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes; but I want to suggest at that point that I did not request he be picked up. I have a copy of my letter to the Attorney General, dated January 31, asking that the man be placed under surveillance. It was the Attorney General who perhaps decided he ought to be picked up. I never requested that he be picked up, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] cannot possibly prove that I suggested he be picked up.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then the gentleman admits he requested of the Attorney General that this person who was going to willingly appear, be placed under surveillance.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. And I will tell you why I did it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. Then the Attorney General places this man in custody and brings him before this committee as a prisoner. Is it unnatural and unreasonable for such a witness to insist that he be permitted to make a statement for 3 minutes or perhaps a little longer? The world would not have been lost; nothing would have been lost, particularly when he said, "I want to answer the questions after I have made my statement," particularly in view of the circumstances under which he was dragged before the committee?

But, as far as the legalistic situation is concerned, I said that it is relatively unimportant, although I doubt whether you will ever get a conviction on this record in the courts. Of course, you will say I am wrong. The majority of the House is against me on the proposition. I was told I was wrong also on the Dodd, Lovett, and Watson cases in this House, but the Supreme Court took the position taken by me on this floor on those three propositions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is something much more important involved here than the strictly legalistic phase. I have taken the floor simply because I refuse to unlearn the lessons that history has taught us. This is the beginning of a Red scare, it is aimed at Eisler, the Communist, but it is aimed at all advocates of democracy. Yes, this is the beginning of a Red scare. History has taught us that behind a Red scare, behind Red-scare hysteria, there marches, slowly but surely, and often speedily, domestic fascism to destroy the democratic rights, not only of an Eisler, but the democratic rights of all people.

The Red scare is the prelude which is now being set forth for an offensive against the rights of American labor, today against the rights of the Communist, tomorrow against the rights of the progressives and liberals. The Red scare is the smoke screen behind which reaction advances to trample ruthlessly over the liberties of the American people in this instance, over the liberties of the Italian people when it was used effectively in Italy; over the liberties of the German people when it was used effectively in Germany. The only issue involved here is whether we shall unlearn the lessons of recent history.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the perfunctory arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in defense of Eisler, the notorious Communist, I was reminded of what Brann, the great iconoclast, once said, that you cannot "explain a dead cat out of a family cistern."

All this argument, and all this sophistry, absolutely fails to offset the fact that this man Eisler is not only a Communist but that he is one of the most dangerous men who ever set foot on American soil. Not only that, but he has been here for years aiding in the undermining of American institutions.

I had never seen this Gerhart Eisler until he appeared before our committee the other day. The gentleman from New York says that had he been allowed to make a statement then, we could have sworn him. No; what he wanted was to make his statement and walk out. He had already given it to the press. He knew if he swore to what was in it, he would commit perjury. His sister came in and testified against him. She said he was one of the most "dangerous terrorists" in the country, or in the world. We have shown that he committed perjury time and time again, and I submit that the statute of limitations does not run against a perjurer while he is out of the jurisdiction of the court. Now, if the Department of Justice will do its duty as far as this man is concerned, he will probably spend the next 10, 20, or 50 years in the penitentiary.

We had before that committee a witness that I had never seen. I am not so sure that I had ever heard his name. He was a Negro by the name of Nowell. Now, you cannot accuse me of being in a race argument here, because this man Eisler and his sister are both Jews as well as his brother who is helping to poison the public mind through the motion-picture industry in California, but who referred to his sister, Mrs. Fischer, as "My former sister."

The other witness was a Negro. Now let us take these folks for what they are. I helped create this Committee on Un-American Activities because of these very dangers that I saw; and I want to say now that when I leave this Congress I will regard the creation of this committee as one of the greatest services I have ever rendered for the protection of my country.

It is the grand jury of America; it is doing more today to smoke out and expose these subversive elements that are trying to undermine and destroy America than any other influence in this country. The FBI is doing a wonderful job, but the FBI has its hands tied by the Department of Justice, which has not yet cleaned its own house.

During the last year or two when we were after these spies who were in here trying to get information on the atomic bomb, when the Committee on Un-American Activities was doing everything possible to run them down, we had this same nagging and the same opposition from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. But we had the help of the Canadian Government, and I want to say again that America owes a great debt of gratitude to the Government of Canada for running those spies down, catching them, and breaking up that ring at least for the time being.

Now, let us turn back to this Negro witness. His name is Nowell. He lived in Detroit. He said he was born in Georgia. Now, I have lived all my life and practiced law for years in a State where we had many, many lawsuits between Negroes and whites and between Negroes themselves. I am used to cross-examining them. I know something of the way they testify, and have a fairly good way weighing testimony, and if I am any judge this Negro, Nowell, was sincere in every word he said.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Is it within the rules of this Congress to refer to any group of our Nation in disparaging terms?

Mr. RANKIN. It is not disparaging to call them Negroes, as all respectable Negroes know.

Mr. POWELL. I am addressing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of the disparaging term used.

Mr. POWELL. He used the term "nigger" in referring to a group.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman to say "Negro."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I said what I always say and what I am always going to say when referring to these people.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not a disgrace to be a real Negro. As I said on this floor before, if I were a Negro, I would want to be as black as the ace of spades. I would then go out with Negroes and have a real good time. These agitators are doing the Negroes of this country more harm than everything else put together.

Let us take this Negro, Nowell. He had been a Communist. They took him to Moscow to give him a course of communistic training. He testified that included in the course he was taught how to plan and carry out the overthrow of the Government of the United States—how to carry on subversive activities of all kinds. It finally got so bad that this Negro, Nowell, revolted, and I want to tell you now the American people owe him a debt of gratitude for exposing this infamous program.

When I asked him the question, he said that that race riot in Detroit a few years ago was caused by Communist agitation. They did not kill 30 Negroes, as was reported. They killed about 700. There was a Negro from my county who had organized a band up in Saginaw, Mich. He was down on Belle Isle playing when this riot occurred. They had 17 Negroes in this band. When the trouble started they got into a bus and started to leave. Their bus pulled up in front of a hotel in Detroit and a mob raided it and killed every single one of them. That is what these Communists are stirring up.

But let us see what this Negro said. We asked him if he was taught the tenets of revolution and he said:

> Yes; on instructions, how to capture a city, we were told how to seize the most vital means of communications, transportation, lighting, water supply, and so on, food; and, of course, the army, the armed forces; any arms, if any arms were stored; then, code, of course, transmission of messages; street fighting.

We asked him if he knew this witness, the man who had just walked out of the room a moment before, who called himself Eisler. He said, "Yes," he was with him in Moscow when they were over there in this Communist school taking training as to how to overthrow the Government of the United States and other governments throughout the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not care whose toes this gets on. My country comes first, and I here and now ask the Department of Justice, and the State Department, to clean house and put only Americans on guard, as George Washington advocated, and I am not saying anything to you that I would not say to my friend Harry Truman, the President of the United States.

I say that every effort is being made now by these aliens who have flooded in upon our shores, bringing with them

atheism, communism, anarchy, and infidelity, and plotting to undermine and destroy the United States, the greatest Government the world has ever seen, and the greatest country on earth.

Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has placed in our hands the atomic bomb, the most powerful weapon of which humanity ever dreamed. Is it not strange that providence did not turn that weapon over to Japan or Italy or Germany? Is it not strange that divine providence did not turn that weapon over to some country that is now destroying human liberty and human freedom?

Talk about democracy. I want you to read some of this Communist stuff that has been coming out of New York. I see where we are going to broadcast to Russia. For God's sake, let us put Americans to doing the broadcasting, and not have some of the stuff that has been coming out of there sent to the Russian people.

You remember the Irishman who, having been asked what he found wrong in France, said that the French were so ignorant that he could hardly make them understand their own language.

Now, if we are going to tell Russia about America, let us get some real Americans to do the talking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, talk about this man not being in contempt of court. I am a lawyer. I practiced law for many years. There is not a court in America that would not have sent him to jail immediately. What I want is to appeal to the Department of Justice to prosecute him for these other crimes.

I hope the House passes this resolution and in that way backs up the Committee on Un-American Activities in its efforts to protect our country from these enemies within our gates.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the question before this House is simple: Has this man Eisler done something which deserves citation for contempt? In my mind there could be no clearer case. This man says he did not refuse to be sworn. But he did refuse to be sworn because he refused to be sworn except upon his own terms, and the moment you allow that privilege to any witness you have broken down the whole system of judicial and investigatory processes in these United States, because if he can specify his terms as a 3-minute speech, he could equally specify them as a 3-hour or 3-day speech or anything else that he desired to as a qualification upon whether or not he should be sworn. And thus the control of an investigation or trial would pass from the hands of the committee or court into the hands of the witness. This is a warning, I think, Mr. Speaker, of the insidious processes, the clever, ingenious processes by which these Communists attempt to break down the judicial proceedings of these United States.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have wrestled with my conscience on this question, and I have lost a good deal of sleep over how I should vote. I have given a good deal of thought to it, as I am sure most of you have, and I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that I am going to vote to cite for contempt in this case. I say reluctantly, because I am not yet convinced that the present committee will not follow in the footsteps of its predecessor committee. I take my oath as a Member of the Congress very seriously, and I believe that committees of this House should be given the rights and privileges to which they are entitled as long as they are committees of this House.

I believe they should be permitted to function to the fullest extent necessary, and I have confidence and pride enough in the House of Representatives to believe that when a committee has not performed, and will not perform, the functions for which it has been established it will be abolished. But as long as we have this committee, I believe it should be supported. I do not want anybody to get up and remind me that I have not supported this committee at times in the past, and I am proud of that fact because I felt that in most instances the committee was wrong. I believe—and I have said many times—that we need in this country a real Committee on Un-American Activities. Let me say to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, that there are many other activities which are equally un-American with the types of activities which the committee has delved into. I agree with my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] when he talks about the Red scare. There is a Red scare here. There is much hysteria being created throughout the country about the Communist menace. While such menace may exist, I abhor the committee's practice of branding all those with whom it disagreed as Communists. But I say to you gentlemen—and specifically to the committee—that there are many other groups whose existence threatens the security of this country and the preservation of its democratic processes. How about the Columbians, Inc.? How about the Ku Klux Klan? Do you not agree with me that they are equally subversive, that they are equally dangerous to the welfare of this country, and that they bode no good to this country whatsoever? They are as harmful and as dangerous as the Communists are, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will consider that phase of subversive un-American activities in the future.

I want to serve notice that I and many who feel as I do in this House will not vote to sustain this committee in the future unless it demonstrates clearly that it will investigate and stamp out all types of subversion, and not proceed, in the same manner as its predecessor, against only those whom it calls Communists.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at all times here and elsewhere, I will always refer to the members of this Nation, whether they are black or white, Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, in the highest terms. It is unbelievable that any practice contrary to this can be allowed in this the highest body of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the Committee on Un-American Activities. I do not agree with it because of the way it was formed. I do not agree with it because of the way it has functioned. I do think there is need for a committee on Un-American activities. I think such a committee properly conceived could do a tremendous job for good. But this present committee has consistently aimed at only one phase of so-called un-American activities—that of communism. I make no brief for communism. It has plenty who can and do speak for it. I am not a Communist and I am not in favor of communism. However, I must defend the right of any individual to maintain whatever particular view he holds until such a view is declared illegal by act of Congress. It is not illegal now to be a Communist. Those of you who are so afraid of Red scares should have the guts to make communism illegal. Until then it is legal.

I am not in favor of this citation or any other, because, first, I have faith in our Department of Justice and our Federal Bureau of Investigation to do the job our laws have set them up for. Second, I have faith in the United States, which we all love, faith in the right, the moral right and the moral power of this Nation to triumph over any form of ism which may be against us. Third, I would vote against Mr. Eisler or any one else if the evidence was properly presented and it was indisputably proven that he was an enemy of our country. Fourth, I am against the Committee on Un-American Activities because of its methods. It follows an un-American patterns of prejudgment. And fifth, the Committee on Un-American Activities is not impartial in its investigations. It is one-sided. It creates a terror of communism while it ignores the deeds of strife and violence. If the Committee on Un-American Activities would go into such things as the Columbians, Inc., the lynchings of Georgia and elsewhere, the anti-Negro and anti-Jewish groups, and the Ku Klux Klan, then I would support it. As it is now constituted and functioning, I cannot support this or any other citation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I became a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities when it was created as a standing committee of the House. At that time I was not thoroughly convinced as to the value of the Dies committee. I had read many statements with respect to the drawing of red herrings across the trail and witch hunting, so I went on the committee with my mind wide open. If you will notice the hearings, you will see that I asked very few questions. I took a very small part in the activities of the committee and in bringing people before the committee. However, it gradually dawned on me that this is one of the most important com-

mittees that has ever been created, and I shall ever remember the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, as its creator, and the part he has played by the creation of this committee in bringing about one of the strongest forces for the defense of this country that we have today.

Certainly no one can ever accuse me of not being friendly with colored people, with Negroes. I was raised with them. I have played with them. I like them and they like me. I admire the colored man who came before the committee recently. He was like a fellow standing up in a revival meeting, after he had been a Communist sinner, who wanted to confess his sins and return to the righteous way. My heart went out to him because surely he is a real American, and I wish he were here to hear me say that. But when I stand there and watch the defiant and contemptible manner in which these people who are cited to come before this committee appear, it puts a fear in my heart. I saw one man come before the committee. He was the son of a distinguished and old American family, and he so misled me that after his first appearance he said, "Well, now, we have caught the committee wrong." He went away promising to do everything. When he came back he was most contemptible, or equally as contemptible as any witness who was ever called before the committee. These witnesses who are asked to appear before this committee seem to be schooled. They all come in alike and they all have the same tactics and all have the same approach. As red-blooded Americans, on the basis of the evidence that has been brought to light here, whether you are a lawyer or a layman, we are asking you to support this committee in the work they are doing in trying to clean up, bore in, and bring to the surface this group that is being permitted to run in and out of America on forged passports and practice their damnable trick of deception and preparation for the overthrow of our form of government. I think it is the greatest reflection on our Department of State and the Department of Justice when we read and hear the facts that have been produced here about this man under question. If I were a layman or businessman sitting on a jury, after I had witnessed his action and his approach to this committee, I would have sat there until the hair on my head grew to my knees before I would ever acquit him of the charge that has been brought here against him today.

Mr. Speaker, I hold here an advertisement which appeared in several North Carolina papers. It purports to be political advertising. That is not its purpose, and any intelligent person in North Carolina or elsewhere will agree. The purpose is to stir up trouble. It is purely communistic propaganda. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

[Paid political advertisement]

A PROGRAM TO WIN A BETTER LIFE FOR THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The people of North Carolina are uneasy about the future. They have a right to be uneasy. Even the experts of big business admit that a recession is on the way. Unless we people of North Carolina unite and fight for a people's program, terrible misery is in store for us.

North Carolina is one of the Southern States in which super profits are wrung from the white and colored peoples by keeping their standard of living below that of the country as a whole. The great corporations, dominated in the State by the Reynolds, the Dukes, and the Cannons, and linked with the billionaire trusts of Wall Street, have a field day at the expense of the people.

They can do so because the dead hand of the slave past still clutches at the people of this State and prevents North Carolina from being the great and prosperous State that it can and will be. One of the biggest lies ever foistered on a people was the one told the white workers and farmers of this State 70 years ago. They were told by the ex-slave-holding plantation owners that the path of progress for North Carolina was to keep the Negro people down and prevent them from winning equal rights as citizens.

Today it is easy to see what that course has meant not only for the Negro people of this State but for the white people as well. United States Department of Commerce figures show that in 1945 the average per person income in North Carolina was only $732 compared to $1,290 for all States outside the South.

In other words, this Jim Crow system robs every white worker in this State of more than $10 a week—money that his children need. In their own interest the white workers of North Carolina must join in the fight to end the Jim Crow system which forces the Negro people to serve as a source of cheap labor and allows the Dukes, the Reynolds, the Cannons, and their Wall Street buddies to wring extra profits from all the people of North Carolina.

Jim Crow also fosters hostility and distrust among our people, therefore its elimination will not only open up a new era of prosperity for North Carolina, but it will also usher in greater unity between the white and Negro peoples of this State, a unity based on mutual respect and trust.

The winning of equal rights for all is a key to winning a better life for the people of North Carolina. Below the Carolina district of the Communist Party lists the main demands in an immediate program for a better North Carolina. The Communist Party, as the political party of all militant working people, regardless of race, creed, or color, raises the goal of socialism for America, but it also leads in the day-to-day struggles of the people.

This immediate program, along with the national progressive demands, such as FEPC, full employment, defense of labor's rights, big three unity for peace, etc., can defend and advance the interests of the people. But only if around these issues is developed the maximum unity of labor, the farming population, the Negro people, professionals, and small businessmen. This is a program that must be fought for through united political action by the people—by all who put the interest of the many above the selfish super profits of the few.

RAISE LIVING STANDARDS

We advocate that the general assembly—

Establish a State minimum wage of 75 cents an hour with overtime after 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week for all workers, including agricultural, domestic, and State employees.

Amend the North Carolina unemployment act to provide benefits of $25 a week for 26 weeks. End exemptions for seasonal workers. Allow benefits for strikers. End delays. Liberalize base-period policy. Guarantee against discrimination.

Petition Congress to extend social security to cover all workers, including agricultural, domestic, and marine.

Require by law that all industries employing women provide a free State-inspected nursery for children of working mothers.

Defeat all antilabor bills.

MEET THE SCHOOL CRISIS

We advocate that the general assembly—

Establish a minimum salary of $2,400 a year for beginning teachers with college certificates, with regular raises for experience and training. Grant full sick leave with pay.

Abolish segregation in education. Open all State schools to all students, regardless of race, creed, or color. This democratic act will end much duplication and our school dollars will buy more education.

Petition Congress to enact the Federal aid-to-education bill.

FULL CITIZENSHIP FOR ALL

We advocate that the general assembly—

Repeal all segregation and Jim Crow laws in North Carolina.

Establish a State fair employment practices act to provide equal job opportunity in industry and government, with equal pay for equal work.

Guarantee the right to vote for all by halting illegal action of registrars that prevents thousands of Negroes from voting, particularly in eastern North Carolina.

MEET NEEDS OF VETERANS

We advocate—

A State bonus of $300 for overseas veterans and $200 for others.

Low cost State-financed, self-liquidating housing projects with priority for veterans, without discrimination.

LAND FOR THE WORKING FARMERS

The plantation system must end. Sharecroppers and tenant farmers must become owners of family-sized farms.

We advocate—

Government loans at low interest rate to guarantee land for the dirt farmer.

Petition Congress to guarantee full parity prices to the family-sized farm.

Help break the monopolistic control of markets by the big tobacco corporations. Establish cooperative control by committees of working farmers.

REPEAL SALES TAX

We advocate—

A tax program based on ability to pay. End the State sales tax which puts heaviest proportionate burden on lowest income group. Tax money should come from large property owners, public-utility monopolies, from income taxes on the higher income bracket, and from capital gain and excess-profits taxes on corporations. Drastic steps must be taken to stop the tax leak resulting from scandalously low assessments by big corporations in North Carolina.

USE BOTH HANDS

United Labor Action—or Else

Big business has captured control of Congress. As the opening gun in their assault against the people's standard of living and democratic rights—they are out to cripple and crush the trade unions.

Workers—AFL, CIO, railroad brotherhoods—unite in action to fight for your unions! Meet together and send joint demands that North Carolina Congressmen oppose all antilabor bills in Congress and that the general assembly at Raleigh defeat all antilabor bills. Send delegations to Congressmen and assemblymen.

Farmers, professionals, all Negro people, small businessmen—join with labor in this fight. It's a struggle between the millions of people on one side and the handful of billionaire trusts on the other. Labor's side is your side!

These demands are only the main ones of our North Carolina program. Write us for more details on any point. Ask us for our program of socialism—when the people, led

by the workers, will own the factories, the mines, the banks, etc., and produce for the use of all, instead of the profit of a few.

SAM HALL,
Chairman,
Winston-Salem, N. C.:

Send me the Worker, the people's fighting weekly paper.

☐ 6 months, $1.50.
☐ 1 year, $2.50.
☐ Send me more information about the Communist Party.
☐ Enclosed find a donation to help publish more advertisements like this one.

Name_____
Street_____
City_____ Zone____ State_____

CAROLINA DISTRICT,
COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A.,
SAM HALL, *Chairman,*
Winston-Salem, N. C.

I also hold here news clippings condemning this brazen attempt to stir up trouble between the good people of all races in North Carolina and a direct attack on the pioneers of industry in the State. I ask that these clippings be inserted at this point:

[From Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer]

LABOR, NEGROES ANGERED BY COMMUNISTS' PROGRAM—STATE LEADERS REPUDIATE PARTY'S BID FOR FAVOR IN LEGISLATIVE PLANS

(By Jim Chaney)

Angry North Carolina labor leaders yesterday unanimously repudiated a Communist Party attempt to affiliate itself with their program and roundly denounced a Communist-sponsored advertisement endorsing labor unions.

The advertisement, carried in the News and Observer Friday, purported to outline a program to win a better life for the people of North Carolina, by way of the Communist Party and the labor-union movement.

"It was a Judas kiss, a kiss of death," union spokesmen charged.

Negro leaders were equally irate.

The North Carolina Elks Association, in a resolution adopted at its midwinter meeting at Washington, N. C., called the advertisement an attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class.

OUT OF REACH

Meanwhile, the creator of the confusion, Chairman Sam Hall, of Carolina district Communist Party, United States of America, remained out of reach of potential interviewers. Hall could not be contacted at his Winston-Salem rooming house by telephone Nor did his landlord know his whereabouts.

"The Communists would do well to keep their —— noses out of the labor unions," R. R. Lawrence, southern director of the Textile Workers' Union of America (CIO), exploded. "We deny any connection with the Communist Party, and we object to their attempt to affiliate themselves with us."

Denouncing the advertisement by telephone from Salisbury, C. A. Fink, president of the State Federation of Labor (AFL) claimed, "It has always been our position to stand against the Communist Party."

"We have no common ground to stand on," he said. "I am sorry the advertisement appeared."

"I didn't know a thing about it (the advertisement) until it came out in the paper. I am certain that no responsible labor group would have been a party to it."

Condemned by unions and capital alike, the Communists have been working throughout the Nation largely on the subsistence provided with funds raised among radical groups. Labor spokesmen interviewed yesterday suggested that the Communists may have used the newspaper advertisement as a subtle means of "knifing the unions for ignoring them."

No real friend of labor would have publicly smeared the labor movement with red paint, Fink, Lawrence, and other union officials pointed out.

Even the Communists must realize that their endorsement in this State of a measure or plan or individual means the death of the thing they support, the labor leaders declared.

PROBABLE REACTION

Appearing at a time when the State legislature is considering at least one bill to curb labor unions, the advertisement could cause the passage of the severest type of anti-labor legislation.

State Labor Commissioner Forrest Shufford pointed out that the general assembly might be influenced to throw its weight against a proposed State minimum wage-hour law and to hold out on other labor requests.

Virtually the only persons pleased by the development were reactionary elements in the legislature and in State politics, who acknowledged that the Communists had supplied them with the political equivalent of an atom bomb. Unless liberal elements and labor can correct the damage, some observers felt, attempts may be made to paste the Communist label on any one who advocates betterment of the Negro race or improvement of working conditions.

If the references to the "Jim Crow system" in the advertisement was aimed at gaining favor with North Carolina Negroes, the committee failed as badly as they did with labor.

F. J. Carnage, Raleigh Negro attorney; Dr. O. S. Bullock, pastor of the Negro First Baptist Church, and other Raleigh Negro leaders described the advertisement as a "blow" to the social program of the Negro race.

"The Communists have been taking advantage of every little incident to stir up trouble among our people," Dr. Bullock said. "We do not need the help of the Communist Party nor of any other such group."

Carnage claimed "the Communists would do the Negro race a favor if they ceased associationg themselves with Negro affairs."

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer]

ELKS' IRE DRAWN BY COMMUNIST AD—OFFICIAL PROTEST ENTERED AT STATE MIDWINTER MEETING; REPORTS PRESENTED

(By Ed W. Davis)

WASHINGTON, N. C., February 15.—The North Carolina Elks Association in midwinter session here this afternoon "went up in arms" in protest against a Communist advertisement which appeared in the News and Observer Friday morning and unanimously adopted a resolution denouncing and condemning an attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class in North Carolina. The advertisement was waved before the meeting by Dr. W. A. Sams, of Marshall, past State president of Elks and present district deputy grand exalted ruler, who shouted "this is the greatest challenge Elkdom in North Carolina has ever had." He read the advertisement and urged the session to consider an action against it.

RESOLUTION DRAWN

President Boyce A. Whitmire of Hendersonville appointed the following committee, Staton Inscoe of Raleigh, J. C. Pittman of Sanford, and Edgar Woolard of Washington, who retired and after due deliberation returned with the following resolution which was unanimously endorsed by the gathering:

"Whereas there appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer on February 14, 1947, a paid political advertisement by the Communist Party, U. S. A., Carolina district, Sam Hall, Winston-Salem, N. C.; and

"Whereas the program of the Communist Party is un-American and threatens the security of our people and our Government and aims to promote revolution, discord, and civil strife and would seek to overthrow our Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the North Carolina Elks Association in meeting assembled at Washington, N. C., February 15, 1947, do denounce and condemn the attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class as shown by the aforesaid advertisement and call on all Elks in North Carolina to use their effort and influence against this and any other false doctrines that threaten our Government or security of the people of North Carolina."

Mr. Speaker, the above is sufficient answer to any communistic movement in North Carolina. It will never thrive there. I ask here and now that every Member of Congress rise up and support the pending resolution and show the country that we are determined to bring this evil in the open and run them out of our country.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I think first of all we should clear up any misapprehension which might exist concerning whether or not this man Eisler is in contempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and of Congress. I think we should clear up any misapprehension which might exist in the mind of some Member of the House who has not had an opportunity to read all these hearings as to whether or not Gerhart Eisler was actually in contempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

You heard the impassioned, although not overly persuasive, argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] who, laboring somewhat under a handicap, found a sentence or two in the hearings and on that tried to build a case that Gerhart Eisler was not in contempt. But he entirely overlooked the first two pages of the hearings of the committee. In fact, Mr. Gerhart Eisler's first statement was clearly in contempt of the committee. Remember, he was brought here under a subpena under which he was instructed to answer questions, and a subpena pursuant to which he was expected to be put under oath so that his testimony could be classified as accurate or as perjurious, as the case might be.

Let me quote from page 26 of these hearings, which, incidentally, are so important and informative. Every Member of Congress and every well-informed American should read them from cover to cover.

Mr. Stripling first said:

Mr. Gerhart Eisler, take the stand.

Mr. Eisler said:

I am not going to take the stand.

If that is not contempt of Congress, then it seems strange indeed to what extremes men must go these days to show their contempt for our legislative body.

A little later the chairman said:

Now, Mr. Eisler, you will be sworn in. Raise your right hand.

Mr. Eisler said:

No.

If that is not in contempt of Congress I would like to know what kind of language one has to use to register his contempt.

A little later the chairman said:

Just a minute. Will you please be sworn in?

Mr. Eisler said:

You will not swear me in before you hear a few remarks.

The chairman said:

No; there will be no remarks.

Then Mr. Eisler said:

Then there will be no hearing from me.

I cannot understand what kind of judiciary must prevail in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] if it cannot find a man in contempt who uses language of that type and that nature when responding to a subpena.

After that had transpired I made a motion, saying:

Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the witness be cited for contempt.

Mr. RANKIN said:

I second the motion.

The chairman:

Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying "aye."

And the chairman declared the motion carried. It was carried by unanimous vote of the committee, with all members of the committee present, accounted for, and participating in the vote. So on that first point there is no question at all but what Mr. Eisler registered his contempt of Congress and the committee and the American system of government here prevailing. The question is whether you want to take it lying down and let this foreign Communist come over here and show his contempt, or whether, on a roll-call vote which is soon to follow, you care to stand up and be counted among those who desire to uphold the dignity and the honor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think I have heard enough to enable me to render my own judgment on the matter, but I would like to have the gentleman indicate to the House, if he will, the nature of the testimony that the committee hoped to elicit from this witness, in a general way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made a very important contribution to the record when he showed that the chairman of the committee put the vote with all members present voting unanimously in favor of the motion. That is why he declared the motion to be carried. There was no necessity for putting the vote as far as the opposition was concerned. I am asking the gentleman specifically for the record on that point, when the gentleman's motion was put by the chairman, whether or not the vote of the members present on that occasion was unanimous.

Mr. MUNDT. The vote was unanimous and all members of the committee were present. Of course, that is the reason the record shows that the chairman did not ask for a negative vote, because in such a small committee as ours, with all the members close together, he could tell that all members had voted and that all had voted in the affirmative. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his helpful contribution in making the record crystal clear on this point.

Pursuing the interrogatory of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I think it might be proper to review a little what we expected to bring out of Mr. Eisler and what we expected to show, because, after all, we expect the Department of Justice not only to act expeditiously from the standpoint of trying this man for contempt of Congress, but also to make certain that he does not leave the country until that trial takes place. We also expect the Department of Justice to move forward with equal expedition on the five other charges that were made against Mr. Eisler, which indicate his great hazard to this country.

May I say in passing that when the trial takes place on the citation for contempt, I offer the faint but vigorous hope that it be tried before a judge of the United States who values the Congress of the United States more than $250 worth, as that was the fine that was last levied against a man who showed his contempt for Congress. I hope that we can find a judge who will value the reputation and dignity of the greatest legislative body in the world higher than $250.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Eisler refused to take the oath because he knew that some questions that the chairman, counsel for the committee, and investigators would ask him would either subject him to perjury or else convict him of subversive activities throughout the United States for the last several years.

Mr. SHORT. And income-tax evasion.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; income-tax evasion, and perjury that he had already committed.

Mr. MUNDT. Furthermore, the reason he refused to take the oath before he made his own prepared statement which he said he could make in 3 minutes but which consisted of 20 pages of legal-sized stationery—the reason he did not want to make his own statement under oath was because it was full of falsifications. Had he taken the oath first he could have been held under perjury charges. Consequently he wanted to put those falsifications into the record with immunity to himself.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If he had been sworn first and then read that statement which he gave to the press there were enough false statements in it to have sent him to the penitentiary for the rest of his life; and he knew it.

Mr. MUNDT. That would not have been long enough to suit me, but, anyway, that is the truth.

Let us go a little bit into the background of this fellow Eisler. I think it is important that we bear in mind the extent of the maneuvers of these people who constantly defend those folks who are being tested and examined by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I think it is interesting to note the interlocking communications and cooperation and the interlocking activities of the various groups we have brought before you. This is part and parcel of one big fabric of un-American activities in this country. It has quite truthfully been said that it is a long trail which does not have a turning; and it is indeed a longer trail which does not lead ultimately to some destination. The trail of Gerhart Eisler leads directly to the doorstep of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which this House in its good judgment cited for contempt in April of 1946—nearly a year ago.

In response to the question of the gentleman from North Carolina, I wish to show you some of the things we expected to bring out from Mr. Eisler in that connection but which instead of bringing them out by questioning him as we planned we placed in the record from the reports of the FBI, from the report which J. Edgar Hoover made on this fellow Eisler. Let me read a portion of it.

Mr. Hoover's report reads:

For the past several years Eisler has made regular daily visits to the offices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, a well-known Communist-front organization in New York City, and it is indicated that Eisler may have been regularly employed by this organization although he has frequently described himself as unemployed. Contacts with Eisler have been made by numerous individuals, including important Communist Party functionaries through officials of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and on many occasions at the offices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. In this connection, it appears that Eisler has been extremely careful about any visits to Communist Party headquarters.

Through the investigation of Eisler, the possibility was developed that Eisler is identical with one Julius Eisman who is known to have been receiving for a considerable period of time regular monthly checks from the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in New York City in the amount of $150.

Subsequent investigation has identified Julius Eisman as Gerhart Eisler. It is known that the following checks were issued to Julius Eisman by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee:

* * * * *

All of these checks which were from the funds of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and were made payable to Julius Eisman were endorsed by Gerhart Eisler.

So there we have the direct tie-up between this man Eisler and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which refused to disclose its books to our committee a year ago and which we were compelled to cite for contempt of Congress because all of its directors and officers, 14 in number, consistently refused to let us look at the books.

Why would they not let us look at their books? Because if they had let us look at their books then we would have known a year ago that Gerhart Eisler was being financed by this group to conduct

Communist activity in this country and that he was the mouthpiece and the spokesman and the transmission belt of Moscow directing the Communist activities here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask at this time unanimous consent to place in the RECORD extracts of the debate which took place on April 16, 1946, when we had before us for contempt citation the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the following quotations are from my remarks found on pages 3843 and 3845 of the bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, during the debate leading to our vote to cite for contempt the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which masks its underhand Communist work under that seductive and deceptive title:

The New York World Telegram as long ago as 1941 published a series of articles accusing Dr. Barsky, executive director of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and many of his present associates of communistic activities. Among the directors we are today asking you to cite for contempt are several self-admitted Communists and at least one who has been a candidate for public office in this country on the Communist ticket.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to read the printed hearings which report the testimony of these directors of the so-called Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee when we had them before our committee on April 4 of this year. They were completely noncooperative. They were consistently insolent, arrogant, and secretive. All had been carefully coached by the same attorney and all evaded questions with the same practiced patter. Of more than passing significance is the fact that most of the directors specifically declined to deny that they were Communists when given an opportunity to do so by our committee. None of them availed themselves of the opportunity to go on record in support of American institutions and ideals.

The issue is clear-cut. Will you vote to uphold the dignity of Congress or will you vote to uphold those who defy and denounce Congress? Will you vote to maintain and preserve and emphasize the authority of Congress to conduct an effective investigation or will you vote to establish a precedent whereby Congress would become impotent in its investigatory tasks upon the refusal of a group or individual voluntarily to cooperate?

Today's vote will long be used as tomorrow's index to the attitudes of those of us who now sit as Members of this House. Unless we are to turn America over to those who depreciate it and to those who would destroy its established institutions it is imperative that we today face up to our responsibilities and vote to uphold the dignity and the authority of Congress. Once the powers of a congressional committee to function effectively in an investigatory capacity have been reasserted as I am convinced they will be in today's roll-call vote, the great job of exposing and eradicating the subversive influences now at work in this Republic can be resumed with vigor and authority.

In the meantime, I would like to suggest to the many fine and patriotic Americans who have been induced to make contributions to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee because of its attractive title and its announced objectives that they refrain from further contributions until we discover the true record of the facts. Before contributing further, Americans generally have the right to know whether the money they subscribe is being used to give relief to the victims and refugees of fascism abroad or whether it is being used to reenforce the ramparts of those attempting to expand the sinister influence of American Communists here at home.

Mr. Speaker, that debate occurred on April 16, 1946. We had the same speakers then defending the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee who have defended Gerhart Eisler today. There were more of them then by a great many voices. The reason fewer spoke today in his favor is because of the 56 people who voted against the contempt citation of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, the people of America in their good judgment retired from office well over half of those 56 on last November 5. I think that is likely to influence today's vote when it comes. The April 26 roll call can be checked for your information. It is found on page 3849 of the bound RECORD. It discloses one compelling reason why so few people spoke here today in condemnation of this committee whereas we had a whole string of them speaking on April 16, 1946. It is my guess today's vote will be a demonstration of confidence in and of approval for the House Committee on Un-American Activities such as is unprecedented in the long history of this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman tell the House what became of that citation proceeding?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I will be happy to do that. Let me quote from the RECORD. The House of Representatives considers itself a coordinate branch of the Government. The House of Representatives sometimes prides itself on the fact that it controls the purse strings of the Government and exercises a lot of influence, that it can get cooperation and some kind of consideration from the executive agencies because it has control of the purse.

Yet, on April 16 last year it passed by a vote of 292 to 56 a contempt citation of this Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Now, the question has been asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], What happened to it? That question, in fact, also appears in the hearings on page 13. I asked the question there. I said, "Mr. Chairman, before we get away from the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee I suggest that this afternoon you address a letter to Attorney General Tom Clark urging him to expedite trial of the contempt proceeding which has been dragging painfully ever since the Congress cited this group for contempt last July." I was in error. It was last April 16 rather than last July. Just exactly nothing has been done, Mr. Speaker, by the Attorney General, to move in on this Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which we cited for contempt almost a year ago. If you wonder why the Communists are given a free hand in America, one emphatic reason is because after you cite them for contempt nothing happens out of the Attorney General's office. What we need from the Attorney General is less lip service against communism and at least a little specific action to curtail communism where it is known to exist.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. That is one reason we feel that after we cite, as we are going to do today, this Gerhart Eisler for contempt of Congress, probably he will be here at least a year while the Attorney General's Department gets ready to act. So, in all events, that will keep him in America and prevent his carrying information back to his bosses in Moscow. However, we sincerely hope the Attorney General's office will really go to work and get action on this Eisler case.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of our committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I think it is important that we also put in the RECORD that in the case of the old Dies committee we sent over six cases to the Attorney General and it took 6 years before they even brought up the first case.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is very important and it is very relevant to the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to one other item in passing, and this is also in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina. I refer to Mr. Gerhart Eisler's relationship to the secrets of the atom bomb. That is the big reason we do not want him deported. You will find this evidence clearly set forth on pages 41 and 42 of our hearings, which are obtainable in the offices of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That is one additional reason we want him cited for contempt and brought before a judge who we hope is American enough to do something about it, including putting this man behind iron bars, not merely fining him $25 or $250 or maybe 25 cents if a Red New Deal judge should hold court in this case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the case against Gerhart Eisler has been ably presented with a transcript of the evidence and the statements made here today, and I do not believe that further detailed elaboration is required.

In general summation I would like to say that it is our sworn duty to uphold, protect, and defend the Government of the United States—to guard it against its enemies.

One such enemy of our Government and the peace and security of our Nation is Gerhart Eisler, whose subversive activities as a guest of our country have been proven beyond possibility of doubt—not an enemy met in combat on the field of battle but of the type that pursues its activities surreptitiously through propaganda—the type that stealthily creeps from behind to plunge a dagger in the back. Eisler refused to testify before a hearing of the Un-American Activities Committee, thus flouting the authority of the Congress of the United States.

The Un-American Activities Committee asks you to endorse the major accomplishment of the committee in securing unimpeachable evidence, apprehending and prosecuting this agent, whose subversive operations have caused untold misery and suffering in various parts of the world.

By your unanimous approval of the action of the committee in citing Eisler for contempt and on other serious charges you will serve notice upon other similarly minded that the United States of America refuses to submit itself as a breeding place for the festering sores that afflict so many other nations of the world and that violators of the sanctity of its government shall receive merited punishment, swift, just, and sure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I think there is little question about the fact that, as a matter of law, the witness, in refusing to be sworn, was prima facie guilty of contempt. It is an occasion, however, for the Members to indicate to the Committee on Un-American Activities their views with regard to the conduct of its investigations. This is due the country and the gentlemen who give their time and energies to this work.

An unfortunate impression got abroad with regard to the Dies committee that it was engaged primarily in a Communist hunt and that it quite neglected the Fascists, Nazis, and their associates in our midst. The Un-American Activities Committee can now render a great service by proceeding even-handedly to unearth the subversives on the extreme right as readily as those on the extreme left, for the committee knows that they both have the same design on our freedoms—to extinguish them.

Let us hope, therefore, that the committee will—and soon—strike this a twin blow for freedom against the Fascists, Nazis, and those like-minded in our midst.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—370

Abernethy	Elston	Knutson
Albert	Engel, Mich.	Kunkel
Allen, Calif.	Evins	Landis
Allen, Ill.	Fallon	Lane
Allen, La.	Feighan	Lanham
Almond	Fellows	Larcade
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Latham
Andresen, August H.	Fisher	Lea
	Flannagan	LeCompte
Angell	Fletcher	LeFevre
Arends	Fogarty	Lemke
Arnold	Folger	Lesinski
Auchincloss	Foote	Lewis
Bakewell	Forand	Lodge
Banta	Fulton	Love
Barrett	Gallagher	Lusk
Bates, Ky.	Gamble	Lyle
Bates, Mass.	Gary	Lynch
Battle	Gathings	McConnell
Beall	Gavin	McCormack
Beckworth	Gearhart	McCowen
Bell	Gifford	McDonough
Bender	Gillette	McDowell
Bennett, Mich.	Gillie	McGregor
Bennett, Mo.	Goff	McMahon
Bishop	Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.
Blackney	Gordon	McMillen, Ill.
Bland	Gore	MacKinnon
Blatnik	Gossett	Macy
Bloom	Graham	Madden
Boggs, Del.	Granger	Mahon
Boggs, La.	Grant, Ind.	Maloney
Bonner	Gregory	Manasco
Boykin	Griffiths	Mansfield, Mont.
Bradley, Calif.	Gross	
Bradley, Mich.	Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield, Tex.
Bramblett	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Brehm	Hale	Mason
Brooks	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mathews
Brophy		Meade, Md.
Brown, Ga.	Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow
Brown, Ohio		Meyer
Bryson	Halleck	Michener
Buchanan	Hand	Miller, Calif.
Buck	Hardy	Miller, Conn.
Burke	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.
Burleson	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.
Butler	Harris	Mills
Byrne, N. Y.	Harrison	Mitchell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	Morgan
Canfield	Hartley	Morris
Cannon	Havenner	Morrison
Carroll	Hébert	Morton
Carson	Heffernan	Muhlenberg
Case, N. J.	Herter	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Heselton	Murdock
Celler	Hess	Murray, Tenn.
Chadwick	Hill	Murray, Wis.
Chapman	Hinshaw	Nixon
Chelf	Hobbs	Nodar
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Norblad
Chiperfield	Holifield	Norman
Church	Holmes	Norton
Clark	Hope	O'Brien
Clason	Horan	O'Konski
Clevenger	Howell	O'Toole
Coffin	Huber	Owens
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Pace
Cole, Mo.	Jackson, Calif.	Passman
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Patman
Colmer	Jarman	Patterson
Combs	Javits	Peden
Cooley	Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin
Corbett	Jennings	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Jensen	Phillips, Tenn.
Courtney	Johnson, Calif.	Pickett
Cox	Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Plumley
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Crow	Johnson, Tex.	Potts
Curtis	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Dague	Jones, N. C.	Price, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Jones, Ohio	Rabin
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Wash.	Rains
Deane	Jonkman	Ramey
Delaney	Judd	Rankin
Devitt	Karsten, Mo.	Rayburn
Dingell	Kean	Rayfiel
Dirksen	Kearney	Redden
Dolliver	Kearns	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Keating	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Kee	Rees
Dorn	Keefe	Reeves
Doughton	Kelley	Rich
Douglas	Keogh	Richards
Drewry	Kerr	Riehlman
Durham	Kersten, Wis.	Riley
Eaton	Kilburn	Rivers
Eberharter	Kilday	Robertson
Ellis	King	Robsion
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Rockwell
Elsaesser	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Va.	Vail
Rohrbough	Smith, Wis.	Van Zandt
Rooney	Snyder	Vinson
Ross	Somers	Vorys
Sadlak	Spence	Vursell
St. George	Springer	Wadsworth
Sarbacher	Stanley	Walter
Sasscer	Stefan	Weichel
Schwabe, Mo.	Stevenson	Welch
Schwabe, Okla.	Stigler	West
Scott, Hardie	Stockman	Wheeler
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Stratton	Whitten
	Sundstrom	Whittington
Scrivner	Taber	Wigglesworth
Seely-Brown	Talle	Williams
Shafer	Teague	Wilson, Ind.
Short	Thomas, N. J.	Wilson, Tex.
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.	Winstead
Simpson, Pa.	Thomason	Wolverton
Smathers	Tibbott	Wood
Smith, Kans.	Tollefson	Worley
Smith, Maine	Trimble	Youngblood
Smith, Ohio	Twyman	Zimmerman

NAYS—1

Marcantonio

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Powell

NOT VOTING—60

Andersen, H. Carl	Donohue	Norrell
	Elliott	O'Hara
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Peterson
Andrews, N. Y.	Fernandez	Pfeifer
Barden	Fuller	Poulson
Bolton	Gerlach	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Gorski	Priest
Buffett	Grant, Ala.	Rizley
Bulwinkle	Gwinn, N. Y.	Russell
Busbey	Hays	Sabath
Camp	Hedrick	Sadowski
Clements	Hendricks	Sanborn
Clippinger	Hoffman	Scoblick
Cooper	Jenison	Sheppard
Coudert	Jenkins, Ohio	Sikes
Crawford	Kefauver	Taylor
Cunningham	Kennedy	Towe
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Wolcott
Dawson, Ill.	McGarvey	Woodruff
Dawson, Utah	Meade, Ky.	
D'Ewart	Monroney	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Engle of California.

Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Monroney.

Mr. Busbey with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Buffett with Mr. Barden.

Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Camp.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Gorski.

Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Priest.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Price of Florida.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Sadowski.

Mr. Jenison with Mr. Hedrick.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Elliott.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Fernandez.

Mr. Crawford with Mr. Grant of Alabama.

Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Clements.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks and include therein an advertisement signed by the Communist Party that was published in the North Carolina papers recently and the reply thereto made by the leading colored citizens of the State condemning the advertisement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address.

Mr. SASSCER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Lithuanian Society of Baltimore.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered on January 20.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter addressed to him dated February 11, 1947.

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REES (at the request of Mr. KILBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article and letter on the subject American Veterans Who Were Prisoners in World War II.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rent control in Louisville, Ky.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Society of Maryland.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that contains the cuts of appropriations for OPA?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The House may go into the Committee of the Whole and later, after debate has occurred, rise, and then a motion would be in order to close debate; but otherwise a motion would not be in order at this time to close?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York states the situation accurately. The House must first go into Committee and have general debate, and then rise and fix the time of debate by vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I take it that the chairman of the committee will see that the minority is allotted time.

Mr. TABER. Unless there is more demand than the first recognition of 1 hour, it will be my purpose to allot out of the hour that I am being recognized for half of the time to the gentleman from Missouri, and see how we get along.

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory, Mr. Speaker, and we will require no further time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1968, with Mr. HERTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent (on motion of Mr. TABER), the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reported for the purpose of supplying certain urgent deficiencies in appropriations and for the purpose of rescinding certain other appropriations which are no longer needed and which the Committee believes is in the interest of the Government that they be rescinded. I will briefly describe what is contained in the bill.

There was in the first place a recommendation on the part of the Budget of a deficiency appropriation of $5,950,000 for the Office of Price Administration, which we have refused. There was an appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation of $143,000, which we have reduced to $130,000. There was an estimate of $135,000,000 for additional funds for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, to which we were unable to give a satisfactory hearing, and which we allowed on the basis of what the Veterans' Administration said would carry them to the 31st of March, so that we would be able to have a satisfactory hearing. That is not intended or presented as a cut in the appropriation, but as a postponement of the hearings. The same thing applies to an item for military and naval insurance, where we have provided $1,000,000 out of an estimate of $4,125,000 for the purpose of carrying them likewise until we can have a satisfactory hearing. There is likewise an estimate for the vocational rehabilitation revolving fund—no year—of $500,000, and we have provided $200,000 to carry them until we can have a satisfactory hearing.

There is an estimate for the Division of Disbursement, the check-writing outfit in the Treasury Department, of $3,520,000. The committee reduced that to $3,000,000.

As to the rescissions, we have recommended a rescission of $9,000,000 in OPA funds. We have also recommended a rescission of $2,400,000 in the funds for the Civilian Production Administration. The estimate there was $1,200,000. We have raised a suggested rescission of Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion funds from $46,000 to $60,000, believing they can get along very well on that with the contraction of activities that they present.

I think I have described the major items which were subject to hearings. In addition to that, the committee has included in the bill which is before you rescissions amounting to practically $700,000,000—to be exact, it is $692,688,579 which the President recommended in House Document 65 in his budget estimate of rescissions.

There are many other items of rescission, some of which will come before the committee upon budget estimates that will hereafter be considered and some will come as the result of the initiative of the committee, so that we may go into the picture to see just what is needed for the operations of the Government. I might say in addition there is one estimate that is pending for the rescission of a very large amount of lend-lease funds, if I remember correctly, approximately $900,000,000, which we have not been able to hold hearings on and are not prepared to report on at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have been informed that there is a very substantial sum of money that is being held by these various agencies that could be recovered running into several billion dollars. Is there anything to that?

Mr. TABER. There is no question but what there is a very large amount of money, the rescission of appropriations of which should be considered by the committee, and it is the intention of the committee to go ahead just as rapidly as possible to hold hearings upon these items and recommend to the House rescissions insofar as it is possible to make them.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman mentioned lend-lease funds. In the past few days the papers carried the story that Lend-Lease officials are seeking to have a change in the law preventing the use of such funds after December 31, 1946, for shipments to Europe. Is there anything in this present bill that would affect that situation?

Mr. TABER. There is not. I might say to the gentleman that our committee held hearings on that situation. We have not taken it up in the Deficiency Committee, and we have not acted upon it. There is one item in connection with that which I think the Congress should act on and should provide for. That is an item of about $100,000 worth of merchandise that the Australian Government purchased from us and for which they have paid in cash. I would think that that presented an entirely different picture from anything else that is in the offing in connection with that situation. I can see no reason why, frankly, any country presently in default of payment, such as the Union of the Soviet Republics is, for the use of ships and which ships have not been turned back as was agreed upon, and where they have failed to get together and make an agreement accepting their obligations, should be handed any more merchandise or should be entitled to the fulfillment of any contract which it is supposed to have made. Frankly, I do not have a ruling on whether or not that alleged contract was of any validity, as yet. But in all transactions there is the right, as I understand it, under any kind of procedure, of stoppage in transit, or of the refusal to deliver things to a proposed debtor who is in default. That is the picture from a business standpoint.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is this not the proposition: The question is whether anyone has the right to make a moral commitment for the United States Government in face of a statute that would forbid the carrying out of that commitment?

Mr. TABER. That is true. On the other hand, with reference to that particular item of $100,000 that Australia has paid for, I think they were in a different category from any of the rest of the outfits.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is this an appropriate place to ask a question with regard to the denial of a deficiency appropriation for the OPA?

Mr. TABER. I would think so. I intended to discuss that at a little greater length, and I will do so now.

Those of you who have the hearings before you I suggest turn to pages 80 and 81. The OPA has not done an honest job in connection with its operations. At the time the hearings were held, a week of two ago, they had 914 employees in the office in Washington drawing $4,000 and more each. They had 851 employees drawing less than $4,000 each. In other words, they had more generals than they had privates, and that picture with reference to their whole operation extends throughout the country except that it is not quite so bad. The only place where they have as high as three privates to one general is the State of New York. Other places it is hard work to figure out how they have two privates to one general. In Washington they have 122 economists. They have no possible need for any at the present time. They have 31 personnel officers and personnel assistants at a time when they should be reducing the force and should not have any to speak of. They have 147 accountants in the Washington office at a time when three or four should be able to do all the work they have to do. They have 37 investigators in the Washington office, absolutely unnecessary.

They have 14 price executives, with nothing to fix prices on except rents. They have 187 analysts who can perform no useful function whatever. They have 21 administrative officers when they need but one or two. They have six labor relations advisers when the time for that sort of activity has passed. They have 168 lawyers and there is no legal activity for any except possibly six or seven in the rent set-up. They have 25 directors. What they have to do is beyond the imagination of the most gullible. They have 14 administrative assistants, 13 information specialists, 4 archivists, 7 engineers, 22 field representatives, 10 statisticians; and on down the line—business specialists, graphic analysts, executive officers, special advisers, deputy administrators, general counsel—four general counsel. What anybody can imagine they would do is beyond my ability to figure out. Rationing executives, two. That is the first item I have struck where they have any excuse whatever for the set-up. They have: Rationing analysts, 2—probably they need them; stenographic reporter, 1; printing and publications specialists, 4; training specialists, 8; commodity standards specialists, 2—absolutely no use for them; auditor-supervisors, 6; administrators, 1; historians, 6. What do they need them for? Procurement assistant, 1.

That is in the Washington office alone.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I see there are 914 employees in the Washington office.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION. One of them seems to be a stenographic reporter.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION. I am just wondering how that one stenographic reporter handles the business of the other 913 generals.

Mr. TABER. I suppose the fact that there is one stenographic reporter indicates the real volume of work that is being done.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that OPA has transferred a lot of employees to the Division of Rent Control.

Mr. TABER. They have increased the number in the Rent Control Division by 1,500 to 2,000. They have put on people in places where it was absolutely unnecessary. They have extended rent control, according to my information, where it was unnecessary, and they have in general a very incompetent staff and a very incompetent set-up.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. As an example, the regional office in my territory is at Dallas, Tex. Recently they sent 11 inspectors to St. Joseph, Mo., which is the largest city in my district, to investigate the property owners there.

Mr. TABER. Probably not over a thousand miles of travel each way.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. It is about a thousand miles, possibly a little more, from Dallas to St. Joseph.

Mr. TABER. Each way.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Each way. They are there at a per diem, as the gentleman knows, of $6 per day, plus all expenses. They have been there for the past 3 or 4 weeks. They are asking the property owners to furnish them with their records from 1938 to the present time. They travel in pairs. One cannot go alone and do the job. They must have two or three who call on the property owners. I call this to the attention of the House so that the Members will know how they are padding the pay rolls and how they are making work for themselves and how they are squandering the appropriations granted to them by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. TABER. I think probably they have a justification for about 50 out of the 914. That would be my judgment from the whole picture.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. We are in no position obviously, in looking over this set-up, not having been in the hearings, to know what these people are doing. I happen to be one who is convinced that we have to have rent control and I do not feel we can have rent control by hobbling the OPA so that it does a bad job of administration. Therefore, I ask the gentleman this question: Is the gentleman convinced, as a result of the hearings, that the OPA will be able to carry on its rent-control functions until June 30, 1947, yet give landlords who have true hardship cases adequate and rapid enough satisfaction so that we will not have the unnecessary pressure from them to do away with the OPA and rent control, which the people in my district are about 95 percent for?

Mr. TABER. My own idea was, after very careful and extensive hearings on this subject, that we could rescind about $12,500,000. The judgment of the committee is $9,000,000. My own idea was to allow every dollar that I could legitimately allow for an honest administration of this rent activity. I cannot see any sense in allowing a great lot of money for them to carry on their pay roll a lot of generals and other personnel that they do not need and that they have no useful function for.

I will give you an illustration of some of the highfalutin activities. They had an employment committee set up composed of 64 people whose average salary from the OPA was $7,500 to $8,000. The job that these people had to do was to go out and get jobs for the employees of the OPA. Perhaps the thing to do is to try to supersede the employment offices

that are set up all over the United States by grants to the States and the District of Columbia under the Labor and Federal Security bill, but, frankly, the idea does not appeal to me. I think it is an utter and absolute waste of money, as well as a violation of the trust and duty imposed upon the managers of the OPA when they were given their appropriation. As I remember the figure, they have two-hundred-and-sixty-odd people involved in getting up a history of the OPA and, in my opinion, the only value that I can see in that would be for guiding future generations in what not to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that he has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How much does this leave the OPA after rescission of the $9,000,000?

Mr. TABER. About $18,000,000, as I remember it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is that not about three times more than it needs?

Mr. TABER. I think it is more than they need; yes. I will give you the exact figure a little later on.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. How much do they have for this year?

Mr. TABER. They had $101,000,000, as I remember the figure, and the amount of expenditures was somewhere around seventy-odd-million dollars.

Mr. ROBSION. That was allowed for a full year.

Mr. TABER. It was allowed for a full year; that is right.

Mr. ROBSION. And for full activities.

Mr. TABER. But their activities have dropped off and they have not reduced their force as they should. For instance, it came along about the middle of November when they cut off a lot of their pricing activities, but they did not serve any notices upon their employees of termination of employment so that their terminal leave could begin to run. They let them hang around the place until the first of December before they got their notices, and they managed everything else in just the same way. They want to carry on, according to the statement that came out in the paper, with 13,500 personnel to the end of the year. They show no disposition to try and put the set-up on a business basis, which is absolutely necessary if it is going to succeed, and if your rent control is not going to be destroyed by bad administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, do I understand the gentleman then to assure us—and the gentleman knows that I have very high regard for his assurance—that he is convinced that OPA can do the rent control job with the funds which will be available to it after the passage of this bill?

Mr. TABER. I believe they can, if they do it honestly.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is in some respects a very satisfactory bill; in other respects not so satisfactory.

It is satisfactory in that the larger part of the bill is devoted to rescissions recommended by the President. There is a vast number of these rescission items and in all save three the bill before us follows the President's recommendations, word for word and dollar for dollar without deviation. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations is continuing the program of retrenchment and rescission so auspiciously begun by the President and the committee in the last Congress. Following the close of the war, this program was consistently adhered to and funds sequestered as rapidly as the liquidations of war agencies and war activities advanced and as surpluses developed and rescissions became possible and practicable and it is gratifying to see it continued in the pending bill.

There are, however, a few items in the bill, some minor and some which merit more than passing attention.

The first item discussed in the report, the provision for Defense Transportation, is a case in point.

Everybody is familiar with the war record made by Colonel Johnson as head of the Office of Defense Transportation. He accomplished the impossible. He provided cars. He kept the trunk lines open. He kept traffic moving. He kept the trains running. He provided transportation during the critical period of the war when collapse was imminent any day.

Incredible as it may seem the traffic load is heavier today than at any time during the war. To complicate the situation the rolling stock is wearing out. Boxcars are being switched off to the junk yard daily and there are no replacements.

Production and consumption are dependent on transportation. It is useless to produce goods when they cannot be delivered; and consumers are helpless if goods are not available. Transportation is the indispensable link.

We must have cars. Labor is short and materials are lacking. ODT is needed to mobilize construction, allocate material, mobilize labor, and expedite construction.

To meet this new and unexpected situation it is necessary to continue ODT beyond the period originally set for liquidation. The estimate for the purpose is $143,000, but the committee arbitrarily cuts the amount to $130,000. It offers no explanation, no basis of computation on which to predicate such a cut. Throughout its war service ODT has returned at the end of the fiscal year every dollar not needed for the economical administration of its activities. Any surplus of the pending estimate will be returned. So why cut it? If not needed it will not be spent. If required any money cut from the estimate will have to be returned as a deficiency. So the only result of the cut will be to leave the impression that economy is being practiced when actually no economy is being effected.

In the same way, an arbitrary cut is made in the estimate for the Division of Disbursements in the Treasury Department. This agency has no control over the volume of its work. It must accept the allocations of the various agencies of the Government which themselves have no choice but to forward to the Division of Disbursements the volume of work assigned to them, whether large or small. The work must be done and money must be provided to do it. The money cannot be expended unless needed. So again, the cut here is merely to leave the impression of saving money when as a matter of fact not a dollar is saved by the cut.

The item for the Office of Price Administration is not retrenchment. It is extinction. The provision for OPA amounts to liquidation.

Here is the analysis of the situation as submitted to the committee:

MY DEAR MR. TABER: We have just completed an analysis of the report of the subcommittee in charge of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1947.

From the determinations made by the committee as indicated by this report, we feel sure there has been a misunderstanding of the information submitted by the Office of Price Administration and the Civilian Production Administration of the Office of Temporary Controls.

We feel that we should immediately call your attention to the following facts and the situations that would result if action is taken on the basis of the committee report:

With regard to the Office of Price Administration, there was available on January 1, 1946, as stated in the committee report, $27,649,222; obligations incurred between January 1 and February 15, 1947, amount to $10,213,534, which leaves a balance available from February 15 to June 30 of $17,435,688. If the recommendation of the committee to rescind $9,000,000 is carried out, there will be left a balance of only $8,435,688. The present dollar value of accrued annual leave is $7,555,974. This would leave only $879,714 for liquidation and program activities—sufficient for only a few days' operation.

If the rescission is made effective and the Office of Price Administration meets its present financial obligations, it must immediately—

1. Stop rent control.
2. Stop all sugar rationing.
3. Stop all price control on sugar, rice, and sirups.
4. Stop all audits in connection with subsidy payments.
5. Eliminate all enforcement and compliance activities.
6. Eliminate all activities in connection with the veterans' housing program.

With regard to the proposal to increase the rescission for the Civilian Production Administration from $1,200,000 to $2,400,000, I should like to call your attention to the statement of Mr. Houston, Commissioner of Civilian Production Administration, as recorded on page 154 of the hearings.

"On the basis of complete termination of all Civilian Production Administration functions by March 31, 1947, * * * the financial requirements would be $15,800,000 as compared to $16,800,000."

This statement makes it clear that the million-dollar reduction is definitely predicated on stopping Civilian Production Administration work March 31, and not June 30, which may not have been understood by the committee.

If the action of the committee is approved, the Civilian Production Administration will have to discontinue all program activities on March 31, which means they must:

Cease all functions performed in connection with the Veterans' Emergency Housing Program, including those provided for by the Patman Act.

Dismiss employees now engaged in allocation and priority operations in connection with tin, rubber, antimony, cinchona, streptomycin, tractors, automobiles, and other imports and exports. In respect to these items, this would mean that even if positive legislation is enacted to implement the recommendations made by the President in his message of January 31, there would be no personnel available to implement the continuing work required by the legislation.

Suspend all functions on premium-payment plans for the housing program, including the audit of accounts for payments already made.

Halt all compliance activities, including the completion of cases now pending in the courts or about to be brought before the courts, whether in connection with housing or earlier programs of the Civilian Production Administration and the War Production Board.

Drop defense of Government claims to which the Civilian Production Administration or the War Production Board was a party. These claims are filed against the Government under section 17-A, Contract Settlement Act, Renegotiation Act, Requisitioning Act, Tax Amortization Act, and other statutes.

Abandon the partially completed program of the agency to analyze and make available for future use the records and details of actions taken by the War Production Board and other predecessor agencies.

Stop informal assistance in support of the freight-car program.

We appreciate the seriousness of the proposal of the committee which, if made into law, would in effect stop all Office of Price Administration program activities immediately and all Civilian Production Administration activities by March 31. In carrying out our administrative duties, we do not feel that we can properly stop these programs based on the committee report but must wait until there is final action by the Congress. This means, of course, that obligations continue to accrue and the situation with regard to available balances will become progressively more serious.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FOLLIN,
Acting Administrator.

To summarize the statement in tabular form, here is the proposition reduced to its simplest terms:

1947 appropriation	$101,000,000
Less transfer to FTC	125,000
Available appropriation	100,875,000
Obligations to Feb. 15	83,439,312
Unobligated balance of original appropriation as of Feb. 15	17,435,688
Less proposed rescission of	9,000,000
	8,435,688
Employees' accumulated annual leave	$7,555,974
This sum available for purposes other than payment of accumulated annual leave, as of Feb. 15 provided $9,000,000 rescission should become effective	879,714

In other words, with only $879,714 remaining, liquidation is the only alternative. What does that involve?

All rent control stops. The law is still in effect but there is no money with which to implement it. Without funds there can be no enforcement. And without enforcement the law is a dead letter.

Rationing of sugar ceases. Without money to maintain the agency, rationing is at an end. Price control on sugar, rice, and sirups stops. Audits on subsidy payments must be abandoned. And all activities in connection with the veterans' housing program must be discontinued.

It may be that this is the committee program. I am not taking issue with it. I am merely calling attention to the effect the agency says will follow enactment of the provisions of the pending bill.

Similarly, the provision for the Civilian Production Administration will force immediate liquidation. According to the figures submitted to the committee by CPA the fiscal program laid down in the bill would have required post liquidation commencing 2 weeks ago in order to comply with the provisions of the act.

Mr. Chairman, while the principal provisions of the bill are in keeping with the program of the President, the Bureau of the Budget and the last Congress, I recommend to the committee and the House a careful and factual study of these individual items which affect so directly the national economy during this critical period of reconversion. Unquestionably they merit deliberate consideration in this or another body.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed to hear the statement by the gentleman from Missouri that the action of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the Office of Price Administration means that the ability to control rents and the control of the rationing of sugar will disappear very shortly. There are two ways to kill an agency—that is, by direct attack through legislation, or by failure to appropriate money. I hope that the price of sugar is not going to increase to 30, 40, and 50 cents. Certainly, if we do not have some kind of sugar rationing, the American public, the consumers, are going to feel it very keenly. If we have a rent situation that is uncontrolled, there is bound to be an increase in rents, and the responsibility will rest upon the Republican Party.

In connection with the appropriations we make for our armed forces, such appropriations are the price or premium that we pay for national security. In connection with this important duty, we should give the benefit of any reasonable doubt to that determination which will assure security rather than insecurity. We cannot let the conditions that existed after World War I be a guide for meeting the conditions that now exist following World War II; that is, unless we are going to follow, as we did then, the road of isolationism. That was the road which the country was committed to by the Republican Party in the Congresses of the years following World War I. I wonder if history is going to repeat itself, and I wonder if the dreadful experiences of World War II are going to be ignored.

After World War I, America failed to assume its dominant role in world affairs. To follow the road of isolationism now, as has been done in the past, will be inconsistent with our present and future national interests. Due to the policy of isolationism that we followed after World War I, and the disarmament conference in 1922, as a result of which we scrapped a mighty fine navy, which, by the way, also was during a Republican administration, appropriations for defense purposes were sharply reduced. In the light of world conditions today and so far as we can see into the immediate future, it would be dangerous to do that now.

An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If any Member thinks he can justify himself or lull himself into slumber by voting for this reduction, $6,000,000,000, and that it is only a gesture, or a meaningless or pious hope, and when specific appropriation bills come up vote the other way, I call his attention to the frank admission made to me only yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that he will consider the resolution agreed upon as instructions to the Committee on Appropriations to keep within that limit. Do not underestimate the ability or the courage of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], nor his tenacity. Also, do not underestimate the same qualities in the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

If my friend from Minnesota had not spoken too soon in favor of a 20-percent income-tax cut across the board, which practically every big taxpayer is favoring, the "quickie" tax, so called, and if it goes through will be a "wickie" tax, meaning wicked, I am strongly inclined to the belief that the situation would be different today.

This reduction is not based on reason. Its basis is the 20-percent "wickie" tax cut. In order for the Knutson bill to have any chance of passing, a large reduction in the budget, even if not justified, must take place to comply with the campaign promises made by a few men in pivotal positions, even if it means our country again taking the dangerous road of pacifism and isolationism.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether my memory serves me completely or not, but it runs in my mind that shortly after I came to Congress the administration of the gentleman then being in power proposed what was known as the Neutrality Act. Some of the provisions of that act were to bar our vessels from dangerous waters, and such other provisions as to prevent the sale of war goods to belligerent countries.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the question?

Mr. HALLECK. The question is simply this, if there was any isolationism in the country, was that not a definite move in the direction of isolationism, and

was it not presented by the gentleman's party?

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that is emphatically "No." Oh, you Republican gentlemen may laugh and smile, but the reason for that answer is that we passed a Neutrality Act in those years so that we would not be permitting the powers of America to be used in the conflict going on in Spain by the so-called Loyalist government. We passed the Neutrality Act in those years so that the foreign policy of America would not be such as to lend assistance, directly or indirectly, to the destructive forces that were engaged in the Spanish conflict. We amended the Neutrality Act in later years because the continuance of it was helping Hitler, and we were helping the destructive forces engaged in the war before we were forced into it. So that the basic proposition is that our country passed the Neutrality Act in the Spanish conflict so that we would not be helping the Loyalist cause which was the only side of that conflict that had freedom of the seas, and could send vessels to America to get arms to transport over there to use against the other forces. We amended that law in later years so that we would not again be helping the destructive influence that was engaged in the World War, represented by Hitler.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a question only, because I have some other observations to make. I yield because the gentleman is majority leader and I respect him, but the gentleman knows I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly do not want to monopolize the gentleman's time.

Mr. McCORMACK. By the way, the gentleman forgot to answer a question of mine yesterday. How did the gentleman vote on the extension of the Selective Service Act in 1941?

Mr. HALLECK. I voted "no" on the extension.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it passed by a 1-vote margin. If that bill had not become law we might not be sitting here today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to answer the question he asked me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I said to the gentleman, as the RECORD discloses, that I voted "no." If the gentleman's administration had told the Congress and the country the true state of affairs in the world, of course I would not have voted "no."

Mr. McCORMACK. What an alibi that is. What an alibi. What a poor alibi.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Wait awhile; I have the floor. I will yield, of course, but let me answer. The gentleman's alibi cannot stand up in the light of history. I now yield.

Mr. HALLECK. It certainly will stand up much better than the gentleman's alibi about how the Neutrality Act was passed to meet a situation existing in Spain. I never heard a more ridiculous assertion in my life.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is losing control of himself. The gentleman voted against every bill before Pearl Harbor necessary for the preservation of the United States of America.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to continue my observations.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield; yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman refers to the fact that as he suggested——

Mr. McCORMACK. It is rather pleasing to know that I get under the gentleman's skin.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly the gentleman does not mean to say what he just said, because no later than yesterday he said: "Why, the gentleman from Indiana voted against all the appropriations for the prosecution of the war."

Mr. McCORMACK. I said before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman said "prior to Pearl Harbor" and I said I voted for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote to lift certain restrictions of the Neutrality Act?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course I did.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is exactly correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman will let me have a portion of my 3 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly will; and I shall be short.

Mr. McCORMACK. There seems to be something about the gentleman from Massachusetts that makes the gentleman from Indiana feel compelled to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts takes the floor.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I always get along.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are warm friends.

Mr. HALLECK. We are warm friends. The gentleman in his speech apparently is complaining about our cutting the cost of government and our action to reduce taxes. I infer from what the gentleman has said that he is against cutting the expenses of government and against reducing the personal income taxes of the people of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, again jumps to an erroneous conclusion. The gentleman has not been following what I have said. I am talking about a $6,000,000,000 cut as proposed and its effect upon our Army and Navy, our national defense, and the national interests of our country. Witness the Republican promise to lift wartime excise taxes even before June 30. Witness the failure to keep that promise and the extension of these excise taxes permanently, the reason being—now mark this—the reason being the necessity for this additional revenue, $1,200,000,000 to put through the Knutson bill. Also further in support of this fact that the legislative pattern is being cut by the Republicans for this "quickie-wickie" tax reduction, our national defense, and our national interest to the contrary notwithstanding.

I call attention to a statement appearing in the Washington Post only this morning purporting to come from my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] in announcing the postponement of hearings on his bill which were scheduled to open tomorrow, saying that the failure of the Congress to slash the President's budget by $6,000,000,000 would materially cut the idea of a 20-percent tax reduction. The evidence clearly supports the finding that a primary purpose of the arbitrary cut is tax reduction as proposed by the Knutson bill—and the national interest of our country be damned.

At this time, with our civilization, our way of life, and our concept of government being challenged by another concept of life, it is my belief that our national interest is more directly linked up with the necessary power of our armed forces than if such a challenge did not exist.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, according to the Legislative Calendar, on Thursday, February 20, the Congress will consider and vote on the proposed cut to the Federal Budget. In my humble opinion the vote on that subject will be the most important that will come before us while Members of the Eightieth Congress. I know how I am going to vote, yet I do not consider it sufficient to merely cast a vote, for the importance of this question requires a statement of reasons as to why one votes as he does.

I hasten to say that I am far from being an expert on budgetary matters.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have seen at firsthand and do know something about the tragedy, the pain, and the devastation of war. Thousands of pages have been written of the destruction, the waste, and the havoc of World War II, and hundreds of thousands of pages have already been written of how vastly more terrible will be the results of World War III. While nobody can accurately state just what the results of World War III would be, certainly all of us agree that insofar as our country—its people, its system of government—are concerned, the results would be catastrophic. Certainly therefore we all can agree that the problem of working out a lasting peace is the No. 1 problem facing this Congress and the world.

Economy is important. Both Democrats and Republicans alike want an economically operated government. There may be some difference in the approach to the question of economy, but in substance I think that everyone wants

economy in government because everyone knows that practical economy usually goes hand in hand with efficiency. Tax reductions are important. Everyone wants less taxes. I have yet to see the man who enjoys paying taxes. Certainly all of us want to lower them at the first real opportunity.

Those two problems are important ones that are facing this Congress; but can anyone successfully claim that the problems of economy and lower taxes are more important to this country than is the problem of peace? No answer is needed. Yet, gentlemen, tomorrow in considering the question of the proposed cut in the budget, we should keep reminding ourselves that peace is vastly more important than taxes.

According to the reports as I read them, the proposed budget cut of $6,000,000,000 would reduce the money allocated to the United States Army by $1,000,000,000. It would reduce the money now allocated to the United States Navy by $750,000,000. It would reduce the money now allocated for the functioning of civilian affairs in foreign countries by $500,000,000.

On February 15 the New York Times quoted Secretary Marshall as saying to reporters following the closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I quote:

> If the Army is deprived of the necessary funds, or adequate funds, to provide food for those people who are so sorely in need of it, a practically impossible situation will be created for our troops and for our Government in its international commitments. We cannot expect to maintain the occupation with our troops if the people are starving. That would be an intolerable condition, and under that condition the present procedure would be impractical.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain we are all aware that upon Secretary Marshall's shoulders has been placed the greatest and gravest responsibility that it is possible for man to carry—that of working out a world peace—yet are we going to make his already difficult and dangerous task onerous by depriving him of the funds that he needs?

Senator VANDENBERG, who has played a large and important part in working out the manifold problems of peace, is reported in the Evening Star to have said that he was opposed to any budget cuts that would require the United States to "disarm alone." He further declared that he feared "a cut of $1,750,000,000 in Army and Navy funds might upset American prestige in troubled international affairs." Senator CONNALLY, the great Texan, who has been a part of this great American team for peace, has voiced strenuous objection to the proposed cut.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is there anyone better qualified to pass judgment on the requirements and needs of the peace problem than Secretary of State Marshall and Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY? I do not know of any Congressman who claims that he is better qualified. Marshall, Vandenberg, and Connally know that, while we have made some steps toward a peace program, world peace is not yet a reality. It is still a hope. They know that another world conflagration could overwhelm us in the space of a few months. They know the necessity for us to have adequate armed forces, not only to protect us during this period of uncertainty and unrest but to give us bargaining power at the conference table.

Someone may wonder what constitutes an adequate armed force sufficient to protect this country in event of an emergency. No doubt we have some military and naval experts in the Congress; no doubt some of them are sitting on this Budget Committee, but do they or anyone else claim that they know more about what the Army needs to maintain adequate standards than does General Eisenhower? Does anyone in this Budget Committee claim he knows as much about the Air Force as General Spaatz, or about the Navy as Secretary Forrestal or Admiral Nimitz? These are the best qualified men in the country to advise us on our armed forces, and they all urge us not to cut the armed-forces allocation, because, and I quote Secretary of War Patterson, "the President's War Department estimate was down to the minimum our leaders believed necessary for support of our occupation forces overseas and for reasonable guaranties for national security."

Most of us have agreed that Secretary Byrnes' policy of "friendly but firm" in dealing with foreign countries was a sensible and wise one. We can be friendly, but how can we be firm if we have reduced our strength to below the standard of adequacy. It takes strength and power to be firm.

Mr. Chairman, if we vote for the proposed $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's Budget, we are grossly ignoring the advice and counsel of those men who, in all fairness, we must admit, know more about the armed forces, the practical problems of peace, and what is needed to protect our country, than does anyone else in these United States. If we vote for the proposed cut, we are closing our eyes to the fact and entrusting our fate to chance. No one can be certain just what lies ahead. Certainly we are inviting trouble by weakening ourselves at this time—yet no one knows—we are gambling. We are gambling the biggest stake in the world—peace—against less than $2,000,000,000. The stakes are all out of proportion.

Money is important. Lower taxes are important. But certainly they are not important when the choice could easily lie between money or bloodshed—less taxes or peace.

I would think that those veterans who had seen their friends, their brothers, their buddies, give their lives in order that the world might have peace, I should think that those fellows who had seen that sacrifice would think a long time before making that sacrifice a mockery by giving it away for $2,000,000,000 and lower taxes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that some of the figures that were given by the gentleman from Missouri came in a letter which was delivered after I took the floor, I feel obliged to take the well of the House at this time and call attention to the serious discrepancies in the stories that have been told by the OPA.

First off, in the President's budget estimate he reports expenditures to the 30th of November of $56,971,000, leaving a balance of $44,000,000. The OPA told us that they had spent $80,000,000 to the 1st of February, or at a rate double what they had been spending in the previous months. Based on the President's budget statement we would be able to cut at least $12,000,000 back and let them go on and operate with the force that they now have, allowing plenty of money for terminal leave and everything else.

Now they come in here with a statement indicating not only that they have spent twice as much money in December, but that they have spent in January and the first half of February $10,000,000, which is just twice as much as they could possibly spend on the same ratio that they have been operating on before.

Frankly, I am in this position: I do not believe a word of the testimony that they have given us or a word that is in the letter, and I shall stick to my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

Amounts available to the departments and agencies from appropriations and other funds are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office for Emergency Management:

Office of Scientific Research and Development:

Working fund, Executive, Emergency Management (Office of Scientific Research and Development), 1942–46, $2,044,477.

Working fund, Executive, Emergency Management (Office of Scientific Research and Development), 1940–46, $160,744.

Working fund, Executive, Emergency Management (Office of Scientific Research and Development), 1945, $6,688,979.

Office of Temporary Controls:

Salaries and expenses, Civilian Production Administration functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, $2,400,000: *Provided*, That the Civilian Production Administration shall be discontinued and its affairs placed in liquidation not later than June 30, 1947.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Price Administration functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, $9,000,000.

Salaries and expenses, Office of War Mobilization functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, $60,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say for the benefit of those who have come in since general debate started that the action taken here with respect to the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration functions means that we are definitely on

our way toward redeeming the pledges made to the people that we are going to save some money out of the Budget, money that has previously been appropriated.

The mandate given in lines 10 to 13 on page 4 provides that the Civilian Production Administration shall be discontinued and its affairs placed in liquidation not later than June 30, 1947. I recognize that it has been said, probably, a little during the debate here, and more will be said in the press, that that interferes with the CPA's continuing to allocate materials, and the red herring will be drawn that that will affect the veterans' housing program.

At a meeting of the committee on veterans' housing conducted by the South Dakota Department of the American Legion, in my own State, along in November, members of the Legion, representing the building trades, the construction industry, and just rank-and-file veterans, came to the conclusion that continued channeling of materials was defeating the purpose of veterans' housing, defeating jobs for the veterans, and retarding the welfare of the veterans generally. It is my own belief that the CPA program has reached its maximum usefulness, and that the provision here for discontinuing its functions by the 30th of June 1947 will have a salutary effect upon the economy of the country and the welfare of the veterans and their housing program.

With respect to the Office of Price Administration, it must be borne in mind that many controls were discontinued last fall. When the statement was made that the people who lost their jobs by reason of the decontrol then would be added to the other functions of the OPA the country heard it with a horselaugh. The people just did not believe that kind of thing was possible or would actually be attempted. Actually, that is what happened. In the field of rent control, on the 1st of July last year the OPA had 5,700 people. That was the 1st of July last year, a year after VE-day. Under the figures given the committee in these hearings, on the 1st of February of this year, many months later, that number had increased from 5,700 to 6,554. They had increased the number of rent-control areas in the country from 535 to 649. That is after the war had been over for a year. They increased by almost 1,000 the number of employees of the O. P. A. Rent Control Division between July 1 last year and February 1 of this year. They did increase by over a thousand in the field offices.

The only way we are going to redeem the promises which have been made to the country with respect to getting rid of controls and reducing expenditures is to have the courage to do it. What the committee is here doing is proposing that not only shall we refuse the increase in money this agency has requested but we shall take back some of the money they have had appropriated for the balance of this year, in order that they may move in the other direction, that of reducing the number of employees rather than increasing them the farther we get away from the war.

When this bill passes, as it will today, you can send out the word: "Congress is in action. We are on the way. We are reducing expenditures. We are reducing the Federal pay roll."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the remainder of the bill involves rescissions which were recommended by the Budget and since the committee is in complete agreement upon it, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

After hearing the distinguished minority leader attacking cuts in the appropriation for the OPA and mentioning that sugar may go up 30 or 40 cents a pound, I thought it might be appropriate to talk a little bit about sugar. Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday of this week, the International Emergency Food Council consisting of representatives from more than 30 countries, will meet in secret session to split up or divide amongst themselves American-owned sugar supplies. We are not unwilling to share a portion of our sugar with other countries where they are in short supply, but the question that I want to raise is by what authority the Secretary of Agriculture or any other representative of the United States Government has the right to enter into an agreement with other nations to keep the division of American-owned sugar secret from the people of the country? There is no law authorizing such secrecy. The American people are entitled to learn all of the facts as to what is being done with the sugar owned by the United States Government. In addition, the people are entitled to find out as to sugar supplies in all countries that now seek to secure a substantial portion of American-owned sugar.

The special food committee to investigate the sugar situation insists that the direct sugar allotment for consumers in the United States be increased from 35 to 40 pounds for 1947 as against 25 pounds last year. The committee also recommends an increase for industrial users of approximately 30 percent. These are minimum recommendations of the committee. If the Secretary of Agriculture or any member of the Cabinet consents to any smaller amount of sugar than recommended by the committee, American consumers should know where the responsibility belongs.

To fill the minimum quotas of sugar recommended by the committee for American consumers for use in 1947, we will need approximately 3,300,000 tons of American-owned Cuban sugar. This amount from Cuban supplies plus 3,808,000 tons produced in American areas shows a minimum requirement of approximately 7,200,000 tons of sugar for the use of domestic consumers in 1947. I insist that the Secretary of Agriculture stand by the recommendations of the committee and that all proceedings of the International Emergency Food Council, including information on stocks and supplies of sugar in other countries, be made available to Congress and the country.

I again invite the Members of the House to secure copies of the report of the committee on the sugar situation, and I also urge my colleagues to contact the Secretary of Agriculture today with a demand that he retain a minimum of 3,300,000 short tons of American-owned Cuban sugar for use in 1947 by the American people.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 26, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Bennett, Mich.	Canfield
Albert	Bennett, Mo.	Cannon
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Carroll
Allen, La.	Blackney	Carson
Almond	Boggs, Del.	Case, N. J.
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, La.	Case, S. Dak.
Andresen,	Bolton	Chadwick
August H.	Bonner	Chapman
Angell	Bradley, Calif.	Chelf
Arends	Bradley, Mich.	Chenoweth
Arnold	Bramblett	Chiperfield
Auchincloss	Brehm	Church
Bakewell	Brooks	Clark
Banta	Brophy	Clason
Barrett	Brown, Ga.	Clevenger
Bates, Ky.	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Buck	Cole, Mo.
Battle	Burke	Colmer
Beall	Burleson	Combs
Beckworth	Butler	Cooley
Bender	Byrnes, Wis.	Cooper

Corbett	Jarman	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Javits	Phillips, Tenn.
Courtney	Jenkins, Pa.	Pickett
Cox	Jennings	Ploeser
Cravens	Jensen	Poage
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Potts
Crow	Johnson, Ill.	Preston
Curtis	Johnson, Ind.	Rains
Dague	Johnson, Tex.	Ramey
D'Alesandro	Jones, Ala.	Rankin
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N. C.	Rayburn
Deane	Jones, Ohio	Redden
Devitt	Jonkman	Reed, Ill.
Dingell	Judd	Reed, N. Y.
Dirksen	Kean	Reeves
Dolliver	Kearney	Richards
Domengeaux	Kearns	Riehlman
Dondero	Keating	Riley
Dorn	Kee	Rivers
Doughton	Keefe	Robertson
Drewry	Keogh	Robsion
Durham	Kerr	Rockwell
Eaton	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.
Ellis	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Rohrbough
Elsaesser	Knutson	Ross
Elston	Kunkel	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Landis	St. George
Evins	Lane	Sarbacher
Fallon	Lanham	Sasscer
Feighan	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.
Fellows	Latham	Schwabe, Okla.
Fenton	Lea	Scott, Hardie
Fisher	LeCompte	Scott,
Flannagan	LeFevre	Hugh D., Jr.
Fletcher	Lemke	Scrivner
Fogarty	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Foote	Lewis	Shafer
Forand	Lodge	Sheppard
Gallagher	Love	Short
Gamble	Lusk	Simpson, Ill.
Gary	Lyle	Smathers
Gathings	McConnell	Smith, Kans.
Gavin	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Gearhart	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Gifford	McDonough	Smith, Va.
Gillette	McDowell	Smith, Wis.
Gillie	McGregor	Snyder
Goodwin	McMahon	Spence
Gore	McMillan, S. C.	Springer
Gossett	McMillen, Ill.	Stanley
Graham	MacKinnon	Stefan
Granger	Macy	Stevenson
Grant, Ala.	Mahon	Stigler
Grant, Ind.	Maloney	Stockman
Gregory	Manasco	Stratton
Griffiths	Mansfield, Tex.	Sundstrom
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Hagen	Mathews	Talle
Hale	Meade, Md.	Teague
Hall,	Merrow	Thomas, Tex.
Edwin Arthur	Michener	Thomason
Hall,	Miller, Conn.	Tibbott
Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Tollefson
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Hand	Mills	Twyman
Harless, Ariz.	Morgan	Vail
Harness, Ind.	Morris	Van Zandt
Harris	Morrison	Vorys
Harrison	Morton	Vursell
Havenner	Muhlenberg	Wadsworth
Hébert	Mundt	Walter
Herter	Murdock	Weichel
Heselton	Murray, Tenn.	Welch
Hess	Murray, Wis.	Wheeler
Hill	Nixon	Whitten
Hinshaw	Nodar	Whittington
Hobbs	Norblad	Wigglesworth
Hoeven	O'Brien	Williams
Hoffman	O'Konski	Wilson, Ind.
Holmes	Owens	Wilson, Tex.
Hope	Pace	Winstead
Horan	Passman	Wolverton
Howell	Patman	Wood
Hull	Patterson	Worley
Jackson, Calif.	Peden	Youngblood
Jackson, Wash.	Philbin	

NAYS—26

Buchanan	Kelley	Powell
Celler	King	Price, Ill.
Delaney	Klein	Rabin
Douglas	Lynch	Rayfiel
Gordon	Madden	Rooney
Hart	Marcantonio	Sabath
Heffernan	Miller, Calif.	Sadowski
Huber	Norton	Somers
Karsten, Mo.	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—87

Allen, Ill.	Andrews, Ala.	Bell
Andersen,	Andrews, N. Y.	Bland
H. Carl	Barden	Blatnik
Bloom	Fulton	Monroney
Boykin	Gerlach	Norman
Brown, Ohio	Goff	Norrell
Buckley	Gorski	O'Hara
Buffett	Gross	Peterson
Bulwinkle	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Busbey	Hardy	Plumley
Byrne, N. Y.	Hartley	Poulson
Camp	Hays	Price, Fla.
Clements	Hedrick	Priest
Clippinger	Hendricks	Rees
Coffin	Holifield	Rich
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Rizley
Coudert	Jenkins, Ohio	Russell
Crawford	Johnson, Okla.	Sanborn
Cunningham	Jones, Wash.	Scoblick
Davis, Tenn.	Kefauver	Sikes
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Utah	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
D'Ewart	Lucas	Thomas, N. J.
Donohue	McGarvey	Towe
Eberharter	Mansfield,	Vinson
Elliott	Mont.	West
Engle, Calif.	Mason	Wolcott
Fernandez	Meade, Ky.	Woodruff
Folger	Meyer	Zimmerman
Fuller	Mitchell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Norman with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Mansfield of Montana.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Engle of California.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. Crawford with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Towe with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Peterson.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Rich with Mr. West.
Mr. Russell with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MADDEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H. R. 1968 for the following reasons:

First. The bill reduces veterans' appropriations from the requested $307,258,000 to $135,000,000.

Second. It eliminates appropriations for OPA. This withholding of funds endangers rent control.

CONFEREES ON EXCISE-TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the number of conferees on the bill which was sent to conference this morning be enlarged to seven.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to act as conferees.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may be privileged to address the House for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE COLONEL EARLE L. JOHNSON

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation sustained a great loss yesterday in the death of Col. Earle L. Johnson, national commander of the Civil Air Patrol, when the plane he was flying crashed only half a mile from its take-off at Cleveland Airport.

Colonel Johnson was my friend for many years. Of gigantic stature, well over 6 feet, with the genial simplicity of a big boy, he naturally had the nickname of "Tiny" Johnson. He was a lineman on Ohio State University first Western Conference football team in 1916. He was active in farming, real estate, and business and served three terms as a representative in the Ohio General Assembly. He became interested in aviation during this period through his friendship with his colleague David S. Ingalls. In 1929 Mr. Ingalls was author of the law creating a bureau of aeronautics for the State of Ohio. I had the honor of being appointed as Ohio's first director of aeronautics. In 1931 various amendments and improvements to the law, which experience had shown were necessary, were drafted in a bill which Colonel Johnson sponsored in the Ohio Legislature. Although this bill was vetoed by the Governor, such a protest arose from friends of aviation that it was immediately repassed with slight changes and is still the law in Ohio. In 1939 Colonel Johnson was drafted from private life by Governor Bricker to act as Ohio's director of aeronautics. In 1941 he helped organize the Civil Air Patrol and in April 1942 he became its national commander. Under his guiding genius the Civil Air Patrol performed vitally important war services while retaining its character as an organization of amateur volunteers. In

1942 when the submarines were sinking ships all along our coast the CAP carried on antisubmarine reconnaissance along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts which was extremely effective in keeping our shipping lanes open. Since the war the CAP has performed many different missions and services, as well as furnishing preflight training for air cadets.

Only a man with the energy and resourcefulness and tact and ingenuity and force of Earle Johnson could have organized and directed the vast volunteer organization of the CAP in war and peace. He loved and understood flying, and people, young and old, and his country. He was only 52 when he died. His experience and his ability would have been invaluable to our Nation in the next few years. His death is a great loss to his family and friends and to his country. Our deep sympathy goes to his widow and his mother who survive him. His memory will be an inspiration to those who served with him and under him and to all who learn of his great character and his great work.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I desire to say that I knew Colonel Johnson very well. I considered him as one of the men who had performed outstanding service for his country during the war as head of the Civil Air Patrol. With the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and others, I want to say how much I sympathize with those of his loved ones who are sad today in the loss of this great man.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Col. Earle Johnson. I was greatly shocked when I learned of his tragic death. Aviation in this country suffered a heavy loss in his passing. For many years he had been recognized as one of the outstanding leaders in matters pertaining to aviation. He was an expert flyer himself, and was tireless in his leadership of the Civil Air Patrol. I first met Colonel Johnson several years ago and was immediately attracted by his charming personality. A visit with him was always a delightful and profitable experience. All who knew him have lost a true friend.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Ohio in expressing my sympathy on the tragic death of Col. Earle L. Johnson, National Commander of the Civil Air Patrol. It has been my privilege to know him down through the years, and he was one of the air pioneers who carried on during this war. He was a leader in the early days and gathered together those who wanted to serve for the air protection of our country.

The colonel was always gracious and held the affection and confidence of his men. He will long be remembered for his distinguished service to our country. My sympathy goes to his family and I know that they will be comforted by the affection and love of his many friends.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, Col. Earle L. Johnson lost his life in a yet unexplained plane crash. Those of us who knew him are certain that if he had time to think it would have been for the two who were with him, not for himself.

For a quarter of a century or more, Colonel Johnson has been a leader in aviation in Ohio and in the Nation, serving as Ohio State Director of Aeronautics, and as director of the National Aeronautics Association. Upon the creation of the Civil Air Patrol he was made Ohio wing commander. At the time of his death he was head of the national patrol organization. His work won him the Legion of Merit.

Colonel Johnson had been recommended for the Distinguished Service Medal and his nomination as brigadier general had been sent to the Senate by the President, all of which attests to the fine service he has rendered his country.

Colonel Johnson was a man who took his responsibilities of citizenship seriously. He has been active in his community of Painesville, Ohio, and Lake County, having represented the county in the State legislature for 6 years, prior to serving the State of Ohio in several capacities.

To his family we extend our deepest sympathy. The Nation can ill afford to lose such a man.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to extend their remarks on the life and character of Colonel Johnson may be permitted to do so at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a certain editorial comment.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN HEALTH

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, during the next few minutes I would that we counsel together on the Nation's health.

Are you interested in the health of your family, your constituents, your State, and our great Nation? If you answer these questions in the affirmative, then the observations I make today should command your attention, inspire you to make a careful and serious study into the health of the people in your own State, and thereafter join in an American crusade to restore health to the people of our great Nation.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REJECTS AS UNFIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE 5,000,000 PROUD YOUNG AMERICANS

On January 8, 1947, the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke briefly before the House and inserted in the RECORD certain findings released by the Selective Service System which revealed the sad, yet true, fact that the health of the American youth had reached a new low. The details are so tragic that this Congress will stand indicted by this and succeeding generations if we fail to offer some remedies.

BASIC MATERIAL

The basic material used in presenting my opinions include medical statistics from the Selective Service System, hearings before the Committee on Education of the United States Senate in respect to the Hospital Construction Act, the Nation's Business of August 1946, releases from the American Hospital Association, findings of the North Carolina Medical Care Commission, not to mention the able counsel and advice of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

OVER-ALL DATA

During the war 5,000,000 young Americans were rejected as being physically unfit for military service. The record shows that of the 22,000,000 men between 18 and 32 registered for military service in World War II, 5,000,000 were deferred on essential occupational grounds. Of the 17,000,000 remaining, examination showed 5,000,000 physically unfit for armed service, this being a rejection percentage of 30.2 percent.

REJECTION PERCENTAGE RACIALLY

A break-down nationally between the races reveals that the ratio of rejection to those examined for Negroes was 53.4 percent and that of the whites 39.2 percent.

HEALTH BY STATES

Every Member of Congress is proud of his State and it is not my desire to embarrass my people of North Carolina or my colleagues from other States as I go a little further than did the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DIRKSEN, and spread upon the record some rather damaging testimony concerning the health of this Nation.

BIPARTISAN APPROACH

My observations today are indeed bipartisan and there must be no aisle separating our joint efforts in this common undertaking to restore good health to the people of our Nation. Since the health of those folks in my home State is of great concern to me, I shall begin by citing the North Carolina record.

In North Carolina out of 530,800 examined for military service—ages 17 through 18—by August 1, 1945, 227,600 were rejected. This is a rejection percentage of 42.9 per 100 men examined. Racially the percentage in North Caro-

lina ran higher than the national average. The only figures available for this State are for the period August 1944 to August 1945, and the rejects to number examined were 57.9 percent for the Negroes and 46.7 for the whites.

At this point Mr. Speaker, I insert along with my remarks three tables compiled by Selective Service showing the rejection percentages for each State.

The first table is limited to inductions. A careful study will reveal one other State with a higher rejection ratio than North Carolina, yet many States with records almost equal that should shock us out of our complacency.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted and rejected* [1]

Age group	Estimated total physically examined [2]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to physically examined
All ages	17,384,700	12,135,500	5,249,200	30.2
18 to 25	8,392,300	6,484,800	1,907,500	22.7
26 to 29	3,996,800	2,821,400	1,175,400	29.4
30 to 33	2,781,500	1,689,100	1,092,400	39.3
34 to 37	2,214,100	1,140,200	1,073,900	48.5

[1] Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants.
[2] Includes registrant enlistees and inductees and nonregistrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

TABLE 1A.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by State* [1]

State	Estimated total examined [2]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to examined
United States, continental	17,384,700	12,135,500	5,249,200	30.2
Alabama	401,300	241,800	159,500	39.7
Arizona	68,500	46,600	21,900	32.0
Arkansas	276,600	168,400	108,200	39.1
California	908,200	672,800	235,400	25.9
Colorado	141,100	95,600	45,500	32.2
Connecticut	233,400	173,500	59,900	25.7
Delaware	36,800	25,800	11,000	29.9
District of Columbia	124,700	83,300	41,400	33.2
Florida	269,400	174,200	95,200	35.3
Georgia	450,400	260,500	189,900	42.2
Idaho	64,000	47,700	16,300	25.5
Illinois	1,002,800	742,500	260,300	26.0
Indiana	433,900	308,800	125,100	28.8
Iowa	285,000	214,600	70,400	24.7
Kansas	205,100	156,100	49,000	23.9
Kentucky	389,600	249,000	140,600	36.1
Louisiana	338,100	214,100	124,000	36.7
Maine	101,800	71,300	30,500	30.0
Maryland	266,200	184,400	81,800	30.7
Massachusetts	524,800	385,000	139,800	26.6
Michigan	709,500	495,900	213,600	30.1
Minnesota	337,800	248,800	89,000	26.3
Mississippi	300,500	190,500	110,000	36.6
Missouri	477,300	323,500	153,800	32.2
Montana	70,000	50,200	19,800	28.3
Nebraska	143,600	104,800	38,800	27.0
Nevada	16,500	12,500	4,000	24.2
New Hampshire	59,500	41,100	18,400	30.9
New Jersey	540,400	416,200	124,200	23.0
New Mexico	71,000	47,700	23,300	32.8
New York	1,731,100	1,264,000	467,100	27.0
North Carolina	530,800	303,200	227,600	42.9
North Dakota	75,400	54,500	20,900	27.7
Ohio	910,700	667,700	243,000	26.7
Oklahoma	289,200	196,800	92,400	32.0
Oregon	132,000	98,100	33,900	25.7
Pennsylvania	1,310,900	974,100	336,800	25.7
Rhode Island	92,800	68,100	24,700	26.6
South Carolina	291,600	162,700	128,900	44.2
South Dakota	71,800	53,100	18,700	26.0

TABLE 1A.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected by State* [1]—Continued

State	Estimated total examined [2]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to examined
Tennessee	418,400	271,300	147,100	35.2
Texas	894,300	607,900	286,400	32.0
Utah	67,900	52,200	15,700	23.1
Vermont	42,700	28,200	14,500	34.0
Virginia	407,000	261,400	145,600	35.8
Washington	210,100	152,300	57,800	27.5
West Virginia	275,900	185,700	90,200	32.7
Wisconsin	354,700	264,800	89,900	25.3
Wyoming	29,600	22,200	7,400	25.0

[1] Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants.
[2] Includes registrant enlistees, inductees and nonregistrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

The second table covers Negro registrants, who were inducted as well as those who enlisted. It is interesting to note that 20 States did not have a single Negro registrant:

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by State* [1]—*Negro registrants*

State	Estimated total examined [2]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to examined
United States, continental	2,123,400	1,124,600	998,800	47.0
Alabama	147,200	68,600	78,600	53.4
Arizona	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Arkansas	74,700	34,600	40,100	53.7
California	31,200	17,300	13,900	44.6
Colorado	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Connecticut	6,300	4,000	2,300	36.5
Delaware	7,100	4,200	2,900	40.8
District of Columbia	45,700	25,800	19,900	43.5
Florida	94,800	51,700	43,100	45.5
Georgia	170,400	74,400	96,000	56.3
Idaho	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Illinois	71,200	44,200	27,000	37.9
Indiana	20,400	10,700	9,700	47.5
Iowa	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Kansas	9,100	5,700	3,400	37.4
Kentucky	33,300	19,500	13,800	41.4
Louisiana	134,000	70,800	63,200	47.2
Maine	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Maryland	56,000	32,200	23,800	42.5
Massachusetts	8,000	4,900	3,100	38.8
Michigan	40,000	21,300	18,700	46.8
Minnesota	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Mississippi	155,000	85,300	69,700	45.0
Missouri	40,900	22,300	18,600	45.5
Montana	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Nebraska	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Nevada	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
New Hampshire	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
New Jersey	40,000	26,800	13,200	33.0
New Mexico	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
New York	81,000	48,100	32,900	40.6
North Carolina	164,300	71,400	92,900	56.5
North Dakota	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Ohio	57,500	35,500	22,000	38.3
Oklahoma	25,600	14,700	10,900	42.6
Oregon	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Pennsylvania	77,900	49,000	28,900	37.1
Rhode Island	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
South Carolina	132,700	57,600	75,100	56.6
South Dakota	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Tennessee	82,400	43,100	39,300	47.7
Texas	155,000	90,100	64,900	41.9
Utah	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Vermont	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Virginia	120,800	65,100	55,700	46.1
Washington	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
West Virginia	18,200	12,200	6,000	33.0
Wisconsin	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Wyoming	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)

[1] Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants.
[2] Includes registrant enlistees, inductees and nonregistrant enlistees 18–37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.
[3] Small number of Negro registrants examined.

The third table covers all races other than Negro, who were inducted as well as those who enlisted:

TABLE 3.—*Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by State* [1]—*white registrants* [2]

State	Estimated total examined [3]	Total acceptable	Total rejected	Ratio of rejected to examined
United States, continental	15,261,300	11,010,900	4,250,400	27.9
Alabama	254,100	173,200	80,900	31.8
Arizona	65,600	45,200	20,400	31.1
Arkansas	201,900	133,800	68,100	33.7
California	877,000	655,500	221,500	25.3
Colorado	139,000	95,200	43,800	31.5
Connecticut	227,100	169,500	57,600	25.4
Delaware	29,700	21,600	8,100	27.3
District of Columbia	79,000	57,500	21,500	27.2
Florida	174,600	122,500	52,100	29.8
Georgia	280,000	186,100	93,900	33.5
Idaho	63,600	47,400	16,200	25.5
Illinois	931,600	698,300	233,300	25.0
Indiana	413,500	298,100	115,400	27.9
Iowa	282,000	212,700	69,300	24.6
Kansas	196,000	150,400	45,600	23.3
Kentucky	356,300	229,500	126,800	35.6
Louisiana	204,100	143,300	60,800	29.8
Maine	101,600	71,200	30,400	29.9
Maryland	210,200	152,200	58,000	27.6
Massachusetts	516,800	380,100	136,700	26.5
Michigan	669,500	474,600	194,900	29.1
Minnesota	335,800	247,200	88,600	26.4
Mississippi	145,500	105,200	40,300	27.7
Missouri	436,400	301,200	135,200	31.0
Montana	69,500	50,000	19,500	28.1
Nebraska	141,300	103,000	38,300	27.1
Nevada	16,200	12,400	3,800	23.5
New Hampshire	59,200	41,000	18,200	30.7
New Jersey	500,400	389,400	111,000	22.2
New Mexico	69,900	46,800	23,100	33.0
New York	1,650,100	1,215,900	434,200	26.3
North Carolina	366,500	231,800	134,700	36.8
North Dakota	75,100	54,400	20,700	27.6
Ohio	853,200	632,200	221,000	25.9
Oklahoma	263,600	182,100	81,500	30.9
Oregon	131,200	97,600	33,600	25.6
Pennsylvania	1,233,000	925,100	307,900	25.0
Rhode Island	91,000	67,000	24,000	26.4
South Carolina	158,900	105,100	53,800	33.9
South Dakota	71,600	53,000	18,600	26.0
Tennessee	336,000	228,200	107,800	32.1
Texas	739,300	517,800	221,500	30.0
Utah	67,600	52,100	15,500	22.9
Vermont	42,400	28,000	14,400	34.0
Virginia	286,200	196,300	89,900	31.4
Washington	208,600	151,300	57,300	27.5
West Virginia	257,700	173,500	84,200	32.7
Wisconsin	352,400	263,300	89,100	25.3
Wyoming	29,500	22,100	7,400	25.1

[1] Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants.
[2] Includes all races other than Negro.
[3] Includes registrant enlistees, inductees, and nonregistrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT RECORDS

I point out to the Members that the voluntary enlistments from each State are over and above the total number of selectees accepted for the armed services. This should be taken into consideration as we study the rejection records by States. To the credit of North Carolina and several other States where the rejection record looks bad, it is interesting to discover that these States have an excellent percentage record of voluntary enlistments. In World War II in North Carolina over and above the 303,200 who were accepted for induction, 66,651 volunteered. If the North Carolina enlistment record was compared with certain States which did not have as favorable voluntary enlistment but did have a lower percentage in rejections, we would not be next to the cellar in the number of rejections.

ACCEPTANCE RECORDS BY STATES

For the information of the Members I insert at this point in the RECORD the acceptance record of the various States showing the percentage of men and women in the service in comparison with the number of citizens 21 years and over in the United States.

According to War and Navy records, North Carolina averaged 19.2 in the service, compared with the national average of 18.9.

Percentage of service personnel, male and female, who served in World War II in comparison with the number of citizens 21 years and over

State	Number of adult population [1] I	Number of service personnel [2] II	Percentage III
Alabama	1,555,369	302,566	19.5
Arizona	263,346	63,495	24.1
Arkansas	1,098,986	199,289	18.1
California	4,455,677	952,255	21.3
Colorado	688,410	124,747	18.1
Connecticut	1,159,601	227,495	19.6
Delaware	171,856	32,253	18.7
District of Columbia	474,793	73,209	15.4
Florida	1,187,827	232,805	19.5
Georgia	1,768,969	315,953	17.8
Idaho	305,311	60,933	19.9
Illinois	5,119,854	940,158	18.3
Indiana	2,198,935	396,638	18.0
Iowa	1,608,926	265,099	16.4
Kansas	1,144,823	101,819	8.8
Kentucky	1,630,772	295,166	18.0
Louisiana	1,364,933	262,450	19.2
Maine	493,506	97,725	19.8
Maryland	1,153,510	117,958	10.2
Massachusetts	2,575,477	539,597	20.9
Michigan	3,131,722	627,730	20.0
Minnesota	1,730,547	236,116	13.6
Mississippi	1,195,079	163,358	13.6
Missouri	2,463,726	402,893	16.3
Montana	343,180	62,608	18.2
Nebraska	817,280	132,795	16.2
Nevada	70,327	17,375	24.7
New Hampshire	295,859	55,814	18.8
New Jersey	2,592,978	534,506	20.6
New Mexico	275,227	63,551	23.0
New York	8,327,563	1,613,910	19.3
North Carolina	1,925,483	369,851	19.2
North Dakota	358,090	60,303	16.8
Ohio	4,404,423	856,314	19.4
Oklahoma	1,362,438	246,691	18.1
Oregon	717,121	140,750	19.5
Pennsylvania	6,031,192	1,253,812	20.7
Rhode Island	424,876	90,128	21.2
South Carolina	989,841	194,364	19.6
South Dakota	378,405	60,944	16.1
Tennessee	1,703,391	317,561	18.6
Texas	3,710,374	777,380	20.9
Utah	298,160	73,968	24.8
Vermont	214,248	36,869	17.2
Virginia	1,567,517	319,632	20.3
Washington	1,123,725	211,918	18.8
West Virginia	1,046,107	221,679	21.1
Wisconsin	1,941,603	319,895	16.4
Wyoming	150,631	34,100	22.7
Total	79,863,451	15,132,525	18.9

[1] Sixteenth Census of the United States, population vol. 1, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington 1941. 1235 pp.

[2] Army Personnel by State of Residence as of Dec. 31, 1945, Showing Accessions and Separations From Nov. 1, 1940. War Department press release, Aug. 21, 1946, 5 pp. Estimated Number of Naval, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard Personnel Serving During World War II, December 1941 Through May 1946. Navy Department press release, Jan. 14, 1947. 2 pp.

BREAK-DOWN OF DEFECTS

Because of my limited time I cannot give comparative data on the five most frequently recorded defects for all the States. However, at this point I will insert in the RECORD the rates per 1,000 examined in the continental United States, Kansas, and North Carolina. Kansas has been chosen for comparative purposes because its rejection rate was the lowest of any of the States. I should point out, however, that Kansas had the lowest percentage of service personnel serving in World War II, the percentage to total population being 8.8, whereas the national average was 18.9; this low average, I would assume, being due to essential occupational deferment.

Continental United States

	Rates per 1,000 examined
Total defects	1,105.7
Eyes	119.6
Teeth	116.1
Feet	90.1
Musculoskeletal	87.5
Cardiovascular	57.5
Ratio rejected to examined (all defects)	30.2

KANSAS

Total defects	729.8
Musculoskeletal	73.7
Feet	70.7
Eyes	68.9
Mouth and gums	56.6
Cardiovascular	46.7
Ratio rejected to examined (all defects)	23.9

NORTH CAROLINA

Total defects	1,157.3
Musculoskeletal	126.5
Feet	123.1
Mental and educational deficiency	116.5
Eyes	78.6
Cardiovascular	63.9
Ratio rejected to examined (all defects)	42.9

FREQUENTLY RECORDED DEFECT

The studies show that a State may have a large number of most frequently recorded defects that do not appear as a chief cause for rejection. This is due to the great variance in the political, social, and economic conditions in the various regions of the country, and it explains the omission of mental deficiency as one of the five causes of rejection in most of the Northern and Western States.

In the South the rejection rates were above the national average for educational deficiency and syphilis.

In the eastern region, cardiovascular defects were above the national average.

In the Midwest, rejections for hernia were above the national average, and also in the Midwest mental deficiency, dental defects and defects of the abdominal viscera were important causes for rejections.

In the far West rejections were above the national average for musculoskeletal defects, hernia, eye defects, and syphilis.

GREAT RECORD OF OUR ORPHANAGES

Before I suggest one remedy for what I have tried to reveal, you would be interested in the excellent acceptance record of the young men called by selective service from our orphanages, and at this point I wish to make a plug for every orphanage in this land.

The figures I give to you for North Carolina are comparable to those for the continental United States. Of 1,154 former students of North Carolina orphanages listed for the Army, only 16 were turned back—and this in spite of the fact that the Army was pretty choosy in the early days of the war.

The orphanage boys had good bodies and good eyes. The rejection rate was 1.4, against a rejection ratio of 42.9 to the number examined for North Carolina as a whole. The orphanage boys came from the same blood lines, presumably, same social and in the main perhaps worse economic background.

The only reason for this great record in our orphanages must be due to adequate hospital and medical care at an age when it was most needed.

WAC'S REJECTED

My approach today is limited to the male rejects, but the same serious health conditions existed among the young women called for service; for example, one-third of the applicants for the WAC in the Nation were rejected for physical or mental reasons.

WHAT IS THE PARTIAL ANSWER?

In the Seventy-ninth Congress the Hill-Burton bill was enacted into law. It was brought before the Congress under the bipartisan sponsorship of Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator (now Justice) Harold Burton, of Ohio. It was passed by a unanimous voice vote in the Senate and by a vote of 136 to 28 in the House.

Examination of the testimony of expert and professional witnesses at the hearings on this bill disclosed many convincing facts in support of a program to increase the availability of medical care and hospitals. Dr. Frederick D. Mott, then chief medical officer, Farm Security Administration, testified that less than one-third of all the counties in the United States, with 69 percent of the population, have 89 percent of the total number of hospital beds. He further stated that 1,785 counties having no cities of more than 10,000 population but including 21 percent of the total population had only 8.8 percent of the total number of general hospital beds. In plain language this means that most of the hospitals have been built close to urban areas and are not uniformly distributed so as to be equally available to all segments of the population.

HOW—THE DESCRIPTION OF THE ACT, ITS SCOPE, ADMINISTRATION AND ENABLING STATE LEGISLATION

I will not presume upon the time of the House to discuss the details of the Hill-Burton Act, its scope and administration and the required enabling State legislation, but for the benefit of the new Members of this House as well as the old, I insert in the RECORD at this point a brief résumé of the act and its broad objectives:

THE ACT

Within the next 5 years the Nation's communities—small and large—will construct $1,125,000,000 worth of hospitals and related facilities under a Federal grant-in-aid program. These are to be built on the basis of need under programs which will be drawn up within the States, and the Federal Government will pay for one-third of the cost of constructing and equipping them. The other two-thirds of the cost will come from sources within the State.

This construction program was made possible by Public Law 725 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, signed by President Truman August 13, 1946. The law is better known by its earlier title, S. 191, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, or the Hill-Burton bill. The American, Catholic, and Protestant Hospital Associations have endorsed and actively supported the bill because of the direct benefit to the Nation's health through increased hospital facilities. Additional support has come from leaders in the public health field and labor, farm, civic, and welfare groups.

There will be hospital construction outside of this program; but the money provided by this law will be used for assistance in building hospitals in those areas which are shown by State-wide surveys to be in greatest need of additional facilities.

ITS SCOPE

Public Law 725 provides grants-in-aid to States for the purposes of (sec. 601[1]):

1. Conducting State-wide surveys and planning for construction of needed hospitals, health centers and related facilities;

2. Constructing hospitals, health centers and related facilities which are part of over-all State plans developed from surveys.

For both surveys and construction the Federal Government is authorized to contribute one-third of the cost with the remaining two-thirds to be provided from sources within the States.

ITS ADMINISTRATION

Administration of the Nation-wide program is under the direction of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service through the newly created Division of Hospital Facilities. The Federal Hospital Council, with members drawn from various interested groups, will assist and guide the Surgeon General in formulation of policies and standards for the program.

Administration at State levels will be through a single State agency and an advisory council. The State agency may be an existing agency or one established for the purpose of administering the new law.

STATE LEGISLATION

Each State, in order to participate, will be required to enact an enabling law and a hospital licensing law.

The enabling law must provide for the proper organization and administration of the State's program (sec. 623 (a)). The American Hospital Association is working with governmental agencies and the Council of State Governments in preparing a model enabling act. As soon as an enabling act is developed which the association can recommend, it will be distributed to officers of State hospital associations and will be available from the Washington Service Bureau.

Public Law 725 does not authorize Federal control over the operation of hospitals after construction is complete; it does specifically require that each State must enact legislation before July 1, 1948, establishing minimum standards of operation of hospitals constructed with Federal assistance under this law (sec. 623 (d)). A model hospital licensing law has been prepared by a special committee of the council on Government relations of the association and is now available from the Washington Service Bureau.

ITS FINANCING

Three million dollars are authorized to assist in surveys and planning. Of this, $2,350,000 have been appropriated. A later Congress may appropriate additional funds as required.

Survey and planning funds are allotted on the basis of State population. For each dollar put up by the Federal Government, $2 must be furnished by the State (sec. 613).

Seventy-five million dollars annually for 5 years are authorized for construction grants. No appropriation for construction has yet been made by the Congress. Construction funds will be allotted according to population and the per capita income of the States, weighted so that States with lower per capita incomes are allotted higher amounts per capita. Each dollar of Federal funds must be matched by $2 from the project applicant (sec. 625 (b)).

[1] Section numbers refer to sections of the act.

Church and other nonprofit organizations in many States will find that constitutional or statutory provisions prohibit their receiving funds through the State's disbursing agency. Public Law 725 provides that under such conditions the Federal funds can be paid directly and the State agency need only certify for compliance (sec. 625 (b)).

THE SURVEY AND PLANNING PROGRAM

In order that a State may participate, it must set up a single State agency and an advisory council to consult with the State agency in surveys and planning. This, in most States, will require enabling legislation, but in some States survey programs have been started under executive order of the governor.

The designated State agency then applies to the Surgeon General for funds to cover one-third of the cost of its survey program.

The groundwork for surveys has been completed in many of the States where groups working with the Commission on Hospital Care have outlined and begun State-wide surveys. These will usually be carried forward by the designated State agency.

From the inventories, plans for a State-wide construction program will be made. The State agency will submit the State plan to the Surgeon General. If the plan complies fully with the regulations drawn up by the Surgeon General and the Federal Hospital Council it will be approved. If the Surgeon General rejects a plan the State agency may appeal to the Federal Hospital Council and that Council may uphold or veto the original ruling. (Sec. 623 (b).)

THE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

As a first step for this phase of the program a State must again designate a single State agency—to administer the construction program. The agency may be the same as the survey agency or a new agency may be selected. This, also, will require State enabling legislation.

Applicants for individual projects may apply for Federal assistance for construction of any project, provided it is part of the approved State-wide construction program (State plan). (Sec. 625.)

Application forms for construction funds may be received from the State agency after construction funds are appropriated by Congress. (It is expected that Congress will make the appropriations by early spring and such action as well as other events significant to the program will be reported in hospitals.) The application will be submitted to the State agency for approval and will then be recommended to the Surgeon General. Should the Surgeon General refuse approval of any project which is part of a State plan, the State agency may appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Upon final approval of the project, Federal funds for one-third of the cost of construction will be allotted, and will be paid in installments as work progresses.

IN SUMMATION

The Office of the Surgeon General will:

1. With the approval of the Federal Hospital Council, draw up complete regulations for administering the law (sec. 622 and sec. 633).

2. Approve State plans and applications for funds for surveys and planning (sec. 623).

3. Approve individual applications for construction projects (sec. 625).

The States will:

1. Pass enabling legislation to set up:

(a) A single State agency to conduct the surveys and planning.

(b) A single State agency (or the same) to administer the construction program (sec. 612 and sec. 623).

(c) An advisory council to consult with the State agency (sec. 612 and sec. 623).

2. Pass a hospital licensing law by July 1, 1948, providing for minimum standards of operation for hospitals and related facilities constructed as part of the Federal grant-in-aid program (sec. 623).

The State agency will:

1. Administer the program with the assistance of the State advisory council in accordance with Federal regulations (sec. 612 and sec. 623).

2. Complete survey work and develop a State plan for construction (sec. 623).

3. Accept applications for construction and forward these to the Surgeon General if they are approved as part of the State plan (sec. 625).

4. Inspect projects and certify payment of installments from Federal funds (sec. 625).

The individual project applicant should:

1. Consult with the State agency to plan its project so that it is in accord with a State-wide plan (sec. 622).

2. Submit application for construction funds, in accord with the State plan and the Federal regulations, to the State agency for approval and recommendation to the Surgeon General. The application should contain:

(a) A description of the site for the project;

(b) Reasonable assurance that the title to the site is or will be vested solely in the applicant;

(c) Plans and specifications which comply with Federal regulations;

(d) Reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for two-thirds of the cost of constructing the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed;

(e) Reasonable assurance of the payment of prevailing wages for construction work; and

(f) Assurance of compliance with requirements of the State plan and regulations concerning the availability of hospital services without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for persons unable to pay, as well as assurance of compliance with State minimum requirements for operation and maintenance (sec. 625).

STATE SURVEY DIRECTORS

Alabama: Preliminary survey completed.

Arizona: State Department of Health, Phoenix, Ariz.; Hilda H. Kroeger, M. D., director, Maternal and Child Health Division.

Arkansas: Hospital and Health Survey, 421½ West Capitol Avenue., Little Rock, Ark.; Miss Helen Robinson.

California: Department of Public Health, 423 Phelan Building, 760 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; P. K. Gilman, M. D.

Colorado: State Division of Public Health, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Florence Sabin.

Connecticut: State Department of Health, Hartford, Conn.; James A. Dolce, M. D.

Delaware: Survey officially authorized but not begun.

District of Columbia: Washington Metropolitan Health Council, St. Luke's Hospital, Amsterdam Avenue and One Hundred and Thirteenth Street, New York, N. Y.; Claude W. Munger, M. D.

Florida: Survey officially authorized but not begun.

Georgia: Department of Public Health, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. John E. Ransom.

Idaho: Department of Public Health, Boise, Idaho; Ruth Raattama, M. D., Division of Maternal and Child Health.

Illinois: State Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill.; Henrietta Herbolsheimer, M. D., chief, Division of Maternal and Child Hygiene.

Indiana: State Board of Health, Indianapolis, Ind.; Dr. Martha O'Malley, Division of Hospital and Institutional Services.

Iowa: State Hospital Survey Committee, State Department of Health, Des Moines, Iowa; Verne A. Pangborn, director.

Kansas: State Board of Health, Topeka, Kans.; Miss Selma A. Czarnowsky.

Kentucky: State Department of Health, 620 South Third Street, Louisville, Ky.; W. B. Atkinson, M. D., Division of Medical and Related Services.

Louisiana: Survey Study Group, Office of the Governor, Health and Hospital Division, Baton Rouge, La.; J. W. Holloway.

Maine: Department of Health and Welfare, Augusta, Maine; Mr. Boyd L. Bailey, Department of Health and Welfare.

Maryland: Hospital Survey Committee, 15 East Fayette Street, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. Herbert G. Fritz.

Massachusetts: State Department of Public Health, 8 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; Donald A. Martin, M. D.

Michigan: Michigan Planning Committee, 422 West Michigan, Lansing, Mich.; Don C. Weeks.

Minnesota: State Board of Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Viktor O. Wilson, M. D.

Mississippi: Mississippi Commission on Hospital Care, 207 Tower Building, Jackson, Miss.; Dr. D. V. Galloway.

Missouri: Survey being considered.

Montana: Hospital Survey Committee, Agricultural Experiment Station, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.; Carl F. Kraenzel, associate agricultural economist.

Nebraska: Committee for Hospital Survey, Room 1004, Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebr.; Dr. W. S. Petty, chairman.

Nevada: State Department of Health, Reno, Nev.; Mrs. Christie T. Corbett.

New Hampshire: New Hampshire State Hospital Study, 201 State Office Building, Concord, N. H.; Thorsten V. Kalijarvi.

New Jersey: Survey of Hospital and Health Center Facilities, Department of Institutions and Agencies, State Office Building, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. Emil Frankel.

New Mexico: New Mexico State Hospital Survey, 300 East Second Avenue, Hot Springs, N. Mex.: Mr. Leo P. Schwartz.

New York: State Postwar Public Works Planning Commission, State Office Building, Albany, N. Y.; John J. Bourke, M. D., Joint Hospital Board.

North Carolina: North Carolina Medical Care Commission, Box 1880, Raleigh, N. C.; John A. Ferrell, M. D., executive secretary.

North Dakota: State Department of Health, Farm Foundation, State College Station, Fargo, N. Dak.; Marguerite L. Ingram, specialist, medical care and health studies.

Ohio: Department of Health, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. Ed V. Turner.

Oklahoma: State Department of Health, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Paul A. Snelson, Director, Hospital Division.

Oregon: Oregon State Board of Health, Portland, Oreg.; Forrest E. Rieke, M. D.

Pennsylvania: Department of Welfare, Board of Education Building, Twenty-first and Parkway, Philadelphia; Hubley R. Owen, M. D.

Rhode Island: Survey Commission for Hospitals, State Department of Health, State Office Building, Providence, R. I.; James P. Deery, M. D., medical director of industrial hygiene.

South Carolina: Box 927, Columbia, S. C.; Mr. W. N. Walters.

South Dakota: State Board of Health, Pierre, S. Dak.; Gilbert Cottam, M. D.

Tennessee: Department of Public Health, Nashville, Tenn.; Dr. R. H. Hutcheson.

Texas: State Board of Health, Austin, Tex.; Mr. Norman Roberts.

Utah: Preliminary survey completed.

Vermont: State Hospital Survey Commission, 50 Nelson Street, Barre, Vt.; Mr. Lawrence C. Campbell.

Virginia: Survey officially authorized but not begun.

Washington: Department of Health, Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. Ralph L. Nielson.

West Virginia: Survey officially authorized but not begun.

Wisconsin: State Board of Health, 400 State Office Building, Madison, Wis.; Vincent F. Otis.

Wyoming: Wyoming State Department of Health, Cheyenne, Wyo.; G. M. Anderson, M. D., State health officer.

HILL-BURTON BILL NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The Hill-Burton bill is not socialized medicine, nor is it considered a step in that direction. It does not provide that the Federal Government shall build hospitals or control them. It does provide that the hospital construction in each State shall be under State control. It provides that in each State an advisory council, composed of citizens who represent a cross section of the community, including doctors and hospital administrators, will advise with the State agency in developing a program that will put new hospitals in the areas where they are most needed in the State. Federal money is not distributed on the basis of political patronage.

NECESSARY APPROPRIATIONS

The Hill-Burton bill authorizes five annual appropriations of $75,000,000 each, to assist the States in developing a medical-care program. The first fiscal year of this program will end June 30, 1947. No funds have been appropriated for the first fiscal year. Perhaps it is not necessary that they should be, since most of the States are surveying their needs as provided and required under the bill.

But at the end of the second fiscal year the Hill-Burton bill authorizes $150,000,000 to be appropriated. Yet the President's Budget requests only $50,000,000 as an appropriation to include the first and second years.

Perhaps the program will not get under way any faster. The $50,000,000 recommended may be all that is needed at this stage. However, it would seem that this question should be carefully examined and a definite reason set forth as to why $50,000,000 is sufficient to meet a $150,000,000 planned program. My opinion is that each Member of the House should determine what progress is being made in his own State and when his State will need the full annual allotment.

SEVERAL STATES HAVE COMPLETED PLANS

My closing remarks are not selfish, as you recall my honest efforts to present an over-all picture; but North Carolina, like several other States, is at the crossroads on this hospital and medical-care program. These States have provided from their own funds plus Federal grants and have completed the planning program as will be revealed by convincing data which I have and will insert in the RECORD.

The legislatures in various States are at this very time beginning to set in motion appropriations from the States to qualify under the hospital construction part of the bill.

STATE PROGRAMS IN JEOPARDY

Yet, if this Congress refuses to support the recommendation of the President, or even go beyond, the program in the various States, including countless small towns and communities throughout this land where the citizenship has raised thousands and millions of dollars to take advantage of the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, will be placed in jeopardy.

NORTH CAROLINA 5-YEAR HEALTH PLAN

If North Carolina was not taking steps to protect and improve the health of her people by providing an adequate health program, frankly I would be ashamed to open up the record and address the House today.

At this time the North Carolina Legislature is in session and is being asked to provide for a $48,000,000 medical-care program, within $2,000,000 of the Federal recommendation for all States, and I believe the greater part, if not all, of the program will be enacted into law.

Your attention is directed to my remarks which follow, which I will not describe in detail, outlining a 5-year health plan, 1947–51, sponsored by the North Carolina Medical Care Commission; this survey and suggested plans having been made possible by the cooperative efforts between the State and the Federal Government.

FIVE-YEAR PLAN, 1947–51, NORTH CAROLINA MEDICAL CARE COMMISSION

For building, first, new general hospitals; second, health—medical—centers; and enlargement of existing hospital facilities.

One hundred counties in State.

Seven new hospitals in what might be termed "rural counties."

Twenty-three modern health centers—these centers being removed from urban areas.

Eleven hospital districts.

When erected these additional facilities will provide for 7,200 additional beds in the State, distributed as follows:

One thousand five hundred beds to mental hospitals, plus 3,374 additional beds, if the State acquires United States Camp Butner, Durham.

Seven hundred beds to tuberculosis hospitals.

Four hundred beds to medical health centers.

Four hundred beds to university teaching hospital.

Four thousand two hundred beds to be distributed on basis of need to new hospitals and for enlargement of existing hospitals.

THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

My contention is that this subject of good health cannot be restricted by race or by geography. Like many other States, North Carolina's No. 1 problem at this time is to seek better health for its citizenship. There is no iron curtain surrounding this State. One million five hundred thousand citizens from every State in the Union visited free of charge the Great Smoky Mountain National Park during the 1946 season, with over 2,000,000 expected this year. We have in the universities and colleges of North Carolina more students from the North, East, and Middle West than any State south of a line beginning on the southern boundary of the State of Pennsylvania extending westward to Kansas.

While each State must first shoulder the responsibility in the improvement of the general health of its people I contend that our national economy and welfare, as well as our National Defense, is now so closely linked together that the health and welfare of the people of North Carolina, as well as that of Arizona, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma is tied closely to and concerns the health and welfare of every State in the Union, economically and socially.

To support that contention consider these economical reasons:

Years ago in the days of the buggy and wagon the citizens of my State purchased these vehicles in Winston-Salem and other points within North Carolina. Today we send our money to Michigan for cars, trucks, and tractors; to Ohio for tires and tubes, to the Middle West for fine farming machinery; we trade on the New York, Chicago, and New Orleans stock exchange.

What are some of the social reasons? A plague in North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Maine, can be planted in Oregon or Washington within 12 hours. Thousands of fine lads from every section of the country were stationed in Army camps in my county and throughout the South, hundreds and hundreds of them married Southern girls, and conversely young men from the South went North and West and married girls in those areas.

All this means the breaking down of so-called State lines, the South, the North, the East, the West, and I am glad to see that day arrive.

But it imposes a problem healthwise since surely these families will from this day henceforth be closer drawn together.

Another reason to support my contention that this subject of health poses a national cooperative effort, I point out that we combined our efforts and created the atomic bomb, won a ghastly war, and we will never change the Selective Service indictment until we combine our efforts and place the power of this Government behind a great health program.

THE AVERAGE MAN WATCHING THIS CONGRESS

The average man in the smaller and rural communities of this Nation, where over 21 percent of the people live, who vote and in so many cases think alike, and who seemed to have been forgotten, are watching this Congress. The people in these communities do not understand and may not be greatly concerned with reciprocal trade agreements, tariff techniques, budgetary controls, freight rates, but they understand what mental deficiency, hernia, and syphilis mean.

CUT THE BUDGET WISELY

My closing plea, this House must cut the Budget wisely, so as not to penalize the essential services of this Government.

I ask, too, that each Member of the House study the health of the people of your State, contact the State survey director in your State, whose name is listed within the body of my remarks, to determine what progress is being made, and get behind this Hill-Burton bill. Remember that in this presentation I have dealt only with the youth. I tremble to think what the record would be if we included the old and very young.

Surely, from a selfish point of view it is not fair for the great State of Kansas to furnish a larger percentage of its youth for the miltary draft than North Carolina.

Surely, we will not face the possibility of another war and see 5,000,000 proud, young Americans, a great reservoir of manpower for national defense, rejected because of physical and mental handicaps.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I commend the gentleman highly on the splendid presentation he has made here, particularly that part which deals with the great movement in North Carolina to improve the health of the citizens of North Carolina and all those who may sojourn in that State.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, slightly more than 5 years ago, on Opana, a lonely Hawaiian hill, two enlisted Army technicians were delayed from their breakfast by transportation which failed to arrive. They climbed back into the trailer which housed the aircraft warning equipment they had been operating for the past 3 months. For lack of anything better to do, they turned on the equipment and watched the indicating screen which, during the months they had been observing it, had failed to indicate anything out of the ordinary. But this morning was to be different. This was Sunday morning. This was December 7, 1941.

We know now the story of what happened. Suddenly the indicator sprang to life. Little pips jumped across the screen—pips of light which signaled the approach of many aircraft. More than 100 miles away, the pips became Japanese aircraft—bombers and fighters, bound for Hawaii.

Frantically, one of the men yelled a warning into a field telephone. That warning, as we well know, failed to take root in fertile ground. The day that will live in infamy recorded itself in history.

History also is the story of how our professional fighting forces—prepared, perhaps, for a battle, but certainly not a war—rushed to the job of putting out the conflagration; a conflagration which grew until it threatened to engulf us all. That conflagration brought men and women from all walks of life rushing to the assistance of the professional fighters. After a desperate and costly struggle, it finally was brought under control. The men and women who survived returned to their homes and their work, to the old problems of civilian life, leaving the professional forces to guard the smoldering embers. World statesmen met to author a program to prevent those embers ever from bursting again, not only in our time, but in any man's time. With the memory and the scars of the holocaust fresh in our minds, we, as a Nation, firmly resolved that this program would be carried out.

Yet—and historians may look back on this moment as unbelievable—with permanent peace still a goal waiting to be won, we here in Congress are debating a proposition to emasculate the only effective instrument at our disposal which will assure the attainment and maintenance of that goal.

Once more, the indicators of danger are jumping across the screen. Once again, the field phone is ringing. Once more, the warnings are being sounded. History will record whether or not they fall on fertile ground. It is imperative on this occasion that they do, lest a world-wide Pearl Harbor jeopardize the future of our civilization.

Our military leaders warn that the proposed action to cut appropriations for national defense at this time is an open invitation to disaster. Yet there are men among us who choose to ignore that warning. I do not choose to be one of those men. Let the names of those who do ignore it be broadcast to the Nation. Let their names be known to the millions of Americans who fought for a new world as men who would sell them down the river for thirty pieces of silver, men who place ill-considered campaign promises above the security of the Nation.

This warning of our professional military leaders is no hysterical appeal dictated by false emotion. This appeal is dictated by stark, fearsome fact presented by the only men who are fully aware of the precarious position in which the proposed action would place our armed forces, and thus our national security. These are men of unquestioned integrity and ability. These men have no political ax to grind. They merely are charged with the preservation of our way of life.

Who are these men? What are their warnings? What could be lost if the warnings are ignored? Examine the answers to these questions in the cold light of the present world situation. Then pass judgment.

These men, the leaders of our military forces and the head of our Department of State, tell us that a further cut of the national defense budget invites disaster. Their names are indelibly stamped in the memory of every true American—Eisenhower, Marshall, MacArthur, Forrestal, Patterson, Spaatz, Nimitz, and many others. These are the men who guided this Nation through its most desperate hour. They are men who have no allegiance to any political platform, although several would be acceptable to either political party as a Presidential candidate were they of a mind to accept. These men already are faced with a tremendous task and the minimum machinery with which to accomplish it. Now they are to be placed on the altar by the Budget hatchetmen to chop their meager forces further, not in the interest of world peace but to facilitate the meeting of campaign promises. Their warning may be summed up in three words—"invitation to disaster."

Do not make a mockery of their warnings. Do not make these men the Billy Mitchells of our time.

What could be some of the results of this proposed cut?

First, there is the problem of carrying out our vital occupation mission, the success of which must be assured if world peace is to become a reality. Secretary Patterson tells us that our funds and the strength of our occupation troops in Europe and in the Far East are presently at the lowest level consistent with performance of the mission. Yet we propose to make necessary a reduction of 100,000 men in the over-all strength of the Army and further, a reduction in funds needed to feed the already near-starving people of the American-occupied areas. That such action would be an invitation to disaster is not merely my personal belief. General MacArthur and General Eisenhower tell us the same thing in plain, simple language.

What about our Navy? Secretary Forrestal has told us in plain words what the proposed cut would mean: our Navy would be immobilized. To his words of warning have been added those of Admiral Nimitz.

Our Air Forces, which will receive approximately 58 percent of the funds budgeted to the War Department, would be forced to absorb a staggering setback.

Both General Arnold and General Spaatz have told us repeatedly that a 70-group Air Force is the minimum force necessary to meet our interim peacetime requirements. Budget cuts to date have already whittled that program down to 55 groups and those at only 80-percent strength. Now we propose another reduction which would slice the program to 35 groups, of which only 3 would be available within the continental limits of this country.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that research and development programs will be seriously curtailed. General Spaatz warns that, with such funds curtailed, we can expect to have a second-rate Air Force in 3 to 5 years. A second-rate Air Force, we all know, is no better than none at all in this atomic age. We can stock pile atomic bombs but we cannot stock pile an air force. New planes do not grow on bushes. Research and development is a slow and costly process. None of the planes with which we fought World War II were developed after hostilities began. The B–29, for example, went on the drawing boards in 1938.

This example of what could happen to our air forces applies to the other branches of the military organization as well. It will mean having not only a second-rate air force, but a second-rate military establishment throughout.

But, most important of all, with our armed forces budgeted into impotency, our diplomats will be seriously handicapped in their peace negotiations with the rest of the world. We cannot bargain effectively with the world if we are not prepared to back up our statements any more than a man can expect to win at cards if his opponent holds all the trumps. Our diplomats have too few trumps as it is; do not weaken their hand further. Remember, eloquence and logic alone cannot win world arguments.

Add to all this even further curtailment of our vital Reserve training programs, procurement of new equipment, abandonment of vital bases. All these are items of major importance. Previous reductions have already eliminated the minor items.

I would question the wisdom of a bank president of an already inadequately guarded bank who would fire guards to obtain additional funds to redecorate his bank. Today I question the wisdom of this proposal to cut national-defense funds so that we might reduce income taxes.

We must find a means of picking the fruit without cutting down the tree.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), for February 19 and 20, on account of official business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN), for Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. HESELTON, for Wednesday, February 19, and Thursday, February 20, on account of attendance at a funeral.

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. DONDERO), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. GWINN of New York (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for 3 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 19, 1947, for the continuation of full committee public hearings on air accidents.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An executive meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with Secretary of State George C. Marshall will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Thursday, February 20, 1947, at 11 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

367. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940 (Public, No. 674, 76th Cong., 3d sess.; 54 Stat. 686), to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes, to vest in the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics certain powers necessary to the performance of his functions and duties in regard thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

368. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the Twelfth Annual Report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

369. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, together with accompanying papers, a report of the Secretary of War dated January 31, 1947, made in compliance with a provision of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 136); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

370. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting the Nineteenth Report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended September 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 137); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

371. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports for flood control on the lower Mississippi River with a view to determining whether additional flood protection should be provided for the St. Johns levee district, Missouri, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

372. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the availability of corporate funds for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

373. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $82,000 for the Federal Communications Commission (H. Doc. No. 140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

374. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of June 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

375. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of July 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities. House Report No.

43. Report placing Gerhart Eisler in contempt of the House of Representatives. Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1350. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1363. A bill to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1376. A bill to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1778. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 731. A bill to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 33. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Pub. Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 126. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 56. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 57. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 58. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 220. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; with amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 221. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 234. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2022. A bill to amend title 11 of the Social Security Act to include certain employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2023. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2024. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemptions of single persons to $1,000 and of married persons to $2,500, and to increase the exemption for dependents to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (by request):

H. R. 2025. A bill to promote and encourage the building, financing, and ownership of good, permanent homes through the traditional American policies of individual initiative, freedom of opportunity, and local control over local matters; to eliminate slums and blighted areas through assistance to local communities; to facilitate the construction of well-designed rental housing through private enterprise and local assistance for families of low income; and to coordinate the administration of all Federal agencies devoted to such activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2026. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper compensation to supervisors in the larger post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2027. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2028. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 2029. A bill to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2030. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2031. A bill to place on the retired list certain commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2032. A bill to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in allied armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2033. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 2034. A bill to provide retirement pay and hospital benefits for Reserve officers who were disabled while serving with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2035. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2036. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2037. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2038. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2039. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2040. A bill to stimulate business recovery and provide relief from war taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2041. A bill to terminate certain monetary powers of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2042. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2043. A bill directing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to apply the law of community property to the residents of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 2044. A bill to change the name of the custodial service in the postal service to

that of engineer and maintenance service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2045. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2046. A bill to authorize the coverage of self-employed persons under title 11 of the Social Security Act on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2047. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2048. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2049 A bill to credit for retirement purposes officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia with service performed in the active military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2050. A bill to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2051. A bill to terminate the war tax rate on retail sales of jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 2052. A bill exempting certain projects from the land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws and repealing all inconsistent provisions of prior acts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2053. A bill to abolish the United States Park Police force in the District of Columbia, to transfer the personnel and powers thereof to the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2055. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction and maintenance of the United States naval stations and fortifications on the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 106. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1367, a bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 107. Resolution to request the Tariff Commission to furnish to the Ways and Means Committee certain information relating to reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make on an annual and continuing basis the appropriations necessary for providing urgently needed additional Federal generating capacity in the Columbia Basin and not to require any increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to erect a monument to the Unknown Sailor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriations in support of the rural electrification program and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of J. C. Bateman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Yeichi Nimura (Tomizo Miki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of Guy B. Slater and Grace M. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Takeru Kawazoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bellia, alias Salvatore Antonio Seminara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Hideko Nishikawa Kawagoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACY:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Michael Palazotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Jean Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Domingos T. Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Alexander H. Salgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide terminal leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of William Park Catchpole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Eaph Toler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

125. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of municipal employees, city of Logansport, Ind., favoring amendment of the Social Security Act to include municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Bronx Post, No. 64, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Bronx, N. Y., urging enlargement of the classes of disabled veterans entitled to free grants of automobiles and amendment to the law fixing the limiting date so that veterans otherwise eligible shall have time necessary to qualify themselves for the benefits of that program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

127. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Yugoslav National Committee in London, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to political freedom in Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we pray for the Members of this body in their several responsibilities. Help them in their offices, in committees, and, above all, as they meet here in legislative session. May they never forget that what is said and done here is not done in a corner, but always under Thy scrutiny. May they feel the weight of their responsibility before Thee, and remember the influence of a good example, that all who come to this place may have a stronger faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people. May the Senators so speak and act that all who wait upon them and serve them may be inspired, rather than disillusioned, by what they see and hear and are asked to do. Lord Jesus, make Thyself real to these men, that each may feel Thee sitting beside him, and hear Thy voice, and win Thine approval in all things. So help them, God, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 17, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 101, Eightieth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. BISHOP and Mrs. NORTON members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees; and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. GEARHART, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. DINGELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1968. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947;

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations; and

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1353) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

BELL NOTICE TO COMMITTEES OF SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. BROOKS. I desire to make an announcement, Mr. President, of certain action taken this morning by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, no committee has authority to sit during sessions of the Senate without the consent of the Senate. Because of delay in closing committee meetings and the inability of Members to reach the Senate Chamber promptly, a suggestion was presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was unanimously adopted, that henceforth there shall be a new system of bells, as follows:

At 15 minutes before 12 o'clock, or any other designated hour of meeting of the Senate, there shall be one long bell announcing the 15-minute period, and at the immediate opening of the session there shall be another bell.

This will be of assistance to committee members in clearing their offices and closing the hearings, so that the committees may abide by the provisions of the Reorganization Act and their members may be available on the floor of the Senate at the time of its opening.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE HEARING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, under the provision of Senate Resolution 47, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding hearings on the critical freight-car situation. We are now in about our seventh or eighth day of hearings. There are present this afternoon some witnesses who came from New York, New England, and more distant points. As chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to proceed with the hearing this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the consent is granted.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARKLEY ON NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point a brief statement which I issued yesterday concerning the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALBEN W. BARKLEY

I regret that the nomination of David E. Lilienthal has aroused so much controversy, and I especially regret the grounds upon which it has been aroused.

As I see it, the question before us is not whether any one of us, if in a position to do so, would have appointed him to this position. The question is whether by experience, character, and general fitness he is qualified for the important post of Chairman of the Atomic Commission.

In my opinion, he is abundantly qualified. He has administered the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority with outstanding success. Before he became its Chairman he was a member of the Board of Directors. His services there were generally regarded as being of a high character.

The report and work of the Secretary of State's Committee on Atomic Energy, of which Mr. Lilienthal was Chairman, have been generally accepted by the country as sound and substantial.

I am under no personal or political obligation to Mr. Lilienthal. During his long tenure in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority he never did me a personal or political favor. So far as I know, though I live within 20 miles of the largest dam in the Tennessee Valley, he never appointed any person to any employment on my recommendation.

The charge that he is a Communist seems to me to be wholly unfounded. It has become fashionable to accuse a man of being a Communist or of having Communist leanings if he entertains liberal or progressive views concerning government or society. By any such standard Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt would have been barred from public office.

I cannot follow such a dogma. I shall therefore vote to confirm Mr. Lilienthal. I recognize the right of the Senate to reject this nomination or any other nomination sent to it by the President. But I fear that Mr. Lilienthal's rejection for any of the reasons thus far given would reflect upon the Senate more than upon him.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 279 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMINISTRATION OF WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 29, 1940, (Public, No. 674, 76th Cong., 3d sess., 54 Stat. 686), "To provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport and for other purposes," to vest in the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics certain powers necessary to the performance of his functions and duties in regard thereto, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF NATIONAL MEDIATION AND RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARDS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth annual report of the National Mediation Board, together with the annual report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nineteenth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended September 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JUNE AND JULY 1946 REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Two letters from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the activities and expenditures of that Corporation for the months of June and July 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of California hereby memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to continue to provide adequate appropriations for the United States Forest Service to enable that agency to carry on with the greatest effectiveness its work of forest fire prevention and suppression, and the proper maintenance of camp and road facilities throughout the mountain areas of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution relative to the procurement of Federal surplus property for the Veterans' Home of California

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States and the Federal agencies charged with the disposal of surplus property are respectfully requested to amend the Surplus Property Act or to issue regulations if legislation is unnecessary which will grant to the Veterans' Home of California the same priority in the procurement of Government surplus property as is given to the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of Government Surplus Property, and the Surplus Property Board."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relating to the Surplus Property Disposal Act of 1944, and rights of States and their political subdivisions to acquire surplus property

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress and the Federal agencies charged with the disposal of surplus property under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 are respectively requested to take such steps as may be necessary to give States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities equal priority with Federal Government agencies in the acquisition of surplus property under the Surplus Property Disposal Act of 1944; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to persons in charge of Federal agencies charged with the disposal of surplus property under the Surplus Property Disposal Act of 1944, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to erect a monument to the unknown sailor

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and President of the United States are urged and memorialized to cause to be erected upon the Pacific coast a suitable monument in honor of the unknown sailors who lost their lives during the Second World War, and that this memorial be designed in the form of a perpetual beacon light, with an appropriate statue at the base, and to be located on the summit of Mount Tamalpais, in Marin County, Calif.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to Federal payments for disabled veterans in veterans' homes

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby memorialized and urged to enact such legislation as may be necessary to increase Federal payments for care of disabled veterans in homes maintained by the States and Territories from $300 to $500 per annum per capita, and to provide that such aid shall be payable from the date of a veteran's admission if he is determined to be eligible for care in a Veterans' Administration facility; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to public shooting grounds

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to provide for public shooting grounds in those areas of California where wild ducks abound, to make funds available for that purpose, and to authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service to establish, and to operate such public shooting grounds in cooperation with the Fish and Game Commission of the State of California in accordance with the laws of said State relating to public shooting grounds.

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 25

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Federal Government to prevent the sale of Japanese-packed crab meat in the United States

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the U. S. Commercial Company, to rescind the call for bids for the crab meat, to abandon all attempts to sell or dispose of the Japanese-packed crab meat for consumption within the United States, and instead to take steps to dispose of the crab meat through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for use in devastated areas of the Orient to feed the starving victims of Japanese aggression; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation to prevent any recurrence of the present situation with regard to any goods so packed and offered in competition with legitimately produced American goods; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to the U. S. Commercial Company, to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to conferring citizenship upon all Indians, native of the United States, releasing them from status of wards of the Government, and dividing and distributing the tribal reservations

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the American Indians of right ought to be released immediately from the virtual political and economic slavery in which vast numbers of them are now held, and to be given the full personal, political, and economic rights and privileges of American citizenship; and be it further

"Resolved, That the tribal reservations ought to be divided and distributed fairly among the members of the respective tribes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress and the President of the United States be and they are hereby urged and memorialized to enact at this session such laws as will confer American citizenship upon all native-born American Indians; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to have the Mammoth Pass Road constructed

"Whereas the completion of the Mammoth Pass Road has been of great public interest for many years and its construction has been the subject of planning and study by State and Federal officials who deem it most appropriate for the economic and recreational development of a vast area; and

"Whereas the propcsed highway will connect United States Highway 99 and United States Highway 395 and provide an important east-west traffic route through the Sierras; and

"Whereas the construction of the proposed highway would be of importance not only from the standpoint of national defense, but would be of inestimable value from an economic viewpoint in that it would:

"(a) Afford opportunity to develop an extensive virgin territory of vast natural resources;

"(b) Make readily accessible more than 2,000,000,000 board feet of commercial timber

badly needed in the San Joaquin Valley, and an additional 2,000,000,000 feet of pulp timber and substantial deposits of iron, lead, and silver;

"(c) Aid in the full power and irrigation storage development of the upper San Joaquin River to meet the needs of the Central Valley project;

"(d) Attract a large number of visitors to view the priceless heritage of forests, mountains, and other scenic beauties of a region now inaccessible because of the lack of roads; and

"Whereas this legislature previously memorialized the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary for the construction of the Mammoth Pass Road which will contribute much to the growth and development of the San Joaquin Valley and other portions of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to take up again a consideration of the construction of the Mammoth Pass Road and order its completion as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the assembly, to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the States of California and Nevada; and the Senators and Representatives of the said States are respectfully urged to request such action."

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly),

"1. That for the protection of the United States in the expenditure of large sums of money, and in the best interests of the people of the States involved, no new projects in the lower basin of the Colorado River for the utilization of the water of the Colorado River be authorized for construction until there be a final determination not only of the respective rights of the States of the lower basin in and to the use of the Colorado River water, but also that there be a safe and adequate water supply available for any such new project.

"2. That California lend every assistance in expediting said determination whether by an agreement between the States or by appropriate action in the courts or by arbitration.

"3. That the California representatives in the Congress of the United States are requested to join as a unit in defending and upholding the rights of California in and to the use of Colorado River water and in supporting the principles set forth in this resolution.

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the singing section of Mutual Benefit and Aid Society of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the alleged mistreatment of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief in annual meeting at Buck Hill Falls, Pa., relating to displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, and praying for the enactment of legislation to allow the entry into this country within 3 years of a fair share of the nonrepatriables among displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A letter from A. E. Williams, president, Arizona State Federation of Labor, Phoenix, Ariz., transmitting copy of complaint filed in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, in and for the county of Maricopa, before Judge M. T. Phelps, senior judge of that court, to test the constitutionality of the anticlosed shop amendment to the Constitution of Arizona (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADMINISTRATION OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD Resolution No. 11 adopted by the Federal Employees Veterans Association, relating to an investigation of the operation and administration of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is believed that in the demotion and furloughing of employees of the association that there has been unjust discrimination against veterans entitled to preference under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and that there has been undue delay in the adjudication of appeals from such demotions and furloughing by the Civil Service Commission; and

Whereas the United States Civil Service Commission has in a number of cases made decisions favorable to the veteran employees but claims or pretends that it has no authority to compel the department or agencies to reinstate the veteran employee to the position from which he was unlawfully demoted or furloughed; and

Whereas because of the long delay in the matter of making decisions, the red tape involved, the veteran employees have been unable to ascertain their status which does not improve the efficiency or the morale of the employees; and

Whereas a number of department and agency officials who are charged by law with employment and supervision of personnel have manifested a hostile attitude to all veterans, and are in fact prejudiced against veterans because of the preference which they have under the law: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Federal Employees Veterans Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., at its regular meeting this 4th day of February 1947, That we protest to the Congress of the United States concerning the conditions herein mentioned; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation limiting the time in which the Government departments and agencies may appeal from the decisions of the Civil Service Commission, and making provision in such legislation for a court review de novo of any such decisions adverse to a veteran employee, with penalties provided for any violations of all veterans' preference acts, and providing that in certain instances that the United States district attorneys appear for said veteran employees, and in establishing uniform rules and regulations in the matter of such appeals to the Civil Service Commission, one of which regulations should provide that any furlough, demotion, or discharge of any veteran employee shall be stayed pending final disposition of the matter on appeal within Civil Service Commission and requiring the administrative heads of the departments or agencies to obey the decisions of the Civil Service Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Civil Service Committees of the Congress of the United States to fully investigate the conditions herein mentioned and make a sweeping investigation of the operation and administration of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, not only as to the agencies covered by our members but as to its operation in all of the departments and agencies of the Government.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION IN MANITOWOC, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, great occasions in the life of a city or a locality, which symbolize America's past, present, and future, are always worthy of note. In this connection I call attention to the fact that the year 1947 marks the centennial of the establishment in the city of Manitowoc, Wis., of the shipbuilding industry and the Rahr Malting Co.

In these 100 years of growth from small beginnings, both the Manitowoc Shipyards and the Rahr Malting Co. have never had a labor strike. What an outstanding message this fact holds for all Americans—a message of the value of work as a means of insuring an ever higher standard of living for our people.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Manitowoc Harbor is universally recognized as one of the outstanding harbors on the Great Lakes. The Manitowoc shipyards made an outstanding contribution to the winning of both World Wars I and II, especially in view of the fact that in the war just concluded, for the first time in the history of the United States, ocean-going submarines were built at an inland port—the Manitowoc River.

I believe that this splendid dual centennial should receive all the fine recognition which it deserves, and, in this connection, I ask that a resolution adopted recently by the Manitowoc County Historical Society be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the year A. D. 1947 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment in the city of Manitowoc, Wis., of the shipbuilding industry and the Rahr Malting Co., the latter still owned and operated by the same family, each having, down through the years, advanced and kept pace with the most improved and most modern American methods, each having, from a small, modest, humble beginning, grown and expanded into an industry and an institution of national and international recogition and renown, each constituting an epoch, as it were, an important, outstanding epoch, in our county's history, living monuments of human progress, each achieving its goal the hard way, on the difficult road, the courageous, fearless, persistent effort and spirit of free and fearless men in free America and demonstrating beyond all doubt, right here in our own community, that American democracy still lives and works, each having for over a century been an important, outstanding, active, living, advancing part of our community's life and progress, each ever holding high the banner inscribed "Let freedom ring. Yes; let it ring, but, also, let freedom live and work"; and

Whereas Manitowoc County has a right to be proud of its history and its heritage, the progress of its industries and institutions and the success of its citizens, for all too often do we fail to appreciate, to commemorate, to celebrate the same, and the taking of an inventory of the past and a

look into the future, will do us no harm, but may bring us new hopes and aspirations, new ideas and ideals for the many tasks that still lie ahead for all of us, individually and collectively. By honoring them we honor ourselves, for we are an inseparable part of that self-same community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Manitowoc County Historical Society in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January, 1947, That Manitowoc County as a whole fittingly, impressively and historically commemorate and celebrate these two notable historical events and such others as may in due time be brought to our attention and that proper plans be formulated, arrangements made and committees appointed with a view toward having all interests, departments and agencies of the entire county, both private and public, actively cooperate and participate, for the education, enlightenment, inspiration and general welfare of all the people of Manitowoc County, making it an effective, impressive, worth-while project as befits Manitowoc County, also marking the forty-first anniversary of the Manitowoc County Historical Society, now permanently established in a house it can call its own, through the generosity of Mrs. Reinhardt Rahr and family and the foresight and tenacity of Mr. J. G. Johnson; be it further

Resolved, That all individuals, industries, businesses, institutions and projects and the like that have reached or will reach the century mark in the year A. D. 1947 communicate that fact with all available information to J. G. Johnson, president of the Manitowoc County Historical Society, care of Rahr Civic Center, Eighth and Park Streets, Manitowoc, Wis., as soon as possible, so that the same can be included in the aforesaid centennial celebration, in effect commemorating a full century of Manitowoc County progress, all together furnishing, if properly dramatized, an invaluable example, stimulus, and inspiration to present and future generations. In short, a century of progress joined with the world of tomorrow; be it further

Resolved, That all individuals, industries, institutions, projects and the like about to reach the century mark in 1948 and thereafter be requested to notify the Manitowoc County Historical Society from time to time far enough in advance so that plans for proper observance thereof can be made in due time.

"Every home has a history—even a peasant's hut," said Bulwer-Lytton. "The perfect historian is he in whose work the character and spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature"; said Macaulay. It always has been and may it continue to be the aim and purpose of the Manitowoc County Historical Society, so far as possible, to be the alert, the practical, the loyal, the perfect historian of Manitowoc County.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 503. A bill to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 30).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 597. A bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 29).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 240. A bill to authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland; without amendment (Rept. No. 31).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 321. A bill to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 32).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 632. A bill to implement the conciliation and mediation functions of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 633. A bill relating to Sunday work for employees of the Government who are opposed because of religious training or belief to working on Saturday or any day other than Sunday.

S. 634. A bill for the relief of Taffel Ahmed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 635. A bill to adjust the compensation of substitute employees of the Postal Service who have had continuous service since July 1, 1945.

S. 636. A bill to provide compensation for overtime service of substitute employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 637. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 638. A bill for the relief of Herman Trahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 639. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 640. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton; and

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Tang Sik Pui, his wife, and his five minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 643. A bill to permit certain Polish nationals to enter the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 644. A bill to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service connected; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 645. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 646. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective inspection and supervision by the Congress with respect to the administration of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 647. A bill for the relief of Frank Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 648. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 649. A bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife, Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter, Isabel Joan Cogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

[Mr. GURNEY (by request) introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 651. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training;

S. 652. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of military, naval, or air training for the common defense;

S. 653. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs of the Army of the United States;

S. 654. A bill to provide for the construction of armories, warehouses, and other storage facilities and the maintenance of same upon an equitable basis;

S. 655. A bill to reduce the age of enlistment in the National Guard from 18 to 17 years in order to conform to the Army and Navy; and

S. 656. A bill to create an Officers' Corps, Army of the United States, to which may be assigned all officers except Regular Army officers, making them available in peace or war as officers of the Army of the United States rather than as Officers' Reserve Corps and National Guard of the United States, and making all Reserve officers available for service within any component of the Army of the United States.]

(Mr. GURNEY also introduced Senate bill 657, to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 69, to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 70, authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Colonel William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens

18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the State of Maryland as a community-property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS RELATING TO THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there have been presented to me proposed bills by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion relating to universal military training. I am asking permission to introduce these bills at this time. The one from the Legion I will introduce first. It is entitled "To provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training."

The title of the bill submitted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a little longer, but it covers the same subject. I introduce them both at this time.

The bills introduced by Mr. GURNEY (by request) were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 651. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; and

S. 652. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of military, naval, or air training for the common defense.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the National Guard Association of the United States has asked that I introduce four bills, which they would like to have the Congress consider.

The bills introduced by Mr. GURNEY (by request) were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 653. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs of the Army of the United States;

S. 654. A bill to provide for the construction of armories, warehouses, and other storage facilities and the maintenance of same upon an equitable basis;

S. 655. A bill to reduce the age of enlistment in the National Guard from 18 to 17 years in order to conform to the Army and Navy; and

S. 656. A bill to create an Officers' Corps, Army of the United States, to which may be assigned all officers except Regular Army officers, making them available in peace or war as officers of the Army of the United States rather than as Officers' Reserve Corps and National Guard of the United States, and making all Reserve officers available for service within any component of the Army of the United States.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I introduce another bill, which was introduced in the previous session of Congress, and was not considered by the committee.

The bill (S. 657) to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PREPARATION OF NEW EDITION OF ANNOTATED UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the preparation of a new edition of the annotated Constitution of the United States of America. The last such edition was published in 1938, and it proved an invaluable guide to all students of constitutional law. I suggest, through this joint resolution, that the previous volume be revised and extended to include annotations of decisions of the Supreme Court prior to January 1, 1948. This new volume will then be printed in the Government Printing Office as a Senate document, as was the previous volume.

I need hardly point out the tremendous importance of insuring an adequate understanding of the United States Constitution among our citizenry and, in particular, in our Congress itself. I would be the last person in this great body to suggest that appropriations be expended for the printing of any document unless I fervently believed that such printing is vitally necessary. But I believe that the sum of $35,000 which would be expended by the Library of Congress in preparing this work, would repay itself manyfold, and I might add that this is a conservative sum that has been asked for this vast undertaking.

William E. Gladstone, as my colleagues will recall, said:

The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

Thomas Jefferson wrote:

The Constitution * * * is unquestionably the wisest ever yet presented to men.

Printing of this revised volume, then, seems but a small but worthy measure to insure wide understanding and familiarity with constitutional law.

I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document No. 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MAJOR GENERAL'S COMMISSION FOR THE LATE COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as major general in the United States Army, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for not to exceed 10 minutes on the subject of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that he be permitted to address the Senate for 10 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for 10 minutes.

AMERICA MUST HONOR BILLY MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today is the eleventh anniversary of the death of one of America's greatest heroes, an immortal son of my own State of Wisconsin, a prophet, pioneer, and martyr, Brig. Gen. William L. (Billy) Mitchell. On this sad anniversary I am introducing again a measure of which I have sought enactment, beginning in 1941, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and extending through the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. This measure would elevate General Mitchell, who was "busted" to a colonelcy by a blind, brass hat court martial, to the rank of major general, as of the date of his death in 1936.

I shall continue to fight for this measure until it is enacted by Congress, and I trust that this fight will be concluded successfully in the Eightieth Congress.

AVIATION IMPORTANCE

It seems particularly appropriate that this joint resolution be introduced at this time in view of the increased importance which might be given to aerial power under the proposed armed services merger plan recently agreed to by military and navy officials. It was Billy Mitchell, of course, who pioneered in the development of air power and who championed it against the land-stuck generals and the rowboat admirals.

MILITARY BUDGET

It is fitting, too, that this measure be introduced in the light of the current controversy over proposed reduction of military expenses as a part of the reduced national budget.

It seems to me that we have become so involved in the question, "How much money for military appropriations?" that we have lost sight of the more important question, "What will the military appropriations be used for?" That is the question Billy Mitchell would have asked. Will the taxpayers' money be spent for "squads right" training, for teaching navy recruits how to tie knots, or will it be spent on guided missile research, on airborne troops training, on bacteriological defense, on radioactive disease research and other present-day needs? Let the Army and the Navy prove that money for which they are asking is being spent for atomic-age preparations rather than for nineteenth century "popgun" warfare.

THE NEED FOR THIS JOINT RESOLUTION

The purpose of this joint resolution is not merely to add an honor to a man who has already been honored by the love and respect of his countrymen. It is not to be a mere formal gesture to one who has now gone on ahead in the great journey we all have to take. Rather, the purpose of the resolution is to declare resoundingly to the brass hats, who have three times prevented the resolution's enactment, that America intends to liberate itself from their fossilized approach to national defense.

Mr. President, I used advisedly the term "fossilized approach to national defense." We remember the French in the last World War, when they had the

Maginot line. They thought they had the answer. They were blind, even as we were blind at the same time.

The greatest honor that we can do to Billy Mitchell is not merely by passing a joint resolution of this sort, necessary as it is, but by erecting a national defense attuned to the atomic age, a national defense of adequate push-button plans for the push-button atomic and bacteriological warfare that will come unless the nations of earth, through the United Nations, can achieve a just and lasting peace.

As indication of the fact that the purpose of this joint resolution is not merely to honor Mitchell, but to constitute a guidepost to the new American concept of security, I repeat now words which I said on June 21, 1940, even before I then introduced a similar measure:

If we are really to vindicate Mitchell, we must erect a monument to his memory in the sacred shrine of a new concept of security.

On May 20, 1941, I said:

I am introducing a bill, not only for the Billy Mitchell who has gone but for the countless host of Billy Mitchells who are yet to come.

I call attention to the fact that that was months before we entered World War II.

By that, I meant the young aviators, the young scientists, the young technicians, who will want to modernize American security plans, but who may be stepped on by brass hats, as Billy Mitchell was.

On June 7, 1941, speaking in Milwaukee on this subject, I said:

We must scrap outmoded ideas, red tape, and mossback thinking. We must insist on open minds, receptive to new ideas. We must slough off the dead timber in our military system. We cannot follow our outmoded thinking of yesterday.

Mr. President, that language was used in 1941 but it is pertinent today.

HISTORY OF MEASURE

I now desire to discuss the history of this movement.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, on May 20, 1941, I introduced a resolution for the restoration of Billy Mitchell's rank of brigadier general. The resolution passed the Senate so late that it died in the House. Again in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on January 7, 1943, I reintroduced the resolution. Once again the Senate adopted it and especially honored itself by conferring on Billy Mitchell the rank of major general, but again the resolution failed in the House. On February 19, 1945, the ninth anniversary of Mitchell's death, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 34. Again this measure passed the Senate unanimously, but again it died in the House Military Affairs Committee.

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S ENDORSEMENT

This was in spite of the fact that General MacArthur, in November 1945, wrote me, endorsing the measure. It had been intimated in some quarters that passage of the Mitchell resolution would embarrass General MacArthur. I recalled, however, that, exactly to the contrary, General Mitchell was a devoted friend of Douglas MacArthur, and that it had been reported that General MacArthur, who served on Mitchell's court martial, had cast the lone dissenting vote against the guilty verdict. General MacArthur confirmed this, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for the many kind and generous expressions contained in your letter which has just reached me.

I was one of Billy Mitchell's most intimate and devoted friends from the beginning to the end. Our families came from the same spot, Milwaukee, and enjoyed the most cordial intimacy for many decades. Your recollection of my part in his trial is entirely correct. It was fully known to him and he never ceased to express his gratitude for my attitude. It would be ridiculous for anyone to say that any posthumous honors that might be granted him would be embarrassing to me. He was a rare genius in his profession and contributed much to aviation history.

I know nothing of the discussion involved in your resolution, but do know that any part I played in his career should have no bearing whatsoever on the matter.

Out here we are making excellent progress. With renewed expressions of thanks and appreciation.

Very faithfully,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

RELATED LEGISLATION

I call attention to the fact that the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Private Law No. 884, which authorized the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to Billy Mitchell in recognition of his outstanding pioneer service and foresight in the field of American military aviation.

The medal was directed to be transmitted to William Mitchell, Jr., son of General Mitchell.

If Congress believes, as it did believe through passage of Private Law No. 884, that this great departed hero is worthy of a Medal of Honor, surely it believes that a similar military honor, elevation of Mitchell's rank, is befitting this immortal American.

In order to make sure that the hidden brass-hat influences, which have previously exerted themselves against this proposal do not again succeed in blocking it, I recently wrote to General Eisenhower, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, asking for his reaction. General Eisenhower stated:

I personally know of no reason why this measure should not be enacted.

He restated the previous War Department position, recommending the enactment of this joint resolution with this amendment:

SEC. 3. No person shall be entitled to receive any bonus, gratuity, pay, allowances, or other financial benefit by virtue of the enactment of this joint resolution.

This amendment is entirely acceptable because it was never intended, through this joint resolution, to confer any financial benefits.

Several months ago one of our former associates, the present distinguished Judge Bennett C. Clark called me up and said, "Senator, what has become of the medal that the Congress voted for Billy Mitchell?" I said, "I presume the medal has already been struck off and presented."

"No," he said, "no medal conforming to the resolution of the House and the Senate has been struck off; in fact, the son of the deceased has never received the medal."

Ah, Mr. President, it is about time we look into some of these things, to ascertain who is running the show. How about the power of the legislative branch of Government?

Judge Bennett Clark said, "It is a shame. I will take it up with the President. The President has funds, perhaps he will see to it that adequate funds are appropriated to pay for this medal."

I saw Bennett Clark a month or so afterward, and he had no information concerning it.

All I am asking in this joint resolution, Mr. President, is what I asked 7 years ago and what the Senate has granted unanimously three times, but the House Committee on Military Affairs, because of certain influences, has not acted. I think the time has come when there should be no question about the prerogatives and power of the legislative branch of the Government.

PROPRIETY OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Some question may arise whether a joint resolution, such as this, is allowed under the Legislative Reorganization Act, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 131 of that law states that:

No private bill or resolution * * * and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing * * * (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

I call attention to the fact that, in the opinion of the legislative counsel, this resolution does not correct a military record in that it does not raise General Mitchell from a colonelcy to a brigadier generalship—the rank from which he was broken; rather it elevates his rank to major general. This is not a correction; it is a promotion—a small honor in the light of General Mitchell's services to our country.

IDENTIFICATION OF BILLY MITCHELL

Mr. President, who was Billy Mitchell? The very name of this giant is his monument. Billy Mitchell, prophet, martyr, crusader, pioneer, valiant rebel against closed minds. Billy Mitchell, son of a great man whose distinguished presence filled this very Chamber. Billy Mitchell, who came up through the ranks from a private, who was the youngest American officer in the Spanish-American War, who was the first American officer under fire in World War No. 1, who was the first American flying officer to cross the German lines just 16 days after our entrance into that war, who commanded the AEF air force in France. Billy Mitchell, the seer who advocated aerial torpedoes, parachute troops, troop transport planes, heavy bombers; the realist who warned us of the Japanese peril to Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippines, and all other foreign possessions in the Pacific; the man of his word who proved

that planes could sink the mightiest dreadnaught; the man of courage who dared to blast the swivel-chair generals and rocking-chair admirals from their seats with the accusation that they were negligent in America's national defense; the man of conscience who kept faith with his young aviators by hounding the "brass hats" who gave them "flaming coffins" in which to fly and die; the man of righteous wrath who so incensed his muddle-headed gold-braid superiors that they court-martialed him, deprived him of his rank, his command, and his duty; made him forfeit all pay and allowances for 5 years and virtually forced his reluctant retirement on February 1, 1926. Billy Mitchell, the man whose warnings of America's dangers, whose colorful personality, whose fearless counsel filled American magazines and newspapers until his death more than a decade ago. Billy Mitchell, who, at last, speaking of his imminent passing, said:

I feel that it is better for me to * * * (be laid to rest) in Wisconsin, the home of my family, although I should like to be with the pilots and my comrades in Arlington.

Billy Mitchell, who is buried in Milwaukee, whence in the unforgettable spring of 1898 he had enlisted as a youth to go off to war.

In the name of this great man and in the name of adequate American defense I trust the Senate and House will pass promptly the joint resolution which I now send to the desk and for which I ask appropriate reference.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to Senate bill 528, to continue rent control until June 30, 1948. The important part of the amendment is this:

No general increase in rents shall be granted under the authority of such act as amended, and no increase shall be granted under the authority of section 2 (b) thereof in the case of any housing accommodations unless such housing accommodations shall have been repainted, redecorated, renovated, or otherwise substantially improved.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I see no reason why rents should be increased in cases in which the landlord has not kept up the property.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish the amendment referred to the committee in charge of the legislation?

Mr. LANGER. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so referred.

The amendment submitted by Mr. LANGER intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 528) to continue rent control until June 30, 1948, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1968. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EMERGENCY WARTIME CONTROLS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1180.)

ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY ON EVALUATING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fifteen Tests for Your Congressmen," written by him and published in the February 4, 1947, issue of the magazine Tax Outlook, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE ON WENDELL WILLKIE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Wendell Willkie—One of the Great Ones," delivered by him on February 18, 1947, at the Hotel Ambassador, New York, N. Y., which appears in the Aupendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN ON PROBLEMS OF TODAY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator AIKEN before the Legislature of Vermont at Montpelier, Vt., on February 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS PREPARED BY THE LATE SENATOR JOSIAH W. BAILEY FOR DELIVERY TO THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey for delivery to the people of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY BEFORE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York, at the fiftieth anniversary dinner of the Canadian Society of New York, at New York City, on February 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAGNER ACT IS AN INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY JAMES J. REYNOLDS, JR.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Wagner Act in an Industrial Democracy," delivered by James J. Reynolds, Jr., member of the National Labor Relations Board, before the Atlanta, Ga., Junior Chamber of Commerce, on January 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

1946 OPERATING LOSS OF PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Pennsylvania's First Loss in History Laid to United States Curbs," published in the New York Times of February 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

OVERTON - O'MAHONEY FORMULA FOR FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Measuring an Obligation," written by John W. Thompson, Jr., and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 8, 1947, together with a letter written by Senator OVERTON to Mr. Thompson which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial "New Thought, New Action Proposed to Republicans," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pertinent Questions," published in the Boston Herald of February 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, written by Frank R. Kent and published in the Baltimore Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lilienthal as Atom Chief," published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 29, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROLLING THE HARVESTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Controlling the Harvests," published in the Wall Street Journal of February 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHNSON & JOHNSON'S INDUSTRIAL PEACE — ARTICLE BY BENJAMIN L. MASSE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Johnson & Johnson's Industrial Peace," by Benjamin L. Masse, from the magazine America for January 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees; and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate 39.1 billion dollars and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed 31.5 billion dollars, of which latter amount not more than 24 billion dollars would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 6, it is proposed to strike out the figures "31.5" and insert in lieu thereof "33.0"; and in line 7, it is proposed to strike out "24" and insert in lieu thereof "25.1."

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kem	Sparkman
Byrd	Kilgore	Stewart
Cain	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Connally	McCarthy	Tobey
Cooper	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McGrath	Umstead
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McMahon	Watkins
Eastland	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK] are attending a ceremony being held today at the State Capitol, Columbia, S. C., where a portrait of former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes is being unveiled.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate, as a member of the Committee on Public Lands visiting Puerto Rico.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, 17 years ago the financial affairs of the Federal Government began to slip out of control and became progressively worse thereafter. While every attempt to apply some control ended in frustration, two lessons were learned. The first was that Congress, as the appropriating authority, must have control of the purse independent of the executive branch, which spends the money. The second was that the facilities for such congressional control must be improved. As a result, there were included in the Congressional Reorganization Act noteworthy new tools with which Congress could better control Federal expenditures and fiscal policies. These fiscal-control features helped arouse widespread citizen support for the Congressional Reorganization Act.

The Congress is applying now, for the first time, the legislative budget procedure established under that act. People have looked to this legislative budget tool as the Moses to lead them from financial wildness if not wilderness. At this moment the Senate may well remember the hope and promise which attentative citizens in every State placed in this new fiscal-control facility. Judging from comments of Members of Congress, I am inclined to believe that many citizens understand the legislative budget procedure and its correct use better than do some of us in the Congress.

This legislative budget procedure is, in fact, the simple application of expenditure control which experience has taught every solvent individual, family, or government is necessary in some form.

The authority and facilities of the Federal Government to spend have been without definable limitations, other than those the Government has occasionally imposed upon itself. Therefore, it is no cause for wonder that the new legislative budget procedure instilled within the people hope that Congress would use it effectively to impose expenditure control. Just how we shall use it is the responsibility of the Congress today.

First, we must understand what the legislative budget is and what it is not. It provides simply that when the President's budget for the ensuing year is presented to Congress it shall go for study and report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. That committee is composed of the members of the four House and Senate committees which handle appropriations and revenue. The functions of this joint committee are to view the fiscal needs of the economy as a whole and to propose a sound fiscal policy which the Congress can adopt and to which it can adhere. The past practice has been to consider Federal expenditures for each division of Government independent of its relation to other divisions and independent of a national fiscal policy. In prescribing that over-all income and expenditure totals should be recommended, the Reorganization Act clearly did not direct that the expenditure limitation should be an arithmetical sum of predetermined amounts to be allotted to each division of Government. Rather, it directs that the total needs for Government expenditures shall be related to the other factors which should be considered in reaching an over-all fiscal policy. Among these factors are fiscal soundness, Federal debt, taxation, cost of living, inflation and deflation, and the needs of productive economy. After Government spending needs are viewed

in the light of these factors, an expenditure limitation must be recommended which is the committee's best judgment for meeting all these interrelated needs. That is the responsibility which the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee discharges and now puts upon the Congress.

This committee report and these recommendations are not a specific official allotment of proposed spending under this limitation. Those spokesmen for the spending divisions of government who are opposing the adoption of the limitation recommended in the report on the ground that it will cripple their programs are not only out of order but are insisting, in effect, that all divisions of government be granted amounts requested in the budget so that all of them may have assurance that their requests will be granted.

After a limitation such as that which the joint committee has recommended is imposed, the expenditure needs of each division of government must be related to the spending needs of all other divisions and must be graded as to necessity. This is the first responsibility of the Appropriations Committees. Of course, a $31,500,000,000 limitation would require a substantial reduction in many of the amounts requested in the President's proposed budget. However, such a limitation subsequently would insure that the most important and necessary functions would be given prime consideration in the allotments under the limitation. One may wonder whether the first cries of imaginary harm we are hearing reveal a lack of faith in the ability of these spokesmen of the various governmental agencies to present facts to justify the amounts requested by their divisions or departments.

Before considering the needs for Government spending in the ensuing fiscal year, we must first remember the other related needs, because this first application of the new legislative budget law comes at a time when the decision of this Congress could have tragic significance. The reasons are understood by all attentive citizens. After a decade of high levels of Federal spending, financed in substantial part by mortgaging the future resources and production of the people, we have waged a war at a cost which is almost beyond comprehension.

The debt incurred in consequence of these expenditures, even at low interest rates, is such that, according to the latest figures available, the annual interest charge exceeds the total general property tax collections in 1942 for all the 48 States, including their counties, cities, villages, and school districts. This annual interest charge, plus the present level of veterans' benefits, means for the Federal Government an expenditure total which practically equals all the expenditures of our 48 States and their local governmental units, including schools. Inevitably, the future Federal tax load will be so heavy that even with our unprecedented high employment and income, it will remain a threat to the development of the national economy which constitutes the tax base we must nurture zealously and guard.

We are now legislating a limitation on Federal expenditures to cover a fiscal year which is two full years after the cessation of war with Japan. Our domestic relief burdens are at a low point. If the Federal Government is to put its financial house in order, it must start now. The key to that start is the reduction of Government spending. The decision facing this Congress is what amount to place as a limitation on expenditures for the coming fiscal year.

The Legislative Budget Committee, composed of 102 members serving on the four congressional committees which guide the fiscal policies of our Nation both as to income and outgo, has reached a decision. The facts involved in that decision are clear. The President has asked for $37,500,000,000 for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948, which begins on July 1, 1947, and ends on June 30, 1948. In the fiscal year 1940, the comparable expenditures were $9,600,000,000; in 1941, $12,710,000,000; in 1942, $32,396,000,000, and during one-half of that year the United States was in the great World War II. Thus, the budget recommended to the Congress by the President for the fiscal year 1948 requests expenditures almost three times those of 1941, and substantially more than those for the fiscal year 1942, during one-half of which year we were in the midst of a great World War. This huge total is the more astounding because our high level of income drastically reduced the proposed expenditures for work relief and direct relief to $7,000,000 in 1948 from $2,189,000,000 in 1940.

These facts bluntly present the issue. If the expenditure total recommended by the President for next year is accepted, this Nation may find fastened upon it a peacetime level of spending which will frustrate any hope of turning our fiscal path to sound foundations, and which will discourage individual endeavor. Individual endeavor is the backbone of our national strength. The need of the people and the need of our economy as a whole for drastic reduction of Government expenditures should be clear to all of us.

What about the needs of Government spending next year?

The first evidence is the President's budget now before the Congress. Some talk fearfully about reducing the spending authority requested in that budget by ascribing a sanctity to it and its details which it does not deserve. The average citizen may know little about the Federal budget, but he considers it a reflection of the desires of those who spend public funds. As a matter of fact, the budget is a composite of varying degrees of needs. Some of the budget recommendations are guesses. The budget is not the result of an annual challenge which makes each division justify its needs starting from zero. It may be only a challenge of those requests which are in addition to or different from those of past years. It does not pretend to conclude that there are not ways to get more for less. It is acknowledged everywhere that reduction in Government spending could be secured by:

First. Eliminating the extravagant, wasteful practices engendered by the war.

Second. Reduction of personnel.

Third. Reduction of Government scope.

Fourth. Reduction of overhead and duplication.

Congressional committees constantly disclose the fruitful opportunities in these fields. The Comptroller General has specifically outlined some of them. If an expenditure limitation is to force action in these fields, it must be severe enough to actually hurt. This may be a grim approach, but nevertheless necessary. It can result in benefit both to the Government and the people and the economy as a whole. This is no time to compromise with this need. In my judgment, more harm will result from compromising at a limitation figure higher than $31,500,000,000 than at a lower figure.

The need of the country and her people to return to fiscal soundness cannot be met by anything but drastic, courageous action. Many believe the $31,500,000,000 figure is too high. Why should the Congress hesitate in applying at least that limitation and earnestly enforcing it? It is not an irrevocable action. Disclosed need could modify it in either direction.

It is said that the proposed concurrent resolution is a will-of-the-wisp and without force because it is only a moral pledge. Such a stricture on the lack of moral faith in the Congress is worse coming from Members of Congress than from others. I say to all such, if they will adopt this concurrent resolution they will soon have the opportunity to give it, not only the moral, but the legal effect of law as well.

The opponents of the resolution before us are inconsistent on other counts. They talk fearfully of cutting the military, and then with equal concern they deplore cuts in civilian activities. The President's budget is equally inconsistent. It urges that large military expenditures are necessary because we are not at peace. Then it urges that large civilian expenditures are necessary because we are at peace and must catch up with the lag in the civilian fields where we postponed and reduced our efforts in order to win the war. The justification of the one undermines the other.

Likewise, where are those defenders of the compensatory theory which justifies large Government expenditures, financed by incurring debt, when employment and income are low, and with equal force maintains that reduction of Federal spending and public debt should be zealously pushed when employment and income are high and inflation is a real threat? The supporters of this theory have had their fling, and they should be the first to support this proposed limitation on expenditures. In view of the budget forecast for income next year, they should be demanding an even lower limitation.

When we apply these yardsticks to the President's budget, we find ample justification for reducing it to a total expenditure limitation of $31,500,000,000.

To compromise this figure in the face of the needs is an act offensive to the financial integrity of our people. Therefore, I stand squarely against reducing that limitation. I would rather compromise to reduce it than to increase it. The longer we wait to take this decisive step, the harder it will be for the Congress and the people.

The report of the committee is before the Senate. I say very frankly that there can be honest differences of opinion, and there are such differences. Decisions are reached as a matter of judgment, as a matter of estimate. There are some Senators who sincerely believe the limitation recommended by the joint committee is too low. On the other hand, there are Senators who believe just as sincerely that the recommended limitation is too high. I should not like to hear anyone attribute ulterior motives in connection with this subject, because what is involved is the determination as to what is a sound figure, a common-sense figure, in fixing an over-all ceiling on expenditures; and as to that, of course, men may differ.

I believe that within reasonable limitations, and within the recommended limitation, there will be ample funds for the domestic essentials of our country and the security of the Nation. I would not for a minute stand here to advocate a limitation which would in any way jeopardize that security. My record is indisputable proof of that truth.

We must all remember that this procedure is new. The joint committee has had only a comparatively brief period in which to work, and it has been without that staff assistance which should be available to it in succeeding years.

In spite of those truths, however, the vital issue should not be obscured.

The vital issue at stake here today is what this country we love can afford to spend within the requirements of internal and external security. I believe each of us knows in his heart that America cannot safely continue to expend the substance of the people with reckless abandon. Yet it is true that some are fearful of the benefits which can be the Nation's if we mend our fiscal ways.

I would ask that Senators bear in mind that my efforts are directed toward a Federal budget which is within the honest means of our country, a Federal budget which is balanced, a sound systematic method for reducing the national debt, and tax relief for the people. In my opinion, the only sound way to accomplish all those objectives is to drastically slash Federal expenditures—or to accept the limitation recommended by the joint committee.

It is for us to determine here today what total expenditures the country can afford. Hereafter, as the deliberations of the Eightieth Congress progress, it will be for us to decide how many dollars of the total we set shall be given to the respective divisions of the Government, according to their and the Nation's needs.

I am firm in my belief that the security of America—internal and external—demands that we spend no more than $31,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. I believe that a limit should be set by the Senate today, and that within that limit the Eightieth Congress should allot funds to the respective divisions of the Government according to the needs they display in relation to the security requirements of the Nation.

It is not for us to prejudge today the number of dollars any given division of Government should be allocated. It is for the Senate and House to decide the total Federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 from which each division may draw. The country awaits our decision.

In summary, Mr. President, let me say that in the contemplation of the Reorganization Act, which was put on the statute books for a definite purpose, the legislative body is a very important factor in considering the national budget. The Congress of the United States has had limited time to arrive at its decision and to make its recommendations. We have approached the problem in the same way in which we will approach it in succeeding years. There is room, I repeat, for honest differences of opinion as to this matter.

As a member of the committee, I believe, and those who joined with me in the recommendation believe, the figure prescribed is a reasonable one, and on it I should like to have the decision of the Senate, recognizing, of course, that in its vote the Senate will use the same good judgment which the committee followed in preparing and submitting the report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the subject now before the Senate for action, it seems particularly appropriate at this time for those of us on this side of the aisle, though the Eightieth Congress is but a few weeks old, to spend a little time in stock-taking.

The atmosphere is so charged with complex and often conflicting issues, the divergent voices crying out in the wilderness of headlines are so numerous, that it might be beneficial to the party and helpful to the country for us to stop, look, and consider.

We can well afford to consider objectively the question of what Republicans as a party should stand for—to take our bearings as to the direction in which we are heading. This is a vital matter because these are momentous days. We are faced today, I dare say, with more crucial questions of policy and of fact than have confronted any party in the peacetime history of America.

There are such vital questions as taxes, the national budget, foreign affairs; questions concerning the economy here at home and the world economy, social problems here at home, labor problems, agricultural problems; questions having to do with the preservation and maintenance of our natural resources, and above all, we are dealing with problems affecting the future peace of the world.

Because these issues are so important, not only to the future peace of the world but also to the immediate and future welfare of our Nation, the need is all the more urgent for us to orient ourselves in relation to these issues so that we can chart a sane and sound course.

I am convinced that the Republican Party is now afforded the greatest and most challenging opportunity any party has ever had to render real and lasting service to the Nation and to mankind. The people of this country turned to the Republican Party last November as the only means of achieving freedom from the chains of bureaucracy.

The way in which our party conducts the affairs of the legislative branch of the Government in the coming months will determine whether or not the Republican Party is entrusted with the executive branch of the Government in 1948.

Make no mistake about it, the people of the Nation are watching the Republican Party closely. The party is on probation. We can no longer get by by pointing out the weaknesses or shortcomings of others. We must deliver the goods.

The senior Senator from Michigan, the President pro tempore of the Senate, speaking in his home State recently, gave the party some good advice when he said that we should proceed on the invincible theory that the best service we can render is the best politics we can play.

We must show the people of the United States and of the world that under Republican leadership this country can make progress in the fields of economics, politics, and social welfare, and at the same time conduct the affairs of the Government in a sound and efficient manner.

The record will bear out the statement that in the past the country has in general had good administration and efficient administration under Republican leadership.

We face the challenge now of showing that we can provide the Nation that kind of leadership again.

The party will not be serving the best interests of the Nation if it tries to cut taxes indiscriminately, without carefully studied judgment; if it tries to forget the recent war and its lessons; if it attempts to repudiate foreign commitments already made; if it tries to shut out the rest of the world and build a wall against the atom bomb; if it ignores the needs of school children and poor and unfortunate people; if it permits the abrogation of any fundamental human rights; if it turns its back on the problems of agriculture and of developing and conserving our natural resources.

Before I go further I want to make it clear to my colleagues that what I say is not colored by personal rancor nor is it intended in any way to reflect upon the good name of any member of the party. These remarks are offered in a spirit of sincere concern for the welfare of the American people.

In the organizational set-up of the party, I realize that the leaders occupy an exacting and difficult role. There is placed upon them a great burden of responsibility not only for what they do but for what they say as well. I submit that we have had some talk for the press and otherwise recently that has not borne much semblance of responsibility.

Some utterances of Republican leaders have been so misleading and have left the public so confused about certain issues that it has been next to impossible for the rank-and-file citizen to discern the facts or to judge what the stand of the party really is.

This places the party and the Congress, since the majority is largely responsible for the actions of the Congress, in an extremely difficult position.

It is only natural that there should be divergent views in our party as in other parties. That is all right. It is in keeping with our democratic way of life. Any honest difference of opinion should be condoned and respected.

I should like now, Mr. President, to discuss some of the main issues which the Republican Party is sure to face in this Congress, and to apprise the party of my views on these issues, for whatever they may be worth.

Without any attempt to take them up in the order of their importance, I shall begin with foreign affairs.

There are some who believe that the United States should go its way alone, leaving the rest of the world to itself.

They would revoke the assistance which America has been giving to the small nations and to some of the large nations as well, leaving them to get along the best they can or forcing them to turn to other quarters for leadership.

These persons would build a high wall about the United States and erect a "keep-out" sign for the rest of the world. They would say, in effect, "Every nation for itself."

What these live-alone-and-like-it proponents overlook is that less than 7 percent of the world's population lives in the United States, and that neither political nor trade barriers can be built high enough to keep atom bombs and robot planes from hurtling down out of the stratosphere.

The United States can never again quarantine and isolate itself from the other 2,000,000,000 people on this planet.

We have no alternative than to cooperate. We must learn to live together as a world family of nations in peace and in harmony or face what is almost sure to be mass destruction if the newest weapons of war are again loosed upon the world.

We should not overlook the fact either that economic and political peace are inescapably joined. We as a Nation cannot be politically international and economically nationalistic.

Mr. President, I should like now to address a few remarks to the subject of taxes and fiscal affairs. Soon after the election certain Republican leaders broke into the headlines with statements concerning reduced expenses and lower taxes.

They promised a reduction of 20 percent in taxes straight across the board and talked of a reduction of $10,000,000,000 or more in Government expenses. They said little about reducing the public debt.

Of course we want reduced taxes, but more than all else, we want to insure the future of our Nation. That future is not secure so long as a debt of $260,000,000,000 hangs around our neck like a millstone.

Much as we may want to reduce Government expenses, we cannot trifle with the security of the Nation with the world in the unsettled condition it is today.

The major expenses of our Government today are interest on the national debt, national defense, and veterans' services.

Add to these the definite commitments for social security payments, tax refunds, definite commitments in foreign fields which can only be cancelled through the repudiation of agreements, and we have the bulk of our governmental expenses.

I have no doubt that appropriations for many purposes can and will be reduced. It should be the aim of the Congress to reduce Government expenses to the lowest point consistent with national safety and national welfare and to pay a reasonable amount on the national debt.

When we have done this, we will know then just how much taxes can be reduced.

As for a reduction in the number of Federal employees, there has been too much talk about arbitrarily laying off 1,000,000 workers.

We should reduce Federal employment to the number of workers actually needed to carry on the work authorized by the Congress, but we must not cripple that work. Some of the statements that have been made regarding personnel cuts have been bad for morale in the Federal service. Such irresponsible statements will result in some of the more capable employees, rather than the less capable ones, leaving the Government.

The next topic to which I call attention is one in which I am particularly interested—I refer to the field of agriculture.

During the war, American farmers were urged to increase their production. They responded by increasing it nearly 40 percent.

Consumption, on the other hand, has increased only about 12 percent over the prewar level.

Congress anticipated that this condition would develop and enacted the Steagall amendment, which guaranteed to the farmers of the Nation a price of at least 90 percent of parity for the crops which they would produce during the war and for 2 years following the end of the war. That means to the end of 1948.

In some instances the Government has already been called upon to make good this promise, but now that the war is over we hear talk of hedging on the promise of the Government to the farmers.

Two fundamental questions confronting the Congress are: First, shall we keep the bargain made with the American farmer during wartime? And next, what will be the long-range policy of government in regard to agriculture?

It is perfectly clear that we should keep the Government's promise to the farmers. I, for one, will fight any proposal to go back on this agreement, which I consider to be binding.

The long-range program, however, will be more difficult to determine. On this subject, two diametrically opposed schools of thought have already taken shape. One of these schools holds that farmers should be guaranteed 90 percent of parity prices, but coupled with this guaranty would be a strict limitation on production. This is nothing more than the old theory of scarcity, of paying farmers not to produce, or to destroy their crops.

It would mean imposition of Government controls on a scale not yet experienced.

The other school of thought would not restrict production but would approach the problem from the marketing end by seeking to find new methods of distribution or disposing of agricultural commodities on a full-production scale.

Personally, I object to requiring farmers to limit production or to destroy crops. I would seek new and expanded means for disposing of our surpluses both at home and abroad.

In either case, the Government will have to spend money and probably the amount will not differ very greatly whichever plan may be adopted. But when we vote today on the concurrent resolution providing for a budgetary limitation I think we must take into consideration the fact that the Government will have to spend money to sustain American agriculture.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that particular point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If we provide money to the Commodity Credit Corporation with which to restore its capital, I think the Corporation will have a sufficient sum to enable it to handle any requirements in the fiscal year covered by the budget we are now considering. The purpose of the Corporation's capital is to take care of such requirements, and the Corporation has been given $830,000,000 this year. The Corporation will be given another $830,000,000 to make up what it paid out in subsidies, in order to restore its capital. So I think the Corporation will have sufficient capital for any purpose of that sort under any budget plan that is now being proposed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to conclude what I have to say before entering upon a general discussion. I say that it will take money in either case to support agriculture, whatever policy may be adopted. We hope it will take a minimum amount of money, but provision should be made for whatever amount may be necessary.

History has shown how important agriculture is in the economy of the Nation, so if we are to maintain a sound national economy we must maintain agriculture on a strong basis.

We know also how important food is as a factor in world peace. We know how important it is in promoting the cause of freedom and democracy. Men universally want food, jobs, and freedom. The ideal, of course, is to have all three.

Aside from what we may term the noble exceptions, if people have to choose they tend to take the food and the jobs even if they have to sacrifice freedom. The hard facts of reality and necessity when pitted against philosophy of government are often stern taskmasters.

In the light of the strategic role occupied by food it seems clear that the agricultural policy finally adopted by the United States will have a very definite bearing on world peace.

With 75 percent of the people of the world in perpetual fear of famine, there is no surer way to incur their envy, distrust, and hatred than to limit the production of, or pay for the destruction of, food in the United States while the rest of the world goes hungry.

The Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress should adhere to its traditional policy of full production by working toward this objective for agriculture.

Closely related to our agricultural policy is the question of our natural resources. In addition to the exhaustible mineral resources, which we need to maintain and conserve, are the resources such as soil and forests, commonly associated with agriculture, which need also to be maintained and conserved. The distinguishing feature of soil and forest resources is that, with proper care, they can be renewed in a relatively short time. Still at the rate of their depletion, we need to be concerned. According to the Department of Agriculture, the annual cut of saw timber, based on 1944 figures, exceeds growth by about 50 percent. During some periods of the war, the drain was even greater. It is easy to see the handwriting on the wall if this rate of depletion continues.

In the category of soil depletion, the danger signal is already out. It is reported that one-fifth of the original area of United States tillable land is now ruined, chiefly by erosion, for further practical cultivation; and that about one-third of the present remaining tillable land is already badly damaged. We are allowing about 500,000 acres to go down to ruin each year as a result of erosion.

In addition to the loss from erosion, we have for more than 3 centuries been taking fertility out of the soil and selling it in the form of produce to get ready cash.

No policy of government can be complete without a definite plan for restoring and maintaining the fertility of our soil.

This problem is not merely the concern of the farmer, it is the concern of every inhabitant of the country.

Our zeal for effecting economies in government should not carry us to the point of encouraging further depletion of the soil and of our forests and the other natural resources to which we owe so much of our strength as a nation.

Surely any program of government which is concerned with conservation of natural resources should provide also for conservation of human resources.

The late war brought home to us with dramatic force the cost we had to pay for neglecting the health and education of our children.

Not only were millions of young men physically disqualified for military service by reason of such neglect, but many others were unable to give full service to their country because of lack of education.

Never again should we let it be said that America lags in providing adequate educational opportunities and medical care for our children.

We are making progress in the field of public health. The Seventy-ninth Congress approved measures to provide for hospital expansion and further research in the field of tuberculosis and mental diseases. There is reason to hope that the Eightieth Congress will continue along the highway to better health.

We have now reached the point where the status of education in our elementary and secondary schools is of immediate national concern. Among the manifestations of the dire straits of our school system are the low salaries paid teachers, the acute shortage of teachers, the substandard qualifications of many teachers who have been pressed into emergency service, the low morale of teachers, the poor condition of the schools, and generally overcrowded classroom conditions.

Many States cannot meet this emergency. I believe the time has come when the National Government, through tax moneys collected—not merely from the landowners, as is now the case in many States, but from all people—should contribute materially to the cost of an adequate education for all children.

This can be done without violating States' rights in any way and under no circumstances should the Federal Government be permitted to control the educational system of any State.

I urge the Republican Members of Congress to take the lead in an effort to provide better education for the children of the Nation. It must not be said that as a party we are willing to neglect the health and education of our children in order to save a few dollars.

Besides the major subjects to which I have referred, we must also take a stand on labor legislation.

As this subject is to be before this body for action in the near future, I will not discuss it here.

It cannot be disputed that some union leaders appear to have forgotten their obligations to the public, but in spite of such provocations as may have been engendered by their actions, the Republican Party must not become the tool of monopoly-seeking industrialists in their thinly disguised efforts to crush the workingman's right to organize effectively.

Whatever labor legislation we enact at this session should be enacted on the basis of its value to the public as a whole and with due regard to maintaining the rights of all freemen as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer once more to the post-election promises of some Republican leaders and the demand on their part for an irresponsible slashing of expenditures and Government employment and taxes on a straight-across-the-board basis.

They say that the Republican Party has a mandate from the people which was given at the last election.

Their imaginary mandate does not come from the people. During the entire preelection campaign the Republican Party offered the people absolutely nothing to vote for. It offered them everything to vote against. The people of this Nation, having been persecuted by bureaucratic orders and petty governmental tyrannies to a point that was no longer endurable, turned to the Republican Party as the only means of escape from this persecution.

If the rank and file of the Republican Party are now giving mandates to the Members of the Congress, how does it happen that these mandates were not in evidence before election day?

Why do they become suddenly recognizable at this time?

Mr. President, what the people of the United States demand is efficient and progressive government for the benefit of all the people.

They gave this Congress no mandate to forget the lessons of the late war and the high ideals and pronouncements in defense of which 1,000,000 Americans were killed or wounded.

They gave no mandate to repudiate the agreements which the United States has made in good faith with other countries.

They gave no mandate to withdraw the help that America is giving to keep millions of children from starving in all parts of this world.

They gave no mandate for this Congress or the Government to blunder along a diplomatic and military path which leads straight to a third world war.

They gave no mandate to this Congress to block the development of atomic energy for industrial purposes or to turn the benefits of such development over to a little group of ruthless and greedy men who would control all the sources of power of the United States and of the whole world if possible.

They gave no mandate to give away the oil reserves on which our national security may some day depend before the Supreme Court can render a decision as to the ownership of those reserves.

They gave no mandate to set the railroads of America and other businesses controlled by great financial interests above the provisions of the antitrust laws.

They gave no mandate to cut the taxes of those best able to pay 20 percent and leave the great burden of taxes on the shoulders of those least able to bear it.

They gave no mandate to take away the milk and other nourishing food which millions of little children are now receiving through the school-lunch program.

They gave no mandate to repudiate the solemn agreement made to the farmers of this Nation as an incentive to greater production.

They gave no mandate to discontinue the soil-building program through which the 8 inches of topsoil, on which the life of every single person depends, may be restored to its former fertile condition.

They gave no mandate to weaken or destroy the Rural Electrification Administration or the Tennessee Valley Authority.

They gave no mandate to discontinue the highway-building and airport-expansion programs at a time when America is desperately short of transportation facilities of all kinds.

They gave no mandate to create an artificial scarcity of food in order that high prices might be artificially maintained while millions of people go hungry in America.

They gave no mandate to take from the American workingman his high standard of living and his right to organize effectively to maintain that standard.

They gave no mandate to weaken the financial structure of our Government by slashing taxes to an ill-considered degree rather than reducing the national debt to a point consistent with national safety.

No, Mr. President, the people who give those mandates are not the rank and file of the Republican Party.

They speak only for a little group of blind, selfish, ruthless men whose voices are loud and persistent and whose influence is far out of proportion to their numbers.

They would make the Members of this Congress believe that they are the voice of the people.

Only this Congress stands between the 140,000,000 people of the United States and the little clique that would control them economically, socially, and politically.

The votes which will be taken in this Congress will reveal to the people which side we are on.

The country will hold the Republican Party responsible for what this Congress does. We can no longer sustain our claim to the support of the voters by simply asking, "Had enough?" for that will not be enough. Only the service which we as a party give our country, our fellowmen, and our God will be the criterion on which we will be judged.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I commend the Senator from Vermont for his very courageous speech. I agree with all he says about the school-lunch program, labor, agriculture, education, and the REA; and I join with him in saying that if the Republican Party, at the behest of the small clique he mentioned, succeeds in an attempt to decrease appropriations for REA, if it succeeds in tearing down appropriations for agriculture and wiping out the 90 percent of parity for agriculture, in my judgment, so far as the western section of the United States is concerned, the majority of the people there will turn from the Republican Party. Instead of having $100,000,000 taken away from REA, the people in my State want at least $100,000,000 added to that sum so that the women folk will not have to slave in the kitchens and the men on the farms may be able to utilize electric power.

So far as I am concerned, I want to tell the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont that with reference to agriculture, education, the school-lunch program, and some of the other items he has mentioned, he will find me fighting shoulder to shoulder with him, and I hope that the majority of the Republican Party will do likewise.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator for his remarks; but I feel that I must say that we shall have to fight to maintain the school-lunch program in America; we shall have to fight to protect the work of the Rural Electrification Administration; we shall have to fight even to maintain the Tennessee Valley Authority, because, in my opinion, there is a determined, organized effort to destroy all three institutions.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator agree that we shall have to fight to maintain the antitrust laws?

Mr. AIKEN. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for the very great speech which he has just made. In my judgment he has provided an adequate answer to those who are asking the question, What is the program of the liberal Republicans?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], to strike out in line 6 the figures "31.5" and insert in lieu thereof "33.0"; and in line 7 to strike out "24" and insert in lieu thereof "25.1."

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kem	Sparkman
Byrd	Kilgore	Stewart
Cain	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Connally	McCarthy	Tobey
Cooper	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McGrath	Umstead
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McMahon	Watkins
Eastland	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he expects that a vote will be taken today on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, that is rather a $64 question. I do not know whether a vote on it will be taken today.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say, Mr. President, that the hearings have not yet been printed. I understand that they will not be available until tomorrow; and I wish to protest against the taking of a vote until Senators have a chance to read the hearings; at least, I wish to read them before I vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT There are no hearings, so far as I know; no hearings were held. The whole question was considered in executive session in the subcommittee and in the full committee; and, so far as I know, there are no hearings to be printed. There are some minutes of a discussion which took place in a meeting of the four committees, and those minutes may be available; but they will not add anything to what can be said here and probably will be said here during the debate.

Mr. LANGER. Will the minutes be available tomorrow? I understand they are being printed.

Mr. TAFT. If they are being printed, they will be available. But everyone who was there is here and can answer the Senator's questions. There was only argument, and subsequently the votes were taken. There was no hearing of any kind.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I have been advised, the only Senator who desires to speak on this question is one who sits on the other side of the aisle. I have been told that he wishes to speak for about an hour. If that be the case, I think the probabilities of having a vote taken this afternoon are somewhat remote. But I am in no position to give any assurance that a vote will not be had today if debate ceases and if thereupon action is taken on the amendment and subsequently on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had assumed that a vote would be taken this afternoon on the Millikin amendment. But if it be in order, I ask permission at this time to offer and send to the desk an amendment relative to the systematic retirement of the Federal debt, so that in case a final vote is not taken today it will be printed and will lie on the desks of all Members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I can only express an opinion about the situation. I think there is a possibility that a vote will be taken this afternoon, but I do not regard it as a probability. I think the chances are definitely that the concurrent resolution will go over until Friday. However, I cannot give any assurance of that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the concurrent resolution for approximately 45 minutes or an hour. I did not assume that debate on the concurrent resolution would be concluded today, and consequently I am not ready to speak on it today.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to suggest that probably we shall not have a more important discussion than the one we are now having concerning the Budget, and certainly I hope the majority leader will not insist upon having a vote this afternoon on the concurrent resolution. I happen to know that several Senators who are away today thought they had been assured that no vote would be taken today on the concurrent resolution. I realize that probably their understanding was not based upon any agreement, but I hope the majority leader will see fit to agree that no vote will be taken this afternoon, and that the concurrent resolution will go over until Friday, so that all Senators can be advised of that fact and can be in attendance on Friday, when and if a vote is taken on that day.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no way of determining the matter unless unanimous consent is given that a vote shall not be had until Friday.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield to me, I am sure if, in his capacity as majority leader, the Senator should propose such a course, it would be agreed to. I am quite sure no Senator on this side of the Chamber would object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the request——

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that, if there is to be a unanimous-consent request, it should be that a vote be taken on Friday at a given time. Then we may make some progress. I never heard of a unanimous-consent request that a vote be not taken on the day the request was made.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Maine will yield, I withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on January 10 the President submitted to Congress a budget providing for the expenditure in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, of $37,500,000,000. This may be regarded as the third peacetime fiscal year budget after the termination of the war.

It is well to remind the Senate that the expenditures recommended by the President are four times as much as those in the year before the war, and further, that the expenditures for this peacetime year are equal to about the total cost of World War I, plus the ordinary governmental expenditures for the years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920. The budget submitted is approximately $10,000,000,000 more than the national defense expenditures for World War I. It is $5,000,000,000 more than the aggregate of all governmental expenditures for the 11 years 1921 to 1931, inclusive.

I make these comparisons with the knowledge, of course, that conditions have changed, but, after all, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in spending public money which must be raised by taxation. For 17 years our Government has been in the red, and in that time the public indebtedness has been increased from approximately $16,000,000,000 to $260,000,000,000. During these past 17 years we have built up at Washington a gigantic bureaucracy, which has attempted, sometimes with ruthless and autocratic control, to administer the affairs of our citizens.

Two things stand out very clearly in my mind: One is that if we do not balance the budget now, it may never be balanced until we go over the precipice of financial disaster. The second is that unless we reduce our Federal expenditures during the present period of high prosperity, then reduction when business recession comes will be much more difficult. By all past experience, the end of the present inflationary level will surely come, and no one can safely predict when it will occur, or how great the recession will be.

The people of America want less legislation, fewer directives, and less governmental interference with business. We desperately need a simplification of our governmental machinery, the elimination of needless red tape and overlapping activities, and a return to the free enterprise system, which constitutes today, as it always has, the chief guardian of the liberties of our people. Only economic freedom, with hard and steady work, will overcome wartime dislocation and start our country on the road to financial stability.

In recent years the average citizen of America has been influenced to hold the belief that a grant from Uncle Sam is a gift. The people think of the Government as a third party, when, in fact, we ourselves are the Government. Its wealth is only the collective wealth of all the people. If our democracy is to survive, the people must support the Government and not the Government the people.

In this task before us, one of the most challenging with which the Congress has ever been faced, let us be aware that there is no easy road to economy. In the past 15 years extravagance and waste have infiltrated virtually every governmental activity. It extends into the great bureaucratic activities throughout the length and breadth of America, and, since the war, peacetime expenditures are spread into large foreign areas. We have in Washington itself a vast number of Federal employees, but, when we consider that only 10 percent of all the Federal employees are in the city of Washington, we can apprehend the vast extension of governmental activities which have now reached such a point that in every county, city, and in virtually every township, there are branch offices and substations of the Federal Government, side by side, overlapping each other. An evidence of this is shown by a chart of organizational units in the executive branch, issued recently by the Joint Economy Committee.

On December 12, 1946, there were 1,039 principal component parts of the Federal Government, including departments, main bureaus, emergency and independent agencies. This compares to 1,141 in November 1944, indicating the elimination of only 102 emergency units in the past 2 years. In addition, outside of Washington there are 526 units of Federal district offices in the States, 3,619 field and county offices and institutions, 416 field divisions and area offices, 290 regional offices, and other miscellaneous units, making a total of 46,865, including the 41,790 post office units.

The opportunity for constructive retrenchment and economy in the activities of the Federal Government is as broad as the land, and it is the duty of Congress to reduce to the absolute minimum all Federal expenditures and still provide for the essential functions of Government. The States and localities must realize that they no longer should come to Washington and ask the Federal Government to do those things they should and could do better and more economically for themselves.

It is interesting to note that in 5 years the 48 States reduced their public indebtedness by $1,175,000,000, or 32 percent, and increased the balances in their general fund by $1,188,000,000. During the period of the war the States and localities have been reducing their public debts, while the Federal Government has been increasing its debt.

Never has a Congress been faced with a greater responsibility affecting the future financial stability of America than now. To adopt the President's recommendation means to continue, in large measure, the waste and extravagance that has characterized our public expenditures for many years. It means that when retrenchment becomes imperative by reason of the failure to collect sufficient tax revenue to pay the expenses of Government, the disasters of that time will be aggravated.

On the side of tax revenue, the estimate is $38,860,000,000, the largest exaction in taxes from the American people our country has ever known. This is about the equivalent of the total receipts of the Government for 10 years prior to the war. How long can we continue to collect from the American people this colossal sum in taxation without impairing the ability of the people to pay? Whenever a republic reaches the point of diminishing returns, occasioned by excessive taxation, then that nation is approaching financial insolvency. We must balance the budget and keep it balanced, and we can only do this by reducing our expenditures. We must provide for payments on the national debt and give a tax reduction only on a sound and conservative basis so as to avoid further deficits in the revenue.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The legislative budget carries with it no mandate in law. It was established as a part of the legislative reorganization machinery. The purpose of it was to fix a goal for expenditures which the Congress thinks can be safely financed by taxation and allowing for payment on the public debt. The first and most important approach to solvency is to reduce expenditures, to eliminate to the greatest possible degree all waste and extravagance, but, at the same time, to provide adequately for those activities of Government regarded as essential for our future progress and security.

It is, of course, true that the legislative budget is an experiment; no one knows whether it will succeed or not; but I, for one, believe that it is a very sound

and important step toward financial stability, as it, for the first time, coordinates expenditures with receipts, and permits an orderly consideration on the part of Congress of a balance between the two.

All of us must recognize the fact that the establishment of an over-all expenditure, as provided under the Legislative Reorganization Act, does not permit the submission of definite and detailed facts as to the exact amount that can be reduced in each of the thousands of budget items. Such detailed information would not be possible between the date the President submits his budget recommendations and February 15, the date on which the over-all figure of expenditures must be submitted to Congress.

Those familiar with the vastness of our present budget, involving the expenditure of thirty-odd-billion dollars in this country and in foreign lands, know that painstaking investigation by the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate is necessary to determine where appropriate reductions can be made. I stand upon the principle, however, that if such reductions are wisely and effectively distributed, we can operate the Government without impairment of the essentials of our national defense or any other required function of the Government, within the sum of $31,500,000,000, recommended by the Joint Budget subcommittee, and passed by a majority vote of 50 to 22 in the full committee.

So as to proceed in an orderly way, I submit that we must change our present practice of bringing in 11 separate appropriation bills, exclusive of deficiency and supplemental bills, so that we may consider all appropriations in one bill, as otherwise, it will be virtually impossible to confine the expenditures to a definite over-all limit, or even know when the limit is reached. It has been the custom heretofore for the 11 regular appropriation bills to be submitted, often at intervals of 30 days apart, and, if that custom is continued, it is possible that proportional reductions may not be made in the first bills, necessitating greater reductions in the later bills, and this obviously would bring about an unfair distribution of the total reductions.

We are trying out a new theory of government but one that gives hope for great benefits. Let us give it a fair trial and if, after full hearings, the Appropriation Committees of both the House and the Senate, reach the conclusion that it is impossible to confine expenditures to the limit fixed, then it would be a proper procedure for these committees to make recommendations to Congress explaining their inability to carry out the mandate and suggesting a revised figure.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and I have introduced a resolution, which is now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration providing for one appropriation bill, which I sincerely hope will be adopted by both Houses, as this will enable the Congress and the citizens better to ascertain the correlated relations of expenditures between the different divisions of Government. This is difficult, if not impossible, during the consideration of 11 appropriation bills, and other deficiency and supplemental bills, that are presented at different times.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senator from Virginia does not concede that any other Member of Congress is more desirous than he is for adequate national defense. In my record of 14 years I cannot recall that I have ever voted to reduce substantially any national defense expenditure recommended to Congress by the Appropriation Committees. Prior to World War II I was an early advocate of vast improvements in our national defense, but I cannot agree with those who think that the Army and Navy recommendations are untouchable by Congress. Neither, let me say, is the present situation clarified by such a statement as recently emanated from the Navy Department to the effect that a reduction of $500,000,000 in the naval appropriation would immobilize the Navy. Immobilizing the Navy means the laying up of all its ships and activities, and to say that a 10-percent reduction in naval appropriations would bring such a dire result is so extravagant as not to carry conviction.

There are vast opportunities for economy in the Army and Navy, and while we admire, respect, and have great confidence in our military leaders, yet we in Congress must realize that these leaders are accustomed to the waste of war, and it is easy to continue such waste, even though it be in lesser degree, in time of peace. For example, the Army and Navy, on January 1, had 1,117,000 civilian employees, including industrial workers, as compared to an armed personnel of 1,600,000. In other words, there were two civilian employees for every three members of the armed services, and it is, of course, true that many thousands of those in uniform perform clerical work.

This item of 1,117,000 civilian employees compares to a total employment of the Army and Navy of 222,136 civil-service employees, including industrial workers, in 1939. I do not think any man can say that there is not a great field for retrenchment in this one single item of the expenditures for the Army and Navy, which, incidentally, is costing approximately $3,000,000,000.

Again, the average cost of maintaining a member of the armed services, his pay and subsistence, is estimated in the next budget at $3,100, as compared to $1,386 in 1940, about two and one-half times as much. These figures are for personal maintenance alone, and do not include any arms, ammunition, or engines of war to implement him. Of course, I know these costs have risen, yet this alone constitutes a $5,000,000,000 item, and certainly there is opportunity for some economy. During the war the over-all cost per man around the world was $6,960, while in the budget the average cost per man in 1948 will be $6,790. These figures include all expenditures for ships, planes, ammunition, and everything else. In other words, the Army and Navy propose to spend, as an over-all average, only $170 less per man than during World War No. 2. To arrive at this comparison in a valid way, of course, means an investigation of the various facilities that were purchased by the Army and Navy in these two periods, but this item needs a clear explanation, especially in view of the fact that, with regard to the Navy, many costly battleships were paid for during the war and are still in good condition.

I venture the assertion that there has not been a member of the armed services, either now or during the war, who has not come in personal contact with the waste and inefficiency of Army and Navy management, and in saying this I do not indict our military leaders. To the contrary, I have the greatest respect and admiration for them. I feel that America will owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to those leaders whose great military skill, courage, and patriotism made possible the victory of our Allied forces. As a member of a delegation of Senators, I visited Europe immediately after the termination of the war and was enormously impressed with the outstanding capacity and ability of the high generals who led us to victory. At the same time, we cannot think of national defense in terms of big armies and armaments alone. There can be no national security against wartime possibilities without financial security in time of peace. We cannot allow wartime extravagance perpetuated in time of peace to devour the primary military requirement, namely, the credit of the Nation.

We must find the balance in this matter and strike it. I shall never vote to dangerously impair our national defense or our national security, military or financial. For this reason I shall vote constantly to make our armed forces more efficient, and I think that can best be accomplished through more economical peacetime operation. I do not believe the Army and the Navy have devoted their best efforts toward this end. Certainly their extravagant statements of recent days—even before they know the full reduction plan, which is not yet developed—do not strengthen their position in my mind.

At this moment we are engaged in a grave economic war. We are fighting to alleviate not only for this country but for the whole world the difficulties growing out of the financial problems inherent in the military war. We must win this economic war now, this year; and I earnestly solicit the cooperation of the admirals and the generals in the effort to place the United States in such a position that it may win another war, should such a great misfortune ever occur, and this can only be done by reducing our public debt, by living within our income, and by a reduction of taxes to the point where the profit motive is once again an incentive to business development.

If there had been a debt of $260,000,000,000 when World War II began, our form of democratic government would today be destroyed, because, if this debt had been nearly doubled, there is no way the freedoms of our Republic could have survived under our present form of government. There has never been a

single democracy anywhere in the history of the world that has been able to outlive financial insolvency, because democracy means freedom of the people to own and operate their business and conduct their private affairs, and when the obligations of the government become so overwhelming that the people cannot by their own free initiative pay the cost of government, then democracy must yield to some form of totalitarianism, destructive of the liberties of the people.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

I am anxious in my desire to give every possible aid and assistance to our veterans, and especially to those who were injured in the Nation's defense. I think, in justice to the veterans, it is proper to require the Veterans' Administration to demonstrate that the administration of this agency is on an economical basis. We owe it to the veterans to provide maximum service at minimum administrative cost. Veterans pay taxes, too, and so will their children. I point out that the Veterans' Administration is requesting 47,000 civilian employees in the Washington office, and a total of approximately 250,000 scattered throughout the United States and its possessions. In January 1947 the total veteran population of all wars was 14,341,000. Therefore, there would be 1 civilian employee to every 50 veterans, and, of course, it is a recognized fact that millions of veterans have made no request for assistance from the Government in any form. I would oppose any cuts in the expenditures for veterans which would render it impossible to provide for them reasonable and proper aid and care, but in this day, when expenditure reduction is so vital, this agency, as well as every other agency of the Government, should come under the scrutiny of Congress.

There are only two untouchable items in the budget; one is the interest on the public debt totaling $5,000,000,000 and the other is the tax refund of $2,000,000,000, a total of $7,000,000,000, leaving $30,000,000,000 for other activities. In my judgment, there is not a single agency of Government which cannot reduce its expenditures and at the same time give satisfactory service to the people. There is not one of them that cannot be rendered more efficient by more economical administration and thus make possible reductions in the pending budget.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

I think it is obvious to the country generally that for the last 10 years there has been an excess of civilian employees in the Federal Government and that a careful and wise pruning would result not only in a large saving of public funds but would actually increase the efficiency of the various departments.

On January 1, there were 2,283,890 civilian employees. Of these, 296,172 were employed outside the continental United States. For many months, as chairman of the Joint Economy Committee, I have been endeavoring to ascertain, with some degree of accuracy, what the nearly 300,000 civilian employees outside of the United States do, but the results of my efforts have been completely unenlightening. I am told by the Army and Navy that they receive the reports so late that when they do come in they have no real value by way of indicating the work performed by these nearly 300,000 employees. Of course we know the work some of them do, but we do not know about the large majority.

I sincerely believe that the civilian employment, beginning July 1, 1947, can be reduced to 1,600,000, and perhaps to 1,500,000, at a saving to the Public Treasury at the rate of $2,500,000,000 a year on the basis of present employment, and nearly that much on the basis of Budget estimates. If this should be done, it would represent even then an increase of 50 percent more than the prewar employment in December 1939 of 943,000.

When the increased pay bill was under consideration, the Senate Civil Service Committee received from the Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau a confidential statement that on June 30, 1947, the total civil service employment would be 1,710,000, so that the recommendation I now make is approximately in line with the planning of both the Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau when the increased pay bill was under consideration last May.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The pending Budget provides for withdrawal from the Treasury of approximately $1,800,000,000 by Government corporations. I desire to call attention to the fact that under the Byrd-Butler bill, all Government corporations are required to return any unused funds to the Federal Treasury, and that the Congress must first approve any new loans or expenditures before they are made. Prior to enactment of this bill in December 1945 the forty-odd Government corporations were a fourth arm of the Government and could use their revolving funds to make such new expenditures as they desired. An analysis of the corporation budgets which are set forth in the President's budget document shows that the 40 Government corporations have a capital of $10,000,000,000, which is supposed to be unimpaired. In view of this situation, it seems to me that it should not be necessary to ask for vast additional amounts out of the Public Treasury.

It should be pointed out also that many of these corporations, following a practice of many years standing, are borrowing money from the Treasury at 1 percent. At the same time the Government—that is the people—is paying an average of about 2 percent for the money it is lending to the corporations at 1 percent. Following through on this situation, we find that those corporations with investment functions turn around and invest in Government bonds on which the Government is paying them 2 percent.

I regret that I do not have actual figures on this matter. They are not yet available, but an audit to develop this information is in progress at the moment. Meanwhile, it suffices to say that this is a source of many million dollars on the receipt side of the Budget if we take necessary steps to recover it.

GRANTS AND AIDS TO THE STATES

As I have pointed out, the 48 States today are in comparatively better financial condition than the Federal Government. They are reducing their debts and increasing the balances in their general funds. All grants and aid to the States should be carefully scrutinized and those that are not absolutely essential should be deferred, if not canceled, and action should be taken to withdraw the Federal Government from all those functions which properly should be financed by the States and localities. By so doing, the exorbitant overhead, which is applicable to all Federal expenditures, can be saved, and this will be one way to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy.

Let us remember that we cannot continue to invade new fields of expenditures and at the same time talk about reducing the bureaus and the number of employees of the Federal Government. We must decide between a continuation of Federal control and Federal appropriations for local objectives, and a less costly and more simplified Government whereby some of these things are done by the States and localities.

The total of subsidies in the nature of grants and aids and payments to the States in the present Budget is $1,500,000,000. In the past 12 years the Federal Government, out of borrowed money, has expended $34,000,000,000 for grants, aids, and payments to the States.

REVENUE ESTIMATES

In considering the estimate of revenue of $38,800,000,000, including the excise taxes reimposed, we must bear in mind that the estimate in the President's budget message is based upon an anticipated national income of $167,000,000,000, which is higher than the income estimate for the current fiscal year. As we know, the national income is the aggregate of the cash income of all the citizens of America. Our existing system of taxation relies heavily on income taxes. If our national income goes down, the decline is immediately reflected in the tax revenue. For example, under the existing system and rates, if the national income should drop to $160,000,000,000, which would be a reduction of only 5 percent, the tax revenue would decline to $34,500,000,000, which would be a loss of approximately $4,300,000,000 compared with the present estimate. If the national income should fall to $150,000,000,000, a reduction of approximately 10 percent, the total revenue would be $32,000,000,000, instead of $38,000,000,000, or a loss of $6,800,000,000 in revenue.

Under our present system and existing rates, including excise taxes imposed, the total receipts of the Federal Government at the various levels of national income would be as follows:

National income (billions):	*Receipts (billions)*
$80	$14.0
$90	16.5
$100	19.0
$110	21.5
$120	23.5
$130	26.5
$140	29.0
$150	32.0
$160	34.5

Suppose our national income should go down to $80,000,000,000. That was the highest point before the war, in 1929. In only one year in the history of this country, before World War II, did we have a national income as high as $80,000,000,000. That was in the year 1929. I do not think it will go down to $80,000,000,000, but I wish to set forth these figures. If our national income should go down to $80,000,000,000, our tax revenue under existing taxes would go down to $14,000,000,000, as compared to $38,000,000,000 which we now receive. These are official figures which I have obtained from the tax experts of the Treasury, as well as from the tax experts of the Joint Tax Committee.

If the national income should go down to $90,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $16,500,000,000.

If the national income should go down to $100,000,000,000—and that would not be impossible—our tax revenue would drop to $19,000,000,000.

If the national income should go down to $110,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $21,500,000,000.

If the national income should go down to $120,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $23,500,000,000.

If the national income were $130,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $26,500,000,000.

If the national income were $140,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $29,000,000,000.

If the national income were $150,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $32,000,000,000.

If the national income were $160,000,000,000, the tax revenue would be $34,500,000,000.

I merely wish to emphasize the fact that our tax system is not on a sound basis. It is volatile and undependable, because it relies so heavily upon income taxes, and particularly upon income taxes in the higher brackets.

Revenue receipts for 1948 are based not only upon continuance of, but actually upon an increase in the unprecedented prosperity which we now enjoy. The highest national income, as I said, before the war was $80,000,000,000, in 1929. The average national income in the 10 years before the war was $68,000,000,000. I do not expect a return to such figures; but, on the other hand, we should protect ourselves from a 10-, 15-, 20-, or even 25-percent decrease in the national income, which would play havoc with this budget. It would create another substantial deficit; and another deficit in Federal expenditures, coming 3 years after the war, and after Congress had made an attempt to balance the budget, would shake the confidence of the American people to its very foundations.

It is for this reason that I am opposed to a tax reduction in the calendar year 1947, although I realize the fact that the present taxes are oppressive to the degree that they will soon reach the point of diminishing returns, and although I know that they are destroying the incentive for profit, which, after all, is the dynamo of our private-enterprise system. I favor tax reduction in 1948 providing the expenditures are sufficiently reduced.

But we must accomplish first these reductions in expenditures, because, from a long-range standpoint, I think it is vastly more important to place our Government on a sound fiscal basis by reducing expenditures and firmly balancing the budget than to reduce taxes first. What could be more reassuring to the citizens than to know that after 17 years of waste, squandering, and deficit spending, our Government is once again in the black? We can wait a few months for tax reduction, and then on a dependable basis be assured the reduction is permanent.

In any event, the effective date of the tax reduction should not be before July 1, 1947, because in this fiscal year we have a deficit; and to reduce taxes retroactively to the beginning of the calendar year 1947 would mean increasing the deficit for this fiscal year. That certainly is not sound government or good bookkeeping.

I favor setting aside $3,000,000,000, as provided in the Knowland amendment, for payment on the public debt. I should like to see the Government in a position where it could pay a minimum of $5,000,000,000 annually on the public debt.

The $3,000,000,000 proposed to be paid on the public debt would also act as a cushion in the event that there should be a reduction in the national income.

The President's Budget for 1948 is $5,000,000,000 less than estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year. If allowance is made for nonrecurring expenditures in the present fiscal year, there is, in fact, not much difference between the expenditures which we will make during this fiscal year and the expenditures recommended by the President for the next fiscal year.

Again let me emphasize that unless we reduce expenditures now, 3 years after the war, the reduction will be more difficult later. The same demands will be made upon the Government which are now made. The same cry will be raised by those who are adversely affected. The time to meet this issue is now, when the country is enjoying a high degree of prosperity. We should eliminate every unnecessary expenditure, simplify and coordinate the Government's activities, and operate our vast governmental machinery in the most economical manner possible. This we owe to ourselves and to future generations.

The greatest internal menace confronting America today is a public debt which is equivalent to more than twice as much as the assessed value of all the property in America. The debt averages more than $5,000,000,000 for each State; and the actual value of the tangible property in a majority of the States of the Union is estimated as being less than $5,000,000,000.

While I am a member of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, I am not a member of the subcommittee which had the benefit of detailed study and which made the recommendation to reduce expenditures from $37,500,000,000 to $31,500,000,000. Neither am I a member of the Appropriations Committee. I speak for myself alone, and I shall attempt to give a broad pattern of expenditure reduction, which can be taken for what it is worth.

First, I would proceed to reduce the number of Federal employees from the present number of 2,300,000 to either 1,600,000, or, if possible, to 1,500,000, placing the number of Federal employees on a basis of 50 to 60 percent more than the year before the war, which number, I am convinced after long investigation, is adequate to perform the functions of government. This would save, in the salary and expenses such as traveling, stationery, rental of buildings, and so forth, the sum of $2,500,000,000. That is the way in which I would start to realize the reduction of $6,000,000,000.

The average salary of Federal employees is $2,640; and with incidentals each employee is costing the Federal Government approximately $3,000 a year, because they must have places in which to work and other facilities.

I would then seek, as the second item of reduction, to require Government corporations to finance out of their existing assets at least $1,000,000,000 of the $1,850,000,000, which is to be withdrawn from the Treasury next year by such corporations. The net capital of Government corporations is approximately $10,000,000,000. The Byrd-Butler bill provides that as the assets of these corporations are liquidated, or if earnings were made, such balances should be returned to the Treasury of the United States instead of remaining in the hands of the corporations. Consistent with this legislation, it would be entirely reasonable to require these corporations to absorb a part of the amount of the funds included in the expenditure budget. They are requesting $1,850,000,000, and I propose to require them to finance $1,000,000,00 out of their existing assets. This may be difficult, but it can be done, I think, even though it may be necessary to reduce the activities of the forty-odd corporations; and I believe that the time has come for this. I have thought for a long time that we should substantially reduce them. That is the next item I would reduce.

In any event, speaking of Government corporations, the item of $830,000,000 which is in the budget to restore the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation has no place in the 1948 budget, as the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation occurred in 1946 and 1947 and, to be fair about it, that impairment should be handled in the present budget and not passed on to the next budget.

These two savings, if effected, would amount to $3,500,000,000, leaving a balance of $2,500,000,000 of the $6,000,000,000 reduction proposed.

Those are my suggestions. Frankly, if I were called upon to balance the budget, that is how I would go about it as to $3,500,000,000.

I am firmly of the opinion that within the scope of the remaining budget expenditures, a saving of $2,500,000,000 can be effected without endangering our national security or any other essential functions of government—the Army, the Navy, or any others—by scrutiny and

careful action on the part of the Appropriations Committees. That would aggregate $6,000,000,000. I will expand that further.

It may be that we shall have to do without some things that are desirable, but not necessary. If the people, through Congress, continue to add to the burdens of the Federal Government by asking the Government to do things which they should do for themselves, then of course these economies are not possible. When I say that there can be a reduction of $6,000,000,000 without doing injury to the essential functions of government, I want to emphasize that the important feature of that program is to allocate and distribute the reductions in the most scientific and fairest possible way. If we apportion the $6,000,000,000 reduction in a just and fair way on the expenditures that are proposed in this Budget, I am convinced that we can effect this economy and not endanger the functions of government.

It may be that some of the things which we have been doing for years we ought not to have been doing, and that they should be dropped in order to reduce our stupendous obligations. It can be done if there is a will to do it. If we say that we cannot do it, we shall not accomplish the desired saving. Every Member of the Senate knows the extravagance that exists in practically every branch and activity of the Army and the Navy. I say this, as I have said before, without criticism of our great military leaders, because they have neither the time nor the inclination to conduct peacetime operations with the necessary economy and efficiency. Let me give a little itemization of the $2,500,000,000.

It may be that there must be reductions in the less essential public-works programs and in other fields of activity of the Government, including the reduction or elimination of an item of $500,000,000 for housing and community work. Personally, I can see no need for such an expenditure under the present situation. Those two items aggregate approximately $1,600,000,000.

From the combination of public works and housing it should be possible to obtain a reduction of $500,000,000, reducing the balance to be cut $2,000,000,000.

The field for economies to produce this $2,000,000,000 cut is very wide. It includes the Veterans' Administration, in which certainly some economies can be made. I believe that such a plan will be devised. It is a comparatively new agency on its present basis, and, naturally, it has been more wasteful up to date than it should have been. I do not know how much can be cut from it. I think something can be, and still give needed service to the veterans.

Economies can be effected in such items as agriculture, national resources, transportation and commerce, finance and industry, and general government. On the items which I have just mentioned we propose to spend $8,000,000,000. We certainly should save at least $500,000,000 out of that $8,000,000,000 in addition to personnel cuts.

That brings us within a billion and a half of what we need to make the $6,000,000,000 reduction. I have not reached the Army and Navy.

Notwithstanding the public statements that have been made by officials of the Army and Navy that no cuts can be made without disaster to our national defense, I am informed by high-ranking officials of both the Army and the Navy that reasonable cuts can be made in the proposed appropriation of $11,200,000,000. I think a 10-percent reduction can be made in this appropriation in addition to a proper reduction of civilian personnel.

It is my opinion that the best service that the Congress can now render the cause of national defense is to insist and demand that the national defense program shall be administered with due regard to economy and efficiency. Looking forward to the future, we must realize that the longer exaggerated military spending is tolerated now, the more difficult it will be to sustain public opinion favoring necessary expenditures for adequate national defense in years to come. Unless we so conduct our national defense program as to bring it within the ability of the people to pay, and at the same time eliminate unnecessary waste and extravagance, then, as the years go on, it will be more and more difficult to induce the people of the United States to pay the taxes necessary to maintain a proper national defense program.

I want to eliminate the water in the national defense programs without injuring our essential objective of a strong national defense; and, by doing so, to convince the people of America that we are performing an essential public service at minimum cost. In the Budget for the third fiscal year of peace after the end of the war the proposed expenditure of $11,200,000,000 is 11 times more than our national defense cost the year before Pearl Harbor, and nearly half the total cost of World War I.

Never in the history of Congress, so far as I can ascertain, has the Congress attempted to substantially lower the budget submitted by the Executive, and succeeded. Mark that, Mr. President: I have never known of an instance, and never have been able to find one in the history of the American Nation, when the Congress has successfully undertaken, as it is proposed to do today, to reduce the fiscal budget of the Nation, as submitted by the Executive, in order to preserve the financial solvency of the Nation.

We are trying an experiment in economy, as contrasted to the many experiments we have tried in spending in the past few years. We are trying an experiment in reducing expenditures and avoiding extravagance, and I say it is time to make this experiment work.

The difficulty, of course, is encountered in apportioning fairly and wisely the cuts to be made. I repeat that I am convinced beyond question of doubt that the expenditures can be reduced $6,000,000,000, or even more, provided that the cuts are properly applied.

I predict that the battle we are beginning will be a bitter contest. We must recognize that we have to meet the opposition of highly organized and powerful minorities who are now the beneficiaries of Federal spending. Federal bureaus are always active in opposition to any effort to reduce their power, funds, personnel; and many of these bureaus do not hesitate, and they will not hesitate today, as they have not hesitated in the past, to use the radio, the mails, and other means to disseminate propaganda, at public expense, to oppose any retrenchment move that affects them.

Mr. President, unless Congress, with the backing of the public, can reestablish control over expenditures and can place the Nation on the sound road of paying off debt and lightening the tax load now bearing down upon the incentive for work and production, we are heading for serious trouble.

Two things which we must do now are: First, cut down Government spending to a level somewhere near our prospective ability to pay—not our ability to pay in the present inflated period; second, try to reestablish conditions which will encourage and stimulate industry and enterprise which are necessary to sustain the production and distribution of goods at high levels. But, first, we must reduce expenditures and allow for payment on the debt before reducing taxes.

This last means a system in which people who show energy, ability, and leadership shall have some prospect of reward for their efforts.

Cutting expenses is one of the hardest things a Congress ever does. Right now decisions are being worked out here in Washington that will go far toward determining the kind of society and economy we are going to live in—whether people will be allowed to spend their own money or whether the Government will spend it for them. During the thirties and the war period the Government intervened in one area after another in our economic life. The present big Executive budget assumes the continuance of that philosophy. With it goes a tax system so onerous that it becomes, in effect, the instrument of socialization by which wealth is redistributed, and by which those who rise above the crowd are cut back to the level of mediocrity.

Mr. President, with the conclusion of the war, it is time we made an abrupt change in that philosophy. What we do about the present budget is a test of how clearly we see this problem and of America's ability to resist the world-wide forces of government dictation and collectivism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia. I wish to ask him whether at the present time he is in favor of specifying in the concurrent resolution a specific amount of debt reduction, or whether he is in favor of leaving that uncertain at this time, until we know more about the tax returns, and then making such a specification at the conclusion of our session.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I expect to vote for the Knowland amendment which provides for a $3,000,000,000 payment on the public debt. I should like to see it provide for a $5,000,000,000

payment on the debt, but I think certainly the first money we can save by cutting expenditures should be used to pay off at least $3,000,000,000 of the public debt, before we reduce taxes. Then we should reduce taxes in proportion to expenditure reduction and on a basis we can make permanent. To reduce taxes prematurely and then be forced to raise them would have a most disturbing effect.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am but one of a rather large group of Members of this body who, during the last campaign, told the people of their respective States that, if elected, they would make a determined effort to reduce the expenses of the Federal Government. This is the first opportunity we have had to show that we meant exactly what we said.

In an editorial published day before yesterday in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which is one of the large and influential newspapers of my State, it is stated:

> The moans over the proposed $6,000,000,000 reduction in the Federal Budget are getting a little ridiculous. Strangely, they are all tuned to the weak theme that the action will wreck our national security—an obvious attempt to let the public believe the whole cut is coming out of the military hide.

Of course, Mr. President, no one of us wishes to handicap or impede General Marshall in the slightest degree in the important mission he is about to undertake. For my part, I believe that nothing will enable him to speak with authority so much as the knowledge that the economy of our country is being placed on a sound basis and that the spirit of production and enterprise is being stimulated and reenergized by the widespread knowledge that the Congress of the United States is seriously grappling with the problem of Government finance.

Likewise, no one of us desires to weaken our national defense. Speaking for myself alone, I am convinced that it is simply not realistic to say that a traditionally, a notoriously prodigal establishment cannot be trimmed without having such an effect. The matter must be approached from a long-range, farsighted point of view. As the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said in effect, let us be sure that we are going to have the powder when we need it the most.

Mr. President, I do not think the proposed cut of $6,000,000,000 goes as far as the people expect, or perhaps as far as they have reason to expect; but, for my part, I am content with the report submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] placing the reduction at $6,000,000,000. I shall oppose the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the eloquent speech made by the Senator from Virginia sets forth so well the principles of economy in government and of reasonable taxation that the subject hardly needs further amplification.

For many years there has been a government philosophy of spending. Now we are proposing that Congress undertake a definite program of economy. Until 1932, Congress was always regarded as the extravagant body. It was always the Executive who felt the responsibility for balancing the budget. It was always the Executive who vetoed appropriation bills. It is the Executive, after all, and properly so, who has the over-all look at the whole range of governmental operations and expenditures, particularly with the assistance of his Budget Bureau. Until 1932 every President of the United States felt a strong personal responsibility for seeing that the budget was balanced, that the burden of taxation did not bear too heavily upon the people of the United States.

Congress is not a peculiarly efficient body in effecting economy. It is difficult for Congress to know where economies can be made. It is difficult, even after extended hearings before an appropriations committee, to feel certain that we can make cuts without impairing the efficiency of the service. Yet it has come to pass that by an almost unanimous vote of the Congress for a bill which has been approved by the President, the chief burden of economy is placed on the Congress. Now we are supposed to establish a legislative budget, cutting below the Presidential budget. We are supposed to pass now, without much information, on the question as to what the over-all limit on expenditures shall be.

When we adopt the figure suggested, we do not imply that we will not cut below that figure, but our purpose is to do our utmost to hold the total appropriation to such a figure that expenditures will not exceed the figure we now fix for the Budget, whether it be $31,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000. That is not easy, yet I think it represents the accomplishment of a great purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator if he really meant it when he said we were to pass on this question without having much information as to what we were doing? Is that the Senator's conception of what we will do when we vote on this question?

Mr. TAFT. We can only make an intelligent guess. We have no information before us as to the particular items of the $37,500,000,000 Budget, in justification for the figure fixed by the Budget. We only know it is requested. We only know the Budget Director has approved it, and the President has approved it. All we can do is to look at the figure and say we think the Budget is too high. We can use our judgment, based on our experience covering a number of years, in making what I think is an intelligent guess. But at the present time we do not have sufficient information to enable us to fix an exact figure.

Mr. McMAHON. Would the Senator mind telling me what goes into an intelligent guess? It would seem to me a guess is an approximation based upon chance; there is not very much intelligence to it. That is why I have difficulty in determining how I should vote. I do not like to make intelligent guesses and have them go out to the people of the United States as representing something more than that. I do not believe in guessing about a matter of this kind. I should like to decide for myself on the basis of hearings, on the basis of facts, on the basis of some information. Frankly, unless I can be satisfied in that regard at the end of this debate I shall vote "present" when my name is called on the roll call, because I do not intend to tell the people of the United States that I am guessing at anything.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Virginia has given some figures. He says he thinks the number of employees can be reduced from 2,300,000 to 1,600,000, with a saving of $2,000,000,000. He is guessing in making that figure. He is making an intelligent guess. He has studied the whole question of Federal employment, and it seems to me that, based on such intelligent guesses, it is fair to arrive at a figure, because, as I see it, that is the only way by which we can hope actually to cut the budget submitted by the President of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it should be developed, I suggest to the distinguished Senator, that what we are doing here has been imposed upon us by law. The Reorganization Act required us to have a budget by February 15. The Reorganization Act did not provide us with a staff to enable us to have the kind of a budget the distinguished Senator from Connecticut contemplates. Therefore we have no alternative but to reach a result based on, let us call it, rough judgment.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator from Colorado is entirely correct, and I may add that while, as the Senator from Colorado says, the duty is imposed on us by law, I think it is a good law, though I believe it can be improved. I think in ordinary years we will have had a staff working during the recess which can give us more intelligent information than we now have. But I know of no other method than that we are pursuing. What is now required is something that has never been done in any Congress of which I have been a member. It has centered the attention of Congress on the over-all expenditures, and it has enabled us to debate what they shall be. It has forced every Member of Congress to go into the budget, to look over the items which make up the expenditures of the Government, and come to some over-all conclusion. Up to this time we have never approached the question of expenditures, except through individual appropriation bills, contemplating the merits or demerits of a particular program, and we never have had to consider the over-all effect of all the individual bills put together on the economy of the United States of America.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state to the Senator that I approve generally of the effort which is being made to arrive at some reasonable judgment about prospective expenditures of the Government. I supported wholeheartedly the reorganization bill, which imposed this requirement on Congress. It may be that the time allowed for preparing a report, namely from the 3d of January to the 15th day of February, was too short. That is a matter we can consider at some other time. We cannot consider it now.

A while ago the Senator from Ohio made the statement that we had no information upon which the $37,500,000,000 budget of the President was based. We have just as much information about that as we have about the proposed $6,000,000,000 cut. Obviously the Bureau of the Budget, the departments, and the President himself, went through the figures, and screened them, in order to arrive at the $37,500,000,000 total.

Mr. TAFT. Let me modify my statement. Of course, what I meant was that we have no evidence; no witnesses, were called to tell us about this item and that item, whether it involved an increase or a decrease. When I said we had no informaton, of course I knew we had the President's budget, with a statement; but we had none of the kind of information the Appropriations Committee finally will obtain.

Mr. BARKLEY. In arriving at the figure given there was a departmental sifting, a budgetary sifting, and a presidential sifting. The President reduced the estimates of the departments by about $5,000,000,000 or more. So that he at least felt that he had based his budget upon information available to him, which had come to him through various sifting processes in the departments.

But let me state what causes me to find fault, and why I think what we have done is wholly inadequate to give the Senate any information. When the first meeting of the committee on the President's budget, made up of 102 Members of the two Houses of Congress, was held, a subcommittee of 20, five from each of four committees, the two Committees on Appropriations, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Finance Committee, were appointed to go over the President's budget and submit a report.

We met on two separate days. The first day was devoted to going through the budget, or a compendium of the budget which was passed around by the chairman of the subcommittee, which I think had been worked out by the Budget Bureau itself. Then we decided to call before the subcommittee the fiscal agents of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget. So we spent one whole day hearing the Director of the Budget, and hearing Treasury officials on the matter of Treasury receipts, which was simple enough. There is no serious controversy about the amount of money which will be raised by present tax rates, and by the extension of the excise taxes during the fiscal year 1948. When we had the Director of the Budget before us, of course he undertook to explain the budget from the standpoint of the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

Then we adjourned, subject to the call of the chairman. Not another witness was called before the subcommittee. No one else was heard. No other information, so far as we were concerned, was ever sought, although I am informally told that a few members of the subcommittee, from the majority side, not even all the majority, were invited into the Sanhedrin sessions, but a few members of the majority—were called in secret session, and by some process arrived at the $6,000,000,000 reduction.

Those of us who were not invited to those meetings, or were not privileged to attend them, or even to know where they were held or when they were held, or were not even told where the crystal ball was located into which the others were gazing in order to arrive at the $6,000,000,000 figure, have never gotten a breakdown, that could be regarded as dependable or official, as to where the $6,000,000,000 could be saved. So that when the Senator says we do not have any information as to the basis of the President's $37,500,000,000 budget, I might say we have no adequate or dependable information as to the reason for fixing a ceiling of $31,000,000,000 or any other number of billion dollars, and any guess we make will be only a guess, and it may not be an intelligent guess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in my opinion, it would have been absolutely impossible for the joint committee to hear evidence on two or three thousand items, or even on two or three hundred items.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with that, and I so stated at the first meeting of the joint committee, that it would be utterly impossible to go into details as to individual appropriations; but we who were on the joint committee certainly were entitled to some information from those who reached the $6,000,000,000 figure. To this hour we have not received it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as far as I was concerned, to satisfy myself I took the budget which is here. Table 10 of the Budget contains detailed figures, and I went through it trying to apply an intelligent guess to the items. In that way I cut the budget all the way through.

Of course, the approach of the Senator from Virginia, cutting off 700,000 Federal employees as a kind of over-all cut, applies to all the items, and is only an approach. I think there was considerable duplication in his figures. If we cut the number of employees, then we cannot cut the Veterans' Administration besides, unless we want to curtail veteran benefits; we cannot duplicate the cut. I did not approach the problem from that standpoint. I approached it from the standpoint of the individual items, and I went through the entire budget.

In discussing table 10, the Senator from Virginia mentioned a billion dollars in connection with government corporations. I fully agree that there is a very large cut possible in the appropriations for Government corporations. The Government corporation expenses added up to approximately a billion and a half dollars, but I reached a total of about $5,350,000,000. However, we cut about half a billion dollars off the billion dollars for foreign relief. I do not know whether we are going to be able to make that saving. The proposal cut into various items fairly deeply, the wisdom of which may appear to be doubtful before we get through. My feeling about this subject is that we ought to be realistic; we ought actually to know what it is that we are going to cut.

I rather challenge anybody to sit down, go through the Budget in detail, figure it out, and reach a total cut quite so large as $6,000,000,000, except in one way. In my figures I cut the Army and Navy 10 percent, which is $1,100,000,000. The figures presented to us ran up to about two and one-fourth billion dollars or two and one-half billion dollars. As I see it, that is the principal difference between the conclusions reached by those who have made the computations in different ways.

I think any organization the size of the Army and Navy can be cut 10 percent, probably with gain to its efficiency, so far as that is concerned if that is what is to be done.

On the other hand, I am somewhat concerned to put up to them a 20- or a 25-percent cut, for fear they will throw up their hands and say, "Well, the only way to do that is to cut out this or that very important item; that is what we will have to do." I feel that as a matter of safety it would be better not to plan on a 20- to 25-percent cut in the expenditures for the armed forces.

I think it should be pointed out that the armed forces already have been substantially cut. Everyone should realize that. The total expenditures of the Government this fiscal year will run close to $45,000,000,000, so that we are asked under the President's budget to spend for the next fiscal year about $7,500,000,000 less than was spent this year.

We would add to that a reduction of $4,500,000,000 in actual expenditures during the next fiscal year, which would make about $12,000,000,000 less than in the current fiscal year. The expenditures ought to be much less.

We have been demobilizing, so to speak, but still it must be borne in mind that the figures we are talking about represent a reduction in an imaginary figure the President has suggested, and not a reduction in the expenditures, which are now being made in the current fiscal year closing on the 30th day of June 1947.

The actual cost of the Army in the fiscal year 1947 will be, as estimated to the 1st of July, $10,500,000,000. The President is cutting it $3,800,000,000. With the additional 10-percent cut as figured by me, the Army cost would be reduced in this 1 year from $10,500,000,000 to $6,030,000,000.

In 1947 the Navy will cost $5,780,000,000; in 1948, according to the President's figures, $4,500,000,000; and according to the proposal for a $4,500,000,000, possibly a $5,000,000,000 reduction in the total budget, the Navy will cost $4,000,000,000, or, in the 2 years, the cost will be reduced from $5,700,000,000 to $4,000,000,000—a cut of about 30 percent.

I think in peacetime the cost of both the Army and the Navy should be considerably less than the new figures—considerably less than $10,000,000,000;

which is about what I would provide for the two of them for this year. I should hope that in peacetime, even with the large Army and Navy, they would not cost in excess of $6,000,000,000.

There are still in the Budget a number of nonrecurring expenditures. We can count certainly on much further reductions in the Army and Navy when the world has settled down, and we do not have to use occupation forces on such a large scale.

The budget provides for about $2,500,000,000 for foreign expenditures, of which $2,000,000,000 is committed. There is no way I can see to avoid that expenditure. One item is the British loan, and the other is the Export-Import Bank. I voted for the Export-Import Bank and against the British loan. Those are commitments, but they will not continue indefinitely.

Items for veterans contain about $2,000,000,000 for educational expenditures, which will gradually disappear. So I figure that with the disappearance of these hangovers from the war, we can probably cut the budget nearly $10,000,000,000 below the figure we determine upon today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask whether the committee has an estimate of how much of the Army's appropriation was for occupational food, for food relief abroad, and that sort of thing.

Mr. TAFT. I think I can say, without revealing anything particularly confidential, that the Army budget which I am figuring, and to which I have referred, covers only expenditures for the armed forces; it does not include provision for any relief abroad, that being a separate item.

As to how much it costs for occupation, we were told by as high an authority as can be found that the occupation of Japan, Korea, and Germany costs about $2,000,000,000 a year, in this budget, and that the occupation of other stations outside the continental United States costs another $1,100,000,000; so that the Army costs outside the United States are approximately $3,100,000,000.

Certainly if the total Army cost is $6,800,000,000, it seems to me that it could stand a substantial cut. The other $3,700,000,000 is being spent in the United States. Most of it is for the air force. The air force is not being used to any great extent in occupational service, and certainly half or more of the expenditures in the United States are for the air force. In fact, approximately $1,000,000,000 is for the purchase of new airplanes and airplane parts to maintain the service. I think that can be cut to some extent. I do not think it ought to be entirely eliminated.

In addition to the Army cuts, my proposal was to cut the foreign relief item from $1,000,000,000 to $500,000,000. The foreign relief figures are about $700,000,000 for the occupied countries and about $300,000,000 for Australia, Italy, and Greece. That is a total of $1,000,000,000 merely for food.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Specifically I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio what reasons he has or what evidence he can now give the Senate as to why he would cut that particular item from $1,000,000,000 to $500,000,000. Before the Senator answers, I should like to say that I do not want the Senate to misunderstand the purpose of my questions. I am as anxious to get every bit of water out of the budget as is the Senator from Ohio, but my position is that I must refuse to act without some evidence which will compel my intellect to accept the choice. Now, I should like to ask specifically: What evidence can the Senator give us as to the reason why the item for foreign relief should be cut from $1,000,000,000 to $500,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. It is the pious hope that the crops in Europe will be sufficiently good so that in the fiscal year beginning next July and extending through next winter the possible demands which are now estimated may not have to be met. However, I may point out to the Senator from Connecticut that after making that cut and reaching the figure of $5,350,000,000, I stated that I regarded the item of food as one that might have to be restored when all the evidence is in. That would reduce my figure to $4,800,000,000, after restoring the item for food.

Mr. McMAHON. That is what might be called rather an "iffy" item.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. It is the most doubtful of the deductions I have made, and I do not know whether it can remain. I understand that Mr. Hoover is now in Europe for the War Department trying to make a complete estimate of the food situation. When he returns there may be better information on that subject, but I do not believe the final information will be available until we are advised as to the character of the crops in Europe and in Africa.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Ohio, I am sure, appreciates the terrific impact that that particular item may well have on the maintenance of the peace and the stability of the continent of Europe which is so essential to our own peace as well.

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree with the Senator, and I say that even though we restore and grant that item as it now appears in the Budget, we can still cut the budget $4,800,000,000, according to my figures.

Mr. President, I now want to say a word with regard to the reduction of taxes, a subject on which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was so very eloquent today. I think the present tax burden is in itself a threat to the welfare of the United States. The Budget cut is for the purpose of enabling taxes to be reduced as well as to bring about a reduction of the national debt. If we cut the Budget $4,500,000,000 in line with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], we will have then a margin of estimated receipts over estimated expenditures of $6,000,000,000; estimated receipts being $39,000,000,000 and estimated expenditures $33,000,000,000. That, I think, will enable us to make, and we should make, beginning with the 1st of July, a tax cut of 20 percent in the personal income tax total receipts, which are now about $17,500,000,000, or a cut of $3,500,000,000. That would leave $2,500,000,000 to apply on the national debt.

At the present moment, however, it is, I think, even more important to reduce taxes than it is to reduce the national debt, particularly in view of the fact that we still have a budget larger than normal because of the aftermath of war. To the present national tax burden of $39,000,000,000 must be added local and State taxes, which bring the total tax burden of the country up to $50,000,000,000 a year. Our national income is $165,000,000,000 a year, so that nearly one-third of our income is being taken in taxes for the support of government. That means that on the average the people of this country are working 1 day in 3 for the Government, and 2 days in 3 for themselves. It imposes an almost intolerable burden on the lowest income group. A man or woman earning $1,200 a year has to pay $100 a year in taxes. It imposes a great burden on the intermediate groups. The President of the United States receives a salary of $75,000 a year, but he has to pay about $40,000 of that amount in taxes.

The imposition of such taxes reduces the incentive to work. Persons who are worth a great deal of money, who have initiated new projects, who have found new ways of doing things, who have enabled new businesses to become started, are practically invited by the end of 6 months to go to Florida rather than to stay at home and do any more work. Individuals in the high-income brackets must pay such a high rate of tax that it is not profitable for them to invest any money in any business enterprises. It is better for them to put their money into municipal bonds. There is not the incentive there should be for them to invest money in creating the new businesses the country desires to have created. In the thirties, for the first time, the amount of money invested per man who worked decreased, and is decreasing today, whereas, as a matter of fact, the way to raise the standard of living is to increase the per capita investment.

It seems to me that the whole effect of the tax structure is to slow up the development of the country and interfere seriously with its welfare. It seems to me that, for the economic advance of the United States, we must take the steps which are necessary in cutting down expenditures so that in balancing the budget we may cut taxes to the point where they will constitute a reasonable burden upon people of all classes, from the highest to the lowest.

So, at the moment, if I only had $3,500,000,000 to apply, I would apply it all to reduction of taxes. The debt is a serious problem, but, as I say, we are not back yet to normal expenditures, and the important thing is that the debt shall not be increased. The important thing is that the debt shall not be used

as an inflationary method to increase expenditures, and actually spend more than we take in.

Mr. President, I think the $6,000,000,000 figure or the $4,500,000,000 figure involves merely a question of degree. Perhaps those of us who think it ought to be $4,500,000,000 are simply a little more conservative. We are not sure, and we think that if we actually reduce expenditures by $4,500,000,000 we are doing a tremendous thing, something that no Congress heretofore has ever done. We are trying an experiment. I would rather put it on the ground that I myself feel it can be done, having satisfied myself to that effect. When the appropriation bills come before us it is not going to be easy to cut them by $4,500,000,000. We are going to have a real job to hold the cut to that figure, in my opinion, but I think it can be done. I would rather hold the cut to that figure than make a cut which personally, perhaps wrongly, I think, cannot be made without impairing certain essential services of the Government.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much that we may undertake a reasonable program, one we can hope to carry out, and one we may in our hearts promise the American people when we vote it that we will carry out. Certainly whatever Congress may decide upon, I shall do everything in my power to see that, regardless of where the chips fall, the promise is carried out and the appropriations are held down, and that even essential services are eliminated, if that be necessary, in order to keep the promise that we here, I believe, are making to the people of the United States.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there have come before the Committee on Armed Services numerous nominations in the Navy, the Army, and Marine Corps. The committee approved all the nominations. In the list there are 1,128 ensigns and 1,100 chief warrant officers. The committee has authorized me to report the nominations to the Senate with the request in order to save the expense of printing, that the nominations of all officers below the grade of colonel or captain be presently considered and approved.

The committee also instructed me to report certain other nominations, in the grades above colonel and captain, in order that they may be listed on the Executive Calendar for consideration at the next session of the Senate.

As in executive session, I report a list of Marine Corps, Navy, and Army nominations below the ranks of colonel and captain, and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota reports from the Committee on Armed Services certain nominations, and asks unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, below the grade of colonel and captain, be immediately considered, as in executive session. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, clearly what is proposed is a contravention of the rules of the Senate; but if there is any substantial reason for proceeding now, I shall not object. I think it is highly important that we conform as closely as possible to the rules of the Senate, and that there be no departure from them unless there is substantial reason for the departure. Specifically, would any harm result to the public if these nominations were to go over until Friday?

Mr. GURNEY. No harm whatever would result. However, by confirming them at this time there will be a considerable saving. The nominations have been considered by the committee. The committee took a record vote upon the nominations of junior officers. A saving of approximately $800 in printing the Executive Calendar would be effected by confirming at this time the nominations below the grade of colonel or captain.

Further, I may say to the Senator from Maine that I am reporting another list of general officers, those of high rank, which I am asking to have placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the item of $800 is not one to be lightly brushed aside. In view of that saving, I withhold any objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Maine that the rule contemplates the possibility of unanimous consent as a means for immediate consideration, because it is specifically so stated in the rule.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Chair is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations below the grade of colonel or captain are confirmed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now report a number of nominations approved by the Committee on Armed Services, and ask that the nominations be placed upon the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report is received as in executive session, and the nominations will be placed upon the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Josiah Marvel, Jr., of Delaware, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Denmark; and

Francis Bowes Sayre, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Dillard B. Lasseter, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service;

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Sundry officers for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol signed October 1, 1946, to exend for 1 year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions, the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940; without amendment (Ex. Rept. No. 1).

MARY SHEARIN PERRY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to report several resolutions.

I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 84 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 84), submitted by Mr. HOEY on February 17, 1947, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary Shearin Perry, widow of John R. Perry, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], as well as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], whether it is proposed to interrupt the discussion on the budget which is now under way in order to take up these resolutions, or whether it is proposed to take a recess following action upon them. Ordinarily such resolutions are disposed of at the end of the day, unless there is some reason for expediting their consideration. When a hot debate is in progress, the introduction of extraneous matters for a few moments always produces a "cold choler." It distracts the attention of Senators from what is going on. I wonder if we are reaching the point where we are about to suspend for the day.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I answer the part of the question which was directed specifically to me. I saw no heated desire on the part of any Senator to rise to the occasion in

the present debate. It seemed to me that the "cold choler" had already arrived. I saw an opportunity to report certain resolutions the consideration of which would not require long because they were unanimously agreed to in the Committee on Rules and Administration. If the Senator from Kentucky has any heat he would like to get out of his system, I will withdraw my request until he has had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no special quantity of heat. I always try to generate my own. When the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] arose a while ago I thought he was rising to discuss the budgetary question which is before the Senate. Instead of that he contributed to the cooling-off process by presenting some nominations. The Senator from Illinois seems to want to add further frigidity to our debate. It is all right with me; but I am wondering whether we are tapering off for the day, or whether we are to undertake to vote today on the pending amendment or the concurrent resolution itself, or postpone it. What is the plan? I suppose that during this colloquy the resolutions which the Senator from Illinois wishes to present might have been disposed of. I shall not object to their present consideration, although I have not received an adequate answer to my numerous interrogatories.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Resolution 84?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SENATE PERIODICAL PRESS GALLERY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 79, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) submitted by Mr. BRIDGES on February 3, 1947, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the base rate of $3,860 per annum for the services of a superintendent of the Senate periodical press gallery.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments of the committee were, in line 2, after the word "until", to strike out "otherwise provided by law" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947"; and in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "$3,860" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,660."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PRINTING OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL FOR EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 86) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 285, Seventy-ninth Congress, a resolution providing for the preparation and printing of the Senate Rules and Manual for the Eightieth Congress is hereby rescinded; and

Resolved further, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eightieth Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire what it is we are voting upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. BARKLEY. We are not ready to vote on that amendment now. I understood, from conversations with several Senators, that it was not proposed to vote on the amendment today. Several Senators wish to discuss it further.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, some time ago I made inquiry as to whether we could reach an agreement for a vote on Friday, so that Senators might be assured that no vote would be had this afternoon. I made no progress with such inquiries. At the moment the legislation is in charge of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and anything that he proposes with respect to the continuance of the session this afternoon is agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was honored by being consulted with respect to an agreement to vote on Friday, a proposal to which I warmed up, and I was prepared to accommodate myself accordingly. A number of Senators are absent today who wish to vote on the pending question. Most of them will be back on Friday. It will be entirely agreeable to me to fix an hour on Friday to vote on the Millikin amendment and on the final passage of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky says he warmed up somewhat to the suggestion he has just referred to. I not only warmed up to it, but was burned by it. I found that I could not get such an agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not intimate that I scorched him, does he?

Mr. WHITE. I do not. I received no encouragement that an agreement could be reached this afternoon for a voting time on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only way to test it is to make the request. If any Senator objects, of course that ends it. I do not think we should admit total defeat without making an effort.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, inasmuch as the issue is before us on the Millikin amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, asking for the yeas and nays is entirely agreeable, but that does not necessarily bring about a vote today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, many Senators, if not most of them, were led to believe on Monday that there would be no vote today. It was practically predicted that there would not be a vote before next Monday, and most Senators felt that that would probably be the case. With that understanding quite a number of them left the city on official business. I am not insisting that the vote be put off until Monday, but under the circumstances I feel that we should not try to force a vote today. I think there was a general feeling among all of us that there would not be a vote today. I hope we may vote as early as possible on Friday. I think, in justice to all Senators, we should not try to take snap judgment by forcing a vote today.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to discuss the amendment, I see no reason why we should not vote this afternoon. But if there is objection I should like to get an agreement as to a time for voting on Friday on the Millikin amendment, and in turn on subsequent amendments which may be offered. I am perfectly willing to proceed to a vote now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that two or three Senators on this side wish to discuss the subject from a general standpoint. It is not convenient to do so this afternoon. It will be convenient to do so on Friday, without any extended remarks. Personally, I am willing to agree to almost any reasonable hour on Friday. I think the chances are that we might get a vote Friday even without an agreement, but I should prefer to have an agreement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to vote not later than 2 o'clock on Friday on the so-called Millikin amendment to reduce the Budget cut from $6,000,000,000 to $4,500,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator make it 3 o'clock?

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire that the pending amendment be voted on at not later than 3 o'clock on Friday?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I feel that the

particular resolution before the Senate, as was stated earlier this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is one of the most important pieces of business that will come before the Senate at this session.

I have been listening to as many of the speeches as my duties have permitted. I understand that I missed a very able speech by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] this afternoon, which I shall want to read between now and the meeting on Friday.

I have been waiting for some reliable information that would indicate to me exactly where the savings are to be made in the Budget. There are a great many features of the Budget which are very vital not only to the country as a whole but to certain sections of the country, and hence I do not think it would be wise to limit debate. I am inclined to believe that we can probably reach a vote on Friday, but something may arise in this debate that will require extended answer because of the vital importance of this issue to the economic welfare of the whole Nation. Therefore, I object to any unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the resolution at any particular time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon objects.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the Senate has made appreciable progress this afternoon in the discussion of this measure. I think it is perfectly certain that we cannot dispose of it this afternoon, in view of the statement made by the minority leader as to the number of Senators who may wish to discuss the resolution. Therefore it seems to me we might as well conclude today's work at this time and go over until Friday, when I hope that Senators will be prepared to discuss the concurrent resolution. I think we shall ultimately dispose of it on Friday afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I know, there will be no delay on this side. We shall be ready to go forward with our part of the discussion promptly on the reassembling of the Senate on Friday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks of the majority leader, if it is the desire of the Senate to recess until Friday, I shall offer no objection. But I shall oppose any partial day's session on Friday. So far as I am concerned, we shall make a full day of it on Friday, and if there is a motion to recess before we shall have fully discussed the question and reached a vote, I will oppose it. To a recess at this time I offer no objection and shall concur in what the majority wishes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish it to appear clearly that the delay in the further consideration of the concurrent resolution is caused by the minority. We have been hearing references to this "Do-nothing Congress," but there seems to be a readiness on this side to dispose of the question by vote. If the delay is out of courtesy to and in consideration of the minority, because some Senators are absent, I think it would be well to clear the record as to who is responsible for the delay of 2 days.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to admit my responsibility so far as any delay is concerned; and I am satisfied that the injection of the observations on the part of the junior Senator from Maine will have a vital effect upon the next Presidential election in 1948. I may say in that connection that I am informed that there are more Republicans than Democrats absent.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we are to become personal, I hope my observations may have a more salutary effect upon the next Presidential election than many of the observations of the Senator from Kentucky upon the Vice Presidential nominations in connection with the last election.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to what the Senator refers. But I am not anticipating any particular observations on the next Presidential nominations of either party, notwithstanding the vital interest of the Senator from Maine.

RECESS UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the discussion of the last few minutes has confirmed me in my judgment that we might as well close now. Therefore I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, February 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19, 1947:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 26, 1946:

TO BE PROFESSOR OF LAW AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Col. Charles Whitney West (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Edward B. Grigg, Navco, Ala., in place of D. F. Grigg, resigned.

Jesse C. Mitchell, Toney, Ala., in place of J. G. Reynolds, transferred.

ARIZONA

William D. McKale, Emery Park, Ariz., in place of G. E. Tanner, declined.

CALIFORNIA

Cecilia A. George, Castroville, Calif., in place of F. E. Faustino, removed.

Marion Gorrindo, Montalvo, Calif., in place of C. W. Chaney, resigned.

Roy J. Summers, San Simeon, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

COLORADO

George J. Peterson, San Acacio, Colo., in place of M. K. Garrison, deceased.

FLORIDA

Billie S. Campbell, Lake Harbor, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

GEORGIA

George A. Bowen, Chester, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carrilee O. Sanders, Culloden, Ga., in place of C. M. Pincher, retired.

ILLINOIS

Waldo M. Hennings, Wayne, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

INDIANA

Lee V. Johnson, New Goshen, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Grace H. Hudson, Bishop, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

John T. Smullin, Jr., Pocomoke City, Md., in place of E. E. Matthews, resigned.

Cosette I. Hopkins, Tyaskin, Md., in place of C. R. Larmore, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Virginia P. Foster, Artesia, Miss., in place of E. G. Stephens, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Anne K. Moran, Ocean Gate, N. J., in place of H. M. Koller, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Willie Earl Gresham, Beulaville, N. C., in place of J. G. Kennedy, transferred.

James C. Chesnutt, Magnolia, N. C., in place of Parley Potter, resigned.

Robert S. Lancaster, Vanceboro, N. C., in place of H. E. Smith, removed.

Joe C. Hinkle, Welcome, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Homer E. Omen, Millfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Kenneth L. Andrews, Camargo, Okla., in place of J. E. Ward, transferred.

Agnes Mae Mills, Valliant, Okla., in place of Loula Merry, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Rauch, Emigsville, Pa., in place of E. H. Zarfoss, removed.

Warren B. Benscoter, Ingomar, Pa., in place of B. D. Dickson, resigned.

Ray M. Spahr, Shepherdstown, Pa., in place of M. E. Spahr, retired.

TENNESSEE

James D. Creson, Sherwood, Tenn., in place of A. L. Wells, resigned.

TEXAS

Andrew J. Hayes, Barstow, Tex., in place of P. A. Hayes, deceased.

Clovis W. Cummings, Ivanhoe, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

David C. Waters, Poolville, Tex., in place of W. D. Wall, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Antonia K. Jeran, Coketon, W. Va., in place of G. D. Rice, resigned.

Charles H. Callison, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of G. L. Carlisle, retired.

Herbert G. Goddard, Laurel Creek, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura H. Coleman, Victor, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19, 1947:

IN THE NAVY

FIRST GROUP

The nominations of the following-named officers for appointment to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy were confirmed today:

The nominations of George W. Bains and other officers for appointment in the Navy, which were received by the Senate on January 29, 1947, are shown in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 29, 1947, beginning with the name of George W. Bains appearing on page 650 and ending with the name of Philip A. P. Stine appearing on page 655.

SECOND GROUP

The nominations of the following-named officers for appointment to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy were confirmed today:

The nominations of Douglas M. Campbell and other officers for appointment in the

Navy, which were received by the Senate on February 7, 1947, are shown in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 7, 1947, beginning with the name of Douglas M. Campbell appearing on page 900 and ending with the name of Norman C. Lunde appearing on page 904.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Albert L. Jones	Lawrence J. Bradley
William D. Patterson, Jr.	Thomas C. Shanahan
George U. Smith	Elvin R. Coon, Jr.
Charles R. Metzelaars	Donald F. Hillmer
Herbert G. Manning, Jr.	Ewald A. Vom Orde, Jr.
Robert T. Donahue	Philip H. Ronzone
George G. Blair 2d	Robert A. Foyle
Kenneth C. Ives	William J. Vetter, Jr.
Arthur G. Patton	Ralph G. Dekle
William A. Whitesell	Frederic A. Gessner
Robert W. Frye	James J. Bozek
Harry A. Spaight, Jr.	William M. Van Zuyen
Edward B. Keyes, Jr.	Jack M. Lerond
Wallace C. Barrett	Donald L. Hall
Harold R. Mackey	Charles R. Munn, Jr.
George F. Good 3d	Arthur C. Beverly
Lemuel C. Shepherd 3d	Michael L. Cannon
Reuel W. Stephens, Jr.	Robert J. McNicholas
George A. Babe	Louis Baeriswyl, Jr.
Elmer J. Anderson	Michael Lash, Jr.
Joseph Koler, Jr.	Wilber F. Taylor
William F. Young	Richard D. McClintic
	William R. Medlock

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Holy Spirit, revealer of truth and sealer of every holy purpose, help us to realize that all things are ours through the illumination of Thy presence. O Thou Crucified One, as we bow at the altars of our hearts, we pray that the perfect blending of the human and the divine may unite in us, for under Thy shadow lies the promise of redemption.

On this day of holy memory and consecration we pray for a rededication. Fill us with high hopes and keep us in the pathway of obedience. Bring surcease to those who weep because of sorrow and failure; and grant Thy blessing, Heavenly Father, to make them peaceful and their hearts pure. Bring a new sense of power to those who are discouraged, and unfold a light to those who are afraid. Keep our lips, Heavenly Father, from impetuous speech. Bless all of those sweet and beautiful ministries in home and in hospital.

And, Heavenly Father, as we view our own sins today, grant us Thy holy presence that we may be kept free from transgressions that hurt and assault the soul.

Let us pray the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 1, 1947, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending for 15 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak for the purpose of calling to the attention of the House the fact that your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has filed today a preliminary report on the subject of safety in air navigation. Since the organization of Congress the committee has been actively engaged practically every day in the week, mornings and afternoons, in conducting an inquiry into the cause of and remedy for air accidents. The committee has collected an extensive amount of important information. However, there is much yet to be done.

I am confident when the committee has completed its investigation and study it will have a fund of information from which recommendations can be made that will prove very worth while. I call particular attention to the fact that the report filed today is only a preliminary report. It is in no sense to be considered as an all-inclusive or final report. The final report will be filed at a later date when the committee has finished its hearings. The vast amount of work yet to be done by the committee will preclude the filing of a final report for some time to come.

To date the committee has concentrated on air safety in connection with scheduled or certificated air operations. It has heard, among others, from representatives of the Department of Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Army and the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Air Transport Command, the Weather Bureau, the Air Pilots' Association, the Air Transport Association, several air lines, insurance underwriter organizations, and oil companies in addition to navigators and airport officials.

In the future the committee intends to hear from the manufacturers of instruments, engines, and airframes, and others who have it within their power to contribute to increased safety in air navigation. At the conclusion of the hearings the committee intends to file a final and complete report which takes in all ramifications of the problem of air safety on the part of scheduled air lines as well as nonscheduled operators and private fliers.

The reason for filing a preliminary report at this time is that the Congress is now, through its Committee on Appropriations, studying the budgets of the several Government departments and agencies which are concerned with civil aviation. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce felt that it was its duty to call to the attention of the Appropriation Committee the needs of those departments and agencies in order to assure the adequacy of their contribution toward increased safety in air navigation.

The committee by no means takes the view that air safety is exclusively the concern of the Government. On the contrary, there are a great many things which the manufacturers of engines, instruments, and airframes, as well as the operators of aircraft, can contribute. However, there are some things which fall peculiarly within the sphere of Government responsibility, and it is those aspects of air safety with which the preliminary report deals, such as airport landing lights, in-flight weather reporting, meteorological studies, and basic research.

I have tried in these brief remarks to show that the committee is giving careful consideration to all matters that enter into a full and complete study of safety in air navigation. I feel certain that the final conclusions of the committeee will prove helpful in promoting safe air navigation.

GERHART EISLER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to House Resolution 104, Eightieth Congress, he did, on February 19, 1947, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful and deliberate refusal of Gerhart Eisler to be sworn and to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 21, 1947, after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, to read George Washington's Farewell Address on February 21, 1947.

INVITATION TO VISIT THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the

Secretary of State and the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from Czechoslovakia, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

FEBRUARY 11, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MARTIN: There is enclosed herewith a communication dated January 30, 1947, addressed to you by His Excellency Dr. Juraj Slávik, Ambassador of Czechoslovakia, which the Ambassador has requested the Department of State to forward to you.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary.

[Enclosure: As stated above.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 30, 1947.*

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Czechoslovak National Constitutional Assembly unanimously passed a resolution inviting the United States House of Representatives to visit the Czechoslovak Republic. The members of the Czechoslovak National Assembly would welcome such a visit and would be happy to receive and to honor a representative delegation of the United States House of Representatives in Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia. In adopting the resolution the members of the National Assembly gratefully acknowledged that it was on the soil of the United States of America where the first two Presidents of Czechoslovakia found refuge in the two world wars and where they were so generously helped both by the Governments and the people of the United States in the struggle for the liberation of the Czechoslovak people and for the reconstitution of their independence. The members of the National Assembly stressed on this occasion that the history of the United States and that of Czechoslovakia have thus become closely associated with one another for all future as both are filled with examples and symbols of the continued efforts toward the realization of the ideals of freedom and of human progress.

Mr. President, the National Assembly hopes that it will be possible for the United States House of Representatives to delegate a group of its Members to undertake this journey in the not distant future to see the efforts which the Czechoslovak Republic is making to repair the ravages of the war and the enemy occupation and to convince themselves that the Czechoslovak people will remain faithful to the ideals of democracy and freedom.

In transmitting this message to you, Mr. Speaker, I would greatly appreciate it if you would bring it to the attention of the honorable Members of the United States House of Representatives and let me know at your pleasure of the action the honorable Members of the United States House of Representatives prefer to take.

Sincerely yours,

DR. JURAJ SLÁVIK,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

TERMINATION OF EMERGENCY AND WARTIME POWERS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 141)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

During the year and a half that have elapsed since the defeat of our last enemy in battle, we have progressively eliminated the great majority of emergency controls over the Nation's economy. The progress of reconversion now makes it possible to take an additional step toward freeing our economy of wartime controls.

Accordingly, I am recommending that the Congress repeal certain temporary statutes still in effect by virtue of the emergencies proclaimed by the President in 1939 and 1941, and I have requested the executive departments and agencies to cease operations under powers derived from certain permanent statutes that are effective only during emergencies, to the extent that such operations are related to the 1939 and 1941 emergencies.

The recommendations I here present for the consideration of the Congress will, if accepted, materially assist in further freeing the country of war controls and will help make possible an early ending of the emergencies. I have under continuing study the question of terminating the emergencies proclaimed in 1939 and 1941, and intend to take action as soon as circumstances permit.

In my recent message to the Congress on the State of the Union I outlined the following program with respect to the termination of emergency and wartime powers:

Two groups of temporary laws still remain: The first are those which by congressional mandate are to last during the "emergency;" the second are those which are to continue until the "termination of the war."

I shall submit to the Congress recommendations for the repeal of certain of the statutes which by their terms continue for the duration of the "emergency." I shall at the same time recommend that others within this classification be extended until the state of war has been ended by treaty or by legislative action. As to those statutes which continue until the state of war has been terminated, I urge that the Congress promptly consider each statute individually, and repeal such emergency legislation where advisable.

Accordingly I now submit recommendations with respect to more than 100 laws which are affected by the limited emergency declared September 8, 1939, or the unlimited emergency declared May 27, 1941.

In the case of those statutes that remain in force until termination of the war, I have directed the executive departments and agencies to assist the Congress in its consideration of these statutes, individually, by making available full information concerning them to the appropriate congressional committees. The work done on this subject in the Seventy-ninth Congress by the Committee on the Judiciary of both Houses, with the assistance of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Department of Justice, and other Government agencies should offer valuable aid to the Congress in accomplishing the task which remains. At a later date it may prove desirable to send a further communication to the Congress concerning these statutes.

Emergency laws dealt with in this message fall into five broad classes: (A) Temporary statutes which are no longer needed, and which consequently should be repealed forthwith; (B) permanent statutes under which operations related to the 1939 or 1941 emergencies have been or are being discontinued, but which should remain for possible use during future emergencies; (C) statutes appropriating funds, which should, when the funds are no longer required, be handled by rescission of funds rather than by repeal of the statutes; (D) statutes which should be temporarily extended by the Congress pending consideration of permanent legislation or other disposition as indicated below; (E) statutes which should continue in force for the period or purpose stipulated.

In appendices to this message the statutes under reference are enumerated according to the above classifications.

A. TEMPORARY STATUTES WHICH SHOULD BE REPEALED

I recommend the outright repeal of the 24 statutes or portions thereof specified in appendix A. To a greater or lesser degree, all these statutes were designed to meet special problems of the war which no longer face us. It should be noted, however, that repeal of one of these laws will restore customs duties over certain commodities. In repealing it, the Congress should provide for the customary 30 days' notice before duty changes become effective.

B. PERMANENT STATUTES EFFECTIVE ONLY DURING AN EMERGENCY

The 36 laws enumerated in appendix B are permanent legislation but come into force only during emergencies. Many of them were enacted during or before the first World War. Nothing requires their removal from our body of permanent law at this time, and it is preferable that operations conducted under them by virtue of the 1939 and 1941 emergencies should lapse rather than that the statutes should be repealed.

I have requested the head of each executive department and agency to discontinue at the earliest possible moment and in any event not later than March 15, 1947, the exercise of such powers as are derived, from these statutes, by virtue of the existence of the emergencies of 1939 and 1941.

C. STATUTES APPROPRIATING FUNDS

When appropriated funds are no longer required, it is the established procedure of the Congress to rescind these funds rather than to repeal the appropriation acts. On six occasions since the surrender of Japan I have recommended that the Congress rescind certain appropriated funds, and I shall continue to make recommendations for rescission of funds whenever possible.

Dependent upon the emergencies of 1939 and 1941 are 20 appropriation provisions listed in appendix C. Expenditures under two of these acts have already ceased. Expenditures under 12 others will be terminated as rapidly as possible, and appropriate recommendations for rescission will be made.

In the case of four acts making appropriations for roads under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, after the end of the emergency these funds will continue to be needed by the Federal Works Agency for maintenance of access road projects until June 30, 1947, completion of access road projects now under construction, strategic network projects, and necessary advance engineering. I shall shortly transmit a budgetary commu-

nication in the usual form for this purpose.

In the case of the appropriation acts by which funds were provided for clerical assistance to Senators and for the Capitol Police force, this is, of course, a matter which exclusively concerns the Congress.

D. STATUTES WHICH SHOULD BE TEMPORARILY EXTENDED

In the case of most of the 12 statutes listed in appendix D, the Congress may wish to consider permanent legislation. In order to preserve existing activities and conditions until the Congress has had an opportunity to consider such legislation, I recommend the temporary extension of these statutes until June 30, 1948. In a few cases, termination on an indicated date appears desirable even though permanent legislation is not contemplated. The reasons for temporary extension in each case, the period of extension requested, and the executive departments and agencies interested are set forth in appendix D.

E. STATUTES REMAINING IN FORCE FOR THE PERIOD OR PURPOSE STIPULATED

Of the remaining 10 statutes affected by the existence of the emergencies, five will continue in force for a stipulated period after the emergencies have been declared at an end, and two have no termination provisions. The remaining statutes consist of one mandatory law under which operations cannot be discontinued during the emergencies (Act of July 2, 1940); and another two laws which are needed until the end of the emergencies (act of June 29, 1936, and act of March 8, 1946). The five statutes with terminal provisions beyond the emergencies should be allowed to remain in force for the periods stipulated by their terms; the two statutes without termination provisions should continue for the limited purposes provided; and the remaining statutes should be permitted to lapse according to their terms.

These statutes are enumerated in Appendix E, which states the purpose for which each of these laws will be needed and lists the executive departments or agencies concerned.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1947.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments this morning I was authorized to insert in the RECORD as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Agencies information as to the number of civilian employees in the United States Government. This table lists the various departments and lists the number of employees in each department by numbers. The numbers are indicated on the margin of the table which I expect to insert in the RECORD. On the margin you will find information from the Committee on Executive Expenditures as to the functions of each department. At a later date, we expect to ask to have that inserted in the RECORD and be made a part thereof. But, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to have inserted in the RECORD this table showing the Members of the House the total number in each department and each division of the Government as of December 31, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

List of agencies, bureaus, corporations and offices in the executive branch, U. S. Government, with the numbers of all paid civilian employees both in and outside the continental United States in each office as of Dec. 31, 1946, and reference number for statement of their functions

[Prepared for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, U. S. House of Representatives, by the following special subcommittee: GEORGE H. BENDER, Representative from Ohio, chairman; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Representative from New York; FOREST A. HARNESS, Representative from Indiana; JOHN J. DELANEY, Representative from New York; and J. FRANK WILSON, Representative from Texas]

Reference number for statement of functions	Agency	Number of employees		
		In continental United States	Outside continental United States	Total
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
1	White House	216	----------	216
2	Executive Mansion and Grounds	100	----------	100
3	Bureau of the Budget	716	----------	716
4	Council of Economic Advisers	26	----------	26
5	Office of Government Reports	[1](134)	----------	----------
	Office for Emergency Management:			
6	Philippine Alien Property Administration	3	----------	3
7	Office of Defense Transportation	74	----------	74
8	Office of Scientific Research and Development	132	----------	132
9	Office of Temporary Controls	19,097	111	19,208
10	War Assets Administration	56,552	23	56,575
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES AND CORPORATIONS			
11	American Battle Monuments Commission	3	85	88
12	Atomic Energy Commission	21	----------	21
13	Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	488	----------	488
14	Civil Service Commission	3,435	5	3,440
15	Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	2	118
16	Federal Communications Commission	1,357	36	1,393
17	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,175	2	1,177
18	Federal Power Commission	790	----------	790
19	Federal Trade Commission	637	----------	637
20	General Accounting Office	11,693	----------	11,693
21	Government Printing Office	8,006	----------	8,006
22	Interstate Commerce Commission	2,286	----------	2,286
23	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,660	----------	5,660
24	National Archives	396	----------	396
25	National Capital Housing Authority	280	----------	280
26	National Capital Park and Planning Commission	6	----------	6
27	National Labor Relations Board	789	2	791
28	National Mediation Board	98	----------	98
29	Panama Canal	186	19,309	19,495
30	Panama Railroad Company	234	7,538	7,772
31	Philippine War Damage Commission	5	115	120
32	Price Decontrol Board	10	----------	10
33	Railroad Retirement Board	2,559	----------	2,559
34	Securities and Exchange Commission	1,209	----------	1,209
35	Selective Service System	9,377	92	9,469
36	Smithsonian Institution	501	8	509
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES AND CORPORATIONS—continued			
37	National Gallery of Art	313	----------	313
38	Tariff Commission	227	----------	227
39	Tennessee Valley Authority	13,431	----------	13,431
40	Tennessee Valley Association Cooperatives, Inc	1	----------	1
41	The Tax Court of the United States	122	----------	122
42	U. S. Maritime Commission	12,280	208	12,488
43	Veterans' Administration	220,377	1,777	222,154
	Federal Loan Agency (total, 9,640):			
44	Reconstruction Finance Corporation			
45	War Damage Corporation			
46	Federal National Mortgage Association	9,369	29	9,398
47	The RFC Mortgage Company			
48	U. S. Commercial Company	130	74	204
49	Rubber Development Corporation	23	15	38
	Federal Security Agency (total, 32,498):			
50	Office of the Administrator	394	----------	394
51	Office of Education	417	----------	417
52	Columbia Institution for the Deaf	88	----------	88
53	Howard University	894	----------	894
54	Public Health Service	12,711	592	13,303
55	Freedmen's Hospital	504	----------	504
56	St. Elizabeths Hospital	2,381	----------	2,381
57	Social Security Administration	12,807	23	12,830
58	Bureau of Employees' Compensation	460	48	508
59	Food and Drug Administration	1,025	----------	1,025
60	Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	154	----------	154
	Federal Works Agency (total, 24,420):			
61	Office of the Administrator	93	----------	93
62	Public Buildings Administration	20,046	2	20,048
63	Public Roads Administration	2,714	275	2,989
64	Bureau of Community Facilities	1,273	17	1,290
	National Housing Agency (total, 19,112):			
65	Office of the Administrator and Expediter	2,244	3	2,247
66	Federal Home Loan Bank Administration	91	----------	91
67	Federal Home Loan Bank System	299	----------	299
68	Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	83	----------	83
69	Home Owners' Loan Corporation	933	1	934
70	Federal Housing Administration	4,406	29	4,435
71	Federal Housing Authority	10,976	25	11,001
72	Defense Homes Corporation	22	----------	22

[1] The 134 employees in the Office of Government Reports were on the rolls of the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Temporary Controls as of Dec. 31, 1946.

In No. 67 above, there was not included a total of 142 employees of the 11 Federal home-loan banks which are also mixed-ownership Government corporations.

List of agencies, bureaus, corporations and offices in the executive branch, U. S. Government, with the numbers of all paid civilian employees both in and outside the continental United States in each office as of Dec. 31, 1946, and reference number for statement of their functions—Continued

Reference number for statement of functions	Agency	Number of employees		
		In continental United States	Outside continental United States	Total
	EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS			
	Agriculture Department (total, 77,983):			
73	General Administrative Services	3,653	36	3,689
74	Agricultural Research Administration	12,296	397	12,693
75	Forest Service	11,285	185	11,470
76	Production and Marketing Administration			
77	Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	15,969	218	16,187
78	Commodity Credit Corporation			
79	Soil Conservation Service	13,090	51	13,141
80	Farm Security Administration	18,131	402	18,533
81	Rural Electrification Administration	1,130	1	1,131
82	Farm Credit Administration	633		633
83	Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	252	6	258
84	Production Credit Corporations	207		207
85	Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C	8		8
86	Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	12		12
87	Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation [1]			
88	Central Bank for Cooperatives and Regional Bank for Cooperatives	21		[2] 21
89	Federal land banks			(4)
	Commerce Department (total, 38,052):			
90	Office of the Secretary	804	149	953
91	Bureau of the Census	5,329		5,329
92	Civil Aeronautics Administration	11,767	1,852	13,619
93	Civil Aeronautics Board	473	12	485
94	Coast and Geodetic Survey	2,230	18	2,248
95	Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	2,128		2,128
96	Patent Office	1,679		1,679
97	National Bureau of Standards	2,339	20	2,359
98	Weather Bureau	7,178	268	7,446
99	Inland Waterways Corporation	1,763		1,763
100	Warrior River Terminal Company	43		43
	Interior Department (total, 48,193):			
101	Office of the Secretary	744	2	746
102	Commission of Fine Arts	2		2
103	Bonneville Power Administration	2,021		2,021
104	United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands	1		1
105	Solid Fuels Administration for War	537		537
106	Southwestern Power Administration	153		153
107	Bureau of Land Management	1,178	52	1,230
108	Bureau of Indian Affairs	10,508	765	11,273
109	Bureau of Reclamation	15,007		15,007
110	Geological Survey	5,854	17	5,871
111	Bureau of Mines	3,130	9	3,139
112	National Park Service	2,363	42	2,405
113	National Capital Parks	231		231
114	Fish and Wildlife Service	2,210	97	2,307
	Government in the Territories	5		5
115	Alaska Purchasing and Shipping Unit in Seattle	56		56
116	Alaska Railroad		1,306	1,306
117	Alaska Road Commission		322	322
118	Governor of Alaska		12	12
119	Governor of Hawaii		4	4
120	Government in the Virgin Islands		112	112
121	The Virgin Islands Company	3	162	165
122	Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration	2	768	770
123	Surplus Property Office	106	399	505
124	Coal Mines Administration	13		13
	Justice Department (total, 24,269):			
125	Legal activities and general administration	4,664	133	4,797
126	Office of Alien Property	677	67	744
127	Federal Bureau of Investigation	7,307	248	7,555
128	Immigration and Naturalization Service	6,689	105	6,794
129	Federal Prison System	3,873	48	3,921
130	Federal Prison Industries, Inc	458		458
	Labor Department (total, 7,749):			
131	Office of the Secretary and Solicitor	569	6	575
132	Division of Labor Standards	129		129
133	Commissioners of Conciliation	437	3	440
134	Bureau of Labor Statistics	2,075		2,075
135	Women's Bureau	76		76
136	Wage and Hour Division	1,396	34	1,430
137	Fact-finding boards	4		4
138	National Wage Stabilization Board	493		493
139	Apprentice Training Service	492	2	494
140	Retraining and Reemployment Administration	89		89
140½	U. S. Employment Service	1,904	40	1,944
	Navy Department (total, 377,310)		51,434	51,434
141	Office of the Secretary	8,853		8,853
142	The Chief of Naval Operations	19,069		19,069
143	Bureau of Naval Personnel	8,044		8,044
144	Bureau of Ordnance	44,950		44,950
145	Bureau of Ships	100,647		100,647
146	Bureau of Aeronautics	65,489		65,489
147	Bureau of Yards and Docks	5,012		5,012
148	Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	48,925		48,925
149	Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	9,126		9,126
150	Marine Corps Headquarters	15,761		15,761
	Post Office Department (total, 458,988):			
151	Departmental service	1,830		1,830
152	Field service	455,765	1,393	457,158
	State Department (total, 22,704):			
153	Office of the Secretary	7,121	16	7,137
154	United States delegation to the United Nations	172		172
155	Surplus property disposal	236	1,437	1,673
156	Foreign Service personnel	128	11,358	11,486
157	Passport agencies	86		86
158	International activities	101	33	134
159	American-Mexican Claims Commission	16		16
160	International Joint Commission United States and Canada	5		5
161	International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada	5		5
162	International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico	506		506
163	Institute of Inter-American Affairs	166	1,124	1,290
164	Institute of Inter-American Transportation	10		10
165	Inter-American Educational Foundation	65	116	181
166	Inter-American Navigation Commission	1		1
167	Prencinradio, Inc	2		2
	Treasury Department (total, 102,447):			
168	Administrative Office of the Secretary	1,060	11	1,071
169	Foreign Funds Control	142	4	146
170	Bureau of Accounts	3,934	60	3,994
171	Bureau of the Public Debt	9,661	4	9,665
172	Treasurer of the United States	1,990		1,990
173	Bureau of Customs	8,918	140	9,058
174	Comptroller of the Currency	1,032		1,032
175	Bureau of Internal Revenue	57,156	227	57,383
176	Bureau of Narcotics	294	4	298
177	Bureau of Engraving and Printing	5,878		5,878
178	Secret Service	934		934
179	Bureau of the Mint	2,699		2,699
180	Procurement Division	3,469		3,469
181	Coast Guard	4,598	232	4,830
	War Department (total, 629,194)		189,971	189,971
182	Joint Chiefs of Staff	184		184
183	Secretary of War group	2,283		2,283
184	Chief of Staff group	5,113		5,113
185	U. S. Military Academy	1,704		1,704
186	Command and Staff College	141		141
187	Miscellaneous War Department group	4,227		4,227
188	Civil functions, Corps of Engineers	28,460		28,460
189	Army Air Forces	125,195		125,195
190	Administrative services	10,778		10,778
191	Technical services	186,962		186,962
192	Army Ground Forces	1,166		1,166
193	Army areas	73,010		73,010
	Total, all agencies	1,980,476	296,380	2,276,856

[1] Being liquidated.

[2] The Regional Bank for Cooperatives, a mixed-ownership Government corporation, had a total of 179 employees, not counted above.

[4] The Federal land banks, which are mixed-ownership Government corporations, had a total of 2,041 employees, not counted above.

The agencies listed below also had in addition to the above figures, the following number of employees who were classified as persons employed without compensation. They receive either subsistence and expenses when employed, or a salary from one of the other Government agencies. In the latter case, they would have been included in the above figure.

Bureau of the Budget	12
Agriculture Department	2,836
Commerce Department	193
Interior Department	196
Justice Department	142
Labor Department	143
State Department	60
Treasury Department	327
Office of Defense Transportation	28
Office of Price Administration	89
Office of Scientific Research and Development	22
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	2
Civilian Production Administration	745
National Wage Stabilization Board	13
War Assets Administration	27
American Battle Monuments Commission	1
Civil Service Commission	70
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2
Federal Works Agency	731
Maritime Commission	5
National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics	15
National Housing Agency	15
National Labor Relations Board	87
Smithsonian Institution	1
Veterans' Administration	3,640
Navy Department	79
War Department	51
Total	9,532

Not included in any of the above figures, were the following number of employees who were paid from a fund for contingencies of the Army, in the War Department:

Inter-American Defense Board	24

Mr. BENDER. There is a total of 2,276,856 civilian Federal employees. I might say that the Committee on Expenditures has been working diligently during the past few weeks obtaining this information, and I am sure it will be of interest to every Member of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article. The Public Printer estimates the cost at $160.34. Notwithstanding the cost, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SUGAR

Mr. MILLER of Nebraka. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from one of my constituents at Lodgepole, Nebr., which I am sure will be of interest to the Members of this House. It reads as follows:

LODGEPOLE, NEBR., *February 17, 1947.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Two packages of sugar have been sent to my wife from Czechoslovakia. The parcels are now in the post office in Lodgepole, Nebr. The postmaster got notice not to deliver except on payment of duty and surrender of four sugar-ration stamps, No. 53 spare.

I have no sugar ration stamps now. We had only two No. 53 spare. I can't understand how they demand ration stamps, as the sugar has been sent as a "gift." I think they are wrong to do anything like this. Please can you advise?

Respectfully,

A CONSTITUENT.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this raises several interesting questions. From whence comes this supply of sugar that permits people of eastern Europe to squeeze it from their meager food supply to send to America? Is it UNRRA sugar bought with our money and in greater supply than necessary? Has the allocation of the world's sugar supply been too liberal to other countries at the expense of the American housewife, as some of us have contended all along?

Something is wrong. It is time that those who are juggling our food supply find out what it is. I am constrained to believe it is basically the result of the New Deal philosophy of controlling our production and consumption. The all-wise Government in Washington must tell the people what to produce and what and how much to consume.

Now take a look at the rest of the picture. When some good-hearted relative, in an attempt to repay for help they have received, sends sugar, some snooping Government agency notifies the recipient he cannot get it without surrendering ration stamps and paying duty. That reaches a new height in the ridiculous.

I have called this matter to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, and the Chief of the Bureau of Customs, asking for an explanation.

SUGAR DECONTROL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, I enclose a statement regarding the decontrol of sugar. This statement was adopted by the American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, meeting at Salt Lake City, Utah, on February 1, 1947:

STATEMENT REGARDING SUGAR DECONTROL

The American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee strenuously opposes the continuation of wartime price and rationing controls on sugar beyond the time necessary to protect the American public against excessive prices. However, just as the public in the past has recognized the need of the domestic industry for protection against excessive world supplies of tropical sugar, the domestic industry now appreciates the need of the public for an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices.

The policy committee believes that current supplies of sugar justify substantial increases in the present ration to housewives and other sugar users of the Nation. It also believes that, just as soon as practicable, all of these sugar controls should be ended.

As long as present circumstances prevail, the policy committee favors continuation of sugar controls, provided that such controls are vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, that he is free to remove any or all of these controls at any time conditions warrant, and that he exercise these controls in a manner to provide maximum possible supplies for consumers, encouraging full production of domestic sugar, and recognize the special problems of the sugar industry remaining under control with the rest of the Nation's economy free of control.

I also enclose a list of members of this committee:

Harry Clark, chairman, Eaton, Colo.; Frank A. Kemp, chairman executive committee, Denver, Colo.; Fred G. Taylor, secretary-treasurer, Washington, D. C.

Vice chairmen: William S. Carson, Weiser, Idaho, Nyssa-Nampa District Beet Growers' Association; E. J. Flanagan, Wapato, Wash., Eastern Washington Cooperative Beet Growers' Association; Myles Gardner, Pine Bluffs, Wyo., Nebraska Non-Stock Cooperative Beet Growers' Association; W. J. Gorst, Worland, Wyo., Montana-Wyoming Beet Growers' Association; Noble Hunsaker, Brigham City, Utah, Utah Sugar Beet Cooperative Association; Gordon Lyons, Stockton, Calif., California Beet Growers' Association; H. M. Montgomery, Chinook, Mont., Northern Montana Beet Growers' Group of Associations; H. M. Trowbridge, Comstock, Minn., Western Beet Growers' Association; C. J. Windau, Pandora, Ohio, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association.

Other members: K. C. Barlow, Lower Snake River Beet Growers' Association; A. W. Beebe, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; H. A. Benning, Amalgamated Sugar Co.; Fred H. Black, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; Wiley Blair, Jr., Holly Sugar Corp.; E. C. Bostock, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; G. L. Buhrman, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; Reginald S. Carey, National Sugar Manufacturing Co.; C. A. Coryell, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; Clarence Diehl, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; James E. Ellison, Layton Sugar Co.; Thomas Heath, Franklin County Sugar Co.; Fred Huddleston, Mountain States Beet Growers' Marketing Association of Montana; R. D. Johnson, Black Hills Beet Growers' Cooperative Association; Floyd Kelly, Goshen County Cooperative Beet Growers' Association; C. W. Kiar, Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association; R. E. Lies, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; G. W. McCormick, Menominee and Superior Sugar Cos.; Fred Messner, Southern Minnesota Beet Growers' Association; Arval Millar, Idaho Beet Growers' Association; C. J. Moroney, Spreckels Sugar Co.; Frank Oberst, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; E. J. Potter, Mason City Beet Growers' Association; Jake Roedema, Growers for Menominee and Superior Sugar Cos.; Walter Ross, Red River Valley Beet Growers' Association; W. I. Sanford, Southern Colorado, Beet

Growers' Association; Douglas Scalley, Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.; J. Stewart, Garden City Co.; G. J. Strodthoff, Los Alamitos Sugar Co.; Roland Tognazzini, Union Sugar Co.; Ralph T. Watson, Farmers and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association; C. Golden Welch, Big Horn Basin Beet Growers' Association; W. N. Wilds, American Crystal Sugar Co.; I. E. Williamson, Western Colorado Beet Growers' Association.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a speech by former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce, and in the other instance an article by Stanley High in the Reader's Digest.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLMES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, at Yakima, Wash.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a house concurrent resolution passed by the North Dakota Assembly.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGARVEY].

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech given on Lincoln's Birthday in New York City.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the economic conditions of Puerto Rico by the President of the Puerto Rican Senate.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch, Cutting the Budget.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain articles from the Chicago Daily News and Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of today confirm the rumors that have been flying during the past 24 hours concerning the actions of certain Republican Members of another body who wish to modify by 25 percent the present contemplated $6,000,000,000 slash of the budget. They say they feel that the Army would be endangered. I charge that they are giving way to the blandishments of their Army general friends. They must know the budget can be cut at least $6,000,000,000 and that income taxes can be reduced at least 20 percent. I think the action is unwise, if not craven. I hope the Republican Members of this House will have no traffic with it.

The newspaper articles are as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 14, 1947]

ECONOMY ALWAYS HURTS

The protests from the War and Navy Departments over the reductions in their budgets proposed by a House-Senate subcommittee are only the forerunners of the bleats that will arise if any substantial portion of the suggested $6,000,000,000 total is cut from the budget.

To the uninformed, the complaints will sound plausible, even convincing. But Congressmen who get around headquarters will not be easily dissuaded from the knowledge that even more than most agencies the Army and Navy have retained the lavish methods of doing business that grew up in wartime.

Any reduction in a departmental budget can be represented as the cost of some essential service. Impressive reasons may be advanced to prove the necessity for every last item of river and harbor work in the Army engineers' budget.

But a Nation as heavily in debt as this one will have to forego some luxuries if it seriously intends to get its finances on a sound basis. It can't afford drones in the Pentagon Building any more than it can afford to flood the mails with useless questionnaires.

The unanswerable case for budget reduction is the fact that civilian employees of the Government are more than twice as numerous as before the war. If every one of them was doing an honest day's work performing a desirable service, we still couldn't afford it.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 17, 1947]

THE ARMY DICTATES TO CONGRESS

The $6,000,000,000 cut authorized by the Senate-House Budget Committee in President Truman's requested budget of $37,500,000,000 represents a 16-percent reduction. The committee could have done better than that if it had been less timid, but there is hope that when Congress as a whole takes up the question of appropriations, the Members will slash expenditures further.

The Army and Navy, whose requested appropriations constitute the largest single item in the budget, are going to feel the effects of the cut already authorized, but there is little doubt that, by setting their spending sights high, and by howling to high heaven against accepting any cut at all, they succeeded to a degree in bulldozing the Budget Committee.

Secretary of War Patterson was the leader in this rear-guard action. One of the most dangerous men in the country, because he strove with all his might to institute the slavery of the labor draft and the intervention of the Army in the civil Government, Patterson wept crocodile tears about what he termed the adverse effect of a budgetary cut upon the "long-term missions of the Army." Truman's budget for the services, he said, "was down to the minimum our leaders believed necessary for support of our occupation garrisons overseas and for reasonable guaranties for national security."

This is an old, familiar tale. The Army is going to make its mission abroad last as long as possible, for that is the way it can get the most money, world without end, to the great satisfaction of the generals as well as the big money grafters in search of profitable contracts at home and the loot of conquest abroad. As long as Congress encourages the War Department by an uncritical surrender of huge funds, the same argument can be expected to be heard at the budget hearings every year.

Patterson was supported in his plaint by General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, who said that cuts would "invite disaster," and by that other old Regular Army man, Secretary of State Marshall, who said that cuts would create "practically impossible conditions for our Government in its international commitments." These men are in contempt of the Nation. They are trying to force on Congress measures which the Senators and Representatives were elected to overthrow.

Both Marshall and Eisenhower choose to overlook what the Constitution has to say about the powers of Congress relative to the Army and Navy. These provisions are as follows:

"The Congress shall have power

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

"To provide and maintain a Navy.

"To make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces.

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

These provisions make it plain that Congress has the constitutional authority to dictate to the Army. The attitude of Patterson and the two generals is that the Army dictates to Congress. It is up to Congress to correct this notion.

While the Constitution fixes a 2-year limit upon the use by the Army of any appropriation, in order to prevent it from becoming strong enough to threaten the Nation's liberties, no such limitation was placed upon the Navy, for it was not thought the Navy could threaten the existence of Government.

Yet, as a spender, the Navy now is almost in the same class as the Army. It is seeking $4,400,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, as compared to $6,700,000,000 for the Army, and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal complained long and loud that even a reduction of $750,000,000 would endanger maintenance of the Navy's reserve, or "mothball" fleet.

Congress, however, should find the problem of introducing economy into the Navy relatively easy to solve. The solution lies in decommissioning the obsolete ships, which means ships not used in connection with aircraft carriers and submarines—the only type of ships which are likely to be at all useful in a future war. The maintenance of battleships, which are no longer of any utility, but reflect a sentimental devotion to tradition, is undoubtedly a major item of cost. Congress can make a start by junking all of them. After that, it can start looking for the other soft spots in Forrestal's spending program.

When these things are done, and the same elementary rules of economy applied to other departments and agencies, Congress will find that it can easily redeem the pledge of a 20-percent tax cut while achieving a balanced budget and still have a couple of billion dollars left over for debt retirement.

COMITY BETWEEN THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, throughout more than 150 years we have labored in the House of Representatives to keep the comity between the House and Senate. It must continue or we cannot legislate. I trust that older and younger Members, when they speak before the House, will refer to the Senate as "the other body," and that no criticism of Members of the Senate as individuals or of the actions of the Senate be indulged in, to such extent that the long-standing comity between the two Houses might be disturbed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials of timely interest.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Dr. Louie D. Newton, pastor of the Druid Hills Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter by the Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, dealing with the necessity for adequate controls of atomic energy.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a final statement of the late Senator Bailey, of North Carolina.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a statement made by Avery R. Schiller, president, of the Public Service Co., of New Hampshire, and in the other an address he made before a Lithuanian group at Lawrence, Mass., on February 16.

CONTINUE THE CADET NURSE CORPS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, many of our hospitals have only a skeleton staff of trained attendants. In some State institutions, the situation has become so serious that patients have been put in charge of the wards. In the all-out emphasis being given to reconversion, we have become machine-minded and have neglected certain fundamental human needs.

First and foremost, we must have skilled personnel to care for the sick and the aged.

That need is not being met.

To correct this tragic oversight before it gets worse, I am introducing a bill to continue the Cadet Nurse Corps which will enable our young people to take up this essential profession and thereby prevent a break-down in the Nation's health.

Doctors warn us that the epidemics which have swept through many hospitals are due largely to the shortage of nurses. Under normal operating conditions, at the first sign of an epidemic, emergency wards would be set up, the sick would be isolated in them and cared for under aseptic technique. Without the nurses, you cannot do it. The infection spreads beyond control, resulting in needless suffering and death.

The Cadet Nurse Corps helped us to meet this emergency during the war, but the shortage has continued into the peace, while we have allowed the Cadet Nurse Corps to pass out of existence without providing a decent incentive for our young people to take up the study of nursing.

For that short-sighted policy we are now paying a heavy price.

I contend that this situation will become more serious as new veteran hospitals are built but not adequately staffed.

In view of this, the Congress should revive the Cadet Nurse Corps.

The bill which I present for your earnest consideration provides that the Government will pay the tuition, board, cost of textbooks and equipment, uniforms and their upkeep, to accredited hospitals which will expand their program for training nurses. The Federal Government would exercise no control over the administration of the individual hospitals.

Graduates of high schools would be eligible for this 36-month course, with the understanding that they are being trained for a nursing career.

Student nurses will be paid $40 a month while in training.

The public health must be protected.

A Cadet Nurse Corps will help us to overcome a dangerous deficiency in trained personnel.

WAR DEPARTMENT EFFICIENCY

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am sure no Member of the House wishes to interfere with the efficiency of the program of our armed forces, but I believe we do want to cut every possible bit of extravagance we can from their budget.

You are all familiar with the fact that all through the war, on the House side, we had a Colonel Pearson who acted as liaison officer between the Congress and the War Department. He was a very fine officer and gentleman and one who has been very helpful to all of us. Now that the war is over, however, and the cases we have to take up with the War Department are materially reduced in number, Colonel Pearson is retiring, or has been transferred. In his place, however, the War Department sends up here to act as liaison officers one colonel and two lieutenant colonels to do less than 25 percent of the work done all through the war by Colonel Pearson alone. Certainly such items should be eliminated from the budget. My remarks are not intended to reflect on the ability of the three officers who are replacing Colonel Pearson. They are fine gentlemen, carrying out their new duties as officers in our Army.

THE NATIONAL BUDGET

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have expressed themselves as being opposed to fixing of the over-all legislative budget at $31,500,000,000, a reduction in the Presidential budget of $6,000,000,000, most of them stating that they were opposed because they were not advised as to where the $6,000,000,000 cut would be applied.

This matter has not been developed in detail. At no place do we find any detailed discussion in the record as to where the cuts will be made. Though the Congress has been in session approximately 6 weeks I understand the special committee of the four committees of the House and Senate met only three times, heard only two witnesses. The majority report is a result of this "extensive" investigation.

I yield to no one in my desire to cut expenditures wisely and well. I voted to abolish the WPA long before it was abolished, the same for the CCC camps. I voted to curtail UNRRA expenditures, and against the British loan, and feel that I contributed somewhat in savings of the Army and Navy during the war by raising the question of the legality of the Standard Oil and Navy contract on the Elk Hills oil reserve, which resulted in that contract being held illegal. I feel that I contributed to economy by forcing the Army and Navy to get together on the use of facilities which resulted in the Navy using $350,000,000 of Army facilities instead of building new ones. Thus in considering this fixing of the legislative budget I believe I can claim to be economy-minded.

I expect to vote for real reductions in governmental expenditures, but I expect to do so after we have the benefit of hearings in detail. I believe there is much merit to opposing the $6,000,000,000 reduction on the basis that no record

showing is made as to where the cuts would apply. However, Mr. Speaker, there is a greater reason to oppose such $6,000,000,000 cut before hearings and that is because we do know where it is contemplated that such cuts will be made by the Republican majority.

Take the Army and Navy. We know from the discussions of the majority that they contemplate a reduction in the Army and Navy Departments of $1,750,000,000. This without benefit of hearings and just prior to the Moscow Conference and other international conferences scheduled for the next few weeks. Can anyone fool himself into believing that such action will not seriously weaken the hands of our diplomatic representatives in their efforts to formulate plans and agreement for world peace. Now I do not say that the War and Navy Departments cannot stand cuts in appropriations. I have voted many times to reduce their expenditures. However, our action has come after exhaustive hearings and we have directed the place where such cuts were to be made, thus making sure that the real strength of the services were not interfered with. That could be done in this case when the proper subcommittee has finished its hearings. After all, this money will not be made available until after July 1. The majority may say that is what they intend to do. Yet we cannot avoid the fact that if the $31,500,000,000 budget is fixed it is commonly known this would contemplate a reduction in the Military Establishment of $1,750,000,000 and would be taken over the world as a retrenchment in this country in preparedness just on the eve of these international peace conferences where all agree that it is imperative that we maintain a strong and firm stand.

Now, in the domestic field we also know what such a reduction of $6,000,000,000 means. Those Republican Members in key positions, where their attitudes will govern, know it is contemplated in the field of agriculture that the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the next fiscal year be cut from nine - hundred-and-forty-seven-million-and-some-odd dollars to five-hundred-and - fifty-three-million-and - some-odd dollars, or a reduction of approximately 42 percent. Now, where do they expect to apply such cuts? The major ones are as follows:

Seventy-five million dollars to be cut from the school-lunch program, thus eliminating such program. Yet just a few months ago, when all were soliciting votes, this program was approved by the Congress.

One hundred million dollars reduction in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, just after we prevailed upon the farmers of the Nation to deplete their soils if necessary to meet the food quotas needed by the world, and the records show that many, many millions of acres of our soils have been practically exhausted as a result. Furthermore, commitments have been made to the farmers of the Nation for this year, based on these funds.

The entire sum of $19,000,000 for agricultural research is to be cut out. Yet the Hope-Flannagan bill passed the Congress last year by an overwhelming vote. Of course at that time the Republican majority was anxious for the farm vote. I firmly believe that to delete this item is one of the most short-sighted actions the Congress could possibly take. All recognize that the farm problem in the next few years will become one of the most serious we have. What to do with surplus commodities, how to maintain reasonable prices—all will be facing us. Why, today, we have the Commodity Credit Corporation with a capital stock of $4,000,000,000 with authority to spend it if necessary to support farm prices. Is it not foolish not to carry forward research in the use of farm products, thereby create demand and possibly alleviate to some extent the cost of supporting prices by buying up farm surpluses, or I wonder if such Republican leaders do not contemplate the removal of support prices for farm products. It is time for those who have the interest of the Nation and of the Nation's agriculture to wake up and take notice.

Is the Congress to eliminate research, that great boon of mankind? John Deere took an old saw, made a moldboard for a plow that would cut Midwest soil, making possible development of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska. McCormick with his reaper made possible the wheat of that section. Eli Whitney with his cotton gin made cotton king. And all these did more to make the United States we have than did all the statesmen so-called. Swift said:

> He who has made two blades of grass to grow where one grew before, or two stalks of corn to grow where one grew before, has done more for the good of mankind than all the race of politicians put together.

Carver with his peanut is an illustration. Are you to develop the atomic bomb to destroy mankind, and deny money to develop and enlarge natural resources of the Nation? Will you build a great Army yet deny lunchrooms to nourish and build the boys and girls who make up the real forces on which we must depend? "When they ask for a fish will you give them a serpent, when they ask for a loaf of bread would you give them a stone?"

Mr. Speaker, we must not do that. Never let it be said that the Congress of the United States would be so short-sighted.

These Republican leaders contemplate a reduction in the Rural Electrification Administration of $394,000,000, which includes a reduction of $125,000,000 in loan authority for the next fiscal year. Thus this great program which has meant much to the rural inhabitants of this country, which is doing much to help keep folks on the farm is to be curtailed. The local cooperatives which charge rates whereby they can and have repaid the Government for the funds borrowed so that practically all are up to date in their repayments will be restricted in bringing the same service to the millions who did so much for the war, wanted electricity then but were told to wait until after the war as the war effort required the materials necessary for their extensions. Thus it goes.

A $50,000,000 reduction is contemplated in the Farmers Home Administration, now that hundreds of thousands of veterans are clamoring for the opportunity it would afford to pay for a farm and a home, a $10,000,000 reduction in roads and trails, which are used in getting lumber out of the national forests for the veteran's home program, reductions in the Soil Conservation Service, and so on through the activities of the Department. And this without and prior to any hearings after commitments to the American farmers. And why is this done? Because the Republicans promised to cut to the bone expenditures and to cut taxes their way 20 percent across the board. I do not mean that this Department should not be cut, but I do believe such plans are premature and as now planned would break faith with the people. Later you cannot say you did not know what this means.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the over-all committee and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was quoted yesterday as saying that if the Congress were to approve the $31,500,000,000 budget, he would take this as a mandate to stay within that figure and I have tried to give you the outlook for agriculture.

There is another reason for such attitude on the part of the Republican majority. Tax reduction on their terms. I realize that conditions can be such, and it is possible that they now are such that we must do without lots of things that are almost essential because we have a huge public debt to be paid. Certainly I, like lots of others, know what it means to do without as an individual to pay off debts. Most all of us have had to do this at various times. Yet, if such is the case here the Republican majority have refused to go along. We tried, in the meeting of the joint committee, to require that any surplus that might be saved as a result of curtailing the expenses of Government even to the extent of the $6,000,000,000 be paid on the national debt. We did this though we believe that the exemptions under the present income-tax law should be increased, but they would not support us because of commitments made in their campaign of last fall to reduce taxes. How? From the actions of many of their leaders by the 20-percent across-the-board reduction.

Such action on the part of the majority members of the committee can only be understood when considered with the efforts of leaders of the Republican majority to force through the Congress tax reduction on a 20-percent across-the-board basis, under which big business—those with a large income—would reap by far the greatest benefits of such tax reduction. It means that the Republican members of this committee then are willing to jeopardize the national defense by reducing the appropriations for the Military Establishment by a billion and three-quarters without hearings; to cut out expenditures for agricultural research, the authorization for which they so enthusiastically supported last summer in an effort to secure the farm vote; to cut the AAA payments after commitments have been made to the farmers

of the Nation by $100,000,000; to cut out the school-lunch program; to reduce the Rural Electrification Administration by $394,000,000, money which would be repaid to the Federal Government by the appreciative farmers and rural inhabitants of the Nation who so badly need this service; to cut out or reduce the power projects, the irrigation projects which mean so much to the Midwest, not in order to reduce the national debt, but largely to pay the money so saved at the expense of the people of the entire Nation and of their actual safety, to the people of the Nation who enjoy large incomes, some of whom would have their left-over income increased as much as 72 percent. Though such tax relief would give a little relief to those of low incomes, necessary we suppose to cover up the tremendous sums such a tax program would benefit those already enjoying a large income.

After all, what counts is what is left over after taxes.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] submitted some figures which are interesting in this connection.

Under the Knutson bill:

Single person with income of $1,000 will receive 2.1 percent of increase in take-home pay. Single person with income of $10,000 will receive 6.1 percent of increase in take-home pay. Single person with income of $100,000 will receive 34.9 percent of increase in take-home pay. Single person with income of $250,000 will receive 65.9 percent of increase in take-home pay. Single person with income of $302,896 will receive 72.6 percent of increase in take-home pay. Single person with income of $1,000,000 will receive 69.4 percent increase in take-home pay.

A large part of the funds to be saved thus do not go to the payment of the national debt, but go to make possible the passage of the infamous tax bill described above. Thus the school-lunch program is abolished to help increase the income of those receiving $100,000 by 34.9 percent. Research in agricultural products is postponed and the rural residents of the Nation are told that they cannot have lights, that such an infamous tax bill may be had. Verily, food is taken from the mouths of little children and the hand of the Nation is weakened at the most trying time in our history, all because of campaign promises.

I glory in the fact that the people of my district have never exacted of me any platform of promises in advance. I am proud of the fact that they have left me free to do what I believed to be right. I do know, however, that if I were foolish enough to commit myself, as apparently many Republicans feel they are committed to this destructive program, my people would want me to go back on any such foolish commitment and vote for the welfare of the Nation, and not to support a program against the interests of the Nation and for the benefit of the few.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote to cut the appropriation of each and every department of the Government, after hearings, just as much as we possibly can consistent with the public good. I cannot be a party, however, to the hasty action with a meat ax which is proposed here.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO COOPERATE WITH OTHER AMERICAN COUNTRIES IN THE CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND RINDERPEST

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 108, Rept. No. 60) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1819, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill, and such amendment for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pathfinder.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an outstanding editorial on the subject of brotherhood week and democracy, by the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice on Miss Democracy on the other side of the House that we can no longer support you in the style to which you have been accustomed.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks just made on the floor of the House by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], indicate very clearly the difficulty that will confront the Congress in its attempt to reduce public spending. Every conceivable power of propaganda that can be waged in behalf of the pet projects of those who want to continue the spending policy is going to be turned upon the Congress. As one chairman of a subcommittee I am now the beneficiary of a tremendous flood of telegrams and letters, even telephone conversations, protesting against the action of the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman before the subcommittee has even started to mark up the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be necessary for the Members of the House and the Congress to have courage if we are to reduce the public expenditures. You are going to have to show courage and stand up and fight against the efforts of those who for years have fattened their own districts with huge expenditures of public funds.

I think the time has come to serve notice that the Republican Party intends to see to it that the public expenditures are reduced.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], is recognized for 25 minutes.

WE CANNOT CONTINUE TO FINANCE THE WORLD

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to give the Members of the House some recent and interesting figures setting out the amounts our Government has furnished to some of the European countries and to China through UNRRA and through lend-lease since VJ-day. I shall also give you some interesting figures as to loans made and in the process of being made to these same countries through the Export-Import Bank.

Doubtless history will record that we have poured out relief on a wider scale than can be justified to the taxpayers, the American people who constitute this Government.

The present administration, with its big majority when UNRRA was enacted into law, must bear the major responsibility for its administration. And may I recall that when the minority attempted to write amendments into the act to follow the goods through to their destination to prevent their diversion away from the hungry people, that such amendments were voted down by the majority. As a result great sums poured out for relief by the American taxpayers have been diverted to build up dictatorial governments in Europe. This is their record, and they must accept it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer these remarks and what information they will convey because the President has called, in his budget for fiscal year 1948, for the further expenditure of aid to foreign countries through UNRRA until it closes shop June 30, 1947, and through the War Department in occupied countries, for the expenditure of over $725,000,000. This amount will largely be spent for relief in such occupied countries as Germany, Japan, Korea, and possibly some in Austria.

Then he proposed when UNRRA folds up that another organization shall be formed either under the United Nations organization or otherwise, to carry on relief to countries in Europe such as Austria, Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, and other countries with the further expenditure of $326,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, on page M–20 of the Budget Message of the President, you will find an item following the words "Proposed legislation" for this $326,000,000. On this same page you will find figures and expenditure during the latter part of fiscal 1947 and for 1948 of the $725,000,000 I referred to a few moments ago. On this page you will find many other items such as the Philippine-aid program of $144,000,000; membership in the international organizations, $18,000,000; State Department, $197,000,000, and again referring to the Philippines, I think it was a $500,000,000 loan we provided for them in the Seventy-ninth Congress to help get this nation started on rehabilitation. In fact, this one page, M–20 in the Budget, headed "International Affairs and Finance" calls for appropriations in the 1948 budget of $1,169,000,000, and, this is only a beginning on our international expenditures. On this page alone something like $1,000,000,000, if the proposed legislation is passed, would be committed for relief to the occupied countries and other nations without any hope or provision for a dollar of it ever to be repaid to our Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee, which is doing a magnificent job, I am certain will give particular attention to this whole question of expenditures for relief. I submit that at this point they will find a fertile field for a considerable cut in governmental expenses. The war has been over almost 2 years, we have given to other nations during the war and after, over $50,000,000,000 worth of relief through lend-lease. Certainly the time has come when we must give more consideration to our own taxpayers' and our Nation's ability to continue to carry such a great part of the financial burdens of other countries.

Soon two harvest seasons will have passed. Certainly the people of other nations with a desire to work, should be almost able in many instances to carry their own load.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes one must wonder when we try to save the lives of a starving people of a foreign country how much thanks come back to the people of America from such countries for the sacrifices we have made. How much good will, if any, comes to our Nation? To be specific, during the war we extended through lend-lease to Russia alone $11,320,864,109. Now, when our Government has on three different occasions approached them in an effort to get them to discuss some return lend-lease, they have not even extended the courtesy of a reply to this Nation, who doubtless kept Russia from being conquered by the hordes of Hitler. Invective and abuse through nationally owned and directed press and propaganda to date have been directed against our Nation. Constant nagging at the American Government and constant objections to and delay of our further efforts for world peace have been the returns on our investment which have come to us from Russia. No thanks or appreciation was ever expressed.

And let me point out that since VJ-day this country has sent through lend-lease to Russia $226,300,000 worth of goods, referred to as being in the pipe lines but not yet delivered. I am informed by the Treasury that there are yet $34,000,000 in lend-lease which will go to Russia. To France, since VJ-day, we have sent $411,500,000 worth of goods. When you read the current events of the day in France and learn that the Government at present is controlled by the Communist Party, that the Cabinet Minister of Defense in that strategic, powerful position is a Communist, that a majority of the police of Paris and most of the large cities in France are communistic; when we know that the Russian Government has inspired and motivated this communistic attempt to take over the Government in France, one wonders what appreciation will be shown in the future for all we have done for France.

To Czechoslovakia, since VJ-day, we have sent in lend-lease $174,000,000, and to Yugoslavia our total lend-lease, to this puppet satellite nation of Russia, has exceeded $33,100,000. This country has gone completely communistic, according to the plans of the Kremlin, and is now ruled by the ruthless dictator Tito, who told the world that he ordered the shooting down of American planes which cost the lives of our American airmen. From Tito not one word of good will or praise for our United States of America for all the aid we rendered.

Our total lend-lease to Poland, that country where people literally died by the millions fighting against Germany, we gave over $20,000,000. The Russian Communist Government is now in complete control of this country. The Russian Government is the beneficiary of much of this large amount of money which came out of the American taxpayers' pocket.

Mr. Speaker, in aiding Poland, Yugoslavia, and the other satellite nations of Russia, one wonders, aside from the pride of saving human lives from starvation, how much real good we have done in turning these human lives over into hopeless political bondage. One wonders how much good will, if any, will ever be manifested toward the United States from these countries which are rapidly falling under control of the orbit of communism.

Other millions upon millions of dollars has gone into relief either through UNRRA or the United States Government to various other countries all over the world. We have paid into UNRRA $2,700,000,000 that has been taken from the American people through taxes. Seventy-two percent of all UNRRA funds has been paid by our Government.

The New York Times, in a Washington dispatch dated January 25 of this year, reported that shipments of relief and rehabilitation supplies reached the 20,000,000-ton mark that week with the loading of Liberty ship *Hoosier State* with a cargo for Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Yugoslavia, according to an UNRRA announcement.

Of this shipment, the Times said, the cargo manifest of the *Hoosier State* "reads like a mail-order catalog." The cargo included artificial limbs, shoes, tractors, auto spare parts, glass jars, horse collars, soya flour, sewing machines, milk-testing equipment, and scores of other items.

General Rooks, the Director of UNRRA, stated, "The departure of the *Hoosier State* highlights UNRRA's huge and dramatic shipping operations." The ships have sailed from any one of about 150 loading areas in both hemispheres and all continents. He described the shipments as the largest peacetime shipping operation in history.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in appropriating funds for UNRRA in the seventy-ninth session directed that no more relief money be spent for Europe after last December 31 and for Asia after next March 31, providing however other items purchased before the ends of these periods may be shipped later.

Of course, a great effort will be made by the other nations of the world to continue this pool of relief to these nations, the larger part of it to be paid by your Uncle Sam. This problem will come before the Congress when the proposed legislation referred to earlier by me of $326,000,000 for the continuation of UNRRA relief will be brought forward by the administration.

It is my opinion that whatever money the United States spends in the future should be spent and directed individually by our own United States Government separate and apart from any world pool. The Congress should demand a tremendous reduction be made all along the line in furnishing relief to foreign countries. The time has come when this Congress should begin to realize that charity begins at home and should show a greater interest in giving some relief to the American taxpayers. We cannot continue to finance the world as we have been doing for the past number of years.

This Congress should not make any further gifts even to avert hunger in countries that have come under the influence of Russian domination.

Mr. Speaker, UNRRA Director General F. H. LaGuardia estimated last November that at least $400,000,000 would be necessary to continue relief through the year 1947 in food, farm machinery, fertilizer, railway cars, trucks, and so forth, in Europe alone for Czechoslovakia, Poland; Greece, Yugoslavia, White Russia, and the Ukraine as well as the former enemy countries of Italy and Austria. One of the biggest mistakes ever made with reference to UNRRA was the appointment of Mayor LaGuardia as Director General.

The above statement is the best evidence of the mistake that was made when he was appointed. No wonder with such leadership that the taxpayers of this country have been paying billions of dollars, and that we have gone so far toward really rendering aid to Russia through her satellite nations.

Mr. Speaker, all sorts of argument and propaganda will come from the internationalists, pinks, American Com-

munists, and their fellow travelers to continue some sort of UNRRA relief at the expense of this Nation to the rest of the world after June 30. UNRRA has gone a long way toward helping to make Stalin the dictator of Europe. We should make certain that any aid we render European countries in the future will not help him further on the road to dictatorship of that Continent.

In addition, his emissaries have been busy organizing and have made headway in the Latin-American countries of South America in an attempt to build up Communist nations to our immediate south.

Mr. Speaker, the recent election in Poland should convince everyone as to Stalin's aggression in Europe. Here are some questions the Members of Congress might well ask themselves when they are considering passing on appropriations for further relief, and particularly if and when they are called upon to reestablish some sort of an UNRRA organization.

First. Are the American people willing and prepared to accept a lower standard of living in order that the standard of living may be raised in foreign lands, including lands enveloped by the Iron Curtain?

Second. Has UNRRA relief been used as a tool of Russian policy and for the purpose of promoting a communistic world?

Third. To what extent have UNRRA supplies been diverted to maintain Red armies and build up the war potential of Russia?

Fourth. How widespread have been abuses of UNRRA personnel with respect to black-market activities, thieving, and loose handling of supplies and funds?

Fifth. Is the United States getting full credit for the generosity of its citizens in providing $2,700,000,000 for UNRRA food and equipment of all kinds, or is Russia taking the credit and at the same time stirring up hatred of the United States through smear propaganda in countries aided by us?

Sixth. Are any of the promoters and sponsors of UNRRA activated by sympathies for a world government requiring an increasing surrender of sovereignty on the part of this country?

Seventh. Is this Congress justified in adding on to the fearful United States public debt and the staggering tax burden of the American people?

Eighth. How far should we go in encouraging the peoples of foreign lands to sit back and wait for Uncle Sam to feed them instead of going to work and raising their own food?

Speaking of UNRRA, if you will read volumes 24 and 25 of the Slaughter committee's investigation of the disposition of surplus property, you will get some idea of the arrogance and independence of this organization. Time will permit me to give but one illustration. When General Marshall went to China to try to arbitrate the differences between the warring factions of that nation, and found they needed their railroads repaired to make it possible to ship the food and supplies delivered at the Chinese ports back into the country, he called for 50,000 tons of steel rails. The order was passed on to UNRRA as an emergency request of General Marshall. They sent their agents out through surplus-property divisions to try to locate these rails. Of the rails located, only a part of them, after they were procured and turned over to UNRRA, were consigned by UNRRA to China. Several thousand tons, however, were diverted to Yugoslavia for the rehabilitation of Tito's Russian-controlled government, and the irony of this diversion of these rails needed in China and ordered for China, then diverted to Yugoslavia, was the fact that these rails crossed the Atlantic going east as the American ship headed west for home was bearing the bodies of the American airmen who had been shot down on the orders of Tito, the dictator of Yugoslavia.

If you will read the Slaughter report, you will be interested in this and in many other phases of UNRRA's work.

Who are some of the officials of UNRRA? Chief of Industrial Rehabilitation Division at the present is Norman Leon Gold. His duties are to supervise on a global basis the acquisition, allocation, and distribution of supplies through UNRRA world-wide. He is a Canadian by birth and became an American citizen in 1937. However, he went to work for Henry Wallace in the Department of Agriculture in 1934, 3 years prior to becoming an American citizen. He is one of the big men of power in UNRRA.

The Materials and Equipment Branch is under Mr. Rodnov, a Russian engineer; Branch of Program Control and Records was under Mr. Weissman, a Yugoslav by birth who has his first citizenship papers from the United States. Transportation and Communications were under Mr. Anderson, an American citizen; Industrial Rehabilitation Service was under Mr. Lassiter, an American citizen; the Fuel Branch was headed by Mr. Uderski, a Pole who was hired by Dr. Gold from the Greek mission.

There are many others holding positions of great responsibility in this organization most of them coming from other departments of Government where they have served for a number of years. Former employees of the NYA, FEA, OPA, WPB, and so forth. It is fair to say when it comes to the spending of the taxpayers' money, these men have plenty of weight and they do not always follow the intent of the Congress and the law too closely in running their global show.

Only a comparatively few weeks ago, UNRRA bought in Boston from the WAA $140,000 worth of construction equipment for Yugoslavia consisting of wheelbarrows, shovels, picks, tractor blades, and dozens of articles that were short in the American market.

There are three planes at Love Field in Dallas, Tex., which were purchased some 18 months ago for Yugoslavia. UNRRA is paying someone $75 per day to turn over the engines of these three planes for an hour a day and has been paying this sum right along for the past 18 months.

UNRRA juggled around about $750,000 of its funds in order to acquire 17 C–47 transport planes for General Chennault for use in a private airline operating between China and the west coast. This transaction was reported to have been agreed upon last June at the Geneva Conference of UNRRA among General Chennault, Mr. LaGuardia, and General Rooks. In addition, UNRRA funds will supply parts for 2 years to maintain these 27 planes. General Rooks has sent a group of mechanics to Honolulu and Manila to overhaul these planes and put them in fly-away condition to take off to China. Certainly this transaction does not come under relief. It appears very irregular that UNRRA would purchase planes with United States taxpayers' money to be used to set up a private air line in China.

I cannot give further time to UNRRA.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

In addition to the enormous amount of aid we have given, here are some interesting figures showing the aid that the Export-Import Bank is rendering to a few of the European countries and to China. These figures are complete as of January 15, 1947, and are official. This bank has established what is termed "credit lines" with the following nations.

Let me illustrate as follows: Let us say the bank agrees to give a line of $200,000,000 credit to France. As France uses the money, she gives a note or I O U to the Export-Import Bank charged against her line of credit.

First we gave England, by an act of Congress, $3,750,000,000, known as the British loan. Then the Export-Import Bank extends a credit line to England for $550,000,000.

The bank gave to France a credit line of $550,000,000 to wind up some lend-lease contracts.

To France another credit line of $650,000,000, of which they have used all of the first line of credit and $112,000,000 out of the second line of credit.

When you realize that France has practically gone communistic, how far will this money go to the benefit of the Kremlin, possibly within the next 2 or 3 years?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman speaks about France being practically communistic; is it not true that Russia uses her tremendous gold production—and she is the second in production in the world—to spend millions in every country on the continent to propagate communism while we are doing the feeding of those who are being converted?

Mr. VURSELL. We are doing the same thing with a different purpose in mind; ours is a humanitarian purpose, theirs is a purpose doubtless of conquest, destruction, and enslavement of those unfortunate people—unfortunate at least by location.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact that there are other special orders, but if

there is no objection the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, they extended a credit to the Netherlands of $93,600,000, also a 2-year credit line of $200,000,000.

A credit line to Belgium of $100,000,000, all of which has been borrowed.

A credit line to Denmark for $20,000,000, of which $15,000,000 is borrowed.

A credit line to Finland of $35,000,000.

A credit line to Greece of $25,000,000.

A credit line to Poland for coal cars and railway equipment, $40,000,000. Russia will find these useful.

To China, $64,000,000.

To Czechoslovakia, $20,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I failed to point out that since VJ-day we have shipped relief amounting to $744,493,578 to China. Our total lend-lease to China was $1,543,385,795. You are familiar with the situation in China. After almost 1 year of the efforts of General Marshall to try to bring the Communists and the Central Government together, he recently abandoned the job and came home. The Communists, doubtless aided and abetted by Russia, have continued their warfare against the Central Government and by vicious propaganda have inflamed the minds of the Chinese, in great numbers, against our Government, after all we have done for them. Demonstrations and denunciations of the Americans continue to increase in China. There is great danger that the controlling influence of China in the future will be Russia.

European and Asiatic conditions as they stand today pose the question, "Have the American people spent $400,000,000,000 with the loss of 300,000 American soldiers killed and 1,000,000 wounded to destroy the dictatorship of Hitler, to be supplanted by a dictatorship ultimately over all Europe and Asia?"

At this time when the American railroads cannot furnish sufficient cars to move the farmers' grain, and Congress is being urged to do something about it, we pick up the New York Herald Tribune of February 12 and learn that official presentation of the first part of a shipment of 160 locomotives and tenders destined to China has been made by Major General Rooks, Director General of UNRRA to Chen Chih-ma, counselor of the Chinese Embassy in Washington.

Is it possible that the UNRRA policy for China has changed since General Marshall pulled out of that country, soon to be followed by the withdrawal of the United States troops. Will this rolling stock in the future in fact roll for Russia when she indirectly or directly brings China under her control?

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the necessity of backing up our international representatives thereby adding to their power and prestige in world-wide negotiations. I think it is obvious from these figures that we have not only backed up our own representatives from a financial standpoint in the world-wide picture but we have backed up, to a large extent, the financial structure of the world, at the expense of the American taxpayers.

And that is not all. Let me now call your attention to the fact that under the Bretton Woods Agreement we have set up the International Bank for world reconstruction in cooperation with some 40 other nations.

This bank has a capital of $8,000,000,000. The United States Government has underwritten the lion's share of $3,175,000,000.

In addition to this we have become partners with some 40 other nations of the world in establishing the International Monetary Fund for Stabilization of Currencies capitalized at $7,300,000,000 in which again, the large sum of $2,750,000,000 of that capital structure is underwritten by the United States Government.

Through these funds will be drawn other billions of dollars which eventually will have to be paid by the United States taxpayers. Certainly we have gone far enough to satisfy the wildest dreams of the most internationally minded if they have any regard left for the financial solvency of our Government and for the well-being of the American people and our future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that the Director General of UNRRA has violated the plain wording of section 11, article 10, of the joint resolution establishing UNRRA by the Congress, that the Congress wrote into the act the following language "the task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief."

They have gone farther and have engaged in world-wide reconstruction in violation of the spirit and letter of the law, and the understanding and representations made to the Congress that we were to provide medicine, food, clothing, shelter, and immediate relief to sustain human life. The act certainly does not provide for the shipment of millions of dollars worth of new machinery for coal mines, industrial plants, such as have been shipped to Yugoslavia and other satellite countries.

And in conclusion may it be said that the majority of the Republican Members of the House since the very beginning of UNRRA tried time and again to limit the activity of UNRRA so that the Congress and the American people could have some control over the distribution of the billions of dollars our Government furnished. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose that we were voted down by the administration forces in our every effort. The administration must answer to the American people for the waste of UNRRA. This Congress must answer to them in the future.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, in his recent message to the Congress, the President of the United States stated that the program of veteran benefits was virtually complete. By that statement he paid great tribute to the foresight of the veteran organizations and the Congress itself in drafting and enacting into law the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Although we may agree with the President that the program is virtually complete, he has not advanced and we must not adopt the premise that the program is anything like perfect. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Although the originally enacted GI bill was considered good at the time and most certainly served its purpose, it is high time that we looked into certain features and the success with which they have been administered.

The fact that the GI bill has been amended only once since its passage in 1944 is a great testimonial to its original quality. Because a law is good, however, should not deter Congress from looking into its administration and taking whatever corrective action as may be found necessary.

For the information of those who are not entirely familiar with the particular phase of the veterans' program I plan to discuss today, a brief review of the subject may be in order. There has been a growing tendency on the part of government and some individuals and organizations to consider the veteran in an abstract sense. Having served as both an enlisted man and a commissioned officer in the infantry on the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne fronts, as well as in the army of occupation in Germany during World War I, I believe that I have some understanding of what constitutes a fighting man in the armed forces of this Nation. From more than 25 years of membership in veteran organizations, having served as department commander and national executive committeeman of the American Legion and as national president of the Ninetieth Division Association, I have come to know the veteran as a loyal citizen devoted to the Republic for which he fought on the field of battle. I deplore the attitude of those who consider the veteran in any other light.

The treatment afforded World War I veterans upon their return to civilian life is a too well known part of our national history. The most important elements in their readjustment—education, training, and employment—were left to the vagaries of chance. The dismal picture of long lines of unemployed veterans fading into soup lines, apple selling, and finally the ill-fated bonus march on Washington is something some of us cannot forget. That these veterans survived and later rose to some of the highest ranks in public and private life is only further evidence of quality of the American fighting man.

Those who suffered and saw the suffering which followed World War I were determined that our comrades in arms from World War II would not return to face the same conditions. It was this determination that brought the GI bill into existence and the enactment in law. The so-called GI bill as enacted into law represented the best thinking of the representatives and officers of the veteran organizations, educators, public and private officials concerned with the programs it encompassed, and the then Members of Congress. The World War Veterans Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I was a member at that time, devoted days on end

to the hearing of testimony and the deliberation of the relative merits of the various provisions. That the bill was passed without a dissenting vote—unusual in modern legislative activity—was a clear indication that the other Members of Congress concurred in our belief that we had at least framed a bill which would serve the immediate need of our returning veterans.

Some of the provisions of that law are more or less adequate and are effectively administered. Under title I and in accordance with other related laws, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs has slowly but steadily moved forward with the hospitalization and claims program. So far as the hospitalization program is concerned, I do not believe it is moving fast enough. There are too many applications on file for hospitalization. Title III has not been too successful, and I, for one, never entertained any great hopes that this form of aid would lend itself to effective administration. However, according to the Veterans' Administration, the fact that 639,387 loans have been made to veterans as of January 25, 1947, totaling $3,421,098,627, of which $1,584,847,177 was guaranteed under the guarantee provision, is a source of some satisfaction.

I am especially interested in title IV, which deals with unemployment of veterans. At the time the GI bill became law, the Veterans' Employment Service, which administers this program, was a struggling and pitifully inadequate organization. Never too strong, it had during the war been completely absorbed and all but forgotten by the War Manpower Commission. Despite resistance and open opposition from many within the War Manpower Commission and later the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service is becoming one of the most efficient and effective agencies of Government. Whereas only three short years ago the Veterans' Employment Service could hardly justify its own existence, it is now a hard-hitting organization with representatives in nearly every area in the country. We owe no apology for this title of the GI bill.

Title V of the bill has proven difficult to administer effectively and there is some question in my mind as to the real honesty with which its benefits have been made available to veterans. At the time the bill was enacted into law, we contemplated that the servicemen's readjustment allowance would prove a temporary stop-gap for the veteran, if needed, while he found the job he sought. However, there was a regrettable laxity in its administration, and it was only recently that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs saw fit to administratively interpret its provisions with any clarity. Because of an improper explanation of this provision to the dischargee by the armed forces, and by reason of the failure of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to take a firm stand, this title has proven most costly to the Government and may not have in all instances been most beneficial to the veteran himself.

I have purposely reserved until the last a discussion of title II of the bill. The educational provisions of that title have in most instances been fairly effectively administered—although at times delays on the part of the Veterans' Administration almost ruined the program—and the educational institutions of this country are deserving of the highest accolade for their magnificent contribution. The fact that 1,600,393 veterans were enrolled as of January 31, 1947, in schools and colleges with financial assistance from their Government is evidence enough that this program is proving successful.

Unfortunately, we cannot with any honesty say the same for the on-the-job-training provision of this title. From the very beginning this very valuable program was permitted to wander aimlessly without any apparent direction, and abuses began to spring up throughout the country. To my mind, this was one of the most important provisions of the bill. It still is.

Following an urgent recommendation from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Seventy-ninth Congress, in its closing days, hurriedly and unfortunately, in my judgment, enacted legislation amending this section of the bill. Not having the opportunity to hold hearings, which would have been most desirable, restrictive legislation was passed. A ceiling was placed on the combined earning—that is, the Government allowance plus the wages paid by the employer—and the period of training was shortened.

Further confusion has arisen among our veterans by the interpretation placed on instruction V by the Administrator on his instruction to veterans with reference to income from seasonal employment. I dare say every Member of Congress has had complaints from veterans concerning this interpretation. I am hoping our World War Veterans Committee will take cognizance of this and change the ruling whereby it will make no difference if the veteran does exceed the ceiling in any one month; it will be the total amount received during the 12-month period that will count.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you can appreciate my interest in this bill. I believe that under the circumstances you can understand why I have conducted my own investigation of the on-the-job-training program under the GI bill. I believe further that you and every Member of this body will be surprised and even amazed at some of the things I have discovered. If that be true, think if you will, how the veteran feels upon learning that his chances for improving his skills or acquiring a new skill have been jeopardized by poor administration and what I now believe to be inadequate legislation.

In the course of my investigation I talked to many individual employers—bankers, plant managers, garage owners, owners of retail establishments, and many others. I talked to literally hundreds of veterans who were anxious to obtain this training. That the program is yet far from a success is clearly apparent.

Several days ago I asked the Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service to furnish me the reports on on-the-job training from his representatives in the several States and Territories. I particularly asked for the reports for the month of September—immediately following the recent amendment to the bill—and also for the most recent reports, those for December.

The following are direct quotations from those reports, and I recommend that every Member of Congress read them all. If you do not have either the time or interest, read, if you will, those from your State, and I am most certain that you will agree with me that it is time we quit talking about our program of veteran benefits and do something about this phase, which practically amounts to a public scandal at this moment.

SEPTEMBER REPORTS

Arizona:

From our viewpoint, the small but increasing number of employers who resist the establishment of on-job training programs because of the 2-year limitation is more significant. These employers argue that (1) their training period is of more than 2 years' duration, but that cessation of Federal subsistence will make the veteran feel that his training is or should be complete in 2 years; (2) that limiting employers not under the apprenticeship to 2 years while allowing training of 3, 4, or 5 years under the apprenticeship system is an attempt of the Government to coerce the employer into coming under the apprenticeship plan.

California:

The VES and USES, up to date, have spearheaded the OJT program for veterans in California. We are still pushing the training under Public, 16, but have had to put the skid chains on our efforts under Public, 346. * * * Veterans are howling about the $175–$200 limit. * * * Labor has declared its "thumbs down" on a program of training where a veteran gets considerably less than an unskilled laborer. * * * Industry is disgusted with a law that is retroactive and interferes with the continuance of programs that they, in good faith, instituted. We, of course, still believe in OJT. * * * We shall continue to try and overcome this new earning-limit obstacle. * * *

It is our thinking that veterans with education or with natural ability should be enabled to use on-the-job training to train for top-flight positions, and to a certain degree maintain a standard of living commensurate with the particular position that is to be their goal. We also agree with Congress that every training program should receive the closest scrutiny * * * turn on the klieg lights so there can be no shadowy doubts as to the program being legitimate. * * * We feel too, that it is a good investment of the taxpayers' money to give subsistence to make an average run-of-the-mill veteran a genius in his chosen field * * * top-flight men, production wizards, always pay dividends. * * * A $200-a-month man trained to earn $400 per month will soon repay the Government via the income-tax channel.

Connecticut:

A number of employers believe they would do better by running their own training programs without a tie-up with the GI bill training programs, as it appears that the new law will offer too many complications in connection with the amount of subsistence allowance granted trainees as well as the records, reports, inspections, overtime problems, etc.

District of Columbia:

Numerous complaints still continue from employers, veterans, veterans' organizations,

and other interested groups. At the present time openings for on-the-job training in the local offices practically do not exist. The restriction particularly affected the construction trades, inasmuch as the wage scale is usually in excess of the limit now placed on earnings.

Florida:

Approximately 8,000 firms in Florida have been approved as on-the-job-training agencies with approximately 16,000 veterans participating. However, this activity is showing little expansion and if anything considerable reduction due to the new amendment. Reports indicate that practically 50 percent of the veterans will be affected in one way or another while employers are becoming reluctant to make application under the present conditions.

Georgia:

This program is still in a chaotic state in Georgia.

Idaho:

Because of the general confusion resulting from the revised OJT program, it has been deemed advisable for local office personnel to proceed rather cautiously in promoting this program. * * * there seems to be quite a good deal of confusion at this time and also quite a lot of dissatisfaction. We will quote a few of the comments from local office VER's:

Blackfoot report: "During the month of September it was noted that, due to the new changes that were made in the Veterans Training Law, No. 346, many of the employers have cancelled their GI training programs and it seems that a strong feeling of opposition against this program exists in this area."

Boise report: "The veterans seem somewhat dissatisfied with the ceiling established for OJT earning and are refusing to work under the prevailing conditions."

Gooding report: "Most veterans will not take a job that is connected with OJT. Several veterans are considering dropping out because of this ceiling. The VFW and American Legion here have gone on record as opposing this program."

Twin Falls report: "Some of the veterans who were already training under this program have given up the job they were on because they had incurred obligations under their previous wages which they cannot meet under the present conditions. These obligations consist mainly of building homes and improving living conditions."

Illinois:

Of course, they continue to operate under the most serious difficulties because of limitations imposed by the amendments to the GI bill on both training time and pay.

Indiana:

The change in the law has continued to lessen activity in the on-the-job training program. There is very little new to report.

Iowa:

Due to the enactment of legislation which changed the requirements for on-the-job training, the picture with respect to this activity was completely confused during the month of September.

Kansas:

Many agreements have been terminated in Kansas. Some are due to disgruntlement of the veteran over the ceilings established; some at the employer's request. The State office of veterans' affairs says the withdrawals average 20 per week.

Kentucky:

Some of the factors causing reluctance to enter into or continue the program are the new wage ceilings, new forms to be completed, delays in approval of programs, proposed check-ups by representatives of the Veterans' Administration.

Michigan:

The OJT program has experienced some slowing down since the passage of the bill placing ceilings on earnings for veterans participating in these programs. In most sections of Michigan the established ceilings are at or below the prevailing rates of wages for workers in the lower skilled levels. Fewer new programs are being submitted for approval and many cancellations of existing programs are being made. In one locality, Midland, one firm canceled 200 openings.

Minnesota:

Both veterans and employers contacted by VER's during the month felt that the combined wage and subsistence ceilings were placed too low and that the veteran would suffer as a result. * * * The veteran objects to the wage ceilings because he feels that his present program has been approved and he has made commitments on the assumption that no changes in his training would be made, provided, of course, that he and the employer fulfilled the requirements of their agreement. * * * They feel that it is unfair to them to be allowed only 2 years, while students and trainees under apprenticeship indentures are allowed 4 years.

Nebraska:

Another cause for the decline in the number of applications is the ceiling placed by Public, 679. This has also caused some employers to reduce the entrance wage.

Nevada:

On-the-job training has received an excessive blow by the new ceiling established by the Veterans' Administration.

New Hampshire:

Since the passage of Public Law 679 limiting the length of training and placing a ceiling on wages, there has been quite a lot of anxiety among employers. I have had the occasion to talk with a number of employers who have definitely stated that they would throw the program right out the window due to these limitations.

New Jersey:

Dissatisfaction has been expressed by both employers and veterans over the new regulations.

New York:

The new ceilings on OJT and apprenticeship training programs have created considerable comment, discussion, and problems since they have been put into effect. * * * It is felt that this ceiling will also increase labor turn-over, as many veterans are leaving their training programs for other jobs that pay higher rates.

Ohio:

Several offices reported that they were experiencing more and more difficulty in setting up programs due to the wage ceilings. OJT activity decreased the most in areas of high-wage scales. We are still of the opinion that an upward adjustment of wage ceilings under OJT to allow for the increased cost of living will do much toward reactivating the interest in OJT both by employers and veteran applicants.

Oklahoma:

Very little has been done in regard to the promotion of OJT in Oklahoma for the past month. The entire OJT program is at a standstill and will continue to be so long as it takes the Veterans' Administration to reapprove some 23,000 employers that have already been approved.

South Dakota:

The number of requests for approval have declined considerably with most employers reluctant to request approval until further clarification is made on recent amendments to the law. There appears to be considerable dissatisfaction mainly on the part of the veteran and which is also expressed by a number of managers in training establishments.

Tennessee:

Employers were quite disturbed (veterans also) over the new maximum wage limitations for eligibility. This has caused some turn-over by veterans and most employers to limit their training to low-pay jobs. It means also that veterans may not have the chance at better-pay jobs since there is no training subsistence-wage incentive.

Texas:

Both employees and employers are generally opposed to the $200 ceiling, and many trainees are dropping out.

Utah:

Since the announcement of recent legislation placing a ceiling on training, we have had a number of veterans in this office who have advised us they are leaving their employment to secure more remunerative work even though they have been on the job a considerable length of time. We are also finding employers contacting this office by phone, or whom we have met in personal contact, who are much perturbed over the ceiling and are finding it difficult to keep some of the trainees whom they claim would be excellent employees at a later date. * * * Employers and veterans are also objecting to the 2-year limit set on training.

Washington:

The recent Federal law limiting employment ceilings to $200 a month for married men and $175 for single men, has seriously cramped progress in this program. * * * Now the employers of the association of auto mechanics feel that they do not want to carry on the program because the normal starting wage is such that they have decided they do not want to follow out all of the red tape.

Wisconsin:

The VER for Beloit, as well as those from other offices, report that unfavorable comments have been received from veterans regarding the ceiling imposed by Public Law 679. Some of the veterans apparently feel that they have been penalized.

Wyoming:

Naturally, some repercussions developed on the new subsistence regulations recently enacted by Congress. Some employers are inclined to drop the program, and some veterans have lost interest.

DECEMBER REPORTS

Alabama:

The OJT program in Alabama is still in a state of flux and unrest. The new amendment 679 has done much to discourage veterans in many fields from taking training or continuing their present training. The peculiar set-up in Alabama which requires all veterans to take related subject work, which is usually given at the local high school, has also been generally criticized by many of the on-the-job training veterans. They state that in many cases this is purely a waste of time as no training was given nor was any studying done with qualified instructors' aid.

Alaska:

Many are anticipating the removal or raising of the ceiling on on-the-job training

under Public Law 346. Should the ceiling be removed, this program will go places in the Territory, for this time the Veterans' Administration have the personnel trained and ready to carry out a good working program.

Arizona:

Most of the participation on OJT during the month of December was in the capacity of peacemakers and appeasers between the apprentice-training group and the OJT group.

California:

Employers are frank with us and have expressed themselves as being fed up with all the bother of so many interviews. They feel there is too much pampering and too much tax money being spent on the program. When employers begin to talk thusly we believe it is high time that some remedial action be taken.

Florida:

It still stands, however, that the interest on the part of employers and trainees is way off, due to the new law which affected subsistence and also many employers are getting cold on the program because of reporting demands. They feel that there is too much detail work in many cases.

Idaho:

Some employers have become discouraged with the OJT program. They are particularly unhappy about the change of the rules and the "ceilings." The VER has had several employers comment somewhat as follows: "We just don't like to have the rules changed on us in the middle of the game."

Illinois:

No cases of special problems have been reported other than continued objection to the imposed ceiling under Public Law No. 679. While they exist, these ceilings will continue to be an obstacle to a full OJT program.

Kansas:

The Veterans' Administration regulation requiring the recertification of all employers caused a retardation of the program the last several months. Also, many complaints are registered against the paper work involved. Firms where the owner does most of his own office work balk at the program for this reason. Veterans with any earning capacity say the restricted OJT program is of no use to them. Some who had hoped to learn new trades find they must stay on jobs which, though unsatisfactory for a career, are paying a living wage temporarily.

Kentucky:

Some local veterans employment representatives continue to report that employers will not accept the on-the-job-training program with its present restrictions.

Louisiana:

The increased cost of living and the apparent slowness of the approving and inspection authorities of the OJT program have presently stymied the program. In some scattered instances, employers with programs in effect are discontinuing them due primarily to ceilings limiting salaries which they express as not being inducive to the higher type trainee.

Maine:

This activity has been greatly curtailed as requested by the VA. * * * Due to the stringent arrangements placed upon employers by the VA, many firms have discontinued many OJT programs for veterans. * * * Still another problem encountered often centers about the resurvey of the job training spots by the VA. * * * Many employers state that they are given no reason for the withdrawal of the approval but are told "That's it." There is no question in the minds of the staff of this office that the on-the-job-training program by the VA is at an extremely low ebb in the minds of employers in this State and sinking fast and lower.

Michigan:

The OJT program in general is still marking time for the most part awaiting such action as Congress may take on the matter.

Mississippi:

We have found that employers who are dissatisfied with the on-the-job-training program refuse to talk about employment of veterans and contacts with these employers are worthless.

Montana:

There have been both reverberations from employers and some dissension among Veterans' Administration representatives because of lack of over-all understanding in proper placement of trainees.

New Hampshire:

A great many employers look upon OJT as something that will cost money to put into operation and something that will require a great deal of additional work. Another objection usually presented is the number of special reports that must be submitted to the Veterans' Administration. Due to these conditions, many employers turn down the possibility of setting up OJT programs within their establishments.

New Mexico:

On or before December 31, many on-the-job-training programs were canceled by the Veterans' Administration. Cancellations for the most part were in those programs set up as on-the-job training that covered apprenticeable occupations. Employers have been advised by the Veterans' Administration that it is necessary to set up a program in accordance with the standards approved by the Federal Government or a State apprentice training council. Other on-the-job-training programs that were set up for a period of more than 2 years were also canceled and employers advised to set up a program for 2 years or less.

New York:

Despite the brighter OJT picture for the month, the OJT ceilings and high turn-over rate continue to mar the program.

North Carolina:

In that Public Law 679 reduces periods of training in certain group classifications to 2 years, automobile mechanic trainee has been shifted to apprenticeship training of 4 years. This has more or less upset planned schedules over the State in garages who have previously been approved for such training and has retarded approval due to the office of apprentice training (State) having to pass on all such applications. We do not hold with the order making automobile mechanic trainee as an apprenticeship training, as we are informed by garages, etc., that 2 years is all they have ever trained mechanics. Then there are thousands of veterans who are not entitled to a full 4 years under the GI bill, due to lack of service. This leaves them out in the cold for any training under this classification, which we feel is unjustified.

Oklahoma:

The biggest problem encountered with respect to OJT is that there are so many more veterans requesting this type of training than there are openings. Many employers have indicated that they are waiting to see what Congress does in respect to the ceiling on wages before they request any more trainees.

Puerto Rico:

We find that there are good opportunities for developing a sound on-the-job training program, but due to official red tape in the Insular Department of Education and the jealousies of some field employees of the Veterans' Administration, many qualified employers fail to be certified and we are robbed of the opportunity to make referrals of trainees.

South Carolina:

Through personal contact with local VERs it appears that both the Employment Service and a great many employers have had their interest dulled in on-the-job training program due to the time that it takes an employer to get a program approved after applications and all necessary forms have been filed.

South Dakota:

Very few new establishments are requesting approval. The wage ceilings and 2-year limitation has caused many veterans to discontinue such training.

Texas:

The general trend over the State is that employer acceptance of the program is at an all time low.

Utah:

During the month of December there seemed to be a dissatisfaction with the employers and veterans alike with the ruling of the Veterans' Administration as to what the veteran might earn while in OJT. The continued delay in getting jobs approved and the veteran getting his pay is a chief source of worry.

Vermont:

While every effort is made by our local offices to develop training opportunities in approved establishments for referral purposes, there are few openings at present because of the reluctance of emloyers to proceed further with the program until such time as the Eightieth Congress might remove or modify the existing ceiling provisions.

Virginia:

There was little activity in this program this month.

Wisconsin:

It has been alleged that the GI training programs have become so involved in red tape, many employers and veterans want nothing to do with them.

There, Mr. Speaker, you have irrefutable evidence from corners of the Nation and even the Territories that what we considered one of the most vital phases of our veterans readjustment program is a dismal failure. Obviously, I have presented today only that which is unfavorable. Many good things can be said about on-the-job training program under the GI bill, but the facts I have laid down before you today constitute an indictment of the program as it is now functioning which cannot be questioned.

Woven through the whole fabric of the data that I have collected is positive evidence that the whole enterprise has been misdirected. It is immediately apparent that a disservice has been done to veterans and employers alike. There is no doubt that the costs of administration have been needlessly increased. There is a clear indication that a studied effort has been made to convert what the Congress intended as a plain and simple training program for veterans into a complicated and confused undertaking.

There is also clearly apparent an attempt to convert the program into a formalized apprentice training program which, good in many instances, is not necessarily required in a great many cases.

We accepted in good faith the recommendations of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Concerned as he is with so many other responsibilities it is highly possible that he erred in his judgment regarding on-the-job training. The whole program demands more than a cursory review. In the interests of the veterans to whom we promised so much in the way of readjustment assistance, I urge the Congress to turn its immediate attention to the careful examination of this misguided venture and the prompt enactment of corrective legislation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. Yes; I yield to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I know the intense interest of the gentleman in veterans' affairs, because he is a veteran of the First World War. I would like to ask my colleague at this point whether he thinks there should be a ceiling placed upon the amount the Government should pay, and if so, where does the gentleman think that ceiling should be.

Mr. STIGLER. I will answer the gentleman by saying that if there is no ceiling placed there will be some abuses. If there is a ceiling placed there will be abuses just as there are now; but those things can be handled administratively.

Mr. RIZLEY. In other words, the gentleman would not want to put on a ceiling? Let the Administrator handle the matter of making the adjustment as between employer and employee?

Mr. STIGLER. That is my idea about it; yes, sir.

Mr. RIZLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree in the main with what my colleague from Oklahoma has said. On the other hand, I think it should be pointed out that Congress undoubtedly intended this program, when it was enacted, to be an on-the-job-training program, to train veterans.

Mr. STIGLER. There is no question about that.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have known of instances and I am sure the gentleman knows many instances where this has been abused. I can cite some cases where young men were in the service and have abused this privilege. For instance, I can cite the case of a young man who was in the banking business, who had been in the banking business for as much as 10 years, advanced from office boy up to vice presidency of the bank. Still, when he came out of the service he went back into the same bank under on-the-job training.

Mr. STIGLER. And abused the law.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is exactly true. Does not the gentleman believe that administratively there ought to be something done about that feature of the program?

Mr. STIGLER. Yes; I do. I believe such action is long overdue.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News, February 12.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Rocky Mountain News.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extracts from pertinent publications.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up some points of misunderstanding we must have the facts as to the cost of coal production, distribution, and sale, together with wages, labor and living conditions in the coal-mining industry.

American coal miners produce more coal annually than all of the rest of the coal-producing nations of the world combined, with 200,000 less men than are employed in England alone. In 1944, with a 25-percent manpower shortage, American coal miners produced 684,000,000 tons.

Coal is the life of the business of the country. Without cheap fuel available at all times we are handicapped in our economic growth. So much depends upon coal that it is quasi public in character, and our citizenship is fast realizing that until we solve the coal problem our national greatness is woefully handicapped.

It is hoped by those who are thinking the deepest on this great national problem that we may eventually find a remedy for the evils in the coal industry and that it may be stabilized so that we may have a steady production at all seasons during the year, and when competition will reign and cheap fuel may be had with good fair profits to the operator and a good wage and steady work for the employee.

In 1945, the weighted average labor cost per ton of coal was less than $1.82 and this includes wages paid mine management, clerical and supervisory forces, which average from 8 cents to 15 cents per ton. On 25,500,000 tons reported in Indiana in 1945 the labor cost per ton was approximately $1.03. Those consumers who pay $5 to $10 per ton can readily see that the miners get a small percent of the retail cost of coal. The retail selling price totals over five times the labor cost of producing bituminous coal. When you consider the operators', wholesalers', and retail margins plus freight and retail delivery costs you won't say the miners are geting too much money.

We should hold the operators in the coal-mining industry jointly responsible with the miners in bringing about strikes. I am certain that the President and his administration are not unmindful of the fact that the country cannot stand another Nation-wide coal strike at this time. The responsibility should rest squarely upon the Government if they do not encourage a meeting of the operators and miners. I am at a loss to know why something is not being done to ward off this terrible threat that now overshadows us. We cannot afford to wait on Supreme Court decisions, because they have had too many recesses in the past. If the operators and miners do not meet soon we can expect a big coal strike in April. An identical situation existed before a long strike in 1922. I hope the President and the Secretary of the Interior will go the limit in trying to get the contending forces together. I am certain the miners and northern operators are willing and anxious to meet. If they meet immediately, it is my judgment that they would arrive at an agreement.

It is obvious that the Government cannot continue to run the coal mines indefinitely. Of course, the operators are perfectly satisfied for the Government to be charged with running the mines when the operators themselves are in complete control. They are, therefore, not laying themselves liable to any charges for increased wages or welfare fund. The Government has refused until recently to name a member of the welfare board provided for in the contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the United Mine Workers. So nothing is being done about welfare conditions and the situation in some mining localities is simply terrible. According to the United Mine Workers Journal, the report of the Navy investigators found sanitation and health conditions in some coal camps deplorable and disgraceful. Telling of a hospital in an unnamed coal community, Admiral Moreell said, "This institution is definitely a disgrace not only to the town, county, and State, but to the Nation in general. It is the most insanitary thing I have ever seen. The health and general sanitation of the community, including water supply, is deplorable and disgraceful. There is no first-class water supply or sewage disposal in the entire county. All sewage is dumped into the streams and the stench that arises from the streams, from which the town gets its water, has a strong odor." At the present I was unable to get the entire report of the investigation from the Navy Department, but I expect them to make their full report to the public soon.

I realize that the lack of an adequate Federal social-security law has created a demand from labor unions for welfare funds. Many miners cannot understand why owners are willing to care for retired mine mules and not willing to do anything for the miners who have worked 40 or 50 years for the coal industry. The widows and orphans of those men killed and those injured so severely as to end their ability to make a living should be given adequate care.

The number killed in the coal mines from all causes annually, 1906 to 1945, averages 1,981, which means that for every working day five men are killed outright. Permanent total, permanent partial, and temporary disabilities for the period 1930 to 1944 total 1,004,524—more than twice the number of men employed in the industry. Statistically, every man was injured twice during that period. I do not believe there is an industry in the world that paid that

price in blood, bone, and human flesh as our own bituminous-coal industry.

Since the passage of the Federal mine-inspection law, which I took the lead to force out of committee, the number of accidents and deaths in the coal fields has been reduced materially, especially where the States have cooperated with Federal mine inspection.

I know, from experience in the coal fields in southern Indiana, that the coal miners are not to be bludgeoned into working if it is at the cost of all they have gained by negotiations of the past. I do not mean to say that any labor organization should be permitted, in key industries, to refuse to yield to reasonable terms and thus bring about national catastrophe, but if union labor has been taught anything in recent years, it has been taught to believe in the efficacy of collective bargaining.

Of course, if the price of coal is increased appreciably because of the granting of union demands, it would have to be passed on to the consumers. This, they say, would bring about an impairment of the coal-mining industry by reason of the competition of gas and oil. It is generally understood by those best informed that it will be a long time before either of these commodities can, except in isolated instances, take the place of coal, because coal, admittedly, is the cheapest commodity to use in producing power. The miners' officials have been informed of this threat for many years and have looked it squarely in the face. They believe, and there is justification for this belief, that the operators, particularly during the last decade, have hogged the trough when profits were being divided and that the miners, during the war and now, have not had their fair share of the profits when measured by that which others were obtaining, although the latter worked under more healthful and less dangerous conditions.

Judged by the number of days the miner was actually employed, his earning capacity was not sufficient to maintain a proper standard of living. Among the factors causing instability in the coal industry are uncertainty of markets, physical dangers to the workers, car and timber shortages, break-downs, and various other factors causing idleness.

It is true that some among the miners, who have the most favored working conditions under the existing wage scale, at times earn a wage that is fairly compensatory and which is adequate to raise their standard of living high among the working people.

There are a number of features of the Government agreement with miners which are objectionable to the mine owners, particularly the southern operators. These include the union welfare fund, the unionization of foremen, and the mine safety code.

One of the chief proposals the miners will demand in the new contract with the operators is a shorter workweek. During the war, and at the present time, the miners are working 9 hours per day, and thousands of miners spend at least 2 hours' travel time in going to and from the mine. Due to the hazardous conditions in the coal mines the miners are entitled to a shorter workweek.

As long as the Government has control of the coal mines, it will be difficult for the operators and miners to reach an agreement. Just remember that the chief counsel for the coal operators resigned in disgust because of the attitude of certain operators connected with the southern coal fields. It occurs to me that the northern operators, particularly our Indiana operators, have not shared with any enthusiasm the "dog in the manger" policy of the southern operators and would be glad, indeed, to have a peaceful settlement on reasonable terms.

The Government and the Congress cannot remain indifferent to the pending struggle of the operators and miners. It is the duty to give the facts to the public.

The United Mine Workers of America ask for no special privilege. These miners who go down into the bowels of the earth and mine the commodity upon which our present-day civilization is founded, merely ask for equality in the economic life of our Nation and in the community life of our people. The miners dream of having their rights recognized to a point where they are privileged to live as other men, and while they are making this fight for that equality of treatment, they are always willing to lend a helping hand to all unfortunates.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Has the gentleman any figures on the cost of mining a ton of anthracite coal; that is, has he any knowledge from his survey or review of the cost of mining anthracite coal that comes to us people in the North? I know that we are paying $16 a ton for stove coal, and I was wondering how much the miner gets for the ton of coal that we pay $16 for?

Mr. LANDIS. I think the highest price I noticed on the list was $2.39. That was the highest price that was listed. It ran from $1.03 in Indiana, on up. It may be $4 in the anthracite coal.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. The coal in the gentleman's State is bituminous coal?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. And anthracite in Pennsylvania.

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. So the highest price for mining a ton of, say, anthracite stove coal would be about $4.

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. That would be the very highest point.

Mr. LANDIS. I think so.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Has the gentleman any comment to make about the reasonableness of the cost to the consumer?

Mr. LANDIS. Of course, we wonder why Indiana coal sells for $10 when the miner only gets $1.03. But you have the operator's profits, freight rates, the retailers and the wholesalers share, and by the time it gets to the consumer, why it is evidently pretty high.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. We think, of course, it is high at $16 a ton.

Mr. LANDIS. That is true.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. It makes us worry a bit to burn coal and look, of course, naturally to oil or something else.

Mr. LANDIS. That is the point I want to make today, that the miner who produces the coal is getting only a very small proportion of it.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Not a fair proportion of it.

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution authorizing the President to conclude the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement with Canada and proceed with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project upon acceptance of its terms and modifications with Canada.

With a few exceptions, the people in my part of the country, the Central Northwest, have for a generation or more aspired and hoped for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to bring direct ocean navigation to the very center of the North American Continent. There is greater unanimity in support of this undertaking in the whole of the Great Lakes and Prairie States than on any other public issue that has come before this Congress.

There was a time not so long ago when defeatist economics assumed that the country's development had reached a stage of maturity and saturation with little opportunity for further development. Our frontiers had reached the Pacific Ocean, and there was, according to this view, no place else to go. We know now that this was inaccurate, and the opportunities for growth and expansion in this country are still unlimited. The new frontiers of scientific and technological development, and in the greater utilization of natural resources within our geographical boundaries, still challenge the best effort of our people.

The development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system of waterways is one of those frontiers of development and expansion which has not yet received adequate recognition as a stimulus to production and enterprise.

As the geographical frontier moved westward predatory exploitation of the natural resources of many of the Western States threatened to leave them stripped of their inherent resources. These States were stripped of their forests, and now they are threatened with the exhaustion of their mineral resources. Unless far-sighted steps are taken for intensive development of what there is left in the soil, and for new enterprises and wealth-creating opportunities through production and trade, we will soon find States like Minnesota denuded of their natural resources and depopulated through migration.

Anticipating the exhaustion of rich iron ore resources in the Mesabi Range, which would have devastating effects upon the industry of the whole Middle West,

I have been interested in the development of the technology of concentrated low-grade ores, and I shall pursue this with all the vigor at my command.

Again, lacking fuel resources in my State, I foresee the time when it will be possible through scientific development and economical techniques to utilize peat for fuel.

Again, those of us who come from the fertile plains of the Northwest must do everything in our power to accelerate a program of reforestation. All of these things we must do, if our part of the country will contribute its share to the common development of our Nation.

In the forefront of the program of natural resource development must be placed the construction of the necessary works to bring deep sea navigation into the Great Lakes, and to harness low-cost electric power on the St. Lawrence River.

There is a tendency to belittle this project by saying that it is an "old story," but the very fact that in spite of delays and disappointments the subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development comes up for reconsideration in every session of Congress, is a proof of its fundamental merit.

Only a few days ago Secretary of State George Marshall recommended to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approval of the pending Canadian-American agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway by this session of Congress. Secretary Byrnes before him, Secretary Stettinius, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson earlier, and Secretary Charles Evans Hughes even before him, all made the same plea. In the past 25 years successive Presidents of both parties insistently called upon the Congress to approve the development of this great undertaking in the interest of the Nation. Presidents Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman have had definite programs before the Congress for the construction of this project.

The fact that it has taken long and has at times been retarded is only due to the magnitude of the undertaking. Democracy moves slowly in the fulfillment of its destiny. It took almost 50 years of negotiation with the United Kingdom and 25 years of constant legislative discussion before authorization of the Panama Canal was approved by the Congress.

If I read historical portents clearly, the time is fast arriving when the St. Lawrence project will also become a reality. The first discussion of a deep waterway began in 1895, and since the early 1920's, that is, 25 years ago, the two Governments—Canada and the United States—have been actively considering this project. If history will repeat itself, I think the time is up and we should put the approval of the Canadian-American agreement on the legislative agenda of this session of Congress.

Of course, there are many arguments for and against a major project of this kind. It is the privilege of a free country to give every man an opportunity to express himself one way or another on any public issue, and those who favor considerable public expenditures for a project of this nature must have persuasive justification.

Since coming to Congress, I have read the record carefully; and without regard to the predisposition of my district in Minnesota, I can say without reservation that the case for the construction of this project at the earliest practicable time is well proved; and the fears of those who oppose it, though sincere and honest, are somewhat exaggerated.

The case is proved by the following evidence:

First. That the navigation through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic Ocean will be economically feasible and beneficial seems beyond question. Two thousand miles of low-cost water transportation to the open seas of the world, with water-transportation costs essentially almost one-tenth of the cost of rail transportation, cannot help but give the whole Great Lakes area a new lease on commerce which should be of benefit to the entire country.

Second. That this expansion of commerce will not be to the detriment of existing modes of transportation is a historical fact, proved by the advantages the whole country has gained from the construction of the Panama Canal, and from the development of inland waterways on the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Mississippi, and other river systems of our country. This is particularly true over the territory from Lake Michigan and Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains. The rail transportation systems in this whole territory will secure greater business by the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, which will make Chicago and Duluth, as well as other Great Lakes cities, terminal ports. Even in the case of eastern trunk lines, the development of commerce and industry, as a result of the advantages of cheap water transportation, cannot but help the traffic in the whole territory south of the Great Lakes, down to the Ohio Valley.

Third. The testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the views of Admiral Nimitz, General Eisenhower, General Marshall, and General Wheeler are incontrovertible that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be a great contribution to national security. Although many interests claimed before World War II that this project was not needed, because we had adequate transportation and adequate power resources, the hard realities of a total war belied their complacency. We let our merchant marine be crippled in the open Atlantic, whereas the St. Lawrence system, if it had been developed, would have given our ships a thousand miles of protected navigation—one-third of the way to the Continent of Europe. We carried the products of the steel mills and machine shops of the Great Lakes 2,000 miles to the west coast and 1,500 miles to to the south to be constructed into merchant ships at increased cost of men, materials, and money, while the Great Lakes were mainly confined to the construction of small ships that could navigate the shallow locks of the St. Lawrence River and the Mississippi River systems. Those larger units that had to be built in the Great Lakes were floated down 1,500 miles to New Orleans over the 9-foot channels, again at increased cost to the taxpayer.

It is conservative to state that the cost of the war, including the excess transportation cost paid on war material, including the increase in the cost of our shipbuilding program, was augmented several times more than the total cost of the seaway.

Fourth. The views of the Department of Interior, as expressed in its recent annual report, establish the fact that the St. Lawrence seaway will correct in considerable degree the dangerous situation that confronts this country as a result of the progressive exhaustion of its natural resources in ores and petroleum.

The high-grade iron ore of the Mesabi range, of which there is claimed to be only 500,000,000 tons available, is scheduled for exhaustion in less than 20 years at the present rate of consumption. That is the reason why I have proposed programs for the development of low-grade ores and we must press this program with all energy. However, under conditions of full employment or national emergency, this country will need, as we did in World War II, almost 100,000,000 tons a year of iron ore. It will take a long time, and an expenditure of close to a billion dollars, in concentrating plants and attendant works, to expand production of concentrated low-grade ores to the maximum requirements of this country. It is a safe insurance at the same time as we develop low-grade ores to take steps so that the steel mills of the great Middle West will not move to the East Coast or to the South in order to take advantage of low-priced foreign ores. It cannot hurt our own program of development of low-grade ores in Minnesota to have access, through low-cost water transportation, to the richer ores of foreign countries. There is no danger in this for our own undertaking because, even with free access between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic, it is not possible to bring in more than a small proportion from abroad. In the next 10 years this factor will be better appreciated. It is important to do something about it now, because it may take as long as 5 years to construct the seaway and several more years after that before full utilization of this new facility takes place.

It is to the interest of the miners and the owners of steel mills to make sure that they do not place the Great Lakes industry at a price disadvantage with respect to accessibility to ore resources. It would be a direct blow to the program of developing low-grade ores in the Great Lakes area if the attraction of high-grade foreign ores caused the transfer of steel mills to the east coast. Under those conditions the concentrating plants in my part of the country would have to overcome not only the greater costs of production, but greater cost of transportation to the steel mills.

Let me make this clear. We should develop low-grade ores to meet a substantial proportion of the national demand.

Finally, the record is indisputable that this country has always had and still has, a need for the large water-power re-

sources at the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. In 1929 a study by the Brookings Institution deprecated the need for this power by saying that there was no market for it. Between 1929 and 1945 in New York State alone, power demand has grown 100 percent by more than twice the capacity of the American share of the St. Lawrence project. This power could have been easily absorbed in that period. In 1941 it was again stated that New York State and the East had adequate power resources. Experience during the war indicated that they were so short of power that the War Production Board had to set definite limitations on the establishment of additional war plants in that area. Experience since the end of the war shows that, whereas much fear was expressed that the country would be confronted by an excess of generating capacity after the war, the Northeast is now short of power. Even in those areas such as the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest where large power dams were constructed, demand has outstripped supply and they must now make provision for new generating capacity.

The Province of Ontario, as well as New York State and adjacent States, have a need for this power right now. It is still the cheapest source of power in this area of the country and we must not deny any segment of our people their rightful desire to benefit by the bounties of nature.

These, then, are the compelling reasons why I sponsor legislation for the approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Agreement with Canada, and why I urge upon the Public Works Committee and my colleagues in this House to set aside sectional considerations and to view these great projects on their merits.

As a member of the Public Works Committee, I expect to view each proposal strictly on its merits, regardless of whether it affects my own district in any way whatsoever. Of course we must represent our constituents in the Halls of Congress, and I shall do so to the best of my ability, but even as compelling, it is our duty to legislate for the country as a whole for its benefit and advancement. We can achieve this common objective, not by tearing down and opposing the interests of other sections of the country, but by combining our efforts for the improvement of every section.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is advisable in view of the editorial comment appearing in some of the newspapers today to say just a few words with reference to the action of the Congress in passing the urgent deficiency bill. The comments of certain newspaper editors and commentators seem to be that the Congress by this action has killed OPA because it has refused to grant the deficiency requested by the OPA; that thereby the Congress had killed sugar control and especially has killed rent control. Now, let us see what the facts are. The facts are these: The Congress indicated by its action yesterday that it did not intend to furnish the OPA funds which it requested to carry on its activities for the balance of the current fiscal year. The rent-control law remains untouched and unchanged. The worst that could happen if the action of the House is sustained in the other body and is approved by the President is that the OPA and its agencies will not have the power of enforcement. It remains with the individual—I hope the people of America may hear and read this—it remains with the individual out in my State, for example, who is operating under an agreement of tenancy by which his rent has been fixed by OPA regulations that in the event his landlord seeks to raise the rent precipitantly or to raise it in violation of existing law and regulation, that individual has the right under existing law to go to his local court and bring suit for treble damages. I have just been wondering, may I say to Members of Congress, whether or not that is not going to be a pretty effective remedy. I am just wondering whether or not that is not going to bring the Government back to the people right at the grass roots instead of having this horde of prejudiced investigators of the OPA performing the service for them. I do not think that the people of America need to fear because every individual will have it within his or her power under the law to seek the protection that every other person seeks, and that is the judicial system of the country and the courts locally to protect his or her rights. Those rights are not destroyed by the failure of the Congress to make appropriations for the money which the OPA requested in the deficiency bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. How many other States have that same provision in their statutes, to protect rent violators?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman apparently did not understand my statement at all. I am not talking about any State statute. I am talking about the fact that under the Federal law an individual has a right to go into a State court and maintain a suit and invoke the protection of the Federal law.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understand that, but I am directing this question to the gentleman, whether or not the Congress of the United States having passed a law controlling rents, and not providing appropriations to carry out the enforcement of that law, is saying to the people of the various States of the Union, "You must seek your own redress in the State courts."

Mr. KEEFE. All I have to say is that the Federal Government passed a rent-control law. It is still on the statute books. The fact that Congress did not implement it by providing this deficiency appropriation does not mean that the law is repealed. It means that the law is still there with all of its force and effect and anybody who violates it may be expected to be summarily taken care of in the State courts, or possibly in the Federal court, with the regular machinery that the Government provides for the protection of its citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STIGLER, until February 28, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees.

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 20, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 20, 1947, in the committee room, suite 356, Old House Office Building. Those Members of Congress who sponsored bills relating to on-the-job training and subsistence ceilings will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at 10 a. m. on Thursday, February 20, 1947.

General discussion on veterans' preference.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 20, 1947.

Business to be considered: A showing of a moving picture on safety fuels for aviation purposes in connection with hearings being held on air accidents, after which the committee will hear statements of Members in regard to various bills introduced by them and referred to the committee.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue public hearings on amendments to the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m. each morning.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

376. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and

pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 279 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

377. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to H. R. 1366, a bill to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by certain agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce submits a report pursuant to section 136 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2072. A bill to prohibit the serving of unsanitary straws and other devices in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2073. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to include certain persons as beneficiaries under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 2074. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2075. A bill to provide standards to guide the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in paying subsistence allowances to veterans enrolled in educational and on-the-job training programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2076. A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2077. A bill to continue in effect, until June 30, 1950, the provisions of the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74, 78th Cong.), relating to the training of nurses through grants to institutions providing such training; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 2078. A bill to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2079. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2080. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Goose Creek, a tributary of Manokin River, Somerset County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2081. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Manokin River, opposite Prickley Point buoy, Somerset County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2082. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Jenkins Creek, a tributary of Little Annemessex River, Somerset County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2083. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H. R. 2084. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2085. A bill designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2086. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 109. Resolution to amend clause XI (m) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 110. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate whether or not certain eastern banking interests have conspired to precipitate domestic air lines into bankruptcy, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Simun Bleus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maynard Mancell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Philip V. Sullivan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of the Bunge North American Grain Corp., the Corporacion Argentina de Productores de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damages, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of the estate of Manuel Santos Barros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Isaac B. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of Demitrios Emanuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

128. By Mr. BRAMBLETT: Petition of Los Angeles Consumer-Tenant League, 625 North Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif., containing 172 signatures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

129. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of employees of the city of Lawrence, Kans., asking that in legislation for the reduction of income taxes provision be made to increase the personal exemption of taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Velimir Andjelkovitch petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to political freedom for Yugoslavs in Cairo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Father, we praise Thee for the dawn of this day which has come from the breath of divine love. In the midst of life's feverish ways, O lead our faltering steps and help us to find peace and unity, which come to those who are led by Thy merciful hand.

Through our waiting hours direct the Congress in Thy wisdom; may we be free from spiritual and intellectual neglect, ever mindful that public office is a public trust and that it may be fulfilled only with stout hearts and deep convictions. Work mightily in us, O God, and guide and sustain us in all our labors; and should disappointment come, grant that it may minister to our greater strength. Help us to realize that what we do will always be determined by what we are; when the workman dies, the work goes on.

"Grant us the will to fashion as we feel;
Grant us the strength to labor as we know;
Grant us the purpose, ribbed and edged with steel,
To strike the blow."

We pray in Jesus' name, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 15 minutes on Monday next, after the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered for that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an address he made on Lincoln's Birthday in Fresno, Calif.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include platform and program of the Steuben Society of America.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and to include two articles.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief resolution.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the life and character of the late Allen T. Treadway.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress will consider House Concurrent Resolution 20. I am completely in sympathy with the idea of economy, but it should be intelligent economy based upon findings from extensive hearings and investigations.

The greatest aid to recovery would be a balanced budget; a reduction in our national debt, and a reduction in taxes. The balanced budget comes first. Then Congress must give careful consideration to a long-range plan for a reduction in the national debt. We should also do as much as possible to give the American public the incentive it needs by a reduction in taxation.

We must balance the budget. That the public insists on. But the same public likewise insists on the safety of our Nation.

I voted in committee to reduce the budget $4,500,000,000 with a token cut in our armed forces. A reduction of $6,000,000,000, with drastic cuts in our armed forces appropriations, would imperil our national safety, which would be unwise at this time. I shall follow the recommendations of Generals Marshall and Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz not to reduce our armed forces below the point of safety.

I hold in my hand a letter which I received from Paul H. Griffith, national commander of the American Legion, which I quote in part:

Are we to ignore our international commitments to the extent that our representatives at peace parleys become the targets for contemptuous mockery by nations which have remained strong and influential?

In this critical and turbulent hour, a world of nations watches us to see what action we will take to maintain our leadership in world affairs. There is a solemn and sacred obligation upon America to remain strong until a permanent, feasible peace plan is established.

Passage of this resolution would be "penny-wise but pound-foolish."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Closed Shop Is Slavery," by Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Morrison
Bland	Gerlach	Murray, Tenn.
Buckley	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norrell
Buffett	Hagen	Norton
Bulwinkle	Harless, Ariz.	O'Hara
Coudert	Hartley	Peterson
Courtney	Hedrick	Potts
Cravens	Hendricks	Poulson
Crawford	Holifield	Russell
Davis, Tenn.	Jenison	Sanborn
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Short
Dawson, Utah	Kennedy	Somers
D'Ewart	Kirwan	Stigler
Domengeaux	Larcade	Taylor
Engle, Calif.	Lucas	Woodruff
Fernandez	McDonough	Youngblood
Fletcher	McGarvey	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ESTABLISHING CEILING FOR EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 103 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948, and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year, and all points of order against said concurrent resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER, and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, the concurrent resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said concurrent resolution. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 20 establishing a ceiling on expenditures for the fiscal year 1948. I think it is important at the outset to say that this is merely an expression by Congress that it favors a $6,000,000,000 reduction in Federal expenditures in the fiscal year 1948. It translates into dollars and cents the wish of the American people that we lower Federal expenditures. We must acknowledge that this resolution is not binding; it establishes no statutory limitations on the Federal Budget, but merely sets a target on which the Appropriations Committee can set its sights. It will give the various departments the right to appear before the Committee on Appropriations and justify their reasonable requests.

I would especially emphasize that, because somehow some people feel that this resolution is an attack on the armed services. I would say, again, in answer to that, that reliable spokesmen of the Army and the Navy can come before the Committee on Appropriations and justify necessary appropriation in the event there is a change in world conditions. I believe I am safe in saying that every Member of Congress at some time has emphasized the importance of governmental economy. So I would say, again, that this resolution gives us the privilege here today to translate their desires into actual being.

Mr. Speaker, this is a closed rule. It provides for 4 hours' debate, after which there may be one motion to recommit. Like many of you, I am not in favor of closed rules, but to you new Members I would emphasize the fact that when I first came to Congress back in 1933 we had many closed rules. I believe the RECORD will disclose that the Democratic leadership during those many years brought in many closed rules, and the Democratic leaders, without exception, voted solidly for those closed rules. At that time bills were sent over by the White House on which we were not permitted to cross a "t" or to dot an "i."

I may say in regard to this particular resolution that perhaps the reason why we are requesting this closed rule is that for 16 years under the Democratic Party this Nation unjustifiably and unwarrantedly squandered billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars, until now we have a national debt of $270,000,000,000. We must do something about

that. It is paramount that we reduce Federal expenditures, that we lower taxes, that we pay off on this stupendous, this tremendous national debt.

In regard to the amounts, President Truman sent to this Congress a budget in the amount of $37,500,000,000. That is many times the amounts the late President Roosevelt requested during peace years. The $31,500,000,000 proposed in this resolution is a reduction of $6,000,000,000 from the request of President Truman. This amount will, however, adequately take care of the necessary functions of our Government.

We must not forget that there are but 55,000,000 workers in the United States. By the simple process of arithmetic, you will find that even the $31,500,000,000 budget the Republican leadership is sponsoring will cost every one of these 55,000,000 workers over $500 a year Federal taxes. The Budget submitted by President Truman would mean a considerably greater hardship. Along with this over $500 each year our people naturally will have to pay the hidden taxes as well as the State taxes and the municipal taxes. No one can dispute that over $500 a year charged against every one of the 55,000,000 wage earners for Federal expenditures is a large figure, but neither can anyone dispute that we can adequately provide for the necessary functions of our Government with that large amount of $31,500,000,000, which is many times higher than the Budget recommended by the late Mr. Roosevelt during the peace years.

Adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 20 will be a positive expression that the House membership intends to stand behind its pledge to the taxpayers and translate into dollars and cents the will of the American people that Government activities and evpenditures shall be brought within their ability to pay. We need have no fears today that our action will impair the efficient operations of the Government. On the contrary, this action is a long step toward removing the superstructure of waste and extravagance from the Federal Government.

I personally do not feel that anyone can afford to vote against a reduction in Federal expenditures, and I predict that there will not be 20 votes in the House of Representatives against it. I hope that the rule is adopted, Mr. Speaker.

THE GAG RULE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], states that this resolution is not binding.

Consequently, it must be only for the political purpose of misleading the people into believing that there will be a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget.

If it is not binding, why bring it in here without the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, or the Committee on Appropriations, making known to the whole country where the cuts to bring about these reduced appropriations are going to be made? Why the secrecy? Why the rigid rule?

REORGANIZATION ACT IS ACTUALLY BEING VIOLATED

I know that gentlemen here will claim that the Joint Committee on the Budget, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, are supposed to bring in their budget recommendations and establish the ceiling by February 15; but instead of complying with the provisions of that act, they are violating its letter and its spirit, for they do not give to the country, nor even to the House membership, any information as to how they arrived at the conclusion that appropriations can be reduced to the extent of $6,000,000,000. They cannot because they do not know. This is a guess. It is the guess of only 10 of the 102 members of the joint committee.

WARNS AGAINST CONSEQUENCES

Consequently, I have no hesitancy in asserting that this is beyond doubt the most drastic gag rule ever submitted to the House since the days of Uncle Joe Cannon's czaristic control of Congress.

It deprives the Members—and I want you new Members particularly to understand what this means—it deprives the Members of all opportunity to discuss or amend this joint resolution. It deprives you of your rights under the Constitution and under the Rules of the House to vote on appropriations in accordance with the public hearing of testimony and evidence. It deprives you of your moral right to know what you are doing when you vote and of not being obliged to confess to your constituents that you obeyed party orders blindly.

From what budget estimates will these reductions be taken? I am afraid that when appropriations are slashed to meet this blind figure, this "guesstimate," you will squirm in your seats at being shorn of the right to vote on sadly needed appropriations for your district, your State, and your country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I regret that I cannot yield. I know that you have been misled by the propaganda that you sent out this morning. I know that you would now like to bring it to the attention of the House; but the Members already have received it, and should pay no further attention to this news release from the Citizens National Committee, which is a private tax-dodging organization made up of rich people who want to escape their just share of the tax burden. You cannot afford to form your judgment on such biased and misleading information.

WARNS AGAINST CANNONISM

When I came to Congress the first time in the Sixtieth Congress Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker and czar of the House. Under his drastic and arbitrary rule, privileges of Members were restricted, and they were deprived of the right to vote with their eyes open, knowing what they were voting for.

I warn you that your present gag policy will soon outdo even Uncle Joe Cannon's dictatorial practices, just as he outdid Speaker Reed, who was first referred to as czar of the House. Uncle Joe Cannon, who ruled the House with an iron hand and brooked not the slightest rebellion, in company with James Tawney, of Minnesota, and "Sunny Jim" Sherman, of Ohio, were the three Republicans of the membership of five on the Rules Committee. Not only was he deaf to the Democrats and to progressive members of his own party, but when he sat in the chair during sessions of the House he could never see to the right side of the aisle; but notwithstanding that daytime blindness he enjoyed good enough sight in his right eye at night.

DICTATORSHIP LEADS TO INGLORIOUS DEFEAT

Again I warn you, if the majority attempts to rule this House with such tyranny it will lead surely again, as in the past, to inglorious defeat at the hands of the American people.

WILL TAX BURDEN BE UNLOADED ON WORKERS?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] states that we are not going to slash Army and Navy appropriations by $1,750,000,000. Where, then, are these six billions of dollars coming from? What departments are going to be crippled? Is chaos to be created and left as our normal way of life by blindly slashing off funds. This will be inquired into more fully by the speakers who follow me.

With all the affection I have for my colleague, I wonder if, when he says that 55,000,000 workers will be obliged to pay $5,000 each for the reduction of our public debt, he is intending to follow the lead of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] in reducing the taxes of the wealthy, of the rich corporations, and the war profiteers, relieving them of any payment of service on the debt while unloading the crushing burden only on the 55,000,000 workers? Does he intend, and does his party intend, to excuse the rich from bearing their just share of the national defense?

Surely, upon sober thought, it must be seen that the statement will be regarded as ridiculous.

FOR ECONOMY BUT NOT FOR BLIND CUTS

Mr. Speaker, I am for economy and for an equitable and orderly reduction of taxes—but I am not for a reduction only in the tax bills of the war profiteers, the black marketeers, and the economic royalists, and I am not for any inefficient, hit-or-miss, shot-in-the-dark false economies.

More than once I have called attention to reckless expenditures by our military and naval gentlemen, and I am of the opinion that even now we have thousands of officers, highly paid civilians, and enlisted men whose services are not essential and could be dispensed with.

But though I am not a militarist, and do not and will not believe that there is any danger of a new war, this is not the time for any reductions that would lower the efficiency of our armed forces.

NOBODY KNOWS WHERE CUTS WILL BE MADE

To be forced to vote on the coming appropriations, after the House has received from the Committee on Appropriations a report on cuts and increases agreed to behind closed doors, appears to me to be outrageous.

I tried my utmost to obtain from the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], when he appeared before the Rules Committee to obtain this binding and restrictive gag rule on the Members, some information as to how the committee had arrived at the conclusion that $6,000,000,000 can be lopped off the President's carefully prepared Budget estimate, and where the cuts would be made in the appropriations for the various agencies and departments.

I was unable to obtain the slightest information.

He did not have it.

He, himself, stated that he did not have it.

CUTS FIRST, STUDY AFTERWARD

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said the committee would begin hearings and afterward would decide where the cuts would be made.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, is this not a ridiculous procedure?

We are asked first to vote on the reduction; the committee will later give us the information.

DEMOCRATS RESPECTED MINORITY RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, during the 16 years the Democratic Party held control of Congress, and during my service of 8 years as chairman of the Committee on Rules, no such abridgment of the rights of Members and of the minority was ever attempted or requested, and no such gag rule was ever presented for consideration of an appropriation bill.

That we did bring in such a rule for a tariff bill or a revenue bill, so technical and complex that the slightest amendment might destroy the structure of a bill which had required months of painstaking study and detailed work by the Committee on Ways and Means, I readily concede but only on unanimous request of the whole committee.

But not only did we never offer any such drastic gag rule on an appropriation bill but, to the contrary, we brought in special rules to liberalize the rules in order to expedite the business of the House by waiving points of order that would have deprived Members of the right to vote on appropriations in a bill. I surmise that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will endeavor to characterize those as gag rules, but to my mind they were not.

MONEY SPENT TO SAVE COUNTRY

Mr. Speaker, charges have been made that the Democratic administration and Congress under President Roosevelt and under President Truman spent vast sums of money.

Of course we did.

We rescued the country from an abyss of depression into which 12 years of Republican misrule, and especially after the last 4 years of Mr. Hoover's term, had led the Nation and the world.

We were obliged to feed and clothe the hungry and the destitute; to provide work for the 16,000,000 unemployed; to bail out the banks, the railroads, the mortgage companies, the insurance companies; to save industry from insolvency and the farmers from bankruptcy.

All those things were accomplished, but naturally it cost money.

FREEDOM NOT MEASURED IN DOLLARS

The war cost money—vast and hitherto undreamed of sums.

Do the gentlemen on the Republican side begrudge those vast outpourings of money to win the war and save us from the attacks of our foreign enemies, from conquest and enslavement?

The people do not begrudge those vast sums. They believe freedom cannot be measured in dollars.

BOUGHT FISSION DISCOVERY

It must be borne in mind that the winning of the war cost at least $50,000,000,000 more than it should have because of the unpreparedness of the country after Pearl Harbor, because our isolationists and our pacifists and our short-sighted, penny-wise and pound-foolish snippers delayed defense preparations.

It was not so long ago that we cannot now recall their ridicule of our efforts to increase our air forces, to expand our Navy, to construct needed fortifications, and build up the Army.

And atomic energy—would these gentlemen have had us forego being the first to split the atom?

Who can measure its value to the world, in peace or in war, in terms of money?

WHO IS A RUBBER STAMP?

Mr. Speaker, in years gone by, when we followed the inspired leadership of President Roosevelt in putting the country back on its feet, and later on in his courageous recommendations to prepare for a war we did not want but could not avoid and keep our freedom, the Republican minority taunted us as being rubber stamps.

Who now is a rubber stamp?

I say now that if there ever was a time that Members of Congress could be boxed up and labeled "rubber stamps," that honor is now yours.

Never, in all my many years' service in this honorable body, have I seen such unanimity on all votes by the Republicans to the advantage of the wealthy and against the interest of labor and the common people.

NO TIME ON RECOMMITTAL

Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen will surely claim that under the rule an opportunity will be given for debate on a motion to recommit. This privilege could not be taken away by the Rules Committee, for the rules of the House do not permit this motion to be foreclosed.

That every other liberty of debate was taken away is shown by the language of the resolution, which reads, in part:

> That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours * * * the concurrent resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment.

NO AMENDMENTS PERMITTED

And now note this language, Mr. Speaker:

> No amendment shall be in order to said concurrent resolution. At the conclusion * * * the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

However, judging by your arbitrary tactics, the previous question again will be moved in denying anyone to say a word in favor of the motion to recommit.

VOTE "NO" ON PREVIOUS QUESTION

If you do not wish to bind yourself for all the remainder of your service to slavish acceptance of party dictates, I urge and appeal to you to vote against this rule, and to vote "no" on the previous question which will be moved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

In view, however, of your caucus action, I fear that very few of you, if any, will have the courage to do so, notwithstanding that by your affirmative vote you are digging your own political graves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing today with a form of procedure that has never before been followed in the Congress of the United States. It is the result of exhaustive study by a special committee which recommended certain reorganization procedures in the last Congress in order to streamline, so-called, the operations of the Congress itself. At the time that the committee was sitting, considering these matters of reorganization, I happened to be one of those who advocated the new procedure which is now being followed. I advocated it for the reason that in years gone by we had appropriated in a rather hit-and-miss fashion, taking up individual bills, one by one, and never knowing from day to day exactly what our fiscal position was. For the last 17 years we have appropriated under a cloud of deficit financing. We have not had a balanced budget in 17 years. Today we are considering both a rule and resolution which, as I said, comes from this new procedure. The resolution itself would, in my opinion, have a binding effect if we were proposing an increase in the debt limit. We are not doing that, because for the first time in 17 years we are dealing with a surplus rather than a deficit. There never was any intent, so far as I know, by those who are members of the Reorganization Committee, to make this resolution a binding resolution from the point of view of expenditures. There was every intent of creating a framework under which the Members could intelligently consider appropriations.

As for this rule, there has been a great deal of discussion about its being a gag rule. In the minority report which was filed in connection with the majority report on this subject there is a great deal in the way of verbiage, but absolutely nothing to carry out the intent of the Reorganization Act; namely, to propose a ceiling on expenditures. The minority, under the rule which I hope will be adopted, has the privilege of advancing whatever figures they like in a motion to recommit. They are not being gagged in any way. Even in the hearing before the Rules Committee, the minority advanced nothing. They did not tell us why they wanted an open rule; what amendments they might offer if an open rule was adopted; nor did their minority report suggest that they had anything to offer in substitution for the one now

before us. Why that should be considered a gag rule when it is wide open for the minority to offer any substitute they see fit and demand a roll call on it, is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. Not at this point. During our debates on the reorganization bill last year we had before us for consideration one recommendation which was made by the Reorganization Committee and was then stricken at the request of the then leadership of the House. That was the recommendation that every Member of the House should be privileged to appear at some time before the different committees of the House in advocacy of some particular legislation which he had filed. That provision, which, to my mind, would have lifted the biggest gag that exists today, was taken out of the reorganization bill at the instance of our very distinguished former Speaker the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. When the matter came before the House for debate I moved that that be reinserted, and in Committee of the Whole it was reinserted. But at the last moment, before the Committee rose, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] took the floor and made an eloquent plea that this should be stricken, and that a continuance of the tremendous powers of the chairmen to gag our own Members should be continued. It was, in response to his prestige, stricken out; but how in the face of that action he can now complain of a gag rule is beyond me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I presume that a rupture of the harmonious relations that have existed between the two parties represented here by the membership up to this moment had to come, but there was and there is no good reason for bringing it on here.

This is the first time that I have ever opposed the adoption of a resolution reported by the Rules Committee, and I would not oppose this resolution except for the fact that it is a violent departure from what has heretofore been the rule and that it makes too great an exaction of surrender of freedom of action on the part of the membership, an exaction which can only be justified by the most extreme emergency which does not exist. The House has considered legislation under closed or so-called gag rules, but those have been, in the main, set up for the consideration of tax bills and were justified in those cases solely because of the technical nature of those bills.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Just a minute, please.

Never in the history of the Congress has any question relating to an appropriation bill been considered under this kind of rule.

Mr. Speaker, there are none of us but who are in accord with the objective the leadership has in mind, that is, reducing Federal expenditures. What we resist here is the method you are seeking for the determination of what the reduction shall be and where and how it shall be effected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have asked the gentleman to yield only for the purpose of keeping the record straight.

Mr. COX. I cannot yield, for a statement. I have not the time. Please do not persist. I will consent that the gentleman's observation may be inserted at this part of my statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is only to keep the record straight.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are doing a very unwise thing in the adoption of this resolution. The report has gone out that in order for the Appropriations Committee to keep within the limit that is here set up it must reduce the Army and the Navy appropriation set up in the President's budget message to the extent of a billion and a half. Cannot my colleagues visualize and understand just what the psychological effect will be of our adopting this resolution which tells the country that the Congress is going to reduce Army-Navy appropriations to the extent of a billion and a half? Army and Navy civilian personnel is unjustifiably high and waste is doubtless great, all of which affords reasons for large savings, but here at this particular time it is unwise and it is dangerous to do that which will carry the implication that to keep within the limit fixed there will have to be a cut in appropriations for essential services. I am certain that my Republican friends do not want to cripple our armed services and I make no such charge, but here is the danger: Our new and great Secretary of State goes to Moscow in a few days, and here on the very eve of his departure we take the edge off his sword. The adoption of this resolution will not only embarrass him but it will handicap him in the contest in which he is about to enter, and it is something we should not do. He goes abroad with the country solidly behind him and we should not do that which might cause the rest of the world to think otherwise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution, and I take the floor because I think this is an historical incident. As has been stated here before, this House has not been accustomed in the past to gag its Members. I have been a member of the Rules Committee for 14 years, and in that time it has been the policy of both the majority and the minority members of that committee to pursue the democratic policy that every Member of this House shall have the opportunity on every bill that comes up to offer his amendments and to offer his suggestions for the betterment of the legislation. There is one exception to that rule, as has been stated by the gentleman from Georgia. That exception has been the matter of tax bills where both the minority and majority recognized the impracticability of writing a tax bill on the floor of the House. Those resolutions have come to this House by the unanimous request of both the majority and minority members of the Ways and Means Committee.

No one in this House is stronger for Government economy, for balancing the budget, for beginning a reduction of the huge national debt, and for a business-like administration of the affairs of this Nation than myself. I expect to vote on the appropriation bills for every cut that I think can be made without affecting the efficiency of Government, and I believe that there are plenty of cuts that can be made, and will be made. But this is an entirely different principle we are talking about this morning.

Mr. Speaker, we are proposing to fix a figure on the national budget that is picked out of thin air. No Member of this House can tell you today, if this resolution is adopted, how much of it is coming out of the armed services. No man in this House, in my opinion, wishes to cripple at this critical hour the armed services. We have no figures. The report gives no figures. Where is your cut going to come from? My Republican friends, you are flush with the powers of victory which you have just had. I think you ought to stop and think about what you are doing to the House and the precedents that have been established over the years, established after a revolt in your own party against czarist measures of your leadership.

I hope somebody will state what is going to be the policy of the majority in this administration.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me ask the question; then I will yield for the gentleman to answer. Do you propose, as a matter of policy, from time to time, to bring into this House bills with a closed or gag rule in which you deny to the membership of your own party as well as our party the opportunity to offer amendments to the legislation? I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say in answer to that question that the policy of the Republican Party, by and large in respect to rules on general bills, will be to have the open rule. I may say further in answer to the gentleman in respect to this particular rule: The gentleman has referred to the precedents on tax bills. In my opinion, the proposal before us more nearly approximates tax bills on which we have consistently had closed rules than any other sort of proposition that has been before us.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I totally disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, with whom I have fought many good battles on his side. There is no comparison whatsoever between these two propositions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just want to add one thought. Here we are dealing with a critical situation on this

budget, and your own party over on the other side has decided that all you can safely cut is $4,500,000,000. You gentlemen here have decided that you can safely cut $6,000,000,000, and yet your own members who are unable to agree with you and believe that all you can safely cut is $4,500,000,000 are prohibited by this rule, if you adopt it, from voting to agree with the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol.

I just want to say this, that if you do not believe in this czarist kind of method, if you do not believe in this thing of gagging yourselves, the one and only thing you can do is to vote down the previous question when it comes up.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I have the highest respect for the gentleman's capacity and ability, and I likewise have the highest respect for the capacity and ability and good judgment of the senior Senator from his own State who said in the other body that the cut should be $6,000,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But I still reserve the right and the hope that I may have the privilege to vote my own convictions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules who voted for this rule which is now before the House, I would like to make a few observations. This rule is not as sinister as depicted, and I will try to remove the smoke screen that has been so adroitly presented today in order to divert attention from the real issues before us. This rule does not prevent any Member of this House from expressing himself fully and freely on the question involved.

The venerable and affable gentleman from Illinois talks about this drastic gag rule. I have been a Member of the House for 7 years, and I have grown rather accustomed to such rules. I know of no Member of the House today who is being deprived of any voting privilege whatever because of this rule.

Let us look for a moment at what the rule does. It provides for 4 hours of debate, 2 hours on each side, and an open rule would not give you any more time. Under this rule each Member of the House has the opportunity today to express himself on how much he thinks the expenditures of this Government can be reduced in the next fiscal year. If he believes, as I do, they can be cut $6,000,000,000, which is the amount the Joint Legislative Budget Committee has recommended to the House, then he should support this resolution. Provision is made for one motion to recommit, and undoubtedly the motion to recommit will include an amount which will probably be less than this amount. If any Member of the House feels he would rather support the smaller amount, he can vote for the motion to recommit. In this way he is given full opportunity to vote his convictions just the same as he would under an open rule. So I do not see that any Member of the House is being deprived of any privilege whatsoever. It is very much the same situation as when we vote on a conference report. We vote it up or down; no Member of the House is given the opportunity to offer amendments. He must vote either for or against the report. Now that is exactly the situation before us here today. You can vote to adopt the recommendation of the committee, or you can vote for a smaller reduction.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. This rule cannot become effective, call it gag rule or not, unless a majority of this House votes for it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is true, and I cannot conceive how any Member of this House can complain that he does not have the opportunity to express his full convictions on the amount of the reductions that should be made in Federal expenditures. By his vote today on this resolution he can say whether he wants to cut the expenditures six billion, or a smaller amount, or not at all. I hope no one will be deceived by all this talk about the rule which is now being discussed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows on a motion to recommit the previous question will be asked for and ordered and the Members will be denied the right to speak on it, consider it, or to do anything about it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You will be permitted to offer an amount, will you not?

Mr. SABATH. But that is the only thing we can do—offer an amendment to recommit; that is all. Then we have not got the figure on which to base the amount.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Your reply confirms just what I have been telling the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for a good many years, and cannot recall its reporting any rule of this character during that time except on revenue measures, which rules in those instances were asked for by the unanimous action of the Committee on Ways and Means. It has been a long time since I have seen a rule of this character for a purpose like this.

I recollect the days when the triumvirate of Messrs. Longworth, Snell, and Tilson used to manage the affairs of the House somewhat in this fashion, and I am wondering if the name of that triumvirate may now be changing to Messrs. MARTIN, ALLEN, and HALLECK.

The Reorganization Act does not direct the joint committee to fix the budget limitation, it directs them to report to the House some amount; yet under this procedure no Member of this Congress, fresh as it is from the people, has the right, upon the adoption of this rule, to offer any kind of amendment to the concurrent resolution that will be thereby made in order. So the House is putting itself in the position today of having to accept what the joint committee has done, or nothing.

Of course, we are all for reasonable economy, but Congress, I am afraid, is by this procedure putting itself in the position of a court that renders a verdict and a judgment and then proceeds to try the case. I would not say that the language of this resolution is binding upon the Congress in any legal sense, but certainly it is binding in the highest moral sense. If Congress does not intend to live up in good faith to any limitation it sets today, then this whole procedure comes close to deceit and at best is nothing but a cheap political gesture that ought to be an insult to the intelligence of the American people. If Congress is in good faith going to live up to any limitation it fixed today blindly and without evidence, then this is one of the most important things this Congress will have to consider all during this session, and behind it are as many headaches. The men who vote for the previous question here today ought to be prepared in the future days of this session to vote for whatever cuts may be necessary to maintain that limitation, no matter what hardships the cold facts may divulge when we get to where we can consider them under some decent procedure by which we have some freedom of action.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, this resolution is no idle gesture. I agree with the distinguished gentleman who just preceded me that those of us who vote today to recommend a reduction to the extent of $6,000,000,000 in the Budget proposed by the President must practice what we preach, and that is what I propose to do. During the rather short time I have been in Congress I have heard a great deal about so-called gag rules. I find that a gag rule is always popular with those that have a majority of the votes and unpopular with the other side. I never heard of anybody now representing the minority shedding tears over a gag rule when the leadership was on the other side of the aisle. I have seen so-called gag rules come in from the now minority, when they were the majority, that had nothing to do with tax bills. There were many such gag rules. I have seen legislation considered under suspension of the rules just because the majority had the votes, when I thought that somebody ought to have the right to amend such legislation. This is not a gag rule. How many Members in this House are prepared today to say that this proposed reduction is unreasonable? There would probably be 5,599,000 amendments if you were to bring this character of legislation in under an open rule. It would be the greatest bill to filibuster that I can think of. The people who are against cutting down expenditures would filibuster to their hearts' content if you had

a wide-open rule. The rule provided for in this resolution is the only kind of sensible rule that you could bring in. There is one thing I think ought to be made clear. The gentleman from Georgia suggested that by this rule we were probably fixing the amount of money that the Army and Navy could have. That is what I infer from what he said. It does not mean that at all. It means that we are reducing the over-all expenditures of the Government by $6,000,000,000, but it does not mean that that $6,000,000,00 is going to be taken from any particular Government activity. The amount that any agency shall receive will be justified when they are considered by the various subcommittees on appropriations and by the Appropriations Committee itself. One of the gentlemen undertook to give some little advice to the new Members who are fresh from the people. Well, I happen to be a little bit fresh from the people today myself, because I just spent a week down in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Ohio. I want to tell you that the people of this country are demanding that this Congress reduce the Budget by at least $6,000,000,000, and if it takes a gag rule to do it, the people want it now. The people are not going to be fooled or scared by this talk that we are ending every national security by reducing expenses in Government.

Yes, gentlemen, the people have had enough of tax, tax, spend, spend, elect, and elect.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle might just as well realize now that the profligate days of the New Deal are over. The people on November 5 brought about the dawn of a new day, and it is up to us, their representatives, to see to it that we carry out that mandate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to our former Speaker the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my Democratic colleagues, old and new, who have not served under a Republican administration in the House of Representatives, that this is not all of it—this is part of it. You will get more of this generous treatment as we run along. I quite agree with my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], that this is not binding. I quite agree that it is a legislative gesture—and an idle one. I do not indulge in personalities with persons, but I brand this resolution as utter and total legislative hypocrisy.

The gentleman from the wind-swept part of Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is the only one I have heard say he is going to live up to it. I wonder how his vote is going to be recorded on the planting of trees and soil conservation in that dry section of the Southwest.

Where are you going to cut? Nobody has mentioned one place specifically that we are going to cut. Now you think this is popular. I do not think so. What is going to be your answer after this pious hope that you express today when, on June 30, you find that you have not reduced appropriations $6,000,000,000, you have not reduced appropriations $4,000,000,000, you have not reduced appropriations $3,000,000,000? You say you are not going to reduce the Army and the Navy.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. No. I have only a few minutes. You say you are not going to reduce the Army and the Navy. Where are you going to make it up? Are you going to cut from the civil functions of the Government $5,000,000,000, $5,500,000,000, or $6,000,000,000? The news that goes out from this Capitol today, my friends, will be sad to people this world around. Do not forget that. I have talked with men in the Department of State, the Department of War, and the Department of the Navy. They are the saddest and most disturbed men I have ever talked to in the 30 or more years I have been a Member of this House of Representatives. Today you are going to say by the adoption of this resolution that nobody can offer an amendment to this thing. Fifty men, seventy-five men and women in this House would like to speak. They cannot do it in 4 hours. They would like to tell what they think about this in a 5-minute speech, in a motion to strike out the last word or in offering an amendment.

The only way you can live up to this pious hope, this legislative gesture, is to have your committees cut appropriation bills $6,000,000,000, and then bring in a gag rule and crowd it down our throats, where we will have to vote for that amount or nothing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the majority leader, of course.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not agree with the gentleman that this is nothing more than a pious hope, but if the gentleman's interpretation is correct, it is a pious hope that arises out of a reorganization bill passed when the gentleman's party was in power in the last Congress.

Mr. RAYBURN. They did not say anything about reducing the Budget $6,000,000,000.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course not.

Mr. RAYBURN. Or four billion or one billion or raising it to ten billion. There is nothing in the bill with reference to that.

Mr. HALLECK. But the terms of the reorganization bill definitely provided for this recommendation to be made by the 15th of February.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course; a report.

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. A report. What kind of report? Pick it out of the air. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], when they were speaking about reducing Government employees 500,000 or a million or a million and a half, snapped his fingers and said, "Oh, I think about a million." The gentleman from New York and his colaborers snapped their fingers and say, "A million." They say, "We want to reduce spending. We will take $6,000,000,000." Where? Nobody has answered where, and I doubt if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will answer that when he takes the floor.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Does not the gentleman from Texas understand that the legislative budget was fixed after four meetings of the Budget Committee, and hearing only two witnesses, when there were 101 days from the November election until February 15?

Mr. RAYBURN. Everybody knows this figure was picked out of the air. It is unjustified, it is ill-considered; and you know you are not going to live up to it. You know that if you had told the members of your conference on yesterday that you would live up to this thing you would have had a mighty lot of trouble.

No wonder these gentlemen want to get up and defend themselves. They will be doing that during the remainder of this Congress and the next session; and this 1948 thing that looked so bright a few weeks ago is dimming out to some extent now.

I started to say that our great Secretary of State is leaving in a few days for a meeting of the first importance, of the very first importance. You cannot let him know or the world know how much you are going to cut the Army and the Navy before he goes. You cannot let him know whether you are going to give him as a weapon some money to feed the starving people on the face of this earth; and I fear that by your action today and the implications here, I deeply fear that when George Marshall flies to Moscow he will fly with a crippled wing.

Feed starving people? People fear communism. You cannot kill communism by making a speech against it or raving against it, you have got to cure the cause of communism. China, Japan, Germany, Europe today do not want communism. I fear that if we do not help these people when they are starving that we will push them into the arms of the Communists, for there is a people that expresses to them some kind of hope.

I fear that you will rue this day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have risen from a sick bed and come here to speak and vote on this rule and on the concurrent resolution because I believe that the votes we cast here today will be the most important in this session of Congress.

We are considering this rule and resolution today because the new Legislative Reorganization Act, and a provision therein, requires that the Joint Congressional Budget Committee meet and report back to the Congress by February 15 its recommendation as to the ceiling which shall be placed upon the annual Budget and Federal spending in the coming fiscal year.

The Legislative Reorganization Act, Mr. Speaker, was enacted by a Democratic Congress. Either the Congress,

and the members of the Democratic Party who voted for the Legislative Reorganization Act, and the provisions of the act which require that a ceiling be fixed on expenditures, with the very thought and purpose that such a ceiling would help bring about some sort of economy in the Government, were sincere or they are insincere. If they were sincere then, they are insincere now in opposing this rule and resolution. If they are sincere now, then they were insincere a few months ago when they voted for the Reorganization Act and the requirement that a Budget ceiling be fixed. I wonder if, during general debate, some of the gentlemen who have already spoken will tell us which time they actually were sincere, and which time they were insincere in the opposite positions they have taken on this matter.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Congressional Budget Committee, spoke and voted against the provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act which required this Budget ceiling to be fixed and this report to be made. He pointed out the difficulties which would be encountered, at the time the Legislative Reorganization Act was before us, and offered an amendment to strike out that section of the bill, but the Democratic majority voted almost solidly against his amendment and for keeping the Budget ceiling requirement in the act. Now they are condemning the very measure that they wrote into the law of the land.

I give the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER] great credit for his present position. Despite the fact he did not want the provision of the law requiring this ceiling and report, he has done his best to comply with the law and to make the report as required. Of course, the Democratic members of that joint budget committee had the full right and complete authority to bring in a minority report and to set forth therein the figure at which they believed the budget ceiling should be fixed by the Congress. However, they failed to do that. Instead they simply wrote a sort of a namby-pamby minority view, saying, "Oh, we are for economy, and a budget ceiling, but we are not going to tell you how much."

I also want to pay my sincere respects to the members of the Democratic Party who put the welfare of their country ahead of partisanship and joined with the Republican majority in fixing the $31,500,000,000 budget ceiling. The Republicans, along with the courageous Democrats on this committee have told you how much they want Congress to cut the President's budget. They want it reduced by $6,000,000,000. Mr. Speaker, any one who stands up here on this floor and tells you it cannot be done is not interested in economy.

Why, of course, the money-spenders do not want to cut the budget. Why should they? That is the way they were elected and reelected until the people finally caught up with the fraudulence of their political operations. Certainly, they will try to tell you it is still necessary, in the third peacetime year after the war, to spend four times as much to operate this Government as was spent in any prewar peacetime year under Franklin D. Roosevelt, when we were spending our way into prosperity.

Yes; we want to cut public spending by $6,000,000,000. We are being mighty good to you spenders, but you do not realize it. You should be grateful to us that we did not make the budget cut $7,500,000,000 instead of only six billion. But we will be back next year with another budget cut; for we are determined to have greater economy in our Government.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentlemen on my right who in past Congresses have made the greatest spending record in all history, that you have voted this country into its present condition. You also created the demand, by your wild profligacy, which caused the people to speak out on November 5 and say they were tired of the reckless waste and extravagance of the Federal Government. By their votes the people clearly demonstrated they wanted a Congress which would do something about it. All of us who ran on the Republican ticket, and many of you who ran as Democrats, promised the people we would do something to curb this reckless waste of the Federal taxpayers' money.

Well, I think I can guarantee you gentlemen on the right one thing—the Republicans in this House are going to do something about it by supporting this resolution when it comes to a vote. I rather suspect there will be a great many Democrats do likewise.

I have heard much talk here today about the Army and the Navy. You and I know that the Army and the Navy appropriations are not going to be cut to where our national defense or security are endangered. Yet, every veteran who served in the late war, and every officer down in the War Department, as far as that is concerned, knows that there is waste and extravagance in our military structure which can and should be eliminated without in any way endangering our national security. The fiscal leaders of this Congress pledge us they will eliminate waste and extravagance wherever found in the War and Navy Departments, but that there will be no reductions in appropriations for true national defense and security needs. I think we can depend upon the loyalty and patriotism of these men being just as great as that of any other Member of this House.

But I want to refer back to one or two statements which have been made here today. I love and respect every member of the Committee on Rules. They are a great group of gentlemen. They do have their weaknesses, however. Some of them are seemingly suffering from poor memories, especially when they come on the floor of this House and try to tell us that the only closed or gag rules which have been put out by the Democratic-controlled Rules Committees in this House in the past have been on tax legislation. Why, gentlemen, I am surprised. I am utterly amazed that your memories are so bad.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I can say as chairman of the Committee on Rules that I do not expect to break the record established by our good friends for the past 14 years in regard to bringing in closed or gag rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would say to the gentleman that even if he does break their record, he will have to bring in a lot more rules than we expect to have in this session.

Let me refresh the memory of some of you gentlemen of the minority who have insisted that you did not put out any gag rules on anything except tax measures. Let me go back and find them for you. Here is one on the Agriculture Adjustment Act. Is that a tax measure? Here is another on the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act. Is that a tax measure? Talk about closed rules. Here is one on the Arms and Ammunition Embargo Act. Is that a tax measure, I might ask the gentleman from Illinois? And here is a closed rule on the Tennessee Valley Authority. Well, perhaps, that was a tax measure in one sense of the word, for we have certainly been taxed plenty for it. And the St. Lawrence waterway. Do you remember that closed rule? Well, I do.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I decline to yield. However, you may just keep a record of these closed or gag rules.

Here is another on the independent offices appropriation bill. And here are more closed rules. One on the sale of securities, or the first Securities Act. Is that a tax measure? This National Industrial Recovery Act? Do you remember that one? NIRA, as they called it—or the sick chicken. Do you remember that closed rule? That was another New Deal measure which cost the American people millions and billions of dollars, of course. I could go on and name a dozen or so more, but I have time to only pick out a few.

Here is a closed rule on the extension of NRA. Another on the Merchant Marine Act. And one for the Blue Ridge Parkway. You even had a gag rule on a bill for the building of a parkway. And another on the Townsend old-age pension bill. Do you remember that one? Here's another on the bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; and still another on the extension of the Sugar Act. Then, of course, we had a closed rule on the famous Economy Act. You remember that Economy Act, do you not? I am sure you do. That is the one by which you took away the pensions of the veterans of the First World War. And by the way, that is the only economy record that you have ever made that I know of. And that was under a gag rule. Sure, you Democrats never had any gag rules? Oh, no.

I can go right on down the list, one after the other; but what's the use? But I do want to call your attention to the fact time after time these rules provided that the bill under consideration should not even be read. The fact of the matter is that many of them were passed under a gagged rule without even being

printed, let alone read in the House. The Members were not given an opportunity to read or know what they were voting on—and yet you talk of unfair methods of legislation? You stand up here and attack the majority because it brings in a closed rule to do the very thing we have all promised to do: to bring about a little economy in this Government. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

I was amazed and surprised at my good friend, the former Speaker—and I have the greatest respect and admiration for him—when he said in substance, "We are not going to cut public spending. We are not going to cut the Budget any $6,000,000,000. We are not going to cut it by $4,500,000,000, we are not going to cut it by $3,000,000,000." Someone interrupted him, but I wish he had gone on, for he probably would have ended by saying, "We are not going to cut the budget at all."

The budget would have been cut a long while ago if there had been a few more Democrats voting with the Republicans in support of amendment after amendment we offered to reduce appropriation bills which have been before this Congress since I have been here the last 8 years. Throughout the wasteful, sinful days of the New Deal—when the Nation's substance was being frittered away—there were many of us who made the good fight for economy and against wild governmental extravagances. We were voted down. Our efforts were generally of no avail—but we were right. Now the people are aroused. They are with us today. That is why this rule and this resolution cutting the budget by $6,000,000,000 will be approved by a majority vote of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RAYBURN. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 174, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—229

Allen, Calif.	Burke	Eaton
Allen, Ill.	Busbey	Ellis
Andersen, H. Carl	Butler	Ellsworth
Anderson, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	Elsaesser
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	Elston
Angell	Carson	Engel, Mich.
Arends	Case, N. J.	Fellows
Arnold	Case, S. Dak.	Fenton
Auchincloss	Chadwick	Fletcher
Bakewell	Chenoweth	Foote
Banta	Chiperfield	Fulton
Barrett	Church	Gallagher
Bates, Mass.	Clason	Gamble
Beall	Clevenger	Gavin
Bender	Clippinger	Gearhart
Bennett, Mich.	Coffin	Gifford
Bennett, Mo.	Cole, Kans.	Gillette
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Gillie
Blackney	Cole, N. Y.	Goff
Boggs, Del.	Corbett	Goodwin
Bolton	Cotton	Graham
Bradley, Calif.	Coudert	Grant, Ind.
Bradley, Mich.	Crow	Griffiths
Bramblett	Cunningham	Gross
Brehm	Curtis	Gwynne, Iowa
Brophy	Dague	Hale
Brown, Ohio	Devitt	Hall,
Buck	Dirksen	Edwin Arthur
	Dolliver	Hall,
	Dondero	Leonard W.
Halleck	McDowell	Rogers, Mass.
Hand	McGarvey	Rohrbough
Harness, Ind.	McGregor	Ross
Herter	McMahon	Sadlak
Heselton	McMillen, Ill.	St. George
Hess	MacKinnon	Sarbacher
Hill	Macy	Schwabe, Mo.
Hinshaw	Maloney	Schwabe, Okla.
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Scoblick
Hoffman	Mason	Scott, Hardie
Holmes	Mathews	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hope	Meade, Ky.	Scrivner
Horan	Merrow	Seely-Brown
Howell	Meyer	Shafer
Hull	Michener	Short
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Conn.	Simpson, Ill.
Javits	Miller, Md.	Simpson, Pa.
Jenkins, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Kans.
Jenkins, Pa.	Mitchell	Smith, Maine
Jennings	Morton	Smith, Ohio
Jensen	Muhlenberg	Smith, Wis.
Johnson, Calif.	Mundt	Snyder
Johnson, Ill.	Murray, Tenn.	Springer
Johnson, Ind.	Murray, Wis.	Stefan
Jones, Ohio	Nixon	Stevenson
Jones, Wash.	Nodar	Stockman
Jonkman	Norblad	Stratton
Judd	Norman	Sundstrom
Kean	O'Hara	Taber
Kearney	O'Konski	Talle
Kearns	Owens	Thomas, N. J.
Keating	Patterson	Tibbott
Keefe	Phillips, Calif.	Tollefson
Kersten, Wis.	Phillips, Tenn.	Towe
Kilburn	Ploeser	Twyman
Knutson	Plumley	Vail
Kunkel	Potts	Van Zandt
Landis	Ramey	Vorys
Latham	Reed, Ill.	Vursell
LeCompte	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
LeFevre	Rees	Weichel
Lemke	Reeves	Welch
Lewis	Rich	Wigglesworth
Lodge	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
Love	Rizley	Wolcott
McConnell	Robertson	Wolverton
McCowen	Robsion	Youngblood
McDonough	Rockwell	

NAYS—174

Abernethy	Feighan	Manasco
Albert	Fisher	Mansfield, Mont.
Allen, La.	Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.
Almond	Fogarty	Marcantonio
Andrews, Ala.	Folger	Meade, Md.
Barden	Forand	Miller, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Gary	Mills
Battle	Gathings	Monroney
Beckworth	Gordon	Morgan
Bell	Gore	Morris
Blatnik	Gorski	Morrison
Bloom	Gossett	Murdock
Boggs, La.	Granger	Norton
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien
Boykin	Gregory	O'Toole
Brooks	Hardy	Pace
Brown, Ga.	Harless, Ariz.	Passman
Bryson	Harris	Patman
Buchanan	Harrison	Peden
Buckley	Hart	Pfeifer
Burleson	Havenner	Philbin
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Pickett
Camp	Hébert	Poage
Cannon	Heffernan	Powell
Carroll	Hobbs	Preston
Celler	Holifield	Price, Fla.
Chapman	Huber	Price, Ill.
Chelf	Jackson, Wash.	Rabin
Clark	Jarman	Rains
Clements	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Colmer	Johnson, Tex.	Rayburn
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Rayfiel
Cooley	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Richards
Courtney	Kee	Riley
Cox	Kefauver	Rivers
Cravens	Kelley	Rogers, Fla.
Crosser	Keogh	Rooney
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Sabath
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Sadowski
Dawson, Ill.	King	Sasscer
Deane	Kirwan	Sheppard
Delaney	Klein	Sikes
Dingell	Lane	Smathers
Domengeaux	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Donohue	Larcade	Somers
Dorn	Lea	Spence
Doughton	Lesinski	Stanley
Douglas	Lusk	Teague
Drewry	Lyle	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	Lynch	Thomason
Eberharter	McCormack	Trimble
Elliott	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Evins	Madden	Walter
Fallon	Mahon	West
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Williams
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Wood
		Worley
		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Norrell
Bland	Gerlach	Peterson
Buffett	Gwinn, N. Y.	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Hagen	Priest
Crawford	Hartley	Russell
Davis, Tenn.	Hedrick	Sanborn
Dawson, Utah	Hendricks	Stigler
D'Ewart	Jenison	Taylor
Engle, Calif.	Kennedy	Woodruff
Fernandez	Lucas	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Lucas against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Bland against.

Mr. Sanborn for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Buffett for, with Mr. Engle of California against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Hagen for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. Russell for, with Mr. Priest against.

Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Fernandez against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Peterson against.

Mr. Dawson of Utah for, with Mr. Bulwinkle against.

Mr. Jenison for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. D'Ewart for, with Mr. Hendricks against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the resolution which was just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 20, with Mr. HARNESS of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the concurrent resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I frankly did not expect my spending friends to be happy with this resolution. It has been presented with the idea of redeeming our pledge to the people of the United States to put the Government's house in order and to reduce expenditures. It has not been our idea that we could have a million civilians employed by the armed forces forever. It has not been our idea that every department and agency of the Govern-

ment could be overloaded 2 to 1 with civilian employees.

The committee's report on page 5 makes an over-all estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1948 of thirty-nine and one-tenth billions. It estimates over-all expenditures as thirty-one and five-tenths billions, leaving an excess of receipts of seven and six-tenths billions. The committee suggests that, in its opinion, the maximum amount to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 be twenty-seven billions, which is five and two-tenths billions below the President's estimates. It suggests that the maximum amount for expenditure under appropriations for 1948 be limited to twenty-four billions.

In arriving at these figures the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I, as members of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House on the legislative budget, together with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have been working ever since the middle of November upon the data necessary to go into this budget, and we have not drawn these figures out of the air, but have a good idea of what we are basing them on.

I appreciate that we are going to have all sorts of questions thrown at us. We are going to be told that we are crippling the Army and the Navy. Instead of crippling the Army and the Navy by cutting out waste and extravagance and unnecessary expenditures, we will help the national defense and help sustain the hands of George Marshall when he goes to Moscow. If we permit the waste and extravagance and those habits that were practiced during the war to be continued, we will be destroying our national defense. Now is the time that we must meet our obligations.

In making up these appropriation bills the Committee on Appropriations is not going to bring in omnibus bills. They will be brought in after the most careful and thorough hearings and investigations. They will be brought in only when items are justified. When it is possible to rescind any appropriation that has already been made, when it is possible to cut down the expenditures for the current fiscal year or for the next fiscal year, that course will be followed.

No one that I know of has the slightest idea that we are going to reduce our armed forces or the operations of our armed forces below what is necessary. On the other hand, we must know what is necessary—and that we are going to know. Anyone who claims that these things cannot be cut just does not understand the situation nor does he understand his responsibilities as a Member of this Congress. In these appropriation bills we will go in detail into the question as to what the money can be spent for and by means of that operation we are going to be able to cut out very much of the waste that is going on. To give you a little illustration of the waste, under the administration of the Department of Commerce by former Secretary Wallace, he moved down here from New York an activity that was operating tabulating machines in connection with customs statistics. There were 50 people operating those machines in New York, and when he got them down here and installed them in that sacred cow, the Census Bureau, he had 700 people operating those same machines, and yet they tell us that appropriations cannot be cut and that savings cannot be made. Let me tell you that savings can be made, and our responsibility to the people of the United States can be met, so that there can be reasonable reduction of the national debt and so that there can be a tax reduction generally so that the economy of America can continue to function as a free economy. Wild expenditures of the peoples' money results only in inflation and in the destruction of our form of government. It is going to be my object to keep within the $31,500,000,000 ceiling, the $27,000,000,000 ceiling, and the $24,000,000,000 ceiling.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to inquire if the gentleman agrees that a vote in support of this resolution cannot be construed as a commitment to curtail the expenditures of the military establishments.

Mr. TABER. Where those expenditures are necessary for national defense.

Mr. COLE of New York. In other words, the gentleman and his committee can assure the Congress and the country that the Military Establishment, both the Army and Navy, will be given every dollar that they can justify as being necessary in the interest of national defense?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I propose to cooperate in cutting this budget. I propose to cooperate in reducing these appropriations.

And I am in favor of cutting deeper than a majority of the Members of the last Congress who are supporting this resolution are willing to cut. That is not a casual statement. If any proof is desired it is only necessary to refer to votes on amendment increasing appropriations in bills which I reported to the House in the last Congress. I have demonstrated that I am for reduced expenditures. And those who voted for these increased expenditures have demonstrated they are not.

> Let not him that putteth his armor on boast as he that taketh it off.

Even more convincing is our record of drastic reduction in expenditures since the close of the war. In the last fiscal year, 1945–46. Federal expenditures totaled $76,200,000,000. For the current year, 1946–47, expenditures have dropped to $42,500,000,000, and as more favorable conditions develop we hope to further curtail that amount. For the next fiscal year, 1947–48, the total amount proposed for expenditure is $37,500,000,000 even before the usual paring begins.

To the surprise of the new majority party when they came in they found a balanced budget. It was in the black for the first time since it went into the red when they last held the reins of government, and was in the black in the tidy sum of $1,800,000,000, assuming continuance of war excise-tax rates and the self-maintenance of the postal service. A Roman emperor said he found Rome brick and left it marble. The Republican Party relinquished the Government in the red and on their return to power find it in the black.

My friends on that side of the aisle held a caucus yesterday afternoon to hold in line their younger and less sophisticated members. They "briefed" them. They "cased" them. They gave them a "pep" talk just before the game, lest they chafe at the rigors of caucus control. In that meeting our great leader, the Speaker of the House—and he is truly a great leader—he is my Speaker as well as your Speaker—I count it a privilege to serve under him on this floor—the Speaker referred to some of us on this side by name and number. The neophytes were warned that we would want to know what they proposed to cut. Of course we want to know what is to be cut—and how much. How can we vote intelligently unless we do know? To vote on the proposition before us here today without knowing where the budget is to be cut or how much it is to be cut is to vote blindfolded. It is voting sight unseen. It is bidding on a pig in a poke. As an eminent Republican Senator from Massachusetts said last week, "Its like a man in a dark room swinging a meat ax. He might cut off his own head."

You may have read in the Merry-Go-Round this week that during the sessions of the joint committee—I did not hear it at the time but have no doubt it happened—in response to an observation from me, a distinguished Member on that side of the aisle explained that the reason they had not brought in a detailed budget was lack of time; that it involved a large number of items and the preparation of a detailed budget would have taken until Christmas. Such a statement is ridiculous. According to the Committee on Appropriation's published schedule the committee with only 43 members must examine every item and report to the House not later than May 16. The joint committee with 102 members could subdivide into subcommittees and report in 2 or 3 weeks.

The truth about the matter is that there has been ample time to present the most detailed report that could be desired. The election was held November 5. And that week majority Members swarmed into Washington from all over the country—arranging to take over the committees, select their rooms, readjust the employees' rolls, and so forth. But none of them gave the slightest attention to the budget—or if they did, have not reported it to the joint committee. Congress convened January 3 and this is February 20. They have had 107 days since the election and 48 days since Congress convened to work on the budget.

There was even more time than that. Speaker MARTIN, in his address to the House on January 3 last said:

> It is not the intention of the Republicans in the Congress blindly and wildly to slash here and there. The best evidence of that is the study committees we have had at work for 2 years and more, preparing for the time when we should be charged, as

we are now charged by the Nation, with the responsibility of putting this country back on the American rails of progress.

But they have held only two sessions of the committee—only one working session. And there have been only three meetings of the subcommittee. Only two witnesses have been called and no actual hearings have been held. There has been some cryptic talk here that the over-all figure was not just drawn out of the stratosphere, that it was based on computations made by some secret committee. But nothing of that kind has been reported in any open meeting. They have chosen deliberately to keep the Congress and the country in the dark. I want to ask now, if they had no information why did not they get it? And if they had it why did they conceal it? It constitutes the most extraordinary instance of calculated legerdemain in legislative records.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the first time I found out today from the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that they have been meeting since the middle of November. This is not only refusing to give to the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, information on a matter of the utmost importance, but it is a refusal to give the people of America information they are entitled to have.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. They had no intention of giving any information to the American people—or the American Congress.

They very cleverly avoided it. They wanted to dangle before the higher-bracket taxpayers—those who are better able to pay reasonable taxes than anybody else—they wanted to dangle before the dazzled eyes of the "20 percent across the board" taxpayers this will-o'-the-wisp to lead them across the political marshes to the fabulous pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Did not the majority, however, indicate some specific cut when it was intimated in the press and otherwise that they wanted to cut national-defense bills which would include some river, harbor, and flood-control items to the extent of two and one-fourth billions?

Mr. CANNON. While there have been surreptitious references to such items nothing official has ever been officially reported to the joint committee or to the House. But it stands to reason that the items to which the gentleman refers are marked for slaughter. You cannot cut large sums out of the post-office appropriations. The mails are heavier than ever before and must be delivered. You cannot save billions in the Treasury Department. Tax revenues are breaking all records and must be collected and processed. You cannot cut the veterans. They have little enough as it is. You are required by law to pay the interest on the public debt, tax refunds, and old-age and survivors' allotments. Where else can these billions in cuts be made except in such items as the gentleman mentions?

On our side we have been consistently cutting such items for years. We have never failed to make every justified reduction in such budget estimates in the last half dozen Congresses.

On their side of the aisle they stand out to be seen of men, and with flashing phylacteries of self-adulation on their breasts they look across the aisle at us and cry out that we are against economy, we are against retrenchment of Government expenditures, we are against reducing the budget, we are against justice and righteousness and windfalls to high-bracket taxpayers. Mr. Chairman, our record shows the greatest reduction in Federal expenditures in the history of this or any other parliamentary body, and larger rescissions than all the combined savings reclaimed by the Government since the Revolutionary War.

In addressing the House on August 12, last, I stressed the need for tax reduction in the interest of business expansion and a continuing high rate of employment, and said that tax reduction was contingent upon lessened Federal expenditures. I said:

> We cannot reduce taxes unless we reduce expenditures, and there will be no reduction in taxes and there will be no permanent prosperity until we have reduced national expenditures and national obligations to a point where we can balance the budget, provide tax reduction, prevent inflation, and reach a standard of living which this Nation has every right to expect.

We were then considering the third deficiency bill, 1946, and I went on and said:

> Not only in this bill, Mr. Chairman, but in every bill which the Committee on Appropriations has reported to the House this session we have had this in mind. We have endeavored to follow a program of retrenchment and economy. We have cut the Budget estimates. We have endeavored to get the country back off its spending spree, away from the huge appropriations which have been necessary during the war, and to initiate a postwar readjustment in costs of operation of Government which will make it possible for us early in the next Congress to reduce taxes. That is the only way it can be done. This bill is a fair sample.

That is a fair statement of the course and objective of our party. We launched an economy drive immediately following the capitulation of Japan. Nineteen hundred and forty-six was partly a war year. The expenditures in that year were sixty-three-plus billion dollars. The current fiscal year total has been estimated to be $42,500,000,000. For 1948 the budget prophesies $37,500,000,000. Obligational availability has been rescinded to the extent of $64,000,000,000, and the public debt during the first 6 months of the present fiscal year has been reduced by $10,300,000,000. The peak debt of $279,200,000,000 had been reduced up to the end of last December by $20,000,000,000.

I submit that is a praiseworthy record of economy that has never been equaled before and which, in my opinion, will never be equaled again.

I favor cutting every item in the budget that can be cut and on which cuts may be justified. Our rule has been, in the Appropriations Committee, in case of doubt cut too much rather than not enough. There is just one exception. When the safety of this country is involved any doubt should be resolved in favor of the security of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, within the lifetime of this generation we have fought two world wars. We did not want to fight, we did not expect to fight, we were not prepared to fight. They were forced upon us. In both of those wars by the providence of God we had two allies who could hold the enemy until we could start production and get ready to fight. Now we face the rather sobering situation of no longer having any allies able to stand between us and the enemy. There will be no time to prepare.

Experts tell us that such a war could be decided in a few hours.

The one over-all dominating issue in America today is, Can we avoid a third war? Nothing else counts. All the tax-saving in the world means nothing if we risk the fate suffered by the nations in Europe in the last war. That is the one thing on which we cannot afford to gamble, on which we cannot afford to take a chance. The supreme head of a nation with the largest standing army in the world, an army ready to the last buckle, ready to move at 6 o'clock tonight—or 4 o'clock tomorrow morning, a nation which dominates continental Europe more completely than it has been dominated since the days of Napoleon, said in an open speech which was published throughout the world that it was inconceivable that his concept of government and our concept of government could exist side by side in the same world, that ultimately one or the other must conquer.

Let me ask those in charge of this bill, Do you seriously propose to reduce our Army and our Navy and the air forces on which we must depend to defend this Nation, below what our naval and military authorities say is the point of safety?

Oh, they tell us there is not going to be any war. That is what they told us in 1916. That is what they told us in 1940. When we look abroad and see great cities which a few years ago carried the wealth of a thousand years of civilization, today such demolished heaps of rubble that you cannot find where the streets were—if, after such a vivid lesson, such a direct warning as that—if those in charge of this bill are not impressed—if they still insist on disarming while other nations are arming—then no warning is of any avail. Even if Lazarus rose from the dead they would not believe.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Presently, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt careful inquiry will disclose that there are what might be termed supernumeraries, picked up during the war, still an item of expense. I think organizational arrangements or procedures adopted by the War and Navy Departments during the war, should be closely scrutinized with the view to shelving until there should be a need for their revival. That is a field for large economies in personnel, civilian and military, and consequent incidental expenses. I think maintenance and operation money for posts and stations should be so restricted as to force skeletonization or a complete shut-down of many, which have no justification except a potential need at some future time. I think procurement money should be granted only upon a definite showing that war surplus is not available or cannot be used, even by improvisation. I believe that very careful inquiry should be made into the duplication of activities by the armed services, including the field of research. I further believe that the air estimates of the armed services should be closely examined as regards procurement, because we had testimony during the last session of Congress that we are now in an interim period as regards aircraft and that air warfare of the future will be conducted with pilotless instrumentalities.

The field is rife with immediate economy possibilities, both as regards procurement and flight training and as regards present personnel engaged in flying and drawing flight pay. Another subject for examination pertaining to the air is the continued employment of service planes for the transportation of passengers. I maintain that a distinct economy would ensue from requiring all air travel to be performed on commercial planes. Now that the war is over the imperative need for air travel by service personnel has for the most part ceased.

I cite these as some possible sources of economy as to the armed services. They would need to be examined, of course.

We cannot do much as regards funds for or on account of veterans except to see that they are administered efficiently and economically. I have much faith in General Bradley, and feel that if, after study, he is convinced that his budget is on the heavy side, he will disclose that information to us.

The concurrent resolution under consideration either should be voted down or recommitted and so rephrased as would enable all of us who are endeavoring to achieve a sound national economy program to vote for it. I trust we will have that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that if we do not materially and substantially reduce the President's budget as transmitted to us we must acknowledge the charge so often heard during the last 10 or 12 years that Federal expenditures are out of control.

Personally, I am convinced we can cut the six billion recommended by our Budget Committee without in any way jeopardizing our national defense or interfering in any way with any essential function of government.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are running true to form. By their spending programs of the last 14 years and their action here today they are demonstrating beyond any possible doubt that they are not interested in economizing in Federal expenditures. Bitten by the old bug of "squandermania" they cannot seem to recover from the disease. They speak of being for economy, yet they stand here and cry out against the pending resolution that really looks to economy. When they say economy, therefore, what figure do they fix as a figure for spending in the next fiscal year?

Unless this Congress can bring the Budget into a real working balance at a figure which the people can support in taxes, then we face down that long road once more which history tells us never has ended anywhere short of disastrous inflation.

Of course, we are concerned about our national defense, and properly so. But let me remind my good friends on the other side of the aisle that no military disaster within the range of possibility today could equal in sweep and violence the destruction of American power and authority which would be accomplished by the all-consuming conflagration of inflation.

That is the first threat to our national security today, for no military system can be sustained in effective strength by a nation suffering the calamitous economic erosion of Government-made inflation.

Of course, we are for national defense, but how does one achieve a strong national defense? It is by giving to the Army and the Navy the funds they need and must have to provide for an efficient Military and Naval Establishment; but back of that, and as our great bulwark of defense, we must have a strong, sound, efficient, productive economy. Who is there who would deny that after the disaster at Pearl Harbor it was the great, strong, productive capacity of America, coupled with the brave, stout men who fought, that brought us to ultimate victory?

When we speak of a strong national defense or our national security, too many of us think simply in military terms, of men, tanks, guns, and ships. and I repeat, we shall make certain that we have the finest military and naval machine in the world, prepared to meet any emergency. We shall see that they have sufficient funds to do that job.

But there is more to our national safety and security. We must be strong financially. We must be able to support our military machine. The most elaborate industrial plant, with the most modern equipment and highly trained personnel, has little value if the company is bankrupt. So it is with a country whose productive power is burdened with debts and weakened by taxes.

Let there be no mistake about the fact that Federal spending is today out of control, and that is the great compelling reason behind the provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act which requires Congress early in the session to set a definite budget figure. That is the only way we shall ever restore to Congress its fundamental constitutional authority over Federal finances.

Just a year ago President Truman submitted his budget for the current fiscal year, which ends on June 30, 1947. As of early January 1946, the Budget for the fiscal year 1947 stood at $36,000,000,000. In April of 1946 the President assured the country anew that "it is our aim to balance the budget in 1947." Then, in August, the Budget was increased from $36,000,000,000 to $41,500,000,000. And in December the total was increased once more to $42,500,000,000.

There you have an increase of $6,500,000,000 in the current budget between January and December of 1946. Instead of a balanced Budget for 1947, as promised last April, we face a deficit of more than $2,500,000,000.

What are we to say of fiscal management which, in peacetime, still cannot come within $6,500,000,000 of estimating actual spending?

Until we firmly set our sights on a limit on Executive spending there will always be a tendency toward stretching the budget in many directions. Every appeal for additional funds always has much to recommend it, and it is always difficult to reject specific items of wide social appeal.

But we cannot have anything approaching an integrated fiscal program until we bring all competing claims for new spending under one ceiling and then cut our garment to the cloth.

Let us not forget for a minute that resistance to any real economy in the Federal establishment is always vigorous. That is inherent in the very bureaucratic system of administration. Whatever new field the Government moves into, there is always a great deal more work to be done than can be accomplished with the amount of money Congress has allocated.

This is not to say that these demands for additional funds are wholly without merit. Nobody knows how much Government could spend effectively and soundly, if money were available in unlimited amounts.

But along with providing the necessary governmental functions and services, the Congress also is under the grave responsibility of keeping taxes in some sound relation to total national income.

The real criterion on sound budget policy is not how much we could spend wisely, but how much we can afford.

That is why I go along with the joint committee's recommendation for a $6,000,000,000 cut.

A peacetime budget of thirty-one and a half billions still would be more than three times the peacetime high of the immediate prewar years, and more than six times the average peacetime budget before the New Deal era.

With our recognized larger needs in national defense, veterans' assistance, and national debt service, we cannot hope to use the prewar figures as a sound budget objective for many years.

But we can make a beginning at bringing Federal spending within the limits of tolerable taxation.

That is the great issue before us in this immediate decision. Lay down the rule that Government may spend no more than the people are willing to pay for in taxes, and you will make at least a beginning toward order and reason in Federal finances.

History is our guide that the situation we face today has existed many times in other nations. The great inflation disasters of the past in other lands did not start out as deliberate plans for national ruin.

We all recall that every step along the inflation path since 1933 has been taken with the promise that it was the last.

But each tentative step has led inexorably to the next, and the next, and the next—until the grass-fire of free and easy spending was out of all control.

Sound fiscal policies are our only defense against this drift, and sound fiscal policies are to be realized only when men of responsibility look honestly at the facts and make those difficult decisions which must be made.

The first of these decisions must be to limit Government spending to a tax level which the people will sustain without improper coercion and compulsion by government itself.

Only a very brief study of the 1948 budget is necessary to show that, apart from certain nonrecurring items eliminated by the termination of the food subsidy programs, smaller terminal-leave pay for the military forces, and similar items associated directly with war functions, there has been no real decrease in Federal spending under 1947.

Yet these figures were sent to us by the White House on January 10, this year, with the President's advice that "it is a tight budget."

At another point, President Truman said:

> I believe that no department or agency feels that its needs are fully met.

That is very probably true. I have never known the time when any department or agency of the Federal establishment ever felt that its needs were fully met.

If that is the criterion used by President Truman in his budget-making, then we need no other proof that Federal spending is out of control, save for brakes we apply on appropriations.

The Congress seeks to cut back reckless Federal spending, not to deny the American people the things they want, but to make it possible for the American economy to function at a sustained high level of production.

We all recognize that we cannot maintain taxes at the burdensome wartime rates.

We all recognize that we must accumulate some surplus to start paying off this terrific national debt.

These are steps essential to our broad program of economic stabilization. If we are to maintain jobs, production, and consumer income, we must hasten to achieve a long-time normal level of taxes and Government spending.

The stakes at issue are not the welfare of any one bureau or department—but the welfare of the entire American people, as measured by the difference between a sound and flourishing national economy and a state of inflationary hysteria which leaves everybody poorer in a false atmosphere of booming prosperity.

The task is difficult and challenging. It is not easy for a nation to turn its face from 14 years of reckless easy-money budgets. It can be accomplished only by painstaking attention to detail in every item of the budget. It calls for the best that is in us. It calls for honesty, courage, and candor in facing the fundamental facts of our national economic situation. It calls for sound appraisal of the relative merits and urgency of competing demands upon limited funds. It calls for fair-minded deliberation, not in a frenzy of fear, not in a panic of defeat because this department or that says it cannot get along with a dollar less than the budget estimate.

Our approach must be one of patriotic devotion, free of petty partisanship.

For if we once concede that the appeal of any particular pressure group is superior to the greater appeal of the general welfare, then we shall lay ourselves open to every inflationary force which has jogged us down Easy Money Lane since 1933.

To follow that course is to surrender every hope for a sound American economy and sustained production.

Worse, to follow that course is to admit defeat before the threat of ultimate inflation, and thus to destroy the one great resource which now tilts the scales for lasting world peace.

Destroy America's productive capacity with the fires of continued Government extravagance, and there will be no power on the face of the earth to preserve the peace.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that if you would give the American people the truth, and give them the facts, they would do substantially the right thing. The Congress is nothing more than a cross section of the American people, and I firmly believe that if you will give the Congress the facts, the Congress will likewise do substantially the right thing. But I do not believe for a moment that if you would give the Congress the truth and the full facts in the present situation, that this Congress would vote for a cut as drastic as $6,000,000,000.

I am for economy, and I am fully convinced that many substantial reductions can safely be made. I shall vote for them when the facts are presented. We are all for economy, but being sensible men and women we like to proceed on the basis of the facts, and the facts are denied us today.

The able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] called attention to the fact that the present distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], had said some time ago that for 2 years his party had been compiling facts upon which to predicate reductions in Government spending. That is well and good, yet those facts are not before us today. Indeed, 101 days transpired between the November election and February 15, the dead line when this report was to be submitted to the Congress and to the American people. One hundred and one days, and what did the party in power do? And mind you the question is desperately important. The destiny of our country, our prestige at home and abroad, $30,000,000,000 and more, were at stake in this period. What did the majority party do about it? They created a Budget Committee. They had four meetings, two of which lasted less than 3 hours. They heard two witnesses, and I think the testimony of those two witnesses is not available to the Members of the House. I know whereof I speak because I was appointed as a member of the Joint Budget Committee and served in that capacity.

I ask you what seasoned, thoughtful legislator, at a time like this, would be willing, upon such limited and unavailable testimony, to vote in favor of a cut in spending of $6,000,000,000, much of it involving national security? It does not make sense. It cannot make sense, and it will not ultimately be accepted by the Congress.

The reason this Congress is not told what major cuts are contemplated is that the majority party leaders fear that it will not be possible to pass the pending resolution if the Members of Congress have the facts.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Not at the moment, please.

I think some cuts can be made in national defense here and there, but I do not for a minute believe that we can cut national defense as drastically as one and three-quarter billion dollars. I agree with General Marshall that a cut to that extent would imperil the security of our country. He is at least one witness whose testimony we have, even though we had no opportunity to hear his testimony, and must rely on newspaper reports for his statement.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] than whom there is no finer Member of the House, said that the agricultural appropriation bill might be reduced by $250,000,000; I wonder whether the gentleman is going to tell the House today that we can cut agricultural appropriations by one-third or more. I wonder whether the gentleman from Illinois is going to tell this House, as he told subcommittee members, where he proposes to make the substantial cuts. I do not mean that he should give every little item of reduction, but I think that the gentleman from Illinois as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture should say now whether or not he still stands behind the statement made to one of the subcommittees that he proposes to cut Soil Conservation $5,000,000 and that he proposes to cut the AAA by $100,000,000 on funds that some of us maintain have already been

obligated. The House Members who are interested in agriculture are certainly entitled to know. Will he tell the House that he still believes the school-lunch program of $75,000,000 can be completely cut out? The program has been worth while. If you cut it out in whole or in part, do not do it blindly. And I think the gentleman should tell the Members of the House if he still thinks that the Farmers Home Administration, which makes loans to farmers and veterans for farm purposes can be cut from $170,000,000 to $120,000,000. Let us have these facts out on the table. Under-the-table tactics are not in the public interest.

And I wonder if the gentleman will say on the floor as he said in the committee, as an individual not binding himself for the future—it was a tentative figure, I agree—that the REA lending can be cut $125,000,000 in fiscal 1948. I am a friend of the REA. I will not subscribe to that; but if the Congress wants to do it let it do it with its eyes open and with the benefit of the facts and figures which Members of the majority indicate they have but are unwilling to divulge to Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Not at the moment, please.

And I would like for my able friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, to tell this House what he proposes to do about some of the major items in that bill, not the little ones, but some of the major ones.

Our roads have been deteriorating from the war. We have a national investment of $30,000,000,000 in our public roads. Because of wartime conditions, there has been much deterioration in the road system, and the President in his Budget is asking us to appropriate $279,000,000 for public roads, farm-to-market roads. Are you willing to sit blindly by today and vote for that cut without knowing what you are doing? Are you willing to subject yourself to the charge that you are just rubber stamps to a figure that has been picked out of the stratosphere and at a time when there is being withheld from the country the facts of the situation?

And I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to tell us, or tell me now, if he will, what he proposes to do, if he proposes to cut the farm-to-market Federal public-roads program?

I take it by his silence that the gentleman feels that such a reduction can be made. Maybe the Congress wants to make it, but I do not. Let us have the facts before us when we do make the cuts and when we cast our votes.

And I could further say, Mr. Chairman, that in answer to the question raised by my distinguished friend the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], as to what figure we would suggest, that specific facts have not been provided and therefore we cannot now set a figure. Instead of meeting day after day and night after night to consider this $37,500,000,000 Budget involving the welfare and the fate of our Nation, the committee only held four meetings. Therefore, exact figures cannot possibly be arrived at now as we do not have the figures. Majority Members may have this information somewhere, but let them pull that information and those figures out into the open and if the Members want to vote for the $6,000,000,000 reduction let them do so intelligently. Those who vote for the six billion cut cannot be heard to come into the House with sad faces later in the session and say, "Well, I did not mean to be voting against public roads, REA, soil conservation, agricultural research, and similar Government programs."

Remember that it is in connection with agriculture that the largest proportional cut in the whole budget is proposed. It cannot then be said, "I did not mean to cripple the armed forces and jeopardize our national defense. No; I did not mean to do that."

If you do not mean to do that, I put you on guard now that this RECORD will show you were told on the floor of the House that the $6,000,000,000 cut contemplates substantially many of the cuts which I have described. As for myself, I want to cut out unnecessary spending, and I do not doubt but that substantial savings can be made, but I cannot accept or approve the course being followed today.

Give the Congress the facts and the Congress will arrive at substantially the right answer Deny the Congress the facts as is being done today, and you are giving a false hope and an illusion to the people. The people are willing to reduce Government spending and deny themselves some of the things they are accustomed to receive under the Government programs, but they want to be told what they are being asked to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we would be in a far better psychological position if we would tell the Members today what cuts generally are contemplated and have them assent to those cuts. Then later on they will feel more or less morally bound to stand by them, and as far as they reasonably can do so, they will. Under the present situation a Member of the House can reasonably feel that he is not obligated to vote for reduction on any particular item. It is just an over-all thing and he can say that he is not obligated to go down the line on a real economy program which will streamline the Government, save dollars and get more for our money, which every Member devoutedly hopes to do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Does not the gentleman think, having regard to our desire to accomplish a sound fiscal policy, that it is worth while that we determine what our revenues will be, take a look at what we ought to pay on the national debt, take a look at what we need in the way of tax reduction, then arrive at an overall figure as to what we can spend and say to these various competing demands, "You have got to come in under that ceiling"; then equalize the demands that are made under that ceiling?

Mr. MAHON. The trouble with that is that no department of Government is told, except the War and Navy Departments, substantially what ceilings they will have to come under, so they are in a position of asking for this money because the Congress is not on record on that point. Furthermore, I do not think any consideration should be given to tax cuts until we have really balanced the budget with a considerable overplus and apply that on the national debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the paramount problem confronting America today, is the problem of putting our financial house in order. Unless order is restored, national solvency is impossible, widespread suffering is inevitable; our very form of government may well be placed in jeopardy.

The national welfare demands, after proper provision for the national defense, that the Budget shall be balanced, that the national debt shall be reduced, and that the tax burden shall be alleviated, with a view of assuring essential production and avoiding Nation-wide suffering.

All of this, in the last analysis, is dependent on a reduction of Federal expenditures, on the elimination of waste and extravagance and all nonessential activities.

Why are we here today? We are here because of the operation of a new law approved on August 2, 1946, the so-called reorganization law. We are here because of a very difficult problem which that law placed in the hands of the joint committee which has had charge of the resolution now under consideration.

That law made it mandatory for the joint committee to propose to the Congress on or before February 15 an overall legislative budget ceiling. The proposed ceiling is before us today; a ceiling of $31,500,000,000 in expenditure, or $6,000,000,000 less than proposed in the President's budget.

Roughly speaking, the reduction is $5,000,000,000 in terms of new appropriations, and $1,000,000,000 in terms of rescission of appropriations already made. The proposed ceiling is before us today for acceptance, amendment or rejection.

I take exception, Mr. Chairman, to the statement that the ceiling figure proposed is taken out of thin air. It is the best possible figure that a majority of the joint committee could arrive at under the conditions by which they have been confronted.

Some members of that committee and of its subcommittees have worked long and laboriously on this problem. They considered the estimates submitted by the President in his budget. They considered comparable rates of expenditure

for the same items in the present fiscal year. They considered reductions in terms of the yardstick which you will find laid down in the committee report, namely, the elimination of unnecessary functions, the holding of appropriations to 1947 or earlier levels, wherever possible, the elimination of unnecessary civilian personnel, the deferment, except as to planning, of unnecessary public works, and rescissions in excess of those recommended by the President in respect to appropriations which have already been made.

They have considered the views of the members of the various Subcommittees on Appropriations of the House. They have considered the views of experts in this general field both inside and outside the Government.

The figure is the best estimate that could be made under the circumstances. It is an estimate of course, and an estimate only. The law so specifies. The resolution before you so specifies. The committee report so specifies.

I quote from page 8 of the committee report as follows:

> Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reductions in specific items contained in the Budget. The resolution expresses an over-all objective and its realization depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon Budget estimates, individually and collectively.

I support the recommendation of the joint committee, Mr. Chairman. I support it as a target at which I believe we should shoot. I support it as an objective which, in the absence of detailed hearings, it seems possible that we may attain.

No one can have a firm estimate at this time in the absence of hearings. We are dealing with enormous items, with unusual items. We may fall wide of the mark—we may conceivably do better.

For my part, I am content to aim high and to leave the final results to the good judgment of the Subcommittees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

Yesterday's newspapers, Mr. Chairman, announced the fact that four former Under Secretaries of the Treasury have endorsed the $6,000,000,000 cut in a joint statement.

The former officials are Hon. Arthur A. Ballantine, Hon. T. J. Coolidge, Hon. John W. Hanes, and Hon. Roswell Magill, three of them appointed by President Roosevelt.

They are quoted in part as follows:

> We believe that $31,500,000,000 is more than enough to run the Federal Government in fiscal 1948, the third year after hostilities. We do not wish to see our Military Establishment weakened, but competent authorities * * * have assured us that the proposed reduction will leave large Army and Navy funds entirely adequate for the Nation's security needs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word in reference to the Army and the Navy, because we have all heard the apprehension which has been emanating either from those departments or in their behalf.

I have already pointed out that the ceiling is not legally binding. The apprehension, therefore, is in my judgment without justification.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member on the floor of this House who in the last analysis is going to vote for any action which in his opinion will impair the essential efficiency of our fighting forces at this time.

Personally, I have always been for national defense. I have always been for a big Navy.

If I live to be 100, I shall never forget the nightmare of those long months between July 1, 1940, and Pearl Harbor, sitting here as we did, knowing that this Nation was taking step after step toward war; knowing at the same time, as a result of figures given us confidentially, which could not be given to the public, that we were lamentably unprepared for war—in a condition, if you please, as a result of New Deal policies which General Marshall subsequently described as "immeasurably worse, except for planning" than the condition by which we were confronted in 1917.

Never again must the country find itself in a similar condition.

That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that you or I or any of us should be compelled to accept any budget estimate that comes from one of these two departments at face value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. These estimates are not sacred—they should receive the same scrutiny that the estimates of every other department of this Government receive.

I do not know how much the estimates of the War and Navy Departments can be cut. I do know, however, that in the absence of hearings, it appears that substantial cuts can be made in both requests without in any way jeopardizing fighting efficiency. Simple arithmetic would appear to justify reductions in certain instances.

Our military and naval leaders have been brilliant in the conduct of war but we can all recall errors running into hundreds of millions of dollars in the field of estimates. If the Congress should fail to scrutinize all estimates, it would fail to exercise its duty to the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted today by the most enormous debt in all our history—$260,000,000,000 as usually computed, $663,000,000,000 according to Bureau of the Budget a year ago if we include contingent obligations.

We are confronted by some 1,039 agencies, or parts of agencies, as compared with 190 in 1935.

We are confronted with a tremendous amount of overlapping and duplication of functions, which has been so strongly pictured by the Comptroller General of the United States.

We are confronted by 2,300,000 civilian personnel on the Federal pay roll as compared with 900,000 in 1939 and 720,000 in 1935.

We are confronted by gross waste and, worse, the Comptroller General having pointed out in one instance—the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration—failure to properly account for $8,100,000,000.

We are confronted by a Budget for the fiscal year 1947 with raises all along the line, generally speaking, in requests for appropriations for the regular departments and agencies of the Government.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted by the Budget for the fiscal year 1948, calling for increases for department after department, for agency after agency; showing little or no effort at any real retrenchment; calling for an expenditure of $37,500,000,000 in the third year after the war; calling for an expenditure four times the largest prewar Budget in our history; calling for an expenditure, if you please, equivalent to $55 a month on the back of every workingman and every workingwoman in this country.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the paramount problem confronting America today is the problem of putting our financial house in order. As far as I am concerned, if I am going to err today in respect to an over-all legislative budget ceiling I am going to err on the side of economy. I have complete confidence in the wisdom of the Subcommittees on Appropriations of the House and Senate and in the wisdom of the Congress as a whole to make any corrections, either upward or downward, which prove to be essential.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the gentleman whether or not he knows how the figure of $6,000,000,000 was arrived at?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The figure of $6,000,000,000 was arrived at by the most careful scrutiny possible under the circumstances of the data to which I have already referred.

Mr. ROONEY. How much do you cut the Army and Navy in that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That remains to be seen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the printed record, which cannot be changed, I think it is extremely unfortunate that some of my good friends on my left have made such wild and irresponsible statements this afternoon. I refer now to the direct charges, and certainly the insinuations of spending—of wasteful spending—and charging that to the Democrats. Why, of course, we have a tremendously large national debt. But how was that debt created? It was not acquired by reaching up into thin air, as my Republican friends have done today, and grabbing out some figures; and who helped create that debt? Was it created by the Democrats alone? And for what purpose was it created? It was created by virtue of

the fact that this country was fighting the greatest war this world has ever known, and the vast majority of those expenditures were for that purpose. I recall during those dark days when those expenditures were being made that my good Republican friends on the left—a good many of them, not all of them by any means—would rise, when this House was considering appropriation bills for the Army and Navy and for the Marine Corps—any one of which appropriations was far in excess in dollars and cents than the entire Budget for the entire Government in 1948—and they would say, "I demand the yeas and nays so that I can go on record as approving this expenditure." Can anyone deny that, and will anyone on the Republican side deny that? I say that a large part of the debt was created in that manner, and was approved by my friends on the left. Where did the remaining part of that debt come from? Have you gentlemen forgotten? The remaining part, gentlemen, came from the Hoover bread lines that the Democrats had to clean up. Those bread lines were created by my good friends under your able, penny-pinching leader, our former President, Mr. Hoover. Now, are you not really ashamed to get up and make such wild statements as some of you have made this afternoon?

Let us keep this record straight. Economy is not a partisan matter. I want to keep my record straight. In the Budget Committee composed of Members of the House and of the other body, I reached into thin air and blindly grabbed at a figure of $4,500,000,000 which I was ready to try to cut in the way of expenditure. But let us be frank about it. You know you have not been frank. You know it was a blind stab when you reached up and picked $6,000,000,000. You know it is not binding on you. I am really glad to take that first step of $4,500,000,000 in the dark but I am not going to walk all night in the darkness. I am willing to cut expenditures by $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 if they are justified by facts, and not guesswork.

My people sent me here to help see to it our commitments to our veterans are carried out; that we maintain an adequate Army, Navy, Marine Corps so we may avoid World War III; to keep the great port of Houston dredged so that world trade can continue to move through her; and to keep our promises to help, little as it is, our old folks and dependent children, and other things. If these things cannot be done with a cut of $4,500,000,000 in the Budget, then I shall not vote to cut the Budget in that sum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] referred to President Hoover, when President Hoover became President our debt was $17,500,000,000. When Mr. Roosevelt became President in 1933 the national debt was nineteen and one-half billion. Mr. Roosevelt campaigned on the issue of reducing expenditures by 25 percent. Twelve months after he took office the expenditures were increased by $6,000,000,000. As a matter of fact, the national debt was $19,500,000,000 when Mr. Roosevelt took over, and before Pearl Harbor the national debt was over $66,000,000,000. During the war years civil functions were increased with the same rapidity and speed that other functions were increased.

The gentleman said he believed in proof. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said when the Democrats took over in 1933 the country was in the red, and when the Republicans took over on January 1 last the country was in the black. I do not know how in the world he figures that, when he knows the national debt as of today is over $261,000,000,000. The national debt when Mr. Roosevelt took office was nineteen and a half billion. The gentleman says they have reduced the national debt.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I am sorry. I do not have time. I cannot yield.

He said we have decreased the national debt by $20,000,000,000. The gentleman knows that is not true. That must be dismissed as moonshine, because there was a cash balance in the Treasury of $20,000,000,000 which was applied on the national debt, but that did not come from revenues. That came from the Public Treasury which the Congress appropriated. It is just a lot of hogwash and moonshine they are giving you here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Not at this time. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are putting the cart before the horse. When you fix a maximum that we can appropriate, that maximum usually becomes the minimum. When you fix a maximum price for anything, it has been my observation that it usually becomes the minimum price.

This procedure is entirely unnecessary, in my opinion. The Congress should have followed the same course it has always followed in the past in reducing Government expenditures as the measure appeared.

This proceeding reminds me of a certain oriental emperor, whom the British minister gave a set of classical English books. The emperor had his carpenter go out and make him some bookshelves. When he finished them they found he had made the shelves too short; the books would not go in them. So the emperor just had them take the books out and saw the ends of them off.

That is about what you are doing here. You do not seem to recognize the relation of prices to the volume of the currency. Prices in a free economy, such as we are supposed to have, are governed by the volume of the Nation's currency, multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. Remember that during the Hoover administration we had less than $4,500,000,000 in circulation. Today we have $28,850,000,000 in circulation, or almost seven times as much, and it is being increased every month.

You had better do something to check the inflation of the currency before you attempt to put Congress in a financial strait-jacket, which cannot be made mandatory. Congress can exceed this limit whenever it pleases to do so, regardless of what we do here now. I am not disturbed about the Army or the Navy, as I am about the atomic bomb. When the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima, from that moment back became ancient history, so far as the weapons and methods of warfare are concerned.

What are we doing to protect the atomic bomb? What are we doing to keep our country prepared to defend herself in case of an attack?

I had a letter the other day from a farmer friend of mine who lives on route 3 from a rural post office. It was written with a pencil, and it had more sense in it on this subject than anything else I have seen or heard for the last 3 months. He said:

> DEAR JOHN: Do not let them give away the secrets of the atomic bomb.

He said:

> You know, Samson of old had a secret one time, but he gave it away, and you remember what happened to him.

What we need to do today is to keep the atomic bomb and the finest air force on earth. Then we will not need the large number of obsolete battleships and millions of men walking around carrying guns on their shoulders. We might as well understand it now, the next war is going to be an atomic war.

If the Communists had the atomic bomb today and we did not have it, America would either become communistic or every city of any size in this country would be destroyed in less than 60 days.

So let us be realistic about this all-important question upon which may depend the very life of the Nation.

Some Members are afraid you may reduce the size of our Army and Navy, the same as we did after the last war. But what I am afraid of is that our country might permit the international fanatics to give away the secrets of the atomic bomb and so weaken our Air Forces as to render us helpless in case of attack. I for one am tired of pouring money into the sinkholes of Europe.

You know that UNRRA would not pass this House today—certainly not with my support.

I am tired of seeing American money used to make enemies for the American people throughout the world, and I for one am in favor of cutting down expenses wherever they can be legitimately cut, without crippling our country.

But there are some reductions I cannot support. I cannot support any reduction in appropriations for an adequate air force.

I understand you contemplate cutting down on rural electrification. Just try

it and give us a roll call and see how far you get. You do not dare cut rural electrification, for you know you would not get enough Members voting with you to form a corporal's guard. You know that; you know the farmers of this country helped win this war and that they help maintain American institutions, and you are not going to cut down on rural electrification until we get it extended to every farm home in this country.

They talk about cutting out soil conservation. In the name of all the gods at once, do you want to see American soil depleted to where we cannot sustain ourselves?

And they talk about cutting out money for our rivers and harbors and the development of our internal waterways.

Now, there is the issue, and it is going to be an issue from now on. We cannot afford to stop the wheels of progress. We need to improve the navigation of our inland waterways as well as our intercoastal waterways, control floods, and the electric energy that is now going to waste.

As I pointed out the other day, there are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. At 1 cent a kilowatt-hour, it would bring more money than the entire wheat crop or the entire cotton crop of the Nation.

Look at the predicament of Great Britain today. What if she had that great wealth of hydro power? If we were to stop our internal improvement today, the development of our internal waterways, who knows but that the time might come when we would find ourselves in the same predicament in which Great Britain finds herself today.

I hope when you bring in bills here to cut down on appropriations that you will not try to paralyze our country or check this great onward march of modern progress in the development of our internal resources that is making America strong and great. Let us keep her strong and make her the leading nation of the world for all time to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have been perfectly astounded at the statements which have been made here today. I would think if there were any legislation brought upon this floor at this time in the hour of the country's peril that at least we could all be Americans. This is not a partisan question at all, it is a question of saving the solvency of the Government. When I say I am astounded at the statements made on this floor today, I refer to one made by a most distinguished and much beloved man on this floor, our former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] who said this was legislative hypocrisy. I believe I can demonstrate where the hypocrisy is, if there be any here in this House today, and I believe I can demonstrate it from the printed record.

I want to call your attention to the fact that in 1944 there was created in this House a special Committee on Post-War Economic Planning.

That committee had on it, I think, some of the most able men in the House. I want to call your attention to these men. There was Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi. Does any one question his patriotism or his sincerity? Do you think he would indulge at a time like this in legislative hypocrisy? What about Hon. JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, whose integrity, patriotism, and ability cannot be questioned—a member of the committee.

There was Hon. FRANCIS E. WALKER, of Pennsylvania, certainly an outstanding and distinguished American on the Democratic side of the House. Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri, a grand, good, patriotic man. Hon. Jerry Voorhis, of California, who is not with us. Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona; Hon. WALTER A. LYNCH, of New York; Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois; Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and Hon. EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas. On our side, there were Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, of Massachusetts; Hon. E. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee; Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, of California; Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas; Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan; Hon. JAY LEFEVRE, of New York, and Hon. SID SIMPSON of Illinois.

The expert to aid this great committee was one of the ablest men in this country on fiscal affairs. He is employed by the Eastman Kodak Co. and measures up in every respect to all the qualifications that would warrant his appointment as Treasurer of the United States, a most able man. I refer to Mr. Marion B. Folsom. He was the guiding light of the special Postwar Economic Planning Committee. That committee made 11 splendid reports. It combed every item of the Government. It had all the experts it required. They had a whole list of economists to help them. The committee went into every possible detail as to how it would be possible to save money.

Let us see what that committee said on page 68 of its report, because it is rather interesting and highly convincing. It is the eleventh report and the final report made on December 12, 1946, in which it laid down the rules for the 1948 budget.

It can be seen from the above 1947 budget that there are several substantial nonrecurring items. Terminal-leave pay, mustering-out pay, payments on account of UNRRA and lend-lease, refunds and international finance all represent items which will either not recur in the 1948 budget or in greatly reduced amount. It is estimated that there should be a reduction of at least $7,000,000,000 in these items alone. While the committee realizes the necessity of continuing heavy expenditures for strong national defense, it seriously questions whether it is necessary to spend over 12 times the amount which was spent in 1939. It would urge upon the officials of the War and Navy Departments that they should realize the effects which such heavy expenditures have upon the economy of the country and that the greatest effort be made to reduce these expenditures, that each item in the Budget be scrutinized to see if it is absolutely necessary; and that projects which are not immediately needed be postponed.

The committee feels that a budget of $30,000,000,000 is a realistic budget and that expenditures can be reduced to this level without interfering with national defense or other normal functions of the Government. At this level the cost to the Federal Government per family of four would be over $850 per year.

Mr. Chairman, where is the hypocrisy? Why do New Deal Members stand up and make the statement of legislative hypocrisy when you have had a committee working since 1944 studying every item of expense and bringing in a report to guide this House. When we attempt to go along with you to save the solvency of this Government, the real basis of national security, when we go along with you on this report in which you have examined every item, you charge us with legislative hypocrisy. Where is the hypocrisy? Search your own conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who, by the way, voted for most of the legislation that was put through under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, made the statement that when former President Hoover came into power there was a $17,000,000,000 deficit and when he left there was a $19,000,000,000 deficit.

Well, in 1928, when Mr. Hoover came into office, the debt was $17,604,000,000 and in June 1933, which is the last fiscal year that Mr. Hoover was President, the deficit was $22,539,000,000—just a slight mistake of approximately $3,000,000,000. The fact also remains that deficit spending started under former President Hoover, and that deficit spending was despite a tax bill that we put through in 1930, and despite the fact that there was not a penny spent to relieve human suffering and distress, with twelve to fifteen million good Americans unemployed, unable to get work, and with millions of persons dependent upon them, wives and children; not one penny appropriated by that Congress when the Republicans were in control, and when Mr. Hoover was President. And yet there was a deficit of about $5,000,000,000 during the last three of his fiscal years.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman refers to my vote. The gentleman has not read the RECORD or was not here when appropriation bills were voted on, because the gentleman would know that time and again, scores of times, I introduced amendments on this floor to cut nondefense expenditures.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman confines himself to appropriations. There are many other bills besides appropriation bills. The gentleman voted for WPA appropriations, did he not?

Mr. BENDER. For the cut in WPA appropriations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote for WPA appropriations?

Mr. BENDER. For appropriation cuts.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman voted for appropriations that went through.

Mr. BENDER. Not on all occasions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said that unless we pass this $6,000,000,000 cut, that the very existence of our country is threatened. The self-preservation of our country is dependent, from his angle, on its passing. But, every one knows that the passage of this resolution is necessary from the Republican angle and the reduction that they have in mind, to bring about a nice, juicy tax cut for the large income tax group in this country; in other words, everything that is done by the Republicans is patented on one objective—a tax cut. The evidence is clear in that respect: 20 percent across the table, 20 cents for the taxpayer who pays $1; $20,000 reduction for the taxpayer who is lucky enough to make enough income to pay $100,000. And they call that equity! They call that applying the rule of equity and justice from the tax angle when they are seeking to bring about tax reductions.

When we are increasing taxes, the rule of capacity to pay is always followed by the Democratic party, and when there is a possibility of a reduction the opposite should apply, the smaller income groups should receive the largest reductions, and the reductions should become smaller and smaller for the higher income tax groups.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the chairman of the House Committee on Rules, one of the outstanding Republican leaders of this House, recognizes that fact. He takes a position entirely opposite to that taken by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. The American people might just as well know that the whole purpose of this resolution is to bring about a juicy income-tax reduction for the large taxpayers of America.

My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is frank. You admire a man who is frank. You may disagree with him but you admire him because of his frankness. The gentleman from New York says they have been sitting since the middle of November "and we have not drawn it out of the air but we have a pretty good idea what we are going to do," referring to the $6,000,000,000 reduction. Those are the very words he used on this floor when he made his opening statement. He has a very good idea, I know he has. I know him well enough to know that he has; but he is not telling anybody what he has in mind. I wonder if he has taken you Republicans into his confidence as to what he has in mind. I do not know what the cuts will be. I do not know how many others know. But I am sure there is only a small group among the Republican Members of this House who know what the gentleman from New York has in mind. He is a clever operator, an effective operator, a determined man, a man with strong convictions. You are going to get in the position after today when for the remainder of this session, between now and June 30, when your projects are cut, when Agriculture is cut, when your toes are stepped on unnecessarily, you are going to get up and try to squirm out of your vote; but the vote stands.

The gentleman from New York said Monday and he said today he is going to try to keep the appropriations within the amount agreed upon, whatever the final agreement is after the Senate acts on this matter and it goes to conference. The gentleman is honest and frank, and he will do it, and he will come pretty close to doing it, no question about that. Then when you come in later, when the individual appropriation bills come in, and you start hollering against what is being done to you and the people of your district and the people of your section, when this project that should go through is cut out and that project is cut out, when the appropriations for soil conservation are reduced, and appropriations are cut all along the line, then many of you will regret the vote you cast today as a result of which you put yourself in a strait-jacket.

Of the $37,500,000,000, $5,000,000,000 is for interest, and you cannot reduce that a penny; $2,065,000,000 is for tax refunds, and the Congress cannot reduce that a penny. Those are contractual obligations; $7,300,000,000 is for veterans, and you are not going to reduce that much. There may be some reductions in administrative expenses, but you are not going to reduce the compensation paid to veterans, you are not going to impair their right to go to college, and you are not going to reduce the benefits they receive under the GI bill of rights. So, for all practical purposes any reductions with reference to appropriations for veterans are out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are $3,500,000,000 for foreign commitments. I do not know what you are going to do there when you consider what the effect of that will be, when our country is supposed to be one of the dominant nations of the world. Practically all the world is looking to Washington or to the Kremlin—most of them are looking to Washington, but if we fail they will be compelled to submit to the influence of Moscow and the Kremlin. Those are matters that come close to our hearts, but the national interest of our country, sooner or later, will stare us in the face. If country after country through disillusionment is compelled to go in the direction of the Soviet orbit, then the American people will wake up one morning and realize that the national interest of our country has been adversely affected and that our position in the world has been impaired.

Then, there is $11,200,000,000 for our armed forces. Those five activities constitute a little over $29,000,000,000. If the cut is going to come only in our armed forces, we know the Senate is not going to stand for a $6,000,000,000 cut. Or the cut is going to come in agriculture. After you get rid of 500,000 employees, you still have very far to go to reach $4,500,000,000. Outside of the school-lunch program which hits the cities and the rural districts, too, which amounts to $75,000,000, and we had a hard job putting that through—the only section of the country that can be hit by a reduction in appropriations is the rural parts of the country. The people connected with the soil are the ones who are going to suffer so far as any cut is concerned further than the reduction which affects the number of employees in Government.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the situation in the rural areas and reference has constantly been made to so-called soil conservation. I hold in my hand a copy of the Delphi Journal of Carroll County in my district, which is a rich farming community. The headline says, "AAA allocates $70,000 to Carroll County soil program." And then it goes on and cites that that will be available to farmers who participate in the program by spreading lime and using fertilizer or through the use of other methods. Then it recites that the sums heretofore have been used to buy lime and fertilizer. Does the gentleman think that we should continue to use Federal funds for that purpose?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is $70,000?

Mr. HALLECK. That is what is allocated in one county.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the gentleman's inquiry. I am unable to answer that question myself except to say that in the 16 years I have been here, when cotton was, I think, at around 5 cents a pound, and wheat at around 25 cents a bushel, I saw those representing the farm districts of the country from the Middle West, the Far West, the Northwest, and the South, begging Congress to do something, and coming from a city district, I felt that something should be done. It was not a question of party in those days—it was a question of helping agriculture and helping our country. All I can say is that the big cut, outside of the reduction in the number of employees, is going to come to agriculture and its allied activities.

I hold in my hand a newspaper. I do not know whether what it says is true or not, but I see where my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], is reported in the newspapers as having said certain things. He is not to blame for that before he makes his speech here, but although the headline is not part of the speech, it states, "Cut expenditures or quit, ENGEL says to Army and Navy heads." But he is quoted as saying:

I say to Secretary of War Robert Patterson, Secretary of Navy James Forrestal, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, and Admiral Chester Nimitz—

They were good enough to serve us in war, all of them, especially Eisenhower and Nimitz—

I say to them that if you cannot give us an adequate national defense during the third year after the close of the war with $14,500,000,000—

That is what it says here—

available for expenditure without wrecking the Air Corps and scuttling the Navy, you ought to step aside and give someone else a chance.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Michigan is misquoted in this paper. But I will let it stand without any comment because it is hard for me to believe that a hard-working, conscientious Member, such as the gentleman from Michigan, would express himself in that manner even if he disagreed with Eisenhower and Nimitz or if they disagreed with him. It is hard for me to believe that he would call on them to step aside and give someone else a chance. We know that this thing is cut and dried. The $6,000,000,000 resolution will pass on roll call, but this is only the beginning. The headaches are going to come between now and June 30. The American people want a bill of particulars. I am entitled to a bill of particulars. You are entitled to a bill of particulars. Nobody has received a bill of particulars. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says we are going to help the Army and Navy by cutting them $2,225,000,000.

Mr. TABER. When did I say that?

Mr. McCORMACK. When did you say what?

Mr. TABER. That.

Mr. McCORMACK. You said "you certainly are going to help the Army and the Navy and General Marshall when he goes to Moscow." Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The rest is my own.

Mr. TABER. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Because the Army is going to be cut a billion and a half dollars. That is the proposal. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars from the Navy. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has greater knowledge about our foreign affairs than General Marshall. It simply shows we are laying the record here for what is going to happen between now and June 30. The former Speaker the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said when June 30 arrives there will be no $6,000,000,000 cut and no $4,500,000,000 cut. The American people expect that whatever is agreed upon the Congress will live up to. On June 30, and long before June 30, they are going to realize that in the case of the excise tax there was double talk; that in the case of the Knutson tax bill double talk is going on now, and that in the case of this six billion or $4,500,000,000 reduction the majority party, as on those two other bills, has been engaging in nothing but political double talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, this particular piece of legislation has caused me no little concern and a great deal of worry, because we are living in a troubled and uncertain postwar period. The shooting stopped in Europe almost 2 years ago, and in the Pacific over 18 months ago, but treaties have not yet been written. We have heard a lot of talk about commitments but I do not know what our commitments are. No members of the War Department, the Navy Department, or the State Department have yet told us what our commitments are. As long as this uncertainty hangs like a sword of Damocles over our heads, this Nation must remain strong on land and sea and in the air.

I traveled all through European Russia. I know the only language they understand is force. They respect strength and have only utter contempt for weakness. God knows I would be the last to let the signs of victory flow through my fingers after suffering more than a million casualties and a national debt of $262,000,000,000 which the second World War in our generation has imposed upon us. But you know and I know, and certainly these American citizens in the gallery and all over our Nation know that the first line of defense of any country is its financial solvency. Today the defense and protection of America does not depend upon large masses of troops, it depends upon a sound economy. This war was won not only by our gallant heroic men and women who fought all over this globe, it was won on the home front as much as the foreign front; it was won in the factories and on the farms, and in the mines, and in the forests of America. The industrial output of this Nation, our productive capacity, is what has startled the whole world.

As one of the six Members of this House chosen to join six Members of the Senate to visit the atrocity camps in Europe, and having flown 38,000 miles in 40 days out in the Pacific last fall all the way from Alaska to Australia, spending time in China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, even in far-off Siam, down to Australia, and in our insular possessions, I want to say to you that there is no immediate danger of attack on America from that source for a long time to come—or from Germany. From Ludwigshafen down the Rhine through Darmstadt, Frankfort-on-the-Main, past Coblenz, Remagen, Bonn, Cologne, Aachen and Duren, throughout the Ruhr, Essen, Hamburg, Bremen, Osnabruck, Kassel, Hannover, Halle, Berlin, Dresden, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Munich, Stuttgart, Karlsruhe—all the land is a heap of rats, rubble, and ruin, just what Hitler promised. Oh, I do not think we are going to be run over by the Nazis immediately.

Mr. JENNINGS. Use the mike.

Mr. SHORT. Can I not make myself heard? I have called too many hogs in the Ozarks. I never liked to speak through a tin horn. It is like kissing a beautiful girl through a screen door—you do not enjoy it.

With the exception of Heidelberg, where I spent a happy and prosperous year back in 1922, an old university town with no military value, practically every city in Germany has been blasted to bits. I have been all over Europe. I visited every country in Europe many times before I ever came to Congress. I paid my own expenses by shining shoes and driving jennies down in the Ozarks. The cities of Germany, with the exception of Heidelberg, have been blasted to ruins, and with the exception of Kyoto, in Japan. Let me tell you that the area around Yokohama, Tokyo, Nagasaki, Kobe, Hiroshima, and other large cities have been literally torn up and down. There is no fear from Germany and Japan or prostrate Austria, where the people even today are starving. They are not going to attack us. In spite of our differences with Great Britain she is our friend, particularly Canada and Australia. Why, Britain is so hard up we have to lend her—or should I say give her—$4,800,000,000.

The only nation in this world that has the potential possibility of reprisal is Soviet Russia, and the great rank and file and mass of the Russian people do not want to fight anybody. I went all over European Russia in 1935. They are worn and they are tired. It will take Russia 25 years to rehabilitate her country, rebuild her railroads, and repair the damage done by the Nazi horde that swept over European Russia to Leningrad, Moscow, and Stalingrad. They tried to throw up a boogie-woogie here. Who is going to jump on America? You know and I know, SAM RAYBURN, that no nation and no government is different from an individual. Neither can spend and continue to spend indefinitely without running into serious difficulty. That, like a cancer, will eat your heart out. The distinguished former majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] told you that the interest alone on our Federal debt is $5,000,000,000 a year, almost as much as it cost to run the Government before this recent war.

When the First World War ended we had a national debt of $23,500,000,000. Under Republican administrations for 10 years we reduced that debt a billion dollars each year and cut taxes at the same time, from $26,500,000,000 down to $16,500,000,000. Of course we had a crash in 1929, due to the backwash, the aftermath, the repercussions of the First World War, that you kept us out of. When you went into power in March 1933 our national debt was $22,000,000,000. Before Pearl Harbor in this recent war that debt had been tripled, to $66,000,000,000.

I was not going to mention WPA, but since my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] mentioned it, I want to assure him there are at least two men in this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself, who always voted against it. You were not interested so much in the welfare of the people as you were interested in getting their votes on election day.

We did not have free elections in the thirties. History will be written without prejudice one of these days. I am reluctant to speak of the dead—let them bury the dead and God bless their souls—but Harry Hopkins in 1936 put 4,500 lead and zinc miners in Joplin, Mo., in my dis-

trict, on the pay roll 3 weeks before the election, and, FRANK BOYKIN, 3 days after that election he put them all off. The scandal was so great in Kentucky that Tom Stokes, a rabid New Deal columnist, won the Pulitzer prize by revealing the stench and the smell in that State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I also have my observations of Europe. They were not as a Congressman but as an enlisted man in the armed forces of the United States during the late war. I know that the people of Europe respect the military power of the United States of America. I agree with the gentlemen on that side that economy also begins at home. National defense begins with the stabilization of this economy—true. My people favor a reduction in appropriation bills. But the point I want to get across to the leadership on the other side is this: I would like to remind you that the VFW, the American Legion and all experts in our armed forces agree that this means a reduction in the appropriations for the armed forces. The Republican leadership has throughout this debate denied that any serious cut is contemplated for the defense forces. They should get together with these men who really know what we need for defense.

May I remind you that this is the same VFW and American Legion that for many long years have advocated before this Congress measures of national defense that would have prevented World War II. Gentlemen of the House, in its national convention in St. Louis, in 1919, the American Legion advocated measures of national defense that most military experts today agree might have prevented World War II. And in every national convention from 1919 to the Japanese attack they pressed these measures and called them to the attention of Congress. So I say to you that before we consider any reduction in appropriations for our armed forces, let us consider carefully these great issues that confront our international policy makers.

Look at research. I am advised that the Army originally asked for research and development over $400,000,000. But the President and the Budget Bureau reduced this nearly one-half. I now wonder what further reductions will take place under this $6,000,000,000 cut. I recall when the United States military forces, the War Department, were conducting research on guided missiles as early as 1921, only to have the appropriation cut and to have to discontinue such experimentation in 1924. Germany took up from there in 1936, and in 1944 they bombed England with the V–1. I say that research is one of the greatest measures of defense before our armed forces today, and I would rather see anything cut than experimentation in research and development of new weapons for our armed forces. It is up to us as Members of this Congress to look 5, 10, 15 and 100 years ahead, that we might prevent World War III. The security of future generations depends on our actions today.

Mr. TABER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I might say by way of starting that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], who has just spoken for higher spending has tried hard to make the issue seem too simplified; in fact, he has made it so simple that it seems impossible for me to believe that anybody on the floor of this House should say that World War II could have been prevented by the passage of a single appropriation by the United States Congress or a certain series of them. It took more than that; the causes were much more basic that began World War II and caused Hitler and Mussolini to rise, and I am sure that one or two little items of experimentation were not the things either done or undone that caused the world to break out into conflagration. However, as a service man brought back from the Pacific on the Republican side, I guarantee that we service men will see on this side, and I hope that you will see on your side, too, sir, that there is adequate provision in the Budget for the Army and the Navy and the Marines, as well as veteran services and also that there is adequate provision for experimentation and research. We do not want our services and the men that are still in the services to be any less well taken care of than we were when we were in there.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Why is it then that the national legislative representatives of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and nearly every authority on militarism and military preparedness in Washington, is afraid of this cut?

Mr. FULTON. Well now, let me say this to the gentleman in answer. Every one of them has not taken such position because I can show you a man on our side that we are very proud of, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of this country, who favors this $6,000,000,000 cut and who will answer the gentleman on that specific problem and allay his fears. So rather than have a general statement of a lot of unknown leaders who favor militarism, I would rather have one of our own Members who has served in those capacities answer the gentleman specifically and allay his fears.

May I add, too, that I have been here probably one term longer than the gentleman, as one of the first few veterans brought back to Congress from the service, and if anybody has suffered in this Congress, I believe we first ones have, because in February 1945, on a Navy carrier on the way up to Iwo Jima, I was taken off the ship and sent down here as a newer Member of this Congress, and sat here without making many speeches so that I, too, have gone through a little bit of suffering back here, and I am sure the gentleman himself will after a few months.

We today have been hearing debates on the floor about the Hoover administration and the Roosevelt administration. We vets of World War II are not interested in that. This is a new Congress, the Eightieth Congress. The Seventy-ninth Congress is history. Let us face the new problem, let us fulfill this obligation.

A taxpayer said to me today, "Give us a slight ray of hope, that little ray of gratitude to show that you appreciate going to Congress as a Representative of the people, carry out your promise of economy and put this country on a stable basis." I am going to do that by my vote for economy today, and I am going to see that some of these sacred cows of the Democratic administration are milked to the full.

I think it is time we have these New Deal agencies put on a business basis. We may keep the *Sacred Cow* for President Truman because he needs it to travel in, but we are going to get rid of some of Roosevelt's other sacred cows and the bureaucrats overcrowding these bureaus because they are not necessary now. We can get along without them and we must in order to obtain efficient Government.

The problem facing us today is to carry out the mandate of the November 1946 election—that is to reduce taxes.

It is now part of our legislative process under the Reorganization Act to set a public budget for the Nation, just as we all budget our personal affairs. The American people have asked for a solvent government run on a business basis.

I intend to vote to give it to them. Some of my Democratic friends have said on the floor today that reducing the yearly budget by $6,000,000,000 to $31,500,000,000 is setting a false illusion to the people. On the contrary we Republicans feel that it is that first small symbol of appreciation for sending us to Washington as the people's representatives. We appreciate their confidence and expect to live up to it.

Of course, on every budget cut, everyone wonders where the cuts will occur. We veterans feel that legitimate economies can be made without hurting the national defense—or the Army or Navy or Marine Corps or veterans' affairs. You may count on the veterans of this Congress from World War II to see that our services' interests are protected when the appropriation bills come up for action. We will see that the weight of the squeeze is applied to the New Deal agencies.

May I emphasize that we will protect the budgets for our occupation troops, and we will continue the policy of assisting the populations they are policing, looking toward rehabilitation and reconstruction so they can in a few years stand on their own feet with self-respect. We will protect the necessary research and development of our armed services as we want our services to maintain their full efficiency with modern equipment. Our defense facilities must equal our foreign commitments.

When the armed services are heard by the committees of this Congress they will receive good and fair consideration of all necessary Budget items.

Let us show the people we mean business and give the working people of this country a bonus from Congress by tax reduction. I am going to do my part today in taking the first step to put extra take home money in the pay envelope, and will vote for this $6,000,000,000 reduction in the highest peacetime Budget we have ever had presented. We must economize and get back efficient Government.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure all the Members that were here a little while ago when the gentleman from Missouri spoke enjoyed his talk very, very much. There is one thing about that gentleman's remarks on the floor of the House, whether you agree with him or not you always enjoy his oratory. Thinking of the enjoyment I was having in listening to his remarks today, my mind went back to 1939 and 1940 when he made the same type of speech against every measure that was presented to this House in favor of preparedness. You older Members will remember that. In those days he got great applause and wonderful acclaim from the left side of the aisle. He used some of the same expressions today that he used in 1939, 1940, and 1941, when under the Democratic leadership we were preparing for an attack which we were almost certain was going to come. So do not be misled by oratory of that sort.

In those days he also said, "Who is going to fight us? Why should we spend all this money for the Army and the Navy and the brass hats?" His arguments today should fall just as flat as his arguments proved to be in those days of 1939, 1940, and 1941.

Mr. Chairman, I first heard about the proposed 20-percent tax reduction last October, and I said at that time, "It is a campaign promise, but if they carry out that campaign promise it is going to be at the expense of the Army at the expense of the Navy, or at the expense of the veterans." That is just what is going to occur, Mr. Chairman.

Two weeks ago the suggestion first came from the Republican leadership that the Army would be cut a billion and three-quarters and the Navy a half billion, but so much protest came from every area of the country about weakening our national defense that today they are afraid to say that that is where the cut is going to be made. They said this 2 weeks ago, but on account of the protests they are not saying it today. They want all the Members on the Republican side to vote for this cut, without knowing where or what or when.

I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to one or two facts that probably were not even considered. Many of the economists today, the best minds of the country in that line, contemplate a recession in business during the fiscal year 1948. If there is the slightest recession in business and national income falls $10,000,000,000, from $165,000,000,000 to $155,000,000,000, that will mean a reduction in the revenue to the Treasury of the United States of $3,000,000,000—$3,000,000,000 if there is a slight business recession which is expected. Then what will the figures covering estimated receipts you are presenting to this House today mean? Also, Mr. Chairman, may I remind you that during the last session, there was a situation confronting the House wherein it was trying to make the Senate agree to pay terminal leave to veterans in cash, and we worked with the other body up to the very last day of the session before we finally backed down and agreed to issue bonds to veterans instead of paying them in cash. Every Member of this House, except one, voted to pay the veterans in cash. That measure will probably come up before this Congress at this session, and practically every Member will vote to pay in cash. That will mean two billion or three billion dollars in additional expenditures. What will this resolution which we are now considering mean when that comes up, Mr. Chairman? There are proposals sponsored by the leadership in the other body which will call for the expenditure of more than half a billion dollars for aid to education. When those matters come up before the House, where will your figures which you are presenting to us today be? Already, Mr. Chairman, Gen. Omar Bradley has cut down on the services to be given to the disabled and other American veterans of World War II. He sent out a telegram last night freezing all Veterans' Administration employees and not permitting any more promotions. That will result in many a veteran not getting the services to which he is entitled. Mr. Chairman, this resolution today is nothing more than an expression of a pious intention, something that our former Speaker of the House called legislative hypocrisy. My prediction is, Mr. Chairman, that before June 30 rolls around, this resolution will be referred to not only in the Halls of this Congress and at the other end of the Capitol, but all lover the country, as nothing but a mere scrap of paper, because neither the Committee on Appropriations nor the Congress will be able to carry out the pious intentions expressed in this resolution today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I should first like to answer a statement made by our distinguished former Speaker the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. In his remarks he indicated that the Republicans were not certain and definite in their program and that no one knew whether a reduction in the Budget would be effected to the extent of $6,000,000,000. In other words he gave the impression that the Republicans were not firm in their determination to reduce the national expenditures. Of course I cannot speak for all of the Republicans and for anyone else in particular but I feel that the Republicans are firm in their determination to reduce the national expenditures and keep the same within a budget of $31,500,000,000.

President Truman has indicated that he needs $37,500,000,000 to spend in the coming year. We will when we pass this pending legislation say to him and say to the world that thirty-one and one-half billion will be the limit of our expenditures. I am sure that with the reputation which our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. TABER has, for honesty and economy, he will guarantee that the Appropriations Committee does not run beyond the budget fixed in this proposed legislation.

I feel that it is not only a pleasure but a duty for me to vote in favor of this legislation. I would be in favor of reducing the Budget another $1,000,000,000 for I feel that the temper of the country is such that the people will sustain a strict, honest, and sincere program of economy. We Republicans must consider that when this legislation is passed that we are bound to confine our spending within the Budget herein fixed and that we must not listen to any programs that will call for a greater expenditure.

I wish also to make reply to a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON]. In his remarks he said in effect that at the end of Woodrow Wilson's term that the country's financial accounts were in the black and that when the Republicans turned the country back to the Democrats that the financial accounts were in the red.

The New Deal is vulnerable in so many places but is probably more vulnerable in its reckless and extravagant spending of money than in any other way. Any time a New Deal Congressman attempts to defend the New Deal administration he will always find an unsurmountable obstacle in the colossal failure of the New Deal financial policy and all of this in spite of the fact that when Mr. Roosevelt came into power he promised that he would reduce expenditures and gave utterance to the famous quotation that "many countries have been destroyed on the rocks of loose fiscal policy."

It may be astonishing to you to know that in the 5 years beginning with the first of 1941 and ending with the close of 1945 our Government spent more than twice as much money as it did in all of the period from Washington's day down to 1941. And it must not be forgotten that we spent a terrific lot of money in 1940 and also in 1938 and 1939.

When the Republicans came into power after Woodrow Wilson's administration, the national debt was about $27,000,000,000. This was at that time considered to be a colossal debt and was the greatest debt under which any nation had struggled up to that time. The Republicans paid that debt off for 10 years at the rate of a billion dollars a year. This was considered a great financial feat, for no nation had ever paid its debt at such a rapid rate.

When the Democrats took over the Government by electing a Democratic House and Senate in 1930, the national debt was about $19,000,000,000. From that time forward until this day the Democrats and New Dealers were never able to operate the Government a single

year without a deficit of anywhere from a billion to $100,000,000,000. In the first year of their administration, they ran behind about a billion dollars and in the end of the war years they ran behind nearly $100,000,000,000.

I was a Member of Congress during the time that we were reducing the debt at the rate of a billion dollars a year, and during that time we reduced the taxes three or four times with the result that after each reduction we were still able to continue our reduction of the debt. Those were the days when the people had faith in the industrial and economic strength of the country. I was also a Member of Congress when the New Deal took over, and I know that no attention whatever was paid to the promises of Mr. Roosevelt that he would reduce the national expenditures. History will record the fact that one of the reasons they gave for naming this new party the New Deal Party was that they had adopted a new philosophy. That philosophy was that it was unwise to attempt to economize and that scarcity should be the program and that we should spend and spend and spend in order that the New Deal Party should be elected and elected and elected.

I remember well what a terrible strain it was upon many of us when we raised the debt limit to $35,000,000,000. When that was done, I, and I am sure many others, promised ourselves that we would never vote to increase the debt limit beyond that amount. But emergency upon emergency came along, and while on some occasions I did not vote for the debt limit to be raised, still it was raised from thirty-five billion to forty-five billion. Everyone thought that would be enough, but soon thereafter it was raised to sixty billion, and not long thereafter it was raised to the colossal sum of one hundred and twenty-five billions. Of course, everyone thought that would be the end of such extravagant spending. However, Mr. Roosevelt preached that there would be no danger because we were owing this money to ourselves. Then later we increased the debt to two hundred and ten billion and many people thought that we would never be able to pay it, and many think so yet. But we went on to greater heights and increased the debt limit to two hundred and sixty billion and finally to three hundred billions. Today the national debt is $259,000,000,000. If we were to pay this off at what we thought was the unheard-of record of a billion a year, it would take us 259 years to pay the debt. We must pay it sooner than that. That is why I would have been willing to have voted to reduce the Budget another billion, so we could have applied that billion on this terrific debt.

There are only three ways by which this colossal debt can be paid.

First. By repudiation. Of course, no one favors that kind of a program. It would be a terrible political crime for our country to tell the many patriotic people who have bought Government bonds that their Government bonds will not be paid. A policy of repudiation would mean that our Republic would go down because our Constitution would not permit such disgraceful national conduct.

Second. Another method would be inflation. No government ever survived that attempted to pay its debt by inflation. The burning forces of inflation would consume our economic fabric and we would tumble into oblivion.

Third. The third method is the established honest, sincere method that we call taxation. We must tax and tax and tax if we are to pay this terrific debt. We can do so if we practice thrift and economy and if we can establish in our country adequate production. We all know that all wealth comes from the ground through minerals and metals and timber and crops plus the skill of the hands of man through labor and plus the acumen of the human brain through management. It is from wealth that taxes are collected and from no other source. Therefore to pay this colossal debt we must do our utmost to establish a firm maximum productive economy in our country.

We are a great people. We are great because we have assumed great obligations and have discharged them valiantly. We will discharge this colossal debt that the New Deal has given us but we will not do so except that we exert ourselves to the limit. Therefore I shall vote for this legislation because I feel it my duty to do so.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, there has been, and there probably will continue to be, some really magnificent oratory today, here on the floor of the House. Speaking after such distinguished spokesmen as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is very much as it must have been when one was called upon to speak after Henry Clay or Patrick Henry. However, there are a few things that I should like to mention in connection with the current debate. There is a lot of smoke drifting around this matter. There are numerous red herrings being dragged across the trail. There is a great deal of hysteria and arduous effort to create hysteria where none should exist. Mention has been made of "fresh" or new Members in the House. I qualify under that description, being a "fresh" Member who only arrived here last January 3. However, I replaced a former Member who was so fresh in the pouring of public funds down the rat hole that the people of my district put him in salt. One of my campaign pledges was to come to the Congress of the United States to help establish some sane and sensible balance in the economy of this Government. That pledge I intend to keep. I might add here that my district is Democratic by approximately 5 to 3 in registration, and I obviously had to come to Congress with Democratic votes. I will be perfectly willing to stand on my vote today establishing this limit, and I will go back and stand on the record in my district when it is necessary, and without apology.

It has been said that America is watching this vote today. It might be well to say that not only is America watching this vote but people like Mr. Eisler are watching the vote, if he can take time out from his other troubles, and so are all the people he works for. So are all of the people who do not want sound economy in this country—those who want chaos and anarchy and all those things that help foster their philosophies of government.

There is nothing spectacular about an orderly process; there is nothing spectacular about economy and about truthfulness and integrity and honesty; so the Eislers and the like do not want them. If you want to continue chaos, continue this mad spending unabated until it reaches a point where it consumes us all.

I, also, am a veteran. As I look on the other side of the aisle I see men with distinguished war records—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]—veterans all, representing every branch of the armed services. I should like to ask in a friendly way if they honestly believe that the men on this side of the House who are voting for this resolution today would do one single thing to cripple the armed services to which we belonged and in which we saw service. I can assure you we would not.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MacKINNON. Speaking about the armed services, is it not a fact that some of the so-called interpreters who were sent to Germany could not even interpret when they got there?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Exactly. Twelve interpreters were sent from this country to Germany to act as interpreters and they could not speak German. If that is not one of the most flagrant examples of a total waste of the taxpayers' money I do not know where you could find one. Those 12 would have felt right at home here. They were masters of double talk. They spoke one kind of German here and another kind over there. They would feel perfectly at home with some of the Members of this House who today are speaking economy double talk. These gentlemen speak economy when talking to the voters in their districts, but on the floor of the House all of those pledges go out of the window.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Just exactly how can savings be effected in the armed services? If any Member on the other side of the House says that economies cannot be effected it is because he spent his time of enlistment or his term of service with his eyes closed. You and I know they can be effected; that overlapping not only exists but from time to time the overlapping comes in layers.

One example, and only one, before I conclude: Picture 70 United States Army

officers, 30 professors, complete with caps and gowns—probably transferred from some bureau—staff secretaries, and all the paraphernalia of this retinue, going overseas to Germany on a 3-year project—to do what? To act as officers of the day? To serve with troops? To facilitate the labors of the occupation? To do any of the things you would normally expect to be performed by an Army officer? No, indeed. They are going over there to compile a history of the Nuremberg trials. Now, it seems to me it is much more important for the people of this country after 3 years to have a few coins to jingle around in their pockets than it is for them to be able to sit down and read a voluminous report of the Nuremberg trials, compiled at fantastic expense in manpower and money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I believe my record in the House for 10 years will rank as high as any Member of the House without regard to which side of the aisle he may serve on. I remember back in 1939 when I brought a bill before the House which actually at that time saved about $14,000,000. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], now the Speaker, reserved the right to object. He was a little afraid, because I was a Democrat, that I would bring in a bill to save some money. Later on he withdrew his objection. I was grateful to that fine American. It gave me an opportunity to demonstrate my belief that we could make a saving in some Government expenditures.

I find myself today opposed to the blanket $6,000,000,000 cut, first because I do not know and have not found anybody who can tell me intelligently where the savings are going to be made, what items are going to be cut. I certainly do not want to see cuts made in our defense program, either Army or Navy, because I can remember Pearl Harbor. If the Japs had had an ounce of brains they could have followed up their attack on Pearl Harbor and taken Los Angeles and San Francisco without difficulty. We were not prepared then. I do not want to see the day come when the surprise of 6 years ago can be repeated and we awaken to find ourselves again unprepared. So I question whether it is good economy to curtail expenditures in that direction at the present time, without any specific information to go on, yet I am just as much for economy as any man or woman in this House.

I cannot understand how it is going to affect agriculture. I can see many projects in my own and other States, flood control and reclamation projects that will not receive sufficient funds to complete them. The net result of dilly-dallying along will cost the Federal Government more in the long run. For instance, to give you one example, the Central Valleys project in California has dragged along so slowly and so long until it has reached the point where it is going to cost the Government twice the money it would have cost had sufficient money been appropriated in the first place to complete the project without these many delays.

I have flood-control projects in my district so badly needed that the farmers cannot get crop insurance on account of the danger of floods, yet if this budget ceiling is adopted it is likely no money will be appropriated to relieve that condition.

I am a Democrat. I am not going to drag a red herring across this debate or even a catfish, but I do have a statement to make in all sincerity and honesty, and I particularly want the Members on the Republican side to listen. One week ago today a most distinguished citizen of our State came to Washington, Governor Earl Warren. In the not too distant future he might be the President of the United States, for he is one of the outstanding Americans living today, Democrat or Republican. Governor Warren has the ability to be the President of the United States and I say he would make a mighty good one if he should be elected, much better than many men whose names we have all heard mentioned.

What did the Governor of California say when he was in this building, adjacent to this Chamber a week ago today, testifying before the Committee on Appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This is what Governor Warren said:

> I am appearing, however, to plead for the earliest possible completion of the several units of the Central Valleys project because I believe that this is in the interests of both the Nation and California.

He said further:

> Unless construction work is accelerated, which of course will require larger yearly appropriations, it will not be completed for another 10 to 12 years, because while the Government has put about $190,000,000 into the project almost a like amount will be required to complete it.

He said further:

> It is because I believe that the people of my State want the project accelerated that I appear before you today to urge an appropriation of $40,000,000 instead of the $20,000,000 provided in the President's budget. This action would clearly set forth the congressional policy that will result in the desired speeding up of the construction I feel thoroughly justified in making this suggestion because I believe it is in the interests of true economy and will actually save dollars to the Federal Government as well as to the people of California.

If we cut this $6,000,000,000 from the budget we do not stand a chance of getting even $20,000,000 for the continuation of the Central Valleys project in the State of California, and it will curtail necessary Federal funds for roads, flood control, reclamation projects, and the entire agricultural program so vital to our Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, having been a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives for nearly 5 years, during which time this resolution offers the first real opportunity the Congress has had to cut down the reckless and wanton waste of public funds. In fact, this is the first real chance we economy-minded folks have had for over a decade to act, and by our votes to balance the National Budget to make a substantial payment on our national debt, and to cut down extravagance in national affairs, and so to give the taxpayers of America some tax relief, which will be appreciated as time goes on.

The people of Iowa are in favor of economy in government. They want a dollar's worth of service for every dollar of public money spent. The Iowa delegation in the House of Representatives truly represent their constituents in their support of this resolution. We know that there are many places where billions of public tax dollars can be saved without in any way interfering with the necessary functions of our Government. The issue is one that goes to the very foundations of our institutions.

The joint congressional Committee on the Budget did not "just reach into the blue sky" for this proposed reduction of $6,000,000,000, but to the contrary, much research and investigation by the members and their staffs of investigators has brought about this figure, and let me assure you that more than adequate national defense can and will be provided in this proposed over-all budget of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. But it will require the agencies overgrown during the postwar bureaucratic era to bring their operations to a size actually in line with the needs of the country; to cut out unnecessary and wasteful activities.

The people of Iowa and of the country have been overrun for years by the hordes of Federal pay-rollers. The people are tired of paying for the maintenance of these tax eaters. The people know that the estimated tax take from the people of the United States this year is nearly $40,000,000,000, or about $1,000 per family. The time to reduce this burden on our people is now. The only way to reduce taxes is to reduce expenses. That is exactly what we propose to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of the entire Iowa delegation in the House of Representatives by pledging continued effort for the complete elimination of all unnecessary spending, waste, and extravagance in government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, we who have faith in our political and economic principles which have guided us for more than a century and a half of great progress should be deeply concerned over the events of the past decade or more.

In our democratic government, careful of the rights of the individual citizen, the conception of an all-powerful central government to which all look for security and assistance in turn has under-

taken to control and direct the lives and destinies of all. We have witnessed in the economic field a centrally controlled economy and intervention of it by the Federal Government. It is my conviction that the many abuses from Government interference must and will be corrected if our people are to enjoy the progress to which they have in the past been accustomed and to which they are entitled.

We should have the courage, the vigor, and constructive ability to develop a program to meet the issues and conditions before us. Not so many years ago one would say, "I am self-supporting." That was considered a virtue. When we heard it said that "he or she is self-supporting," everyone held that individual in high regard and respect.

The immense sums which we have appropriated over the years with the exception of the expenditures necessary to carry on to a successful conclusion our war efforts was not derived from national income. It was, therefore, borrowed by making use of the national credit. This means that we are no longer self-supporting. We are just like the individual living on borrowed money. We have mortgaged the future of our children and our grandchildren. There is a limit to national credit. We have invited disaster. We have borrowed up to the point of disaster. We must get back to the position where we can say "we are self-supporting."

The Republican Party is definitely committed to this course, and we must now devote our best thoughts and efforts to make the venture successful. There is a moral obligation resting upon the minority to follow in this direction, too. The budget is not beyond control. We can balance it if we have the integrity to do so.

There is no doubt in my mind that an economic system based upon individual freedom and the maintenance of competition under legal provision by which business and industry may check abuses and promote progress for their own guidance, subject to Government regulation based upon law, is the creed to follow. We cannot have this kind of economic system if we continue to appropriate money to carry on an all-powerful centralized bureaucracy, whose authority is over everybody and who is not responsible to anybody. Of course, if we vote for a great reduction in expenditures, we naturally will offend many and probably leave ourselves vulnerable to threats that we must depart our political office. However, the Constitution, as I understand it, was not established to satisfy the aspirations of a single generation, but to secure the blessings of enduring principles to all posterity.

Our national debt is now $260,000,000,000. A debt which means $2,000 for every man, woman, and child to pay. The interest, or carrying charge, on the national debt amounts to $5,000,000,000 a year. To come anywhere near meeting this huge obligation we must retrench. The taxpayer must pay this if our economy is to survive. To be fair with the taxpayer, and all of us are helping to pay the bill, the much-needed reduction of governmental employees, which now number more than two and a half million, is in order. It must be evident to any thoughtful mind that unless we call a halt to the tremendous pouring out of financial assistance it will be impossible to restore our Nation to a healthy and sound Government.

I believe we have the support of the vast majority of the American people in reducing expenses and cutting out the waste in government. This is evidenced by the mandate given Congress on last November 5. It is up to us to show to the people that we measure up to the duties and responsibilities imposed upon us. We can reduce the expenditures of the departments, including the War and Navy, without interfering with their essential administration. The uninformed will naturally fall for the appeals of the armed services departments, but the complaints of those in high positions in these departments are not justified as I am certain we will prove to them and the Nation within the months to come. These departments cannot expect to continue the lavish methods of spending money now as they did during our participation in the last war. They should learn the lesson now that all of us, to hold the respect of the Nation, must be self-supporting. This can be done if we are to survive as a great nation. I venture to say that it will be done by reason of the fact that the people demand it.

We and the people of the Nation are not asking any department to reduce beyond the point of waste and non-essential activities. If we were unreasonable in our demands for a reduction of expenditures beyond that of the $6,000,000,000 recommended, then our recommendations would be far greater than this amount.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

CAN WAR DEPARTMENT BUDGET BE CUT?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss very frankly the action of the Congressional Budget Committee, of which I am a member, in its attempt to cut the President's budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, by $6,000,000,000. I want to give the reasons I supported that action and particularly why, as chairman of the War Department Appropriation Subcommittee, I took the position that the War Department could take a cut of $1,500,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, in its military and civil functions budget. I concede to everyone the same sincerity, the same honesty of purpose, and the same desire to protect the interests of my country as I claim for myself. For my part, I want to be guided by facts. Those of the War Department, I know.

FOREIGN POLICY

I am supporting and shall continue to support the foreign policy of our Government as expressed by the senior Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, and his colleagues who are representing our Nation in the foreign councils of this Government. While I do not always agree with them 100 percent in their policy, I am supporting that policy 100 percent in the interest of unity.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I have repeatedly stated on the floor of this House that I shall support a national defense policy which will make our foreign policy effective. I believe with Theodore Roosevelt in speaking softly and carrying a big stick. Secretary of War Patterson, General Eisenhower, and others have stated that they will require an army for the fiscal year of 1948 of 1,070,000 men, of whom 400,000 men will be for the Army Air Corps.

After studying the budgetary and other figures carefully, I have come to the conclusion that we can cut one and one-half billion dollars from the Army appropriation for 1948, including civil functions, and still have an efficient Army of 1,070,000 men, including an efficient Air Force of 400,000 men. I have asked in the past and all that I am asking now, Mr. Speaker, is that the War Department and Navy Department produce a dollar's worth of national defense for every one of the hard-earned dollars the taxpayers are turning over to them.

OVER-ALL PICTURE

In order to understand what can be done, we must consider the 1947 and 1948 Budgets together. We must consider the expenditures and the proposed expenditures and the balances left at the end of each year. If you will examine that 2-year Budget, you will find that the Government will have $46,200,000,000 available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. June 30, 1948, the end of the fiscal year, will be 3 years and 3 months after the cessation of hostilities in Germany. Total expenditures for all purposes during the first 5 months of the fiscal year 1947 were $14,000,000,000, or $2,800,000,000 a month or at a rate of $33,600,000,000 a year. The 1947 appropriation was $33,656,000,000. Total expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, are estimated and, if we allow everything they ask for, will be $36,698,000,000.

Despite the reduction in our Army from 1,889,690 men on July 1, 1946, to 1,070,000 in 1947; despite the reduction in the Navy; and despite the discontinuance of other agencies, the Government proposes to spend in 1948 over $3,000,000,000 more than the total appropriations allowed by Congress during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

When we deduct the estimated expenditures for 1948 of $36,700,000,000 from the $46,200,000,000 available for expenditure in 1948, the Government will have a balance of $9,500,000,000. If we hold them down to the 1947 rate of expenditure, it will have a balance of nearly $13,000,000,000—see footnote A.

WAR AND NAVY OVER-ALL APPROPRIATIONS

The amount available for expenditure for all purposes by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, according to the Budget, is $10,038,000,000. The amount available for expenditure by the Navy Department for the same fiscal year is $6,618,000,000. The

total amount available for expenditure by the War and Navy Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, will be $16,656,000,000, providing we give them everything they ask for. If we add a $300,000,000 supplemental budget request, not in the Budget but now before us, they will have approximately $17,000,000,000 available for expenditure in 1948. A 10-percent cut would give us a $1,700,000,000 reduction. A 15-percent cut would save $2,550,000,000 and leave the armed forces $14,460,000,000 available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1948. Yet General Eisenhower, Secretary of War Patterson, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, and others are broadcasting over the country that they cannot take this cut without wrecking national defense, crippling the Air Corps, and scuttling the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and affection for General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, Secretary of War Patterson, and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. However, spending $46,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned money is not a matter of affection but is a hard-boiled business proposition with me. I want to say very emphatically to President Truman and his administration, "If you cannot operate this Government during the third year after the war with less than $46,000,000,000 available for expenditure, you and your administration ought to get out and let someone else try it"—see footnote B.

I say to Secretary of War Patterson, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz that if you cannot give us an adequate national defense during the third year after the close of the war with $14,400,000,000 available for expenditure, without wrecking the Air Corps and scuttling the Navy, you ought to step aside and give someone else a chance. I mean just that.

CAN THE ARMY TAKE A $1,500,000,000 CUT IN 1948?

I did not like to take any straight across-the-board cuts as some of you know. I like to put my finger on just where I think we can make the cut and in connection with my own field, War Department expenditures, I believe I can do that. From here on I want to discuss the War Department and the War Department only.

While I believe we can make considerable savings in the Finance and Quartermaster Departments of the Army, I am not discussing these departments. I shall make certain that there are adequate funds to pay, feed, clothe, and house an army of 1,070,000 men including 400,000 for the Air Corps. Any figures that I give or discuss will be costs outside of these items in the Quartermaster and Finance Departments of the Army.

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

First. The War Department asked my committee for $500,000,000 for Government and relief in occupied areas for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

Second. The House of Representatives acting upon the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee cut this amount to $350,000,000. The other body put the item back to $500,000,000. The Army used every argument then that is being repeated now. We were told we must give them this $500,000,000, or increase the armed forces in Japan and Germany; that if we did not give them this money there would likely be a revolution in Japan and Germany.

Third. A House-Senate conference committee gave the War Department $425,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for that purpose and the bill passed the Congress with that amount.

Fourth. According to the budget, the War Department spent $107,269,000 or $21,400,000 a month out of this fund during the first 5 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, leaving $318,000,000 for the last 7 months.

Yet the War Department is right now asking our committee for $300,000,000 more in spite of the fact that it only spent $107,000,000 during the first 5 months of the year and has $318,000,000 left.

If this appropriation is granted, the War Department will have $618,000,000 or more than $88,000,000 a month for the last 7 months of 1947 as against $107,000,000 or $21,400,000 a month for the first 5 months of this fiscal year. It is asking for a total of $725,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and another $725,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, or a total of $1,450,000,000 for the 2-year period—see footnote A.

Let us analyze this further. Five months of the 2-year period are gone and it has cost us $107,000,000 in these relief funds. If we granted the entire amount for the 2-year period as presented by the budget, the War Department would have $1,343,000,000 for the last 19 months of the 2-year period. Yet the rate of expenditure for the first 5 months was at the rate of $21,400,000 a month, or $264,000,000 a year, or $528,000,000 for the 2-year period. If the War Department continues spending for this 2-year period at the same rate it spent during the first 5 months, it will have $922,000,000 left at the end of the 2-year period. If it doubles its rate of expenditures, it will have more than $400,000,000 left. In fact, budget figures show that if we give them the additional $300,000,000 they are asking for government and relief in occupied areas, they will carry over into the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, or the fourth year after the war, with a balance of $549,000,000. I, for one, do not propose to give them all of this money. I believe we can cut from a half to three-quarters of a billion dollars from this item.

AIR CORPS

First. Total appropriation for the Air Corps for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, was $1,199,500,000.

Second. Total spent during the first 5 months of the fiscal year $338,850,000.

Third. Rate of spending was $67,500,000 a month, or $810,000,000 annually, and remember we are reducing the armed forces from 1,889,690 to 1,070,000 during this fiscal year.

Fourth. The Air Corps will have $389,000,000 unspent if it does not exceed—and it should not exceed—the rate of spending during the first 5 months of the 1947 fiscal year.

Fifth. The amount asked for in the 1948 budget is $850,000,000.

Sixth. If we allow the budget figures, the amount available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1948 will be $1,566,000,000, or $130,000,000 a month, as against $67,500,000 a month during the first 5 months of this year.

Let us assume that the Air Corps will spend at the same rate in 1948 as in 1947. If it does, it will spend $810,000,000 and have an unexpended balance of $756,000,000. The Air Corps budget contains $440,000,000 for construction of new airplanes. I am told the amount for new construction by commercial airlines during the next 3 years totals only $300,000,000. The unliquidated obligations at the end of the fiscal year, if we carry out the program as proposed, will be $416,000,000. For my part I question the advisability of spending $440,000,000 on new airplanes at this time, airplanes some of which will be obsolete in 2 or 3 years. I believe we ought to tool up to produce these planes, produce a certain number of them so our men can learn how to fly them. I do not think we should go into mass production at this time, but we should be ready to go into high speed production on short notice. While the thousands of wartime planes we now have might be considered obsolete when compared to some of these later planes, they are still good fighting planes and I am wondering just who in the world has anything that is better or equal. I want a modern Air Corps. I want to be ready to jump into mass production by tooling up. I want enough modern planes to train our men to try these planes and take the bugs out of them. But I believe such a program can be carried out for less than $440,000,000.

Here is still another point, for illustration. The Air Corps contains money for the Air Transport Command which will have 27,000 officers and men in 1948. I have before me maps showing permanent Army and Navy transport lines both in the United States and overseas. The Army and Navy are duplicating air transport lines across the United States to Alaska, down almost to Australia and into the Dutch Indies. Is there any reason that we should have air transport command lines to Dakar, Monrovia, Cairo, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Tehran in Africa and Persia, undoubtedly maintaining airports and crews at those points? While I feel we must have air transport planes, I question advisability of having the Army and Navy duplicating commercial lines, plus the operation of weekly routes all over the world. I believe we can make a great deal of saving here without wrecking the Air Corps.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First. The total amount appropriated for engineers' service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, was $816,044,000. The Engineer Corps spent $210,625,000 during the first 5 months of this fiscal year.

Second. Rate of spending during this period was $42,000,000 a month or $504,000,000 a year.

Third. There will remain $312,000,000 in this appropriation on June 30, 1947, if the Engineer Corps is not permitted to spend more per month during the last 7 months than it spent during the first 5 months when we had a large Army. Is there any reason we cannot use this $312,000,000 to reduce the 1948 budget without wrecking the national defense or the Air Corps?

Fourth. The original budget request for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, was $365,000,000 or approximately $30,000,000 a month for Engineer Corps. Total amount available for spending through 1948 if this request is granted, will be $623,000,000 for the year. In addition to this there is a supplemental estimate of $125,000,000 for engineers' service and $100,000,000 for the construction of military posts, making a total of $848,000,000 available for expenditure in 1948. Here we have a department asking for a supplemental appropriation of $225,000,000 before we have even begun to hold hearings on the regular appropriation. If we grant all its requests, its rate of spending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, will be more than $70,000,000 a month as against $42,000,000 a month for the first 5 months of the present fiscal year, an increase of almost 100 percent. In this budget we find $229,000,000 for maintenance of structures and operation of facilities. I have before me two books, one the program of War Department installations and the second the report of the War Department Installation Board. I have gone over them rather hastily and find that out of 1,300 installations in the United States the Board has recommended that only 88 be unconditionally declared surplus. No wonder whe have $229,000,000 for maintenance and operation of these facilities. It is time to get rid of more of them and cut down the costs. If we allow this department the same rate of spending that it used during the first 5 months of 1947, it will spend $504,000,000 a year. But it will have available $843,000,000, leaving a carryover of $343,000,000. Surely we can make a saving here.

MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

On July 1, 1946, the War Department had 1,889,690 officers and men. These were to be and are being reduced to 1,070,000 on June 30, 1947, a reduction of 483,000 men, or 32 percent.

On December 31, 1946, it had 162,515 officers and 1,156,968 men, or a total of 1,319,483. Its report shows that on June 30 of this year it proposes to have 146,152 officers and 923,848 men. Between December 31, 1946, and June 30, 1947, it will reduce the enlisted men by 233,120, or 20 percent, and officers from 162,515 to 146,152, a reduction of 16,363 officers, or 10 percent. There will then be 1 officer for every 6⅓ enlisted men, or 3 officers for every 19 enlisted men. I believe we can cut these officers at least 20 percent and take another 16,363 officers from the Regular Army. We have a large pool and will continue to have a large pool of Reserve officers from which to draw. I believe we can safely cut at least an additional 16,000 officers from this list and replace them with enlisted men. In my judgment, the ratio of officers to enlisted men is completely out of balance in making up the over-all strength of 1,070,000.

COST OF ARMY PERSONNEL

According to the Budget, it will cost us $5,713 a year for each of the 63,689 Air Corps officers and $5,383 per year for each of the 82,463 officers other than Air Corps. It cost us $2,800 in 1946 and will cost us $3,150 in 1948 for every soldier for pay, allowances, food, clothing, medical care, and maintenance of quarters. No wonder the captain who wrote a story appearing in last week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post said he could live the life of Riley, have servants, and still save $300 a month. His income was $5,700 a year. I recall a captain named ENGEL who served in World War I, who is now talking to you. He was paid $2,400 a year, 10 percent for foreign service, and paid $60 a month for rations and quarters, and he did not live the life of Riley, with servants, while he was in the army of occupation in World War I, and, of course, there is nothing sacred to him about cutting off a few dollars from occupational forces to take some of the Riley living costs off the backs of our taxpayers.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

First. On December 30, 1946, the War Department had 629,194 civilian employees, 189,961 of whom were overseas and 439,233 in the United States.

Second. The War Department proposes to have 469,000 civilian employees in the Army in 1948 or more than 1 civilian employee for every 2 enlisted men in the Army. Of these, 105,000 will be overseas and 364,000 in the United States. This does not include the thousands of civilian employees who will be paid out of the military government appropriation. If we pass this budget as the War Department asks us, the Army will have the following personnel:

Officers	146,152
Civilian employees	469,000
Total	615,152
Enlisted men	923,848

We will have six officers and civilian employees for every nine enlisted men in 1948. When you try to cut them, they say you are wrecking national defense and wrecking the Air Corps.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me repeat the budget figures I started out with. If we give the President what he asks for, there will be available for expenditure in 1948, 3 years after the conclusion of the war, $46,200,000,000, or nearly one-third the assessed valuation of the United States in 1939. The Government will spend $36,698,000,000 or more than $3,000,000,000 a month. It has spent during the first 5 months of the fiscal year 1947, $14,000,000,000 or at the rate of $2,800,000,000 a month. It now expects to exceed that rate of expenditure by $200,000,000 a month.

The War Department will have available for expenditure $10,038,000,000 and the Navy Department $6,618,000,000. If we add the $300,000,000 supplemental for government and relief in occupied areas, the two Departments will have available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, nearly $17,000,000,000. A 15-percent reduction would amount to $2,550,000,000, the exact amount of reduction the Budget Committee had in mind. If the Navy budget is analyzed as I have the War Department, I believe we will be able to increase the saving by at least half a billion and still have a fully adequate Army and Navy to back up our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say this: This is my eleventh year on the War Department subcommittee, the most critical period in the history of our Nation. I go back and think of the days of Dunkirk when I saw our country turning what little ammunition and the few guns we had over to England to prevent the collapse of the British Empire. That was before we had entered the war. A few of us on the subcommittee sweat blood during that time when we were trying to convert a shotgun ammunition capacity to a wartime need. I do not want to go through that period again and I want no one else to go through that experience. There is no one who wants adequate national defense more than I do. I believe we can have that adequate defense and a sizeable saving, too, by honest and sincere cooperation between the War and Navy Departments and Congress, cutting off every unnecessary dollar and giving us a dollar's worth of national defense for every dollar we spend. That is all I am asking. If we do it, you will be amazed at the saving.

Footnote A: It takes time to obligate certain new appropriations. It is for this reason that I prefer to consider all estimated expenditures against all available expenditures for any given year.

Footnote B: The total assessed valuation of every piece of property in the United States as fixed by local assessing officers was only $150,000,000,000 in 1939.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will indulge me to talk on a nonpartisan basis for a few minutes on this business of trying to get some good, common business sense into the management of our fiscal affairs.

The reorganization bill, which was the child of about 90 or 100 Members of Congress, was supported by more than two-thirds of the Members on both sides of the aisle. It has been supported thoroughly by the Republican leadership, by our Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and others in the House. The Senators on the Republican side in the Senate have given far more than lip service to this step forward, which was designed to strengthen the hand of the Congress in the handling of the job the Constitution placed upon it. What weakening of the act thus far has not been by their encouragement, but has largely occurred through lack of understanding—or an unwillingness of Members or committee chairmen to live up to its provisions.

I am glad the Budget was brought in. I am not ready to stand here on the floor and say that the legislative budget, which I consider to be one of the major

achievements of reorganization, is a failure. The very fact that we here today are discussing the merits and the demerits of the first attempt to provide a legislative budget has caused more comment, more joint study, and more consideration of the two most important items of fiscal affairs—how much money do we have coming in, and how much money do we expect to spend—than has ever been occasioned in any entire session since I have been here. Only by relating these two all-important items in one congressional action can we approach a real fiscal policy or carry one out.

My worry, however, is that this first budget is an experiment. It is new. We have had no signposts to go by, no past experience of the joint committee at work. Worse than that, we have had no staff work going on for 6 or 7 months to help us to know how and where we can effect these cuts.

If there was any one motivation behind the Legislative Budget in the fiscal section of the reorganization bill it was to try to get away from the meat-ax method of slashing without regard to the effects it would have on the operation of Government. We hoped that we could effect hundreds of economies in a business-management way, with auditors, with specialists, with skilled men searching with a surgeon's knife to take off the excess in the many, many, many places that you and I know have waste and duplication in this vast Federal enterprise of ours that costs between thirty and thirty-seven billion dollars.

I cannot blame the Budget Committee that brings in this report except to say that I doubt that they realize the importance the Nation is attaching to the action we take here in adopting a Legislative Budget today. This budget is not a pious hope, a well-intentioned guess, or a New Year's resolution as some older Members have characterized it. It must be, as the Reorganization Act intended, a well considered, reliable, and responsible estimate by a responsible Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable under the circumstances to defer the matter for a few weeks and afford an opportunity for the accumulation of data on which to base an authoritative conclusion?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the distinguished minority member asked me that. In the original bill on reorganization, as it passed the Senate, the date for consideration of the legislative budget was fixed at April 15. The bill came to the House with that date in it and it was only at the positive insistence of the members of the Committee on Appropriations that those of us that had to do with the bill in the House compromised and said, "We will put it up to February 15," knowing at the time it would probably be a premature date.

Mr. CANNON. The Appropriations Committee took no such position officially. I am certain I did not concur in any such change.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not intend to attach any blame, but perhaps after we have had a year or 2 or 3 years' experience we might take the February 15 date.

But this year is an unusual situation. My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] says that if we err we should err on the side of economy. Gentlemen, I am afraid we are looking at this in the wrong way.

I think if we err this time in fixing a ceiling, let us err on the side of fixing a ceiling that we can live under. The people of America expect Congress to be a responsible agency in the handling of the fiscal affairs of this Nation, and if we pass irresponsible and unreliable Budget figures now which we cannot come within 2, 3, or 4 billion dollars of living within when we finish the individual appropriation bills the blame will fall on the Congress itself. The blame will not be only on the majority party, but on the entire Congress, which we tried to strengthen by passing the Reorganization Act.

I would far rather, as we start this new and useful budget mechanism, to set a spending ceiling figure high enough so that when the session is over we will not only have lived up to our pledge to stay within it, but we will have a margin of safety left. The Congress would then stand in a better light with the people we represent as being responsible. What extra margin that we might be able to cut under our own spending ceiling—set in advance of the minute examination of appropriation requests, would be hailed as an extra windfall for economy, and perhaps could add to the reduction of the public debt, rather than be lost forever in the form of a tax reduction.

I strenuously object to the manner in which passage of the resolution is being handled here today in its first trial. I don't think closed rules, limited debate and waiting points of order to be good legislative practice, particularly on a bill of this great national importance. Surely the majority have the votes to work its will without binding the House to accepting the violation in spirit of the Reorganization Act. By the closed rule and waiver of points of order, we are not permitted the opportunity to even vote for amendments concerning a figure some of us could support. Those of us who oppose the $2,200,000,000 reduction on the national defense appropriations are not given an opportunity to amend the act to place this unwise reduction back into the bill.

Those of us who favor a definite fixed amount of mandatory debt reduction are not permitted to insert that into the resolution despite the clear intent of the Reorganization Act to provide for it. I believe, sincerely, that if points of order had not been waived by the rule, a point of order would lie against this entire business—because of the failure of the joint committee to make any specific or definite recommendation as to the amount of debt retirement we are providing for.

Section 138A:

If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt.

Surely it is not my understanding that the language of the report on page 5, paragraph 6, of the summary and recommendations, which read:

"The committee recommends that a portion of excess receipts over expenditures be applied to the public debt," fills this requirement in the act. I do not think this vague statement that a "portion" of the excess will inform the millions of American bondholders, or others who are worried about our record-breaking public debt of $260,000,000,000, of what we really intend to do about debt retirement. I think these people would like to know that we intend to reduce this debt, and do it by as much as we possiby can. What portion of this excess will be devoted to debt retirement—one hundred million, a billion, two billion, or the suggested six and one-half billion? Only paragraph 6 informs us "a portion of the excess of receipts over expenditures be applied on the public debt."

Mr. Chairman, we are, indeed, making a very bad start in the use of a valuable mechanism in the conduct of the Nation's fiscal affairs. The irresponsible use of this mechanism—the Legislative Budget—will not only discredit the Congress, should our estimates prove to be irresponsible—as I firmly believe they will—but will also discredit the mechanism of the legislative budget itself. Irresponsibility of our estimates will cause the Nation to eventually believe that the mechanism, as well as the Congress, is unable to handle our fiscal affairs in a sound business way.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have this time to add a few words to the debate on this highly important subject, which relates to the attitude of the Members of Congress upon the subject of economizing or reducing the cost of our Government. I was greatly alarmed when the vote was recorded upon the rule on this measure. On that vote, if I mistake not, every Member on the minority side voted against the rule, which was a vote against the consideration of the pending House Concurrent Resolution 20, today; while, on the other hand, every vote on the majority side was cast for the rule, and for the consideration of the pending concurrent resolution, and for the consideration of economy in our Government. That forms a direct and a positive issue upon this subject. May I say that the people of this Nation are deeply interested in economy in our Government; the people are demanding that economy be practiced; they want those economies put into effect at the very earliest moment, and they want those economies practiced to such an extent that the people will secure some relief in their taxes and their obligations to their Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the purpose of this resolution to practice economy at the expense of our national defense or our security as a Nation. We recognize that the people want an adequate national defense, and they will have that defense for the security of the people.

All appropriations which are necessary for our national defense will be promptly granted, and with the adoption of the pending resolution, which is merely an expression—an expression which will materialize into a reality, I am confident—when the Army and the Navy come before the Appropriation Committee and ask for money, they will merely make a showing of the amount to which they believe they are entitled, and when those requests are sustained by the facts, they will receive that to which they are entitled. However, may I say in passing that with approximately 1,000,000 civilians upon the pay roll of the military and naval forces, there is ample room for a cut—a deep cut—in those appropriations; there are more civilians upon those pay rolls at the moment than we had on the pay rolls in all departments and agencies of our Government during World War I. We happen to be at peace, at the moment; yet those civilians are retained on the pay roll, and they will be so retained until the end of the present fiscal year, which will not expire until June 30, 1947.

Therefore do not be misled by the argument that the passage of the pending resolution will cripple the Army or the Navy. That will not happen. We will maintain our national defense, and we will maintain the security of our Nation. The reductions proposed will be made in the agencies and in the departments of our Government in which there are too many employees and in which too much money has been expended and wasted. We must get down to business in our country, and we must operate in a businesslike manner, if we are to save our country.

Mr. Chairman, as this debate proceeds, let us distinctly remember that the appropriations already made, and which appropriations are available for use in every department of our government, until June 30, 1947. There is no way that those appropriations can now be disturbed. They are fixed, and the agencies of our Government have access to that money, and that money will be available until June 30, 1947. The resolution, now pending, relates to the appropriations for the next fiscal year, commencing on July 1, 1947, and ending on June 30, 1948. This same fact applies to every department and agency of our Government, including our military and naval forces. This point must be made crystal clear, so all may understand the period of time which the appropriations already made will apply, and the period of time to which the pending resolution will relate. I am convinced the people will want to know that fact, as it is pertinent in this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced many of the Members, here present, want to economize in the future. We have witnessed the "spending period," and this period of spending will be a loadstone upon the necks of the people now here, and to those not yet in being, and this resolution is, in a measure, to assure us, and the people, that there will not be any recurrence of that area. The people of every walk in life are demanding that this Congress economize, and that all spending be limited to the actual needs and necessities in our Government. The people so expressed themselves upon that issue at the last general election, and they are still expressing their feelings upon that issue by written communications and by and through the public press. The people know just what they want. This is their Government. They are the paymasters. And, may I say, that in every agency and department of our Government I expect to use my efforts to reduce the funds available for their use to the very minimum—to that which is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of that agency and department of Government, without waste and without extravagance—and I am certain every Member should subscribe to that doctrine.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when we give an expression, such as we will do on this resolution, we are merely conforming to the requirements of the provisions of the Reorganization Act, which was passed when the majority was on the other side of the aisle—on your side—on the Democratic side of the aisle. We are merely complying with that law, passed by you, and it is my hope that you, now of the minority, will give this question fair and just consideration, before the final vote comes, and express your views upon the subject of your belief on the question of economy. Remember, a vote for this resolution will announce that you are in favor of practicing economy to the extent of $6,000,000,000, and a vote against the pending resolution will announce that you are not in favor of expressing yourself as being in favor of practicing economy, as indicated, and thereby giving the overburdened taxpayers a break at a time when they need help. In order to maintain our national defense we must remember that we must have a sound and strong financial structure; we must have and maintain a strong and forceful Nation behind the line of the Army and Navy; we must have a people able to cope with any situation which may confront us in the future. This can never be accomplished if the very substance of our Nation and our resources are sapped away by a ruthless and needless waste and spending program. We must face this problem, and we must face it realistically and without fear or favor; we must do those things which will redound to the ultimate benefit of our Nation and to the people.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, our former Speaker, spoke of the need of feeding starving people of the world. We should realize that every time we lay off one Government employee we can feed a dozen or more starving people throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the resolution which reduces the President's Budget for the next fiscal year by $6,000,000,000. The longer we delay the cutting down of this tremendous Government, the more difficult the task will become. Wartime agencies and the wartime expansion of regular agencies of Government became more permanent in character day by day. The only way to reduce expenditures is to make less money available for expenditures.

The President has recommended to the Congress that our expenditures be $37,000,000,000. This exceeds the cost of World War I. It is more than 60 percent of the average national income during the period of the New Deal prior to the war. It is more than three times the Federal Budget for 1940.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the essential functions of Government can be carried on and that a number of meritorious undertakings can proceed on this reduced Budget. The American people have a right to expect the size of our Government to be cut down, the elimination of waste, and full value for every dollar that they pay in taxes. It is regrettable that the War and Navy Departments are not today fighting side by side with the Congress to prevent waste in those departments. We would then have a stronger national defense. I hold no brief for the pacifists who would cripple our defense in this critical period. The way to make our defense strong is to compel these departments to do an honest, efficient job, and give the taxpayers more per dollar than they have ever done before.

Can you find any American who has observed the operations at an Army or Navy base who did not find a gross waste of building materials, automobiles, trucks, gasoline, tools, equipment, and property generally? Can you find such a citizen who will not testify as to waste of manpower, overstaffing, duplication, and needless civilian employees?

The majority of the people living in the district that I have the opportunity to represent do not want the air forces crippled, or any other vital branch crippled, but they are confident that the War Department can get along without a lot of chauffeurs, attendants, escorts, and equipment for officers. The people of America are intelligent. They know that the Navy can stop spending millions of dollars for the most expensive silver finger bowls and still not have it cripple the striking force of the United States Navy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree that we want to do what is proper and necessary for the armed services, but I have two telegrams which I think are very pertinent at this point in the debate. One is from Boston, Mass., and reads as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *February 19, 1947.*
Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK,
House of Representatives:

Navy request bid on approximately 140,000 pieces of hollow ware, including 80,000 finger bowls and plates. All in expensive design with gadroon mounts and many with fluting and piercing, which adds substantially to cost. Some of salt and pepper shakers of cut glass estimated to cost four times that of ordinary pressed-glass construction. One item, approximately 5,000 sugar bowls, is for the article to be made by plating on 18 percent nickel silver base metal with gadroon mounts. War Assets Administration is continually selling same items as included in current Navy order and within the month circularized us asking for bids on surplus

sugar bowls made for Navy during war on brass base without mount; perfectly good for use now. We estimate Navy will pay for sugar bowls in this latest order approximately 10 times what Government will receive for those being sold through War Assets Administration. My guess is this is just a sample of what is going on, and why I think we can have adequate national defense at less than the cost called for in the Budget.

SINCLAIR WEEKS.

The other telegram from Meriden, Conn., is as follows:

The Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK,
House of Representatives:

Following Sinclair Weeks telegram Navy request here bid on approximately 140,000 pieces silver-plated holloware included in which 38,000 finger bowls and 80,000 plates for same. All in expensive design fluting and piercing and gadroon mounted border adding substantially to cost. Also included 23,000 salt and peppers with cut-glass linings. Cut-glass linings today are very expensive. Other items also. Understand War Assets Administration offering surplus items made for Navy during war apparently good for current use. My guess is this is just sample of operations which make me believe we can have adequate national defense at less than the cost called for in the Budget.

ROY C. WILCOX.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sinclair Weeks is no pacifist. He served with distinction in the United States Senate as did his father. His father served also as Secretary of War. Mr. Sinclair Weeks is an open advocate of a strong Army and Navy and he is for peacetime military training. Three of his sons and two of his sons-in-law served in World War II.

If an honest attempt is made to bring about economy, there is no good reason why this $6,000,000,000 slice in the Federal Budget should cripple the national defense or any other needed and desirable function of the Federal Government.

The businessmen of my State are harassed and hampered by mimeographed pamphlets and bulletins appearing in the mail from the Department of Commerce. They offer to the businessmen a lot of services that the businessmen do not want and which would not be any good if they used them. The cost of franking this mail is the small portion of it, but the cost of the research men, the publicity artists, the stenographers, typists, messengers, writers, editors, and others, as well as the rent on the office space used in carrying on such unwanted and unneeded programs is tremendous. What I have said of the Department of Commerce can be said of a lot of other Government agencies. These agencies should stop trying to force their services on the American people.

My own State of Nebraska has Federal offices that ought to be eliminated. For instance, during the war, employment offices had to be set up in many, many communities to solicit needed war workers. Those offices do not handle agricultural labor, yet they remain. The number of these offices should be greatly reduced. Every effort should be made to take the Federal administrative hand out of the affairs of State government. It not only costs the Federal Government more but it makes State government more costly. The maximum amount of local self-government that can be had is not only the sure way to perpetuate freedom but it is the most economical way to operate.

The administration of the disposal of surplus property is a national disgrace. An individual in whom I have great confidence writes that he has been in the warehouses of the War Assets Administration in New York, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, Indianapolis, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha. He says:

In every case they have 100 percent too much help. Their records are lousy, incomplete, and invariably inaccurate. They have a lot of chair warmers and few competent and experienced men, and Washington ties their hands with red tape.

Mr. Chairman, when the Joint Committee on the Budget meets next year, a better job can be done. The shortage of time has prevented that committee from giving proper consideration to this huge, burdensome, staggering Budget of the President's for $37,000,000,000, which is the product of a Government bureau of 700 employees. This cut of $6,000,000,000 represents a determination on the part of this Congress to take the Government off the backs of the people and reduce it in size so that it can be tolerated and paid for.

If the Federal expenditures are ever to be reduced, the Congress must reduce them. If the affairs of this Republic cannot be financed in the next fiscal year with $31,500,000,000, the people may rise up in their righteous wrath and elect a Congress that can operate this Government economically.

The time has come for honesty and forthrightness in government. The bureaus may fool the Congress, but they cannot fool the people. Last April, when the demand was being made for a pay raise for civil-service employees, the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget stated that by June 30, 1947, the number of employees would be 1,710,000. The President's budget, which is prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, calls for an average employment for the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1947, of 2,100,000 employees. Can it be that Government figures are different for different occasions?

The people have every reason to expect great things from the Eightieth Congress. The founding fathers devised a system of government that gave to the Congress control over the purse strings. If our Government is to be cut down, the debt reduced, and taxes lowered, the Eightieth Congress must make the start. If we fail, the result will be far-reaching and disastrous. During recent days, I have been studying the history of our national debt. Our Republic had to assume an obligation for considerable sums when it was organized, but this debt was more or less gradually reduced until the Civil War and following it. For many years following the Civil War, we had an unbroken record of debt reduction. The debt rose a little in the period of the Spanish-American War.

I want to give you some details concerning the history of the debt since the turn of the century. The Fifty-sixth Congress ended in March 1901. The per capital national debt in that year was $15.71. The Fifty-seventh Congress, ending 2 years later was controlled by the Republican Party. They reduced the per capita debt to $14.40. The Fifty-eighth Congress was another Republican Congress and they further reduced the per capita debt to $13.60. In the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses, the Republicans controlled both the House and the Senate. They continued a program of debt reduction and when the Sixty-first Congress ended in 1911, the per capita debt was $12.28.

In the Sixty-second Congress, which ended March 1913, there was a Republican majority in the Senate but a Democratic majority in the House. That Congress reduced the per capita national debt the sum of 2 cents. The Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress in the Sixty-third Congress, which ended March 1915. They reduced the per capita debt by 43 cents. For that year, it was $11.83.

The Sixty-fourth Congress was a Democratic Congress. It ended in March 1917 and the per capita debt for that year had risen to $25.87. The Sixty-fifth Congress was the World War I Congress. Both Houses were controlled by the Democratic Party. The national debt in 1919 had risen to $240.09 per capita.

The Republican Party controlled the Sixty-sixth Congress. It came to a close in March 1921. The per capita debt for that year had been reduced to $221.09. The Republicans also controlled the Sixty-seventh Congress which ended 2 years later with a reduced per capita debt of $200.09. The Sixty-eighth Congress was a Republican Congress. It ended its labors in 1925 with the per capita debt reduced to $177.82. The Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, and Seventy-first Congresses were likewise controlled by the Republican Party. These Congresses ended with the per capita national debt being reduced to $156.04, $139.40, and $135.37 respectively.

The Seventy-second Congress was from December 1931 to March 1933. The Democratic Party gained control of the House of Representatives and when the Seventy-second Congress adjourned, the national debt had risen to $179.21 per capita.

In the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, and Seventy-sixth Congresses, the Democratic Party had substantial majorities in both Houses. The per capita debt rose steadily, it being at the close of each Congress $213.65, $261.20, $285.43, and $368.08, respectively.

The Seventy-seventh Congress was the first World War II Congress. The Democratic Party had a clear majority in both Houses. The national debt at the time it closed had risen to $540.68. Likewise, the Seventy-eighth Congress, which ended January 2, 1945, was a war Congress and controlled by the same party. The per capita debt had then risen to $1,486.

The Seventy-ninth Congress came into being on January 3, 1945. Eight months later World War II came to an end. The last 16 months of the Seventy-ninth Congress were months of peace. Retrenchments should have been in order and vast sums of money recovered from

the sale of surplus property. The per capita debt, however, at the close of the Congress was $1,831.

The men and women who believe in America, who hold her bonds, fight her wars, and pay the taxes are concerned about the trend of our national debt. The Eightieth Congress will determine that trend, Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am a new man in this House. I came here with the idea of seeing legislation passed that would benefit the people of this country. I came here with the idea of going into legislation with my eyes open and voting as my conscience dictated to me. I did not come here as a Democrat necessarily, because we have only an insignificant number of Republicans in my district, so I do not have to vote along partisan lines. I vote as my conscience tells me to vote and I do not intend to go into this thing blindfolded.

The action of the Republicans in reporting this reminds me of a bunch of blind hogs in a bowling alley—they know they want to get out of the door but they do not know where it is or how to get to it. For six long weeks 102 men on this committee have been working together over here in an attempt to cut the Budget that the President reported in a clear, concise businesslike itemized form. You are trying to cut that budget, and at the end of six long weeks, after listening to the remarks and after hearing the testimony of experts and after getting the opinions of the distinguished economist—the gentleman from New York—and others, you come out and report a little bill that says, simply, "Let's cut it down to $31,000,000,000—cut it $6,000,000,000." Well, I do not know in what direction you intend to go, I do not know what you are going to cut or where the cuts are coming, and I cannot follow you on that. Are you going to cut soil conservation and leave some useless agency untouched? Or are you going to cut the useless agencies and leave soil conservation untouched?

We are all in favor of cutting out useless bureaus and we are in favor of cutting down the personnel of those useless bureaus, but let us be sure they are useless rather than indispensable before we swing the ax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the membership of this House is today acting under a mandate of the reorganization law commanding that the Congress shall establish the ceiling for Federal expenditures and appropriations for the fiscal year 1948. The law requires that this be done in February. We Republicans and some of our Democratic friends are supporting the resolution recommending a $6,000,000,000 reduction in the thirty-seven billion five hundred million sum requested by the President for the operation of the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1948.

A majority of our Democratic friends seem to be elated and overjoyed with the thought and conviction that the New Deal in its 14 years of taxing and taxing and spending and spending has created such a multitude of new offices and turned loose such swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance, and has piled such a debt on the backs of the people that we cannot reduce expenditures, cannot lower taxes, and cannot make a payment on the national debt.

We Republicans are today voting in obedience to an emphatic mandate from the people who sent us here to cut the Budget and to bring it into balance with the Federal income.

In 1932, Candidate Roosevelt promised to reduce the expenses of the Government 25 percent, to end deficit spending and to reduce taxes. His promise was honored more in the breach than in the observance. When he entered the White House his campaign pledges went out the window.

When he became President the national debt was $19,500,000,000. When Pearl Harbor came on December 7, 1941, the Nation's debt under Roosevelt's New Deal had risen to $66,000,000,000. The New Deal spending spree grew speedily into the world's greatest orgy, and saturnalia in the dissipation of the Nation's wealth. F. D. Roosevelt spent more money than all of 31 predecessors combined.

The utter abandon, the unfettered prodigality of the New Deal spenders exceed that of the prodigal son. They could, if they would, learn a lesson from him.

In the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel according to Luke is the parable of the prodigal son:

Then drew near unto Him (the Saviour) all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him. * * *

And He said, A certain man had two sons, and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living.

And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living.

And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land; and he began to be in want.

And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him unto his fields to feed swine.

And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat; and no man gave unto him.

And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!

I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee,

And am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants,

And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.

And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.

He repented and was forgiven. Unlike our friends on the other side of the House, the prodigal son came to himself, repented, sought forgiveness and asked only to be as one of his father's hired servants.

And there is this further fact in favor of the prodigal son—he wasted his own substance. The unrepentant cut purses of the Republic—wasted not their own money in their riotous maladministration—they dissipated the hard-earned money of the taxpayers.

They want to keep on spending and spending and spending with the abandon that made Washington unique among the cities of the earth. All roads lead to Washington. It is the only capital in the world where things are given away. In the heyday of the Roosevelt spending, he scorned the suggestion that some security should be had from Russia and other recipients of our generosity. He flippantly and gaily asked, with a toss of the head and a flick of his cigarette, "Who cares about the silly old dollar mark?" Thus billions of the people's money burned while presidential cigarettes to ashes turned.

A majority of the American people came to themselves on November 5, 1946. This Nation spent in waging this war and in aiding allies who have since turned against us the unprecedented sum of $400,000,000,000. Our national debt today is $262,000,000,000. The Republican Members of this House last fall entered into a solemn contract with the people who sent them here to preserve our system of free enterprise by freemen and freewomen in a free country. To do this, we must keep this country and the Federal Government solvent and strong.

The citizens who own $90,000,000,000 of United States bonds, the banks, the insurance companies, the trust companies who own billions of dollars of these bonds must be paid the interest on their bonds as it accrues and the principal amount of these bonds when they mature.

I know what my people expect and are demanding. The businessman, the industrialist, the banker, the farmer, the man in the street, in the factory, in the mines are of one mind. They want this senseless, unnecessary spending of money we do not have for things we do not need and can do without stopped. Now is the time to stop. The way to reduce is to reduce.

That President Truman's proposal to spend $37,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948 can be cut $6,000,000,000 and reduced to $31,500,000,000 is supported by the report of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning filed on December 12, 1946.

This committee was composed of the following distinguished and able Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress: Jere Cooper, Francis E. Walter, Orville Zimmerman, Jerry Voorhis, John R. Murdock, Walter A. Lynch, Thomas J. O'Brien, John E. Fogarty, Eugene Worley, Democrats; and Charles L. Gifford, B. Carroll Reece, Richard J. Welch, Charles A. Wolverton, Clifford R. Hope, Jesse P. Wolcott, Jay LeFevre, and Sid Simpson, Republicans.

I quote from the eleventh report of the committee, pages 66, 67, and 68. In its report the committee said:

All those who have studied fiscal policies of the Federal Government, however much they differ on other views, agree that during a period of high employment and income there should be a surplus in Federal revenues to apply toward reduction of the debt. It forebodes danger for the future if we cannot under these very favorable conditions handle the fiscal affairs of the Government in such a way that the Budget can be balanced. The committee, therefore, strongly urges that additional efforts be made to reduce expenditures during the remainder of the fiscal year so that the Budget can be brought into balance and a surplus created.

The Budget for the current year represents 25 percent of the national income, whereas in 1939 the Federal Budget was only 12 percent of the national income, and prior to 1931 it was less than 5 percent. The Budget, therefore, has much more significance to the whole economy than previously. It should be realized that an expenditure of $41,000,000,000 by the Government affects not only the amount left to the individual to spend for himself, but, insofar as it is spent in goods and services, reduces the amount of materials, factory space, and workers who are available to produce the goods for which there is great demand.

The committee calls attention to the slow progress which is being made in the reduction of the number of civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government. From a total of 2,920,000 reached in August 1945 the force had been reduced to 2,150,000 in October 1946, but it is still more than double the August 1939 level of 909,000.

In its fourth report the committee estimated that the cost of the Federal Government in 1940, if reduced to the basis of cost per family of four, was $180. If a postwar Federal expenditure of $20,000,000,000 were assumed, it estimated the cost would be increased to $570 per family, and if the cost of State and local governments were added the total would be about $900 per year per family of four.

With the Federal Budget at the $41,000,000,000 level, the cost of the Federal Government per family of four is $1,130. If the cost of State and local governments were added it would bring the burden up to $1,430 per family. The serious effects of such a burden should be obvious. The committee wishes to reiterate more strongly than ever the necessity of reducing expenditures substantially. It realizes that we cannot reach the $20,000,000,000 level during the next fiscal year. It would, however, urge serious consideration to reducing expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, to $30,000,000,000, with further substantial reduction during the following year, but with the objective of a $20,000,000,000 budget at an early date.

I have never yet seen a calf or a bureaucrat who when threatened with weaning but that bawled and screamed. Let us go ahead and apply the knife. It hurts, but it will do us and our friends good. Many of us were raised under the old dispensation where our fathers and mothers gave us castor oil under a closed rule, a gag rule. It did us good. If it takes a gag rule to administer this medicine of economy, well and good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] may be allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He described how he, as a veteran and a man active in veterans' affairs, felt that a sound economy was most essential for our Government. I entirely agree with him, and I believe that every veteran on the Democratic side of the House is also in favor of a sound economy. But, Mr. Chairman, what we are opposing today is not sound economy, but an ill-conceived act which might result in more veterans—the veterans of World War III.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has asked me if I sincerely think that he or the other Republican veterans would do anything to weaken or endanger our national security. I hasten to state emphatically, no, of course they would not do so deliberately or intentionally. But this cut in the armed forces appropriation is a matter of judgment. Whose judgment shall we accept in this case, that of the war veterans on the Republican side, most of whom had distinguished military records, but most of whom will certainly agree that they are not better qualified to pass on what constitutes adequate national defenses than General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, or such distinguished civilian experts as Secretary of War Patterson or Secretary of Navy Forrestal?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] released to the press a speech in which he called for a reduction of expenditures for armed forces by 15 percent or for the resignation of Secretary Patterson, Secretary Forrestal, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz. That is a bold-faced admission that the Republicans expect to cut the armed forces appropriation by $1,750,000,000. It is obvious that they expect to cut into national defense. During the war we had 11,000,000 men in the armed services. Today we have less than 1,500,000, and on top of that these gentlemen on the left side of the aisle propose to cut the appropriation by $1,750,000,000 and further reduce the number of men in the services. Obviously such a cut will cripple our national defenses and world prestige.

I am further opposed to this cut, for it is uncertain, vague, and indefinite. This cut might easily wreck the Federal Housing Agency, the rivers and harbors development, old-age assistance program, Federal education program, soil-conservation program, and others that are vitally necessary to our economy.

I am for economy, but not blind meat-ax economy, where no bill of particulars will specifically indicate where the cuts will be made. Every useless, excessive Federal employee and all outmoded, purposeless Federal agencies should be eliminated immediately. I certainly want economy and lower taxes, but not to the extent where they weaken Secretary Marshall's position at the conference table and endanger our national defense.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, we have been doing a lot of talking about cutting the Budget today but, of course, we know that no one here is silly enough to believe today that that is what we are doing. We are talking about a sort of Ladies' Aid Society resolution which it has been explained by various learned Members of this body has no legal effect whatsoever. It is just a sort of effort to bind you in your conscience so that some day if a bill comes out, a bill that you know nothing about at the present time, that you will vote for it sight unseen. I have been here for some 12 years and more, and I will say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to my good friends on the Republican side, that many times I have voted to reduce appropriations, but I have never yet done it sight unseen. Never yet have I been willing to be gagged and blindfolded at the same time. I have never been willing to surrender the keeping of my conscience to somebody else and agree months in advance to some unknown proposition. That was not what I promised to my people in Missouri that I would do when I came down here; and I am not going to start now.

I remember one afternoon a good many months ago there was a bill before this House seeking to appropriate $75,000,000 to buy free lunches for the children of America when their parents were perhaps better able to pay for them than they had ever been before in history. I came down in this well and pleaded with the Members on the Republican side as I did with my friends on the Democratic side to save that money and vote against the bill. Imagine my surprise when you gentlemen who are today so economy-minded walked down into this well by the dozens on a teller vote and voted to spend that $75,000,000. When the time comes, and actual appropriation bills come before the House, a good many of you are going to do the same thing that you have done in the past. You are not voting on them today. The only thing you are doing is what the old Greek sailor, Ulysses, did some two or three thousand years ago. You probably remember the story. He knew his ship was going by a certain dangerous rock and on the dangerous rock there was a siren, a very alluring lady. He did not trust himself. He was just worried that maybe he would give way to her charms and he could not handle his ship. So he called his strong men in and said, "Bind me to the mast so I cannot help myself when the time comes." That is what you gentlemen are trying to do today. You are trying to bind yourselves to the mast so that when the free-lunch bills come up again you will be helpless, you will not be able to vote for them as you have in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

TIGHTENING OUR BELTS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is in the throes of acute debt indigestion.

From every quarter of the country there comes a demand that we reduce

governmental spending, cut the Budget, balance the Budget, begin to pay off the debt, and reduce taxes all along the line.

At the same time there continues to pour in from abroad demands for help; warnings that if we do not continue to feed, finance, and generally support the peoples stricken by war, that starved old people will die; starved middle-aged people will linger on into a horrible old age; and that undernourished children will grow up to become a vast Old World criminal class who will bring on an era of reckless anarchy in Europe and the Orient.

Meanwhile, every project that has been started or talked about has its proponents, who do not want their own proposition disturbed by withholding of appropriations.

The people at home continue to want all of the multifarious services the Federal Government assumed and performed for them through governmental agencies over the past 15 years.

We knew when we went into the war that the continuing cost of that war in veterans' benefits would be staggering. That is a national problem from which there is no escape and from which we do not desire to escape. When men and women are called from their homes, and their peaceful pursuits, and their plans for careers, and are sent across the seas to fight in the most horrible war—there is no way in which we who stayed at home can ever repay those men and women for the suffering they experienced, and the memories they will carry with them to their graves.

Certainly no one questions the wisdom or the justice of the Nation making up to those who were on the fighting lines as much as possible in benefits for the lost opportunities, the interrupted or blasted careers, the human agony, and the physical suffering they endured and which many of them must continue to endure. That is a part of a dreadful war and a responsibility this Nation took on, and will always take on, whenever it calls on its people to engage in war.

We are told that we are heading into a very serious situation because of the teaching staffs of our schools being underpaid. They are underpaid. They are disgracefully underpaid. But this question, like many others, involves a further problem which we must solve. That problem is whether or not we are going to continue to set up systems of Federal grants in aid which will allow centralized government at Washington to assume control of our very lives or whether we are going to try to work out a system whereby any grants in aid can be equitably distributed among various States, to be controlled by the States, and still be safeguarded against an attitude on the part of some of the States that they can be as extravagant as they like because it is not their money.

A good many of the States have sizable working balances in their own treasuries. Over the last 15 or 20 years, however, the Federal Government has assumed more and more of the functions which the States and local governing units used to perform for themselves, the Federal Government began more and more to invade and take over the tax resources of the States and local governing units. Finally they became mendicants, as it were, at the door of the White House and on the steps of the United States Treasury.

It is time we stood off and took a frank look at our situation. We cannot have our cake and eat it too—stereotyped as that phrase may be.

We cannot have economy in Federal spending; a balancing of the Budget; payment on the debt; and a reduction in taxes, and at the same time continue all of the spending, and all of the extra-governmental functions which the Federal Government has been performing.

Either the American people are going to pull in their belts, and prepare to deny themselves some of the governmental services they have enjoyed heretofore, or else there will be no balanced budget; there will be no reduction in Government spending or in taxes.

There are tremendous readjustments which must be made by everybody in this country. Industry, agriculture, all groups, and all sections, must prepare to adopt the most rigid economies, if we are to get America back on a sound, prosperous peacetime basis.

These readjustments are going to be painful. Retrenchments, whether individual, family, or national are always painful.

There is no opiate so dangerous to a people, and to governmental units such as States, and to the Federal Government itself, as the opiate of deficit spending. Pay day has a way of catching up. When pay day comes around, then the pain of readjustment has to be faced.

What we need to do—what we have got to do—in this country is to resurvey our local, State, and National Governments, the functions performed by each, the bureaus which exist under each, and determine which of these functions and bureaus shall be abolished.

Functions do not perform themselves. Whenever the Federal Government, or a State government, takes on a function, there must be created a bureau or a commission, or a department, to perform the function. Each time such a bureau or commission, or department, is created, a new agency for spending public funds comes into action; and we are one step further along the road to national bankruptcy.

There is a strange, but not curious, danger involved in this business of the Federal Government taxing the people and then carrying on services for the people which either local governing units or the people themselves should be performing. In that curious danger lies the secret of growing governmental extravagance and a growing arrogant bureaucracy.

When the member of a family or a clan is in need and is being taken care of, his immediate relatives and friends have him constantly under surveillance; and they see to it that he does not become so accustomed to being cared for by others that he becomes indolent and shiftless. Their criticism keeps him spurred up to efforts of his own to help take care of himself.

When individuals in a community have to be taken care of at public expense, or when bridges have to be built at local expense, or sewer systems have to be constructed at local expense, the local taxpayers know the source of the money. They know the cost of the project and are able to watch the operation. They are conscious of the drain on their own pocketbooks. They are able to keep such expenditures on something like an economical basis, within the bounds of their capacity to pay. In other words, they can confine themselves to expenditures which they can afford.

The moment, however, the Federal Government begins to tax the people and then to hide those taxes in prices of goods and services, in income taxes and inheritance taxes, and in taxes on business which, in turn, must be passed on to the ultimate consumers, the people begin to lose touch with the cost of the projects and the drain on their own pocketbooks. They begin to get a sense of receiving something for nothing at the hands of the Federal Government. As soon as this feeling becomes fixed over the Nation, pressure groups and sections begin to vie with one another as to how much they can get out of the Government at Washington.

Motivated by this sense of getting something for nothing, the people submit to the Federal Government taking over State tax sources, with the final result that the States, counties, and municipalities find themselves dependent upon the Federal Government to hand back to them some of the dollars taken from them.

I was forcibly impressed by a resolution recently adopted by the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana. I think it contained a message that ought to be pasted on every billboard and published in every newspaper, and adopted by the people of every State in the Union. In plain, forcible language that resolution adopted by the Indiana General Assembly said in part:

> Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magicians' tricks that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger to us when it comes back. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight on its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as "Federal" aid. We know that there is no wealth attached that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States. So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalisms. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

There in a very few words is the best statement of America's No. 1 problem, and its solution, that could be devised. "So we propose henceforth to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves." What a grand challenge to the bureaucrats who for 15 years have preached and practiced the doctrine that the American people must be ruled by officials at Washington, D. C.

That sentiment is a healthy and wholesome return to the philosophy of that immortal statesman, Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we have just

celebrated. He clearly saw the danger of the Federal Government extending a policy of paternalism over the States to their detriment when he said:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

I wish every State legislature in the Union may heed the call of Indiana. That House concurrent resolution adopted by the assembly said in its last paragraph:

Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them, to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

Yes; cuts in appropriations must be made if this country is to remain economically sound. A starting place is offered us today. By our votes we indicate our earnest desires and intent to begin such reductions in Government spending that will permit this Nation to regain a solid financial footing.

In the recommendation of a $6,000,000,000 estimate of hoped-for reductions in expenditures, we do not desire nor do we intend in any way to impair the efficiency or operation of our armed forces or other agencies of Government. I am one of those who conscientiously believe that our Government departments can and will be able, with reduced funds, to carry on all their necessary functions. I shall wholeheartedly support the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this debate has decidedly gone along the line of national defense with the inference on the part of the Democrats that the Republicans may be overlooking national defense. I see before me a number of Members with whom I served during the past 8 years on the Committee on Military Affairs. I think that they will bear with me when I say that we worked very hard on that committee in those 8 years to build up national defense, and we have not lost sight of that fact over on the majority side for 1 minute. I see Members with whom I worked very long and hard in building up a strategic stock pile, intelligence and information service, and any number of other bills, such as research and development and also an adequate training program.

I just want to assure the minority side that in my own judgment we can go far in the direction of economy without crippling national defense. I do not think for 1 minute that it would discourage General Marshall in his future deliberations as Secretary of State if we provide more efficiency and economy in the Army and the Navy. I have a vivid picture of the need for some good and workable plan for weeding out the unfit in the officer force of our Army. I have not forgotten the failure of section 24 (b) of our National Defense Act to eliminate inefficient and unqualified officers between World War I and World War II and the consequent reduction of efficiency and economy in our national defense. I assure you that anything I can do to maintain adequate national defense will not be overlooked by me, even though I am now serving on the Ways and Means Committee and am no longer a member of the Armed Services Committee. I have tremendous confidence that the Committee on Appropriations and this new Congress will go after this matter of improving and making more efficient and economical our national defense. Our national defense will not fall down with this attention on the part of the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress itself in the years ahead. I would dislike very much to be put on the spot where I have to earmark each item of economy months ahead of the time these bills come before the Committee on Appropriations and the House of Representatives for consideration. This is an over-all limitation and a very wholesome one, and again I assure you of one thing, there is no disposition on the part of the Republicans to cripple our national defense. With that situation before me at this time, I wholeheartedly support the $6,000,000,000 saving provided in the bill now before us.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I do not have more than 2 minutes, because 2 minutes is entirely inadequate to cover this subject. We have heard today from the Marines, the Navy, and the Air Corps. I think you should hear a few words from the Infantry also.

In December 1942 I was assigned to an Infantry battalion. Two years later, in December 1944, after 6 months on the front line, after a number of wounds, I was forced to leave that battalion. At that time there had been 300 men killed and over 500 wounded. If I voted for any bill which I believed would weaken national defense, I would feel like a traitor to those men and to every American who sacrificed anything in this war.

The question is, Will it weaken national defense? I have heard nothing but statements, no proof in any form or fashion that it will not weaken it. What evidence do I have that it will weaken it? While we were fighting we believed that we had the greatest leadership in the world in General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz. Those men say today that it will weaken national defense to a dangerous degree. As far as I am concerned, their opinion is good enough for me. If you will cut $200,000,000 or $300,000,000, I will vote with you, but when you cut so much that it is a definite detriment to national defense, then I will not vote with you.

I would like to take 1 minute to read a letter from a Republican up in Connecticut. All of you received this letter. I hope you read it. This man lost three sons in the war. He should have a right to speak.

The above are photos of my boys, and I am speaking to you as their representative and that of millions of other boys who gave their lives for you and me and in thousands of cases because of our inefficiency and pure selfishness.

You or your predecessors failed to provide proper police protection, and as is always the case, Hell broke loose.

One of these or all three of these boys might have been your sons, or might be your sons 5, 10, or 20 years from now. Bear that in mind as you read the following results of your or your predecessor's bungling of selfishness in connection with our national safety.

Bud (F. L., Jr.) was the first to go at Avon Park, Fla. Reputedly a fine flyer, a fine pilot instructor on the early B–26 (commonly called Widow Makers), he brought in a B–26 on its belly without a scratch on the crew. On Sunday, February 28, 1943 he was killed—one plane cut off the tail of another in mid-air. Whose fault—yours and mine for not providing in the years 1920 to 1940 adequate amounts for training of personnel and proper equipment. The reasons given were necessary speed-up with too little training. Are you going to let this happen again because of lobbying of selfish interests from all walks in life.

I heard a so-called educator lobbying over the air against military training. He spoke of refusal of educational funds where they did not have ROTC and of such military training being proposed by our Army personnel to build a military hierarcy to get us into the next war. He did not mention his own personal selfish interest or his own communistic leanings and teachings under the guise of education.

Personally, I am a Republican, a great believer in college education, a believer in higher pay for educators and teachers—and especially if we can weed from our entire educational system communistic windbags of this type who have taken the education received at the expense of taxpayers of a free democracy to undermine that democracy in the minds and thinking of our younger generation.

Frank Lloyd Wassell, Jr., might probably be here today with many thousands of other fine, upstanding, patriotic, democratic, right-thinking young men who should be our future leaders. He loved life, the people around him, his home, and his country.

You are representing these young men, and especially the youngsters they left behind. In the names of those men and regardless of your political affiliations, examine what we have suffered in the past through our failure to provide means of self-defense. We know what happened twice in the past. We do not know what the future holds, but we know that criminals do not attack in broad daylight from the front. They attack in the dark and from the rear.

In later letters I will give you two additional true stories from the lives of my two other boys whom you will have to represent since they are not here to represent themselves.

I firmly believe that President Truman is first an American and second a Democratic Party President. As an American thinking in terms of the protection of its interests through compulsory military training, he should be given the unselfish and nonpolitical backing of every Member of Congress.

Remember those who gave cannot speak for themselves.

Sincerely yours,

F. LLOYD WASSELL.

We have just paid over 300,000 American lives and billions upon billions of dol-

lars for our way of life in the United States, and it was a bargain at that price.

It is my belief that had the Congress of the United States seen fit to spend a few of these billions in the twenties and thirties we would not have had to pay the price we have for our freedom today.

Much is said about waste.

The greatest waste in World War II was the waste of American lives because adequate defense which would have prevented World War II was not provided.

It was noted in one paper that research would be cut, and an American scientist recently said over the radio that Russia has many more scientists than we have, and they have 10 times the governmental backing that we give our scientists in the United States. If we stop research at this time, Russia will pass us, and it will be impossible to catch up.

I believe in economy in Government; I believe there are many governmental agencies which should be completely eliminated; but I also believe a weak national defense is the greatest false economy there is. Also, it is said the Department of Agriculture will receive a $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 cut, and that the Soil Conservation Service will receive a large part of this. This is also false economy, as soil conservation is insurance for our children in years to come.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I think the majority of the Members of the House know of my interest in national defense and my standing with organized veterandom. They know that many weeks ago I was separated from active service with the United States Navy and returned to Congress. Since my return to Congress, I have been deeply concerned with appropriations affecting national defense, veteran expenditures, and the economy of the country in general. When I desire definite and authentic advice in regard to national defense, one of the Members conferred with is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], whom I have known for many years. Another is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], whom I have likewise known for many years and whose opinions I hold in high regard. Today the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] this question:

> In other words, the gentleman and his committee can assure the Congress and the country that the Military Establishments, both the Army and the Navy, will be given every dollar they can justify as being in the interest of national defense?

To that question the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] replied:

> That is correct.

Several days past the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made this statement about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]:

> Just as I said, the gentleman from New York always gives an honest answer.

So I am taking the answer of the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, confirmed and supported by the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, as my position in regard to the adequate appropriations for our national defense. It is for that reason I am supporting the $6,000,000,000 reduction in the national budget as far as it concerns national defense.

With respect to the Budget and its effect on appropriations for the Veterans' Administration recently I conferred with several leaders of organized veterandom, not presently identified as active officers of any of the major veterans' organizations. We discussed the question of economy. We found we were in complete accord with respect to giving the veteran 100 cents on the dollar when he receives a pension award. Today the veteran receiving a $50 pension is actually not receiving that specific amount because of the shrinkage in the value of the American dollar. We concluded that it is to the best interest of our country in general and the veterans in particular to take a stand in support of sound economy, reduced Federal expenditures, and decreased taxes. Such a position would certainly be in keeping with the patriotic aims of all veterans' organizations.

It was the consensus of opinion among the veterans present that the veterans' organizations of the country should give serious consideration to the need of supporting a sound national economy, which would include reduction of taxes, curtailment of national expenditures, thus permitting a genuine start toward reduction of the national debt.

Like the majority of you in Congress today, I was sent here with a mandate from the people of the Twenty-second Congressional District in Pennsylvania to support a program of sound economy in the administration of governmental affairs. I intend to discharge this obligation without regard to fear or favor.

A sound American Government is the best guaranty to the American people that we will be financially able as a nation to support the needs of our national defense.

Every agency of the Government who can show the actual need of appropriations for practical purposes need have no fear of the pruning of the National Budget, as every dollar actually needed will be forthcoming.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, today we have our first opportunity as Members of the Eightieth Congress to take a stand on the all-important question "Should the Federal Budget be reduced?"

I promised the voters of the First Connecticut Congressional District last fall that I would do everything any one Member of Congress could do to bring about a reduction in the cost of Government. I intend to keep that promise.

There is one fact that we should all keep in mind and that is the fact that here in the United States we cannot continue working one-third of our time simply to earn enough to pay the cost of Government. We cannot continue that practice if we intend to maintain our present standard of living.

There is bound to be some misunderstanding about just what we are doing here today under this new reorganization bill procedure. We are not passing an appropriation bill. We are not adding or taking away from any department of the Government a single dollar. By voting for this resolution we simply say that we want the Federal Budget reduced by a minimum of $6,000,000,000.

The new Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget has told us that the budget can be reduced by as much as $6,000,000,000 without decreasing the efficiency of our Government and without interfering with the program of the Army and Navy. I am convinced that this Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget has done a marvelous job in the time available to them. They have worked unofficially since the day after election and officially since January 3 of this year in trying to determine how much of a cut could be made in the President's $37,500,000,000 budget.

I have great confidence in the members of this joint committee. They are patriotic men, and they know a great deal about the fiscal operations of our Government. I intend to follow their recommendations.

I am not satisfied with the $6,000,000,000 reduction, and I fully expect that when the various departmental appropriation bills come to us, we will be able to obtain a greater reduction. This $31,500,000,000 is a ceiling and not a floor.

It has been said on the floor of the House today, and we find the same thought expressed in the minority report, that the passage of this resolution will embarrass Secretary of State Marshall when he goes abroad for the important conference he is about to attend. It has been said that he will fly abroad with a broken wing.

This suggested ceiling of $31,500,000,000 should not embarrass Secretary Marshall. He knows, the American people know, and the people with whom General Marshall will confer know that his is the voice of the United States and behind him he has not $31,500,000,000, but every asset and resource possessed by the people of the United States.

It has been said that we cannot reduce the budget of the Army and Navy without interfering with their proper functions. There is not a Member of this House who does not know there are extravagances in the operation of our Army and Navy that should be eliminated.

It has also been said that we cannot reduce the budget of the Veterans' Administration. There are many Members of this Congress who served in the armed forces either in World War I or World War II. They, and other Members of the Congress, will be insistent that our war veterans will not be deprived of benefits we have already voted for them. I yield to no man in my determination that the returning veteran be fairly, yes generously, treated. It is for the future welfare of our veterans pretty largely that I am so deeply concerned. If we

continue on year after year with an unbalanced budget, or with a budget of twenty-five or thirty billion dollars, the day will surely come when the checks we issue to our disabled veterans will not be worth much more than the paper on which they are printed.

The same is true of our desire to aid the distressed people abroad. Unless we get our own house in order, or unless we protect the value of the American dollar, we will not be able to do the things abroad that we want to do, and that we should do. We have reached the point here in the Congress, when we must determine that every dollar we appropriate is absolutely necessary to the successful operation of our Government.

In the future when new undertakings are proposed in this Congress, I am not going to ask myself "Is this a good program?" but rather I will ask myself, "Is this an expenditure that we can safely postpone for some time?"

Today we have an opportunity to stand up and be counted, and the American taxpayer will watch the votes we cast today with deep interest.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Budget Committee placing a ceiling on the money to be appropriated for all Government bureaus, departments, and agencies for the next fiscal year is to be regretted. This in itself is tragic, but the gag rule making silent every Member of the Congress in his effort to alter the recommendations of the afore-mentioned committee astounds and horrifies me beyond any ability to express myself on this occasion.

There is a difference of opinion as to the effect of the $6,000,000,000 reduction in the President's recommendation to Congress. Some say the action of the committee is binding morally on the several committees of the House to effect a $6,000,000,000 cut. Others, including myself, feel that it is not only morally binding, but it is legally binding, and I quote from section 138 (b) of the Reorganization Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, which reads as follows:

SEC. 138 (b). The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such Budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $——.

It will be my purpose to cooperate with the majority or the minority in reducing expenditures for all Government agencies, wherever humanly possible, but I cannot distort my thinking or perjure my conscience in weakening our armed forces or breaking the promises we have made to the farmers and to the recipients of rural electrification throughout the years. You know and I know that I have joined on many occasions with the majority partly in curtailing needless expenses. This will be my policy in the future, but today we are bound, gagged, and forced to swallow a fanciful figure.

The section above referred to clearly says that the reports shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for the expenditure in such year.

This is clearly a mandate and clearly places a ceiling over which we dare not morally or legally transcend. The only excuse we have to vary from this restriction placed by the Budget is that the national income shall exceed the estimate.

I know that the outcome today will be a clear-cut majority on the part of the majority party, but I wonder how each of you will feel when Marshall faces Stalin in Moscow, when MacArthur faces the hungry, seething mob in Tokyo, or when McNarney faces the unrest of the German occupation on one hand and the Russian encroachment on the other, with funds running low, and occupation forces being withdrawn.

I wonder if we realize the great potential powder keg that is Korea, with the Soviets on the north and the small American forces on the south and the onward sweep of communism unchecked and unabated.

What we do today will not be felt tomorrow, but may plague us in the years to come. What we do today will have its effect many years hence.

What are we going to say to the veteran who won this war when the promises we have made to him are unfulfilled? What are we going to say to that maimed and dependent veteran when no longer his education or his training is continued?

The answers are with you, my colleagues. As for me, I propose to have no part in weakening our national security, deceiving the able and disabled veteran, or cutting Marshall down from behind.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to buy a pig in the poke. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I am also a member of the Legislative Budget Committee, and while I have attended the only two meetings of the Legislative Budget Committee that were held and have sat on the floor of this House all afternoon, today I have not yet been able to learn where and how the cuts will be made that will make possible a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget submitted by the President.

I believe it is only fair that Members of this House should know how and where cuts are to be applied before they go on record in support of this $6,000,000,000 cut.

It is doubtful, in my mind, that more than three or four members of the so-called Legislative Budget Committee have any knowledge of the basis for these proposed cuts.

It is true that the Legislative Budget Committee is composed of 102 members and thus is a very unwieldy one. It is for that reason that a subcommittee of 20 was appointed to survey the Budget and study the necessity of the various appropriations included therein. But what has happened? The subcommittee held only three meetings and heard only two witnesses. The figure of $6,000,000,000 was arrived at by an unofficial subsubcommittee of about three Republicans, and they ask us to accept their judgment without revealing to us the facts upon which their judgment is based. For that reason I shall have to vote against this resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, earlier today when the vote came on ordering the previous question, I voted against it and thus did what I could to open this matter up for discussion and amendment. That vote failed and therefore I shall vote to recommit this bill when a sensible motion to recommit is offered, as I know it will be offered. If the vote to recommit should fail, I shall certainly vote against this bill.

It may be said then that I am not in favor of economy. No, it does not necessarily follow that a vote against this bill is a vote against economy. I am in favor of the right kind of economy, and I do not know of a Democratic Member of this House who is not in favor of the right kind of economy. To pass the bill before us today may and probably will be the most blundering economy that this Congress ever attempted. When you ask me whether I favor economy, indicating it by such a proposal as this before us by saying "yes" or "no," I and all Members of this body are put in about the same position as a man who is called on to answer "Yes" or "No" to the question whether he had stopped beating his wife.

Another simile comes to my mind. Suppose we have a crying, hungry baby here and also a filled bottle with well-suited nipple is conveniently near, shall we give the bottle to the baby? Would you? Can you answer me "Yes" or "No"? I would suggest, however, in that case it would be well to inquire what is in that bottle, for it might be sweetened poison. It is a crude illustration to show the danger of an act with good intent. Yes, you say, "Here is an economy measure, to save the American people $6,000,000,000. Do you not want to economize?" But I say it is imperative that one know on what we are going to economize before answering that question.

I have heard it said that nobody has any intention—certainly not the Republican majority—of cutting on our armed forces or jeopardizing our national security. It is my solemn opinion that such assurances will mean nothing if this measure passes today at this critical juncture in America's international affairs. It has been significantly said that to pass this bill simply sends Gen. George Marshall flying to Moscow with a broken wing. The leaders of Europe cannot read your minds; they will read only the provision in this measure with its implications. Other nations will read a meaning into this in connection with the Republican attitude in the former

postwar period toward the outside world, and they will not believe the leopard can change his spots.

Ah, but you say, "We're simply carrying out the mandates of the law as passed in the last Congress, and also the mandates of the American people expressed at the polls on November 5 last. I do not believe this is necessary to carry out the new law, and as for mandates, I would suggest to my Republican colleagues that they read carefully all, and particularly the latter part, of the words of a great Republican Senator uttered yesterday in the other body in regard to mandates of the people. I refer to Senator AIKEN of Vermont, in one of the finest speeches recently delivered in the Senate of the United States.

It is true that the people want economy and should have it, but with a huge Republican majority in both Houses surely the Republican majority can secure effective economy by trimming appropriation bills according to the evident real needs of the governmental departments as such bills are presented. Is the Republican majority afraid of its own leadership? And must the majority by such a measure as this tie the Congress up into a moral obligation? In my judgment, there is a way of meeting the requirement of the Reorganization Act without placing Congress in such a strait-jacket as this which is offered us in Concurrent Resolution 20.

You say you do not intend to cut to harm the armed forces. I sincerely hope not. But if you do not greatly reduce the Army, or the Navy, or the Veterans' Administration, or the Department of State, or relief for the starving people of Europe, or the fixed charges on the public debt, or all of them put together, where are you going to cut the President's budget $6,000,000,000? I know and everybody knows where you will attempt to cut it, and there is not that much there to cut. You will attempt to cut it out of such things as soil conservation, public roads, flood control, reclamation, school lunches, and such other governmental benefits which we have been carrying on. Many of these are national investments and others, like school lunches, while not reimbursable, are as proper and legitimate objects of public expenditure as those that we feel duty bound to spend abroad.

I want particularly to ask what this Congress intends to do about carrying out the agricultural program under the Steagall amendment which was designed to protect the American farmers for 2 years following the war? Perhaps you intend to cut that out either by repealing that law or rendering it ineffective by lack of appropriation. But even if you cut out all the things I have enumerated, the sum will total less than half of the six billion which you are pledging the House in advance, and without knowing the facts, to trim the President's budget. Not only is this a serious mistake from the international standpoint, but from the standpoint of our domestic economy, this, in my judgment, is a most serious blunder. We ought to have the facts, and in the absence of facts we cannot make any wise economies.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped for a report with a resolution that would make it possible for me to join in an effort to reduce Government expenditures. I had, indeed, prepared some remarks in advocacy of such a course.

But in consideration of the subject, what do we find or have presented to us? Nothing but a "pig in the poke."

Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 753, second session, in section 1389, on the subject Legislative Budget, reads:

> The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

And subsection (b) reads as follows:

> The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

This resolution is then offered on the floor of the House:

> That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $31,500,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $24,000,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made for obligation in such fiscal year.

Now what is reported to the membership of the House? If we are to solemnly resolve that expenditures should not exceed $31,500,000,000, we should know where cuts are to be made. The report gives no information on that subject. It is only a discussion of over-all receipts, expenditures, and appropriations without any information or specific report as to any items, activities, or functions proposed to be reduced, or eliminated, other than a proposed reduction of civilian employees, not saying in what department, and deferring unspecified public-works projects.

It has been said, not in the report but by a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that the reduction in expenditures contemplates the following as to agriculture: Agricultural cuts, over-all, from $947,000,000 to $553,000,000; school-lunch program, $75,000,000, to be eliminated; $100,000,000 cut in the AAA program; elimination of all of the $19,000,000 for agricultural research.

This may be a sample of a proposal and purpose to harmfully reduce and arbitrarily eliminate most important and most needed appropriations for the public welfare. These referred to would be disastrous. If we had a report with specific information we might find others just as ill-advised.

I cannot accept the explanation that this resolution is not binding. If we vote for it we shall be in all honor bound to do that which the resolution says should, or ought, to be done.

To the Members of the House, not on the committee, this is a shot in the dark. The report should have reported, that Members might know all the facts.

How can one satisfy his conscience, regard his responsibility to the people with the slight information furnished? In the situation we find ourselves, I cannot support this resolution, however much I would like information on which I could act and vote otherwise.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a concurrent resolution which, if passed, will cut the President's budget by $6,000,000,000.

The concurrent resolution does not tell us where the cuts are to be made.

The majority has talked here for hours, but they have not yet told us where they intend to cut the Budget. They have talked all around Robin Hood's barn. We have had their thinking on many subjects, but their Budget cuts are still a secret.

Why? Could it be that they themselves do not know what cuts they will make? Could it be that they are just grabbing a figure out of the dark? Could the majority party be so reckless, or is the majority party shrouding itself in secrecy because it hesitates to place in one piece before the American people the Republican budget for 1948? Would a disclosure of the Republican budget also disclose the Republican mind? Is that, perhaps, what it is afraid of?

Mr. Chairman, at this point it might be helpful to have the figures of the President's Budget before us.

Five billion dollars for interest on the national debt.

Two and one-tenth billion dollars, refunds due under the tax laws.

Eleven and two-tenths billion dollars for national defense.

Three and five-tenths billion dollars for international affairs and finance.

These five items—interest, refund, national defense, international affairs, and veterans require expenditures of $29,200,000,000 or almost four-fifths of the total budget.

Do the Republicans propose to cut these items?

Why do they not tell us what they propose to cut?

Now, we come to the domestic program for which the President's Budget recommends, in all, $8,300,000,000.

What in the domestic program do the Republicans propose to cut?

They have talked much today about a stable economy. We are agreed we must have a stable economy if we are to have security at home and peace in the world. But we insure nothing but disaster if we follow the same old McKinley policy which led us to the agony of 1929.

Let us take note that in this year of our Lord, under Democratic leadership, more people are working and business is more prosperous than at any time in our history, and that after we have just come through a global conflict which has left one-half of the world in ashes.

We are healthy today, Mr. Chairman, because under Democratic leadership, we had the vision and the faith to invest in the future of the American people.

Why are the Republicans attempting to blindfold the American people? Down what road are they attempting to lead us?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House desires more earnestly than I to reduce Government expenditures. I realize that, unless the Federal budget is balanced for the fiscal year 1948, and a substantial payment is made on our national debt, we are headed for economic chaos.

I am unwilling, however, to vote for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in expenditures at this time under a gag rule when I know that figure was plucked out of thin air; that it is thoroughly unrealistic; and that it will eliminate many vital services of this Government and tremendously weaken the national defense.

Let us for a moment be realistic. Included in the $37,500,000,000 of expenditures, as recommended by the President, is one item of $5,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt. That is a fixed item. It is a contractual item in which there can be no reduction without impairing the faith and credit of our Government. In addition there is a fixed item of $2,065,000,000 for refunds of taxes and customs to those who have paid more to the Government than the amount of their liability. That item cannot be reduced because it is a debt which the Government owes to its citizens. Deducting these items leaves a balance of $30,000,000,000 to which the cut must be applied.

Included in this amount is an item of $7,343,000,000 for veterans' services and benefits. Is it conceivable that the people of this country have so soon forgotten their obligations to the men and women who fought to preserve our freedom and our American way of life, and the widows and orphans of those who made the supreme sacrifice, that they are willing 2 years after the war to begin to curtail the services and benefits which were promised to them under the GI bill of rights? Deducting this item leaves only $23,120,000,000 to which the reduction can be applied.

The President's budget recommends expenditures of $11,256,000,000 for the national defense. General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz, have all issued warnings to the American people that any substantial reduction in this item will jeopardize the safety of America. If, however, that item is eliminated the balance to which the reduction may be applied is only $11,864,000,000.

Of this amount $3,510,000,000 is for international affairs and finance. We have already agreed to a loan for Great Britain and have made commitments to the United Nations and the International Bank. If we refuse to appropriate these funds we will be repudiating our international obligations just as we did by refusing to enter the League of Nations and the International Court after World War I. If, however, this item is deducted there is left a balance of only $8,354,000,000 for all of the remaining governmental services. To attempt to cut this balance by $6,000,000,000 would be ludicrous.

I cite these figures merely to show the absurdity of the proposal now before the Congress. This analysis plainly demonstrates that if the budget is reduced there must be unreasonable slashes in the appropriations for the national defense, for veterans and for international affairs and finance.

Frankly, I think there can be some cuts in all of these items. I voted for a reduction of $4,500,000,000 in the Joint Legislative Committee and I am ready and willing to vote for that figure today, but under the gag rule which has been forced upon us, and which does not permit the offering of any amendment to this resolution, my only choice is to vote for or against the $6,000,000,000.

I know that if there is a cut of $6,000,000,000, the rural electrification program, which has meant so much to the farmers of our country, will be greatly curtailed and possibly eliminated; that the soil-erosion and flood-control program will be threatened; the work on rivers and harbors will cease; the appropriations for public roads will be curtailed; the school-lunch program will be discontinued; services and benefits to veterans will be decreased; and the national defense will be threatened.

It has been said on the floor of the House today that there is no danger of any other nation attacking the United States at the present time. I think that is true. It was also true immediately following World War I, but in those fateful years we laid the foundations for World War II. I am unwilling in this year 1947, 2 years after the cessation of hostilities, to begin to lay the foundations for World War III.

We cannot afford to gamble with destiny at this uncertain and critical time in world affairs. We tried it after World War I and lost. Moreover, if we desire to check the spread of communism throughout the world it cannot be done by witch hunting here in the United States when we weaken our influence abroad and open the door to Russian aggression and domination.

I shall, therefore, vote against the pending resolution, but when the various appropriation bills come before this House, after a careful review by the appropriate committees, I shall vote to eliminate every unnecessary penny and to curtail expenditures to the maximum extent that sound judgment dictates and the national security will permit.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I know that nothing which I might say will sway the majority party in their determination to pass the resolution under consideration at this time on the joint committee recommendations of reducing the Budget from the amount recommended by the President by the sum of $6,000,000,000.

However, Mr. Chairman, knowing that it will be futile to raise my voice in protest, I do most vehemently protest against this action and will vote against adoption of the resolution for the reason that it has been announced that the reduction is made principally at the expense of national defense; that is, appropriations for the Army and Navy, and at the expense of reducing the funds for many other governmental departments that are indispensable and invaluable to the people and our country. I do not have to reiterate all of these items which serve to give some benefits to our own citizens in so many ways as the same have been mentioned by most of those who have the same views which I have, and who have already covered the same when they preceded me here in registering their protests and objections to this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, coming from a predominantly agricultural district, naturally my obligation is to protect that industry to the limit of my ability, and I do here and now reiterate my interest and the fact that I am solicitous and always concerned with the protection and welfare of my constituents engaged in this great and important industry, and that I am concerned with the reductions assessed against the various departments of our Government dealing with the benefits, treatment, progress, and future of this industry, many of the products of my district and Louisiana which are peculiar to our climate and soil, and of such necessity and importance to the balance of our great country.

Mr. Chairman, the reductions in the proposed Budget limitation not only affects this most important segment of our national life but also many other activities connected with the welfare, prosperity, security, and happiness of our people, but of greatest importance of all, in my opinion, the very lives, fortunes, and freedom of the people of our great country, and even the welfare and future of our veterans are involved in reductions in this Budget made to attain a flat, arbitrary cut of $6,000,000,000 without full and deliberate consideration.

Mr. Chairman, there is no use of my naming all of the governmental programs which will be hampered by restricted appropriations under the proposal here, as they have been enumerated in detail by some of my colleagues, and a discussion of same will only be repetition, and while I appreciate the fact that there are many opportunities for retrenchment and economy in our Government, I feel that my record in the Congress will disclose that I was one of those that time and again called to the attention of this House the waste and extravagance in this respect, and while

it is too late to do anything about the matter now, I do not think it is right to penalize our countrymen for these mistakes.

Mr. Chairman, when I was first a candidate for the Congress I promised my constituents that, if I was elected that my country would never be caught unprepared again as we were caught in the last two wars, if I could, by my vote prevent it. While there is no detailed information available as to exactly what items of the recommendations of the President will be reduced it is generally understood that the majority party intends to reduce the appropriations for the Army and Navy, and if so, I am apprehensive for the future of our country in these unsettled and troublesome times.

I have stated time and again that, I am in favor of retaining all of the islands and bases in the Pacific for which our boys shed their blood, and in addition, I am in favor of acquiring by purchase, negotiation, or otherwise, all of the bases in the Atlantic and elsewhere which are required to build an impregnable ring of steel around our country, and that we should maintain a strong air force, a strong Army and Navy, and a trained reserve in order that we may be prepared, at all times to defend our country.

Mr. Chairman, can it be that the Members of this Congress and our country have already forgotten that at the beginning of the last war how totally unprepared was this country. German submarines roamed the high seas and sank our ships at will? Do they not remember how a German submarine cruising leisurely within a mile of Jacksonville, Fla., in full sight of the population on shore sank a fine ship carrying supplies to Europe. We had nothing to defend our ships or shores.

I remember that more than 100 merchant ships were sunk off the coast of my State—87 at the mouth of the Mississippi and 14 at the mouth of the Calcasieu River off the shores of the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, certainly, we all should not have forgotten that on the top of this magnificent Capitol Building and on the top of the office buildings of the House and Senate, and on the tops of all of the other buildings of our National Capital, all that we had to repel an air raid was wood anti-aircraft guns with wood soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, I visited Nome, Alaska, during the war and I was told by the people there, and I observed that the statement was correct, that if the Japanese had followed up the invasion of the Aleutian Islands and attacked Alaska there, all that the people there had for protection were a few shotguns and Eskimo whaling spears. Such conditions existed nearly everywhere in our country. Is this Nation going to permit itself to be caught in this position again?

Mr. Chairman, I have read and listened to all the debate in regard to the atom bomb and I have wondered if this country would be foolish enough to give this secret away. Last night I viewed a preview of the picture entitled "The Beginning or the End," which portrayed the creation and development of this terrible weapon, and I wondered then if this country, after spending billions of dollars to produce this weapon, would stop appropriating funds for further scientific research to produce weapons for the defense of this country.

I am not a warmonger, nor am I an isolationist; I hope and pray that the United Nations will be a success and that we may obtain peace through that organization, and I am in favor of the full cooperation of this Nation to that end, but we have witnessed in this generation on two occasions that treaties and covenants mean nothing and that the only nations which have survived are those that were able to defend themselves.

Money spent for the defense of our country is good economy and, in my opinion, will save lives and money again in the future. Waterways are part of national defense, and money spent for the development of rivers and harbors pays handsome dividends, to say nothing of protecting lives and property, yet I understand that under the proposed resolution limiting the budget for the next fiscal year that there is practically no provision for this item. We have spent money lavishly in other countries, yet we do nothing for our own country.

I find that in regard to flood control since this Government accepted responsibility for this important and necessary function that we have only expended approximately something over $3,000,000,000 over the entire United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, at one swoop over $4,000,000,000 was appropriated to another country on a so-called loan agreement.

Do not you think it is long past time for us to do something for the United States?

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we are all in favor of reducing the expenses of government which necessarily entails reductions in taxes, and I sincerely believe that it is possible to reduce taxes by economy in government, but I have the confirmed opinion that, if taxes cannot be reduced without the appropriation to our armed forces for the defense of our country that, our people would be willing to continue to pay high taxes for some years to come rather than place our country in the position of being at the mercy of another aggressor or agressor nation and be caught for the third time as we have been on two occasions during this generation.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that this question is submitted for consideration without any opportunity to offer amendments, and while I know that the resolution will be adopted here in the House, I sincerely trust that when the resolution reaches the Senate that full and careful deliberation and consideration will be had on this vital matter, and that due consideration will be given to all of the problems which have been discussed here in the House today and that when a final determination is made in conference that full provision will be made for appropriations to insure, at least, the proper defense of our great country.

I will not vote to sell America "short."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have not been in the House nor in politics long enough to develop a full appreciation for supporting or opposing matters solely because they have party leadership approval. I do some of my own thinking. I believe that the vast majority of the Members of this House are motivated by a desire to promote the best interest of our Nation irrespective of partisanship.

I deplore the type of rule submitted to this body today. It is contrary to my concept of democracy. I confess my ignorance on parliamentary procedure, but I believe I know something about the wishes and needs of my constituents.

It is not on a partisan basis that I oppose the rule, nor on a partisan basis that I shall oppose the resolution. It seems to me that our entire approach is wrong. I do not believe that there is in this House a more stanch advocate of efficiency in Government than I, but when I vote for or against any Federal expenditure I want to know what agency is affected. Surely there must be numerous Federal activities with which we could dispense without doing injury. Our national defense program is not one of these. Perhaps greater economy could be practiced by both the Army and Navy without reducing efficiency, and the simple expedient of cutting the Budget by no means assures such an outcome. I shall vote against the resolution—not against efficiency and economy—but against the haphazard and indiscriminate approach to a problem that needs to be worked out in detail and on a sound, sensible basis to assure that our national welfare will not be placed in jeopardy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, budget statistics available today point out that any cuts in the 1948 Budget ought to be cautious and moderate insofar as the armed forces are concerned.

There should be an orderly and progressive demobilization and reduction of our armed strength over a period of more than a year instead of a drastic slash in one year.

The statistics do not imply that no cuts should be made—but that what cuts are made should be considered with deep study and care.

To arrive at some fanciful figure and pull it out of thin air without any substantiating reason to back it up is foolhardy.

I am opposed to any abitrary figure for the mere purpose of its political effect to substantiate previously unwarranted claims and statements that are now hard to support with facts.

Hanson W. Baldwin has today in an article in the New York Times, described the situation perfectly. The article entitled "A Warning on Budget Cut" follows:

A WARNING ON BUDGET CUT—STATISTICS OF ARMED FORCES SHOW NEED FOR CAUTION ON PLANE, RESEARCH FUNDS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Congressional advocates of a $1,750,000,000 cut in the defense budget will find little aid and comfort

in certain budget statistics that became available today.

These statistics support in general the argument of the armed forces that cuts in the 1948 Budget ought to be moderate and careful, not wholesale unstudied slashes. The figures must be read, too, against the background of the service desire for an orderly and progressive demobilization and reduction of the United States armed strength throughout a period of years, instead of a sudden major cut in 1 year.

The statistics do not imply that no cuts ought to be made; indeed, it is certain there are many areas in the service budgets that can and should be cut, but they do indicate fields in which cuts ought not to be made.

Aircraft procurement is one of them. The Navy's budget as submitted to Congress by President Truman would provide funds for the procurement of only 579 planes (exclusive of experimental planes) during the 1948 fiscal year. The Bureau of Aeronautics originally asked for funds for some 1,600 planes; this figure was reduced to about 1,100 by the Navy Department, and the Bureau of the Budget further pared that to 579. If the $1,750,000,000 cut is made even this number—one-third of what the Bureau of Aeronautics originally estimated as its needs—will be cut in half.

RISING COSTS ALSO A FACTOR

The Army Air Forces find themselves in a roughly comparable position. Their 1948 budget, as submitted to Congress, contains funds originally estimated as sufficient to procure 900 new planes of all types, but the increasing unit costs of aircraft will probably limit the number that actually can be procured to about 800. If the projected $1,750,000,000 slash is made, this number probably will be reduced further.

Thus the Army and Navy together will be able to procure in the 1948 fiscal year if—and it is a big "if"—Congress makes no cut in the requested funds for aircraft procurement only about 1,400 or 1,500 planes. This is half the 3,000 that a postwar study indicated was the minimum number of military planes that must be procured annually by the armed services to maintain a healthy industry.

The second statistic concerns research and development, admittedly a field that ought not to suffer any serious cuts. For the current 1947 fiscal year, some $45,000,000 was appropriated for the Office of Naval Research.

About $23,000,000 is being expended through some 100 university contracts for basic research that cover an extremely wide range of scientific problems and that help, incidentally, in the training of young scientists. The Office of Naval Research had hoped, during the 1948 fiscal year, to obtain a little bit more than the $45,000,000 appropriated for this fiscal year, but if the $1,750,000,000 cut is made, a reduction of about one-third in this research budget will be necessary.

The Chemical Corps of the Army offers another statistic that shows a region where no cut ought to be made. In the 1947 fiscal year, this corps, which has charge of two of the most terrible and most important weapons of modern war—weapons that incidentally offer many byproducts of great therapeutic value to mankind—received about $6,000,000 for research and development. This supported all of the national research into chemical warfare (gases) and in the dreaded bacteriological or biological warfare.

FLEET SCRAPPING OPPOSED

For the 1948 fiscal year, the Chemical Corps for its researches and development of gas and biological warfare (including extensive and important medical research) asked for about $8,000,000 but this figure was cut down before the budget reached Congress to about $5,800,000. If the $1,750,000,000 over-all cut is made, the tremendously important researches may be cut still further.

One other statistic will show another field where cuts can be made only with difficulty. Congress has stood firmly since VJ-day against scrapping the great modern fleet built during the war. To preserve a great number of fighting ships not needed in active operation and to save money, the Navy laid up hundreds of ships, carefully "pickling" them against corrosion and deterioration.

Even when the job is complete, perhaps a year or more from now, it is estimated that 25,000 to 35,000 of the Navy's officers and men will be required permanently to maintain and guard the thousands of laid-up fighting ships that are being kept as a form of national insurance.

This is a high overhead, and some naval officers think that perhaps the United States is keeping too many ships in the "moth-ball" fleet. But that overhead cannot be reduced without scrapping some of the ships Congress has insisted be retained. Here, then, is another area in which cuts perhaps can be made, but they must be made with caution.

The service budgets can and should be cut, for there is excess "fat" and some waste and empire building in the armed forces. It is true, too, that special pleaders in all phases of military activities will cry out against cuts of any sort. But this merely points up the need for great congressional responsibility and care. Congress must find by wise and patient exploration of those fields where cuts can be made, and also must ascertain those fields where cuts must not be made under any circumstances.

UNIFICATION BILL STALLED

About five legal drafts of the so-called unification agreement recently reached by the armed forces have been prepared, and each successively has been criticized and amended. The final draft was endorsed completely and wholeheartedly by the War and Navy Departments and then sent to other Government departments for comment.

The Bureau of the Budget, which has been assuming an increasing power in executive government, found some fault with the legislation, and it has been held up. Its chances of passage at this session of Congress are dwindling with the delay in introducing the bill, and unless it reaches the Capitol Hill soon with the full support of all affected departments and agencies behind it, it probably will be on the unfinished business calendar when Congress adjourns in the summer.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I favor drastic reductions in Government expenditures. An examination of my record during the 8 years I have served here will show that I have constantly supported measures to effect economy and have opposed measures to increase public spending. When the congressional Reorganization Act was adopted, I hoped the provision for the legislative budget would go a long way toward stabilizing our expenditures. However, we now come to the first experience under that act and, if this is an example of the manner in which we are to function, we should repeal the provision for a legislative budget. The proposal before us is not a budget in any accepted meaning of that term. The very term contemplates an estimate of anticipated revenue and an allocation of that revenue to the various expenditures and savings. Here we have nothing but a round figure stated to be the judgment of Congress as the limit to be placed upon Government expenditures. There is no statement of the amount or percentage of the total to be expended for each of the various functions of government.

Every Member should be morally bound by the legislative budget if he votes to sustain it. He should be bound to an honest attempt to keep each department and each function within the limits specified in the budget. Under this proposal, there is no means by which any Member can know the limit to which he can go on each appropriation bill as it comes before the House. Each Member is likely to find himself, after some or most of the appropriation bills have been passed, to have exceeded by his votes the over-all amount pledged in this resolution. He must then decide whether to appropriate nothing for essential functions of government or exceed the budget. Some have pointed out that the adoption of this resolution will not legally prevent the appropriation of funds in excess of the limits herein provided. However, this is the first time we have attempted to operate under the legislative budget provided by the Reorganization Act. If this Eightieth Congress establishes the precedent of exceeding the amount fixed in the budget, that precedent is established for all time. The budget will amount to nothing, not even the pious hope of which some Members speak.

The adoption of this so-called legislative budget means, for all practical purposes, that we will not accomplish the good for which we hoped in providing for it. It means a continuance of the old system of spending without any forethought or coordination.

A little reflection will show that this Budget, if observed to any extent, will call for reductions in one place and one place only. That is the place where we cannot afford such a drastic cut in these troublesome times. That cut will be in national defense—the Army and Navy.

Veterans' benefits are fixed by law and cannot be reduced. Interest and servicing of the national debt cannot be reduced. We all know that the representatives of the great agricultural areas, and they sit on both sides of the aisle, will see to it that none of the agricultural programs will be curtailed. Flood control, reclamation, rivers and harbors, and all of the other public works, constitute local projects. No locality will agree that its own project be eliminated or curtailed. Resort will be had to old-fashioned logrolling. Members on both sides of the aisle will vote for projects to garner support for their own. By the time that process is completed, practically all of the local projects will be intact. Where then will the cuts come in order to be within this Budget? Only the armed services will remain. Only the Army and Navy will suffer any material reduction. The men who led us through the war have all told us of the disastrous effects of a reduction such as is contemplated by this budget. All of those now representing us in our contacts with foreign nations, in making the peace treaties and making the United Nations work, have given us fair warning.

Surely none here subscribe to the idea of unilateral disarmament for this coun-

try. We have already disarmed to the point that our representatives are practically impotent in dealing with other nations. We have contemplated an Army of only 1,070,000 men for next July 1. This Budget will reduce that figure to approximately 750,000, with the occupation of Germany and Japan still to be carried out. To those who take the position that mass armies are no longer necessary and that scientific research and development must be stressed, let me say this Budget means the curtailment of research and development. As an example, the President's budget provided for only 900 new airplanes of all types for the Army Air Forces during the next fiscal year. Where will this reduction leave that small number? Does anyone know? Surely the House has not been informed. Does anybody care? This cut means the drastic curtailment of aviation development and experimentation by the Army.

Let the legislative budget be a budget in fact. Let us here, as the responsibility of the House, allocate the funds to be expended. It is not enough that some members of the committee say they have decided where the cuts should come. It is not enough that some members may say they have been informed by officers of the Army and Navy that such a cut may be made, but they cannot disclose their identity. This proposal contains none of the characteristics of a budget. Its adoption as a budget means the death of the new provision for a legislative budget. It should be defeated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have just learned that the program for the Reserve Air Corps training has been drastically cut because of the reduced Army budget. I understand that other needed defense programs are to be reduced because of this budget reduction.

I am distressed to learn of the cuts in the appropriations needed by the armed services to maintain a reasonable security of this country. The men who know the situation best—General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, General Spaatz, Secretary Forrestal, and Secretary Patterson—whose interest at this time is to see that the advantages of the victory so recently won, at the shocking cost to this country alone of more than $300,000,000,000 in wealth and more than 300,000 in precious lives, is not dissipated by the practice of false economy are likewise alarmed at the proposal. Those of us who served in the First World War vividly and sadly recall that this same pattern of leaving unguarded the security of our democracy, encourage the ambitious totalitarian leaders of Europe to try again by force of arms to conquer and regiment the nations of the earth. The situation seems to me to be analogous to an incident in the life of a friend of mine. He was visiting in one of our large cities and as he walked down a more or less deserted street a gunman stuck a "rod" in his ribs and demanded, "Your money or your life!" "Take my life," said my excited friend, "I am saving my money for my old age."

We have just fought and won a great war for the preservation of liberty. We all know that there are influences developing in the world that would use the fruits of our victory for the advancement of their own selfish interests, which in turn will mean the strangulation of that very liberty which we sought to maintain. We should always be mindful of the fact that we are dealing with an uneasy and confused eastern world, taught for generations by bitter experience to respect only those countries which are militarily strong, and that we will neither attain worth-while recognition, nor friendship, unless we are in position to command their respect. I am convinced that both the psychological and practical effect of any such cut in the appropriations estimated to be needed for the armed forces, as is proposed, would be to weaken our position in the negotiations which are shortly to take place abroad. Throughout history civilization has been called upon to pay dearly, in wealth and in life, in ever-recurring installments for the preservation of that civilization simply because there has been no adequate policing of those who are ambitious and lustful, and no adequate information or education for those who do not understand democratic principles.

Certainly the majority of us want economy in Government—and I am convinced that there are many places in which economies can be effected—but insofar as our defenses are concerned there is a point beyond which we dare not go if we are to maintain ourselves as a great and successful democratic nation. It appears to me to be a question of whether we shall spend a reasonable amount of money now to try to maintain our security and ideals of government, or whether we shall spend an unreasonable amount of blood later to preserve our security and our ideals.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

REDUCING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget voted in favor of reducing by $6,000,000,000 the President's budget estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year 1948. This will reduce proposed expenditures for 1948 from $37,500,000,000 to $31,500,000,000. As a member of the Legislative Budget Committee, I voted for the proposed reduction for two primary reasons:

First, I have always been an advocate of economy in government and believe that Government expenditures should be held to a minimum. The proposed expenditures of $37,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948 exceed by a wide margin the expenditures in any other full peacetime year, with the single exception of the current year. If Federal Government expenditures are ever to be brought down, I believe a start must be made now.

My second and primary reason for advocating an expenditure reduction for the fiscal year 1948 is my desire to maintain the credit of the United States. Only by reducing expenditures to a minimum in a period of high tax collections will it be possible to make any sizable reduction in our enormous debt, currently estimated at more than $259,000,000,000. On the basis of the figures of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, receipts for the fiscal year 1948 will amount to $39,100,000,000 and expenditures to $31,500,000,000. Most of the difference between this receipts figure and the estimate of $35,700,000,000 appearing in the President's budget can be accounted for by the assumption that the reenactment of the present excise-tax rates will occur. On the basis of the Senate's action this last Monday, this now appears to be a certainty. With these receipts and expenditure estimates, it would be possible for the Federal Government to have a surplus of $7,600,000,000. I believe this should make it possible to make a real reduction in the debt. Only by strenuous efforts of this type, when business is good and incomes are high, will it be possible to have any permanent effect on the debt. Token reductions now are likely to mean no reductions later when the business activity is on a somewhat lower level.

It has been suggested by several persons that although they are in favor of reducing expenditures, the $6,000,000,000 proposed by the Legislative Budget Committee is too drastic. To a large extent, I believe this is based upon the report that the Legislative Budget Committee intends to reduce the over-all expenditures of the War and Navy Departments by $2,250,000,000. While this was suggested as one possible way of reducing expenditures, the report of the Legislative Budget Committee clearly states that no one is bound to reduce any specific expenditures by any amount. Permit me to quote two sentences from page 4 of the committee report bearing on this subject:

> Details of the over-all reduction which will be ultimately effected will manifestly unfold as and when the various appropriation measures are presented and processed from time to time by the two Houses of Congress. Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reductions in specific items contained in the Budget.

It is the duty of the appropriating committees to determine where the reductions should be made. I believe that the appropriating committees will be able to make some reductions in military expenditures without impairing the national defense, which I shall definitely and determinedly oppose as no one is more in favor of adequate national defense than myself.

Moreover, there is plenty of room for reduction in nonmilitary expenditures. These are shown in the Budget as amounting to over $26,000,000,000, only a little over a billion dollars less than in the current year, and $7,500,000,000 more than in 1946. Such an expansion of civilian functions at this time appears to me to be wholly without justification. The highest level of expenditures in civilian functions in any prewar year was reached in the fiscal year

1939, when such expenditures amounted to nearly $8,000,000,000. This figure must be multiplied by three and one-third to reach the level of proposed civil expenditures for the fiscal year 1948.

While I recognize that we are faced with increased expenditures for such items as veteran benefits and interest payments on the debt as a result of the war, I believe that total expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 can be held to a level of $31,500,000,000, largely by eliminating waste and inefficiency and by limiting the expansion of nonmilitary functions to a minimum. If we are ever to check profligate spending on the part of the Government, the time to act is now when incomes are high, and the need for relief expenditures is low. It is only through such fearless action that we can maintain the credit of the country and make a sizable reduction in our national debt.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my opinion that the budget submitted by the President can very substantially be reduced, and I expect to support a reduction in certain respects at the proper time.

In the current resolution now before the House which we are asked to support I find this statement:

> That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000, and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $31,500,000,000.

If I should support that resolution I should find myself in the position of saying to the people of America that upon the best information obtainable we do not need more than $31,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. I cannot so state. The majority leadership, I am informed, held only two meetings on the budget which has lasted altogether only a few hours, that only two witnesses were heard and they gave very little testimony. This testimony has not been made available to the Members of the House. There has been no information made available to the Members of the House upon which the Appropriations Committee ask that the House of Representatives approve this resolution. We know only what we have read in the papers. This includes statements from the head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the head of the American Legion, and Admiral Nimitz and General Eisenhower, and including also General Marshall, who should know as much as any man in this Nation about our needs, all to the effect that this budget is not sufficient to assure the safety of this Nation. How could I say upon this evidence and this alone that it is my judgment "upon presently available information" that $31,500,000,000 is sufficient. I would be going contrary to the judgment of the highest military authorities in the Nation, contrary to the leadership of our veterans' organizations, contrary to the leadership of our greatest diplomats and resolving out of pure opinions of politicians against such an array of learned men.

I understand the Republican leadership gave their freshman Members a pep talk within the last 2 or 3 days to be sure they would support this resolution. I can understand why they might not support it without a pep talk. I wonder how in good conscience they can support it at all because no information has been made available to them upon which to make such a finding.

When the appropriation bill is reported out of the House Committee, I shall vote to remove every dollar from the budget which I believe should not be there; but to tie myself now to any figure without any information seems to me like making a blind date with destiny. I am unwilling to take such an unjustifiable position.

I agree with many Members of this House that a large number of Government employees can and should be removed from the pay roll, many agencies should be abolished and that other economies should be effected, and I expect to support action in this respect at a later date during this Congress, but again repeat that I am unable to go along with the majority party in their contention that Members of the House ought to blindfold themselves and vote the way they are requested so to do without any evidence to support their position and against the opinion of the top military leaders of our Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather broad subject to attempt to discuss or cover in the length of time that we have available. First, I certainly know that I am for economy in government. I have supported such a program and expect to vote to reduce appropriations just as much as possible consistent with the national good.

No hearings have been held on this $6,000,000,000 reduction. No basis for this action is offered. We do not have to take this hasty action. When these appropriation bills come up we can cut where they should be cut.

We know this six billion contemplates reductions of approximately $1,750,000,000 in the armed services just on the eve of the Moscow and other peace conferences.

I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] will work unceasingly and untiringly to cut out waste and extravagance in the War and Navy Departments and I have no doubt real reductions can be made. I have supported such reductions in the past, but I say to him he should wait until he has the witnesses before him with all the evidence, then he could apply the cuts in such places that the world will know we have not weakened the national defense. But, today, without any showing as to where such cuts are to be applied to the armed services, our action will go out to the world as a retrenchment in our military preparedness; the world will believe that we are withdrawing our support from our armed services at a time when our distinguished diplomatic corps is ready to go to the Moscow Conference and other peace conferences, where we know they must keep up a determined front and need to have full support behind them. The Republican Party, which brings that reduction to you, has a history in this country. We all remember after the last war your voting records on preparedness and we are asked to make a reduction today which does not point out where it will be applied, and that will be taken as a move to isolationism, a drawing into our shell just as this Nation, with your help, did after the last war. Now, what is the effect of this bill on the domestic front? A few days ago figures were submitted to members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture as to how this cut would be applied. Attention was called to the fact that the Department of Agriculture could stand a cut, by those responsible leaders whose word will likely become the law of this land when this appropriation bill is passed. It was pointed out that that appropriation would probably be cut from $947,000,000 to $553,000,000. These proposed cuts were submitted as follows:

Seventy-five million dollars to be cut from the school-lunch program, thus eliminating such program. Yet just a few months ago when all were soliciting votes this program was approved by the Congress.

One hundred million dollar reduction in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, just after we prevailed upon the farmers of the Nation to deplete their soils if necessary to meet the food quotas needed by the world, and the records show that many, many millions of acres of our soils have been practically exhausted as a result. Furthermore, commitments have been made to the farmers of the Nation for this year, based on these funds.

The entire sum of $19,000,000 for agricultural research is to be cut out. Yet the Hope-Flannagan bill passed the Congress last year by an overwhelming vote. Of course, at that time the Republican majority was anxious for the farm vote. I firmly believe that to delete this item is one of the most short-sighted actions the Congress could possibly take. All recognize that the farm problem in the next few years will become one of the most serious we have. What to do with surplus commodities, how to maintain reasonable prices—all will be facing us. Why today we have the Commodity Credit Corporation, with a capital stock of $4,000,000,000, with authority to spend it if necessary to support farm prices. Is it not foolish not to carry forward research in the use of farm products, thereby creating demand and possibly alleviate to some extent the cost of supporting prices by buying up farm surpluses, or I wonder if such Republican leaders do not contemplate the removal of support prices for farm products. It is time for those who have the interest of the Nation and of the Nation's agriculture to wake up and take notice. As I stated yesterday:

> Are we to eliminate research, that great boon of mankind? John Deere took an old saw, made a mould board for a plow that would cut Midwest soil, making possible de-

velopment of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska. McCormack, with his reaper, made possible the wheat of that section. Eli Whitney, with his cotton gin, made cotton king. And all these did more to make the United States we have than did all the statesmen, so-called. Swift said, "He who has made two blades of grass to grow where one grew before, or two stalks of corn to grow where one grew before, has done more for the good of mankind than all the race of politicians put together." Carver with his peanut is an illustration. Are you to develop the atomic bomb to destroy mankind, and deny money to develop and enlarge natural resources of the Nation? Will you build a great army, yet deny lunchrooms to nourish and build the boys and girls who make up the real forces on which we must depend? When they ask for a fish will you give them a serpent; when they ask for a loaf of bread will you give them a stone?

Gentlemen, we must not do that. Never let it be said that the Congress of the United States would be so short-sighted.

These Republican leaders contemplate a reduction in the Rural Electrification Administration of $394,000,000, which includes a reduction of $125,000,000 in loan authority for the next fiscal year. Thus this great program which has meant much to the rural inhabitants of this country, which is doing much to help keep folks on the farm, is to be curtailed. The local cooperatives, which charge rates whereby they can and have repaid the Government for the funds borrowed, so that practically all are up to date in their repayments, will be restricted in bringing the same service to the millions who did so much for the war, wanted electricity then but were told to wait until after the war as the war effort required the materials necessary for their extensions. Thus it goes.

A $50,000,000 reduction is contemplated in the Farmers Home Administration; now that hundreds of thousands of veterans are clamoring for the opportunity it would afford to pay for a farm and a home, a $10,000,000 reduction in roads and trails, which are used in getting lumber out of the national forests for the veterans' home program, reductions in the Soil Conservation Service, and so on through the activities of the Department. And this without and prior to any hearings, after commitments to the American farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that under some circumstances we have to do without many things that are essential. I have had to do it to pay debts, and most of the members of this committee have had the same experience, but I say to you this is not the purpose of the Republican majority in this instance. They have talked here continuously about sustaining the solvency of this country. If that be their desire and if that be their purpose, we gave them two opportunities to say so and make certain this reduction would go to such purpose.

We offered an amendment to this resolution which would have provided that any savings in reduced expenditures as a result of this budget cut would be applied to the national debt. Did they vote for it? No. They voted it down. Then we tried to get through another amendment which would provide that $3,000,000,000 that might be saved should be applied to the national debt. That was voted down. It was voted down because in the November election of last fall twofold promises were made by the Republican Party. They promised to reduce public expenditures and they promised to reduce taxes. How? Along the line of the Knutson plan, which would mean that a man with $100,000 would have a take-home pay increase of 70 percent and the man who made a thousand dollars would have his take-home pay increased 2.1 percent. So when you say you have saved all this money to maintain the solvency of this country, will you not have the courage to admit that your party voted against applying it to the public debt? That they refused to provide in this resolution that such reduction would go toward payment of the public debt? When the people face you on the ground that you have not provided for public roads and trails and eliminated the school-lunch program; when you have reduced the AAA and the REA, will you not tell them that you did it to get the money to pass the Knutson bill, which would give the benefits of these savings not toward paying on the debts of the Nation, which are serious, but to give most of those benefits, through your Knutson tax bill, to those already enjoying the larger incomes and not in giving tax relief as we would by increasing exemptions so those needing it would get relief.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I expect to support real cuts in appropriations based on testimony and on hearings, but I oppose this action here today, which would have much more merit if the savings were to be applied to the national debt. We can do without many things to pay our debts, but this is an effort to cut out worth-while programs not to pay our obligations but to give the money to those who need it least.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is a happy day for me; it is the first time since I came to Congress that we have considered how much money we should spend for the operating of our Government before we started to spend. If you will look back over the record you will see that I have advocated it back in 1933–34–35–36–37–38–39–40 and up to this time. It is a very sensible procedure in Government operation. If I want to build a home of my own, I talk it over with my wife and we decide we will spend $10,000 for our home. During our construction we figure on getting the best home we can for the money; we from time to time change our plans, ever keeping in mind the cost. If we can build for $9,700 so much the better, but if it costs us $11,000 we know, if we only had $10,000, we must borrow the extra $1,000 and we have that debt to pay at some future time. Oh, it is sensible to plan, it is wise to plan, it is good business to plan.

What have you been doing the past 14 years? Spending, squandering, and ruthlessly getting our Nation into a terrible situation by creating the greatest debt in all history, by this or any other country. The New Deal increased the debt from twenty-one billion until today it is two hundred and sixty-nine billion. A travesty to any good, sound people. You have increased our taxes since 1933, 16 times—think of it 16 tax bills in 14 years, New Deal taxes. The people are sick, tired, and disgusted with their heavy taxes. The New Deal is at fault for this. I want to reduce taxes but I must reduce expenses first. This is the beginning of cutting down expenses. I am for it. It is not going to be easy. There will be more propaganda to spend for this and for that. It will require lots of intestinal fortitude to do the job. I expect to do a good job in this respect if I have the health and strength to do it.

We can cut expenses of Government. We can clean out some of the bureaus and some of the bureaucrats.

Just think, there are 75 bureaus dealing with transportation. Why?

There are 12 Federal retirement systems. Why?

There are 15 agencies dealing with public housing. Why?

Labor relations are spread over eight departments and agencies. Why? A dozen departments deal with public lands. Why? Oh, there is much that can be done in consolidation, streamlining, and elimination.

We have talked and talked about cutting down on expenses, but with some it has been a jest. Your vote is what counts. I do not like a hypocrite—the fellow that talks one way and votes another.

It is about time we look after America and stop trying to pay for running the world. I said before and I say now, we will soon be the worst-hated nation on the face of the earth because we are sticking our nose in other people's affairs.

Now for the Army, Navy, and other branches of the armed service; I do not want to weaken our strength. I want to squeeze some of the excess water out of this sponge. It is full of it. We can do wonders in creating efficiency, eliminating waste, and cutting out duplication. We can and must do it.

Now we Republicans can and must do this job; the New Dealers are too hungry for jobs and cash to stop any spending. They got us in the mess and we must dig the American Government out of the morass. A bankrupt nation is useless. So let us strengthen our national defense by creating a solvent, safe, sane Government. Our people want it, the national solvency demands it. You were elected to perform it. So let us go—vote for the resolution. As the days go by and the appropriation bills come on the floor, remember our promises.

As we stick together as Republicans we win—if we lose, the Nation falls. I will do my part. If what the minority leader says is true—we have a hard job—we can expect no help from him or the

New Deal. We must count on any Jeffersonian Democrats and Republicans. Cut down Government expenses, save taxes, eliminate functions of Government, consolidate departments, get rid of Communists, and run out the radical bureaucrats from the pay roll.

We can do it. We must do it. We will do it if we would save our form of government.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, any budget, in public or private business, is merely a preliminary guess, but it is important to sound business to make such a guess as accurately as possible, and then to follow it as closely as possible. I have attempted in the past few weeks to go over at least the high spots in the 1,434-page Budget the President has sent to Congress. Radio and newspaper commentators are able to say exactly what this Budget should be. I receive letters from people who, I am sure, have never gone through the Budget, but who tell me just what size it should be. My study reminds me of the old song: "You don't know how much you have to know in order to know how little you know."

I do not know yet just how much we must spend this year or just how much we will collect. I suspect the President does not know, either. Even though it is called the President's budget, we all know that it is compiled, not by the President, but by his hired help. It totals thirty-seven and five-tenths billions. On the other hand, the congressional Budget of thirty-one and five-tenths billions was compiled by distinguished Representatives and Senators, whom I know and respect. I happen to know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] have spent months on this Budget, working day and night, consulting with officials, high and low, in the Government. In the words of Resolution 20, which is now before us, "It is the judgment" of these gentlemen and a majority of the 102 Members of the House and Senate on the Joint Budget Committee "based upon presently available information, that expenditures should not exceed $31,500,000,000" next year. As between these elected officials and the unknown bureaucrats who compiled the so-called President's budget, I am giving a vote of confidence to my colleagues.

It is now my judgment "based upon presently available information," including the opinions and conclusions of our congressional committee, that expenditures should not exceed thirty-one and five-tenths billions this year.

As more information becomes available I will vote on each appropriation bill as it comes up, to preserve our national security by maintaining our national defense and our national free economy. In considering each bill, however, I shall remember that our country must stay solvent to stay safe.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, after observing the tears shed on the Democratic side of the House over this bill, I have begun to suspect that the crocodile has replaced the donkey as the national emblem of the minority party. So many of these tears have been shed for the rural areas of the United States—as is the custom—that I am constrained to rise and say that I represent in this Congress a district which is almost entirely agricultural. I know what my people want. They want economy and they said so unmistakably on November 5 of last year. There were some California Congressmen who represented rural areas before that date who did not come back because they held to the theories expressed by the Democratic side of this House today. When I go home next time, I am not concerned that I will be asked why I voted for a cut of six billions; I am very much afraid I will be asked why it was not a larger cut.

One concern on the part of the Democrats seems to be about soil conservation. "What are you going to do," asks the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] "about soil conservation?" I will tell you. We are going to ask why $32,000,000 is needed for the administration of the Soil Conservation Act and $38,000,000 for the administration of the AAA Act when they are largely duplicating administrations.

We are going to ask why so much money is to be taken from section 32 funds for some of these agricultural subventions, when in my opinion there is doubt about the need for that much money and greater doubt about the propriety of using their funds for the purpose.

"What are you going to do," cries the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] "about the REA?" I will tell you that too, as one who has supported the extensions of rural power. We are, I hope, going to ask why the REA should go into the district of my neighbor, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and build a power line which duplicates the existing private line, and install a Diesel plant, when it is admitted that the power cannot be sold from that plant as cheaply to the ranchers as the power from the private company. We will ask if tax money is being used for this same purpose, as I am informed, in other States.

"What are we going to do," wails the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] "about school lunches?" I do not know what the gentleman is going to do, but I will tell him what I have already done. A few days ago the Governor of California, whom I consider one of the outstanding governors in this Nation today, was here in Washington. I mentioned the school-lunch program. I pointed out that the Federal Government was $260,000,000,000 in debt, and that the State of California was about $400,000,000 in the clear. I would like to ask those gentlemen who have beaten their hands today against the Democratic Party's wailing wall, if their States do not also have surpluses in their treasuries. We must, in the Congress, weigh relative urgencies. If school lunches are as desirable as I think they are, then I hope my State will weigh that urgency against some of the other things for which the spending of the State surplus is being asked. The way to convince me that a school-lunch program, or a program for farm-to-market roads, is as urgent as we are told, is for the States to appropriate from their own funds for those programs, rather than use the money for subventions to other taxing agencies, or for purposes which, desirable as they may be, could wait a while in this time of national crisis.

So I hope we are going to investigate the Department of Agriculture, just like the other departments—not against the farmers, but at the request of the farmers. I could give other illustrations, but I desire to use my limited time to say to the gentleman from Texas, our distinguished former Speaker, that I am probably—and I say it regretfully—more familiar with Moscow than I am with any city in the great State he represents; and therefore I say to you from personal knowledge that when General Marshall goes to Moscow he should go, after the vote today, with encouragement and a strengthened point of view which he did not have before. It would be good news in Moscow if they were to learn that the United States planned to continue its pathway toward bankruptcy. It will be good news for the United States to have him say in Moscow that we have decided to stop our travels on that pathway and that from now on the Congress of the United States will defend the integrity of this Nation, the integrity of its currency, and the integrity of that form of government under which it became possible for us to support the rest of the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a number of telegrams. They are largely from patriotic organizations throughout the United States, and from the ladies' auxiliaries of these organizations. The people have been reading the press and listening to the radio and they are fully informed as to what is going on in the United States and what is going on in the world. They are people whose integrity cannot be impugned. I wish to read you just one telegram. It is very short. It is from one of these patriotic organizations:

> Our organization strongly urges you to oppose any reduction in the appropriation for the armed forces or veterans' affairs which may be effected in the proposed slash in the Federal budget.

I read that for the reason that these people representing patriotic organizations throughout the country do not want me to abdicate my functions as a legislator. They want me to stand here and see that the armed forces are properly provided for and that the veterans are properly handled in reference to appropriations.

As I conceive my duty today, I feel that a vote to slash $6,000,000,000 off the budget when there remains unanswered adequately the proposition as to whether or not this is going to cripple the national defense is an abdication of my duties as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Armed Service Committee of the House.

I have had a chance that these people have not had to listen behind closed doors to some of the troubles that are menacing the world today. I have had the opportunity to know the weaknesses of our own defense and the strength of the defenses of other nations. This is no time to scuttle our defenses.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy. I intend to vote to eliminate waste and extravagance. I intend to vote to eliminate unnecessary governmental functions and to generally cut down on expenditures. I want an opportunity to decide myself as to what is necessary and what should be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to pose the query, Are the pressure groups at work now? An employee of the War Department whose name I understand is Miss Symonitz, secretary to a Mr. Young, legislative and liaison officer in the Pentagon Building, Extension 71865, called my office at noon today and stated that she was calling from the War Department to say that the Air Reserve training program will be discontinued at the Tulsa Municipal Airport due to fiscal limitations in the 1947 budget.

She further stated that the 70-unit program will be reduced to 41 active Air Reserve training detachments.

Why the call today while this resolution is before us for consideration? It sounds like New Deal bureaucratic reprisal because a number of other Members have had similar calls or warnings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hopes and prayers for the future of the vast majority of workers, farmers, housewives, business and professional people in this Nation are tied to the favorable passage of this resolution. These citizens of our Nation have their eyes on us today seeking the answer to the question how much of their hard-earned money are we going to permit them to keep?

This resolution is the first step in answering that question. It is not the final step because by the very nature of the situation any act of Congress is always subject to subsequent amendment. But while it is not the final step, neither is it an "idle gesture," as has been charged. And, may I add, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle know that it is not an "idle gesture." That is why they are opposing it. It is not an idle gesture but a menacing gesture aimed squarely at the heart of a bureaucratic and wasteful Government. Since that Government contains so many friends and appointees of the opposition it is natural for them to rise in opposition to this move to return sanity to Government.

This resolution is not aimed at the armed forces and veterans. It is aimed at the swarms of "billion dizzy bureaucrats" and tax eaters who are unwilling to readjust themselves to the voice of the people at the last election.

Now, what is the choice here today? What alternative figure does the minority offer? Thirty-five billion? Thirty-four billion? Thirty-two billion? Do they offer thirty-seven and one-half billion—the President's figure? No. Believe it or not but they offer no figure. They do not even support their President. With all the resources of their administration at their command the minority report claims they do not possess sufficient information to arrive at any figure. So they come before this body and admit they have not done their home work and ask that the Reorganization Act be amended so as to give them more time.

So between this definite figure and the request for delay, the opposition offers no real choice to this House or to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat my belief that the hopes of this Nation are tied up with our favorable action in support of this resolution to cut $6,000,000,000 from the administration budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] as he may desire.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the proposed budget cut of $6,000,000,000 for the reason that it is unsupported by finding of fact and moreover because it is arbitrary and may be impossible of fulfillment except at great risk to our national security and to the public services. The fact that it is not based on any disclosed figures makes it dangerous and dubious. Means, too, that the benefits of deserving veterans including hospitalization may be hopelessly endangered. It is known that I am particularly anxious about the armed services and veterans' appropriations since I tried specifically to exempt these two items from budgetary or appropriation cuts. The fact that the majority steam roller without any disclosure or debate crushed the motion, gives cause for apprehension and suspicion of secret and sinister plotting against our veterans and the armed services which means our national safety.

It is charged, and quite properly so, that the $6,000,000,000 figure was taken out of thin air and applied to an already irreducible budget submitted by President Truman and that moreover it is meaningless in that it is not binding upon the Appropriations Committee and the Congress. The proof of this is to be found in the recorded statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], when he said in referring to the magnificent cut and without being prodded that it was just a pious hope and not binding upon us to actually pare the budget as the public is being led to believe.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in sound governmental economy and will go as far as anyone to really reduce unnecessary expenditures, but I want to know where, when, and how big the reductions are to be. I want a bill of particulars, not a nebulous figure taken out of the sky by some Member from provincial Swink, Minn., or Podunk, N. Y. All of this tremendous slashing was done arbitrarily without any public hearings, without the minority of the Budget Committee being present or consulted when the decision was made.

As a member of the Joint Congressional Budget Committee I served on the subcommittee of 20 members and I feel I am entitled not only to know how and when the figure was determined but also to have a part in arriving at a safe and sound amount which the House can accept and the Nation can support with confidence. The $6,000,000,000 figure was a complete surprise to most of the members of the Joint Congressional Budget Committee. We Democrats, of course, were excluded from the inner councils. That is in accord with the autocratic policy of secret and star-chamber proceedings of the Republican Party, temporarily in control of the Congress, but we were as surprised as many Republican Members were shocked to learn that they too were excluded and that only the most faithful among the Republicans were admitted to the inner and secret chamber where sat the wise men from the bucolic hinterland and in the sanctity of the Sanhedrin did sanctimoniously decide against the prodigality of the Army, the Navy, yea, even against the defenders in war of our country, the veterans, so it is admitted in whispers. We hear from the underground and are apprehensive about these eliminations and meat-ax cuts performed in the dark without benefit of any expert advice or testimony of competent witnesses. These mysterious moves will endanger or wipe out school lunches for our needy school children.

Cuts in the appropriations for repair of war-torn highways, the moneys in some instances already allocated as is usual in such highly efficient organizations as we have in our Michigan highway department, will have to be canceled. Rivers and harbors improvements, delayed or curtailed to the danger point during the war, mean nothing to some people living in and representing a dust-bowl constituency. These reduced appropriations might mean strangulation or the death of Great Lakes shipping upon which depend not only our prosperity and security but also that of the Nation. Delayed indispensable public improvements previously authorized and contracted for are doomed. In many instances partially completed projects are deteriorating at an accelerated and costly rate. They will become a total loss unless completed at an early date. For the farmers the cut may be only a Republican gesture and nothing to fear for those representing the farm belt. They will get their usually liberal share of the expenditures first even though the spokesmen for the needs of the rest of the country have to be thrown to the wolves.

Mr. Chairman, my views in the matter of the budget coincide with those of Senators ARTHUR VANDENBERG, CHAN GURNEY, and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and strangely enough square with the idea of ROBERT TAFT about a reduction of approximately $4,500,000,000. I go a step further in this regard, however—I don't want any proposed cut to be a mere and

"pious hope." I want it to be a real cut, not a hoax. I want the figure to rest upon factual findings of unnecessary and wasteful spending and concededly there must be a considerable amount in both categories. Such savings moreover should then be applied first to the reduction of our war debt in a fixed and substantial amount. Tax reductions in the order of need with priority for liberalized dependency exemptions should be the next order of congressional business. Secrecy in these fiscal matters should be forthwith abandoned and public hearings in the good old democratic American way restored. To vote blindly on this proposal is like taking a pot shot in the dark at a cat in a bag. It is dangerous and may be injurious to our own best interests. Ill-considered cuts approved in haste may mean untold losses and subsequent deficiency appropriations. It is not always best to cut most unless the operation is performed expertly with care and knowledge. No Republican has as yet been able to disclose any specific figure as to when or where reductions are to be made. The majority leadership was not at all confident of being able to pan off this cat in the bag upon its own Members and had to call a Republican caucus and was forced to do some plain talking and some whipping to make the boys tractable and responsive.

Why shouldn't there be grave apprehension on all sides and among our military leaders when the plan to cut the budget by $6,000,000,000 really contemplates an over-all reduction for the armed forces alone of $2,225,000,000, in utter disregard of the Nation's safety. Gen. Douglas MacArthur expressed confidence that there would be no move which would prejudice fulfillment of occupation objectives. This may be father to a wish, for he realizes the danger to our youthful forces in the midst of millions of disappointed and depraved Japs who may revert to cannibalism, as they feast upon our forsaken Army. I am not sloppily sentimental about our former enemies. I am following the advice of our experienced and battle-tried leaders who tell us that whatever we might save in nonmilitary and other occupational costs will have to be replaced with other expenditures to cover doubling or tripling our forces in Germany and Japan. I am sure that the parents of our American boys would prefer to keep them at home.

The Director of the Budget reduced the Army and Navy figures substantially before submitting them to the President for his approval. It is said they are the irreducible minimum figures and barely sufficient to maintain our armed forces at safe and efficient levels. Further cuts are considered unjustified and dangerous. They are opposed by Chief of Staff Dwight D. Eisenhower and Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz, who believe our national prestige and security would be endangered at this time in proportion to the budget cut.

Defense appropriations are not in themselves necessarily sacrosanct, but it is argued they should be held inviolate for the time being for psychological if for no other reason. We must do nothing to weaken or undermine Secretary of State Marshall on the eve of the important Moscow Conference. If we appear strong and determined Joe Stalin will understand, for it is the only language that will register and make an impression. A good deal made at Moscow now will permit us in all probability to recapture even more at a later date than the amount of the present proposed defense cut. Any cut, large or small, could be justified, however, only upon the signing of agreements guaranteeing peace and security. The present proposed reduction comes prematurely and at the wrong time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to convince anyone on this floor by my remarks, and because I can fail to convince in a short time as well as in a longer one, I shall not ask for any extended time in which to make this statement. I make it, however, so that my position on this resolution will be known.

If this resolution expresses merely a hope that we can cut tne budget by $6,000,000,000 I would like to amend it so that such expression of hope be increased to at least twice that sum. If it indicates, however, a real possibility of cutting the Budget by such sum, then I submit it is incumbent upon the proponents of the resolution to show where the Budget can be cut, and by how much it can be cut in each instance. That has not yet been shown. I cannot vote for this resolution—much as I would like to cut the Budget—until it is shown how it can be reduced without endangering essential Government functions and without curtailing progress in furnishing essential and necessary social services.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have, as a Member of Congress, serving the people of the Fifth District of Louisiana, sought to carefully consider all phases of the important question now facing us—the proposed $6,000,000,000 Budget cut.

I realize, and I recognize, that it is not at all impossible to affect a tremendous saving in our National Government by judicious and wise elimination of wasteful and extravagant expenditures on the part of some of the agencies of our Government.

I must confess that I am not unduly exercised over reports from the War and Navy Departments. These and other departments can be run on smaller budgets than those proposed, without affecting the strength or efficiency of any of them.

But, seeking to represent my people, and bring back to them sound and economical administration of their Government, I find that the proponents of this resolution have brought this resolution to the floor with a closed rule as to where these Budget cuts will be applied. There is to be no examination of the facts. Cuts are to be made at will and without the slightest consideration of all of the representatives of the people.

So far as I know, all public-works expenditures, including funds for flood control so vitally needed in my district, may be omitted. This may also apply to agriculture and to the free school-lunch program. I certainly could not support a measure that may eliminate from my district all of these just benefits.

I had until today made up my mind that the Budget cut was justified, but when I am denied the right to cast an intelligent ballot for lack of information, then I feel it my duty to my people to oppose this strange method of budget adjustment. I shall cast my ballot against this reduction.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I include the following telegram and letter regarding the resolution under consideration:

CHARLOTTE, N. C., *February 20, 1947.*

Hon. HAMILTON C. JONES,
House of Representatives Office Building:

Charlotte Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association of United States, is strongly opposed to proposed reduction of national budget allowances for the armed services, the immediate and lasting effect of which will be seriously to endanger our capacity for essential defense and accomplishment of our occupation mission. We urge your continued opposition to measures which repeat so soon the near-fatal mistakes made after World War I.

E. A. TERRELL, Jr.,
President, Charlotte Chapter, R. O. A.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
February 16 1947.

Hon. HAMILTON C. JONES,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Three and one-half million men who fought our country's two world wars know from first-hand experience the value of national security and the folly of unpreparedness.

These veterans are righteously alarmed at the prospect of further reducing the strength of our armed forces. Such reductions are implied by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee's irrationally recommended $6,000,000,000 cut in the national budget.

They vigorously oppose the reported slice of $2,250,000,000 for the armed forces, including a cut of $750,000,000 which would destroy the naval reserve training program and preclude further developments in naval aeronautics; the proposed slash of $500,000,000 intended to feed the starving people in occupied countries whose behavior might otherwise necessitate the expense of additional troops; the terrific hacking away of Air Force funds, and the $200,000,000 reduction in the Veterans' Administration appropriations. They are appalled to learn that their Government contemplates sabotage of the proposed universal military training program, recommended by high Government officials and demanded by the public, through a $1,000,000,000 cut in Army appropriations.

Are we to discard already the lessons learned in the last war?

After each war we have adopted the penny-wise, pound-foolish philosophy which has reduced our armed forces to impotency. Our token forces in occupied countries are now dangerously near tourist strength. Through our weakness after each war we have invited aggression. These world wars created the heavy taxes which Congress is now trying to

reduce. Wars are responsible for the enormous public debt.

For more than a century and a half America has refused to make the small sacrifices in peacetime which would have prevented such great sacrifices in men and money. As a result this Nation, whose people cherish peace, has found itself regularly at war.

Must we again confess our guilt in weakening ourselves in the eyes of the whole world and rendering ourselves incapable of securing in peace our wartime victory?

Are we to ignore our international commitments to the extent that our representatives at peace parleys become the targets for contemptuous mockery by nations which have remained strong and influential?

In this critical and turbulent hour a world of nations watches us to see what action we will take to maintain our leadership in world affairs. There is a solemn and sacred obligation upon America to remain strong until a permanent, feasible peace plan is established.

We must not permit America's insurance policy to expire at this uncertain hour.

The American Legion has always been a proponent of economy in government. It detests red tape and bureaucratic bungling that penalizes taxpayers and prevents good government. The American Legion is confident, however, that economy achieved at the expense of security or veterans is no economy at all.

May I respectfully remind Congress that it is directed by the United States Constitution to provide for the common defense of the several States.

If the issue involved must be resolved by guaranteeing citizens their constitutional rights or fulfillment of campaign pledges, there can be only one American answer.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. GRIFFITH,
National Commander.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, once in a while we read an editorial in a newspaper with which we thoroughly agree. On yesterday my attention was called to an expression in the Christian Science Monitor editorializing on the resolution which is now before the House. As we all know, this newspaper is not and never has been isolationist. It has always believed in and advocated strong national defense and an adequate Army and Navy. In these circumstances its utterances on budget cutting are particuluarly pertinent. The editorial of February 15, 1947, to which I refer reads as follows:

THE BUDGET WILL BE CUT

It is absolutely essential to take a positive stand on the question of reducing Federal expenditures. We therefore welcome the news that the House-Senate Budgetary Committee has voted to cut President Truman's budget by $6,000,000,000.

The Committee rejected a plan to keep hands off the proposed appropriations for the armed services. This is common sense, for military expenses ought not to be considered sacrosanct. This newspaper has urged great care in cutting provisions for the Army and Navy. Congress will do well to give the most serious attention to the warnings of General Eisenhower and Secretary Marshall about the dangers of weakening the United States' military-diplomatic position in the world.

But it would be foolish to assume that there are no unnecessary expenditures, no extravagances by the armed services. Indeed, considering the fact that proposed expenditures per man are about $1,000 more for next year than at present and will exceed even the naturally wasteful wartime rate, the burden of proof is rather on the other side. We have great sympathy with the feeling of the Army and Navy that they are neglected in peacetime and then called upon suddenly to do the impossible. But the next five years are likely to be the safest in the coming quarter century. With materials short, military construction should be kept to a minimum.

The plan of the budgetary subcommittee to slice $1,750,000,000 off military expenditures looks rather like a meat-ax gesture. But some definite limit has to be fixed. The services themselves would undoubtedly find places for saving if they found they had to do it. We hope Congress will not cut recklessly, but we are glad to see a determination to cut.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not vote for a $6,000,000,000 cut that I thought was going to destroy our national defense or weaken our position in bringing about that which I hope will be a lasting peace. I would not vote to cut the Budget by any specific amount simply because someone in my party made personal commitments during a political campaign. Under the new Reorganization Act it is mandatory that the House-Senate Budgetary Committee report to Congress a tentative budget for the coming fiscal year. This does not mean that the hands of the Congress are tied or that the Congress is prohibited from appropriating more than the amount estimated in the Budget report if, in the wisdom of the Congress, after more mature deliberation, it is thought that the welfare of the country demands that the Budget ceiling be raised.

In short, $6,000,000,000 is the amount which the Budgetary Committee feels can be eliminated from the Presidential estimate for the year 1948, and still provide sufficient funds for the national defense and the carrying on of all essential activities of the Federal Government. Maybe this committee is wrong, but I am not ready to say that it is wrong until I have some proof to that effect. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in voting for this resolution I am not casting a political vote. Neither am I precluding myself or the Congress from appropriating every dollar that is later found essential to our national defense and our national well-being. There is a vast difference between desirable activities on the part of the Government and essential activities. Fine furniture and eloquent drapes add much to the looks and the comfort of the home, yet these things are entirely out of place unless there is something in the pantry and unless the kitchen larder is stocked with the essentials of life. This principle of sane, budgetary housekeeping must be applied to our Government and the declarations contained in the resolution now before us expresses an intention and a determination on the part of Congress to adopt this common-sense philosophy of economy and thrift. I shall, therefore, vote for this resolution. I hope that the $6,000,000,000 cut is possible, but, remember, this resolution makes it an objective and not a fixed amount from which we cannot deviate.

Yes, this is an objective to be devoutly hoped for and I, for one, shall do what I can to accomplish the purpose, conditioned only on the necessities which I have just suggested.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES].

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, I give my full support to the pending resolution to reduce the proposed budget by $6,000,000,000 and to limit expenditures during the coming fiscal year to $31,500,000,000.

I wonder how the frugal Jackson, whose birthday the Members of the minority party used to celebrate so expensively, would vote on this economy issue if he were in this House today.

Every Member of this House has a personal budget. He knows that he is obliged at the beginning of each year to estimate his income and to plan to limit his expenditures. I see no reason why that principle, which I have been taught all my life is a sound one, cannot be applied to the business and activities of the Federal Government. It will be, with the adoption of this resolution.

Not one Member on the majority side has advocated or favors any limitation upon the budget which would in any degree weaken the armed forces or prejudice our national security, and yet from the Democratic side of the aisle has come a veritable tirade of charges that the object of this resolution is to take away from the United States that security which every one of us who has seen service in her behalf would lay down his life to protect. No man who has looked at the white crosses over American graves in foreign lands, or who has seen and shared in the bitter hardships and the tragic losses in American lives overseas would vote for any measure which in any degree impaired the efficiency of our defenses. Mr. Chairman, I would not do so under any circumstances.

The tumult of protest from the other side of the House is calculated to terrify the people into believing that the budget cut proposed by this resolution will leave the Nation virtually unarmed and helpless. Nothing could be further from the truth. But their real objective is to distract attention from the myriad extravagances and wasteful expenditures which require careful scrutiny and drastic action by the Congress.

No, Mr. Chairman, the people of my district and the people of the United States will not feel insecure if we fix a budget ceiling which contemplates elimination of Navy expenditures for the specially designed silver sugar bowls and the fancy cut glass we learned about a few minutes ago. Nor will they feel imperiled if we undertake to find out why the War and Navy Departments need two civilian employees for every three men who are in uniform. As of January 1 last there were in the two services 1,100,000 civilian employees and 1,600,000 men and women on duty in uniform.

The basic mistake of the minority in the debate today is their position that this resolution fixes ceilings upon particular appropriations. Obviously it

cannot, and it does not attempt to do so. The amounts to be made available to the several executive departments, including the War and Navy Departments, can only be determined by the appropriation bill ultimately enacted by this House after the Appropriations Committee has considered all of the information furnished by the departments as to their requirements. What we are doing today is fixing an over-all limit within which we shall strive to contain our total expenditures for all purposes. After the profligate spending which became a habit during the New Deal it is no wonder that that seems like a strange and inconvenient procedure to the gentlemen on the other side.

The thirty-one and five-tenths billion dollar budget which will result from this resolution is still a terrible burden for the American people to carry.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority whip, has warned us that trimming the budget to that size will cause headaches and will hurt. Of course, it will. What else could be expected in this morning after the long night of reckless and unrestrained Government waste and extravagance?

The people have demanded economy. Common sense requires that there shall be far more than a token cut in the cost of government, and that the first application of the savings shall be to the reduction of the gigantic national debt. We cannot approach economy timidly, nor can we afford to temporize or compromise with extravagance.

With the conviction that neither our national defense nor our diplomatic position will be endangered by the proposed budget ceiling, I urge the adoption of the resolution. By that action we shall fulfill our covenant with the American people that our Nation shall be secure and our economy shall be strong.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, during the last election campaign I pledged to the people of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of New York, which is in Bronx County, that I would work for drastic reduction in the size, cost, and power of the huge bureaucracies which are bossing the people and wasting their money.

The people of my district elected me on that program. That district had been represented by Democrats for the previous 26 years. My constituents felt so strongly about what was happening to their country that they felt constrained to reverse that custom. They expressed the wish for economy in government and I intend today to redeem the pledge which I made last November to the people who sent me here to do just that.

There are 12 Republican platform planks which I held out to the people. I take pleasure in checking another one off today. The others will follow in like procedure.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I suspect that in some quarters on the minority side a concern for the pending fate of some constituents about to be lopped from the pay roll, or for some pet projects about to be reduced, lies concealed beneath an asserted concern for the national defense. I am inclined to question whether the real concern of my friends on the minority side about this resolution is in national defense or local political fences.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman should not lump them all in; there are a lot on that side that are with us.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Those that are with us, of course, we welcome. We are glad to have them.

There are two points of view here: One, those who favor economy, and, two, those who favor economy—but. I am taking my stand on the side of those who favor economy, period; and I shall support this measure. So many persons have protested that they voted with us in the past to reduce appropriations that one wonders why, with so much help we are supposed to have had, why more of these appropriation cuts proposed by Republicans when we were in the minority were not successful. Had you Democrats helped us then, the budget would not be so great a headache now.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, certainly the most important business before this Congress concerns budget and taxes—the sinister siamese twins which so disturb the peaceful sleep of all sincere statesmen.

It is futile for us to bleat pious platitudes about freedom and liberty, the Bill of Rights, and so forth, if we are unable or unwilling to establish the conditions of economic freedom within which alone political and social freedom can exist with security. Without economic freedom, political and social freedom soon becomes meaningless. Witness the examples of Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy.

Economic freedom will not long survive the appalling burden of wartime expenditures and taxes. If these are continued indefinitely at present levels, then economic disaster, to be followed by some kind of a totalitarianism, in the not too distant future, is almost inevitable.

The newly created Legislative Budget Committee has made a valiant start in the direction of cutting down Government outlay. This is no time to repudiate that committee and its component members in the most thankless and painful of all public tasks.

On the contrary, the Budget Committee and our own House Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], are entitled to an expression of confidence from the House and a fair opportunity to prove their case. That opportunity will come with the individual appropriation bills. At this stage of the proceedings there should be only cheers.

We have no right to assume that the Appropriation Committee will be unmindful of the essential necessities of our Military and Navy Departments. Nor on the other hand have we any right to abdicate our own power over the national purse by giving the Army and Navy, or any other department of Government, a free hand to fix their own appropriations. This House cannot escape that ultimate responsibility, and I am confident it can be safely counted upon to provide adequate funds for the essential services of national defense.

This resolution should be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, President Truman, in his annual message and budget, told the Congress that it would require $37,500,000,000 to carry on the activities of the Federal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948.

In the Legislative Reorganization Act, passed last year and approved by President Truman August 2, 1946, when the Democrats had a majority in both Houses, it was provided that the House and Senate set up a joint committee on the legislative budget. It also provided that this Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget should make a careful study and determine what the Federal revenues would amount to for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and the necessary expenditures to operate the Government for that fiscal year. It required this committee to make a written report to the Congress not later than February 15 of each fiscal year. This Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget was named. It was made up of 102 Members of the House and Senate. This committee appointed a subcommittee of 20 members from the House and Senate. Five of the high-ranking and long-experienced members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and five from the Finance Committee of the Senate, five from the Appropriations Committee of the House and five from the Senate made up this subcommittee. We know all of these members well. Each of them have had many years experience on matters of revenues and expenditures of the Government. After hearing the representatives of the various departments and agencies of the Government, they filed their report with the full committee of 102 members and the full committee, after further consideration, submitted the report of the full committee and directed that there be introduced a resolution setting forth the approximate amount of revenues and the amount of expenditures during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. This report of the full committee was adopted by a vote of nearly 2 to 1.

Pursuant to the report of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 20. The report and the resolution declare that the revenues collected by the Federal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, will approximate thirty-nine billion one hundred million and the expenditures of that fiscal year should not exceed thirty-one billion five hundred million. The President, in

the Budget submitted by him to the Congress for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, asserts that the expenditure will amount to thirty-seven billion five hundred million. This Joint Legislative Budget Committee declares that expenditures will not exceed thirty-one billion five hundred million. In other words, the Budget Committee insists that President Truman is asking for six billion more than is necessary. At the conclusion of the debate and the disposition of the motion to recommit, if the minority should desire to submit such a motion, we shall be called upon to vote for or against reducing the President's budget by six billion, or in other words, voting for a budget of thirty-one and a half billion or thirty-seven and a half billion.

Our Democrat friends have made many speeches against the cut of six billion but so far as I have heard, they have not indicated the amount, if any, they would cut from the President's budget of thirty-seven and a half billion. We are now confronted with a condition and not a theory. We have admitted national obligations of two hundred and sixty billion. We also have many, many billions of contingent liabilities. We have the highest taxes that this country or any other nation has ever had. We have had 17 consecutive years of deficits. The President has told us that there will be a deficit for the present fiscal year, which began July 1, 1946, and which ends June 30, 1947, of approximately two billion. The present fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, is chargable to the action of the last Democratic Congress and the present Democratic administration. The Eightieth Congress will now provide for the revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. What business concern could survive with 17 consecutive years of deficits?

The Democrats got control of the Congress March 4, 1931, and the executive branch in 1933. They have been warned again and again of the results of this persistent and consistent spending in excess of our income. We well remember how Mr. Roosevelt and the Democrats denounced the heavy expenditures of President Hoover. President Hoover's administration in no year, even in the worst depression this country ever saw, expended approximately four billion in a single year. In at least three of the years of his administration, he spent approximately three billion each year.

President Roosevelt, in his most extravagant years of spending and wasting, never did expend more than about thirteen billion in any one year in peacetime. Now President Truman says he must have thirty-seven and a half billion to spend in a peacetime year, and he and his Democrat supporters in the House claim that if we reduce his budget request, that we will interfere with the efficiency of the Government and injure our armed forces. If we cut one and one-half billion as charged by the Democrats, the armed services with the money they now have will have at their disposal over 15 billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. This sum is three-fourths of the cost of World War I at time of signing of the Armistice. Are not our Democrat friends more alarmed over loss of a million political jobs? The useless officeholders are also alarmed.

Many well-informed persons say that his budget could be cut ten billion. The Republicans in the 1946 elections promised the American people that they, if given control of Congress, would cut expenditures, pay something on the national debt, balance the budget and reduce taxes. Many, many Democrats, in order to allay the feelings of the American people, also promised to cut expenditures, balance the budget, pay something on the national debt, and reduce taxes.

In letters and public addresses I made such a promise to the people of my district and I shall vote for the six-billion cut in order to carry out that promise to the people of my district and in response to the mandate they gave to me and to the Republicans elected to the House and Senate.

INSOLVENCY AND INFLATION

It does not take a wise man to see that if we continue to spend more than we take in, the inevitable results must be an insolvent government, the destruction of the faith of our people in our Government, accompanied with uncontrolled inflation. If we cannot reduce our expenditures, balance the Budget, and begin paying on our national debt in this period of prosperity, when can we hope to do this very thing? But for the reckless waste and extravagance of the Democratic administrations through the years and their persistent practice of being the Santa Claus for the world, our country would not be in its present deplorable condition.

The American people have seen their tax burdens and their national debt increase year by year. They have seen their tax and bond money squandered and wasted on boondoggling projects to promote the political fortunes of their party and nominees, and they now propose that the Republicans follow that same course. In this, they will be sadly disappointed. The American people have voted for a change, not merely of officeholders, but a change to economy, honesty, and efficiency in government. They want their Government placed on a solvent basis. They want their debt decreased and not increased. They insist that their tax burdens must be reduced. They insist that waste and inefficiency must stop and that the money paid by them to the Government, through toil and sweat, be not wasted, or to continue to be the Santa Claus for the world.

They are now trying to alarm the people. They say we now have an emergency. In fact, the New Deal administrations have been experts in creating emergencies in the public mind. Every time we attempted to reduce the tax burden and stop going into debt, they pulled an emergency out of the hat. They now say that we propose to weaken our armed forces in this cut of six billion. It is the desire and purpose of every Republican to vote for such sum or sums as may be necessary to provide adequately for our armed forces. Everyone in a position to know does know that there has been a great deal of unnecessary waste in our armed forces. They are engaged in civilian activities of every kind and character in this country and throughout the world. They have hundreds of thousands of civilian workers. Most of them are unnecessary. They are pouring out the American people's property and money with a lavish hand to various groups and nations throughout the world.

While this Nation has been very generous in dealing with needy people, the American people are beginning to wonder if this is to continue forever. We have been borrowing the money with which to act as Santa Claus. We are having very little trouble with the people of Japan, Germany, and Italy—our enemies in World War II. We are pouring out these billions to countries for which we gave so much American blood and treasure, but who now insist on raising insurrections, carrying on revolutions and warfare among themselves and even threatening our own country. Is it now about time for us to say to these people, "We came to your rescue; we saved you; we have helped you for 2 years or more since the end of war to get on your feet. Now, you must quit fighting and raising hell and go to producing for yourselves and relieve our country of those burdens." We cannot continue to carry these burdens for the people all over the world.

We already have the largest debt of any country in the world and the heaviest tax burden. It will take the American people a hundred years to liquidate the debt that we now owe. If this debt is ever paid and we avoid insolvency, inflation, and finally, repudiation, we must put our house in order. The time was when we only had a few million income-tax payers in this country. We now have approximately 40,000,000. An overwhelming majority of these are wage earners, teachers, and others working for wages or salaries. The cost of collecting the taxes from millions of these wage earners and salaried workers is more than the taxes received, but, it does furnish jobs for thousands of office holders. These persons should be cut from the tax rolls and these unnecessary office holders cut from the pay rolls. We have at least a million of useless office holders. We not only have to pay their salaries but we pay hundreds of millions of dollars annually in expenses incurred by them. In fact, they cost us now about $7,000,000,000 a year.

We must turn our backs on the policy of "Tax and tax, spend and spend, increase and increase our national debt." If we continue to go into debt and sell more and more bonds, what will happen one of these days when the people finally lose faith in the solvency of this Government and there is a mad rush to cash the hundreds of billions of dollars worth of bonds and securities that are now outstanding? We must reduce taxes so as to encourage people to invest their money in productive and job-making enterprises. Who wants to risk his money in job-making enterprises under present conditions? Therefore, let us reduce the expenditures by six billion and thereby balance the budget, pay a reasonable sum on our national debt and reduce taxes. This is the only sane, safe, and

honest course to pursue. We must put our own house in order. Any other course threatens the very life of our Nation and the welfare of the 140,000,000 American people, and, of course, this includes our defenders and their dependents, the workers, the needy, our farmers, and each and every one of us.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, as a woman, I would like to speak on the subject of Government economy from the angle of the average housewife. The women of this country realize the plain fact, that political economy is simply household economy on a large scale. First, they realize fully that money is money, whether you are dealing in dollars by the hundreds, or by the billions.

Money is nothing but a token representing the sweat and toil of some individual. The fallacy that Government can give food, jobs, or anything else, is the biggest hoax that has ever been put over on mankind.

Every cent of Government money is taken from the people through taxes; every cent of that money has been earned by the people, and belongs to the people, and should be accounted for, to the people.

This budget, the largest peacetime budget ever offered to a civilized nation, can well be cut. In my humble opinion it can well be cut more than the $6,000,000,000 which the Republican Party is asking for.

This budget can be cut by doing just two things; eliminating waste and extravagance in all Government services. No service need be curtailed, the efficiency of no service needs to be in any way jeopardized. After all, our last peacetime budget under the late President, who was by no means famous for economy, was $13,500,000,000.

And now, the present members of the late President's party in this House, tell us that it is impossible to render the necessary services to our people with a peacetime budget of $31,500,000,000.

The women of the United States know enough about household economy to realize that this waste and extravagance must stop. As a result, no one will suffer. Waste and extravagance never produced efficiency.

We can have efficiency, we can have a balanced budget, we can make substantial payments for the retirement of the debt.

The housewives of America, regardless of party, know this, and I believe they are demanding it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, with the assurance that the appropriations which are necessary and justifiable for the armed services will be taken care of, I shall support this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, my stand on national defense, not only the present and future but also the past, is well known to the majority of the membership of this House and to organized veterans. For many years it has been my good fortune to be privileged to serve my State and Nation as a member of the New York National Guard. As a past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it has also been my high privilege to have assisted in the formation of their programs for many years, a program dedicated to the policy of an adequate national defense.

I am deeply concerned with adequate and justifiable appropriations not only for the Regular Establishments but also for the National Guard and Reserve. To my mind this is no time to be lacking in an adequate national defense, and while speaking in behalf of such adequate national defense, I also speak out against the tremendous waste of funds which from time to time appears on the surface and the careless and bungling manner in which the administration of some programs are carried out. It certainly does not make sense to me that during the time we were waging war there were some 10,500 colonels on active duty in an Army of over 8,000,000 while today, with the Army a little over 1,000,000 men, there are still some 6,500 full colonels on active duty.

Today I am supporting the resolution before us on the grounds that justifiable appropriations will be granted to the services and also for the reason that even with these appropriations, we will still be able to save the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars. Too much money has been spent in a wasteful and vicious manner during the past 14 years and the time has come to retrench.

During my campaign last fall I promised support to a program of sound economy in governmental expenditures and this promise I intend to carry out. With a sound economy program in expenditures, we will be able to support the program of an adequate national defense. To carry out such an economy program, every request for funds from any source whatsoever must be scrutinized to the limit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to support this resolution which seeks to fix a limit on Federal expenditures of $31,500,000,000. My only regret is that the amount is not lower, but it is my hope that the Appropriations Committee will find it possible, as the hearings continue, to effect savings to a point where the limitation will not be in excess of $25,000,000,000. It can be done; it should be done.

There has been a lot of talk here today, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that the adoption of this resolution will impair the military services. I have heard no reliable statement from the Democrats as to just how this would happen. We do have, on the other hand, the positive statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] that cuts can be made in the budget for the military without hurting the efficiency of the services one iota. Our colleague from Michigan is the best informed man in the country on the military budget, and we can rely on his statements. When he tells us that the military budget, including civilian functions, can be cut $1,500,000,000 and still provide an Army of 1,070,000 men, plus an Air Force of 400,000, I will take his word for it, because he knows what he is talking about. A few days ago General Spaatz, Chief of the Air Force, is reported to have said:

> Well, if ENGEL says we can have an efficient Air Force with the money allowed us in the Budget, then I am satisfied we will have.

What greater testimonial can a Member of this House receive? I recommend that all Members read the statement of our distinguished colleague as he gave it here today.

We can cut some more, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that the great chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and his coworkers will show the country that we intend to reduce the cost of government and at the same time make adequate provision for the armed services and implementation of our foreign policy. It can be done; it must and will be done.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I am a veteran of both World Wars. Furthermore, my son volunteered for military service and is a private in the Army Air Forces. My family has a continuous record of service in the armed forces from Colonial days. I am intensely interested in national defense. However, we can reduce the Budget by $6,000,000,000 and still maintain adequate defense and carry on all of the essential functions of our Government. As a matter of fact, I believe that we are being entirely too generous and that we are not cutting the Budget enough. I believe and I hope that this is just one step toward reducing waste in Government and unnecessary expenditures. The people of this country are tired of carrying such a heavy tax burden.

I am mindful of the fact that the people of my district sent me to Congress because they want economy in Government, elimination of wasteful bureaucracy, a substantial payment on the national debt and a reduction of personal income taxes. The same can be said for the majority of Members in the Eightieth Congress.

Of course, we want adequate funds for national defense. In providing these funds, we believe that we can eliminate some of the frills that are unnecessary to national defense. I spent 7 years of my life as an officer of the United States Navy. I have a high regard for the Navy. At the same time, I had occasion to see waste in the Navy and know that economy can be effected which will enable the Navy to operate more efficiently.

I believe it will have a wholesome effect on the rest of the world when they learn that the United States of America has come to its senses and intends to return to some sort of frugality which has made this country strong. By our action today in indicating our desire to effect sensible economies, we shall regain to a slight extent the respect of other nations. We are starting, I hope, on the road to solvency and turning away from the path that leads only to bankruptcy. Let us hope that this will give notice that our

country is returning to some degree of sanity.

As I have previously said, the people of this country want us to reduce the staggering debt, reduce taxes, return to industry some of the vast number of people unnecessarily on the Federal pay roll and get back to a sound economy. As long as I am in Congress I shall work to this end and urge others to do the same thing.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any blanket reduction in the Budget which will effect any arbitrary cuts in the national-defense program.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have made it my business to familiarize myself with our defense requirements and our program for meeting those requirements.

So far as the Army and Air Forces are concerned, I am convinced that the War Department's program for 1948 does not even begin to meet the real requirements of defense based on a realistic appraisal of our world situation. They are skating on very thin ice indeed. Their safety factors have been cut so low that any further reductions—particularly arbitrary ones without specifying exactly where and how reductions are to be made—would be little less than suicidal.

This is a strong statement, but I earnestly believe it is supported by the facts. Let us look at these facts for a moment.

The Ground Army is furnishing the occupation governments. Some 125,000,000 aliens are being administered in all phases of national government by 350,000 Army personnel. General MacArthur has said, "Send me men or send me food." If we are going to starve these people, we are going to have to govern them by force, or we are going to have to pull out of there.

Now, the way to pull out is to pull out, not to give lip service to full nonpartisan support of our international commitments and our foreign policy and then cripple our forces abroad by voting for this blanket reduction which, I understand, will necessitate a reduction of both the men and food which General MacArthur and General Clay say they must have to do their job. If this body is going to belie its words by its action, I will not be a party to such action.

The way this cut is proposed gentlemen can say, "Oh, we do not propose to cut the men and food for the occupation." Now that is just what I want to know. If you are not going to cut the feet from under our foreign policy by cutting the occupation where are you going to cut?

The Ground and Service Forces of the Army are almost 100 percent in support of the occupation mission and in support of the Air Forces. We are almost literally without any ground combat reserves. There are fewer men under arms in this country today than there were a year before Pearl Harbor.

If you are not going to cut the occupation but insist on imposing this blanket reduction, I will tell you where you are going to cut. You are going to cut the Army Air Forces and scientific research and development—those are the only places left to cut.

Now, I have the greatest faith and confidence in General Spaatz and General Eaker. I think that our Army airmen make up one of the finest body of men the country has ever seen. When they tell me that this cut will reduce the Air Forces in this country to only three groups, I believe them. And when they tell me this cut will stymie the modernization program of our Air Forces, I believe them. If we cannot believe these men who saved our skins in 1943 and 1944, who are we going to believe?

Now, if you believe them, are you still going to vote for a measure which will take our greatest military advantage—air power—and throw it out of the window? I, for one, refuse to do so. I have never talked to a single military expert who did not believe that air power will be the decisive factor in any future world conflict. It can be the means of preventing the early possibility of any such conflict. Are we going to deliberately tear up that insurance policy? I, for one, refuse to do so.

If we do not cut the occupation and do not cut our air power, what is left? Scientific research and development. Gentlemen know that our scientific research coupled with our air power brought about an early end to World War II. Gentlemen know that there is an international race for supremacy in the scientific weapons of the future. Today we have the advantage in that race but we can lose that advantage tomorrow if we deliberately take away the money from our military-scientific research teams. The present Budget figure for this purpose is already alarmingly low. Any further cut here represents a criminal disregard of the lessons of the fall of France, Pearl Harbor, and Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I, for one, refuse to be a party to any such blind recklessness.

Now, if we do not cut our occupation or our air power or our research and development there is very little left to cut. Doubtless economies can be effected by increased efficiency and we should insist on those economies. But the way to effect that is by a critical analysis of each item, not by any blanket cut which—applied to already dangerously low defense programs—must of necessity cripple those programs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that anyone who has the security of this country at heart and who understands our military requirements and program will vote as I will vote against this dangerous and arbitrary proposal.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, today is a fateful day in the history of the United States and of the world. The overwhelming Republican majority in this House has decided without benefit of debate, by employing the gag rule, to arbitrarily slash the budget of the Government of the United States in the amount of $6,000,000,000. Today is indeed fateful, and possibly even tragic, because the action comes in spite of and in the face of warnings by the great leaders who now control the affairs of our Army and Navy and State Departments. It comes in spite of the fact that the majority of the people have expressed grave doubts and fears about its advisability. It comes at a time when all the rest of the world is facing economic chaos and when the British Empire, which has been one of the bulwarks of free enterprise and free government is crumbling throughout the world, and while France and western Europe totter on the brink of communism. It comes at a time when aggressive and expansionist Russian ideology directed by the Red rulers of the Kremlin is on the march everywhere in the world.

It comes, too, without benefit of hearings or without the essential testimony that must be gathered to determine whether it be wise or unwise.

Throughout the capitals of the world it can only be interpreted as a return to traditional short-sighted, war-causing, Republican isolationism. When this vote is taken this afternoon and the gentlemen of the majority have voted in favor of the cut, the message goes out to the capitals of the world, to the peoples who still have a flicker of hope in democracy, as well as to those who are dedicated to its destruction, that the voice and the power of this great democracy is being silenced. It goes out as a message to the world that we are back on the way to stupid, ill-advised, ill-conceived disarmament, and that the beautiful, hopeful, dream of peace may not be realized. Specifically and immediately it takes from General Marshall, our magnificent Secretary of State, his greatest weapon when he meets in Moscow a few weeks hence and attempts to bargain with the men of the Kremlin who understand power, and power alone.

It is not surprising that the first real action of this Republican Congress should be to return America to isolationism and to destroy the power of America. Our Republican colleagues are being consistent. After all, does not history record the sad fact that immediately following the First World War they scuttled the peace machinery that was established? Is it not a fact that they immediately set up the most outrageous tariffs and trade barriers that the country had ever known, so that trade and commerce were stifled throughout the world and our ships lay idle and our ports were desolate? And as a result, hunger and starvation and unemployment soon stalked the world, breeding the dictatorships of Europe which brought about World War II and its train of death, destruction, and despair? Is it not a fact that the same Republican leadership which advocates destroying the power of America here today gave us the phony prosperity of 1929 and the bleak, desolate, despairing depression that followed? Is it not a fact that this same leadership fought every constructive measure to bring America out of that depression? And is it not a fact that this same leadership told us in 1940, after Hitler had conquered practically all of Europe, after France and the Lowlands lay under the despot's heel, that selective service was not necessary, that lend-lease was not required, that all of the

measures essential to the welfare and to the protection and preparation of this Nation should not be enacted? Yes, my colleagues, this is that same blind, unthinking leadership in action. But it is difficult to believe, and I for one do not believe, that the American people, confronted with the awful realities of atomic power, guided missiles, and aggressive and expansionist communism, will tolerate the step that is being taken here today.

It may be good that it comes now, because America has the opportunity to recognize once again its false leaders, who in their mad desire to protect special interests would again destroy the security of this Nation, bring about economic chaos everywhere, and make possible the unbelievable calamity of a Third World War.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] made the statement that if he erred in his vote today he wanted it to be on the side of national economy. If I err on my vote today, I want it to be on the side of national security. Only a few minutes ago we witnessed a demonstration of what I regard as the inconsistency of our Republican friends. The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] arose and complained bitterly that the War Department had only today advised him that the Air Reserve Training program in his own city of Tulsa was to be discontinued.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to yield so early in the course of my remarks, but I will.

Mr. TABER. The idea, which I do not think the gentleman stressed, is that this call from the War Department was received today. That was the point.

Mr. THOMASON. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, as long as a month ago, I believe all the members of the Committee on the Armed Services were advised that the War Department was then prepared to abandon some 30 or 40 Air Reserve posts, and one of them happens to be in my own city of El Paso, Tex.

I make no serious complaint about it if that, in the judgment of the War Department, is necessary to come within the Budget and also to meet adequate requirements for the national defense. My feeling today is that if we ever bought a pig in a poke, this is it. If there was ever a shot in the dark, it is happening today. I yield to no man in my desire for economy. I am for eliminating all unnecessary bureaus, discharging all unnecessary personnel, doing away with all war agencies that have served their purpose, but I repeat, I am not for injuring or damaging the national defense, which I undertake to say this measure will do if you carry out your threats and intentions.

No man here received a mandate from his people at the election last fall to cripple national defense at this critical time. No man received a mandate from his people to vote against all appropriations for soil conservation, rural electrification, meritorious dams, harbors, flood control, and things of that sort. We did receive a mandate that we should practice economy in this Congress, and that is exactly what I expect to vote for, but I demand a bill of particulars. I do not propose to vote blindfolded.

You would think from some of the speeches today that this country is just about broke and in bankruptcy. You would think that the Government of the United States was set up as a money-making enterprise, a profit-making business. Government is established to serve its people, provide educational facilities, transportation, communications, national defense, postal service, roads, parks, and things of that character.

Speaking of the country being almost broke, as some would have us believe, I undertake to say that the country was never so prosperous in all of its history. There never was no much money in the banks; there never was so much employment; there never was so much prosperity and, in fact, too much easy money and high living. People are riding in new automobiles; most people wearing good clothes. As one of my colleagues commented today, the women spent $200,000,000 last year for hats alone. We are living in a country where no enemy bomb was dropped and no property destroyed. We are the only country in the world today that has not suffered the ravages of war in the sense of not having been attacked. Now, the Republican leaders bring us a proposition that we shoot in the dark and say that this Budget shall be cut $6,000,000,000, and nobody dares say where or how.

I admire the courage and frankness of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of this great Committee on Appropriations, because I know that when this resolution is passed, as it probably will be, he is going to stand pat and cut this appropriation $6,000,000,000 if he can, but he knows he will not. I also admire the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], who said that he expected to vote to put into effect the $6,000,000,000 cut if it passes the House. As my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], said, I shall look forward to the time when some of these appropriations come in, to see how you vote on your own pet projects, just as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE], complained so bitterly about his air reserve post a few minutes ago.

The leaders in the other body, headed by Senator VANDENBERG, Senator MILLIKIN, and I believe Senator TAFT, are already on record that they will cut this bill down to $4,500,000,000. So there is something haywire somewhere. In other words, it is nothing but politics, insincerity and a gesture at keeping their campaign promises of last fall. We should cut out all unnecessary activities of the Government. We ought to reduce personnel to the point where we have only those left that we actually need. But when we come to the question of national security I do not know anybody that we can better follow or trust more than General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, General Clay, and our Secretaries of War and Navy.

Let me tell you briefly the situation as it exists today. I happen to be a member of the committee which is dealing with the subject. Not only that, but our committee in the last 2 weeks has had executive sessions with high authorities in both the Army and the Navy who said we had already reduced our armed forces by 90 percent. We had during the war approximately 11,000,000 men in the Army. We have cut them down now to 1,070,000. So I would just like to ask anybody who says this is not going to cripple national defense and national security to tell the House where he is going to cut $1,750,000,000, as the Republican leaders have proposed.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] was quoted in the press as having said they would cut the War Department a billion dollars. That does not include civil functions. He said further they would cut the Navy Department $750,000,000; and then I believe they would take from General Marshall his $500,000,000 to feed the starving people of Europe.

Let me pause to ask somebody to tell us just where you are going to cut a billion dollars out of the Army. I undertake to say you cannot do it, and you will not do it; but I will go further than that and say that in my deliberate judgment there is no more chance of cutting this Budget $6,000,000,000 than there is of taking wings and flying unless you cut some $2,000,000,000 out of our armed forces, and I do not believe the people will stand for that.

Nobody has said where they would cut, whether it would be rural electrification, whether it would be rivers and harbors, whether it would be public buildings, whether it would be soil conservation, or whether it will be the Army and Navy. When anyone asks where and what the cut will be, the reply is, "We are not going to cut your project; we are going to cut somewhere else." Is that the way we are going to legislate in this Congress?

I am not one who believes we are on the verge of immediate war. I am not willing, however, that we return to pre-Pearl Harbor isolation days. I want us to remain strong because there are some people in the world who only respect force. We have reduced our Army from 11,000,000 to 1,070,000. We now have only 140,000 men in Europe and 175,000 in Japan and Korea. General MacArthur has said that he cannot operate with safety in Japan and Korea with fewer men than he has, 175,000. The same is true of General Clay in the European theater. He is having plenty of trouble there with only 140,000 men to carry out his task—but in marked contrast—and I make this remark because the record bears out my statement—in Russia today they have over 5,000,000 men under arms. They have not compulsory military training, they have universal compulsory military service where every young man has to serve in the army from 2 to 5 years. In Russia today they have 12,000 aircraft as compared to our approximately 4,000

aircraft. The War Department budget carries only about 900 modern airplanes. Are we going to cut that item? I can understand how some gentleman like the gentleman from New York, [Mr. KEARNEY], and the gentleman who just spoke a few moments ago would say that if you are not going to cripple national defense, then I am for this. But nobody has or can give them that assurance. I think they are being misled.

It is also of interest that every veterans' organization I have heard from, be it national, State or local, has said that under no condition do they believe we can with safety cut this budget for the Army and the Navy. We are hearing the same story over again that we heard in 1940 and 1941. Many of our friends today who are leading the fight for this bill today were opposed to every single national defense measure before Pearl Harbor.

I do not know whether we are drifting back to isolationism or not, but as far as I am concerned, I want to be lined up with men like General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and those men who know the conditions and who know the situation. We trusted those men with our boys to fight the war and they won a great victory. We still live in a chaotic world. We can take no chances. The next few months will probably determine if we are to have another war or permanent peace.

Mr. Chairman, to me it would be absolutely unfair and outrageous to cut this Budget until we have a break-down and know what we are doing. You ought to file a bill of particulars. You ought to give us a little time, and I hope somebody will offer a motion to recommit so that this matter can go back to the committee in order to have some hearings and let us act intelligently and in the best interest of the country.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. This resolution provides that it is the judgment of the Congress that the Budget be cut $6,000,000,000. Now, how can we form a judgment as to the specific amount to be cut until we are furnished with some information?

Mr. THOMASON. Well, the question answers itself because nobody can say what we are going to cut or where you are going to cut or how much. This House has always had facts and figures before it. The bills have been based on hearings before some committee to show how much we are going to cut. I repeat that it is politics, a wild hope and an empty gesture.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman then is not satisfied with what Members on that side of the House did. I suppose he has read the Colmer report?

Mr. THOMASON. I have read that report but it has nothing in it that recommends any such cut or action as you propose in our armed forces.

Mr. REED of New York. It put a ceiling of $30,000,000,000 on national expenditures.

Mr. THOMASON. There is nothing in the Colmer report that favors a reduction in the armed forces, such as this bill provides.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman repudiate the men on his side who were members of that committee?

Mr. THOMASON. No; but the report does not show what the gentleman tries to indicate. You will find in the hearings in the Committee on Appropriations, that every high official in the Army and Navy, together with men like General MacArthur and General Clay, has said that under present conditions they cannot operate with such a reduction.

Mr. REED of New York. Did you not try to wish 200,000 men on MacArthur and he sent word back that he did not need them?

Mr. THOMASON. No; I do not know anything about that and I do not believe the record will substantiate that statement. I do know that he and General Marshall and General Eisenhower are hoping and praying that the cut you propose will not be adopted.

Mr. REED of New York. The record will substantiate it.

Mr. THOMASON. General Marshall leaves in a few days for Moscow. What is done there will likely determine if we are to have permanent peace. We should uphold his hands. We can take no chances. I beg of you not to cut the Army and Navy by $2,000,000,000. That, I am certain, would endanger our national security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution. It seems to me that if we will find the issues, there can be no difficulty in coming to the right decision. The arguments in the newspapers, their columnists, and even in the mails opposing this bill constantly say, "Do not cut the armed services. Do not cut our defense. Do not weaken our security in these perilous times." Of course, everyone agrees with these "dont's," and there is no issue.

However, if they would go further and say, "Do not cut extravagance, waste, and unnecessary expense in our armed services" we would be getting down to the real issue. Or, if they would say, "There has been no extravagance, waste, and unnecessary spending in our Government for the last decade, and, therefore, you can accept the President's Budget," they would be getting down to the real issue, and these are the issues that should be debated.

It has been abundantly shown in the debate that on the basis of the real issue, the opposition has no meritorious defense, and, therefore, it centers practically all of its ammunition on the aforesaid nonrelated issue of impairing our defense, for which no one contends.

The real issue of cutting unwarranted expense is in itself a vital one in our security. The American people have been told by our great leaders and have themselves known since the beginning of our history that as long as we maintain our form and fundamentals of government we can never be destroyed from without. That if destruction ever comes, it will come from within, and our security is in far greater danger from within than it has ever been in our national history. Unless we reduce spending, we are surely threatened with financial and economic collapse.

On the floor it has been said that our potential danger can come from only one source—from without. It is my firm belief that with the force that we possess at the present time we need not fear that danger for a decade or more.

However, it is also well known that that same source of potential danger is working with Trojan horses within our gates. It is also known that continued budgets of $37,500,000,000 in peacetime are their greatest hope for the threat of destruction from within. Unless we can keep our production and economy as secure as it was in the last war, the gallantry of our military forces will be of little avail. We cannot keep our economy secure by a continued doctrine and philosophy in which we tax and tax and tax, spend and spend and spend, elect and elect and elect.

To balance our national budget, to cut down our national expenditures, and to rebuild a healthy economy is more necessary in the next decade than to prepare for a military attack, although, of course, the latter cannot be lost sight of.

To accomplish this objective for our security will require the combined effort of the American people, including our armed services, to cut out, insofar as is possible, every extravagance, waste, and unnecessary expense.

That this resolution seeks to accomplish, and unless we can accomplish it, as I said before, we will succumb to the forces within which, unless stopped, will more surely destroy our Government than will a military attack from without.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, when I was in the military service in World War I, I recall an Indian who was a private in the Army. After he had gone through the usual squads right and squads left, someone said to him, "Sam, how do you like the Army?" He said, "Me no like." He said to him, "Why not?" He said, "Too much salute; not enough shoot."

That has been the trouble with economy. There has been an awful lot of verbal saluting. There has in the last 14 or 15 years been very little shooting. The people want some forthright shooting on this issue. They are not interested in a congressional debating society, and my good friends over on this side can go home and say you have been gagged by those mean Republicans, but the $64 question will be, What did you do for economy?

Now, there is one thing that you need and that is the will to economize. That

is the one thing that is needful. You remember when Martha, the sister of Lazarus, was fretting herself about all the household chores and the fact that Mary was not helping to get ready for the entertainment of the Galilean, He, with that benign countenance said to her, "Only one thing is needful." Only one thing is needful for economy, and that is the will to economize, and all the escapes and all the pretty speeches that you have made today are going to avail you nothing when finally you must make answer to a real abiding demand of the American people. They insist that solemn and serious pledges be redeemed.

Now, you say to us today that this is a gesture. Then why are you so concerned if this is a gesture? If this means nothing, why not save all the rhetoric today? Why not husband your energies for some better day?

Evidently you are concerned that this is something more than a gesture, and we mean to make it more than a gesture, even though in the language of section 138 of the Reorganization Act it must necessarily be a recommendation to the Congress. The Congress can give and the Congress can take away. The Congress can approve and the Congress can take off the ceiling. But make no mistake and find no refuge in the fact that this is going to be a gesture. We cannot afford to take action that is not purposeful.

You say we shall fail. Is it not much better to be like Galileo who said, "Why should we who have lived in the dark refuse to keep our eyes upon the stars?" We can come today with a recommendation for $1,000,000,000; we can come with a recommendation for $2,000,000,000. Do you think it will be satisfactory to the millions of people in this country who have been feeling the crush of expenditure for, lo, these many years? Suppose we do fail. Suppose when the record is written at the end of the year we have saved only $4,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 or $5,000,000,000? It shall be written to the everlasting glory of the party that we had our eyes upon the stars. But you on the minority side can do the magnanimous thing by aiding in achieving this reduction.

But, on the other hand, my good friends, it may be that we can eclipse that ceiling and make it $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000. There is a settled body of opinion in the country that perhaps the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget should have gone further. That, of course, will be determined when hearings are held on the various appropriation measures.

You say to us that there will be sadness in the world when this action is consummated. Oh, yes; the debtor is always sad when the creditor decides that he is no longer a good risk. We have been pretty open-handed in our largess. We have scattered money into all the corners of the earth. When I was in Tunisia somebody said to me, "Why, your people do not pay taxes in the United States, do they?" Marvelous. They think money grows on plum trees here.

So, there comes a day when for our own fiscal integrity there must be a reckoning and there will be a happy day in this country when we can give that assurance to our own people that we have reduced expenditures, we have reduced taxes, and we have reduced the public debt.

You say we send General Marshall to Moscow and take the edge off his sword. Oh, I think the sharpest sword, the shiniest sword, and the best weapon we can give him is an efficient Army and an efficient Navy, with the fat and the water squeezed out, predicated upon a solid fiscal economy back home that is conducive to an atmosphere that will make the very genius of America in the field of production flower. That is the kind of a sword with which to send him to Moscow and then, of course, they will listen. His best weapon is an America where freedom flourishes and incentive is preserved. They can be preserved by what we here propose.

Now then, we sent Secretary Byrnes up to Lake Success along in August, and you know, something happened at that time. Let me read you the letter the President of the United States sent to Secretary Forrestal dated August 2, 1946, which is 5 months ago. President Truman said in that letter:

> I wish, therefore, that you would forthwith take the necessary action to adjust the current naval programs that the total expenditure in the fiscal year 1947 will not exceed $5,150,000,000. This will necessitate a reduction in prospective expenditures of $650,000,000.

Did you raise your voices at that time, when your own President took $650,000,000 out of the Navy budget, when they were fighting the battle of Lake Success and the Waldorf Hotel with Mr. Molotov and all the rest? Where were your voices and your concern and dismay at that time? No word was uttered, and it was safely done. Where was the impairment in the national security? Did you say then that the edge was being dulled on the sword of Secretary Byrnes as he contested with Molotov, Gromyko, and Voroshuloff?

On that same day, when the Secretary of State was up there battling with the Soviet Commissars on disarmament, atomic-energy control, and other vital matters, the President of the United States wrote to the Secretary of War, and what did he say to him on that day? Quoting President Truman:

> This will necessitate a reduction in prospective expenditures of $1,000,000,000.

The President took $1,650,000,000 out of the defense budget as late as August 2, 1946. Where was your concern? Did you hear Mr. Forrestal raise his voice? Did you hear Secretary Patterson raise his voice? Did you hear them say, "National security will be impaired"? Oh, no, indeed; no, indeed. Yet you say to us today we would impair security. We are as much interested in security as are you.

You say today, "What has been happening over on the Senate side?" You say Senate Republicans do not see eye to eye with us on this matter. I am like Mrs. Murphy. I prefer to hoe in my own garden here in the House of Representatives rather than look at what the Senate is doing. That will be their business, not ours. We have a responsibility of our own.

You say communism is stalking over the earth, and if we should cut some of these funds for foreign relief, there will be sadness and sorrow and that perhaps the shadow of Red fascism will move even further. There will be a harvest in Europe when they start spending this money. This becomes effective on the 1st day of July 1947. There was a partial harvest in 1945. There was a harvest in 1946. There will be a harvest in 1947. Shall we cajole them in their occupational complex, which becomes a settled part of their thinking until they depend always on this country? Is that what we propose to do? As for Red fascism, better known as communism, let me tell you that today we have $750,000,000 invested in the French Republic, but their Minister of War this good hour is a Communist, and Red fascism is engulfing that ancient Republic that had a great tradition for liberty.

We gave Tito $363,000,000, and did it make any difference in the march of totalitarianism that has engulfed that country until there is no freedom whatsoever?

Shall we continue a futile effort to halt communism with hand-outs of American cash?

No; the best answer we can make in this rather sad hour is to be strong at home. That is the way the 140,000,000 people in America can best serve the peoples who are living in misery amidst the rubble and debris of World War II.

You say to us today that we bring you no detail and no break-downs. We bring you no detail? What difference would it make if we had brought you detail? Take a look at this Budget. There are 1,448 pages in this Budget. There are hundreds of thousands of items. If we brought you detail, we would be here until next Christmas, and you know it. So you have been making pretty speeches here about giving you details. You know why you want detail—that is the sacred cow. "Oh, it is all right to cut agriculture, but do not cut flood control." "It is all right to cut rivers and harbors, but do not cut the Soil Conservation Service." You want to take the "me" out of economy. Well, economy, my friends, is a pretty painful business when the virus of spending has become so thoroughly engrafted in the corporate body of the Republic. So when you ask for detail, we could give you detail and give you a break-down, but section 138 of the Reorganization Act does not require any detail. Go back and read the law. It says we are to report a ceiling figure. That is what it calls for. So where is this argument about detail except to string it out for a long, long time and to accomplish nothing. The people want a little shooting on the subject of economy and a little less saluting.

Now, you say to us that we have reached into thin air and made a guess. Here is the first volume of data that was prepared at the request of the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER. It was prepared by the Budget Bureau. Everything is there—the rate of expenditure in the fiscal year 1947, the

availability of funds, the amount we are asking for in 1948, how they propose to dispose of the new appropriations. It is all there in detail. There is the unliquidated contract authority. We have been working on this subject for weeks. But the trouble with our good friends of the minority is that they think you can do this business in committee meetings. You know there is a presumption that when you are elected a Member of the House of Representatives that you do a little individual work. And we have been working at it. I assure you the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, has worked day and night, far into the night. The gentleman from Massachusetts, DICK WIGGLESWORTH, has fairly neglected his family for weeks. I have gone all through the Budget. I have been through that Budget over five times and have checked the Army and Navy accounts many times. Other Members have done likewise. Besides, it is not very nice, my friends, for you to reflect upon those Members who for years have been serving on the Committee on Appropriations working with the Army and Navy budget. Do you not give them some credit for the years of service on the subcommittees for the War Department and Navy Department? Do you not give them credit that they know a little something about it without having to have the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy come up every 25 minutes? They know what it is about. They have years of background. For many years, many members of the committee have been working on the needs and requirements of Army and Navy. They know the needs of the services. They also know waste and extravagance when they see it. Does experience count for naught?

Consider the clerks of these committees who have worked on these budgets for years. They have a wealth of background. Finally let me say that John Pugh, who until recently was clerk to the full Committee on Appropriations, is an old Navy man who for many years has served the committee and is one of the real experts in the Nation on this matter. Does that mean nothing?

You say we have acted arbitrarily. Let me tell you here in public that when we marked up the rescission bill in June and took millions out of the Navy Department we asked one of the high officials to come down. We said, "We have finished our hearings. We have determined what we are going to take out. Is there any more to take out?" Then, without any abashment, he said, "Gentlemen, I am of the opinion that you can take out another $1,250,000,000." We took out another one and one-fourth billion without a line of testimony. So, you see, we know something about this business. We did not reach out into thin air. We have been going through the mill. We have been particularizing. We have been laying out schedules of economy: What can be eliminated, what can be reduced, what can we cut back on projects, can we cut back projects that are in process at the present time?

The guide lines are all in this report. Do not let anybody fool you as to whether this was such a rough and ragged guess after all. No indeed. We had the services of people from the outside. The Brookings Institution let us have one of their best men. We had available to us some of those who are working with the Postwar Tax Policy Commission, headed by probably the outstanding tax man in the United States, Mr. Roswell Magill, who was appointed by a Democratic President as the Under Secretary of the Treasury. We have had many things at our disposal. So as we have gone through it, combing items here and there, examining on those that could be eliminated, those that could be cut back, those that probably ought to be cut back to 1940, and a great many other items, I say to you on my own responsibility in behalf of the subcommittee that prepared this report and then managed to secure a vote of 50 to 22 in a closed session of the full committee last Friday all day, that it represents no thin guess.

Finally, let us see how close we are going to come to it. A chairman of a subcommittee said before the Budget Committee when the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, convened them for all-day sessions, every member of the subcommittee, both Democrats and Republicans, having an opportunity to come in, the chairman of one subcommittee made his estimate and it was put down. Part of the bill that has been prepared is already marked up. It will come to this floor perhaps next week or the week following. How well did that subcommittee meet the estimate? I will tell you. They estimated a saving of $61,000,000 in that portion of the bill, and the saving will be over $80,000,000. So they are doing better than the estimate after full hearings. So this is pretty well prepared. I commend to you, in the interest of the American people, that this resolution be enacted by a resounding majority so that we may have our hands upheld to hold it at the $6,000,000,000 level. For years the subject of economy has been idly saluted. Today it calls for some real shooting. This job can, and it must, be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

The debate provided on the resolution in House Resolution 103 having been completed, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 20, pursuant to House Resolution 103, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. CANNON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the concurrent resolution to the Joint Committee on Legislative Budget with instructions to report back to the House and Senate by April 15, 1947, with recommendation of such amounts of reduction as can be made in the Budget, based on their findings and in accordance with the facts deduced from their hearings and investigations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 231, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—166

Abernethy	Folger	Monroney
Albert	Forand	Morgan
Allen, La.	Gary	Morris
Almond	Gordon	Morrison
Andrews, Ala.	Gore	Murdock
Barden	Gorski	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	O'Brien
Battle	Granger	O'Toole
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Bell	Gregory	Passman
Blatnik	Hardy	Patman
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Boggs, La.	Harris	Pfeifer
Bonner	Harrison	Philbin
Boykin	Hart	Pickett
Brooks	Havenner	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Powell
Bryson	Hébert	Preston
Buchanan	Heffernan	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Burleson	Holifield	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Rains
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Cannon	Jarman	Rayburn
Carroll	Johnson, Okla.	Rayfiel
Celler	Johnson, Tex.	Redden
Chapman	Jones, Ala.	Richards
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Clark	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Clements	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Kefauver	Rooney
Combs	Kelley	Sabath
Cooley	Kilday	Sadowski
Cooper	King	Sasscer
Cox	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cravens	Klein	Sikes
Crosser	Lane	Smathers
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Larcade	Somers
Dawson, Ill.	Lea	Spence
Deane	Lesinski	Stanley
Delaney	Lusk	Teague
Dingell	Lyle	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lynch	Thomason
Donohue	McCormack	Trimble
Dorn	McMillan, S. C.	Walter
Douglas	Madden	Wheeler
Drewry	Mahon	Whitten
Durham	Manasco	Whittington
Eberharter	Mansfield, Mont.	Williams
Elliott	Mansfield, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Evins	Marcantonio	Winstead
Fallon	Meade, Md.	Wood
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Worley
Fisher	Mills	Zimmerman
Fogarty		

NAYS—231

Allen, Calif.	Auchincloss	Blackney
Allen, Ill.	Bakewell	Boggs, Del.
Andersen, H. Carl	Banta	Bolton
	Barrett	Bradley, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Bradley, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Beall	Bramblett
	Bender	Brehm
Angell	Bennett, Mich.	Brophy
Arends	Bennett, Mo.	Brown, Ohio
Arnold	Bishop	Buck

Burke	Hill	O'Hara
Busbey	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Butler	Hoeven	Owens
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Patterson
Canfield	Holmes	Phillips, Calif.
Carson	Hope	Phillips, Tenn.
Case, N. J.	Horan	Ploeser
Case, S. Dak.	Howell	Plumley
Chadwick	Hull	Potts
Chenoweth	Jackson, Calif.	Ramey
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, Ill.
Church	Jenkins, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Clason	Jennings	Rees
Clevenger	Jensen	Reeves
Clippinger	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Coffin	Johnson, Ill.	Richlman
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ind.	Rizley
Cole, Mo.	Jones, Ohio	Robertson
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Robsion
Corbett	Jonkman	Rockwell
Cotton	Judd	Rogers, Mass.
Coudert	Kean	Rohrbough
Crow	Kearney	Ross
Cunningham	Kearns	Sadlak
Curtis	Keating	St. George
Dague	Keefe	Sarbacher
Devitt	Kerr	Schwabe, Mo.
Dirksen	Kersten, Wis.	Schwabe, Okla.
Dolliver	Kilburn	Scoblick
Dondero	Knutson	Scott, Hardie
Doughton	Kunkel	Scott,
Eaton	Landis	Hugh D., Jr.
Ellis	Latham	Scrivner
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Seely-Brown
Elsaesser	LeFevre	Shafer
Elston	Lemke	Short
Engel, Mich.	Lewis	Simpson, Ill.
Fellows	Lodge	Simpson, Pa.
Fenton	Love	Smith, Kans.
Fletcher	McConnell	Smith, Maine
Foote	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Fulton	McDonough	Smith, Wis.
Gallagher	McDowell	Snyder
Gamble	McGarvey	Springer
Gathings	McGregor	Stefan
Gavin	McMahon	Stevenson
Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.	Stockman
Gifford	MacKinnon	Stratton
Gillette	Macy	Sundstrom
Gillie	Maloney	Taber
Goff	Martin, Iowa	Talle
Goodwin	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Graham	Mathews	Tibbott
Grant, Ind.	Meade, Ky.	Tollefson
Griffiths	Merrow	Towe
Gross	Meyer	Twyman
Gwynne, Iowa	Michener	Vail
Hale	Miller, Conn.	Van Zandt
Hall,	Miller, Md.	Vorys
Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Hall,	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Leonard W.	Morton	Welchel
Halleck	Muhlenberg	Welch
Hand	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Harness, Ind.	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Hartley	Nixon	Wolcott
Herter	Nodar	Wolverton
Heselton	Norblad	Youngblood
Hess	Norman	

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Norrell
Bland	Gerlach	Peterson
Buffett	Gwinn, N. Y.	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Hagen	Priest
Courtney	Hedrick	Russell
Crawford	Hendricks	Sanborn
Davis, Tenn.	Javits	Stigler
Dawson, Utah	Jenison	Taylor
D'Ewart	Kennedy	Vinson
Engle, Calif.	Keogh	West
Fernandez	Lucas	Woodruff
Flannagan	Murray, Tenn.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Flannagan for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Gwinn of New York against.

Mr. Bland for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Jenison against.

Mr. Engle of California for, with Mr. Buffett against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Dawson of Utah against.

Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Russell against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Gerlach against.

Mr. Priest for, with Mr. Hagen against.

Mr. Lucas for, with Mr. Fuller against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. D'Ewart against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Sanborn against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 239, nays 159, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—239

Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Maloney
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Martin, Iowa
Andersen,	Gearhart	Mason
H. Carl	Gifford	Mathews
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Meade, Ky.
Andresen,	Gillie	Meade, Md.
August H.	Goff	Merrow
Angell	Goodwin	Meyer
Arends	Gossett	Michener
Arnold	Graham	Miller, Conn.
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Md.
Bakewell	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Banta	Gross	Mills
Barrett	Gwynne, Iowa	Mitchell
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Morton
Beall	Hall,	Muhlenberg
Bender	Edwin Arthur	Mundt
Bennett, Mich.	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Bennett, Mo.	Leonard W.	Nixon
Bishop	Halleck	Nodar
Blackney	Hand	Norblad
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Norman
Bolton	Hartley	O'Hara
Bradley, Calif.	Herter	O'Konski
Bradley, Mich.	Heselton	Owens
Bramblett	Hess	Pace
Brehm	Hill	Patterson
Brophy	Hinshaw	Phillips, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Phillips, Tenn.
Buck	Hoffman	Ploeser
Burke	Holmes	Plumley
Busbey	Hope	Potts
Butler	Horan	Ramey
Byrnes, Wis.	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Hull	Reed, N. Y.
Carson	Jackson, Calif.	Rees
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Ohio	Reeves
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Chadwick	Jennings	Richlman
Chenoweth	Jensen	Rizley
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Robsion
Clason	Johnson, Ind.	Rockwell
Clevenger	Jones, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Clippinger	Jones, Wash.	Rohrbough
Coffin	Jonkman	Ross
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Sadlak
Cole, Mo.	Kean	St. George
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Sarbacher
Corbett	Kearns	Schwabe, Mo.
Cotton	Keating	Schwabe, Okla.
Coudert	Keefe	Scoblick
Crow	Kerr	Scott, Hardie
Cunningham	Kersten, Wis.	Scott,
Curtis	Kilburn	Hugh D., Jr.
Dague	Knutson	Scrivner
Devitt	Kunkel	Seely-Brown
Dirksen	Landis	Shafer
Dolliver	Latham	Short
Dondero	LeCompte	Simpson, Ill.
Doughton	LeFevre	Simpson, Pa.
Eaton	Lemke	Smith, Kans.
Ellis	Lewis	Smith, Ohio
Ellsworth	Lodge	Smith, Wis.
Elsaesser	Love	Snyder
Elston	McConnell	Springer
Engel, Mich.	McCowen	Stanley
Fallon	McDonough	Stefan
Fellows	McDowell	Stevenson
Fenton	McGarvey	Stockman
Fletcher	McGregor	Stratton
Foote	McMahon	Sundstrom
Fulton	McMillen, Ill.	Taber
Gallagher	MacKinnon	Talle
Gamble	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott	Vursell	Wilson, Tex.
Tollefson	Wadsworth	Wolcott
Towe	Welchel	Wolverton
Twyman	Welch	Wood
Vail	Whittington	Youngblood
Van Zandt	Wigglesworth	
Vorys	Wilson, Ind.	

NAYS—159

Abernethy	Fogarty	Miller, Calif.
Albert	Folger	Monroney
Allen, La.	Forand	Morgan
Almond	Gary	Morris
Andrews, Ala.	Gordon	Morrison
Barden	Gore	Murdock
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	Norton
Battle	Granger	O'Brien
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bell	Gregory	Passman
Blatnik	Hardy	Patman
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Boggs, La.	Harris	Pfeifer
Bonner	Harrison	Philbin
Boykin	Hart	Pickett
Brooks	Havenner	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Powell
Bryson	Hébert	Preston
Buchanan	Heffernan	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Burleson	Holifield	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Rains
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Cannon	Jarman	Rayburn
Carroll	Johnson, Okla.	Rayfiel
Celler	Johnson, Tex.	Redden
Chapman	Jones, Ala.	Richards
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Clark	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Clements	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Kefauver	Rooney
Combs	Kelley	Sabath
Cooley	Keogh	Sadowski
Cooper	Kilday	Sasscer
Cox	King	Sheppard
Cravens	Kirwan	Sikes
Crosser	Klein	Smathers
D'Alesandro	Lane	Smith, Maine
Davis, Ga.	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Larcade	Somers
Deane	Lea	Spence
Delaney	Lesinski	Teague
Dingell	Lusk	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lyle	Thomason
Donohue	Lynch	Trimble
Dorn	McCormack	Walter
Douglas	McMillan, S. C.	Wheeler
Drewry	Madden	Whitten
Durham	Mahon	Williams
Eberharter	Manasco	Winstead
Elliott	Mansfield,	Worley
Evins	Mont.	Zimmerman
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	
Fisher	Marcantonio	

NOT VOTING—34

Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Peterson
Bland	Gerlach	Poulson
Buffett	Gwinn, N. Y.	Priest
Bulwinkle	Hagen	Russell
Courtney	Hedrick	Sanborn
Crawford	Hendricks	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	Javits	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Jenison	Vinson
D'Ewart	Kennedy	West
Engle, Calif.	Lucas	Woodruff
Fernandez	Murray, Tenn.	
Flannagan	Norrell	

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Flannagan against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Bland against.

Mr. Jenison for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Buffett for, with Mr. Engle of California against.

Mr. Dawson of Utah for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Russell for, with Mr. Fernandez against.

Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Hagen for, with Mr. Priest against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Lucas against.

Mr. D'Ewart for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. Sanborn for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, when the name of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was called I mistakenly answered to his name, believing that the Clerk was calling my name. I ask unanimous consent that the roll call be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the name of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] a second time.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. JAVITS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the roll call will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk announced that Mr. GWINN of New York was paired against the bill. There must be an error, as Mr. GWINN was paired in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The pair will be corrected according to the statement of the gentleman from New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two speeches made by Mr. Farley and in another instance to extend his remarks to include an article on George Washington.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today, and include certain quotations.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Teacher Looks at His Job." Mr. Speaker, I have an estimate from the Public Printer who states that the cost is $159.75. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that this extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in five separate instances and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial from the Jersey Journal, and in the other an address delivered in Jersey City by Mr. George E. Stringfellow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill today and on the rule may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I was under the impression that the gentleman from New York obtained permission for that before we went in Committee.

Mr. TABER. I did ask for permission for all Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD but that would not cover the revision of remarks by Members who had spoken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include a quotation from a newspaper.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles, Calif., in support of the legislation recently passed covering coastal and intercoastal water-borne commerce; in the other to include a statement of principles adopted by the Kodiak Chamber of Commerce in regard to water-borne transportation to and from Alaska.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUFFETT, for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. D'EWART, for 6 days, on account of public business.

To Mr. SANBORN, for 6 days, on account of public business.

To Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for remainder of week, on account of illness.

To Mr. PRESTON, for Friday and Saturday, on account of official business.

To Mr. RUSSELL, for 6 days, on account of public business.

To Mr. DAWSON of Utah, for 6 days, on account of public business.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 19, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insrance Act of 1940, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 21, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10:30 a. m., Friday, February 21, 1947.

Business to be considered: Full committee public hearing of Members in regard to various bills introduced by them and referred to the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

378. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in connection with venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

379. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

380. A letter from the Chairman of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1946, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

381. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945, amounting to $136,100, for the Navy Department and naval service (H. Doc. No. 142); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

382. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the twelfth annual report of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

383. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia who are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

384. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposal to extend the Reclamation Act to certain Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

385. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a proposal to continue the increases in the rates of postage and fees prescribed by title IV of the Revenue Act of 1943, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

386. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 143); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 450. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use, with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 2096. A bill to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2097. A bill to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2098. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2099. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2100. A bill to prohibit prosecutions under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 2101. A bill to provide housing units for veterans of World War II who lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs as the result of service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2102. A bill to provide for 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2103. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain emergency officers of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2104. A bill to incorporate the World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2105. A bill to provide that the children of a veteran of World War II shall be entitled to the educational benefits granted to such veteran but not used by him; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2106. A bill to provide 4 years of college education, or the equivalent, to the children of persons whose death resulted from service in the armed forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2107. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 2108. A bill to remove the limitation on amount of retirement pay, under certain conditions, of persons retired for disabilities resulting from injuries or disease incurred in line of duty in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2109. A bill to amend section 1003(b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2110. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 2111. A bill to amend the National Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2112. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime services of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2113. A bill for the relief of the city of Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER (by request):

H. R. 2114. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2115. A bill to provide for crediting active service in the armed forces of the Dominion of Canada as military service for purposes of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2116. A bill to authorize the appointment as chaplains in the Regular Army of certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps over 45 years of age who served on active duty in the Army of the United States for at least 5 years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2117. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 2118. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1888, so as to require that judgments and decrees of district courts of the United States be filed only in the records of such courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2119. A bill to amend section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2120. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2121. A bill to grant pensions to certain disabled women veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2122. A bill prohibiting membership in subversive organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2123. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws relating to merchant-marine personnel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution recommending that any parties or organizations advocating overthrow of the United States Government be prohibited from entering candidates in any State or National elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 relative to the legislative budget; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the Federal Public Housing Authority to cooperate with Salt Lake County, Utah, in the reconversion of Camp Kearns, Utah, into a temporary housing project for veterans in order to alleviate the critical housing shortage in Salt Lake County, Utah; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 2124. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2125. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Richard K. O'Connor; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2126. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John W. Jones; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 2127. A bill for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2128. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Emmerling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2129. A bill for the relief of R. C. Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Lune; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Domenic Scipione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2133. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Nahorski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Michel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2136. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2137. A bill to extend the contract for carrying the mail on star route No. 37303; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2138. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Nora Ellsworth, guardian of Kenneth Edward Ellsworth, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2139. A bill for the relief of A. Z. Shopoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2140. A bill for the relief of Claude A. Mutchler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 2141. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Durang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2142. A bill for the relief of Eleanor P. Simmonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

131. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mrs. Maud Liddy Brotherton and 21 other citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging the passage of the Lemke antivivisection bill, H. R. 462; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

132. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for appropriate steps to effect reappointment of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii in accordance with the spirit and intent of section 55 of the organic act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 19, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We recognize, our Father, as George Washington saw so clearly, that "no people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

Believing that the Hand that hath brought us thus far will not forsake us now, but if we are willing will lead us on into further inspiration and service to all mankind, we would join our prayers this day with those of Christian women all over the world in this day of prayer. With so many souls united in intercession for our own beloved country and for all mankind, may there come an outpouring of Thy Spirit into our hearts and minds, that we shall feel it, and all men may know it.

"Lift us above unrighteous anger and mistrust, into faith and hope and charity, by a simple and steadfast reliance on Thy sure will."

We pray for some evidence in what is said and done here, that Thou hast been permitted a vote, and that men yielded to Thee. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 19, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 19, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees; and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the Senate, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], heretofore designated for that purpose, will read Washington's Farewell Address.

Thereupon Mr. REVERCOMB advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated

with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have very inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were proceured? will they not

henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not

trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinon, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be ob-

served in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISIONS OF RESCISSIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 10)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two proposed revisions of rescissions of appropriations for the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF INCREASES IN POSTAGE RATES AND FEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the increases in the rates of postage and fees prescribed by title IV of the Revenue Act of 1943, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION ACT TO CERTAIN TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Reclamation Act to certain Territories and possessions of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VENEREAL-DISEASE RAPID-TREATMENT CENTERS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act in connection with venereal-disease rapid-treatment centers, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation covering its operations for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, and the same is hereby resolved by authority of the same, That there exists at the present time a great need for an immediate and thorough investigation by the State of Georgia and the United States Government into matters concerning great frauds that have been and are now being made by certain building contractors against veterans of World War II, and whereas,

"Be it resolved, That an immediate and thorough investigation be instituted immediately into the affairs concerning veterans

of World War II who are being defrauded by unscrupulous building contractors throughout the State of Georgia and the Nation as a whole; and whereas,

"*Be it resolved,* That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby requested by said resolution to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Attorney General of Georgia, to the Attorney General of the United States, to the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senate of the United States, and to the Veterans' Administration."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Utah State Legislature, memorializing the Congress to direct the Federal Public Housing Authority to cooperate with Salt Lake County, Utah, in the reconversion of Camp Kearns, Utah, into a temporary housing project for veterans in order to alleviate the critical housing shortage in Salt Lake County, Utah

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas there is a critical housing shortage in Salt Lake County, Utah, and that many veterans and others are unable to find suitable housing accommodations; and

"Whereas the outlook for immediately alleviating such shortage due to the unavailability of materials and labor is remote, and that normally new construction processes will not provide the necessary housing for a considerable period of time, perhaps several years; and

"Whereas Camp Kearns, Utah, located near Salt Lake City, has been declared surplus by the proper Government agency having authority to act in such matters; and

"Whereas the majority of the buildings now existing at Camp Kearns, Utah, were constructed to house personnel in the armed forces and civilian workers and thus can be easily and readily converted to provide temporary housing for veterans, who are badly in need of housing accommodations in the metropolitan Salt Lake City area: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the Congress direct the Federal Public Housing Authority to immediately effect the necessary arrangements with Salt Lake County, Utah, and the appropriate Government agency having jurisdiction over said Camp Kearns, Utah, to immediately proceed to convert Camp Kearns, Utah, into housing accommodations under the provisions of the Lanham Act relating to temporary housing for veterans; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Senator and Representative of the United States from the State of Utah."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial relative to the development of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for irrigation and other purposes

"To the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled, to Each Member of the Congressional Delegation From the State of Montana, and to the Governor of the State of Montana:

"Your memorialists, the members of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized certain reclamation projects for the development of the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin; and

"Whereas the general welfare and economic stability of the people of Montana and all States of the Missouri River Basin is in a great measure dependent upon a continuous program of reclamation development; and

"Whereas reclamation projects meet a present need for providing means for a living for veterans during the construction period, as well as opportunities for their future homes; and

"Whereas reclamation projects lead to the production of new wealth and their benefits extend widely to large sections of industry, transportation and trade; and

"Whereas their construction costs are repayable to the Federal Treasury and their operation and maintenance costs are paid by the water users and are, therefore, not a continuing public expense; and

"Whereas because of the aforementioned facts we believe that the need for curtailment of public expenditures should not seriously affect the prosecution of this development program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and House concurring), does hereby respectfully petition and request that the Congress of the United States provide adequate appropriations for the construction of the authorized reclamation projects described in this memorial and this development program be continued in an orderly manner; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be mailed by the secretary of state of Montana to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, to each member of the congressional delegation from the State of Montana and to the Governor of the State of Montana.

"Approved February 14, 1947.

"SAM C. FORD,
"Governor."

The memorial of Clifford G. Esterbrook, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of antilabor legislation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., requesting that appropriate steps be taken providing for reapportionment of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii in accordance with the spirit and intent of section 55 of the Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PROTEST AGAINST UNNECESSARY SPENDING OF PUBLIC FUNDS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a timely letter from L. A. White, 1227 North Green Street, a leading businessman of Wichita, Kans., protesting against the unnecessary spending of public funds by the Government. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., *February 17, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to let you know how I feel about the budget. If it is ever to be cut, now is the time. I have been hoping for a Republican Congress for a long time, and that they would really get down to business and cut the unnecessary spending that has been going on in Government.

It is beginning to look as though each Senator and Representative is hoping to get something for his district. It is about time to think of us little taxpayers and get rid of unnecessary Government job holders.

Yours respectfully,

L. A. WHITE.

LEGISLATIVE FARM PROGRAM OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which he presented before both the House and the Senate Committees on Agriculture, setting forth the legislative farm program of that organization.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. We believe the present basic agricultural legislation, which includes the conservation of soil, water, and forest resources, acreage adjustments and marketing quotas when needed, commodity loans, and surplus disposal programs should be retained and strengthened.

2. We insist that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation be extended, with sufficient funds provided to carry out loan, support, and other authorized programs. We oppose the use of these funds for consumer subsidies.

3. We insist that the Government's price-support commitments for agricultural commodities be maintained for the 2-year period. Support prices for Steagall commodities must be maintained at not less than 90 percent of parity or comparable price, adjusted for seasonal, geographic, and grade differentials in the market place at all times during the marketing season. The support-price programs may need to be contingent upon compliance with production quotas or other mechanism to prevent excessive production.

4. We urge studies designed to develop long-time programs for agriculture which are more nearly self-sustaining and which correct the basic causes of disparity between agriculture, labor, and industry.

5. We urge the strengthening of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act and its extension to other commodities.

6. We favor the continuation of crop insurance, but insist that it be on a sound actuarial basis.

7. We urge programs for developing new uses and new markets for agricultural products. A positive program for regaining and maintaining our fair share of the world's markets should be developed. Section 32 funds should be retained, and Congress should provide that these funds remain available until expended for their intended purpose.

8. We believe that the parity concept is basic to the welfare of agriculture. For the Steagall support-price period the present parity formula should be used in administering the support-price programs for most agricultural products. For certain nonbasic commodities, such as livestock and dairy products, some revision is needed in the parity formula for administering the support-price program. At the end of the Steagall support-price period the parity formula should be modernized.

9. Duplication, overlapping, and unnecessary expense in Government operations must be eliminated. It is imperative that farmers have a voice in developing and administering farm programs. A minimum of centralized control from Washington and a maximum of decentralization in administering agricultural programs is absolutely essential. Programs must be developed to meet the needs and local conditions in the various agricultural areas. The Secretary of Agriculture should consult with representatives of bona fide farm organizations in establishing agencies responsible for carrying out agricultural laws and programs.

10. We urge a program of conservation of soil, water, grazing, and forest resources designed to secure a maximum of conservation with a minimum of expense. We reaffirm our previous position on coordination of agricultural conservation agencies. We urge decentralization of program planning and operation on a grant-in-aid basis of conservation programs, with responsibility placed in bona fide local, district, and State farmer committees.

11. Steps must be taken to make the farm credit system fully cooperative—farmer-owned and farmer-controlled. The Farm Credit Administration and the direct Government lending agencies should be placed under the direction of an independent national bipartisan board. The present maximum loan rate of 65 percent of the normal agricultural value of land in farm-mortgage loans by the Federal land banks should not be increased, unless some program of insurance is established within the system to assure financial integrity of the Federal land banks. The present limitation as to amount that may be loaned to one borrower should be eliminated. We believe improvement of farm housing can best be met by utilizing the existing credit agencies under the Farm Credit Administration.

12. We favor a national soils fertility program which will encourage the fertilizer industry to increase its production of both low- and high-grade phosphate and potash. Farm organizations should acquire adequate natural reserves of phosphate and potash for developing a reasonable percentage of needed plant capacity for the production and distribution of high-concentrated materials. Tennessee Valley Authority should be authorized to acquire reasonable phosphate reserves in the Florida area and to construct an experimental blast furnace phosphate plant in the Mobile area to develop new processes and new forms of concentrated fertilizer, but definite provision should be made for the disposal of this plant to a private agency within a reasonable period. The test demonstration program should be expanded under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the land-grant colleges and the TVA, to a reasonable number of farms. A program should be developed for the conservation and utilization of phosphate and potash resources in the intermountain area for the benefit of farmers.

13. We oppose the transfer of the farm-labor program from the Department of Agriculture to any other Federal agency. This program should be administered at the Federal level through the Extension Service, and at the State level through the State extension services, or, in any State where the extension service does not desire to administer this program, some other State agency created or approved by the State legislature for this purpose.

14. We urge the President and the Congress to make available by appropriation the full increment authorized for the Extension Service under the Bankhead-Flannagan Act and the full increment authorized for agricultural research in the Bankhead-Jones Act and the Marketing and Research Act of 1946.

PROPOSED TAX REDUCTION—LETTER FROM HENRY L. SHATTUCK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received from a prominent and thoughtful citizen of Massachusetts, Hon. Henry L. Shattuck, of Boston, a letter which I desire to read. Mr. Shattuck is well known as a philanthropist; he has a remarkable record of public service; and is possessed of a wide knowledge of affairs. His letter is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *January 27, 1947.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CABOT: I am glad to note from receipt of newspaper reports that the plan for a flat across-the-board reduction in taxes will probably be abandoned.

I believe that any reduction which it may be found possible to make should be made principally by increasing exemptions in the lower brackets. I believe that this would have a strong tendency to cut down increased wage demands. It would also tend to relieve State and local governments, as a large part of the pressure for increased wages and salaries is due to the heavy deductions on State and municipal pay rolls: As the take-home pay forms the basis for discussion of wages and salaries, the deduction is virtually a tax on the State and municipalities.

I have seen a reference in the newspapers to a bill introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, providing exemptions for single persons of $1,000 and for heads of families of $2,000 plus $500 for each dependent. This may perhaps be too liberal, in view of the needs of the Government, but it seems to me to be along the right lines.

Yours very truly,

HENRY L. SHATTUCK.

Mr. President, I have stated that after Congress has balanced the budget and begun a systematic retirement of the public debt we should reduce taxes. The method proposed by Mr. Shattuck, coupled with an easing of so-called "taxes on ambition," is, I think, clearly the way to begin.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY AIR SAFETY

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask permission to file not later than Monday next, February 24, 1947, an interim report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of an investigation of the matter of air safety made by a subcommittee of the said committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 33).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; with amendments (Rept. No. 34).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an additional report made by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and a statement prepared by me with reference to Federal civilian personnel.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE WITH REFERENCE TO FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

During the month of December 1946, for the second successive month, general decreases in personnel continued throughout the Federal Government, according to reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the various agencies. Total employment, both inside and outside the United States, dropped 46,487 from the November total of 2,330,467 to the December total of 2,283,980.

Largest decreases occurred in the War Department, which dropped 23,996 employees; the Office of Price Administration, which dropped 16,794 employees; the Navy Department, which dropped 3,497 employees; the Department of Agriculture, which dropped 2,776 employees; and the War Assets Administration, which dropped 2,320 employees. The only large-sized increase during the month was in the Veterans' Administration, which took on 5,136 employees and now has a total of 226,896 workers. This approximates 1 employee to every 66 of the 15,000,000 veterans of World War II.

It is gratifying to the forces of economical government to find reductions at last taking place. However, these are but a token appeasement of economy. Actually, 6 of the 10 departments have increased employment since the peak of VJ-day—Commerce, Interior, Labor, Post Office, State, and Treasury. Twenty-three other agencies have also increased during the same period. And seven postwar agencies have added over 60,000 employees to the Federal pay rolls. There are still almost 300,000 civilian employees stationed outside the United States, while inside the United States there are 439,000 War Department employees and outside the United States, 190,000, three and one-half times as many employees as there were in that Department in 1939. The Navy Department shows a similar increase.

It remains for the Congress to make further reductions mandatory.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941, ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1946

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER 1946, AND A COMPARISON WITH NOVEMBER 1946

(All figures compiled from reports signed by the heads of Federal establishments or their authorized representatives)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the continental United States during December decreased 36,186 from a total of 2,023,994 in November to 1,987,808 in December. Excluding the War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 17,748 from the November total of 1,240,378 to the December total of 1,222,630. The War Department within the United States decreased 15,922 from the November total of 455,145 to the December total of 439,223. The Navy Department inside the United States decreased 2,516 from

the November figure of 328,471 to the December figure of 325,955. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States Federal personnel decreased 10,301 from the November total of 306,473 to the December total of 296,172. The majority of these employees are industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of the War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 1,246 from the November figure of 56,019 to the December figure of 54,773.

The consolidated table presenting data with respect to personnel inside and outside the continental United States shows a total decrease of 46,487 from the November total of 2,330,467 to the December total of 2,283,980. Excluding War and Navy Departments' reductions of 27,493, there was a decrease of 18,994 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the November figure of 1,296,397 to the December figure of 1,277,403. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of December decreased 16,670 from the November total of 659,757 to the December total of 643,087. The War Department decreased 8,582 outside continental United States and decreased 5,142 inside the United States in the industrial group, making a total reduction of 13,724 employees. The Navy Department showed a decrease of 2,727 industrial employees. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include regular maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1946, and comparison with November*

Departments or agencies	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget	750	750	
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Agriculture Department	82,114	79,441	−2,673
Commerce Department	35,513	35,293	−220
Interior Department	44,188	44,791	+603
Justice Department	24,022	23,850	−172
Labor Department	7,629	7,314	315
Post Office Department	456,894	457,595	+701
State Department	8,587	8,678	+91
Treasury Department	101,655	101,059	−596
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Defense Transportation	103	102	−1
Office of Price Administration	31,993	15,483	−16,510
Office of Scientific Research and Development	212	155	−57
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	161	161	
Selective Service System	9,625	9,377	−248
Postwar agencies:			
Civilian Production Administration	4,333	4,241	−92
Council of Economic Advisers	26	27	+1
National Wage Stabilization Board	637	611	−26
Philippine Alien Property Administration		3	+3
Price Decontrol Board	15	11	−4
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission		21	+21
War Assets Administration	58,899	56,579	−2,320
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	4	4	
Civil Aeronautics Board	450	478	+28
Civil Service Commission	3,517	3,505	−12
Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	116	
Federal Communications Commission	1,358	1,357	−1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,178	1,178	
Federal Power Commission	793	790	−3
Federal Security Agency	30,671	30,853	+182
Federal Trade Commission	537	545	+8
Federal Works Agency	24,035	24,163	+128
General Accounting Office	12,134	11,693	−441
Government Printing Office	8,001	8,006	+5
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,270	2,286	+16
Maritime Commission	12,952	12,280	−672
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,724	5,675	−49
National Archives	392	396	+4
National Capital Housing Authority	277	280	+3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	315	313	−2
National Housing Agency	19,148	19,069	−79
National Labor Relations Board	876	876	
National Mediation Board	102	98	−4
Panama Canal	417	420	+3
Railroad Retirement Board	2,287	2,559	+272
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10,084	9,522	−562
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,207	1,209	+2
Smithsonian Institution	502	501	−1
Tariff Commission	225	227	+2
Tax Court	123	122	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,284	13,431	+147
Veterans' Administration	220,026	225,119	+5,093
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,240,378	1,222,630	−25,061 / +7,313
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−17,748
Navy Department	328,471	325,955	2,516
War Department	455,145	439,223	15,922
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,023,994	1,987,808	−43,499 / +7,313
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−36,186

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1946, and comparison with November*

Departments or agencies	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Agriculture Department	1,481	1,378	−103
Commerce Department	2,327	2,307	−20
Interior Department	4,772	4,069	−703
Justice Department	609	601	−8
Labor Department	88	85	−3
Post Office Department	1,397	1,393	−4
State Department	14,202	14,086	−116
Treasury Department	641	683	+42
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Price Administration	375	91	−284
Selective Service System	91	92	+1
Postwar agencies:			
Civilian Production Administration	22	20	−2
War Assets Administration	23	23	
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	[1]94	[2]85	−9
Civil Aeronautics Board	10	12	+2
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	36	36	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	
Federal Security Agency	698	663	−35
Federal Works Agency	295	294	−1
Maritime Commission	232	208	−24
National Housing Agency	49	58	+9
National Labor Relations Board	2	2	
Panama Canal	26,708	26,675	−33
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	116	118	+2
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	
Veterans' Administration	1,734	1,777	+43
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	56,019	54,773	+99 / −1,345
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−1,246
War Department	198,045	189,971	8,074
Navy Department	[1]52,409	[2]51,428	981
Total, including War and Navy Departments	306,473	296,172	+99 / −10,400
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−10,301

[1] Figures as of Oct. 31, 1946.
[2] Figures as of Nov. 30, 1946.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1946, and comparison with November 1946*

Departments or agencies	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget	750	750	
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Agriculture Department	83,595	80,819	−2,776
Commerce Department	37,840	37,600	−240
Interior Department	48,960	48,860	−100
Justice Department	24,631	24,451	−180
Labor Department	7,717	7,399	−318
Post Office Department	458,291	458,988	+697
State Department	22,789	22,764	−25
Treasury Department	102,296	101,742	−554
Emergency war agencies:			
Office of Defense Transportation	103	102	−1
Office of Price Administration	32,368	15,574	−16,794
Office of Scientific Research and Development	212	155	−57
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	161	161	
Selective Service System	9,716	9,469	−247

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1946, and comparison with November 1946*—Continued

Departments or agencies	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Postwar agencies:			
Civilian Production Administration	4,355	4,261	−94
Council of Economic Advisers	26	27	+1
National Wage Stabilization Board	637	611	−26
Philippine Alien Property Administration		3	+3
Price Decontrol Board	15	11	−4
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission		21	+21
War Assets Administration	58,922	56,602	−2,320
Independent agencies:			
American Battle Monuments Commission	98	89	−9
Civil Aeronautics Board	460	490	+30
Civil Service Commission	3,522	3,510	−12
Export-Import Bank of Washington	118	118	
Federal Communications Commission	1,394	1,393	−1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,180	1,180	
Federal Power Commission	793	790	−3
Federal Security Agency	31,369	31,516	+147
Federal Trade Commission	537	545	+8
Federal Works Agency	24,330	24,457	+127
General Accounting Office	12,134	11,693	−441
Government Printing Office	8,001	8,006	+5
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,270	2,286	+16
Maritime Commission	13,184	12,488	−696
National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics	5,724	5,675	−49
National Archives	392	396	+4
National Capital Housing Authority	277	280	+3
National Capital Park and Planning	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	315	313	−2
National Housing Agency	19,197	19,127	−70
National Labor Relations Board	878	878	
National Mediation Board	102	98	−4
Panama Canal	27,125	27,095	−30
Railroad Retirement Board	2,287	2,559	+272
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10,200	9,640	−560
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,207	1,209	+2
Smithsonian Institution	510	509	−1
Tariff Commission	225	227	+2
Tax Court of the United States	123	122	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,284	13,431	+147
Veterans' Administration	221,760	226,896	+5,136
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,296,397	1,277,403	+6,621 −25,615
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−18,994
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	380,880	377,383	−3,497
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	455,145	439,223	−15,922
Outside continental United States	198,045	189,971	−8,074
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,330,467	2,283,980	+6,621 −53,108
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−46,487

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees*[1] *of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during December 1946, and comparison with November 1946*

Departments or agencies	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):			
Commerce Department	1,009	1,055	+46
Interior Department	4,903	4,684	−219
State Department	252	274	+22
Treasury Department	5,684	5,512	−172
Independent agencies:			
National Housing Agency	17	16	−1
Panama Canal	2,689	2,675	−14
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,175	6,294	+119
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	20,729	20,510	+187 −406
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−219
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	263,794	261,067	−2,727
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	208,918	203,776	−5,142
Outside continental United States	166,316	157,734	−8,582
Total, including War and Navy Departments	659,757	643,087	+187 −16,857
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			16,679

[1] Industrial employees include unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled, and supervisory employees on construction projects. Maintenance and custodial workers not included.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 658. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 659. A bill to provide for advancement on the retired list of certain officers receiving retired pay of a higher grade and to give retired Army officers benefits already granted by law to retired officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 660. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; and

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lum Shee Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 662. A bill for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 663. A bill for the relief of the Albany National Bank;

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart; and

S. 665. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 666. A bill providing for payment of $300 to each enrolled member of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., from joint funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 667. A bill for the relief of certain alien nationals of India; and

S. 668. A bill for the relief of certain Indonesian aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. THYE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MALONE, Mr. HOEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. ELLENDER) introduced Senate bill 669, to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 670. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 671. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; and

S. 672. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia who are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 673. A bill to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 674. A bill to provide compensation for overtime service of substitute employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 675. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Mary Gemma Kawamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Louise S. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 677. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. CAPPER (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LANGER) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 76, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

BONUS ON WHEAT AND CORN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr.

JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. THYE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MALONE, Mr. HOEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EQUAL RIGHTS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. LANGER], and myself, I am proud to ask unanimous consent to reintroduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing to the Constitution the so-called equal-rights amendment, which would give women full justice under the law. This proposed amendment will some day soon, I hope, take its place in the Constitution beside the woman-suffrage amendment as its logical successor.

It is with added pleasure that I introduce the joint resolution proposing the amendment because its first sponsor in the United States Senate was my colleague, Senator Charles Curtis, of Kansas, later Vice President. He had my support at that time. Furthermore, the first Representative to introduce the equal-rights amendment in the House of Representatives was another Kansan, Daniel R. Anthony, nephew of the great Susan B. Anthony. The day will soon come when everyone who believes in justice will understand the need of securing an equal constitutional status for women.

The equal-rights amendment has made great progress. Both the Republican and Democratic Parties approved the proposed amendment in their 1944 national platforms. The President of the United States has given his support to the amendment. The governors of 30 States have declared for it. The chairmen of both political parties have endorsed the amendment, and during the Seventy-ninth Congress this measure was voted on in the United States Senate, receiving a majority vote. Furthermore, a large number of important national women's organizations have voiced their approval of this measure.

It should not be forgotten that the Charter of the United Nations declares in its preamble for "fundamental human rights—the dignity and worth of the human person—the equal rights of men and women." The United States will take the necessary steps toward equality and justice through the adoption of this amendment.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. CAPPER (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds with the consideration of the unfinished business I should like, if I may, to speak on another subject. I shall take but a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement regarding the confirmation of Mr. David Lilienthal's nomination as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission—which he has been heading since January 1—for a 2-year term, at which time the whole issue will again be before us.

After careful study and analysis I have come to the conclusion that the accusations made against his character and patriotism are without proof and without foundation.

I also have satisfied myself that he is the only man in the United States who has ever administered a project anywhere near so large and so complex as that which he will be required to administer as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and that therefore he is exceptionally well trained and well qualified.

I shall therefore vote to confirm his nomination.

LINCOLN'S PHILOSOPHY THEN AND NOW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Lincoln's Philosophy Then and Now," delivered by him before the Middlesex Club, Boston, Mass., on Wednesday, February 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION OF JEWS INTO PALESTINE—LETTER FROM SENATOR WILEY TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 20, 1947, addressed by him to the Secretary of State regarding the admission of 100,000 Jewish displaced persons into Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR ON LABOR LEGISLATION: MEDIATION BOARD PROPOSALS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Labor Legislation: Mediation Board Proposals," delivered by Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, February 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTIAN RACE RELATIONSHIP—ARTICLE BY REV. WILLIAM F. JUNKIN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Christian Race Relationship," written by Rev. William F. Junkin, and published in the Southern Presbyterian Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

APOLOGY TO AUTHOR OF "PEARL HARBOR"—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Apology to an Author," published in the February 3, 1947, edition of the Chicago Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN AND HIS MOTHER—EDITORIAL FROM COLUMBIA (S. C.) RECORD

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman and His Mother," published in the Columbia (S. C.) Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish briefly to state to the Senate my viewpoint regarding the pending business. I have the greatest respect for the courageous recommendations of the Joint Congressional Budgetary Committee as presented by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I applaud this drive upon swollen Federal expenditures which dangerously threaten to persist unless they confront a sturdy, relentless cru-

sade to force them back toward fiscal sanity. But the actual over-all budgetary figure upon which we shall ultimately agree is less important than the fact that we shall, for the first time in history, set an over-all legislative limitation upon our appropriations for the next fiscal year. This is an epochal innovation, pregnant with hope for the long-suffering American taxpayer. I heartily applaud the principle and I shall realistically support it.

Whatever the final outcome of our debate respecting specific figures, it seems certain that we shall pledge ourselves to a cut of at least four and a half billion dollars in the Presidential budget. This represents major and unprecedented economy, if, Mr. President, we subsequently vote on actual appropriations as we now vote on the far less painful issue of their abstract, total boundaries.

Therefore I have no quarrel with any of my colleagues as to the actual over-all figure we should set. I personally favor the $4,500,000,000 gash as proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], for reasons which I shall briefly explain. But I have complete respect for those of my colleagues who would set the gash at $6,000,000,000, so long as they do it with a conscious purpose to match their personal zeal with the ultimate fortitude which their prospectus will require of them in the tough days to come when these economies must be given actual and specific application.

I favor promising an over-all reduction of $4,500,000,000 in the Presidential budget, and then striving to make it $6,000,000,000 if we can. The pledge of $4,500,000,000 in no sense precludes the achievement of $6,000,000,000 if the facts warrant and if our fortitude persists when we face actual and specific appropriations. I do not vote against $6,000,000,000 when I support the Millikin amendment. I only vote against a pledge which, on the basis of the joint committee's work sheets, I do not believe to be attainable without serious threat to the public welfare.

I take judicial notice of the fact that any figure named today, in the absence of supporting testimony, is a gigantic speculation.

If subsequent facts justify $6,000,000,000, then $6,000,000,000 it should be; and $6,000,000,000 it can be, regardless of contemporary pledge that we shall cut at least $4,500,000,000. If subsequent facts do not justify $6,000,000,000, I prefer—and I think the people would prefer—present commitments more in keeping with future performance. And, Mr. President, since the committee's work sheets apparently plan to take something like two and a quarter billion dollars of the $6,000,000,000 out of national security at home and abroad, and since I cannot hereafter conscientiously vote all of this particular reduction because I deeply fear it jeopardizes our winning of the peace, it is obvious that I must support the Millikin amendment if my own commitment and my own performance are to harmonize.

Before coming to the latter part in great detail, I wish to make one further over-all comment. Mr. President, there are still 16 Senators here who were here in March 1933, when the Roosevelt administration took power. I am one of them. I have poignant recollections of what happened at that time. It will be remembered, however reluctantly, that a key pledge of the original Roosevelt administration was to cut Federal expenditures 25 percent. It will be remembered that the President, in his first address to Congress, eloquently said:

> Most liberal governments are wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy: we must avoid this danger.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that the first major action of the Congress at that time was to pass the drastic economy bill. There was no guesswork about that one. It sank the ax into the very heart of specific appropriations. Nearly everyone, in the preliminary zeal of a great emotion, voted for the economy bill, myself included. The country rejoiced. We were heroes, pro tempore. Soon the slashes began to take effect. Great sectors of the country began to groan. Economy in the concrete was far less popular than it had been in the abstract. Representatives and Senators began to sweat. Our orchids began to wilt. It was not long before Congress was whittling at the Economy Act, and it was not very long before the 25 percent reduction promise was out the window; and when it flew out, the biggest spending spree in all our history flew in.

Mr. President, I am not seeking to precipitate a political debate. I am simply speaking historically. I do not remotely suggest a prospective parallel today. Neither do I deny that the Economy Act of 1933 required remodeling in many particulars. I am simply saying to the Senate that Senators will not have saved so much as one thin dime by the passage of this concurrent resolution today in respect to the generalities of economy. The votes that will count will be the votes on the subsequent reduced appropriations themselves. If Senators cannot vote for the latter, I beg of them not to vote for the former. I feel reasonably sure that we can subsequently vote to take $4,500,000,000 out of the Presidential budget, although I can promise you, Mr. President, that even this will not be easy in the pinches. Therefore, I shall vote for the $4,500,000,000 cut. I shall be glad to join in striving for still more. I hope we can do still more. I shall be very happy if we can reach a cut of $6,000,000,000.

I agree that Republicans came out of the last campaign under special mandate to heavily reduce Federal expenditures. I propose to keep that pledge to the maximum degree. But, Mr. President, I do not believe it is any more prudent to overpromise than it is to overspend.

I have a particular reason, Mr. President, for being unable to join in promising that last $1,500,000,000 in reductions in order to reach the $6,000,000,000 cut. According to the joint committee's work sheets, as I understand them and as reported in the press, $2,225,000,000 of the proposed $6,000,000,000 cut is contemplated as a reduction in appropriations for the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, our occupation forces abroad, and food for the American occupied areas in Germany, Korea, and Japan. I shall have to say it bluntly, Mr. President: I cannot escape the conviction that this may prove to be sheer folly. At this critical juncture in world affairs, when there are great powers which think only in terms of force, I do not believe we have any right to speculate, to indulge in guesswork—and that is all we are doing here today—at the expense of our national security in this restless and unpredictable world. In my view, this is the year of all years when we must hold the line.

Mr. President, I reread two sentences from Washington's Farewell Address, to which we have listened today:

> As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it.

Mr. President, I wish to be plainly understood. I do not for an instant deny that, under the impact of war, the armed forces have been prodigally extravagant and wasteful. War is that way. I do not deny for an instant that it is possible to dig out repeated exhibits, here and there, to hold the Army and the Navy up to scorn, even to ridicule, in their procurement programs. I do not deny for an instant that the War Department and the Navy Department should contribute to reasonable economy in the fiscal year 1948. I do not for an instant pretend that the Army and the Navy should be untouchables in this campaign for economy—to borrow a word from the able address given last Wednesday by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whom I have always supported in his notable economy drives.

But, Mr. President, I beg of all Senators to remember that the President cut the original estimates of the Army and the Navy by several billion dollars. I beg of them to realize that when we support the Millikin amendment, putting the present over-all estimate at $4,500,000,000, we are voting for another cut of $750,000,000 in these items for the armed services and the national defense, on the basis of the work sheets of the joint committee. That is not "hay." That does not leave them either untouched or untouchable. I beg of the Senate to remember that the war is not over for us until we have safely finished with our occupational responsibilities in middle Europe and the Far East. It is not over until we have won permanent peace. Discount their testimony as you please; call them "brass hats" if you wish; but listen, at least for one monitory moment, to what the responsible military and civilian heads of the national defense and America's foreign policy have to say about what their share of this

contemplated $6,000,000,000 cut may threaten in respect to the necessities which they must serve.

Mr. President, this is what they say is at stake:

First. The possibility of reducing our air power to that of "a second-rate air force, largely equipped with obsolete planes within 3 to 5 years."

Second. The possibility of laying up most of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets.

Third. A reduction in the over-all strength of the Army by from 200,000 to 300,000 men—below the minimum force required to occupy former enemy countries in Europe and the Far East, and to cut the strength of the Navy below the minimum level of 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers.

Fourth. To bring inevitable starvation in the occupied areas by reducing the already low civil ration, and that is definitely and specifically the prospectus on the work sheet in respect to the funds available for this particular purpose.

On this point I remind my colleagues of Secretary Marshall's statement:

> If the Army is deprived of adequate funds to provide funds for these people who are so sorely in need, a practically impossible situation is created for our troops and our Government in its international commitments.

I also remind the Senate that under similar circumstances General MacArthur once wired home, as follows:

> Send me food or send me soldiers.

And it is proposed that we take both away from him!

Fifth. It radically reduces vital research and development for both ground and air weapons at the very time when science is writing new mass-destruction prophecies with a rushing pen.

Sixth. It curtails by 50 percent the strength of the National Guard and Organized Reserves; reduces procurement of modern combat planes from 900 to 500; curtails pilot training; requires disposal for scrap of large numbers of ships valuable as a security reserve.

Mr. President, we may discount all of this as we please, cut it by 50 percent, cut it by 75 percent, or cut it by 90 percent, but what is our vindication for what we do? Upon whom shall we depend for guidance in a matter of this utterly vital concern? Even though we take off the greatest percentage we may wish, so long as we leave a single factor threatening the national security of the United States at a moment like this in the history of the world, in my humble opinion, and with the greatest respect for those who may do so, I think they are taking an unjustified and unwarranted action.

Mr. President, I simply do not believe that America can afford any part of such a hazard. In my view it would duplicate the tragic error we made by our unshared idealism after World War I. Until the United Nations demonstrates itself to be a wholly dependable alternative reliance, we must continue to rely upon ourselves. Until we get universal disarmament on a disciplined basis, we cannot afford to disarm alone; and, if we do disarm alone, we shall lose all our influence and all our authority in creating any sort of effective international disarmament agreements on the part of other nations.

The war is not over for us, Mr. President, until German and Japanese occupation is over. Any lapse in our purposes or resources in this connection will be an open invitation to Soviet Russia to fill the vacuum.

Economy which produces any such results is penny wisdom and pound foolishness of the bitterest and most expensive sort.

This year of all years, when the chips are down in the most important postwar developments on the diplomatic front which this Nation ever encountered, it is my relentless view that we dare not present to the world the picture of a pacifist America hastening to retire into her vulnerable shell, a picture of Uncle Sam with a chip on each shoulder and both arms in a sling.

Mr. President, perhaps my colleagues think that I vastly overemphasize my challenge. Perhaps I do. Perhaps General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, General MacArthur, Secretary Marshall, Secretary Patterson, and Secretary Forrestal are all wrong about this matter; perhaps it is safe to dismiss these warnings in favor of our own uneducated speculations, but why take the chance? Why is it necessary even in the name of economy to take the chance? Why close the door upon our own congressional effort to deal with these factors as events themselves shall recommend? Why not fix this over-all figure at $4,500,000,000, and then if facts presented to our Appropriations Committees subsequently warrant further reductions at the expense of the Army and the Navy, let the additional cut then be made as the facts justify. Thus, if it is safe, the $6,000,000,000 figure may be reached just as surely, just as easily, as if we committed ourselves to an unknown equation this afternoon.

If we develop the proof in passing upon actual appropriation bills this spring that we can safely cut deeper than $4,500,000,000, I for one will earnestly join those who favor that in the economy drive, but in a matter of this transcendental importance, why not await the proofs? The economy drive does not end today. It only just begins.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks a telegram from Paul H. Griffith, national commander of the American Legion, supporting every word I have said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 16, 1947.*

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Three and one-half million men who fought our country's two World Wars know from first-hand experience the value of national security and the folly of unpreparedness.

These veterans are righteously alarmed at the prospect of further reducing the strength of our armed forces. Such reductions are implied by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee's irrationally recommended $6,000,000,000 cut in the national budget.

They vigorously oppose the reported slice of $2,250,000,000 for the armed forces, including a cut of $750,000,000 which would destroy the Naval Reserve training program and preclude further developments in naval aeronautics; the proposed slash of $500,000,000 intended to feed the starving people in occupied countries whose behavior might otherwise necessitate the expense of additional troops; the terrific hacking away of Air Force funds, and the $200,000,000 reduction in the Veterans' Administration appropriations. They are appalled to learn that their Government contemplates sabotage of the proposed universal military training program, recommended by high Government officials and demanded by the public, through a $1,000,000,000 cut in Army appropriations.

Are we to discard already the lessons learned in the last war?

After each war we have adopted the penny-wise, pound-foolish philosophy which has reduced our armed forces to impotency. Our token forces in occupied countries are now dangerously near tourist strength. Through our weakness after each war we have invited aggression. These world wars created the heavy taxes which Congress is now trying to reduce. Wars are responsible for the enormous public debt.

For more than a century and a half America has refused to make the small sacrifices in peacetime which would have prevented such great sacrifices in men and money. As a result this Nation, whose people cherish peace, has found itself regularly at war.

Must we again confess our guilt in weakening ourselves in the eyes of the whole world and rendering ourselves incapable of securing in peace our wartime victory?

Are we to ignore our international commitments to the extent that our representatives at peace parleys become the targets for contemptuous mockery by nations which have remained strong and influential?

In this critical and turbulent hour a world of nations watches us to see what action we will take to maintain our leadership in world affairs. There is a solemn and sacred obligation upon America to remain strong until a permanent, feasible peace plan is established.

We must not permit America's insurance policy to expire at this uncertain hour.

The American Legion has always been a proponent of economy in government. It detests red tape and bureaucratic bungling that penalizes taxpayers and prevents good government. The American Legion is confident, however, that economy achieved at the expense of security or veterans is no economy at all.

May I respectfully remind Congress that it is directed by the United States Constitution to provide for the common defense of the several States?

If the issue involved must be resolved by guaranteeing citizens their constitutional rights or fulfillment of campaign pledges, there can be only one American answer.

PAUL H. GRIFFITH,
National Commander,
the American Legion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. When the Appropriations Committee enters upon its deliberations, if the facts should warrant the conclusion that a $4,500,000,000 cut would not be safe, the Senator from Michigan takes the position, as I understand, that the cut should be less than $4,500,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the Senator from Michigan takes the position at all

times that the cut must not be at the expense of the honest public welfare, and that today's pledge under any circumstances is secondary to the public welfare.

On the other hand, the Senator from Michigan takes the position that when we set our sights today at a particular target, we are morally committed to make every possible effort we can make, even under the travail which our souls will have to sustain, in order to try to reach that target, if it does not interfere with the public welfare.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the statement made by the Senator from Michigan, but I think it should also be made clear that the same authorities he has cited against a $6,000,000,000 cut have not said we can safely make a $4,500,000,000 cut.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been asked by four or five Senators to yield. It is perfectly obvious that if I yield to one I shall have to yield to all who have requested it. I ask, therefore, that I be permitted to proceed. My remarks will not be lengthy, and I must decline to yield at this time.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator decline to yield for one moment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Because I have five requests, I would not care to yield to one without yielding to all, and I hope the Senator from New Jersey will appreciate my predicament.

Mr. HAWKES. I do, and I shall not ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at this fateful hour in the affairs of nations and men there is no greater service to be rendered to the people of the United States, or of the world, than to maintain in this country an adequate national defense. It is now, and will likely remain for some time to come, our greatest national need. All other propositions are secondary to it. There is no other need which remotely approaches it in importance.

Without an adequate national defense, no bond of this Government may be worth the paper it is written on. The Budget of our country could be forever out of balance. The currency system of our Nation could be torn to shreds. Our American way of life could disappear. The world could be involved in the greatest war of all times. In sum, our national and individual existence rests more firmly on an adequate national defense than on any other single element with which our Government has to deal.

Men, in this Chamber and out, view with alarm the expansion and the potential power of the Russian Government. They fill our ears daily with the dangers of communism. They point to countries which they assert live under the oppression of the Russian yoke. They demand that Russia withdraw from Korea, or China, or Azerbaijan, or Poland, or the Balkans. They tell us that the Russians are working day and night, and moving with might and main, to learn the secret of the atom bomb. They say that once this secret is learned it may conceivably be loosed against us and the world. They picture the great world chaos resulting from such a war. They say that never again will there be the luxury of time to get ready. They say that a nation is either ready or it is devastated and defeated. They say if we are not prepared America will go down in ashes, our system lost, our treasury depleted, and 155 years of national existence will be wiped out and our people exterminated. They say that here is the great Gibraltar of democracy, the home of freedom, the land of opportunity, the rallying point for liberty, and the strongest citadel for the dignity of the average man, for the years that are to come.

And yet, having said all these things, they stand here with the broad-ax, the rapier, and the sledge hammer, ready to shower tragic and ill-considered blows of disaster upon the one thing that above all others will save the things we hold dear. In sum, they are willing to vote to cut off, without the most searching and careful examination of the facts—and over the combined protest of the greatest military leaders this Nation has ever produced—the sum of $2,250,000,000 of the estimated needs for an adequate national defense during the coming year.

Men who do not know the bow from the stern of a battleship say battleships are not needed in the next war. Men who have never been out of their own country can glibly pass over the conditions that exist in other lands. Men who have forgotten the tragic moments following Pearl Harbor, their quickened pulses at the hazardous landings on the beaches of France, the great naval battle that for a time hung in the balance in the Philippine Sea, or the dark moments in the dead of winter when the Battle of the Bulge was taking a heavy toll of as fine men as the world will ever see, now seem satisfied with just-so-so national defense.

Cassino, with its agonizing months of assault; the rivulets of blood that mixed with the muddy waters of the Rapido in Italy; the daring and dangerous feat of blasting the Ploesti oil fields; the dark, somber and desperate days of Dunkirk—all are as nothing now. Here but a few months after the greatest war of all times has ended, with confusion still existing everywhere, with hundreds of thousands of displaced persons, with transportation systems yet disrupted, with food scarce among most of the people of the earth, with giant armies still bearing their wartime equipment, they have so soon forgotten the fear-filled moments of but yesterday.

Every man here knows that when war comes it costs an unprepared nation a hundredfold more in men and money to get ready than it would have cost had it kept reasonably prepared. Yet, even after the last war, which largely because we were not ready has left us with a national debt of $260,000,000,000, there are those who would put the Nation in the position where we would have to spend $100 where we might have spent one, as we move forward into the war-clouded skies of the future. And all of this is done in the name of economy—the most abused word, in the instant case, that has fallen from the lips of man since I have been in this Chamber.

With the great, smoldering fires from World War II still burning, gentlemen would diminish the amount of fire insurance which they would carry on the United States of America and its 140,000,000 people. And they would do this in the name of economy.

Mr. President, I assert that a $2,250,000,000 cut in the appropriations for the armed services is as gross a piece of extravagance—viewing the world as it really is at this moment—as has ever been considered by any parliamentary body in the history of mankind. In essence, it is the very antithesis of economy. While it embraces open-handedly greater extravagance in the long run, it embraces open-handedly, too, sharper danger in the long run.

Of course economies can be effected in the armed services; they can be, and they should be; but there is no military genius in this body, nor financial expert for that matter, who can say that $2,250,000,000 could be cut off of the military appropriation, without courting the risk of spending a hundredfold more in the end and exposing the Nation and the world to catastrophe.

Now let me prove these contentions by hard and cold facts. Wednesday, the eminent and able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is deservedly recognized for his great service in this body, made the following statement:

> The average cost of maintaining a member of the armed services, his pay and subsistence, is estimated in the next Budget at $3,100, as compared to $1,386 in 1940, about 2½ times as much.

Let us take these figures and see where the blame for any so-called extravagance lies. First, the pay of a private in 1939 was $21 per month. The pay of a private in 1947 is $75 per month. Here is an increase of 3½ times in the cost of pay alone in 1947 as compared with 1939. Who made this increase of 350 percent? It was made right here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. It was made by the Congress itself. Then why blame the Army for this enormous increase, as my eminent friend from Virginia has done in the sentence I have quoted, when, as every Senator knows, the blame, if any, belongs here in this Chamber.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I do not blame the Army at all. I thought some economies could be effected in the cost of $3,100 a year for the maintenance of each member of the armed forces; and I still think there can be some economies.

Mr. TYDINGS. The total pay cost for Army personnel alone; that is, for military personnel, in 1948, will be at a per capita cost of $2,339 for the next fiscal year as compared with $897 in 1939. Again, in 1939 the total pay cost of the military personnel in the Army was $166,000,000, while in 1948 the same item costs $2,503,000,000, or 15 times as much.

Now take the question of Army subsistence. In 1939 with the Army nearly all quartered in the United States, the cost was $162 per capita, while in the next fiscal year it will cost, with 500,000 soldiers overseas, $327—nearly twice as

much. In other words, when food prices were down and when food was available next door to the camps in this country in 1939, and when refrigeration and huge supply houses were not essential, it cost $162 per man. However, now with large forces overseas and food prices greatly increased and with added transportation costs, due to the long distances, it costs about twice as much. Does any Senator feel that in this day of high prices, when a soldier's food costs $327 a year, there can be, in spite of isolated cases, any great waste in this item or any place where it can be reasonably reduced?

Three hundred and twenty-seven dollars a year is the cost and the allowance for feeding one man in the armed services during 1947. Considering how our armed forces are scattered, the mystery to me is how in the name of common sense they can do it and feed them so well.

Now let us take the item of travel, which in 1939 was only $3,000,000 a year. With our troops overseas, many on short enlistments necessitating replacements, it costs $158,000,000 for travel in 1948. Can much economy be effected here? If so, how?

Let us take the question of medical and hospital care, which in 1939 cost us $2,000,000, while in 1948 it costs $78,000,000. There are still 9,000 wounded men in the military hospitals of the Nation. This item includes, of course, the maintenance of hospitals abroad, because of the more dangerous character of present-day soldiering over all the earth for our troops, as compared with the conditions which prevailed in 1939, when nearly all of them were quartered in this country. How much can we cut down on the medical and hospital department of the Army? Perhaps to some extent, but who is going to cut the appropriation for the sick and wounded materially, considering the conditions to which our troops are exposed, which did not prevail in 1939.

Let us take another figure—and all these figures pertain only to the Army, but a similar comparison can be drawn for the Navy—the cost for the Army personnel in 1939 was $415,499,000, or $2,242 per man all told. Then they were practically all in the United States. The war had just begun and was then on a small scale; food was plentiful; our troops were at home; costs were down. But next year it will cost $6,385,000 to maintain these troops, or an average of $5,967 per soldier. This is a little more than twice as much as it cost 8 years ago. These men are in Germany, Japan, China, the islands of the Pacific, Alaska, as well as home, and the turn-over is more rapid than it was in 1939. The figures I have given the Senate are all for the Regular Establishment. They do not include the National Guard, Organized Reserves, or ROTC. However, the figures for the Army make up nearly 60 percent of the total estimated military budget of $11,000,000,000.

Let me repeat, I do not believe that Congress is going to reduce the pay of the men serving in the armed forces—if any gentleman thinks Congress is going to reduce their pay I should like to see him, for I would have great respect for his fortitude—or their subsistence, or their clothing, or their hospital and medical requirements, or their travel, to any great extent, if at all. And when items such as these are eliminated from the Budget, where in the world are we going to make a two and a quarter billion dollar cut in the remainder of it when it is estimated that the Army alone will need $6,000,000,000? And if a cut of two and one-quarter billion dollars is made there will only be three and one-half billion dollars left in which to make a billion and a half dollars of savings.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can by careful scrutiny compel the Military Establishment to cut out everything in the program that is not vitally necessary to the Nation's defense and cut out everything in the military program that may be termed "extravagant" or "wasteful," or even "inefficient." But, after we have done this, mark my words, as the figures I have presented will show, there is not going to be any cut of two and a quarter billion in the armed forces unless Congress, in contrast to the many prepared speeches I have heard here, is willing to say that now there is no danger of war; that now we do not have to be prepared; that now we can forget about world affairs pretty much altogether.

May I call the Senate's attention to the fact that Senator after Senator in this very Chamber has criticized the Russion occupation of Poland, or of Hungary, Austria, Yugoslavia, and other countries. They have criticized the Russians for not withdrawing promptly from China. They have criticized the Russians for not withdrawing promptly from Azerbaijan. They have criticized the Russians for the attempts to grab the Dardanelles. They have criticized the Russian occupation of Korea. They have criticized Russian actions in the United Nations.

Does any man in his right mind think that Russia will take a kinder attitude in the future toward these and other problems if our Military Establishment is so weakened that its ability to maintain world stabilization, as well as our own defense, is called into question? Many men who have spoken on Memorial Day, at American Legion rallies, Flag Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Jefferson's Birthday, and repeatedly on the floor of the Senate have declaimed "This must never happen again: we must never be unprepared again, for the next time there will be no time to get ready."

Have these patriots of the naked word forgotten the speeches of but yesterday? Do they now repudiate all the patriotic fervor and emotion with which they declared this would never happen again?

Are they content to pace the floor at night, having learned much of the secrets and potentialities of the atomic bomb, and with cold fear at their side whispering into their ears that an atomic bomb war is possible and that unless the world can be organized for peace, America, if unprepared, is gone? Do they propose to be prepared but slash nearly one quarter of the estimated Army and Navy requirements for reasonable national preparedness?

But yesterday our great generals and admirals were acclaimed deservedly as heroes—Marshall and King, Eisenhower and Nimitz, MacArthur, Bradley, Patton, Clark, Halsey, and others. What a strange metamorphosis has taken place since the shouts and the cheers on their return have died. I am astounded to learn now that Eisenhower knows nothing about world matters, our military requirements, and is incompetent to tell us about the need of our own national defense; while the grand old man of the Navy, Admiral Nimitz, is secondary as a military strategist in naval requirements to the bemedaled and epauletted Senate admirals who, from the quarter-deck of their desks, are now planning the strategy to avert all dangers from whatever quarter they may come.

With a feeling of solemnity and a saddened heart I say that the 32,000,000 human souls who were killed and wounded in two great world wars seem to have taught us little, if anything. The amputees, the blinded, the wounded—the real debt of this recent great holocaust—no longer are expert witnesses in the trial of America's critical future. It was to such as these that we said, "It will never, never happen again." We meant it when we said it, but the question is, Do we mean it now?

It may interest some of the Members of this body to go back and read the debates of 1929 on the 15-cruiser bill. Then Hitler had not been heard of. Then Mussolini was just beginning to strut across the stage. Then Japan was a far-off, isolated country. I can hear those speeches now, and see, as clear as day, the Senators who made them. "There will never again be another war! It is a waste of money to build 15 new cruisers for our Navy. All we have to do is to sound the horn and men with their rifles will come down from the hills and form overnight an invincible army that will sweep back all opposition." Letters and telegrams piled up in our offices. Those of us who advocated the program then advocated for the Navy were denounced as militarists, as being under the domination of the Army and Navy clique, the brass hats. That is what the wise-crackers, the boys who molded public sentiment, the boys who knew it all, uttered in that day 18 years ago.

After Pearl Harbor, Mr. President, the 15 cruisers then authorized after weeks and weeks of debate in this body were the only thin remaining line holding the Japs at bay and protecting the shores of our country. Those 15 cruisers became the nucleus of the Navy that afterward went forth and finally dispatched the enemy on the high seas and in the air.

Those cruisers then—and mark well this fact—did not cost one-fourth as much as they would have cost had they been built during the course of World War II; and if we had not had them, the price we would have paid would have been a thousandfold more than their original cost of construction.

I likewise am astounded that because we have invented the atom bomb, men

think the last word in weapons has been attained. Scientists tell us that it is possible to invent a new atom bomb 1,000 times as devastating as those we have already learned about.

Do Senators, who represent the sovereign people of this free Republic, not know that there is in the not-far-distant future the prospect of success in developing a plane which will fly more than 1,000 miles an hour? Do Senators forget that when the atom-bomb tests took place at Bikini more than 300 flights, some of them in giant 4-engine planes, were made without a single man being in any of those ships? Do Senators forget the flying bombs of Hitler which covered hundreds of miles and almost brought London to its knees?

Do Senators forget that the proximity fuze self-exploded the shell at the desired point upon an unseen target? Do Senators know that scientists are now working on harnessing and developing cosmic rays, which are even more formidable than the atom bomb? Do Senators know that there are able and sound-thinking men high in our Military Establishments who feel that the day is not far distant when guided missiles can be fired across the ocean?

Or are we living in a dream world, still watering the flowers of sweet innocence in the peaceful garden of yesterday?

Would we rather cut these military estimates and make an unusually large temporary saving, only to spend 1,000 times more later because of these cuts? Would it not be appropriate respectfully to suggest to the President of the United States that his best admirals and generals are in this Chamber? For here we have men who could have won the war more quickly, more efficiently, and under whose wise leadership not a single pound of butter would have been wasted. The war would have been ended months before. Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo were really nothing to worry about. Amateurs like Eisenhower and MacArthur, Nimitz and Halsey, just did not know how to conduct a war as we could have conducted it from the floor of the United States Senate, and as we propose to conduct the preparedness program if the suggested cut is made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has stated the amount of the budget for the armed services; he has also stated what, in his opinion, are certain irreducible expenditures; and he has further stated that a $2,250,000,000 cut in the armed-forces appropriation is out of the question. If this be the proper time to ask the question, Has the Senator made any estimate as to what would be a reasonable and safe cut in military expenditures?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to that very point now. I thank the Senator for suggesting it.

This is the consideration upon which this whole debate should really turn: Concededly, laymen like ourselves, after thorough and careful examination, can cut the military estimates. We can lop off some millions of dollars here and millions of dollars there without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. We may, without hurting our Military Establishment, even approach a cut of $500,000,000. Indeed, it is conceivable that after we balance all the factors we might make a billion-dollar saving in the military budget, without the serious disapproval of those who, unlike us, have the real responsibility of springing to instant action when the hour for fighting comes.

I am not contending against such action. What I am attempting to develop, and the point upon which our decision should turn, is this: Is it wise so to cut military expenditures as to jeopardize the world's peace, weaken the hands of our representatives in the peace councils, weaken the potential bargaining power of our Nation in the United Nations Security Council, and weaken the chance of obtaining what our President is valiantly fighting to secure, namely, gradual and proportionate world disarmament in all nations?

Let us look at it from another angle. Will the saving of an additional billion dollars, from the drastic cutting of military estimates, really conduce to the peace of the world, a long-time reduction in our national debt, and a lightening of the burden of taxation? I do not believe we will aid world peace or serve the welfare of our own people, unless we approach a reduction in military estimates with caution and care. Viewing the circumstances which now confront the world, it seems to me a dangerous thing to make larger cuts than safety considerations indicate are wise.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I shall therefore support the proposal of the Senator from Colorado to cut the Budget but $4,500,000,000 instead of $6,000,000,000. In doing so, I feel I am making the greatest contribution to the financial stability of this Nation, to the perpetuation of its free institutions; to the retention of its system of free enterprise; to the peace of the world; and to an ultimate greater reduction in all taxes. In my own humble way, I think I shall be keeping faith with the millions of dead in all lands who have unnecessarily made the supreme sacrifice, because democracies never seem to learn, even though they are taught in the school of blood, sweat, and sacrificial experience.

If it be said that there will be no time to get ready when the next war breaks out, then it is self-evident we must be better prepared than we have ever been before in our history.

If it be said, as some have said, that the next war will be so rapid that it will simply be a matter of push buttons, then we must have the push buttons and the men ready to press them, and the missiles which they will send forth at a moment's notice.

If it be said, as many have said, that unless we are ready our great industrial cities, wherein live millions of our people, will be wiped out in a few hours or a few days, then we must have available the means to prevent this catastrophe.

If it be said, as many have said, that the next war will be a war employing science and invention on a scale never before witnessed, then we must have the research laboratories operating and the discoveries therein made translated into material things or we shall face national extinction.

If it be said that we must not repeat the mistake of the Naval Disarmament Conference of 1922 when the United States practiced disarmament by example, then we must keep up our armaments while other nations keep up theirs or we shall by too drastic a cut in the military estimates in effect embrace disarmament by example all over again.

If it be said, as many have said, that the next war will be an atomic war, then we must have the atom bomb and supporting weapons, the men, the planes, the factories, the fields, and the equipment to protect America on an hour's notice.

If it be said, as many have said, that the financial stability of this Government depends on drastic reduction of Government expenses, then we must make up our minds to make most of these reductions outside the Military Establishment; for there can be no financial stability in America or the world if we are not strong enough by our might to make it conceivably disastrous for any nation to break the peace. A breach of the peace may mean doubling the size of our national debt, doubling the taxes that all must pay, surrendering many of our freedoms, and, indeed, defeat and national disaster.

Mr. President, I shall favor every reasonable cut in the budget of the armed services which prudence and caution make wise. I shall not favor any cut in the military estimates which endanger the security and the welfare of my country; and I know from a partial examination of the facts that no such cut as is contemplated by the proposed $6,000,000,000 slash in the budget estimates can be achieved without impairing the defenses of the country we all love.

For these and other reasons, I shall vote against the $6,000,000,000 cut and support the $4,500,000,000 cut, believing that by so doing we shall have achieved the maximum economy possible and still kept our Nation reasonably prepared in a troubled world for any emergency that may conceivably arise.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Maryland has quoted facts upon which he bases the statements and arguments he has made here today. May I inquire of the Senator where he obtained those facts?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have before me, and I shall ask permission to insert in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, a statement of the War Department showing the break-down for the entire $6,385,000,000 of the Army's part of the defense appropriation. The figures from which I quoted were in the columns for 1939 and 1948, which I used for comparison. The total in the column for 1948, $6,385,000,000, includes pay of more than $2,500,000,000, which leaves only $4,000,000,000 for subsistence and all the other items that go into our military department. Therefore, if $1,500,000,000 were cut from the Army appropriation it

would take from the $4,000,000,000 remaining, after eliminating the cost of paying the troops, about $2,500,000,000 for all the other ramified activities, which I shall not discuss at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understand the Senator, he has devoted his own individual effort and time to obtaining the exhibits and this information upon the basis of which his address has been made.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator from Maryland, through his own initiative, obtained these facts, and could find nothing in connection with the report which was made by the Legislative Budget Committee which would give him any information whatsoever upon which he could make the speech he has just made on this question?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I should like to conclude, inasmuch as the Senator has asked me a question, with one other figure; and I hope Senators will keep in mind the two figures I am now about to mention.

Of the total of $11,200,000,000 for both the Army and Navy, the amount requested for the Army amounted to $6,573,000,000. Keep that figure in mind. In the Army food, clothing, and pay alone cost more than $3,000,000,000. Therefore, if we subtract $3,000,000,000 from the six and one-half billion there is only $3,500,000,000 left; and if we make a cut of a billion and a half dollars in the Army appropriations, as has been frequently proposed, it would mean taking away almost half of the total remaining appropriation for equipment and all the other services which the Army deems vital.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two columns of the table which has been under discussion inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average cost per military person during fiscal years 1939 and 1948

Item	Fiscal year 1939 (185,000 man-years)		Fiscal year 1948 (1,070,000 man-years)	
	Obligations	Per capita	Expenditures	Per capita
Pay	$166,000,000	$897	$2,503,000,000	$2,339
Subsistence	30,000,000	162	350,000,000	327
Clothing and equipage	14,000,000	75	188,000,000	176
Regular supplies	4,000,000	19	112,000,000	105
Transportation of things	9,000,000	48	424,000,000	396
Medical and Hospital Department, Army	2,000,000	9	73,000,000	73
Welfare	35,000	.2	10,000,000	9
Travel	3,000,000	15	158,000,000	148
Housing and facilities (barracks and quarters, military posts, and 430 engineering services)	27,000,000	149	526,000,000	491
Air Corps	73,000,000	394	1,150,000,000	1,075
Signal, Engineers, Ordnance, and Chemical	65,000,000	354	590,000,000	551
Special field exercises	464,000	2.5	8,000,000	8
Expediting production	0	0	2,000,000	2
Miscellaneous	22,000,000	118	286,000,000	267
Total, excluding National Guard, Organized Reserves, and Reserve Officers' Training Corps	415,499,000	2,242.7	6,385,000,000	5,967
National Guard	43,000,000	217	111,000,000	412
Organized Reserves	12,000,000	397	52,000,000	43
Reserve Officers' Training Corps	7,000,000	37	25,000,000	141
Total	477,499,000	----------	6,573,000,000	----------

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Maryland has made a very full and able argument as to why he does not wish to cut the appropriations for the armed forces or does not believe it is possible to cut them more than a billion dollars at most, and probably less than that. He has stated that he will vote in favor of a reduction of four and a half billion dollars in the President's budget.

Has the Senator made a sufficient estimate of the other $3,500,000,000 or more to warrant a moral commitment on his part as to that reduction?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator himself several times has gone over the budget submitted by the President. It is a very complicated document, and the Senator from Maryland has not the capacity to penetrate the ramifications of all the departments and bureaus.

I may say that I approve, with all the force at my command, what the able President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said earlier in his address. I am shooting at the $4,500,000,000 figure. Not that I think it is sure to be attained, and not that I think it can be done, but I am shooting at it as a possible objective which we might hope to reach. Likewise, I am opposing the $6,000,000,000 cut, because I do not believe it is attainable. But if I find on subsequent examination, in addition to that which I have already made or which others may suggest, that it is possible to go as far as $6,000,000,000, I should like to go to that extent. But I do not think it is possible to go to $4,500,000,000, if the Senator wishes my honest opinion, unless we leave the armed services in a position where world peace will perhaps be jeopardized, where world disarmament will be jeopardized, and where conceivably riots and uprisings may break out abroad due to things which may grow from small bonfires into conflagrations. It is conceivable that inadvertently we might have to expend many billions of dollars for purposes which we did not have in mind when we made such economies.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Illinois. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the early part of his address, the Senator from Maryland referred to the cost of maintaining a man in the Army, either per annum or month; I forget which. Does the Senator from Maryland recall what those figures are?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator repeat them now?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall repeat them, briefly. For pay, alone, in 1939 it cost $897 per man. For pay alone in 1948 it will cost $2,339 per man. In 1939 a private received $21 a month. In 1948 a private will receive $75 a month, plus 20 percent, which we ourselves put into the law, for service overseas.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the total per annum?

Mr. TYDINGS. The total per annum is as follows: In 1939 it was $166,000,000 for pay alone. In 1948 it will be $2,503,000,000 for pay alone, without subsistence, without clothing, without medical supplies, and without transportation.

Mr. AIKEN. How much is that per man?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is $2,339 per man.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Maryland have any figures to show what are the maintenance costs per man?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I have them. Let me sum them up in this way: In 1939, for pay, food, clothing, and equipage, the cost was $210,000,000. In 1948, for food, pay, clothing, and equipage the cost will be $3,041,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. How much is that per man? Does the Senator have those figures, as well?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can give the Senator the figures afterwards, and he can add them up. They are broken down.

Mr. AIKEN. I was simply asking for the figures, so that I might compare the cost of maintaining a man in the Army with the cost of maintaining a civilian employee of the War Department, because the War Department has greatly increased the number of civilian employees who are doing some of the work that men in the Army used to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I explored that situation as far as I could. We can eliminate some of the civilian employees; but if we do not watch out, when we eliminate a civilian employee we shall find that an Army man is put in his place, and, of course, often the cost of maintaining an Army man is higher than the cost of maintaining a civilian employee.

Let me give the Senator from Vermont one example: We have 9,000 wounded men now in the hospitals of the Army, scattered all over the earth. We have civilian nurses who look after them; I believe they are called civilian orderlies. If we take those orderlies out of the hospitals, in many cases it will be necessary to have Army men take their places. If we do that, the net cost will be greater than it would have been if we had let the Army stay out of it, and had let the civilians run it.

So one who approaches this matter with a broadax or with a sledge hammer simply makes a fool of himself, as he will find if he examines the facts afterward. The time to use the sledge hammer is after we have examined all the facts.

Then we should use it where it can be used effectively.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I have asked for the figures so that a comparison can be made between the cost of doing the work with Army personnel and the cost of doing it with civilian employees.

Mr. TYDINGS. Lest I leave the Senator from Vermont under a misapprehension, let me say that I have no figures as to the work done by civilian employees. But I caution that we had better look forward before we have the work done by Army personnel, rather than by civilian employees.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I feel sure that I correctly understood the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, but I wish to ask a question. From the Senator's remarks, I know he is definitely in favor of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That amendment proposes to cut the budget by $4,500,000,000. However, I do not think the Senator from Maryland wishes any implication to remain in the RECORD that in the event, after all the evidence is in, that the Appropriations Committee should determine that a cut of $4,500,000,000 will seriously interfere with an adequate national defense, he will still be in favor of the $4,500,000,000 cut.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true. As I have said, this resolution binds no one. I am willing to adopt it tentatively, and then in the Appropriations Committee see how close we can reach it in good faith; but I wish it distinctly understood that in voting for it I am not saying that I am sure it is a goal which we can attain.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to carry just a little further the point the Senator from Illinois has raised, because I think we should have a clear understanding of it. If I correctly understood the Senator from Maryland, he said he felt that we should endeavor to make a saving of $4,500,000,000, if possible. Now I understand, from his answer to the question put to him by the Senator from Illinois, that by voting for the Millikin amendment he neither thinks he pledges himself to a $4,500,000,000 cut nor does he think he is morally bound to a $4,500,000,000 cut, if upon further investigation of the Budget at appropriation time he believes that either the national defense or the public welfare in any other respect would be endangered or injured by such a $4,500,000,000 cut in the Budget. Is that a correct interpretation of the Senator's statement?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator affirmatively by saying that, of course, none of us, including the Senator from Maryland, will be bound by this resolution. However, we are morally bound to try to attain the ceiling proposed by the resolution through appropriate cuts in the appropriation bills. I might not be able to find more than $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 of cuts which I could conscientiously support, but I shall try to reach the $4,500,000,000 point, and I think there is a remote chance that we might get near it. But I certainly would not wish to say that I am sure we can reach it or that I think we can achieve a $6,000,000,000 cut.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it very important that the RECORD should show our respective views on that point, because I agree with the Senator from Maryland that each one of us is morally bound to save every dollar that possibly can be saved. That is why I object to putting in the ceiling on the savings, as I think the Millikin amendment tends to do.

In my opinion, it should be clear that by voting for the Millikin amendment we are not pledging ourselves to save $4,500,000,000 because of a moral pledge of any kind, although today we find that the press is trying to give the American people the impression that if the pending concurrent resolution shall be adopted, the Senate will have morally bound itself to a $4,500,000,000 cut.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we are morally bound to strive for it as an objective, but we are not morally bound to reach it, if good judgment shows that it is unwise.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. The inquiry I am about to make is based upon what I conceive to be the absolute accuracy and correctness of the Senator's position, as indicated in the statement he has just made. I should like to ask the Senator's permission to read at this moment the resolution to which the Millikin amendment refers, because it seems to me to make absolutely certain that there is no pledge, express or implied, by the adoption of the Millikin amendment, or the resolution as amended, that if any considerations of national welfare shall make it impossible for us to have a four and a half billion cut, we are bound nevertheless to have it. If I may have permission of the Senator from Maryland, I should like to read the resolution with the Millikin amendment:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year shall not exceed $33,000,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $25,100,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether in his judgment it is not true, as I understand it is his judgment, that the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, to which the Millikin amendment applies, merely expresses the judgment of Congress, "based upon presently available information," as stated therein, and cannot by the slightest possibility indicate that if Congress should later on discover that the considerations of the national welfare make it impossible or unwise for $4,500,000,000 to be slashed from the appropriations, we are nevertheless obligated to proceed. Does not the Senator from Maryland thoroughly agree with that analysis of the resolution?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it is only fair to assert that, of course, the four-and-a-half-billion-dollar proposed cut is based, as the resolution itself says, on presently available data and information. Naturally, as the various appropriation bills come up, there will be more and more information at hand which is not now available. So it is safe to assume that eventually we will know more about what we want to do than we know at the moment.

I do not see how a man can be bound to a contract, so to speak, when only half of the contract has been disclosed to him. That is a crude illustration, but it serves to make my point. Therefore, none of us could be bound, regardless of the effect on the welfare of the country and the circumstances involved, to make a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar cut when upon subsequent information we might find it would ruin the country to do it. It would be silly to say, "We adopted this, therefore we have to do it, anyway." I look upon the proposal before us as an honest effort to set a goal, which we hope is attainable, which we will try to make attainable, but which, in spite of our best efforts, we may find to be a little bit too high for us to reach.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not a fact that the Millikin amendment proposes to do nothing else except change the figure "31.5" to the figure "33", to change the figure "24" to the figure "25.1"? Is it not further true that while we all agree, I take it, that in adopting the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, we certainly express our present judgment, as therein stated—and I take it all of us will endeavor to carry out our present judgment if the welfare of the country will permit it—nevertheless, is it not true, undeniably, that the expression by the Senator from Maryland is sound and correct, as was the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Michigan, and, as I take it, that stated also by the Senator from Oregon? Is it not true, undeniably, that if conditions should arise under which the welfare of our Nation demanded the expenditure of more money than would be permitted under a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar slash, the hands of Congress, by the adoption of the resolution, would not be so tied as to injure the general welfare of our Nation?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's statement is absolutely correct and cannot be successfully disputed by any sound-thinking man anywhere.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. If it is about my own remarks, I yield, but I desire to yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is about the Senator's remarks.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Maryland that if the concurrent resolution incorporating the $4,500,000,000 cut shall be agreed to, and Congress afterward finds it impossible to make a cut of $4,500,000,000, Congress will then be bound, morally or otherwise, to take any further action under the resolution, which we may soon adopt? Or will we just go ahead and make such appropriations as seem to be necessary to the welfare of the country, without regard to the resolution?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to put it this way: The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. When this concurrent resolution shall finally be agreed to—setting $4,500,000,000 as the goal for the cut—and he calls us together, he will say, "Gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations, you know that the Congress wants us to cut expenditures $4,500,000,000. Here is the first appropriation bill. We have to begin somewhere. This is a bill for such and such a department. It is quite obvious that if we are going to cut $4,500,000,000 we have to start in to cut wherever the needs of the Nation will permit." Therefore, we would start on that bill and we would then proceed with the next one. When all the bills are passed, we may have made cuts amounting to $4,500,000,000, or to $3,000,000,000, or $2,000,000,000, or a billion and a half dollars. But I would look on the resolution as a directive to me to do the best I could to meet the figure included in the resolution if it could be met without impairment of the essential services which a free people have a right to expect from their Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Maryland think any further action on the part of Congress will be needed after this resolution is agreed to?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I do not. I do not mean this by way of disparagement, but it is merely a New Year's resolution, which we may break on the 2d day of January.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the question because it was suggested a few days ago that we might have to adopt a subsequent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe implicitly the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. He is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, associated with me as a member of that committee, and I am sure he agrees that this budget estimate is something we believe should be realized if possible; that it is only an objective; that the final action will be dependent entirely upon the appropriation committees of the two Houses passing on the appropriations as they see their necessity, and submitting them to the Senate and House for action.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. I shall conclude by saying that it is much like when either the Senator or myself runs for public office. We tell the people certain things we believe in and certain things we hope to do if we are elected. Quite often when we get into office circumstances have changed, conditions have varied, and we find that we have made too many promises. I have learned in the past 10 or 15 years not to make any election promises at all, and I no longer do, but before I learned in the hard school of experience, sometimes I would be catapulted into a promise; and that is exactly what is happening here. We make a promise, but it is understood the promise is not binding; the resolution means that we will try to fulfill it if it is humanly possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest to the able Senator, in view of his statement, and the observation he just made, that those of us who have served on the Committee on Appropriations with him can be just as sincere in stating that we feel we should strive for a cut of six billion, as are those who believe that a cut of four and a half billion dollars should be made.

I say to the Senator, and I think he will agree, that I have always voted for the appropriations for national defense for which the military asked, and I quite agree with the Senator now that if conditions change and we need more money, there will be no doubt that the Committee on Appropriations will approve larger appropriations.

I ask the Senator, if there is no moral commitment, if this is merely something we are shooting at, would it not be a pretty good New Year's resolution to shoot at a reduction of $6,000,000,000 instead of $4,500,000,000, and still keep the faith with the people who have asked us, in making appropriations, to cut out every dime of waste possible?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator believes a $6,000,000,000 economy can be effected, he should vote for it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe it can be effected, so I am voting for the smaller amount, because I do not want to mislead the people.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad the Senator made that explanation. I want him to know that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am just as sincere in telling the people of Nebraska and the people of the Nation as a whole that we can cut appropriations $6,000,000,000, if the Congress will have the will to go on and cut that much, and my moral obligation is met in the same terms of honesty as is the obligation of the Senator who says we can cut the appropriation only $4,500,000,000, or $2,000,000,000, or none at all.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There has been much talk about this being no more than a pious hope and a sort of loose expectation. I simply wish to refer to section 138 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which says:

> The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

I think that makes it very clear that we are to fix here the amount to be appropriated for the expenditures in the current year. I think it is also axiomatic that no Senator, by taking any current action, ever pledges himself to take action in the future that might destroy his nation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true. I will conclude by saying that if tomorrow Congress were to pass unanimously a law saying that the Federal Government shall not expend more than $33,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948, 5 minutes after passing such a law we could pass another law fixing $40,000,000,000 as the amount; and such action would be perfectly constitutional and, without any disparagement of but keeping with the character of Congress.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I am trying to give up the floor, because the eminent junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has been trying to get the floor for a long while.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall not delay the Senator from North Dakota.

I have followed this argument with a great deal of interest, and I think it has been made quite clear on the floor of the Senate, certainly, that we are not, by the action taken here, fixing the amount of taxes or of appropriations, or taking any course that might affect the taxes imposed on the people.

However, the mail which I receive—and from discussions with other Members of the Senate I know it is true regarding the mail they receive—indicates that many people have a feeling that the fixing of a ceiling—a proposed ceiling on expenditures, I should say, as is proposed in this resolution—is a course of action directly affecting taxation. Of course it will affect it remotely, it will have a guiding influence upon it, in a way, but I think it should very clearly be made apparent to all the people of the country that when we fix a ceiling we do not have to attain that ceiling. The Congress can make its appropriations below it, and, I hope, far below it, in the operation of the Government; and when appropriations and expenditures are lowered, taxes will come down. There is no doubt in my mind, and, I take it, there is no doubt in the minds of other Senators, that the people of this country have insisted that taxes be lowered. The new Reorganization Act, placing a ceiling upon the Budget, or fixing a budget and placing a ceiling, a proposed and an intended ceiling, if I may say so, upon appropriations, as has been so ably said, contemplates a mark at which we shoot as a top figure; but there is a mark below that, just as far below it as we can go in making the appropriations to cover the expenditures of the Federal Government.

I hope that from these discussions the people of the country will derive an understanding that what we are discussing here is not the expenditures which will be made, but the limit which is to be fixed, unless, as has been said, unforeseen circumstances arise that require it to be changed. No man can see into the future nor can the Congress see into the future. May I close by saying that it is important our people understand that the action taken by the Senate today in adopting the resolution is not a fixing of appropriations, it is not a fixing of taxes. It is our hope, and certainly I express my own hope, that the appropriations will be far below the mark set as the limit of the budget, and that we may substantially reduce taxes generally.

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, because of its bearing on the question of the Budget, which the Senate is now considering, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 20, 1947, entitled "Confusion on the Budget."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFUSION ON THE BUDGET

It has seemed at times during recent weeks that the Federal Budget must exercise some sort of hypnotic influence over many Members of Congress, an influence under whose spell the process of reasoning appears to become strangely inverted, causing its victims, as it were, to put last things first and first things last.

The first intimations of this phenomenon were manifested even before the Eightieth Congress foregathered for its first session. They were conspicuously exemplified in the public statements of Representative KNUTSON, the incoming chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Hardly were the elections behind him when Mr. KNUTSON announced that the first business of the new Congress would be to slash taxes (including excises) by 20 percent. With that out of the way, it would then take up such matters as the balancing of the Budget and reducing the public debt. It was some time before the Minnesota Representative could be made to see that he had got the cart before the horse—that a balanced Budget came first, debt reduction second, and tax reduction last.

The same sense of confusion and unreality seemed to pervade the meeting last week of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget and this week's meeting of the Senate Republican conference. At the first of these meetings it was agreed to cut the President's Budget from $37,500,000,000 to $31,500,000,000, or by $6,000,000,000. Certainly it is essential to cut the Budget substantially, but at this meeting no details were given as to where the cuts were to be made or how the particular total of $6,000,000,000 was arrived at. The implication which this seemed to convey, that the committee had more or less picked a figure out of the air and proposed to realize it by cutting all items uniformly and indiscriminately, regardless of their comparative importance, evoked expressions of apprehension from many commentators in and out of Congress. Did this break the spell? Did it bring any fresh information as to the methods to be used in reducing the Budget, or assurances that the $6,000,000,000 cut could be achieved without imperiling the Nation's military strength or its other international commitments? Not at all. It simply brought a new figure. Instead of cutting the Budget by $6,000,000,000, the objective, it was announced, would be $4,500,000,000. This, the theory seemed to be, would put an end to the disquieting possibility that the larger figure might require such a slash in Army and Navy funds as to endanger the country's security. Meantime House Republicans rallied solidly yesterday behind the $6,000,000,000 cut.

It is pleasant to be able to record that one member of the Senate majority, at least, was not befuddled by the proceedings. That was Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., who left the meeting early, but paused long enough to observe to reporters that this approach to budget-cutting was "like a man wielding a meat axe in a dark room," who "might cut off his own head." Mr. LODGE omitted only one point to make his comparison complete. He might have added that in the dark a man's head could be severed by a meat axe with a 4.5-inch handle quite as effectively as by one with a 6-inch handle.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an article which, like the editorial submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, is entitled to serious consideration in connection with the subject now under debate. I submit a newspaper article showing that the Red Army's budget is $4,000,000,000 greater than the budget for our national defense, and showing the total appropriations for the Russian Government, translated into dollars, to be $74,280,000,000.

Last year we reduced the total appropriation to approximately $34,000,000,000, and I, for one, want to state positively that I do not intend to vote for the $6,000,000,000 reduction, nor even for the $4,500,000,000 reduction, because I do not know what serious effects it may have on the security of our country and the continuation of our armed forces.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED ARMY BUDGET TOPS OURS BY MERE 4 BILLIONS

Moscow radio, monitored by the Associated Press, said last night Russia's military expenditures during 1947 will amount to $13,400,000,000—nearly $4,000,000,000 more than the sum Congress is expected to authorize for United States defense in the United States Budget now being considered.

Arseni Zverev, Soviet Finance Minister, who submitted the new Russian budget of $74,280,000,000 to the Supreme Soviet for approval, said the 13,000,000,000-figure for national defense represented a decrease of $1,120,000,000 from the 1946 military total.

Under President Truman's proposed $37,500,000,000 Budget, $11,200,000,000 would be earmarked for national defense. The $6,000,000,000 slash approved yesterday by the House is understood to include a cut of $1,750,000,000 in the United States military appropriation.

Thus, should the reduction be approved by the Senate, only $9,450,000,000 would be granted the American War and Navy Departments for the new fiscal year. This means that the United States arms budget is approximately 29 percent less than the amount Moscow will spend for armed might.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of reluctance and in a very humble spirit that I follow on the Senate floor two of the United States Senate's most distinguished Members, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I have only the greatest admiration and respect for the able manner in which the Senator from Michigan has represented the Republican Party, the Senate of the United States, and the Nation as a whole at the peace tables of the world. I wholeheartedly endorse their speeches in favor of the $4,500,000,000 Budget cut as against the proposed $6,000,000,000 cut.

Mr. President, Congress has pledged itself to a program of extreme economy. I am thoroughly in accord with that objective. It is time that we cut down from wartime levels of expenditures. It is time that steps be taken to eliminate unnecessary government controls, services, and outlays necessary to maintain its services. We should demand efficient and economical administration from every governmental department and agency. All requests should be subjected to an intelligent and exhaustive study, but it is with great concern that I view the steps that have been taken to arbitrarily slash the budget without that intelligent study necessary to determine where the cuts can be made and how much those cuts should be.

I do not understand how we can proceed on the basis of pure guesswork. To a considerable degree I am willing to accept the recommendations of those who understand how much is necessary to maintain our Army and Navy at a strength sufficiently large to meet our requirements. To a considerable degree I am willing to accept the recommendations and good judgment of our able colleagues—Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY—on military strength vitally necessary to back up our position at the world peace tables. It would seem to me if we are to preserve world peace—if we are to stop the aggressive spread of communistic Russian domination over all the nations of Europe and the Pacific—I believe a strong military force is of greatest importance. Apparently, military strength is the only language dictators understand.

Of course, there can be cuts in the military appropriations, and I am sure there will be—but this should not be done until after careful and intelligent examinations by both Appropriations Committees. As a farmer, coming from an agricultural State, I am naturally concerned about the welfare of agriculture. This should also be of great concern to every Member of this Congress, since there never has been any long-sustained period of prosperity in this Nation when farm income was low. Farmers everywhere—and particularly in the Midwest and West—are naturally concerned about reclamation, flood control, and irrigation. These worthy projects are not merely an expenditure, but, rather, an investment in the economic

security of all who live within deficient rainfall areas.

These programs must not be abandoned. We cannot expose our resources, and our farmers to the drought, dust storms, erosions, and floods which have devastated our economy in the thirties. I cannot forget those years, but apparently others have.

The electrical power generated by the existing power projects provided the electricity necessary for our vast industrial power during the war. The potential power output from our projects now under construction will develop those areas where low-cost power is not now available.

Soil conservation is recognized as one of the most necessary programs in this Nation. It is a part of both the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1944. It is necessary, if we are to believe our economists who state that by 1970 this Nation will need double its present agricultural production. It is a necessity, if we want to save our agricultural productivity from the devastating soil erosion prevalent in many other countries. I need only mention the plight of Mexico, which was once a fertile land, and now millions of acres are incapable of even small production.

Two years ago, when the Bureau of the Budget drastically cut soil conservation appropriations, Congress reinstated the cuts with an implied 2-year guaranty; this was carried by the House, I understand, by approximately a 5-to-1 vote.

Farmers everywhere naturally assumed that this would be the continued program, and so adjusted their farm practices. It should be understood by this Congress that farm soil conservation practices are more than a 1-year program. Most of them involve 2- and 3-year practices. If this Congress—through cutting of soil-conservation appropriations—made necessary expensive farm-practice changes, there certainly would be just resentment on the part of all farmers.

The President's budget already has cut $100,000,000 from the $300,000,000 budget for soil conservation. If this Congress proposes to abandon soil conservation it should—in all fairness—give farmers at least a 1-year warning so that they could adjust their programs accordingly. The leaders in Congress, advocating a $6,000,000,000 cut in appropriations, generally have stated that such a program would call for drastic cuts in agricultural programs.

Certainly, anyone who has made a study of the proposed budget would have to admit that if the $6,000,000,000 cut is to be made—then all Government functions would have to share in the reductions necessary to reach this goal. I personally believe, after a careful study of the budget, a $4,500,000,000 cut is entirely possible, without bringing serious injury to any segments of our economy.

In fact, that difference of $1,500,000,000 may well have a great bearing on the national economy of this Nation in the next year, far and above the $1,500,000,000 saved.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee who, I believe, is absolutely honest in his views stated to the press, that REA appropriations would be reduced $100,000,000. Although this would be a saving, it could only be classed as a book saving, since the farmers have a record of nearly 100-percent repayment on REA loans. In fact, many of the REA projects have paid off their indebtedness well in advance of the scheduled time for repayment.

It would be most regrettable if this Congress saw fit to cripple the REA program. No one, except a farmer who has lived by the light of a kerosene lamp or a farm wife who has washed by hand or other inefficient methods, or one who has actually experienced all the hardship of kerosene lighting, could understand how close REA is to the hearts of every farmer. Surely this Congress will not wreck this best of all farm programs for the sake of a mere book saving, and to make the budget look better, at the expense of the misery and hardship of millions of people.

At the present time only 52.9 percent of all the farms in this Nation have electricity. In my own State it is only 10.4 percent. The farmers of this Nation have waited patiently through the war years, fully aware that materials were more urgently needed in the prosecution of war than they were for REA. It will be a bitter disappointment if they are denied the benefits of electricity now because Congress is so economy minded that it is unwilling to lend money on the best credit risk in the world. Compare, if you will, this nearly 100-percent repayment of REA loans by the farmers to that of RFC loans to business. As of July 1 their estimated accumulated deficit will be $7,862,694,000. I think in fairness it should be stated that much of this vast deficit is for subsidies to the food consumers of this Nation and, I might add, to pay part of their grocery bill.

During the war the Government courted the farmer. He was urged to expand and produce more and more food, and even now is asked to reach certain goals to win the peace. The farmer has responded by pushing agriculture production to an all-time high. He did this in spite of hardships such as shortages of labor and machinery. He produced by working harder and putting in longer hours, but he did not receive overtime pay. Instead, the Government put ceilings on the prices that he could receive for what he produced. The farmer accepted those ceilings because the Government promised to support agricultural prices for 2 years after hostilities ceased. Now there are many in this Congress planning to default on this promise by refusing to approve appropriations necessary to carry it out.

These prices were only to be supported at 90 percent of parity, and in figuring parity, labor costs were not included. We all remember the conditions of a few years ago in the agriculture industry when wheat sold for as low as 30 cents per bushel, and other farm products were on a comparable basis. I hope this Congress will not fail to fulfill its pledge to support farm prices, as provided in the Steagall amendment.

The Steagall amendment was specifically passed to insure the farmer of a fair income during that period when he will have to undergo expensive reconversion of his entire farm practices to a normal basis. It certainly would be unfair, and even unreasonable to ask that farm prices go back, to a supply-and-demand basis, when industry is able to constantly increase their prices to meet increased costs, and when labor has collective bargaining, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, social security, and other rights. The farmer would be forced to compete, without any protection, with the other two great segments of our national economy.

Such a policy would again bring disaster to all farming and eventually to the entire Nation. This Congress must—and I believe it will—before the Steagall amendment expires, write a long-term agricultural policy, a program that will give security to agricultural interests without any great cost to the Government. This, I believe, can be done by finding new commercial uses, and new foreign markets for agricultural products.

There has been considerable discussion in this Congress, among Republicans, as to what the Republican policy is. After a careful study of the Republican platform of 1944 and the platform adopted by the last convention of all Republican State chairmen meeting in Chicago last year—and I may add that I know of no other national conventions that have been held since this one—I can find no mention of the 20-percent straight-across-the-board income-tax reduction. I can find no mention of many other policies, now advocated as being those of the Republican Party, in the last elections. But I do find considerable reassurance to farmers in both of these documents. In fact, there are some very fine promises.

For the information of the Senate, I want to quote the following from the Republican platform of 1944 regarding agriculture. Under section 2 of agriculture, I find this:

> An American market price, to the American farmer and the protection of such price by means of support prices, commodity loans, or a combination thereof, together with such other economic means as will assure an income to agriculture, that is fair and equitable in comparison with labor, business, and industry. We oppose subsidies as a substitute for fair markets.

I wish to add also that many are of the opinion that subsidies, which cost billions of dollars, are paid to farmers. In fact, the subsidies are to the consumers of the Nation, and never to the farmers.

Section 8 reads as follows:

> To make life more attractive on the family-type farm, through development of rural roads, sound extension of rural electrification service to the farm, and elimination of basic evils of tenancy wherever they exist.

Section 10 reads as follows:

> A comprehensive program of soil, forest, water, and wildlife conservation and development, and sound irrigation projects, administered, as far as possible, at State and regional levels.

In this connection I wish to repeat that the President of the United States has already cut $100,000,000 from the soil-conservation program, which was a part of both the Republican and Democratic platforms.

Mr. President, this Republican platform contains many other good promises to the farmer that I shall not now take time to read. In the platform adopted at the Republican convention of Republican State chairmen, there is only a small paragraph dealing with agriculture but it in no way refutes the promises made at the previous National Republican Convention. The section on farm policy reads as follows:

> We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to better rural living.

Mr. President, I believe it was on the basis of these promises that Republican Senators received such a great majority of farm votes. Knowing something of the integrity of the Members of the Senate, I am sure that neither Republicans nor Democrats will go back on their solemn promises, made through their campaign pledges as adopted by the national conventions.

After having made a careful examination of the Budget requirements I, for one, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will support the $4,500,000,000 reduction, although I believe that even its limitations will make it difficult to fulfill our campaign pledges to the American people. This will still be a saving in the budget of a year ago of approximately $12,000,000,000, and I am sure that many additional billions can be cut from the Budget 1 year hence when we should be well on the way to peacetime economy.

Even this $4,500,000,000 reduction will require great reductions in almost every department of Government, the elimination of thousands of Federal employees and the curtailment, or even abandonment, of many worthy existing programs. In fact, it will require the strictest economy in all branches of Government. This I will support to the utmost of my ability.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would it be a fair interpretation of the Senator's very able speech, for which I commend him, that he is somewhat fearful of drastic cuts in the Budget, so far as concerns the retention within the appropriations of adequate support for wealth-producing projects of the West, such as reclamation, soil conservation, and the development of the power resources of our streams?

Mr. YOUNG. That is true, based both on public statements made by Members of the House and Senate advocating that policy, and also on private statements which they have made to me.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that these projects are in fact wealth-creating, and that to cut them would be a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy?

Mr. YOUNG. Very much so. There is nothing more important to the West than reclamation projects, which are an investment in the future security of the West.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that the time has come for the farmers of the West, irrespective of the political party to which they may belong, to concern themselves with this whole budgetary problem as it may affect the interest of the farmers of the country?

Mr. YOUNG. I certainly agree; and I think there should be a new awakening among the farmers of the Nation to the fact that their economy, their life, and their happiness are more important than any political affiliation whether it be Democratic or Republican. Personally I believe the farmers greatest hope of economic certainty lies in the Republican Party.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say that I am in full agreement with the Senator's views.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota for the very able speech he has made, with which I find myself in full accord. I also wish to inform the Senator that from the information which I have received, in arriving at the budgetary cut of $6,000,000,000 there was included $175,000,000 for the REA extension. I think the Senator's people in North Dakota know that that would affect their welfare.

Mr. YOUNG. In relation to that matter I have received hundreds of letters from farmers bitterly protesting such an unwise budget cut. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have great respect.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the greatest service that can be performed for the people of the country is to make them aware of what this Congress is likely to do if they do not fight some of the proposals which are being advanced.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota for the very able speech which he has made, and I should like to ask him whether it is not true that in the last campaign Republican speaker after Republican speaker over the radio assured the farmers not only in North Dakota but throughout the West, that appropriations for reclamation, for REA, soil conservation, and school programs would not only be maintained, but would be increased, and that the people relied upon those promises on the part of Republican speakers, many of whom were sent out by the National Committee.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for that comment. In fact, I challenge any Member of the Senate to show a speech of his in which he advocated cutting any reclamation project or the cuts now being proposed in most necessary agricultural programs.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I shall support the House of Representatives reduction of the President's Budget by $6,000,000,000 because I believe we can save $6,000,000,000 without impairing necessary Government functions or destroying the effectiveness of the armed forces of the United States.

There is a lot of hysteria and emotionalism pervading the atmosphere. No one likes to have his allowance cut, and it is perfectly normal for men to say in self-defense "we are doing an effective job now and we need practically all the manpower and materials we are asking for in order to maintain and continue the effective work we are doing." I have heard this same story repeated dozens of times during the course of my life, but always I have seen successful organizations find a way to do as good or a better job on less money when conditions made it imperative to cut expenditures in order to preserve the institution which was responsible for making the expenditures and paying the bills.

I shall not discuss statistics, as has been done so effectively by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and other Senators, to show the relative expenditures today as compared with those made in years prior to the war; but what a confession of weakness it is to say that the armed forces of this great Nation cannot maintain themselves in proper effectiveness on $9,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 a year. What a confession it is to those powers in the world whom some Americans fear. Think of us, a capitalistic nation, saying to those of different ideology and philosophy, we must spend more than $9,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 a year in order to maintain ourselves in a position to keep them from destroying us.

What could be more satisfactory to those foreign powers, if perchance, they are trying to injure or interfere with our progress, than to have us admit we must continue to do those things which will absolutely destroy our capitalistic system and thereby accomplish the objective which they might seek through other means.

There are two ways by which the United States of America can become a socialistic or totalitarian state. One is by the action of an external force having the power to make us subservient to its will. By this I mean war, as a result of which we would be conquered. I agree with Lincoln who said if we are ever destroyed, we will be destroyed from within, and will be guilty of committing national suicide. If we act wisely, I doubt the ability of any foreign foe ever to force its will upon us, and if we act honestly and under the guidance of God Almighty, I doubt that there will ever be any combination of foreign foes who will seek to destroy us. Our page in history is the brightest page in the history of the human family since the beginning of time.

The second way for us to destroy our American system of free men, or the capitalistic system, is to be profligate, careless of our morals, and prone to dissipate our substance in maintaining things which are not necessary at the moment, but which may become vitally necessary in 10 or 15 years from now. Let us not so weaken ourselves financially at this time that we will find ourselves unable to resist effectively and attain victory if the time ever comes when we must defend ourselves against a strong foe or foes. Remember, Mr. President, national bankruptcy or inability to meet our obligations, whichever one may wish to call it, is one of the surest ways to socialism.

No man knows that he is right when he says the cut in the budget should be four billion, four and a half billion, five billion, six billion, or eight billion dollars. But every intelligent man does know that the Congress is available for further action, and if anybody can prove a positive case, the Congress should admit its errors and take such action as will protect the vital interests, promote the welfare, and assure the safety of the people. Certainly if we set out to make a cut of $4,000,000,000, we shall not reach a $6,000,000,000 cut in expenditures even if, as I believe it to be, it is perfectly possible to do so without impairing any activity which is vitally essential to the welfare of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to stop, think, and contemplate about what human beings have done in life and what they are doing. When Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "Hitch your chariot to a star," he meant that if we aim low, the goal we reach will be low, whereas if we aim high, although perhaps we shall not reach the goal we seek, nevertheless we shall reach a better goal than the one we would have reached if we had not aimed high.

Mr. President, I do not go along with those who say that if we begin with a cut of $6,000,000,000 and achieve finally a cut of only $5,000,000,000, the people will condemn us. I would rather have the people's judgment of me based upon a $6,000,000,000 cut, even though we arrive at only $5,000,000,000 saving in the end than to attempt to make a $4,500,000,000 cut and, because of waste, inefficiency, and failure to stop spending the people's money uselessly, end up with a $3,000,000,000 cut.

Mr. President, I do not know of a Senator or a Representative who would not vote an additional $10,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 to protect the safety of the American people if an emergency necessitated such an expenditure. What I cannot get through my mind is the argument that if we set a goal—and that is all that is sought, namely, a goal which in good faith we must endeavor to attain—then, if an emergency arises, we cannot change it. The Congress is here to change it, just as it is here to set the goal in the first place.

Mr. President, a few days ago one of the ablest Members of the Senate said to me, "How do we know that General Marshall will not be strengthened instead of being weakened, when he goes to Moscow, if the Russian people realize that the Congress of the United States is decreasing its expenditures for the armed forces, rather than maintaining or increasing them?" I hold no brief for a contention of that kind, and I would not say that such action on the part of Congress might affect the conference favorably; but I do say that no one knows, and that those who are so positive that this thing cannot be done or that some other thing can be done are being swayed more by emotionalism than they are by knowledge of the facts.

So great an American as CHARLES A. EATON, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, has voted for a cut of $6,000,000,000 in the President's budget. CHARLES A. EATON is the dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, and he is one of the most respected men in the State of New Jersey. He was appointed by President Roosevelt as a delegate on the part of the United States to the San Francisco Conference, which ended in the agreements which brought forth the United Nations. He was again appointed by the President as an alternate adviser to Secretary of State Byrnes when he went abroad for the conferences in connection with peace and the peace treaties. No one can deny that CHARLES A. EATON is a great American, with almost a devout feeling for the welfare and safety of the American people. I talked with him this morning, and he is convinced that $6,000,000,000 of the people's money can be saved without in any way affecting the real, vital strength of the armed forces of the United States, and he so voted yesterday in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I go even further, and I say that if the present Congress gives evidence of a desire to be thrifty and saving and economical with the people's money, procured through the power of taxation, it may be the beginning of a rebuilding of the moral fiber of the people of the United States. We have reached a point in this great Nation when few ever stop to think whence comes the money which has been spent so freely. Likewise, we have reached a time when everyone is beginning to say, "We want the waste stopped; we do not want to be working 30 percent of our time for the Government."

Mr. President, such a wasteful condition as that is not what made the United States of America the leader of the world, and it will not keep the United States of America the leader of the world. It is not what will make the United States so strong and powerful in the right that no other nation will ever attack her or attempt to destroy her.

Let us always remember that national solvency is our bulwark of defense. If, through waste and profligacy and failure to organize effectively, the financial strength of this Nation is dissipated, some of the younger Members of Congress will wake up some day to realize that the only effective defense of a capitalistic state against the inroads of socialism and totalitarianism has been destroyed.

We have won magnificent victories in two world wars. We had the money when World War I started, and, contrary to what everyone in the world thought we could do, we prepared ourselves and we defeated the tyrants. We had the money when World War II started, and we did then what no one in the world thought we could do: We started from scratch, and we succeeded in defeating the greatest military force on earth. When an emergency arises let us never find ourselves in the position of being impotent because we have destroyed our financial structure. Let us never find ourselves without the funds necessary to protect the American system of free men and free enterprise.

Mr. President, if I did not believe firmly that we can maintain all the power necessary in the armed services under a $6,000,000,000 cut, I would not vote for such a cut.

I shall vote for this $6,000,000,000 economy measure in the full belief that I am serving the best interests of the people of the United States from every standpoint.

I thank the Senator from Illinois very much for yielding to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, what I wish to say in connection with the proposed budget cut may be misunderstood in some sections of the country. I can see now, in certain newspapers, headlines that "Senator LUCAS favors no budget cut whatsoever"—which will be just as false as Lucifer, in the event that such statements are published by those who wish to do other than report the facts correctly.

In the beginning of my remarks, I should like to say that I am in favor of every conceivable kind of cut that can possibly be made in the President's budget, after witnesses have been heard, hearings held, reports submitted, and the arguments considered here on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment the Legislative Budget Joint Committee which has been created by the Reorganization Act has not done its duty as required by the act, because it has failed to give Members of Congress the facts it could have given them at least upon one item of the President's budget, namely, national defense.

As a premise for this argument, and in order that I may keep the record straight, I desire to call attention to section 138 of the Reorganization Act, under the caption "Legislative budget." Paragraph (a) reads as follows:

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation—

They are important words—

giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees.

If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

The words "study" and "consultation" mean something. Those two words mean to take advice and counsel from someone. And, lo and behold, when we ask what was done by the subcommittee of the Legislative Budget Committee insofar as taking any testimony was concerned, insofar as any hearings were concerned, insofar as any of the Senators having the least bit of information upon which they could make an intelligent guess or reach an intelligent conclusion is concerned, there is not a single line, other than a report which has been filed by the majority, which is most innocuous other than what is contained in one section under the caption "Expenditures." They say:

In estimating those expenditures the committee availed itself of all possible information and conducted independent explorations in this field.

Where is the evidence of those independent explorations they conducted which the rest of the Senate should have in order to make an intelligent decision upon this great question? Then they say:

1. Conferences with the fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

2. Detailed statistical data on all available funds and rate of expenditure in the current fiscal year, which were prepared by the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the committee.

3. Conferences with all members of all of the subcommittees on appropriations of the House of Representatives.

4. Data from informed persons both in and out of Government.

Where are those data, where is that information, which the subcommittee tells us about in this report, upon which the subcommittee made its recommendations to the full committee? Not one line of evidence, not one report, is before the Senate upon which any other Senator might make an intelligent examination and arrive at a sane conclusion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wanted to ask the Senator whether it could be that the proponents of this severe budget reduction were not taking the matter too literally, because if the newspapers are correct in expressing the views of some, it was intended to be only a sort of a pious hope anyway.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not know what the majority expected it to be, but if I understand the Reorganization Act aright, I take it to be more than a pious hope when I vote on this question today. That is why I cannot support either the $6,000,000,000 or the $4,500,000,000 cut as proposed. Having no evidence before me, it would be a mockery to vote upon either one. I definitely know that I could not support either under any circumstances if I thought the $6,000,000,000 or the $4,500,000,000 cut would interfere with the national defense.

Mr. President, that is what I fear. I doubt that a $4,500,000,000 cut can be made unless we slash defense expenditures now sought by the Army and the Navy. I do not want to go on record as pledging to the American people that I am for a $4,500,000,000 cut, and then later, when the evidence unfolds before the Committee on Appropriations, discover that such a cut cannot be made. That is why I shall not support either one.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I call the attention of the able Senator from Illinois to the fact that I noted on the 19th day of February, as appears on page 1173 of the RECORD, that the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in commenting upon this matter and speaking about this budget, said:

We can only make an intelligent guess. We have no information before us as to the particular items of the $37,500,000,000 budget, in justification for the figure fixed by the Budget.

We only know it is requested. We only know the Budget Director has approved it, and the President has approved it.

I wish to ask the able Senator from Illinois if it is not his understanding that the various departments of the Government that make requests of the Bureau of the Budget present detailed figures, an itemization of the funds they seek, so that when the Budget Director made a recommendation to the President, and when the President approved a budgetary recommendation, the executive arm of the Government did have detailed facts and figures? I ask the Senator further, if the President did not submit to the Congress a factual budget based upon detailed facts and figures, carefully screened over months of hearings, and if it is not that kind of a budget, and that kind of responsible figures, the opposition is attacking with what at best is only an intelligent guess?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is eminently correct. There is no doubt about how the Bureau of the Budget screened all estimates for months and months before they finally arrived at the figures of the total expenditures which they sent to the Congress. The Senator well knows that the President of the United States cut the recommendations made by the Army and the Navy and other departments in tremendous amounts before he sent the estimates to Congress.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio when he said the other day that it would be impossible for the Legislative Budget Committee to sit down, in the length of time they had, and carefully scrutinize the hundreds of items which were before the President when he made up his budget. What I am complaining about—and I have a right seriously to complain about it—is that the Legislative Budget Committee never called Secretary Patterson, never called General Eisenhower, never called Secretary Marshall, or anyone else, to testify on the great question before the country and the world, and the most vital part of the budget—what is necessary for an adequate defense of this country. They never called these witnesses and had them testify and reduce their testimony to writing, so that the Senate might have a semblance of a notion, at least, as to what the military men were thinking about when the Republicans were talking about lopping off $2,250,000,000 from the national defense appropriations, which they now admit they will do if the $6,000,000,000 cut is allowed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator from Illinois, in view of the unusual problems involved in effectuating the Reorganization Act, if the proper course of the joint committee, if it hoped to present something upon which intelligent men could base a rational judgment, was not to come back to the Senate and go back to the House and ask for an extension of time, or to endeavor to amend the Reorganization Act by providing another 30 days, applying the amendment to this year only, so that the committee could have submitted a budget on which we would not have had to make a guess?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is correct, so far as the Senator from Illinois can judge, and his question illustrates what I am complaining about. Certainly the Senate would have given unanimous consent to an extension of time if the committee had wanted to hold hearings, to call witnesses, and to prepare some kind of a report upon this one question. I would not ask the members of the subcommittee to go into every detail. That could not be done. But involved here is a question which affects the security and the safety of our country, and what affects the security and safety of America affects the security and safety of the world.

Mr. McMAHON. And is not a proper subject for a guess.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly it is not a proper subject for a guess. What I fear is that if I vote for a four and half billion dollar cut I am more or less morally bound to go along with it, and then I may be confronted with findings of the Committee on Appropriations, who may finally say that in order to cut four and a half billion dollars it will be necessary to slash materially defense funds. That is what is expected by those upon the other side of the aisle who seek a $6,000,000,000 cut. They say, "We can cut two and a quarter billion dollars from the national defense funds in reducing the Budget $6,000,000,000."

Mr. President, until the evidence is in, and the Members of the Senate have a right to cross-examine those who are responsible for the defense of the country, the Senator from Illinois is going to rely upon George Marshall, General Eisenhower, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, rather than

some armchair economic strategist in the United States Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. On February 18, at a time when budget reductions were being recommended, the first deficiency bill for the year 1947 was passed by the House and sent to the Senate. That bill appropriates millions of dollars of deficiency funds for almost every agency of government, including the Housing Authority, the War, Navy and Treasury Departments. I should like to ask the Senator, is it not his opinion that if such a budget ceiling as that now proposed is ever fixed we shall have not one deficiency bill, but many others after the Committee on Appropriations goes fully into the items of appropriations?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate will be considering one deficiency bill after another, in my humble judgment.

Mr. President, I was not informed of the fact that there was no report on file until the minority leader rose the other day to make a statement on this budget cut. I had asked for a report, but failed to find one. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] raised my hope when on Wednesday last suggested that the vote be postponed because he understood the report would be printed on the morrow. When that colloquy occurred, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] rose and said there were no hearings; that only minutes of the meetings were kept, and he did not know where the minutes of the meetings were. When questioned as to how he reached his conclusion even as to the four and one-half billion dollar reduction, the Senator from Ohio stated he took the President's budget and went from one end of it to the other, and simply slashed here and there—as though he might be cutting a piece of pie in a downtown restaurant. It was easy for him to reach the $4,500,000,000 cut.

Mr. President, that cannot be done when the expenditure of billions of dollars in an orderly manner is involved. Senators cannot give to themselves or to the country an intelligent guess, without figures or facts before them. I fear that the people of the Nation are receiving a wrong impression about what is happening here in the United States Senate.

A great many election pledges were made last year, and many persons are still attempting to fool the American people by advocating a $6,000,000,000-debt reduction, in order to carry out those pledges. It is another promise. I hope that such promises can be fulfilled, and the Senator from Illinois will do everything within his power to cut the budget to the bone if necessary, but he will never be found doing it at the expense of the national defense, jeopardizing the safety of the country and the youth of tomorrow. I have seen this happen twice in the last three decades.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I find myself so much of the same opinion as the Senator from Illinois that I rise to ask him a question or two on the same point on which I have asked questions of some of the other speakers today, because I still think we ought to make our record crystal clear on the subject of moral obligations to which the Senator has referred.

The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I think has made it clear for the RECORD that if we vote for the Millikin amendment there is no moral obligation upon us to cut the budget $4,500,000,000, if we should subsequently decide the public interest does not warrant our making such a cut. Am I to understand the Senator from Illinois to feel that if he votes for the Millikin amendment he would be under a moral obligation to cut $4,500,000,000 from the budget, irrespective of the effect of the cut upon the national welfare?

Mr. LUCAS. I seriously doubt the advisability of taking a definite position upon that proposition. That is why I am not going to vote for either the $6,000,000,000-cut or the $4,500,000,000-cut. I do not want to commit myself today on $4,500,000,000. I do not want to commit myself on anything related to this subject, because, frankly, I do not know what this is all about; and no other Senator on the floor knows what he is being called upon to do here. It is in reality a farce if I ever saw one; it is a snare and a delusion; and I am not going to vote for either proposed cut.

Let me further answer the Senator in this way: So far as moral obligation is concerned, that may rest in the opinion of the individual Senator. The answer to it is a good deal like the remark made by an old professor of a law college when he was asked a question which was a little difficult to answer. He was a pious old gentleman. He would raise his eyes to the ceiling and say, "Young gentlemen, there is much to be said on both sides of that question."

There is a good deal to be said on both sides of the question, but I will say to the Senator from Oregon, and to the Senate, that, as I see this matter, I cannot conscientiously vote either for the $6,000,000,000 or for the $4,500,000,000 cut, because I fear that if I did, I might be bound to the extent of voting something that would ultimately cripple the national defense. To vote now in favor of a $4,500,000,000 cut, and perhaps later on vote for appropriations which are not in conformity with that cut, would not only be inconsistent but could be too easily misunderstood. So I am not going to vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I want to make, now. Does the Senator from Illinois fear, as I do, that the voting of the $4,500,000,000 cut will be looked upon by the public generally as a pledge to cut $4,500,000,000 from the budget?

Mr. LUCAS. They cannot help doing that. They have a right to look upon it in that way, as I see this debate developing.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am not quite sure at all that I agree with the Senator from Illinois. When Senators see a group, or perhaps a majority of this body, plunging headlong into disaster, we might say, with the proposal for a cut of $6,000,000,000, and we could reduce it to $4,500,000,000, I think there may be a responsibility and an obligation to take the lesser of the two evils and to reduce it as much as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot see any difference in principle. There is nothing upon which to base the cut of $6,000,000,000; there is nothing upon which to base the cut of $4,500,000,000; so, there being nothing upon which to base either, I shall not vote for either.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Was I correct in understanding the Senator from Illinois to say a moment ago that this entire proposal is a farce?

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not a part of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and during the early days of the present session did not the Members of this body plead that we might comply with the spirit of that act?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not understand what I am talking about. When I say it is a farce, I am talking about what the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget failed to do. That is the farce of this whole thing. That committee had an obligation under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The committee was required to act.

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment; I have the floor. That committee had an obligation under the act, and they failed, in the humble judgment of the Senator from Illinois, in the performance of that duty and obligation, in not giving to the Senate sufficient information of some kind and character upon which it might intelligently act.

There is no evidence here, there is not a word, there is not a report, upon which the $6,000,000,000 recommendation can be based. That is why I say it is a farce.

Mr. DWORSHAK. But will the Senator from Illinois concede that the committee acted strictly in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act?

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield to the Senator, but I shall answer definitely in the negative.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Something has been said about the spirit of the Reorganization Act. The particular provision which is now under discussion contemplated that the Budget Committee would use some degree of intelligence to ascertain a reasonable figure at which to fix the ceiling in the Budget, after calling, perhaps, as the Senator has suggested, the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of War, and other witnesses. That would be in ac-

cord with the true meaning and spirit of the act and would make possible an intelligent recommendation to the Congress. When the Senator says it is a farce, he is not criticizing the act——

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. HATCH But he is criticizing and condemning the manner in which it has been observed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico is absolutely correct. I think the manner in which this matter has been handled by the majority is a snare and a delusion and a farce. That is the point I make. There was ample time for those on the Budget Committee to summon witnesses to testify upon the important question of national defense, and obtain information upon which all Senators could form some kind of an intelligent conclusion before casting a vote affecting the general welfare of all Americans.

Mr. President, I have listened in vain all through these debates for someone to give me information upon this point. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for whom I have great respect, and who is my friend, the new Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has utterly failed to give us a break-down. He has quoted facts and figures galore, but not one fact or figure has he given us on the break-down of the $6,000,000,000. He made an excellent political speech. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke next, but said nothing about it. Then, Mr. President, in order to secure some facts upon which I could make my own record and in an effort to obtain adequate information which I might submit to the Senate I called up the War Department and the Navy Department. The departments were glad to give me the facts, which they would have given to the Legislative Budget Committee all for the asking, Mr. President. But no, the little coterie on the Budget Committee, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said the other day, would not even invite some of the minority members to their secret sessions which they held in connection with finding the ways and means to cut $6,000,000,000 from the Budget.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have heretofore called attention to the fact, as the Senator has just quoted me as saying, that no one in the minority, even of the subcommittee of 20 which was selected out of the full Budget Committee of 102, was either invited to be present or notified that there was any meeting. We do not yet know that there was a meeting held. There was no report made by the chairman of the subcommittee or the full committee to the full committee with respect to any witness who was ever heard. We heard a rumor that General Eisenhower had been asked to come to the Capitol and have a personal conversation with the chairman of the committee and perhaps one or two others. I do not know how many individuals were present because we were never given any information about it, but the chairman of the committee never reported to the full Budget Committee that General Eisenhower was ever called upon to appear, or was ever heard, or ever said anything, or if he did, what he said or what he recommended. Nothing of that kind was ever revealed to the committee that was required to make up an estimate of the over-all Budget. So, Senators here on the floor are no more ignorant about the facts than the committee itself was ignorant when they passed on this $6,000,000,000 cut.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his contribution. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if it is not a fact that under the Reorganization Act all authorizations for both the Army and the Navy are combined in an armed services bill?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that a large number of authorization bills must be passed first before discussion can be had on the appropriations. For instance, an authorization must be made for the fleet reserve. We have a large fleet tied up. At the present time the Navy has a program of establishing some 110 fleet reserve units throughout the United States. The bill making such provision is now before the Armed Services Committee. It has never been acted upon because it cannot be decided until the authorization bill is passed. And here we are trying to write appropriation bills before the Armed Services Committee itself has had an opportunity to pass upon or to study a single piece of important national defense legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his contribution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from Illinois assume that if the Budget Committee had called in the military and naval experts of the Nation they would have received any reliable information upon which they could have depended?

Mr. LUCAS. Whom else would we depend upon, I will ask the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JENNER. I understand that the same authorities who the Senator said should have been called in and interviewed, in the past sessions of the Congress when we were in the midst of a great war could not guess within thirty-two billion dollars of what it would actually cost to prosecute the war. In my opinion the information furnished by anyone who cannot guess within thirty-two billions of dollars with respect to a budget would not be worth a dollar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as one vitally interested in an adequate national defense at this critical time in our history. I am deeply concerned over the action by the joint committee in recommending a 16 percent cut in the President's budget. Having been unable to obtain any satisfactory information from the subcommittee of the Legislative Budget Committee, I thought it necessary at least to obtain some facts from the Army and the Navy that the Senate and the country should have.

These facts which I am about to relate to the Senate could have been obtained by the subcommittee of the Legislative Budget Committee had the members thereof seen fit to do so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the cut of $32,000,000,000 in what it was estimated we would have to expend during the war was not made by reason of the fact that the war was brought to a close during that budget year?

Mr. LUCAS. I think perhaps that is true.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The war ended during the year for which the budget estimate was made, and of course we did not have to spend as great an amount of money as we would have had to spend had the war continued.

Mr. LUCAS. I assume the Senator is correct. I am not going to get into the debate between the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from South Carolina, but I hope the Senator from South Carolina will explain the situation to the Senator from Indiana in due course of time. It is quite easy to rise on the floor of the Senate and shout "Thirty-two billion dollars" in a debate of this kind when one is not familiar with the facts. If a figure of $6,000,000,000 can be pulled out of thin air, then a figure of $32,000,000,000 can be pulled out of the air just as easily.

Mr. President, a 16-percent cut contemplates a reduction of $1,000,000,000 in the military funds and one-half billion dollars in the civil funds requested by the War Department.

I wish to take this opportunity to express praise for the wonderful speech which was made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] today, as well as the speech made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I go along with them 100 percent upon the question of national defense, as so eloquently portrayed and debated by both. But I cannot go along with either in support of the four-and-one-half-billion-dollar cut, because I am not convinced, as I have said many times, that we can cut either $6,000,000,000 or four and a half billion dollars without materially slashing the national defense program.

Recently, Mr. President, the Secretary of War stated that a reduction of $1,000,000,000 in the appropriation for the Army would not only cripple our military forces to a degree which would jeopardize the reconstruction measures upon which the Army is currently engaged in Japan, Korea, and Germany, but would smash the very foundation of our future national defense. He has pointed out that the War Department budget, as submitted by the President, was the minimum our military leaders believed necessary for support of our occupational forces overseas and for reasonable guaranties for national security. The position taken by the Secretary of War is

the same position that is taken by General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, and by General Marshall, Secretary of State. Here are three men who were far in the forefront in winning the greatest war that civilization has ever known. We did not challenge their military judgment as one victory after another came to a free civilization. No one in the flush of great military victories was asking these men to resign if they could not get along with less than they had.

Now in this great reconstruction period, one that is unlike anything in the history of mankind, a period which marks the entry of the entire world into the atomic age, we find men here in the Senate of the United States who are willing to dismiss the pleas of our greatest military leaders as though they amounted to nothing.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable and fantastic to think that men in the United States Senate, with no facts or figures before them, could become economic strategists overnight and defy the men who have been on the front, both in peace and in war, during the past 10 years.

Mr. President, the War Department budget, as submitted to us, already represents a 40-percent cut in original estimates. It already necessitates large reductions in funds needed for scientific research and development. It already forces the closing of many stations which the Army felt should be retained in the interests of national security. It already means that the Army troop strength must be reduced by 80,000; that occupation forces must be pared to the danger point; that the Air Forces 70-group program must be reduced to 55; that field maintenance of equipment will approach an economically unsound level; that maintenance and repair of posts, camps, and stations will be reduced to levels 40 percent below wartime standards; that the activation, training, and equipment of our civilian components will be appreciably slowed down; that all new constructions must be eliminated; and that pilot training will be curtailed for lack of sufficient funds to provide necessary aviation gasoline and maintenance materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been listening attentively to the able address of the distinguished Senator. I ask him if he intends to discuss the Navy?

Mr. LUCAS. I do.

Any further major reductions—and, Mr. President, here is a vital point—can be absorbed only by further major eliminations in the planned security structure.

I asked the Secretary of War what form these additional major eliminations would take. He responded that a further cut of $1,000,000,000 in the appropriations for the military functions of the Army would, in addition to the drastic reductions already made, compel a reduction of approximately 200,000 in the strength of the Army. Our occupation forces cannot be further reduced without depriving our overseas commanders of the necessary forces for carrying out their occupation missions. Our ground and service troops in this country are at a minimum to support the occupation forces. Therefore, the only place left for sizable cuts is in our Air Forces, and they must bear the brunt of this reduction.

Recently there was sent to me a copy of the American Press Magazine containing a poll upon some of the important current questions of the day. One question in that poll greatly intrigued me. It related to cutting the appropriations for the Army and Navy by as much as $5,000,000,000, as suggested by several Senate leaders. Only 23 percent of the people participating in the poll voted "yes."

On the question of cutting American occupation forces in Germany and Japan, only 17 percent of those participating in the poll voted "yes." This poll was taken through the country editors of the United States. It reached down to the grass roots of the population. I place in the RECORD the question for the information of Senators:

Cut appropriation for Army and Navy by up to $5,000,000,000 as suggested by several Senate leaders, 23 percent.

Cut American occupation forces in Germany and Japan, 17 percent.

To continue with the information furnished me by the Secretary of War, the second point which he made was that it would be necessary to cut our number of air combat groups from 55 to 35, of which only 3 would be located in the United States.

In addition, it would be necessary so to curtail our combat plane procurement program as to reduce our once powerful air force to a second-rate position within 3 to 5 years. That was the observation made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in his eloquent speech. Think of it. These men who are military leaders are telling us that under a two-and-a-quarter-billion-dollar cut our air force would be reduced to a second-rate position within 3 to 5 years. I shall never vote for a cut of that kind, in view of the commitments made under the United Nations Charter, which was passed almost unanimously in the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In the state of the information which the Senator has, can he give me any assurance, or give the public any assurance, that the reduction in the case of the armed forces would be limited to two and a quarter billion dollars?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not. I can only say that that is exactly what the newspapers have stated. They have stated that those seeking a cut of $6,000,000,000 were hoping to lop two and a quarter billion dollars from the national-defense appropriations.

Mr. HATCH. They admit that that much would be lopped off, but does anyone have any assurance that the reduction would not be even more?

Mr. LUCAS. No one has any assurance on that score. No one knows what will happen before Congress gets through.

The Secretary of War further stated that a cut of this kind would—

Bring about the abandonment of as many as 50 Air and Ground Forces posts, camps, and stations;

Materially restrict progress in the fields of research and development and operate to nullify work done at the expense of large investments already made;

Cut by 50 percent the planned programs for our civilian components, the National Guard, and Organized Reserves, already at a low level.

I have before me a telegram from the adjutant general of the National Guard in the State of Illinois deploring any reduction in the Federal Budget affecting national defense. It reads as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *February 19, 1947.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate:

Your aid to prevent a reduction in the Federal budget which will seriously impair the national security and the post-war National Guard reorganization program now in progress in every State is earnestly solicited.

LEO M. BOYLE,
The Adjutant General.

The adjutant general of the State of Illinois definitely believes that, once we agree to a $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 cut, the National Guard in his State will be affected. Judging from this telegram, he understands that what we are doing here today is to become the law of the land. Of course, he wants the National Guard continued, and rightfully it should be continued if we are to have the kind of defense we need.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not the opinion of the distinguished Senator that those in charge of the Army and Navy are taking this proposal very seriously, and are now beginning to cooperate, upon the theory that this proposal might be agreed to, and that if it should be, they would immediately accept it as a mandate from the Congress?

Mr. LUCAS. The whole country feels that what we are considering at the present time is definitely a mandate or law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that only yesterday it was necessary for General Bradley, the head of the Veterans' Administration, to discontinue certain transportation, and to recall large numbers of Veterans' Administration employees from the field, where they were trying in distant places to assist veterans who have no other means of assistance?

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is true. I read such a statement in the newspaper.

So far I have touched upon only those aspects of a reduction in appropriations for the military functions of the Army. But we have been told that the civil funds of the War Department are to be cut approximately $500,000,000. Do Senators know what that will mean?

Mr. President, the budget figures for the civil functions of the War Department stand today at slightly more than $1,000,000,000. This total includes seven hundred and twenty-five millions for

food for the starving peoples within our occupied territories, two hundred and ninety millions for the river and harbor and flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers, and small amounts for military cemeteries and for the Alaskan Communications System. Assume that not one dollar is authorized for expenditures other than for food. It is not a practical assumption, but let us make it. This would reduce the total appropriation by approximately three hundred million. To cut it by five hundred million means taking an absolute minimum of $200,000,000 worth of food from the destitute and starving peoples whose present lives and future hopes are our immediate trust.

Mr. President, if the Secretary of War is correct—and I must assume for the moment that he is—what he is talking about is what General Marshall was talking about recently. If we lower the food rations of these destitute and starving people, we shall be doing more to promote communism in these countries than any one thing I know of. We shall be playing directly into the hands of Joe Stalin, the individual whom so many Senators constantly condemn and criticize on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. With respect to food, is there not an agreement, which is carried into the United Nations agreement, between this Nation and our allies, and between various other nations and representatives of the United States? In other words, are we not breaking a written agreement and promise that has been made?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure of all the details of that agreement. The only definite information I have is the information which I have received from the Secretary of War as to the amount of food necessary to prevent starvation among the people who are in the occupied areas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was there not an agreement between this Nation and the other powers involved that they would be responsible for seeing that those people should not starve?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is eminently correct in that statement.

Mr. President, if I had made some of the critical and condemnatory speeches that have been made here about Stalin, giving the implication to the American people that some men here fear and dread him, I would not be voting to cut the national defense, but, to be consistent, I would want to increase it. Yet some Senators who talk the loudest and the noisiest about communistic Russia and the fears they have of that nation are the ones who are loudest in their demands for a cut in national-defense appropriations.

Mr. President, disregard the human factor, if we will. Look at it coldly. People do not suffer the pangs of starvation in silence. The civil ration in our occupied areas is already dangerously low. To cut it further is to risk adding riot and bloodshed to the formidable problems confronting our occupation forces. Obviously, this will affect the strength requirements of our overseas garrisons.

Mr. President, what is true of the Army is true of the Navy also. A reduction in the amount of $500,000,000, which is approximately 16 percent, is contemplated under this $6,000,000,000 cut. The Secretary of the Navy says—and this statement is confirmed by Admiral Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations—that a reduction in the amount of $500,000,000 would so greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Navy as to render it practically immobile and impotent as an instrument of national defense. Do not forget that. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made a point of that this week. "Impotent and immobile as an instrument of national defense" means that it would not be ready to fight. That is exactly what the Secretary said.

In asking Secretary of the Navy Forrestal to expand further that statement and give to me the results involved under the cut, he replied as follows:

There will be a proportionate reduction of enlisted and officer strength below 425,000 enlisted and 46,000 officers—which are minimum requirements for 1948. When this reduction is made, the following will be the results:

First. Immobilization of the major portion of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets.

Second. Abandonment of material salvage program.

Third. Inability properly to administer and train the Naval Reserve.

Fourth. Further inactivation of advance and continental air and operating bases.

Fifth. Serious curtailment of essential training of pilots; air and general service ratings of all branches.

Sixth. Revocation of educational commitments to officers transferred from Naval Reserve and enlisted categories to the Regular service.

Seventh. Breaking faith with enlisted personnel by forced separation from the service.

In addition to the above, there will be a drastic reduction in the Naval Reserve training program, reduction of the Marine Corps personnel, reducing the effectiveness of amphibious training and development of techniques for amphibious operations. There would be a drastic reduction in the naval aviation program and other matters involving research and development.

Mr. President, I have made a summary of what was submitted to me by the Secretary of the Navy, and I ask unanimous consent at this point to have placed in the RECORD this exhibit, the caption of which is "Effect of $500,000,000 reduction, fiscal 1948."

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF $500,000,000 REDUCTION, FISCAL 1948

1. Further reductions in the 1948 budget estimates as furnished to Congress by the President would seriously impair the effectiveness of the naval arm of national defense, not only during fiscal 1948, but also for several years to follow.

2. A reduction in the amount of $500,000,000 would so greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Navy as to render it practically immobile and impotent as an instrument of national policy. The information as to its impotency could not be kept from foreign governments.

3. There are set forth below certain of the drastic steps all of which would be necessary under a further cut of $500,000,000 together with an indication of the results involved.

(A) COURSE OF ACTION

Proportionate reduction of enlisted and officer strengths below 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers (which are minimum requirements for 1948).

RESULTS

(1) Immobilization of the major portion of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets.

(2) Abandonment of material salvage program.

(3) Inability properly to administer and train the Naval Reserve.

(4) Further inactivation of advance and continental air and operating bases.

(5) Serious curtailment of essential training of pilots; air and general service ratings of all branches.

(6) Revocation of educational commitments to officers transferred from Naval Reserve and enlisted categories to the regular service.

(7) Breaking faith with enlisted personnel by forced separation from the service.

(B) COURSE OF ACTION

Drastic reduction in Naval Reserve training program.

RESULTS

The effect of a drastic reduction in the Naval Reserve training program would mean practically the abandonment of the program as now planned, because, in addition to the drastic cut in Reserve funds, the Regular Naval Establishment will, under reduced budget, be unable to lend the necessary Regular Navy support to the training and cruising of Naval Reservists. The Reserve offers a means of maintaining the proficiency of personnel trained in war, and failure to maintain that proficiency will result in extravagant expenditure of much larger sums of money in the event of future mobilization.

(C) COURSE OF ACTION

Proportionate reduction of Marine Corps personnel.

RESULTS

This would reduce the effectiveness of the Marine Corps personnel.

This would reduce the effectiveness of the Marine Corps for carrying out commitments in support of United States policy outside the United States and reduce the effectiveness of amphibious training and development of techniques for amphibious operations.

(D) COURSE OF ACTION

Effect drastic reduction in force of Group IV (b) (supervisory) civil service personnel.

RESULTS

Further reduction of personnel for planning, design, research, contract termination, industrial mobilization planning, and surplus disposal which is inadequately provided for now under present ceilings. Backlogs of work already exist throughout the many activities of the Navy. This would lead to virtual inability to handle veterans' matters such as hospitalization information, and requests for information essential to veterans under the GI bill of rights. Would lead to separation of many civil service employees of long service and special skills peculiar to the Navy.

(E) COURSE OF ACTION

Proportionate reduction of BuShips funds.

RESULTS

(1) Such a reduction would reduce the volume of repairs to a low level which would

not adequately care for the material condition of the fleet, and would almost entirely eliminate improvements in the nature of alterations.

(2) Inactivation of ships in the reserve fleet could not be adequately accomplished, and much damage would result to the material condition of those ships which are not yet inactivated. This reduction in funds for the reserve fleet would require the disposal for scrap of large numbers of ships valuable as a security reserve.

(3) The project under electronics was laid out on the basis of a modernization and replacement program of electronics equipment in the active fleet within a period of 5 years. The requests presented to the Budget, based on that proportional part of the $705,000,000 requested, reduced the rate of this replacement program to cover a period of 10 years. The amount of funds cleared by the Budget further reduced the rate of replacement to where it could be accomplished in about 15 years. Further reductions will prolong the replacement time still further, and a continuation of similarly small amounts in future years will result in the electronics equipment of the fleet becoming obsolete in about 6 years. If we are to retain any advantages in communication and intelligence equipment of this nature, further reductions are unrealistic and fraught with great danger.

(4) Further reductions in severely curtailed funds (under investigations and tests) would reduce any research and development activity to such a small amount that our improvements in technical fields will be minor. The benefits of research and development can only be realized in time of peace; after a war starts, it is too late to try to overcome the shortcomings of neglect in these fields.

(5) In the shore establishment, employment is based entirely on the support and maintenance of the operating fleet. The personnel is tailored to fit the minimum requirements of the workload resulting therefrom. It is estimated that a further reduction in funds available for this purpose will cause the discharge of very large numbers of men in naval shipyards, from numbers already inadequate to do the work in hand for the proper upkeep of the fleet. The obligation for this upkeep is large, whether the ships are active or in reserve. Naturally, the volume of the work can be reduced somewhat when fewer ships are active, but the workload cannot be eliminated entirely without unacceptable deterioration of material.

(F) COURSE OF ACTION

Drastic reduction in Bureau of Ordnance programs.

RESULTS

(1) Loss of services of personnel with invaluable know-how, with consequent inability to furnish adequate support to the fleet.

(2) Drastic curtailment in support of the Navy research program and further increase in cuts of few remaining programs due to lower production rates.

(3) Serious curtailment in production of antisubmarine weapons, and in manufacture of newly developed antiaircraft guns.

(4) Practically no manufacture of newly developed types of ammunition. (Schedule for segregation, overhaul, and reworking of ammunition on hand will have to be extended from 3 to 5 years, during which some ammunition will deteriorate to such extent as to render it worthless.)

(5) Loss of Government material now stored in private plants due to deterioration or disposal with consequent great loss in capital investment, and inability to meet mobilization requirements.

(6) Extensive inactivation, reduction to caretaker status, closing down, and leasing of Bureau of Ordnance shore facilities.

(G) COURSE OF ACTION

Drastic reduction in the naval-aviation program.

RESULTS

(1) Collapse of important segments of the aircraft industry due to cut-back in new aircraft, making impossible the meeting of the remobilization schedule. The air forces of the fleet would rapidly become obsolete and would be reduced in strength as normal attrition takes place.

(2) Maintenance and operation of aircraft would be curtailed and combat readiness of naval aviation would be seriously impaired. Fleet efficiency would rapidly fall off with resulting increased hazard. A large amount of valuable material would deteriorate.

(3) It would become necessary to make a marked reduction in the strength of the aeronautical organization with a consequent serious result on the effectiveness of the combat potential of the fleet.

(H) COURSE OF ACTION

Reduction of funds allocated to naval communications.

RESULTS

(1) Seriously reduce the Navy's share of the vital joint Army-Navy communication intelligence task, thus seriously undermining national security.

(2) Seriously interfere with the gradual improvement of the communication material in use by the naval service and force the use of other less modern and less efficient equipment.

(I) COURSE OF ACTION

Curtail intelligence activities to conform to reductions in funds.

RESULTS

Limited funds for defense preparations require that available funds be expended most efficiently for only those activities essential to meet prospective enemy operations, and consequently require more accurate intelligence during this period than is required when funds available permit preparations capable of meeting all contingencies. Budgetary reductions will impair the national security by curtailing essential intelligence.

(J) COURSE OF ACTION

Reduction in funds allocated to research and development.

RESULTS

Would seriously retard the development of new ships, aircraft, aircraft power plants, guided missiles, armament, electronics, and communication materials.

4. On September 1, 1946, the Navy completed a demobilization of unprecedented scale and speed. Incident to that demobilization the fleets, except for a few units on foreign stations, were immobilized and rendered impotent.

5. Because of the demands for manpower to care for surplus property, surplus bases, and surplus ships; and to lay up the valuable ships to be retained in reserve; the active ships and aircraft squadrons were left without adequate crews, and not until this spring will the so-called active fleets begin to regain combat efficiency.

6. The estimates for fiscal 1948 as submitted in September 1946 to the Bureau of the Budget by the Navy Department, requesting $5,790,000,000, contemplating an orderly shrinkage of the Naval Establishment. In December 1946, when the allocation to the Navy for 1948 of $3,654,000,000 was announced by the Bureau of the Budget, a drastic adjustment in the program was necessary. The adjustment was sufficiently severe so that the further demobilization required thereby will again reduce drastically the effectiveness of the fleet in a ratio which will be disproportionately large because of the cumulative effects during the longer time in which ships will be without adequate crews.

7. The effect of further large cuts in appropriations, particularly for uniformed personnel, will be destructive of the combat efficiency of the fleet because:

(a) Since ships transferred to the inactive fleet require large crews to lay them up, the brunt of any reduction must be borne for many months by the ships intended to be active.

(b) A cut in average strength by any proposed number requires a reduction of approximately twice that number by the end of the year in order to reach the required average.

(c) The men engaged in caring for property on shore, in training, in hospitals, and on terminal leave cannot be cut, which again causes the so-called active fleets to bear almost the total effect of any rapid reduction.

8. With time it will be possible to reduce naval strength without undue impairment of the effectiveness of the fleets at their reduced size. The personnel reductions already planned represent the maximum that can be accomplished without eliminating the Navy as an effective factor in our national security for the period involved.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know whether the Senator is going to speak of it or not, but I have understood that this cut would practically stop all ship construction.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is correct. The exhibit which I have just placed in the RECORD I am certain explains the point that I wanted made.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been told by the Secretary of the Navy that it would stop all ship construction. Is it not the Senator's opinion, from the experience of the past few years, that it is absolutely essential to keep up some construction of modern ships, because what may be modern today may be obsolete next year?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator another question. He has spoken of the Secretary of War. The Secretary of the Navy is a most able and successful businessman. He knows business from A to Z. He is not an Annapolis-trained man, but he is a civilian who made a great name and a great record for himself in private life, and he is as much interested in the taxpayer as is anyone else.

Mr. LUCAS. There can be no question about that. He is one of the most competent and able citizens of this country, and was one of the outstanding men in the business world before he became Secretary of the Navy. In my opinion, he has done a remarkable job while in that position.

Mr. President, I want it understood that I am for a cut in the Budget wherever it can be made. I hope that those who have pulled out of thin air this $6,000,000,000 figure will be able to make good when these matters are ultimately considered by the Appropriations Committee, but I predict now that they will not be able to do so, unless they severely cripple the armed services of this country at a critical time when we need to show strength to the entire world.

There is not one single line of evidence before this Senate that a $6,000,000,000,

or even a $4,500,000,000, cut will not impair national defense or repudiate some of our international commitments made under the United Nations Charter and the laws that we have passed.

Mr. President, I for one am not willing in this hour of peril to toy with our national defenses in such a whimsical and carefree way. I am not one to toss six billion, or $4,500,000,000 around in thin air, with our national defense in danger, even though it were to carry out some political commitment that has been made. Until I have facts upon which to base an intelligent judgment and not a speculative guess, I cannot conscientiously support either of these measures. You who today indulge in this speculation are gambling with the destiny of the future of America. What we do here may undermine our prestige among the nations of the world, make our foreign policy less effective, play into the hands—and I repeat, play directly into the hands—of communistic Russia.

Gentlemen, you who propose to cut the armed forces budget carry a very heavy burden for your country. The world is in too critical a state for it to be otherwise. It is in too critical a state for the Congress to be carelessly pulling figures out of a hat and saying to the armed forces, the Budget Bureau, and the President, that in your judgment the national defense budget does not require expenditure of $11,200,000,000. That is particularly true when we in the Senate are called upon to vote for a cut of this kind without the slightest bit of evidence, without hearings of any kind, without reports of any significance.

Mr. President, other nations of the world are watching our course of action with absorbed interest. The effect of our national defense effort is a matter of vital concern to them. I for one do not propose to weaken our standing in the world by telling our military and naval leaders—great men that they are—great men that they were both in peace and war—that they are talking through their hats on national defense at a time when civilization is at the crossroads.

Call it what you will, the proposed 16 percent cut in the Army and Navy budget is a 16 percent cut in our security. It is a 16 percent unilateral disarmament. It is a 16 percent reduction in the backing this body is willing to give to General George Marshall, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Warren Austin, our American delegate on the Security Council of the United Nations. Instead of giving to General Marshall an ace in the hole, as he prepares to leave for Moscow to participate in the conferences that will affect the fate of the world, we are handing him a joker. The greatest thing that we in Congress could have done to strengthen the security of this Nation and advance the peace of the world would have been to say unanimously, "Yes, we are for cutting the President's budget to the bone, except for national defense, and on that we stand wholeheartedly and enthusiastically back of the President, the Army, the Navy, and the State Department." That is the least that could have been done until the evidence was unfolded and considered before the Appropriations Committee.

DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME AND OTHER TAXES OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 121, and to submit a report (No. 35) thereon. In this connection, I also ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate give immediate consideration to the joint resolution.

Let me make a brief word of explanation, Mr. President. This measure has been passed by the House of Representatives, and has been unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Finance. Prompt action must be taken by the Senate on the joint resolution, because it exempts from taxation the gift of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., of approximately $8,500,000 for a site for the United Nations in New York City. The options on the property expire on February 28, and the whole plan will fall through if the options are not exercised in time.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is so drawn that it does not open the door to all sorts of gifts to the United Nations. It is so drawn that it is practically limited to this single gift, it being the opinion, at least of the Senate Finance Committee, that so far as all gifts of this type and all other tax features are concerned, each case should be considered on its own bottom.

So I hope action on the joint resolution may be taken without delay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report on the joint resolution will be received, and the joint resolution will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY OF MARITIME COMMISSION TO OPERATE VESSELS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 114, which I believe is at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (H. J. Res. 114) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say a brief word about this matter. I had introduced in the Senate a resolution in precisely the same terms as this House joint resolution. The House joint resolution was the subject of hearings by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine, from which the resolution was unanimously reported to the House. It was considered by the House, was passed by the House, and was sent to this body on February 17. I have been authorized by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report the joint resolution to the Senate.

I may say, first, that it is a matter in which the President and his administration are vitally interested. The President feels that the continuation of the authority, as proposed by the joint resolution, is absolutely essential if we are to carry on vitally important trade of the United States in vessels of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the authority which is sought to be extended by the resolution expires within a few days; does it not?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So it is important that the extension be made promptly.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; it is most important.

Mr. President, the first provision of the joint resolution extends for a period of 3 months, only, the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels in the domestic trade.

The second section of the joint resolution authorizes for a period of 3 months additional, namely, to June 30, 1947, the use of what is called the operating fund of the Maritime Commission. That is used primarily in our foreign trade.

It is absolutely essential, so the President believes, so the Maritime Commission believes, and so all maritime groups and interests in the country believe, so far as I have heard, that this authority be continued if we are to service the needs of our own commerce, if we are to transport the coal and grain which are necessary for many peoples in many parts of the world, if we are to meet our military demands, if we are to service the movement of displaced persons, and if we are to carry on our coastwise and intercoastal shipping. So it is generally believed that prompt enactment of the joint resolution is imperative, and I very much hope that it may receive the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 114?

There being no objection, the joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANTS, AND SO FORTH, BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 75, authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make certain expenditures and employ temporary assistants.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 75), submitted by Mr. FERGUSON on January 29, 1947, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, in line 7, after the word "assistants," to strike out "as it deems advisable" and insert "for the purpose of investigating surplus property and its disposal," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants for the purpose of investigating surplus property and its disposal.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, is there any Member of the United States Senate who does not sincerely desire to see our astronomical public debt reduced? I am sure there is not. I am sure no Member of the Senate enjoys paying the present high income tax, particularly if it were possible to reduce that tax substantially without danger to our country. I know the people of the United States want economy in Government. I know the people of the United States have borne a terrific, back-breaking financial load in helping with their dollars, as well as with their own energies, to win the worst, most terrible war in all history. I know these things as well as any other Member of the Senate knows them, as well as any of the many Pennsylvanians who have written me on this problem of Federal expenditures know them, and as well as the people generally throughout the country know them.

Consequently, I have no intention or desire to stand here today and say that the Federal debt should not be reduced or that Government spending should not be curbed wherever it is practical to do so. On the contrary, Mr. President, I want those things done. I do not plead for any blank checks.

During the war I frequently supported what amounted to blank checks to the President and to the military without knowing in all specific details how that money was to be used. The Members of the Congress generally all did the same thing. In the war we had to take the word of the men directing that war that they needed the money to win the war. Thank God they got that money. With it, thank God, the war was won. The best example I know of the blank-check appropriation in those days was the $2,000,000,000 adroitly slipped into a variety of appropriation classifications to buy us the atomic bomb.

That was a necessary method of fiscal operation in war. I do not think it a proper approach in peacetime. I say that because I want the record to be clear. I do not want a single agency of the Government to get a single dollar of appropriation unless the Congress knows what that appropriation is for and approves its use. That is one of our most important single obligations, as Members of the Congress.

On the other hand, Mr. President, while insisting that every appropriation be justified on its merits, I insist that every slash in the President's budget for the forthcoming fiscal year likewise be justified to the complete satisfaction of the Congress.

Today we are making an unprecedented decision. We are deciding, under the mandate of a new law, the magnificent La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act, what our Nation's Budget should be. The spirit of this act is clear that the budget we adopt should be a thoroughly reasoned-out document, based upon facts, figures, and the very best information which it is possible for Congress to obtain.

I might say in passing, Mr. President, that I am more than a little concerned by the increasing number of violations of our own new basic congressional law which have already occurred in these few short weeks in which the act has been in effect, violations expressly sanctioned by the Congress—as it technically has the right to do despite the clear intent of the Reorganization Act—and other violations which have occurred, if not with the sanction of the Congress, then without the active opposition of the Congress. By the latter, I am referring specifically to the disposition on the part of the majority party to indulge with unseemly frequency in the holding of closed-door executive committee sessions when the Reorganization Act provides so definitely that committee meetings, with but few exceptions, should be open to the public.

The legislative budget we are now considering is a prime example of this disregard of the Reorganization Act, which has already become so commonplace in the Eightieth Congress. It is a good example in two ways of the disregard of the spirit, if not the letter of the Reorganization Act.

First, this resolution is a product of closed-door secrecy. It is legislation by a back-room cabal. I had thought that political candidates at one time were selected in that manner, but I never thought the United States Congress would legislate in that way.

We of the minority party, and I suspect that many of the members of the majority party, know practically nothing of how this resolution and the figures it contains were developed.

We have been told, in effect: "Here it is, take it. Ask no questions." We have been told that even if we asked any questions, they would not be answered.

Here, indeed, Mr. President, is an insult to the intelligence not only of the Members of the Congress but of the American people. It is understandable that we could not during the war have every citizen of the United States, or even every Member of the Congress, participate in a decision over whether there should be $2,000,000,000 expended for an atomic bomb. In a matter of such grave military importance, it was proper that the atomic-bomb development had to remain a secret not only from the citizens who were putting up the money for it but even from most of us Members of Congress, who were voting the money for it.

Is such secrecy either necessary or seemly in peacetime on a matter so simple but so important to every man and woman and child in the United States as our Nation's Budget? I do not think so.

Mr. President, the second violation of the act, of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Reorganization Act in connection with the resolution is that the framers of the resolution have admittedly failed to make any thoroughgoing study of the facts in reaching their decision, but have, in fact, reached into the thin air, above the smoke in that smoke-filled room, and have plucked out a figure of $6,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I realize that smoke in a smoke-filled room rises to the ceiling, and that it would be very difficult for anyone to reach above the smoke to find the thin air from which the $6,000,000,000 figure could be extracted. That is what makes this performance all the more remarkable; it violates not only the letter and the spirit of the Reorganization Act; it even violates the basic laws of nature. More, it seeks to get blood out of a turnip. It seeks to remove from the body politic an appendix, namely, governmental extravagance, but it proceeds to do that by chopping with a meat cleaver into the abdomen of Government itself.

Mr. President, if the patient is to be murdered on the operating table, can it not be done with a little more finesse, with a little less gore?

As I said before, I earnestly hope to see Government expenditures reduced. I should like very much to be able to vote in honest conviction for a legislative budget which would reduce Government expenditures.

I do not know, from the information I have received so far from the joint committee which has presented this resolution, whether the Budget can be reduced safely by $6,000,000, let alone $6,000,000,000. And that, Mr. President, is the trouble. Nobody knows. The members of the joint committee do not know. They said they hoped the Budget could be reduced by this mysterious figure of $6,000,000,000, a figure of uncertain parentage.

Hopes, Mr. President, save no money. Facts, Mr. President, if reliable, can open the way to great savings. Facts? There are no facts before us. There is a hope. It is a hope similar to the hope we heard expressed so often in Congres. 8 years ago by those who would have prevented

us from getting ready for war, because it was their hope there would be no war.

We all have a hope that the budget can be substantially reduced, just as we all had a hope 8 years ago that war could be avoided. But, Mr. President, we are dealing with too important a matter now, as we were dealing with too important a matter 8 years ago, to let our hopes determine the law which governs our country and which protects our safety.

May I say here, Mr. President, that the fumbling in the dark which characterizes this approach to a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget is to me painfully reminiscent of the fumbling in the dark which characterized the approach of some Members of Congress less than 10 years ago to the protection of our Nation's safety?

There were those then who felt that expenditures for military purposes were unnecessary, that our Army in its pitiful weakness in those days was sufficient to meet a challenge we were assured would never arise anyway.

There are those among the Members of the Congress today who insist that military expenditures described as necessary by the men most able to judge the need are in fact not necessary at all. Similarly, there is opposition to the use of funds to implement our great victory on the battlefield by aiding to bring about a more unified world in which civilized nations can work together for their mutual safety to prevent aggression.

There is also a belief among some of those who would cut our budget blindly that funds spent toward developing good will throughout the world for this great, rich, and therefore envied country of ours is also a waste of money.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in reducing expenditures?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; I do.

Mr. BRIDGES. How much would the Senator reduce the Budget?

Mr. MYERS. I would not reduce the Budget blindly. I am a member of a committee on the economic report. We were supposed to file a report; we knew we did not have time to file a complete report, and we frankly admitted that fact. We filed merely a brief report. I think that is what the Committee on the Legislative Budget of which the Senator from New Hampshire is a member should have done. That committee should have filed a report asking for an extension of time; otherwise it should have done nothing. Instead, they have blindly groped in the dark. As has been said here today, this is nothing more than a New Year's resolution. For myself, I am not going to vote for a New Year's resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. May I say to the Senator that it is very obvious to him and to me, then, that what he advocates is a disregard of the law? He supported the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and he now advocates bypassing it and paying no attention to it.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator propose to submit a concurrent resolution, to accompany the pending resolution as a part of the committee's report, expressing it as the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased by the amount of the excess, if the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts?

The Legislative Reorganization Act requires the filing of such a concurrent resolution; that anytime the appropriations exceed whatever the Congress determines upon, another resolution shall be filed increasing the public debt by that amount. Does the Senator propose to submit such a resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. If such an emergency should occur——

Mr. MYERS. No, not an emergency; the Reorganization Act requires it and demands it. The Senator is not complying with the Reorganization Act.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, yes; we are complying with the Reorganization Act.

Mr. MYERS. Oh, no, the Senator is not complying with it, and he does not propose to do so. I think the Senator is trying to hoodwink the American people. I shall come to that a little later, because I shall discuss some of the remarks of the Senator a little later.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield a little further?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Not referring particularly to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but referring generally, perhaps, to the remarks of my friend, the Senator from Illinois, as well as the remarks of certain other Senators who are present, the fact is that they are against reducing expenditures. That is the issue here, regardless of any effort to camouflage it. The fact remains that the Legislative Reorganization Act provides the method of making some correlation between expenditures and receipts of government, and, in good faith, with the Reorganization Act in mind, the committee made a recommendation. Now, so far as I can see, the opposition is against a reduction of expenditures.

Mr. MYERS. Why were the minority members not called in? Why was it a back-door proceeding? I would use the word "conspiracy" if the rules of the Senate permitted. Why was it that a few members gathered together, calling no witnesses? According to the report of the committee, two witnesses were called, and the committee then came forth with a mysterious figure of $6,000,000,000.

It is stated in the report that "data from informed persons both in and out of Government" were received. Who were those informed persons?

I am in favor of cutting expenses. I am in favor of reducing expenses; I am in favor of balancing the budget; I am in favor of reducing taxes; but I want to know how it is to be done. I do not think any Member of Congress should be obliged to take the word of a particular group that expenditures are to be reduced by $6,000,000,000, when we are not told how, and when the Senator from New Hampshire does not dare tell us how.

Mr. BRIDGES. Because, if now the Senator were told how, or if this figure were to be broken down, the work of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House would be immediately prejudged.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator means he does not dare to tell?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not mean I do not dare to tell. Of course we can tell.

Mr. MYERS. Then why not tell?

Mr. BRIDGES. Because the law does not require it. The committee does not have to do that. That was not the purpose of the law. The purpose of the law was to arrive at an over-all ceiling, based upon the judgment of certain committees. Such a judgment was reached and the proposal submitted. The details will have to be worked out by the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The esteemed chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just used the word "judgment" as being that which was arrived at. Webster defines "judgment" as—

> The mental act of judging; the operation of the mind, involving comparison and discrimination, by which knowledge of values and relations is mentally formulated.
>
> The power of arriving at a wise decision; discretion; discernment.

Has the Senator from Pennsylvania in his possession anything which would indicate that the committee went through any of these operations in arriving at the so-called judgment?

Mr. MYERS. I might say to the Senator that many Senators who signed this majority report say it is merely a guess.

Mr. McMAHON. Perhaps the members of the committee sent out for a Ouija board.

Mr. MYERS. They might have done that. One Senator said here, "Oh, well, really, it is nothing more than a New Year's resolution." Now, I do not know what we are voting upon, and I again call to the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire the requirement of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. BRIDGES. May I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if it is a New Year's resolution, is it not a great thing that, after 15 years of the New Deal, we do have now, for the first time, a New Year's resolution looking toward a reduction of governmental expenditures?

Mr. MYERS. No; I never make a New Year's resolution that I have no intention of keeping and know I cannot keep. I know the Senator is convinced that we are not going to cut the budget $6,000,000,000. I shall come to that, and I shall give the Senator an opportunity to interrupt a little later.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. MYERS. But I submit to the Senator again that the Legislative Reorganization Act imposes the following requirements upon the joint committee:

First, that it submit a budget; second, an estimate of Federal receipts; third, an estimate of expenditures; fourth, a resolution for the maximum amount to be appropriated and recommendation for the reduction in the public debt; and fifth, a recommendation to be included in a concurrent resolution which accompanies the committee's report expressing the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased by the amount of the

excess if the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator misunderstands me. We do not estimate that there will be a deficit.

Mr. MYERS. Is the Senator going to submit such a concurrent resolution? That is what I ask him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not going to submit now a concurrent resolution for increasing the national debt when we intend to cut expenditures rather than to increase them. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania has become so accustomed during recent years to spending at the rate of up to $100,000,000,000 in 1 year, and then $30,000,000,000 and $40,000,000,000 a year, that he cannot forget that fact.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator inquired what I thought of the Reorganization Act; if I was in sympathy with the Reorganization Act, and I said "Yes"; but I said that I thought the Senator was only accepting a part of it. I ask the Senator, as representing the majority: Did the majority in the caucus or the conference determine to ignore the last provision of section 138 of the Reorganization Act?

Mr. BRIDGES. If it becomes necessary, when the expenditures of Government exceed the receipts of Government, then of course we shall make such a recommendation, but the belief is that the receipts will exceed the expenditures of Government and we provide for a cut in expenditures and a cut in appropriations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before the Senator from New Hampshire leaves?

Mr. MYERS. I yield. I do not want him to leave.

Mr. LUCAS. I want emphatically to challenge the statement which the Senator from New Hampshire made concerning the Senator from Illinois a moment ago, either directly or by implication. I stated over and over in my address, and I repeat it again, that I am definitely in favor of any savings that can be made. What I said I could not do was to vote blindfolded either for a cut of $6,000,000,000 or of four and a half billion dollars without knowing that by so doing I would obligate myself to vote eventually for something which might impair the national defense of the country.

Now one further observation, while the Senator from New Hampshire is on his feet. Knowing him as I have all these years, and having a great affection for him, and having watched the way he has voted respecting national defense both before Pearl Harbor and during the war when Congress voted billions of dollars of appropriations for war purposes, which the Senator from New Hampshire always supported, I was more or less surprised, in fact I may say I was shocked to discover, through the press, that my good friend was advocating—and I am sure he did so, or he would not have been quoted to that effect—a cut of $2,500,000,000 in the national defense. It seems to me that is a considerable amount of Budget reduction for a Senator to ask when he knows nothing about whether it can be done or not. That is what I am complaining about, and that is all. I can understand how some Members of the Senate, in view of their past records, would follow such a course. But I had high hope when my friend from New Hampshire became chairman of the Appropriations Committee that he would continue on the high plane of statesmanship upon which he has been traveling all through the years he has been here, and during that time he was in the minority. I thought his statesmanlike qualities would now carry him to greater heights. But, alas, I was sorely disappointed in the first statement I read in the newspapers, quoting the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the national defense program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois in his speech a few moments ago said:

> The War Department budget was cut 40 percent from the original estimates and it already necessitates large reductions in funds for scientific research and development.

I ask who made this 40 percent reduction at the start? Let me point out that the War Department must have come in with a budget 40 percent higher than the one the President recommended.

Mr. LUCAS. It had been cut twice.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, according to the Senator from Illinois, the War Department must have been right then; and the President must be wrong in cutting the War Department's estimate by 40 percent.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. How can the Senator make that statement? The War Department in the estimate it made at the beginning and the President in cutting that estimate 40 percent, could not both be right.

Mr. LUCAS. The only argument between the Senator from New Hampshire and myself, as I view this discussion, is that I am sure the President of the United States had the advice of all the experts and screened all the different departments carefully and cautiously before he finally arrived at his budget estimates. I am satisfied that the Army and the Navy thought they needed more to do a superb job, but they now say definitely, as the Senator knows, that the amount requested in the Budget is the least on which they can possibly get along and carry out their responsibility for the defense of the Nation in a way that will maintain our security and safety in an uneasy world.

Mr. BRIDGES. But they said to the President, to begin with, that they required the full amount of the estimate.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not know that they said that to the President. I do not know what they said to the President, and neither does the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. They would not lie to the President. They presented the case of their needs, and the President had to cut them 40 percent, and if they were 40 percent wrong then is it not reasonable to assume that they might be a trifle wrong now?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Hampshire can make any assumption he desires to make. All I am saying is that, so far as the record is concerned, I am willing to take General Marshall's statement, General Eisenhower's statement, the statements made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and the President in preference to that made by the Senator from New Hampshire, who admits that he does not know a single thing about the Budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not admit any such thing. Let me tell the Senator from Illinois that I have a complete break-down of every department, as to exactly where I would cut the Budget. All I am trying to do is to cut a little of the fat out of the New Deal agencies and cut some of the fat out of the Army and the Navy. I do not want to cut the Army and the Navy in such a way as to endanger in the least degree the security of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want to make a cut that would have such an effect. We hear much said to the effect that a cut in a certain amount would reduce us to the level of Honduras or some fifth-rate country. Such talk is bunk, in view of the fact that it is proposed to appropriate nine or ten billion dollars for the armed services. When the Senator's party came into power in 1933 our country was spending about a billion dollars a year. Mr. Roosevelt and the Senator's party said that sum was too great, and they proposed to cut it by 25 percent, or down to $750,000,000. Yet now we are spending not two times that amount or three times that amount, but more than ten times that amount. And that was in the days of Hitler.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator and I were not here at that time. We did not know anything about 1933.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator can so readily take himself out from under what happened then.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am not taking myself out from under anything. If the Senator from New Hampshire had been present this afternoon and heard my speech he would not say that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was in a committee meeting. I am sorry I was not present. But I thought so highly of the Senator's speech that I went into the room of the official reporters and read the speech and made longhand notes from it.

Mr. MYERS. Was the committee meeting which the Senator attended a closed meeting or an open meeting?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Hampshire does me great honor when he looks over my remarks. I am glad I have impressed someone by my statement.

If I can impress the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I feel I have accomplished a great deal this afternoon.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. If he has in his office the fine break-down of the budget of which he speaks, why was it not submitted to the Senate?

Mr. BRIDGES. Because that is against the theory of the Reorganization Act. The Reorganization Act calls

for an over-all ceiling. It does not call for prejudging the work of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House. The respective committees have work to perform after long study and hearings. But we do provide as a top ceiling a framework within which the committees shall operate.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say in closing that the Senator did prejudge the work of the committees.

I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me, and I apologize to him for the great amount of time I have used.

Mr. MYERS. No, Mr. President; no apology is necessary. I have enjoyed the colloquy immensely. Mr. President, I said before, and I repeat, that every dollar spent by this Government in the forthcoming fiscal year should be justified to the Congress. The time to decide whether expenditures should be lower or greater than the President has recommended for specific purposes is after the facts have been presented in full. No facts have been presented in connection with the pending concurrent resolution. I understand there are no facts to present, that the joint committee neglected to try to find any.

The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who was vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, has told us that he knows how $6,000,000,000 can be cut from the Budget, but, he adds, he is not going to tell us how it can be done. It is a big secret. It is as big a secret, apparently, as the atom bomb, and that was the best-kept weapon secret since the days Hannibal led his elephants across the Alps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator's approach to this question is entirely wrong. If the work of the appropriating committees of the House and the Senate is to be prejudged, as well as the work on the floor of the Senate and the House, by the action of making a complete break-down at this point, we might as well entirely eliminate those committees.

Mr. MYERS. I think the way this committee operated, it might have been much better to eliminate it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am talking about further work.

Mr. MYERS. I am talking about the joint committee. If it is to operate in the future as it operated this time, I think it would be much better to eliminate it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that in the future the committee will operate in correct fashion, just as previous joint committees have operated. The Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] will have an opportunity to vote on economy measures in the Senate. We are to have some record votes, to see how Members of the Senate really stand on specific economies. They will not be able to camouflage their opposition to a general reduction by patriotic speeches on behalf of the armed services.

Mr. MYERS. I do not characterize this as a patriotic speech.

Mr. President, I have said that the atomic bomb was the best kept secret since Hannibal led his elephants across the Alps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I do not know where the Senator from New Hampshire and his colleagues think they are leading the GOP elephant as a result of this highly secret maneuver, but I definitely suspect that it is not in the direction of victory in 1948.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator talks about the secret of the atomic bomb being the best-kept secret. I may say that I was one of the four Senators who had knowledge of the atomic bomb, and I helped to provide the money for it.

Mr. MYERS. Perhaps that is the difficulty. The Senator is learned in the ways of secrecy, and he wants to continue that policy.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Pennsylvania will have to admit that the Senator from New Hampshire did a pretty good job in that direction, and he will try to do an equally good job in the future in connection with anything entrusted to him.

Mr. MYERS. I congratulate the Senator on keeping the secret of the atomic bomb, just as I congratulate him on many of his votes in the dangerous days before Pearl Harbor, when he saw the danger. But now I disagree with him, and I cannot congratulate him on his present position.

Unlike the Romans who were surprised by Hannibal's elephants, the American people have seen the elephant in action before. They had hoped, I think, in voting Republican majorities in the Congress, that the GOP elephant had learned something during the past 16 years; but they will know, if this irresponsibly conceived resolution is pushed through, that the Republican Party has learned nothing, and that irresponsibility is still the keynote of that party's policy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I shall state why I can not at this time, and on the basis of facts available to me, support a resolution for a $6,000,000,000 slash in the budget, or even one calling for a reduction of $4,500,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator speaks about irresponsibility. He has been in the Senate for some time. Previous to that he was in the House. He knows that his party, the New Deal party, was in power for a great many years. Can he think of any party that could ever be built up in America that could better typify the word "irresponsibility" than his own party, based upon its record during the past few years?

Mr. MYERS. The Senator should get a little flag and wave it as he makes that speech.

The Senator has referred to 1932 and 1933. If he wishes me to take him back and compare present-day America with the America of 1932 and 1933, I shall be glad to do it some day when we have more time. At present I should like to devote my time to the question of the Budget.

I have said that none of us, with the possible exception of the Senator from New Hampshire, knows how the reductions would be made. Unless I know, I cannot vote for a reduction which may threaten the very lives and property of thousands of Pennsylvania citizens, and the economy not only of my own State, but of the entire Nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator from Pennsylvania feel that his quarrel is with the Reorganization Act, which he supported, rather than with the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MYERS. Not at all. I am in perfect accord with the Reorganization Act. I deny the Senator's premise that gentlemen can gather in smoke-filled back rooms, prepare a budget without any figures, and say to the Congress, "Take it or leave it; we will not explain it." That is particularly true when the minority party is not even admitted into the secret chambers. I am in wholehearted accord with the Reorganization Act, but I do not believe that the committee has followed its mandate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under the Reorganization Act would the Senator present a complete break-down showing in detail where reductions are to be made?

Mr. MYERS. I would give as much information as I could; but the committee has given us no information.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would not that be prejudging the work of the Appropriations Committees?

Mr. MYERS. No. The Senator's committee has given us no information.

Mr. BRIDGES. I can tell the Senator very simply where the cuts will come. They will come within every single department of Government, down the line.

I am not making a charge against the Senator from Pennsylvania, because I like him and respect him. I have great affection for him. But I am saying that most of the opposition is not particularly aimed at the Army and Navy.

Mr. MYERS. No; I am coming to that point.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is aimed at other things.

Mr. MYERS. A portion of it is.

Mr. BRIDGES. The other day it was reported to me that the great Secretary of the Interior was quoted as having said, "The boys on the Hill will not dare to cut my appropriation, because I can put too much pressure on them." That is the kind of arrogant bureaucracy we have in Washington, and that is why we must take steps in the direction in which we are going.

Mr. MYERS. I am coming to the other departments of government. Others have spoken of the armed forces.

All the discussion so far vouchsafed on this resolution by the majority party

leadership has been restricted almost entirely to the contention that a $6,000,000,000 cut will not jeopardize our military security. There is so much doubt on this score among very prominent members of the majority party here that we are now being told that a four-and-one-half billion dollar cut is advisable in order to protect our military security. There has been absolutely no discussion about what happens under either reduction to the normal functions of government and to all the programs of government which the Congress has time after time approved and which the Republican Party, as such, time after time in recent political campaigns, and especially in the 1944 campaign and in last year's campaign, pledged itself to continue.

No one, leastwise the able Senator from New Hampshire, has dared—I use the word advisably—dared, I say, to tell us what happens to flood control, rivers and harbors, the farm price support program, which this Congress pledged itself to continue for 2 years after the war, the school-lunch program, the Federal-aid highways and airports program, veterans' housing, rent control, the taking of various censuses, including a business census so desired by many manufacturers, our mine-safety program, the conservation of natural resources, the development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes, the improvement of air safety equipment, testing, development, and research in many of the departments, including the Agriculture and Interior Departments, the prosecution of antitrust violations, the expansion of our instruments for foreign relations, our participation in the United Nations and our obligations under that participation, and so on, encompassing the myriad necessary functions of government. No one, I say, has told us what happens to these programs if the legislative budget here presented is adopted and obeyed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The reason for that is that all the departmental heads will have an opportunity to appear before the committee to present their case, and if their case is good enough their requests will be acted on favorably within the framework we establish in this legislative budget.

Mr. MYERS. Within the reduction of $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. Whichever is adopted. Within that framework we will make the cut and do it on its merits after we hear the evidence.

Mr. MYERS. I think it should have been done on its merits and the committee should have had the evidence before it established this mysterious figure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. MYERS. I shall have to hurry on.

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope the Senator does not mind yielding for a moment. The Reorganization Act was passed last year. Congress convened on the 3d of January. The deadline was on February 15. The new committee set-up was not established until sometime after Congress convened. It was not a matter of weeks or months, but it was actually a matter of days that this joint committee had to work to establish the legislative budget. If it had gone into all the details, if it had heard everyone who wanted to testify, it would not have completed its work until perhaps next July. Believing that under the law we had to make a report on February 15, we did the best we could, and in my judgment we did a good job. We did it with work sheets before us showing a complete break-down. I differ with the Senator with respect to the obligation to present the break-down to the Senate. I think that would be a violation of the spirit of the law.

Mr. MYERS. In the absence of any indications to the contrary, I am afraid it would doom every flood-control project now under construction or in the planning stage. In my State, this means dooming the lives of perhaps hundreds of people in areas such as Williamsport, McKees Rocks, Punxsutawney, and other parts of Pennsylvania where floods have been periodic sources of real and sudden tragedy and where the homes and businesses and jobs of thousands have been wiped out by one quick, irresistible surge of water terrifying to behold and terrifying to experience. Are we voting to kill off these people and their jobs? The Senator from New Hampshire, by refusing to tell us how these reductions would be made should this Budget proposal prevail, leaves me no choice but to decide that should we agree to a cut such as has been proposed here, flood control definitely would not continue, even at the reduced pace which has marked progress in this necessary field in the past year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. At what time does the Senator think we could get this legislative budget through, and how much work does he think we would have to do in the Senate, if the committee had reported that the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana was to be eliminated, and the So-and-So Dam——

Mr. MYERS. It could have been shown how much money was to be allotted for flood control in the Nation and how much was to be allotted for various agencies in the United States. I do not think it was necessary to specify the dams and river projects, but the committee could have said, "We are going to cut, and we believe that the Appropriations Committee could well cut flood control by a certain amount." But that was not done.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr OVERTON. About the only thing which is really definite in the report made by the Committee on the Legislative Budget is with reference to public works, which include flood control, in which the Senator very justly manifests so great an interest.

Mr MYERS. I am coming to that in my remarks.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to refer to it now, even in anticipation of what the Senator intends to say.

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. OVERTON. The report makes "boondoggling" of all public works, including flood control. Public works are to be deferred until unemployment again stalks the land, as it did during and after the Hoover administration.

The report provides for—

The deferment, other than planning, of public works projects—

That is all public works projects—

wherever this might be accomplished without substantial deterioration—

That is, deterioration of works then in existence, not new works—

so that the benefit of such projects might be utilized in any subsequent period of unemployment.

That is mere "boondoggling," so far as public works projects are concerned.

The committee wants to emphasize it. The next paragraph, numbered 7, says:

The deferment, other than planning, of newly authorized public works projects, and their retention on the shelf for utilization in a period of unemployment unless such projects were esteemed vitally necessary.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he does not think that is very sound policy?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I do not.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator and I differ. I am sorry that there is that difference of opinion. I cannot think of a sounder plan than that.

Mr. OVERTON. If the able Senator from New Hampshire considers this to be a sound plan, then I have lost the confidence which I have always entertained in his good judgment.

Consider the western irrigation and reclamation projects. They add to the wealth of the Nation; and when they add to the wealth of the Nation they add to national income, and the Federal Government receives greater revenue from income taxes on that account. Is it wise statesmanship to permit floods to sweep down the Ohio and cause disaster in Pennsylvania, and permit them to sweep down the lower Mississippi Valley and destroy crops, property, and lives, and defer work that will protect human life and save property until unemployment stalks once more through the land?

Mr. BRIDGES. Did not the Senator read that the committee recommended that vital projects be continued; and would not the terrible things to which the Senator refers come under the definition of "vital"? I agree with the Senator much more often than I disagree with him, but I think that he has not properly interpreted the report.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly the lower Mississippi Valley is a vital project.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want to go into that subject.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly flood control on the Ohio is a vital project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as has been said by the Senator from Louisiana, in the cursory report issued by the majority members of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, the members say flatly that in arriving at an expenditure figure for the fiscal year the committee—that, is the majority members of the committee—had in mind certain considerations; included among which was—and these are the words of the report itself:

(6) The deferment, other than planning, of public works projects wherever this might be accomplished without substantial deterioration so that the benefit of such projects might be utilized in any subsequent period of unemployment.

(7) The deferment, other than planning, of newly authorized public works projects and their retention on the shelf for utilization in a period of unemployment unless such projects were esteemed vitally necessary.

Before I vote for any budget based on such a proviso, I want to know what it means to Williamsport, Pa., to Punxsutawney, to Pittsburgh and the whole Pittsburgh area, to Latrobe and Elk County, to the Wilkes-Barre area, to Sunbury, and to all the other communities in Pennsylvania which have flood-control projects now under way or in the planning stage, or projects which have been authorized by Congress.

These projects are all esteemed by the people in those districts and are esteemed by me, I may say, to be vitally necessary. But, Mr. President, that is no assurance that they could ever be undertaken under this program; for, in words made famous by another Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, I should like to know, should this budget be adopted: Where are you going to get the money?

We have the word of the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as cited in the minority report filed by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, that the proposed $6,000,000,000 Budget cut contemplates a reduction of one and three-quarter billion dollars in the military appropriations for the armed services and then about one-half billion dollars from such civil functions of the military as flood-control and similar work.

Mr. President, that is enough for me to know in order to hold this resolution suspect. The entire Budget for the flood-control program for next year, as proposed by President Truman, is far less than $200,000,000. How, then, if we cut $500,000,000 from Army civil functions will any flood control projects receive funds?

Again, Mr. President, we do not know. The majority members of the joint committee—those who profess to know—have no intention of telling us or the people of this country where the money and the cuts are to come from.

Will it come out of veterans benefits? We do not know. We do know it cannot and it will not come out of sums set aside to meet interest on the national debt—interest amounting to $5,000,000,000 a year. The veterans' program will take $7,000,000,000, an amount which is more than an estimate, for it is a sacred obligation and one which we cannot repudiate. Is there any Member of the Senate, Mr. President, who would vote for this Budget slash, knowing it was to come out of obligations we have solemnly pledged to the veterans of our wars?

Another obligation which is unavoidable and unassailable is one for approximately $2,000,000,000 in tax refunds. The people are entitled to their tax refunds; we would have as much right to deny them this money as we would have to repudiate the payment of war bonds.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MYERS. I yield, although I should like to hurry on.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been very generous in yielding, and I shall not impose on his time; but in connection with the item of $2,000,000,000 in tax refunds, which the Senator has mentioned, let me point out that the Senator has been rather generous in referring to guesses or estimates, and I should like to know how the Senator supposes the figure of $2,000,000,000 for tax refunds was arrived at.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have taken the word of the minority leader that he or the minority members of the committee secured the information, because it is information which certainly should be obtainable, and I do not doubt at all that before the minority members signed the report they went to the proper source for that information.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, that figure is merely an estimate.

Mr. MYERS. But it is an estimate based on something. On the other hand, the majority have given us nothing to substantiate their estimate. Many Members of the Senate on the majority side of the aisle have said that the figure is nothing but a hope and a guess.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly it is an intelligent guess.

From a common-sense viewpoint, will not the Senator from Pennsylvania admit that the expenditures of the Government should be reduced?

Mr. MYERS. Certainly I will. I say so definitely, and I have said it a dozen times.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then, why is not the Senator from Pennsylvania willing to vote for an over-all ceiling, reducing expenditures?

Mr. MYERS. I shall not vote for it, because I do not know what is proposed, and I wish to know.

Mr. BRIDGES. From a common-sense viewpoint, the Senator from Pennsylvania knows that Government expenditures should be cut substantially.

Mr. MYERS. But all the information should be made available to the minority members of the committee. This is the first time in my short experience in the Senate or in my 6 years of service in the House of Representatives that the majority members of a committee have gathered in secret session, behind closed doors, and have not even told other members of the committee what they are doing—not even daring to tell them, and frankly admitting that "We do not intend to tell you." That is not good business, it is not good legislation, it is not good government. Certainly when we were in the majority, we never acted that way, in my experience, in any committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct; because when you were in the majority, you never tried to cut expenditures.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Senator knows that is not true.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, yes; it is perfectly true.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator knows that time after time the committee cut the Budget as submitted by the President. Let us be fair.

Now, Mr. President, let me continue my remarks.

The British loan and other international obligations amount to more than $3,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year. I do not think the Senator from New Hampshire will deny that. Do we renege? Can we afford to? Do we dare? We have heard so much in recent months about our bipartisan foreign policy. Are we to see that bipartisanship, to the extent it now exists, destroyed by a Republican repudiation of obligations made by a Democratic administration, made by that administration with the active support and assistance of Republicans such as our esteemed President pro tempore, who is regarded as the spokesman for his party on foreign affairs? Well, are we? Now is the time to know, if we are.

In any event, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] pointed out in his incisive minority report on this budget proposal, the irreducible items in our budget, such as those I have just listed, aggregate more than $20,000,000,000. There is no doubt that the Congress can pare here and economize there to reduce some of these individual items, but not much.

That leaves, then, approximately $17,000,000,000, altogether, subject to real and substantial budget slashing. Cut it by six billions, Mr. President, and as the Senator from Kentucky pointed out, we have eleven billions altogether for national defense and for all the other current, customary, necessary functions of Federal Government.

Yet the armed services alone maintain they need $11,000,000,000 for national defense, and many prominent Republicans contend that in the absence of proof to the contrary they must assume that armed services' estimates are approximately correct. That, then, leaves for the purpose of running our Federal Government exactly zero—nothing, Mr. President.

Before the Army and Navy get a dime, I want them to prove they need it, and prove it to the satisfaction of the Congress. But similarly, before the Army and Navy are cut a dime, I want them to have a chance to defend their requirements fairly, and I think most Members of Congress want to be convinced that the economizing can be done without economizing ourselves into disaster.

Right now I am receiving hundreds of letters on this issue of Government spending and the budget, and I suppose other Senators are, too. Generally, they run to a pattern: Cut the budget with a hatchet; cut it six billion or eight billion, or some other number of billions.

I say, certainly, let us cut that budget to pieces, when we know what we are cutting and where we are cutting.

I have received a letter from a lady in Oil City, Pa., urging a $6,000,000,000 cut because, she says:

It is my understanding that such a cut can be made without impairing our Army and Navy program.

Perhaps so. But I would appreciate it if this lady and others who have written me in similar vein would give me some of the facts as to the places where this $6,000,000,000 cut could be made without impairing the Army and Navy. Normally, one would expect the members of the joint committee making this report to give us those facts. Alas, it is a secret, Mr. President; and they will not tell.

Therefore, rather than take the word of a few Members of the Senate and a few Members of the House that it can be done, I would like to be shown.

And so, to the good lady in Oil City I must say that much as I should like to, I cannot do what she asks because, although I am a United States Senator, I find myself unable to obtain the information which she seems to possess, indicating we can have our Army and Navy, in the size we need, and run all the rest of the functions of Government, and do all this out of $11,000,000,000, which would be the total amount available for both purposes—for military purposes and for all the other normal functions of government, should this cut go through—and which also represents what the Army and Navy say they need exclusively for themselves.

I have a telegram from a gentleman in Philadelphia who urges a budget cut of $6,000,000,000 on the basis, as he puts it, of "Budget Committee assurance that national defense will not be impaired."

He has that assurance from the Budget Committee. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the Budget Committee's report or in its approach to the problem to give me any such assurance, and I feel sure the rest of the Members of the Senate similarly lack such assurance.

A couple in a small Pennsylvania community also wrote me urging a Federal budget, not of $31,500,000,000 but, if you will, of $25,000,000,000. However, they coupled their request for steep budget slashes with another: they say that while they want the budget cut so steeply, they do not want it to affect the old-age assistance or the blind pension.

That is one for the distinguished majority members of the Budget Committee to figure out; I am sure I cannot do it.

I have a card here from a constituent in Easton who asks for a budget cut of at least $8,000,000,000. That is another good round figure and as feasible, I believe, as the $6,000,000,000 cut. If we are going to do away with all the things I have listed: agricultural benefits, school lunches, flood control, our highways program, mine safety investigation, and all the other assorted expensive or inexpensive functions of Government, then we might just as well do away with the Army and the Navy, and devote our entire budget to pure research in how to create a perfect vacuum. Then we can live in it.

On the other hand, I have received a different type of letter. I have received many communications such as this one from Scranton:

DEAR SIR: I think the budget should be cut severely and our Government put on a sound, economical basis. Will you please use your influence toward that effect?

Sincerely yours,

_____.

To the lady who wrote that, I can say in all honesty and conviction: Yes; I think the budget should be cut severely, wherever it can be cut without endangering us all, and I shall gladly use my influence toward putting our Government on a sound, economical basis. Then I should like to have the Joint Committee on the Budget to help me do that by making a thoroughgoing investigation into the budget and the Government's needs and then telling us, in detail, how it thinks expenditures can be cut and where and by how much.

A nurse in Philadelphia wrote me and asked that I "use the power vested" in me "to see that the Federal budget is cut to the very utmost; that careful study and investigation be made of that budget so that all the padding and unnecessary items be eliminated." To that I say, "Amen." I say that young lady has a far more intelligent approach to this problem than the joint committee of Congress set up to consider it.

There have been many copies sent me, too, of another type of letter, and here again, I think, the people of this country demonstrate much more foresight than has been shown by the joint committee. A gentleman in West Chester, Pa., writes:

I am in entire sympathy with the program of the Republican Party to cut expenditures and to balance the budget. I cannot agree with the proposal that expenditures for national defense should be reduced approximately $1,500,000,000. To do so will jeopardize our position in international affairs and our present Military Establishment has been reduced to a point where our national safety is at stake. My purpose in writing you is to request your support for a budget reduction of not more than $4,500,000,000 and a complete restoration of the budget recommended by the President for the armed forces.

In similar vein, a Pittsburgh veteran of 4½ years continuous service urges me to vote against any budget cut relating to our national security. Says he:

Must we again start the vicious cycle of unpreparedness and sucker punches? We will continue to have Pearl Harbors if we follow the doddering old system of tearing down our best barrier against attack, and those barriers are the world's best Army and Navy.

He wrote me about seeing the sunken hulks at Pearl Harbor, and added:

I pray I do not have to go through it again, but I'll be damned if a few short-sighted politicians will cause me to see it again. Let's wise up. Vote against any cuts in defense budget. * * * The best way to preserve peace is to have strength enough to discourage attack against us.

This gentleman confides that in his opinion those who propose cuts in our defense budget would be the first to howl, as he states it, if any power were to pounce upon us.

To this gentleman I cannot give the complete assurance he asks. He asks that I vote against any reduction in the military budget estimates. To pledge that here and now would be as improper, I believe, as to go to the opposite extreme and pledge deep cuts without knowing what effect they would have. When the facts on military needs are presented to Congress in detail, then, only then, can I determine whether I will comply with this veteran's wish and vote against any cuts or whether I will let the facts dictate to me those cuts I can in good conscience support. Undoubtedly, in any budget of such size and scope we can find sizable savings. But I want to see them before I vote to make them.

There was another type of communication I received on the budget which to some extent flabbergasted me. I shall read one:

This organization strongly favors $6,000,000,000 budget reduction recommended by Joint Congressional Budget Committee and urges your support.

It comes from the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

The Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce is a very alert, active organization. Whenever anything affecting Pittsburgh's existence, her future, or her economy is before the Congress, this alert organization is right down here enlisting support—my support, along with the support of other Pennsylvanians. I am glad to give this organization all the support I can on matters affecting the city and the city's future.

Whether the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce realizes it, however, Pittsburgh's existence, her future, is bound up in this proposal for a six billion cut in the Budget. I am convinced there will be no money for the Conemaugh River flood-control reservoir in any budget which has been reduced six billion or even four and one-half billion under the estimates submitted to Congress by President Truman. I should think that would be obvious to any organization much less alert than the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce. And yet, I have in my hand the telegram from which I have just read.

It is only a year or so since the Pittsburgh Chamber was down here in alert self-interest for its city's future clamoring for $5,000,000 to get that reservoir under way. It is now under way, thanks to the action of the Senate in adding the funds to an appropriation bill after the bill had passed the House without the money. Since then, this reservoir has been a top priority interest of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

It may be the chamber has information which I, as a Senator, find denied to me, but frankly, Mr. President, I have no reason to believe that reservoir can be constructed under a budget such as has been suggested here. And without knowing how the Conemaugh Reservoir, and the Punxsutawney dikes, and the Williamsport dikes, and the mine-safety program, and the price-support program for agriculture, and the many,

many, other Federal functions so important to my State are to fare under this suggested budget, I cannot possibly support it.

I was utterly amazed to read that the Pennsylvania Republican delegation in Congress had decided to support this six-billion cut without knowing the answers to these questions which bother me so seriously.

Have they had enough of flood control? Of rivers and harbors improvements—a term which was used so glibly in the last campaign? Have they had enough of soil conservation and forest management and mine safety and weather bureau forecasts and highway aid and public works advance planning funds, and all the other Federal functions which are of such vital importance to my State and to all the other States?

In similar vein to the telegram from the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce was one I received from the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce. Bethlehem, like Pittsburgh, has a serious flood-control problem; Bethlehem, like Pittsburgh, has an extensive flood-control program.

Have they had enough of those programs? Do they not want them any more? Were this $6,000,000,000 cut to go through, or even a lesser cut, which left the military needs of the armed services untouched—a $4,500,000,000 cut, say—there would be, so far as I can foresee, no flood control for Pittsburgh or Bethlehem.

I know from personal study that the funds recommended by Presdent Truman for flood control and rivers and harbors work in the Nation in the next fiscal year will not begin to meet what I consider to be the need. The President has asked for $188,000,000—millions of dollars that is, not billions—for flood control, which would barely keep going the projects now under construction, and provide some funds for planning and for preliminary construction on some of the projects for which initial funds were just recently appropriated—projects in areas devastated in the past few years by rampaging floodwaters and subject to repeat tragedies in the foreseeable future if these projects are not built.

These projects, those in Pennsylvania, for instance, of which I have personal knowledge, are not pork, they are not extravagance, they are not governmental waste, they are not bureaucratic boondoggling. To my mind, they are not deferrable. If anyone thinks the Conemaugh Reservoir is boondoggling, or waste, or extravagance, or deferrable, he should ask the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, the same organization which seems to think it wants this budget cut to go through. If there is any disposition to think a proposed reservoir in Elk County, Pa., is wasteful extravagance, the doubters should talk to the good folks of Johnsonburg, Pa., who got swept out of any doubts they themselves once might have had by the rampaging East Branch of the Clarion River one day in 1942. Williamsport, with a diking project recently renewed after wartime lapses, was inundated as recently as last spring. I think they think these dikes are rather important. I know they think so.

Am I, Mr. President, expected to vote blindly for a blind arbitrary cut in the budget, without knowing how these towns and their projects are to be affected? Although the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce believes I should, I am afraid I cannot.

If I had not considered these projects, and the other functions of Government menaced by this cut, to be essential to our economy and to our poeple, I would not have voted for them in the first place. Neither, I am sure, would the other Members of the Congress. To reverse the will of Congress on these functions and on these needs by the simple means of refusing appropriations for them is, to my mind, the height of legislative dishonesty.

If the Republican Party means to repeal the flood-control program innovated by a Democratic Congress only 11 years ago, let it do it directly by legislation and not indirectly by fiscal subterfuge. Is the school-lunch program to go? Then repeal it, and follow the same course with regard to protection for agriculture and all the other matters I have mentioned. They should go only after careful study.

Mr. President, there has been much talk on the part of some of the Republican leaders to the effect that this proposed legislative budget actually means nothing, that it is merely—and I repeat—a pious hope; that it leaves the Congress free to decide on individual appropriations without being bound in any way by the adoption of this ceiling on expenditures.

To adopt this resolution on that basis would be sheer hokum, an attempt to deceive the earnest citizens now clamoring for lower governmental expenditures into thinking that it means something, while, out of the other side of our mouths, telling those who know the real needs of our Government that it does not mean a thing and not to worry.

I say such an approach is a flagrant violation of the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act. That act contemplates this budget should mean something; that it should set a definite ceiling on expenditures.

I firmly believe that, despite the protestations of some Republican leaders who want to eat their cake and have it, too; who want to stand now for economy but later feel free to boost any appropriations they favor regardless of the ceiling; that this Budget, once adopted, will, in fact, mean something.

One of the Members of the other House most able to do something about enforcing this ceiling, once adopted, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has stated flatly—and it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for us all to read—that he will feel himself bound by this budget and will do all in his power to fit appropriations to it. He can have a lot to say about what the bills look like when they come here and when they come back again from conference. I warn now, Mr. President, that we are not voting on something which means nothing. And if we are, we should be roundly ashamed of ourselves.

No, Mr. President, I cannot vote to cripple flood control, soil conservation, and all the other Federal programs which we all know mean so much to the people of this Nation—programs we would not dare oppose.

I will not vote blindly and unknowingly to cripple our Army and our Navy or to sabotage and scuttle our program for real international cooperation for enduring peace. The price is too high, and the risk too great.

On the other hand, I do not want to be identified as one who blindly upholds any and all requests for governmental expenditures without knowing whether they are justified or not.

In short, Mr. President, I do not know and I have been unable to learn from the joint committee, whether the budget cut here proposed is practical or not, reasonable or not, proper or not. And so it has taken me long today to say what a young veteran from Pittsburgh in a letter to me put in very concise terms. This is what he said:

As a citizen of the United States, I am highly interested in efficiency and economy in government. But as a responsible citizen, I want no part of an economy achieved by sacrificing our national defense, by undermining the prestige of the United States, by welshing on guaranties given to other peace-loving nations, by breaking faith with those of us who served in World War II, particularly those who didn't come back, and by passing on to future generations the tremendous cost in blood and treasure which may be the consequence of a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy.

I further unqualifiedly condemn the attainment of such false economy when it is carried out, not for the sake of economy alone, but in fulfillment of an ill-considered promise of a political campaign.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot support the concurrent resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks certain editorials and news articles.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 15, 1947]

NEW VETERANS' HOSPITAL

The decision to build a 1,248-bed veterans' hospital in the Pittsburgh medical center, despite the underlying mine tunnels which will make the foundation work expensive, is an important victory for Pittsburgh and for the veterans who will use the hospital.

Pittsburgh will benefit through the building and maintenance of this multimillion-dollar project and by the expansion of its medical center.

Much more important, however, is the benefit to the veterans. They will get better care through the interchange of ideas and facilities that will be possible in the medical center.

All too often, in the past, veterans' hospitals have been located in isolated spots, far from patients' homes and from centers of medical knowledge.

The medical staffs were on their own. Very often, competent physicians hesitated to take positions in such institutions because of their isolation and the lack of contact with medical-research activities.

Political considerations, rather than medical, dictated the choice of the sites. Bumpkin Crossroads hadn't benefited from any Government spending to speak of, so—give it a veterans' hospital.

Since Gen. Omar N. Bradley has been Veterans' Administrator, he has fought this tendency. He wants to locate as many veterans' hospitals as possible in or near medical centers.

He had a difficult decision to make on the Pittsburgh site. There's no doubt that the abandoned mines underneath will make the cost of construction high. But the proximity to the medical center apparently outweighed this disadvantage in his mind.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette]

POUND FOOLISH

The United States learned its lesson after World War I, we have been told by Mr. Byrnes, Mr. VANDENBERG, and others, and this time we won't disarm alone.

That sounded very reassuring, until Congress got hold of President Truman's budget.

There is more than one way to disarm. One way is to sink warships and junk B–29's. Another is for Congress to fail to provide the armed services with funds sufficient to do their jobs.

We haven't sunk our warships, yet. But President Truman's 1948 budget, calling for an appropriation of $11,200,000,000 for defense activities, has gone under the ax of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget.

Included in a $6,000,000,000 budget slash, recommended by the committee, is a cut of $1,750,000,000 in Army and Navy operating funds

It would be interesting to know how the committee arrived at the figure for reducing defense expenditures. A minority of 19 House Democrats reports that the committee's budget decision came like "a court rendering a verdict without evidence."

The committee held only three meetings and heard only two witnesses, say the dissidents. Moreover, no itemized estimates of the proposed major reductions had been made available.

Could it be that the committee, keeping a sharp eye on the Republican pledge to reduce income taxes by 20 percent, cut the budget, including military appropriations, on a convenient percentage basis without regard to evidence?

Before a final decision is reached on a budget ceiling, Congress must be made aware of the dangers inherent in weakening national defense at this precarious juncture in world affairs.

The dangers have been pointed out by Secretary of War Patterson and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

"No one picks a fight with Joe Louis," said Mr. Patterson. He also recalled that General MacArthur, facing a food crisis in Japan a year ago, appealed to Washington to "Send me food or send me soldiers."

This country's military obligations do not stop with the maintenance of armed forces.

If we are to retain leadership in an atomic age, we must remain active in military research, in which to be penny wise and pound foolish could easily prove fatal.

If we are to avoid trouble in countries where we are controlling 100 million persons with fewer than 500,000 troops, we must keep the people of these countries fed, and do what we can to put them on a self-sustaining basis.

To fail in these tasks is to invite trouble far more costly than the amounts we are asked to spend now. It is practical economy to give the War and Navy Departments what the generals and admirals say they need. The word of high brass is not Holy Writ, but certainly military leaders know more about the situation than Congressmen so intent upon reducing taxes that they fail to hear more than two witnesses in a budget study.

We favor economies by Congress. But we earnestly hope that the advocates of moderation, like MILLIKIN, TAFT, and VANDENBERG, will show the way to budget reductions that won't be made at the expense of national security.

[From the Washington Post]

WASHINGTON CALLING — BACK-TO-NORMAL BUDGET TALK IS DANGEROUS AT THIS TIME

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—In the dispute over how much the Federal Government shall spend next year, neither side has talked about how the cutting is to be done. If you use a scalpel with patience, skill, and intelligence, you get one result. Using an ax, you get quite a different result.

Impetuous economizers of the type of Chairman JOHN TABER, of the House Appropriations Committee, are brandishing the ax. They are ready to hack away no matter what the consequences to the Government of America's position before the world.

Vital in the budget dispute are the eleven billions requested by the Army and Navy. Those who know the operation of government from long experience believe that with patience and persistence these requests might be trimmed without doing damage to either service.

But no one shows any sign of using patience and persistence. The arbitrary use of an ax will inevitably do great damage. That is why responsible Republicans, such as Senator GURNEY and Senator VANDENBERG, are determined to prevent a flat reduction in the appropriation for defense. They will have a hard fight, particularly when it comes to standing up to the Republican steamroller in the House.

There is a special sanctity about the eleven billions for defense. Even the ax-wielders pause when they realize that to slash the defense budget may radically alter the precarious balance now prevailing in world affairs.

But no such sanctity hangs over the items in the budget that cover the normal expenditures for our Government. And to use an ax instead of a scalpel can be nearly as disastrous when it comes to the regular functions of Government.

Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, one of the most influential Republicans in the House, went back to his native State not long ago and made a rousing, old-fashioned economy speech. He compared appropriations for Government departments in 1939 with the requests made by the Truman administration for the fiscal year 1948.

This was an easy exercise in vote-getting aimed at 1948. It conveniently ignores two monumental facts. Fact No. 1 is that we are only just slowly emerging from the greatest upheaval in this history of the poor, battered, old human race. As a part of that upheaval, we are witnessing the liquidation of the British Empire.

That means the end of 150 years of order-keeping in the world. It means a political and military vacuum that will not long remain a vacuum. To shut our eyes to what is happening across the seas is to invite final disaster.

Fact No. 2 is our economic and technological supremacy over every other nation. Power also means responsibility. If we shirk responsibility, we shall certainly lose the power.

The ax wielders seem determined to close their eyes to these facts. They act as though nothing had happened between 1941 and 1946.

You get little idea from the political debate of how important and how delicate is this matter of the budget. If the slashes are too deep, they may contribute to the deflation that has set in as an inevitable reaction to the inflation of 1946. What is essential—absolutely essential—is to maintain the national income at a level of $150,000,000,000 a year. Should we fall substantially below that level, any hope of balancing the budget would be out the window. We should then face a struggle to meet the $5,000,000,000 of debt service and keep afloat some $80,000,000,000 of short-term indebtedness.

Talking about "back to normal" at this point is dangerous moonshine. Next year's budget will be nearer to normal. Some six to eight billions, connected in this year's budget with the termination of the war, will be eliminated.

When the economy-back-to-normal drive is questioned, the old-line Republican says: "Don't you know the people voted out the New Deal and all that spending on November 5?"

In part, at least, that is true. There was a revolt last November against something known vaguely as the New Deal. But one thing is certain. The voters on November 5 did not vote for a return to the Old Deal of pre-1933. Republicans who think they did may be badly fooled in 1948.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 18, 1947]

MIKE MONRONEY HAS MISGIVINGS ABOUT SNIPING AT REORGANIZATION

(By Charles T. Lucey)

Representative MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, the man who, with ex-Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, had most to do with the Congressional Reorganization Act passed last year, has serious misgivings about the way its success is being jeopardized.

When Messrs. MONRONEY and La Follette fought reorganization through to acceptance last year, the reform was acclaimed as one of the longest steps forward in years. Overlapping committees were consolidated, a means of providing a better legislative check on national spending was provided, congressional pay was raised, and better staffs provided.

THREE DANGERS

But as Representative MONRONEY sees it, three chief dangers to the effectiveness of reorganization have arisen.

First, he fears that Congress may not bring in a "responsible, well considered Budget that Congress itself can live within this next year." Some Congressmen, he points out, are saying the Federal spending ceiling to be set by the new Joint Legislative Budget Committee is only a "hope."

This Mr. MONRONEY denies. If the real intent of the act is to be observed, he says the outside budget figure to be set should be "reliable and responsible," and not something Congress can take or leave alone later. He says he fears the budget ceiling will be fixed so low it cannot possibly be observed in subsequent appropriations bills, and that because of this an attempt may be made to discredit the machinery provided in the new law.

Second, he opposes closed hearings of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees. He points out that 90 percent of legislation takes form in committees—before it ever reaches the House floor. The Reorganization Act provided open hearings but left committees with discretion to keep them closed for discussion of properly confidential information. The Republicans have stretched the provision to cover nearly all discussion.

"I THINK IT'S VICIOUS"

The Ways and Means Committee, Representative MONRONEY pointed out, announced it would hold closed hearings on the subject of tax revision, with representatives of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Bureau to testify. Presumably it would tee off on the proposal of Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, its chairman, for a 20 percent across-the-board cut.

'I think it's vicious to act in closed hearings on one of the biggest issues to be before the Congress this year," said Mr. MONRONEY.

A third point on which the Congressman sees a departure from the intent of the reorganization law concerns committee staffing.

"There has been too much of a tendency," he said, "to bring in relatively unimportant clerical help rather than to obtain competent expert assistance that was contemplated in the reorganization plan."

Most of the opposition to the Reorganization Act has been below the top leadership level. Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, has insisted that the La Follette-Monroney Act should be given a thorough trial before any move is made to change it. But there are many antireorganization snipers among both Republicans and Democrats.

"Nibbling at the act can do a lot of damage," Representative MONRONEY says.

On the budget question, Representative MONRONEY's belief is that the $31,000,000,000 set by the Joint Legislative Committee—$6,500,000,000 under the budget proposed by President Truman—is impossible of fulfillment. Many Republicans agree.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in considering the pending concurrent resolution and the amendment, and in voting upon them, there are two things which it seems to me we all have in mind. The first is national solvency The people of the United States should not be required to support an expenditure of thirty-seven and a half billion dollars on the part of the Federal Government at this time. The burden of the taxes which must be imposed to support this tremendous expenditure is a load that the American people cannot and will not continue to carry.

The second is the matter of national security, national security in an unsettled, unstable world.

The proposed appropriations in the executive budget deal with three general classifications: The normal civilian peacetime agencies and services of the Government; national security; and fixed obligations. The third general classification is made up of debt service and such other fixed obligations as veterans' benefits. These cannot now be changed.

It is in the first two classifications that reductions could be made. It does not seem to me that the people want the ax of economy applied indiscriminately or equally in these first two broad fields, that is, in the field of general Government services and in the field of national security. While I am hopeful and believe that it may ultimately be possible to accomplish an over-all reduction of $6,000,000,000 in these portions of the budget it would seem that in making any reductions we must first concern ourselves with the recommendations for normal civilian peacetime agencies and services. Is there any sound reason why these could not be reduced to substantially what they were in the last peacetime year before the war—in the Budget for 1941? We could add to these items percentages representing increased costs and yet fall well within an adequate appropriation for all these agencies and services that we now find necessary. Even then, their cost would be far under the estimates and recommendations proposed for the same agencies and services in the President's budget. In other words, we can disregard in the executive budget the proposed appropriations for the national defense, and the estimated expenditures for veterans' services and benefits, interest on the debt, commitments for the United Nations, foreign loans and rehabilitation, and other already fixed obligations, and still find that the proposed expenditures for the remaining services and agencies of the Government—those I refer to as the normal civilian peacetime Government agencies and services—are approaching twice what their costs were in 1941.

Whether we set the figure at $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000, we should first make reductions in that part of the budget that could not directly affect our national security or our obligations on the public debt or veterans' benefits and services, or foreign loans or the United Nations. If we were to set the figure at $4,500,000,000, there is an excellent prospect that we could accomplish at least that and probably more, too. We could then approach the question of waste and extravagance in the armed services. I have no doubt that substantial savings could and should be made there. But I firmly believe that we must not seek economies that might prove false economies. We must not now hastily risk the possibility of weakening our strength to preserve peace. If we set the figure of reduction too high and then, in order to achieve it, make cuts and slashes indiscriminately, we may find that we have seriously endangered our national security by making cuts in the armed services that our national security cannot endure.

It would seem far wiser now to recall the lessons we should have learned in the past, where relations with other nations were concerned, and be sure now that we do not make impossible adequate preparation for whatever the future may hold in store.

The fact that nearly 80 percent of the budget we are now considering is made up of items the cost of which is directly attributable to recent world wars should force us to pause and appreciate that we cannot afford, even from the financial viewpoint, to risk an action that could leave us insufficiently prepared to preserve peace.

This does not mean that we cannot make a drastic cut in the budget. I believe a reduction of $4,500,000,000, as suggested, can be effected without endangering our security, or crippling expected Government functions.

The amendment does not imply any weakening of our avowed determination to seek out waste and extravagance in every requested appropriation. It does not imply that we will grant any appropriation having in it provision for unneeded or useless governmental activity. It does not imply that our interest in debt reduction and tax reduction—both vital to our economy—has diminished in the slightest.

The amendment not only makes clear our determination to observe drastic economy, but our equal determination to recognize the possible price that might be set for world peace and national freedom.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment providing for a reduction of $4,500,000,000 will prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I inquire from the Senator from Michigan if he desires to proceed this evening. I had hoped that we might have a brief executive session and then take a recess until Monday.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized at the opening of the session on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Michigan on Monday.

RELIEF OF SUFFERING PEOPLES ABROAD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 144)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1301.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and the withdrawal of a nomination, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Elliott Northcott 2d to be an ensign in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 5th day of December 1946.

EXTENSION OF INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive B (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a protocol to extend for 1 year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions, the inter-American coffee agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT FOR ONE YEAR FROM OCTOBER 1, 1946

Whereas an Inter-American Coffee Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in Washington on November 28, 1940; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed in Washington April 15, 1941, the Agreement was brought into force on April 16, 1941, in respect of

the Governments on behalf of which the Protocol was signed on April 15, 1941; and

Whereas Article XXIV of the said Agreement provides that it should continue in force until October 1, 1943; and

Whereas by unanimous consent the Governments signatory to the Agreement twice extended the said Agreement unchanged for one-year periods, these extensions being duly attested by two certified and signed Declarations passed by the Inter-American Coffee Board on May 12, 1943, and July 25, 1944, respectively, which were duly deposited in the Pan American Union on June 11, 1943, and September 11, 1944, respectively, in accordance with the provisions of Article XXIV of the Agreement; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1945, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1945, with certain changes recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board.

Now, therefore, in support of a recommendation made by the Inter-American Coffee Board on August 16, 1946, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term, subject to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory to the present Protocol for a period of one year from October 1, 1946.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol agree that the provisions of Article 1 through and including VIII of the Agreement shall be inoperative, except that, under emergency conditions, such articles of the Agreement shall again become effective upon a motion approved by at least 95% of the total vote of the Inter-American Coffee Board.

ARTICLE 3

a. During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by March 31, 1947, a thorough analysis of the world coffee situation and shall formulate recommendations for the consideration of the governments now participating in the Agreement and of other governments that might be interested in participating in a revised agreement regarding the type of international cooperation that appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound, prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both producers and consumers.

b. Such recommendations shall take due account of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreement which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations prior to the submission of such recommendations.

ARTICLE 4

The present Protocol shall be open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 3, 1946, until November 1, 1946, provided, however, that all signatures shall be deemed to have been affixed under date of October 1, 1946, and the Protocol shall be considered as having entered into force on that date with respect to the governments on behalf of which it is signed.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at the City of Washington in the English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages. The original instrument in each language shall be deposited in the Pan American Union which shall furnish certified copies to the Governments signatory to this Protocol.

OCTAVIO DO NASCIMENTO BRITO
Brazil

EMILIO TORO
Colombia

RAFAEL OREAMUNO
Costa Rica

GMO. BELT
Sujeto a la aprobación por el Cuba Senado de la República de Cuba

EMILIO G. GODOY
Dominican Republic

O. GARCÍA
Ecuador

FELIPE VEGA-GÓMEZ
El Salvador

ENRIQUE LÓPEZ HERRARTE
Guatemala

Ad-referendum
JH. D. CHARLES
Haiti

JULIÁN R. CÁCERES
Honduras

A E DE LOS MONTEROS
Mexico

GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA
Nicaragua

JORGE PRADO
Peru

SPRUILLE BRADEN
United States of America
Subject to ratification.

M. A. FALCÓN BRICEÑO
Venezuela

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original of the Protocol for the Extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement for one year from October 1, 1946, deposited in the Pan American Union.

Washington, D. C., January 6, 1947.

[SEAL] WILLIAM MANGER,
Acting Secretary of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, was this protocol unanimously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think I can answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut. The protocol was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee. It is desired by the State Department and by the President. It is a simple extension of the protocol until October 1, 1947. The coffee quotas are in suspension, the substantive purpose of the treaty having lapsed; and it is merely desired to maintain the framework for another year, pending the results of a study being made regarding the future coffee prospects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol to extend for 1 year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions, the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol was signed October 1, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE—NOMINATION RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert E. Arnold to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that this nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herman B. Baruch to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis Bowes Sayre to be representative of the United States of America in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Josiah Marvel, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dillard B. Lasseter to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald B. Duncan to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles E. Dickerson, Jr., of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Gilson G. Blake, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

William K. Ailshie, of Idaho, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Frederick D. Hunt, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 26, 1946:

TO BE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM JULY 1, 1947 (DATE OF APPOINTMENT)

Russell K. Alspach

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps in the ranks hereinafter stated:

The following-named officer to be a captain:

Fenwick N. Reeve

The following-named officer to be a first lieutenant:

Richard E. Figley

The following-named officers to be second lieutenants:

Henry G. Ammer
John H. Anderson
Joseph R. Arnaud
Edward J. Artnak
James S. Ashman
Arthur J. Bachhuber
Laurence A. Ballinger
Walter A. Baran
Billy H. Barber
Jerome J. C. Beau
William H. Beckett
Earle W. Belknap, Jr.
George S. Belli
Paul F. Bent
Henry A. Berck
Charles F. Bethell
David M. Bidwell
John C. Boulware
Myrl E. Boys
Ralph E. Brandel
William Bradford
John C. Brewer
William B Buckner, Jr.
Carrol B. Burch
Samuel B. Burnett
Elzia M. Cable
Charles M. Cable
Donald S. Callaham
Howard D. Campbell, Jr.
Bobby Carter
Kenneth E. Caulkins
Arthur R. Causer
Thomas F. Cave, Jr.
Alexander D. Cereghino
Charles B. Chambers
Cecil L. Champion, Jr.
Thomas J. Ciszek
Joseph O. Compton, Jr.
John J. Conrad
Edward L. Constantine
Donald Conroy
Lester W. Corey
Ruel H. Corley, Jr.
William M. Crapo, Jr.
William B. Creel
Russell A. Davidson
Joseph E. Davies
Philip A. Davis
Marion H. Deckard
Wesley F. Demmons
Warren J. Dillberg
Robert L. Dominick
Donald F. Draeger
Remmel H. Dudley
James C. Dunphy
Earl W. Dunsmoor
James R. Dyer
Edward V. Easter
John W. Eberhart
Samuel L. Eddy, Jr.
Charles W. Egan
Robert H. Emswiler
Dexter E. Evans
Robert J. Fairfield
Richard A. Flanagan
Norman W. Flinn, Jr.
Daren J. Flitcroft
Benjamin A. Fornonzini, Jr.
Arthur C. Frazier
Louis S. Frazier, Jr.
Joseph L. Freitas, Jr.
Burnette R. Gallagher
Richard M. Giddens
John R. Gill
David D. Girard
Frederic J. Goff, Jr
Herbert Gomes
Frank W. Harris III
Joseph B. Harrison
Albert Hartman
Eric W. Harslem
Andrew Hedesh
Paul B. Henley
Harry G. C. Henneberger
Teddy W. Hill
Bruce F. Hillam
Walter L. Hill
Don M. Hinshaw
Henry W. Hise
Robert R. Holmes
William R. Holt
Thomas J. Horgan, Jr.
Charles A. House
Hardy V. Huffstutter, Jr.
Walter G. Hunter
Glenn R. Hunter
Oscar A. Imer
Clayton R. Ingraham, Jr.
Charles J. Irwin, Jr.
James H. James
Clyde R. Jarrett
Curtis D. Jernigan
Victor E. Johnson, Jr.
Mark Jones
Donald R. Judge
George W. Kaseman
Joseph Keller
John P. Kelley
Jack G. Kelly
Charles D. Kenneday
Melvyn H. Kerr
Robert R. Kiernan
Daniel R. Kingsley
Julius King
Walter C. Kirk
Robert R. Klingman
Oliver J. Koester
Claude R. LaPlant
Richard H. Lewis
Ralph H. Lewis
Eldon L. Little, Jr.
Orlan R. Lodge
Edwin B. Long
Gustave F. Lueddeke, Jr.
John K. Lynch
Dermott H. MacDonnell
Henry G. Maeger
Nathaniel F. Mann, Jr.
George S. Mansfield
Thomas E. McCarthy
Grant W. McCombs
Thomas F. McGraw, Jr.
Vance F. McKean
Fenton J. Mee
Marion F. Mehlinger
Byron J. Melancon
Kenneth G. Meyer
Lynn E. Midkiff
Lee R. Miller
Willie J. Mixson
Malcolm G. Moncrief, Jr.
Arthur M. Moran
Frank P. Moran
Robert E. Munkirs
Frederick A. Murchall
John J. Murphy
Anthony R. Nollet
Kirt W. Norton
William H. Nuckols, Jr.
Robert E. O'Hare
Frank J. O'Hara, Jr.
Roy E. Oliver
James R. O'Moore
William T. O'Neal
Mackubin T. Owens
Will S. Patee, Jr.
Harvey M. Patton
James Payette
Edward K. Pedersen
Robert R. Peebles
John S. Perrin
Robert Peskuski
George L. Peters
Paul R. Piana
Clarence E. Plocke
William D. Porter
James A. Pounds III
Lawrence H. Pratt
William R. Quinn
James H. Reeder
James H. Reid, Jr.
James H. Rinehart
Eugene S. Roane, Jr.
Eddie L. Robinson
Murray O. Roe
William H. Roley
Robert L. Rose
Robert J. Rossi
Arthur L. Rourke
Roger M. Sanders
Richard J. Schening
Robert F. Scott
Jeremiah D. Shanahan
James F. Shea
Frank J. Sheppard
John C. Shoden
Edward W. Shugert
Jack C. Smith
Joseph Smith
Mercer R. Smith
Nathan R. Smith
Ralph A. Soderberg
Daniel A. Somerville
Melvin D. Sonneborn
Parks J. Stallings
Theodore A. Stawicki
Bernard J. Stender
John Stepanovich
Frank P. Stivers, Jr.
Russel H. Stoneman
Victor Stoyanow
Lesley V. Strandtman
Sedley N. Stuart
Richard H. Tabor
Jack W. Temple
Franklin C. Thomas, Jr.
Richard S. Togerson
Lyle V. Tope
Bernard L. Turner
John A. Wachter
Guy L. Wade
Robert Wade
Robert C. Walker
Emerson A. Walker
Charles M. Wallace, Jr.
William A. Wefr
Sheppard Werner
Howard A. Westphall
Leo T. White
James L. Whitaker
Frank E. Wilson
Robert L. Willis
Donald G. Wood, Jr.
Warren R. Young
Elmer J. Zorn

The following-named officer to be a first lieutenant:

Everette H. Vaughan

The following-named officers to be second lieutenants:

Frederick S. Aldridge
Philip R. Anderson
James Antink
John G. Babashanian
Gene M. Badgley
John E. Barnett
Lyman A. Bates
Lewis D. Baughman
John W. Beebe
William C. Benton
Carl L. Bilinitzer
Wallace D. Blatt
Thomas E. Bourke, Jr.
James W. Brayshay
George A. Brigham
Edwin B. Bucholz
Clifford W. Buckingham
James M. Burris
William K. Byrd
Earl W. Cassidy
Armon Christopherson
Matthew A. Clary, Jr.
Louis Conti
Clement T. Corcoran
Oliver W. Curtis
Thomas J. Cushman, Jr.
Armand G. Daddazio
Alexander P. Davidson, Jr.
Eldon E. Davidson
Charles F. Dekeyser
Armond H. Delalio
John S. Dewey
Ernest R. Doyle, Jr.
Charles J. Dyer
Kenneth T. Dykes
George M. Faser
Fred J. Fees, Jr.
Daniel G. Felding
Francis E. Finch
Billie L. Fletcher
Harold R. Foltz
David Foos, Jr.
Martin I. Frederick, Jr.
Owen V. Gallentine
James E. Gibbons
Hobson J. Gifford
Jack Glenn
Jerome L. Goebel
William F. Goggin
John L. Greene
Edmund K. Griswold
Raymond F. Hargrove
Carl O. H. Haroldson
Robert G. Harris
William S. Harris
Robert M. Healy
John L. Herndon
Gene M. Hoover
Gerald G. Hoover
Louis T. Iglehart, Jr.
Wayne R. Johnson
Thomas J. Johnston, Jr.
William G. Joslyn
George T. Keys
John M. Kusiak
Charles A. Labbo
John Ladutko
William H. Lanagan, Jr.
Harold V. Larson
John H. Lavoy
James Leffers
Julius O. Lemcke
William E. Lesage
Harry M. Lindberg
Harry L. Lottes
George T. P. Lovelace
Kenneth A. Lund
Jan Mason
Lyle B. Matthews, Jr.
Raymond McArthur
James C. McFerran II
John R. McGuigan
Harold G. McRay
Maxmillian W. Mier
Harry A. Moore
Edwin G. Nelson
Arthur W. Newendorp
Richard B. Newport
"J" "P" Nixon
Keith D. Nolan
Virgil D. Olson
William R. Ourand Jr.
Thurman Owens
John Padach, Jr.
Douglas D. Petty, Jr.
Eugene V. Pointer
Ernest E. Poor
William T. Potter
John G. Prestridge
James R. Priddy
Dwain L. Redalen
Alvin R. Rieder
David Riley
John P. Roden
Elmer W. Rothenburger
Robert R. Roy
John W. Ruhsam
Charles C. Samis
James Sanzo
Valdemar Schmidt, Jr.
Charles C. Schwartz
Frank A. Shook, Jr.
Jack R. Sloan
Jerry B. Smith
Richard E. Smith
James B. Soper
Alfred V. Soupios
Alan M. Stewart
John D. Stith
William D. Stone
David G. Swinford
John G. Theros
Frank C. Thomas
Roger B. Thompson
McDonald D. Tweed
Hiel L. Van Campen
Harry Van Hunnik
Carl M. Viner
Stanley B. Voth
Don C. Ware
Stephen G. Warren
James R. Weaver
Paul T. Wiedenkeller
Robert G. Williams
George L. Wineriter
Robert E. Woerner
Ralph C. Wood
Vance L. Yount, Jr.
Clarence F. Zingheim
John W. Zuber

The following-named officers to be commissioned warrant officers:

George K. Acker
Jack A. Bingham
Jack R. Bishop
Arthur H. Bourne
Frederick Bove
Arthur E. Buckner
Vincent J. Buettner
Edward E. Burt
James W. Campbell
Jack V. Canzonieri
John A. Clayton
Sidney W. Cooley
Alfred T. Coon
James D. Connolly
Lawrence R. Darner
William A. Davis

Sloan M. Diaz
James P. Drummond
James R. Einum
George F. Elliott
Chester H. Fritts
George M. Garner
Wilbur P. Gorsuch
John E. Halliwill
Rayburn B. Harper
George E. Hynes
Eric E. Isaacson
George D. Johnson
Carl W. King
James L. Knott
Alfred G. Kohler
Frank R. Leech, Jr.
Henry J. Lendo
Burt A. Lewis, Jr.
Albert L. Litka
William H. Meadors
Herbert L. Merwin
Adam A. Metz
Alfred N. Milbert
Robert A. Morehead
Philip A. Murphy
Charles E. Neus
Benjamin F. Osborne
Edd F Peel
Haakon B. Rasmussen
Robert B. Reynolds
Merle G. Richard
Roy H. Roark
John F. Russell
John L. Seifert
Levi B. Silverman, Sr.
Richard W. Sinclair
Benjamin S. Singleton
Dorsie R. Smith
Elmer H. Sorley
Elwyn M. Stimson
James G G. Taylor
Paul N. Taylor
Harry G. Torbett
James W. Tuma
Fred Turner
Charles W. Walker
Hugh L. Wehrly
John F. Wheeler
Peter J. Wilgus
William L. Woodruff

The below-named officer to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps to correct spelling of his surname, Nenefee, Melville M., as previously nominated and confirmed:

Melville M. Menefee

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

Francis Bowes Sayre to be the representative of the United States of America in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Josiah Marvel, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Dillard B. Lasseter to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. James Kirk to be assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment.

Brig. Gen. Spencer Ball Akin to be Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment.

Brig. Gen. William Herschel Middleswart to be assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment.

Col James Wilson Green, Jr., to be professor of electricity at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

Col. Kenneth David Nichols to be professor of mechanics at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

To be major generals

Clarence Self Ridley
James Eugene Chaney
John Clifford Hodges Lee
Oscar Wolverton Griswold
Leonard Townsend Gerow
Charles Philip Hall

To be brigadier generals

Archibald Vincent Arnold
Junius Wallace Jones
Louis Aleck Craig
George Fleming Moore
William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr.
Walter Melville Robertson
Frank William Milburn
George Jacob Richards
Charles Wolcott Ryder
Stafford LeRoy Irwin
John William Leonard
Idwal Hubert Edwards
Grandison Gardner
Franklin Otis Carroll
Charles Carl Chauncey
Edward Michael Powers
Kenneth Bonner Wolfe
Alfred Maximilian Guenther

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Orval Ray Cook
Emmett O'Donnell, Jr.
Malcolm Cummings Grow
Edwin William Rawlings
William Henry Draper, Jr.

To be brigadier generals

Eugene Martin Foster
George Warren Mundy
Donald Leander Putt
William Maurice Morgan
Samuel Robert Brentnall
Donald Norton Yates
George Craig Stewart
Hubert Don Hoover
Ernest Marion Brannon
Edwin Kennedy Wright
Turner Ashby Sims, Jr.
Eustace Maduro Peixotto
Bryant LeMaire Boatner
James McCormick, Jr.
Earle Levan Johnson

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals of the line

Sumter de Leon Lowry, Jr.
Norman Everard Hendrickson
Kenneth Frank Cramer
William Hamilton Sands
Charles Christian Haffner, Jr.
Leo Myron Kreber
Ray Cook Fountain
Jim Dan Hill
Edward James Stackpole, Jr.
Joseph Arthur Teece

To be brigadier generals of the line

Winston Weidner Kratz
Stanford Willis Gregory
Hal Lowndes Muldrow, Jr.
Philip Charles Bettenburg
Charles Clarence Curtis
Charles Ralph Fox
Louis Evans Boutwell
John Uberto Calkins, Jr.
David Phillip Hardy
Chester Arthur Files
Daniel Harrison Hudelson
Howard Sanford Searle
Roy Washington Kenny
Elgan Clayton Robertson
Reginald William Buzzell
Otto Edward Sandman
Edward Clark Rose
Richard Smykal
Kenneth Cooper
Cecil Brainard Whitcomb
Daniel Bursk Strickler
Harry Lynn Bolen
Alexander Gallatin Paxton
Clayton Price Kerr

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Department

Curtis Dion O'Sullivan
William Henry Harrison, Jr.
George Hilton Butler
Vincent Henry Jacobs

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

James Harold Doolittle

To be major generals

Victor Emile Bertrandias
Joseph Wilson Byron
Edward Peck Curtis
William Joseph Donovan
Thomas Francis Farrell
Carl Raymond Gray, Jr.
Patrick Jay Hurley
Ralph Maxwell Immell
Harry Hubbard Johnson
Frank Edward Lowe
Cyrus Rowlett Smith
Edward White Smith
Leif John Sverdrup

To be brigadier generals

Donald Bennett Adams
Julius Ochs Adler
Wayne Russell Allen
Frayne Baker
F. Trubee Davison
Edward Arthur Evans
Lawrence George Fritz
Gene William Hall
Thomas Oates Hardin
Harold Ross Harris
Rudolph Charles Kuldell
Hanford MacNider
Timothy James Manning
George Hamden Olmsted
Charles Merville Spofford
Frederick Smith Strong, Jr.
L. Kemper Williams
Robert Wilbar Wilson
Thomas Bayne Wilson

Chemical Corps Reserve

To be brigadier general

Hugh Meglone Milton II

Finance Department Reserve

To be major general

Arthur Hazelton Carter

Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve

To be brigadier general

William Robert Clayton Morrison

Medical Corps Reserve

To be brigadier generals

Stanhope Bayne-Jones
Isidor Schwaner Ravdin

Ordnance Department Reserve

To be brigadier general

Edward Samuel Greenbaum

Quartermaster Corps Reserve

To be brigadier generals

Georges Frederic Doriot
Bernhard Alfred Johnson
John Reed Kilpatrick

Signal Corps Reserve

To be major general

William Henry Harrison

To be brigadier generals

Carroll Owen Bickelhaupt
Ephraim Franklin Jeffe
Charles Eskridge Saltzman
David Sarnoff
Samuel Morgan Thomas

IN THE NAVY

To be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service

Donald B. Duncan

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Frank W. Sommer to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour of serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy holy will, not waiting for tomorrow but yielding today.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain.

Lift us above unrighteous anger and mistrust, into faith, and hope, and charity, by a simple and steadfast reliance on Thy sure will.

In all things draw us to the mind of Christ, that Thy lost image may be traced again, and that Thou mayest own us at one with Him and Thee, to the glory of Thy great Name. Amen.

(Prayer written by James Martineau in 1805. Used at the request of the United Council of Church Women.)

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 21, 1947, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. This is the day designated under previous order of the House on which Washington's Farewell Address is to be read. In accordance with past custom in other years, the Chair feels that this shall come first, and therefore recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] to read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. LODGE read Washington's Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium

of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady

adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinon, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral posi-

tion. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RELIEF TO PEOPLE OF THE LIBERATED COUNTRIES (H. DOC. NO. 144)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $350,000,000 to assist in completing the great task of bringing relief from the ravages of war to the people of the liberated countries.

The period of full-scale supply operations by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is rapidly drawing to a close. In some of the liberated countries UNRRA will have achieved its objective fully, for these countries will once again be self-supporting so far as the basic essentials of life are concerned. In other liberated countries, however, this is not yet the case. Compared with what has already been done, what remains to be done is relatively small and limited in time and scope, but nonetheless vitally important.

On humanitarian grounds, and in the light of our own self-interest as well, we must not leave the task unfinished. We cannot abandon the peoples still in need. To do so would be to replace hope with despair in the hearts of these peoples and thus to undermine the spiritual and economic stability upon which our own hopes for a better world must rest. Others will help but such is the preponderance of our economic resources that success cannot be acheived without us. If we fail to do our part, millions of human beings will be denied the elemental necessities of life. Their strength and recuperative powers, which have been slowly growing, will be undermined. The time, now in sight, when they can once more exist without help and make their contributions to the peace, prosperity, and progress of the world, will be indefinitely postponed.

I recommend that this relief assistance be given directly rather than through an international organization, and that our contribution be administered under United States control. International cooperation in the program and the necessary coordination of our relief activities with those of other contributors can be achieved by informal consultations with all nations concerned through the mechanism of the United Nations and otherwise. I believe that our relief contribution should be used only for providing the basic essentials of life, such as medical supplies, food and items which will aid in the production of foodstuffs.

The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year. The most critical period will be in the spring and summer months, when UNRRA shipments will cease and the harvests are not yet available. Swift legislative action is necessary if our help is not to come too late.

The United States, in keeping with our traditions of immediate and wholehearted response to human need, has stood in the forefront of those who have checked the forces of starvation, disease, suffering, and chaos which threatened to engulf the world in the wake of the war. The task is nearly finished. I urge the Congress to act promptly to insure that we do not stop short of the goal; that we do not endanger the permanence of the gains we have helped to achieve.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 21, 1947.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, I would be pleased, and I am sure the membership would be pleased, if the majority leader would give us some idea of what we may expect in the way of legislative program next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I will be pleased to do so.

Monday is District day. I understand the Committee on the District of Columbia is proposing to call up for consideration on that day H. R. 1700, which is the daylight-saving bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. RAYBURN. May I interrupt the gentleman? I would like to know if there is any scheme for the expansion of this kind of legislation beyond the District of Columbia by enactment of Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. I spoke to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, about the bill. I must confess I am not informed as to its detail, except I assume that, coming from the Committee on the District of Columbia, it applies only to the District of Columbia. If there is any member of that committee present who could enlighten us about that I would be glad to have him do so. Otherwise I will be glad to make inquiry and inform the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. If there is any contemplation of having any such legislation apply to the entire country I will say now it will have hard sledding.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the absence of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which committee would likely have jurisdiction of such matter, I know of no legislation before the committee to that effect.

Mr. HALLECK. I was about to say that when we had Nation-wide daylight saving time before, the bill originated with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; so I am very sure that this measure applies only to the situation within the District.

On Monday we also hope to call up the Hobbs bill, H. R. 4. This is a bill dealing with the Supreme Court decision in the McNabb case, which has to do with the competency as evidence in criminal trials of confessions under certain circumstances.

It is my hope and plan to adjourn from Monday to Wednesday. On Wednesday it is proposed to call up a resolution which has been reported out by the Rules Committee to re-create the so-called Newsprint Committee.

Also if the resolutions are reported from the Rules Committee it is our purpose to call up a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], which would re-create the so-called Small Business Committee that has heretofore operated

Also, to call up a resolution offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], chairman of the Committee on Labor, which would be designed to give the Committee on Labor the power of subpoena and certain authority.

On Thursday we are hoping to call up the Gwynne bill, H. R. 584, known as the portal-to-portal bill. That of course is contingent upon the Judiciary Committee's completing its work on the bill and making its report, and the granting of a rule on the bill.

Friday of next week, so far as I know, is undetermined and will be so designated.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the committees in order on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the translation of a Spanish song apropos Washington's Birthday.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 87 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation, inquiry, and study to be conducted by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, or subcommittees thereof as authorized by House Resolution 36, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. RALPH BURTON

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 89) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to H. Ralph Burton the sum of $600 for professional legal services rendered the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, during the month of January 1947, in preparing the final reports of the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, investigating the national defense program.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "COMMUNISM IN ACTION"

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 17 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 500,000 additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action," of which 375,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 125,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by (h) (1) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "authorized by (h) (1) of rule XI" and insert in lieu thereof "with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h)."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$60,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments created a subcommittee to investigate war assets. That was a continuation of the so-called Slaughter committee. A member of that committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] was made chairman and he said it would require some $50,000 to make a proper investigation, which, in my humble judgment, is a very modest request. I understand a similar committee in the Senate which is going to take up another part of the investigation—there is no duplication—is asking for and will get $100,000.

The Committee on Expenditures, acting upon a request from a very distinguished Member on the minority side, which was conveyed to our committee by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], created a subcommittee that is similar to and which if granted funds will carry on the duties of the so-called Smith committee, which rendered such a valuable service during the last Congress.

The Committee on Expenditures also authorized a limited and circumscribed investigation of the State Department, one which has nothing to do with or which will not in any degree or manner encroach upon any investigation or with the duties or the proceedings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There was a committee authorized to investigate the enforcement or lack of enforcement by the Department of Justice of the law prohibiting labor and other racketeering.

In short, Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Expenditures assumed that rule XI meant what it said, that it wanted certain investigations made by the Committee on Expenditures—no duplications—and so the chairman of that committee asked the Committee on House Administration for a total of $60,000, which included the $50,000 requested, and for which I shall vote, by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] and an additional $10,000 for the committee's other subcommittees. When that matter came before the subcommittee it was inclined to give us, as I understand it, an over-all of $75,000.

Then when the resolution went before the full Committee on House Administration on motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], all but the $50,000 was stricken out, so that as the matter now stands your Committee on Expenditures has not one thin dime to enable it to function in any manner except as the subcommittee may now work on surplus war assets. That is all right with me, if that is the way the House wants to let the matter rest, with this exception: One of the investigations which has been undertaken—that relating to labor racketeering and for which witnesses have been subpenaed—will be carried on regardless of whether the House gives us a penny or refuses to do so.

I understood that when the meeting of the full Committee on House Administration was held—and the gentleman from Massachusetts is here—when this matter was up, he voiced opposition to the Committee on Expenditures having any money, favored giving it all to the subcommittee, which again is all right with me if that be the procedure; though while the committee is denied funds and the money given to a subcommittee, the resolution makes the committee chairman, not the chairman of the subcommittee, responsible for the disbursement of the fund—a queer procedure, that of denying the committee funds but making its chairman a disbursing agent. Then from the minority side of the House Administration Committee came opposition on another ground. The statement was made in effect—and if I am wrong the gentleman can correct me—that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures had refused to consult the committee minority in making appointments to the subcommittees. There is absolutely no foundation whatever for that statement. I do not know where he got it. I do know that the ranking minority member of the Expenditures Committee named every minority man who was appointed to a subcommittee.

I see here before me the ranking member of the minority on that committee, and if I am in error I hope he will correct me. I am addressing that remark to him. I notice here other members of the committee on both sides, and if I am in error they can correct me, any one of them, and unless they now do so let us assume that my statement is correct. What I did do and what I now understand was contrary to my duty, and the minority whip would lay it down for me, was to fail to consult the ranking minority member of the committee prior to asking the individual members of the committee in open meeting and prior to the appointment of the members what line of duty each would be interested in. In my ignorance and my innocence and my desire to be democratic, to be considerate, in order that, as Drew Pearson says, democracy may live, I perhaps inadvertently, when the subcommittee was authorized—and the duty devolved upon me to appoint members of the majority and the minority to that subcommittee—I say, perhaps inadvertently, I said, "Now, who on the majority side and who on the minority side"—and here sit two members of the minority, freshmen—"wants to go on that committee and thinks he would like to serve there, doing the particular work which will fall to the lot of that subcommittee?"

Shall I apologize to the minority whip because I did not secretly, prior to naming minority members of a subcommittee, consult with the ranking minority member of the committee, but instead, when authorized to name a subcommittee, at once, in open meeting, asked the members to state any preference each might have as to the work he desired to do? The ranking minority member sits before me. I understand he is satisfied—so far I have never heard from him to the contrary—is satisfied with the action that was taken. If he and the new members who are on the committee are all satisfied, why should the minority whip complain? I can see how party discipline on the minority side is not aided if I just ask the members of the committee what they think they are qualified to do, what they would like to do, instead of forcing every new committee member to run to the whip, ask him to see the ranking minority member. These new members are able to speak for themselves. They have not advised me they have selected the whip as their bargaining agent, and so I am going to continue that practice of asking them what they want and of giving it to them when possible.

So today, Mr. Speaker, apparently because of the joint action of a Republican member of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], and the minority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], a resolution from which was stricken the paltry sum of $10,000, a part of which might have been used to inquire as to whether the Department of Justice intended to prosecute alleged extortionists and robbers by a committee authorized by statute to make such an investigation is now before us. I shall vote for the amended resolution even though our modest request for $10,000 was stricken, because and only because I believe the subcommittee may need the $50,000 and I am sure the chairman of that subcommittee will not waste any part of it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that there was no disposition on the part of the Committee on House Administration to interfere with the activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The original request was for $50,000, and it seemed that that was adequate to take care of the investigation of this one Subcommittee on Expenditures, now headed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], investigating the activities of the War Assets Administration. I think that is the committee which was formerly known as the Slaughter committee. Mr. RIZLEY'S own resolution called for only $50,000.

In the event the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments brings in a resolution for additional money, it will be considered very carefully in the House Administration Committee. As to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] about the rights and privileges of the minority, may I say that I will defend with all my strength the rights of the minority at all times.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has brought to the floor a matter which was unnecessary, and so far as we on the Democratic side are concerned we knew that the Republican leadership was not aware of it or would not stand for it, and we on this side felt that the gentleman from Michigan himself had no intent to take a course of action which was inconsistent with the custom that has existed from time immemorial, and which has the practical effect of a right of both parties. So, the gentleman need not feel disturbed, and, certainly, anything he says with reference to myself does not disturb me, because, whether he intended it or not, he conveyed to the Members of the House the fact that I was simply performing a duty. Now that this has been brought into the open, the information that I received from my leader, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], was that it was going to be taken up with the Republican leadership and the facts ascertained, so that it could be ironed out in an understanding way, which we knew it would be. Before that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], we assumed unintentionally, was undertaking to directly or indirectly dictate the appointment of minority members of the subcommittees.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course I will yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not intentionally.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Not intentionally; I said unintentionally, directly or indirectly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows I could not make it without making it intentionally. Will the gentleman yield to me for 3 seconds? First, I want to thank him for the lesson in the correct way to make appointments.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am not giving the gentleman a lesson. He is not going to get away with that. He should not say I am trying to give him a lesson because I am not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do not be disturbed.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; I am not disturbed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us get back to the issue.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am not disturbed, but the gentleman is not going to put into the RECORD statements that in no way are consistent with the truth, not when he is dealing with me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is what I did.

Mr. MCCORMACK. If the gentleman will sit down, I think it will all come out all right, because the gentleman has conceded that the position I took was correct. I was not taking it as an individual. I would expect the gentleman's side to take it if they were in our position.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield to let me answer his statement?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I have yielded.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right in this, that before the committee—and there sit two of the freshmen over there now—what I said was, "Do any of your gentlemen want to serve on a subcommittee, and if you do, what committee do you think you are qualified to sit on, and do you want to sit on such-and-such a committee?" That is what I asked them. Was I wrong in asking the freshmen Members of Congress what they would like to sit on, without seeing the minority man over here? The minority man, who sits right here, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], named every member of the minority on every subcommittee. Am I right, Mr. MANASCO?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan met me outside yesterday. Some observations I made in the House committee, which were impersonal, were carried to him. I said, "Yes." "Who told you?" I told him who told me. It was the ranking member of the committee himself, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], and the confirmation is there.

This is all over. This will not happen any more. I do not say the gentleman intended it.

The gentleman made one other remark, that I opposed his resolution in the committee yesterday for $60,000. The gentleman is very greatly mistaken in this respect. What I did say is that it is up to the Republican members to determine to what extent, if any, his committee is going to encroach upon the original jurisdiction that belongs to other committees, and that I would cooperate with my Republican colleagues in preserving the jurisdictions and dignity of any other standing committee of the House. I said that, and I did not oppose $60,000; as a matter of fact, I did not care whether $50,000 or $60,000 was reported out. So when the gentleman says I opposed it, he is laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, since this matter has arisen as to the right of the minority to make their assignments, may I say that it was my fortune or misfortune to serve in the minority for 12 years, and through all of those years I recall that the then majority party gave to the ranking minority member of the committees on which I served the full and complete right to select the members to serve on the various subcommittees. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Michigan understands that situation and will afford to the ranking minority member on any committee on which he serves that same privilege, as we certainly, so far as I am concerned, will yield to the minority leadership and ranking committeemen generally the right to make such appointments.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]

Mr. SABATH. I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Indiana whether that should not apply to all of the committees and not only to the committee of which the gentleman from Michigan is chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. I thought I made it clear that it would be so applicable. Certainly, if I did not make it clear, I want to make it clear now.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RELIEF TO LIBERATED COUNTRIES

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object to this request, I wish to advise that I will object to any additional 1-minute speeches before the House proceeds with the consideration of legislation on the hoof-and-mouth disease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, in the message from the President of the United States which was sent to us today, there was this sentence:

> I recommend that this relief assistance be given directly rather than through an international organization, and that our contribution be administered under United States control.

I rise on this occasion to pay my respects to the President of the United States and to compliment him for wanting future moneys for relief to be administered under our control.

When the original bill for UNRRA was under consideration, on January 25, 1944, I offered an amendment that would have put all the funds for relief and rehabilitation under the supervision of the American Red Cross. The amendment was defeated by the Democratic side voting solidly against it.

Everyone knows the scandals that have come out of UNRRA and how much of the funds were used to entrench puppet governments of the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics.

It is gratifying in part at least to know that President Truman acknowledges through his desire now to have future funds administered under United States control that it was not handled correctly under UNRRA.

A Democratic President and a Congress controlled by Democrats were responsible for insisting that funds should be spent through their political child, UNRRA.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances—in one to include a resolution by the Steuben Society and in the other to include a resolution.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. MACKINNON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address delivered by former Governor Stassen.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter, and in another instance to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. James Farley.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a copy of a newspaper article.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and a newspaper article.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in each.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Virginia junior Senator, Mr. ROBERTSON.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 108.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1819) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, and

all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill, and such amendment for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 108) makes in order consideration of H. R. 1819, which is a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

It is my understanding that this bill was given very full consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and that that committee unanimously reported H. R. 1819. I may say to the membership that this rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. It is an open rule and amendments will be in order under the 5-minute rule.

A few weeks ago a number of us who live in the agricultural sections of the country, especially those who have districts that raise a great deal of livestock, had called to their attention the fact that in Mexico the so-called foot-and-mouth disease was becoming quite prevalent and that if something was not done to aid and assist the Republic of Mexico by this country it was very likely that the disease would spread to this country and would probably result in the devastation of thousands upon thousands and perhaps millions upon millions of cattle in this country.

Further, it is my understanding that preliminary surveys have been made by the Department of Agriculture. They sent some representatives down there and found these conditions to exist. They came back and made their report and it was their considered judgment that the Republic of Mexico was unable to handle the situation and that if we were to protect the livestock industry in this country, so that we might be assured of beef for ourselves and for other people we are trying to help feed, we had better do something about it.

After these reports were made the matter was called to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture. After hearing the experts and the gentlemen who were sent down by the Department of Agriculture they came to the unanimous conclusion that something should be done about it. Pursuant to that, this bill, H. R. 1819, was introduced by one of the able and distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture, Dr. GILLIE, and it is his bill that is before the House today for consideration. The members of the Committee on Agriculture will explain the full purposes of the bill. I do not propose to take further time under the rule. It is an open rule subject to amendment when the bill is considered on the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Coming from a cattle district, I know the importance of the action of the Rules Committee in expediting the passage of this legislation. Those of us who come from the livestock producing States such as South Dakota and Oklahoma realize that it is important that something like this be done immediately.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Has not this bill passed the Senate already?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am informed that a similar bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. WORLEY. A bill similar to this was passed by the Senate a few days ago.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to the House that this bill, of course, does not carry with it any appropriation. The amount of money to be expended must be justified before the Appropriations Committee before any expenditure is authorized.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the rule making this bill in order is, indeed, a broad and liberal rule. Because the bill itself is of such importance to the Nation I feel that there cannot be any opposition. Unlike the rule that was brought in yesterday on the budget resolution, a bill of transcendent importance, on which we were gagged and deprived of even the right to offer an amendment, this rule is a broad and liberal one that permits any kind of amendment germane to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House more than to express the hope that when the bill is considered we will insert a limitation as to the amount that should be allowed for any Mexican cattle that may be ordered killed. I recall that in 1914 and 1915, when our country suffered a great deal from this same foot-and-mouth disease among cattle and many cattle were killed, that from $10 to $15 per head was allowed. I hope that in this case, too, the House will put a limitation on the amount that can be paid.

I also notice there is no limitation as to the expenditures. I am told that there may be from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 required to combat the disease. I do not object if it is properly expended and if it is needed and required.

As to the legislative procedure, may I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that, in view of the fact that the Senate has already passed a bill, I think it might be in the interest of saving time to offer this as an amendment to the Senate bill or adopt the Senate bill in lieu of this if it is on all fours with this bill, except that we should limit the power that is given to the Secretary of Agriculture. Though I have confidence in him, nevertheless I do not like to give unlimited power to anyone to spend millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is so enthusiastically in favor of this legislation, and, if I may have his attention, I would like to discuss in part the suggestions he made with reference to placing a limitation on the authorization and expenditures under the bill. Our committee unanimously felt that there is a need for legislation of this kind. When we see a prairie fire coming to us at a distance we try to put it out before we are destroyed. So we have an idea that the best thing we can do is to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in an effort to eradicate and control the disease in that country before it comes over to ruin the livestock of the United States.

We went into the question of expenditures. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that we tried in every possible manner to secure some idea as to the amount of money involved to cope with this problem, but we were unable to secure any definite information as to the cost. It is said that the disease exists in about 10 States in Mexico, and that there are approximately 2,000,000 head of cattle in the area. It may not be necessary to destroy all those animals, but surely, if they are destroyed and if we are required to pay the entire sum, it will run into a substantial amount of money. However, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State had not proceeded far enough in negotiations with the Government of Mexico to determine what we might be required to spend; so the committee wrote a provision into the bill which required a report every 30 days to the Congress by the Department of Agriculture in order that we may be fully informed and, accordingly, could raise or lower our estimates on the requirements of what had to be done to stop this disease from coming into the United States.

I doubt if there is anyone here who can suggest any fixed sum of money with reference to cost and, too, it may be dangerous to fix an amount of money here because there may be people in some other countries who may feel that if we set a limit of $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 or $50,000,000, since the money has to be spent through the instrumentalities of that country, the money should be turned over to them in a lump sum. We did not want to spend it in that way because we want to control and eradicate the disease.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understand the gentleman from Illinois proposes still another limitation upon the bill and that is that there should be a limitation per head as to the value of the cattle or other stock that might be necessarily slaughtered under this act. It seems to me it would be well to point out that within the territory now infected in Mexico are some of the most valuable breeding stock in the Republic of Mexico; therefore, you cannot fix across-the-board average valuation because some of that stock runs into thousands of dollars, whereas most of them are poor stuff.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say that the price of cattle has gone up, as the gentleman knows. He will remember that one man told our committee that they would average about $50 a head.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Perhaps you have been over this same territory in some of the hearings, but I think it ought to be in the RECORD again. Did this outbreak or this epidemic arise out of or through a violation of any treaty between this country and Mexico?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, how far we should go into that, I do not know. But I might say to the gentleman that there were certain Americans and other nationals who were engaged in bringing in bulls from Brazil; several hundred of them.

Mr. BUFFETT. The American taxpayer is going to pay for that, is he not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The American taxpayer apparently will have to pay for it, but we have to do this now. We are forced into a situation where we cannot help ourselves.

Mr. BUFFETT. Certainly, but at the same time we should have full information as to how this money is going to be spent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be glad to relate the incident that brought about the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think that would be helpful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me relate the whole matter of how this came about. I cannot give specific dates, but I will try to put them in the RECORD.

In 1945 there were certain Americans, and possibly people from Mexico, and possibly from Brazil, whom I would call promoters, that brought in several hundred bulls from Brazil to Mexico for stock. These bulls were put into quarantine. It was found that some of the bulls were infected with the foot-and-mouth disease and consequently they were quarantined. The quarantine was placed on them, in which the Government of Mexico joined. But, for some strange and unknown reason, the then President of Mexico overnight issued an order releasing those bulls, distributing them to the ranches in Mexico, and so the disease spread throughout Mexico, and the bulls which cost these promoters around $300 apiece were sold for from $5,000 to $20,000 each in Mexico.

Mr. BUFFETT. Were the American citizens a party to this agreement then?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So I am informed. There were some American citizens, together with others, who were interested in this promotional scheme to make money.

Mr. BUFFETT. Is our Department of Justice doing anything about that violation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am informed that those American citizens are not in the United States.

Mr. BUFFETT. Should not that be investigated at the same time we appropriate this money?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It might be well to investigate it. But here we have reached a situation that we have trouble with, and unless we take the precaution now, even though there will be heavy expenses, the foot-and-mouth disease may be spread throughout the United States.

I might say to the gentleman that last year, when the OPA took away meat from the American people, thousands of those head of cattle were brought into this country over quarantine from Mexico, and were put in some 28 States in the United States, but apparently we have not discovered any infection from those cattle.

Mr. BUFFETT. If American citizens helped to bring about this violation, unless our Government operates to prevent the recurrence of that sort of thing by appropriate measures, certainly we are not doing our full duty by simply appropriating money to eradicate it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that. I think the gentleman is right. We should confiscate the property and the assets of those people wherever they may be, but that is only a drop in the bucket compared to what it will cost in the long run.

Mr. BUFFETT. Is the gentleman's committee taking any positive action in that connection?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. You may be sure that we will, if we are given the information.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As soon as our committee heard of these bulls last spring, we made provision for a quarantine on Swan Island, which makes provision for places where animals like this can be put on an island in the Caribbean Sea and kept for 90 days under supervision to determine whether there will be any foot-and-mouth disease. That is the first time there was any such provision made.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman, Are the facts I stated approximately correct?

Mr. POAGE. I think so, except there were two shipments of bulls. The first came in in 1945, in October—160 bulls, I believe—and there was no foot-and-mouth disease ever attributed to any of those, although they were kept for a good many months and then scattered rather widely, after they were brought in, and apparently there was no foot-and-mouth disease. Some 300 bulls were brought in in April or May of last year, and they were kept for some time in quarantine at Vera Cruz, and then, as the gentleman says, the President of Mexico let them go.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], who has done such a fine job in bringing this legislation before the Congress. He is a man who is trained not only by education but by having had experience in the controlling of this dread disease, commonly known as hoof-and-mouth disease.

There is nothing very much new to be added to what has been said, except that I should like to say that this is a very good answer to the people who have continuously put before the country that the sanitary quarantine was a ruse of the livestock producers to keep livestock out of this country. We have had this quarantine against the importation of cattle and other livestock from countries where hoof-and-mouth disease exists for a number of years. As far as I know, this is the very first time that cattle have been exported from infected areas to free areas, which in this case is the Republic of Mexico. The very first time it was done we had an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, so it should call to our attention the necessity of continually seeing to it that the quarantine against infected areas is maintained.

I think the quicker this legislation is passed the less it is going to cost this Government. It is going to be a painful and expensive project, in my judgment, but I think the legislation is necessary and should have the support of every Member of the House.

May I also say that when it was learned these bulls were brought from other countries into Mexico our Department, under the treaty we have with Mexico, vigorously protested the importation of these cattle. As a result, they were quarantined and held in quarantine until it was thought the danger was over. Then, as has been said here, some of them were sold to individuals throughout Mexico.

This is a dread disease, and whatever it may cost—and I say we should use all the precaution necessary—this disease should be stamped out as quickly as possible, right in its tracks.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said in regard to this fight to protect our livestock, and also to express my appreciation to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for bringing the legislation to the floor today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. In view of what has been stated as to the tremendous profit that has been made out of these imports of bulls, may I not suggest to the gentleman that it might be wise, because of the profiteering that is going on, to place a limit on the amount that should be allowed for the Mexican cattle that will be killed in Mexico and which we will be obliged to pay for. Understand, I am for this, but I want to restrict as much as possible the actual cost to our Government.

Mr. GRANGER. The Committee on Agriculture considered that question very thoroughly. Some of us thought that perhaps when this appropriation was made a limitation might be placed on it, and I think it will. I think it should be. I believe this problem can be handled in a businesslike way and can be prosecuted very quickly if the House acts promptly in passing this authorizing legislation. Furthermore, that the Appropriations Committee and the Congress makes funds available so that the work can start immediately.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the subject of hoof-and-mouth disease is extremely important, and in the few minutes that I have I would like to suggest to all Members of the House that it affects every district. It is not a problem affecting the cattle industry alone. The situation in old Mexico today is so serious that it could in itself change the cattle economy of the United States and put us in a very bad position—so far as cattle breeding is concerned—for the next 50 years or more.

I mean by that that England, the Latin-American countries, and perhaps every nation except the United States and Australia, have this disease and have established partial immunity against it, while the infection here would destroy our herds, our milk supplies, and our meat sources, and it be another 50 years or more before we built up the same immunity.

Not that such an immunity would be desirable. The disease in any form is serious, expensive, and destructive, but I am pointing out our position today, and what the introduction of the disease could mean to us.

It is not, as I say, a question only for cattlemen and a problem affecting them only. It would limit the production of cattle for food. The outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease has been shown to increase the price of beef, because of scarcity. An epidemic of hoof-and-mouth disease will dry up dairy cows and will make it impossible for cattle to breed, and in every way upset the entire cattle economy and industry of the United States. It affects people in the cities just as much as it affects people in the rural areas and the cattle-producing areas, except that the people in the cities do not have to see the tragedy of the cows that are infected with this disease. The hoof-and-mouth disease is a virus disease of such intensity that a single drop on the claws of a bird can infect a drinking trough and thus infect all of the cattle which subsequently use that drinking trough.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is it not true that this disease is no respecter of boundaries and can jump from county to county and from State to State and finally infect the whole country?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The disease jumps, as the gentleman from New York has said, from county to county and respects no boundaries. The only known preventive is destruction. The only thing to do is to destroy the animal. It affects all cloven-hoofed animals, such as cattle, deer, goats, oxen. You realize the problem that confronts the United States from the diplomatic, economic, and practical standpoints, to go into a country like Mexico where the ox is a domestic animal used in farming, and where almost every rural family has a milk goat and where goats roam wild over the land. You appreciate the problem confronting the United States in attempting to help a nation shut out the disease which is already so well established that perhaps the solution may be the quarantining of the infected area in Mexico, about 250 kilometers by 150 kilometers, and then to fight the spread of the disease outside of that area. May I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] who is on his feet, before I yield to him, and before my time expires, that the United States has spent $200,000,000 in the past to keep this disease away.

Mr. MILLER of California. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that when the disease was prevalent in California, the California Division of Fish and Game spent in excess of $300,000 slaughtering deer when the disease got into certain sections of the mountains where the deer were and it was many years before the deer population became great enough again to furnish the usual sport that is carried on there.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, because those of us who have seen these outbreaks know that it is a very serious situation and a tragic one if we cannot control it in the adjoining country. In our attempt to eradicate the brief outbreaks in California, the one in 1924, and subsequently in 1929, it was necessary if the disease broke out in a dairy to destroy the dairy cattle in that particular dairy and in the adjoining dairies on either side in an attempt to stop the disease.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the hoof-and-mouth disease threat is a real threat to the Nation and I am supporting this legislation designed to do something about the danger. May I make an observation and ask a question. I think the gentleman is aware that very often Members of Congress from agricultural areas are accused of trying to spend too much money for agricultural purposes. Is it not true that this bill and the fight against the hoof and mouth disease will be of almost as much benefit to the general public as to the cattle raisers themselves?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. It will benefit the general public even more than the industry itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a foot-and-mouth disease summary of information on its history, character, and method of control, as compiled by the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives, the House Committee on Agriculture, and the Subcommittee on Animal Foot-and-Mouth Disease is indeed fortunate in having the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, chairman of this subcommittee. Dr. GILLIE is a veterinary of long standing. His experience at this time is valuable.

H. R. 1819, before the House today, and of which the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, is the author, is vitally necessary because of the fact that under existing law, the Department of Agriculture has no authority to engage in any formal joint undertaking with the Government of Mexico on vesicular stomatitis or foot-and-mouth disease as it is commonly known.

The Department of Agriculture only has authority to consult with the Government of Mexico on such problems.

This legislation provides joint undertaking authority and to authorize appropriations of necessary funds by the United States Government.

Foot-and-mouth disease can attack any cloven-footed animal or those with split hoofs.

This means cattle, hogs, sheep, goats, and deer would be affected in the United States should the epidemic break out.

While North America is freer than any continent except Australia, we have had, I believe, eight epidemics, the most recent occurring in 1929.

As report 38 accompanying this legislation will show, this present epidemic which is below the border in Mexico has rapidly spread into 10 Mexican States.

It can spread among animals as fast as the flu epidemic spread among humans during the last World War.

It is the most highly infectious of animal diseases and is correspondingly dreaded with livestock owners as smallpox or cancer with humans. It is so infectious that troops are being used at

present to patrol the affected areas in Mexico.

The worst epidemic to occur in the United States was in 1914. During this outbreak, 22 States and the District of Columbia were affected. The State of Illinois at that time had 1,226 herds slaughtered which included 31,074 cattle, 45,560 hogs, 1,866 sheep, 66 goats, the total for Illinois being 78,566 animals, the appraised value of which was $2,569,102. The appraised value of the slaughtered animals for the entire United States in 1914 was $5,865,720.

Should a similar outbreak occur today the amount would be many times greater.

Of 102 counties in Illinois, 54 were affected. Illinois had the largest slaughter for any State in the Union. In Pennsylvania it was necessary to slaughter 892 herds, the disease spreading through one-half of the counties in that State. In Illinois the disease lasted from November 1914 to May 1916. In Pennsylvania it lasted from November 1914 to April 1915. In Illinois and Wisconsin it lasted 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I desire to insert the statistics of this disease for the 1914 outbreak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Statistics of foot-and-mouth disease outbreak of 1914[1]

State	Counties		Herds slaughtered	Animals slaughtered					Appraised value of animals	Duration of outbreak
	Total[1]	Infected		Cattle	Swine	Sheep	Goats	Total		
Connecticut	8	3	35	701	175			876	$48,366	November 1914 to April 1915.
Delaware	3	1	12	152	49	22		223	8,068	November 1914 to December 1914.
District of Columbia			4	48	39			87	7,139	November 1914 to March 1915.
Illinois	102	54	1,226	31,074	45,560	1,866	[3] 66	78,566	2,569,102	November 1914 to May 1916.
Indiana	92	20	118	2,437	3,973	640		7,050	179,731	October 1914 to August 1915.
Iowa	99	9	49	1,547	2,335	32		3,914	125,297	November 1914 to March 1915.
Kansas	105	4	12	1,218	313			1,531	76,097	February 1915 to March 1915.
Kentucky	119	11	82	2,942	866	216	1	4,025	135,000	November 1914 to June 1915.
Maryland	24	10	70	1,008	1,784	313		3,105	69,038	November 1914 to May 1915.
Massachusetts	14	9	103	2,066	6,088	78	6	8,238	217,848	November 1914 to October 1915.
Michigan	83	16	272	2,951	4,108	818		7,877	212,334	October 1914 to August 1915.
Minnesota	86	1	1	25	35			60	2,384	August 1915.
Montana	31	3	42	1,416	11	240		1,667	67,603	November 1914 to January 1915.
New Hampshire	10	1	3	78	26			104	4,960	Do.
New Jersey	21	8	52	1,315	815	9	6	2,145	123,387	November 1914 to June 1915.
New York	62	21	219	5,737	625	150	33	6,545	476,578	November 1914 to August 1915.
Ohio	88	39	228	4,069	5,003	3,070		12,142	359,971	November 1914 to April 1915.
Pennsylvania	67	34	892	15,294	10,634	368	10	26,306	947,958	Do.
Rhode Island	5	3	59	985	379	33		1,397	71,096	November 1914 to March 1915.
Virginia	100	3	9	378	650			1,028	27,744	Do.
Washington	39	1	1	102				102	4,050	November 1914.
West Virginia	55	3	27	194	189	148		531	12,814	February 1915 to April 1915.
Wisconsin	71	12	40	1,503	1,435	1,764	1	4,703	119,155	November 1914 to May 1916.
Total	1,284	266	3,556	77,240	85,092	9,767	[3] 123	172,222	5,865,720	October 1914 to May 1916.

[1] Exclusive of dairy show herds isolated at the national dairy show.
[2] The number of counties in each State is given in order to show, by comparison with the number infected, the approximate area involved.
[3] Including 9 deer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman tell us where this disease started at that time?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Just a little later in my remarks I will bring that out.

The present alarm on foot-and-mouth disease has reached such proportions that according to the press when President Truman visits Mexico next month he expects to take up the matter with the President of that country.

The Foot-and-Mouth Disease Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture has been given information that this disease is constantly prevalent in England, Europe, Asia and Africa.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman is doing a very fine thing by putting all this material in the RECORD at this point. I particularly want to emphasize what he has just said about England, and the Latin-American countries. They have developed a sort of immunity against it which we do not have and therefore we are trying to keep the disease out.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It is just as prevalent in these countries I have just mentioned as is the common cold in the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very much interested in the very able speech the gentleman is making and the remarks that have already been made. May I inquire if any so-called sanitary laws or inspection laws are effective in the case of meats which come in from infected areas to see whether the virus of this disease, or whatever you call it, has been destroyed?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I will touch on that in just a few moments.

Our committee received information that an English soldier had brought it back from Germany to his father's farm during World War II. The entire herd on this farm was slaughtered. It has been constantly prevalent in South America. The virus has been known to live a year in frozen meats. It does not seem at all impossible that American veterans returning from infected areas could bring foot-and-mouth disease to the United States.

If this assumption is correct it could break out here at any moment. It has especially followed invasion routes during a war. It was further testified before the committee that England has made research experiments on a ship at sea, because the disease is so infectious. It is so infectious no experiments may be conducted in our country. It is my understanding the virus may be carried on shoes, clothing, or bodies of persons, upon the feet or bodies of poultry, birds, dogs, cats, or any other animal which may be in the vicinity of afflicted animals.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman said it is brought in in frozen meat. I still ask the question—if the gentleman cannot answer it perhaps someone else can—In whatever form the meat comes in, whether it comes from South American countries or other countries, are we able to discover whether that meat is infected with the virus of this disease before it goes on to our market?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Later I will show you where it came into this country in frozen meat and started a big outbreak in Niles, Mich., in 1914.

Mr. REED of New York. Not only frozen meat but other forms of meat.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I do not know about canned meat.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. Canned meat is cooked, and presumably the cooking has a sterilizing effect on this just as on any other germ. That is the very reason a great many of us have for so long insisted on

maintaining the exclusion of Argentine fresh meat, because for years we have known that you could bring in this disease in fresh meat. While there have been those who alleged insincerity on the part of us who have opposed the bringing in of any Argentine beef, we know what we are talking about. The outbreak of the disease in California was traced to scraps of beef from a ship that came from South America and where they fed the scraps of meat to hogs and the hogs became infected.

Mr. REED of New York. I have always opposed the entry of meats from these other countries into the United States for other reasons, but I want to get into the RECORD if possible every angle of this so that the people who say we ought to be importing meat at the present time from these foreign countries to relieve the shortage of meat here will see the reason that prompts us to maintain our opposition.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Obviously, fresh meat carries the disease if it came from diseased animals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

It is believed to be carried by insects or particles of straw or litter which may be carried by the wind. It has been known to have been introduced into the United States through infected meat. It is especially interesting that when the 1914 outbreak occurred in Niles, Mich., it was first noticed in infected hogs which had been fed scraps obtained from a local butcher, who in turn purchased frozen meat from a dealer whose records showed that this butcher had been shipped several thousand pounds of imported frozen meat from South America.

I hope the committee today can appreciate the task confronting the Secretary of Agriculture if this joint undertaking is authorized with the Government of Mexico.

It is my understanding that oxen and cows are used in many States in Mexico for plowing. Many Mexicans have milk goats. I am sure all of you can appreciate how a Mexican family would feel living in an infected area and having the government slaughter these family animals. These Mexican people who live in an infected area may not be so easily convinced. Remember, the disease is not over 1 to 3 percent fatal. Calves and young cattle are the more seriously affected. While, as stated, the mortality rate is not high, but the animal and the productiveness for breeding purposes is rendered useless.

As near and as close as the foot-and-mouth disease is to the border we cannot afford to take any chance on the fine herds in this country becoming infected. If this should happen the animal industry could suffer untold millions. During 1943 in England one shorthorn herd of 84 head, valued at $40,400 were necessarily slaughtered. Think what this would mean to many of the fine American herds today.

It is to the interest of the entire membership to support this legislation.

It is to the interest of those from agricultural sections to support it, and I feel that they will.

It is to the interest of those Members living in the cities to support it because of the daily quarts of milk delivered to their doorstep.

H. R. 1819 can affect everyone. When foot-and-mouth disease strikes it is nonpartisan. This is legislation into which no partisan politics should be injected. I do not believe that it will.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON ITS HISTORY, CHARACTER, AND TREATMENT

I. History

A. General:

Foot-and-mouth disease has been known for centuries to be one of the world's most contagious and devastating livestock maladies. Greek and Roman writers have made vague descriptions of different disorders, one of which may well have been the foot-and-mouth disease. No reliance can be placed on this evidence, however; it was not until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that its presence was definitely proven in Germany, Italy, and France. During the nineteenth century it became widely diffused. Hungary, Lower Austria, Bohemia, Saxony, and Prussia had severe outbreaks in 1834; France and Switzerland in 1837; and Belgium, Holland, and England in 1839. Between 1839 and 1902, Great Britain suffered 11 distinct outbreaks of the disease. Since the World War the disease has appeared in numerous districts of Great Britain, but has been held in check by restriction of movement of cattle over a radius of 15 miles from the center of infection, and compulsory slaughtering of diseased animals.

It was introduced into Denmark in 1841 and into the United States in 1870. It appeared in Australia twice during 1872 but was stamped out on each occasion. It also appears to be well known in India, Ceylon, Burma, the Straits Settlements, South Africa, and South America.

B. United States:

There have been eight outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States. These occurred in 1870, 1880, 1884, 1902, 1908, 1914–16, 1924–25 (twice), and 1929. Since 1929 the United States has remained entirely free of the disease. This has been achieved by cooperation of Federal and State veterinary officials in maintaining a rigid national quarantine to exclude infection from outside sources and in promptly eradicating outbreaks that occurred in spite of that precaution.

Following are brief outlines of each of the eight outbreaks:

1. 1870: This first outbreak was introduced by way of Canada, where the infection was brought by an importation of cattle from Scotland. It spread into New England and New York and appears to have been arrested within a few months.

2. 1880: Two or three lots of diseased animals were brought into the United States, but there was no extension from the animals originally affected.

3. 1884: A small outbreak occurred at Portland, Maine, caused by imported cattle, but was limited to a small number of animals and was easily brought under control.

4. 1902: The disease was discovered in November in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, having probably been imported from Japan in the form of cowpox vaccine virus which had been contaminated with the virus of foot-and-mouth disease. The outbreak involved Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island. It was eradicated in about 6 months by slaughtering 3,872 cattle, 360 hogs, and 229 sheep and goats. The animals slaughtered were valued at $184,155 and the total cost to the Department of Agriculture of stamping out the disease was about $300,000.

5. 1908: The outbreak was first observed in November near Danville, Pa. It was traced to stockyards at East Buffalo, N. Y., and Detroit, Mich. The disease appeared in Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. Source of the infection was contaminated Japanese vaccine virus. One hundred and fifty-seven premises were found infected and 3,636 animals, valued at $90,033, were slaughtered. Owners were reimbursed for the value of their animals and property destroyed, one-third being paid by the States and two-thirds by the Federal Government.

6. 1914–16: The outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease was discovered near Niles, Mich., in October 1914, and turned out to be the most serious and extensive ever known in this country, the last infection not being disposed of until May 1916. It occurred in 22 States and the District of Columbia. The Middle Western and Eastern States were mostly affected, the chief sufferer being Illinois, where more than one-third of the total losses occurred. The Union Stock Yards in Chicago became infected early and were a source of dissemination of the contagion in all directions. During the outbreak, 77,240 cattle, 85,092 swine, 9,767 sheep, and 123 goats were slaughtered as infected or exposed. The entire cost of eradicating the outbreak amounted to about $9,000,000, of which the Government paid about $4,600,000. No further outbreaks have occurred in the States involved in this attack since 1916.

7. 1924–25: The disease was first discovered in two herds of dairy cattle near Oakland, Calif., in February. The source was unknown but it is believed that it came from the Orient as the disease was traced to hogs feeding on garbage from ships. Some unusual difficulties were encountered in eradicating the disease due to the spread of the disease in large ranch herds and flocks in rough, poorly fenced country, and in deer in a national forest. Simultaneously the disease appeared late in September 1924, in a herd of Zebu cattle south of Houston, Tex. Final eradication of the Texas outbreak did not occur until October 1925. In the California outbreak, 58,791 cattle, 21,195 swine, 28,882 sheep, and 1,391 goats were slaughtered. In addition, 22,214 deer had to be destroyed. In Texas a total of 31,918 animals had to be destroyed. The appraised value of animals and property destroyed in these outbreaks was more than $5,000,000.

8. 1929: The latest outbreak occurred in southern California in January, under much the same conditions as the preceding California outbreak in 1924. The 1929 outbreak was confined to 5 premises but 28 additional contact herds were also destroyed as a precautionary measure. The total number of animals slaughtered was 3,591 comprising 277 cattle, 3,291 swine, and 23 goats. The appraised value of the animals and property destroyed was $109,958.

II. Expenditures on foot-and-mouth disease

Two types of expenditures should be considered, those used in the actual eradication of the disease, including primarily the reimbursement to farmers whose cattle have been destroyed, and those used for research. Table I indicates the amounts paid annually by the Federal Government for eradication of the disease. As indicated by statements of the United States Treasury, the total for the period since 1915 was $7,133,064, the majority of which was spent for the outbreaks in 1914–16 and 1925–26. No eradication expenditures have been incurred since the fiscal year 1935.

The principal actual research expenditures by the Federal Government were those connected with the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Commission study in Europe in 1925. Approximately $85,000 is the estimated total cost of research to the Federal Government.

Of this $85,000 about $55,000 represents expenses of the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Commission; the remaining $30,000 was for expenditures over a period of years for research in the United States on related vesicular disease that might be mistaken for foot-and-mouth disease in the absence of the knowledge gained.

TABLE I.—*Federal expenditures for eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals, fiscal years 1915–45, as indicated by the U. S. Treasury*

Fiscal year:	*Expenditures*
1915	$1,066,789.45
1916	787,174.59
1917	45,276.89
1918	45,091.14
1919	43,004.14
1920	55,993.50
1921	60,755.14
1922	55,017.08
1923	38,814.63
1924	1,624,863.42
1925	2,103,288.15
1926	414,163.80
1927	287,120.35
1928	35,851.39
1929	192,947.56
1930	9,127.01
1931	40,490.44
1932	142,599.34
1933	54,013.53
1934	30,072.94
1935	609.92
1936–45, inclusive	Nothing.
Total, fiscal years 1915–45	7,133,064.41

Source: U. S. Treasury Department. Combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U. S. Government for the fiscal years 1915–45.

The research provided first-hand knowledge of the disease and showed that a rigid national quarantine, together with the slaughter policy of combating outbreaks, as used in the United States, is both effective and economical. The average cost of eradicating the few outbreaks that have occurred has been less than $4,000,000. By contrast, even in much smaller countries where the disease is well established, vastly greater losses occur constantly. If through inadequate measures or lack of foresight, foot-and-mouth disease had been allowed to become established in the United States, its presence would probably cost this country fully $200,000,000 a year, judging from reliably reported losses that it causes abroad and the toll that less serious diseases take in our own country.

It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that State expenditures for eradication and research are about equal to those of the Federal Government. However, definite figures on total expenditures by States do not appear to be available.

III. Characteristics, transmission, and treatment of the disease

A. Characteristics of the disease:

Foot-and-mouth disease affects all cloven-footed animals, especially cattle and swine. Human infections occasionally occur, but cases are rare and not serious. In cattle the disease is characterized by the appearance of fever and vesicles filled with a clear fluid. The vesicles occur principally on the mucous membranes of the mouth, tongue, and lips, but are seen also on the skin of the muzzle, between the claws and on the teats and udder. Affected cattle become lame because of the soreness of the foot lesions, and they drool from the mouth and refuse to eat because of mouth soreness. The vesicles rupture, leaving raw surfaces which become shallow ulcers.

The mortality from foot-and-mouth disease is not high; generally not more than 1 to 3 percent. Calves and young cattle are more severely affected than older animals. The greatest losses, as a rule, consist of the morbidity, the loss of flesh and of milk, rather than the loss of life.

The incubation period of the naturally acquired disease is seldom more than 4 days and frequently may not be greater than 48 hours. The onset is marked by fever and depression. The vesicles appear in the mouth in from 12 to 36 hours after the onset of fever. Cases without complications caused by pyogenic bacteria usually recover within 2 or 3 weeks. Complications are frequent, however, and recoveries may be greatly delayed.

The infective agent in foot-and-mouth disease is a filtrable virus. The size of foot-and-mouth disease virus has been estimated to be between 8 and 12 millimicrons, which places it among the very smallest of these ultramicroscopic infective agents. The virus is present in the fluid and the covering of the vesicles and can also be found in the blood in the initial feverish stage of the disease. Saliva, milk, urine, and other secretions may also contain the virus. The fluid and covering of the vesicles in the animal usually lose their infectivity within 4 to 6 days after the lesions appear. Definite evidence is available to show that in one instance in the United States the virus persisted in the field for 345 days. It is of utmost significance in the control of outbreaks, therefore, to regard the virus as resistant to destruction.

B. Transmission:

The commonest agent in the spread of foot-and-mouth disease is, of course, the infected animal itself. In fact, once an infection has entered a herd practically every animal on the premises belonging to a susceptible species will contract the disease before the outbreak is over. Milk, meat, and the raw byproducts of the slaughter of infected animals may also be instrumental in distributing the virus. The feeding of the meat or other parts of animals slaughtered in the feverish stage of the disease to susceptible animals obviously may result in infection.

The British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee found that when the carcasses of experimentally inoculated guinea pigs were bled out and kept at temperatures slightly above freezing the blood remaining in tissues around the throat was virulent after 21 days, while the bone marrow contained active virus for periods of 21 to 87 days. In experiments with cattle and hog carcasses kept in freezing temperature, active virus was found in the bone marrow for 76 days. The examples mentioned explain how meat scraps, bone, and other parts from infected animals, when included in garbage, butcher shops, or slaughter-house scraps, can be a source of infection in hogs.

C. Immunity:

Cattle which have recovered from foot-and-mouth disease generally have enough immunity to protect them from the same type of virus for a year or more, but the resistance is not lifelong. Natural immunity in cattle and swine is negligible, although some individuals have greater resistance than others.

D. Methods of control:

Two general methods of control are used: (1) The drastic slaughter method and (2) local quarantine with or without the use of serum or vaccines. In the United States the drastic slaughter method has been used exclusively. A commission from the United States Department of Agriculture made a study of foot-and-mouth disease and methods of control in Europe in May 1925. This study was authorized by a special act of Congress (43 Stat. 1325). This study showed definitely that the drastic slaughter method of eradication is best for the United States. It is based on the reasoning that the sacrifice of a few animals is much wiser than to allow so costly a disease to become permanently established, as has occurred in many other countries.

1. Under the drastic slaughter method the entire premises, all animals, and people, are placed under rigid quarantine as soon as the disease is diagnosed in a herd. As rapidly as possible, all susceptible animals are slaughtered and buried on the premises. After thorough cleaning and disinfection, the quarantine is lifted but susceptible animals are barred for sufficient time to insure that no active virus remains. All herds in the neighborhood are carefully and frequently inspected for signs of the disease. The area quarantine is not lifted until 60 or 90 days after all evidence of the disease has disappeared.

2. Local quarantine with or without the use of serum or vaccines: These methods are generally used in European countries, particularly by the continental countries where national border lines are close together, where the disease practically always exists in one area or another, and where, as a consequence of these conditions, it has been found impossible or uneconomical to use the more drastic method of slaughter of all infected and exposed animals. Even in these countries, the slaughter method is sometimes used in the beginning of outbreaks with the hope of curbing the disease before it becomes widespread. Generally speaking, the philosophy in these countries is that they must resign themselves to living with the disease.

Immunization in itself still appears to be in the experimental stage and has been found largely impractical because of the fact that there are varying strains of the disease and the vaccines made from one do not protect against another. Also, infected animals, though rendered immune in short periods, remain as potential spreaders of the disease.

In brief, conditions that favor the prompt eradication of foot-and-mouth disease are: (1) Early discovery of the infection, (2) a cooperative attitude on the part of livestock owners and local agencies, (3) dependence on time-tried measures having a scientific basis, and (4) faith in the ability of the eradication forces to conquer the disease again as they have done before.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

THE SPREAD OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN THIS COUNTRY WOULD BE DISASTROUS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of foot-and-mouth disease is much more important than most people realize. It affects cattle, hogs, sheep, and other cloven-hoofed animals. It is one of the most highly infectious animal diseases known. There is absolutely no cure for it. The only way to stop the spread of it is to destroy all herds where the disease appears.

A few weeks ago our attention was called to a sudden outbreak of the disease in Mexico when thousands of cattle were ready to cross the border into the United States. The outbreak of the disease in Mexico was caused by the shipment of infected animals from Brazil. The intent of this bill is to prevent an outbreak in the United States by cooperating with the Government of Mexico to control and eradicate this deadly disease before it reaches across our borders.

Our country has had experience with this disease on two or three occasions. In 1914 it spread across 22 States before it could be stopped. Again in the 1920's there was an outbreak that was finally

controlled after the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of valuable herds of cattle. Animals valued at more than $100,000 were destroyed in my area during the 1914 plague.

Mr. Speaker, we have had what is known as a quarantine against the shipment of cattle from South American countries over a period of years. Those of us who have insisted on maintaining that quarantine have at times been criticized. This is a further indication that the quarantine against the importation of live cattle from South America must be maintained and rules and regulations concerning the problem must be strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, everything possible should and must be done to prevent the spread of this dread disease. It must be stamped out. The spread of the disease will not only seriously injure the cattle industry, it will paralyze the food supply of America. Again, I say every precaution should be taken and everything should be done to prevent the spread of this disastrous epidemic to the United States.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

CHEAPEST TO STOP IT SOUTH OF THE BORDER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if anyone has any doubts on this proposition, he should see the picture of one animal with the loathsome foot-and-mouth disease. It is a virus disease that attacks the membranes of the foot and mouth. All cloven-hoofed animals are susceptible—cattle, hogs, sheep, goats, deer, elk, and antelope.

The tongue swells. The feet develop raw sores. Soon unable to eat, drink, or walk, the animal wastes away. The disease spreads rapidly and can be carried by birds. In fact, as the committee report on the bill says:

> It is one of the most infectious diseases known and is comparable only to pandemic influenza in humans in the rapidity with which it spreads.

Fences and quarantines will not stop it if contact with carriers is permitted. It can only be stamped out.

That is the reason for this emergency legislation. I do not like the prospective follow-up request for funds, but I support this proposal as the only alternative to much greater losses and costs if we permit the disease to become established in this hemisphere.

It is economy to stop this disease where it is—south of the border.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1819) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1819, with Mr. AREND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the American livestock industry is in the gravest danger. The most serious and most infectious livestock malady known to man—foot-and-mouth disease—has broken out in Mexico and is raging like wildfire over that country. It is threatening to spread across the border. Unless protective action is taken without delay by the American Government, the disease inevitably will come to this country.

The bill before us today is America's answer to that threat. It is an emergency measure, proposing emergency action. It declares war on foot-and-mouth disease and pledges to the Republic of Mexico full United States aid in stamping it out.

This bill has the unanimous support of the House Committee on Agriculture and of every livestock and farm organization in the Nation. It is America's answer to the most serious threat which has confronted United States livestock since the last outbreak of this disease in the United States in 1929.

The American livestock industry is the backbone of our entire farm economy. Our investment in it is equal to the combined investment in the steel and automobile industries. With an investment of that character, we simply cannot take the chance of having foot-and-mouth disease in this country.

Mr. Chairman, time is of the essence in fighting this disease. The longer we wait the less chance we will have of suppressing it and the more it will cost us. A dollar spent to keep this disease from our border now will be a hundred dollars saved if we are forced to fight it on our home soil.

This bill deserves the support of every Member here today.

The outbreak in Mexico now covers an area of some 45,000 square miles. The Mexican authorities do not have the equipment, the experience, or the men to deal effectively with the disease. They have indicated that our cooperation will be welcome.

If this disease gets into the United States, no one can foretell how many million cattle might have to be slaughtered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very splendid effort he has made in bringing this bill before the House. There is one question I would like to ask. I was reading some time ago in the papers where the statement was made that a huge fence was in process of construction between Texas and Mexico. I would like to know what the gentleman knows about that operation.

Mr. GILLIE. I have heard that there was a bill before the House now to build a fence along the border. That is a long-range matter. A fence would never stop this disease if it ever got within 50 miles of the border. If this disease ever gets to within 50 miles of the border we will have it in this country, as sure as the world. The fence will not stop it. The fence might help in keeping some animals from coming across the border, like deer or other wild animals, farm pigeons or perhaps some dogs. We must deal with the disease more effectively right now, if we hope to prevent it from spreading in the United States.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In connection with that, the gentleman will recall the witness we had before the committee who outlined an idea that he proposed, that a strip of land between the Mexican border and a point in the State of Texas might be used for a quarantine area. I wonder what the gentleman thinks of that, and how large he thinks it should be.

Mr. GILLIE. It might be necessary to do that yet; having a zone along the border, perhaps 50 or even 100 miles wide as a safety zone in which, if something should happen, we could prevent it from spreading into the country. But, in my opinion, if we get to work now and keep this disease down in the southern part of Mexico, where they have it now, some 250 miles from the border, it will be a lot better than to have a zone. But that will be worked out when the Mexican officials come here after we pass this bill. They are all ready to come. I understand that the Bureau of Animal Industry has their visas and telegrams all ready, and the Mexican officials will be here in 48 hours after we send them word.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I think it is only fair for the RECORD to show that some of us who have favored the building of an international fence all the way from San Diego, Calif., to Brownsville, Tex., have never claimed that that would be an answer to our immediate and emergent problem. The truth is that there is already authorization for the International Boundary Commission to build a fence along the border, and are now building some of it in sections. That has been actively advocated for 25 years not only by the cattlemen but by the Department of State, the Treasury Department, acting through its customs officers and border patrol, and the Department of Justice through its Bureau of Immigration, so any idea about the fence is looking to a long-range program not only to help establish the line and mark the border and provide some protection against smugglers and aliens and things of that sort, but also to stop the smuggling and the drifting of animals, either domestic or wild, from Old Mexico across the border into the United States. It is my judgment, and that, I think, of all the cattlemen in my great big district, that it would in the long run be of very

great benefit. So I want the record to be clear that none of us who favor the fence have said that that is the answer to the immediate problem. We are strong for this bill the gentleman has so very ably sponsored.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The discussion of the fence will come up shortly, but a good deal of the discussion is about repairing the existing fence. It is not a new idea.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have been advocating for several years, and for the last 4 or 5 years I have gone before committees asking that money be appropriated to build a fence along our southern international border. We have already actually built quite a bit of that fence, but not all of it. As the gentleman from Texas says, that is not advocated now as the sole or best means of stopping that disease, but there are plenty of other reasons for such a fence. We know the ineffectiveness of a fence to stop the spread of this dread disease, but the fence should have been built long ago.

Mr. GILLIE. That is the point I wanted to get across, the fact that a fence built now would not be very effective in trying to stop this disease. The fence problem is another one, beyond that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the hoof-and-mouth disease affect horses, sheep, and hogs?

Mr. GILLIE. Sheep and hogs, yes; but not horses.

Mr. Chairman, prevention of this disease is so vital to the great American livestock industry that we had better forget about the border between Mexico and the United States, insofar as spending American dollars is concerned.

I sincerely hope that we will not have to spend huge sums of money to eradicate this disease, but if we have to do it, it is better to spend it in southern Mexico than it is to have to spend a hundred times as much all over the United States if the disease gets into this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Indiana is one of the recognized authorities in this country on diseases of livestock. May I ask him if he feels that this disease can be controlled or if steps must be taken to eradicate the animals within the quarantine area?

Mr. GILLIE. I think the United States has the best way of controlling the disease. That is destruction of the animals, followed by thorough disinfection.

It is necessary to stamp out this disease. The problem in Mexico is going to be different. As you know, they now have established three different zones around Mexico City and Veracruz. The first zone is where the animals now are infected. They are going to keep those animals there, and if the animals get better they will slaughter them for meat after they recover. In the next zone anything that becomes infected will be destroyed.

There is one picture I hope you do not have to see, and that is the picture of a big trench, about half as wide as this room and about three to four times as long, where they drive in perhaps 100, 150, or 200 head of cattle—full-bloods, pure-bred—cattle grades—hogs, sheep, goats, perhaps animals that are worth thousands of dollars, driven into this big trench and five or six men are stationed on each side with their rifles shooting.

I remember back in 1914 when we had the outbreak in my country and I saw just such a picture. I know what a terrible disease this is.

I have been assured by officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry that they have men and equipment ready to move into Mexico the moment this legislation is passed.

The longer we wait, the harder it will be to wipe out this disease and the less chance we will have of success. We cannot afford to delay action on this bill.

The Senate already has acted on a measure similar to this one. The bill passed the Senate unanimously 3 days ago, with very little debate. The House should—and I believe the House will—do likewise.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the outbreak of the hoof and mouth disease in Mexico is the greatest threat to our economy I know of. If we permit this disease to spread to America, it will sooner or later practically paralyze our American economy. We will have to put under strict quarantine any area in which the outbreak occurs and immediately begin to slaughter off animals in that area. With our transportation system such as it is, it is possible for this disease to jump not only 100 miles or 500 miles but a thousand miles or more over night. Someone may walk through a field and get some of the virus on his shoes and then get into a plane and fly from Texas to New York. The next day or the day after that the cattle in that area will be infected. We gave honest consideration to the drafting of this legislation. We have brought in the best bill we knew how to draft, after consulting with the best authorities we could contact, in order to safeguard the rights of our Government in every way. It has the unanimous approval of the Department of Agriculture and the unanimous approval of the Department of State. I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to pass it by a unanimous vote.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been studying this problem for the last 60 days and, as has been said here today, the most effective method is by slaughtering the cattle. Does this bill give full authority to permit our Government to go into Mexico and have those cattle slaughtered in Mexico as well as to treat them medicinally?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The Secretary of Agriculture is given broad power under this legislation. While that might not be the right way to legislate, it is the wisest way in this particular case. Our scientists will have to go down there and work out with the Mexican authorities the best program to eradicate the disease.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, my district and the State of Louisiana are very much interested in this legislation. I am very glad to see that the committee has been able to bring this legislation to the floor of the House so expeditiously. I do not believe it is necessary to have any further argument about the bill because at the time the rule was under consideration the legislation was fully explained during that debate. I do not know of any opposition to the legislation. I might say in passing, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years my State has expanded the cattle industry tremendously. Coming from a State where 20 years ago all we had was scrub cattle, with the eradication of the cattle tick, the cattle industry in my State is expanding rapidly. Now, if you go through my State, you will see nothing but high-bred cattle, such as white-faced Herefords, Angus cattle, and others of the finest breeds in the United States.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily back of this bill and am supporting it. You remember the old saying, "A stitch in time saves nine." I think we can magnify that simile and say, "A step in time will save ninety-nine" in this case. We must fight this disease before it reaches our border. I think this legislation is the effective way of doing it.

Referring again to the matter of a fence along the border with Mexico to which I referred when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] had the floor, I want to emphasize that building it is a long-range program on which we have been working for years. It is a vast stretch of desert country along the Mexican border from El Paso to the Pacific Ocean, and while it has been surveyed and marked, it has never been fenced nor adequately guarded and patrolled. Each year several miles of border fence have been built, but thus far it is only a beginning. I think it is important enough for various reasons in addition to the danger from the foot-and-mouth disease, to continue the program of fence building despite the scarcity of steel and concrete.

Members will recall that I have frequently advocated a better guarding of the border against smuggling and the importation of drugs, narcotics, and the like, and the minimizing illegal entry of aliens to the United States. A suitable fence would help to protect the border in many ways.

One reason why I am very anxious that we cooperate with Mexico effectively in stopping the spread of this foot-and-mouth disease as far south in Mexico as possible is that we want to disrupt the international trade between the two countries as little as possible. There is a vast trade amounting to many millions of dollars between the United States and Mexico, and many thousands of persons ordinarily cross and recross the border daily and hourly, which traffic would have to be stopped or closely guarded if this dread disease gets within a 100 miles of that border. In order to take necessary precautions against the spread of the virus it might be not only disastrous but extremely costly to carry it out. Quarantining or stopping the plague in the heart of Mexico would be far less expensive than fighting it, possibly ineffectively, when it reaches an area just south of the border, when fighting it on the border would disrupt commerce and travel.

As a citizen of Arizona a quarter century ago when the foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent in California, I remember the extreme precautions taken by local authority in Arizona then as our State fought desperately to keep the disease from spreading to us from the west. At that time every passenger train from California carrying passengers into Arizona had to require passengers and crew members alighting on Arizona soil to walk through a disinfectant placed on the platform in shallow pans. These pans were placed at the steps of every car opened, somewhat as the small steps are placed by the pullman porters for passengers who are alighting. I remember distinctly that I "hit the sawdust trail"—the disinfectant in the shallow pans was a saturation of sawdust—during that period when this disease was prevailing in California and probably it did not do the soles of my shoes any good, but I hope it killed any virus that I might have carried back with me. That great amount of trouble and expense was undoubtedly worth while, for the disease did not invade our State.

Likewise, arriving automobiles were driven through sterilizing pits as a part of this same process of precaution, all of which was a tremendous expense but shows what is required to fight this disease when it comes very close home. However, the cost in such precautionary measures is but slight compared with the necessary cost of killing the infected animals to eradicate the disease. We must fight this thing effectively no matter what the cost.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad this bill comes before the House today with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture of this House. Our chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] when this problem first confronted our country, appointed the gentlemar from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, a member of our committee, as chairman of a subcommittee to make an investigation of this terrible disease that has broken out in Mexico. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, for the fine service he has rendered our country in sponsoring this bill and in doing so much to get it before this body today. The gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, is a veterinarian who has been through some of these battles. He knows what it means to the people of this country. As he so ably told you a few minutes ago, this industry is one of the most important industries of this Nation. It has more to do with our national economy than probably anything else. I hope there is no opposition to this bill. Every State in the Union will be affected by this disease if it breaks out in the United States. It will not only affect the big cattle ranches in Texas and other parts of the country, but it will affect every dairy herd in the country. It will reach Chicago, New York, and all our great centers where livestock is distributed. Not only will it affect cattle, but it will affect sheep, hogs, goats, and in some cases it has affected human beings.

I think the provisions of this bill are wise, because a stitch in time saves nine. We were told in our committee that the State of California spent $200,000,000 in getting rid of this terrible disease, to say nothing of what our Government has expended and what other States have expended to get rid of the disease. This is our opportunity to go down into Mexico and fight the disease on their soil. The experts who came before our committee said we could not afford to have a laboratory in this country to make tests in regard to the treatment of this disease because it was so terrible that we could not afford to have an experiment station here in our own country. For that reason, they wanted to go down there and establish laboratories and make a study of this disease to find out the means of eradicating it. We have an opportunity to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in stamping out this disease before it gets to this country. That is what we want to do. We all felt it was to our great advantage to fight the terrible war we have gone through on foreign soil and not have the war fought on our soil. We do not want to have to fight the foot-and-mouth disease in this country.

So I feel this bill should have the unanimous support of this body. It will affect you men in the cities. Do not forget that. You will have a shortage of milk. You will have a shortage of beef. The price of beef will go up. The entire livestock industry of this great country will be absolutely destroyed or at least greatly hampered for many years to come.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In our dealings with this foot-and-mouth disease, the fact that we are going to give this power to the Department of Agriculture to go to Mexico to try to work out a solution of the problem, does not the gentleman think the Mexican people ought to be grateful to us for sending our men down there and that they should be willing to pay at least 50 percent of the cost of doing away with that disease in their own country, and that we ought to insist that they pay at least 50 percent of it?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I think the Secretary of Agriculture will try to work out just such a plan; and I will say this further, that we had before our committee a distinguished citizen of our country who is probably the largest rancher in Mexico, a man who is very close to the Mexican Government. He told us that the Mexican Government would cooperate with us. That is all this bill seeks to do, enable our country to go down there and cooperate with the Mexican Government. Mexico is a sovereign power. We cannot go down there and take control unless they give us permission or invite us. This bill permits us to accept such an invitation and we have to leave it up to our own Secretary of Agriculture to work out plans of cooperating with the Mexican Government in dealing with this thing and do everything that is possible and necessary to stamp out the disease and make sure that it does not get up into Pennsylvania where the gentleman lives or up into Missouri where I live, and to every section of this country where cattle raising is so important.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman in that, but I cannot forget that in the last 6 or 8 years we have been stressing the good-neighbor policy, going into the South American countries and helping them instead of letting them help themselves, and bearing part of the expense. We have been acting as though we were all-wise, all-powerful, and had wealth beyond measure, that the people of this country did not care a rap about paying taxes. I resent the action of some of these departments going into these other nations and squandering American dollars and burdening American taxpayers at the very time we are trying to help them. It seems to me these countries ought to do a little more to help themselves. I am even sick and tired of trying to help American individuals help themselves when they do not want to help themselves. Everybody in this country wants to get on the back of the American taxpayer. We ought to try to guard against just those things in this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I agree with everything that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, but I do not believe he realizes just what a very critical situation we face. This is an emergency which must be met now. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] said, this disease will jump from two to three hundred miles at a time. Unless we get down there and do what we can to help these Mexicans, we will soon have it in our own country. They have not the technicians to cope with it; they do not know as much about this subject as we do. Unless we go down there and help them, it could come to our country, and I am sure the gentleman does not want that to happen.

Mr. RICH. No; I do not want that to happen, and I want to do what I can to help prevent it; but I want the people

to realize that, if they want help from us, they have got to help themselves instead of trying to get us to carry the entire load. I want to stop that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This is one instance where we cannot stop and argue about the method, because we have got to go down and cooperate with these people. I think this is a time when by supporting the bill the gentleman will be rendering a real service to his country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman that, in order to be effective and not waste our money, we must have full cooperation from this country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think the gentleman knows that we have been assured that we are going to get that from the men who have been down there and who know the situation; in other words, we have got to deal with those people. They have shown a very friendly attitude up to this time. They have invited us to come there and give them the help they need to stamp out this disease.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We hope there will be full cooperation for our own protection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to call attention to the fact that the provision included in this legislation providing for a report every 30 days is a pretty good indication of the apprehension that members of this committee had in this particular instance.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right; and I think that is a guaranty to our friend from Pennsylvania and others that we will know what is going on.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think my friend from Missouri will agree that we do not expect them to go down there and rehabilitate the Mexican economy or to upset it. It is a multimillion-dollar proposition. I think perhaps my record of voting against things here is pretty well known; however, I am willing to go all out for this measure to protect not only our beef and dairy herds but pork and the rest. This is a pretty good guaranty toward that end, and I think we better act fast.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am glad to have the gentleman's views, because I am sure all of the committee feels that way.

Mr. ELSTON. I am certain that will be done, too.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to touch on the point that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] mentioned, and that is the spirit of cooperation. The gentleman will recall Mr. Kleberg, a former colleague of ours here in the House, appeared before the committee on several occasions and emphasized that unless the Republic of Mexico and the rank and file of the people cooperate with this program it cannot be a success. I am sure the gentleman joins with me in the hope that the rank and file of the people of Mexico will cooperate. It all depends on a system of education on the part of the President and the rest of the Government of Mexico.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing the challenge before the House that this affects city as well as rural areas. In the matter of a disease of this kind there is no rural or city area.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It will affect Ohio, Missouri, and every State in this Union and that is the reason we should take action today. That is why I hope we can get the approval of this measure by every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we all realize the importance of this bill. May I say that if my close neighbor's house gets on fire, I better get out there and help him put it out without finding out who is going to pay the bill of the fire department.

We better put this out and put it out now as long as we are welcomed in Mexico to do it before a potential catastrophe overtakes our country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD in favor of this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill asking the Congress to make an initial appropriation to eradicate the hoof-and-mouth disease now ravishing the livestock industry in Mexico will no doubt receive some criticism from people not familiar with the seriousness of the situation or the threat that it constitutes to our own livestock industry, as well as to our economy in general.

I realize too that this is probably the beginning of a long hard fight, and to completely eradicate the disease in Mexico we will have to have the wholehearted cooperation of the Mexican Government. It will require stern enforcement of every regulation laid down by the authorities. Unless we clean up Mexico where the disease broke out only last September and is now sweeping the country like a prairie fire it will only be a matter of months before it crosses the border whether or not we close the border.

To combat it here will be extremely costly and avail us nothing so long as it rages on the other side of the border. We can never be free of it, or feel safe, unless it is eradicated in Mexico, so we better do it now, and the sooner the better. I recall as though it were yesterday the outbreak we had here in the early twenties, when I saw herds numbering 100 head driven into large trenches dug adjacent to the barns and then shot, covered with quicklime, and buried. The premises in every case were placed under strict quarantine during which they needed to be thoroughly cleaned up, disinfected, and so forth. In some cases where the affected livestock were kept in old barns or sheds the buildings were burned as the only means of cleaning out the disease. While the disease in many cases does not prove fatal the cattle become so ill they are reduced to bones and hide. It takes a long time for an animal to recover, if ever. In dairy cows their milk usually dries up and if they ever again become useful it will be after their next freshening period. It affects all cloven-foot animals with the same disastrous results.

I sincerely hope that we can get the needed appropriation and the cooperation in Mexico to go to work inside the next 30 days. Eradication in Mexico will not be as costly as in the States because the value of their livestock is just about 30 percent of the value of our own, except in the Mexico City milkshed, where most of the dairy cattle have been imported from Minnesota and Wisconsin. There, I understand, the infection is heaviest, and eradication will be extremely costly.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, any effort to prevent the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease in this country is not academic to those Representatives in Congress who come from areas which have been infected in the past. In the attack of 1914, the congressional district which I have the honor to represent suffered severely. This was through no fault of the farmers and stock producers of that section.

It so happens that there are a large number of feeding lots in the Second District of Michigan. The steers are purchased largely in the Chicago market, conditioned in these lots, and the fattened steers are sold in Detroit, Toledo, Buffalo, and other slaughtering centers. When this disease got started in the stockyards it naturally followed the steers to our feeding lots. The manner in which the disease spreads and in which the infection is communicated has been minutely and adequately outlined in this debate.

In 1914 I was prosecuting attorney in my home county. The State bureau of animal industry was charged with the enforcement of sanitary laws. The epidemic was so great and so dangerous that the Federal Government took over at once, and by efficient Federal direction and enthusiastic State cooperation hoof-and-mouth disease was stamped out in Michigan almost before it got started; however, 274 of our finest herds were slaughtered and buried in great trenches as a preventive measure. Not only that, but all other cloven-hoof animals on these farms were also destroyed.

The loss was terrific, not only in dollars and cents, but in the destruction of prize cattle, which had more than the commercial value allowed by the Government as compensation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have personal knowledge as to what can happen if this dread scourge gets a foothold in our

land. This legislation is necessary. Time is of the essence and there should not be 1 day's delay. I feel sure that the Congress will not quibble and that it will pass this legislation unanimously and now.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, foot-and-mouth disease, caused by a virus, is one of the most highly infectious diseases which affects the cloven-hoofed animals such as cattle, hogs, sheep, goats, and deer. It is a disease that attacks the membranes of the mouth and the hoof, rendering the animal virtually incapable of walking and eating. It renders the animal almost worthless.

The present epidemic in Mexico affects an area about the size of the State of Missouri and includes some 2,000,000 head of cattle. Mexico has approximately 9,000,000 head of cattle.

Outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease occurred in the United States in 1914. The disease spread from Chicago into 22 States before it could be stopped. The State of California in 1924 spent $300,000,000 eradicating the disease. The only acceptable and successful method of stopping the disease is to kill the animal. This frequently means the destruction of all herds in which the disease appears together with all herds directly exposed and all other wild animals in the area by a thorough disinfection of the premises involved.

The resolution now before us, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease. It will cost some money, but this will be only a drop in the bucket compared to the cost should the disease appear in the United States. It will appear in the United States if permitted to go unchecked in Mexico.

The old adage, "A stitch in time saves nine," might well be applied in this case. We might also say that our neighbor's house is on fire. Are we going to help put out the fire or will we sit idly by until our own property is consumed.

It is my opinion this resolution should have the wholehearted support of the Congress.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in 1924 California had an outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease. It was very bad in my home county, the county of San Joaquin. That epidemic cost our State about $10,000,000 in the value of cattle killed and in administrative costs. The indirect cost was also great. For instance, in order to make the eradication effective, it became necessary to kill over 20,000 deer, as it was felt that they were or might be infected, and in turn infect our livestock.

There is only one sure way to avoid this disease. That is to eliminate all possible sources of infection. We have been told by experts, such as our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], that once that disease gets a foothold it will spread throughout our entire country unless the sources of infection are absolutely eliminated. Our congressional delegation has a Subcommittee on Agriculture of which the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman. He has called numerous meetings, all of which I have attended as a member of that committee. We heard from representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State. From what these men told us and from what Members of the House and Senate who are familiar with the dangers of the foot-and-mouth disease told us we became convinced that we should stop short of nothing in trying to prevent infection of our cattle, due to the presence of the disease in Mexico now. The bill under consideration seemed to us to meet the danger. I therefore wish to add my voice to the many others that we pass this legislation so we may realize our hope that we will not have to face, in our own country, the dreaded foot-and-mouth disease. I know my people will confirm my great gratitude to the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, for his great service in bringing this problem to us, and in furnishing the leadership that will result in its passage.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, every man in the United States has an interest in preventing the hoof-and-mouth epidemic. I presume that Iowa and Texas are friendly rivals in the matter of the cattle industry; Texas, perhaps, No. 1 in the total number of beef cattle; Iowa, No. 1 in the number and value of corn-fed cattle. In this case time is of the essence. The whole United States has a very vital interest in this measure today. Every city, hamlet, and village, as well as the Corn Belt area, is deeply interested in this resolution.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. Something was said a few minutes ago about inserting in the bill a record of reports; that we should receive certain reports from the infected area every so often. No one need be afraid of that, because the Bureau of Animal Industry will receive reports every 24 hours on this disease.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has had the good fortune of fighting and winning its battles on foreign soil. During the First World War, as well as during the Second World War, no enemy set foot upon our shores. That is exactly the thing we are doing here today; fighting the battle of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

I commend to the membership of this House the report of the subcommittee which presents this bill. It is very comprehensive, indeed. Those of us who come from the cattle country and from the great agricultural States know something about this dreadful foot-and-mouth disease. Those of you from the cities and the larger centers of population could well afford to read this very comprehensive report.

Mr. Chairman, we have a practical problem here. Whether or not certain animals with the disease were illegally imported into Mexico from Brazil is water over the dam. We have a very practical problem right here and now. The foot-and-mouth disease is raging in Mexico. They do things very differently in that republic than we do here at home. They let their cattle run at large, and there are no fences. Some of the Mexican farmers own but one ox or some such animal that is almost sacred to them. In eradicating this disease, these oxen or other animals may have to be taken away and slaughtered. Very little has been done by the Mexican Government to educate the people about the disease, and there are few veterinarians in Mexico. Three methods have been proposed during the past few years to eradicate this disease; first, by immunization, which has not been found to be practical; second, by quarantine and disinfection, which was not successful. So, the only really effective way of eradicating the disease is by slaughtering the infected animals.

If we are called upon to do this in Mexico, we may have some trouble. Then, too, the eradication program will cost money. No one knows what the cost will be. Some Members may feel that they are between the devil and the deep blue sea on this kind of legislation. We all want to economize in Government and reduce expenditures, but we have a practical situation which we must act upon now.

The great epidemic of the disease which swept this country in 1914 should demonstrate to us the need for doing something right now before the thing gets out of control in Mexico. In the short period of 3 months in 1914 this disease swept 22 of our States and we were required to slaughter 172,000 animals during that period, at a cost of over $5,000,000. If the disease once gets into this country it will spread like a prairie fire. It will affect milk production and meat production and many segments of our economy. It might even result in national chaos itself.

The people of Iowa, I am sure, do not want the foot-and-mouth disease to get within the borders of our State. We do not want it anywhere near us. We want to stamp it out before it gets near the Mexican border. Iowa, with its many cattle and hogs, simply cannot afford to take a chance. In the long run, whatever time, effort, and money this Government is called upon to use in eradicating this dreadful disease now while it is still far away should pay big dividends, not only to the farmers of Iowa, but to the entire Nation.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill. The subject has already been thoroughly covered. This is no time to quibble over who pays what. The house is on fire. I represent a district along the Mexican border within 200 miles of which this dread disease is now raging. In its movement the disease recognizes no border lines. Within less than 3 months following its outbreak in Mexico the virus had spread to 8 States and more than 50,000 cattle are affected. An additional 2,000,000 have been exposed. Every day hundreds of new cases are being reported. That simply serves to emphasize the importance of speed in passing this legislation and getting our experts into Mexico to work with Mexican officials in making war on this terrible malady.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in our State, as one gentleman a moment ago said, we are in the beginning of a new industry, the beef cattle industry. In years gone by we had there the experience of having the cattle-tick fever break out and then having to slaughter the cattle after the disease became established. I have also seen fine dairy herds where Bang's disease broke out. There were farmers who could not afford to have their cattle slaughtered, but they would have to have their cattle slaughtered and bear the greater part of the loss. We have in Georgia some fine pure-bred Aberdeen Angus cattle herds. I myself have one. We have fine pure-bread Hereford cattle herds, both the polled and the horned. I fear that if this disease gets established there, all these herds would be wiped out and possibly would never be reestablished.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The State of Arizona is very much interested in this proposed legislation. Not only do we have a great many cattle in our State, but we have one of the major ports of entry at Nogales, Ariz., where cattle have been shipped into the United States from Mexico. All shipments of cattle from our southern neighbor have been stopped, but this does not mean that the dreadful hoof-and-mouth disease cannot come into our country at an early date. In view of the fact that the disease is carried by ticks which can be brought into our country by means of either fowl or animal, it is eminently necessary that this law be passed forthwith; otherwise, we may suddenly find that the cattle of the United States are infected in spots far north of the border. This is an insidious disease because it can spread so quickly and it is so difficult to control. This is an opportunity for our scientists and our agricultural experts to go into Mexico, where the disease now prevails, and develop new methods of cure, possibly a vaccine which will not only eradicate the disease from Mexico at this time, but will make it possible to control it for all time in the States. I commend the Committee on Agriculture for bringing in this proposed bill, and I trust that the House of Representatives will see fit to act favorably on it at this time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I also come from the Mexican border because the district I have the honor to represent extends from El Paso down to the Big Bend of Texas, more than 300 miles. In that district are some of the finest herds of cattle in all the land. The cattlemen in my part of the country are worried; they are terribly alarmed about this situation. I think everybody who has given this matter any study or investigation appreciates the importance of this legislation. The big thing, as I view it, is action, and that very promptly, so that the Secretary of Agriculture, through his accredited representatives, can get busy.

Foot-and-mouth disease is the most contagious and dangerous known to animals. We can take no chances. If that disease should become an epidemic in this country, no person can estimate the damage that would be done to the livestock industry. We must fight it in Mexico and stamp it out before it crosses the border. One of my good friends, Mr. Raymond Bell, of Durango, Mexico, and one of the largest cattle raisers in that country, testified before the committee last week. He has seen the infected herds in Mexico and knows how alarming the situation is. In company with him, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Zimmerman, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Worley, Hon. Richard Kleberg, Judge Joe Montague, Mr. Dolph Briscoe, and Mr. Dolph Briscoe, Jr., we went to the White House last week so Mr. Bell could give the President first-hand information of the true situation. The President is giving the fullest cooperation of our Government, but enabling legislation like this bill is necessary. That is the reason I urge haste in its passage. Time is of the essence.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see the same unanimity of opinion on the floor of the House that was most evident in the work of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Agriculture. It might be well, however, to bring out now that unless we do enact this legislation quickly the Department of Agriculture is absolutely powerless to go into Mexico and take any steps whatever toward eradicating and suppressing the foot-and-mouth disease.

The State Department also is without power to continue their negotiations. So, with all deference to the membership of the House, I believe that if we could get along with the reading of the bill for amendment, we could pass this legislation quickly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it should be understood that the officials of the United States are not going down into Mexico to actually kill the cattle, but that we are going down there to furnish technical skill and to work in cooperation with the Mexican officials to control and eradicate this disease.

Mr. WORLEY. I am glad that the gentleman has made that point. Too many of us are assuming that this involves a gigantic expenditure of money. That does not necessarily follow at all, because the disease can be suppressed and eradicated so that eventually there will be no danger to us.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it is going to cost plenty of money, but I do not think the impression should be left that we are going down there and kill these cattle. It is going to be done by the Mexican Government, and they must cooperate with us, and we are furnishing our financial assistance and skill.

Mr. WORLEY. But when it is necessary to stamp out the disease and the cattle must be killed, of course, they will be killed with the consent of the Mexican Government.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, due to the recent outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, the livestock producers have asked that the border between the United States and Mexico be closed and guarded. They testified that some 130 head of Brahma bulls were imported October 1945 to Mexico from Brazil. The Bureau of Animal Industry protested this shipment and asked that these bulls be left on an island for a sufficient length of time to be certain that they were not infected. This was not done and now a tract of land in Mexico nearly 400 miles square has become infected. The committee concluded the hearings by recommending that sufficient funds be provided to assist Mexico in stamping out this disease and further provided for proper protection along the Mexican border.

This disease is so highly infectious that every object with which the diseased animal comes in contact may become a source of infection to other animals. And while the other animal may not be susceptible to the infection, it may become a carrier of the germ. In fact the germs may be carried on shoes, clothing, or bodies of persons; upon the feet or bodies of poultry, birds, dogs, cats, or other animals which may have been in the immediate vicinity of an afflicted animal. Many investigators feel that even insects or particles of straw used as litter might well be a carrier of the infection.

There are three methods of control:

Immunization: This method is in the experimental stage. There are varying strains of the disease and the vaccines made from one do not protect against another. Also, it seems only to control and not eradicate the plague.

Quarantine and disinfection: This is not a satisfactory method, as countries using this plan have constant recurrences of the disease.

The slaughter method: This has been found to be the most effective, provided the reinfection from outside sources is thorough and complete.

The first serious outbreak occurred in the United States in 1914. Cattle, hogs, and sheep in 22 different States and the District of Columbia were slaughtered and the disease eradicated. This outbreak was caused by the importation of dressed meat from the Argentine. In Illinois 1,226 herds were slaughtered; Pennsylvania, 892; Michigan, 272; Ohio, 228; and other States totaling 3,556 herds or 172,222 head of livestock. Since a rigid embargo was established in 1927, we have had only one minor outbreak, that in garbage-fed hogs in California in 1929, due to garbage brought ashore from a ship just returned from Buenos Aires.

It is easy to imagine what terrible damage might occur if the disease should spread from Mexico to the cattle country in Texas and from there into the western livestock-producing areas. Undoubtedly every assistance and aid should be given to Mexico to stamp out this infectious and destructive disease.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure and compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], the subcommittee chairman, on the dispatch with which he has handled this matter.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, which has held extensive hearings on the subject of foot-and-mouth disease, I am considerably alarmed over the testimony presented. I am convinced the bill now before the House providing for cooperation with Mexico to combat this dread disease should be passed.

Ordinarily I would not favor a measure which seems to give so much power to a Cabinet officer. Nor am I enthusiastic over the idea of entering another country, the rank and file of which we are not absolutely certain will cooperate with outsiders. As I was told during the hearings, the Mexican Government has first to do a selling job on this proposal to its own people.

This selling job must get the Mexicans to like the idea of losing their oxen, their beef, and dairy cattle by necessarily ruthless steps which our Department of Agriculture must and will take to eliminate this disease. It remains to be seen how successful the salesmanship of Mexican authorities will be. As one who wants to see our campaign against hoof-and-mouth disease progress, I hope we will be able to gain their confidence and proceed immediately.

While we are extolling the crusade the Agriculture Department is about to launch, let us not forget that it will cost money, and a lot of money. Naturally, if the hoof-and-mouth disease is stamped out south of the border, the cost will be justified. I am sure with our experts, scientists, and veterinarians, highly specialized and well informed as they are, the battle will be won.

This calls for an aggressive war and carrying it into our neighbor's back yard. I feel sure everything will go as planned and that we will be doing the Mexicans and ourselves a great service when final victory is attained.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, coming from a State whose annual income is derived to the extent of at least 85 or 90 percent from livestock and livestock products, it goes without saying that I am certainly interested in this legislation and absolutely in favor of it. I do think, however, that with all the testimony we have had before our committee and with the debate that we have had here today, we should analyze the situation and look forward to what might happen.

This legislation, to me, has many possibilities of repercussions. There are certain points of it that I did not like to support in the committee and which I do not like to vote for in the bill, because I do not like to see the Secretary of Agriculture have so much power, regardless of who the Secretary of Agriculture might happen to be. I did not like it during the other sessions and I certainly do not like it now. We have to meet these situations that exist, however. This legislation has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I wish to say to every Member here that I have great confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and the ranking minority member and ex-chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable GEORGE GILLIE, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Honorable JOHN TABER, and in view of the fact also that we are going to have these 30-day reports from the Department of Agriculture, I feel that we are all justified in voting "aye" on this legislation which is now before us.

The Congress can give; and the Congress can take away.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, fortunately it appears that the entire membership is conscious of the necessity for this legislation. The tremendous importance of protecting our herds from the menace of foot-and-mouth disease was forcefully brought to my attention last October by Mr. Tom Lasater, of Falfurrias, Tex., and by others who are vitally concerned with keeping our country free of infection.

Some Members have questioned the advisability of this country's moving into Mexico with unlimited funds in the effort to stamp out this malady, having, I fear, some question in their minds as to the cooperation we may expect from Mexico. But since they live so far away from that splendid nation, and because I am so close to it, I would like to call their attention to the wonderful cooperation this country has always enjoyed from our neighbor to the south.

Throughout the war, particularly, the Mexican Government did all things possible to help win the victory that was finally achieved. They contributed their great national resources, their manpower, and deserve the highest commendation for their full and valuable cooperation. We are very happy with our neighbors and have all confidence that they will contribute their share to eliminate foot-and-mouth disease which unfortunately broke out in the northern part of the Mexican Republic.

It is, of course, unfortunate that we must spend this money, but it is inevitable. It was our reluctance to spend money, our hesitance to involve ourselves in the affairs of other governments, which caused us to wait so long before using our resources to combat a still more insidious disease which threatened us long before 1941. We could have saved many lives as well as millions of dollars had we acted then before it actually touched us.

We are receiving excellent cooperation from the Department of Agriculture and, as I have said, from the Government of Mexico. The legislature of my own State of Texas has appropriated a substantial sum to carry out this program.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the livestock industry in Louisiana has grown to huge proportions in recent years. This has been made possible in part by the improvement of our pastures and has further been made possible by the building of thousands of cattle ponds, which are available in every locality. This industry therefore in my native State is a major consideration to our economy and business life.

Great herds of some of the finest blooded cattle in America now feed on our hillsides and in our valleys. Because of a salubrious climate, these cattle thrive and develop. The development of new grasses available to the livestock makes fall field grazing and early spring grazing a matter of course. As a matter of fact, very few days in the course of a year are unfit for outside grazing purposes. The finest type of Angus and Hereford herds are seen on many a farm and milch cattle which produce enormous quantities of milk have caused the dairying industry to expand to most unusual proportions.

I therefore am vitally concerned with the possible spread of the hoof-and-mouth disease. Although my congressional district in the State of Louisiana is removed from the Mexican border by over 1,000 miles, our cattlemen and our dairymen are already alarmed at the reports of the wildfire-like spread of this dreaded cattle disease. Many meetings have occurred and much discussion has taken place regarding what action should be taken to prevent the spread of this epidemic disease to our cloven-footed friends.

Many of us remember the heroic efforts which occurred years ago when the hoof-and-mouth disease penetrated the State of Texas. At that time, Louisiana was not a huge cattle-raising State as it is at the present time and although the

boundaries of Texas are contiguous to the boundaries of our State, the people did not have the investments of the present in blooded livestock and were therefore not so vitally affected. This is contrasted with the spontaneous reaction of our cattlemen at the present time. They do not want this disease to spread into the United States and they want prompt and effective action by this Congress. The bill which is presented to the House of Representatives will give the Secretary of Agriculture authority which he says he needs. I hope it will go far enough to prevent any possibility of this dreaded scourge crossing the Rio Grande and moving northward into the great Southwest—the region of our country more than any other section devoted to the propagation of cattle. This legislation is vital and I am therefore pleased to give to it my most wholehearted support.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, foot-and-mouth disease is the most serious and devastating malady affecting livestock. This is true not only because of its disabling effects, but because of the fact that it is extremely contagious. For these reasons, when foot-and-mouth disease has broken out in this country in the past, the most drastic methods have been used to suppress it. The methods used were the prompt slaughter of all affected and exposed animals, as well as thorough fumigation and disinfection of all buildings and premises which might have become contaminated.

Foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in most parts of the world. The North American Continent is one of the few areas where rigid policies of eradication has prevented all but sporadic outbreaks. The present outbreak is the first on this continent since 1929. This outbreak resulted from importation into Mexico of diseased animals from Brazil. The importation of these animals from a country known to have foot-and-mouth disease was in direct violation of a treaty between the United States and Mexico, which was proclaimed in January 1930 and has been in effect ever since. When it became known late in 1945 that a shipment of Brazilian bulls had been brought into Mexico, this Government protested. This first shipment, consisting of 130 Zebu bulls, arrived in Mexico in October 1945. The shipment was originally unloaded on Sacrificias Island, adjacent to Vera Cruz, and was brought to the mainland in December 1945. Later, in May 1946, a second shipment consisting of 327 bulls reached Mexico and was taken first to Sacrificias Island and then to the mainland in September 1946. As soon as it became known that a second shipment of these Brazilian bulls was going to be brought into Mexico, this Government again protested the violation of the treaty, however, without avail.

When it became apparent that the Mexican Government was permitting shipments of cattle from Brazil to be brought in in violation of the treaty, this Government on May 28, 1946, amended the regulations covering the inspection and quarantine of livestock imported from Mexico in such a way as to place severe restrictions on the entry of cattle and other ruminants, as well as swine, from Mexico. Those regulations remained in effect until October 18, 1946, at which time they were removed.

In the meantime, there had been a meeting of the Mexican-United States Agriculture Commission in Los Angeles during the week of July 22, 1946, at which time representatives of the Mexican Government agreed to remove all of the bulls which had been brought into Mexico in the second shipment. Later, however, by action of the then President of Mexico, the order providing for the removal of the bulls was rescinded, and in the course of time they became widely distributed over Mexico.

On December 18, 1946, what was thought to be foot-and-mouth disease was discovered in Mexico, and upon the invitation of the Mexican Government two veterinarians from the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture were immediately dispatched to Mexico, and pronounced the infection as genuine foot-and-mouth disease. Following this, the receipt of any cattle from Mexico was stopped on December 26, and on January 3 a formal order was issued prohibiting the importation of all ruminants and swine from Mexico.

While the Department of Agriculture has authority to go into the various States of this country and cooperate in stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, and while it has authority to cooperate informally with foreign countries in suppressing outbreaks, it has no authority to cooperate formally and directly with any foreign government. The purpose of the bill H. R. 1819 is to give our Government that authority. Until this legislation becomes law it will be impossible for our Government to make any binding and effective agreement with the Government of Mexico. That Government possesses all needed authority to act.

The Committee on Agriculture has very carefully considered this legislation. Shortly after the convening of Congress and the appointment of the committee, I appointed a subcommittee to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture and to determine what legislation might be necessary in order to enable this country to assist Mexico in eradicating this disease. That committee consisted of Mr. GILLIE, of Indiana, chairman; Mr. SIMPSON, of Illinois; Mr. BRAMBLETT, of California; Mr. GRANGER, of Utah; and Mr. WORLEY, of Texas. This committee went to work immediately upon its appointment and has done a great deal of work and given the matter much study. The bill H. R. 1819 was introduced by Mr. GILLIE, the chairman of the committee.

All who are familiar with foot-and-mouth disease are agreed that it is of the utmost importance to the livestock interests of this country and to our economic stability as a whole, that everything possible be done to prevent the spread of the disease to this country. It is also agreed that if the disease spreads all over Mexico, or if it gets near the Mexico-United States boundary line, it will be impossible to prevent its spread into this country. For that reason, it is felt that it is of the utmost importance that this country cooperate with Mexico in taking effective measures to stamp out or retard the disease, and that this complete cooperation must begin at the earliest possible date. The committee, in reporting the legislation, did so with the thought and understanding that any funds or other assistance which might be furnished by this country should be matched in at least equal amount by the Government of Mexico. There was some discussion as to whether or not a limitation upon the amount expended should be placed in this bill. The unanimous conclusion of the committee was that it is impossible to put such a limitation in this bill. There is no way of knowing at this time what the cost will be. It is simply a case where we must depend upon the Appropriations Committee to make such appropriation as are found to be justified in enabling this country to cooperate with the Mexican Government in its fight on this terrible disease.

Time is of the essence in this battle. One dollar spent today may save $50 or $100 later on. The Senate has already passed a similar bill. It is my understanding that as soon as the proposed legislation becomes a law, our Department of Agriculture and representatives of the Mexican Government will get together to work out the details of a program. I, therefore, urge that the House pass the present bill without amendment and without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Clerk will read the committee substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, or control, or to prevent or retard, foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. In performing the operations or measures herein authorized, the Government of Mexico shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out such operations or measures on all lands and properties in Mexico and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this act on the part of the United States and on the part of the Government of Mexico, including the expenditure or use of funds appropriated pursuant to this act, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The authority contained in this act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

SEC. 2. For purposes of this act, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may also be used for the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, for printing and binding without regard to section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895, or section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (U. S. C., title 44, sec. 111), for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the limitations contained in section 607 (g) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, including the employment of civilian nationals of Mexico, and for the construction and operation of research laboratories,

quarantine stations, and other buildings and facilities.

SEC. 3. Thirty days after the enactment of this act, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a report to the Congress with respect to the activities carried on under this act.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1819) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, pursuant to House Resolution 108, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 568) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with any other American country in the control and eradication of emergency outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest in such country where he deems such control or eradication necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make any expenditure from funds appropriated hereunder or adopt any method or measure found by him to be required in accomplishing the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated hereunder may also be used, without employing the authorization in section 2, for the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, printing and binding without regard to the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the limitation contained in section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. Where necessary to control or eradicate such diseases, the Secretary or his designated representative may authorize employees of the Department of Agriculture to accept from the interested country appointments without compensation or with nominal compensation.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act. The authority contained in this act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the bill S. 568.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H. R. 1819 as agreed to in the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 1819 was passed will be vacated and that bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 18, Rept. No. 68) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problems of small business.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on, or before December 31, 1947, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or a member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 111, Rept. No. 69) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, during proceedings in the Committee of the Whole today I asked permission on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that he might extend his remarks in the Appendix and include extraneous matter. This request, I understand, was not in order.

I now renew my request and ask that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts from letters and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include an editorial on foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made yesterday by Secretary Patterson.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes following the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any special orders that may already be entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SELECT COMMITTEES AND THE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the membership for a few moments on what I feel might grow into a very, very serious break-through of the Reorganization Act.

I was greatly disappointed to hear the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], announce that on Wednesday next we would take up the establishment of two special or select committees, both of which will be established in competition with the carefully established jurisdiction of standing committees of the House.

I have been greatly pleased with the wholehearted, aggressive support that has been given to the Reorganization Act by the leadership of the House, the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from Ilinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and those who have put into effect as best they could practically all the many provisions of the Reorganization Act.

It is a great disappointment to me—as I know it must be to many, many other supporters of the Reorganization Act—to see, for no good reason that I can fathom, the break-through of the carefully planned reorganized committee set-up by the establishment of these two proposed extraneous special committees.

Particularly is this true in the proposed establishment of a special select committee to study newsprint. This committee was in existence last year, it is true, but as a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The subcommittee functioned well and creditably, even with the vast load of wartime activities which the parent committee was carrying. As a subcommittee, it had the power to legislate when it found legislation necessary.

For the life of me I cannot see why, for personal reasons, and personal reasons alone, we are being asked here next Wednesday to establish another select committee in violation of the spirit but not the letter of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman made the last statement. He says that the setting up of a special committee is not in violation of the letter of the Reorganization Act, which is, of course, true and correct. That has not been so represented by some persons who have undertaken to speak about this matter of special committees. Beyond that I cannot agree with the gentleman as to what he calls the spirit of the act. As I have asserted on previous occasions, and as the gentleman knows, when the Reorganization Act was formulated and presented, it contained a firm prohibition against the setting up of any special committees. However, that provision was taken out and is not now in the law. As I have heretofore asserted, that can give rise to no assumption other than that the right was reserved in the spirit and in the letter of the law to create special committees if for any reason they would be deemed to be desirable.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the gentleman mentions that, because I definitely feel that every special committee set up in competition and in conflict with the newly arranged reorganized committees destroys the effectiveness of our new committee structure.

I am not arguing with the gentleman that it is any violation of the letter of the law; but here we have a period of less than 45 days under a committee system which I honestly believe is a far superior system to any we have ever had.

May I give due credit to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who arranged most of that committee structure and recommended it to the Committee on Reorganization.

Within 45 days after this new committee structure comes into being we are asked to vote a special committee to study the newsprint situation. We do not give that committee any jurisdiction to legislate, just to investigate. If we follow this pattern, and I am afraid we will, if you can make a case for the investigation of newsprint conditions outside of the regular structure of your standing committees, then you will find a thousand other excuses just as compelling and urgent to set up other special committees.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I respect the gentleman's integrity and his intention to do what is fair and right, but when you commend us in previous sentences for going to great lengths to live within the Reorganization Act, and I may say parenthetically there are some things in connection with that that have not been too easy to formulate——

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure it has been difficult to get this organization started.

Mr. HALLECK. And then seek to impute to us any intention of widespread departure from the letter and, yes, the spirit of the act, is not to give us credit for what we have done in living under the terms of the act. And again may I say that has been quite difficult at times.

The gentleman has referred to the newsprint resolution. It just so happens that in the last Congress I introduced the resolution to create that committee and I provided in the resolution that it go to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I was then a member. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was a member of that committee.

Without undertaking to exclude other reasons for the creation of that committee upon the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the very terms of the Reorganization Act as adopted took the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] off the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He worked on that newsprint committee all through the last session of Congress. I was on the committee so I approach the matter with some humility and modesty, but I think I can fairly say that in the minds of everyone who knew anything about the accomplishments of that committee it was felt that under the able chairmanship of Lyle Boren, of Oklahoma, it did a magnificent job. It so happens that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] served on that committee. They know all of the background and they know the tie-in with everything that has been done. If the gentleman wants to talk about efficient functioning and operation, then it certainly seems to me that to forego the services of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] on that committee, if we are to have such a committee, would be not in the direction of effective administration but rather, away from effective administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five addditional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very glad to have the word of the distinguished majority leader, because it brings out exactly the point I have in mind of objecting to special committees.

We can no longer afford the luxury in this Congress of creating committees on the basis of the personality of the Members who will serve on it. If the machinery of this Congress is going to be determined by the personality of any Member, whether he is the chairman of the committee, the ranking member, or the last member on the committee, then we are indeed violating the spirit of good congressional organization.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman refers to personalities.

Mr. MONRONEY. I did not refer to personalities. The gentleman did.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, the gentleman did. He referred to personalities, and I do not know just what he is seeking to convey by that. It has been contended by some that special committees are set up as a matter of personality to make somebody chairman of the committee. That has not been the purpose here and will not be the purpose. If you want to refer to personalities—and that is not the way I would put it at all if I wanted to be fair about it—I would say rather than indulging in personalities by reason of somebody being chairman of a committee, that what we are doing is continuing to make available to the services of the Congress of the United States and the people of the country and the people affected the services on that committee of a man who has served in the whole process in the last Congress and, as I say, knows more about it than anybody here.

Mr. MONRONEY. I grant that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana are most able on this committee. But I cannot see, for the life of me, how we are going to run an effective congressional organization if the intent of this organization is to be based on any personality; on any person who will serve. We have to plan these things in accordance with sound organizational procedure, not on persons.

I wish the gentleman would give me one reason, if he will, why, after operating during the war years as a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we must now create a select committee and take the jurisdiction away from the committee that has always had it and put it into the realm of a special committee.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman talks about luxury. There will be nothing in the way of luxury if by referring to luxury you contend that it will cost something that something else will not cost. On that score, it does not make any difference whether it is a standing or special committee. I take it the gentleman would not urge that there should be a complete turn-over of the regular standing committee. We all recognize the fact that the man who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or the ranking member on that committee, should continue on that committee; at least, it is advisable that he should, because out of his years of experience he develops an acquaintance with the problems that are before that committee, and hence his service is more valuable.

Now, if the gentleman undertakes to say to me that that thing will not apply in a special field like that involved in this newsprint investigation, then I say he is departing from what is good judgment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am afraid I must disagree with the gentleman, because the basis of his argument would obtain for the reestablishment of every select committee that we had during the last Congress, or the Congress before, because they all contained experienced men. But in a reorganization we try to recreate these activities and put them in the standing committees of the House.

To the gentleman's great credit he has provided in the Committee on Expenditures subcommittees that are now investigating many phases in our governmental activities. I cannot see how he goes off the deep end on this matter of newsprint to establish a special committee because of the experience of a committee member or two. I think this and the establishment of the Committee on Small Business is going to be the opening wedge to sap the jurisdiction and the strength of the regular standing committees of the House, the one thing that we were trying to improve in the reorganization of Congress. The gentleman knows that 90 percent of the work of Congress is done in the congressional committees. If we are going to come back to the old tanglefoot committee system where we do not know where the jurisdiction of one select committee leaves off and where the jurisdiction of a standing committee takes hold, you are going to get yourself back into the obsolescence and the mire of the same kind of duplicating and overlapping committee system which we have just left.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman had his name on the reorganization bill. Of course, I understand his solicitude for its provisions. For some of us who have been faced with the difficulties of trying to live under that act, may I suggest that the drafting might in a place or two have been done with a little more care. That is not to say that many improvements have not been made. The gentleman refers to the fact that the reorganization bill has apparently, as he puts it, removed all questions of jurisdiction between the different committees.

Mr. MONRONEY. I did not say all questions of jurisdiction.

Mr. HALLECK. You wrote into the bill certain provisions regarding the Expenditures Committee and then imposed on the standing committees the duty to exercise a continuing observation and audit of agencies under their control. Those things themselves are creating innumerable difficulties, with which we are now trying to cope in order to avoid conflict. So I think that, if I may say it, the gentleman's attack on this action that is now proposed does not come with too good grace, having regard to what the gentleman has already pointed out as the great extent to which we have gone to live within the act and otherwise to follow its spirit and its letter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will yield, I desire to make this observation. I was a member of this Reorganization Committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. A very able and helpful one. who attended all our sessions.

Mr. MICHENER. I was a member not by solicitation on my part, but by appointment. I think that we must approach the carrying out of the terms of this Reorganization Act in a spirit of tolerance, in a spirit of understanding, with the knowledge that there are many defects in the law. Trial and error only is going to make a success of the Reorganization Act. I am sure those responsible in the House at this time have been tolerant. They are trying to be tolerant and helpful. I know, as one Member of the House and of the majority, there have been many Members who wanted to repeal the whole thing or parts of it, because the act seems impossible of practical application, and because this law is delaying action in the House at the moment. Yes, there are some mistakes in the law. Few laws are perfect. This thing will work out if given time. I think it does not behoove my colleague, who did such valuable work on the committee, to start an attack against a good-conscience effort to make the law work before an opportunity has been given to do everything we can to make a success of the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I say to the gentleman, who did such wonderful work in helping us on this, that this is not the child of any one man, as he knows. More than 100 Members of Congress made these recommendations. A great many of these Members of Congress recommended the improvement in the integrity of the standing committees of the House.

I am as aware as the gentleman is of several defects in the law, and would be the last one to say that we should not dot an "i" or cross a "t".

But I would say to the gentleman that the establishment of these extra special committees is a matter of high policy. We are either going to build up the standing committees of this House to their proper position or we are going to tear them down if, as I am fearful, this practice of establishing one committee on special activities here and another committee on special activities there is allowed to continue.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me the observations made by the gentleman from Michigan are much broader and relate to different parts of the Reorganization Act than that to which the gentleman from Oklahoma is addressing himself. The gentleman is addressing himself to two resolutions to establish special committees, not subcommittees within the standing committees but special committees, both to investigate subject matters that specifically come within the jurisdiction of two of the standing committees of this House. The gentleman is protesting the break-down of the Reorganization Act in that respect. If I correctly interpret what my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the

majority leader, has said, and if I have misinterpreted it, I would like to be corrected, it is difficult for me to escape the conclusion that if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] were a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this year instead of a member of the Committee on Rules, you would not have this resolution to establish a special investigating committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of George Washington is the spirit of the Constitution, and of American and democratic institutions of government. What better day, outside of Christmas Day, is there to make remarks on the importance and necessity for respect, understanding, and tolerance among Americans than today.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews has set aside this week to emphasize that the men and women of this Nation are dedicated to those ideals which seek unity and not division, irrespective of religious belief.

The ideology which would divide a people is the ideology of destruction. Democracy is dynamic, positive, constructive. There is no space within the confines of our Government for intolerance. We are all Americans. All true Americans believe in the letter, the spirit, and the traditions of our Constitution.

The United States of America has grown in power and splendor under God through the efforts of no single race, class, or religion. Our ancestors—yours and mine—came from many lands. Their contribution to the present majesty of our country was real. Descendants of every nationality and creed have enriched our national life for the greater good of all our citizens.

We live under a constitutional form of government, with logical separation of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of government.

Our Constitution of 1787 recognizes and provides the foundations upon which men of all races and creeds can live together in domestic tranquillity.

World wars have tested the vitality of our nationality at horrible cost. We have, however, learned that we cannot have strength if divided by class hatred, religious bigotry, and intolerance. We have learned that the solidarity of our national greatness and the influence of our national prestige is proportioned to our ability to conquer our national superficial differences of opinion on matters relating to race, color, or creed.

We desire to lead the world to permanent peace on earth. Peace with our sister nations is unobtainable if we cannot have peace at home. "The only way to have a friend is to be one." If we cannot be friends with our fellow Americans, we cannot be friends with the world.

Suspicion and mistrust based upon differences of race, color, or creed are mean, low, degrading, contemptible. Such feelings quickly lead to hatred. Americans have faith in their ability to live in harmony with themselves and with other decent peoples of the world. The challenge of today is not difference of religion. Atheistic communism, the foe of human dignity, which comes from God Himself, is not the enemy of any particular religion, but the enemy of all religion.

Man without the Omnipotent would be the essence of nihilism. The state without religion cannot continue to permanently exist. Our forebears were men of deep religious conviction. Religious freedom was the primal objective of those who founded America and gave us our most precious heritage.

The war is over, but the world is not at peace. The future is in the hands of man, inspired and activated by faith.

The necessity for the extension of spirituality among those now living needs no word of elaboration. It is a self-evident truth—the universal resurgence of faith in God and fellow man would stifle intolerance and lead to happiness not only in community, but international relationships. The road to understanding of our neighbor is found on the imperishable sign post, "The brotherhood of man, the fatherhood of God."

I recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, beloved President of our nation, in time of great domestic trial, spoken at his second inaugural:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

This address of a great statesman expresses the underlying religious spirit of the American people. The words might well be uttered by any statesman of today, or by all persons possessed of a decent, tolerant, understanding mind.

We, as a nation, have drunk the bitter cup of two world wars. We must carry the fight for peace on earth with that courage of heart and soul which inspires the men and women of our armed forces. There were no religious differences on the battlefields of the Bulge, of Iwo Jima, or elsewhere. Those who served were recognized for themselves, not for his or her racial origin or religious beliefs, heritage, nor for the color of their skin. Why should life be different in our quest for a just and lasting peace among all nations?

President Truman recently stated that only a moral and spiritual awakening can save the world from disaster:

> The Protestant church, the Catholic church, and the Jewish synagogue, bound together in the American unity of brotherhood, must provide the shock forces to accomplish this moral and spiritual awakening. No other agency can do it. Unless it is done, we are headed for the disaster we deserve.

There is a greater need in America today for brotherhood among the citizens of this Nation than ever before in history. Prejudice, bigotry, and narrowness of spirit have ever weakened the foundations of a world at peace. Hatred and bigotry are unnecessary curses of mankind, mankind made, in violation of the law of God, and contrary to the instincts of persons of good will and of decent minds. They must be eradicated if happiness is to be found in world society. We all belong to one family under God. Brotherhood Week is dedicated to this truth, affirming as it does that the good-neighbor policy at home is as important as the good-neighbor policy in international relations.

The American people must be educated to realize the iniquity of any doctrine which preaches race supremacy or which would divide the citizens of this country into antagonist groups, based upon race, color, or creed.

Racial injustices thwart educational advances and help prevent economic security. Hatreds, discrimination, and defamation can never lead to decreased criminality. Interfaith amity sponsored by organizations of high-minded citizens brings neighbor in friendship to the door of neighbor—regardless of personal religious conviction. Mutual understanding among men is the sole curative for intolerance. Ceaseless effort in the search for a common denominator on which all men, irrespective of race, color, or creed, can work together for the greater good of the greatest number is the duty of every true American.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star and an article by David Lawrence.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, to hold hearings on House Joint Resolution 134, providing for relief assistance to countries devastated by war. The meeting will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Com-

merce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(Monday, February 24, to Friday, Febuary 28, 1947)

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m. each morning.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

387. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting certain statistical information relative to the operations of the Public Roads Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action"; without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1777. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 67. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 2143. A bill to amend the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 2144. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 2145. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 2146. A bill to permit the completion of certain low-rent housing projects which were interrupted by the war emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 2147. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide additional loan benefits to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2148. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EATON:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to countries devastated by war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 112. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on the Big Chazy River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to recommending an immediate and thorough investigation by the State of Georgia and the United States Government into matters concerning great frauds that have been and are now being made by certain building contractors against veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to strengthen present sanitary requirements covering the importation of livestock and livestock products and to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, and also to offer to the Government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, and appropriating money to provide for such facilities and to extend financial aid to the Republic of Mexico in order that foot-and-mouth disease may be eradicated; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the development of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for irrrigation and other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 2149. A bill for the relief of Herbert Therrien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 2150. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment on the claim of the P. Dougherty Co. for the value of three wooden barges which the War Production Board ordered scrapped or disposed of, to salvage anchors, bells, and other metal equipment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2151. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Paul Boulanger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 2153. A bill for the relief of Albina Bucewich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 2154. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert W. Listman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2155. A bill for the relief of Ralph Cannovo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

133. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Pvt. Joseph Francis Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, urging amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 19, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we know that Thou canst see the hidden things in every heart. If our intentions are good, help us to make them live in good deeds. If what we intend or desire makes us uncomfortable in Thy presence, take it from us, and give us the spirit we ought to have, that we may do what we ought to do. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 563) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 1 week, on business in my State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

NOMINATION OF HUGH MEGLONE MILTON 2D—RECONSIDERATION AND RECOMMITTAL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senate in executive session confirmed the Presidential nomination of Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d to be a brigadier general in the Chemical Corps Reserve, a permanent appointment. I have been in communication with General Milton. He had a distinguished and enviable record in combat and won his star in actual combat service. This commission places him in the Chemical Branch of the Army. At General Milton's request, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the vote by which his nomination was confirmed on Friday be reconsidered, and that the nomination be restored to the calendar for future action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I asked reconsideration of the vote by which the nomination of Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d had been confirmed, and asked that the nomination be restored to the calendar, which was done. Since that time I have been in conference with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and it has been suggested that this nomination should be recommitted to that committee for further consideration.

Therefore, at the request of General Milton, I now ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination of Hugh Meglone Milton 2d to be a brigadier general in the Chemical Corps Reserves be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 12)

A commuication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, amounting to $3,474,000, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REAPPOINTMENT OF HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESERVATION OF INDIAN LANDS FOR POWER OR RESERVOIR SITES OR IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, that no reservations were made during the calendar year 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

LOAN OF CERTAIN CAPTURED ENEMY ORDNANCE AND CAPTURED EQUIPMENT TO NAVY CLUB

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting, pursuant to law, a proposed loan of certain captured enemy ordnance and equipment for exhibition purposes to the Navy Club of the United States of America, an accredited veterans' organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF THE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his twelfth annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

STATISTICAL INFORMATION RELATING TO OPERATIONS OF PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, certain statistical information relative to the operations of the Public Roads Administration (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

CAPITOL ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, is entitled "Relating to the appropriation for the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the Capitol, and for other purposes." A portion of the law reads as follows:

Provided further, That the project, insofar as it affects the Senate wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon recmomendation of the chairman of the Senate Commitee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The Chair construes the law as a continuing mandate until the project shall be completed.

There is a vacancy in the chairmanship of the committee, due to the death of the late Senator from Florida, Mr. Andrews. The Chair appoints as a new member, and a chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which, under the Reorganization Act, succeeds the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

There is a second vacancy, due to the resignation of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as a member of the committee. On recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, as required by law, the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] to fill the vacancy, the Senator from Illinois being the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is generally in charge of the Capitol.

The net result is that the new committee stands as follows: The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Georgia, favoring an immediate investigation into the affairs concerning veterans of World War II allegedly defrauded by building contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore, February 1, 1947, pp. 1259–1260, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to promptly consider approval of pending legislation in Congress affirming the rights of the States to submerged lands

"Whereas the States of the Union have always considered that they were owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders and that at no time has such title been relinquished and as such ownership has long been recognized with the result that both public and private interests, relying thereon, have expended vast sums of money in their development including the improvement of harbor facilities, reclamation and filling in; and

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in Congress declaring the States to be the owner of these tide and submerged lands within their respective borders; and

"Whereas it appears necessary at this time that legislation confirming such title to the States is necessary to avoid any possible thought of a cloud on such titles: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Michigan Members of Congress of the United States are hereby urged to promptly consider approval of Senate Joint Resolution 14, or House Joint Resolution 51, affirming the rights of the States to submerged lands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate and clerk of the house immediately transmit copies of this resolution to the Michigan Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, January 23, 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, February 12, 1947."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Senate joint memorial to th Congress of the United States petitioning Congress to

strengthen present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products and to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture in order that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the importation of people, animals, and materials, carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease, and also petitioning Congress to offer to the government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, and appropriating money to provide for such facilities and to extend financial aid to the Republic of Mexico in order that foot-and-mouth disease may be eradicated.

"To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease now exists in livestock in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the disease has spread from the six original States involved in the vicinity of Mexico City as far west and north as the State of Zazatecas; and

"Whereas it is extremely doubtful if the Government of the Republic of Mexico can eradicate this disease from their livestock without additional assistance; and

"Whereas the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico presents a very definite threat to the prosperity of the livestock industry and the entire economic welfare of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and from other countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists; be it further

"Resolved, That we earnestly petition Congress to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry United States Department of Agriculture in order that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol be established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the importation of people, animals and materials carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease; be it

"Resolved, That we petition and urge the Congress of the United States to offer to the Government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities and assistance as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture and to appropriate funds to provide for this assistance and to provide direct financial aid to the Government of the Republic of Mexico in order that foot-and-mouth disease be eradicated from their livestock; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this joint memorial be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States and to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Secretary of State, the Honorable Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana with the request that they bring this matter forcibly to the attention of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

"Approved February 11, 1947.

"SAM C. FORD,
"Governor."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial to the President and Congress of the United States requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation authorizing the immediate redemption of bonds issued to the enlisted members of the armed forces for accumulated-leave pay under the terms of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946

"To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled and to the Honorable James E. Murray, the Honorable Zales N. Ecton, the Honorable Mike Mansfield, and the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart:

"Whereas the avowed purpose of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 is to grant equal treatment in the matter of leave to all personnel of the armed forces; and

"Whereas under the terms of that act commissioned officers continue to receive compensation for accumulated leave in cash while enlisted personnel receive only a fraction of their accumulated-leave pay in cash and the balance in bonds which are nonnegotiable and payable only after 5 years from the date of issuance; and

"Whereas the need of former enlisted members of the armed forces for immediate compensation for accumulated leave in cash is, in most cases, greater than that of commissioned officers in order to assist such members in the trying period of readjustment to civilian life, therefore justice and fairness requires that such enlisted members should have the benefit of immediate payments under the terms of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; and

"Whereas a consideration of the equities and a balancing of alleged inflationary effects of such payments against the very urgent need of enlisted personnel for such compensation immediately demonstrates that enlisted personnel are entitled to prompt cash payment for all accumulated leave: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation providing for the immediate redemption of all bonds issued under the terms of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 in cash, and that all future payments under the terms of such act be made in cash; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to old-age assistance

"Whereas old-age assistance is most unsatisfactory as now administered in that:

"1. The amount of assistance is changeable, indefinite, and undependable;

"2. The method of awarding assistance virtually requires the applicant to prove pauperism resulting in humiliation and embarrassment; and

"Whereas old-age assistance should be adequate, definite in amount, dependable, and be awarded as recognition of venerable old age and years of service as a member of the human family as a matter of human right; making such award a badge of honor comparable to retirement pensions of industrial concerns and not a humiliating grant given after a lot of red tape and a searching investigation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the Twenty-ninth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact legislation to eliminate or appropriately modify the regulations criticized herein; and to permit the granting of old-age assistance to qualified recipients without unnecessary red tape and searching investigation.

"Approved February 15, 1947.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

The petition of G. D. Allen, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Chicago, Ill., favoring restoration of prewar functions by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Landlords' Association, Inc., at a multiple-State meeting in Dallas, Tex., favoring an investigation of the personnel, executive management, field direction, and directors of all executive area action in relation to rent control and other remaining controls for a period of at least the last 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to give like privileges to income-tax payers resident in noncommunity property States as are being enjoyed by residents of community property States

"Whereas an inequality exists between citizens and residents of the several States of the United States, in that residents of 9 States having community property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income-tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of 41 States not having community property laws; and

"Whereas by reason of the premises, legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequality by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in its thirtieth regular session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America that suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to United States Senators CHAN GURNEY and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, to

Congressmen FRANCIS CASE and KARL E. MUNDT, and to United States Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN and to Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON.'

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate the necessary funds to carry on the construction of Fort Randall and Angostura Reservoirs and to initiate construction of the Oahe Reservoir as proposed by the Corps of Engineers and to initiate construction of the Shadehill Reservoir, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas the Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized a comprehensive plan for protection of the Missouri River States against the hazards of flood and drought; and

"Whereas the authorized construction will create immense new wealth for the people of the United States through the capture and use of water which now serves only to create destructive floods; and

"Whereas a large part of this captured water will be impounded in reservoirs to be built on the main stream and tributaries of the river in South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That the Congress is hereby requested to appropriate funds required to carry on construction of the Fort Randall and Angostura Reservoirs now in progress, and to initiate construction of the Oahe Reservoir, as proposed by the Corps of Engineers, and of the Shadehill Reservoir, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the presiding officers of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of South Dakota.

"SIOUX K. GRIGSBY,
"Lieutenant Governor."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"To the President of the United States and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Washington, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the water-power resources of the State of Washington constitute the only adequate source of low-cost fuel for industrial development; and

"Whereas the State of Washington has achieved a marked industrial growth, the existence and extension of which depends primarily upon a dependable supply of inexpensive hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas low-cost electric energy from the Federal projects on the Columbia River has made feasible electrification of rural farms and homes in sparsely populated areas, and

"Whereas the program for reclaiming large bodies of arid land in the Pacific Northwest is primarily dependent upon the sale of large blocks of surplus hydroelectric energy, which can be marketed to basic industries only at the prevailing low rates; and

"Whereas a retention of existing wholesale power rates is essential to the further development of the natural resources of the State, the creation of new opportunities, employment, and taxable wealth; and

"Whereas Congress is being urged to seek an increase in power rates for energy from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and other projects to be constructed on the Columbia River, becaus of the unfounded contention that prevailing rates are not sufficient to amortize the Federal investment within a reasonable period of time; and

"Whereas independent commercial audits for the operation of the Columbia River power system clearly indicate that electric-power revenues have not only been sufficient to meet all costs of power operation but have provided a net surplus of $16,326,047 as of June 30, 1946; and

"Whereas a comprehensive survey of existing and potential power markets, made by the Department of the Interior, indicates that existing power rates will provide adequate revenues to repay not only all costs allocated to power, but also to reimburse the Federal Government in excess of $200,000,000 of construction costs allocated to irrigation, and further to provide a substantial surplus: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists hereby respectfully petition and memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to take no action that would lead to an increase in the wholesale power rates for energy generated at the Federal projects on the Columbia River; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Washington is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of the congressional delegation from the State of Washington."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Topeka and Waverly, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 332, to provide for the registration of certain firearms, the taxation of the transfers thereof, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS IN NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Miss Susie D. Allen, secretary of the Raleigh (N. C.) Council of Church Women, expressing approval of the bill now before the Senate which prohibits liquor advertisements in newspapers and magazines. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and to have it printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, February 17, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In behalf of the Raleigh Chapter of the United Council of Church Women, I want to thank you for introducing a bill in Congress to ban liquor advertisements in our periodicals. We feel that this is a step in the right direction and we as individuals and as an organization of women heartily endorse it.

Respectfully yours,

SUSIE D. ALLEN,
Secretary, Raleigh Council of Church Women.

PROTEST AGAINST LOWERING OF TARIFFS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a telegram I have received from the United Trades and Labor Council, of Pittsburg, Kans., expressing opposition to the lowering of tariffs. The telegram reads as follows:

The United Trades and Labor Council representing 30 locals at Pittsburg are opposed to lowering tariffs at this time that protect our workingmen.

IRA HALL,
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the telegram presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance

RESOLUTIONS OF FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, the resolutions adopted by the Fourth Annual Convention of the National Livestock Association, held recently at Phoenix, Ariz.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Hoof-and-mouth disease outbreak in Mexico

Whereas the recent outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico constitutes the most dangerous threat ever experienced in its history to the livestock industry of this Nation—our economy, our credit, the normal movement of livestock in the natural processes of production and marketing and to the supplies necessary properly to feed our domestic population; and

Whereas this situation has been permitted to develop through no fault of those engaged in the industry but rather through weaknesses in the sanitary treaties presently existing between this country and Mexico; and

Whereas the American National Live Stock Association and the various State livestock association members of the American National Live Stock Association have repeatedly brought to the attention of the authorities in Washington the dangers incident to the unrestricted movement of livestock from infested areas to countries bordering on the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., January 10, 1947, respectfully urges that the proper departments of Government lend every assistance possible toward effectuating the protection that would be afforded through the following program:

1. The Bureau of Animal Industry should be given adequate funds to insure that no handicap be placed on its work in preventing a spread of this dreaded disease to this country.

2. The United States-Mexican border should be patrolled as if it were a prison

camp. The present force engaged in that work is merely a skeleton of the former patrol. That force should be multiplied.

3. The Government of the United States, acting through the Department of Agriculture and the State Department, should prevail upon the Mexican Government to slaughter and bury the suspect bulls in the proximity of the border. This step is highly important, and action such as this would breed some confidence in the good faith of the affected Governments.

4. The work of eradication of the disease in Mexico should have full cooperation and assistance of the American Government. Regardless of the number of trained men that may be required to render this assistance, they should be supplied promptly and in adequate force.

5. Construction of a permanent border fence extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean should be started and rushed to completion.

6. By far the most important step from the standpoint of future outbreaks, such as now are in evidence, is the consummation of real sanitary treaties with Mexico and Canada. The existing treaty with Mexico was negotiated several years ago and has now proved to be wholly inadequate. New treaties with each country with strong and sharp teeth in them should be effected. That will call for quick and skillful negotiation with the named countries.

Resolution 2

Inspecting animals originating in Mexico

Whereas the presence of foot-and-mouth disease has been reported in Mexico; and

Whereas large numbers of cattle from that country have been imported into these United States since October 17, 1946: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the sanitary officials of each State immediately to locate all livestock within its boundaries originating in Mexico, after October 17, 1946, and have it inspected and kept under constant surveillance by a Federal or State veterinarian for foot-and-mouth disease until said cattle have been slaughtered or otherwise removed from this earth.

Resolution 3

Reciprocal trade

Whereas the program of writing new trade agreements with sharp reductions in tariff rates, advocated by the State Department, is a distinct threat to the restoration of stable conditions in agriculture, industry, and labor; and

Whereas many foreign countries are now making bilateral agreements which are directly in opposition to the United States program of multilateral agreements and will make such program ineffective so far as opportunity for exports from this country is concerned; and

Whereas it is now impossible to foretell the conditions that will exist in 2 or 3 years when new agreements made now will become fully effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we strongly oppose the making of these new agreements and tariff reductions because it is opposed to the national interest and unfair and unequitable to American agriculture, industry, and labor.

Resolution 4

Interstate sanitary regulations

Whereas the movement of cattle has been and is being hampered by confusing and conflicting State regulations, particularly in regard to cattle vaccinated for Bang's disease; and

Whereas progress is being made in the methods for controlling this disease; and

Whereas the officers of the American National Live Stock Association have been cooperating with officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, and the National Assembly of Livestock Sanitary Officials for promoting uniform sanitary regulations covering movement of cattle between the various States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend this effort be continued and that the various State officials cooperate in making regulations effective in their States and in seeking uniformity on all rules and regulations affecting the interstate movement of livestock.

Resolution 5

Packers and Stockyards Administration

Whereas there are now under supervision of the Packers and Stockyards Administration less than 200 posted public markets; and

Whereas it is estimated that there are eligible to posting under the definition of a "stockyard" in the Packers and Stockyards Act several hundred additional public markets, which should be posted in order to preserve equitable competitive situations and to insure protection of the shippers to such markets through supervision of scales, marketing charges and practices, and the recognition by railroads of such points as public markets with the absorption of loading and unloading charges as provided by the Interstate Commerce Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake a study to determine how many markets there are now that should be posted under the Packers and Stockyards Act and to recommend a course of action that will make it possible to place them under supervision.

Resolution 6

Unfair publicity

Whereas Life magazine in an editorial published last October made a very unfair attack on the American National Live Stock Association, attributing purely selfish and greedy motives to us and the livestock industry in general in connection with our long fight to preserve intact the sanitary embargo section of the tariff act and keep foot-and-mouth disease out of this country; and

Whereas numerous radio commentators and magazine writers have in similar fashion and without proper knowledge of the facts urged the importation of meat from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists; and

Whereas the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, traced to imports of Brazilian bulls into that country, clearly justifies the stand we have consistently taken: Therefore be it

Resolved, That now, with the threat of foot-and-mouth disease at our very door we urge the daily press, the magazines, and the commentators to aid in publicizing the need for cooperative effort in meeting this threat, with as much zeal as they previously and mistakenly gave to the wrong side of the cause.

Resolution 7

Government statistics

Whereas there have been many complaints in the past few years that statistical bureaus of the Federal Government have been pressed by high administrative officials to provide statistics to support whatever program happened to be under promotion; and

Whereas this practice has grown until today there is a general lack of confidence in the material put out by these bureaus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we condemn the practice of using these agencies to supply propaganda that is misleading, incorrect, and weighted or unweighted to fit the occasion, and urge that they be restored to a plane that will command the confidence of all.

Resolution 8

Representation under Railway Labor Act

Whereas the public has no representative under the present Railway Labor Act, such as it had on the former Railroad Labor Board; and

Whereas the shipping public is required to pay the labor bills of the carriers in rates assessed and collected for transportation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to amend the Railway Labor Act so as to include members representing the public.

Resolution 9

Bulwinkle bill

Whereas our entire transportation rate structure for many years has been effectively and harmoniously developed through the clearing agencies of rate-making bureaus or conferences; and

Whereas the public interest requires the continuance of such bureaus or conferences, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536), which would have exempted carriers' agreements as to rates and services, but not including ownership, when approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, from operation of the antitrust laws, failed of passage in the last Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That like legislation be reintroduced in the present Congress, and the principle thereof be again supported by this organization.

Resolution 10

Interstate Commerce Commission

Whereas the national transportation policy enacted into law in 1940 provides fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; and

Whereas this policy can be fulfilled only by the development of the cost of performing transportation by each of the modes of transportation; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has, within its own organization, established its Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, which is composed of essential and highly skilled experts to determine adequately the cost of performing transportation by each mode of transport, and the work thereof is conducted efficiently and economically, and is of great value to the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we commend the Interstate Commerce Commission in this respect, and urge the continuance and enlargement of its Transport Economics and Statistics department.

Resolution 11

Livestock loss and damage claims

Whereas it has become the fixed policy of the railroads to refuse to pay more than 50 percent of the actual damage to livestock killed or injured in transit; and

Whereas attempts are being made by some of the railroads to apply this policy where animals are killed or injured on the rights-of-way; and

Whereas this policy is inequitable, unreasonable, and wholly contrary to existing law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to instruct the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of and report on railroad loss and damage claims covering livestock, and thereafter a law be passed authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules and regulations governing the filing, investigation, and payments of all loss-and-damage claims on livestock.

Resolution 12

Memorial park in California

Whereas a bill was introduced in the last session of Congress providing for the acquisition by the Federal Government of all California redwood timberlands in the counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma, comprising an area of approximately 2,500,000 acres, to be dedicated as a memorial park and forest in memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

Whereas such acquisition would greatly reduce the tax base essential for the support of local governments, would greatly restrict the production of timber, agricultural and mineral products, and would weaken or destroy long-established public, civic, and spiritual institutions, private businesses, farms, ranches, and homes; and

Whereas this association has repeatedly protested expansion of Federal land holdings in the Western States where Federal ownership is constantly encroaching on private land holdings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we unalterably oppose this proposed acquisition by the Federal Government.

Resolution 13

Congressional investigation of national forests

Whereas members of the national forest personnel have been guilty of using abusive and near-libelous statements to the discredit of the leadership in the livestock industry, and have also discredited the general policy stated by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

Whereas the subterfuge of range protection has been resorted to in making cuts on transfers of permits from fathers to sons and in many cases to the detriment of veterans of the recent World War; and

Whereas the present Forest Service, self-made, self-interpreted, and self-executed type of bureaucratic administration is the most vicious type of dictatorship in a democratic government, a detriment to our form of government in causing widespread dissatisfaction among forest permittees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That congressional investigation be made of the administration of grazing on the national forests so the Members of Congress will see the need for legislation to remove existing evils and insure fair adjudication of grievances; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture to instruct the Forest Service to refrain from making any cuts in livestock permits until a congressional investigation is held and appropriate legislation is enacted.

Resolution 14

Maintenance of breeding herd preferences

Whereas it has been the customary policy in past years for the Forest Service to issue short-season and long-season permits in addition to the established preference numbers in breeding herds, which is to provide the customary removal of the normal increase; and

Whereas the Forest Service has in numerous instances reduced the established breeding-herd preference to cover the short- or long-season increase as a method of preference reduction: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the breeding-herd preference shall not be reduced to take care of the normal seasonal increase.

Resolution 15

Transfer of grazing lands now in forests

Whereas there are millions of acres of lands within the forests which are not and never will be valuable for timber lands; and

Whereas these lands are chiefly valuable for grazing and are dependent upon privately owned lands for their highest use; and

Whereas maladministration and the practice of cuts by the Forest Service depreciates the value of these privately owned lands and further denies the stability and highest use of these forest grazing lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we instruct the legislative committee to prepare and present the necessary bill for congressional enactment to provide for a survey of forest lands and the transfer of those lands chiefly valuable for grazing to the Taylor grazing service; and be it further

Resolved, That lands so transferred shall carry the existing preferences of lease or permit and be subject to all the provisions of the Taylor Act for lease or sale.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL—TELEGRAM FROM H. R. CULLEN

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram sent to me by H. R Cullen, one of the most prominent and respected citizens of Houston, Tex. The telegram deals with the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal, and Mr. Cullen would like to have it made available for all Senators to read.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *February 21, 1947.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Dr. James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University and member of Atomic Bomb Advisory Committee, was entertained yesterday at luncheon at Houston Club. Regents of University of Houston and Rice Institute and their presidents were present at luncheon. Among the subjects discussed at luncheon was the atomic bomb, and the question was put to Dr. Conant by me, Why was he in favor of President Truman's appointment of David Lilienthal as Chairman? Dr. Conant answered that he was acquainted with Lilienthal and thought he was capable of making a good chairman of the committee. However, he closed his remarks with this statement: "But, of course, we all know he is a New Dealer." Literally thousands of great Americans who have made America have stated from time to time that the New Deal is close kin to communism, nazism, and fascism. Has New Dealism succeeded in hypnotizing the Members of our great United States Senate to that extent, that they must seek support from and lean upon well-known New Dealers, admitting they are not capable of acting alone as United States Senators? Wired to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Robert A. Taft, Tom Connally, Carroll Reece. Mailed to Frank C. Waldrop, Washington Times-Herald.

H. R. CULLEN.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD two telegrams relating to the Lilienthal nomination, the first from Hon. Herbert H. Lehman and the second from Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 17, 1947.*

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building:

Strongly urge the prompt confirmation of David E. Lilienthal and the other men nominated as the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 17, 1947.*

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Chamber:

Together with millions of other citizens, I am deeply disturbed by the political fight over Mr. Lilienthal. I urge on you his confirmation. The attack on Mr. Lilienthal has degenerated into such discreditable meanness that the whole country is shocked and everyone I talk with thinks the main motive for the attack to be a political grudge hiding behind utterly unfounded accusations concerning communism that the Senate of the United States in dealing with this profoundly important matter, affecting both national and international welfare, should allow this conspiracy against an able public servant to succeed seems to me unthinkable. If it does do so, it will be a national disgrace.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 70) to exempt employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 37) thereon.

INTERIM REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF AIR SAFETY FILED DURING RECESS (S. REPT. NO. 36)

Mr. BREWSTER, on February 22, 1947, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 21, 1947, submitted an interim report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of an investigation into the matter of air safety, made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the interim report submitted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, which has been filed and sent to the Printing Office. It will be available to Members of the Senate, I understand, either today or tomorrow.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Air Safety, is absent today, and has asked me to make a few remarks to the Senate in connection with this report.

First, I wish to say that nothing is more important to the Nation than the development of safety, certainty, and speed in aviation.

Even the value of the atomic bomb as a defense against aggression will be measured in the speed, safety, and supremacy of our Air Forces. Our ability to deliver such a bomb against an aggressor while he is still beyond our shores is paramount in importance. The atomic bomb and supremacy in the air are inseparable.

The investigation of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee has revealed a few notable facts. The pilots have an exceptionally clean bill of health and no accidents of major importance are traceable to their misconduct or misbehavior.

The standardization of rules and regulations governing not only flight under the jurisdiction of the pilot but airport rules and regulations promoting safety and certainty of flight, is vital to the ultimate success of the aviation industry and America's supremacy in the air.

It has been demonstrated to me, and I believe to the other members of the subcommittee, that all our major airports should be immediately equipped with the latest and best navigational and piloting aids which have been developed during and since the war so as to insure safety at the time of take-off, while in flight, and at the time of landing. Such installations should include the utilization of new telecommunication and electronic devices, the lengthening of existing airport runways, the improvement of runway lighting systems, and the fog-dispersing apparatus, known as "Fido," which is under test and bids fair to prove successful, particularly for use at airports located in areas where extreme fog conditions prevail.

It seems to be the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that these various devices supplement each other, and the interim report recommends that this procedure be adopted with the greatest speed possible.

The report further shows that aviation under the American flag, particularly under scheduled operations, controlled by the CAB and CAA, is the safest in the world, and the record of fatalities per passenger-mile in 1946 is the finest record made since aviation began. The statistics prepared by the CAB on this point are available in the report.

Your committee had the finest kind of cooperation in the hearings at which appeared some of the most important men in our armed forces and in commercial aviation throughout the Nation.

Everyone seems to appreciate that the truth and the facts regarding what we have done and are doing in aviation should be brought home to the American public at the earliest possible moment, so as to correct a psychology which has seemed to develop because of accidents which have occurred throughout the world to planes not under the American flag, as well as the unfortunate accidents which have occurred domestically under the American flag. The fact still remains that domestic air travel under the American flag is one of the safest forms of transportation available to our citizens.

The aviation industry is new and romantic, and naturally anything that happens in the air makes interesting reading for the American public, but if we are to be supreme in the air we must know the facts and be guided by them.

Your subcommittee will make a further report after further investigation, and it is hoped that the Congress and the American people will see the wisdom of making safe and certain the airports we now have before we spend our money in other directions.

In conclusion, I call attention to the fact that the authorities who appeared before the subcommittee were of the opinion that certainty of flying schedules depends upon safety and the use of the necessary safety devices, and that through the proper and prompt expenditure of the necessary funds, we can assure the safety which brings the desired certainty, and that 90 to 95 percent of all scheduled flights can be carried out regardless of weather conditions. Weather is the pilot's greatest foe. The pilot has a life just as does the passenger, and he is entitled to the same consideration through the installation of all available and reliable safety devices known to us.

I urge every Member of the Congress to read this interim report of the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to the end that we may be prepared to act with speed and wisdom when the recommendations come before the Congress.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of January 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE

FEBRUARY 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter E. Connell, 4632 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

Frank D. Byrne, 510 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $7,341.60.

Paul F. Morrison, 1205 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.; General Accounting Office; annual salary, $5,403.80.

OWEN BREWSTER, *Chairman.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 678, to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing certain medical aid to needy and other individuals, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 680. A bill to provide that periods of vocational rehabilitation training in Government establishments undertaken by disabled veterans who subsequently enter the employment of the United States shall be credited for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 681. A bill to be known as the General Welfare Act or General Welfare Act amendments to the Social Security Act, to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage thereunder to all groups and all classes, to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide the revenue for an all-inclusive system of matured annuities for America's senior citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 682. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 683. A bill to provide for the review of the cases of officers removed from the Regular Army pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), and for their restoration if justified; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 684. A bill to provide for exemption from the admissions tax for admissions to agricultural fairs which are conducted with financial aid from States or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 685. A bill to provide for crediting postmasters and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department with sick leave for the periods of their service in the armed forces during World War II; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 686. A bill to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 687. A bill to adjust awards of disability compensation and pensions administered or paid by the Veterans' Administration according to annual increases or decreases in the cost of living; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 688. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes;

S. 689. A bill to extend the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 690. A bill relating to the furnishing of automobiles to disabled veterans;

S. 691. A bill extending to June 30, 1948, the time within which certain disabled veterans may be furnished automobiles by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 692. A bill to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 693. A bill defining the powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Colorado River under the treaty with Mexico of February 3, 1944; authorizing the construction, acquisition, and administration of works required for performance of said treaty on the Colorado River; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 694. A bill relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 695. A bill relating to the retired status of Commander Edward V. Valz, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 696. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit refunds of deductions from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of wartime employees;

S. 697. A bill to provide for payment of overtime compensation to supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office

Department; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 698. A bill relating to the payment of national service life insurance of John W. Moutz; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 699. A bill for the relief of Frederick J. Roggow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 700. A bill to prohibit prosecutions under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 701. A bill to assist in the immediate alleviation of the critical shortage of moderate-rental housing for veterans, to expedite the orderly demobilization of the war effort, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 702. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by the Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. CONNALLY) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 77, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

MEDICAL AID TO NEEDY AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing medical aid to needy and other individuals, and I request that a statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 678) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing certain medical aid to needy and other individuals, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the statement presented by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

The title of the bill which I have today introduced says that it is "to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing certain medical aid to needy and other individuals."

It is substantially the same as a bill which I first introduced on March 19, 1940. At that time I pointed out that the reason for the bill springs from the fact that there are at present a number of medicines the manufacture of which has become thoroughly standardized, and which are properly regarded by the layman as specific remedies for well-defined diseases. These particular medicines, unlike the majority of medicines, are so expensive that they are beyond the reach of many persons. For example, big hospitals will make gifts of small quantities of most types of medicine. For these hospitals, however, to give away the medicines to which this bill refers would be to strain their finances to a point which they could not bear.

The bill therefore provides Federal aid, on a matching basis, to those States which have a plan for making these medicines available to those who are entitled to them. The medicines covered by the bill are as follows:

1. Sulfa drugs: Used for pneumonia, streptococcus infections, and other infections.

2. Insulin: Used for diabetes.

3. Liver extract: Used for pernicious anemia and occasionally for other anemias.

4. Mercury diuretics: Used for patients with congestive heart failure.

5. Endocrine products—most of these except thyroid gland are expensive: Used for glandular and nervous disorders.

6. Vitamin preparations—thiamine chloride, nicotinic acid, viosterol, vitamin K: Used for a variety of conditions, especially nutritional deficiency.

7. Typhoid vaccine: Used to prevent typhoid fever and is already compulsory in some States.

8. Penicillin and streptomycin for various infectious diseases.

This list covers medicines which enter into the field of internal medicine. I hope and believe that with the publication of this bill additional medications used in other branches of medicine, such as dermatology and obstetrics, will be proposed and included.

The same philosophy is carried into the field of medical services. It provides for Federal aid on the same basis, so that persons in need of these services may obtain the use of respirators, the so-called iron lung, and, above all, of large-scale X-ray facilities. I believe it is not disputed that countless instances occur every day in which X-ray examinations are desirable—nay, essential—but are not given because of the prohibitive cost.

The suffering which could be prevented by prompt X-ray examination is indescribable. Needless to say, the prevention of disease automatically tends to reduce the cost of caring for the disease once it has been allowed to take hold. The use of respirators and X-rays involves a technique which has become relatively standardized. There is really no longer any mystery about them. In the case of the X-ray it is not inconceivable that it would become a routine part of every physical examination were it not for the cost. In the case of people of moderate means the cost prohibits its use. In the case of persons who can afford it, the use of X-ray is known to be so unusual that its prescription sometimes causes alarm.

At a later date I shall submit data showing the amount which might be initially authorized. Until the list of medicines to be provided is complete, the sum to be authorized could not be stated with any exactitude. It is safe to say, however, that in comparison with the total outlay for social services in which the Government is now engaged the figure would be most moderate.

This measure would not regiment. In all cases the initiative would rest with the individual. He himself would choose his own doctor and his own hospital. The Federal Government would merely give full recognition to the work of private enterprise, and simply set up the machinery whereby the self-respecting man might help himself. Questions of medical personnel and hospital standards would remain where they now are, in the devoted hands of professional physicians. The part played by the State and local governments is recognized and enhanced. There is no invitation to haste and waste.

There is to be no large-scale splurging of money in building programs and in contracts for materials. There is to be no setting up of a bureaucracy or of any other obstacles between the patient and his health. This scheme is as direct as a governmental scheme can be. It provides specific, concrete, definite aid for definite diseases. It is believed that in giving everyone a chance to have these medicines and services according to his ability to pay very great good can be done.

In recent years we have taken important steps looking toward the establishment of a well-rounded, integrated social-security program. Workmen's compensation for many years has provided financial aid to those who have suffered from injuries sustained during the course of their employment. Unemployment compensation aims to protect the unemployed from loss of wages. Old-age pensions are being developed which will safeguard our people from the hazards of insecurity. A well-conceived health-insurance program should bring measurably nearer the day when the American people will be physically fit.

This bill is a humble first step toward this inspiring goal.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR SENATE SECTION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $2,500 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized for the purposes specified in Senate Resolution 63, agreed to January 20, 1947.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action," was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRICES UNDER OPA AND NOW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a year ago in the debate on OPA there were many predictions as to how high prices would go if the ceilings were removed. At that time there were predictions that the price of bread would go to $15 a loaf, that beefsteak would go to $3 a pound. At some appropriate time I should like to review all the predictions and statements which were then made; but I was very much interested yesterday to read in the Times-Herald an editorial entitled "By the Way, Where's That $15 Bread?" I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY THE WAY, WHERE'S THAT $15 BREAD?

Many of us still remember, and all of us should be reminded from time to time, and everybody who reads this column will be, that when President Truman kicked price controls off meat last October 15 Elliott Roosevelt keened to the press:

"You will see bread at $15 a loaf. This is the beginning of the end. I am disappointed."

It was indeed the beginning of the end of price controls. Truman blew the ceilings off meat because his political advisers were telling him the OPA's meat famine, then in full swing, would lose dozens of the November 5 elections for the Democrats if it weren't stopped somehow.

Sure enough, meat was rolling through the pipe lines soon after Truman decontrolled it. The famine ended as fast as was physically possible, and shows no signs of coming back—

though the voters stayed sore about that and other things long enough to elect Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress.

Elliott's prophecy about bread going to $15 a loaf is what we'd like to discuss in the rest of this editorial.

Of course, Elliott's prediction didn't pan out. What he meant was that his crystal ball showed him a wild inflation coming because Truman had been spurred by practical politicians into giving the law of supply and demand a chance to reassert itself in this country.

Since shortly after Pearl Harbor, that law had been partially in the discard. The Roosevelt administration had clapped controls on prices to prevent wartime inflation, though it hadn't had the courage to put similar halters on wages and salaries.

After the war, the "great brain" and planned-economy crowd in Washington—Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, etc., etc.—set up a howl that if price controls were called off we'd zoom into a ruinous postwar inflation. So controls were kept, and we zoomed into an inflation anyway.

There was a barrel of money around, but there was less and less to buy.

The situation finally blew its top, and for about 3 months we have been living in a largely free-market, unplanned economy again.

Prices are still high in many categories. Food isn't dirt cheap yet, by a long shot. But neither are we paying Elliott Roosevelt's $15 a loaf for bread. Prices for most items are no longer climbing, and many of them have started down.

Just now, market prices for wheat, corn, oats, and hogs are high. But that is chiefly because the Government is determined to ship large quantities of these foods abroad in the next few months. European crop prospects are growing worse as spring draws near.

PLANS VERSUS NO PLANS

Our own crop prospects, however, are excellent. Therefore, future prices bid by grain and hog speculators are a good deal lower than spot prices. Market analysts assure us that these basic food items are destined for sharp drops later in the year.

Meanwhile, our unplanned, supply-and-demand economy, still groggy though it is from the planners' long bulldozing, is able to ship heavy relief consignments to Europe and eat well itself.

Europe, on the other hand, is more and more of a paradise for planners, from Spanish Fascists through British and French Socialists to Russian and Yugoslav Communists. These babies plan and plan; but they keep coming around to us for things to eat and wear—all the while, of course, damning us as backward and economically illiterate for not adopting one or another of their planned systems.

These facts pretty much write their own editorial. The proper comment, it seems to us, is that when it comes to getting results which people can eat, wear, and warm themselves with, our unplanned economy delivers better than any other system yet invented if given half a chance to do so. Our own home-grown planned-economy fans are lying fairly low at present, having been stunned by the Republican victories in the last elections.

CAN PLANNERS KID US AGAIN?

But just as soon as the slightest recession sets in—as will probably happen sooner or later—they will bounce back with schemes for planning us into endless prosperity.

These people planned us into a meat famine once, and until kicked in the teeth were planning us into chronic shortages of everything except inflated money. Are we going to buy their plans again—ever?

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Washington's birthday address delivered by him at the annual Drew University Alumni Association banquet, Madison, N. J., February 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF JAMES F. BYRNES

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of the proceedings in the Senate of the State of South Carolina, at Columbia, S. C., on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of James F. Byrnes, on February 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN THE REPUBLICAN—ADDRESS BY CLYDE DUFFY

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Lincoln, the Republican," delivered by the Honorable Clyde Duffy, of Devil's Lake, N. Dak., on February 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT BY RUSSIA OF GERMAN ATOMIC SCIENTISTS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch from Goettingen, Germany, relative to employment by Russia of German atomic scientists, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURRENT STATUS OF AVIATION LAW

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Current Status of Aviation Law," a progress report to the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association by the Committee on Aeronautical Law, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION (H. DOC. NO. 145)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a brief message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1368.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair refers the President's message to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

On behalf of himself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Chair now asks unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to implement the President's message.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77), providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, introduced by Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. CONNALLY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered at the last session of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is recognized.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] proposing to strike out in lines 6 and 7 the numerals "31.5" and "24", and to insert in lieu thereof "33.0" and "25.1", respectively, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness; the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent on State business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Legislative Reorganization Act approved by the Seventy-ninth Congress is, in my opinion, one of the outstanding enactments of the last two decades. I say this for a very clear reason. Passage of the Reorganization Act demonstrated that Congress, after nearly 14 years of subservience to New Dealism, inefficiency, and waste of taxpayers' and bondbuyers' funds had wearied of the charge of rubber stamp and had decided to reassert its constitutional control of the

public purse. I, like many of my colleagues, was gratified to note the favorable public reaction to our efforts. For the first time in many years we gave hope to the taxpayer—the housewife, the wage earner, the farmer, and the countless other classes of citizens who had tired of supporting the greatest bureaucracy any nation had ever seen.

But now, Mr. President, I am alarmed. I am fearful that we may have brought forth a mouse. For one reason or another the intent of the act, and particularly of its fiscal provisions, is being confused; and while in the process of confusing its intent, we are fumbling what may well be our last opportunity to return the Federal Government to the path of fiscal sanity—a path foreign to it these many years.

What do I mean by confusion of intent?

The purpose, the intent, the objective, whatever one may wish to call it, of that part of the act having to do with a legislative budget is, to my way of thinking, misunderstood by many of us. In voting for the act, I for one never contemplated any extraneous discussion of budget detail as a prelude to the establishment of a ceiling on expenditures. The absurdity of our attempting, let alone ever accomplishing, any agreement on detail in the short space of time since January 3, when the President submitted his Budget message, is apparent to me. How can we, a body of perhaps 96 divergent opinions, agree on detail in 40 days when the President and a large staff of unified opinion require more than 6 months to pose the detail? And why should this body attempt to usurp the functions of its Appropriations Committee?

Mr. President, I care not about detail at the moment, but I do care about the policy we are to adopt. For policy is our responsibility here today. The policy issue can be stated simply, Are we to have a balanced Federal Budget for the fiscal year 1948 and, if so, by how much? The question is clear, and it deserves a clear answer. Such fundamentals as this should occupy our current attention, not the details of the program involving particular grants and projects. Some may say, "But the Budget already is in balance." To that I reply, "Yes; for the first time in 17 years, but if past records are any criterion it will not long stay in balance." A margin of $202,000,000, or one-half of 1 percent, between revenue and expenditure is entirely inadequate insofar as I am concerned, particularly in the light of the $259,000,000,000 of Federal debt accumulated during the past 17 years. In fact, the margin of its balance, as proposed by the President, would operate the Federal Government for only one and one-half working days. Moreover, all of us appreciate how the President's Budgets grow as the year wears on. In the fiscal year 1947 the original message proposed expenditures of $36,000,000,000. Then in August it was revised upward to $41,000,000,000. Now the fiscal year 1948 Budget indicates that expenditures will total $42,500,000,000 for 1947, or 18 percent more than was originally proposed by the President in his Budget message.

Last Friday we received from the President a message asking that we appropriate $350,000,000 chargeable to the 1945 fiscal budget for foreign relief to be used where UNRRA had been used—I happen to be in sympathy with the objective of that message, for it may bring peace to this earth—but it does indicate how budgets grow and get out of balance. Before that item was recommended the 1947 Budget had been increased 18 percent more than was originally proposed by the President in his Budget message.

Today some in the Senate are fearful that if we fix $6,000,000,000 as the figure by which the President's Budget of expenditures shall be reduced, it will not be possible actually to effectuate a decrease of $6,000,000,000 in expenditures and, therefore, from a political standpoint, it may be inadvisable to take such action. I do not agree with this. Politics should not be considered in connection with this question of policy.

The Budget is said to be in balance. As I previously stated, it is in balance only by the narrow margin of 1½ days' expenditure by the Government. So we must do something to reduce expenses so that we shall really have a balanced budget for 1948.

Mr. President, I believe that a clear-cut determination of policy by Congress that the expenditure ceiling for fiscal 1948 should be $31,500,000,000, as recommended by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, would go a long way toward correcting the fantasy that is now called the budget process. It would allow substantial debt reduction and a readjustment of tax rates, both of which, to my way of thinking, are of the utmost importance at this time.

Some of us are fearful that a ceiling at this level is impractical. I say that if it cannot be done now, to apply the third year after hostilities, it will never be done.

All of us know that the Federal Government's left hand frequently does not know what the right hand is doing. There is shameless duplication, overlapping of functions, and waste of taxpayers' moneys. Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, a reputable Federal official, emphasized this condition when he said:

> Our Government is in a mess. * * * We have developed an extravagant hodgepodge of duplications, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies * * * 75 different bureaus and agencies of the Government that have an important connection with transportation * * * public housing * * * at least 15 different agencies * * * 14 agencies dealing with forestry matters, and no less than 65 gathering statistics * * * 34 different agencies could acquire land * * * one-fifth the entire land area of the United States is owned by the Government. * * *

The legislative budget ceiling is intended to make a beginning toward elimination insofar as possible of this nonsensical waste.

There is growing realization among our citizens that the President's $37,500,000,000 spending proposal is neither fish nor fowl—neither a peacetime transition nor wartime budget. Justification for some of its billions of dollars appears to be based on the possibility of immediate war. Other billions of dollars are proposed on a now-the-war-is-over-we-must-catch-up kind of reasoning. Still other billions of dollars are excused on what seems to be little more foundation than that we have the money—let us spend it.

War, peace, or transition might justify various budgets. Certainly all three cannot be used as justifications for the same budget.

I believe that a Budget of $37,500,000,000 is much too high an assessment against our production capacity in peacetime. It is a charge of nearly 23 percent against national income at the estimated 1946 rate. Added to State and local expenditures, the aggregate Government charge amounts to nearly 30 percent.

In the first year of war, the fiscal year 1942, Federal expenditures were $34,000,000,000. But in 1948, the third year of peace following that war, the Federal Government proposes to spend a sum more than $3,000,000,000 greater. This, I maintain, is an inconsistency that must be justified in full, not only in Congress but to the public as well.

The cost of government in the United States has reached staggering proportions. All State and local government operations actually cost about one-third the cost of the Federal Government. Combined, government cost actually exceeds the Nation's food bill. In other words, it now costs us more to be governed than it does to eat.

Expenditures proposed in the 1948 Federal Budget are approximately one-half greater than the cash income of all farmers from marketing their produce, nearly three times all dividends and interest paid to security owners, and more than twice the combined income of all persons receiving $10,000 a year or more. That is the cost of Government to the taxpayers and the people of America.

Even a budget involving expenditures of $31,500,000,000, which some of my colleagues apparently believe is too low, will be a burdensome charge. It represents nearly $1,000 per family, on the average, in addition to accumulated overhanging debt liability of more than $7,000 per family.

I personally believe that the Budget ceiling might be lower, but I shall not quarrel with $31,500,000,000 as a ceiling limit.

The time-worn question, "Where can we cut?" does not trouble me. My feeling is that we can cut almost everywhere. Take the domestic nonmilitary field, for example. Since 1941, excluding outlays for domestic relief, which is no longer an important budgetary factor, expenditures in the domestic, nonmilitary field have increased $4,500,000,000. This, I believe, is a fertile field for economy.

The Budget predicts a reduction of 301,984 in the average Federal employment by Federal agencies other than Post Office and Government corporations between the fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

Later, I shall say something about Government corporations. The Senator from Michigan is the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having to do with that subject. That is a net figure, however. War and Navy Departments, eight other agen-

cies with direct war-connected responsibilities which are being discontinued, and five smaller Federal agencies, are lopping off 342,755 employees. Remaining Federal agencies are adding more than 40,000 employees to their pay rolls. Thus, the actual fact is that roughly two-thirds of the nonmilitary agencies of the Government have requested personnel increases averaging 10 percent over the previous year, for the fiscal year 1948.

The military and naval sides of the budget have been discussed at length in the press and elsewhere. As I indicated before, it is unfortunate that appropriation detail should cloud Congress' mind in striving to set a fiscal policy for 1948, but since it has happened, I should like to make several comments.

As a member of the Senate War Investigating Committee I have seen countless examples of waste, bad judgment, and inefficiency, all of which inflated spending out of proportion to its actual benefit. I am not ready to be fooled into believing that the malpractices are only wartime mistakes, amplified by the need for speed. Some of them probably exist today, only in different forms.

Mr. President, in America we are forgetting that the great war surpluses which are in warehouses or being sold by the War Assets Administration were in many cases the result of over-buying, and we are thinking now only of the question of their disposition.

It is, in my judgment, improper and in bad taste for the departments and agencies to attempt to influence Congress at this time on policy determination. Such decisions constitutionally reside with Congress, not the spending units of Government.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to comment on the budget sent to Congress covering Government corporations. The Bureau of the Budget asks that we make the following appropriations for five corporations: For the TVA, $27,000,000; Federal Public Housing, $8,300,000; Federal Crop Insurance, $9,300,000; and Inter-American—two corporations—$8,115,000; a total of $52,715,000. But they do not ask direct appropriations. The Federal corporations show that they will disburse $1,310,000,000, an amount which will be borrowed from the United States Treasury. This is really not an appropriation, but is included in the President's budget where he shows the expenditure of $37,500,000,000. It should be there, because that money will be spent; but the Congress is not asked to appropriate it directly. The Government corporations get that money from the sale of bonds under the old Liberty Loan Act. In other words, we sell the bonds, call them what we may, to the public generally, and the money goes into the Treasury. Eighteen dollars and seventy-five cents is paid for a $25 bond, and the RFC and other Government corporations go to the Treasury and borrow the money.

This entire sum will be spent if Congress does nothing about it. If we default and do not pass legislation prohibiting the spending of this sum, these corporations will spend it.

Mr. President, in 1946 these corporations showed assets of $15,624,000,000. In 1947 they had $11,843,000,000; and the budget indicates that in 1948 they will have $12,405,000,000 of assets.

I ask, Why should we not compel them to start to liquidate some of the assets which they are accumulating? Why should they go to the Treasury of the United States and borrow $1,310,000,000 and make it a debt against the United States when they have assets? If they should liquidate their assets and reduce their activities we would not have to appropriate this sum.

I say to the Members of the Senate that if we are diligent and scrutinize the Government corporations' budget as to expenditure we can deduct a billion dollars from the budget. We can compel the corporations to sell a billion dollars' worth of assets to the taxpayers of America who want them. The corporations are doing business. They are not paying taxes upon their income, but they use this method of getting all the money they can on direct appropriations, and then they borrow the balance they wish to use from the funds of the taxpayers and make it a debt against the United States.

Take the Commodity Credit Corporation and the item of $830,000,000. When was that money spent? We talk about keeping faith with the people as to the budget. Mr. President, $800,000,000 of that money was spent in the fiscal year 1946.

Why was it not put in the budget then? Thirty million dollars more of it was spent in 1947. Why is it not put in the budget for this year 1947? It is put in the budget for 1948, because by so doing last year's budget, which has gone up from $36,000,000,000 to $42,500,000,000, can be kept down to the extent of $830,000,000. If that sum were added to it the budget for the current year would be in excess of $43,000,000,000.

For many years the RFC came to Congress and asked for an increase in its borrowing power. No one seemed to know the borrowing power of the RFC. Even Jesse Jones said before Congress that it would take a corps of accountants a long time to figure that out. Then we passed the Control Act, but that act did not require the RFC or other Government corporations to come to Congress and obtain appropriations of the money they spent. We still allow them to borrow from the Treasury of the United States. What we are permitted to do by that act its to give the opportunity to review their budget. If Congress is silent, we give consent. Take the item of $830,000,000 of the Commodity Credit Corporation to which I have referred, and which is now included in the 1948 budget. It is called an impairment of capital whereas it is only a recognition of expenditure made out of borrowing from the United States Treasury. How does the United States Treasury get this money to loan to the RFC and the other corporations? It gets it by the sale of war bonds. The $18.75 the people pay for a $25 bond does not all go to actually fight the war. This is contrary to the spirit of our Constitution. It was intended that money spent by our Government should be obtained through the congressional appropriation process.

The President's Budget shows that the budget expenditures for administrative and personnel purposes by Government corporations and credit agencies are showing a persistent tendency to grow, notwithstanding the reduced scale of operations of most of these corporations and agencies. For example, the Budget shows—page 962, exhibit A:

Actual, 1946	$96,901,513
Estimate, 1947	104,247,558
Estimate, 1948	106,100,332

A detailed examination, corporation by corporation, of the behavior of expenditures for administrative and personnel purposes reveals many situations in which these expenditures are increasing in a seemingly inexplicable and unjustified manner.

For example, the RFC has budgeted a 25 percent increase in 1948, as against 1947; certain corporations do not include, or include only a grossly inadequate account of, administrative and personnel expense; certain corporations which President Truman has recommended be liquidated budget an increase in administrative expense in 1948 as compared with 1947; some corporations which President Truman has announced are already in process of liquidation, such as the Institute for Inter-American Affairs, budget an increase in expenditures for administrative and/or personnel purposes in 1948, as compared with 1947. One corporation, Prencinradio, which the President has announced was in process of liquidation, budgets an administrative expense of $8,850 (an increase as against 1947) that is incurred to administer a radio program budgeted at only $12,637. Mr. President, why should the Federal Government continue to operate one of these corporations which was supposed to be liquidated? Its function was to broadcast to South America during the war. Why should it remain in existence in 1948, almost 3 years after the close of the war, and why should it require administrators whose compensation must continue to be paid? Even where this class of expenditure shows a decline in 1948 as against 1947, it very seldom drops to the level of 1946.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of some of the corporations with respect to which the amounts budgeted for administrative or personnel purposes seem open to question or show increases.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Export-Import Bank: Increase one-tenth in 1948 to $892,200 (schedule B-1, p. 975) including a $69,000 jump in personnel (schedule B-2, p. 976).

Panama Railroad Company: Increase capacity $500,000 in 1948 (schedule B-4, p. 995).

RFC: Increase 25 percent in 1948 to $45,204,000 (schedule B-2, p. 1060).

TVA associated corporations: Does not show administrative expenses; not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for administration.

TVA: All personnel services increase from $38,605,603 to $38,836,958 (schedule D–1, p. 1023).

Federal National Mortgage Association: Nearly double in 1948 (schedule B–1, p. 1075).

United States Commercial Corporation: Up from $1,940,000 to $2,104,000 (schedule B–2, p. 1087).

Federal Home Loan Bank System: All personnel services, net increase from $1,293,315 to $1,479,805 (p. 1099); administration increases from $203,751 to $228,344 (p. 1100).

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Total administration up from $532,000 to $670,000, including a jump in personnel services from $381,727 to $424,111 (schedule B–1, p. 1109).

Federal Housing Administration: Total administration goes up nearly $4,000,000, including a jump of nearly $3,000,000 in personnel services net (p. 1127).

Federal Public Housing Authority: Administrative and personnel services fall, but only to level of 1946 (schedules A and A–1, pp. 1187 and 1190).

Inland Waterways Corporation: Administrative and personnel expenses shrink very little (schedules B–2, B–3, B–4, pp. 1281, 1282).

Warrior River Terminal Company: Administrative and personnel services do not decrease at all in 1948 although President Truman recommended liquidation of Company (schedules B–3 and B–4, p. 1290).

Virgin Islands Company: Personnel services increase $47,000, although President Truman recommended liquidation of the Company (schedules B–4, B–5, p. 1302).

Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Administrative expense and personnel services increase, although President Truman announced it was in liquidation (schedules B–1 and B–2, pp. 1315–1316).

Inter-American Educational Foundation Inc.: Both the administrative and the personnel expense increase in 1948 (schedules B–1 and B–2, p. 1329), although the proposed expenditure for programs in 1948 shrinks by more than one-fourth (exhibit B, p. 1327).

Prencinradio, Inc.: Administrative and personnel expenses increase in 1948 to a total of $8,850, although the only activity indicated for that year is a radio program to cost $12,637, notwithstanding the fact that President Truman announced the corporation was already in process of liquidation (exhibit A, p. 1339).

Commodity Credit Corporation: Personnel services shrink as compared with 1947 but remain more than $1,000,000 above 1946 (schedule B–3, p. 1213–14) and the same is true as regard administrative expenses (schedule B–2, p. 1213), although the total of funds utilized will be one-third less than in 1946, and $830,380,811 of these funds will be furnished by the Treasury's cancellation of the Corporation's notes in this amount (exhibit A, p. 1204).

Federal Crop Insurance program: Total administrative expenses is roughly one-third higher than in 1947 and nearly double what it was in 1946, and total personnel expenses increase in the same amounts (schedule B–2, p. 1229), all of which to be provided by appropriation (amount involved $9,330,000).

Regional Agricultural Corporation of Washington: Personnel services increase slightly in 1948 (schedule B–2, p. 1272), although total administrative decreases (schedule B–1, p. 1272), and notwithstanding fact funds applied (exhibit A, p. 1268) are only two-thirds what they were in 1947.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss some of the items which appear in the list to which I have just referred, and for the RECORD I shall indicate some of the administrative expenses which show increases. I shall not now read all of them, because that would involve too much detail. As I said earlier, I do not care so much about giving many details, but I wish to mention a few details concerning some of the Government corporations. I shall mention one in particular because the Senator from Michigan happens to be the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with it, and I wish to point out where I believe money can be saved in that particular budget.

At the present time there is no real mechanism for liquidating Government corporations.

The record of Government corporations placed in liquidation, which extends back to the First World War, shows that procedures that have been and are currently employed are unconscionably slow, inefficient, and expensive. I cite just one corporation, the United States Spruce Production Corporation, organized August 20, 1918. Its function was the production and allocation of aircraft lumber to the United States and its Allies. On June 28, 1920, suit for dissolution of the Corporation was filed in the Superior Court of Washington State. However, the final dissolution of the Corporation was not entered until December 12, 1946. In 1947, Congress allowed a $10,000 item in the appropriation bill for the purpose of winding up that Corporation. That was used the first part of the year.

Mr. President, the Corporation has not yet been wound up, but it has finally been turned over to the War Department. After some difficulty I have obtained the figures which I shall state at this time though they are not entirely complete, and therefore I shall have to do some estimating.

The operating expenses of the United States Spruce Production Corporation for the fiscal years 1945 and 1946 were as follows:

1945	$20,696.33
1946	20,793.47
Total	41,489.80
1942	20,299.38
1943	19,995.46
1944	20,522.01
Complete total	102,306.65

Since the Corporation has been engaged in liquidation since 1923, for a period of 24 years, it may be assumed that the operating expenses for the entire period from 1923 to 1946 were $496,712, using expenses for the year ended June 30, 1945, as typical of the preceding years. We do not have the exact expenses for each year prior to 1942.

Congress has enacted a law which provides that all these corporations must end by June 30, 1948. But if the illustration I have just given is an example, as I believe it to be, of what is likely to happen, we shall discover that in the future these corporations will be continuing and will be making the same kinds of expenditures as those they are making today. The law will not be effective unless we act. That is why I have brought these details to the attention of the Senate.

Let me give another example. An item for the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation appears at page 309 of the Government Corporation Budget Estimates, 1946 and 1947, Seventy-ninth Congress. I cite this simply to show what happens even though some persons may say that the amounts involved are "merely peanuts," for when we examine the details and make a total of the "peanuts" that are being distributed over the United States, we find that they amount to billions of dollars. What are the facts with respect to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation? According to last year's budget—1947—its assets were as follows: One Government agency owed it $131, and others than Government owed it $136. Those items are not in thousands of dollars or in millions of dollars, but they are simply $131 and $136, making a total of assets receivable of $267, and these are all the Corporation's assets according to the Budget. Mr. President, do you know what that Corporation asked the people of the United States to appropriate in order to wind up that business and to collect the $267? Some may classify it as peanuts, but the Budget Bureau asked the Congress to appropriate $40,000 for personnel and administrative expense to collect $267. Schedule B3, 1947 Budget, showed a request for personnel services of 1 liquidating officer at $6,230 per year and 11 other employees. That is why I stand on this floor today and say something about bureaucracy and Government corporations for whose appropriations the Congress is made responsible by the Constitution. It is time we become responsible for spending in America. That is why I said in the beginning of my remarks that for two decades there has not been brought to the consciousness of the Senate and the House of Representatives a more important act than the Legislative Reorganization Act. We have a constitutional responsibility to work on this budget, and I have no doubt that in due time we will go to work on it in the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate.

In the 1948 fiscal budget Prencinradio, Inc., a Government corporation, certificate of dissolution was filed, secretary of state, Delaware, May 14, 1946, yet this year 1948 Budget shows its only business will be a radio program, $12,637, and it asks an appropriation of $8,850 to operate.

Military and naval estimates of appropriations and expenditures are guesses at best; their tendency is to err on the high side. By no means are they a precise measurement of the minimum or maximum amounts of funds necessary to finance security. No less an authority than Admiral Nimitz clearly indicated this fact when he stated before an appropriations subcommittee last year:

> No naval or military man is ever satisfied with what is made available, and again I must say very frankly that it is a guess as to what is adequate.

Again I must say very frankly that it is a guess as to what is adequate. I recognize clearly the need for an alert Army and Navy. Although I am opposed to promiscuous reductions in the service appropriations, I believe that substantial economies can be achieved without im-

pairing either the efficiency of the services or the security of the Nation.

Mr. President, it appears to me that in connection with the question of fixing the budget the proverbial red herring is being drawn across the trail. It is being said on the floor of the Senate and all over America that we intend to cut down the American Army and the American Navy. I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who would vote consciously—certainly all Members of the Senate will have the facts, and be conscious of what they are doing—to cut down the real efficiency of the American Army and the American Navy. We must first know that real peace is here to stay before we cut them down. But I think it is unfair to the people to say nothing about any of the expenditures except those of the Army and the Navy, and seek to make them believe that we in Congress want to cut down the effectiveness of the Army and Navy of the United States.

No nation on the face of the globe should take what I say here today as an indication that those who believe in a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget do not stand for a really efficient Army and Navy, which can take their places in the uncertain world in which we live. No nation should draw such a conclusion, because it is not justified.

Our defense establishment proposes to spend $6,790 per man per annum during 1948. This is only slightly lower than the expenditure of $6,960 per annum per man during fiscal year 1945, when we were engaged in an all-out war. Considering the vast stores of equipment and supplies which remain available to the services, Congress would be remiss in its duty to the Nation if it did not question Army and Navy budget estimates.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate the War Assets Administration, from the meager investigation I have made it appears there is surplus property worth billions of dollars declared surplus by the Army and Navy. I also find, after the Army and Navy declares property surplus, they revoke the declaration and the property is returned to the Army or Navy. This should reduce the amount of appropriations for the Army and Navy.

I have been unable to get the exact figures showing what the War Assets Administration has sold, the proceeds of which it has turned into the Treasury of the United States, but that certainly should be applied on the debt, so that we can reduce interest charges on the debt and taxes.

It is believed that a measure providing for unification of the armed services will probably pass in this Congress, yet no one has mentioned that item. It should cut the expenditures of our national defense, if we are to take the testimony of General Eisenhower. In testifying before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, he said:

Comparing the two opposing plans—

He was speaking about unification—

Comparing the two opposing plans, I should say you could develop a more efficient fighting force with unification, with 75 percent of the men that you would have if you had separate forces.

"Seventy-five percent of the men," he said. What a reduction that would mean in the expenditures; yes, and in the sacrifice of lives by the American people.

In reply to a question by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asking if he could give a reasonable guess as to the expenditures we might have saved during the past war had we had a unified Military Establishment, Secretary Patterson said, "No, except it ran into billions of dollars." It would run into billions of dollars. General Marshall agreed with Secretary Patterson.

The President of the United States spoke about unification, and what a saving we might effect through unification. But nothing is said about it in the Budget. No one is mentioning that.

In his state of the Union message to Congress on January 6, 1947, the President referred to the unification as "the one certain way by which we can cut costs and at the same time enhance our national security."

No Member of Congress desires to cripple our national security. I maintain, however, that effective security and efficiency of Government is not merely a matter of absolute spending totals. Dollars themselves are not security, but their wise use is. In suggesting a ceiling of $31,500,000,000, I am hoping we can compel the prudent administration and effective direction of tax moneys to essential projects.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. I hope order will be maintained both on the floor of the Senate and in the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). The Senate will be in order, and the occupants of the galleries will refrain from conversation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I would not expect the galleries to be in order, for most of the occupants, I perceive, are from the departments which seriously object to the Senate reducing expenditures by $6,000,000,000. But the people back home are not going to be silent about this reduction, or, for that matter, the people of the whole world, because on our solvency in America will depend the path on which the world will move in the future. A part of my statement consists of figures, and while some Government departments may not be interested, and may not want to hear what I say today; and while I know that politically this is not the appropriate thing to say to those who want to spend, and to those who have been living upon the taxpayers of America, and who have caused the spending of as much money for Government as the people have been spending for food; yet all the people, in their sober moments, even those who are employed in government, will some day be interested in the solvency of the United States of America.

In our Nation's history we have reached a crisis where clear thinking, free from partisanship or bitterness, must be used if we are to emerge a solvent oasis in a world of bankruptcy. If we are to help stabilize an unstable world, we must build a sane, solvent economy founded upon our imperative needs and our actual resources.

Having established our need and having evaluated our assets, it becomes our duty to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare of our people and thereby secure the blessings of liberty. We must have a sound, efficient economic base upon which we can operate nationally and internationally. Certainly I shall not vote to jeopardize our national security but I shall vote to cut down the unnecessary duplications of bureaus and senseless spending of millions of dollars for purely political purposes. I shall vote to retain the essentials, and I shall vote to do away with waste and extravagance such as has been pointed out repeatedly in the Senate and House hearings, instances of which I have seen as a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator made a comment on a matter about which I feel very strongly. He states that he would not vote to jeopardize our national defense—and, of course, he would not, as everyone who knows the Senator must be aware—but I want to emphasize again that the strongest bulwark of our national defense is national solvency, and I say to every Member of the Senate that if 5 years or 10 years from now, when other nations may be wanting to attack us, we have failed to achieve national solvency, and are at war amongst ourselves, the United States of America as we have known it heretofore will be a thing of the past.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, because I believe what he has said to be a true statement of fact that cannot be disputed.

If the Nation remains sound and strong, with an efficient Army and an efficient Navy, we can increase our strength and go into battle against any nation or nations, but if the Nation becomes insolvent, if its assets become dissipated, then we shall be unable to defend ourselves. No nation can survive or help the rest of the world to recover, when its people are taxed beyond the level where initiative is killed and only existence or survival remains. When the Government takes a third of its citizens' income, the result is hardship, dissatisfaction, and demand for a change. The only excuse for taking that amount of money is when the Nation is actually at war or is immediately facing a war.

Therefore, essentials must be recognized and must be guaranteed and nonessentials must be equally recognized and just as definitely must go. It is imperative that we remain strong if we are to help the rest of the world in its struggle back to peace and prosperity.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I firmly believe that the United States is at the fiscal crossroads. Which road the Nation follows will determine its internal strength for years to come. The choice

is up to Congress in its decision on the legislative budget. If the road to easy, unchecked Federal spending is accepted, our national substance may be so weakened as to leave us easy prey to internal emergency or external foe. If the more difficult road is followed, and the legislative budget ceiling of $31,500,000,000 approved, we will retain for real emergency the fiscal substance upon which our strength must rely.

NOTICE OF NIGHT SESSIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, last week the Republican policy committee, with the approval of the Republican conference, decided that the Senate should be asked, rather than to meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays, to meet Monday and Wednesday evenings. I told the conference at that time that we would give 2 weeks' notice before any such schedule went into effect. I now am compelled to give such notice. We intend to ask the Senate to meet on Monday and Wednesday evenings beginning 2 weeks from tonight, which will be March 10.

The new schedule is an experiment; we do not know how it will work. The proposal is to continue in session until perhaps half-past 5 and then recess until 7 o'clock, so as to give everyone an opportunity to have supper downstairs and then to sit from 7 to 10, perhaps, on Monday and Wednesday evenings, in order that on Tuesdays and Thursdays there may be more time for committees to meet and do their work, and also in the hope that we may have better attendance and perhaps accomplish more work at the evening sessions than is ordinarily possible during the day.

If the schedule does not work satisfactorily, we shall have to adopt some other plan; but the notice is in accordance with the present plan of the majority policy committee.

I may say, as to the schedule, Mr. President, that we now have on the calendar for consideration after the completion of the pending business the joint resolution limiting the President's tenure to two 4-year terms. The portal-to-portal pay bill has been reported in today, and the question of the confirmation of the Lilienthal nomination will be ready next week. So it looks as if from now on we shall have to run rather long sessions in order to complete the business of the Senate.

By the time the matters to which I have referred are completed we expect to have a major labor bill ready, and important foreign-relations matters and treaties will also come before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, Does the announcement mean that we shall also meet on Fridays?

Mr. TAFT. We shall meet on Fridays, but not on Friday evenings. The purpose is to try evening sessions only on Mondays and Wednesdays.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator has found himself getting behind, and he wants to catch up on the work, is that it?

Mr. TAFT. The only trouble is that Friday evening is the beginning of the week end, and I thought it would be inconvenient for many of the Senators to remain for sessions Friday evenings. If we cannot do it in this way, we shall have to begin to meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays also, but we thought we would try it and see how this plan would work.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

Mr. CAIN. To my mind, Mr. President, there are things yet to be said about our budget-reduction problem which have not been said before.

Ninety percent of what we have listened to has revolved around our national security. Some would have us believe that merely to look at Army and Navy budgets is somehow to hold them in peril. I wonder how many people, including Senators, really believe this to be so.

What about the required needs of the Nation's armed services? Are they properly provided for in the President's Budget? Should they have less or must they have more than the requested $11,500,000,000? Like many a Senator and Representative, I do not know, but I do know men and budget estimates and the record, and knowing these things in a general way I am convinced that as they apply to the armed services they must be examined and questioned and reexamined with a preciseness and thoroughness not in evidence for many years. To question and to doubt any requested budget item is not to doubt either the integrity or sincerity of the branch having jurisdiction over the item. In taking for granted that economies can be made which will not hinder or injure the several missions which the Congress has given to the armed services, the Appropriations Committees of House and Senate will render a true and substantial service to the armed services and to the Nation.

I have a clear right to voice a positive objection, and I do, to the logic used by some Members on both sides of the aisle who appear to want the Nation to believe that a vote in favor of the $6,000,000,000 cut proposal is a vote in support of a turn-back to isolation, and a threat to our national security. That I think a majority of our citizens everywhere will take no such view is an understatement. These citizens, Americans all, want the armed services to have what they clearly need and nothing more. There is nothing unfair or unreasonable in this average American position, and I know of no first-rate military or naval leader who thinks otherwise.

It is not for me to say what cuts, substantial or small, can be made with safety in the submitted budgets of the armed services. Were I to listen solely to those who dissent on this floor I would obviously conclude that no cuts are possible. But those who dissent the more vehemently and at greatest length have not even admitted or recognized possible large-scale savings which could come from eliminating duplicating supply lines, facilities, and services. If the services are to be integrated is it not about time that this very considerable task was undertaken? We should not talk about taking needed monies away from the services until we are further convinced that the services are doing all they humanly can to make every dollar of present appropriations go as far as it can.

I wonder if every precious dollar is presently serving a useful purpose. Many years ago the Congress decided that special compensation should be granted to officers of the Army and Navy who had something to do with airplanes. This was known as flight pay and there was a sound reason why it came into being. Airplanes were new. Riding around in them constituted a painful duty and hazardous occupation, and the services thought the offer of a premium would attract the personnel required. All of this was years ago, but unless the prevailing policy is changed, flight pay will go on forever. Perhaps it is proper today to pay a premium for doing something which has become a national habit—for doing something which is no longer unusual or hazardous. My own feeling is that flight pay, like many another practice, has outworn its usefulness and ought to be done away with. Not only would dollars in surprising amounts be saved but to eliminate flight pay would be to recognize that special privilege is no more required in the Army and Navy than in any other walk of life. I wonder what the budget-cut dissenters think about flight pay. It represents a sizable sum of some millions of dollars; a sum unnecessary to expend for this purpose; a sum which could be used to far greater purpose somewhere else.

The Senators who favor the $6,000,000,000 cut are looking for reductions which will not curtail service. The merger and flight pay are but two examples. I hope the Appropriations Committees will find more, and I defy any other Senator to prove that I have less respect and admiration than does he for the fighting qualities of the armed services and their magnificent leadership. In doubting their stated dollar needs, I am willing to provide what they prove in due time they must have.

Like every other freshman Senator, I had nothing to do with the Reorganization Act, but I have already, as an American, learned to be grateful for its existence. If it were not for the Reorganization Act, we would not now be debating the difference between a cut of $4,500,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 in the President's proposed Budget of $37,500,000,000. We should, I think, if the Reorganization Act did not make it otherwise, be sitting here in the midst of a land of make-believe. We should be leaving reality up to others. The Reorganization Act, which requires a legislative budget, has forced the Senate to consider America's financial future. The legislative budget permits and encourages us to determine if we want to bankrupt America or to move as rapidly as we can in the direction of financial security, sanity, and solvency. If it were not for the legislative-budget requirement, we would be leaving America's future financial policy up to com-

mittees of the House and Senate; we should be ignoring a responsibility which belongs, and ought to belong, to us.

I am grateful, moreover, to those who recommended to the Senate a budget cut of $6,000,000,000. That such a figure is concretely attainable, I do not know and I do not particularly care. That it cannot be too far away from what can be accomplished is certain because of the men, both Senators and Representatives, who have said that the figure, from their point of view, is reasonable and possible, and because of what others, not members of the Legislative Budget Committee, have pointed out and said.

What I do have a conviction about is this: If the committee had not recommended $6,000,000,000, we would not be arguing over a compromise figure of $4,500,000,000. If those of us who want six billion get one and one-half billion less than what we want, we are actually going to live well within our income for the first time in years. This in itself would be a tremendous achievement, and it might turn out to be more because the conference between the Senate and the House will compromise whatever dollar differences they have.

I shall vote for the $6,000,000,000 cut for several reasons. I shall vote for it:

(a) Because Senators and Representatives whom I respect have said that it can be accomplished without injury to the national welfare.

(b) Because I am satisfied that if we knew how to do it, and I frankly am satisfied we do not at this time, we could cut the Budget $10,000,000,000 without injury to anyone.

(c) Because I assume, and for very valid reasons, that the President guarded against a sizable cut by fashioning his budgets accordingly.

(d) Because I want to join with others in declaring unrelenting war on paternalistic big government, on deficit financing, on tragic extravagance, on bureaucracy, on doing for States and municipalities what they ought to and must again do for themselves.

(e) Because I recognize a vast dollar difference between what government must have to be effective and what it naturally enough, because of its paternalistic character, wants in order to accomplish its myriad purposes.

(f) Because I feel no real or solid assurance that our present high level of national income will long continue.

(g) Because I conceive the national debt to be an obligation and not the figment of somebody's imagination. It must be retired or repudiated. Over the long pull there is no middle course. It is freedom on the one hand and feudalism on the other.

(h) Because tax burdens, if long continued, will further destroy our American enthusiasm and need for incentive without which we should become as helpless and futile as other peoples have become who struggled only for the state.

(i) Because I see no reason for apology or embarrassment should we fail in the attainment of a $6,000,000,000 goal.

There is an honest difference of opinion between those of us who seek the four and one-half billion and those who favor the $6,000,000,000. There is no quarrel between us, for we argue only about degree. Both sides wish to repudiate New Dealism in its every sordid financial aspect. We seek to release the American people from a tax burden and Federal-debt dictatorship. We hope to help them understand the incredible fallacy which is ever present in the premise America has followed in recent years that an individual, a group, a city or a State can get something for nothing. If our present Congress could do this and this alone, it would go down in history as having made a real contribution to the march of progress, and to the development of society.

But all Senators and Representatives are not impressed with the imperative need for Federal retrenchments. They say they have no information as to how the proposed cuts can be made. They insist on being shown, but they will not look for themselves. They cry to high heaven that we budget cutters want to destroy the national security, but they do not suggest nor do they even admit that in practically every field of Federal endeavor, financial madness and foolish extravagance have been in the saddle for a good many recent years gone by. In my American eyes these gentlemen are recognized for what they stand for, and I shall fight to stay here long enough to see them eliminated one by one.

Whether we cut four and one-half or six billion dollars from the budget the task will not be easy. The American people have been trained to expect gratuities from the Great White Father and from the Congress. Blank-check legislation has helped to make this true. No one denies that such is the fact. The people have been taught that there is no point in waiting until tomorrow to get what they want when they can get it today. But I think those very same people will listen to reason, that they will understand, that they will appreciate the need for economy—provided we define the issue and let it be known that all regions and areas are expected to make the same kind of sacrifices. I lay particular stress on the need for an equality of sacrifice because I am a western Senator and as such I have a greater selfish interest in continuing Federal expenditures than do most Senators. The West is a going and a growing concern. Its destiny continues to lie beyond the horizon. Billions of dollars can be invested out there and there will long be a need for billions more. Were I a Senator only from my State of Washington I might care little for the state of the Nation or for the rights and needs of others. I might only insist on getting more and more from the Federal trough. But no Senator belongs to his State or his section alone. He belongs to the Union as well, and for that Union of 48 States he must likewise, as for his own State, work and persevere and dream. If in being a Senator from Washington State I got for that State everything it wanted, but in getting things it could get along without at this time, I helped, along with other Senators who were doing the same thing, to bring financial ruin and a valueless dollar to the Nation of which all States are a blessed part, I should have done my State no favor; I should have betrayed my public trust.

Mr. President, the soundness of the American dollar is a prize and goal worth fighting for. The dollar is worth only what it will purchase. That it buys so little today is no compliment to the Congress of the United States. In joining with other Senators who support the proposed $6,000,000,000 budget cut I give evidence of my individual faith in the willingness of the American people to make sacrifices today which will retain for our tomorrows a free and solvent opportunity for all.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few minutes.

During the hearings which have been in progress for the past few weeks before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal, who has been appointed as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, a great many things have been proved. A great deal of comment has been provoked by columnists, newspaper editors, and others. I wish to read at this time a comment by Mr. Harold Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, February 21. The article is entitled "Man to Man. Lilienthal's Monopoly of All Virtues Leaves Commentator a Little Queasy." Mr. Ickes said:

MAN TO MAN—LILIENTHAL'S MONOPOLY OF ALL VIRTUES LEAVES COMMENTATOR A LITTLE QUEASY

(By Harold L. Ickes)

The attacks of Senator MCKELLAR on David E. Lilienthal have been reckless and intemperate. No one believes, probably not even the Senator himself, that Mr. Lilienthal ever has been a Communist or possessed of sympathies for communism. And yet while we may be impressed with the injustice of the attacks on Mr. Lilienthal, we are entitled to feel a little queasy about the extremes to which his devotees have gone, although, of course, it may really be true that Mr. Lilienthal is a citizen whose loftiness of soul, whose exclusively unique abilities, and whose noble characteristics can be compared to the greatest in the pages of American history only to the disadvantage of the latter.

Perhaps Senator MCKELLAR is a black political devil, with never a redeeming quality, but he has made our choice easy for us by taking the pastel shadings out of our political life. We like an issue to be black or white; a man either devil or angel. We insist on being on the side of the angels, and since Senator MCKELLAR is a devil, Mr. Lilienthal is necessarily an angel.

MORE FUEL ON THE PYRE

Many of our newspapers, exercising their freedom to be above discrimination, day by day throw more fuel on the pyre around the poor old man from Tennessee, depending on spontaneous combustion to supply the flash of consuming flame. At the same time, they exalt ever higher the white-robed figure of David Lilienthal, with lyre in hand and eyes straining upward. The man who does not accept Mr. Lilienthal as the indispensable man (at long last) necessarily believes in Army control of atomic energy, betrays the cause of liberalism, seeks to destroy our democracy, and wants to share the secret of the atom with Russia.

I hope that Mr. Lilienthal, who admittedly has a monopoly on practically all of the

virtues, is not as good and as pure as this hysteria would have us believe. I hope that the Senate will quickly resolve this issue. I do not feel comfortable living on the same earth with a man who is conscious that he possesses all of the virtues and not a single fault. I am ill at ease in the presence of this radiant and transcendent human being, who, if he could permit himself to boast, would acknowledge all of the spiritual qualities that have been generated from Thomas à Kempis to Aimee Semple McPherson.

One columnist compares him to the late Louis Brandeis and Charles Evans Hughes. Others represent him as being a composite of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln. If he bears any resemblance to Franklin D. Roosevelt, that would be a top military secret because of those Senators who still hate that man. However, we do not need Franklin D. Roosevelt as a yardstick. We still have a long list to draw on for a proper setting for our hero, even although they may not be worthy to tie the laces of his shoes. Are there not Peter the Hermit, Jeanne d'Arc, Lorenzo the Magnificent, and Big Bill the Builder?

FLAG IN THE STRATOSPHERE

If it were permitted to pursue Mr. Lilienthal into the stratosphere, where he exhales the purest of oxygen, we would undoubtedly find him, as usual, wrapping himself up in the TVA, the flag, or democracy. No one except Senator MCKELLAR (exclamation point!) would be so base as to deny that Mr. Lilienthal is a knight in shining armor, who would disdain any thought except on behalf of the people; or to question that he is the only symbol that we have of international cooperation, and that the early doom of our democracy and civilization is in the cards, if Mr. Lilienthal is not given the job that he did his damnedest to avoid by pulling every wire to get. If it were true as basely charged that, despite his ability, he is predisposed to intrigue, is given to ruthlessness, and, at times, is not too scrupulous in promoting his personal ambitions, this is not to his discredit. After all Mr. Lilienthal is Mr. Lilienthal, while Senator MCKELLAR is just Senator MCKELLAR.

Some time ago, when Senator MCKELLAR wasn't looking, Mr. Lilienthal smote a rock and brought forth a book called Democracy at Work, which was a paen of praise of the works of the TVA and, of course, of Mr. Lilienthal. In it he describes how the TVA has improved the land by teaching the farmers soil erosion control methods and the like. He states proudly that the farmers of the area were induced to accept these better methods by gifts of free fertilizer. This is the system that he hails as democracy. Only the hypercritical would suggest that paying some one to do something is a poor description of democracy. Just so, "Hinky Dink" Kenna, who used to slip the human derelicts in Chicago's first ward a dollar on election day to vote his ticket, was knee deep in democracy.

Mr. Lilienthal doubtless believes implicitly in his eloquent words on democracy of which he delivered himself so glibly (considering that they were supposed to be extemporaneous), but he knows how selfless he is and how superbly equipped to serve the people, even in spite of themselves.

As for me, I am going to listen to the voice of God, as filtered through the newspapers, and be on the side of Mr. Lilienthal. I want him to remember me when he hands out free samples of atomic power.

Mr. President, I desire to read a few selected portions of the record which has been made in the hearings, to which I referred at the outset, before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, during which time consideration was given to making a report upon Mr. Lilienthal's appointment as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I first want to call attention to the examination of a witness from Chicago, a lady who was at one time Mr. Lilienthal's secretary when he was privately and otherwise employed in that locality. One of the principal purposes of calling attention to this testimony is to point out the fact that Mr. Lilienthal held a public position in the State of Wisconsin by appointment of the Governor. He held a membership on the Utilities Commission of the State of Wisconsin; and, in defiance of law and contrary to the statute of Wisconsin, he held other employment. That condition continued for more than a year—or possibly a year and a half, or 2 years he held two positions in violation of the plain provisions of the laws of the State of Wisconsin.

I want to read the testimony of Mrs. Meads Duncan Leitzell, who resides at 1520 North La Salle Street, Chicago. Her testimony was taken before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on February 19 last, and it appears in volume 16, pages 1398 to 1409. She was examined by the chairman of the committee, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your name, please?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Meads Duncan Leitzell.

The CHAIRMAN. And where do you live, Mrs. Leitzell?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I live in Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your occupation now?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I am a housewife.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time a subpena for you was suggested, or some time after that I was given a memorandum as to the line of testimony that you were desired to give, and it apparently is not in the file that I brought down this morning. But, as I recall it you were, at one time, employed by Mr. Lilienthal.

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was that, and in what capacity?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I have a statement if you would like me to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. If that will answer the purpose, you may proceed. That may have been what I was handed.

Mrs. LEITZELL. This is a carbon of that statement. Would you like me to read it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; proceed in any way you want to. I am not certain what the line of examination is which I should follow here.

Mrs. LEITZELL. My name is Meads Duncan Leitzell. I am a housewife and live with my husband and three children at 1520 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

I was born in St. Joseph, Mo., on April 7, 1904.

My husband was transferred to Chicago from St. Joseph in January 1928, where I joined him a few weeks later. I then secured a position as stenographer with Commerce Clearing House, in the Continental-Illinois Bank Building.

At that time, Mr. David E. Lilienthal was employed by Commerce Clearing House as editor of "Public Utilities and Carriers' Service," and used to send his material to CCH office.

That name is in quotation marks, and I assume it is a pamphlet or magazine of some kind issued periodically.

Part of my work was to type material that came in from him.

Mr. Lilienthal's office at first was in the same building with the Commerce Clearing House, but later he took an office in the Straus Building.

While at the Straus Building, his secretary stopped working for him and he asked me to become his secretary. I went to work then in his office in the Straus Building.

During the time I worked in the Commerce Clearing House office, I was paid by them, but after I went to the Straus Building, I was paid by Mr. Lilienthal, always by check.

In the Straus Building office, in addition to Mr. Lilienthal and myself, Harry Booth also worked for Mr. Lilienthal in connection with the preparation of the Public Utilities and Carriers' Service.

The Public Utilities and Carriers' Service was a legal publication service dealing with court decisions and legislative bills of interest to utilities and carriers. I don't know what the cost of the service was, but it was considered more expensive than other publications of the Commerce Clearing House.

Mr. Lilienthal paid Harry Booth, me, and later Joseph Swidler, by check.

The CHAIRMAN. Who?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Mr. Lilienthal paid Harry Booth and me, and later, Joseph Swidler, by check.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether he is the same Joseph Swidler that has been with TVA?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes. I know that he was paid by Commerce Clearing House, and understand that this arrangement with Commerce Clearing House was by formal contract.

I don't recall the date, but Mr. Lilienthal moved from the Straus Building to an office at 1 North La Salle Street. This was, however, before he was appointed to the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, which is now called the Public Service Commission.

After moving to 1 North La Salle Street, Joseph Swidler came into the office and worked for Mr. Lilienthal. There had been two private offices in the Straus Building office.

There were three private offices in the 1 North La Salle Street office.

After moving into the 1 North La Salle Street office, I continued to act as Mr. Lilienthal's secretary. In that capacity, I prepared manuscripts for the Public Utilities and Carriers' Service.

I handled such correspondence as was necessary. Mr. Lilienthal often wrote his notes and material in shorthand. I could read and transcribe his shorthand notes.

I handled his checkbook, preparing checks for payment of myself, Booth, and Swidler, and for office expenses, such as telephone bills and rent.

I checked his monthly bank statements against the stubs in his checkbook, which was kept in the office.

Early in 1931, Mr. Lilienthal was appointed to the Wisconsin commission and went to Madison.

He continued to maintain his office at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago. He continued to pay the office rent. He continued to pay me. He continued to pay Mr. Booth and Mr. Swidler.

He handled these checks in one of two ways: Either he would come into the office and sign the checks or I would mail them to him in Madison for signature.

After his appointment to the Wisconsin commission, Mr. Lilienthal told me to tell anybody who asked for him that the office was no longer his. I followed his instructions.

If I couldn't cope with any situation that came up, I turned it over to Mr. Booth or Mr. Swidler.

I continued to work for Mr. Lilienthal under these conditions through and beyond the summer of 1932. I remember the date, because in the summer of 1932, my husband went on a camping trip and I returned

to work for Mr. Lilienthal after coming back from that trip.

I know that I was no longer working for him in the summer of 1933. My husband and I had planned another camping trip that year, but just before we started, the luggage compartment of our car fell on my thumb, forcing its amputation. I will never forget that year.

I worked for Mr. Lilienthal after the 1932 camping trip, but I do not remember the exact date when I stopped working for him. But it was before the 1933 accident to my hand.

During the entire period I worked for Mr. Lilienthal, he was always courteous and considerate as an employer.

A number of years have elapsed since my employment by Mr. Lilienthal, but I believe the principal facts stated can be confirmed by records.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Leitzell, that is not the memorandum that I had been given. I had never seen your statement before. I was given a short memorandum of your testimony. I think the point that was emphasized in this statement, as I say, that was given to me, either at the time of or after your subpena, I forget which, was something questioning the conduct of Mr. Lilienthal in connection with his receiving compensation from the Commerce Clearing House Association while he was holding the position as a member of the Wisconsin State Power Commission. Do you know anything about that?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I do not quite understand.

The CHAIRMAN. I said the suggestion was made that the point of your testimony would be that Mr. Lilienthal was receiving pay, or income, or compensation for his services in connection with the Commerce Clearing House activities while he was a member of the Wisconsin State Utilities Commission.

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, as I say here in my statement he did receive checks from the Commerce Clearing House during that time, and I was paid by him. You see, he went to the commission in 1931, and I was still working for him through the summer of 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, I see. Now, as I recall it, a question was raised that as an employee of the Wisconsin State body there, he was prohibited under the Wisconsin law and the obligations of his job from accepting compensation from other employment any place else. Did you know anything about that?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I didn't at the time. I know now, that that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. And how long did this compensation from the Clearing House continue, so far as you know?

Mrs. LEITZELL. So far as I know, as long as I worked there. Whether it continued later, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Your employment ended prior to your vacation in the summer of 1933? Is that correct?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it continued into the spring of 1933?

Mrs. LEITZELL. No, I don't think so. I really don't remember, but I am sure it was after the camping trip in the summer of 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. You were not working for him at the time you had this unfortunate accident to your thumb?

Mrs. LEITZELL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that is all. Just a moment, though. There may be another question. Yes, Senator CONNALLY wants to ask you a question.

Senator CONNALLY. What were the duties or services that he rendered?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Pardon?

Senator CONNALLY. I say, what were his duties to this concern in Chicago that you were working with?

Mrs. LEITZELL. What do you mean? When he was in Chicago?

Senator CONNALLY. No; after he went to Madison, or before he went to Madison. What was he supposed to do?

Mrs. LEITZELL. He was the editor of it.

Senator CONNALLY. Editor of a magazine?

Mrs. LEITZELL. It was not a magazine, sir.

Senator CONNALLY. What was it?

Mrs. LEITZELL. It was a service for attorneys, utilities, and carriers. That was the name of it: Public Utilities and Carriers' Service. It was gotten out in loose-leaf form, and sent at different times, after court decisions.

Senator CONNALLY. To keep them advised as to the status of the affairs of the utilities and the railroads? Is that right?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Mere court decisions dealing with utilities and the carriers.

Senator CONNALLY. I say to keep them advised as to the situation as to what was happening to railroads and public utilities. Now, did he continue to do that after he was appointed to the commission in Wisconsin?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I don't remember how much editorial work after he went up there.

Senator CONNALLY. Well, you say he continued to receive a salary for it?

Mrs. LEITZELL. He did.

Senator CONNALLY. And he continued to pay you for the work on this stuff?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator CONNALLY. Was there any difference of his conduct of the business after he went to Wisconsin, as compared to what he did before?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Well, surely he was not as active after he went to Wisconsin.

Senator CONNALLY. Because he was not there all the time?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Because he was not there.

Senator CONNALLY. But was there any change in the nature of the work that he was doing?

Mrs. LEITZELL. The work was the same, as far as the office went.

Senator CONNALLY. All right.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did Mr. Lilienthal reside in Chicago when he was appointed commissioner of the State Power Commission of Wisconsin?

Mrs. LEITZELL. He did live in Chicago before he went to Wisconsin.

Senator MCKELLAR. Well, when he was appointed, then, he was living in Chicago, was he not?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I do not know whether it was Chicago or whether it was one of the suburbs. I think it was one of the suburbs.

Senator MCKELLAR. You do not know where he was living. But when he was appointed, did he move to Madison?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. He moved up there?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did he just come occasionally down to your office?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, sir; that is right.

Senator MCKELLAR. And how long was it, according to your best memory, after he was appointed, that you ran this business for him in Chicago?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Well, I did not run it.

Senator MCKELLAR. I thought you said you did.

Mrs. LEITZELL. I was merely a secretary.

Senator MCKELLAR. Well, put it this way: Did Mr. Swidler and Mr. Booth and yourself run it? And how long was it after he left that you ran it?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I didn't run it.

Senator MCKELLAR. I mean all three of you.

Mrs. LEITZELL. I continued to work there in his office after 1931, through the summer of 1932.

Senator MCKELLAR. He left in 1931?

Mrs. LEITZELL. That is right.

Senator MCKELLAR. And you continued to work in his office through 1932, and you said in the spring of 1933 you still were working for him, did you not?

Mrs. LEITZELL. No, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. You did not say you were there when you left on your spring vacation?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I worked for him through the summer of 1932. My husband and I had taken a camping trip in the summer of 1932, and I went back to his office after we came back from that camping trip.

Senator MCKELLAR. And how long did you work after you came back from the camping trip?

Mrs. LEITZELL. That I don't remember.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did you not say it was early in 1933?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Pardon?

Senator MCKELLAR. You said 1933 a while ago, did you not?

Mrs. LEITZELL. No, sir.

Senator CONNALLY. Do you know when he terminated his services with this concern?

Mrs. LEITZELL. No; I don't.

Senator CONNALLY. You don't know how long he continued in this relationship after you left?

Mrs. LEITZELL. Pardon?

Senator CONNALLY. I say, you do not know how long he continued this relationship with this concern in Chicago?

Mrs. LEITZELL. No; I don't know that.

Senator CONNALLY. Do you know how much compensation he was drawing from the company?

Mrs. LEITZELL. At one time it was something over $300 a week, and it was reduced to something over $200, but I don't recall the exact figures.

Senator CONNALLY. When was it reduced? When he went to Wisconsin?

Mrs. LEITZELL. I do not recall exactly when it was reduced.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mrs. Leitzell. Thank you very much.

Mrs. LEITZELL. Thank you.

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, VOLUME 17, FEBRUARY 20, 1947, PAGE 1438

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, may I offer at this point, before we start on Mr. Shelton, two sections of the Code of the State of Wisconsin of 1945, in connection with the testimony that was taken yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir. Will you give the code citations?

Senator MCKELLAR. The Wisconsin Statutes, 1945, section 195.01, provides:

"(2) Ineligibility: No commissioner shall be pecuniarily interested in any railroad, public utility, or motor carrier, and if any such commissioner shall voluntarily become interested his office ipso facto shall become vacant; * * *" (Laws of Wisconsin, 1929, ch. 504, p. 925.)

And subsection 4:

"(4) Full time office: No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit or pursue any other business or vocation or serve on or under any committee of any political party, but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office." (Laws of Wisconsin, 1929, ch. 504, p. 925.)

I want to insert that in the record, and the code is here if anyone would like to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the record.

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, ON FEBRUARY 20, 1947, VOLUME 17, PAGES 1503–1507

Senator MCKELLAR. I want to put two biographies from Who's Who in the record, one from volume 24, 1946–47 edition, and the other one from volume 23, 1944–45 edition, of Who's Who, and several telegrams in the record concerning service of Mr. Lilienthal in Wisconsin and Chicago at the same time. Is there objection to it?

The CHAIRMAN. No objection.

Senator MCKELLAR. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you identify the pages?

Senator MCKELLAR. Yes, sir. I have got one of them transcribed, and I will identify the other one.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean at this point in the record, can you identify the pages of Who's Who?

Senator MCKELLAR. Yes, sir. The first one is 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. 1945 edition of Who's Who?

Senator MCKELLAR. Yes, sir. I do not have the page. I will have to put that in. (Citation is to page 1261 of volume 23.)

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator MCKELLAR. The other one is 1946 and 1947, on page 1407.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir; and if you will give the reporter the telegrams you want to put in at the same time, they will go in all together.

Senator MCKELLAR. All right, sir. Thank you.

I wish to read next a quotation from volume 23 of the 1944–45 edition of Who's Who:

David Eli Lilienthal; Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, lawyer; born in Morton, Ill., July 8, 1899; son of Leo and Minna (Rosenak) L.; A. B., DePauw U., Greencastle, Ind., 1920; LL. B., Harvard, 1923.

It states the names of the members of his family and then—

Admitted to Illinois bar, 1923; Tennessee bar, 1934; in practice of law, Chicago, 1923–31; Chicago, 1923–26; alone, 1926–31.

For a period of 5 years he was not a member of any firm.

Then it states:

Member Wisconsin Public Service Commission, 1931; Director, Tennessee Valley Authority since 1933; appointed Chairman, 1941.

Then there is other personal description. It states he lived at that time in Norris, Tenn.

I shall not undertake to read the full quotation from the 1946–47 edition of Who's Who, but it is the same, with the exception that the first line underscored in the 1944–45 edition has been deleted. It leaves out the statement that he practiced law in Chicago during the time he was a member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

Next is the following telegram:

FEBRUARY 20, 1947.

Hon. FRED ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State, Madison, Wis.:

Please wire me immediately Government collect date of appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to Public Service Commission.

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

The reply from Mr. Zimmerman is as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *February 20, 1947.*

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR:

David Lilienthal appointed to Wisconsin Railroad Commission (now Public Service Commission) on February 12, 1931.

FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

There was a supplemental telegram from Mr. Zimmerman, not placed in the record of the hearings, bearing the same date, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *February 20, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR:

David Lilienthal received pay as railroad commissioner of Wisconsin from March 25, 1931, through June 30, 1933. His salary was $5,000 per year and he received a total of $11,347.23 for his services as commissioner.

FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

There was another telegram, dated February 19, from Senator MCKELLAR to the Commerce Clearing House, Chicago, Ill., as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1947.

THE COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE,
Chicago, Ill.:

Please wire me Government collect the date that Mr. David E. Lilienthal received his last check from you as editor of the publication, Utilities and Carriers Service, or in any other capacity. Give the dates of his going with you and the date of his last month with you.

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 19, 1947.*

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Answering your telegram of even date our records show that the first payment to David E. Lilienthal for his authorship of Public Utilities and Carriers Law Reporting Service was made September 18, 1926, and that the last check from us was dated August 27, 1932. During the entire period his personal services were rendered from his own law office and our records do not disclose requested dates with us except as indicated by foregoing dates of payment.

COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE, INC.

Mr. President, that completes the reading of the excerpts from the hearings which have been proceeding now for several weeks. I read them particularly in order to point out and emphasize and call specifically to the direct attention of the Members of the Senate that for a period of a year and a half or more David Lilienthal, whose name has been sent to the Senate for confirmation as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, occupied a position of trust under the State of Wisconsin in violation of the laws of that State, which he had subscribed to an oath to support, in that he at the same time held another position although the laws of Wisconsin expressly provided that he should do no other work, that he should serve no other master, that he should not, during the period of his service on the Wisconsin Commission, even have private employment.

Mr. President, that is the purpose and the reason for my imposing on the Senate to call this matter particularly to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, we are discussing whether or not it would be possible to cut $6,000,000,000 off the Budget which the President recommended. In other words, we are debating whether we shall follow the recommendation of the President and spend, in round figures, $37,000,000,000, or whether we shall cut that figure and spend, in round figures, $31,000,000,000.

It seems to me that those who believe in a reduction in expenditures of the Federal Government have allowed themselves to be maneuvered into a very undesirable position. I do not think we should be discussing here today the question of whether or not the President's Budget shall be reduced to $31,000,000,000. I think what we should be discussing is whether or not the Budget should be reduced to $25,000,000,000.

This is not the place to attempt to go into a detailed discussion of the Budget which the President has proposed, but I think if we will simply take an over-all look at the situation, we will be constrained to reach the conclusion that a Budget of $25,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year and a Budget of not more than $20,000,000,000 for the succeeding fiscal year would be entirely reasonable.

The memory of my colleagues, I am sure, goes back to the utopian days of the New Deal, when I think everybody agreed that there was being employed every known means of funneling money out of the Federal Treasury to all individuals and governmental agencies who would offer to take the money and put it into circulation. Occasionally during those days we would hear a few stouthearted Democrats, who were already in bad repute with the then ruling dynasty, observe that this Government was engaged in wasteful expenditures of public funds; occasionally we would have some member of the Republican Party make the observation that New Deal socialism was leading us into bankruptcy.

It seems to me that our memories are inclined to be short. Back in the days when the New Deal was being criticized for being wasteful, when the New Deal was being criticized for using the Public Treasury as a means of perpetuating itself in public office, the top amount which they were ever able to think up means of spending in any one fiscal year was slightly more than $9,000,000,000. Back in 1940, the last year before we entered the war, the New Deal brethren were only able to think up plans to spend a little more than $8,000,000,000.

Now we come to the point where we are planning our expenditures not for a war period but for a peacetime period, 2 and 3 years after the war is over, and we find ourselves here debating the question of whether we shall spend $31,000,000,000 or $37,000,000,000. It is my personal judgment that if we would set as a limit $25,000,000,000 instead of $37,000,000,000, certainly that would be a liberal limit, which should be cut to not more than $20,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

I realize, of course, that we must find a means of servicing our public debt, which will require five or six billion dollars annually, and I think we all realize that we must maintain an adequate system of national defense, but if the Budget were cut to $25,000,000,000 that would give us $17,000,000,000 to allot to national defense, debt retirement, and veterans' relief over and above what we were spending in 1940, and then it would enable us to continue to operate the "gravy train" which the New Deal was operating and spend $8,000,000,000 for that purpose. It seems to me this ought to be enough to satisfy the most liberal spenders.

I want to say to my colleagues in the Senate that there is no easy way to reduce Federal expenditures; every time a move is made to unhook a coach from the New Deal "gravy train" which has been running for the past 12 or 13 years, there are going to be plenty of squawks from the passengers on the train. There is only one sensible way to reduce public expenditures, and that is to reduce them. Give the bureaus and agencies a certain amount of money to spend and tell them to spend it and quit.

Because of the situation built in this Nation during the war period, we are actually collecting in Federal, State, and local taxes more money than the total national income was 12 or 13 years ago. Private business and private enterprise simply cannot exist under this kind of tax load.

No one is a stronger advocate than am I of adequate national defense. The best way in the world to have a strong national defense is to have a strong, solvent, national economy. Whatever we do which will tend to start the wheels of business moving so as to furnish employment for our people and enable them to maintain a high standard of living is the very essence of building a strong national defense. It is simply impossible to do this and at the same time bleed the citizens of this country white through taxation, and it is impossible to reduce taxes without reducing expenditures.

My judgment is that the results of the election on November 5 prove without any question of doubt that the American people are sick and tired of the kind of government we have had for the last 14 years. They voted for a change. I think the American people are tired of the plan of operating the New Deal "gravy train" at Washington at the expense of the taxpaying public, and I should like to suggest to the new Members of the Senate that I do not think the people simply voted to change engineers and conductors on the "gravy train"—I think they want the unnecessary coaches unhooked. I think they want all surplus boards and bureaus eliminated. I think they want Government to get back to operating on a sound and reasonable basis, and my opinion is that if the leadership of the Republican Party has reached the conclusion that the only thing wrong with the governmental philosophy which has grown up in the past 14 years and that the only thing wrong with the taxpayer-financed "gravy train" we have been operating in the past is that the conductors and engineers have been Democrats and not Republicans, the Republican leaders are due for a rude awakening at the next election. The people want the New Deal "gravy train" stopped and its schedule canceled. I think the people are seriously concerned about getting the cost of operating Government back on a reasonable basis, reducing taxes to the point where a man not only can make some money but can keep a part of it.

I think the people are sick and tired of a government so controlled and operated that those in power utilize the public purse to satisfy groups and blocs and thereby assure their own safety in the forthcoming election. I believe the people will applaud Members of Congress who have the courage to stand firm and square for real sure-enough economy.

In my judgment, the people are ready and willing to support the leadership that offers constructive evidence of its intention to reestablish free enterprise and to make it possible for business to operate and for the individual to be rewarded by allowing him to keep a reasonable portion of what he earns.

For these reasons I shall certainly vote to sustain the idea of reducing the President's budget to $31,000,000,000, unless I have an opportunity to vote to reduce it to twenty-five billion. I certainly think the reduction should be, not to $31,000,000,000, but to $25,000,000,000. Furthermore, if given an opportunity I shall vote for a 20 percent reduction in taxes, provided I do not have an opportunity to vote for a greater reduction.

My opinion is that within the next 2 or 3 years Federal expenditures should be cut at least 50 percent, Federal taxes should be cut at least 50 percent; and I think it is reasonable to suppose that both of these objectives could be accomplished if we would go to work in earnest to get the job done.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I feel impelled to make a brief explanation of my position on this issue, because I understand that the parliamentary situation is such that we shall probably not have an opportunity to vote on whether we favor a $6,000,000,000 reduction in the Presidential Budget.

I am not one of those who believe it is impossible to cut the Budget by $6,000,000,000 without seriously impairing the strength of our armed forces. There is not a Member in either branch of the Congress who does not recognize that, at a time when world conditions are chaotic and unsettled, it is highly essential that the United States and the representatives of this Republic take a firm position in all of its relations with foreign countries.

We have demonstrated, through our efforts in cooperating with other countries individually and through the United Nations, and in other ways, that we are willing to make every necessary sacrifice to make possible rehabilitation of the devastated areas of the globe and to make possible an enduring peace.

It has been said frequently during the debate on this issue that any Senator who does not favor giving the armed services every dollar they ask for takes a position that he is jeopardizing our national defense. It think it is not fair to place that stigma upon any Senator who sincerely believes we can have national defense and security as well as economy and efficiency in the administration of our armed forces. Throughout the years of the war we heard that same suggestion repeated time and again before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. It was invariably said when the budget officers of the War and Navy Departments made requests for funds that members of the legislative branch could not justify withholding a single dollar without seriously jeopardizing the defense of our country and the prosecution of the war.

I know what the record is. We are proud of the magnificent work done by the 15,000,000 young men who won a military victory over the Axis Powers. The peace has not been won yet, and we know that the legislative branch of the Government, as well as the executive branch, is obligated to do everything possible to win the peace not only abroad but on the home front.

Recently I asked a member of the Appropriations Committee staff to do some research for me to determine whether the armed services during the war years used all the money appropriated by the Congress. I shall confine my figures only to the military functions of the War Department and submit at this time some figures which I am sure will be highly illuminating to all Members of the Senate.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, the War Department had unobligated for that 12 months' period the sum of $1,317,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1942 the Congress of the United States had appropriated $32,368,000,000 in excess of the capacity of the War Department to spend during that one year.

In the fiscal year 1943 the Congress provided $15,176,000,000 beyond the capacity of the War Department to spend in that crucial year.

In the fiscal year 1944 the figure again exceeded $32,000,000,000, being $32,766,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1945 we appropriated $10,397,000,000 more than could be obligated by the War Department.

In the fiscal year 1946, after VE-day, the War Department had remaining unobligated of its 12 months' appropriation the sum of $1,892,877,000.

It is true that some of these amounts were reappropriated, but the point I desire to stress is that notwithstanding the fact that the War Department budget officers had insisted in each of those years that they needed every dollar they were requesting, the record shows they were given billions and billions beyond their current requirements.

Public Law 301 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, rescinded $30,263,000,000.

Public Law 391 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, rescinded $1,544,000,000.

Public Law 521 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, rescinded $1,563,000,000.

I understand there is now contained in House Document No. 55 a request for the

rescission of about $35,000,000. That means that already there has been recaptured by the Congress a total of $33,406,951,000. Of course it must be recognized that all that money was appropriated by the Congress, and was recaptured because even during those war years it was impossible for the Military Establishment to expend those funds.

It has frequently been said during this debate that there may be some element of partisanship in the approach made by the various Members to the proposal to cut the budget by $6,000,000,000 or by $4,500,000,000. I hold in my hand a copy of House Report No. 2729 which was filed on December 12, 1946—just a few months ago—by a committee, the majority members of which belonged to the Democratic Party. They made an extensive study of postwar economic policy and planning, and on December 12 filed a report, from which I shall take the liberty of quoting, as follows:

> While the committee realizes the necessity of continuing heavy expenditures for strong national defense, it seriously questions whether it is necessary to spend over 12 times the amount which was spent in 1939. It would urge upon the officials of the War and Navy Departments that they should realize the effects which such heavy expenditures have upon the economy of the country and that the greatest effort be made to reduce these expenditures; that each item in the Budget be scrutinized to see if it is absolutely necessary; and that projects which are not immediately needed be postponed.
>
> The committee feels that a Budget of $30,000,000,000 is a realistic budget and that expenditures can be reduced to this level without interfering with national defense or other normal functions of the Government. At this level the cost to the Federal Government per family of four would be over $850 a year.

I quote from this report merely to show that as late as December spokesmen for what was then the majority party of the Seventy-ninth Congress said a realistic budget at this time would approximate $30,000,000,000.

I should like to call attention to another development which took place on February 13, 1945. That is not so long ago; about 2 years ago. On that date Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, a man who has had extensive service in the Congress and whose judgment and integrity are respected by every Member of the Congress, appeared before a congressional committee to discuss the expenditures in the executive branch of the Government. At that time a Member of what was then the majority party asked Mr. Warren to express himself concerning the cost-plus system of awarding contracts which was in effect throughout the war. This Member asked Mr. Warren how much that particular program had added to the cost of the war, and according to the hearings printed, and which are available, Mr. Warren responded as follows:

> It is just so staggering that it is beyond our guess or computation.

When pressed further he said that the cost would be at least $50,000,000,000. In the rush and in the urgency of prosecuting the war, the War Department, through its procurement program, wasted $50,000,000,000 of our money, and the money of our children and grandchildren, merely because they did not adopt policies which provided for economy and efficiency in the handling of those contracts.

I recall last summer that when the pay measure was before the legislative branch of the Government, the Bureau of the Budget at that time—and the Bureau of the Budget represents the Chief Executive of our Government—made some promises and assurances to congressional committees that at the end of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1947, it was reasonable to expect the number of civilians on the Federal pay roll would reach the figure of 1,611,000.

I read with considerable amazement a few weeks ago that the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission said that, according to the records of this Federal agency, there would be approximately 2,100,000 civilian employees on the pay roll at the end of the present fiscal year. This means only that the Budget Bureau will miss its guess during one 12-months' period, Mr. President, by nearly 500,000, indicating that a great deal of talking takes place respecting retrenchment and curtailment of the operation of our Government. However, the record shows we do not have invariably that consistent action which is necessary to carry into effect proposals for economy.

I realize very well that the debate on the proposal made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, after mature deliberation, whereby it was recommended that $6,000,000,000 be taken from the Presidential Budget, was more or less a gesture or symbol. Of course, we have not had an opportunity to scrutinize the recommendations made by the President, but under the Reorganization Act this procedure is required. So far as I am concerned I wish to stress the point that, whether the reduction be $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000, or any other figure, the full responsibility rests upon the Congress to carry out the express will of the American taxpayers; namely, that now, 2 years after the end of hostilities in World War II, we determine that the waste and inefficiency which impaired the operations of our Government during the war shall not be continued.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I serve notice upon my colleagues that I feel it incumbent upon myself to do everything I can to see that every possible dollar is cut from the 12 appropriation bills. Above all, that means that we should scrutinize the requests for funds submitted to this body by the War and Navy Departments. I am not one of those who believe that those in charge of the armed services are unwilling to cooperate. They are patriotic Americans who realize that we must have efficiency in the armed services as well as in every other department of Government.

Mr. President, we must have ample funds and we must have sufficient manpower not to jeopardize our national security. But above that, we need the national will and the national determination to put our fiscal house in order, because an essential part of national defense is a strong internal economy.

For these reasons I favor the $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's Budget.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, today in this critical hour of our country's financial welfare, in this hour when our country may be tottering on the very brink of insolvency, at this time when our national debt of $260,000,000,000 represents much of all the available money in the world, and at what may be the epochal period in determining whether we shall survive as a country of free enterprise, the whole people are looking to their President and to their Congress for leadership.

This is no time, Mr. President, for weak, vacillating leadership, but instead the exigencies call for men of iron determination, iron will, clear thinking. Above all, it may demand personal political sacrifice on the part of those of us who represent the people in this Government.

If anything has been proved by the debate on the Budget during the past few days, it has been the ghastly failure on the part of those to whom since 1932 has been entrusted the foreign policy of the United States, a policy that has brought us today to the very brink of extinction as a leading country, symbolic of justice, freedom, liberty, and happiness.

It would not be a pleasant task for me to review how failure succeeded failure in foreign affairs, until today we find ourselves the most hated country in the world—until today when, as the result of the last 14 years of miserable leadership, we find ourselves with few dependable allies and the overwhelming population of the world standing in actual fear of America.

Search our consciences as we will, the cold, hard reality is that our leadership in foreign affairs for 14 years has been a failure. Today the question facing the Senate is how to get out of the steel vise which daily is tightening around us; and in the choice we must make, whether for future war on the one hand or peace on the other, there will be agonizing distress.

It is almost fatalistically prophetic that Congress is called upon to act upon this Budget under the new Reorganization Act. This is true because it offers a gigantic challenge to us, and that challenge says, "There are but two ways to go—the right way or the wrong way, and go the latter way at your peril."

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to go the way of peace, and not of war. As I have listened during the many hours to Senators who have discussed this momentous problem, I have come to one inevitable, unchangeable, American decision; and that decision is that America shall not continue to be the leader in armaments, that the Senate shall not by its vote confirm the actions of men who in my opinion have become utterly hysterical with fear. Their attitude to me is reminiscent of that date in 1933 when the then President said:

> The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of

our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory.

Personally, I have no fear of the present crisis, if the Senate will stop and take stock of itself, accurately estimate the feelings of the people of America, and then have the stamina to act.

The greatest danger we face is not another immediate war, but a repetition of a depression similar to that of 1933, when the then President said:

> Values have shrunk to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone.

Let me make it plain that I believe that in this Budget there are two kinds of money: The first, money which will yield returns; the second, money which will be wasted. In the first category we find the loans for rural electrification, which will be repaid to the Federal Government in their entirety; the maintenance of 90 percent of the parity price for agricultural products; the maintenance of the soil-conservation program; the continuation of school lunch, educational, and labor programs; the maintenance of veterans' benefits; the interest on our debt; and various other similar items. These are items which are absolutely essential. They are those elements in a government which provide the greatest good for the greatest number, in health, in education, in prosperity. But the second kind of appropriations, those which are for war, are universally admitted to be unproductive and, in an economic sense, wasted.

Therefore I stand four-square for an all-out continuance of the first kind of appropriations. Last week a distinguished Senator said that, with the proper economy, we could save $2,500,000,000 by a reduction of the number of Federal employees. I may say that that statement has just been repeated by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, let me say that I believe it will be done.

The truth of the matter is that, since the shooting ended, 1,483,100 civil-service employees are no longer on the pay roll. I repeat that 1,483,100 have either resigned or been removed from the civil pay roll of the United States Government. This does not sound as if those who have been yelling, "Fire a million employees!" were telling all of the story, does it? This reduction was accomplished without publicity and in an orderly, sane, and businesslike manner under the terms of the Byrd-Langer amendment with the full cooperation of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal agencies.

In addition, every day more Federal employees are being released because more than a year ago Congress fixed a ceiling which provided that a certain number of employees should be removed every 3 months. This means that by June 1, 1947, there will be a total employment of 1,167,220, plus those additional empoyees hired by the Veterans' Administration, the War Assets Administration, and one or two minor agencies. With these added, the Senate Committee on Civil Service received from the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget a carefully prepared statement that on July 1 next the total civil-service employment will be 1,710,000.

On January 1 there were 2,283,890. So we see that because of the careful planning that has been done by the Congress, by July 1 there will be a further reduction of 573,890 persons.

Mind you, Mr. President, all of this was done by a law, passed last year, which provided for a careful, systematic reduction, with every precaution being taken to protect those who had been experienced in civil service, and also providing for all possible veterans' preference.

Moreover, the Senate Committee on Civil Service has been meeting two or three times a week, with the result that further reductions will take place, so that the number will be decreased to approximately 1,500,000 employees.

In December 1941, when the war started, we had 1,620,922 civil-service employees, so that even with an addition in the Veterans' Administration, the number of employees will be, by December 7, 1947, approximately what it was on December 7, 1941, when we entered the war.

I suggest that this record made by the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the heads of the various agencies, by the Congress, and by men like the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and Representatives REES, DIRKSEN, and TABER is a record of which every American can well be proud.

This brings me to the matter of the Budget about which we have been hearing so much lately. The Budget recommended by President Truman calls for an expenditure of $37,528,000,000.

From the statements of some of the gentlemen who want to dismiss 1,000,000 employees, the impression might be derived that by so doing the Budget could be reduced almost half. The truth is that if every employee of the Federal Government were discharged, the Budget would be reduced by only approximately $6,000,000,000. By the reduction that Congress already has provided for, and which will be continued by congressional action based on the House and Senate Civil Service Committee hearings, there will be a reduction of approximately $2,300,000,000 more.

So it can be realized that a small proportion of the total of President Truman's Budget of $37,500,000,000 goes to the employees. Where does most of the money go?

Five billion dollars goes for interest on the national debt. So, Mr. President, the interest on our national debt alone will be more than the total salaries of everyone working for the Government.

How much, Mr. President, do you think goes for education and general research? Only $88,000,000. How much goes for agriculture? One billion six hundred million dollars. How much goes for the veterans and veterans' benefits? Seven billion three hundred and forty million dollars. Listen carefully, please. How much goes to the Army and Navy? Roughly, $11,500,000,000.

So we see that even if the Republicans reduce President Truman's budget by $6,000,000,000, leaving $31,500,000,000, approximately one-third of the total Budget will go for the Army and Navy. I ask whether this is necessary and needed?

Bear in mind that in 1940, just prior to the declaration of war, the entire Federal Budget was $9,297,000,000, or over $2,000,000,000 less than is now asked for the Army and Navy alone. Thus, the budget recommended to the Congress by the President for the fiscal year 1948 requests expenditures almost three times those of 1941. Even in the war year 1942, when everyone was straining every nerve to win the war, the Budget was less than $32,500,000,000.

You will be amazed, Mr. President, to know that the expenditures for this peacetime year are equal to about the total cost of World War I, plus the ordinary governmental expenditures for the years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920.

Again, consider the fact that the Budget submitted is approximately $10,000,000,000 more than the national-defense expenditures for all of World War I.

Or, to put it another way, the proposed Budget is $7,000,000,000 more than the aggregate of all Government expenditures for the 11 years, 1921 to 1931, inclusive.

For 17 years our Government has been in the red; and in that time the public indebtedness has been increased from approximately $16,000,000,000 to $260,000,000,000. As has been so well stated, during the past 17 years we have built up in Washington a gigantic bureaucracy which has attempted ruthlessly and autocratically to administer the affairs of our citizens.

Recently it was stated that there are 1,039 principal component parts of the Federal Government, including departments, main bureaus, emergency and independent agencies, which are only 102 less than we had at the very height of the war. But I call attention to the fact that not one of those departments, main bureaus, or agencies could exist unless the Congress had first passed a law making possible its organization.

So we see that the determination of the size of the Budget is entirely the providing of the men and women who are selected by the people to administer the affairs of the Nation through the Congress.

That brings us to the question whether we should appropriate $11,000,000,000 for the Army and the Navy.

I ask, what experience in business or fiscal affairs has the average general or admiral? How many of us, if we needed a business partner, would pick an admiral or a general whom we happened to know, in preference to a good, hard-headed businessman? These men are trained, not to conserve material, but to waste it.

Now, "let's look at the record." In 1941, some of the same generals and

admirals asked for nearly a billion and a half dollars more than they needed, and the money was appropriated at the expense of the taxpayer. In 1942, when we were at war, these generals and admirals asked for nearly thirty-two and a half billion dollars more than they were actually able to spend. In 1943, they asked for fifteen billion one hundred million more than they were able to spend. In 1944, after 2 years of experience in the war, when certainly we would figure they would know what they were talking about, they asked for nearly $33,000,000 more than they were actually able to spend. In 1945, they asked for over $10,000,000,000 more than they were able to spend. In 1946, it was nearly $2,000,000,000 more. Now, in 1947, at a time when the people by an overwhelming vote have said that, although they were willing in wartime to pay high taxes and suffer the tyranny of bureaus and departments, now they want tax reduction, now they want the Government run on a business basis, those admirals and generals are asking for fifteen or sixteen billion dollars more, which has been cut down by the Congress to roughly eleven and a half billion dollars, and which I maintain is only half a start on what the cut really ought to be.

Mr. President, I am one who under no circumstances would do anything to harm the defense of this country. But I am not afraid of fear when I compare what our situation is today with what it was in 1941. Today we have thousands of ships which certainly cannot be obsolete, because they were all built within the last 4 or 5 years. We have thousands of fighting planes, and certainly they cannot be obsolete. We have billions of dollars worth of other materials which we did not have in 1941. So, comparing the status of the Army and Navy equipment in 1941 with present-day equipment, we have a great deal more now which we did not then have. In addition to that, we have spent scores of billions of dollars in giving lend-lease to scores of countries. Most of these countries are our allies, so that they, too, are much better equipped for military purposes than they were in 1941. In addition, we have stock-piles of war materials which in 1941 did not exist. Remember, Mr. President, that to attain this security, the American taxpayer has paid and paid and paid and will continue to pay.

When I was a freshman Senator, I, too, believed most of what the admirals and generals said on financial matters. I knew they were good fighting men who knew their military strategy. However, even then I did not follow them when they spent hundreds of millions of dollars in building the road to Alaska and another road through South America, and when they spent $130,000,000 on the Canol project and other projects. Likewise, I did not follow them when they insisted that the Antitrust Act not be enforced, and permitted the people to be robbed by cartels and monopolies.

As chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee I have discovered that thousands of Army and Navy men were blanketed into the civil service as civilian employees, with an increase in pay from $300 a month to $540 a month, for doing exactly the same work in the same locality. Also, I find that almost half of the entire civil-service personnel is in the War and Navy Departments—in this, a time of peace. I ask, in heaven's name, how much more do the admirals and generals want?

I ask that the REA, education, and labor appropriations not be interfered with. I believe in a square deal for the small businessman, for labor, and for the farmer. I agree that all these things should be done, but I totally disagree with a man who takes the position that Americans have to continue to pay billions of dollars to various foreign countries. When we consider that many of our veterans are without jobs and in hospitals, and that thousands of our aged depend upon our Government for their living, then I believe that charity should begin at home. Let us remember that as far back as May 1940 President Roosevelt said, "The Navy is stronger today than at any time in the Nation's history." Let us remember, too, that at the end of the war our Navy was stronger than the combined navies of all the other nations of the world. Let us remember, too, that the late President said, "In types of planes, we are not behind the other nations of the world."

In my opinion, the Budget of $31,500,000,000 is an invitation to other countries not to disarm, not to advocate peace, but, on the contrary, to arm as they have never armed before—to arm to get ready for another war, to keep the United States of America from being the master, the dictator, the ruler of the world. It gives to the leaders of countries who may not like us the propaganda weapon of saying, "Look: One-third of the entire Budget of the United States is for the purpose of holding our country in subjection."

Mr. President, the United States, the country which went into the last two wars with high ideals, to make the world safe for democracy and with the cry "this shall be the war to end wars," the United States of America, the country which, after winning two wars, finds itself in the most desperate plight in its history; the United States of America, which, through its great military leaders, its great generals and admirals, won remarkable victories in both the last wars, finds itself almost helpless to secure the peace which the overwhelming number of the people of the United States demand.

It is here, Mr. President, that I believe positive action should be taken to eliminate the fear which is paralyzing the thinking of our country, the fear on the part of our people that there will be another war, the fear of the fathers and mothers that their sons will again be called upon to go across the waters and fight upon the bloody battlefields of Europe and Asia, the fear of another horrible slaughter.

Mr. President, one distinguished Senator has stated that he does not want "Uncle Sam to have a chip on each shoulder, with both arms in a sling." And I desire to reply to that epigram. I ask today, "Why should Uncle Sam have a chip on either of his shoulders? What is the necessity for it?" So far as I am concerned, in this critical period, I am going to back up the President of the United States. He has seen fit, after the most thorough investigation, to believe the men who are in charge of our foreign policies, the generals and admirals who are in charge of our war forces. They have convinced him of the absolute necessity of a Budget in excess of $37,000,000,000. He guesses that that is what will be needed, just as those who favor the reduction by $4,500,000,000 guess, and just as those who favor a $6,000,000,000 reduction guess. If the situation is as critical as is indicated by the appointment of General Marshall to the office of Secretary of State, then I am for the President's Budget. If, as time goes on, the situation becomes more critical, I am for a higher Budget. If the situation develops favorably, then of course there is no necessity for spending anything like $37,000,000,000.

But we either have or have not confidence in our President and in our State Department. If we do not have confidence, let us frankly say so. If we have, let us back them up. But, Mr. President, I am reminded of two men who, by means of lawyers, are fighting each other in a legal battle. On the contrary, the situation today calls for direct negotiation. Therefore, I personally call upon President Truman himself to take charge of negotiations with Russia.

When England wanted to find out what Russia was going to do, she did not subscribe to what the United States thought about the matter, but she dealt directly with Russia. President Truman should act accordingly. Russia's budget for this year has been approved at $70,000,000,000, of which 18 percent has been assigned to the armed forces. Our Budget calls for, roughly, thirty-seven and a half billion dollars, with 30 percent, or $11,200,000,000, assigned for defense.

It is my considered judgment that instead of acting through intermediaries, no matter who they may be, the President should say to Marshal Stalin, "Marshal, let us get together and talk this thing over. What is it that you want? Is it an outlet of warm water to the ocean? If so, your country may be entitled to it. We are not interested in what type of government your people want. We want to make it clear to you that you cannot establish your kind of government over the American people. We have no right to tell you what kind of government you should have; and if there are people over here who try, by force or intrigue, to establish your kind of government over us, we will take care of them in due course. I ask you now, as an ally to whom we have given billions of dollars, to state what it is that you want. And we will get together, talk it over, come to an agreement, and use this money that would be wasted in case there was a war to develop roads and hospitals and irrigation and in a multitude of other peacetime aims. Your people do not want war, and our people do not want war. You and I can get together and settle this thing. We can get together and do away with the fear of each other which is prevalent

among the peoples of our countries. I want you to know that Uncle Sam has no chips on either one of his shoulders. We want peace—a peace so sound that it will last for years and years and years to come, a peace so sound that both you and I, if we break both our arms, can walk around with all four arms in slings. Let you and I get together, as sooner or later our countries must, and settle this thing now, and wipe out this fear that is paralyzing the world."

I say, fellow Senators, that our President should do that, regardless of what any other nation may think about it, because today there are only two great dominant nations in this world—the United States and Russia. And I say if President Truman will do what I suggest, if he will personally pick up the telephone and call Joe Stalin, arrange a meeting, and eliminate the element of fear which each country has for the other, he will render a service to this country of such magnitude that it will never be forgotten.

I call upon him to take the initiative, because, after all, the disagreements of nations are similar to the disagreements of two human beings. It is my belief that these two men can sit down and, through mutual understanding and covenants openly arrived at, do away, I hope forever, with the feeling that we are on the verge of war with each other, and secure peace. If peace cannot be secured, if war must come, then any budget we set today will mean nothing anyway, any more than it did in 1940, 1941, and 1942, when the budget was constantly increased by Presidential messages sent to us by our former President, and we will be simply wasting our time.

Personally, I have every confidence that President Truman would rather cut off his right hand than harm a single individual in this country. I have the greatest respect and the keenest admiration for him. He is the one man to whom has been given the golden opportunity of securing peace for the world. It is my belief that he should seize that opportunity, and become one of the very greatest Presidents this country will ever have known; a President whose name will ring down to posterity through the ages as a man who unshackled himself from all red tape and face to face with the leader of another great power, personally settled the issues without recourse to force of arms, the loss of millions of lives, and the wasting of billions of dollars, as is evidenced by the budgets of the United States and of Russia.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND RINDERPEST

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 568) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, or control, or to prevent or retard, foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. In performing the operations or measures herein authorized, the Government of Mexico shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out such operations or measures on all lands and properties in Mexico and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this act on the part of the United States and on the part of the Government of Mexico, including the expenditure or use of funds appropriated pursuant to this act, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The authority contained in this act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

SEC. 2. For purposes of this act, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may also be used for the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, for printing and binding without regard to section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895, or section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (U. S. C., title 44, sec. 111), for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the limitations contained in section 607 (g) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, including the employment of civilian nationals of Mexico, and for the construction and operation of research laboratories, quarantine stations, and other buildings and facilities.

SEC. 3. Thirty days after the enactment of this act, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a report to the Congress with respect to the activities carried on under this act.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to understand the situation a little better than I now do.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I can explain exactly the amendments the House has made to the bill originally passed, and which was sent to the House from the Senate.

The first amendment limits the activity of the United States, in the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, to Mexico.

The second amendment authorizes the Department of Agriculture to establish a research laboratory in the infected area in Mexico.

The third amendment provides that the Department of Agriculture shall report to Congress once every 30 days the progress of the activities of the Department of Agriculture under the act.

Mr. WHITE. And the Senator has moved that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House?

Mr. THYE. Yes; I have so moved.

Mr. WHITE. Have the amendments been considered, in some other form, by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate?

Mr. THYE. They have been considered in this manner: The members of the committee of the Senate have discussed the amendments. The importance of taking action is so great that we should not delay until another committee hearing can be held. Committee members concurred personally in the amendments, rather than as an official act.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I served on the subcommittee with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. As I understand, time is of the essence in this matter, as we say, and because the situation is serious, and rapid action is necessary, and because, in my opinion, the amendments are satisfactory, I think it well that the Senate concur in them, and not lose the time it would take to appoint a committee of conference. I make this statement as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, nothing affecting agriculture in America is more threatening than that which is involved in the particular measure now under consideration. The foot-and-mouth disease came into this country about 25 years ago, immediately after the First World War. It cost the stock raisers of America hundreds of millions of dollars, because the only way to eradicate the disease, or check it, is to destroy the herds which have become infected. Thousands of livestock have come across the line from Mexico into some of the Western States. How far they have reached we do not know, but we do know that the disease exists in central Mexico, and that it is spreading rapidly toward the border.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall occupy the floor for only a moment more, with permission of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Members who have come in since this motion was made by me, I might say that the Senate passed the bill (S. 568) and it was sent over to the House. The House amended it, and I stated the three amendments made in the House. The reason I am speaking is that members of the committee agreed, as did the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BUSHFIELD], that a motion should be made to concur in the House amendments. The Senator from South Dakota is not in the Chamber today, and therefore, is unable to submit the motion, but the Senator's secretary spoke to me about it and assured me that concurrence in the House amendments was the action that had best be taken, inasmuch as it is necessary to act immediately in order

that the Department of Agriculture may be authorized to proceed at once.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am only trying to assist the Senator from Minnesota in his motion, by explaining what the motion is, and why it is so imperative that the House amendments should be concurred in now.

To continue, if I may, with the permission of the Senator for a moment, the experience the country had immediately after World War I taught us the lesson that we must protect our livestock, and in order to protect them from the hoof-and-mouth disease we must go into border countries where the disease is prevalent and from which livestock are likely to come and have already come into our country.

I hope the Senator's motion will prevail.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Is the bill now in the form approved by the secretaries of agriculture of Minnesota, North Dakota, and of all the other interested States, when the meeting was held here about 2 weeks ago?

Mr. THYE. I understand the question of the senior Senator from North Dakota is, whether the bill is in the form concurred in by all the secretaries of agriculture of the various interested States of the Union. I will say to the Senator that I am unable to answer that question, but I know we found no opposition to the bill recommended by the Senate committee, which was passed by this body and sent to the House.

The House amended it in a very simple manner, and I personally would concur in the amendments, as would all the other members of the subcommittee and the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is the recommendation of the subcommittee that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the Senate bill.

Mr. LANGER. Then, Mr. President, in view of the experience the distinguished Senator had when he was commissioner of agriculture of the great State of Minnesota, which is North Dakota's neighbor, I certainly hope the amendments will be concurred in.

Mr. THYE. I may say that the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Minnesota would concur in this bill, and in the amendments.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as coming from a State which has a very important and growing livestock industry, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I want to give hearty support to the motion of the able Senator from Minnesota that the Senate concur in the House amendments. There are only three respects in which the original bill is amended: First, it is limited to work in Mexico, as I recall; second, provision is made for the establishment of a research agency in Mexico; and, third, provision is made for monthly reports.

It means a great deal to the livestock industry of the South, and I hope the Senate will speedily adopt this preventive measure to stop the spread of this very infectious disease.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 568.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was absent from the floor for a few moments, and just as I returned the Senator from Minnesota was concluding his remarks. I understood that the Senator moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I stepped over to the Senator's desk and asked him what the amendments were; and, if I understood correctly, the Chair was stating the question on the motion to concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I hurriedly read the amendments, and I am now perfectly willing to express my approval of them. I, too, like other Senators from the cattle-growing States am interested in the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. If I recall correctly I offered the resolution which was the basis for the consideration by the subcommittee of the proposed legislation. I hope that the Senate will concur in the House amendments immediately, and that the action will be unanimous.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I might raise the point that the Senator from Minnesota cannot hold the floor and yield indiscriminately, except that I do not want to make a point of order of that kind.

As a matter of fact, like all the other Senators from the Western States, I want to have the House amendments concurred in. I was about to rise, Mr. President, to make a parliamentary inquiry: Have or have not the amendments been concurred in?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been concurred in.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, under the statement of the Chair that the amendments have been concurred in, cannot Senators obtain a little information in respect to the matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can move to reconsider if he desires to do so.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask a question. I was on my feet seeking the floor when the Chair made the announcement that the amendments had been agreed to. I am curious about this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota no longer has the floor, but the Senator from Indiana undoubtedly can raise the question.

Mr. JENNER. I should like some Senator to tell me whether the foot-and-mouth disease occurs in any other country in the world except Mexico?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Indiana by saying that the foot-and-mouth disease occurs in many countries of the world in such a form that most of them have found it necessary to adjust themselves to living with it.

We in the United States have always eradicated the disease promptly as soon as it appeared anywhere within our borders. We now find that there is such an infection in the neighboring country of Mexico. If the disease is permitted to get across the border from Mexico, then we shall have to adjust ourselves to living with it; and that would be far too expensive. The Department of Agriculture must be authorized to take every possible step to confine the infection to the area in which it appears at present and to keep our side of the border free from infection, so that there may be some degree of safety for cattle within the United States. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. JENNER. In other words, it cannot be controlled through inspection of animals that are brought into the United States from another country?

Mr. THYE. No, indeed; it cannot; because not only animals but even birds can carry the infection, and once it develops on this side of the border, it will cost the United States millions of dollars rather than possibly thousands of dollars to control the disease in the present area of infection.

Mr. JENNER. Is the proposal satisfactory to Mexico?

Mr. THYE. We certainly hope it will be; it should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana want to move to reconsider?

Mr. JENNER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I raise a point of order. Have the House amendments been concurred in?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been concurred in unanimously.

Mr. WILEY. That, as I understand, is the final disposition of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate having concurred in the House amendments, the bill is finally passed.

Mr. WILEY. I am very much interested in having it passed.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to speak to the pending question. The essential facts, as I see them, are that the President has submitted what he considers a rock bottom budget of $37,500,000,000. The Senate section of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget has recommended a $6,000,000,000 cut, and we are now discussing an amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that the cut be $4,500,000,000. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on the subject. I shall not undertake to review any particular facts, nor do I

claim that I know what the answer should be; but very briefly I desire to make five points which I think are worthy of consideration and eminently relevant:

First. There is much confusion about the matter. We speak of a cut in the President's Budget—whether it shall be $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000. First, let us recognize that the figure $4,500,000,000 is a minimum reduction, not the maximum. I am sure that every Senator hopes the Congress will find it possible to make the maximum reductions in the national budget without imperiling our national security. I am sure every Senator will agree that America's defense in this atomic age must not be jeopardized.

Second. The second point is that the men who spend the money must see to it that every dollar is spent carefully and that the Government will receive a dollar of value in return. Every dollar spent for defense must be scrutinized also to see whether it will actually assure modern defenses or whether it is going into military waste, extravagance or outmoded training or arms as we have noted time and time again in the past. I have spoken repeatedly on that subject, and I shall not bring up the historical instances of which we are all too well aware. I call attention again simply to what happened when Billy Mitchell, the prophet of his era, told the learned men of his time what was coming in the future.

Third. Those who call attention to waste and squandering of the public money do so, I am sure, hoping that such reprehensible practices will cease.

Away back in the time of Tacitus an individual was criticized in the following language: "He knows how to squander but not to bestow." We have had too many officials in public life of that character. Every generation of men has those who "waste their substance in riotous living." Shakespeare in Twelfth Night said, "You waste the treasure of your time."

I bring that point up, Mr. President, because it seems to me to be the first fact of which we must become cognizant.

Fourth. I believe that still further cuts can be made if each committee of the Congress will maintain continuous oversight, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, over the executive departments and agencies within its jurisdiction. I read that section of the act:

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, a few years ago a Governor of one of the Midwestern States took a very significant action. The same thing occurred in one of the Eastern States. A number of useless agencies had been created. They were what we now call a bureaucracy. This Midwestern Governor said:

I do not know anything about the agencies in question, but I shall create three committees to make investigation. I shall ask the house and the senate of the State legislature each to appoint one member on each of the three committees—

That would be one State senator and one assemblyman—

and I shall appoint to the committees the best efficiency experts I can secure. I will take them from the large corporations of the State. I shall constitute three separate committees and I shall divide up the functions of the State so that each committee will screen a certain number of State agencies in order to determine what waste is occurring, what extravagance is taking place, what bureaucracy has been created, what useless expenditures are being made of the money in the State treasury which belongs to the people.

The results were very beneficial.

Mr. President, Congress, of course, has the responsibility to ascertain how the people's money is expended. Why does not Congress secure the help of the best efficiency experts? It may be said that congressional committees hold hearings on the subject of Federal expenditures. Countless tales that are related on the floor of the Senate can be authenticated to the effect that useless practices are in effect here and there in Government agencies. But what about the way in which the money asked for is going to be spent for the national defense? It is a fact patent to anyone that most of the military leaders from early youth have been educated at the expense of Government and have never earned a dollar.

I am trying to suggest that our duty is not completed when we have appropriated money after appropriation committees have evaluated the facts, which, by the way, are always brought to us by individuals in interest. As practitioners we know that we scan the testimony of individuals in interest. I am not reflecting upon any individual or on any particular group. I am thinking in terms of my responsibility as a Senator of the United States and of methods of obtaining practical results. It is obvious to every expert observer that the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, joined with the Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, can not possibly, with the available personnel, scrtinize every dollar of the $33,000,000,000 Budget. To make such a scrutiny it will be necessary that each committee perform what I think was the intent of the Reorganization Act. Irrespective of what the intent was, it is the obligation of this body to follow through on the expenditures and see, especially in the critical time in which we are living, that we get a dollar of value for every dollar that is spent. That applies to every department and agency of the Government. Perhaps this will require additional help on the committees.

What a beautiful job we have done. As legislators we limited by law our right to helpers on a committee to 10. The jurisdiction of my Judiciary Committee has been extended—and it is called streamlining—between 600 and 700 percent. We limit the number of efficient helpers that we can have. Why? Are we to perform our function in screening expenditure of this money? I am not saying that we as a body can do it. But the philosophy of America, from the days of the Constitution—and it is imbedded in every fiber of our being—has been a system of checks and balances. Yet we have no checks and balances on the money we expend. We merely appropriate. In my opinion we are not performing the legislative function which has been delegated to us under the Constitution.

The fifth and last point I desire to make is this: How can we, the legislative branch of this Government, render more efficient service to our constituents in relation to the treasure that is placed in our hands to account for? We know the tendencies that have been prevalent in relation to mushrooming of bureaus. We know the tendency inherent in many mortals when they get into positions where they handle funds of others—to play fast and loose with them. We know from years of observation how, generally speaking, Government lacks efficiency in many matters. Now the time has definitely come, irrespective of what we do today, to ask ourselves. What can the legislative branch of the Government do to see that funds are not wasted? Are we going along in the same old rut? We are living in a new day. The world has turned a corner. We talk in terms of billions of dollars when we used to talk in terms of hundreds of millions. What can the legislative branch of Government do to see that funds are not wasted, and that men who handle funds fully recognize their trust capacity and obtain full value for every dollar spent?

I have previously stated, and I repeat, that big business interests have efficiency experts. They have checks upon waste and carelessness. It is not uncommon, when a change in the economy of the Nation takes place, for a business concern to say, "We are expending $1,000,000 or a certain department. We are running into a period when that expenditure must be cut," and someone is put in charge to do the job with 50 percent of the former expenditure.

To my knowledge, and to the knowledge of many of my associates, there are countless instances of such action having taken place. In the past we have never taken such action with respect to Government. We have never claimed that it was our function. It is said that we must continue listening to those who say how much they need, and give them the people's treasure without asking ourselves, "Do we get value received?"

We have a few wartime controls. Formerly contracts had to be let to the lowest bidder. But at present that is not so. Perhaps as a wartime measure such a course was wise; but is it wise now? What should be done? The Government of the United States is the largest business in the world. Can we not have checks on efficiency? Can we not have efficiency experts working for us?

As I previously stated on the floor of the Senate, when I came to Washington we were appropriating approximately $1,200,000,000 a year for the Department

of Agriculture, and I was receiving between 95 cents and $1.25 for milk which cost me $1.80 to produce. Was that Department operating as it should? How many useless employees did it have? How many dollars were going into the waste basket? I use that Department merely as illustrative.

It is true, as some one has said, that in Government there are literally thousands who have never had to work for a dollar, provide a pay roll, or meet situations outside their positions in the Government. Their checks have come to them regularly from the Government. The time has come to place men in Government who will insist that a dollar of value be received for every dollar spent.

I am not seeking to condemn a class. I know that there are many conscientious, hard-working, efficient employees in the Government; but as a rule there is little premium paid for that sort in any government. What is the answer?

If we were discussing ways and means to find the answer, we could more profitably continue this debate. We would not be spending so much time on what I consider almost irrelevant questions. Intelligent consideration of all domestic and foreign factors involved must precede Senate action, in accord with wisdom, economy, and the public interest.

REGENERATION OF JAPAN—LETTER FROM GENERAL MacARTHUR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss a message from Gen. Douglas MacArthur recently sent to Assistant Secretary of War Petersen and General Eisenhower. The message bears significantly upon the question now pending before the Senate. It portrays a dramatic but extremely hopeful picture of the economic, political, and social conditions of Japan, provided that the Congress of the United States upholds and defends the position of General MacArthur. In clarity of expression, and in its appeal for continued support for the preservation and advancement of our American interests in the Orient, it will rank as one of the leading documents of its time. I believe that the message should be read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1947.

From: CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, signed MacArthur.

To: War Department, for Assistant Secretary Petersen, General Eisenhower:

Reurads War 91969 and War 91976. There is a popular misconception that the achievement of victory in modern war, wherein a clash of ideologies is involved, is solely dependent upon victory in the field. History itself clearly refutes this concept. It offers unmistakable proof that the human impulses which generated the will to war, no less than the material sinews of war, must be destroyed. Nor is it sufficient that such human impulses merely yield to the temporary shock of military defeat. There must be a complete spiritual reformation, such as will not only control the defeated generation but will exert a dominant influence upon the generations to follow as well. Unless this is done victory is but partially complete and offers hope for little more than an armistice between one campaign and the next. The great lesson and warning of experience is that victorious leaders of the past have too often contented themselves with the infliction of military defeat upon the enemy power, without extending that victory by dealing with the root causes which led to war as an inevitable consequence. Thus, in the occupation of Japan, while we have destroyed Japan's war-making power and neutralized from a material standpoint its war-making potential, we are yet in the process of finalizing the victory that the ensuing peace at war's great cost may be vital and real. This will require a complete reformation of the Japanese people—reformation from feudalistic slavery to human freedom, from the immaturity that comes of mythical teachings and legendary ritualism to the maturity of enlightened knowledge and truth, from the blind fatalism of war to the considered realism of peace.

In the accomplishment of this purpose, all policy in the administration of the occupation is attuned to those very ideals for which we fought—that by example we may point the way. This in turn is infusing in the Japanese mind both an understanding of and an enthusiasm for our own concept in human relationship—a concept which embodies within itself a spiritual repugnance to war.

If we are successful in the accomplishment of this purpose, we shall not have finalized the victory by bringing under control basic causes of war, but we shall have erected here in the western Pacific a strong bulwark against the reappearance and spread of those same causes which are calculated to plunge the world into future war, for history has shown the futility of dependence upon the violence of war alone to preserve the peace. This is the stake for which we strive. It is yet too early to measure the degree of final success, but Japan is now already governed by the form of democratic rule and the people are absorbing its substance. They have learned by the hard way the futility of resort to arms for individual and national advancement, and appear to have completely assimilated this bitter lesson. Having repudiated war and renounced all rights of belligerency, they have placed their full reliance for future protection on the good faith and justice of mankind, and are proceeding through legislated reform to develop here a state dedicated, in full reality, to the welfare of the people. Given encouragement, this can prove the exemplification of the superiority, in the advancement of the human race, of moral force, generated by spiritual strength, over physical force, with all resources employed for constructive rather than destructive purposes. A spontaneous development which offers both encouragement and inspiration as a measure of the progress of this concept lies in the increasing number of the Japanese people—already estimated at over 2,000,000—who, under the stimulus of religious tolerance and freedom, have moved to embrace the Christian faith as a means to fill the spiritual vacuum left in Japanese life by collapse of their past faith. This is partially responsive to the opportunity for comparison between the qualities of the old and the new—to an understanding of those principles of tolerance, justice, and human decency which govern our action in the tragedy of their defeat, and, more particularly, from close-hand observation of the American soldier standing in their midst, reflecting, as he does, those fine traits of character, outgrowth of the American home. Through the firm encouragement and strengthening of this yet frail spirit of Christianity in the Far East lies hope that to hundreds of millions of backward peoples, now easy prey to the ignorant fatalism of war, may come a heretofore unknown spiritual strength based upon an entirely new concept of human dignity and human purpose and human relationship—the very antithesis to those evil attributes which throughout history have led to war.

The American forces committed to occupational duty in Japan, now cut to only a fraction of their former strength, are at the lowest numerical level consistent with either reasonable security or the accomplishment of the regeneration of an entire race from its traditional threat to peace to a powerful bulwark against the recurrence of war—with its orderly emergence from the chaos of destructive defeat to economic, political, and social stability. And high-lighting all else, of course, lies the grave responsibility of protecting our national security against future threat to our Pacific coast. In short, the consolidation of the gains which victory has brought, that we may have peace. Our task is thus but a final phase of war, and it is inescapable that its avoidance may only be at the expense of victory itself.

In war the complete blockade of a force dependent for food and other supply from outside sources is the most effective weapon known to military science. It was through the use of this weapon that our starving men on Bataan and Corregidor were finally forced to yield to the enemy hordes who surrounded them. It was through the use of this same weapon, more than any other, that the Japanese armed forces were finally brought to the futility of further resistance, as segment after segment of their extended positions, by envelopment, were cut off from needed supplies on the grim road back. Thereafter, when reconquest of the Philippines completely severed the Japanese war-gained empire and permitted a blockade of the Japanese home islands themselves, traditionally dependent for sustenance from sources without, total collapse became imminent.

Since the surrender this blockade of the Japanese home islands has been continued, extended, and intensified. Not only have Manchuria, Korea, and Formosa, long contributors to Japanese sustenance, been taken away, but many millions of Japanese citizens have been repatriated from the outside back into these four home islands. Trade and financial intercourse with the rest of the world is by our decree so prohibited as to constitute economic strangulation.

Cut off from our own projected relief supplies in these circumstances, countless Japanese would face starvation, and starvation breeds mass unrest, disorder, and violence. Worse still, it renders a people easy prey to any ideology, however evil, which bears with it life sustaining food. To permit such a condition to arise would be to repudiate those very ideals and principles on which our country has always stood and for which many of our countrymen selflessly have died. For under the responsibilities of victory the Japanese people are now our prisoners, no less than did the surviving men on Bataan become their prisoners when that peninsula fell. As a consequence of the ill treatment, including starvation of Allied prisoners in Japanese hands, we have tried and executed many Japanese officers upon proof of responsibility. Yet can we justify such punitive action if we ourselves in reversed circumstances, but with hostilities at end, fail to provide the food to sustain life among those Japanese people over whom we now stand guard within the narrow confines of their home islands.

Nor must sight be lost of the circumstances under which such food and other emergency relief supplies are provided. There is involved an appropriation of public funds only for the purpose of their acquisition, the corresponding cost becoming thereafter a charge against Japan, which should be protected by a first lien on every asset within Japan. It is not charity, nor have I found that the Japanese want charity. It is but a means to secure needed life preserving sustenance until such time as we ourselves relax the restrictions which now prevent Japan from securing the same by the normal methods of trade and commerce with the other nations of the world. Nor, if reasonable precautions are taken, will the Ameri-

can taxpayer ultimately be out of pocket a single dollar as a result.

At most it is but a temporary measure in discharge of a clear responsibility which victory has imposed. It must be and remain our firm purpose to restore peace and normalcy at the very earliest time practicable, and it is my full intention to recommend removal of the existing military controls over Japan just as soon as civilian controls safely may be substituted. History points out the unmistakable lesson that military occupations serve their purpose at best only for a limited time, after which a deterioration rapidly sets in—deterioration of the populace in an occupied country which becomes increasingly restive under the deprivation of personal freedom, inherent in such a situation—and deterioration of the occupying forces which in time assume a dominant power complex pointing to the illusion of a master race.

While I have herein discussed our national responsibilities of occupation largely from the viewpoint of Japan, much that I have said applies with even more poignant force to Korea, wherein our public commitment to assist in the establishment of a stable, free government, for a friendly people liberated by Allied arms, imposes upon us an even more solemn obligation.

I am in fullest accord with the desire of the American Congress to practice the most rigid economy in the administration of government which our national interests reasonably may permit. Economy in both blood and supply was a rule which guided every strategic plan in the prosecution of our phase of the Pacific war, and economy has since been the rule here in the extension and consolidation of victory. A rationalization of the cost involved in this great task shows it to be, in the aggregate, infinitesimal compared with that which might have been incurred in a comparable period of extended combat.

I have observed the workings of the American Congress for many years, and have never seen it hesitate vigorously to preserve and advance our American interests. When provided with full knowledge of the situation, I do not believe, therefore, that it will take any action which would prejudice fulfillment of occupation objectives, to which we are already committed and in honor bound, as a prerequisite to finalizing the victory and insuring the peace.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. Is it his opinion that if any substantial cut is made in the military appropriations, it will jeopardize the situation in the Pacific, as set forth by General MacArthur in the letter the Senator has read just now?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from what I know of the Budget and from my examination of the needs of the Army and the Navy, I believe that a $6,000,000,000 reduction in the Budget, if it is made, will mean that approximately $2,500,000,000 will have to be taken from the Army and Navy appropriations. It is perfectly clear that if $2,500,000,000 or $2,225,000,000 is taken from a requested $11,000,000,000 appropriation for the Army and the Navy the situation in Japan, whatever it may be, will inevitably be affected adversely; and that is exactly what General MacArthur has stated in the letter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the letter the Senator from Illinois has read is most pertinent to the issue now before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is why I read the letter to the Senate, and that is why General MacArthur sent it to the Assistant Secretary of War, namely, in order that the Senate and the House of Representatives and the country at large may know what that great man is doing in the Pacific as he attempts to establish peace among those who in the past have been pagans.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Last Friday, when the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was speaking, he was interrupted by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who at that time criticized the War Department because, as he stated, it had seriously miscalculated its estimates for the needs of the Army in 1946.

When that statement was made, I interrupted the Senator from Illinois and asked that I be permitted to reply to that remark. When the Senator from Illinois consented, I stated that the reason that the Army had missed the correct estimate by approximately $32,000,000,000 or $33,000,000,000 was that it did not anticipate that the war with Germany and the war with Japan would end so soon.

After the Senate session on Friday ended, I telephoned the War Department and requested a substantiation of the statement I had made. I desire to read into the RECORD at this time the Army's statement regarding what took place during that period:

DATA ON WAR DEPARTMENT RESCISSION ACTS

1. Preparation of the War Department military estimates for fiscal year 1946 began in late fall of 1944. Such estimates had been prepared on the basis that the war would continue. Hearings began in Congress on May 25, 1945. However, the war with Germay terminated unexpectedly in May 1945. It was not clear at that time as to just what course the war against Japan would take and the rate at which partial demobilization could take place. Consequently, although it was recognized that all funds contained in the estimates would probably not be required, it was deemed advisable, in view of the late date, to appropriate the funds estimated on the original basis, and then withdraw such funds as appeared proper after further study. In accordance therewith, the fiscal year 1946 appropriation act was enacted on July 3, 1945, and study immediately began leading up to a rescission bill—the first. Hearings were begun on this September 25, 1945, and the First Rescission Act (Public Law 301) was finally enacted February 18, 1946.

2. Before the hearings on the First Rescission Act started, however, VJ-day occurred and further withdrawals became possible. These additional sums were considered and the First Rescission Act, when finally enacted in February 1946, withdrew $30,263,923,993. As plans were further revised and further study proved it advisable, the Congress withdrew additional sums by means of the Second and Third Rescission Acts, enacted, respectively, on May 27, 1946, and July 23, 1946.

3. The sums withdrawn by the three rescission acts are indicated below:

First Rescission Act (Public Law 301)	$30,263,923,993
Second Rescission Act (Public Law 391)	1,544,490,612
Third Rescission Act (Public Law 521)	1,563,283,587
Total	33,371,698,192

The action of the War Department shows plainly to me that they were trying to cooperate, not only in winning the war but also in saving dollars for the people of the United States. Instead of not knowing what was taking place, as the Senator from Indiana insinuated, it seems to me they did know what was going on, gave reliable figures, and saved us a great amount of money.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. In answer to the statement just read by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, I should like to know whether the War Department gave him the figures regarding the estimates of what they said they would have to have for the past 6 years? Did they give the Senator that information?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was not a member of the Senate during all of the last 6 years, nor did the War Department give me the estimates. I am not a member of the Committee on the Armed Services. I understand the War Department did from year to year give estimates to the Congress.

Mr. JENNER. For the Senator's information, let me suggest that the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] this afternoon placed in the RECORD the estimates the War Department had made for the past 6 years, and in their estimates of the bottom dollars they needed to carry on the defense of this Nation they had made a mistake, over the 6-year period, of from $2,000,000,000 to $33,000,000,000. I merely said to the Senator from Illinois the other day that any department which cannot guess within $33,000,000,000 of what it actually needs does not know what it is doing, and I still maintain that contention.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I refuse to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington declines to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. So much has been said in both Houses of Congress, and in the press, concerning the report of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget for the fiscal year 1948 that I thought it apropos, as an individual Senator, to add my views.

The joint committee recommended a slash of $6,000,000,000 in the Budget submitted by the President of the United States for the coming year. The President estimated the minimum needs of the Government to be $37,500,000,000. The joint committee has proposed that this figure be reduced to $31,500,000,000.

Mr. President, the Reorganization Act placed upon the appropriate committees in both Houses the responsibility—and I quote from the act itself—"to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the Budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year, shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15."

I may observe that passage of the Reorganization Act in itself was a significant milestone in the progress of the Nation toward better, more effective government. From my point of view, the provision of the Reorganization Act which I have just read is a wise one. For the first time since I came to the Congress of the United States the opportunity was made available to the Members of the Congress to see at one and the same time estimated Federal income in relation to estimated expenditures. I say again this is a wise, businesslike provision and procedure.

Under this procedure the joint committee had the obligation to report to their respective Houses by February 15. This they have done. The committee, therefore, has not failed in its responsibility to make a report—it has failed in its responsibility to make an adequate report.

The Reorganization Act was passed at the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress, in August 1946. From the date of its passage the leaders of both parties knew that on February 15, 1947, a report on the legislative budget must be made to the Congress. On November 5 the leadership in the Congress passed from the Democratic to the Republican Party. Certainly from that day on the new majority leaders in this body knew the responsibility which was theirs.

From the Senate there were on the joint committee 19 members of the majority party, 15 from the minority. I mention this to emphasize that the majority party held the balance of power in the joint committee. They used this balance of power in a manner contrary to the best traditions of this great body and contrary to the basic principles of democratic action. They held, I am informed, secret and closed sessions, at which minority members of the committee were not present. The report is they called only two witnesses. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated on the floor of the Senate last week that there were no hearings, that there were minutes of the sessions, but he did not know where those minutes could be obtained. This kind of procedure and tactics I say again is contrary to the best traditions of this body and of democratic government.

Majority leaders in both Houses have issued press statements on matters related to the legislative budget which are confusing and misleading to the American people, who, I assure Senators, are watching these proceedings with the utmost interest and concern. We have seen quotations in the press from House majority leaders saying the proposed cut in the President's Budget must be made to provide for a 20 percent across-the-board cut in income taxes. If income taxes are to be cut, I submit with all the vigor at my command that an across-the-board cut violates every aspect of ability to pay.

Let us examine for a moment, in view of these statements, what the 20-percent cut across the board would achieve. The average yearly income in this country today is about $2,600. The average family consists of between three and four persons. An American wage earner with an income of $2,600, supporting two children, would pay an income tax of $67. To him the 20-percent reduction would mean a saving of $13.40. Contrast this with the juicy cut of $14,000 to $15,000 that would accrue to the man with an income of $100,000.

Or contrast this saving of $13.40 with the effect upon his real income of another piece of legislation which may soon come before the Congress. We are told that the average rental unit in this country costs approximately $30 a month—or $360 a year. A 15-percent increase in ceiling rents would add $54 to the average tenant's yearly outlay. So, on the one hand, we reduce his taxes by $13.40, and on the other, if some present proposals are written into law, increase his living costs by $54.

The original rumors emanating from these statements and from the closed sessions of the small group who formulated the recommendation of the joint committee were to the effect that to achieve an over-all cut in the President's Budget of $6,000,000,000, two and a quarter billion dollars would be slashed from the armed services.

Many statements have also been made to the American people since last November regarding the financial situation which continue to mislead. The statement about the necessity of making a slash in the armed services appropriations is true, because if such savings are to be effected as were stated by the members of the majority party between the last election and the time Congress met, and even since that time, there are only three or four places in the Government where it is possible to achieve anywhere near such savings. One is in appropriations for the military, another in the appropriations for the veterans, another the fixed interest on the debt, which we cannot touch. The fourth, of course, is the appropriations for the great developments and projects in the West. Despite the fact that every Member of the Senate, and everyone who has any knowledge of Government, knows that in order to achieve these cuts we would have to cut the Army and Navy substantially, even that has been intermittently denied and confirmed by the majority leaders, depending on who was speaking. The performance we have witnessed in this regard leaves the public, the heads of the armed services, and many Members of Congress completely in the dark as to what are the real intentions of the majority leaders.

Last week on the floor of the Senate majority leaders were repeatedly asked by their colleagues on both sides of the aisle, What items specifically do you intend to cut? There has been no satisfactory response. There has been no study, as was recommended under the Reorganization Act, as to where these cuts shall be effected. Yet, in New Haven, Conn., on Saturday, February 22, the senior Senator from Ohio is quoted as saying, "Most of us agree that by rigid economy and cutting out a lot of popular projects we can take out three and a half to four billion dollars without touching the armed forces."

It is said by the senior Senator from Ohio that we can save between three and one-half and four billion dollars by rigid economy, by cutting out many popular projects. The Senator implies, at least, that he or somone on the other side of the aisle knows to what popular projects he refers. What are those projects? Why have we not been apprised of them so that we might vote on this question in the light of that knowledge?

We in the West should like to know, for instance, whether or not in order to make these cuts the Military Establishment is to be touched. If the statements regarding maintenance of efficiency of the military organization are to be lived up to, how will the $6,000,000,000 cut affect western projects? How will it affect the development of the great dams on the Columbia River? How will it affect the Columbia River Basin? To such questions we have had no answer, and the Senator from Washington finds himself in a very difficult position. He believes in the Legislative Reorganization Act and its provisions for a legislative budget. He deeply desires to have an opportunity to vote on a resolution substantiated by facts. He finds instead that this vital question has been shrouded somewhat in secrecy within the committee, and confusion, tailored out of many conflicting statements and assertions in the press and on the floor of both Houses.

I therefore must vote on this important subject, guided not by the information received from the majority leaders of the joint committee, as contemplated under the Legislative Reorganization Act, but guided by my own general knowledge of the affairs of our Government and such information as might be obtained on the floor of the Senate during the course of this debate on the $6,000,000,000 resolution.

Personally, I shall support wholeheartedly any bona fide efforts to achieve economy in governmental expenditures. We all want that. I want it understood, however, that when the choice is be-

tween economy and the national security, or public health or welfare, I perforce must choose the latter.

We cannot at this stage of world affairs afford to tinker with the national security or the health and welfare of our citizens.

An amendment increasing the joint committee's recommended $31,500,000,000 ceiling to $33,000,000,000 has been submitted. I shall support this amendment. I shall support it as an objective which we will make every effort to attain, namely, some form of national economy. However, as individual appropriation bills come before the Senate I shall have to consider each one on its merits and vote on each according to the demonstrated need of the department or function concerned. Moreover, in considering individual appropriation bills, I shall have to differentiate, as I think the majority leaders have failed to do in this case, between appropriations for expenses of Government and appropriations for investment by the Government. By "investment" I mean funds requested for the protection of the health of our citizens, for instance, such as the school-lunch program; funds requested for conserving our greatest of all national resources, soil conservation and flood control, and funds requested for self-liquidating, wealth-producing projects, such as reclamation and rural electrification. If these be the popular projects referred to by the Senator from Ohio, I think he should apprise us of that fact.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], today, suggested in a very able address that probably the Budget could be cut to the extent of $10,000,000,000. The Senator posed, however, a very apt question: Where is the cut to be made? How is it to be made? He suggested that probably if we knew where to make the cuts, we might even make the reduction more than $6,000,000,000; and, of course, that is the information I am seeking. There are certain cuts that some of us want to make; other cuts have been suggested we do not think it desirable to make.

I am sure that all the Senators living west of the Mississippi River would like to know where the ax is to fall. Those are some of the things about which I think we have been kept completely in the dark, as has also the American public.

I desire to return briefly, Mr. President—and I shall not prolong my remarks unduly—to the question of income-tax reduction, which is an integral part of this whole problem. I have already made clear my position relative to the across-the-board approach to this issue. I now address my remarks to the utilization of any income for 1948 in excess of expenditures.

As has been pointed out previously on the floor of the Senate, our national income was at an all-time high of $165,000,000,000 in 1946. There is no way of knowing how long income will continue at that level. A reduction of $10,000,000,000 in national income would mean a reduction of $3,000,000,000 in Federal income. Our national debt stands at $259,000,000,000. Because of the threat to our national solvency contained in this stupendous sum, it is my conviction that all excess revenues for 1948 should be applied to reduction of the national debt.

I therefore find myself in support of the so-called Knowland amendment.

In conclusion, I hope that in the course of this debate we shall be given some indication, either by the committee or by Senators on the other side of the aisle, as to where it is intended to make the various cuts. If cuts are to be made in the military appropriations, let us say so; if they are to be made in the western projects, let us say so; if the cuts are going to kill the self-liquidating reclamation projects of the West, we should like to know.

In the meantime, we of course shall do what we can to find out, as individual Senators; but when we are considering the $6,000,000,000 cut which is proposed to be made in the President's Budget of 1948—which was slashed considerably before it arrived in the Senate, and on the floor of the House—I think the people of the West would like to know just where it is intended to take out the $6,000,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is my intention to submit a motion to the effect that action on the pending Budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) be postponed.

My motion, however, will not call for indefinite postponement. I am one of those who support the Budget procedure as it finally emerged from the Legislative Reorganization Act, and I believe that a vote should be taken upon the Budget resolution as soon as possible.

But I also believe that Senate consideration of the Budget resolution should be consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Legislative Reorganization Act and with the traditions of this great deliberative body.

My motion, therefore, will call for postponement of action on the Budget resolution until such time as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has submitted to the Senate its findings and recommendations on the Economic Report of the President.

But why, one may ask, should action on the Budget resolution be held up until the Joint Economic Committee has reported on the President's economic program?

My answer to this question is threefold.

First, it was the clear and unmistakable intention of the Legislative Reorganization Act that the Joint Economic Committee's report on the President's economic program should precede action on the legislative Budget.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to two significant sections of the Legislative Reorganization Act—section 225 and section 138. Section 225 provides that by February 1 the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report containing its findings and recommendations on the economic report of the President. Section 138 provides that the Joint Budget Committee shall submit its Budget resolution by February 15.

The intention behind these two dates was unmistakable. The intention was that the Congress should first review the broad economic recommendations of the President, and then consider the President's recommendations on the Budget. The intention was that the problem of the Budget should be considered in the light of a considered analysis of the health of our economy and of the character of the Federal Government's economic program—an analysis to be prepared by a joint committee composed of 14 outstanding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has not yet had the time to complete its analysis of the President's Economic Report. As the joint committee reported to the Senate on January 31, it has not yet hired its staff of experts, and is, therefore, not yet prepared to submit to the Senate in detail its "findings and recommendations upon the main recommendations in the Economic Report of the President, as called for under the Employment Act of 1946.

I am not criticizing the Joint Economic Committee for having delayed in submitting to the Congress its complete findings and recommendations on the President's economic program. Surely, it is essential that the Joint Economic Committee submit well-considered conclusions to the Congress at a later date rather than to submit ill-considered conclusions at an early date.

In the same way it would surely be better for the Senate to take well-considered action on the Budget resolution at some later date than to take ill-consindered action today. It would certainly be the wiser course, therefore, to postpone action on the Budget resolution until the Joint Economic Committee has given the Senate the benefit of its conclusions upon the President's Economic Report.

While I have been informed by the Senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, that no specific date has yet been set for the Joint Economic Committee's report, I am sure that no one in this body need fear lest the Joint Economic Committee delay too long in the preparation of its statutory report. The members of the Joint Economic Committee are Senators who are deeply familiar with economic problems, and I am sure that once the staff organization of the committee is completed, the committee will submit its report to the Congress without further delay.

The second reason for postponing action on the pending Budget resolution is to provide the Senate with essential information without which intelligent action on the Budget resolution will be impossible.

In the years gone by, the Budget of the Federal Government was so small that it had relatively little effect on our economy. Today, however, for better or for worse, the activities of the Federal Government are so vast that the Government's Budget plays an exceedingly important role in determining the future course of employment, production, and purchasing power.

Furthermore, there is not one Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives who does not accept the fact

that the Federal Budget for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1947, will call for expenditures over and above thirty billion dollars. There is not one Member of Congress who does not accept the fact that the Federal Budget for the next fiscal year will call for the collection of more than $30,000,000,000 in tax revenue.

Since these facts are self-evident, Mr. President, how can this huge Federal Budget be properly analyzed, debated, or voted upon except in the light of its relation to economic conditions?

When I look at this pending Budget resolution, Mr. President, many economic questions of great significance arise in my mind.

Are we entering a period in which there is a danger of inflationary trends—or does the prospect of deflation loom ahead?

What is the anticipated level of national income during the coming fiscal year—and what level of national income should be our goal?

What percentage of the national income is represented by the expenditure estimate in the pending concurrent resolution?

Do economic conditions call for a balanced Budget during the next fiscal year or for a Budget surplus?

If a Budget surplus is indicated, how much should it be?

Mr. President, I do not have the answers to these questions. I have not seen the answers to these questions presented to the Senate during the debate we have thus far had on the pending Budget resolution.

Mr. President, until I know the answers to these questions, I cannot vote intelligently upon the pending concurrent resolution. Until the Senate has discussed these broad questions of fiscal policy in the light of the needs of our economy, I do not see how the Senate can vote intelligently upon the pending resolution.

Since the Joint Economic Committee will necessarily have to discuss these questions in submitting to the Congress its findings upon the President's Economic Report, I believe that action on the Budget resolution should be deferred until the Joint Economic Committee has had an opportunity to prepare its report to the Congress.

The third reason, Mr. President, for postponing action on the pending Budget resolution is to give genuine strength and meaning to the resolution that is finally adopted.

It has been charged by some that the pending resolution is meaningless because the figure it establishes on appropriations will be merely a target and have no statutory force.

Now it is perfectly true that any figure finally adopted in the Budget resolution will be merely a target and will represent no binding ceiling upon the actual level of appropriations and expenditures. This is as it should be. It does not mean that a target figure is meaningless. The acceptance of such a target figure by the Congress will mean that the Congress has committed itself to act in a certain manner.

But if the target figure in the Budget resolution is agreed upon without an adequate analysis of the relation between the national economy and the Budget, then the target figure will have no force whatsoever.

It will be regarded by the public as a figure without meaning—as a figure snatched out of the air for the purpose of making a play to the galleries.

It will not be adhered to by either House of Congress.

Lacking the force and vigor that can come only from well-considered action, from action based upon a genuine analysis of our economic needs, it will be openly flouted by the Congress as we take action upon individual appropriation and revenue measures.

It will be used as the basis for heaping scorn and derision upon the Members of Congress when only a few months later it is found that Congress first established a Budget policy and then proceeded to ignore it.

How much better it would be, Mr. President, for action on the Budget resolution to be deferred until the Joint Economic Committee has had a chance to present to the Congress a well-considered and integrated analysis of our budgetary requirements in the light of the economic needs of our country.

Mr. President, I have not attempted to suggest a specific date for the report of the Joint Economic Committee. I know that that date will depend upon the success of its present plans for recruitment of staff and upon the pressure of other congressional business. I am merely suggesting postponement until whatever date it is that the Joint Economic Committee submits its report. If the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the senior Senator from Ohio, believes that it is possible to set a specific date—whether that date be March 15, April 1, or some other date—I shall be delighted to amend my motion accordingly.

Mr. President, it was my original intention to ask that the pending Budget resolution be postponed until 15 days after such date as the Senate shall have received the report of the Senate Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and its detailed recommendations on the Economic Report of the President as called for under the Employment Act of 1946. I find, however, that the rules of the Senate will not permit such postponement to an indefinite time. It is necessary therefore for me to fix a definite date of postponement.

I therefore move that the consideration of the pending Budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) be postponed until April 1, 1947, at which time it is expected that the Senate shall have received from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report such committee's report containing its detailed finding and recommendations on the Economic Report of the President, as called for under the Employment Act of 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Montana repeat his motion?

Mr. MURRAY. I move that the consideration of the pending Budget resolution be postponed until April 1, 1947, at which time it is expected that the Senate will have received from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report such committee's report containing its detailed findings and recommendations on the Economic Report of the President, as called for under the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator's motion in order, with the amendment pending?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is in order, and takes precedence, and is the pending question before the Senate.

The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that consideration of the pending concurrent resolution be postponed until April 1, 1947. The motion is debatable.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] be laid on the table.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. If the motion to lay on the table should be agreed to, would Senators be denied the privilege of debate upon the motion of the Senator from Montana?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be the effect.

Mr. PEPPER. Is that the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the parliamentary situation, at any rate.

The Senator from Montana moved that the pending resolution be postponed until April 1, 1947. The Senator from New Hampshire moved to lay the motion of the Senator from Montana on the table. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire, which is not debatable. [Putting the question.]

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move that the pending resolution be deferred until April 2, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the Chair's view, the motion is technically in order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida that consideration of the pending resolution be postponed until April 2, 1947.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Does any Senator have the floor at this moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. When a Senator makes a motion does he automatically retain the floor after making the motion, or is new recognition required?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. New recognition is required.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator from Florida been recognized the second time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not. The Senator from Florida is now recognized, because he was the first to address the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Chair.

It seems to me, Mr. President—and I believe it is the consensus of the Senate and of the country—that this matter is of sufficient consequence to deserve consideration by the Senate; and I am sorry that there is any disposition to deny Senators the opportunity to debate it. I think there are Senators who desire to debate the question. They are in accord with the pending motion, which, although not the same as the original motion, is somewhat akin to it.

There is an orderly scheme provided in various statutes which are pertinent to this question, and that is what we are suggesting that the Senate follow.

The Full Employment Act requires for the first time in connection with a momentous piece of legislation, bipartisan in conception and character, that the President shall make an economic report to the Congress. The President has discharged his duty under the law; and on January 8 the Senate received from the President a very comprehensive and commendable economic report. I think it is only fair to say that the comprehensiveness and clarity of that report have challenged the admiration and favorable comment of all sections of opinion in the country.

Under the law it was the duty of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to consider that report and to advise the Congress of its recommendations relative thereto.

That has all been recognized in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President which was filed on January 31. The date when the joint committee was under a duty to recommend to the Senate relative to the President's report was February 1. Senators will recall that it was May 1 in the Full Employment Act, but in the Reorganization Act the date was fixed as February 1. So the first point in the sequence was the report of the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Reorganization Act fixed the date as the 15th of February, not the 1st of February.

Mr. PEPPER. The date of submitting the report of the committee on the President's report was fixed as February 1. The date of the filing of the legislative Budget is February 15.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The first step in the sequence, therefore, was the President's economic report telling the Congress what the signs in the economic sky were and making recommendations as to what was necessary to keep employment at a high level, to maintain the prosperity of the country, and to carry on a stable program for the Nation.

On February 1 it was the duty of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President to report back to the Senate. It was contemplated by the law that that report should not be a mere casual report, not a cursory consideration of the very momentous recommendations of the President on the national economy. It was to represent the deliberate act of a bipartisan group giving careful consideration to the subject—something that would be a guide, as the law itself said, to the various legislative committees of the Congress in the performance of their several duties.

Mr. President, it was provided in the Reorganization Act that on February 15—although the margin of time was narrow, the Congress fixed the date as February 15—it was then the duty of the Committee on the Legislative Budget to make a recommendation to the Congress fixing the over-all limit of the Budget, fixing expenditures in relation to receipts as best it could, and, if the expenditures exceeded the anticipated receipts, providing for a resolution that the national debt limit should be extended by the Congress.

Mr. President, all that is an orderly, rational procedure laid down, not by the executive branch of the Government, but by the Congress itself. I am asking, as did the Senator from Montana, only that the Congress follow not only the letter but the spirit of those enactments. I point out, first, that we have the President's Economic Report; that on February 1 we received a substantial report from the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report; and I further ask that when we act upon the Legislative Budget, we not only have the benefit of the President's executive report on the economic situation, but have before us for our benefit the results of a sound study and a substantial report by a committee of the Congress on the Economic Report.

Do we have that before us? When we vote today, as I assume we shall, upon fixing the over-all limitation on the expenditures of this Congress, are we going to have the benefit of such information? Shall we have such information when we say, as the resolution would have us say, "That it is the judgment of the Congress"—not the intuition of the Congress, not, as the able Senator from Ohio said the other day in his remarks, "an intelligent guess," not an emotional impression, not an imprint, but the judgment of the Congress?

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the exercise of judgment is based upon fact, and is preceded by inquiry, and is the result of consideration and deliberation, following which a conclusion is reached. Accordingly, I ask whether we have before us from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report what the law contemplated that we should have before us when we acted upon the Budget?

I need not emphasize the importance of this matter. It affects the action of this whole Congress. The able President pro tempore of this body, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], spoke eloquently in the Senate the other day and told us that the resolution, in the form in which it originally came to us, cutting $6,000,000,000 from the Budget recommended by the President, would take $2,225,000,000 from the appropriations for the armed forces of the United States. He said it would endanger and imperil the national security, and he quoted the language of Washington to warn against a danger of that character to the national well-being and safety. He had to confess, as shown on page 1265 of the RECORD, that even with a cut of $4,500,000,000, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], if I read aright the language of the able senior Senator from Michigan, the situation would be as follows:

> But, Mr. President, I beg of all Senators * * * to realize that when we support the Millikin amendment, putting the present over-all estimate at $4,500,000,000, we are voting for another cut of $750,000,000 in these items for the armed services and the national defense, on the basis of the work sheets of the joint committee.

So, as I understand the language of the able senior Senator from Michigan, even if we cut the Budget only $4,500,000,000, that will commit us to cutting by $700,000,000 the Budget for the armed services. Is it the deliberate judgment of the Senate, Mr. President, that we can afford to do that? Have we before us the substantial, carefully arrived at conclusion of the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report to advise us in undertaking this momentous step? Of course, we have before us the testimony of the Secretary of War and the testimony of other representatives of the armed services. They have told us the danger of cutting the appropriations for the armed services, and how it will imperil the national defense.

I hold in my hand the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President, which was supposed to be a guide to the standing committees of the Congress and, of course, to the Congress itself in passing upon the matter of the Legislative Budget. In its report the committee explains that there has been

delay in a number of things preliminary to its report. It says its has not had time to select a staff. I read the following from the report:

The problems to be considered by the committee are the most complex economic problems which the country faces, and it is vitally important that the best possible staff and consultants be procured in order that the best possible studies may be made. The committee is now engaged in canvassing the qualifications of a number of men for this work, but as yet has not selected these men or begun the necessary studies.

The committee has considered the Report of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, made in December 1946 (S. Doc. No. 6), and the Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 49). It has particularly considered the recommendations of the President in the "short range program" appearing on pages 20, 21, and 22 of his report. The committee agrees with the President that removal of wartime controls and the return to a freer economy places on business, farmers, labor, management, and consumers the main responsibility for working out price and wage relationships. The committee joins in the President's hope that business will reduce prices; that labor will refrain from excessive wage demands; and that both will bend every effort to increase productivity.

The short-range recommendations of the President calling for congressional action may be summarized as follows:

1. Congress should extend rent control.

2. Congress should extend the coverage and raise the rate of the minimum wage.

3. Congress should extend the coverage and revise the benefits under the social-security system.

I shall refer to that a little later. That would cost money.

I read further from the report:

4. Congress should enact a long-range comprehensive housing program.

That likewise would cost money.

The report further states:

5. While the tax burden should be reduced as soon as possible, it should not be reduced at this time.

6. Congress should deal with the whole field of labor management relations in which sound collective bargaining is essential.

All of these six matters are already under consideration by standing committees of Congress which will make a detailed study of each one of them and submit recommendations to the Congress. Most of them are highly controversial. A recommendation from this committee at this time which could only be casual before our studies are made, would not be helpful to the solution of the problems. The committee will proceed to consider these problems with reference to their effect on the maintenance of a stable economy and continuous employment.

The basic problem which this committee has to consider is the method of preventing depressions so that substantially full employment may be continuously maintained. No problem before the American people is more vital to our welfare, to the very existence of our way of life, and to the peace of the world. It is the most complex and difficult of all the long-range domestic problems we have to face. It involves a study of price levels and wage levels and their relation to each other, a study of methods of preventing monopoly control in industry and labor from distorting prices and wages, a study of spending for consumption and for capital investment, a study of individual and corporate savings, and a study of many other economic forces bearing on a stable economy.

Until we have further studied and analyzed the basic considerations which underlie this problem, we do not feel we should become involved in controversy on current issues which have many aspects besides their effect on the prosperity of the country.

With regard to the President's long-range program, no immediate recommendations are necessary. The committee will proceed to consider his different proposals as rapidly as we can reach them, to determine whether they bear a relation to the principal task of this committee and, if they do, make recommendations to Congress with regard to them.

The committee notes with approval that the report places special emphasis upon an over-all policy directed toward the preservation in agriculture of the family-sized farm (p. 25) and in industry of free competitive enterprise (p. 28). The details of a program to prevent another agricultural depression and of an affirmative program, in the words of the report, "to enlarge the opportunities for efficient and enterprising small businesses" will be among the primary subjects of committee study.

Regardless of the recommendations of the report on which there may or may not be controversy, it is our desire to commend the compilation of statistics and economic facts which are contained in the President's report and furnish a substantial basis for further study.

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman.
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Vice Chairman.
JOSEPH H. BALL.
RALPH E. FLANDERS.
ARTHUR V. WATKINS.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.
FRANCIS J. MYERS.
JOHN SPARKMAN.
GEORGE H. BENDER.
WALTER H. JUDD.
ROBERT F. RICH.
EDWARD J. HART.
WRIGHT PATMAN.
WALTER B. HUBER.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator's motion should be adopted, would it result in delay in the consideration of and report by the Appropriations Committee of the Congress on appropriation bills?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I would not consider it so, Mr. President. I would consider that it would be the orderly procedure.

Mr. OVERTON. Then the committees of Congress could proceed to consider appropriation bills before the Congress acted on the resolution proposed by the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget; could they not?

Mr. PEPPER. I know of no prohibition to their doing it.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think there is a prohibition, though it is possible, within the contemplation of the Reorganization Act, that the Appropriations Committee will not take action until the Congress has adopted the legislative budget. I assume that.

Mr. PEPPER. I think I can say with safety that there is no prohibition in the Reorganization Act to any Appropriations Committee considering an appropriation before the Congress has acted upon the legislative budget.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let us see what is the most orderly procedure and the more intelligent procedure for the Senate to observe. If we adopt this resolution proposing to cut the budget by a certain number of dollars, we have pledged the good faith of the Congress to the observance of such action. We cannot go out to the people and say, "This is merely a pious hope; this is merely a well-meaning declaration; it is for political purposes and aims." The country is going to take it as the solemn commitment of the Congress, duly arrived at, as the statute itself says, "after study and consultation." That is quoted from section 138 of the Reorganization Act. The people are not going to believe that the Senate of the United States passed a measure providing for a cut of $4,500,000,000, or $6,000,000,000, or any other sum, as an over-all legislative limit, without knowing what it was doing, and acting like rational legislators rather than like one who makes a guess upon a momentous public matter.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. If the country should misinterpret what we are doing, I think it would be the country's fault, because no Senator has risen in this body, on either side of the aisle, and claimed, as they could not claim, that what we were doing was arriving at any more than, first, what was denominated an "intelligent guess," and, secondly, "a rough judgment"—very rough indeed. I do not see how any of our citizens who considered the matter could be misled as to what we are doing.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. I think another way to characterize what is proposed is "budgetary blind man's buff."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was on the committee which drafted the Reorganization Act, was he not?

Mr. PEPPER. I was.

Mr. BRIDGES. And he voted for it?

Mr. PEPPER. I did.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator stood here a few weeks ago and fought any effort for the appointment of special committees because he said it was sabotaging the Reorganization Act, did he not?

Mr. PEPPER. I did.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is not what the Senator proposes deliberately sabotaging or dodging the Reorganization Act, of which he was one of the author?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator asked that question. Let me say, first, I am glad the Senator calls attention to the grief of the Senator from Florida, which he attempted to express on this floor when the able Senator from New Hampshire and his colleagues were the first ones to tear a hole in the Reorganization Act, and to make an exception to its provisions by setting up two special committees.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Will not the Senator allow me a moment? I am going to answer his question. He always asks pertinent questions.

Secondly, the Senator from Florida believed that the enactment should

have been observed by the Senate, and I am sure that that was the overwhelming position of Senators on this side of the aisle. But when the Senator from New Hampshire suggests that I, in my answer to the able Senator from Louisiana, was proposing the thwarting of the design and the purpose of the Reorganization Act, let me tell him that I am merely contending that when a condition precedent has not occurred, one is not under an obligation to discharge an obligation subsequent when the latter is inextricably interwoven with the performance of the first. In other words, it is very clear that the Reorganization Act contemplated that when we acted on the legislative Budget we should have before us two things, first, the report of the President, carrying all the weight his high office carries with it; secondly, that we should have before us the recommendation of the Joint Committee of the Congress on the Economic Report.

The able Senator from New Hampshire will remember that on this floor, while we were considering the Reorganization Act, we moved up the date from May 1, when the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report was supposed to be made, to February 1, so that it was 15 days ahead of the time when the legislative Budget was supposed to be filed with the Congress for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, then I shall yield again to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I view the situation, there is no legislative or parliamentary connection between the report of the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report and the report of the Joint Committee on the President's Budget. The joint committee provided for in the Employment Act, which was passed months ahead of the Reorganization Act, required a report by the 1st of February on the President's Economic Report. The form or shadow of a report was made by the 1st day of February, and, so far as I know, the Senate is powerless to compel any further report, either by the 1st of April, or any other time during this Congress. So that if we were to postpone the consideration of the President's Budget until the 1st of April, on the theory that there would be another report made by the other joint committee, we might, and probably would, reach the 1st of April with no further report.

Therefore, frankly, I see nothing to be accomplished by postponing until the 1st of April the consideration of the pending matter which we have been debating for weeks. There would be no further report from the other joint committee, and we would then debate the pending question for another week or two, and be about where we are now, as I see it. So, personally, I think that inasmuch as we have been dealing with this matter for the past 2 or 3 weeks, we might as well dispose of it. I do not see any advantage to be gained, either for the President's Budget or for the economic report, by putting it off to the 1st of April, or the 2d of April. There is no power in the Senate to compel the other joint committee to make another report, and when it has been announced by the chairman of that committee that no further report will be made, I do not see what we will gain by stopping now, after we have been debating this matter for weeks, and coming back another day to take another whack at it. That is the way I see the matter, though I do not like to disagree with my friend, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Kentucky knows with what reluctance I disagree with him, but I am sure that if he will refresh his memory he will recall that when we were considering the Reorganization Act attention was called to the fact that the Full Employment Act provided that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report should file its report on May 1, and that it was pointed out that that date should be changed because we had made the time for the filing of the legislative budget February 15. It was felt by the Senate—and I am sure it was a Senate amendment—that the Senate should have before it the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President before we acted on the legislative Budget.

I base that on what appears on page 30 of Public Law 601, and I read section 225. The caption is "Joint Committee on the Economic Report."

SEC. 225. Section 5 (b) (3) (relating to the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "May 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1."

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that circumstance, but I still say that the creation of the two separate joint committees was in no way connected. We passed the Reorganization Act the latter part of July, and the Employment Act had been passed a month or two before that, as I recall. I have forgotten the exact dates now.

The joint committee provided for in the act had already been created, and it was brought to the attention of the Senate, I think, that the joint committee created under the Employment Act should file its report prior to the report of the Joint Committee on the President's Budget, and the date was set forward from May 1 to February 1 in order that that might be done.

The point I make is that when the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report comes forward and files, however inadequate, a report on the day when it is designated it must be filed, how can we compel them to file another one by the 1st of April, or any other date, so that we would be justified in postponing the consideration of the pending matter, even though another report might be submitted by the 1st of April?

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to call to the attention of the able Senator from Kentucky, if the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has no objection to my doing so, a letter which the Senator from Ohio wrote to the Senator from Montana on this subject. A reading of the letter apparently indicates that it was the intention of the Senator from Ohio that his committee should file a full and comprehensive report at a subsequent time.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to correct my statement as to the dates of the passage of the two acts. The Employment Act, which was first known as the Full Employment Act, but became known as the Employment Act of 1946, was signed by the President on the 20th day of February.

Mr. PEPPER. Of 1946.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The Legislative Reorganization Act was signed by the President on August 2d.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that a period of several months elapsed between the two dates.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I agree with the able Senator from Kentucky, the Senate has no authority to compel the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to make a report. I say it does not have it though I suppose the Senate always has control over its committees and subcommittees; but I had understood, and I am going to base that on the letter I have in my hand, written to the Senator from Montana by the Senator from Ohio that it was the intention of this committee to file a more full and complete report as soon as it could obtain the personnel and could feel that it was capable of doing the job. This is the letter dated February 15, 1947, sent to the Senator from Montana by the Senator from Ohio:

I have your letter of February 12 with regard to the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

I have felt that the permanent job of developing the principles by which an economic depression may be prevented, and stable employment assured, is the great object of our committee. To accomplish this purpose it is necessary to get the very best economists we can secure. I have already interviewed several and consulted a number of others, but I want to make no mistake in the selection. Once these economists are secured and have had time to begin their studies, I hope we may be able to make some interim reports on the short-term recommendations of the President. Whether and when such reports are made will depend upon the decision of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TAFT.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana was not critical of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and neither am I. They gave a very good reason for not having filed an effective and substantial report. They have not had time to secure personnel and to give the matter the consideration that its magnitude in their opinion requires. I agree with them; yet we are expected here upon the floor of the Senate, without a report even from the Budget Committee containing any factual data, with proponents of this measure describing it as anything from an intelligent guess to something else equally ambiguous—we are expected to act and tell the people of the United States, in the language of the concurrent resolution, that it is the judgment of the Senate of the United States that $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000, as the House provided, or some other amount that evidently seems determined upon here, should be cut from the President's Budget.

Mr. President, let us talk about good government for a moment or two. Let us talk about orderly procedure. Let us talk about a course of action that will command confidence from the public.

The President of the United States has made a Budget recommendation to the Congress. We all know that for months the Budget Bureau with all its many aides, presumably competent and experienced in their tasks, have sat, no doubt day and night, and heard the department heads and agency representatives, including the heads of the armed services, present their needs, and then when all that was done, the Budget Bureau no doubt made a recommendation to the President, and the President finally settled upon a figure and submitted it to the Congress of the United States.

But, Mr. President, I have here a quotation from the New York Times, from Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, as to what even the President had to do to the armed services and to the security of America. I am reading now from the New York Times of February 20. Mr. Baldwin said the following:

> The Navy's budget as submitted to Congress by President Truman would provide funds for the procurement of only 579 planes (exclusive of experimental planes), during the 1948 fiscal year. The Bureau of Aeronautics originally asked for funds for some 1,600 planes.

The President cut the number of airplanes for the Navy from 1,600 requested by the Bureau of Aeronautics, in charge of this matter for the country, knowing more about it than we know, I respectfully submit, to 579.

This figure was reduced to about 1,100 by the Navy Department, and the Bureau of the Budget further pared that to 579.

> If the $1,750,000,000 cut is made, even this number—one-third of what the Bureau of Aeronautics originally estimated as its needs—will be cut in half.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who does the Senator think was right—the President of the United States, or the Army and Navy in their original request? One of them must have been right, and one of them must have been wrong.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say this, in my opinion—and I say it with deference to my colleague—they both know more about it than we do.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should have some question about that. It may apply to the Senator from Florida, but not perhaps to every other Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. Perhaps I should have said that, excepting Zeus himself, who undoubtedly from his Olympian position might have had better information than the rest of us have; but I am presuming that if the Senator had had this information he would not consciously withhold it from his colleagues; and I do not find it in his report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask the Senator a simple question in good faith. One or the other must have been wrong. Either the Army and the Navy were wrong in their original request, or the President was wrong in cutting the Budget. Who does the Senator think was wrong?

Mr. PEPPER. I should construe error as going too far downward in framing the Budget, and the President went down, in my opinion, far enough. If he committed an error, we ought not to make it worse by further reducing the amount.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difficulty with the Senator from New Hampshire is that he thinks both of them were wrong, and he is trying to have his own figures adopted instead of theirs.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say, if the Senator will allow me, that, in my judgment, they are both wrong, but I think probably that if the President, as Chief Executive of the United States, in his good judgment, found the figures of the Army and the Navy 40-percent wrong, and acted accordingly, it is entirely possible that the figures could be a trifle wrong now.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me to say so, I would not attribute to him vanity; I would say he has a superior confidence in his judgment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may say with regard to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, that, after all, three very excellent economic advisers have made a report, which Senators have all had time to study.

Furthermore, presumably with their advice, the President has made an economic report to Congress, which all the Senators have had full time to study; and I cannot possibly see anything bearing on this issue which would be particularly enlightened by any further reports by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Let me read what the President said:

> In the Budget message, I review in detail expenditures and receipts for the current fiscal year, and transmit recommendations for the next fiscal year. There is no need to repeat those details in this economic report.

In other words, the Budget report is one thing, and his economic report is another.

> With an outlook of high economic activity for the current year, the revenue policies are designed to balance the Budget and achieve a surplus toward the retirement of the national debt.

We all agree with that. Certainly our committee would agree with it.

> The expenditure policies are designed exclusively to cover the essential cost of the national defense and war liquidation, to meet our international commitments and the obligations to war veterans under existing law, to carry forward programs required by the Congress, and to take some small but essential further steps toward fulfilling the duties of an alert and progressive Government.

I certainly can take no exception to that.

The only difference between the President and ourselves respecting the Budget is as to how much is necessary exclusively to cover the essential costs of national defense and war liquidation. Certainly that question is one which the Joint Committee on the Economic Report ought not to go into. That is for the Appropriations Committees to go into when they have that question before them. It seems to me that on this particular question even if we made a report, it could cast no beneficial light. There is no difference between the Congress and the President except on the question of how much is necessary for these essential services. The President said we should only have essential services performed this year, and so do I. It is up to us to decide how much is necessary to cover essential services. I do not think our committee could possibly throw any light on that particular subject.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am afraid the able Senator from Ohio does not attribute the importance to his committee which he attributed to it in his written report in which he spoke of the magnitude and complexity of these problems, referred to the fact that they require study, and said he regretted that he had not had a chance to secure a competent staff that would be able to grapple with the problems, and that sort of thing, and he also made the same statement in his letter written to the Senator from Montana.

I agree with the Senator's written report and his letter to the Senator from Montana as to the extreme importance of his committee, and how much Congress should be expected to rely upon the competence and the adequacy of a report from it. We ourselves cannot go into a detailed study of all these things. Every Senator cannot undertake such a study. The Senate and the House constituted the joint committee as their adviser. Now, the Senator indicates that there does not seem to be any difference between his committee and the President. In the first place, the President recommended that the tax burden should be reduced as soon as possible, though not immediately. He did not contemplate any reduction in the tax at this time.

Obviously the President expected that his Budget of thirty-seven and a half billion dollars was to be considered as coming from the executive branch of the Government. That Budget, as the Senator set out on page 2 of his committee's report, mentioned, among other things, the recommendation of the President that Congress should, for example, extend the coverage and revise the benefits under the social-security system. What did we do about it last year? We raised our own salaries $5,000 a year and raised old-age pensions $5 a month. And the President, probably correctly, emphasized that we should reconsider or give continuing consideration to the question of the extension of benefits under the social-security law. We, as Senators, know that if that recommendation of the President is carried out, it will cost money which will have to be a part of

the expenditures provided for by the Appropriations Committees. So that recommendation alone necessitated the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report giving consideration to what effect it would have upon the legislative budget, not to mention housing and other items mentioned by the President.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we are asked to act without any factual data before us from a competent committee such as the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report, and without factual data from our own Legislative Budget Committee, and the able Senator, while he has given a general summary, will not, I think, contend that he has given us a basis in figures as to what he proposes to reduce in the Budget of the President.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Florida knows as well as I do that under the Reorganization Act it is not intended that Congress should prejudge the President's Budget, or to attempt to give a break-down with respect to where cuts could be made, because it is literally impossible to go into all the ramifications and details that are involved. That could only be done after months and months of hearings on the various appropriation bills. Therefore the Legislative Budget Committee submitted a report which would fulfill the provision of the Reorganization Act. The ground and the basis for that report was a well-defined judgment based upon concentrated work over a period of considerable time. It is an estimate, but it is the committee's judgment that we cannot give a break-down, we cannot give details, unless we undertake months and months of hearings, because that is the only way the details of the various appropriations can be obtained.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Now, Mr. President, if that is all this is, to use the language of the Senator from Ohio "an intelligent guess" or to use the language of the able Senator from New Hampshire "an estimate," then surely these able Senators cannot blame some of the others of us for preferring to go along, not with "an intelligent guess," and not with "an estimate," but with a factual Budget submitted by the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget created by the Congress of the United States. How are we to choose? Am I to say I will take the "intelligent guess" of the Senator from Ohio or the "estimate" of the Senator from New Hampshire in preference to a factual budget of figures and data submitted in a lawful way by the President of the United States? I do not think, Mr. President, I should be called upon to vote for the concurrent resolution proposed by the able Senator from New Hampshire based upon the "intelligent guess" of the Senator from Ohio and the "estimate" of the Senator from New Hampshire and in rejection of the Budget report of the President of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator believes the Legislative Budget Committee should have done what he suggests, then he should have sought to provide in the Reorganization Act that instead of from January 1 to February 15, in effect from about the middle of January to February 15, one month, the Legislative Budget Committee should have had at least 6 months, or a year, in order to study all the details of some 1,400 pages contained in the Presidential Budget. But the Senator from Florida did not do that. He proposed a simple overhead ceiling. It was his committee which made that report. He voted for it in the Senate. He stood up on the floor of the Senate and advocated not tampering with the Reorganization Act, and said nothing about special committees interfering with the spirit of the act. Now he attempts, in my judgment, by the postponement here proposed, to sabotage what we attempt to do under the very act which he helped to create.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is merit in what the Senator from New Hampshire has stated about the possible desirability of a change in the date. Surely there is no use to have a committee if all it can give the Senate is an intelligent guess or an estimate as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire. We might as well change the date if that is all the significance the action of the committee is going to have. What the Senator from New Hampshire has said I believe has merit. But the law did not require the Senator from New Hampshire to propose anything below the Budget submitted by the President. How much better it would have been, how much more rational, I submit, it would have been, if the Senator from New Hampshire had said to his colleagues: "Gentlemen, the President has submitted to us a factual Budget. We are entitled to attribute integrity to the Budget as coming from the Chief Executive of our country. We do not have time to make the thorough study of the subject the President and the Bureau of the Budget have made, and not being confident that we are correct in tampering with the national security, or endangering the national defense, we will put that matter above our intelligent guess or our estimate, and we will say, 'We will recommend the Budget submitted by the President, but if we find we can cut it later on without detriment to the national security and welfare we will do so?' "

Mr. President, I ask my able friend, would that not have been a more statesmanlike, perhaps a little less political approach to the problem, than to have taken the position which the Senator from New Hampshire has taken?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has outlined the position which the Senator from Florida has taken here year after year and year after year since the present administration and the preceding administration have been in power. The preceding administration came into power with a pledge to cut expenditures 25 percent, but instead of cutting expenditures 25 percent increased them year after year and year after year, until in the war period expenditures went up to $100,000,000,000 a year. Now I can see that the Senator is merely being consistent when he suggests that we should not cut the President's Budget. I think it should be cut. I believe that the appropriations of every department of Government can be cut. I know that the process will be painful, but we cannot have our cake and eat it too.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida is consistent, as the Senator from New Hampshire suggests. He has always tried, when he bought dollars, to appraise what he paid for them. I am told—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that a member of the House Appropriations Committee stated that the over-all cut for agriculture, for example, if there were a $6,000,000,000 cut in the Budget, would be from $947,000,000 to $553,000,000. This would include a cut of $75,000,000 in the school-lunch program. When I buy dollars I am not willing to pay children's lunches to get them. Mr. President, I am glad that I have been consistent in voting to save lives and the health of children rather than someone's dollars; and I believe that my method will give us a better America in the long run.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator excuse me for just a moment? I believe the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] or the Senator from Maine wishes to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine and I and other Senators have been negotiating with respect to a limitation of debate on Wednesday. I know that the Senator from Maine wishes to propose such an agreement. If it can be entered into it may enable us to suspend now and go over until Wednesday, and complete consideration of the resolution on Wednesday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that seven or eight Senators desire to discuss, not the matter immediately before the Senate, but the concurrent resolution itself. It seems certain that we cannot conclude the debate and dispose of the resolution this evening. I understand that Senators would like to dispose of the motion made by the Senator from Florida this evening. If that can be disposed of promptly, then I shall proffer a unanimous-consent request for limitation of debate beginning on Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me suggest to the Senator from Maine that any limitation entered into now would apply to the pending question as well as to the concurrent resolution itself. Personally I see no objection to allowing the pending question to go over, with the understanding that the limitation of debate will apply to it. Of course, it would apply to any motion which any Senator might wish to make. The Senator from Florida might not be willing to yield the floor now in order that his motion might be disposed of at this time. I think we would get along just as fast by letting the limitation apply to everything.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in the complete belief that it is impossible to dispose of this matter tonight, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning on Wednesday and continuing until the final disposition of the pending resolution, no Senator may speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes on the concurrent resolution or upon any amendment thereto or substitute therefor——

Mr. BARKLEY. Or motion pertaining thereto.

Mr. WHITE. Or motion pertaining thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the majority leader has an understanding with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say in answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Oregon would not agree to a definite time for voting. However, I have cleared with him, as has the Senator from Kentucky, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and he would not object to the suggested limitation upon debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the 20-minute limitation applies as an over-all limitation?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is an over-all limitation on everything.

Mr. TAFT. Then the Senator from Florida could not make a motion and speak for 20 minutes on the motion, and then make another motion and speak for 20 minutes on it?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Would that apply also to the Senator from Ohio? [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the proposed limitation is a 20-minute over-all limitation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to have any misunderstanding about it. Any amendment could be debated for 20 minutes. The concurrent resolution itself could be debated for 20 minutes, or any substitute could be debated for 20 minutes. Any motion could be debated for 20 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe that such a limitation would serve a very useful purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the usual limitation which we enter into. There is no way to obtain an agreement under which an amendment could not be debated by the author or by other Senators for 20 minutes, or any length of time which might be agreed upon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Kentucky says, I believe that the unanimous-consent request follows the usual form of such requests.

Mr. TAFT. With all due respect to the Senator, there is no usual form for unanimous-consent requests. Sometimes they are in one form and sometimes another. It seems to me that very clearly there ought to be only 20 minutes on the resolution and all motions relating thereto. Then if it is desired to have 20 minutes on each amendment and all motions relating thereto, I have no great objection. However, I do not believe that there ought to be an indefinite number of possible motions to be debated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how we can limit the number of motions that may be made with respect to a pending question. As a rule, an indefinite number of motions is not made. The Senator may conjure up a situation in which that might happen, but I do not think it will happen in this case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests the Senator from Maine to repeat his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHITE. I do not know whether I can repeat it in precise words, but I can repeat it in intendment.

I ask unanimous consent that beginning Wednesday and continuing until the disposition of the pending resolution, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes upon the resolution or any amendment, or any substitute, or any motion with respect thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make it clear to the Senator from Ohio and other Senators that the Senator from Florida is not making this motion to try to filibuster or otherwise delay consideration of the resolution. I have in mind no other motions. If this motion should be unfavorably disposed of, I should like to see the question put in such a way that Senators who wish to vote for the $37,500,000,000 Budget of the President may have an opportunity to do so. If no Senator makes a motion of that character, and I can find a parliamentary way to do so, I propose to make such a motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The way to get at it is to vote against all amendments, including the original resolution. If the Senator votes against the resolution, or any other limitation, he votes for the President's $37,500,000,000 Budget. It is not necessary to make a motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was saying that I have evidence that a member of the House Appropriations Committee stated that if this Budget cut were contemplated it would take $19,000,000 from agricultural research. He also stated that it would take $394,000,000 from REA. There would be a reduction of $125,000,000 in the amount available for loans by the Rural Electrification Administration. He also stated that it would take $50,000,000 from the Farmers Home Administration, and $10,000,000 from appropriations for roads and trails. Those are only a few items which have been suggested in connection with the adverse effect on agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the question now before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to postpone consideration of the concurrent resolution to April 2, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the pending question.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, that is the question still before us for consideration, and it is proposed to vote on that question this evening?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to point out that the facts and figures which have been produced by the able Senator from Florida can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, February 19, on page 1186. The point I make is that facts and figures were discussed in the House of Representatives in connection with the agricultural budget, and apparently the House had no misgivings about the figures. Yet there is nothing in the Senate in the way of information from the subcommittee of the Legislative Budget Committee.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that in the debate last week, as the Senator perhaps recalls, the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], stated that he had a break-down of the figures, that he knew where he would make the cuts, but he did not give any information to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, since we are engaged in pioneering in respect to this new legislation, I emphasize that the Senator from Illinois has just called attention to information which someone seemed to have authority to put before the House of Representatives, and I call attention to the fact that the Senate's Legislative Budget Committee has not given the Senate any specification or suggestion as to where the cuts are to be made.

I respectfully submit that if it is not to be an intelligent guess, if it is not to be an estimate, if the honorable committee does not have the personnel or the time to go into this matter thoroughly, we should be told the field from which the money is to be derived. Is any money to be taken from agriculture? Is any money to be taken from social security? Is any to be taken from the national-defense program?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The money will be taken from every department of the Government, down the line, in every division, every bureau, and every department.

Mr. PEPPER. Does that include interest on the national debt?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is not a department of the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Does it include expenditures for veterans?

Mr. BRIDGES. It does not include any payments to veterans or veterans' benefits.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought the Senator said that it went all the way down the line.

Mr. BRIDGES. It hits the administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Then the Senator is telling us that if we vote for this Budget cut, a portion of the cut will come from veterans' expenditures.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not saying that it will come from veterans' benefits. It will not affect a single veteran. The saving will result from elimination of some of the duplications and overlapping activities in Veterans' Administration affairs.

Mr. PEPPER. There will be some cuts, then, in the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but they will not affect a single veteran.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is helpful. The Senator has clarified our minds on that point.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me clarify another point. The Senator made a statement regarding school lunches. I do not know whether or not the appropriations for school lunches will be cut in the final analysis, because that decision will be up to the respective committees, but in the worksheets on which I based my figures school lunches were not included.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire I desire to make it a matter of record that in the discussions of the full Committee on the Legislative Budget the statement was expressly made by a member of the House committee that the appropriation for school lunches would be cut in its entirety. That was the point of view of one of the principal spokesmen for the alleged $6,000,000,000 reduction.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order to answer the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Various committees and groups worked on this subject. I quoted from my own work sheets, from which I arrived at the total, as a member of the committee, and on my work sheets school lunches are not affected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very gracious. In view of the remark just made by the Senator from New Hampshire regarding his personal work sheets, I cannot avoid advising the Senate that such work sheets are extremely personal, so personal that no member of the minority was permitted to see any of them. No report was made to the full legislative committee as to work sheets by any member of the subcommittee. The majority members of the subcommittee met in executive session to compare their individual work sheets, which apparently differ one from another, which, of course, reaches the final absurdity which was set forth so clearly in the report filed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in which we find this sentence:

> Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reductions in specific items contained in the Budget.

So our friends of the majority find themselves in the very convenient position of saying to the veterans, "Oh, you are not cut on my specific work sheets. My personal work sheet does no injury to the veterans."

Then to the Senator from Louisiana, who is interested in river-and-harbor improvements, the majority member can say, "On my specific work sheets river-and-harbor improvements are not included."

Then to my friends from the West, western Republican Senators who know so well how invaluable to the building up of the West is the construction of reclamation projects, the majority Member can say, "No reclamation projects are cut on my work sheets."

The vice of this whole matter is that there are no work sheets which have any probative value at all. Nothing was presented by way of a specific report, even by the exclusive majority subcommittee, with respect to the specific reductions which were to be made.

We are here debating a resolution which is extending to the people of the United States a false promise, the pretense that several billion dollars are to be cut from the Budget, without any work sheets to show where the cuts will be made. The absence of work sheets is clearly to be explained by the plain fact that the majority members of the committee have not been able to agree as to where the reductions can be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator from New Hampshire about to give us his work sheets?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire wants to make one remark to the Senator from Wyoming. If the Legislative Budget Committee had reported in detail where the cuts were to be made, and thereby prejudged the work of the Appropriations Committee, the first Senator who would stand on this floor and scream to high heaven against that procedure would be the Senator from Wyoming. I can hear him now. Therefore, we are leaving it up to the committees to work out the actualities.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Hampshire is not a very good prophet. He has never heard me screaming against economy.

I am in the position of the Senator from New Hampshire. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have never filed minority views against any bill that was reported; and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who has been on the Committee on Appropriations so long that he is now the chairman, never once in all his service filed an objection to the expenditure reports of the Appropriations Committee, save once when he objected to the action of the Appropriations Committee with respect to reclamation appropriations for the Interior Department.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may answer the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. On many occasions both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, I have offered amendments looking toward economy; and in most instances on those occasions, so far as I can remember, the Senator from Wyoming was on the other side. I assure him that in the months ahead there will be ample opportunities to vote for economy, and there will be some record votes, and we shall see very clearly that a great deal of this talk today having to do with national defense actually is made because the Senators on the other side of the aisle are against any cut for anything. That is the story.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think we have had a most interesting exhibition. It is almost like a shell game at a fair, where the question is under which shell the bean rests. Someone is trying to put the finger on the private figures of the Senator from New Hampshire, and obviously the $64 question is where are the private figures of the Senator from New Hampshire.

However, this matter is not really a game, in spite of the fact that it reminds us a little of the game of blindman's buff. This is a solemn request of the Senator's committee that if he has predicated his request on certain figures and factual data, why does he not disclose them to his colleagues and let us know that he, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is using them as the basis on which he acts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not do so because I do not wish to prejudge the work of the Senate or of the House or of the Appropriations Committees. We arrived at what we thought, in our judgment, was a fair, over-all ceiling for the expenditures of the Government; and within that framework the respective committees, and subsequently the Senate and House of Representatives themselves, can work out the details.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire, inasmuch as he said he did not

wish to prejudge the work of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, why in the secret session that resulted in a final call of the subcommittee of 20 of the Joint Committee on the Budget, the Senator from New Hampshire did prejudge, in his own mind, the action of the Appropriations Committee, because in his so-called work sheet, which he never submitted to the full committee, but which he did submit, from a memorandum held in his own hands, to the subcommittee, he cut off $2,225,000,000 from the appropriations for the armed services. I recall that item specifically. He cut off $250,000,000 from the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I recall that specifically. If the Senator from New Hampshire does not wish to prejudge them now, why was he willing to prejudge them then in his own individual, secret, personal memorandum, which he threw in our faces, as to what he would do if he had the power to make such cuts?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it was because we had to arrive at this over-all ceiling, as provided in the act of Congress which was reported to the Senate by the joint committee of which the Senator from Florida was a member; and we had to arrive at that ceiling in the best possible manner, according to the best judgment of the Congress, acting on all available information. We had to arrive at the best possible intelligent judgment of that group. But we could not break down that figure or ceiling, because if we did so, immediately it would be said that we had prejudged the work of the committees and that there would be no object in holding months of hearings.

Of course, Mr. President, I answered the Senator. I said, "Of course, there are going to be cuts in every department, all down the line."

That is the trouble today, here on the floor of the Senate, because some Senators do not wish to cut. It is hard to make cuts, and it causes a great deal of trouble, in view of all the propaganda, and so forth. I say it is going to hurt, to reduce the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, Mr. President; the Senator from New Hampshire has given a clear-cut statement of what he proposes; namely, that there are going to be cuts all along the line—and this time he is sticking to his statement. So there will be cuts of the armed services and cuts of the Veterans' Bureau and cuts of the Department of Agriculture and cuts of Social Security, and there will be cuts all along the line. If a Senator does not favor making cuts all along the line, then I assume it is only logical that he should vote against this resolution.

Mr. President, I believe that the President of the United States has submitted to the Congress a sensible, commonsense Budget. It may be possible for the Appropriations Committee, when later they come to take up the matter in detail, to make some cuts here and there. If so, here is the able watchdog—and I use that word in a deferential and dignified sense—here is the able watchdog of the Treasury, the Senator from New Hampshire, standing there as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I know we can count upon the diligence of the Senator from New Hampshire in making any cuts in the President's Budget that it is feasible to make, and as to which he can secure the concurrence of a majority of his committee. Over in the House of Representatives there is the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, another diligent advocate of economy; and we know that he and his colleagues will give very careful scrutiny to every request for appropriations, and will make all possible cuts in the appropriations which come before them. Where they believe that such cuts can be made and where they can be successfully advocated on specific issues, undoubtedly such cuts will be made.

However, it is obvious, now that we have this intelligent guess of the Senator from Ohio and this estimate of the Senator from New Hampshire, that Senators still can vote against both of them and nevertheless vote in the committee and in the Senate itself for any specific items of reduced appropriations which may be found to be appropriate. The difference is that in that case Senators will be giving probity to the recommendation of the President and will be acting upon facts and figures, instead of indulging in speculation, which is the basis upon which we are asked to act today.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I observe that it is 5 minutes before 6 o'clock. Let me inquire whether it is the intention of the majority leader to have the discussion continue indefinitely this evening.

Mr. WHITE. I hope that this evening we may dispose of the motion of the Senator from Florida. If we can do that—and the sooner the better, so far as I am concerned—then I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the invitation of the able Senator from Maine, I shall not indulge myself in the pleasure of addressing the Senate very much longer. I shall gladly cooperate with him in endeavoring to dispose of my motion, so far as I am concerned, in a very short time.

I do not think it is necessary to go further into the matter which has been under discussion during the last few minutes. We see now what the position of the Senators is.

As I have said, Mr. President, we are told that there will be some cuts in the recommendation for the armed services. I wish to finish reading the New York Times article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin as to the cuts already made in the Budget recommendation for the armed services. I resume where I stopped reading a few minutes ago:

> The Army Air Forces find themselves in a roughly comparable position. Their 1948 budget, as submitted to Congress, contains funds originally estimated as sufficient to procure 900 new planes of all types, but the increasing unit costs of aircraft will probably limit the number that actually can be procured to about 800. If the projected $1,750,000,000 slash is made, this number probably will be reduced further.

That figure is 800 planes for the Army and 579 planes for the Navy. That is based on the $6,000,000,000 cut. Of course, if the cut is only $4,500,000,000, there would be a proportional reduction.

I read further:

> Thus the Army and Navy together will be able to procure in the 1948 fiscal year if—and it is a big "if"—Congress makes no cut in the requested funds for aircraft procurement only about 1,400 or 1,500 planes. This is half the 3,000 that a postwar study indicated was the minimum number of military planes that must be procured annually by the armed services to maintain a healthy industry.

Mr. President, I do not know what group it was that made that postwar study. I was not a member of it. I do not know whether they are entitled to credulity or credit for their statement. But that is what this committee, presumably appointed by the President or the armed services, recommended; namely, 3,000 planes a year. The Budget recommends 579 planes for the Navy and approximately 800 or 900 planes for the Army.

Mr. Baldwin further points out that there will be a reduction of about one-third in the budget of the Office of Naval Research, which is carrying on a program of basic research on a wide variety of problems through some hundred of our universities.

Mr. President, what may be stifled in some university research laboratory by taking a few dollars away from it? A laboratory may be on the verge of a discovery which will be of world-shaking significance, but withholding the few dollars which the able Senators are going to save may stifle the fruition of that research. What would it have meant in respect to the atomic bomb if we had blindly struck out part of the appropriation and said, "It can be reduced 25 percent"? What might have happened in the research on the atomic bomb? Is that the way legislators defend their country?

Mr. Baldwin proceeds to say the Chemical Corps of the Army will also suffer curtailment. Appropriations asked for the Chemical Corps have already been pruned in the submitted budget from approximately $8,000,000 to $5,800,000. Then he proceeds to say:

> Congress has stood firmly since VJ-day against scrapping the great modern fleet built duing the war. To preserve a great number of fighting ships not needed in active operation and to save money, the Navy laid up hundreds of ships, carefully "pickling" them against erosion and deterioration.
>
> Even when the job is complete, perhaps a year or more from now, it is estimated that 25,000 to 35,000 of the Navy's officers and men will be required permanently to maintain and guard the thousands of laid-up fighting ships that are being kept as a form of national insurance * * * that overhead cannot be reduced without scrapping some of the ships Congress has insisted be retained.

But the Senators, with a chopping ax, would cut an appropriation without any consideration as to where the cut is to fall, or what is to suffer.

Mr. President, some of my colleagues and I have differed about international policy. I hope we can have universal disarmament, but I have never advocated unilateral disarmament. I would favor

the President taking the initiative and asking all nations at the same time to stop making new weapons, but I am not going to be one of those who will say we should unilaterally begin to disarm.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Michigan referred to some of the incidents which occurred in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the days of the economy cut, and the spending that occurred thereafter. He said his reference was not a political criticism, that he was merely commenting on history. I accept his statement in the good faith in which it was given. But, Mr. President, if we are to talk about the responsibility of the two parties to the people of the country, I should like to make a comment on history.

Did the Democratic Party cut the Army and Navy after the last war, or was it the party now in the majority? Did the Democratic Party sink a part of the American fleet, or was it the administration of the party now in the majority?

When President Roosevelt came to the White House, what kind of an Army and what kind of a Navy did he find?

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Year after year, over the protests of the American Legion, they were cut and cut and cut, until, if I understand what he said aright, even General MacArthur pleaded with the Congress to give him support, as Chief of Staff, to build America's armed forces, which support he never got.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. When President Roosevelt came to the White House, we had an armed-service budget of about a billion dollars a year, and Mr. Roosevelt advocated cutting it 25 percent. That was one of his campaign promises. So the Senator is a little twisted in what he says.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct; in the early, misguided days, when the President thought it would work, he did recommend that there should be economy, and perhaps he set a good example; perhaps the majority will change its mind on defense, as did President Roosevelt when he found that that kind of blind economy was contrary to the national interest.

But I will say that when President Roosevelt found he had based his action upon a mistake, and had the courage to try to correct it, and from then on there was a building up of the armed forces of this country. Time after time the President took PWA funds and other funds when he could not get direct appropriations from the Congress, in his effort to build up the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Florida has pointed out that during the early years of the New Deal the Chief Executive had to plead constantly for larger appropriations with which to build up the armed services. Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. PEPPER. It was not so emphasized in the early years of his administration as it was when the international crisis was approaching.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In doing that, was not the Chief Executive pleading with members of his own party, and no blame could be placed on the Republicans for any failure to give him the appropriations he needed?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say that he got an increasing amount of appropriations from his party, that but when the international crisis became acute. I should be glad to have the Senator read the record of how the votes were between the parties in building up our airplane strength, our naval ships, our merchant ships, and our armed forces. The situation today is not as it was in 1932, 1933, and 1945. Today we know the unsettled status of the world. Today we are legislating in the face of that condition.

I wanted to make it clear that the first proposal to cut the armed forces, the first proposal to reduce our Navy, to reduce our Army, to diminish our Air Force, and to weaken our research activities, is coming from the majority party, which now has the responsibility for the purse strings.

Mr. President, I think the Senate might stop, look, and listen before it blindly commits itself to a course which not only would impair the general welfare, but seriously threaten the national security of America, in a time of great international concern.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to postpone consideration of the pending concurrent resolution until April 2, 1947.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Florida be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph C. Reing, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice himself;

Pasquale J. Federico, of Ohio, to be an examiner in chief on the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office;

Samuel Wolffe, of Pennsylvania, to be an examiner in chief on the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; and

Eugene W. Geniesse, of Michigan, to be an examiner in chief on the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, terminating recess appointment, vice Gera'd Robert Corbett.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there are only two names on the Executive Calendar, and it does not seem necessary to hold an executive session at this time. I therefore move that the Senate stand in recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, February 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

((*) Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

*Yager, Ray F.

LIEUTENANTS

*Riggins, Leslie E.
Sliney James G.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Aho, Kauko A.	*Powers, Robert D., Jr.
*Bjork, Wilbert M.	Skinner, James L.
*Dabbieri, Peter V.	*Spencer, Frank A.
Hughes, Jack J.	

ENSIGNS

Alberta, Edward T.	Brennalt, Earl H.
Allaben, Gerald R., Jr.	Brown, Edward E.
Ambrose, Robert B.	Brown, Russell D.
Ammidown, Robert L.	Buegler, Robert J.
Amos, James W.	Cardillo, Robert J.
Andrews, Samuel G.	Carlson, Robert L.
Aponowich, Frank	Carlstead, Edward M.
Archer, Derrek S.	Carter, Jack L.
Arnett, "A" "B", Jr.	Christopher, Frank J.
Arnold, Eugene F.	Clemmons, Robert H.
Arthur, Frederick E.	Cochran, Billy E.
Athow, James K.	Cochrane, John A.
Aubrey, Joseph H., 3d	Conkling, Raymond F.
August, Gerald J.	*Cook, Herbert B.
Baar, Don R.	*Corcoran, Daniel J.
Bailey, George G.	Counihan, Henry R.
Baker, James J.	Crawford, John R.
Baker, Paul B.	Crites, Robert J.
Banks, Daniel L., Jr.	Culbreth, Howard C.
Barrett, James L.	Darr, James, Jr.
Bayes, Howard S.	Davies, Henry E., Jr.
Bedford, Thomas A.	Denissen, Richard J.
Belew, Harold E.	*Denny, John H.
Bemis, Lawrence R.	Deviney, Stephen J.
*Birgel, Henry T.	*Dickey, Donald H.
Bishop, Billy P.	Dimoff, Allen S.
Bishop, Charles R.	Dougherty, Edmund D.
Bixler, Jene M.	Dunlap, George R.
*Black, Lawrence W.	Dunnells, Robert E.
Blackwelder, Buren L.	Durey, Orin J.
Blocker, Leo B.	Edge, Norman C.
Bobsin, Ralph A.	Egeler, Paul L.
Bodamer, Robert E.	Endacott, Jack A.
Boehner, George C.	Evans, Robert A., Jr.
*Borden, Paul F.	Faull, Joe D.
Bose, Bertram L.	Fay, Robert J.
Brabant, Robert J.	Ferguson, Robert E.
Braly, Henry L.	Fisher, William B., Jr.

Fleck, Richard W.
Flood, Robert B.
Forsyth, Donald D.
Frey, Gordon J.
Frye, Gurney E.
Gafford, Gerald A.
Garbee, Edwin T.
*Glenn, Hardy
Goodwin, Merle W.
Gott, Charles L.
Gould, Maxwell
*Grady, Joseph W.
Graham, John H.
Grantham, Robert D.
Granum, Robert M.
Graves, Jack C.
Gray, Harland A., Jr.
Green, Robert P.
Greene, Wallace A.
*Grimshaw, George E., Jr.
Hall, Richard L.
Hallin, Harold H.
Hardy, Paul
Hardy, Willis A.
Harp, Orland C.
Harrison, Thomas B.
Harsh, Forrest G. D.
Hauber, Erwin J.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Hein, Joseph J., Jr.
Herda, William K.
Hoffman, Harold H.
Holmberg, Frank E.
Huber, Ernest, Jr.
Humphrey, Glen E.
Huse, George W.
Hussey, Patrick F.
Ihrig, Lewis C.
Imming, Cyril L.
Irish, Edelbert E.
Jenkins, Merlin F.
Jenson, Svend I.
Jones, Allen, Jr.
Jones, Marvin D.
Judd, George S.
Judson, Sheldon B.
Kane, Howard F.
Kelly, William F.
Kelly, William J.
Kenedy, Richard L.
Kilgore, Frank J.
Kitchen, Charles C.
Kleczewski, Marion J.
Knapp, Richard G.
Koehler, Philip W.
Koller, Raymond W.
Kopps, Richard L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kroes, Henry W., Jr.
Kubiszewski, Robert J.
Lagergren, Johan G.
Laizer, Edwin J., Jr.
Lambertson, Tomme J.
Leisk, William H.
Leist, Frederick
Leonard, Elmer F.
Leutz, Leon H.
Lillesand, Alan M.
Linder, Ivan L.
Linton, George H.
Litsey, John F.
Logan, James L., Jr.
Longo, Charles R.
*Lowe, Frank W., Jr.
Lucero, William H.
Manber, Solomon
Mann, Frederick "H", Jr.
Mann, John B., Jr.
*Manser, Burton R.
Martin, William
Mattson, Kenneth B.
Maxwell, Raymond C., Jr.
Mayo, James O.
McAdams, Joseph B., Jr.
McAfee, Clellan B.
McCann, James A.
McCoy, James A.
McCrory, Thomas S.
*McDonald, Edward L.
McEvoy, James A., Jr.
McHugh, Paul J., Jr.
McLellan, James N., Jr.
McMillen, Frank V., II
McNaughton, Clark "H", Jr.
McNeil, Richard S.
Mehr, Charles E.
Menge, Robert F.
Merryman, Charles A., Jr.
Mills, Lee G., Jr.
Mische, Lester L.
Mitchell, William, Jr.
Mizell, Archie L.
Morgan, Newton H.
*Morgan, William B.
Morgiewicz, Daniel J.
Mularz, Frank A.
Murphy, Robert L.
Nelson, Lionell H.
Newell, Harold P.
Newhouse, George B., Jr.
Nicholson, Thomas A.
Nickols, Frank A., Jr.
Oberg, Owen H.
O'Grady, John P.
Oprea, George W., Jr.
Paulson, Rex E.
Perry, John L.
Pettee, Warren E.
Petterson, Wendell K.
Pfundstein, Thomas D.
Phelan, John J., Jr.
Phinney, Glenn W.
Pick, Albert L.
Polson, Arthur D.
Pool, George R., Jr.
Posch, Frank M.
Potter, Eugene "W"
Pyle, James H., Jr.
Reeb, Robert H.
Reilly, William T.
Richards, Floyd C., Jr.
Richards, Kurt "D"
Ricker, Marshall A.
Rickman, Wilford M.
Romaine, Robert R.
*Ross, Julian A.
Ross, Melville T.
Ross, Robert P.
Rove, Robert G.
Sabin, Nelson
Saubers, Maurice D.
Saul, James O.
Sauter, George G.
Sayler, Richardson W.
Schammel, Leo A.
Schexnayder, Robert L.
Schoenherr, Charles G.
Schoonover, Donald L.
Schricker, Frederic W.
Schulenberg, Duane E.
Seay, Howard R.
Shanks, Lawrence B.
Shea, Stephen J.
Sheen, Raymond H.
Simmons, John A., Jr.
Smith, Aubrey H.
*Smith, Frederick W.
Smithey, Talmadge A.
Snyder, Charles D. B.
Sommer, Charles A.
Stanchina, Joseph C.
Stansfield, Richard J.
Stepanian, George
Stewart, William C.
Stobie, Edwin F.
Stone, John F.
Stroupe, Joseph R.
*Sturkey, Charles M., Jr.
Sweeney, James R.
Tait, Albert J.
Talago, Joseph, Jr.
Taylor, William W.
Thummel, Gerald F.
Thurman, Russell, Jr.
Tilghman, Walter N., Jr.
Timpson, Nephi H., Jr.
Uretsky, Jack I.
Vallely, James R.
Van Alstine, Daniel P.
Vaughan, Jack A.
Vollrath, Richard L.
Wagner, John E.
*Walker, Archie C.
Walker, Marvin J.
Waller, William
Watt, Reid B.
Webster, Daniel A.
Webster, Warren M.
*Weeks, Harold L.
Werle, Joseph P., Jr.
Whaley, Lucien O. G.
Whelchel, Hoyt H., Jr.
White, David T.
Whitmire, Vivien C.
Williams, Dwight L.
Willis, Beuford N.
Wilson, George C.
Wilson, Robert M.
Wolcott, John R.
Wolfe, Jack B.
Worden, Donald D.
Wright, William R.
Zowarka, James G.
Elwood, Albert A.
Hartdegen, Carl, 3d
Regan, Joseph A.
Sproul, William C.
Bagley, John F.
Julian, Scott M., Jr.
Rezny, Ivan F.
Ruff, Ernest D., Jr.
Salyard, Robert R.
Adams, Hershel L.
Ambrose, David W.
Bean, George D.
Bornhop, Rodney E.
Clement, Robert F.
Daley, Edwin M.
Decker, Harvey L.
Dobson, William T.
Fowler, Walter B.
Fleming, Joseph C., Jr.
Gourlay, Everett C.
Hartwell, Hamilton
Hoffman, David G.
Hopkins, William H.
Kojm, Leonard R.
Lang, Richard C.
Lyon, Eugene
McMaster, William R.
McNutt, John W.
Miller, Paul S.
Moriarty, John T.
Peterson, Joseph F.
Sanders, James E.
Sapp, Earle W., Jr.
Scheid, Donald
Shumway, Keith C.
Signer, Roy M., Jr.
Simonson, Nelson C.
Taylor, Robert C.
Waterman, John T.
Cochrane, Edward L., Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEON WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Spangler, Paul E.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Clark, Irving T.
Force, Berwyn R.
Mead, Charles A., Jr.
Rice, Moses E.
Turney, William B.
Tomlinson, Walter B.
Dimmette, Robert M.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Wetzel, Daniel W.
Sword, David R.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Lofink, George S.
Peckham, Charles W.
Campbell, Robert R.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Armstrong, William H.
Auten, Howard L.
Barnett, Damon J.
Chazal, John P.
Cooper, William M.
Dye, Kenneth R.
Eddy, George, Jr.
Ethridge, William C.
Gascoigne, Richard F.
Giberson, William H., Jr.
Gueliff, Pierre H.
Koenig, Victor J.
Laws, Robert H.
Lockwood, Lyle M.
Longmire, Billy R.
Martinson, Harold B.
Merrick, Robert W.
Murphy, Robert F.
O'Keefe, Paul "D"
Penny, LaRue D.
Prather, Earl L.
Sigman, William E.
Stalhr, Donald R.
Walker, John H.
Walker, Woodrow T.
Walther, Frederick W.
Watson, Lawrence A.
Whitney, George O.
Whittles, Carl, Jr.
Wright, John E. C.
Wright, Sylvester C.
Weiss, Howard R.
Duke, Edwin L.
Foil, John L.
Ireland, Charles W.
Lawson, Walter E., Jr.
Miller, James
Paolantonio, John F.
Rieve, Roland
Small, Joseph T.
Thorpe, William L., Jr.
Van Pelt, James C.
White, Ernest C.
Whiteside, Charles E.
Wolfe, George M., Jr.
Wright, Robert A.
Wuest, Robert J.
Fletcher, Max E.
Knight, Reed H.
Leiman, Alfred A.
Mathay, Philip W.
McGinnis, Thomas C.
Powell, Reed M.
Shaw, Robert H., Jr.
Walsh, John F.
Whitlock, Jack H.
Williams, Shelly S., Jr.
Anderson, Scott K.
Baumann, Wesley O.
Bellock, Philip
Belensky, Michael J., Jr.
Connolly, Paul J.
Del Vecchio, Anthony J.
Fellows, Clyde H., Jr.
Furtwangler, Leo E.
Groover, Gordon L.
Harvey, Clinton "D"
Howard, Richard P., Jr.
Jones, William F.
Kennedy, John W., Jr.
Lewis, William L.
Mason, Charles M.
Seelig, James J.
Snowden, Robert B.
Strott, George G.
Thum, Robert E.
Weart, Elliott M.
Weedlun, Merle E.
Bowers, Hugh H., Jr.
Freidman, Arnold J.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

CHAPLAIN WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Zimmerman, John D.

ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Brewerton, Peter H.
Buchholtz, Paul H.
Danielsen, John M.
Doyle, William F.
Gesel, Cranston R.
Gluck, Joseph C.
Grygiel, Andrew J.
Hayes, Joseph A.
Klesh, Francis J.
Raynor, Paul J.
Topmiller, Malo A.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Greey, Elmer B.
Ventres, Daniel B.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Coffin, Robert C., Jr.
Dawson, Archibald
Lieberman, Morris S.
Mathews, Norris

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS IN THE NAVY WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Arn, John A. M.
Healy, John J.
Housell, Harold R.
Jacques, Stanley J.
Tarhan, David G.
Nicholson, Oscar F.
Turner, Charles W.
Graves, Lenson W.
Hayen, Charles L.
Johnson, Henry J.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

McClure, Birt W.
Robinson, Henry H.
Swanson, Adrian L.
Walker, Ira G.
Wilson, John O., Jr.
Blackwell, Richard T.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Cronk, Henry V.
Guthrie, Harry A.
Hosmer, Herbert B.
Mullis, Fred W.

CHIEF GUNNERS

Budzaj, Zygmond
Mahlandt, Melvin H.
Nikkonen, Rudolph

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

Smiley, Andrew M.

CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Anders, John A.
Carlson, Richard S.
Culbreth, Dossie O.
Flowerree, Carl R.
Harnden, Robert D., Jr.
Marples, Ellis, Jr.
Nelson, Nels J.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

True, John R.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Bingham, Cordell
Erishman, Charles A.
Leslie, Raymond C.
Miller, Stuart R.
Myers, Freeman H.
Penola, James L.
Seago, James T.
Secl, Joseph
Sinyei, Louis
Stemmer, Frank H.
Vance, Dale W.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Burchfield, Kenley N.	Maconaghie, Dysart O.
Dixon, Harry F.	Peterson, John E.
Dobis, Edward S.	Shelton, Frank C.
Easley, Ira D.	Stright, Stephen A., Jr.
Harrington, Miles W.	
Johnson, William R.	Weddle, William H.

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERK

Escott, William H.	Sluyter, Raymond P.
Rodstrom, Francis J.	Socha, Edward J.

CHIEF AEROGRAPHER

Martin, Millerd E.

CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Brannon, Thomas F., Jr.	O'Brien, Charles W.
	Slack, Robert H.
Dias, Paul E.	Smith, Whitner W.
Keck, Truman W.	Vickroy, Robert K.
Law, Paul C.	Whalen, William F. C.
McAllister, Damon O.	Willis, Gerald J.
Miller, Warren L.	

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Barlie, Emmett O.	Lambert, Marcus H.
Breeden, Robert L.	Miller, James H.
Dille, George A.	Otis, Richard E.
Dunn, John M.	Rankin, Leonard G.
Gaddy, Howard L.	Tatum, Browder F.
Harris, Robert E.	Thatcher, George
Juracka, John E.	Uskievich, Byron

The following-named officers to the rank and grades indicated to correct spelling of name as previously nominated and confirmed:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Curtis, Walter L., Jr.

ENSIGNS

Berkstresser, Charles G.	Stephens, Walter
	Treadwell, Thurman K.
Gordon, Donald	
MacDonald, James K.	Thurmon, Norman E.
Miller, Floyd E.	Weidlein, Leopold
Myers, Robert W.	

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Payson, Stephen H.

CHIEF BOATSWAIN

Kasworm, Marvin A.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 5th day of June 1946:

Bertram H. Curwen, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

Paul Mazzuca, Jr., a citizen of Illinois.

Stewart B. McCarty, Jr., a citizen of Oklahoma.

Grady P. Mitchell, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who givest to all men liberally and upbraideth not, we pray for mastering strength to direct in us the impulse of pure love. O take from us the indifferent and the chilled heart, and soften our determined wills that the things which concern mankind may not be alien to us. O lift us into the folds of the gospel of human sympathy and understanding.

Blessed Master, in these demanding hours may we not put our trust alone in democracy and government but in God may we trust; in Him alone are hope and life for the storm-beaten face of this earth. O undergird it with Thy never-failing might; when we cannot see, guide us; when threatened, deliver us; and when challenged, equip us with the strong arm of a righteous God. Bestow upon us the blessing of contentment within our own borders, and inspire us to discharge our whole duty toward Thee and our fellow men. Hear us, our Father, and Thine shall be the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 21, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the State Legislature of Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial and an article.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the disposition of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY ESSENTIAL TO DEFENSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing resolutions which, if adopted by the Congress, will authorize the President to extend to Iceland, in the name of the Congress and the American people, an invitation to become a State in the American Union; to open negotiations with Denmark for the purchase of Greenland; to open negotiations with Great Britain, France, and such other countries that may be involved for the purchase of all islands off the coast of continental United States, in the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean, that may be deemed essential to the defense of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Philippine Islands.

Further, my resolutions would direct negotiations looking toward the acquisition without cost to the United States of all of the islands mandated to or owned by the Empire of Japan as the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War shall find essential to the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean areas, an obligation which, by unwelcome circumstances, has become the prime responsibility of the United States.

I recommend these resolutions to the favorable consideration of the Congress.

THE CROSSER ACT—RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced bill H. R. 2169, to repeal the so-called Crosser Act governing the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. Since passage of this act, and particularly since the effective date of its increased taxing provisions, January 1, 1947, I have received a great number of requests from railroad employees asking for repeal of the law, most of them saying they never wanted it in the first place. Many Members of Congress have told me that they also have received a great many complaints against some or all of the provisions of the Crosser Act.

While I recognize that there is no unanimity among the employees themselves, nor between the employees and the companies, as to what changes are most desirable, I am assuming that the best way to go about it is to correct the serious mistake made by the Seventy-ninth Congress in passing the Crosser Act

and begin all over again to set up a system that will be satisfactory to the majority of employees and workable so far as the companies are concerned. There were some of us in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and I feel there are many more of us in the Eightieth Congress, who feel the Crosser Act is not in the best interest of the employees or the companies, and our feeling in that respect has been greatly strengthened by the strong ground swell of resentment to the act by the employees themselves.

The railroad retirement system is financed solely by payments made by the employees and management under a law which requires that each pay one-half of the cost. The railroad unemployment insurance system is financed entirely by a tax on the companies, no part of the tax being paid by the employees. Since these systems are financed without any subsidy from the Government but entirely by the employees and the companies, I think the interest of each of these contributors should be given due consideration. I might say, in a sentence, that the Crosser Act merely extended the bureaucracy of the Railroad Retirement Board, without satisfying the employees or the companies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Hon. Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy, entitled "The Man on Horseback."

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Chicago Association of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by Mr. LODGE, of Connecticut, at Bridgeport, Conn., last evening to the members of the Faetano Society.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Long Beach Independent in support of the efforts of Congress to cut the President's Budget for the next fiscal year.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior recommending legislation extending the Reclamation Act to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Rochester, N. Y., chapter of the Lithuanian American Council.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Red menace.

DUPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT EFFORT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who are not thoroughly convinced that there is a lot of overlapping, overstaffing, and duplication of effort in Government, I want to read the following letter from Dunlap & Co., Columbus, Ind.:

In one recent mail delivery we received six duplicate notices in six separate envelopes from War Assets Administration, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Here are the six envelopes mailed from the same office to the same address. Here are the six identical duplicate notices of sales of the War Assets Administration contained in those envelopes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How would you keep those people busy if they did not do something like that?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to the OPA and the reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a good deal of discussion has been created by the action of the House dealing with appropriations for OPA. It is being stated that this was legislation by indirection designed to kill the OPA without facing the issue. General Fleming, head of the Office of Temporary Controls, says rent control will die if this bill becomes law. I do not believe that the House had any intention of killing the OPA in this way. I have a letter from the OPA Administrator stating that he "failed to make our—OPA's—problem sufficiently clear to the House Appropriations Committee when I had an opportunity to testify to that body." Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to an explanation from the head of the executive department on this point.

The House passed the bill on a record vote after assurances by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in response to my questions, that OPA could handle rent control effectively until the 30th of June, provided that OPA administered its finances honestly. Members on both sides of the aisle voted overwhelmingly for it, including the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, who had stated OPA's position in the debate.

I am convinced that practicably tenants cannot have adequate relief under the present law, nor can landlords, unless rent-control administration continues. The Bureau of Labor statistics price index is at the highest point in its history. The high cost of living must not be added to by a rent boost now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

TAX CONSCIOUSNESS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a majority of the Members of this House agree with me that the people of the United States should be tax conscious—that no substantial segment of the population should entertain the false idea that the other fellow pays the cost of operating the Government. Yet we pass up the best possible means of creating tax consciousness by failing to print on the revenue stamps which must be affixed to all tobacco products, the money value which those stamps represent.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has written me that there is no valid historic or present reason why this money value should not appear.

Within the next few days, I shall introduce a bill whose purpose it will be to acquaint every buyer of tobacco products with the amount of tax he pays the Federal Government when he buys a package of cigarettes or a can of smoking tobacco.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter written by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MINISTER OF PROPAGANDA

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many charges against the House of Representatives, but there is one that I wish to call attention to which has not heretofore been called to my attention.

I received this morning two letters, one addressed to the Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.; I can understand how they might have put that in anybody's mailbox, so it came to me. But another one was addressed "House of Representatives, Propaganda Department, Washington, D. C." It starts off "Minister of Propaganda. Dear Sir." I do not know the name of the person to whom this letter should be directed. Nor have I yet learned that we had a minister of propaganda.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from W. E. Hill, Wellsboro, Pa., relating to sugar.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a memorial of the Oregon Legislature.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Commander in Chief Louis E. Starr, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bristol Courier.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Polish-American Congress, Inc.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Providence Visitor of February 20.

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Kenneth C. Royall at Henderson, N. C., January 31, 1947.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. GORE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Progressive magazine.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the first of a series of six editorials entitled "Gentlemen of the Congress," appearing in the Pike County Republican.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the sentence stated by George Washington in his Farewell Address that as a very important source of strength and security we should cherish public credit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, when you called the gentleman from Vermont, Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, to the chair to preside over the House on the 20th, you made it possible for our good friend to realize a lifetime ambition, namely, to preside over the House of Representatives of the United States.

He used the gavel he used in 1912–15 while he presided over the Vermont House of Representatives—which some assert is the most distinguished parliamentary body among the States—and I never have seen that statement successfully challenged among Vermonters.

Anyway, we are glad to join you in your recognition of the gentleman from Vermont, Speaker PLUMLEY, as he presided over us. We congratulate you and him.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week I introduced a bill, H. R. 2100, which would alleviate what I think to be a most unjust condition with which many honest and sincere business people throughout the country are faced.

During the existence of OPA many regulations were promulgated in an effort to carry out the program. People all over the Nation complained about the difficulty in keeping up with the regulations and the technicalities involved therewith. I think it is generally assumed that in many instances it was almost impossible for many businesses, and especially small businesses, to comply with all the complicated regulations.

To further complicate their problems, OPA lawyers filed many suits on the basis of technical and border-line interpretation of their regulations. Most of these cases, I understand, that were tried resulted in a verdict for the defendant. Naturally a few of the suits filed were successful. The reason for the lack of success was because most of them could have only been brought on technical violations in order, many people think, to justify their continuance on the Government pay roll.

On November 9, 1946, President Truman ordered the termination of price control on all commodities except sugar and rice. This order was put into effect by the OPA Administrator on November 10, 1946, at which time OPA was practically "washed up."

However, there is a very determined effort to continue to prosecute these old suits for violations of these regulations and orders which no longer are in effect. If they are permitted to carry out this unjustified action, it would not only cost the Government a lot of money but would be an injustice upon good citizens throughout this country.

I am proposing to relieve these people of such prosecution, and I invite the attention of the Members of the House to this proposal for your consideration. I hope you will join me in freeing the business people of this country from such "lame-duck prosecutions."

ANSWERING ATTACKS ON THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, attacks have been made all over the country on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs because we have followed the same policy the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation followed for the last 20 years, to hear only those organizations that are composed of veterans exclusively.

Now I see in the New York Herald Tribune a statement signed by Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., complaining of "the deterioration in the Congress." He asks for contributions up to $100,000 to try to force us to hear the American Veterans' Committee before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and assuring contributors that "every gift is tax exempt."

The last time I heard of Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., with reference to this American Veterans' Committee, I understood he was running out of it, because of its alleged Communist infiltration. Now he seems to have run back into it.

When he asks me to follow him, I feel somewhat as did the old fellow down in one of the Southern States when he found on his neighbor's tombstone this epitaph:

"Hark ye, strangers passing by,
As you are now, so once was I.
As I am now, so you must be.
Prepare for death and follow me."

He knew the old man quite well, so he took out his pencil and wrote under it:

"To follow you I'd not consent
Unless I knew which way you went."

The American Veterans' Committee is the most controversial veterans' organization operating in the United States today, in fact one does not have to be a veteran to join it.

At the first national convention of the organization, which took place in June 1946, in Des Moines, Iowa, the Communist element made a strong effort to secure control of the organization, and according to observers, this element was defeated by a very small majority. Immediately following the Des Moines convention, Charles G. Bolté, the national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, made what has been called a feeble attempt to purge the national office of Communist elements. It has been alleged that some 14 members of the national organization suspected of being affiliated with the Communist Party have been discharged. However, the extent of Communist infiltration into the American Veterans' Committee seems to be more firmly entrenched in some of the local chapters of the organization than it is in the national organization. It has been reported that upon a number of occasions, National Commander Bolté was approached by interested individuals and asked what he intended to do with a number of the State organizations which were known to be controlled and dominated by the Communists. Bolte is said to have replied that the State and local chapters enjoyed local autonomy and that because of this, he was powerless to do anything.

It has been reported that the top-ranking leaders of the American Veterans' Committee having admitted that a number of the State organizations are Communist controlled, and that the State organizations in New York, Michigan, and California fall into this category. In the case of the State of Michigan, it has been reported that at the organization's meeting held in the Barlum Hotel in Detroit on September 7 and 8, 1946, the Communist forces succeeded in electing the entire slate of State officers.

The executive board of 16 members which was elected at the Michigan State convention of the organization, is reported to be made up for the most part of persons who are known Communists or who are closely associated with the Communist Party. Among the members of the executive board who were elected was one who is reported to be the Detroit correspondent for the Communist organ called the Daily Worker. He has been a candidate for Governor of the State of Michigan on the Communist Party ticket. Another individual who was elected to membership on the executive board of the Michigan chapter of the organization is reported to be labor secretary for the Communist Party. Another individual who was elected to membership on the executive board, is reported to have been ousted from the United Automobile Workers because it was claimed that he was a Communist.

With reference to the situation in the State of California, it is interesting to note that in the February issue of the American Veterans' Committee Bulletin, the official publication of the organization in California, several members of the organization wrote open letters on the subject of communism in the American Veterans' Committee. One of these letters, which was written by Theodore Robinson, chairman of the progressive caucus, representing 15 chapters of the American Veterans' Committee in southern California, states that—

> The American Veterans' Committee must stand firmly behind the national planning committee's resolution condemning communism and fascism. We have spent too much in the struggle against fascism to tolerate it now. And the views and acts of the American Communists are destructive to a democratic and progressive organization such as ours.

Another quotation from this letter indicates that Robinson is opposed to the present leadership of the organization in the State of California. Also contained in this Bulletin is a letter written by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., wherein he states that—

> We recognize that communism is not an issue in the majority of chapters across the country. However, these must recognize that it is an issue in certain specific areas and must lend their support to the non-Communist groups who are struggling with the problem in order to achieve an overwhelming victory at our national convention in Milwaukee. There are no civil liberties or anti-Russian issues involved in the necessity of non-Communist members of the American Veterans' Committee being organized to combat Communist influence and infiltration in order to maintain the American Veterans' Committee as a genuine, independent organization devoted to the accomplishment of our liberal aims and objectives in a free America.

These two letters indicate that it is known that the Communists are endeavoring to control the American Veterans' Committee, and that even Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., knew it when he wrote this letter.

It has been reported that the reason the American Veterans' Committee has had difficulty in attracting large numbers of World War II veterans is the fact that it did not, and has not, confined its membership to war veterans. For instance, for a time the American Veterans' Committee permitted membership to those who were associated with the merchant marine during World War II. In this connection it should be stated that in June 1946 an organization was set up by the Communist-dominated maritime unions which was called the Committee for Maritime Unity. The Committee for Maritime Unity, according to a statement made by a certain individual at one of the meetings of the committee, hoped to create a general strike in the United States through the creation of a strike in the maritime unions. The man who made that statement is a known member of the Communist Party and at one time was given credit for recruiting more members into the Communist Party than any other Communist. It is not known whether this man is a member of the American Veterans' Committee or not. However, the point involved is that at the same meeting of the Committee for Maritime Unity, another individual, who was a member of the publicity committee of the American Veterans' Committee, also made an address during which he said that the American Veterans' Committee was opposed to the use of the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard in maritime strikes. He also pointed out during the address that seamen were eligible for membership in the American Veterans' Committee, and in this connection he further stated that its membership was growing by leaps and bounds. This, of course, is evidence of the association between the American Veterans' Committee and known Communists and Communist-front organizations.

The fact that the American Veterans' Committee is known to have tolerated association between its members and known Communists and Communist-front organizations until at least a short time ago, is another reason why it has not been able to attract large numbers of World War II veterans. In addition to the illustration mentioned above, showing association between members of the American Veterans' Committee and communistic activities, other illustrations of the same type can be presented. For instance, the American Veterans' Committee receives more favorable publicity in the Communist organ, the Daily Worker, than all other veterans' organizations combined. Another illustration is the fact that in a letter written upon the stationery of chapter No. 1 of the organization in Chicago, Ill., the publication In Fact is recommended as reading material by Miss Nelson, a member of the chapter mentioned. The publisher of In Fact, George Seldes, is a well-known fellow traveler.

A newspaper clipping from the Washington Times-Herald dated November 22, 1946, refers to the resignation of the chairman of the Greenbelt, Md., chapter of the American Veterans' Committee. In resigning this chairmanship, William F. Miller stated that he was resigning because of the rabble-rousing tactics of the George Washington University Chapter of the American Veterans' Committee. The clipping quotes a letter which Miller wrote to the headquarters of the organization in New York City in which it was stated that "these tactics have reduced the American Veterans' Committee to the level of a semipolitical organization, rather than one that is supposed to be primarily a veterans' organization."

Recently, a chapter of the American Veterans' Committee in Washington, D. C., sponsored a speech by Ernesto Da Cal, a Spanish Civil War veteran, who spoke on the case against Franco Spain. Every Communist-front organization in the United States is at present endeavoring to cause another civil war in Spain and as a primary step cause a break in diplomatic relations between Spain and the United States.

The American Veterans' Committee has joined with numerous Communist-

front organizations in their efforts to have the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives abolished. For instance, the Madison, Wis., chapter of the American Veterans' Committee passed a resolution in May 1946 which was sent to all Members of Congress urging that they cast their votes against the contempt action taken by the Committee on Un-American Activities against the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., is one of the foremost Communist-front organizations in the United States.

During the month of April 1946 the Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in the city of New York in the Federal courthouse. Before these hearings began and during the course of the hearings certain Communist-front organizations and known members of the Communist Party picketed the courthouse where the hearings were conducted. Among the organizations picketing the courthouse was the American Veterans' Committee.

The executive secretary of the organization at that time issued a statement wherein he said that the American Veterans' Committee protested the activities of the Committee on Un-American activities and would attempt to have it abolished. During the month of October 1945 the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, published a list of organizations which were seeking the dissolution of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The American Veterans' Committee was listed among these organizations. At least nine of the organizations mentioned in the Daily Worker have been cited as Communist-front organizations and are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

The Greater New York Council of the American Veterans' Committee joined with the CIO and the International Workers' Order, a Communist-front organization, in picketing the office of Western Union in New York during the February 1946 strike of the Western Union employees.

The New Leader on April 20, 1946, stated that the executive secretary of the New York chapter of the American Veterans' Committee was a Communist. He has been referred to as being active in the attempts of the American Veterans' Committee to abolish the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. The New Leader of the same date also stated that the Brighton, N. Y., chapter of the American Veterans' Committee is under Communist control.

The Daily Worker of April 5, 1946, states that the American Veterans' Committee sent delegates to the Win-the-Peace Rally, which was held in Washington, D. C., during the summer of 1946. The Win-the-Peace Rally has been exposed as a Communist front. Its successor, "The National Committee to Win the Peace," is considered one of the outstanding Communist fronts operating in the United States today.

During the month of April 1946 the American Veterans' Committee and the Communist Party of Englewood, Colo., combined to picket the Baptist Church of Dr. Harvey Springer, of Englewood, during which time some Communist Party literature was distributed in front of the church. The pickets included a prominent member of the Communist Party and a leading member of the American Veterans' Committee. Both these individuals were subsequently arrested for picketing the church, and during the course of the trial admitted that the literature which had been distributed had been printed at the local Communist Party headquarters and then distributed to the American Veterans' Committee through John Miller, a member of the organization.

As a further illustration of the association between Communists and members of the American Veterans' Committee, it is of interest to note that even in Japan the American Veterans' Committee has associated with known Communists; for on January 30, 1946, in Tokyo, Japan, the American Veterans Committee at one of its forums had as the principal speakers Mr. Sanzo Nosaka, Communist Party leader who had recently been in Yenan, China, which is the headquarters of the Chinese Communist forces now engaged in civil strife with the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. During his address to the veterans attending the forum, Nosaka said:

> Communism is twentieth century democracy; only through communism can Japan attain democracy.

Obviously, this was an effort by those members of the American Veterans' Committee who arranged for the meeting to secure the veterans' sympathy for communism in Japan, despite what views their leader, General MacArthur, may have on the subject. Nosaka's statement on democracy closely parallels the slogan of the American Veterans' Committee, which is "Achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world." The moderator of this forum was Barnard Rubin, who is presently writing a column for the Communist organ, the Daily Worker.

Two prominent members of the AVC, one of whom is a member of the national planning committee of the American Veterans' Committee, were formerly staff members of Stars and Stripes, the official publication of the United States Army in the Pacific area. Both these individuals were removed from their posts on the staff of Stars and Stripes after it was alleged that a loyalty check on them had resulted in a negative report to their commanding officer, Col. John F. Davis.

As a matter of fact, on January 13, 1946, an estimated 9,000 GI's attended a demonstration on Okinawa which was held under the auspices of the American Veterans Committee. Both of these men were members of the Tokyo chapter of the American Veterans Committee at the time of the demonstration.

ATTITUDE OF OTHER VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS TOWARD THE AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE

Perhaps one of the best illustrations of the feeling of other veterans' organizations toward the American Veterans' Committee is contained in a press release issued by Jack W. Hardy, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II, which is dated September 13, 1946, at Washington, D. C. The first three paragraphs of this press release are quoted as follows:

> WASHINGTON, September 13.—Amvets today struck sharply at reports of an impending merger with the AVC, asserting that the two organizations are guided by different concepts and that the latter has "sought and attracted to its membership many fellow travelers and those of communistic bent."
>
> Jack W. Hardy, Amvets national commander, made public a letter which he has sent to Charles G. Bolté, national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, in New York City.
>
> The message by Commander Hardy emphasized that Amvets welcome into their ranks "all bona fide World War II veterans who can and do unreservedly subscribe to the Amvet declaration of principles" and "dedicate themselves to the preservation of American democratic principles." He pointed out, however, that when the idea of a merger had been broached several months ago by Chad Patterson and Gil Harrison, AVC officials, a review was made of "the inherent difficulty which would be encountered in efforts to purge AVC of its radical elements" who Amvets "would not be interested in accepting as members."

Pertinent paragraphs of the letter referred to in Mr. Hardy's press release are quoted as follows:

> Prior to your national convention at Des Moines, Iowa, in June, I was approached by AVC representatives on two occasions relative to the possibility of AVC merging with Amvets.
>
> At his suggestion, Mr. Chad Patterson and I had lunch together, at which time the coming AVC convention and its policies and the possibilities of a merger were discussed by him. Later Gil Harrison, one of the AVC founders and presently its vice chairman, whom I have known personally for some time, called on me and a similar discussion was had.
>
> On each of these occasions I indicated that there was no present basis for such a suggested merger, as the two organizations were guided by different concepts; that AVC had sought and attracted into its membership many fellow travelers and those of communistic bent; that AVC solicited and accepted into membership persons other than those who had been honorably discharged from the armed forces; and that AVC, apparently, had embraced in their entirety economic, political, and sociological programs of a leftist labor-political movement.

These quotations are self-explanatory and indicate that the American Veterans of World War II fully realize the leftist nature of the American Veterans' Committee.

An example of the feeling of the American Legion toward the American Veterans' Committee is contained in a bulletin issued by the North Shore Post

of the American Legion, Post No. 21, Chicago, Ill., which is quoted as follows:

From Valley Forge on down American war veterans have never engaged in campaigns of vilification of their fellow veterans. All men who have served to defend American institutions have felt themselves bound together with hoops of steel. Those men who fought with Grant and Lee pitched their tents side by side after recall sounded. The Blue and Gray fought together to secure legislation to rehabilitate their fellow veterans. Spanish-American veterans participated in the affairs of the boys of '61. The men of Argonne and Chateau-Thierry are ready to assist the patriots of Tarawa and Bastogne. So let it be, one for all and all for one.

Charles Guy Bolté, who served with the Kings Royal Rifle Corps and is said to be directing the policies of the American War Veterans' Committee, has signed his name to an article which was published in a picture magazine here in our country. This article is typical of the technique used by the Communist smear bund and we believe that it was written by some long-haired professor who hues to the "Red" party line. Create chaos and confusion, play one group against the other, divide and conquer.

Bolté wrote: "Digging into the past I found that the Legion had been organized deliberately to quell the Bolshevist bogey among Armistice-happy doughboys of the AEF, had spent its chief talents in warning America of an exaggerated "Red" menace, had been a consistent violator of civil liberties and had almost entirely ignored the rising tide of fascism—although its traditionally isolationist policies were reversed after the fall of France."

According to the American Legion post, Bolté is talking like a typical Communist when he says we Legionnaires are violators of civil liberties; this has been the cry of saboteurs of Americanism for 25 years. Mr. Bolté speaks of an exaggerated "Red" menace. We of the American Legion prefer to believe our own Lee Pennington, Chief Inspector of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He said, "This group of rats has set out with the avowed purpose of infiltration into the American Legion. We believe the rats are directing some of the activities of Mr. Bolté's organization without his knowledge. * * * It is true that the American Legion has been fighting communism; we know all the angles. We know that the social security of our Nation rests in the Constitution of the United States of America and not in communistic social-security legislation such as Communists are trying to fasten upon American laboring men."

These quotations clearly show that the American Legion believes the American Veterans' Committee to be engaged in a smear campaign against patriotic veterans' organizations.

As further evidence of the smear technique employed by the American Veterans' Committee and one of the reasons it was cited as a smear organization by the American Legion, we need only to become acquainted with the facts contained in the following five paragraphs:

On October 24, 1945, the American Veterans' Committee joined with the CIO Political Action Committee and the National Negro Congress (Communist-front organization) and 17 other left-wing and Communist-pressure groups in demanding that Congress abolish the congressional Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities. In this connection, reference is made to a circular distributed by the American Veterans' Committee, in which it compares its program with that of the American Legion in the following language:

"From the American Legion's pamphlet, It's a Fact, we read of the following program of Americanism:

"'The Legion * * * cooperates with public education in its fight to hold the line and in its fight against Federal control.

"'The Legion * * * fights against release of alien and questionable Nisei Japanese from war relocation centers.

"'The Legion continues to help the Dies committee do an effective job of exposing subversive elements.'"

AVC, on the other hand, believes that brotherhood of race, color, and creed and the support of socially progressive legislation are more important than witch hunts which seek to hold the line against imagined subversive elements, more constructive than convention carnivals and isolated bonus grabs.

The report of the Communist Party of the United States, published in January 1946, entitled "Party Policy in the Veterans' Field," attacks the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as being reactionary. In listing the American Veterans' Committee, however, it refers to it as a group composed to a great extent of social and democratic elements. In the report, quotations from Charles Bolté's book, The New Veteran, are used freely.

Therefore, it will be seen that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was justified in the position it took in limiting veterans' organizations that are invited to appear before it to the ones that are composed exclusively of ex-servicemen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION (H. DOC. NO. 145)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I recommend that the Congress authorize the United States to participate as a member of the International Refugee Organization.

As an aftermath of the war, there are more than one million displaced persons remaining in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Almost two-thirds of these are under United States care and control. The Allied military victory over the Axis Powers brought with it a practical and moral responsibility with reference to these victims of the Axis.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has considered the problem of these displaced persons carefully and at great length. At the first session in London, certain basic principles were established. It was agreed that this problem is international in scope and nature; that every effort should be made to facilitate the repatriation of displaced persons who desire to return to their homelands; that displaced persons who have valid objections to return should not be forced to do so, but should be cared for by an international agency until new homes can be found for them elsewhere. Between the January and October sessions of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council made a detailed study of the entire problem and recommended the establishment of an international refugee organization which would provide an integrated and effective solution. At the meeting of the General Assembly in New York which ended in December, the draft constitution recommended by the Economic and Social Council was adopted. The United States representative to the United Nations, Senator Warren Austin, signed the constitution of the International Refugee Organization subject to subsequent approval by the Congress.

This constitution represents an earnest effort by the United Nations to solve one of the most poignant and difficult problems left in the wake of the war. The organization to be created will have no governmental powers. It can in no way alter the statutes of any of its members. It can obtain funds only by appropriations by the constitutional processes of its members. It will be solely a service organization to aid in the solution of a common problem. I am confident that with the full support of the United States, the International Refugee Organization will demonstrate the practical effectiveness of cooperation and understanding among nations. The participation of this Nation in the Organization was proposed in my Budget Message for the fiscal year 1948, and provision was made for the necessary funds within the proposed budget.

With respect to those displaced persons in our areas of occupation, the United States Army has an excellent record of performance in a field which is not traditionally the responsibility of soldiers. The Army from the first recognized the need for making the maximum use of international civilian agencies, and has done so. With the forthcoming termination of the supply of civilian personnel from other organizations, now used in the care and supply of displaced persons, I believe that it is of the utmost importance that the International Refugee Organization be established as soon as possible. It would indeed be serious if it were not in a position to begin operations on July 1 of this year.

It is not unreasonable that many of the other potential members of the International Refugee Organization should watch closely the attitude of the United States before making their own definite commitments. I feel sure that with the firm and prompt leadership of the United States, this Organization will be in a position to function as an international body to perform an essentially international service.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 24, 1947.*

DISTRICT DAY

DAYLIGHT SAVING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1700) to provide for daylight saving in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of each year the standard time applicable to the District of Columbia shall be advanced 1 hour

and at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of September of each year such time shall be returned to the standard time applicable to the District of Columbia. The time fixed under this act during the period of the year to which it is applicable shall be considered the standard time fixed by law.

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the first Sunday following its passage and approval.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

THE LATE TEX RANKIN

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I received word of the death of Tex Rankin, who was killed yesterday in an airplane crash near Klamath Falls, Oreg. Tex Rankin became nationally known for his services in the First World War, and as a stunt flyer. His reputation grew with the great service he rendered his country in this last war, in establishing the Rankin Academy at Tulare, Calif. The Tex Rankin school, known as the Rankin Academy, gave to our country many of its outstanding flyers; Major Bong was among its graduates. The Nation has lost a fine American, and a great man, who gave so much to aviation. His wonderful advice and knowledge, which contributed toward the building and flying of better airplanes, will be missed. I know my deep sympathy for his bereaved wife and family is shared by every American who knew Tex Rankin the man, and Tex Rankin the patriot.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a letter from one of my constituents on the subject of rent control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

DAYLIGHT SAVING FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the first District Day that has been claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

May I say for the benefit of the Members who have not had full opportunity to examine all the rules of the House, that the Committee on the District of Columbia has jurisdiction which is limited to the affairs of the District of Columbia, the seat of Government, and can, under the rule, claim the second and fourth Mondays in each month for the consideration by the House of District business.

Before we get around to the pending bill, let me say a word or two, by way of introduction, about the affairs of the District of Columbia and the responsibilities of this committee. The Members who serve on the District Committee serve with considerable sacrifice, I assure you. Your labors here do not pay great political dividends in the ballot box back home. More often than not you are criticized for the time you devote to the District of Columbia. But it is a responsibility that has been imposed upon the Congress by virtue of the Constitution which provides that exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District of Columbia is vested in the Congress. That responsibility has been articulated in many different ways over a long period of time since the seat of Government has been established here.

There was a time when they had a president of the District of Columbia, appointed by the President of the United States. There was a time when they had a governor and a bicameral system of government, consisting of a council and a house of delegates. They have had all forms of government. Some of them did not work out very satisfactorily. At one time they had a gentleman who did a great job of lifting the District out of the mud, paving the streets, improving the buildings, but he left the District hopelessly in debt. It was about at that point when the Congress began to exercise its responsibility in the matter, and so it assumed to take over and to establish a new form of government, which consists of three commissioners, one of whom is a War Department engineer, and all of whom are appointed by the President of the United States and who express the executive functions for the District of Columbia.

That Board of Commissioners consists of Russell Young, chairman of the Board; Guy Mason, a very prominent attorney who has served for a number of years; and General Young, who has been appointed from the War Department. Their responsibility is to administer the affairs of the District, but the responsibility of Congress, of course, is to provide the necessary legislation under which that administrative work shall carry on. When the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress considered this matter of streamlining the committee structure it ultimately resulted in a reduction of committees from 47 to 19. Some question arose as to what we could do with the District of Columbia. Having served for 18 months on that joint committee, and having had a very modest part in the preparation of the Reorganization Act, I had a particular interest in what we might ultimately recommend. We did recommend a larger measure of home rule for the District but that proviso was finally stricken from the Reorganization Act, and so it is necessary under the structure as it now obtains, to have a District of Columbia Committee for the House of Representatives, and a comparable committee in the Senate. I understand that if it has not already done so a bill may be introduced to achieve a joining of the two District Committees of the House and the Senate so that we can operate jointly, but in any event the thing that I present to you today is that the Committee on the District of Columbia has this job of looking after the affairs of the District of Columbia.

You may be interested in knowing that you cannot change the name of a street in the District of Columbia unless a bill is first introduced, referred to the committee, enacted by the House, and then goes through a comparable process in the Senate. That is one reason why as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I designated a subcommittee to be known as the Subcommittee on Home Rule for the District.

I, for one, believe that there is stability of relationship between the Federal and District Governments of such character that the District can exercise a larger degree of home rule and a larger degree of self-government than they have had before. When that obtains then so many of the little bills that ordinarily find their way to the attention of the Members of the House on District Day will no longer come here. As a matter of fact, the business of establishing daylight saving time for the District of Columbia is a chore that should be properly carried out and expressed by the executive heads of the District, but since they have no authority they must come here and ask for the authority, and so it is presented to you today in the form of H. R. 1700.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress we endeavored to provide daylight saving time for the District of Columbia. The bill, however, was considered so late in the session that for practical purposes it would have done very little good. A great many instrumentalities such as the railroads and their lines have a very abiding interest in this whole question of time. Nothing was done in the Seventy-ninth Congress. We did, of course, have national daylight saving time as a wartime measure; but now we must come to grips again with the proposition of daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia.

In support of this proposal there are a good many organizations recited in the report which accompanies the bill; for instance, 33 of the citizens' associations are in favor of it. The citizens' association, incidentally, is an informal group of citizens in some contiguous area in the District of Columbia who get together 1 night a week or 1 night a month and then discuss these common problems. Sometimes they enact a resolution and thereby indicate to the Congress what their own notions are about the things that we consider up here. Thirty-three of these citizens' associations have expressed themselves in favor of daylight-saving time. The Board of Trade, which is the principal organization for expressing business opinion in the District of Columbia, has declared itself in favor of daylight saving; and likewise the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

There is one thing, of course, that we have got to keep in mind: We are not insensible of the fact that a good many people who work in the District of Columbia live in the adjoining States of Maryland and Virginia, but somewhere along the line the initiative must be taken, and probably nothing will be done

in Maryland or Virginia unless the Congress first acts thereon. The Legislature of Maryland is in session at the present time and I can say to the House this afternoon that the House of Delegates of the Maryland Legislature has already passed an enabling act for daylight-saving time in the State of Maryland, and there is every reason to believe from the information we have from Annapolis that the upper chamber will do likewise. So that Maryland will come in line with the District of Columbia if this bill gets favorable approval.

In that connection, may I recite to you that a good many agencies in Maryland have expressed themselves in behalf of and in support of daylight saving. This would include the Prince Georges County Chamber of Commerce, the Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce, the Montgomery County Commissioners in the adjoining county in Maryland, and also the Bethesda Chamber of Commerce.

With respect to Virginia, the situation is not quite so easy, but I am confident that if the Congress takes favorable action today the Virginia Legislature in due course will take similar action so that Arlington, Clarendon, Lyon Park, Falls Church, Alexandria, and all the other contiguous communities will fall in line. In this respect, I can say to you now that the Arlington Chamber of Commerce, directly across the Potomac River, and also the chamber of commerce at Alexandria, Va., have indicated themselves in favor of daylight-saving time.

Here are some of the reasons why I believe this bill ought to commend itself to the favorable consideration of the House. The first one is that the radio networks will go on daylight saving at the customary time in April and terminate in September. This means that programs will come an hour later in Washington. Sometimes it becomes necessary, where programs cannot be rescheduled locally, for transcriptions of network programs to be made and played from transcription at the many radio stations located here.

In respect to trade and commerce, may I say to you that the City Council of the City of Baltimore has already adopted an ordinance for daylight-saving time. There is a great deal of commerce and industry and interchange of trade between that great city of 800,000 in Maryland and the metropolitan area of Washington; so with the divergence of time, if this does not meet with your favorable approval, it adds very materially to the difficulties of those who are pursuing trade between these two metropolitan areas. This would go for Annapolis where it has already been adopted.

As we contemplate the eastern seaboard, first we start out with the fact that Greater New York and New York City will be on daylight-saving time. Philadelphia will be on daylight-saving time, along with a great many other communities in the State of Pennsylvania. New Jersey will be on State-wide daylight-saving time. Rhode Island will be on State-wide daylight-saving time, likewise the State of Connecticut, the State of New Hampshire and the State of Massachusetts. So if we have one time in Washington we are just a little bit out of line with all other metropolitan centers on the Atlantic seaboard that are so closely integrated with Washington by air-line and rail connections.

One of the reasons the bill came on at this stage of the proceedings is that if anything is to be done about it we must act now because the railroads will require abundant time to so modify and alter their schedules, that new schedules can be printed before this goes into effect.

I want to say at this juncture in the proceedings that this bill comes to you because I have had the members of the District of Columbia Committee polled without going through the motions of a formal hearing. It is not a practice I like particularly. We did, however, have extensive hearings on this bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I knew that the Senate was going to have hearings on it. So I assumed the privilege of polling the members and I have learned from it that a very clear and predominant majority are in favor of daylight saving.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I know the gentleman has given a great deal of thought to this subject. Has he given any thought to the situation out on the west coast? There are now 3 hours' difference in the time out there and here. If we add another hour, what effect will that have on my people out there should they want to call Members of Congress here in Washington about legislation that might be pending? For instance, there might be a meeting in my congressional district at 10 o'clock in the evening and they might want to call immediately their Congressman by telephone. They would wake him up and get him out of bed at 2 or 3 in the morning under this kind of a program. I am wondering if this legislation is for the people in the District of Columbia or are we considering that some of the other States are in the United States along with the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are quite a number of answers that can be made to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is what I want.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The first answer, of course, is that in this bill we are legislating not for the State of California but for the District of Columbia. You know, we often lose sight of that fact. Opinions may be expressed, for aught I know, on how will it affect Illinois, how will it affect Michigan, how will it affect California? Well, as a matter of fact, the citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to a little consideration of their business quite aside from how it affects our own individual personal convenience because this bill applies only to the District of Columbia. I live in a different time zone. I live in the central time zone as distinguished from the Pacific time zone in which the gentleman from California lives. Now I have had the same experience. If I tried to tally the number of times that I have been got out of bed at 1 or 2 o'clock by constituents in the last 15 years it would add up to a very substantial amount of time. But that is a part of one's public service.

But, first, let me emphasize that in this bill we are legislating for the District of Columbia. Secondly, it would be up to other States and other areas of the country to determine the time question for themselves.

Now, then, in the State of Illinois we have a great many communities that have daylight-saving time. We have some that operate on standard time. But the city of Chicago, with some three and one-third million people, which is the focal center for air-line travel that comes from all western points, Northwest, Southwest, and Midwest, and then into Washington and New York, will have daylight-saving time. So it is a case of integrating these metropolitan centers wherever that can be done. So, while we want them to get into line, there is also something to be said for us coming in line with the adjoining areas.

We are legislating on this matter because it represents the clearly settled opinion of a vast majority of people who want daylight-saving time.

The Washington Post went to the trouble of polling the citizens of the District, and I think the poll will disclose that a very clear 67 percent or more are in favor of daylight saving. That is, after all, the very first consideration if Congress is going to do its proper duty by the citizens who abide here in the seat of government.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the reason I am asking the question is the effect it will finally have if you continue to raise the hour of time in other States. It might go to States as far west as California. Now, California is a great agricultural area. The farmers there are very much opposed to daylight-saving time in the agricultural area. Now, we talk about legislating for the District of Columbia. I am wondering if the people of the District of Columbia realize how the farmer produces this foodstuff. We have to eat and they have to eat. It is the farmer who produces the food, and I am taking into consideration the effect this might have if we get every State out of line with the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am confident that the residents of the District of Columbia have a due appreciation of the inconveniences and the difficulties that beset those who till the soil, but the essential fact about all that is that there is only one farm in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am not quite clear as to what the gentleman said about Maryland. As I understood him, Maryland is not putting in daylight-saving time unless the District of Columbia puts it in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is one of those mutual, reciprocal things. Somebody has to make a start, so that if we make a start

here they will follow. They may make a start on their own responsibility. The house of delegates has already passed it, and it is on third reading in the upper house, so the Maryland Legislature is going right about it, because Baltimore by virtue of self-rule had an opportunity to do it by municipal ordinance, and since a large portion of Maryland must necessarily integrate itself to the business hours of Baltimore, that would be reason enough for the adjoining State to do it for itself.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Has the gentleman ever lived in a city where there was daylight-saving time while the surrounding district did not have it, and has he observed the confusion that results from a situation of that kind?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely. I can recite the confusion by saying that even within the confines of my own congressional district, my home area having been on daylight saving, if I agreed to address a group of farmers or the members of the American Legion or a parent-teachers' association and was not always too careful to inquire about the time, I found that almost invariably I got to the meeting an hour late. So I have had a good deal of experience with that matter. But may I say to my good friend from California that we have tried to be mindful of that situation, and if a start is made now we not only can feel reasonably sure that those in contiguous areas will come along but we are in line then with Baltimore, with New York City, with Philadelphia, and with a good many other metropolitan areas on the Atlantic seaboard with whom there is a close relationship.

I ought to mention one other thing. Let us not forget the matter of markets and business. After all, the closing of the markets, the work of the brokerage houses, the telegrams that must be sent, the acceptances, and the offers that go out are important, so there ought to be something done that will bring us pretty nearly in line with the market practices that prevail by virtue of the fact that New York City is on daylight-saving time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman read a list of the organizations that are in favor of daylight-saving time. I thought mostly employees' organizations. Has the gentleman a list of those who are opposed to it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. The gentleman will find them printed in the report. It looks to me as if there are about 10 against and a very, very large number of organizations and groups in favor of it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman indicated a moment ago something about bringing other places in line, localities contiguous to the District of Columbia, or other places throughout the Nation. Is the gentleman indicating that this is the first step toward bringing about Nation-wide daylight saving time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. In the first place, our committee would have no jurisdiction over a bill that is national in scope. Secondly, there is no intention to give impetus to or to retard in any way what the Congress may have in mind with respect to national daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman was arguing, however, that this bill should be adopted because it would have some influence on the State of Maryland and other contiguous areas in taking similar action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is for the convenience and for the facility of business in all these areas along the seaboard that are so essentially hooked up with the Nation's Capital, but it is not designed to suggest to any State or Commonwealth of the Union that it should or should not have daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the position of the parent-teacher organizations in the District?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the gentleman examined the report?

Mr. HARRIS. I looked over the report and saw that there is a recommendation here from the District of Columbia Board of Education. I see here the name of the Keene Parent-Teacher Association.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I see only one parent-teacher association that is listed against the bill. That is the Congress Heights Parent-Teacher Association which, as the gentleman recalls, is out here almost at the Maryland line.

Mr. HARRIS. I see only two of such associations which have indicated their position for the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I rather fancy that a good many of those parent-teacher associations have expressed themselves through the citizens' associations, of which 33 have indicated their favor.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman tell the House what the attitude of the farmers surrounding the District of Columbia, in Virginia and Maryland, is in regard to this legislation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can say only on the basis of what happened last year and what representations were made to the District Committee. When the bill was up last year, it seemed the principal opposition came from two sources; the first was some of the restaurant owners in Washington, and, second, the motion-picture theaters. A third source of opposition, I believe, were one or two people identified with the Central Labor Union, who were somewhat interested. But, insofar as I know, there has been no real concerted representation against the bill by the farm organizations, although I would say that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], could speak on that with more authority than I.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a very firm and substantial recommendation for it. I think it is in the interest of the very convenience of life in the summertime when you have to match it up with daylight-saving time in so many areas whose business has a bearing on the Nation's Capital. It would be in the interest of the radio stations. It would be in the interest of railroads, and it would be in the interest of air lines and would facilitate their schedules. I do believe, in view of the fact that such a substantial body of the citizenry of Washington has manifested their favorable interest in this bill, it ought to be adopted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I wonder if the gentleman will explain further just how it would affect transportation, the railroads, and air lines, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Daylight-saving time in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore would make a difference of an hour scheduled in departure from or arrival in Washington. I fancy there would be a good deal of confusion on the part of many Government workers who in the summertime will be commuting out of the city for week-end leaves and who will have to keep the situation in mind as to whether the hour of their leaving is on standard time and whether their destination has daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the time schedules be changed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The railroads will change their time schedules; that is right.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. I understand the gentleman's bill, so far as the District is concerned, would make this permanent legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. What obligation is there on a common carrier to change its schedules? Is the common carrier compelled to change its schedule?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As to that, I am sure I could not say whether he is compelled to or not, but certainly it would be in the interest of the common carrier to do so.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it not a fact that we do have standard time schedules while daylight-saving time is in effect?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. That would mean that all the timetables would have to be changed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would mean, for instance, that the 24 trains that run practically on the hour between Washington and New York would be on daylight-saving schedules over the entire route since the point of departure and destination are both in the same time zone. Obviously, they can take care of it when they run between here and the Central West, because there you have an hour's time difference. But if we changed it or, for instance, if Chicago changed it, then you have not disturbed the schedule particularly but there would be the difference of 1 hour.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that if we pass this bill the railroads would change their timetables? If my memory is correct, during the times that we have had daylight saving, beginning with World War I, the railroads have always kept their regular standard timetables, and it was up to the person who traveled to know

what the situation was with reference to whether or not he would arrive at any particular destination on standard time or daylight-saving time, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is somewhat in error in this respect. While many standard-time schedules probably will not be changed, they do put out so many of these supplementary schedules with reference to one or two given routes of travel. Obviously, they would have to be changed for this very good reason. If the Congressional Limited leaves Washington at 4 o'clock, by the timetable now, and arrives in New York at 7:45, when they go on daylight-saving time and it remains standard time here, obviously the Congressional arrives there at 8:45. Now, the railroads can let you guess at it or it can get out some supplementary schedules, and that is what they would doubtless do.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think there were many of those schedules printed during the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite confident we have had extra schedules printed. As a matter of fact, the Pennsylvania Railroad has so advised me.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHADWICK. May I be assured that the committee has carefully considered the implications of their choice of language when they say that this new act shall be considered the standard time fixed by law? May I say that is different from the legislative form as I know it in other States and municipalities. Is there any possibility that favorable action on this resolution will compel the railroads for instance to adopt 1 o'clock time when from their point of view it is still 12 o'clock under the act?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt it. I think the reason that language is there is to be sure that the change of time is validated in case questions should ever arise.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this question of daylight-saving time is one that has always been controversial. I recognize the interest of both the urban population and the country population in their divergence of interest in this matter.

We have heard from the chairman of the committee an expression of the desires of the urban dwellers. I am deeply in sympathy with that. I know what it means to get out earlier in the afternoon in the summertime and work in the garden, but I do not think it would be fair if someone did not present the views of that other very large part of the population, that is the part of the population known as the farmers who are really the people that feed the city people. It is very easy to sit around here in comfortable offices and legislate about what the time shall be, but let us think a moment about the man who makes it possible for us to sit around here and eat three times a day. The cities live only by reason of the fact that the farmers produce enough food to feed you. I know something about the hardships of farm life. I happen to run a farm. At 4 o'clock in the morning eastern standard time, the farmer gets out of his warm bed, beats his way through the snowstorm and commences to milk his cows. At 7 o'clock in the morning, before you boys get up, his work in the way of milking and feeding his stock has been done. It is completed. His milk cans are set out there ready for the truck, and the truck arrives at 7 o'clock and brings that milk to town so that you boys can continue to live in reasonable comfort.

Now, what this thing does to that man is that he has to get up at 3 o'clock in the morning and he has to have that milk ready by 6 o'clock in the morning. In considering this matter I am simply asking that we do give serious consideration to the hardships that we are imposing upon that very important element of our population. I say I recognize the other side of the story. I live in the city myself. I know it is nice to be able to get away early in the afternoon and get out and enjoy some sunshine, but I think we should consider both sides of the proposition, and in the light of that consideration do whatever you think is right about it.

There is one other point I want to make before I yield. I have mentioned it privately to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who I am glad to know is chairman, and who I know is going to do a great deal for the District of Columbia in which I am very deeply interested.

This bill was never considered by the District of Columbia Committee of which I am a member—in this Congress. There has never been a meeting of the committee in which this bill was considered. There were no hearings, no meeting of the committee. I understand the members of the committee were privately polled as to whether they were for or against, but there has not been any meeting to reach a conclusion. With all deference to my distinguished chairman, I want to say to him and to the House that I do not think that is the way to legislate, and I hope we will not have any more bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia coming to the floor of the House until the committee has had a formal meeting and has had the opportunity to consider them in the regular legislative way.

Another point: This is permanent legislation as now drafted. I doubt the wisdom of making this permanent legislation. I am inclined to believe that if you are going to do it at all you had better do it one year at a time. You may regret it if it is permanent legislation. I shall probably offer an amendment at the proper time to make this applicable for 1 year instead of making it permanent; because, after all is said and done, we do not know what these surrounding States are going to do. Take Virginia, for instance: My distinguished chairman says 14 Members of Congress live in Maryland. I am sure a great many more than 14 live in Virginia. They are going to have to carry two watches if this bill passes, one watch to get up and eat breakfast by and the other watch to get to Washington by. That applies not only to Members of Congress, whose convenience I am not considering particularly, but to all the people of the State of Virginia and probably the Southern and Western States as well.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right in his statement and views as to the effect this legislation will have. It will be far-reaching in its effect because many States will feel themselves impelled to adopt daylight saving because they will believe it is a national policy, having been adopted for the District of Columbia. Many protests are coming in against daylight-saving time. We know the many protests we had during the last war.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman from Virginia brought out the fact that the farmers' schedule would be completely upset. He should also bring out the fact that if this bill were passed it would mean that the farmer would have one market time in Alexandria and another market time directly across the line in Washington, which would make a very difficult situation in the feeding of the people.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I should like to propound this question—I understood the gentleman to say that there were no hearings on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I said there was no hearing in this Congress. I believe the chairman said there was a hearing in the Senate in the last Congress, but there has been no hearing and no meeting of the committee on this legislation during this Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. What about the provision of the reorganization bill which says that no legislation shall be brought to the floor unless it is considered by a quorum of the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That inquiry should be directed to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I know it should, but I did not know but what the gentleman himself might care to express a little opinion on it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I do not. I am not criticizing my distinguished chairman, I am just calling attention to what happened. I know we have all been quite busy.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time. The gentleman can submit his parliamentary inquiry as soon as I have finished, and I am almost through.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD along with my remarks a resolution recently adopted by the board of supervisors of Fairfax County relative to this subject, expressing their opposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

At a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County, Va., held in the board room in the county office building at Fairfax, Va., on Wednesday, February 19, 1947, at which meeting all of the members of the said board were present and voting, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it was brought to the attention of the board that there was a movement on foot to inaugurate daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities; and

"Whereas farmers would have to start working an hour earlier each day in order to meet revised schedules of milk trucks, delivery trucks, trains, and other communicating systems; and

"Whereas crops cannot be harvested until the dew has dried, and there would be absolutely no advantage in going to the fields an hour earlier than is the usual custom, causing this extra hour of daylight-saving time to be wasted, thereby causing inefficient use of farm labor and adding to the cost of production of food and feed crops, and farmers will still be required to work as late as usual in order to harvest the crops within the required period; and

"Whereas if daylight-saving time is inaugurated, it would have serious effect on the cost of production of food and feed crops, thereby raising the cost of these commodities to the consumer; and

"Whereas farmers are now working as many hours as they can physically endure, and the adding of six additional hours each week caused by daylight-saving time would add materially to the hardship and cost of producing milk and other food products in the metropolitan area of Washington; and

"Whereas there is no excuse for daylight-saving time under the pretense of the war emergency program, and the board feels that it is preposterous to advance the idea of setting the clocks up at this time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this board go on record as opposing the plan to put daylight-saving time into effect at this time for reasons stated hereinbefore; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senators HARRY F. BYRD, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, and Representative HOWARD W. SMITH be, and they now hereby are, requested to use their best efforts to prevent any legislative act being passed to create daylight saving into a law; and be it still further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. B. B. Derrick, secretary-treasurer of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, and to the proper governing body of the following: City of Alexandria, town of Falls Church, and counties of Arlington, Prince William, Loudoun, and Fauquier.

[SEAL] "R. M. LOUGHBOROUGH,
"Clerk of Said Board."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman mentioned the difficulties under which the farmers would operate under this so-called daylight savings. He did not mention the fact that all of the school children waiting for busses must go an hour earlier and in many cases in darkness to wait for their particular school busses. Nor did he mention either, Mr. Speaker, the fact that each and every farmer must wait a full hour after the sun is up before his alfalfa and his grain are ready for harvest.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. They will meet the question of the school children, if this bill is put into effect, the same way they met it when the original daylight-savings bill was passed to put the whole of the United States on daylight-saving time. The District of Columbia Board of Education met and changed the school hour so as to have the kids go to school in the middle of the morning by the clock.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not familiar with that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in taking a position in opposition to this bill I suppose I shall be accused, as I have been on many occasions in the past, with being a reactionary.

The gentleman from Virginia has told the truth about the dairymen. I am not sure I can add much to that. I happen to run dairy farms and I see what happens to the men who work on those farms under daylight saving. You would think, of course, that a country district 20 miles out of Washington or out of New York City would be independent with respect to the hours it keeps; but when the big city goes on daylight-saving time and changes all its business to a new time system, to a new clock, so to speak, the effect is felt clear out through the country. That milk truck, to which the gentleman from Virginia has referred, must be operated on city daylight-saving time because the milk distributors' plants in the city are under daylight saving; therefore, that milk truck must come out of the country an hour earlier. The milk must be ready.

Now, in the portion of the globe in which we live the situation of the farmer can be described about as follows: From late spring until early autumn when he gets up to do his normal work, including dairying and other work, it may be said he gets up at dawn. During that summer period the sun rises around 4:30 to 5 o'clock in the Temperate clime. My experience has been confined almost entirely to up-State New York. So, for 3 or 4 months he gets up at daylight, if you please; but as the seasons change and the autumn comes, winter follows and is followed by early spring, whether he likes it or not or whether you change the clocks or not, he must get up in the dark. I think it is safe to say that the average farmer engaged almost entirely in feeding the people of the cities has to get up two-thirds of the year in the dark and probably three-fourths of the year. These bills make him get up in the dark 12 months of the year, or 352 days in the year. He is the only man who has to do that in our entire economy.

The thing that disturbs me these days is the fact that there is an ever-increasing number of people, good people, earnest people but an ever-increasing number of our people who have not the slightest conception of where their food comes from. They see it on the grocer's shelves. They are intensely interested in price and quality, but they do not know where it comes from or how it is produced. The bottle of milk is delivered on the doorstep at a certain hour. If it is there on time, if it is good milk at a decent price, that is all they care about. They have not the slightest idea of how that milk is produced.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask country doctors the effect of this daylight-saving situation upon country families, they will tell you it has an adverse effect; and I am thinking not only of the man who has to get up in the dark the year around but of his wife and children. The wife has to get up an hour earlier and cook breakfast, get the kids out of bed, and dress them an hour earlier. Does that mean that she can go to bed an hour earlier in the evening? Not at all. She cannot get those children to go to bed by daylight. I see these men and these women working on my own farms, and I can tell you that while it is difficult to point your finger at it and prove it, there is a degree of strain and fatigue existing in the farm family wherever daylight savings is imposed upon them. I am against the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think we have no quarrel with the general consideration that the gentleman from New York makes, but it looks to me like we are dealing here with realities. Now let us take close to home. Baltimore will be on daylight-savings time. There are milk producers in this milkshed who will be delivering to the Washington area and Baltimore as well. They will be delivering 1 hour later in one case and an hour earlier in another if they were on daylight savings and we were not. I think the gentleman will agree that the farmers around the New York milk area are in the same identical fix, because I think they have been on daylight-savings time quite some time. Philadelphia is a focal point as a milk center. Chicago is the center of a great milk-producing area that embraces the southern part of Wisconsin and the northern part of Illinois. Yet they are on daylight savings, and they are able to accommodate themselves. So it occurs to me as we look at this picture of the seaboard area that it might just as well be imposed on Washington, D. C.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I note the use of that word. I recognize that use of the

word "impose." It is imposed upon people who do not want it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; all legislation necessarily imposes things upon people. So, while I do not use the word advisedly, I see nothing wrong with its general connotation. But that is going to be the situation here, and the chances are that fewer farmers will be inconvenienced in this area than are presently inconvenienced in the Philadelphia area, in the New York area, and all up and down the seaboard.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then apparently the gentleman from Illinois is for this thing because it only inconveniences a few additional people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Hardly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That since the farmers near Philadelphia and New York are already being inconvenienced, there is no reason why the other people should not be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the people in Washington certainly are entitled to some consideration in this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think they should first have consideration for their neighbors. Honestly, I do not think they realize what this does out in the country. They meet in their little citizens' associations—perfectly decent, honest people—and pass these resolutions without the slightest understanding of what it does 30 miles away.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I respectfully ask the gentleman would his view be the same with reference to all these other metropolitan areas?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; decidedly. If I were a member of the New York Legislature and a bill of this sort came up authorizing the city of New York to adopt daylight saving, I would vote against it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the gentleman will agree that all up and down the State of New York there are a great number of communities—some 30 or 40, including Greater New York—that have daylight-saving time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is perfectly true, and it is a great error.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who voted against the reporting of this bill, I state here that I appreciate the viewpoint of those who desire daylight saving time, but I do want to call your attention to some of the implications that are contained in this bill. First, it will be cited as an exemplary action for various drives on every conceivable plan of daylight-saving legislation. We could give better consideration to some bill of national scope, rather than piecemeal consideration. I think all of us remember too well the disturbance and the bitterness we had during the war and the difficulty we had in removing daylight saving time as a great national vehicle for grief.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We repealed it as quickly as we could.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, we repealed it as quickly as we could, but how long it took to get action. Secondly—may I call your attention to what adds to and illustrates the field of confusion. Most of you have this situation. Let us say we pass this bill. Instead of there being just an hour's difference in time between here and your district there will be 2 hours' difference in time. John Smith out in your district puts in a call at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. You have worked up until 6 o'clock here, and you and your staff have put in a long day. Then he, at 4 o'clock at home, calls you and the operator says, "The Congressman does not answer." Naturally you have gone home from the office. Then he sends you a telegram and wants to know whether you are keeping bankers' hours, and what is the idea of your going home at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. You write him and say, "We have daylight-saving time in the city of Washington and I went home at 6 o'clock."

Many of our office staffs work until 6 or 6:30. I know mine do, and I do generally. But if it is 6 o'clock here and only 4 o'clock home, and a constituent calls me on an important matter, I am going to be embarrassed to explain to him what the situation is, and it may take quite a little time to convince him.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KNUTSON. What would the gentlemen say to a proposal to import starlings into Minneapolis because they have them in Washington?

Mr. O'HARA. It might be appropriate to this discussion.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Can the gentleman think of any good reason why we should have daylight-saving time in one section of the country and not in the other?

Mr. O'HARA. No I cannot.

Mr. REES. As I understand, somebody got the idea somewhere along the line that we ought to have daylight-saving time during the war period, on the idea that we might be able to work a little longer or do a little more work during that period.

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. REES. That was done as a sort of war measure, as I remember it.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder how much good it really did.

Mr. REES. I wonder that myself; but it seems to me that this is a haphazard thing. The fact that somebody saw fit to put it through in Philadelphia or somewhere else is not a good reason for doing it in Washington.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Was not the purpose of initiating daylight saving time during the war to alleviate the tremendous shortage of electricity throughout the whole eastern seaboard?

Mr. O'HARA. That was a theory to which I never subscribed.

Mr. HARRIS. That was the heart of it.

Going further along the line suggested by our distinguished friend from Kansas, what good reason is there for enacting daylight saving time anywhere?

Mr. O'HARA. That is an inquiry to which I also seek an answer.

Mr. REES. That is the point I was just making.

Mr. HARRIS. It might be argued that the purpose of it is to permit people who are working in business houses or in other jobs to leave their work earlier for recreation. I appreciate that situation.

Mr. O'HARA. I will say frankly that some of them do use the time for working in their gardens, and for recreation.

Mr. HARRIS. Could not the the business establishments in the District of Columbia just as well move up the hours at which the employees go to work?

Mr. O'HARA. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. I believe the Reorganization Act provides that no bill shall come to the floor unless it is reported out of committee when a quorum is present. As I understand the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, there was no meeting of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The point of order comes too late. It should have been made before debate started on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I was careful to explain in the course of my remarks how the bill got on the floor, and I am quite sure my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] will bear me out, that it was in the interest of expediting action, and because of the necessity that existed of making a determination in the event the railroads' schedules were to be reprinted. On account of those circumstances, we polled the committee. That is nothing new. I have been a member of the House District Committee for 15 years and have been its ranking Republican member for a long, long time before I became chairman. Ofttimes we had difficulty in getting a quorum present at a good many meetings, and for many, many years we have sometimes followed the practice of polling the committee on bills that we do not regard as too controversial. The fact of the matter is that there was a hearing on this bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the hearings were available to everyone. We could have gone through the same motions all over again, but there was the time factor. If Congress is going to do it, then, of course, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad and the air lines and the others who have a stake in the matter, must be advised abundantly in advance.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to my distinguished chairman that it is true quite often in bills of this kind where we have had hearings and have had the subject matter up in previous sessions, it is customary to merely poll the committee. And I will say further that it is no reflection either on the chairman of the committee or the committee as to the manner in which the bill comes on the floor of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so, and I can assure the Membership of the House that it is not a common practice and certainly would be avoided where any major interest was involved.

With respect to the observations made about the farming interests, certainly I am not insensible to the farming interests in this bill. I come from a farming area myself and have served for many many years as a member of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations.

Mr. REES. Do they have daylight-saving time in Illinois now?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They do in many communities.

Mr. REES. Now?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume they will have it this year as well and, of course, they have it in Chicago. The argument that has been made here can be made on the same ground against every metropolitan center in the United States that has daylight saving. They certainly peddle milk on the streets of Baltimore, and they have daylight-saving time. So, the farmers living in the adjoining area would have to get up earlier. They have daylight-saving time in Philadelphia, so the farmers living in the adjoining area would have to get up earlier. They have daylight saving in New York City so the farmers living in the milkshed area of that city would have to get up earlier. As a matter of fact, a good many of the farmers who deliver to both major milksheds here in Washington and Baltimore would not be affected particularly if we did or did not have daylight-saving time because they would still have to get up earlier. But, when all is said and done, it has been my observation, on the basis of what little farming I have done, that the farmer pretty well follows his own devices in the final analysis as to when he is going to get up. He may have a mind to get up at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning, but that is a matter that he is going to determine pretty well for himself. Certainly, as a matter of practice, I am confident the farmer on the average does not get up as early in this day and age as he did in other years. I know a little something about this business of getting up at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning and getting ready to go out on a threshing rig. But in the last few years I have not observed that the practice is quite the same, and they do get up somewhat later.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he went threshing at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We would be tooling up at that hour. There were chores to be done before the threshing day began. I have had my share of milking, may I say, with my hands and not with a milking machine.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You never saw a threshing machine working before the sun came up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is part of the day, may I say to my friend; it is just a part of the farm day. I have had a small share of it, and I know something of this business of getting up early. While I am not a professional farmer, I have been around farms a great deal, because most of my immediate family were engaged in good, hard agriculture ever since I can remember.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows, of course, that while the farmer can set his own time so far as getting up in the morning is concerned, the farmer cannot tell those men whom he hires to keep on working until 8 o'clock in the evening when the picture show in the adjoining town opens at 7 o'clock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota that it is being done in so many of the metropolitan areas. So it does seem to me that it is only fair if the people of the Nation's Capital are so overwhelmingly in favor of it they are entitled at least to make a start on it. I want to say to the House it does not make much difference to me whether this is permanent legislation or not, but I do believe we are entitled to have it tried out.

So, as the general debate closes, I propose to offer an amendment to make this applicable only for the year 1947. After that time, if it does not work out in this area, then whatever the Congress may want to do about it in the spring of 1948 is something for the Congress to determine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the words "each year" and insert the words "the year 1947."

On line 6, strike out the words "each year" and insert the words "the year 1947."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment requires no belaboring. It was suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I am sure it meets with his approval.

I move the previous question on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 44, noes 86.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 124, nays 210, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—124

Abernethy	Halleck	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Harless, Ariz.	Mitchell
Allen, Ill.	Harness, Ind.	Monroney
Arends	Hébert	Morgan
Bakewell	Hess	Morton
Banta	Hinshaw	Muhlenberg
Bates, Mass.	Howell	Mundt
Battle	Javits	Pace
Beall	Jenison	Patterson
Bloom	Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin
Boggs, Del.	Jones, Wash.	Ploeser
Buck	Jonkman	Poage
Busbey	Karsten, Mo.	Potts
Canfield	Kean	Price, Ill.
Carroll	Kearney	Ramey
Celler	Kearns	Reeves
Chadwick	Keating	Rich
Clason	Keefe	Robertson
Coffin	Kelley	Rogers, Fla.
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Rooney
Cole, Mo.	Kilburn	Ross
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Sadlak
Corbett	Kirwan	St. George
Cotton	Lane	Sarbacher
Crosser	Latham	Sasscer
Crow	Lea	Smith, Maine
Dague	LeFevre	Snyder
D'Alesandro	Lewis	Stockman
Deane	Lodge	Stratton
Devitt	Love	Taylor
Dirksen	Lucas	Teague
Durham	Lusk	Tibbott
Fogarty	McCormack	Tollefson
Forand	McDonough	Towe
Fulton	McDowell	Twyman
Gavin	McGarvey	Vail
Gifford	Mahon	Walter
Goff	Manasco	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Mansfield, Mont.	Wolcott
Gossett	Meade, Md.	Wolverton
Granger	Merrow	Youngblood
Grant, Ind.		

NAYS—210

Albert	Buchanan	Dorn
Allen, La.	Buffett	Doughton
Almond	Burke	Douglas
Andersen, H. Carl	Burleson	Eberharter
	Butler	Elliott
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Ellis
Andresen, August H.	Cannon	Ellsworth
	Carson	Elston
Andrews, Ala.	Case, S. Dak.	Engel, Mich.
Angell	Chapman	Evins
Arnold	Chelf	Fellows
Barden	Chenoweth	Fenton
Barrett	Chiperfield	Fisher
Bates, Ky.	Church	Flannagan
Beckworth	Clevenger	Folger
Bell	Clippinger	Gary
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Gathings
Bennett, Mo.	Cooley	Gearhart
Bishop	Cooper	Gillette
Blackney	Courtney	Gillie
Bonner	Cox	Gore
Bradley, Calif.	Crawford	Graham
Bradley, Mich.	Cunningham	Grant, Ala.
Brehm	Curtis	Gregory
Brooks	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Brophy	D'Ewart	Gross
Brown, Ga.	Dolliver	Gwynne, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Domengeaux	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bryson	Dondero	

Hardy	Mansfield, Tex.	Sabath
Harris	Martin, Iowa	Sadowski
Harrison	Mason	Schwabe, Mo.
Havenner	Mathews	Schwabe, Okla.
Heselton	Michener	Scrivner
Hill	Miller, Calif.	Shafer
Hobbs	Miller, Conn.	Sheppard
Hoeven	Miller, Md.	Short
Hoffman	Mills	Sikes
Holmes	Morris	Simpson, Ill.
Hope	Murdock	Simpson, Pa.
Horan	Murray, Tenn.	Smathers
Huber	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Kans.
Hull	Nixon	Smith, Ohio
Jackson, Calif.	Norblad	Smith, Va.
Jackson, Wash.	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Jarman	O'Konski	Spence
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Toole	Springer
Jennings	Passman	Stanley
Jensen	Patman	Stefan
Johnson, Calif.	Peden	Stevenson
Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Calif.	Taber
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.	Talle
Johnson, Okla.	Pickett	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Tex.	Plumley	Thomason
Jones, Ala.	Preston	Van Zandt
Jones, N. C.	Price, Fla.	Vinson
Kerr	Rains	Vorys
King	Rankin	Vursell
Knutson	Rayburn	Wadsworth
Landis	Redden	Welch
Lanham	Reed, N. Y.	West
Larcade	Rees	Wheeler
Lemke	Richards	Whitten
Lesinski	Riehlman	Whittington
Lyle	Riley	Williams
McConnell	Rivers	Wilson, Ind.
McCowen	Rizley	Wilson, Tex.
McGregor	Robsion	Winstead
McMillen, Ill.	Rockwell	Wood
MacKinnon	Rohrbough	Worley
Madden	Russell	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—98

Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Marcantonio
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Meade, Ky.
Bender	Gamble	Meyer
Bland	Gerlach	Morrison
Blatnik	Gordon	Nodar
Boggs, La.	Gorski	Norman
Bolton	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norrell
Boykin	Hagen	Norton
Bramblett	Hale	O'Brien
Buckley	Hall,	Owens
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Peterson
Byrne, N. Y.	Hand	Pfeifer
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	Poulson
Case, N. J.	Hartley	Powell
Clark	Hays	Priest
Clements	Hedrick	Rabin
Combs	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Coudert	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Cravens	Herter	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.	Holifield	Sanborn
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Ohio	Scoblick
Dawson, Utah	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Delaney	Kee	Scott,
Dingell	Kefauver	Hugh D., Jr.
Donohue	Kennedy	Seely-Brown
Drewry	Keogh	Somers
Eaton	Klein	Stigler
Elsaesser	Kunkel	Sundstrom
Engle, Calif.	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Fallon	Lynch	Trimble
Feighan	McMahon	Weichel
Fernandez	McMillan, S. C.	Woodruff
Fletcher	Macy	
Foote	Maloney	

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Meyer against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Weichel against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Engle of California against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Clements against.

Mr. Seely-Brown for, with Mr. Fletcher against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Jones of Ohio with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Kunkel with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Rayfiel.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Judd with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Hand with Mr. Fernandez.

Mrs. Bolton with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Rabin.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Hagen with Mr. Gordon.

Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Gorski.

Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Herter with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Nodar with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Owens with Mr. Hedrick.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Norman with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. LeCompte with Mr. Morrison.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders on next Wednesday I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Springfield Daily News of February 21, 1947.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX and Mr. REDDEN asked and were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Conciliation Service.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. FOLGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

SAFEGUARDING ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 105 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 4, which is a bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain criminal cases. It relates to the admission of statements made by persons accused of committing a crime.

This bill comes to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule was also unanimously reported by the Rules Committee.

I might state that this legislation is not new in this House for the reason that a similar bill was passed by this body in the Seventy-eighth Congress and again in the Seventy-ninth Congress. This legislation has had our approval on two previous occasions.

This is an open rule providing for 2 hours' general debate. I would like to make a brief statement as to what the bill provides. I will not go into the merits of the legislation because members of the Committee on the Judiciary will present a full explanation as to why this bill should be passed.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is made necessary on account of a certain decision handed down by the United States Supreme Court. The title of the case is McNabb et al. against United States, which was decided on March 1, 1943, and is reported in Three Hundred and Eighteenth United States Reports, page 332. In that case the Supreme Court decided that a confession or statement of a person apprehended for the commission of a crime could not be admitted in evidence if the same was taken by the officers prior to the time that the defendant had been arraigned.

Justice Frankfurter wrote the opinion and called attention to the fact that Congress, through the Criminal Code, has given explicit instructions to the United States marshals, their deputies, and other officers as to what their duties shall be on apprehending persons suspected of a crime. I quote from the decision and the following language is the basis for the conclusions reached by the Court:

Congress has explicitly commanded that—

And now Justice Frankfurter quotes the statute as found in the Eighteenth United States Code, paragraph 595—

It shall be the duty of the marshal, his deputy, or other officer, who may arrest a person charged with any crime or offense, to take the defendant before the nearest United States Commissioner or the nearest judicial officer having jurisdiction under existing laws for a hearing, commitment, or taking bail for trial.

Justice Frankfurter also cites the act of June 18, 1934, chapter 595, Forty-eighth Statutes 1008, Fifth United States Code, paragraph 300a, authorizing officers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make arrests, and calls particular attention to the requirement that "the person arrested shall be immediately taken before a committing officer."

In this particular case which was before the Court several brothers had been arrested for the crime of murder in the State of Tennessee. A Federal officer had been shot while endeavoring to apprehend these brothers for operating a still. The murder occurred at night. There was no evidence as to who had fired the fatal shot. One of the brothers confessed and implicated another brother. On the strength of these confessions the defendants were found guilty of second-degree murder.

Justice Frankfurter in this case held that the statements although made voluntarily, and after the defendants had been fully informed of their rights, were inadmissible in court to sustain these convictions solely for the reason that the defendants had not been arraigned prior to the time the statements were taken. These men were arrested late at night, I believe about 2 a. m., and were questioned for several hours before the statements were made.

During the debate on this bill cases will be called to your attention by members of the Judiciary Committee where miscarriages of justice have occurred because of the effect of this decision. It is therefore necessary for Congress to act in order that justice may be done in future cases. The bill contains only four lines and merely provides:

That failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer shall not render inadmissible any evidence otherwise admissible.

I wish to read a few more lines from the decision which I believe will give you a pretty clear picture of what the issue before us is. Justice Frankfurter said this:

In holding that the petitioners' admissions were improperly received in evidence against them, and that having been based on this evidence their convictions cannot stand, we confine ourselves to our limited function as the court of ultimate review of the standards formulated and applied by Federal courts in the trial of criminal cases. We are not concerned with law-enforcement practices except insofar as courts themselves become instruments of law enforcement. We hold only that a decent regard for the duty of courts as agencies of justice and custodians of liberty forbids that men should be convicted upon evidence secured under the circumstances revealed here.

In other words, the Court found that these statements could not stand to sustain these convictions under the interpretation the Court placed on the statutes I have quoted. I do not believe that Congress ever intended any such construction of the law. Of course we want to see defendants arraigned promptly, but, in my opinion, it is unreasonable to hold that the defendant has been deprived of any of his constitutional or statutory rights if at the solicitation of the arresting officers he voluntarily, and after being fully informed of his rights, decides to make a confession of the crime for which he has been arrested. It is up to Congress to express our intention clearly on this point, and that is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. Was there a dissenting opinion?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Justice Reed wrote a dissenting opinion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the test of a long-established line of decisions on the question of the confession of a crime, as long as no force or violence was used?

Mr. CHENOWETH. This decision overrules all of the decisions handed down prior to this time, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan. The trial courts have been embarrassed since the announcement of this decision and it is now very difficult to determine what statements are admissible. The court apparently was trying to say to the law enforcement officers of the country that "you must be more careful in dealing with those you have apprehended for committing a crime; you must have them arraigned regardless of the time of day or night they are arrested before you can take a statement from them." That is virtually what this decision says.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The force and effect of the Supreme Court decision would be to deny to any police officer the opportunity to even interrogate any person he might arrest and whom he may accuse of crime?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would say that would be the practical effect of the decision. He might question the defendant but any statement made would be inadmissible. It certainly has created a very embarrassing and distressing situation. Many cases could be cited where a flagrant violation has been permitted to go unpunished because the courts and the law enforcement officers were not permitted to carry out their usual duties. There should be no opposition to either the rule or the bill.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. I wonder if the Supreme Court cited any authority to back up the holding it handed down in this case other than their interpretation of the language that they were passing upon?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I may say that the basis of the opinion is the fact that Congress has instructed law-enforcement officers concerning their duties to see that defendants are arraigned promptly, and the court found in this case the officers had taken statements from the defendants before they were arraigned. For this reason the statements were inadmissible.

Mr. REDDEN. The officer before he may talk to the criminal must take him before a committing officer and have him committed or a hearing held, then he may talk to him, is that right?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes, that appears to be the theory of the court, which I contend is wrong and should be corrected.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. As a matter of fact, there was no authority cited by the justice who wrote the opinion because there was no authority holding kindred to what his opinion is in this case; is that correct?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In this case the gentleman mentioned that the matter had been before the House on two previous occasions. Why is it here the third time?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The other bills failed to pass the other body.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bill did pass the Senate, but it was caught in the deluge of bills that were not passed at the end of the session.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I stand corrected. The bill did pass the House on two different occasions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The statement was made here a minute ago about the passage of this bill. In other words, under the McNabb decision as it stands a police officer after arresting an individual cannot even interrogate him. That is not what that decision says. It says that until he has been arraigned the confession will not be allowed to be admitted in evidence. There would be nothing to keep him from questioning the prisoner during that period of time. All the McNabb decision says is that the individual's statement shall not be admitted into evidence if it was procured before he has been arraigned.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is true. They can question him, but any statement taken at that time would not be admissible under the McNabb ruling. We are seeking to correct this ruling by this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In this case the arresting officer, who was an alcohol prohibition agent, questioned him for a period of 14 to 16 hours?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Fourteen hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. They had ample time the next morning from 9 o'clock to 2 o'clock in the afternoon to have arraigned him?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know what the circumstances were, whether there was an officer present before whom they could have arraigned him or not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think it is good policy upon the part of the Congress to pass a law because it does not agree with the opinion of the Supreme Court in a particular case? Does not the gentleman think that is going pretty far?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I may say to the gentleman it is unfortunate that the Congress is called upon to correct a mistake of the Supreme Court. However, this is not the first time we have been called upon to do that. It is becoming rather common. I do not intend to be critical of the Court, but I cannot understand why the Court reached such conclusions. It is the duty of Congress to act promptly to clarify the law, which has been misconstrued by the Court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is it not the duty of the Supreme Court to construe the law as written by the Congress but not to make the law and when there is a wrong interpretation, is it not the duty of the Congress to correct the law so that it will clearly express the intent of the Congress?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it seems to me that here is a decision that some Members of Congress do not agree with and I think, because some of the Members of Congress do not agree with this decision that is the reason we are bringing this legislation before the House. Now we are criticizing the Supreme Court; in fact, it was just brought out a minute ago that this defendant was held from 14 to 16 hours while they attempted to extort a confession from him. I do not know whether I want to say that the Supreme Court was wrong in this particular case or not, because I do not know, but there are many cases in which the police go too far in getting confessions. It seems to me if we pass this legislation it will be an encouragement to the arresting police officers to use almost any method to get admissions and confessions, and I would not be willing to go that far.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact that the trial court, and the jury hearing the case in Tennessee, and the Supreme Court of Tennessee, all held that this was a voluntary confession and that the man's constitutional rights were fully protected.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right. Let me read further from the decision and I think the basis for the same will be more clear. I quote:

> The circumstances in which the statements admitted in evidence against the petitioners were secured reveal a plain disregard of the duty enjoined by Congress upon Federal law officers.

As I mentioned before, that is the basis of this opinion. This is where the Court is wrong. Congress has never declared that statements taken before arraignment are inadmissible—this is the construction of the Court and entirely without foundation, in my opinion.

Let me read further:

> Freeman and Raymond McNabb were arrested in the middle of the night at their home. Instead of being brought before a United States commissioner or a judicial officer, as the law requires, in order to determine the sufficiency of the justification for their detention, they were put in a barren cell and kept there for 14 hours. For 2 days they were subjected to unremitting questioning by numerous officers. Benjamin's confession was secured by detaining him unlawfully and questioning him continuously for 5 or 6 hours. The McNabbs had to submit to all this without the aid of friends or the benefit of counsel. The record leaves no room for doubt that the questioning of the petitioners took place while they were in the custody of the arresting officers and before any order of commitment was made.

There are the grounds for the decision; namely, that the officers took these statements from the defendants before they were arraigned. Regardless of the other circumstances involved, the Court found that this was sufficient reason why the statements could not be admitted.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think the Court had sufficient facts to rule that in this particular case the confession was forced?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the Court would have upheld the conviction had it not been for the fact that the statements were taken before the arraignment. That seems to be the basis of the decision. And of course any statement taken by officers from this time on is inadmissible unless the defendant has first been arraigned.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. The Supreme Court there is relying on a situation that was not taken advantage of or claimed by the defendants or their counsel at the trial.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is easily answered.

Mr. ROBSION. No; that is not easily answered. If it was obtained by duress or fraud, and so forth, they should have taken advantage of it in the lower court.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. This pending bill is remedial legislation. This is not the only case where men guilty of crime have escaped punishment by reason of this ruling. There is one case where a man had committed burglaries all over the United States. He took the arresting officers not only to different places in Washington, but to other cities where he had committed burglaries and took them where he had hidden the loot, and in the face of all of those repeated voluntary confessions an acquittal was directed by the trial court. The test as to whether or not the confession is admissible in evidence has long been and should always be whether or not it was voluntarily made.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You are absolutely right. The test is that the statement must be voluntary and the defendant warned it will be used against him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There are two pertinent quotations from the code in this connection. One the gentleman quoted a while ago, Eighteenth United States Code, page 595, to the effect that an arresting officer should immediately take the prisoner before a committing magistrate. The other will be found in Fifth United States Code, page 300–A, wherein they were giving the FBI additional authority. They also made it very plain that Congress intended having the law-enforcing agents of this country, when they made an arrest, take the man before a magistrate immediately. This case involved keeping a man from 2 o'clock until 9 o'clock the next morning, 6 or 7 hours. Then they brought the confession in. The gentleman here said that the just test is whether it was voluntary or involuntary. All of you who are lawyers know this: How much chance does a defendant, after being up all night and half the next day, have of coming in and then proving that it was not voluntary?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the observation made by the gentleman. I think no Member of Congress wants to vote for legislation which would deprive a person of any of his constitutional rights. I think it is well established that a confession in order to be admissible must have been made voluntarily, the defendant must have been fully informed of his rights, and that he was not compelled to make any statement unless he so desired. He should be advised that his statement would be used against him at his trial. I am sure anyone who has had any experience in law enforcement has always been very careful to inform the defendant fully and advise him of his rights.

Mr. JENNINGS. If the gentleman will yield further, in this case the only people who could possibly have shot down this law enforcement officer were these moonshiners. They were the only people who had a motive for doing it. They were the only people there in the darkness of the graveyard.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is my understanding of the case. There was no evidence to the contrary.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. Has not the test always been whether or not the accused made a confession freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right. We do not want another test added, which is the effect of this decision.

Mr. REDDEN. Has it not been held from the time we have had courts in this country that if he made it under those conditions it was admissible to be used against him? If that is not true now by reason of this decision, then the tens of thousands that have been convicted upon such confessions are innocent under the law.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is correct. All we are doing by this legislation is continuing the rule as it has been through all these years and as it has been uniformly followed by the courts.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Has not every safeguard been placed around the accused by guaranteeing to him in the first place that if he makes a confession it is incumbent upon the court to determine whether or not the confession was voluntarily made?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. In the second place, even after the court finds a confession is admissible the jury may disregard it if it was made under compulsion.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is a question of fact for the jury to determine.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. As I understand the McNabb case, the confession was not held inadmissible, but one of the steps which Congress has prescribed for the arraignment of prisoners, that is in taking the prisoner before a commissioner, had not been complied with.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It was held inadmissible because that step had not been taken prior to the time the statements were made.

Mr. SNYDER. The Supreme Court vitiated that conviction because that particular step had not been complied with and not because the confession was not taken properly?

Mr. CHENOWETH. You are correct.

Mr. SNYDER. Then this bill simply eliminates the necessity to arraign a prisoner, one step the Congress has heretofore prescribed?

Mr. CHENOWETH. We have never said that such a statement would be inadmissible. The Court admitted that Congress has not explicitly forbidden the use of evidence so procured. All we are doing by this legislation is to inform the law-enforcement officers that they can take a statement, which is admissible in court, before they arraign the prisoner, and surely no one will contend such authority should be denied.

Mr. SNYDER. A man can be convicted without even having a preliminary hearing?

Mr. CHENOWETH. No. That is not the question involved. I do say it is a serious impediment to the administration of justice in this country if officers are not permitted to take such statements.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Since the Supreme Court has made this decision in the McNabb case, other courts have interpreted it to mean that confessions made before arraignment are not admissible.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is the only position they can take. This is the law until clarified by an act of Congress. This is the issue before us today.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no requests for time on this side, Mr. Speaker. I know of no objection to the rule. I understand this bill has been passed by the House on two previous occasions. In the interest of saving time and with the understanding that the gentleman from Colorado has no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and suggest that the gentleman from Colorado move the previous question.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill has been pretty well discussed under the rule. I might say to the gentleman from West Virginia, who made inquiry, that there are two words used in the general statutes concerning the time when those charged with crime must be arraigned. One word is "forthwith" and the other is "immediately." These words have to do with the procedure to which the gentleman from West Virginia has referred. The courts have interpreted the words "forthwith" and "immediately" in other statutes as meaning within a reasonable time. It is a question of fact in each case. Bear in mind that the jury always passes upon whether or not a confession was voluntarily given by the accused. The court also passes on that question. So I think a person accused of crime is, has been, and, I am sure, always will be, well protected under American law, as interpreted by the courts before the McNabb case. I think I am entirely within the bounds of factual information when I state that every law-enforcement agency in the United States, including the FBI, is urging this legislation. Most of these agencies appeared before the committee at the hearings and pointed out the handicap caused by the decision in the McNabb ruling. Extensive hearings have been held. I hold the printed hearings in my hand—142 pages. I am surprised that there is any opposition to this bill. It must be from misconception of what it does.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CELLER. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a very able member of the Committee on the Judiciary, at all times looks after what he calls the underdog or the common man. He is very meticulous about that. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] agrees that a bill should come to the floor unanimously, I am sure there is very little cause for anyone else to object.

I cannot take any more time because I have yielded all of the time on this side. I simply want to repeat, this bill has a unanimous report. It has passed the House on two other occasions. It has passed the Senate but was lost in the shuffle in the closing days of the last session. It should be passed. I want to ask every Member of the House to read the committee report. Many reports are perfunctory. They do not bring to the Congress much information. This one is exceptional and I do not believe any Member, having read it, will question the reasons why this legislation should be enacted.

I now yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], to be yielded as he may see fit. He is the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill and will explain its provisions in detail.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we may get all the facts in this case properly before us, I would like to give a short review and I would appreciate it if I be not interrupted until I have concluded my statement.

This case is known as McNabb against United States, reported in Three Hundred and Eighteen United States Reports 332. It grew out of what we call an illicit still case. The McNabbs lived about 12 miles from Chattanooga, Tenn., and they had arranged to sell some illicit liquor to several informers, who, in turn, informed the Alcohol Tax Unit of the proposed sale. Four officers accompanied the informers to the scene where the sale was to be consummated. They got out of the automobile and the informers drove off. The McNabbs met the informers and were in the act of transferring the illicit liquor when the Federal officers came up and one of them called out, "All right, boys. Federal officers."

I bring that to your attention at the start, that these men were apprised of the fact that these were officers of the

law. In this connection, if you will take the trouble to read the case as reported in One Hundred and Twenty-third Federal (2) 848, where it was before the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit, you will find that one of the men said, when he handed a shotgun to another, "Here comes the law. Pour it on them, boys. Pour it into them." So, with the statement on the part of the Federal officers, there was recognition on the part of the McNabbs that they were confronted by arresting officers. Therefore, we start off on the basis that each side knew the other.

The informers having left, the McNabbs fled into a cemetery. One of the officers, Leeper, heard a movement in the cemetery and went in. While using his flashlight he was shot, and the shot came from a shotgun, and he fell. Another officer rushed in and his light proved a target, and he was shot while he was dumping two cans of liquor. Later along that night three of the McNabbs were apprehended and taken to Chattanooga. They were not taken before any committing officer—a United States commissioner or a judge—nor were they arraigned at that time. The officers knew there were two other men implicated in this matter, one by the name of Emuil and one by the name of Barney. Those two men were subsequently acquitted by direction of the trial court.

At this stage it is interesting to realize this fact: That during the trial of these men the trial judge excluded the jury and heard the statements of the arresting officers as well as the defendants, for the purpose of ruling upon the admissibility of the confessions. After hearing the testimony on both sides, with the jury excluded, which is the proper practice in Federal courts, he recalled the jury and admitted these confessions and statements as voluntarily made.

Prior to this decision, the sole test of admissibility of statements made by persons accused of crime was laid down in the case of *Wilson* v. *United States* (?96 U. S. 318), that a confession must be free, voluntarily made without coercion or compulsion and without inducement. That has been the standard which we have accepted and gone on for years.

While three of the McNabbs were being held, a fourth McNabb came in late on Friday afternoon and stated that he understood that he was wanted, and surrendered himself to the local authorities, not to the Federal officers. The local authorities placed him in the county jail where he was held for some time. Then, later on, a fifth McNabb came in.

What I am illustrating here is the length of time between the original arrest and the time when the final man was in custody, which accounts almost entirely for the time these men were held incommunicado. They did not ask for attorneys. In the place where they were held there were no bunks, no beds. They lay on the floor. The men were called in a number of times, and finally one of the McNabbs admitted that he had fired the first shot but denied firing the second shot. He stated that the gun had been placed in his hands by one of the others. The court then directed the acquittal of two of the men. The three remaining defendants were convicted of murder in the second degree, and on this they took their appeal to the circuit court of appeals, which upheld the district court. The Supreme Court granted a certiorari, and the case came before that Court.

In my opinion, good law is set forth in the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Reed, and I wish to quote from his opinion for a moment:

> Now the Court leaves undecided whether the present confessions are voluntary or involuntary and declares that the confession must be excluded, because, in addition to questioning the petitioners, the arresting officers failed promptly to take them before a committing magistrate.

Here is the nub of the whole case, right here:

> The Court finds a basis for the declaration of this new rule of evidence—

That is what you are confronted with, a new rule of evidence—

> in its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice. I question whether this offers to the trial courts and the peace officers a rule of admissibility as clear as the test of the voluntary character of the confession.

There you have the whole case: A new rule of evidence.

What has happened? This is what occurred: This bill was prepared by the Attorney General, Hon. Tom Clark, and at his request we have it before us today. The statement was made before our committee that on an average 50 men a day are released, men who have made confessions and then set up the fact that they were not immediately taken before a committing magistrate and given a preliminary hearing and arraigned, with the result that all over the United States hardened criminals are being released. This, therefore, is not permanent legislation.

In an effort to follow the rulings laid down by the English courts on criminal procedure, where the judges have outlined a series of questions which will be addressed to a prisoner, an effort is being made by the American Bar Association in this country, as well as the Attorney General's Department and other organizations similar in character to the American Bar Association, to formulate a set of rules which will govern in cases of arrests of this type. This bill is intended to bridge the gap until that time arrives. That is what we are driving at here. This is merely a temporary emergency measure.

The next thing is that we have a uniform arrest act under consideration. Other bills have been prepared but have not yet been enacted into law.

As a consequence all of these forces are working toward the retention and detention of known criminals until an investigation can be completed.

The reason the Attorney General wants this bill that we are today asking for the enactment of is that crimes are no longer simple matters. You have heard me make this statement before. I have tried 299 murderers in my time. Many of those men, yes, dozens of them, would not have been convicted if we had been compelled to have immediately taken the prisoners before a committing magistrate prior to the time we could run down the other facts and actors entering into the case. The hands of the officers are tied, if the law remains as it is. Some question was raised here today that we were seeking to take from the Supreme Court the power to adjudicate; but the Supreme Court usurped the power and prerogative of the Congress to enact legislation and by judicial interpretation placed a new rule of evidence in effect which has burdened the arresting officers to the point where they are unable to carry on if this remains law. There is the whole matter in a nutshell.

In many of the types of crime we have to deal with today the alibis and the defense have been prepared in advance. I have tried this type many times where even records had been prepared a long while in advance in order to defeat the evidence offered. If this rule is to obtain and retain its force you can almost bid goodby to effective law enforcement in the United States. This matter was up in the Seventy-eighth Congress and it passed the House. It came up in the Seventy-ninth Congress and passed the House and Senate by a very large vote, but in the closing days of the Congress it was lost. It is back here again at the request of the Attorney General.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that enforcement of the criminal laws might break down if the rule is continued as indicated by the Supreme Court opinion. The fact is this is only important in cases involving confessions?

Mr. GRAHAM. Correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman mean a moment ago that criminals had been released who had made confessions before being taken before a committing magistrate?

Mr. GRAHAM. I did.

Mr. COOLEY. They certainly would not have been released if the arresting officer had other substitutive evidence which justified the holding of the prisoner?

Mr. GRAHAM. The confession was ruled out.

Mr. COOLEY. Even though the confession may be ruled out, if they had additional evidence which would warrant the holding of the prisoner, he may still be held?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; he can be held.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman will agree with me that it is not unreasonable to require arresting officers to take prisoners forthwith before a committing magistrate, because that is a constitutional right?

Mr. GRAHAM. Correct.

Mr. COOLEY. It is not the purpose of this legislation to weaken in any degree that constitutional right?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no; rather to strengthen it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I know the modesty of the gentleman will forbid him saying what I would like to say about the gentleman who is in the well of the House. He himself has been a very distinguished United States attorney and in his lifetime, as I recall, has tried something like 14,000 cases in the courts; is that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct. I have handled about 38,000 altogether in all of my capacities as State district attorney, Deputy Attorney General of Pennsylvania, and United States Attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I believe the gentleman will testify from experience that virtually all confessions are obtained before arraignment?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. After an accused has been arraigned and he secures counsel, counsel tells him not to talk and there are very few confessions then?

Mr. GRAHAM. Correct.

Mr. ELSTON. So that if the rule laid down by the Supreme Court is to continue, it will have the effect of virtually wiping out all confessions?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is true.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is substantially the same bill that has passed the House twice before, and I feel that it is not necessary to extend the discussion of a measure which has had the wholehearted support of this body on two previous occasions. This bill merely would write into law a rule which had been adhered to in our courts throughout our history—until the unfortunate decision of the Supreme Court in the McNabb case.

That decision set free a confessed murderer and established a rule or precedent which subsequently has been used by lower courts in freeing additional confessed criminals. At least two such cases have arisen in the District of Columbia. In one, a man confessed that he had broken into an apartment occupied by three girls and assaulted one of them, inflicting lacerations requiring 11 stitches. But he is now a free man, having been acquitted because of the Supreme Court's decision in the McNabb case. In another case, two men were convicted of housebreaking and larceny—after they had confessed and even reenacted the crime—but a higher court freed them on the basis of the Supreme Court's McNabb decision.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. In one of those cases I will ask the distinguished gentleman to state if it is not a fact that Judge Pine, of the District Court of the District of Columbia, stated, when he liberated the accused, that it was strictly a miscarriage of justice.

Mr. BRYSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. And that was on account of the McNabb decision.

Mr. BRYSON. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me ask the gentleman this: In all of these cases that the gentleman is reciting, are we to understand that the law-enforcement officers had no evidence to go on other than these confessions which they had gotten out of these men while they were holding them incommunicado?

Mr. BRYSON. I would not know about the individual cases.

These are flagrant cases of miscarriage of justice, and many others have occurred and many others will occur in the future unless a law is enacted to stop up this technical loophole in the law.

The right of a prisoner to be promptly arraigned is granted him by law and that right should never be denied. When it is denied, those who have failed in carrying out their duty should be punished.

But prompt arraignment is one thing and the admission of evidence is another. Prompt arraignment does not add weight to a voluntary confession and, conversely, the failure to promptly arraign, in itself, cannot by any way of reasoning take any weight away from a confession which has been made freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort.

I can see no reasoning by which we can justify the release on society of confessed murderers and other criminals simply on the grounds that a law-enforcement officer was derelict in his duty, or through circumstances beyond his control, was unable to arraign his prisoner forthwith, as required by law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], the author of the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I take any time at all is because I hate to see anyone in this audience cast a vote against this bill because of a misapprehension as to the actual facts. The misunderstanding grows out of the fact that in the McNabb case there were two arraignments, each of them, immediately. The raid of the still was made after midnight. At 8:30 the same morning, before many courts would have been open, those boys were in court and duly arraigned, and they pleaded guilty to the distilling charge. No one then knew who had fired the fatal shot; so no officer who had respect for his oath of office could have sworn that he had reasonable cause for believing and did believe that any particular man or men had committed the murder. So it was not until the next day that they had their first hint as to who pulled the triggers in the graveyard after the postmidnight still raid. Then one boy confessed his part in the killing of Sam Leefer, and implicated two of his brothers. Immediately thereafter these three paragons of virtue were arraigned on the charge of murder in the first degree, and they pleaded guilty.

So there were two arraignments, each of them immediate. But, of course, we at that time had four arraignment statutes. Now, because of the adoption of the uniform rules of procedure in criminal cases promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States, the only requirement is that arraignment should be made "without unnecessary delay." What we complain of in the McNabb decision is that the Supreme Court states categorically that there was a failure of prompt arraignment, when just the reverse was true. Motion was made by the Solicitor General of the United States for a rehearing, and the sworn evidence and photostatic copy of the original record from a Chattanooga, Tenn., court, shows that this was a mistake, that far from having no prompt arraignment, there were two, and each of them immediate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. If this bill, of which I understand the gentleman from Alabama is the author, passes, may a confession still be held inadmissible if the delay in arraignment is used to force the confession?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes. I would not have any respect for a court that held otherwise. As our distinguished chairman, Mr. MICHENER, has so well said, that has been the law for 150 years. That is my next point. If I have disabused your minds of this type of misrepresentation about the fact of the arraignment, I will pass on to the real milk in the coconut, which is: Thank God the Supreme Court and every other agency of law in this country must bow to the Constitution of the United States! Thank God it is still supreme! The question that you are called upon to answer today, as you have already answered it twice before, is whether or not a decision which promulgates a rule of evidence unheard of before—unneeded for 150 years—shall take precedence over the Constitution of the United States? I quote from the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "quite apart from the Constitution" and although "Congress has not explicitly forbidden the use of evidence so procured" the law is laid down by the ipsi dixit of the Court.

Bear in mind that the Solicitor General of the United States, in support of his application for rehearing, had shown indisputably by court records and affidavits that there had been prompt arraignment and commitment. We are

simply coming back to the Constitution, which says, as everyone knows, that no man shall "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself" under any circumstances, at any time. So, we simply say that the time when confession is made is not of the essence. The question is, and still will be, and has been ever since the Wilson case, whether or not the confession was "made freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort." If it was, it is admissible, no matter when it was made. If it was not free, then it is inadmissible, and that is all that this bill says in its 33 words—that no evidence that is otherwise admissible shall be rendered inadmissible because of the failure of an officer of the law to do his duty with regard to arraignment within a reasonable time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has said that time is not of the essence. That being true, was this Congress kidding when on two occasions it said that a defendant shall be arraigned promptly? I take it by this bill you mean that he shall be arrested promptly, but be held several hours incommunicado until a confession is wrung out of him. Is that right?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; that is not only not right, but that is an assumption which is absolutely unwarranted not only by the facts of the McNabb case, but by every principle of fair play that should govern you in your debate. When the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, composed of 27 lawyers, men who are familiar with the courts as you are, come here both from the Republican and Democratic side, and recommend this bill for the third time, when this House has passed it twice and is going to pass it again today, and when the Rules Committee unanimously endorses it to you and recommends that the rule be granted, I say it is not a fair argument, with all due respect to the distinguished gentleman, that he should insinuate that any such motivating principle is in this case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is that not the effect of the law if we pass this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman from New York. My answer is again, most emphatically, "No."

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. While the law does provide that a prisoner shall be arraigned promptly or immediately or forthwith, there is nothing in the law anywhere or in any decision of our higher courts that I have ever read, except in the McNabb case, that provides that any confession, freely and voluntarily made, is incompetent or inadmissible in evidence.

Mr. HOBBS. The distinguished gentleman, who served so well in the Senate as well as in the House, has spoken the truth again. He is absolutely right, and he could have gone much further. He could have pointed out also that although that requirement was made, it was respected in this case, and although the lack of support in truth of the major premise of the decision was called to the attention of the Supreme Court, the majority denied rehearing, and in the Mitchell case said:

We adhere to that decision—

McNabb against United States—

and to the views on which it was based.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. This question has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of this Nation hundreds of times. I ask the gentleman if this is not the first time it has ever been held that a voluntary confession was not competent in evidence.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. On the question of the element of time, the gentleman will recall, no doubt, the Lisenba case, where the prisoners were held 12 days after questioning, and the Supreme Court upheld that confession.

Mr. HOBBS. Surely. The gentleman speaks truly, of course.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, there is no relationship whatever between the making of a confession and arraignment, because if a confession is improperly obtained and it was obtained within 5 minutes after the arrest, it is rejected.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, sir, that is right.

Mr. ELSTON. And if on the other hand it is properly obtained it does not make any difference whether it was obtained before the arraignment or afterwards; it is admissible.

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly right. And because a court in Tennessee rises to the majesty which should obtain in every court and says because this record of arraignment would disclose the fact that all three defendants pleaded guilty to murder in the first degree, we will delete that in order that we may be perfectly fair to the defendants, with the consent of the defendant's counsel, is that silence of the record under those circumstances to be taken as proof of no arraignment when just the reverse is true and established?

We have an estimate of 50 self-confessed criminals a day walking out of our courts because of this McNabb decision. They are walking out free men, at least for the time being, by nol pros or reversal, and those who won the general affirmative charge after their trial began are perfectly and permanently freed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as author of the bill I would like to have the gentleman answer one question.

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina to ask any question he may care to, whether I am the author of the bill or not.

Mr. COOLEY. So that it may be clearly understood, I understand from the gentleman it is not your purpose nor the purpose of this legislation to in any way impair the right that an accused should be taken forthwith before a committing magistrate.

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly not, sir. Not at all. We do not amend any of the arraignment statutes. We insist upon their observance.

My concluding plea is just this, that as you respect your oaths, see to it that the guilty are punished and not the innocent. The guilty men who fail to observe the law of arraignment are just as guilty as any other criminal and should be punished. But those who are punished now are the innocent members of society who see self-confessed criminals walking out, with license given to them by the McNabb decision to go and commit murder, or rape, or any other crime, if they should be smart enough to confess before arraignment.

The chairman of your Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], has recommended and urged that the report of this bill be read. Being in accord with him, I read it into the RECORD:

THE NEED FOR SUCH LEGISLATION

The Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332), on March 1, 1943. That decision established, without constitutional or legislative authority, a rule of evidence utterly new and variant from the standard set up by the Constitution of the United States in the Bill of Rights. In that part of the Bill of Rights known as the fifth amendment there is the familiar guaranty that no person shall "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Since the Bill of Rights became fully ratified as a part of the Constitution on December 15, 1791, this has been recognized as the supreme law of the land on this subject. Such recognition has been accorded by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and prior to the McNabb decision, it had become well settled that the sole test of admissibility of statements made by persons accused of crime while in custody was whether they were "made freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort" (*Wilson* v. *United States* (1896), 162 U. S. 613, 623; see also *Lisenba* v. *California* (1943), 314 U. S. 219, 239).

Whether an individual in custody had or had not been arraigned prior to the obtaining of a confession from him was never before

considered a determining factor in considering its admissibility.

For the first time in legal history, in the McNabb case, the Supreme Court used section 595, title 18, of the United States Code as a factor in determining the admissibility of confessions. This section provided that it shall be the duty of the marshal * * * or other officer who may arrest a person charged with any crime or offense, "to take the defendant before the United States commissioner or the nearest judicial officer having jurisdiction under existing laws, for a hearing, commitment, or take bail for trial * * *."

Thus, the Supreme Court has substituted a rule or law of evidence, written and adopted by a majority of the Court, for and instead of the Constitution. The Constitution says that involuntary confessions must not be admitted as evidence in any criminal case. Therefore, by plain implication and on ample authority, voluntary confessions should be admitted as evidence. Yet, in the McNabb case, the Supreme Court says:

"Quite apart from the Constitution, therefore, we are constrained to hold that the evidence elicited from the petitioners in the circumstances disclosed here must be excluded. For in their treatment of the petitioners the arresting officers assumed functions which Congress has explicitly denied them."

The Supreme Court does not say that the confessions of the McNabbs were involuntary, but "quite apart from the Constitution," and although "Congress has not explicitly forbidden the use of evidence so procured," because the arresting officers failed to comply with the requirement that defendants should be promptly arraigned—no matter how voluntary the confessions may have been, no matter that the trial judge, jury, and the Supreme Court of Tennessee had held them to be voluntary, no matter that Congress had not forbidden, and no matter what the Constitution provides—the confessions were inadmissible as evidence.

"Mr. Justice Rutledge took no part in the consideration or decision of this case."

Mr. Justice Reed dissented, as follows:

"I find myself unable to agree with the opinion of the Court in this case. An officer of the United States was killed while in the performance of his duties. From the circumstances detailed in the Court's opinion, there was obvious reason to suspect that the petitioners here were implicated in firing the fatal shot from the dark. The arrests followed. As the guilty parties were known only to the McNabbs who took part in the assault at the burying ground, it was natural and proper that the officers would question them as to their actions.

"The cases just cited show that statements made while under interrogation may be used at the trial if it may fairly be said that the information was given voluntarily. A frank and free confession of crime by the culprit affords testimony of the highest credibility and of a character which may be verified easily. Equally frank responses to officers by innocent people arrested under misapprehension give the best basis for prompt discharge from custody. The realization of the convincing quality of a confession tempts officials to press suspects unduly for such statements. To guard accused persons against the danger of being forced to confess, the law admits confessions of guilt only when they are voluntarily made. While the connotation of voluntary is indefinite, it affords an understandable label under which can be readily classified the various acts of terrorism, promises, trickery, and threats which have led this and other courts to refuse admission as evidence to confessions. The cases cited in the Court's opinion show the broad coverage of this rule of law. Through it those coerced into confession have found a ready defense from injustice.

"Were the Court today saying merely that in its judgment the confessions of the McNabbs were not voluntary, there would be no occasion for this single protest. A notation of dissent would suffice. The opinion, however, does more. Involuntary confessions are not constitutionally admissible because violative of the provision of self-incrimination in the Bill of Rights. Now the Court leaves undecided whether the present confessions are voluntary or involuntary and declares that the confession must be excluded because in addition to questioning the petitioners, the arresting officers failed promptly to take them before a committing magistrate. The Court finds a basis for the declaration of this new rule of evidence in its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice. I question whether this offers to the trial courts and the peace officers a rule of admissibility as clear as the test of the voluntary character of the confession. I am opposed to broadening the possibilities of defendants escaping punishment by these more rigorous technical requirements in the administration of justice. If these confessions are otherwise voluntary, civilized standards, in my opinion, are not advanced by setting aside these judgments because of acts of omission which are not shown to have tended toward coercing the admissions.

"Our police officers occasionally overstep legal bounds. This record does not show when the petitioners were taken before a committing magistrate. No point was made of the failure to commit by defendant or counsel. No opportunity was given to the officers to explain. Objection to the introduction of the confession was made only on the ground that it was obtained through coercion. This was determined against the accused both by the Court, when it appraised the fact as to the voluntary character of the confession, preliminarily to determining the legal question of its admissibility, and by the jury. The Court saw and heard witnesses for the prosecution and the defense. The defendants did not take the stand before the jury. The uncontradicted evidence does not require a different conclusion. The officers of the Alcohol Tax Unit should not be disciplined by overturning this conviction."

It is most interesting to note, in connection with the McNabb decision, that no point was made by the defendants nor by their counsel of any failure on the part of the arresting officers to arraign the defendants promptly. The decision is grounded solely upon the assumption indulged by the Court that the petitioners had not been promptly arraigned. The record was silent on this most important point. The petitioners and their counsel did not claim that the petitioners had not been promptly arraigned. The truth is that the petitioners had been promptly arraigned. The prisoners were arrested early Thursday morning on the charge of operating an illicit still. They were properly and promptly arraigned and committed on that charge between 8:30 and 10:30 the same morning. During the raid on the distillery, or shortly thereafter, the murder had been committed in an adjacent cemetery in the darkness of night. No one had been seen, nor apprehended. There was no clue as to the identity of the murderer or murderers. There was a strong suspicion that the McNabbs who had been operating the illicit distillery, or some of them, were also guilty of the murder. However, there was no evidence sufficient to justify a committing magistrate in binding them over on the murder charge. So there was no arraignment on the murder charge until after three of them had confessed; but every question put to any one of the prisoners was put after they had been promptly arraigned, and committed.

Almost immediately after the decision in the McNabb case was handed down, the administration of justice in criminal courts was thrown into confusion because of the McNabb decision, and in case after case defendants were, solely because of the rule promulgated in the McNabb case, freed by orders of the courts nolle prossing, or reversing, or directing verdicts, in pending cases. Many of such cases are cited in the hearings on H. R. 3690, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, pages 21 (cited by the author of the bill), 31, 32, 33 (cited by the Attorney General), and 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60 (cited by members of the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington).

In one of these cases, *Mitchell* v. *United States*, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia (138 Fed. 2d 426) reversed convictions and upon certiorari granted by the Supreme Court the decision of the court of appeals was reversed by the Supreme Court, April 24, 1944, although the Supreme Court said in part: "We adhere to that decision" (*McNabb* v. *United States*), "and to the views on which it was based."

The history of the Mitchell case is bad enough, but that of the Wilborn case is infinitely worse. While the convictions of Mitchell were reversed by the court of appeals, yet this reversal has now been reversed by the Supreme Court, so Mitchell may now be punished. In the Wilborn case, however, Judge Pine is quoted as having stated from the bench in the trial that, although his acquittal would constitute a "miscarriage of justice," nevertheless he must be acquitted because of the Supreme Court's decision in the McNabb case. So, Judge Pine directed a verdict of acquittal, and Wilborn walked out of the court a free man. The Constitution prohibits another trial, because a second trial would constitute double jeopardy, so he is as free and clear as anyone could be. What was his self-confessed crime? About 1 a. m. of March 18, 1943, he broke into the apartment occupied by three girls, where he assaulted one of them, inflicting lacerations requiring 11 stitches, though he did not complete the rape because of the screams of the other girls. He was arrested about 2 a. m. on the same night. About 4 a. m. he confessed. About 5 a. m., in the presence of the arresting officers and his victim, he reenacted the circumstances. About 11:30 of the same day he signed a written confession, and was arraigned about 3 o'clock that afternoon. But the McNabb decision held that no confession could be used as evidence if the self-confessed criminal had not been arraigned promptly, and the judge construed this to mean just that. So, Wilborn, not having been arraigned for several hours after he might have been, was freed by a reluctant jury, because of the court's direction, made solely because of the McNabb decision. Is this only a miscarriage of justice or is it a license to rape?

WHAT H. R. 4 WOULD DO

It would merely nullify the new rule of the McNabb decision.

It would declare that no such policy as that indicated in the McNabb decision underlies the laws Congress passed requiring prompt arraignment.

It would leave the law exactly as it was before the turmoil and confusion caused by the McNabb decision, and wipe out the attempt to bypass and ignore the Bill of Rights, restoring to the full the protective guaranty that no person shall "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

MERELY A TEMPORARY EMERGENCY MEASURE

The bill H. R. 4 is not designed to be a complete nor permanent solution of the problems involved in arrest, detention, and interrogation of criminal suspects. These problems are many, varied, and important. They cry for adequate remedies—for full, painstaking study and solution.

All of us favor prompt arraignment. Failure to observe the legal requirement thereof should be punished. The punishment, however, should be inflicted upon the guilty—not the innocent. The arresting officers are the guilty when they fail to see to it that prisoners are promptly arraigned. The public—"We, the people"—are the innocent. Yet, under the McNabb decision only the law-abiding, innocent citizens, whose safety is jeopardized by turning self-confessed criminals loose, are punished.

A part of the solution should be the enactment into law of the requirement that all arresting officers be bonded, so that any failure on their part to observe the law would make them not only subject to suit, as they are now, but also able to respond in damages.

THE UNIFORM ARREST ACT

The Uniform Arrest Act, by Hon. Sam B. Warner, is a suggested solution that should have careful study.

The suggestion given by the Attorney General of the United States (see his tesimony in the hearings, pp. 35, 36, and 37) that the arraignment statutes should be made uniform and should have but one requirement as to time, to wit: "within a reasonable time," has been met by the adoption of the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the District Court of the United States, which have now unified the time requirements of several arraignment statutes into one rule requiring all arraignments to be made "without unnecessary delay."

As suggested in the McNabb decision, the English rules for the interrogation of prisoners while in custody prescribed by the judges of the King's Bench should also be studied diligently and constructively with a view to seeing how they may be adapted to the administration of the criminal law in the United States. As so adapted, similar rules should be made by law a part of the solution of this problem.

The bill of rights committee of the American Bar Association, under date of May 15, 1944, has furnished the subcommittee that held the hearings on H. R. 3690 with a splendid brief showing clearly and fully the need for protracted and indefatigable study of this whole problem and for the enactment into law of its proper solution. They very kindly offer the services of this committee in collaboration toward these objectives.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, it is manifest that this bill is but an emergency measure, the sole purpose of which is to stop immediately the wrecking of our law-enforcement machinery resulting from the McNabb decision.

The enactment of this bill would do this and give your Committee on the Judiciary time, without the pressure and penalty of suspended law enforcement, within which to study these delicate and difficult problems, and for the preparation of such a bill as may be then agreed upon.

Indorsement of the Attorney General:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1947.

Hon. EARL C. MICHENER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for my views concerning the bill (H. R. 4) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases.

This bill would provide simply that the failure to comply with the requirements of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer shall not render inadmissible any evidence otherwise admissible.

Formerly, acts of Congress defined differently the time within which a prisoner must be brought before a committing magistrate. Rule 5 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure of the District Courts of the United States, however, has superseded all statutory provisions on this point and fixes a single standard. That rule provides that the person shall be taken before the nearest available commissioner or other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with crime "without unnecessary delay."

It is doubtful whether the full effects of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332) have yet been felt. In that case, conviction of the defendants was reversed by the exclusion of a confession obtained on the ground that arresting officers failed promptly to take them before a committing magistrate. Involuntary confessions are inadmissible because in violation of the provision against self-incrimination in the bill of rights. The question as to whether a confession was voluntary or involuntary is always reviewable by the court, and when found to have been involuntary such a confession is properly excluded. In the McNabb case, however, the court did not decide whether the confessions were voluntary or involuntary but declared that the confessions were not admissible because the arresting officers failed promptly to take the accused before a committing magistrate (id. 349).

The decision in this case has arisen to plague and embarrass the prosecution in many instances, although the rule laid down therein was modified somewhat in *United States* v. *Mitchell* (322 U. S. 65). Adherence to the rule in the McNabb case by lower courts has resulted in the miscarriage of justice in a number of cases. The ruling in that case has been seized upon to set aside conviction based upon confessions properly obtained, and self-confessed offenders have been discharged as freemen merely because an arresting officer had failed to take the arrested person before a committing magistrate within the time allotted by law.

As an example, your attention is invited to the recent case of *Carl Akowlsky* v. *The United States*, decided December 16, 1946, in the United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia. The facts briefly are as follows: A restaurant in the District of Columbia was broken into early in the morning of March 25, 1944, and a large quantity of whisky was stolen. Four days later, Akowlsky and two others were arrested between 3:30 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The prisoners were taken directly to police headquarters and booked on an open charge. No effort was made to arraign them until about 5 or 5:30 p. m. on the same day, when a telephone call to the United States Commissioner's office was unanswered. Akowlsky was questioned continuously until approximately midnight, when he made an oral confession of the crime which was reduced in writing between 1:45 and 2:45 a. m. of the next morning. The prisoner was then taken to the restaurant where he reenacted the crime. The court, in holding that the detention of the prisoner was illegal and that the incriminating statements were inadmissible as evidence, stated:

"The record discloses a series of occurrences specifically condemned by the Supreme Court. For the evidence shows that in taking the accused parties from the place of arrest to police headquarters both the United States Commissioner's office and the municipal court were bypassed. While we recognize that in many instances the circumstances may dictate that some delay ensues between arrest the commitment amounting to one, two, or many hours, such is not the case here. The Commissioner and several other committing magistrates before whom the accused might have been taken for a hearing had their offices on or near the axis connecting the place of arrest and the place of detention. It is only reasonable to conclude that the parties could have been transported to the office of one of these officials in less time than it took to get to police headquarters. It is furthermore both by law and practice true that application for hearing might have been made to any of these committing magistrates at any hour. It follows that the detention was inexcusable and illegal at the outset."

The purpose of the bill here under consideration is not intended to encourage delay in taking accused persons before committing magistrates, nor does it constitute an attempt to encroach upon the constitutional safeguard against self-incrimination. Enactment of the measure will leave unimpaired the rule that involuntary confessions are inadmissible, and it will detract nothing from the duty of the arresting officer to take the arrested person before the committing magistrate without unnecessary delay. The sole purpose of the bill is to leave voluntary confessions and otherwise admissible evidence unaffected by a failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer.

I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

RECENT ILLUSTRATION

The lead editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star, in its issue of January 31, 1947, brings us up to date on the long story of ill effects of the McNabb decision rule on the administration of justice almost within sight of the marble palace in which the McNabb decision was handed down:

[From the Washington Star, January 31, 1947]

"M'NABB CASE AGAIN

"The McNabb case continues to hamper law-enforcement authorities in the District of Columbia. Latest of the many repercussions of the Supreme Court's much-debated opinion that prisoners must be arraigned immediately after their arrest has just occurred in district court. Two men who were convicted of housebreaking and larceny have been freed as a result of a ruling by the United States Court of Appeals that even a voluntary reenactment of a crime by a prisoner is of no value unless he was taken before a magistrate as soon as arrested.

"The new ruling was made in the case of Carl Akowlsky, who, with another man, was arrested about 4 p. m. on March 29, 1944, by police investigating the theft of a large quantity of whisky from a restaurant in southeast Washington. The men were taken direct to police headquarters and booked on an open charge. Police began to question the prisoners. About 5 or 5:30 p. m. the arresting officers telephoned the United States Commissioner's office, but received no answer to their ring. The questioning continued until about midnight, when, the court stated, Akowlsky made an oral confession to the robbery. This confession was reduced to writing and was agreed to by the second defendant.

"The court of appeals, in its decision, related that subsequent to the confession, the pair was taken to the restaurant, where they described to the police officers and the proprietor 'how they had entered the premises and pointed out correctly the place from which the whisky had been taken.' On the basis of the confession and the reenactment of the crime Akowlsky was convicted in district court. He appealed the verdict on the ground that the McNabb case ruled out not only the confession but the demonstration, since police had failed to arraign him before starting the questioning.

"What makes the latest interpretation of the McNabb ruling particularly disturbing to the police is the implicit contention of the appellate court that the officers should have taken the prisoners direct from the scene of

arrest to the Commissioner's office or the municipal court, instead of to police headquarters. Under this theory police would have no opportunity to develop their evidence, check alibis, etc., before taking a prisoner before the magistrate to be charged. This restriction gravely hampers the police in carrying out their responsibilities to the public and gives the prisoner extraordinary advantage over the law-enforcement officer. There are times when the prompt arrest of a criminal known to be dangerous is essential to protect the public, yet it would be impracticable to arraign him without some measure of preliminary investigation.

"This is additional evidence of the need for enactment of the Hobbs bill, which would authorize the questioning of prisoners prior to arraignment and thus end the multiplying absurdities of the McNabb decision The bill has passed the House twice, but failed of enactment in the rush of closing Senate business. Congress will render an invaluable service to the cause of law enforcement by passing this important measure."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation has been very carefully explained. I do not think there is very much that has not yet been covered. All of us know, who have read the McNabb decision (318 U. S. 332) and who have gone through the bills and reports that heretofore have been presented to the House, all of which have passed the House, and I am certain you are entirely familiar with this situation. This is the third time this question has been presented to the House of Representatives and it is my hope that it will pass this body the third time when we vote upon it today.

Under the McNabb decision, and practically everyone is familiar with it at this time, the Court attempted by that decision to announce a new rule of evidence as to the admissibility of evidence in criminal cases under the fifth amendment of the Bill of Rights. All of us recall the provision contained therein which provides that no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to become a witness against himself. That has become positive law in this country, and in interpreting how far we can go it has been the law, and it has been decided repeatedly, and there has been no decision to the contrary until the McNabb decision, that when an admission or a confession is "voluntarily made without compulsion or coercion, and without inducement," then that admission or confession could be used in evidence against the accused person. That has been the law throughout the years, and I am happy to know that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, recognizes and approves that as being the law.

But on the other hand, confessions and admissions which are involuntarily given—and it does not make any difference when the man was arraigned insofar as that confession is concerned—if it was involuntary then it does not make any difference when he makes the confession, whether it was before the arraignment or after the arraignment—that type of confession is not admissible and the courts will not permit that evidence to be admitted in the trial of a case. On the other hand, where the confession or admission is "voluntarily made," and the person has been advised regarding his rights as provided by law, and there has been no compulsion, coercion, or restraint of any kind asserted, then that confession likewise is admissible under the law regardless of when it is made. That has been the law throughout the years until this decision in the McNabb case.

The turning point in the McNabb case—and I was surprised when I read from that decision, and read from that part of the opinion which was written by Justice Frankfurter in which he says:

Quite apart from the Constitution, therefore, we are constrained to hold—

In other words, he goes so far as to say that regardless of the Constitution or the provisions of the Constitution—and we might say regardless of the decisions of the court of the several States, and the Supreme Court of the United States up to that time, they held contrary to the established rule, and the McNabb decision is predicated upon "the time when the confession is made" and as to whether there had been an arraignment at that time or whether there had been no arraignment. But in this particular case, as my distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama has stated, there had been an arraignment. This is confirmed by the decision of the circuit court of appeals which reviewed the decision of the district court, and that was brought forcibly to the attention of the Supreme Court of the United States. Regardless of the fact there had been an arraignment, and the court found there had been an arraignment and that the confessions made were absolutely voluntary, and thus coming wholly within the law, this anomalous decision is announced by that Court wherein it holds that the confessions made were inadmissible. This holding by the Supreme Court operated to liberate the murderers of one of our Federal agents who was attempting to arrest those who were engaged in the operation of an illicit still.

Let us reflect upon the results that have flowed from this decision in the McNabb case. There have been many cases, some of them in the District of Columbia—the Mitchell case is one—in which there has been an absolute miscarriage of justice. I want to call your attention to another case, the Wilborn case, which is one of the most notorious and vicious cases that has been called to my attention. In that case Justice Pine was forced to liberate a man who had admitted the commission of attempted rape where by his own admission he entered an apartment where three young girls were living, at an unusual hour in the nighttime; the accused was frightened away before he completed his criminal act; however a doctor was compelled to take 11 stitches to close up the wounds and lascerations he had inflicted upon one of these young ladies. Justice Pine said, "Although under the McNabb decision I am forced to dismiss this case, it is certainly a miscarriage of justice."

Throughout the country in various courts this decision in the McNabb case has operated to liberate and free criminals. As I recall the statistics which we have received, they show that at least 50 confessed criminals have been set free each day since the McNabb decision, and by reason of the new and novel rule promulgated by that unusual decision on the question of the admissibility of confessions in the trial of criminal cases.

Mr. Chairman, I hope when this vote comes that every Member of the House will stand up and take his position on this question. I hope the Constitution of the United States of America will be fully respected. I hope that all of us, as God-fearing men and as law-abiding citizens, will stand by the law as it has been written, as we have known it, and as it has been construed, and as it has been followed throughout the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it gives me no pleasure this afternoon, the first time I appear on this floor to make a talk, to be arrayed against all the distinguished gentlemen who compose the Judiciary Committee. I realize my disadvantage right there. I have the highest regard for all of them. I know that in their minds they are motivated by high motives; but I do not want to sit idly by this afternoon and vote on this thing without expressing my views.

Our Constitution, and the succeeding Congresses of this country, has always been very zealous in safeguarding the interests of the individuals of this country. Let us not make any mistake about what this McNabb case is all about. You know as well as I do that the reason the decision was handed down over there was to get away from the third degree in this country. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania "let the cat out of the bag" a minute ago when he said, "Why you know that a district attorney cannot get a confession out of a man after he has been advised by counsel." There is the nub of this thing.

Do you know that there was a case—I think it was Zerbst against Johnson—which held that every individual shall have the right to counsel at every stage of the proceeding. I do not know the McNabb boys; I do not know anything about them, or any of these other cases that you have cited. But I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania was eminently correct in his statement. Of course he was. When they take them and hold them for 12, 14, and 16 hours they come up with their confessions. If they promptly arraign them, as the Congress of these United States said that they should on two occasions, and as the Supreme Court said, they should have the right of counsel at every stage of the proceedings, they might not get that confession.

They say that our American law enforcement will break if the McNabb case stands. I submit to you that I do not believe for one minute that the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Department of Justice over there under Tom

Clark, with their fine body of law-enforcement officers, are going to let the criminals take over this country just because the McNabb decision stands.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Does a prisoner remain in charge of the FBI after he is arraigned? As a matter of fact, after his arraignment the FBI has nothing more to do with him and therefore under the gentleman's argument, if it were to prevail, the FBI could never get a confession from any criminal, and their hands certainly would be tied.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In answer to that let me say this: They are talking about criminals being let go because they cannot convict them as long as the McNabb case stands. All right. In these cases that they are talking about all they have had to go on is the confession which they got out of them before they arraigned them. But all I know is this, that the enforcement officers should go out and get their confessions instead of holding them incommunicado in the Federal building and holding them 12, 14, and 16 hours. All of you who have practiced law know these things. You know what they do. You have had them come to you, parents of people being held, and you go to the district attorney's office to question them and you find locked doors and you cannot get in there and question them, and finally out comes the district attorney or the alcohol tax officers, and they will open the door and they will say, "Mr. Attorney, you can come in now; we have gotten a confession."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is the gentleman aware that the Attorney General has recommended that this bill pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I am aware of that, and I heard about it a minute ago. I will say this to you: You know what he is up against. In one or two of these cases some of his agents have not been able to get their evidence, and as long as the McNabb case prevails they cannot take them down somewhere—I am not saying this now against Tom Clark's boys, but I am saying it against some of the police officers of this country—as long as they cannot get them down in those rooms and "sweat them out under the white lights," they cannot get a confession. But I say to you that the American system of government was not founded on that practice, that the only way we are going to get justice in this country is by outlawing the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. We have this situation before us. We have two sections of our United States Code—18 U. S. C. 595 and 5 U. S. C. 300a—which says that when a man is arrested he should be taken before a committing magistrate, and that without too much delay or within a reasonable time. One thing we are trying to get around here today is this: As long as the McNabb case stands you are going to get prompt arraignments in this country. You pass this law here today and it will vitiate the McNabb decision; it is going to open the gates, and you are going to give the law-enforcement officers of this country a "blank check" to start their own third-degree methods, a thing we have not had for the past 3 years. This is not a simple bill; it looks simple. It is one of the most simple I have seen on the floor. But, you know you almost do not see it when you sit there, it is so inoccuous, so innocent. But do you think the United States Court wrote that decision over there for fun? They were trying to back up two sections of the law in this country that this Congress had passed in previous sessions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall in my experience in the Congress or in the practice of law a matter as clear as this. Here some officials went out into the hills of Tennessee to arrest some fellows for moonshining. Then one of the moonshiners concealed in a graveyard in the darkness of the night fired upon a Federal officer and this faithful officer had no chance to defend himself. So you have moonshining and murder. These defendants then were taken before the proper officials and plead guilty to murder and to moonshining.

You read this record from one end to the other and there is no intimation that there was any coercion or force used in securing these confessions. If there ever was a confession proved to be voluntary and free from oppression, it was these confessions.

It grieves me very much to see the highest court in the land work around the Constitution, not uphold it, and establish a new rule of evidence that permitted these self-confessed moonshiners and murderers to go unwhipped of justice.

It does not mean the return of the third degree if you pass this bill. It means we return to the Constitution and the rule of evidence that has always prevailed in this country for 150 years until the McNabb case.

One of the justices writing a dissenting opinion declared that this undertakes to establish a new rule, and a vicious rule. Is it a vicious rule? Yes; any rule is a vicious rule in any court that permits moonshiners to add to their crime by killing an officer of the United States, and permit such men to go unwhipped of justice in this country.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Not only has this rule of law prevailed ever since the adoption of the Constitution, it is a common-law rule which has prevailed for hundreds of years, even before we adopted the Constitution.

Mr. ROBSION. My able lawyer friend from Ohio is absolutely right.

This is a very short bill. All it provides is:

That failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer shall not render inadmissible any evidence otherwise admissible.

There is no third degree about that. It takes away no legal right of those charged or guilty of crime. It merely makes a voluntary confession admissible as evidence whether it was made by defendants before or after he is arraigned. The confessions in this case were voluntary and absolutely free of coercion. Neither the defendants nor their attorneys when these cases were tried made any such claim.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure the gentleman is more familiar with the proceedings of that trial than I am because it has been some time since I have read it or taken any notice of it. Does the record show that they had offered other evidence or did they try to offer this without any supporting evidence?

Mr. ROBSION. Of course, there were circumstances and other supporting facts in the case. Yes, there was other evidence.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There was positive evidence?

Mr. ROBSION. Of course there was other competent evidence.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They had proof of the corpus delicti?

Mr. ROBSION. I do not know all the evidence that they had, but there was plenty. The jury convicted them and this was upheld by the court of appeals. But this is the point that disturbs me very much. It is most interesting to note that neither the defendants nor their counsel in the lower court claimed that these confessions were obtained by coercion, under duress. compulsion or third degree. The question was not raised. They appeared before the proper officers and pleaded guilty on both charges when arraigned. They made a confession which was enlarged later on by them, giving full details. I do not understand how the majority of our Supreme Court could say that any of the constitutional or legal rights of these defendants had been denied.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Would the gentleman suggest why, in his opinion, the Congress enacted the requirement that a speedy arraignment should be had and that the officers should produce the defendants before a committing magistrate or commissioner?

Mr. ROBSION. Perhaps you have in your mind that there was not an immediate arraignment. There was such an arraignment in both cases.

Mr. FOLGER. No; I am asking you why the Congress did that. Was it to protect a man, not McNabb particularly, but any man who is accused of a crime against the third-degree practices before being arraigned?

Mr. ROBSION. There is not the slightest hint in the record of the trial

court of third degree. That has to do with the question of being taken before a committing magistrate or other proper officer for arraignment. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is no statute anywhere passed by Congress which says or even squints toward the proposition that a confession taken before arraignment or after arraignment, as long as it is free and voluntary, is not competent evidence. That is all this bill says. This bill means, if a confession is made at any time, voluntarily, before arraignment or after arraignment, the court can consider it as competent evidence. This bill does not disturb in the slightest the proposition that persons must be taken promptly and forthwith for arraignment. It means that a confession voluntarily made and free from coercion can be considered by the court and jury whenever made. That is the law now. Suppose an officer walks up to a fellow just after he has committed a crime and, of course, has not been yet arraigned, and the fellow says, "I committed the murder. I shot the man." According to the argument of some Members here this afternoon, that confession, although voluntary, could not be given in court. He could not be convicted under the McNabb ruling. One of the greatest shocks our law-enforcement officials ever received was the McNabb decision, and if we are going to hamper our public enforcement officers in that way and let them be killed and then turn the defendants loose on the public after they have voluntarily, freely, and without coercion confessed, then we might as well burn our courthouses and let the lawless element take the country.

Mr. Justice Reed stated in his dissenting opinion the Court declared a new rule. Congress did not do this. The Supreme Court and other courts are given too much to making laws. They can only interpret them. Now it is necessary to enact this bill to get our highest Court back to the Constitution.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GREENLAND, ICELAND, AND THE PACIFIC AND CARIBBEAN ISLANDS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out earlier in the day, I am today introducing resolutions which, if adopted by the Congress, will authorize the President to extend to Iceland in the name of the Congress and the American people, an invitation to become a State in the American Union; to open negotiations with Denmark for the purchase of Greenland; to open negotiations with Great Britain, France, and such other countries that may be involved for the purchase of all islands off the coast of continental United States, in the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean that may be deemed essential to the defense of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Philippine Islands.

Further, my resolutions would direct negotiations looking toward the acquisition of all of the islands mandated to or owned by the Empire of Japan as the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War shall find essential to the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean areas, an obligation which, by unwelcome circumstances, has become the prime responsibility of the United States.

But a hasty review of the public prints reveals that the time has arrived for affirmative action if American rights and responsibilities are to be respected and observed.

With Russia extending herself in all directions, and England and France clinging tenaciously to their respective empires—in the interest of their defense, they assert—are we to stand idly by as they divide amongst themselves all of the fruits of our joint sacrifices?

First, we receive the disquieting news that Russia is demanding that she be consulted in the administration of all international settlements regardless of what world areas might be affected; that the Dardanelles be placed in her trusteeship, that she be permitted to establish bases in the Spitzbergen Islands and weather stations in Iceland, and, presumably, in Greenland, too. Further revealing her interest in world areas into which she has never heretofore sought to intrude herself, it is said that she has occupied certain Danish islands in the Skagerrack and Kattegat and is demanding that the Kurile and other strategic islands be turned over to her as prizes of war, even though she did not contribute anything to their redemption.

As Russia prepares to expand herself all over the world, France and England tighten their grip upon their outlying possessions, their colonies and protectorates, all of which were saved to them by American arms, American valor, American sacrifice in lives, in materials, in resources, in money, all these beyond evaluation.

And as they cling to what they have and grasp for more and more, America, altruist in the extreme, stands calmly by, too proud to claim its just entitlements, too noble to insist on even a fraction of that which a grateful world of a few months ago would have lavished upon us with a generous hand—if we had but made our wishes known. That was when their vast holdings, their world position, their very existence, hung in the balance.

Now that the victory for which we strove with all our heart has been achieved, those who represent us in international councils, those in the palms of whose hands our destiny rests, seem to be impressed not at all with the bitter struggle for real estate, for military bases, for strategic placements, for control of the crossroads of the world that is going on among the other powers all over the world.

If we do not make our demands known before the last flicker of gratitude among our erstwhile allies dies out, we will be soon awakened from our idealistic dreams of a world of brotherly love to learn that we will have achieved in these days following the close of World War II the same unhappy position that it was ours to occupy after the smoke of the battles of World War I had cleared away.

As a specter of a World War III begins to take form, others look to their defenses while America treats only of the intangible things of the irrepressible spirit.

Are we, as war clouds lower, to again ask nothing in return for our sacrifice in two great wars; are we to profit not at all from the lessons learned at such a cost?

Are we, as Admiral King has stated, to be forever "fighting and building and winning and giving away—only to fight and build and win and give away again?"

Are our resources so great, our wealth so fabulous, the lives of our people so cheap, that we can go on generation after generation dissipating our resources, squandering our money in billions, sacrificing the lives of our youth in millions, all this in utter disregard of the practicalities that govern the thinking and control the activities of all of the other nations on this earth?

America must give thought to the ramparts we watch, not merely to the ramparts we once watched. It is time that we give some consideration to the ever avaricious outside world, to the problems that living with them present. Let us think of the future.

The adoption of my resolutions will make clear to the President, his administration, to the world, that America has a policy for an enduring peace, for the future as well as for the present, and that it is one that is based upon the open-eyed recognition of the responsibilities that have become ours. America is not only interested in the peace of the moment, but in its security in the future as well.

The islands of England and France off our coasts and in the Caribbean mean nothing to the defense of Europe; but they mean much to the defense of America should we become embroiled in another world conflict—and we should have them.

The islands of the Pacific mean nothing to the defense of the great Eurasian powers; but to America, upon which rests the burden of the maintenance of the peace in the Pacific, they mean everything—and America should have them.

Iceland and Greenland lie on the line of march of any marauding empire that might be bent on world conquest. In the face of an onslaught, Iceland would, standing by itself, be helpless. In any world war that might involve us they are indispensable to our and its defense. Their strategic value cannot longer be ignored.

Icelanders and Americans alike cannot fail to perceive the necessity of a partnership arrangement in mutual defense.

We have much to offer to Iceland—military protection of its homeland, dignity and freedom for its citizens, development of its harbors and natural resources, access to the best market in the world for its products.

By accepting American citizenship and statehood under our Constitution, self-government would be guaranteed to them in all matters essentially affecting home rule. By giving up only that which they are quite unable to successfully administer themselves in times of stress, they

would acquire under the Constitution of the United States elements of freedom which they have never dared to lay claim to heretofore.

As a citizen of the United States and of the Republic of Iceland, an Icelander would acquire and hold in common with all other American citizens the personal protection of our Bill of Rights, the greatest guaranty of personal liberty and individual freedom ever achieved by mankind anywhere on this earth. In addition to these would come the blessings and security of our Federal system, a method of self-government which today commends the respect and admiration of the entire world.

When the Icelandic and American flags fly side by side then indeed, will tyrants tremble, dictators despair, freedom-loving people rejoice everywhere, for, as a consequence of the union of these two great peoples, one of the greatest temptations to would-be world conquerors to aggress against the weak people of the world will have been removed from their considerations.

But back and behind all these considerations lies, as it must lie, not only the military security of continental United States—our homeland—and of those who will aline themselves with us but the financial integrity of our country as well.

We were too proud to accept any of the spoils of victory of the war of 1917–19 as our allies and associated powers scrambled for and grabbed everything in sight. When the smoke of battle had cleared away—and a few years had rolled by—not only did good, old, kindly Uncle Sam find himself empty-handed but that his pals of World War I had, calling it by the high-sounding name of "loans," picked his pockets of billions of dollars, very little of which has ever been repaid.

That must not be permitted to happen again. As a means of preventing it, I arise to propose not loans, nor gifts, nor lend-lease, all discredited and unreal, but real-estate deals, transactions that will not be hanging fire for generations, causing, perhaps, unpleasant international controversies in the distant future but which shall be fully completed here and now, as the consideration passes.

What all this boils down to is that the time has come for the United States to claim something in return for the American dollars credits we are extending to more than a score of nations. Britain, Russia, China, and France, for example, are asking for—and some of them have already received—huge postwar loans to rebuild their devastated countrysides and with which to rehabilitate themselves industrially.

But since our experience in the past is that loans of this character are never repaid, another way of insuring ourselves against loss must be found. Extending loan credits which immediately become gifts is a poor way of protecting the American taxpayers' money.

Instead of again extending dollar credits and calling them loans when we know they will turn out to be gifts, why not make the transactions one for the purchase and sale of real estate at the very outset.

Why not acquire these strategic islands, islands of small value to the sellers but of the greatest importance to the defense of America and the performance of our part of the responsibility of maintaining the peace of the world.

This strikes me as common sense, and something which most Americans can agree on.

While Russia and Britain and other countries are everywhere extending themselves, are we going to be caught in the same old song and dance that followed World War I—namely, giving our money away and getting nothing in return?

These vast extension of credits—or loans or whatever they may be called—will not come back to us. In fact, they could only come back to us in one of two ways: either in the form of manufactured goods or raw materials of which we will have a surplus of our own, or in the form of gold, of which we already have a vast useless hoard stored, for want of a better place, under the ground in old Kentucky.

That means that—to be perfectly frank—it would be folly for us to permit the loans to be repaid even if the borrowers were able to satisfy their indebtedness, for the importation of billions of dollars of manufactured goods would only glut our market, close our factories and render millions of our fellow citizens jobless and an importation of billions of dollars in gold—which Russia, for example, can mine at $6 an ounce and which we would have to accept at $35 an ounce or go off the gold standard—would only mean more unwanted metal to store in the hills of Kentucky.

The time has come for us to face this issue realistically. It is about time we in the United States talked in the same realistic terms as those in Russia and France and Britain. There is only one thing we can get in return for our loans—that is, only one thing of real, practical value to us—and that is real estate. If we get that and nothing else, our millions, yes, our billions, would not be wasted.

Is there anybody who contends that the islands off our coasts, those owned by England and France, for example, are necessary to the defense of Europe? That is nonsense. There is no military or naval or air factor into which they could possibly be fitted.

If, by an unfortunate turn of events, our present-day allies should become our enemies of the future—as Japan and Italy became after fighting loyally at our side in World War I—these outlying possessions would become a distinct menace to our national security in their hands.

On the other hand, they are necessary to the defense of the United States. They are within a few hundred miles of us. They are outlying bastions of our continent. They should be and of right ought to be territory of the United States.

As for Iceland and Greenland, these are natural parts of our political and economic world. The Republic of Iceland, the people and Government of Greenland would sacrifice none of their liberties under our Constitution, and their citizens would enjoy the protection of our Bill of Rights. And in time of war they would have the protection of the most powerful nation on earth.

The future is before us. We can bungle it or profit by it. We can go on, as Admiral King once said, "fighting and building and giving away" or we can make our position, in a military and political sense, so impregnable in the world that our natural and innate altruism, our passionate and determined will for peace, will command a respect and wield an influence for permanent peace that will be lasting.

The choice is ours. Have we not the courage to make it, to declare the policy of the American people?

The State Department has been weak and vacillating to the point of timidity in respect to the questions now under discussion, fearing, it would seem, to offend a more aggressive power of the Eurasian continent, oblivious, if I mistake not, to the hopes and aspirations of the American people.

Is this not an appropriate time for the American people to declare themselves through their chosen representatives in this Congress assembled? Is it not high time that an American policy be laid down to the world that none will misunderstand?

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of my resolutions will accomplish no less than that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the resolution, House Resolution No. 4, reported to this House by the Judiciary Committee, provides that:

> Failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer shall not render inadmissible any evidence otherwise admissible.

The purpose of this measure is to restore the rule of law in force in this country for more than 150 years until it was stricken down and set aside by a majority opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States handed down in the case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S., p. 332), on March 1, 1943. The rule of law set aside by the Supreme Court in this decision is this:

> Confessions of guilt by persons accused of crime while in custody of officers of the law made freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort are admissible in evidence against such persons on their trial for said offense. (*Wilson* v. *U. S.*, decided 1896 by the Supreme Court of the United States, 162 U. S., pp. 613, 623; *Lisenba* v. *California*, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, 1943, 314 U. S., pp. 219, 239).

In the McNabb case five of the McNabbs were tried in the United States district court at Chattanooga, Tenn., on the charge of having shot and murdered from ambush a Federal officer named Leeper, who at the time, was in the discharge of his duty on the night of July 31, 1940. The twin brothers, Freeman and Raymond McNabb, and their cousin, Benjamin McNabb, were convicted by the jury and sentenced by the judge to a term of imprisonment for 45 years. This conviction of second degree murder was sustained by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The Supreme Court of the United States granted the petition of these three

McNabbs for certiorari and in an opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter the conviction of these three defendants was reversed and sent back to the United States district court for a new trial. The Supreme Court did not base its reversal of the case on the ground that the defendants' confessions were not freely and voluntarily made, it did not base its reversal of the case on the ground that these confessions were made as the result of compulsion or inducement of any sort. It did not put its opinion on the ground that any constitutional right of the defendants had been violated. It did not reverse the conviction on the ground that it was acting in obedience to any Federal statute requiring the exclusion of the confession of these defendants on the ground that the officers who arrested them did not take the defendants promptly before a committing magistrate. The Supreme Court did not find as a fact that the confessions of the defendants were not voluntary, and I now quote the exact language of the Supreme Court:

> Now the Court leaves undecided whether the present confessions are voluntary or involuntary and decrees that the confessions must be excluded because in addition to questioning the petitioners, the arresting officers failed promptly to take them before a committing magistrate. The Court finds a basis for the declaration of this new rule of evidence in its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice.

The language I have just quoted is the language of Mr. Justice Reed, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in setting forth the ground on which the majority of the Court reversed the conviction of these defendants who had murdered in the nighttime an officer of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue engaged in the performance of his official duties. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court in this case is judicial legislation.

The Congress of the United States had, prior to the commission of this murder, passed an act that provided:

> It shall be the duty of the marshal, his deputy, or other officer who may arrest a person charged with any crime or offense, to take the defendant before the nearest United States clerk or the nearest judicial official having jurisdiction under existing laws for a hearing, commitment, or take bail for crime.

But Congress never provided in any of the laws for the taking of a person charged with crime immediately before a committing officer after his arrest, that the failure of the arresting officer to promptly, forthwith, or immediately take the prisoner before a committing magistrate should render inadmissible in evidence against the accused a confession made by such accused person.

As a result of this decision of the Supreme Court in the McNabb case, when the McNabbs were tried the second time on the charge of killing the officer, Leeper, from ambush, their confessions, of course, were not admitted in evidence against them, and they escaped with a light sentence for the lack of positive evidence that they fired the shots which killed Leeper and wounded one of his associate officers.

These McNabbs lived some 12 miles from Chattanooga and were notorious moonshiners.

On the afternoon of Wednesday, July 31, 1940, information was received by the officers of the Chattanooga Alcoholic Tax Unit that these defendants were planning to sell whisky that night on which Federal taxes had not been paid. The officers made plans to arrest the McNabbs while they were actually engaged in their illegal sale of this untaxed whisky. That night four United States revenue officers, accompanied by the Government's informers, drove to the McNabb settlement. When they approached the place where the sale of whisky was to be made, the officers got out of the car; the informers drove on and met five of the McNabbs, three brothers and two of their cousins. The five McNabbs and the informers proceeded to a spot near the McNabb cemetery where the liquor was hidden. While cans containing whisky were being loaded into the car, one of the informers flashed a prearranged signal to the officers, who thereupon ran toward the McNabbs. One of the officers called out, "All right, boys; Federal officers." The McNabbs took flight.

The officers then began to empty the whisky from the cans. The officers heard noises coming from the direction of the cemetery. Shortly a large rock landed at their feet. The officer, Leeper, ran into the cemetery. Looking about with his flashlight, he discovered no one; but noticing a couple of whisky cans, he began to pour out their contents. The other officers, upon hearing a shot, ran into the cemetery, where they found Leeper on the ground, fatally wounded. A few minutes later, about 10 o'clock, he died, without having identified his assailant. A second shot slightly wounded another officer.

Three or four hours later Federal officers went to the home of Freeman, Raymond, and Emuil McNabb and arrested them. Benjamin McNabb came to the office of the Federal officers in Chattanooga on the following morning and voluntarily surrendered.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his opinion stressed the fact that these defendants who were convicted for the murder of Leeper had lived in the settlement all their lives, had not gone beyond the fourth grade in school; and that two of them had not been farther from home than Jasper, the county seat of Marion County, although they lived within 12 miles of a city of 200,000 population, Chattanooga, and had frequently been there.

This allusion of the Supreme Court to the extent of the travels of the defendants and their lack of a high school or a college degree introduces a new element of defense on behalf of those charged with crime. There is no pretense and no ground for assuming that these defendants did not know the nature of their act and that the act was wrong.

They were sufficiently skilled in the way of the world to know that it was against the law to manufacture and sell untaxed whisky. The fact that they had it hidden close to the family graveyard and that they made the sale in the night time; and they they were armed and that they were desperate and lawless enough in their resentment at having been detected and seeing their merchandise poured out on the ground, they shot and killed the officer, Leeper, and wounded one of his associates and fled, is conclusive in the light of their voluntary confessions that they had deliberately embraced and were following a lawless occupation and were prepared to take human life in the prosecution of it.

When the admissibility of the confessions of these defendants came before the trial court, as was proper, the trial judge sent the jury out of the court room and heard the testimony of the defendants and the officers to whom they confessed. Upon this full hearing of the officers who testified to the confessions and upon the testimony of the defendants, the court decided that the confessions were admissible; that they were freely and voluntarily made by the defendants and without compulsion or inducements of any sort. The jury was then called back into the court room and the officers were permitted to testify not only to the confessions but to the fact that they saw these men up there that night. These defendants were there at the place where the whisky was being delivered. They were there where the murder was committed. Under the facts of the case they were the only persons there except the informers and the Federal officers. These defendants were the only persons who had an opportunity to commit the murder. They were the only persons who had a motive to commit the murder.

These defendants did not take the witness stand upon the trial of the case, upon their trial for murder with which they were charged and which they had confessed.

And there can be just one reason why they did not take the witness stand. While their failure to testify in their own defense before the jury could not be alluded to in argument by the Government attorneys, yet we all know as lawyers and as men of common sense that the only reason of these defendants, especially where there were three of them, for not taking the witness stand is the fact that they were guilty. Their guilt was so thoroughly established by their confessions that they knew, and their lawyers must have known, that it would not do them any good to take the witness stand. And, of course, nobody in his right senses expects a criminal lawyer undertaking to do the best he can for his guilty clients to in any way aid the prosecution in establishing their guilt.

In reversing the conviction of these defendants the Supreme Court did not place its action upon any Federal statute forbidding the admission of the confessions of the defendants. It did not place its action upon any constitutional ground nor upon any question made in the trial court or in the United States circuit court of appeals, but upon the ground that "the Court finds a basis for the declaration of this rule of evidence

in its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice."

The Supreme Court did not base its reversal of the conviction of these defendants upon the Constitution, because no constitutional question was involved. It did not base it upon any prior decisions of the Court nor upon any statute. Its decision is an innovation of the law.

No court had ever before held that when it had been determined in the trial court that a confession was voluntarily and freely given without coercion or constraint that such a confession was not admissible in evidence.

Not only this but out of that abundant precaution which the law cherishes for the person accused of crime the trial court submitted to the jury the question of whether their confessions were freely and voluntarily made.

What has been the result of this holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the McNabb case?

Under this decision hundreds of men guilty of murder, burglary, robbery, and rape have gone scot free. A reading of the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in this case makes inescapable the conclusion that this holding discloses but little concern for the protection of officers charged with enforcement of the law and less for the lives, persons, and protection of the victims of the horde of criminals who both by day and night wage relentless warfare against the decent people of this country.

By this decision a band of outlaws went virtually free for a cowardly and brutal murder. This decision withdraws the protection of the law from officers who are sworn to enforce it. It withdraws the protection of the law from the victims of burglaries, robberies, assassinations, and rape, and extends the protection of the law to those who commit these burglaries, robberies, murders, and rapes.

The Congress never intended that if an arresting officer failed to take promptly his prisoner before a magistrate for arraignment that a voluntary confession made by the prisoner should be inadmissible in evidence against him.

To establish the facts upon which the crime may be punished is of primary importance. In the first place, there would be no arrest if robbery, burglary, rape, or murder had not been committed. When such a crime has been attempted or committed, and a suspect has been arrested the task of the officers is to establish the facts, make a speedy investigation, before the evidence is lost or destroyed. This is all-important in the effort of the law-enforcement officers to bring the criminal to a speedy trial and to make certain his conviction.

Those who commit crimes often have confederates. They may be members of a criminal gang. If, instead of making an investigation of the facts in an effort to establish the guilt of the criminal, he is rushed to a criminal lawyer before he can be questioned, the criminal lawyer may tell the criminal to keep his mouth shut, the evidence may be destroyed.

The person robbed, the helpless victim of a rape, or a murder has no warning that he or she is to suffer at the hands of a criminal. In most instances such victim has no one to assist him or her. Mr. Justice Frankfurter apparently proceeded upon the theory in his opinion that the law is more concerned for the criminal than for his victim; for his escape rather than for his punishment. This opinion strikes a blow for crime unprecedented in our history.

Why do men voluntarily confess? There is but one reason for such a confession and that is an overwhelming sense of guilt on the part of the criminal.

Crimes are planned by their perpetrators. The victim has no chance to plan a defense. The victim has no advance notice of the intention of his or her assailant. Such a victim ordinarily is alone in the night, helpless, and unable to resist the armed assailant in the darkness. The victim cannot see or recognize the criminal.

Law-enforcement officers know where criminals reside. They know the criminals. They know their associates and hang-outs. They are trained in the apprehension of criminals and in the detection of crime. This is why they are able so often to track down and capture the guilty. What is the purpose of criminal law? I conceive it to be to protect the law-abiding, innocent, decent, helpless members of society. Justice to the guilty is mercy to the innocent. No one need be worried with the thought that any innocent person is going to be punished. The safeguards thrown around the person of a criminal are ample for his protection when he is apprehended and put on trial. He is presumed to be innocent. In the light of my experience and observation, I am prepared to assert, without the fear of successful contradiction that this presumption of a person's innocence is a violent presumption, contrary to human experience and common sense. In the next place, a person accused of crime must be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. And in addition to this, in most States a person charged with a capital offense has as many as 15 preemptory challenges. This means he or his attorney may tell as many as 15 citizens called as jurors to stand aside for no other reasons than that the defendant or his lawyer feels that such person would be in favor of enforcing the law.

Mr. Chairman, this unprecedented rule of evidence announced by the Supreme Court of the United States in the McNabb case should be outlawed. It has afforded a broad avenue of escape under which thousands of criminals who have confessed their guilt have been enabled to have their confessions excluded from the evidence against them and to go unwhipped of justice.

The testimony heard by the Committee on the Judiciary showed without contradiction that the opinion of the Supreme Court in the McNabb case is one of the greatest handicaps that has ever confronted law-enforcement officers.

In the case of United States against Mitchell, the Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, testified before the Committee on the Judiciary to the following facts:

On October 12, 1942, a police officer found in a jewelry store a pair of cuff links answering the description of links stolen some months before from a Washington home. The jeweler's records indicated that they had been purchased the day after the burglary in question from a person giving the name and address of the defendant. This clue led the officers to call at the defendant's home where they talked with him. The same evening, after the cuff links had been identified by their owner, two officers went to the defendant's home and asked him to go with them to the precinct station for questioning. The defendant without being formally arrested accompanied the officers willingly, and upon arrival at the station they told the defendant "that they knew what he had done, that he did not have to say anything," but that "all they wanted to know was who had worked with him." Thereupon the defendant, according to the testimony of the police, "freely admitted" that he had stolen the cuff links in question as well as other property. The entire confession was given within a few minutes after the defendant's arrival at the station house. At the same time the defendant gave the officers express permission to go to his home and obtain the other property that he confessed to having stolen, telling them where it was. Pursuant to this consent the officers went to his home and found the property in question. Thereafter the defendant was held for 8 days without arraignment.

His detention for this period of time was, however, explained by the fact that the officers had recovered from the defendant Mitchell's home property that he had stolen in more than 30 Washington housebreakings and that the defendant was cooperating with the police and the victims in identifying this property pursuant to his expressed desire to assist the police in investigating the various housebreakings in which he was involved. The defendant was not mistreated during his detention, but, on the contrary was shown every possible courtesy and was on occasions visited by his mother and others. It is true that the defendant testified that he had been subjected to violence and denied making the statements to which the Attorney General referred, which were oral, not written. But the court found that he had not been mistreated nor subjected to any violence.

On these facts the district court held the confession made immediately upon Mitchell's arrival at the police station admissible and the defendant Mitchell was convicted. The court of appeals reversed this conviction not on the ground that Mitchell's confession was not voluntary but reversed the conviction on the ground that he was not promptly taken before the committing magistrate. This reversal was in obedience to the rule announced by the Supreme Court of the United States in the McNabb case.

Another case referred to by Attorney General Biddle in his testimony was the case of United States against Wilburn in the District Court of the District of Columbia. These are the facts:

Wilburn, a 17-year-old Negro, had attacked one girl at about 7 a. m. on March 17, 1943, and another girl at about 1 a. m., on March 18, 1943. He was arrested at about 2 a. m. on the same night of March 18 and made a verbal confession

of the second attack at about 4 a. m. At about 5 a. m., in the presence of the complaining witness, he reenacted the circumstances of the second attack. He signed a written confession of both crimes at about 11:30 a. m. on March 18, and was arraigned before the juvenile court at about 3 p. m. the same day. In the first case he was convicted of assault with intent to commit rape and was sentenced to imprisonment of from 6 to 9 years. However, Judge Letts, on July 2, 1943, granted a new trial because of the admission in evidence of the written confession. Thereafter, because of the difficulty of proving the case without use of the confession, Wilburn was allowed to plead guilty to simple assault and received a sentence of 1 year. In the second case, Judge Pine, on November 15, 1943, directed a verdict of acquittal, ruling that the Government could not even introduce testimony to the fact of the oral confession at 4 a. m., or the reenactment of the crime at about 5 a. m.

Scores of other cases were cited in which men charged with murder, with rape, with robbery, with burglary, were arrested and confessed their guilt and afterward were freed by the courts of the country in obedience to the rule of evidence declared by the Supreme Court in the McNabb case. Each and every one of these crimes in which the criminals escaped punishment is a reason for the enactment of the bill in this case.

The maudlin, muddled sympathy with and protection of criminals in this country demands the enactment of the pending measure.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to commend the very splendid statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. He has shown great courage in presenting his viewpoint in the face of major opposition. But it is just such a spirit as his that makes our Constitution live and breathe.

As a practical matter, I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, we are all aware that pursuing modern day police methods not a great deal of attention is devoted to the strict legal concept of giving those charged or suspected of a crime the full protection and measure of their constitutional rights. We all know that the people are placed in jail before a warrant of arrest is issued, that they are held incommunicado for days, that their family may not know where they are, that in many, many instances they are denied the privilege of legal counsel pending investigation. I do not defend this procedure. I state it as a fact, as being the now acceptable police practice in the major cities of this Nation. Of course, the purpose of this is to extract a confession from the suspect before he has had an opportunity to confer with others or to receive legal advice. Much can be said on both sides of this question. I am, however, reminded that the courts always retain the power to determine whether or not confessions obtained under the circumstances of the McNabb case are voluntary or involuntary. It is not for this purpose, however, that I address the Members of this House; that I speak upon this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the Members' attention to a possible constitutional question on which I should like to have some enlightenment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state that I thoroughly agree with my friend in his expressions about the courage of the gentleman from Oklahoma for speaking as his conscience dictates. It took real courage and I admire, as the gentleman has so ably expressed it, the gentleman from Oklahoma for the courage which he has displayed in speaking as his conscience dictates.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, I agree with the gentleman. I should like to direct a question to the chairman of the committee and I should like an answer. There are 27 lawyers on that committee, many of whom have great ability.

In the case of *McNabb et al.* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332) the defendants charge a violation of their constitutional rights, to wit, fifth amendment. The Supreme Court, replying, states on page 339:

> It is true, as the petitioners assert, that a conviction in the Federal courts, the foundation of which is evidence obtained in disregard of liberties deemed fundamental by the Constitution, cannot stand.

This point occurs to me. If the Supreme Court states there has been a denial of a fundamental constitutional right in receiving evidence such as is indicated in the McNabb case, how can this Congress by legislative enactment heal that constitutional breach? Is this an encroachment by this legislative body into the field of the judiciary? Is this not a legislative invasion of a judicial function?

In another portion of the McNabb decision, page 340, it states:

> Judicial supervision of the administration of criminal justice in the Federal courts implies the duty of establishing and maintaining civilized standards of procedure and evidence.

And, again, on page 341:

> The principles governing the admissibility of evidence in Federal criminal trials have not been restricted, therefore, to those derived solely from the Constitution. In the exercise of its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice in the Federal courts, see *Nardone* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 338, 341-342), this Court has, from the very beginning of its history, formulated rules of evidence to be applied in Federal criminal prosecutions. * * * And in formulating such rules of evidence for Federal criminal trials the Court has been guided by considerations of justice not limited to the strict canons of evidentiary relevance. Quite apart from the Constitution, therefore, we are constrained to hold that the evidence elicited from the petitioners in the circumstances disclosed here must be excluded.

Does the Supreme Court mean to imply that since the beginning of the history of this Nation it has formulated these rules of evidence and, if so, can Congress legally assign itself the task of changing that rule by legislative enactment?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman suggesting that we ought to abdicate our legislative power in favor of the Supreme Court?

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is not suggesting anything. I am asking a question of the Chairman. I have not made up my mind as to how I shall vote on this, and I am presenting this question to the Chairman. If we have the power we ought to act. The question I raise is: Do we have the legislative power to invade the judiciary? I do not know.

Mr. HALE. It is my impression that this is a legislative body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Another point in this connection is this: In the dissenting opinion I note that Justice Reed also mentions this same point. As I have said to you, I have no convictions; I am not against this bill, but I should like to take a minute of my time to ask the chairman of the committee: Have you fully considered this matter?

Mr. GRAHAM. May I suggest that the gentleman from Alabama answer the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly will appreciate the opportunity, and I quote from the report:

> The Supreme Court does not say that the confessions of the McNabbs were involuntary but "quite apart from the Constitution," and although "Congress has not explicitly forbidden the use of evidence so procured."

So by plain implication the Supreme Court itself answers the gentleman's question by saying that if Congress had explicitly forbidden, they would respectfully bow to the legislative mandate.

Mr. CARROLL. That was considered by the 27 lawyers in the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks by giving the information which may be gratuitous that I propose to vote for this bill, but in doing so I must suppress an inclination I have toward the feeling that as a lawyer I can hardly sustain that action. The must, if not altogether, insistence that this bill be debated, has been a retrial of a case they call the McNabb case. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that in our disappointment arising almost to the point of resentment and disgust with respect to the outcome in the McNabb case, we are about to surrender our long-time notions and ideas and convictions with respect to legal trials under the Constitutions of our several States and the United States of America.

I am not talking about the McNabb case, I am not talking about any case, but I am talking about the fundamental principles of law that have obtained since the Bill of Rights was embodied as

a part of the Constitution. I look with a little bit of pride upon my own State's action in refusing to subscribe to the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was included. They relate to personal things, to the fortunes and the lives of men, not speaking in material vein.

I am afraid that in our resentment at the ultimate results of the case against the McNabbs, based upon our assumption that the confessions were voluntary and were not obtained by third-degree methods—and that is all we know about it, but that I do not wish to discuss—we propose as lawyers and lawmakers to deny the efficacy of that which we have lived by for 150 years, that a man charged with crime is presumed to be innocent, and that that presumption of innocense follows him through every stage of the trial; that it is better that a guilty man go unpunished than that an innocent man be punished for something of which he is not gulity; and that a man shall not be compelled to testify against himself, and in that is embodied and included the guarantee that confessions shall not be wrung from him at a time when he has not an equal opportunity to defend himself against the agents of the law.

I am going to vote for this bill, but I do hope that no officer of the United States of America or any State in the Union will conclude that we are putting off the time of arraignment sufficiently long to give him an opportunity to wring confessions from men who may be innocent though charged with crime.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all those who have spoken on the bill today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer shall not render inadmissible any evidence otherwise admissible.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases, pursuant to House Resolution 105, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the so-called portal-to-portal or Gwynne bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the News-Observer, of Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 45 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FULLER (at the request of Mr. TABER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. LECOMPTE (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for 10 days, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN], who has a special order for today, may be privileged to speak at this time and that I may be privileged to follow him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress have been addressed on the situation in Palestine. Very fittingly one of these speeches was made by a Democrat and one was made by a Republican. However, both speeches were made by Jewish Members and both came from the city of New York.

I think it is very fitting that I, a Member from the Midwest, a non-Jew, a gentile and an active Christian, should address the House on this very timely subject.

My interest in the Palestine situation is not of a short period. I have been interested in the Palestine situation to a greater or less degree for a period of over 20 years. Before leaving Chicago to take my oath as a Member of this body, I requested the leading members of Jewry in Chicago to sit down with me and discuss the Palestine situation.

The first contact I made upon arriving in Washington was with the Speaker of the House and expressed my desire to speak on the Palestine question. I had hoped that this might be my maiden speech before the House but I held off hoping that it might not be necessary. The time has arrived, however, when I feel that I must express myself.

The Members of Congress should know, and I presume they do, the terms under which Palestine comes under control of Great Britain. For those who do not know, I merely wish to state that a declaration was made by Lord Balfour to Baron Rothschild giving assurance that Palestine would become a Jewish homeland. As a result of this declaration, the Jews of Europe and of the world rallied to the Allied cause in World War I and contributed greatly to the resultant victory. Later, Palestine was placed under the control of Great Britain under a mandate given by the League of Nations. This mandate did not provide that Palestine was to become a British colony, but nevertheless Great Britain saw fit to transfer the administration of Palestine from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office.

Great Britain has failed to solve the Palestine problem. The cruel, ruthless methods carried out by its military have been of no avail in bringing about peace for which all mankind yearns. I rise to condemn the present British regime in Palestine which mocks those very ideals in whose name the American people fought side by side with Britain and the Allied Powers. Great Britain has descended to employ its Navy and its Army divisions in military operations against defenseless men, women, and children who have lived with death for more than a decade and who ask only the elementary human rights of life, work, and home. I do not believe that the British Government's military action against the Jewish refugees and the Jews of Palestine are designated to preserve "law and order." Had Britain chosen to fulfill its obligations under the Balfour Declarations and the mandate, which would have made possible the free entry into and the settlement of Jews in Palestine as guaranteed by these documents, it would long ago have established peace in the Holy Land. Britain's methods of violence have only produced violence. The Jews of Palestine, like the Minutemen of the American Revolution, are resisting British tyranny in Palestine in order to defend their internationally guaranteed rights to continue the upbuilding of the Jewish national home. The British Labor Government has brought lawlessness to Palestine by imposing a policy declared illegal by representatives of the civilized world, speaking through the Mandates Commission of

the League of Nations. I feel certain that if the causes of this violence were removed, it would cease.

The last proposed solution to the Palestine problem that Britain offered has been rejected by Jews and Arabs alike. The solution was contained in a second edition of the ill-conceived Morrison-Grady plan, which called for the creation of a Jewish ghetto in Palestine and which our Government rejected. The latest British plan was in fact a new embodiment of the principles of the White Paper of 1939, cast in a fresh mold, but tending to the same end: to cramp Jewish development within severely restricted areas; to limit Jewish immigration so as to freeze the Jews as a permanent minority of one-third of the total population, and to hold out to the Arabs the prospects of ultimate domination in a preponderantly Arab state. Under the terms of the latest British plan, Jews would have no control over their immigration into Palestine or over settlement on the land. They would have no right to govern themselves as was envisaged by the Balfour Declaration which promised the establishment of a Jewish homeland.

Having failed to persuade either the Arabs or the Jews to accept its proposal, Foreign Secretary Bevin has, in desperation, announced to the world that he would throw the whole matter into the laps of the United Nations. By this token, Britain acknowledges its inability to deal forthrightly with the problem, which it could have solved if it had chosen to be guided by principles of equity and justice.

Mr. Bevin says the Palestine mandate is unworkable. The fact is that the mandatory government has done everything in its power in the last 10 years to make the mandate unworkable by spiking it and doing nothing to foster it. A generation has passed since the nations of the world resolved to end for all time Jewish national homelessness and to reestablish Jewish nationhood. They entrusted the British Government with this great task, but the guardian of the trust proved unfaithful to its trust and sought to frustrate its fulfillment.

It is easily recognized by all that great delay must follow if the solution of the Palestine question becomes a matter for discussion before the United Nations. This is not the first delaying device that Britain has employed to make impossible an adequate solution of the Palestine problem. You will recall that a year and a half ago, President Truman directed a request to Great Britain to permit the immediate entry of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine and renewed this request in 1946 on Yom Kippur, Day of Atonement, the holiest day of the Jewish year. These Jews were to be taken out of the displaced persons camps in the American and British zones and given the opportunity to settle in the Holy Land, Britain's only response to this request was a proposal for the creation of another commission. After some months of inquiry, that commission produced a unanimous endorsement of President Truman's original request. Though Britain had committed itself, by partnership, in the commission, to an acceptance of its recommendations, it found excuses for its failure to implement them.

The London Conference which came to a dismal collapse with the issuance of the revised Morrison-Grady plan, rejected by both Arabs and Jews, now leaves the way open for further delay until the United Nations can come to an ultimate agreement on what is to become of the promises which Britain had made to the Jewish people. There will be delay and more delay. The displaced Jews in the American and British zones, whose numbers have now grown to 225,000 will become more and more despondent. These people must not be left in Europe where the poison of Hitlerism has made it impossible for them to live as free men and women.

What is to happen in the interim until the final decision is reached by the United Nations? Britain, as the mandatory power and trustee, is under obligation until a final solution is reached by the United Nations, to fulfill the terms of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate and the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. These terms demand free entry of Jews into their homeland, their settlement upon the land, and the fullest opportunity for economic and cultural development. How can we expect the peoples of the world to have faith in the United Nations if one of its leading proponents falls down on its own pledge? Nothing new is asked of Britain. All that is asked of Britain is that it fulfill its pledges until the problem is solved by the United Nations. In fulfillment of its pledges, at least 100,000 Jews must, along the lines indicated by President Truman, be permitted to enter immediately into Palestine and be given the opportunity to buy land there—rights which were denied to them under the illegal White Paper of 1939. In effect, the interim policy must call for the abolition of the White Paper with all its restrictions and discriminations which it imposed upon the Jewish people in Palestine.

As one of the leading members of the United Nations, the United States, through President Truman, Secretary Marshall and the congressional leaders of both Houses and parties, must assume the initiative and take the lead in insisting that England carry out this interim policy until a definite arrangement can be arrived at. I must point out that our Government is a party to this responsibility. We are a party to the Palestine mandate. We have a convention which was entered into with Britain which sought to secure to the Jewish people the promise of nationhood.

I want to call your attention also to the fact that Britain's failure to permit the displaced persons in the American zones to enter Palestine has imposed an extraordinary financial burden on the United States. Indeed, the American forces in the occupied zones have carried graciously this burden, from which England should have released us long ago. Every American can, indeed, be proud of the magnificently generous manner in which our American forces have carried out their responsibilities to all displaced persons, but the time has come for us to say to Britain, "You can no longer expect us to bear the load which your resistance to immigation to Palestine imposes, in addition to the load which a collapsed British economy has placed upon us."

Right now the American people are very conscious of the heavy load of taxation. Wives and mothers of American soldiers serving in Europe would like to see their men returned home. The men themselves would like to return to more gainful occupations. Presently there is no solution of these problems, but there would be, if progressive steps were taken to reduce the number of Jews held in Europe against their will by permitting them to enter Palestine.

Within a few weeks the Secretary of State will be going to Moscow to meet with other ministers of the great powers. We know that our Secretary of State will have a most impelling task. Many matters will come up, but I respectfully suggest to him that, if there is any possibility of bringing up the burning question of the displaced people now in the German area, he should take the lead in bringing about a solution which would enable the hundreds of thousands of Jews who are now, to all intents and purposes, incarcerated in this area, to go to Palestine, to which the overwhelming majority desire to go.

Great Britain, as a signatory to that treaty, should be required to agree that Palestine must be opened to those Jews who desire to live among their own people in the land of their fathers.

Both the War and the Navy Departments have expressed their readiness to make possible the transportation of the displaced Jews from the occupied zones to Palestine. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that we have the right to ask Great Britain, before we even sit down to write the German peace treaty, to permit the transfer of the Jews from the displacement centers, to begin at once. Every competent authority on the situation in Germany including General McNarney have recommended that, in the best interests of peace, it is necessary that those Jews ought to be permitted to go to Palestine.

The question arises, What role will America play in the United Nations when the Palestine problem is brought before it? There can only be one answer to this question. The United States recognizes only one solution, namely that which calls for the establishment of a national Jewish homeland in Palestine.

This solution must be based upon three cardinal principles:

First. The free entry of Jews into their homeland.

Second. Fullest opportunity of economic development, particularly as envisaged by the Lowdermilk plan for a Jordan Valley Authority.

Third. The status of sovereignty, of a free and independent Jewish nation, to be achieved through statehood and symbolized by a seat in the United Nations.

As long ago as 1922, by joint congressional resolution, and again in 1924 in

the Anglo-American Convention on Palestine, the United States reiterated its position on the question of a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine. As late as December 1945, Congress, in a concurrent resolution, reaffirmed its traditional American policy for the right of the Jewish people to a national home in Palestine as expressed in the Balfour Declaration. I urge that the American representatives in the United Nations be instructed to insist upon the right of the Jewish people to a Jewish commonwealth. Our country, which is wedded to the practice of justice for all peoples, great or small, powerful or weak, will not fail the Jewish people. A solution embodying America's traditional policy of support of Jewish national aspirations would provide an additional impetus to world peace and stability and would advance the principles to which America stands committed in the world.

I call upon the Members of Congress to give their attention to the Palestine situation. I urge them to learn all about this most important subject and give their time, energy, and support toward working out constructive measures to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish mass immigration and colonization and bring about the earliest transformation of that country into a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. All powers of our Government must be exerted toward the immediate fulfillment of that policy to which America is so deeply committed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the gentleman believe that if Britain had fulfilled its obligations under the mandate to bring about a full settlement of Jews on the land of Palestine and refrained from these iniquitous restrictions on land sales we would have a condition of tranquility instead of a condition of completely despairing violence in Palestine today?

Mr. TWYMAN. I believe that. I furthermore feel that, if the people in Palestine, Jews and Arabs alike, were left to work out their own solution of the relationship between them, friendship and peace would be the result.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the problem, a very vexatious problem, indeed; and I think we are all grateful to the gentleman for his very forthright and very sympathetic consideration of this subject.

Mr. TWYMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say to my colleague from Illinois that during the Seventy-eighth Congress when the Palestine resolution was before the House, I tried to talk with a great many of my colleagues at that time, and I could find no opposition whatever among the Members of Congress. The only opposition I found was the fact that the then Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and the then Secretary of War, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, testified before the Senate committee against the Palestine resolution, evidently at the request of the administration.

Mr. TWYMAN. This is not the only thing that challenges our imagination with reference to the administration and the State Department. Let us hope that by our interest here in the House we may encourage others in the State Department to do what they should have done a long time ago.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in my speech this morning I may include some excerpts from statements by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 35 minutes.

BRITAIN'S FAILURE IN PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would that the Members who are not in the Chamber at this time will take the trouble to read the address that has just been delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I think they would profit thereby, and would learn a little more about this problem of Jewish homelessness and the desire of the displaced persons who are of Jewish extraction now in the occupied areas of Germany, who would like to go to Palestine, and be relieved of all their troubles.

The shameful and shocking record of Britain's administration of its mandate over Palestine is not the common knowledge it should be. Palestine is not an abstraction like some unapplied mathematical formula. In Palestine we are concerned with living people whose pattern of political life had been set by international covenant and then upset by tenacious, unrelenting grip of the appointed trustee—Great Britain.

One would be led to believe by the behavior of Britain that Palestine is her own vassal state to be dealt with without regard to the obligations and responsibilities she had assumed with the granting to her by the League of Nations of the mandate over Palestine.

In the settlement following World War I, the issues were clearly cut and clearly met. The Allies promised independence to the Arabs in certain provinces of the Turkish Empire which up to that time was in complete domination of the Arabian world and Palestine was set aside as a country for the Jewish national home. Keep in mind that Palestine was specifically exempt for the purpose set forth by the Balfour Declaration, "to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland." This was definitely agreed to by King Emir Feisal, representative of the Arab peoples at the Peace Conference.

The promises to the Arab people have been kept scrupulously. Even Trans-Jordan, once part of the Palestine mandate, was thrown in for good measure. But the solemn pledge of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine was breached again and again by the power entrusted with its fulfillment. Seven independent Arab states exist today with representation on the United Nations and other international councils. Their area extends over 1,000,000 square miles. Of all the class A mandates established by the League of Nations, a class A mandate being one that is directed toward self-government, only Palestine's independence is unfulfilled. There are the independent sovereignties of Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Trans-Jordan, four of the five mandated territories. Four have received and achieved independence, but not Palestine, the fifth of the mandated territories. This tiny bit of land of 10,000 square miles is now the scene of frustration and tugging interests, where human and moral values struggle with the demands of power politics, oil, military defenses, and the British cry of external security.

In 1939 the British promulgated the Palestine white paper, which has been adverted to by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, which drastically restricted land purchases by the Jews of Palestine soil and limited to a mere trickle the immigration of Jews into the Holy Land after 1944. Today the gates of Palestine are practically closed.

It is interesting to note that the delegates to the International Refugee Conference at Evian, France, were seated around a table and the question was asked, where were the displaced persons to go. That was in 1938, when the Jews were feeling the scourge of Hitler's fiendishness and sadism. The first man to be asked that question at the International Refugee Conference at Evian, France, in 1938, was the representative from the Dominion of Australia, and he significantly stated the following. I give it in haec verba:

We in Australia have no racial problem, thank God, and we don't intend to have one started.

That very terse but tragic observation was reechoed all around the table of 52 delegates. Nobody wanted to take the Jews who were seeking to get out of Hitler's clutches. Six million of them died. The conclusion is inescapable that there is no place where the Jew is wanted, let us admit it, save Palestine, and now the gates of Palestine are closed.

After 5 years, 1944, after totaling 75,000 entries, further immigration would be dependent upon Arab consent. The reasoning behind this infamous maneuver was quite obvious. Then, as now, the Arab leaders used threats and blackmail to throw their support and their oil to the highest bidder. It was relatively simple for the British to seize this pretext of Arab opposition and turn it to her own uses:

We are helpless—

Britain told the world—

we cannot do other than appease the Arabs and then stay in Palestine to maintain law and order.

Meanwhile, thousands upon thousands of Jews perished under Hitler's rule. No place would accept them and the gates of Palestine were sealed by British perfidy. Boatloads of escaping Jews sank off the shores of Palestine while the British colonial administration followed the policy of the British Foreign Office. Thus, the land which by international covenant signed by 52 nations of the League of Nations and subsequently by the United States by separate treaty, was to be a national homeland for the Jews was opened to everybody but the Jews. And at a time, too, when every civilized country professed their horror at the tragedy that had befallen the defenseless Jews.

The peace brought with it for a while the beginning of new hopes for the little countries and for minority peoples. The Labor government came into power in Great Britain as standard bearers for a new liberalism in Europe. The Jews in Palestine and the Jews who had witnessed the massacre of their kin and who had themselves survived, reviewed the record of the Labor Party and its stated, and restated, policy on Palestine, and were jubilant. Surely now deliverance was at hand. In 1940 the Labor Party conference declared:

That in order to remove the root cause of Jewish suffering and to insure the existence and free development of the Jewish people, international assistance should be given for the continued growth of the Jewish national home in Palestine by immigration and settlement. The London conference of 1942 reaffirmed "its determination that in the new international order after the war Jews shall enjoy civil, religious, and economic equality with all other citizens, and that international assistance shall be given to promote by immigration and settlement the Jewish national home in Palestine."

The Labor Party conference of 1943 stated in its resolution:

That victory must insure for the Jews full civil, political, economic equality, and their national rights. It reaffirms the traditional policy of the British Labor Party in favor of building Palestine as the Jewish national home.

In 1944 the Palestine problem formed a special chapter in the NXX document known as the International Postwar Settlement, proposed by the national executive and introduced by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee. It received 8 months' deliberation by the party. It must be kept in mind, too, that at the time the 1944 Palestine policy was adopted the Labor Party was not in opposition, but a fully responsible partner in the coalition government. The Labor Party, in other words, were in a position to know, and did know, all the pertinent facts. I read a part of the Palestine chapter as written by the Labor Party in 1944:

But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated plan to kill all Jews in Europe.

In 1945 the national executive of the Labor Party published this resolution:

The committee reaffirms the policy accepted by the annual conference in December 1944 on Palestine. It therefore calls upon the British Government to remove the present unjustifiable barriers on immigration and to announce without delay proposals for the future of Palestine in which it has the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments.

Those are the words of the Labor Party on record. But the words of record are far, far removed from the deeds of record. No sooner had the Labor Party come into power than there came a complete reversal of attitude, policy, and direction. Jews, who after months and months of the long, long trek following the beacon of Palestine, found not the dignity, not the hope of beginning life anew, but the barbed wire of concentration camps on the island of Cyprus. Illegal searches and seizures on the part of the British colonial administration became the order of the day. Imprisonments without trial, withdrawal of the right of peaceful assembly, daily curfews became part of the routine of Palestine life.

It is little wonder, therefore, that the bitterness and frustration in Palestine reached the breaking point. The Jews who had redeemed the soil of Palestine, made of it a center of science and cultivation in the Middle East, Jews who died of disease in clearing the marshes and planting the life-sustaining trees, Jews who had contributed more than their allotted share to the Allied war effort were all forgotten. It is little wonder then that they asked, "Why?" And again, "Why?".

The English proposed and the United States acceded to an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. That committee recommended the immediate admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine. The Eisenhower report and the Harrison report, both undertaken at the request of President Truman revealed the dire need of the displaced Jew for Palestine. But again there followed delay. It would seem that the British by every possible device sought to postpone an equitable solution. Twice they offered what they knew would be unacceptable federalization plans for Palestine, but turned down the proposal of a carefully worked out, reasonable plan for partition offered by the Jewish agency for Palestine.

Now, the British in transparent insincerity offer submission of the Palestine problem to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Past and present experiences have taught us to be wary. The farcial ending of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, if nothing else—and there is far more evidence—leads us to conclude that this is another British dodge and stall for time. Reference to the General Assembly will lead to reference to the Trusteeship Committee of the United Nations where Britain can, if she so wills, exercise a right of veto. Approval of the old mandatory power is essential before the appointment of a new mandatory power can be made.

We must, at this point, ask ourselves: Shall the United States which since 1922 has reaffirmed its policy of favoring the establishment of the national Jewish homeland in Palestine permit the United Nations to serve the purpose of British imperialist interests in the Middle East? Keep in mind that the United States has openly and continuously reiterated this policy—the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine—not only by separate treaty with Great Britain, but through congressional resolutions and declared Executive proclamations by various Presidents of these United States, beginning with President Wilson and following through to President Truman. It has been repeated in the political platforms of the two major parties and has been the subject of numerous congressional debates.

Now the opportunity presents itself concretely to the United States Government to stand by its policy in the Palestine issue when it arises before the United Nations. By its great moral strength, by the force of its present leadership in world affairs, the United States can prevent in this instance the United Nations from becoming merely a sounding board for British interests. By direct interest and guidance, the United States can throw its great weight on the side of the equities, sustained as it is by the existence of recognized international documents and international and national commitments that favor the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish national home. It is up to the United States to prevent another farce and to avert the tragedy that must follow in the wake of British political machinations to continue her control in Palestine with regard to corresponding responsibilities.

And again, if the approach in the United Nations is to be a sincere one, then direct representation to the Jews of Palestine must be allowed. The Arabs as I have pointed out above, already have such representation. Britain has her own vote and those of her dominions.

Britain will have in the hollow of her hand all of the Arab votes, the votes of Canada and British South Africa, New Zealand and Australia, and very likely the votes of Belgium, Holland, and Denmark, because of the economic connection between those three latter nations.

The Jews of Palestine who constitute over a third of the population of Palestine and who have specific and special international status as conferred upon them by the League of Nations mandate, have no such representation. Most certainly the contention cannot be made that they are not interested parties.

I believe, too, that if the United Nations is to act as a court of equity, then Britain must come into that court with clean hands. To do so, Britain must abrogate at once the Palestine white paper of 1939 which was, and is, in direct contravention to the purposes of the man-British must cease to pervert the purdate of the League of Nations. The mandates commission of the League of Nations declared at its outset that in so promulgating this white paper, the British were acting unilaterally in breaching an international covenant and, therefore, rested on no lega' foundation. The

poses of the mandate. Otherwise, she brings with her submission of the Palestine issue to the United Nations the evidence of her betrayal of a trust and stands self-accused by her own record of complete misadministration of the mandate which in good faith was placed into her hands.

The question is still open. Will the United States permit Great Britain to use the instrument of the United Nations, fashioned, we hope, to secure our peace, as a cloak to hide her ill-becoming practices in Palestine? To permit Britain to do so would weaken tragically the basic structure of the United Nations. Or will the United States stand firmly and independently behind its own declared policy on Palestine?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JOINT INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1947, I introduced in the House H. R. 1759, entitled "A bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States." The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the computation of surtax) as precedes the table therein is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Computation of surtax:

"(1) Separate return: Except in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual a surtax determined by computing a tentative surtax under the table set forth in paragraph (3) of this subsection, and by reducing such tentative surtax by 5 percent thereof.

"(2) Joint return: In the case of a joint return by husband and wife under section 51, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the aggregate surtax net income of the husband and wife a surtax determined—

"(A) by computing a tentative surtax under the table set forth in paragraph (3) of this subsection upon an amount equal to one-half of such aggregate surtax net income;

"(B) by multiplying the tentative surtax ascertained under subparagraph (A) by two; and

"(C) by reducing the amount ascertained under subparagraph (B) by 5 percent thereof.

"(3) Surtax table: The table referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) is as follows:"

STANDARD DEDUCTION

SEC. 2. Section 23 (aa) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the optional standard deduction for individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Allowance: In the case of an individual, at his election a standard deduction as follows:

"(A) Separate return with adjusted gross income $5,000 or more: Except in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, if the adjusted gross income is $5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be $500.

"(B) Joint return with adjusted gross income $5,000 or more: In the case of a joint return by husband and wife under section 51, if the aggregate adjusted gross income of the husband and wife is $5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be $1,000 or an amount equal to 10 percent of such aggregate adjusted gross income, whichever is the lesser.

"(C) Adjusted gross income less than $5,000: If the adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, the standard deduction shall be an amount equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income upon the basis of which the tax applicable to the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer is determined under the tax table provided in section 400."

TAXABLE YEARS TO WHICH APPLICABLE

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946.

It has come to my attention that on February 19 the senior Senator from Maryland, Mr. TYDINGS, introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 649, which is in all respects identical with H. R. 1759.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal income-tax laws do not have equal application throughout the United States. In nine States—Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington—the so-called community-property law is in effect, with the result that many citizens of those States pay substantially less in Federal income taxes than do citizens of other States upon identical income. Eighteen percent of the population of the United States and, according to the latest available figures, one-sixth of all Federal income taxpayers reside in these nine States.

Whenever the net taxable income of a citizen of a community-property State—whose wife has no income—amounts to as much as $3,000, his Federal income tax is less than that paid by a citizen of a non-community-property State whose domestic and financial situation is precisely the same. This anomaly derives from the community-property concept that income accruing during marriage is the product of the joint endeavors of the husband and wife. Each of them, for example, is considered to have a vested one-half interest in the husband's earnings, and each is entitled to report his one-half separately for income-tax purposes. Thus, for illustration, if the husband's earnings are $6,000 per year and there is no other family income, the husband reports $3,000 and the wife reports the remaining $3,000 for income-tax purposes. If the husband earns $6,000 and the wife, also employed, earns $2,000, so that their total joint earnings are $8,000, each of them reports $4,000 for income-tax purposes.

The tax advantage is immediately apparent. Substantial savings result from the fact that lower surtax rates apply to the divided income. In the first of the two cases assumed, and on the further assumption that there are no minor dependents, the income-tax liability is as follows, if in a non-community-property State:

Income	$6,000.00
Personal exemptions	1,000.00
Standard deduction	500.00
Net taxable income	4,500.00
Total tax	921.50

But in a community-property State each would report $3,000 for a tax—taken from the tax table—of $427, or a total tax for both of $854. In other words, as a practical matter, the Federal income tax on a $6,000 income in a community-property State is $67.50 less than it is in a non-community-property State on the same income.

The disparity increases progressively with increases in the size of the income, as indicated in the following table:

Comparison of tax liabilities of married couples (with no dependents) in community property and noncommunity property States

Net income before exemption	Total tax on married couples		Tax saving in community property States	Tax saving in community-property States as a percentage of tax liability in non-community-property States
	Non-community-property State (only 1 spouse has income)	Community-property State (income divided equally between spouses)		
$10,000	$2,185	$1,843	$342	15.7
$15,000	4,047	3,154	893	22.1
$25,000	9,082	6,460	2,622	28.9
$50,000	24,795	18,725	6,070	24.5
$100,000	63,128	50,274	12,854	20.4

For the 10-year period from 1937 through 1946 the tax savings of residents of community-property States who are married and have incomes of $5,000 or more amount to impressive totals. For example, in the 10-year period this favored group of taxpayers have enjoyed the aggregate tax savings over taxpayers similarly situated in non-community-property States as shown in the following table:

TABLE NO. 2.—*Aggregate tax savings of married couples (with no dependents) in community-property States in the income years 1937 through 1946* [1]

Combined net income before exemption:	*Aggregate amount of tax savings*
$5,000	$320
$10,000	2,864
$25,000	20,633
$50,000	53,144
$100,000	132,187

[1] Tax for non-community-property States is computed on the assumption that only one spouse has income, and in community-property States that income and exemptions are divided equally between the spouses.

Both of the foregoing tables are taken from material prepared by Stanley S. Surrey, tax legislative counsel, Treasury Department.

During the 10-year period a married resident of Texas, or any other community-property State, and earning $5,000 per year, has paid $320 less in Federal income taxes than a married man living in Missouri, or in any other non-community-property State, with exactly the same income. When it is considered that on a $50,000 income the 10-year savings are $53,144, and on a $100,000 income the 10-year savings are $132,187, it is not difficult to understand why the non-community-property States are deeply concerned about the flight of capital and wealth to the community-property States. It is important to note that during only a portion of the 10-year period used were the present steep surtaxes in effect; during a 10-year period at the present rates the savings and tax advantage enjoyed by taxpayers in the community-property States would be correspondingly much greater.

It is not surprising that there is Nation-wide complaint at this radical discrimination in favor of taxpayers in the community-property States. In all fairness, how can the Congress permit this inequality to continue? The whole tax structure ought to be reexamined and modified to eliminate it and to rectify any other existing inequities.

For purposes of this discussion perhaps the most vivid illustration of the tax disparity would be found in a comparison of the income-tax liability of two Members of this House, one from a community-property State and the other from a non-community-property State; each with only one dependent—his wife—and neither with any income except his congressional salary. Let us first consider Congressman A, who represents a district in 1 of the 39 non-community-property States. His tax computation is approximately as follows:

Salary	$12,500
Exemptions	−1,000
Standard deduction	−500
Taxable income	11,000
Income tax	2,869

Congressman B, from a community-property State, figures his income tax in this manner:

Self:

Divided income	$6,250.00
Exemption	−500.00
Standard deduction	−500.00
Taxable income	5,250.00
Income tax	1,106.75

Wife:

Divided income	$6,250.00
Exemption	−500.00
Standard deduction	−500.00
Taxable income	5,250.00
Income tax	1,106.75

Total income tax for self and wife, $2,213.50.

In other words, the Member from the non-community-property State pays $655.50 more per year in Federal-income taxes on his congressional salary than does his colleague from a community-property State.

It was largely as a matter of self-protection that Oklahoma adopted the community-property system in 1945, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue now accepts separate returns, representing a per capita division of income, from husbands and wives who reside in that State. There is ample authority for the statement that Oklahoma made the change solely for tax considerations. See address of Stanley S. Surrey, tax legislative counsel, Treasury Department, June 4, 1946, as reported in Taxes, the tax magazine, volume 24, No. 10, page 982, October 1946; also Community Property Law in Oklahoma, by Frank Eagin and Charles Everett Eagin (1940); Midwest Printing Co., Tulsa, Okla., chapter 10, section 92.

Attracted by Oklahoma's successful conversion to the community-property system with its substantial Federal income tax savings, at least five other State legislatures—in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming—are considering legislation designed to adopt the community-property system. Undoubtedly many other States will take this action to prevent the flight of capital to community-property States and to prevent citizens of substantial income from removing their legal residences to community-property States.

The alternative, of course, is legislation by the Congress which will equalize the Federal income tax liabilities of residents of non-community-property States with those of residents of community-property States. No other course is open, since it has long been held that the Federal Government cannot deny to a husband and wife, who are citizens of a community-property State, the right to divide their income per capita and file separate income-tax returns. Such a provision was stricken out of a revenue bill introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 61, part 6, pages 5909–5922, October 1, 1921—on the strength of an opinion by the Attorney General—Treasury Decision No. 3138, March 3, 1921.

On April 2, 1945, the Senate and House of Representatives of the Oregon Legislature addressed a memorial on the subject to the governors of the other 38 non-community-property States, urging that action be taken to induce Congress to enact legislation placing Federal income tax payers of non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States. The memorial in question so excellently states the problem that I include it. It reads as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 3

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully urge and petition as follows:

Whereas the 40 common-law States are placed at a distinct competitive disadvantage with the community-property States under the now existing Federal personal-income-tax laws; and

Whereas this disadvantage is reflected in the reluctance of business enterprises to establish themselves and carry on their business in common-law States due to the fact that they seek places for doing business which are advantageous to their officers, employees, and stockholders; and

Whereas this disadvantage to common-law States is reflected in the fact that citizens and residents of such States domicile themselves in community-property States after retiring from the activities which created their taxable wealth; and

Whereas in this regard many persons while engaged in active business in common-law States establish their residence in adjacent community-propety States in order to obtain the advantages of income taxes, with the result that the common-law States likewise lose inheritance taxes, and in many instances lose all or a portion of the business; and

Whereas in equity the Federal personal-income taxes should be borne equally by all residents of all States, thereby creating economic equality between the States; and

Whereas it is in accordance with the tenets of sound tax theory and a sound marital status between husband and wife to permit the determination of net income of husband and wife as is now done in community-property States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby respectfully suggest, urge, and petition the legislative assemblies of the aforesaid common-law property States in session assembled, to take such appropriate action and to memorialize the Congress to remove the aforesaid disadvantages and to enact legislation to accomplish this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That we request, petition, and urge the Congress of the United States to enact such Federal legislation as will place Federal personal-income taxpayers of common-law States on a parity with those of community-property States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon transmit copies of this memorial to the Oregon Senators in Congress, the Honorable GUY CORDON and the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, and Representatives in Congress, the Honorable JAMES W. MOTT, the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN, the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, and the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and to the governors of each of the common-law States.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I first want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on having submitted to the House a proposal to deal with this important question, and to further commend him for the study he has made of this subject matter. It certainly goes without saying that it is extremely inconsistent that individual incomes should be taxed different amounts because the individuals happen to live in different States. I think it is very important that the subject matter be dealt with here in the United States Congress rather than to permit the various States to adopt or pass laws providing for community property rights, because there are problems involved under community laws other than the question of the division of individual income for tax purposes. I am glad to have the gentleman's explanation. I think he is doing a good job in bringing it to the floor of the House, and I trust the Members will read his remarks carefully and will go into this question of providing Federal legislation in place of letting the States deal with the problem.

Mr. REEVES. I am grateful to the gentleman for his contribution. It goes without saying that I agree completely with his remarks on the subject.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the question which the able gentleman is discussing a Federal question or is it a State question; in other words, can a State pass a law through its legislature to remedy the discrimination which the gentleman has so clearly pointed out, or it is a matter for the Federal Government to deal with through the Congress?

Mr. REEVES. It is my opinion that it is a matter which only the Federal Government can settle satisfactorily. I should probably say to the gentleman that the only way in which a State which is now a non-community-property State can protect itself in this situation is to convert itself to a community-property State. There are some obvious disadvantages to that action which I shall undertake to point out as I go along.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Is it not a fact that your whole Federal income-tax law needs simplifying, and is it not a fact that it seems like every time they draw up a Federal law here in Washington they get so-called experts that make it so complicated that the common people, the everyday man in the street, cannot understand what it is all about?

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman is entirely correct; and I think that one of the most constructive things this Congress could do in the way of tax legislation would be to adopt a method of computation which could be understood by the ordinary individual. I think that is especially true in view of the fact that the income-tax laws now reach much lower levels of income than they ever have before.

The Legislature of South Dakota, on January 27, 1947, memorialized the Congress to the same effect, and I understand that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is interested in H. R. 1759.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. I am interested in this matter and the State Legislature of South Dakota has adopted a resolution urging that the Congress act upon it. I desire now to commend the gentleman from Missouri for taking hold of this proposition. He has shown courage in tackling it and he has shown ability in his discussion on the subject.

I may say that during the past year I mentioned to the Governor of South Dakota the inequitable treatment which our Federal income-tax laws impose upon the citizens of the non-community-property States, I suggested that South Dakota might well consider enactment of a community-property law in line with what the State of Oklahoma has done. During the current session of the State legislature, such a bill was introduced by the Honorable Charles Bruett. The objection has been made to State action, however, on the ground that a certain amount of confusion in handling of property might result and that it should not be necessary for States singly to adopt laws to correct an injustice perpetrated by a Federal practice.

With that argument I can find no fault. The Federal Government should act.

One of the canons of income taxation, certainly, is that there should be no discrimination as between persons of like income in like circumstances. The present situation violates the spirit of equity if not the letter.

Recently I asked the legislative counsel of the House to prepare an appropriate bill for me that would remedy this situation. I was informed that such a bill had just been written for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES]. I was very happy to go to him and say that I would defer to him and do whatever I could to secure enactment of his meritorious measure, H. R. 1759.

The gentleman from Missouri deserves the thanks of the country for bringing this matter to a head. The State Legislature of my State of South Dakota has passed a concurrent resolution endorsing this proposition, as the gentleman, has stated, and with the permission of the gentleman and the House, I will insert that resolution at this point:

(The matter referred to follows:)

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to give like privileges to income-tax payers resident in noncommunity property States as are being enjoyed by residents of community property States

Whereas an inequality exists between citizens and residents of the several States of the United States, in that residents of 9 States having community property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income-tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of 41 States not having community property laws; and

Whereas by reason of the premises legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequality by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in its thirtieth regular session assembled respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America that suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States: be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to United States Senators CHAN GURNEY and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, to Congressmen FRANCIS CASE and KARL E. MUNDT, and to United States Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN and to Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON.

SIOUX K. GRIGSBY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

G. W. MILLS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association has likewise interested itself in the problem. At its national meeting in November 1946 it adopted a resolution urging amendment of the Federal income-tax laws to permit the division of income between husbands and wives, and to provide that the tax on a joint return should be twice the tax computed on one-half of the aggregate net income.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1759 accomplishes exactly that result. It provides that in case of a joint return by a husband and wife the surtax shall be calculated upon one-half their aggregate surtax net income and then multiplied by two. The standard 5-percent reduction is retained. The result is exactly the same as though each spouse separately reported one-half the aggregate income for income-tax purposes. Since in separate returns each spouse would be entitled to a standard deduction of $500 or 10 percent, whichever is the lesser, upon adjusted gross income of $5,000 or more, provision is made for a standard deduction, in the case of a joint return of aggregate adjusted gross income of $5,000 or more, of $1,000 or 10 percent, whichever is the lesser.

I urge that careful consideration be given to H. R. 1759 by the Congress. Before any action is taken looking to the reduction of income taxes, the entire tax structure should be adjusted to eliminate the substantial inequities and inequalities in the application of the tax laws to the two classes of states. While H. R. 1759 is intended to be a tax equalization measure and not a tax relief measure, its enactment would make applicable to residents of noncommunity property States the lower surtax rates now enjoyed exclusively by residents of the nine community property States.

H. R. 1759 makes no distinction between earned and investment income, or between income from property acquired prior to and income from property acquired during marriage. All income of husband and wife from whatever sources may be aggregated for purposes of the joint return. This is substantially the rule now applicable to Texas taxpayers. In the remaining community-property States all earned income is reported on a community-property basis, but the rule varies with respect to income from investments. Accordingly, in the interest of simplicity, it was considered desirable to authorize income from all sources to be included in the joint return. In addition, there is further simplification in that neither spouse is obliged to file an additional separate return as to income not derived from community sources.

Inevitably the question arises as to the reduction in the tax revenues of the Federal Government which would result from enactment of this measure. Mr. Surrey, whose position with the Treasury Department lends considerable weight to his views, has stated that it would involve, at present rates, "a decrease in revenue of a little less than a billion dollars." Such a decrease can be absorbed in the constructive economies planned by this Congress. I urge that action be taken to amend the income-tax laws at this session, since the National Budgets in future years may be so closely figured and balanced as to preclude the change at a later date.

Moreover, if the Congress fails to take action the several States may achieve the same result by voluntarily adopting the community-property system. As I have already said, at least five additional States are already considering legislation to that effect. If 5 or 10 or 20 more States by law accept the community-property basis, as they very well may in the present circumstances, Federal income-tax revenues will drop anyway, as a result. And, in addition, the development of divided estates will eventually have an adverse effect upon Federal revenues from gift and estate taxes. Why should the Congress, by inaction on this subject, compel the States to adopt the community-property principle in self-defense, and with virtually the same effect on Federal revenues as the enactment of H. R. 1759 would have?

Congress should not, in my opinion, take any course which would compel wholesale conversion by the States to a community-property basis. The entire concept of community property is

foreign to the common law, which obtains generally throughout the Nation. It originated in the United States with French and Spanish settlers, and probably survived because of its peculiar adaptability to frontier and pioneer life in some sections. Radical differences respecting property ownership, estates, and the like would create untold confusion and difficulties if widespread adoption of the community-property system were made compulsory by the income-tax policies of the Federal Government. The rights of creditors would be substantially affected, for example; the rules of probate, inheritance of estates, property rights in divorce cases, and many ordinary commercial practices would undergo basic changes. Evidently, the State of Oregon found the community-property law not adapted to her needs, for after adopting it in 1943—Laws of Oregon, 1943, chapter 440—she repealed it in 1945—chapters 270, 340, 389.

I am satisfied that the enactment of H. R. 1759 or a substantially identical measure would result in abandonment of community-property legislation by the States now considering it. Certainly, these States and other should not be obliged to make a radical and basic change in their property laws merely to escape the unequal burden placed upon them by this discriminatory application of the Federal income-tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, in these few minutes I have endeavored to acquaint the House with the unequal application of the Federal income-tax laws resulting from the recognition accorded to the community-property system of nine States and to demonstrate the need for a change in the existing income-tax laws and the kind of change which should be made. I do not understand that there is opposition to H. R. 1759. Certainly, its enactment is of considerable interest and importance to the taxpayers of the 39 non-community-property States, including my own State of Missouri. It merits the careful consideration and active support of every Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables, a memorial, and the text of H. R. 1759.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LOYALTY STANDARDS AND THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, some days after November 5 the President appointed a Commission to draw up standards on employee loyalty. It is to be welcomed. The United States Chamber of Commerce has issued a special report on Communists within the Government with practical suggestions on this question.

May I call the attention of the Members of the House to this document which has been distributed to all Members and which merits the most careful study. Communists Within the Government was published as a public service by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Included in this work is an analysis of the significance of Communist Party membership as far as it affects Government employees, the operation of the Communist patronage machine, an analysis of various court decisions affecting Communist employees, the various obstacles in the way of ridding the Government of pro-Communist infiltration. This is followed by 17 specific proposals, which I shall list briefly herewith:

First. The question of loyalty should be the sine qua non of Government employment, at all times, regardless of the status of the employee.

Second. Responsibility for staff loyalty to be placed upon all department and section heads as well as upon the Civil Service Commission. The FBI should be authorized to make recommendations based upon its files, in regard to employees with records showing doubtful loyalty.

Third. Loyalty records should be centralized.

Fourth. Investigations should be conducted and evaluated by specially trained personnel.

Fifth. Communist front organizations should be clearly defined and listed.

Sixth. Civil-service rules rendering previous loyalty investigations innocuous, should be revised.

Seventh. All loyalty investigations, hearings, and so forth, should be conducted under clear and precise standards as to what constitutes Communist Party membership, submission to its discipline, what is meant by a fellow traveler, and so forth.

Eighth. Security regulations should be drafted in order to make more efficient the care of files and documents, with proper penalties for violations.

Ninth. All employees should be fingerprinted and photographed.

Tenth. The application form should be improved to include information regarding parents' names, former addresses, use of aliases, service for a foreign power, and so forth.

Eleventh. Falsification of material records in the application form should be punishable by discharge and prosecution.

Twelfth. Persons removed on grounds of loyalty from one agency should not be reemployable by the Government.

Thirteenth. Congressional committee staffs should be subject to the same loyalty checks to which all Government employees are subject.

Fourteenth. Efforts should be made to locate and liquidate centers of pro-Communist patronage.

Fifteenth. Adequate funds should be provided for loyalty investigations.

Sixteenth. A sound public opinion should be stimulated in reference to what the Government is seeking to do in its loyalty investigation activity.

Seventeenth. The Civil Service Commission should be assisted by a special advisory board consisting of labor, business, and legal representatives.

May I specially urge a careful consideration of the specific proposals in this document by both the Civil Service Committee of the House and the Committee on Un-American Activities so that proper legislation along these lines may be enacted as speedily as possible.

The President's Commission to draw up standards in connection with loyalty investigations, created as a result of severe criticism of present practices, has not yet reported. It is high time this Commission acted in order that existing conditions may be speedily remedied.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, who has done such excellent work along this line.

Mr. REES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. My information is that the President's committee, which was appointed sometime in November to study and report on this problem, was expected to file a report on the 1st of February and had the time extended to the 20th of February. I am also advised that a report was submitted to the President a few days ago. Together with the gentleman who has the floor, the distinguished Member from Michigan, I, too, am anxiously awaiting the report of that committee. I am informed that the President has just released a statement in which, among other things, he has directed the various Government agencies to dismiss all incompetent persons from the pay rolls of the Government.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think that goes to the heart of the trouble. A person can be incompetent without being a Communist. A Communist might be the most competent person, but also the most dangerous person to have in our Government employ.

Mr. REES. I was going to follow up my statement with the observation that it certainly is the duty of every agency, without the necessity of a request or a demand by the President, to dismiss every incompetent person from his agency. With reference to the gentleman's statement concerning disloyal persons who should be removed from the pay rolls, may I say that I have made a request of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to furnish our committee with the names of individuals whose loyalties have been questioned and who are still on the pay roll of the Government or when removed from service. We hope to examine the files and find out just what the situation is with respect to those persons whose loyalties have been questioned and who remained on the pay rolls of our Government after adverse reports were made in such cases.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman will not alone have the sympathy but also the moral support of every loyal American in the United States in his splendid efforts to rid the Government of those who are within the Government and who would destroy us if they could.

Mr. REES. May I express my deep appreciation for the efforts of the gentleman from Michigan in dealing with this important problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

at that point where I interrogated the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] during the course of his remarks I may insert Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

IRELAND MUST BE UNIFIED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in designing the fabric of postwar peace, one of the problems which must be solved is that tense situation which has resulted from the partitioning of Ireland.

We have given our moral and political support—deservedly so—to other peoples who wish to throw off the yoke of imperialism and win through to freedom and sovereign statehood.

We can do no less for the Irish people, remembering that 14 Presidents of these United States stemmed from that liberty-loving stock.

In line with this, I earnestly recommend that we, the Congress, go on record as favoring the union of Ulster with Eire. We have already worked side by side with the British on a joint commission to explore the problem of Palestine. As a result of this investigation, we have arrived at conclusions which are a step forward toward the solution to this issue.

I propose that we make the same approach to the Irish question.

Great Britain is beginning to feel the burdens of empire. In Palestine, India, and elsewhere, she is trying to find solutions through geographical compromise instead of reconciling the divergent viewpoints within the problem. But dividing a people and splitting the territorial integrity of their country is a temporary expedient which confers a dubious freedom. It is a patchwork which will not hold. Protecting minority rights by erecting new barriers between people who should be together is no solution. Instead, it breeds antagonisms, sharply defined by artificial boundaries.

If Britain, by some stretch of the imagination, had controlled our country through the last century, she would probably have settled the issue between the States, by separating the North from the South, or by giving dominion status to the North, while keeping the South.

Happily, we, as a sovereign people, learned to reconcile our differences and thereby strengthen our unity.

That is what the Irish people want to do. They need every help and encouragement in doing it in a manner that will save them from the terrible cost of civil strife. For the people of Ulster, or the six northeastern counties of Ireland are, by their own will, united to Britain. The problem involves Eire, Ulster, Great Britain, and, through justice and sentiment, ourselves.

The British find themselves in a difficult situation. Where, years before, they forced their way into Ireland, they would now like to retire gracefully, if they could. But the Free State wants complete severance while Ulster wants to stay with Britain. The latter is perplexed, and Ireland is divided against itself.

The Irish have long memories. Those in the Free State will not soon forget the cruel sufferings they endured at the hands of the invaders. Whatever moves the present-day British make—whether they are right or wrong as viewed objectively—will be regarded with suspicion by the people of Southern Ireland. To them, Britain wil never be able to live down the sins which were committed in the past. In this strained atmosphere, negotiations between the two is virtually impossible.

The United States, particularly during the past hundred years, became the haven for so many oppressed Irishmen, that their descendants have become a leading element in our population. Our consistent support of human freedom, as exemplified by our recent and voluntary grant of complete independence to the people of the Philippines, has won for us the faith and confidence of subject peoples everywhere. By a strange irony, in the war just ended, our service men and women—many of whom were of Irish descent—fought side by side with the British to defeat the greatest threat of tyranny that the world has ever known.

Because of these and other factors, we are in an excellent position to help mediate the Irish question. We have earned the trust of all the parties concerned.

Even with this favorable approach, however, the problem is not an easy one to solve.

Wher the Irish Free State—the larger part of Ireland, lying to the south—was created by the British Parliament in 1922, a majority of Ulstermen—the north—wanted to retain union with Britain. Northern Ireland was offered any safeguard that would satisfy her when home rule was being discussed. She rejected these. In the opinion of northern Irishmen, this was justified by subsequent events. The first change of premiership in the Irish Free State wiped out all the safeguards inserted into the treaty and northern Ireland feels that this bears out her suspicions. The northerner is not merely divided from the southerner by religion, and, as he has been told, by racial origin, but by economic differences as well. The north is industrial, is noted for its shipbuilding and its manufacture of linens. The south, at present, is largely agricultural, although it is making strenuous efforts to develop industries. Both sections have in mind the prosperity of their country, but the one is politically unionist and the other is as vigorously separatist. Economically the north cultivates the closest relations with her nearest neighbor and best customer—Britain—while the south wants self-sufficiency.

On the other hand, the objectives of Eire—the Irish Free State—are clearly projected in the declaration of independence proclaimed by the Dail Eireann on January 21, 1919, from which I quote in part:

> Whereas the Irish people is by right a free people; and
>
> Whereas, for 700 years, the Irish people have never ceased to repudiate and have repeatedly protested in arms against foreign usurpation; and
>
> Whereas English rule in this country is, and has been, based upon force and fraud and maintained by military occupation against the declared will of the people; and
>
> Whereas the Irish people is resolved to secure and maintain its complete independence; * * *
>
> We solemnly declare foreign government in Ireland to be an invasion of our national right which we will never tolerate, and we demand the evacuation of our country by the English garrison; * * *
>
> In the name of the Irish people we humbly commit our destiny to Almighty God, who gave our fathers the courage and determination to persevere through centuries of a ruthless tyranny, and strong in the justice of the cause which they have handed down to us, we ask His divine blessing on this, the last stage of the struggle which we have pledged ourselves to carry through to freedom.

Under the new constitution—effective December 29, 1937—its provisions apply to the whole of Ireland but stipulates that, pending the reintegration of the national territory, the laws enacted by the Parliament established by the constitution shall have the same area and extent of application as those of the Irish Free State.

Prime Minister Eamon deValera contends that, so long as Eire is economically dependent on Britain for essential raw materials and manufactured goods, it cannot be politically free.

While this economic tension continues between Eire and Britain, there is little hope of bringing back into Eire the alienated six counties of Ulster. Common-sense principles of geography and economics—Ireland and Britain being but a few score miles apart—cannot be ignored. Both countries serve as natural markets for each other. Inevitably they must come to see that it is to their mutual interest to engage in reciprocal trade, rather than use trade barriers as a weapon of economic war.

The Irish, both in the Catholic south and the Protestant north, are faithful to their respective religions and this is a sensitive point of difference. Many, many years of suspicion, bitterness, and violence have accentuated this tension. But this is an issue by no means confined to Ireland. It is found in the Indian and Palestinian problems. All of Ireland, however, is Christian and there is no language barrier separating the people of that country. I venture to say, in view of these facts, that a reconciliation is possible on this score. Strong guarantees of religious freedom in the Constitution, implemented by the fellowship of inter-faith councils, can develop an atmosphere of democratic tolerance.

Unilateral action never solves any political problem. To correct the unnatural partition of Ireland, I suggest that we promote a series of conferences between representatives of Eire, Ulster, Great Britain, and the United States. Only by working together on this problem, airing grievances both real and

fancied, and listening to all sides of the question, can an area of understanding be reached.

Hundreds of years ago, the Irish were one people. They had cultivated a civilization greater than that of larger and more powerful nations on the continent. That was before foreign aggression trespassed on their peace, levied cruel tributes on the people, and split their unity.

This ancient wrong must be remedied. It is just and proper that our Nation, which enunciated "the four freedoms," should encourage this fundamental one. We should use our good offices to bring the two parts of Ireland together again.

I have sketched some of the realities which must be faced, because it is only by facing them that we can make progress toward a solution.

The United States, by virtue of its leadership in the cause of human liberty, and its reputation for fair play, is in a position to help heal this old wound.

As cosponsor of the joint resolution favoring the reintegration of Ulster with Eire, so that Ireland's original unity may be redeemed, I ask the Members of this House to give it their fullest support.

Furthermore, I believe that we should press for the admission of Eire to the company of the United Nations. Her passionate love of freedom, unwavering through centuries of oppression, is needed in the councils which are shaping the destiny of that one world which must be built on the foundations of freedom with responsibility.

An old friend will appreciate our championship of her just claim.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 45 minutes.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S STUPID BLUNDERS IN ARGENTINE RELATIONS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that little by little the double-dealing and double-crossing policies of our State Department are being revealed, it is the moral duty of every Member of Congress to closely scrutinize the stupid conduct of our State Department the past 6 years in Argentine affairs. We should prepare to the end that such gross stupidity will not be repeated.

During the war, behind the State Department's iron curtain, it was impossible for American citizens—even Members of Congress—to get a glimpse of what was really going on in our shameful meddling in Argentine affairs. Our State Department's blunder in Argentine affairs was the most stupid and arrogant blunder in our Nation's history.

Argentina has been the victim of the most outrageous smear campaign during the past 6 years. Argentina was the most lied about country in our Nation's press and by responsible United States Government officials. All this at the instigation and direction of our State Department.

The thing that stands out most in our State Department's conduct with Argentina is the patience exerted by the Government of Argentina and its people in taking the abuse that was heaped upon them without any rhyme or reason. It must be said to the credit of the Argentine Government and its people that they certainly must have wanted harmonious relations with the United States to take what they did.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we owe it to ourselves and for Western Hemisphere solidarity to scrutinize these gigantic stupid blunders. At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert my remarks, which bring up through 1944 our State Department's shameful conduct in Argentine affairs. I hope that Members of Congress will read these remarks and get the background.

Within a few days I will address this Congress on what transpired after 1944. But to get the background in this message, I go through 1944. If you are concerned about this matter through 1944, I wish to warn that after that time our State Department's stupidity is even more serious.

It is time that this Congress and the people of America published a Blue Book about our State Department and lift the ghastly iron curtain behind which it operates. It should be publicized the world over that the attitude of our State Department toward Argentina does in no way reflect the attitude of the American people. The American people want friendly relations with its friend—the Argentine. With this as an introduction, let us proceed to the relation of events through 1944.

The Argentine question became a veritable cause célèbre during the months before the conclusion of hostilities and has continued its turbulent way down to the present time. An avalanche of tendentious interpretations and speculation has obscured the issue and distorted the facts. There are several definite stages in the evolution of the Argentine problem. There is the internal one, with reference to the type of regime set up under Pedro Ramirez, Edelmiro Farrell, and President Juan Domingo Perón. There is the war period, during which the tugging and heaving had to do primarily with active collaboration by the Buenos Aires government with the United Nations, and there is the later period, in which we still find ourselves, when the role and place of Argentina in inter-American life is the fundamental issue.

The present speech deals with the course of events up to the end of 1944, with reference mainly to the period during which Mr. Cordell Hull guided the destinies of American foreign policy. The later epoch under Stettinius and Spruille Braden constitutes a prolongation of this era and deserves treatment apart. I intend to expose the utter stupidity of the latter at a later date soon.

The New York Times, in an editorial comment of July 28, 1944, just after Secretary Hull's assertion that the Argentine Government was a danger to the United States during the war, opined that "probably no government, except in a declaration of war, has attacked another with greater severity." The New York World-Telegram, reflecting the same point of view, stated that the United States' declaration was the most violent conceivable short of war.

It is not entirely improper to examine the record of the tumultuous months of 1944, which shows the tone and temper of our policy. We have been forced, as a government, to shift about. We refused recognition to Edelmiro Farrell for a long time; we closed the door on negotiations; we denounced first, but then capitulated at Mexico City and later at San Francisco. We published the famous Blue Book with the apparent motivation of discrediting Perón, and he was promptly elected to the Argentine Presidency, which he has occupied since June 4 of this year. The wavering and weaving that has distinguished American policy toward Argentina cannot be the source of any great satisfaction to the American people.

During the period in which Mr. Hull was Secretary of State we performed what was one of the most extraordinary steps in modern diplomatic history: of refusing even to admit that the Argentine case was a legitimate topic of conversation with the Argentine Government. Secretary Hull, in his declarations of July 26 and September 7 of 1944, closed the door on negotiations. The matter seemed settled. Argentina must change her government or we would not deal with her. The unprecedented nature of this attitude is evident. We were not at war with Argentina, yet we dealt with that Republic in terms which were more severe and uncompromising than those used with Germany or Japan prior to the actual outbreak of hostilities.

We were technically at peace with Germany in 1940 when the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, visited Europe to talk personally with Adolf Hitler and other German leaders. Certainly, he did not go with the thought of accomplishing anything to deter the German leader from his course, but with the idea that all doors to some conceivable understanding should not be closed. Japanese-American relations were definitely at the breaking point when Kurusu and Nomura entered upon conversations with the Department of State. We knew where we stood and the bellicosity of Japan could admit of no doubt, yet we were willing to receive a Japanese mission. But with Argentina there could be no compromise, no dealings, no negotiations. We were adamant in refusing to have anything to do with that Government until our wishes were fulfilled and Farrell and his cabinet were thrown out of power.

The Buenos Aires daily, La Prensa, which is a first-class newspaper and was definitely pro-Allied, commented editorially on this aspect of the problem on September 8, 1944. Referring first to the statement of Prime Minister Churchill in the House of Commons on August 2, 1944, in which he censured Argentine isolation, this daily speaks of the tone of Mr. Churchill's statement as "measured and respectful." It contrasts this expression with the "unmercifully severe tone" employed by Mr. Hull in his denunciation of September 7 in which he branded Argentina as a focus of Nazi-fascism. The paper's criticism of the Secretary of State was not for what he said as much as for what it implied. It recognized the right of the statesman to launch accusations in a press conference, but it did criticize the fact that this had become the only channel through

which the Department of State was speaking on the matter. The procedure followed by the Secretary of State put the whole thing outside the normal procedure. In a matter as serious as this, the Buenos Aires daily expressed the hope that other and less virulent ways might be found for discussing this problem. The Associated Press comment, which appeared in the press all over Latin America, on the American declarations of July 26 said that "the accusation against Argentina is without precedent in its frankness and violence."

Every step taken by Argentina after the conference of Foreign Ministers in Rio de Janeiro was followed by a sharply worded denunciation from Washington. A curious and not unfruitful study might be made of the rising tone of these statements, which reached a climax in the utterances of September 7, 1944. The ascending order of these statements might be charted as follows: first, Argentina did not fulfill the obligations of Rio de Janeiro and consequently was not cooperating with the other American nations. Then, when the break with the Axis was made by most of the republics, Argentina's failure to act constituted the new bone of contention. When Argentina did break with the Axis in January of 1944, the Argentine Government refused, it was alleged, to expel Axis agents and suffered their presence there to the detriment of the rest of the hemisphere. The whole thing reached a frenzy after Farrell replaced Ramirez. His government was accused of Fascist inclinations and of being a threat to all of the hemisphere during the period of the war and the charge was added that Argentina was a permanent menace to America because of its Nazi-Fascism.

Every concession made by Argentina toward greater cooperation with the United Nations was followed by a new form of condemnation. When, toward the end of October 1944, the Buenos Aires government announced that no newspapers of totalitarian tendency would be allowed to continue publication, the Department of State released a broadside against the danger of Argentine armaments, asserting that Argentina was exerting every effort to create a powerful armed force. Instead of stating that the decision of President Farrell and his cabinet to suppress the obstreperous pro-Axis press represented a considerable gain toward collaboration, we chose to ignore the whole thing and concentrate attention on some other phase—as though we were seeking to keep the fire going no matter how much effort was made to extinguish it. We continued the same policy at the time of the break with the Axis. For months we had protested and argued to get the Argentine to break with Germany and Japan. Chile had taken many months to get around to doing the same thing, but, once she had made the break, no difficulties were raised against receiving her into the good graces of the rest of the American republics. When Argentina did break her relations with the Nazis, instead of claiming a diplomatic triumph, we merely discovered some other point on which to concentrate and kept right on beating the Argentine Government.

One of the basic reasons, so it is said, for not recognizing Gen. Edelmiro Farrell was that Argentina had not cooperated with the United Nations but had, on the contrary, given aid and succor to the enemy. This contention was fundamental and ought to be examined critically. But there are several separate items which can be cited to demonstrate the degree to which Argentina actually cooperated with the American republics first and with the United Nations in general. These may be considered as the measures designed to aid the Allied cause or to carry out specific resolutions adopted at the Rio de Janeiro conference.

While it may be contended that Argentina delayed far too long in breaking with the Axis, the fact remains that she finally did so. If we are to hold it eternally against Argentina that she did not break with the Axis on the evening of December 7, 1941, then we might consider keeping perpetually alive memories of the Russo-German pact of 1939 as a source of criticism of our Soviet ally, or throw in Turkey's face her tardiness in doing something about the war. Bygones have to be bygones in international living, else we would spend all of our time constructing new quarrels on the basis of ancient episodes. The fact is that on January 26, 1944, Argentina broke relations with Germany and Japan and declared her relations with France, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania interrupted.

Argentina had been unwilling to take this step until she decided in her own good way to do so. American readers might bear in mind that Argentina and the Argentine people are among the most nationalistically minded in South America and are inordinately proud of their own achievements and the degree of sovereignty which they have attained. As Foreign Minister Peluffo stated in his address of July 26, 1944, Argentine foreign policy is her own, to be dictated by no one. Argentina did not believe at Rio de Janeiro that a break with the Axis should necessarily be automatic. Each nation was to determine its own policy on the basis of the most rigid respect for sovereignty. Argentina is economically powerful, dependent more on Europe than on the United States, far removed geographically from the United States, and possessed of an overweening sense of national dignity and self-determination. These sentiments came into play when there was talk of immediate and uniform action on the part of all of the American states in the face of an aggression against one of them. Argentina preferred to take this crucial step when she was ready to do so, and no amount of pressure from outside would change this will.

A second tangible step taken by Argentina was the suspension of all radio, telegraphic, and telephone communications with the Axis countries. This resolution dated January 27, 1944, fulfilled, incidentally, Resolution 40 of the Rio de Janiero Conference. One of the first decrees of the new government, back in June 1943 (decree 75 of June 10, 1943) was to suspend all cipher communications or the use of code messages to Germany or Japan. Argentina was suspected of harboring innumerable Axis spies. As a matter of fact, the Argentine Government clamped down on this type of activity from the beginning and continued to root out spies with laudable diligence and persistence. On November 3, 1942, the American embassy denounced the existence of a spy ring in Argentina. The government proceeded at once to arrest those discovered and bring them to trial.

The German naval attaché was expelled because of his implication in this unsavory business. Specific groups of spies have been arrested and their activities broken up. Among the first were the Becker, Seidlitz, Langer, and Harnish groups with important ramifications. The running down of spies as they cropped up was a continuing affair. New espionage activities, discovered in December 1943 and January 1944, were suppressed. On August 24, 1944, three important Germans were arrested for sending information abroad through clandestine channels regarding Allied shipping.

Axis news agencies and press services were immediately closed down upon the breaking of relations. These included the Transocean, DNB, Domei, and the Servicio Informativo Americano of Genoa, in charge of one Piero Porro. All of these agencies were put out of business. The Argentine policy was particularly diligent in unearthing clandestine radio stations, a number of which were known to exist. Their suppression was immediate. The espionage group of which Johann Sigrid Becker was the ring leader had such a radio station in Senator Moron Street in the suburb of Bella Vista, which was broken up and its apparatus confiscated. By the decree of November 10, 1943, over 2 months prior to the break in relations, the German sailors on the *Graf Spee* were interned, six camps being set up for this purpose. Argentina cooperated with other governments in the matter of coordinating activities for the suspension of espionage and participated in a conference on methods and procedures in this field.

As soon as the decision was taken to break with the Axis, the Argentine Government took immediate steps for the transfer abroad of the diplomats and other functionaries whose presence was no longer grata. On January 27, 1944, the preliminary steps were taken to expel from Argentina all of these diplomatic agents. Within 5 months, in spite of the difficulties of obtaining safe conduct, transportation, and the like, these diplomats had left Argentina. Other American Republics took infinitely more time to arrange for the departure of these undesirables. Axis agents accused of espionage, of whom there was a goodly number, were maintained incommunicado during this entire period. The Axis diplomats left on the *Rio Jachal* and the *Cabo de Buena Esperanza*. The *Rio Jachal*, incidentally, was the best vessel of the Argentine merchant fleet and was taken out of ordinary commercial service solely for the purpose of deporting the Axis personnel. It represented a considerable economic loss to Argentina, and if the Argentine Govern-

ment had been desirous of retaining in its territory these representatives of European totalitarianism, a postponement undoubtedly could have been arranged. Moreover, if the Argentine Government were as cynical about its alleged noncooperation as is asserted, it might have taken singular delight in offering hospitality to the German diplomatic agents whom it sent away within a few months after the break.

One of the most important single acts of cooperation, however, was the granting of nonbelligerency status to the United States and to all the American Republics which were at war with the Axis. On December 9, 1941, within 48 hours of Pearl Harbor, the Argentine Government announced that, in its relations with the United States, the latter power would be treated as a nonbelligerent. It was a fiction, of course, but an important one, since it meant that American warships could enter Argentine ports for an indefinite period and that American planes could use Argentine airfields and, in general, enjoy the facilities which Argentina could provide. Under international law, a belligerent vessel is allowed a maximum of 48 hours in a neutral harbor, even if its condition demands repairs. If it delays beyond that time, it is subject to internment. When Brazil entered the war, Argentina promptly declared that country's status to be the same as that of the United States. And we should note that this step with reference to the United States was taken before the Rio de Janeiro conference. After Argentina broke with the Axis, all of the American countries were declared nonbelligerent. The significance of this determination can hardly be overemphasized. It is a definite and tangible form of active assistance to the American Republics and very particularly to the United States. If Argentina had been bent on maintaining an absolute neutrality or, worse yet, if she were bent on aiding the Axis, as it is stated, this decree would be senseless and illogical.

Not only did Argentina expel those citizens of the Axis who were deemed undesirable, but on January 28, 1944, she issued a decree forbidding the extension of visas to nationals of the Axis countries or of Axis origin, even if they ostensibly bore another nationality. This was devised to avoid the admission to Argentine territory of persons from the Axis countries or those who might, under guise of another nationality, serve Axis interests.

An even more important form of aid to the United Nations was the supplying of foodstuffs and strategic materials to the United States, Great Britain, and the other American Republics, many of which found themselves in dire need as a result of the suspension of much of the normal transportation on which they depended.

This collaboration took various forms. Some of these measures were in conformity with resolutions of the Rio conference. Resolution 3, for instance, provides for appropriate exports to other American countries. Prior to the conference, Argentina signed an agreement with the United States in which it obligated itself to sell its exportable tungsten exclusively to the United States. The United States thus received the benefit of Argentine tungsten, as well as certain oils necessary for the war, whose exportation has constituted a serious sacrifice for the Argentine people. In conformity with Resolution 4 of the Rio conference on economic and financial matters, the Argentine Government authorized a national tanker to carry oil between Brazilian ports to solve the acute shortage of combustibles in that Republic. The petroleum resources of Argentina were limited, constituting perhaps about half of what is necessary for local consumption. Nevertheless, at the instigation of the United States, she agreed to supply the needs of Uruguay and Paraguay in return for the necessary drilling material. Late in 1943, at the urgent request of Brazil, whose southern states were in dire need and had wheat reserves for only 2 or 3 weeks, Argentina ordered the immediate embarkation of cereals to the port of Santos, even though it meant diverting two vessels of the fleet already obligated for service elsewhere. Even more important was the collaboration of Argentina in the extreme food shortage in Rio de Janeiro and other Brazilian cities during September of 1944, when the Brazilian Government begged Argentina for relief from this crisis. The Argentine Government authorized the immediate shipment of 5,000 tons of meat to Brazil.

The most curious commentary on this economic cooperation and the way in which economics and politics sometimes function miles apart is the announcement concerning Argentine wheat imports into the United States, contained in an Associated Press dispatch of July 27, 1944, the day after the Peluffo speech caused such a furor. The Department of Agriculture in Washington announced that before the end of September 1944 the United States would import 10,000,000 bushels of Argentine corn for its own use and that of several other American countries. Mr. Wallace MacMonnies, of the Food Administration, announced that these shipments would also serve the needs of Venezuela and Mexico, both of which were short of corn. It was indicated that in the distribution Mexico might receive 240,000 bushels and Puerto Rico, 300,000 bushels. The statement closed with the following words, "Argentine corn will help feed the coastal areas of the United States." It is noteworthy, first, that the United States did not refuse to trade with Argentina in spite of the talk of sanctions, and, secondly, that a restriction of Argentine commerce would unquestionably have affected most seriously the food situation of many of the other Latin-American countries.

Most readers have not considered the economic importance of Argentina as an exporting nation. Her influence in the southern part of South America flows from the fact that her export trade is vital to the surrounding republics. Argentine meat, wheat, and similar products are indispensable for the actual existence of Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Chile. Brazil has come to depend more and more on importations from Argentina and, for the first time in history, far-away Mexico is developing a thriving trade with Argentina, with vessels of the merchant fleet flying the Argentine flag putting in every month in Tampico, Vera Cruz, and Acapulco. El Universal Gráfico, of Mexico City, under date of November 2, 1944, reported gleefully that "The problem of the scarcity of wheat, which no amount of effort by the authorities has solved, will be largely overcome by the arrival within a few days of thousands of tons from Argentina." Instead of a cessation of trade through alleged political antipathy, the contrary was taking place, especially with countries heretofore outside the immediate economic orbit of Argentina. This was done in spite of the statement of Minister Ezequel Padilla in Habana in October of that year that Mexico was already applying sanctions against Argentina. As has been indicated, the surrounding countries depend on Argentina to such a degree that an Uruguayan economist has observed half seriously and half facetiously that if Argentine tourists ceased to frequent the beaches around Montevideo, the Urguayan people would starve to death.

Resolution 4 of the Rio conference dealt with transportation. Argentina fulfilled this agreement to the letter. All Argentine vessels, and there were about 40 in the Flota Mercante del Estado, were mobilized for the movement of materials of interest to the United States. No Argentine vessels went to Europe nor was there any trade whatever by means of national boats with any other part of the world except South and North America. Argentine trade with Europe depended entirely on Spanish, British, Greek, and other vessels. Seventy-five percent of all merchant tonnage was assigned exclusively to the United States and 25 percent to the other American republics. The vessels of the Argentine fleet which plied between Buenos Aires and American ports, especially New Orleans, carried only what was assigned to them by the War Shipping Board. On their return to Buenos Aires, they transported only what the American Government authorized them to take. It should be mentioned that in spite of the tirades directed against the political set-up in Buenos Aires, commerce continued on its merry way and the Argentine vessels leaving New Orleans were by no means empty, nor were those which arrived from this so-called Fascist-minded nation. Argentina improved rail communication with the neighboring countries to facilitate the transportation of vital foodstuffs. At Argentine expense, rail lines with Bolivia and Chile were increased. The Transandine over the Uspallata Pass was revamped and a new road by way of Socompa built to connect with Antofagasta. In Bolivia, work took place on the railroad from Tacuiba on the Argentine frontier to Santa Cruz. The Ferrocarriels del Estado, the Argentine national railways, made every sacrifice to carry food to countries which could otherwise not provide for their people.

On January 27, 1944, the Argentine Government suspended completely all financial and commercial relations with the Axis Powers and with territories controlled by them. Resolution 5 of the

Rio conference provided in its two parts for effective steps toward the suspension of such relations and means for preventing any form of commercial advantage in the Americas through subterfuge or chicanery of one sort or another.

Decree No. 1875 of January 27 suspended all such relations. Long before this, Argentina had already embarked on the road to the severance of commercial ties with the Axis. On April 18, 1940—Decree 60569—the transfer of funds to Norway and Denmark was forbidden. On May 6, 1940—decree 61707—the same restriction was placed on Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. In July 1940—decree 67305—a complete restriction was placed on the transfer of all funds abroad. On December 19, 1941, 12 days after Pearl Harbor, all direct or indirect commercial operations were curtailed between Argentina and Japan. A series of decrees followed to prevent reexportation or any procedure the purpose of which was to violate the definite restriction. The second part of the resolution deals with Axis firms or interests within the American republics. On January 9, 1942—Decree 110790—provision was made for the strictest supervision of all commercial transactions by persons of Axis nationality. Various provisions were included to make it impossible for them to do business outside Argentina or to transfer funds of any description abroad. A second decree—110791—provided for the transfer to such areas as the Government might deem fit of persons attempting to violate these regulations. Another resolution of May 2, 1942, tightened the whole system up further.

The number of German firms whose activities were curtailed or entirely eliminated was considerable. The Argentine Government did not allow Axis business houses to flourish untrammeled. As a matter of fact there was practically no conceivable way to communicate between Argentina and Europe except the thin trickle of neutral vessels which plied back and forth, all of which functioned with navicerts granted by Great Britain. In order to control funds and deposits a decree of June 15, 1943, provided that persons having dealings with non-American nations or carrying accounts must make full information about them available to the Banco Central. Further decrees imposed severe penalties for those carrying on commercial transactions which might be detrimental to continental security. As a result of this law, 13 firms passed under direct Government control.

Argentina has been accused of taking full advantage of the business opportunities provided by the war. The statement has been made that the contribution of Argentina has been merely good business and bigger profits and that consequently it would be absurd to speak of sacrifice. In this same way firms which obtained war contracts or responded to the impetus given American business generally might all be accused of simply making money out of the war. Argentina prospered because she was so placed, with large surpluses of food, as to be able to do business where others could not. But there is another side to this story and one that ought to be widely known.

Argentina did not merely sell merchandise and pocket the profits; she was generous in the gifts she made to the devastated countries of Europe. Great Britain, as the purchasing agent of the United Nations in Argentina, has taken vast amounts of meat and other foodstuffs. All profits were retained to Argentina's credit in London to cover payments of such exportations as Britain might make. As these were small during the war, Argentina held in London a balance of some 62,000,000 pounds sterling. The importance of this exportation of food to England could hardly be overestimated. The British people lived on Argentine meat and, parenthetically, thousands of American troops in the British Isles might have been in a bad way were it not for the constant flow of Argentine food, which became, in due time, lend-lease in reverse to benefit American fighting men. Argentina made outright gifts of huge food stores to the devastated nations. Her Government placed 150,000 tons at the disposal of the International Wheat Board. Through the International Red Cross 50,000 tons of wheat were shipped to Greece in April 1944. On June 7, immediately after the occupation of Rome, the Argentine Government extended a credit of 5,000,000 pesos for the feeding and sanitation of Rome. On August 24, 1944, the Argentine Government offered the people of France, as a gift, 100,000 tons of wheat and 5,000 tons of meat. Prior to these substantial gifts to Greece, France, and Rome, Argentina had provided large amounts of basic foodstuffs for Finland and Norway. Not one cent was received for any of these materials nor did this activity represent in any respect whatever a commercial transaction. The actual arrangements for getting the food over were made through London and outside the UNRRA. This fact provides an interesting commentary in the whole policy of the United States toward Argentina, which, in spite of what may be said of British cooperation, is merely forcing Argentina more and more into British arms.

The last of these 15 points which show the cooperation of Argentina with the Allied Powers was the attitude of Argentina toward the occupied countries—a policy which reveals eloquently the absence of any sympathy for the Axis and much less for an active effort to aid the common enemy. Argentina carried out the Rio Resolution 38 in the nonrecognition of territories taken by force, by recognizing the Danish Legation in Buenos Aires as the legitimate government of Denmark when the chief of this diplomatic mission declared himself independent of Copenhagen. The same was done in the case of Norway, Holland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, and Greece, all of whose exiled governments received full Argentine recognition. Argentina was, moreover, the only American republic which recognized the state of war between reconquered Italy and Germany after the capitulation and the proclamation of the puppet government of northern Italy. Argentina was the only Latin-American state to establish relations with the government of Victor Emmanuel upon restoration of a free Italy.

The second fundamental question that is raised regarding the Argentine regime is whether it was in reality the Nazi-Fascist arrangement it has been accused of being.

An objective observer must fit the crisis of June 1943 and the rise of the military power since that date into the general background of both Argentine history and the broad experience of all Latin America. Military dictatorship has a long and dishonorable tradition in that part of the world. Since the dawn of independence caudillos and those dubbed euphemistically liberators, regenerators, and deliverers have more often than not sprung from the ranks of the army. The army has been the sesame to politics and to high position. The military clique has developed into a standard institution. The rank of general is almost as necessary to admittance to political life as is the doctorate in the United States if one aspires to teach in an institution of higher learning. Argentina, like the rest of Latin America, experienced its era of dictatorship, of anarchy, and of rule by the man on horseback. During the first part of the last century, until 1863, this state of affairs was virtually endemic in Argentina. But after the middle of the century this Republic snapped out of the chronic civil war and made vast progress toward political and economic stability. The events which led to the latest military uprising are too complex to permit analysis here. Suffice it to say that the military had not disappeared and that, in the hour of crisis, this element came forward to lead the nation out of the wilderness.

The Farrell regime was strictly military. Its leaders were army officers. They were blessed—or condemned—as the case may be, by the military mentality, which obviously has its limitations. Their vision of the world and of man was not the most ample. They reflected the powerful nationalism of their country and their almost blatant pride in her achievements. They partook of the arrogance which is not entirely absent from the Argentine character. But to say that they are dominated by a Nazi mentality, or bowed to the ideology of Mussolini, is far from correct. It would be more accurate to say that they conceived of administration very much in terms of the barracks and of the mission of their country to be complete self-determination, dependence on no one, and as much isolationism as is reasonably possible. Military rule does not make fascism. In Latin America military rule is simply the rule by the strong and the powerful, minus all such complexities and subtleties as a program or creed. The Argentine dictatorship possessed very few of the indispensable attributes of nazism or fascism. It is just plain military dictatorship à la latino-américaine, unmixed with Nazi-Fascist complications.

The regime presided over by Gen. Edelmiro Farrell and supported by his fellow officers was an executive government, since the congress no longer functioned. Political parties were left in a state of suspended animation, at least for the time being. No other features existed, however, that would conjure up in the mind of anyone the externals and much less the essence of Nazi-fascism.

There was no single party with the mechanism of the National Sozialistische Partei; there was certainly little taint of racism to be found anywhere. There was no element of totalitarianism in the structure of the state or of the constitution, since the regular republican constitution was not touched in a single line of its text. The government of General Farrell declared over and over again that it was a transitory phase and would abandon office in the near future. There was no systematic affront to the dignity of the human person. The ordinary Argentine citizen was not strait-jacketed into a rigid system in which he became a mere automaton and pawn of the state. There was no attempt to create mysticism along the lines of the Rosenberg effusions.

We can analyze this phase of the existing regime from various points of view. First of all, the Farrell government maintained respect for the constitution and for the national courts. In a recent article which appeared generally in the Latin-American press, Rafael Ordorica, of the Associated Press, writing from La Paz, Bolivia, says: "President Gualberto Villarroel has obtained the recognition of all the American republics, Great Britain and the rest of the United Nations. This is the principal difference between his regime and that of Edelmiro Farrell in Argentina. Another difference is that in Buenos Aires, the military government, powerful as it is, functions within the framework of the constitution and the restrictions imposed on extra-constitutional acts."

In the second place, the judiciary was left intact with its faculties unimpaired. An example of the independence of this branch of the government is the fact that, in a case involving a British corporation which the military government wished to expropriate—the Companiá Primitiva de Gas—the supreme court declared the proposed expropriation unconstitutional and the military government was forced to back down. One of the essential features of the totalitarian set-up on the other side of the water was the complete concentration of all authority in the executive branch.

It is well to reflect on the difference between this state of things and that in Brazil, where the Vargas dictatorship was infinitely more rigorous than the Argentine. In 1937, Getulio Vargas promulgated a completely revised constitution, eliminating virtually all autonomy on the part of the states and creating what is known officially as the Estado Novo, that is, the new order. The restrictions on the press, on freedom of expression and the like, were infinitely stricter in Brazil than in Argentina. If we were entirely consistent and logical, our anti-totalitarian ire would have been less concentrated on Argentina and would include perhaps other Latin-American nations whose regimes have been every bit as dictatorial as the Argentine and in some cases much more so.

A good index of the character of a regime is the expression to which it gives voice regarding its intention, temper, and goals. The Argentine regime was depicted as violently bellicose. From time to time the press informed us that its avowed purpose was the conquest of the neighboring states and the realization of a long pent-up desire for Lebensraum. What were the facts as far as we can perceive them?

Over and over again, the Argentine leaders reiterated the absence of any imperialist intentions. Perón, in press declarations, emphasized a greater degree of self-sufficiency as the national goal. General Farrell in his speech of July 19, 1944, stated bluntly: "I promise no hostile act or aggression against any country." Chilean military men have been given full opportunity to visit Argentine military establishments in Patagonia, from which Argentine imperialists would supposedly launch the attack on the neighboring country. Gen. Jacinto Ochoa Rios, of Chile, director of the war factories of that Republic, visited Argentina a few months later with full facilities for inspecting similar establishments in the latter Republic. The accusation that Argentina was seeking to increase its armed strength through the development of war industries was entirely true. Argentina has received no benefits from lend-lease. Every other American republic has been modernizing and mechanizing its army with the aid of the United States. Brazil, Uruguay, and Chile have been the recipients of this assistance, which is transforming their armed force into an up-to-date organization. For what purpose? For the protection of the Hemisphere, it is said. Can we expect Argentina, deprived of all such aid, to do nothing about placing her navy and army on a somewhat comparable basis? Can we expect the Argentine Government to stand by while Brazil is turned into an armed camp and take no steps, even the modest ones of which she is capable, in the direction of improving her national defense?

Let it be borne in mind, too, the history of aggression in South America—of expansionism, if you will—is not on the Argentine side. No nation has had a more pacific development. The latest international war involving directly vital Argentine interests was waged against Brazil in 1823, with Uruguay as the bone of contention. The War of the Triple Alliance in which Barteleme Mitre led the Argentine forces against Paraguay at the side of Brazil and Uruguay, was not provoked by Argentina but began as a Brazilian-Paraguayan quarrel over Uruguay. Argentina entered after the Paraguayan President, Francesco López, invaded the Province of Corrientes. The record of Brazil as an expansionist power is stronger than that of Argentina. Look at the map and observe that Brazil occupies half of the South American continent. Her territorial expansion has included territories taken from Paraguay and Bolivia and frequent intervention in the affairs of Uruguay. The tradition of a nation is of primary importance in judging the temper of her people. The Argentine people have a long and honorable record for abstinence from international disputes and for the peaceful settlement of those that have arisen such, for example, as the boundary controversy with Chile.

On September 30, 1944, General Farrell spoke over a nation-wide hook-up to the Argentine people. One significant passage in this address merits quotation, to give some hint of the ideology behind the present regime:

> The spiritual content of our national unity is based on the universal culture to which we all belong as members of the Western world. In this government's program, religious values hold an extremely high place. The Revolution has sought to interpret faithfully the traditional sentiments of the people and has translated into action those evidences of faith which distinguished civilized communities from totalitarian paganism.

The speech was for local consumption only and indicates that, for one thing, the Farrell regime was very far from professing the anti-Christian, anti-occidental concepts which were inherent in Nazism. There was no note of official anti-Semitism in the program of the Argentine government. Buenos Aires possesses a large Jewish population and no small number of the most distinguished of Argentine men of letters are of Jewish extraction. There is anti-Semitism in the form of attacks and calumnies in certain publications such as Clarinada. This is no index, however, of the official position any more than the existence of the propaganda of the Silver Shirts in the United States or of the Ku Klux Klan in its day reflected the official attitude of the United States toward the Jews. One positive proof of how far the Farrell regime was from professing anti-Semitism was to be found in the resignation of Baldrich, former minister of Public Instruction, who was suspected of pro-Axis sentiments and his replacement by Rómule Echeverri Boneo who authorized, among other things, that Jewish children in the state-supported schools should be free to attend all of the religious exercises of their faith without such absence being counted against them.

The idea that Argentina would serve as refuge for Nazi leaders was exploited day after day in the American press. No amount of denial on the part of the responsible Argentine officials made any perceptible difference. The assumption was simply made that, of course, once the Reich collapsed, Hitler and his henchmen would take up a bucolic existence in one of the Argentine provinces. Argentine declarations on this point were categorical. On September 5, 1944, the Argentine chargé d'affaires in Washington disclaimed any intention on the part of his Government of offering a sanctuary to war criminals. On September 28, of that year, the Argentine Embassy in London, on direct instructions from the Government in Buenos Aires, stated flatly that no refuge would be given for Axis criminals. The statement added more importantly still that the Argentine Government would deny all opportunity for the investment of Axis capital or the acquisition of property by Axis citizens. We accepted the similar statements of Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, and Spain, but assumed that the Argentine Government was not stating its real intentions when it declared so categorically that the Republic would offer no asylum to fleeing Nazis.

The gradual emancipation of the press after the first impact of the military movement was clear. Freedom of the

press constitutes, we are told, another essential condition of democracy as against totalitarianism. If Argentina were Nazi-Fascist, then we would expect to find a completely curtailed and muzzled press, with no latitude whatever in presenting anything but the unilateral interpretation of what is going on. On August 9, 1944, all restrictions were lifted on the national press, with a very few exceptions. Foreign press news was free to be sent abroad. On October 17, all foreign language newspapers of pro-Axis tendency were suppressed, notably the Deutsch La Plata Zeitung, and the Mattino d'Italia. One of the main accusations against Argentina was that it allowed the publication of newspapers of open and avowed hostility to the Allied cause. Until the recent suppression, that was true. There was considerable latitude for criticism of the United Nations and papers, such as El Cabildo La Fronda and others, exploited this to the maximum degree. This charge, however, is weak from one angle. In other American Republics there are papers, great and small, which continued to flourish, and their governments were not called to task for allowing them to survive even though they are openly anti-United Nations. The Mexican Government, for example, was never asked to suppress such newspapers as Omega and El Hombre Libre which were completely antidemocratic. No one asked that the Diaria de la Marina be proscribed in Habana because of its vigorous support of Franco Spain.

An examination of the leading Argentine papers is an interesting study in just how free they really were. I have gone over issues of La Nación and La Prensa for many weeks during the summer and early autumn months of 1944. One of the extraordinary features of this press was that it published in full the text and commentaries from the United States, denunciatory of its own government. Editorial comments from New York and Washington, the full statements of the Secretary of State, and the press reactions from all of the other American Republics were quoted in toto. A casual selection can be made to substantiate this point. La Nación reproduced, on July 28, 1944, for instance, a vitriolic article by Dr. Juan Andres Ramírez, published in El Plata, of Montevideo, in which there was a more than liberal sprinkling of the terms "traitor," "Nazi-Fascist," "prototalitarian," and the like. It quoted in full an article by Jacinto Fombona in El Nacional, of Caracas, urging sanctions against the Argentine despots and usurpers. It quoted an editorial from the Longview (Wash.) Daily News, describing the will to conquer of the Argentine Government. No matter how violent the reactions abroad, the Argentine newspapers gave their thousands of readers a full and complete picture. There was no coloring, no playing down, no attempt to put the best interpretation on a denunciation. The Buenos Aires newspaper published the war bulletin of all the powers, exactly as does the New York Times. Anti-Communist as the regime supposedly was, the bulletins from Moscow were given the same attention as all the rest. There was nothing in the news items or editorial comment to indicate any restriction on this score. Moreover, the great Argentine newspapers have felt free to comment editorially on acts of the Government and to raise points in criticism regarding matters in which they are in disagreement.

Did organized labor support the government or was it forced underground? Some labor elements were unquestionably opposed to the regime. The more leftist of the groups, especially those of the socialistic persuasion, opposed it. On the other hand, vast numbers of organized labor manifested a strong support of the Farrell ménage. Late in July 1944 this labor section demonstrated its solidarity in a series of meetings held all over the Republic and in giant parades in the city of Buenos Aires. The position of labor in supporting General Farrell was summarized under four points: First, international policy as in line with commitments; second, self-determination and complete sovereignty of Argentina; third, the efforts to attain economic independence and, fourth, a rejection of the implication of pro-Nazi activity. This declaration was subscribed to by an enormous number of labor unions and affiliated bodies. It would be impossible to list them all. A few may be selected and their Spanish names given to avoid any suspicion of juggling: Confederación Nacional de Trabajo; Union Ferroviaria; La Fraternidad; Asociación de Obreros cerveceros; Asociación de personal de Hospitales; Sindicato Obrero de la Industria del Calzado; Federación de Obreros Portuarios Obreros de la Construcción. This is a mere sampling to indicate the wide variety of labor organizations involved. The more recent election of Gen. Juan Perón has revealed the extraordinary support of Argentine labor.

The attitude of the United States has been one of uninterrupted and unconcealed hostility to the Argentine Government with a constant application of the worst kind of needling and irritants. What has been the reason for this? What has this country expected to get out of the antagonism to Argentina? Has the rest of Latin America been strongly behind us in the effort to ostracize and isolate Argentina? These are fundamental questions which any American citizen sincerely interested in preserving the tremendous good of the good-neighbor policy achieved over the past 10 years must seek to answer. The bold assertion that Argentina is a danger to our security, a menace to our institutions, and a cancer on the body politic of Latin America simply does not stand criticism. However bad we may think its government is, there are several other American republics with governments which reek to high heaven and with whom we are on terms of bosom friendship. We had no objection to the automatic Hernández Martinez of El Salvador who in years past had no compunctions in mowing down thousands of workingmen for the sole reason that they opposed his tactics and methods. We supported Juan Vincente Gomez for years on end in Venezuela, and Machado in Cuba, whose regime was literally unspeakable. And yet we suddenly get very squeamish over the Argentine regime and go off in a temper every time that Government takes a step which we interpret as unfriendly to us.

There have been only four conceivable reasons why the United States has put the heat on Argentina over these years. Those reasons are as follows: First, to force Argentina to declare war on the Axis; second, to force the Argentine people to change their government by revolution and put one in office pleasing to us; third, to oust the military and replace them with civilians; and fourth, to admit unrestricted United States domination in the economic life of Argentina, which, by implication means the ousting of British and other European interests.

The first of these reasons collapses of its own weight. If we were following the policy of threats and epithets to get Argentina to declare war, then in all good logic we ought to have quit when she did so. The second question is more important. Have we invited the Argentine people to throw their government out by force? Everything pointed clearly to this since our Department of State proclaimed that it would not treat with the wicked men in Buenos Aires until such a time as the composition of the Argentine Government changed. If this is not an overt invitation to revolution, it would be difficult to find one anywhere. And the most grievous aspect of the thing is that we were butting in on the domestic affairs of another people in the most obvious, direct, and outrageous manner. It was nothing but a clear-cut violation of the concept of de facto government and nonintervention in the domestic affairs of another people.

Mr. Sumner Welles, in his able and illuminating articles, has scotched this conception. The use of intervention is a dangerous weapon and usually works in exactly the opposite way to the one intended. It fortifies the Government against which it is directed; it arouses the national pride of the people, and obliges them, for good or for ill, to support that Government, so that they cannot give into foreign pressure. We have strengthened the Argentine Government by every declaration that has emanated from Washington. We did everything in our power to assure the perpetuity of the Farrell regime and probably accomplished the incredible result of making that regime actually popular. We applied the most utterly inadequate method for obtaining results that could be conceived and we got exactly what we might expect: The antagonism of the Argentine, the bitter resentment of its people, and the fear and not too well concealed anxiety of the rest of Latin America. Pressure politics, high-handed treatment, threats of economic extinction and nonrecognition—these are the time-honored methods of the strong against the weak, of the imperialist against the nation seeking to preserve its national integrity. Where are the sacrosanct declarations of Montevideo and of the conferences since then? Where is the rigid respect for the self-determination of another state, even if it chooses to elect the worst kind of government? If we have been seeking merely to convert the Argentine Govern-

ment from military rule to the civil, our policy has no leg to stand on. Half of the Latin-American States are under military rule and if we start getting sanctimonious about army officers, we shall have to break with a dozen Latin-American States: Paraguay, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Mexico itself.

The last of the four reasons bears the stamp of being a real one. The United States has given considerable hints it would welcome the ousting of alien economic interests in Argentina. Under the surface there can be no doubt of the tugging and pulling of American and British commercial interests in that country. It may be that we are fundamentally interested in keeping the Western Hemisphere nice and clean for American trade with no poachers allowed.

Argentina is powerful economically. Her whole economic life is geared to Europe. She enjoys prosperity and produces food not only in abundance for her own people but in vast quantities for exportation. She stands on her own feet commercially and here, precisely, is the rub. In this connection it is well to observe the attitude of the rest of Latin America on these matters. The idea that the 19 Latin-American nations besides Argentina were for sanctions, nonrecognition, and general pressure is not borne out by the facts. There has been no unanimity on the fundamental point of nonrecognition of Farrell. Four South American republics maintained full and perfectly normal relations with Argentina during the time we refused to recognize her: Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Ecuador. In many of the other cases, while formal recognition was not extended, the Argentine diplomatic mission enjoyed all of the privileges and prerogatives normally extended to recognized countries. Mexico was a case in point. Leftist as Mexico is supposed to be, the Argentine Chargé d'Affaires suffered no restriction in his official contracts with the Mexican Government and was on the lists for every function and for all of the relations which were customarily carried out with the chief of a foreign mission. The Argentine embassy in Brazil was on exactly the same basis. There was none of the rigid nonrelationship which prevailed in Washington, in which the Chargé d'Affaires of Argentina could not communicate officially with the Department of State but did so through the medium of another embassy.

Moreover, country after country in Latin America offered their good offices to iron out the kinks in American-Argentine relations. If they were bent merely on securing the overthrow of the Farrell group this certainly would not be the procedure to follow. The countries which undertook in some form or another to mediate or to obtain an understanding were Mexico, Peru, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, and Ecuador. The last country made three separate gestures toward this end. President Trujillo proposed the offices of the smaller republics of the West Indies and Central America for this purpose. They were promptly and abruptly slapped down by an indignant Washington. None of these gestures received any consideration whatever.

Why did Latin America continue to try to bridge the gap between the United States and Argentina? For the simple reason that the state of affairs was intolerable and the uneasiness among all of them steadily growing. Let us note a specific point. The Hull declaration of July 26, 1944, on the danger of Argentina in time of war was supported by official declaration from exactly 6 of the 19 republics: Guatemala, Salvador, Peru, Cuba, Colombia, and Venezuela. The Hull declaration of September 7, of the same year, which condemned Argentina as a focus of danger for all times was supported by official statements from exactly none of the other American Republics. Did this not indicate a perfect meeting of minds?

Evidences of cordiality and even warmth between Argentina and the other republics were by no means lacking. On August 25, 1944, for example, the Uruguayan national holiday, President Amézaga of that country exchanged with Edelmiro Farrell, the most cordial of felicitations, distinguished by the unaccustomed personal emotion contained in these ordinarily rigid official communications. Farrell on this occasion repeated his oft-stated intention of never violating Uruguayan independence. Brazil and Argentina carried on a surreptitious flirtation for many months. O Journal of Rio under date of July 28, 1944, praised in effusive terms the peace and good relations with Argentina. The same paper in two striking editorials spoke in undeniably cordial terms of the need for rapprochement with Argentina. Later in the year a delegation of Brazilian newspapermen, invited officially by the Argentine Government, visited Buenos Aires. They were from Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, and Uruguayana on the Argentine-Brazilian frontier—evidence perhaps that Argentina was not on the verge of pulling a Sudeten irredentist stunt on the unsuspecting Brazilians. This delegation provoked an outburst of camaraderie from the Argentine press and Government. The delegation presented the Argentine President with an Argentine flag, made and embroidered in Brazil. A trivial incident, perhaps? But tremendously significant as an indication of the way the wind blows.

Argentine-Chilean relations in the economic field have boomed and flourished. In August of 1944, the Instituto de Economía of Chile, a government organization, urged the development of a wide program of importation of Argentine meats. This did not smack of economic sanctions. La Nacion, of Buenos Aires, in an editorial of August 5, 1944, expressed satisfaction in the increasing economic ties with Chile and pointed out the extraordinary welcome given Argentine capital in the copper and iron mines of the neighboring country. It would be impossible to cite, within the scope of this article, the numerous expressions of the Latin-American press favorable to Argentina. In Mexico City, where official statements and the press generally have not gone overboard for Argentina, one of the most distinguished and independent of Mexican writers, Salvador Noro, who could not conceivably be accused of fascism, fifth columnism, or falangism, wrote in his column in Novedades—September 30 and October 10, 1944—regarding Argentina. He noted the growing downward trend in the good-neighbor policy and spoke of Secretary Hull as "deplorably and irritably violent with reference to Argentina." If one reflects on the fact that the Mexican press is extremely hesitant to make even the slightest criticism of this Nation's foreign policy, the importance of these comments is even more striking.

We turn to the British reaction. Here, I suspect, is the essence of the whole question. How did British opinion react to the American policy? The British press was full of comment and most of it never reached the American reader. Some of it was nothing short of startling and ought to be known in this country. The general trend was to fight shy of any anti-Argentina commitments for two basic reasons: British capital investment in that republic, and British consumption of Argentine food, without which the population of the United Kingdom would have been, to put it very mildly, in an extremely tight spot.

The British press and responsible journals look at the question candidly and concluded that it was best to let it alone. The idea of sanctions certainly aroused no glee on the other side of the water. In a wire to the New York Times from London, dated July 28, 1944, it was stated that—

> The suggestions made by some correspondents in Washington that Great Britain might apply economic sanctions are considered with incredulity in London financial and trade circles.

The Sunday Observer, in July 1944, noted that—

> Great Britain should be prudent in the matter of sanctions since it depends much more on the Argentine than does the United States.

The Southampton Journal, of August 5, 1944, spoke out quite frankly:

> If the United States Department of State had wished to fortify the position of the Argentine Government, its accusations could not have been better timed. It is hard to see Washington's intentions. From the Argentine point of view, the basic question is the respect for national sovereignty and the right of a people to decide freely its own conduct. This is one of the principles which has determined entrance into this war.

The Economist of London, in August 1944, spoke out:

> The United States and England are mutually suspicious of each other. England suspects imperialism; the United States suspects exclusion from the Argentine market.

The same journal extended its comments further:

> The simplest arguments against sanctions is that they would fortify Farrell. Moreover, an economic war would cause more harm to the United Nations than to Argentina. Argentine hides and meat, without mentioning other articles, are vital to Great Britain. It is doubtful that restrictions would bring Argentina to her knees, since she has reserves and can wait until the not distant end of the war in Europe, when the hungry nations of the ravished continent will look to her ample stocks of food.

The pungency and potency of this argument can escape no one. This sedate journal concluded by saying that—

The United Nations should not single out Argentina when economic war has not been waged on Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, Ireland, or Turkey. Great Britain is no longer in a position to break carelessly with Argentina.

The number of quotations could be multiplied ad infinitum. It is plain that the British press did not consider that the application of economic sanctions would immediately produce the exit of the Fascists from office.

The New York Post editorialized on July 28, 1944, that "if we cease business with Argentina we seal the destiny of the Farrell regime and provoke its downfall. The Argentine people in their disillusionment will expel the Fascists." This is far from the truth. We could cut off every bit of commerce with Argentina: we could clamp down every sanction about which we have any knowledge; we could exclude every dollar from flowing to Buenos Aires, and the net result would not be strangulation. We do not dominate the economy of Argentina. We cannot take measures of a drastic kind which would prove effective unless we actually blockade Argentine waters and cut off her shipping with the rest of the world. We cannot actually force Argentina to make a change, short of war And certainly no American in his right mind contemplates such an alternative.

If one analyzes the structure of Argentine economy it is clear that if sanctions were to be effective they will have to be applied by a group of about nine powers, the combination of which under the present circumstances is just about impossible. These states are Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, Bolivia, and Chile in South America, with the United States, Great Britain, Spain, and Sweden outside South America.

A brief table on the status of Argentine foreign trade will illustrate the point graphically:

EXPORTS

[Millions of pesos]

Period	British Empire	United States	Brazil	Other American countries	Sweden
1937-39	577	221	86	62	30
1941	553	562	83	138	16
1942	689	492	102	220	72
1943	894	498	138	323	60

IMPORTS

1937-39	371	284	51	90	27
1941	314	370	123	169	22
1942	264	329	190	142	81
1943	222	150	169	123	83

These figures speak for themselves. They show the tremendous exports to the United Kingdom in a steady increase between 1937 and 1943. They show a goodly increase of exports to the United States which are much heavier than the imports. The proponents of sanctions would have to explain just how they are going to hurt Argentina by cutting off trade when in 1943, the United States imported 498,000,000 pesos of Argentine products and Argentina imported exactly 150,000,000 pesos of American goods. Notice, too, the increase in trade to Brazil and the other American republics; from 62,000,000 in the case of the latter in 1937-39, to 323,000,000 in 1943. The figures for imports show an equally healthy increase.

Let us reflect on the fact that Argentina held in 1944 a favorable balance of nearly 400,000,000 pesos with Great Britain and then speculate on how far the British were willing to go in putting on the screws. Argentina has become more and more industrialized and has found it possible to curtail substantially her imports of manufactured products. For example, the country imported 146,000 tons of textiles in 1939, while in 1943 the amount was 63,000 tons. Iron products in the same 2 years dropped from 693,000 tons to 76,000. Rubber goods from 14,000 to 1,000. The production figures on industry show that between 1935 and 1943, Argentine manufacturing increased over a hundred percent. The total production figures for 1935, in millions of pesos was 3,330 while in 1943 it had increased to 7,800. To show how important this industrial activity became, one may contrast it with the production in agriculture and cattle raising, which in 1943 were 1,600 and 1,750, respectively. All this adds up to one thing: that Argentina made vast strides in self-sufficiency during the years since the commencement of the war in Europe and that there can be no question of starving into submission the 15,000,000 Argentine citizens.

The story of agitated and tightened Argentine-American relations does not end with the close of 1944. Recognition came reluctantly after that. Accusations of Nazi influence continued, culminating in the Blue Book. General Perón became the favored target of attack and diatribe. The United States showed up badly in the long run. The examination of the Argentine case is indispensable if the full story of inter-American relations is to be understood. Aside from all that has been said regarding the conduct of the Farrell regime and what could be said regarding Perón and the new government, there is still the highly important question of whether this policy of pressure and frontal attack produced the results that were planned. We could assume, for the sake of argument, that the Argentine government in the past few years has been every bit as bad as it has been depicted; the fact remains that nothing that we tried produced the result that we professed to achieve. It is not merely question of fact, but of tactics and techniques. The story of what happened since the revolution of June 1943 can lead only to one conclusion: that somehow, in some form, we have set inter-American relations back a long, long time.

I wish to extend to Richard Pattee, and the University Press, Notre Dame, Ind., credit and thanks for supplying me the material for this insertion.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, February 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, to hold hearings on House Joint Resolution 134, providing for relief assistance to countries devastated by war. The meeting will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(Tuesday, February 25, to Friday, February 28, 1947)

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m. each morning.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

There will be a meeting of the full Committee on Armed Services at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, in room 313, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, in executive session, in the committee room, suite 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, in the committee room, 1301 New House

Office Building, to consider the matter of the disposition of permanent war housing under the Lanham Act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

388. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fifth annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940); to the Committee on Public Lands.

389. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed loan of certain captured enemy ordnance and equipment to the Navy Club of the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

390. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to authorize certain persons assigned by the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations to be reappointed to the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

391. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, stating that section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, and that no reservations pursuant to section 13 of this act were made during the calendar year of 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

392. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games; to the Committee on Armed Services.

393. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ending December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

394. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presented to Secretary Krug by the Bureau of Reclamation of this Department on August 6, 1946, on the Central Valley Federal reclamation project in California (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2102. A bill to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide that any service rendered and any deductions made or taxes paid by any person under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, any other Federal retirement act, or the Social Security Act, may be credited to such person for the purposes of any other such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 2157. A bill to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALMOND:

H. R. 2158. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to activities of police or fire departments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2159. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2160. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2161. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190); to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2162. A bill to create a United States Foreign Legion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2163. A bill to provide for exclusion from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts received as retirement pay by retired military personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2164. A bill to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to the application of such section to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2165. A bill to emancipate certain Indians of the United States who served in the armed forces during World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2166. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to car service, with particular reference to charges as between carriers or between carriers and other owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2167. A bill to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura water conservation and utilization project of certain lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2168. A bill to provide percentage depletion in the case of barite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2169. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2170. A bill relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOVE:

H. R. 2171. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemptions from $500 to $700 and to reduce by 10 percent the normal tax and surtax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUSK:

H. R. 2172. A bill to extend the loan benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to the widows of persons whose death results from service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2173. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2174. A bill to adjust the rates of pension and compensation payable under the laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration on the basis of the cost of living in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 2175. A bill to require labor organizations which act as collective bargaining representatives to have democratic organization and procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2176. A bill to amend certain provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2177. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2178. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2179. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion, for purposes of calculating benefits under such act, of time spent in vocational rehabilitation by veterans injured while in the armed forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2180. A bill to extend the Reclamation Act to certain Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 2181. A bill relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 2182. A bill to repeal provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 2183. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2184. A bill to amend section 304 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIZLEY:
H. R. 2185. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:
H. R. 2186. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:
H. R. 2187. A bill to limit the importation of shrimp into the United States from Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:
H. R. 2188. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LUSK:
H. R. 2189. A bill to amend section 116 of the Internal Revenue Code (title 22, sec. 116, U. S. C.), as amended, so as to exempt pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:
H. R. 2190. A bill to provide that schools constructed under the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, may be donated to local school agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 2191. A bill to place the position of Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEARHART:
H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution requesting that negotiation be entered into with Denmark for the acquisition of Greenland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution requesting that negotiations be entered into for the acquisition of certain islands in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and in the Caribbean Sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a letter of invitation to the Government and people of Iceland to become a State in the Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EATON:
H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. Res. 113. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk to the majority and minority whips, respectively, to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish the Civilian Production Administration and to promptly terminate all the functions and activities assumed by said agency pursuant to Executive Order No. 9638 or any other order or statute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take no action that would lead to an increase in the wholesale power rates for energy generated at the Federal projects on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds to carry on the construction of Fort Randall and Angostura Reservoirs and to initiate construction on the Oahe Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a memorial requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation authorizing the immediate redemption of bonds issued to the enlisted members of the armed forces for accumulated-leave pay under the terms of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:
H. R. 2192. A bill for the relief of Massman Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:
H. R. 2193. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:
H. R. 2194. A bill for the relief of J. H. Mullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:
H. R. 2195. A bill for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:
H. R. 2196. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Mrs. Fuji Imai (the former Mrs. Fuji Aoki), and her children Michio Aoki, Yoshiko Aoki, and Hisako Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2197. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Kiyoko Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2198. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Susumu Imai, alias Kojiro Toba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:
H. R. 2199. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 2200. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jerzy W. Kaulbersz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2201. A bill for the relief of Antonina Gertruda Lewandowska (Sister Mary Rita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2202. A bill for the relief of Dusan Pejak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2203. A bill for the relief of Maria Rozalia Wiktoria Czarnota (Sister Mary Assisia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:
H. R. 2204. A bill for the relief of Spiros Harry Kefalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2205. A bill for the relief of John or Jan Zahursky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2206. A bill for the relief of Haralambos G. Kaminaris, also known as Harry G. Tsoliatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:
H. R. 2207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROSS:
H. R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Robert Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 2209. A bill for the relief of Chester J. Babcock; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:
H. R. 2210. A bill for the relief of Rex Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:
H. R. 2211. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Alphonse Pellicano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Eustace A. Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:
H. R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Salvatore F. Punnuzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 2216. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tsan Paing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2217. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Mon Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:
H. R. 2218. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

134. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of veterans domiciled at the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Home, Quincy, Ill., and other veterans and citizens of Adams County, Ill., for enactment of H. R. 2859; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

135. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition signed by Mrs. Frank Hammond and 74 other citizens of Pennsville and Chesterhill, Ohio, relative to liquor advertising in newspapers and over the radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Commission on Christian Social Relations, Diocese of New York, urging ratification of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization and appropriating $71,030,000 for its program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

137. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon memorializing the Congress of the United States to abolish the Civilian Production Administration and to promptly terminate all the functions and activities assumed by said agency pursuant to Executive Order No. 9638 or any other order or statute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Transport and Quartermasters' Departments Service Men of the Spanish War, McKinley Fleet, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting favorable report on bills S. 340 and H. R. 886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.